

August 2014 E-dition



The Monthly Amendment

This is the first of monthly editions of The Amendment, available electronically, “e-ditions.” I’ve never heard that term that I recall, but somebody must have used it somewhere. In any event, if I’ve coined it, I hope you enjoy it; the contents, not the name!

Speaking of names, it comes from my book and could be a newsletter, magazine, brochure or what have you; whatever you the reader prefers, it is. This month offers ten topics in each of three areas, the list (*not in order*) below.

Submit suggestions for future issues on the website’s “CONTACT” page. One purpose is to offer what might not be generally known, certain to generate disagreement, the motor of humanity. Other themes will arise as each monthly chapter is digested.

Bon appétit.

Science

1. Telekinesis
8. Crop Circles
6. World Climate
9. Reincarnated
Geometry

Humanity

2. Russia
4. US Politics
10. Predictions & Accuracy

Celebrities

7. Robin Williams
 3. Richard Nixon
 5. Robert Reed
-

1. Telekinesis

Telekinesis is defined as the ability to move objects at a distance by mental power or other non-physical means. “Mind over matter” is what occurs to me; how about you? Does it matter and do you mind? We turn to The Committee.

Q: Esteemed Committee, what does humanity gain from using mental energy to create physical effect?

C: Understanding, principally. The ability to move physical objects with mental ease occurs where the need is do so is irrelevant, for the most part.

Q: What should humans understand from it? If a doubter observes it in such a way s/he truly believes the mental energy is doing it, after having doubted it was possible until that moment, what would be understood?

C: That beliefs support and limit. They create and constrain, prepare yet hold back. You are encapsulated in your beliefs, just as a capsule carries you. It is seen as protection, as a safe enclosure and vessel of movement.

Q: *How would telekinesis expand belief?*

C: View and touch. There it was, now here it is. Touch and feel if you doubt that. Does this not establish it, in the near absolute majority of humans?

Q: *How does telekinesis work? What is the operation, the mechanism, the technique or the procedure? (Boy, that question sounded annoying and pedantic, huh?)*

C: All movement of physicality on Earth is displacement or switching of location. We suggest the elevator of a tall building, to illustrate telekinesis. The elevator is not hoisted by force, which opposes the gravity seeking to draw it towards or hold it on the ground; as anyone briefly familiar with their operation knows, elevators are counterweighted. The motor simply moves the weights, which nearly cancel the effect of gravity, as one weight pulls down to assist the lift.

This occurs with the movement of all things on Earth; the ground beneath humanity might seem fixed in place, but it is not. Earth moves constantly, its orbit not circular but in actuality, a twisting ellipse as Earth, its central star and all planets of your system, traverse space along with your galaxy.

Every object on Earth, in relation to the universe and what is called outer space, is always moving. Telekinesis moves an object before you by causing it to switch places with what formerly occupied its location.

Q: *What formerly occupies the location? A tea cup and saucer on a table, moved a few inches, has what occupy its previous location?*

C: Given the relative velocity of movement of Earth through space, it is the higher density plasma of the area you would perceive to be close to your moon and another planet, if you “wait” just a few minutes. Earth’s relative movement in the universe, which is essentially a high percentage of the movement of the galaxy you occupy, is such that the distance you perceive to reach your moon is crossed in a few seconds of Earth time.

As a telekinesis effect would move the tea cup, the cup’s former location is already well beyond the sphere and atmosphere of Earth. The vibrational energy of your true home traverses this distance with ease and instantaneous effect, so the fraction necessary to descend into human density existence does so easily.

Q: *Can anyone achieve telekinesis like this?*

C: Yes, certainly. The effect of movement of the cup, the table, floor, house, ground and planet underneath is massive, when taken together. The cup alone is miniscule by comparison, and so the telekinetic effect is rapid when frequency of vibration aligns. The brainwave energy moves it easily.

Q: *Is this how magicians can seem to move things through a table?*

C: Yes, entirely.

Q: *Why can’t anybody just do it?*

C: You doubt it is possible until you see it. Then you believe it; that someone else can. You do not believe you can, so you cannot. You must believe you can; once you have this belief, you unlock what the belief has imprisoned. Belief is a steel trap, and strongly holds within itself that which it is asked to restrain.

Q: *Why don’t we all just discard physical beliefs then?*

C: Why don’t you? Who stops you, your parents? This is one way to perpetuate belief in all things, for your primary exposure and learning come from them. If humans were taken from their parents and regularly exposed from birth until several years of age, to the point where physical motor control has been mastered to a great extent, to examples of human mind telekineses, the beliefs it is possible would exist. Humanity would change course in a nearly permanent way. Who among you will allow your children to be raised by those believing and performing telekinesis? If you do not already accept and perform telekinetic acts yourself, we suggest there would be very few takers of such an offer. Because of this telekinesis, as occurs with many beliefs, does not expand. Not yet.

Q: *Not yet? So..what's coming and when?*
C: Belief in it, by demonstration and practice.

Q: *Who will demonstrate it, that will cause a rise in general belief?*
C: Mostly humans, those using anti-gravity devices. The apparatus powered by electricity humans generate will move the object, and the mental energy will then replicate the act, seen previously to be a trick. Once done sufficiently and at the direction of skeptics, lowering suspicion the effect is a trick, it will become far easier to establish the link between the electricity powering the anti-gravity device, as both achieve similar result. This implies what is true; a similar force and mechanical effect. What those of you having studied geometry might call congruence; do you recall?

There will also be extraterrestrial demonstration of telekinetic effect, once the appearance of your physical cousins is at least accepted as not a threat. The minority among humanity yet a majority of readers of these words, will discard any concern of risk your cousin visitors might invoke in others. They will embrace the demonstration, awareness and belief both growing from there.

Q: *How does the telekinetic effect operate, on an object?*
C: Our apology; we did not explain this. Once the mover focuses mental energy and desire upon the object, this begins a synchronization of subatomic frequency resonance between the human mover and the cup. The one is a multiple of the other as the comparison of all things, the one to the other, also reveals the proportions between them. These energies are sporadic and diffused until the focus occurs; physical sight through eye organs is a good way, however a blind human can achieve telekinesis with equal ease. By touching the object, a blind person establishes belief in its existence, just as eye organs and sight do. The alignment of the human mind with the existence of the cup complete, it is but a matter of the electromagnetic energy of your soul, what is and powers your thoughts, to attach to the object. As this occurs, the natural movement of the cup through space is distorted and made to flow along a slightly different route. This new route causes its movement along other lines of direction; what you see as a human is only the shift of direction. You do not see the movement you have, just as you do not see the movement of the table, floor, house and Earth and planet below. These all seem fixed.

We suggest the breeze as it causes a bullet fired from a rifle to deviate from trajectory. The cup moves at even higher velocity than a rifle bullet, but if the rifle itself, the target, the shooter holding the rifle and all things surrounding them also moved along with the bullet, then what humans would see is the bullet shifting an inch or two in position, as it remains in the rifle's chamber, attached to the brass cartridge. The difference in movement is large and rapid, between the bullet and its surroundings, so fleet that it is not seen and nearly impossible to record. Its mark and effect are unmistakable thus its trajectory certain.

The tea cup moves just as quickly, without differential of speeds within Earth perception. The key is Earth perception, the creator of belief from illusion.

The mental energy, believing the tea cup indeed can be moved a few inches, achieves it.

Q: *This sounds like the first Star Wars movie, when Yoda attempts to teach Luke Skywalker to lift objects.*

C: A demonstration to humanity, was this movie. We suggest a new name for the genre, science illusion. It is not science fiction; if it can be imagined, that is because it can – and has – been done. It is never fictitious when imagined. Imagined means image; image is a picture or view. View of reality.

Q: *One last question, or deepening of the explanation, of telekinesis, if I might.*

C: Certainly.

Q: *What is the force of effect that travels from the human mind to the cup? Light photons, messenger pigeons, rescue dogs, what?*

C: As your younger human adult likes to say in these times, LOL. The force traveling from your mind to the cup is the same that communicates with all things everywhere, tuned and synchronized temporarily to that of the object tea cup. This force is sub, sub, sub atomic to many levels below the atoms humanity recognizes. Because the origin of the thought is the eventual force; gathered, bundled and grouped to

lower its vibration to the cup and environment, it transcends and permeates all things until reaching its target, where the bundled, grouped frequency takes effect. This energy misses all things outside its range; just as microwave energy of your ovens heats water molecules but little else. Porcelain, plastic and paper are themselves unaffected.

Telekinesis operates this way; as your mind focuses on its target and movement, this batches the required energy to reach, when added up, the equivalent resonance of the target, passing through and missing all else.

The force need not be strong; the movement of all things simply requires this energy to divert course a fractional amount. As all things move along at congruent velocities, they equalize and thus cancel out any effect, leaving only the object's movement to be noticed.

Q: *Esteemed Committee, my thanks.*

C: Our pleasure, and happy telekinetics to you all. We suggest a club you shall form, great fun shall its members have with skeptics and doubters alike.

2. Russia

Q: *Esteemed Committee, as these questions are asked, we are ending the eighth month of year 2014 so I will inquire based on what's been quickly and generally offered in the news, recognizing there will be developments and also knowledge already understood by aficionados of current Russian activity.*

C: Please, and do go on.

Q: *Is Russia attempting to gain complete control of Ukraine?*

C: Yes.

Q: *What is sought?*

C: Control, dominance, influence and wealth that derive from them.

Q: *Could this be compared to Nazi Germany?*

C: Yes, many similar motivations were involved then, as now.

Q: *I see the effort by Russia as mistaken; the wealth they would seek is better and more quickly obtained by developing it voluntarily, attracting economic players willingly.*

C: Yes, always however this approach lacks one attractive ingredient; control and power and their use. These hold priority and instill both fear and strength in those people who believe they wield this ability to create the fear.

Q: *Is this a predestined event, a role Vladimir Putin agreed to fill for this lifetime?*

C: Yes.

Q: *Is there any mysterious, unseen motivation at work, to be later or possibly never completely revealed?*

C: No. Russia acts towards that it appears its acts will gain.

Q: Why the attraction to Ukraine?

C: Cultural similarities make its re-integration uncomplicated, setting the table for the next phase.

Q: What does Russia hope to do and should they be stopped?

C: Extend commercial influence in their interest father west, then east. There is a strategic plan to counterbalance China's growth and the threat to Russian dominance, thus wealth, a more powerful China would represent.

The answer to whether Russia should be stopped lies in the moving definition of sovereignty; what does it mean and if it is to be maintained, what need a sovereign state do to maintain it?

We suggest Ukraine has little ability to return force directed its way, to compel its inclusion within Russian administrative, legal and military control. Where the ability to repel threats balances the power of intrusion, the latter are unlikely.

Q: This seems terrible, that a nation would be taken over by force.

C: At what point will a nation require permanent life support from elsewhere? On Earth, in human societies, there are few nations capable enough to repel simultaneous takeovers of many others; none might extend this force across a great majority of the human population. If attempted, it would bring about the demise of the futile savior nation. To endure, a sovereign state must possess desire then create the means.

Q: This sounds like war mongering.

C: If that view is preferred, then yes. If the desire for a sovereign nation is chosen among neighbors willing to exercise force to dominate it, it will eventually require like force to survive. In this example, war is avoided by avoiding the creation of sovereignty.

Q: Sounds like surrender.

C: It is, if that view is preferred.

Q: Why shouldn't diplomacy be attempted?

C: If diplomacy deflects the dominator away from what it desires, diplomacy will serve to postpone, only.

Q: What will dissuade Russia from its pretensions in Ukraine?

C: Cost in excess of return.

Q: There is a lot of talk, much of it aimed at increasing political advantage, that the USA's relative weakness has caused or at least contributed to Russia's moves.

C: The USA has potential to be a significant obstacle. The USA gains little, for its short or long term interests, by intervention and is unlikely to do so. Ukraine loses little in wealth, much in pride and control. It possesses not the ability to repel; should it surrender? This decision is a good option for placing maintenance of life as a high priority, and can be used to secure certain conditions. Surrender is only

valuable in negotiation where the offering party can demonstrate ability to oppose. Ukraine has ability to resist for a certain time, but it cannot effectively oppose, then halt its annexation by Russia. This decision lies immediately before the Ukrainian people; their decision is not yet made.

Q: What about Russia?

C: They have already decided to grasp Ukraine, to re-provincialize it. The decisions falling to them are merely execution; as each proximate step approaches, they have already planned a course from that point, reaching the desired destination. They have also anticipated any moves to be made by third nations to assist Ukraine, and have plans to surmount these obstacles.

Q: It sounds like a foregone conclusion.

C: We say, Russia has timed its long planned moves to coincide with USA political activity yet Ukraine can still act, as can third nations, such as from the European Union. This is not likely; as your probability forecasts suggest, it is more than two thirds certain Ukraine becomes a firm part of Russia before the current USA President's term concludes.

Q: Does Russia place importance on a stand-off with the USA, in the way a cold war occurred previously?

C: No; Russia sees such situation as a relatively useless application of resource. It prefers a pragmatic, material return for its efforts. This will be derived from dominance of Ukraine and heavy influence in commercial trade with Europe.

Q: Energy, such as crude oil and natural gas?

C: Yes, however we will forecast this currently apparent comparative advantage will not be sustained. Russian efforts might attract admiration where success they bring, however human consumption of hydrocarbons will fall away far sooner than Russia believes, much as human society also believes this activity will continue as far ahead as can be forecast. It will not, thus Russia's leverage will fracture, eventually.

Q: Committee, thank you.

C: A pleasure; please return.

3.

Richard Nixon



Richard Milhous Nixon (1913-1994) was the 37th President of the USA and the only one to resign. A Republican from California, Nixon was a US Representative, Senator and the 36th Vice President of the USA. Born in Yorba Linda, southeast of Los Angeles, he was a lawyer before World War II, serving in the US Navy as the war unfolded. After two terms as Vice President to Dwight Eisenhower, Nixon narrowly lost the White House to John F. Kennedy in 1960 and the race for California Governor in 1962, to the father of California's current Governor Jerry Brown. He reached the White House in 1968, re-elected in a 1972 landslide.

Nixon's second term plunged his administration into scandal, eclipsing political support and bringing about his resignation before imminent removal. He was pardoned by his successor and rehabilitated his image in retirement. A debilitating stroke at age 81 brought about his death four days later, in April of 1994.

Q: President Nixon, if you do not mind me calling you this, what current or historical point is there to being the sole President to have resigned the office?

RMN: That everyone can get into hot water. You may certainly call me that, although Mr. Nixon is fine.

Q: There's always talk of an elected official being called upon to resign anytime anything happens. I feel like it cheapens the suggestion.

RMN: Politics is indeed a contact sport.

Q: If you could do one thing differently about the Watergate scandal what would that be?

RMN: Nothing; I was going to leave office over it, one way or the other. Nothing would have mattered.

Q: Wow, you were accused of everything in that scandal.

RMN: Of course, the more made, the more likely one might stick. It worked, didn't it?

Q: So what did happen, really?

RMN: A group of what I'd think of as punks decided it was in their interest to break-in and steal information. When my office found out, pursuing it meant I'd have the White House crusading on behalf of my political enemies. That would cheapen the process just as badly as if I attempted to defend it. I decided to remain neutral. I could not ask the Attorney General to pursue it; I'd be filing a complaint to support my adversaries? That would be interpreted as a cover up.

Q: Interesting; so why would it not be pursued?

RMN: No national security interest was damaged; no vital, confidential or risky information to that was obtained, leaked or compromised. No American lives were put in danger; it amounted to a compromise in security, a violation of private property. This is a crime for local police and courts to pursue. If any Prime Minister or President anywhere in the world allowed their office to become distracted by such an issue, where would executive leadership end up?

Q: So you chose not to pursue it.

RMN: Yes, and I told my staff as much. Let the victims, who were well able to do so, make their case through the proper channels. This was twisted to appear as if I approved, ordered and condoned such behavior. The gains to be had by succeeding are so valuable.

Q: Would you have ever ordered something illegal done?

RMN: In a minute, if it would prevent damage or harm to the USA, or save innocent lives, primarily American ones. It was my job to do that.

Q: The idea any US President would suggest, or even do, anything illegal, is unnerving to frightening.

RMN: In a Pollyanna perfect world, perhaps. In the reality of humanity, few situations are so black & white. I learned this in the Navy; one must act with incomplete information in some cases. Failure to act will bring about swift failure sometimes.

Q: To this day, more than twenty years after you died, your adversaries will say you were guilty of masterminding or at least supporting the Watergate break-in.

RMN: I did not step in and figuratively behead the wrongdoers. That was dressed up as a crime. I will say, did anyone truly believe I was dimwitted enough to risk such a scandal over such slim pickings? If there were anything that worthwhile to my campaign, it would have never been locked in that office, exposed to theft, able to be taken so easily.

Any successful politician, and reaching the White House is the pinnacle of political success, learned long ago, any risk taken must offer a benefit to outweigh it. I knew this intrinsically, as does every prominent world leader.

I was accused of many things, being sinister, cold hearted, profane, uncaring and abrasive but never of being careless, sloppy or unthinking.

Q: What do you consider your greatest achievement in life?

RMN: My long and happy marriage.

Q: The greatest achievement of your administration?

RMN: Landslide re-election after a difficult first term. President Johnson's stewardship did not leave the USA in a good place, not as good as it could have been. US involvement in Indochina was a terrible balancing act between loss of US lives and the spread of violent totalitarian communists, a redundant description, I admit. Have communists ever been beneficent? I digress...so achieving broad approval to stay the course was a significant achievement.

Q: What would you have done differently, overall? Knowing now what you could not have understood, in the 1950s, 60s and 70s?

RMN: I would have left Vietnam very quickly. Less American lives would have been lost and I suspect a more rapid takeover would have been less horrible for the Vietnamese and Cambodians. It still would have been bad.

Q: What advice would you offer the current President of the USA, regarding recent trouble in Iraq and the region?

RMN: Define your objective, set out a decision tree of routes to achieve it, measuring investments and costs of each distinct path. Be prepared to say, little can be done to shift outcomes. This is considered a political debility, to suggest relative impotence. The current president is a valiant and brave person, more than most Americans realize. Typically pragmatic American citizens focus on results and don't see them, at the moment; set aside this argument, valid for another discussion. I see a brave, calculated daring in the current US President missing for many administrations. I would disagree completely with nearly all decisions made, yet admire profoundly what is being decided to reach certain goals.

Q: Is there a former world leaders club in Heaven?

RMN: No, although your question makes me and more than few former colleagues chuckle.

Q: Who?

RMN: I am certainly not the only dead world leader paying rapt attention to what you are asking.

Q: You're not going to tell me who, are you? My GAGs The Committee just said that.

RMN: They are correct, I will not.

Q: Of all the elected offices you held, which did you enjoy the most?

RMN: My first term in the White House.

Q: Why?

RMN: To see progress and improvement missing through the 1960s, until I took office.

Q: What did you think of JFK, to whom you narrowly lost in 1960?

RMN: He surprised me as a leader, pleasantly. I admired his ability to delegate to strong willed members of his cabinet. I was concerned, as my campaign against him made clear, that he would unintentionally open the door to a progressive uprising, a backlash of sorts against the Eisenhower years. Had this happened, it would have undermined the nation.

Q: What did you think of LBJ? (Lyndon Johnson, who took office after JFK's assassination)

RMN: Not much, at the time.

Q: In the USA, there are constant cries and complaints about hyper-partisanship currently. What's your view?

RMN: These are tactics used to gain ground with supporters, to solidify support already generally given. When has there ever not been partisanship? I offer that there should always be; all in agreement is not the natural way.

Q: Are things now truly more partisan than previously?

RMN: No; this tactic is used because traditional political strategies are not effective in a way they once were. The effect of diminishing returns enters the process before one side or the other has achieved what it hopes to get. The ability to sell their case falls a little flat, a little short. They perceive horse trading as less effective and frankly weak; they rather enjoy the political game for its own sake. They launch these accusations in furtherance of the game and in hopes they will be more effective. Remember, a candidate wins primarily by getting voters to dislike an opponent. As long as one candidate has a lower disapproval rate, s/he will very likely win.

Q: We hear about a candidate going negative and how that's bad.

RMN: Winning is better, so doing what's necessary happens. For any candidate, it's not a question of if, it's when. S/he must pin negative attributes on the opposition. If a candidate waits for an opponent to do it, it will be too late to start up and maintain or open the lead. A candidate must be ready to do this, to win. Suggestions a political campaign could be successful without negative information offered about an opponent are naïve. Simply saying a candidate has gone negative, is itself, going negative.

Q: Mr. Nixon, we've taken you on a long walk; to conclude, I ask, do you have any advice for humanity, against what you now see occurring in the world?

RMN: This advice isn't likely to spread beyond the English speaking peoples of the world, outside primarily English speaking or bilingual nations that include it. I am thinking of India and Israel as examples. I will address the world from this viewpoint, English speakers.

Travel and communication have shrunk Earth; humanity has reacted by drawing back into the comfort of custom, habit and tradition as pressures rise to blur them. How separate need you be, to maintain comfort? My advice is, comfort is offered in greater amount outside your well traveled path. You will explain your beliefs not by grasping, holding and touting them at every turn. You shall expand them by examining new ones, even strange ones originating far from what you know and understand. Strength and comfort are both found through understanding of that which seems unusual or even weird. If you see resistance across the gap, an unwillingness to look upon your habits with curiosity, forget about that. Understand your

place by seeking comprehension of others, and place little mind on their reciprocity or opinion of what you do.

Q: Mr. Nixon, thank you coming to speak with us.

RMN: It was a pleasure. Enjoy your history as it unfolds. It will make reverse origami seem tame.

4. US Politics

After a prominent politician like Nixon, I have to follow with the scheduled topic of US politics.

Q: Esteemed Committee, a subject near and dear nobody's heart, with the exception of certain operatives being paid to twist or report on it, is US political activity. Certain to enthral or annoy, I ask what is going on at the moment and what awaits through the remainder of the current White House administration?

C: Decisions await, as challenges request them. We offer that the pace of challenge arrival will not reduce over the period of time you suggest.

Q: The next two and a half years?

C: That is correct.

Q: I'd like to break things down into the USA's foreign affairs and then what's going on at home, national interests or domestic policy.

C: An artificial separation of the link, for you know, these are connected and influence one another. They can be artificially examined in isolation, as the podiatrist might seem unconcerned with dermatology, however permanently connected are any nation's affairs, independent of borders.

Q: We dove into this a bit, in the earlier entries. OK, what is going to happen to the USA's involvement or relationship with Israel?

C: Very little; Israel is likely to preemptively strike a neighboring adversary. Once convinced it must do so to prevent an attack upon itself, it will act swiftly. Israel has already prepared for vicious protest in the USA and elsewhere, if it acts as it believes it if forced to do. The loss of support, meaning trade, military assistance, direct aid and other benefits it has calculated. It possesses a plan to manage these, factoring in such developments as a cost of survival.

Q: There is significant reporting that the USA's relationship with Israel has soured. How true is this?

C: It is, however temporary the Israelis see it would be. Even if an Israeli strike were to cause a rupture in US Israeli relations, it is understood there this will change with a new and incoming administration. Israel has waited out the now more than six years of the current administration in the USA and will easily do so until a new leader heads the USA.

Q: OK, we had a good session on Russia, the Ukraine and the USA came up. What about the USA and Russia in general, not just as it relates to Ukraine but overall?

C: Russia will always seek to turn US policy to its advantage, as do many nations around the world, all nations that trade significantly with the USA. Even if a nation's trade is small for the USA, where the volume is meaningful and material to the nation, they will regularly seek advantage above the obvious maintenance of good relations and trade. Russia is not unique, and pursues this also. By size and custom,

and habit of act, Russia gains more attention. It exerts influence and enjoys observing, if not also feeling, the effects of this exertion.

Regarding the USA, Russia will move as quickly as it can in nearly any direction with little regard to the USA's attitude or statements. Russia cares almost exclusively about what the USA would do to Russia directly. What sanctions, restrictions and limits would strangle sectors of its economy. The USA would not impose such measures without cost, and Russia counts on US policy being relatively unwilling to incur such costs to cause them to a painful extent in Moscow.

Russia will crawl, walk or sprint towards its objects, monitoring USA resistance continuously. At this moment, Russia is running steadily, prepared to sprint at a moment's notice if circumstances in the USA make that attractive.

Q: What circumstance could do that?

C: Departure of the US President from power.

Q: Is that even likely? Wow.

C: Its probability rises; details and scandals they set off await. Russia understands this is not likely to be, yet prepares prudently for the interlude opportunity dropping into its lap.

Q: OK, we've done Russia and Israel; what about this terrorist group taking over Iraq, Islamic State of Iraq Syria? What is the USA planning, if anything?

C: Little planning occurs; as events unfold, there will be a USA reaction but little action.

Q: Are these organizations a serious threat to the USA?

C: Yes, certainly. They have operatives ready to strike, inside the USA now.

Q: If the strikes are not carried out, why would that be?

C: Even suicide attackers will be identified and this would lead to their associates and then planners. Attacks will be carried out to make this risk low, however that lowers the size thus effect.

Q: Will these organizations be content to dominate areas they now control, or will there always be a push to expand and attack adversaries?

C: The latter; absent an ideological foe, they lose momentum. A successful attack against one regains it.

Q: So what will the USA do about them?

C: Relatively little; there is resistance to the idea of renewed engagement of Armed Forces and perceived political danger in doing so. Focused, secretive operations and attempts to thwart aggression against the USA shall continue. These have been taking place continuously for years.

Q: OK, here's a subject that bridges the foreign relations and domestic policy gap; immigration to the USA, most pointedly, the illegal variety. What will happen there?

C: This subject is perhaps the most politically driven subject in government action. The objective all elected officials have to allow illegal immigration as much as necessary while giving the appearance it is not favored. One view is that good enforcement of laws will create a backlash likely to harm the political party pushing the enforcement; another view is that outright criticism of the law and calls to ignore it will gain favor, as compared to avoidance of backlash. In both views, the objective is gain votes or at least maintain political position.

Q: One argument we hear often is the porosity of a nation's borders indicate the strength of sovereignty, and higher means weaker, tougher means stronger. Is this true?

C: The issue revolves heavily around money for one political interest in the USA, that named Republican. This interest seeks a continuance of contributions and donations, and allowing relatively unchecked immigration pleases larger donors to political campaigns. The opposing political affiliation, called Democrat, sees not money for political gain but rather an erasure of attitudes immigrants, in violation of laws, perceive to exist.

There is a subtle yet powerful awareness among recent and now many illegal residents in the USA, that language and culture have adapted in their direction in a way not previously done. This outreach is greeted with joy, seen as a concession, an entitlement and lifts desire for more of it. The many illegal residents who come from stratified, segmented societies, itself a factor in the economic conditions driving them to the USA, are well prepared to feel excluded by the relatively strange and not entirely welcoming aspect they encounter. This sense of outsider already exists with many of them, in their nations of birth. They see little if any opportunity for education, advancement and prosperity and many descend from so many generations of a lesser advantages social economic status, they are resigned to and comfortable with this station. Arrival in the USA does little to lower or alter this view, and US politicians are keen to take advantage where possible. By expressing sympathy and compassion for plight, they seek voter support and a perpetuance of elected position.

Q: What will occur with this issue in the USA?

C: This must be decided; there are several options and courses where USA immigration may go. Alternative life courses, in the collective. We have spoken often of these as they relate to an individual; these alternatives also apply to many a collective concern, issue or idea.

One option is tightening of border movement and this is pursued currently. The importance of this occurring is not about immigration; it speaks more to what has often been called the shift. The one large US state which now uses its own resources to police the border is a symptom of growing disillusionment with central authorities. This disappointment will grow in many ways and in many areas, so you see, this is the one significance of the option to close up, relatively speaking, border movement.

Another option is to open wider, which is easiest since little resources are now applied to the issue, effectively allowing easy crossing while simultaneously providing the appearance of control not actually intended.

Little change will occur if this option is followed. Economic changes in the USA over the coming years will make this issue relatively unimportant. There will be little need for one side to support and push the notion of reforms, which means a loosening of what little restrictions are now put on. This side of the issue will become disillusioned with that development. The notion of tightening border movements is supported by calls for crime reduction, but as economic changes in the USA lower the magnet, the draw of the incentive to cross into the USA for economic opportunity, this side will also see its position fall against the greater issues to rise above and in front of them.

Looming over this is the growing pressure for one state to abandon the USA.

Q: Esteemed Committee, nice segue into another subject, Texas secession. Will this happen?

C: It is very likely, as we have discussed. Avoidance of debt, maintenance of a currency's viability, which means ongoing faith in the continued acceptance of a valid means of exchange, will push the issue forward.

Q: If there is a Texas secession, will it be violent?

C: No, not generally. Exceptions might occur, these would be limited and sporadic. We know you wish to ask, would there be armed force used to quell such uprising, sent by the USA to halt Texas departure? We say no, this would not happen. The economic conditions giving rise to the secession will

be well and widely felt, and to the contrary, there would be desire to relocate by American citizens from other states, to the newly separate republic.

Q: This idea is often criticized, and those doing so say pretty insulting things. When I hear such things, it makes me feel there is latent, buried fear and concern inside the critics.

C: Indeed, there is. This aspect you can cast aside and ignore. The decision will not be a difficult one; those opposed will do so on emotional grounds, well understood however looming problems with no hope for a solution will outweigh nostalgia for prior times.

Q: Let's turn to one last area in US politics, energy policy. The USA created an agency in the 1970s to reduce imports of crude oil and dependence on them. Exporters simply lowered the price to maintain position, maintain volume yet this issue continues. Because crude oil's principal uses in rubber and plastic, more than half the consumption and fuels, almost the remainder, are vital to economic activity, could there ever be a significant shift in US policy regarding crude oil production and use, especially as it relates to importation?

C: One area not yet seen as a target but soon to rise, will be higher taxes on crude imports. As US domestic production capability is seen to meet demand, there could likely be an increase in import duty upon the remaining foreign imports. Domestic producers will raise prices to come within just a few percentage points, maximizing their revenue yet still maintaining a price advantage. Little of this will be seen at the retail pump; there will be a general increase in price. This will fuel, pun intended, inflation. It could act as a spark. State taxes on fuel will rise as retail prices climb, soothe many indebted states will see this as positive despite citizens complaints.

The business will not continue this way, as crude oil consumption will fall as production is curtailed by a series of events, causing intermediate price shocks by higher trends as markets appear to recover after each one, to then experience another.

The spark of higher fuel prices will ignite price inflation, exacerbating economic trouble, bringing about many things, including the previously mentioned desire for Texas to consider secession.

Q: Committee, thank you.

C: Our pleasure.

5. Robert Reed



John Robert Rietz, Jr. (1932-1992) was an American stage, film and television actor and director, best known for the role of Mike Brady on the situation comedy *The Brady Bunch*, 1969-74. Despite unhappiness and protests to the producer, Reed never allowed his dissatisfaction on camera, admitting after the show's cancellation money motivated him. Despite lackluster critical reviews, the show was popular and enjoyed long syndicated reruns and an eventual reunion program. In 1976 and 1977, Reed received two Primetime Emmy Award nominations for *Rich Man Poor Man* and *Roots*. Married from 1954 to 1959 with one daughter,

Reed concealed his homosexuality. He died from colon cancer at age 59, his doctors noting on the certificate Reed was HIV positive when he died.

Q: Mr. Reed, thank you for being willing.

RR: It's Robert, please. Reed was a stage name.

Q: I have to say, I did not know when, how or what contributed to your passing and was surprised to discover a popular figure I remember, was not what he appeared to be.

RR: I was an actor, and a good one. It was not difficult to apply some of that away from stage and camera. Not hard at all; you've heard of Ronald Reagan, of course.

Q: I liked the show, the Brady Bunch, but being the middle of three boys, I found the idea six kids, three girls from marriage "A" mixed with three boys from marriage "B" who would not destroy the house and their parents' new marriage, a bit tough to swallow!

RR: In entertainment, anything is possible. As nearly impossible as it would be, in real life and you're right. Six kids thrust together by a widow and widower would be a challenge.

Q: Mike Brady was a widower but was the wife character a widow?

RR: Never said so in the scripts.

Q: This brings up the next question, was there still a reluctance to show divorce, marital trouble or strife on TV in the late 1960s?

RR: There is now! Look at the popular show Modern Family; there is a male homosexual couple never allowed to show cracks in the relationship, isn't there? Emotion and excitement fill the script, but a serious hint they will each go their own ways? Not emphasized, to put it gently. Discord doesn't sell and I will say, this has gotten more so in entertainment, not less. The show portrays homosexual couples and adoption, heterosexual couples, second marriages with younger spouses, estrangement, step parents and all the related issues but stays pretty far away from conflict and strife. There is a subtle theme everybody must accept and get along. Not so realistic.

Q: Obviously you believed revelations of being gay would set back your career.

RR: Without a doubt. In the 1950s? An absolute certainty.

Q: In the lifetimes of us reading this and of our parents certainly, attitudes towards or shall I better say, reaction to revelations of homosexuality have shifted quite a bit. Why?

RR: The shift. I will say, it's not about homosexuality, really. It's about understanding yourself. Criticism or condemnation of it achieved what? The large majority of humans are heterosexual, always were. How many were forced to be homosexual, against their will? None..so why would anyone fear what they could simply ignore? The answer was always inside each person offering dislike, disgust or condemnation. Gay bashers, an extreme example, really bash themselves.

Q: What about homosexual marriage? The two words were truly an oxymoron not very long ago and now, common.

RR: Understanding marriage is the understanding of marriage, hetero or homo. What's really happening, not commonly realized, is most people are coming to understand what marriage really means, what its purpose was, is and could be.

Q: I've found the minority voice that shouts phobia every time an objection to homosexual marriage comes up, annoying.

RR: That reaction isn't really about homosexual marriage, it's a current fad for some people when they hear a point of view they don't like. Anything somebody considers important is fair game nowadays, to scream, blanko-phobe!

Q: *Where's the notion of homosexual marriage going?*

RR: It's gone nearly as far as it will. As I said before, the end of controversy will come when understanding of oneself and one's expectation of marriage, the meaning a person wants it to have, is more complete. There is a small component of inferiority in many homosexuals, who say loudly, equal treatment, equal rights, it's all the same. Ideas, reactions and attitudes can't be legislated; laws are enforced through fear of punishment. It is not logical to put fear of punishment on somebody who dislikes homosexuality; this is what was done to homosexuals, like I was. It was hidden out of fear. Supporters of homosexual normalcy should stop engaging in this; I know it's not every supporter but the loud ones sure shout, don't they?

Q: *I've always had a more libertarian idea about cohabitation, and have not always been popular for it. Why do any two or three people require general approval for what they like?*

RR: Three people? Bigamy, you mean?

Q: *No, I meant kids, but I'm glad you said that, Mr. Reed. I mean, Robert!*

RR: Structure is the one word answer; people like structure. When they believe they have fit themselves into it, they are safer or better than they'd be, if outside it. Everybody who really likes a certain food will suggest it to anyone else, right? Not everybody that tries it, will like it. Same thing with structure.

Marriage enforces responsibility for children, and fair division of assets. Women are the biggest supporters of it, as its primary beneficiaries. Biology explains it, and nearly every adult understands that. Society's structures have changed, work roles along with them. The idea of homosexual marriage is a natural development. What will develop are more modifications of legal enforcements regarding fidelity, alimony and custody. Gender will be ignored, however heterosexual females will resist this, where there is any resistance.

Q: *I remember watching your show quite a bit as an adolescent, and enjoyed it. Other than disputes with the producers over scripts, what stood out as important to you?*

RR: The show made a statement about untraditional families, not so common in the late 1960s. The baby boom in the USA had abruptly ended about five years earlier, but three child families were still common. The combination of two of them was a foray into something uncommon, yet still socially acceptable and in that way, it was leading edge. I liked that overall concept.

Q: *Is that why you conflicted with the producer?*

RR: Yes, certainly. The scripts turned the show into a series of gag lines and jokes, and there wasn't a sense of real family in that. So I did what I could to change it, where I could. I attribute the show's ongoing popularity to that. Audiences are almost always more insightful and understanding than producers appreciate, especially on television.

Q: *If you could do one thing over again in life, what would it be?*

RR: I would not have kept my true feelings hidden so long. Most people who knew me well or worked with me closely understood but avoided the subject. They knew what I knew, there was a sense public disclosure, beyond rumor, would be bad. To a degree, we were all right but I should have opened up before I died. Maybe long before I died, it could have helped more people. This was a life lesson for me, I learned it well.

Q: *You answered my next question, Robert, thank you.*

RR: OK, what's the one after that?

Q: *My last question is, given your experience and talent on stage and television, where do you see visual entertainment going?*

RR: The internet will continue to eclipse television and movie houses as a way to distribute programs and movies. It will never be a full eclipse, because computer screens are too impersonal. Going to the movies alone isn't really common, it's more fun with other people, like anything done in groups of two, three and four. Two or three people can watch a television screen just as easily as one; not as simple with a computer. So the internet will grow a bit for this.

What I see happening with internet movies especially, are longer multi-part films. Up until now, movies are usually an hour and a half long, and not more than three, audiences lose interest much after that. Movies will be available on-line in several segments and will be more like documentaries and books, than they are now.

Q: *Robert, thank you.*

RR: It was an honor and a pleasure. Take care now...

6. World Climate

Q: *Esteemed Committee, I understand the name of this part is redundant, but so many climates exist inside Earth's weather patterns...*

C: Yes, and the sum total creates a trend. You are not redundant, as you are being redundant.

Q: *We hear what seems to be never ending opinion, commentary and study about human activity changing Earth's climate for the worse. We've touched on this before and the answer has been clear; erratic patterns of weather are not caused by humanity. What can you say to us about the world climate currently?*

C: Humans still do not control it, and will not, through physical activity. Collective mental power can, however exert influence in a material way.

Q: *One issue regarding carbon dioxide I've never understood is, higher concentrations favor vegetation, all else being the same. More vegetation however, emits more oxygen, favoring animal life and many other chemical reactions involving oxidation. At some point an equilibrium was reached, long ago. Are we falling away from equilibrium?*

C: No and all you say is correct. No means there exists to measure carbon dioxide concentration above a rain forest at altitudes within which ninety nine percent of Earth's atmospheric gases exist. The technology to do so does; it is uneconomic to do so, to place weather balloons at one, five, twenty and forty thousand meters above sea level. This would have to be done in many thousands of locations to show the trace differences in concentration and overall proportion of carbon dioxide and any other gas. Surface measurements are not sufficient; warm air rises. We offer clouds as evidence.

Q: *That was funny, that last sentence. So, the equilibrium of gases has not been materially affected by human industrial activity over the last century?*

C: No.

Q: *For argument's sake, what if carbon dioxide levels increased ten percent?*

C: They would not; they cannot. The majority of carbon dioxide production on Earth comes from the decay of vegetation, the very thing that consumes it to live, producing carbohydrates as it does. Human activity does not cause more plants to perish, liberating more carbon dioxide.

Q: The idea the consumption of hydrocarbon fuels, principally crude oil and coal, have tilted carbon dioxide out of balance, is there any truth to this?

C: No. Insufficient emissions of the gas result from the combustion of these fuels. Bear in mind, the oxidation also produces carbon monoxide. This gas is not nearly as stable as carbon dioxide its cousin, and soon liberates oxygen into the atmosphere. The equilibrium is not threatened.

Q: What about platinum catalytic converters in cars? They eliminate most carbon monoxide, don't they?

C: The majority of devices using fuels where such converter would do so, are not equipped with one. Little carbon dioxide is produced from such vehicles; carbon monoxide is larger in amount and decays.

Q: Erratic weather is not a theory; there is a good bit of evidence to support this.

C: Yes and to the weather and evidence we attribute two causes; the normal cyclicity of weather trends and magnetic Earth field variation, related to the shift.

Q: Is there anything humanity can do about the weather?

C: Enjoy it when you like it and anticipate that when you do not.

Q: The protests that supporters of global warming are really pushing a political agenda, is there any validity to that?

C: Yes, however it is not a malevolent agenda. Just as the opposition is likewise not malevolent. It is amusing to see the concern mixed with such firm belief humans are truly in control of Earth's climate to the extent believed by supporters of, as you call it, manmade global warming.

Q: I've always wondered what women think of that term; "man-made" anything. [Sidebar, in the interest of full disclosure and the event of any confusion; I am male, the person responsible for the Qs in all this.]

C: We prefer, as you have noted regularly, to say "humanity" Earth gender roles, in humans, are of the Earth, not so much our environment.

Q: Can you explain the global warming origin?

C: A rise in environmental awareness, as part of a general rise in awareness, regarding all things. This rise in environmental attention increases where humans dwell, and are thus notable; where few humans live, attention is not placed on the subject and never upon cooling. Anywhere temperatures fall to a level of discomfort, as has always been this case in the current phase of human history, warmth has been generated. Because the cold will yield to warmth with the seasons, its variations are not measured to such extent. Also not measured are the increase in cold and ice formation away from human habitation. The regional peaks and valleys, highs and lows occurring recently, to which the idea of a general global warming is attributed, have origins in magnetic fluctuation of Earth's field.

The majority of Earth heat comes from underground, rising to the surface. Only a small portion of Earth's solid surface is frozen permanently, and it is not material. It is too small to affect surface climate. The majority of Earth's surface is under seawater, and never frozen, never below a few degrees negative on the Celsius scale. The majority of Earth's solid surface is not ever frozen and the minority portions that freeze for part of the year, do so to only a shallow depth and only for a minority part of the annual cycle.

This small variation, caused by changing sunlight angle, is enough to cause seasons. This has been occurring and has reached climatic equilibrium long before humans existed on your planet.

The Earth's central core, ferrous metal, is magnetically affected by the field it creates as that field interacts with solar wind and other magnetism outside Earth's own. These subtle magnetic interactions cause corresponding variation to core thermal radiation reaching the oceans' floors. This is the cause of erratic behavior in Earth climates. Humans do not control this, and have no influence in the process.

Q: You just destroyed an entire industry and agenda, Committee.

C: As the personal computer did away with typewriters; change is permanent.

Q: Will there be any other effects from the magnetic field interaction you just cited?

C: Yes, as your sun's behavior changes, it will create many effects other than this, felt both geologically and directly.

Q: Earthquakes, volcanic eruptions and blackouts?

C: Yes.

Q: What do we do about any of these things?

C: Nothing, however you can do much about your reaction. React well and with understanding. These effects occur for good and beneficial reason; we cite the discomfort of chemotherapy as cure for cancerous tumors and cells. We suggest not that natural events, climatic and otherwise, are to be chemotherapy as cure for malignancy. Earth is not, and no malignancy of humanity need be cured. We simply suggest this as an inevitable development which shall occur to humanity's great advancement.

Q: Esteemed Committee, thank you.

C: Our honor, do return.

7. Robin Williams



I'll always think of him as extra-terrestrial visitor Mork from Ork

Robin McLaurin Williams (1951-2014) was an American actor, comedian and filmmaker. A stand-up comic in the mid-1970s, he rose to fame as Mork from Ork in the TV series *Mork & Mindy*, 1978–82. He continued stand-up comedy and became a feature film star. His career included *Popeye* (1980) *The World According to Garp* (1982) *Good Morning, Vietnam* (1987) *Dead Poets Society* (1989) *Awakenings* (1990) *The Fisher*

King (1991), *Good Will Hunting* (1997) *Hook* (1991) *Aladdin* (1992) *Mrs. Doubtfire* (1993) *Jumanji* (1995) *The Birdcage* (1996) *Night at the Museum* (2006) and *Happy Feet* (2006). Williams was nominated three times for the Academy Award as Best Actor and won for Best Supporting Actor in the role of therapist Dr. Sean Maguire in *Good Will Hunting*. He received thirteen other prestigious recognitions over his long, successful career; two Emmy, four Golden Globe, two Screen Actor and five Grammy Awards, in all. In August 2014, Williams took his own life at home in Paradise Cay, California. It was disclosed soon after he had been recently diagnosed with Parkinson's Disease.

Q: *Mr. Williams, thank you.*

RW: For what, pal? I didn't do it! By the way, you started this off with that nice blue font, and now you've blackened it. Your nickname now? Gunpowder!

Q: *Gunpowder's mostly gray, isn't it?*

RW: Don't tell Malcolm X, you think he wants to be part of a militant organization that shouts Gray Power? It's OK, black it is. It's the PC way today.

Q: *Nice rhyme.*

RW: [Putting on Mrs Doubtfire's voice] My specialty, dear.

Q: *I liked your Mork character, but not the show.*

RW: Pardon me, while I get out of this intruder's way [*Joan Rivers has just come in*]

JR: Ask him about Mork's dork!

Q: *Oh no, I can't ask that!*

RW: She just did and yes.

Q: *Yes, what?*

RW: Yes, Mork did.

JR: You gonna interview me, sweetie?

Q: *Will it hurt?*

JR: If you ask nicely, maybe. I wouldn't hurt a soul, I might get my throat ripped out.

Q: *Ouch!*

JR: I'm interrupting, gotta go see Carson, 'cause here's Johnny! Bye.....

Q: *Mr. Williams, I have...*

RW: [*Interrupting*] It's Robin, Like Batman's no. 2, remember? What do you call Batman & Robin after they got run over? Flatman & Ribbon!

Q: [Raised eyebrows] *That was bad; and good. As I was saying, we have a bunch of serious questions more than a few readers requested. Do you mind?*

RW: Of course not. Want more bad jokes? Why is a chemistry experiment better than war? 'Cause it's a solution!

Q: [I see NOTHING has changed. Buckle your seatbelts, folks.] *Your sudden passing was a shock.*

RW: My new Heaven nickname is voltage. Yes. It was. Sorry for it. [*He's really serious all of a sudden.*] I fucked up. [*His eyes are teary, and he's starting to cry a little.*]

Q: *Did you go too early?*

RW: yes. [*He insisted I write that really small.*]

Q: *What drove you home?*

RW: Not a car, that's for sure. [Long silence, un Robin Williams-like] I fell to the pressure of money, image and fear I wouldn't work and lose the first two. I fucked up.

Q: *Fear of the disease's progression? Was that a part of it?*

RW: No, although I didn't look forward to that. Who would? Shit. It was soon gonna end my career. I had a hard time, too hard a time, imagining myself poor, alone and handicapped.

Q: *I don't think that would have happened.*

RW: Look at those guys who come back from war, injured and disfigured for the rest of their lives. Wow. I'll be the first one in line when their saints come marching in.

Q: *First question from a reader is, "now that you are on the other side looking back, what is the best way to deal with an alcoholic? I grew up with an alcoholic mother. In al-anon they teach you to detach with love. They make you crazy, angry, depressed. How can one deal with an individual in their life that continues to abuse alcohol? If they are family, you cannot get away from them. I know we are supposed to have compassion, but at times this is nearly impossible."*

RW: Deal with the alcoholic or react to her or him? You can get away but if you do, then what? Compassion and involvement can operate apart a little bit. When I drank, it was to escape. I didn't know what I was running away from, but I knew where it went, to a hangover! So when I drank again, I did it because it worked, it ran away and took me along. You see what happens? The drinker is running away. If you can, show them what they're trying to escape. They might see it isn't necessary to run away from. If they still want to run, they will. Don't hand your happiness over to a bottle you ain't drinkin' from.

Q: *Second question, why did you leave now and not years ago when your addictions and depression were also raging? Was this suicide planned and has this been his life plan all along? I bet you are so glad to be home.*

RW: I didn't have Parkinson's then and thought I'd always find work. My depression came and went so I suspected it would go again. Earlier on. No, the suicide wasn't the plan, the Parkinson's was. Please forgive me, all of you who read this. Please. I never really beat the addictions, just buried 'em. They flared up like cicadas on their periodic whatever it's called.

Q: *"What were his last few hours of life like? The media is saying asphyxia, so what were the events and your thoughts in the run up to it?"*

RW: I went to bed depressed and sad the night before, woke up feeling like shit, mentally. Not physically as much as mentally. I'd been thinking about it, the disease, since I knew. I knew drugs would help a little with the symptoms but the doctor was real good and didn't bullshit me; it was degenerative and I'd get worse, no telling how much or how soon. That plunged me into despair. I was so upset people would walk into the fuckin' room and see me in a chair with that look on their face...I couldn't stand the idea.

I waited until nobody was home. I changed my mind after I started to choke but I couldn't pull myself up and get the belt unfastened. Once I passed out, I rose up from where I was and realized what I'd done.

Q: *"Robin Williams visited New Zealand several times :-). Tell him we all loved him very much over here in Kiwiland and I know he loved our country very much :-). I would like to know did he plan his death as Suicide in his Blue print?. Was his death to show us to remember to lighten up and have fun, be silly etc :-). Big hug and love to him..."*

RW: No worries love, adorable acksint, you hev there. Sorry for the joke, but did I like New Zealand? A blind man would love it, you can tell how good the place looks just by aroma.

No. I didn't, never planned to climb the big Mount Cook to the sky with a wee belt around the neck. My life was a message to do that, at least outwardly, to lighten up. It was hard to apply that to myself, but I tried. Like the doctor that smokes cigarettes.

Q: "Please could you ask Robin Williams First of all his passing has been very sad. He has been an inspiration to me because making people laugh has always been what my true purpose has been about. The joy of laughter is wonderful. It's so important to have on earth. How do you feel about the quote you made " "Suicide is a permanent solution to temporary problems". Do you think suicide is the way out to problems? Are you worried about the consequence you left behind to the masses who suffer with depression and suicide? Now that you used suicide what is your work on the other side? Will you have to re-incarnate to learn it again or work on the other side preventing this on earth? Thank you for answering my question. We miss you and you are always treasured for the laughter you brought to our lives through film."

RW: Awww...that was nice and thank you. Being backwards, and I don't deny it, and you shouldn't either, I will answer the questions the same way, reversed.

No, I am not going to reincarnate for that lesson, to learn about what I did. I'm learning now.

No, it's NOT a way out of problems. It's a way to create them. I developed a bad habit (several actually, liquid and powdered, to name two) of learning to escape rather than solve. Taking my life was the pattern. Bad pattern, any seamstress will tell you. I'm working my damndest to fix the mess, wipe up the shit and clean up the poop. It wasn't too bad a mess but that's like saying it wasn't too bad a building collapse. As if there could be a good one? It isn't even a permanent solution to anything, but it has that permanent part, doesn't it? Don't take your life, it's thievery I say! Thievery! You will be condemned to Heaven no longer flying on the surface. You'll feel like a mosquito watching sunbathers in the shade on TV, it'll be unpleasant.

Q: What was your favorite character to play?

RW: To play, from the actor's point of view or the character, the role, the person? I'll say both! My favorite to do, from a work angle, was the therapist in Good Will Hunting. The costumes were really easy to handle and it was easy to like being so compassionate without being crazy. I like to be both, mostly the second one.

The character I most admired, even if I hadn't been the actor, as if I were the critic [*suddenly he is looking down his nose through reading spectacles perched on the tip, smoking a cigarette in a long holder with a silk ascot around his neck*] I would say Daniel Hillard in Mrs. Doubtfire. He loved his kids and look what he did to hold on to them. Mrs. Doubtfire was funny, the other characters were kind of plastic and predictable, but hey, whatcha gonna do? Can't have everything perfect but Hillard wanted his kids and showed something too many fathers don't.

Q: What did you see as your life's purpose, Ribbon?

RW: To flatten 'em with laughter! Seriously, to grapple with the appreciation of, then the loss of fame, to manage receiving compassion. I didn't make it all the way through the last parts. I learned quite a lesson confronting and avoiding it. I was a good example of biting off too much in the pre-life plan. I bit off too much. I should have included the Parkinson's and left fame aside. Oh well, whatcha gonna do?

Q: Tell us a joke.

RW: About politics, sex or work?

Q: You pick it.

RW: I ain't talkin' 'bout no Bill Clinton, ya hear?!?

Q: What was the best joke you ever heard? Not told but heard?

RW: Too many to pick from, there were scillions of good ones.

Q: Robin, you're at peace it seems. I hope.

RW: Yeah, after being in pieces. After everyone I shook up, making 'em all feel like they were singing an Elvis Presley hit. I did what I did. You all do your best. Nobody follow me, my ass smells, trust me and if I see you coming, I'll fart. Stay away from here. Heaven can wait, the bus can't so get on it and go.

Q: Thank you for visiting.

RW: Thank you for inviting me, and for not being angry with my mistake. Y'all take care now, ya hear? Now go polish some grits or grind your hay, whatever sinks your boat.

8. Crop Circles

Q: Esteemed Committee, these have gotten their share of attention and speculation, and if I could, I'd retrain everybody to call them crop designs. Circular is the least interesting aspect of them.

C: The many circles within have much meaning also.

Q: No doubt you have heard of all the explanations for them, the foremost being that nobody has ever seen one being made.

C: Unless the visitors doing so reveal their presence, or uncloak themselves, this is correct.

Q: I thought they were done at night.

C: They are, to avoid the design itself being seen but not the visitor ship doing the work.

Q: How long is required for the design to be done?

C: This depends on size, as you know, obviously. Several minutes for the more intricate, to avoid wind creation and any risk of noise.

Q: Several minutes? For the sizes of some of them? That's amazing.

C: With magnetic propulsion and gravity force equalization, including lateral movement, no.

Q: That last answer was a mouthful. Please explain!

C: The ability to hover and move is achieved through magnetic fields. Earth is surrounded and permeated by one, with nearly infinite flux or flow lines through the field. It is an easy matter for a visitor ship to hang itself on them, and use them as wires from which to suspend itself.

Q: Using its own magnetism?

C: Yes. Like fields repel, opposites attract, just as electricity flows. No difference. So the vessel simply creates a like field to that which surrounds it.

Q: How about propulsion? What moves it, once it's floating?

C: Adjustments to magnetism. The flow lines of the field are straightforward to detect. It is a simple matter to create one like, repelling field for suspension or float and another opposite field to the nearest flux lines, which attracts or pulls the visitor ship. Relative to the visitor ship, no matter what its size, Earth's magnetic field is large and easy to use.

Q: Are the crop designs made by large vessels, such as in the movie Independence Day?

C: No, often a small scout vessel, is what you would call it, is used for this.

Q: How does the vessel remain hidden?

C: It cloaks itself inside a reflection, as we have explained before. The operation is similar to a hologram, which provides a three dimensional reflection, the image appears to move as the angle of view is changed. The device concealing the vessel views its surroundings and then projects that view. The ship looks to where it would be observed from the ground and recreates the image that would be seen. This is done in a similar way to a flat screen television, although the screen is not flat, it is the exterior surface of the vessel hidden.

Q: Doesn't this look fake?

C: No, because the distance of an observer and the visual acuity humans possess make the points or pixels, as you call them, impossible to distinguish.

Q: This can be done at night or also in the daytime?

C: The cloaking or concealment, yes. The intensity of your central star is replicated in the light emitted to create the image.

Q: How is that possible? That light is very bright.

C: Magnetism, just as it is used for propulsion, it is amplified. Just as is used for propulsion. The magnetic field is used to produce a series of electrical pulses to illuminate what on Earth is called a diode. The component can change color and intensity based on the electrical signal sent to it. This is a more advanced version of a digital photograph, now common on Earth. This is a moving photograph, similar to digital images already made on Earth. The intensity of the light is much higher, using metallurgy not understood on Earth, and conversion and amplification of magnetic fields to illuminate the diode-like devices.

Q: So the ship doing the work is hidden, but the design appears as it is created. Because of that, it is done at night?

C: Yes, to avoid the design being seen.

Q: What if a person were to come close?

C: Humans do not venture deep into standing crops in the dark early hours of the day. If one were to do so, the ship would not be seen and the crop design is impossible to be seen from the ground. The ship would simply rise and await the person's departure if too close. The issue is the sound of the crops being manipulated or shaped. The greater risk, which is also small, is the arrival of human aircraft. These are detected and avoided long before they arrive.

Q: What makes these extraterrestrial ships invisible to human radar?

C: That is the simplest device yet; radar is the reflection back to source of electromagnetic waves. To hide from this detection device is simply to not reflect the waves that strike it.

Q: How is that done?

C: Frequency reversal; the incoming signal has a frequency variation and an amplitude variation, as do all electromagnetic signals. This is simply reversed upon reflection and the return signal is cancelled. This technology is already used on Earth to cancel sound waves.

Q: The problem for humans is, electromagnetic signals travel at the speed of light so cancelling them means there needs to be the ability to exceed this speed, which doesn't exist. Or does it?

C: Your question has supplied its answer. Yes, it can be exceeded and without difficulty.

Q: OK, so how does the crop design itself get built?

C: Each stalk or stem of the chosen field is bent at an angle of ninety degrees, approximately.

Q: How is that done?

C: The design is already chosen before the vessel approaches, the stalks are bent with electromagnetic energy.

Q: How? Are they physically touched? I have read that often the stalks are not damaged and in many cases, the crop continues growing at the bent angle. Not always, but when they are examined, there is no mark on the stalk showing where it was touched, or gripped or held with anything. It's simply bent over at a precise point and all the adjacent stalks are also bent at the same, precise height above the ground.

C The design is visualized by projecting upon the area to be used, a map. We suggest an electronic overlay. The distance to each point is a simple matter to calculate, using basic geometry, you call this the Pythagoras theorem. The vertical distance to the surface less the height above it already chosen, is the one side of the triangle. From there the distance to the next stalk is the second angle, the straight line back from that point on the stalk to the vessel is the third. As you understand well, the sum of the squares of the two shorter segments is the square of the longest side. Simply math determines the precise distance to the point on the stalk. To this point a focused series of electromagnetic pulses are sent, simultaneously. There are three sent, one to the stalk, another second like pulse which repels or pushes the stalk and a third opposite pulse, which attracts and pulls the stalk over.

Q: How is this possible, when a stalk is not able to be magnetized?

C: The vegetable matter of the stalk is not magnetized, although residual magnetism can remain in the iron based or ferrous compounds the plant could contain. Your Earth use of magnetism always creates two fields. The use of two and the introduction of a third field achieve the same effect around an object otherwise not affected by a magnetic flux line. The electromagnetic pulse is intense, well beyond anything Earth science can yet replicate, although if demonstrated would be understood. The key component is the projection of the signal, its focus. Issuance of these signals on Earth is done generally, such as for radio transmissions. We suggest the lens of a flashlight where the visible beam can be focused narrow or opened wide; this is also possible with electromagnetic signals although that technology we shall leave for another discussion.

In addition to focus for aim, the signals can also be tuned for length, thus the precision of distance calculation.

Q: Like those laser beam measuring devices already common?

C: Yes, and these are often used however a visible laser as known on Earth is not the only way. Invisible to the human eye light works well also, and generation of a laser like beam of ultraviolet light is just as straightforward as it is with a synthetic ruby and electrical signal as human science now uses.

Q: So the crop design takes how long to create?

C: Once the bending of the crop stalks begins, as we said, several human minutes for a large complicated design, especially if the crops are numerous and dense; a rice field is an example. Your Earth day is divided into twenty four hours, sixty segments within and sixty again within each of those. These latter segments called seconds, the large design would consume two hundred fifty to three hundred of these seconds.

Q: How many plant stalks are able to be bent in one second?

C: Of the eighty six thousand four hundred of these segments in one Earth rotation, this process allows an extraterrestrial visitor ship to bend several hundred per segment.

Q: A couple of hundred cornstalks per second?

C: Yes, up to that speed, depending on the design. If all the stalks must fall in the same direction. If there must be a reversal of direction because of the design, the topography and the growth of the crop, this rate can be as little as half that.

Q: *Is there a reason these are usually done where it is flat?*

C: Yes. This improves visibility from the air.

Q: *Why aren't these design carved into rock and made almost permanent?*

C: This interference is not permitted. This would scar your civilization's environment. There is no permission to do this. Would an acclaimed artist sculpt his neighbor's rocks? Would a talented painter create one of his works on the wall of a randomly chosen house?

Q: *These are nearly always done in crops that can be harvested, why?*

C: To lose as little of the crop as possible, to make a sharper design and to ensure the design disappears quickly. Think of cloud shapes, many of you have seen designs and faces and objects in clouds. These are not as random as you believe. These are done with angelic intervention and we must say, are enjoyed greatly in Heaven. They appear and dissipate in a few moments. Crop designs last longer however not materially so.

Q: *Last vital question; why? What is their purpose?*

C: There are several; to show some temporary art, the aesthetic angle. To send information in symbols, to show images of things you might like to see and to say hello. We also do say, there are competitions between extraterrestrial visitors. The comparison of the designs is good fun.

Q: *They seem to be concentrated in the south of England but have appeared elsewhere. Is there a reason?*

C: Yes, the many nodes of Earth's electromagnetic field come together, so the energy level is attractive in this area. Also, the likelihood these designs will be quickly recognized before the crops perish, is better than across the USA, as an example. A cornfield in many other larger countries is likely only to be overflowed from higher altitude, the design possibly unseen for several days.

Q: *Esteemed Committee, thank you for the information on a mysterious and interesting subject.*

C: It is a pleasure for your extraterrestrials to do this and to be here as it has been explained. As you know, many have contributed to these answers, excited this information is again discussed.

9. Reincarnated Geometry

*** Reader note: this question comes from a loyal, long time reader of The Amendment website and book. ***

Q: *Consider a large circle (A) representing one's Large (soul) self. Inside the circle are dozens of very small circles (Cs) (representing past lives) and one small circle (B) (representing current incarnation) that is both within and out of the large circle, much like a Venn diagram.*

The impact of the C circles is directly related to unresolved issues. If there are any, then there are attachments (like tentacles) into A. If the incarnation had no unresolved issues, it is simply there. The amount of attachment between A and B is related to an awareness of A by B. If B is operating as totally human there would primarily be tentacles leading from A to B but the corresponding flows from B

to A might be weak.

By default some of the unresolved C issues (like emotions that were stuffed or repressed) flow to B through the A links. I've seen the unresolved issues, from both B and Cs, referred to as cell memories and it is these cell memories that must be addressed we seek to resolve.

So, I wonder, how far off is this idea or picture? And, if it has merit, how does one find cell memories and let them go if one hasn't a clue what they are to begin with? Or is that even necessary?

Let's say, for example, one was burned as a witch--I suspect that might create some unresolved issues. If those issues seep into one's current life, how does one find them and release them? Does every issue need to be brought up to consciousness and dealt with? Same thing goes for childhood repressed memories.

And, this one escapes my understanding: if there is no "time" how can we have past lives that affect us????

I was once told that I had taken this trip to Earth 44 times. Not sure the validity of that statement, however; if true, am I actually experiencing all incarnations simultaneously since time does not exist? That would drive a person nuts, wouldn't it?

C: If life were, what you have on Earth called a television series, with ongoing questions, and episodes and events, the idea of unfinished or unresolved issues fits this diagram well and it is a good and accurate symbol. We suggest one change; the circles A, B and C are spheres or globes. They are not flat.

The larger, the older and the current sphere within the larger, these represent your soul's existence well. We also suggest adding color to the globes and in some cases making them blurry and others very sharp, shiny, polished and gleaming. Some cloud like, some jewel like. We know the idea of a round jewel might appear unusual or strange however we say, it is not. It will shine and reflect with brilliance equal to any flat surfaced or faceted one.

The flows from A to B are strong, very powerful, permanent. What varies are the perceptions of them you allow.

The memories flow through the cells of a body, and are contained in your energetic soul in a similar way. The existence and structure of cells in Earth organisms, and many others, mimic the storage of memory and information, the essence of your existence.

You select what you call unresolved issues, however we prefer they be called fertile opportunities. The travails leading to what a human on Earth feels contentment and resolution should be, these are opportunity taken from an aspect of a previous incarnation. Upon life review and plan for a new one, the opportunity will be seen, if you choose to take it.

You let go of nothing in your true existence. There is no need to and you would never do so. On Earth you very much desire to release that which is unpleasant. Of course, you embraced the opportunity for the unpleasantness and you have encountered your reward. What is learned from it, you will soon appreciate, if not already.

The trauma of being accused and executed for a falsehood or superstition, as you suggest, is a choice. It need not be carried into another life and it is resolved when you incarnate again. You are never condemned or remanded to the torment of a prior life problem or unpleasant event. You may choose to pursue a theme related to it, or you can choose to continue and develop it, but it is never something that

controls you, from life to life, incarnation to incarnation, ash to ash. That control you hold yourself, and completely.

How your “past” lives affect you, in the absence of time, is thus; time allows you the illusion of lining up and ordering your experiences. You are correct that past is present is future. We suggest a movie house where several films play simultaneously. You can only be in front of one screen at a time. If you were to run from theater to theater every five minutes, little would you understand of the three movies and as each was assembled and produced to be viewed continuously, you would end up with little understanding for the large effort. The illusion of time, very real on Earth, allows you to remain in one theater with the plot, characters and sounds of a single film, taking in what it offers. Your other lives are prior and subsequent when artificially placed against the Earth timeline as you select they be ordered. On Earth there is a past and a future because your body only exists for a sort span, and the bodies and souls occupying others around you also exist for only a short span as they interact with you and the environment in which you exist. Because there are no humans on Earth from the time when Marie Antoinette, George Washington and King George the Third of Great Britain were alive, this time exists for you as previous, only because of the numeric timeline humans assign to the day and night cycles. Upon your return home you will see how your life now is not before or after this era in Earth history, unless an Earth environment is superficially imposed.

Yes, you may and do ride your locomotive down forty four simultaneous, parallel sets of railroad tracks. On Earth, you only allow yourself to see the one locomotive and the one set of tracks upon which it runs. If you choose to carry a talent, idea, memory, trauma or knowledge from one train to another, you do so for benefit and experience aboard the new train. On and for a purpose. If you wish no qualities and experiences to come along, none do. Your personality and the essence of your soul, these are eternal. Your view and observance of human history and time sequence will seem the way it does to a human, if you choose to see it in this fashion. You may observe it any way and in any segment you please.

10. Predictions & Accuracy

Q: Esteemed Committee, this subject never ceases to grasp attention. Predictions of the future and their accuracy. That will never, it seems, stop being a hot button with believer and skeptic alike. The idea information is precise, wrong, off the mark or accurate...that really intrigues, excites or disappoints. Can you explain this a bit? I will stand down and offer no more questions in this final entry, and allow you all the floor.

C: If life were a list of tasks, set out before you in a certain order the logic of which seems irrefutable, and success involved an ordered ticking of the boxes, what would your life be? So to ask for a prediction is another way of asking for the line item you want. To know when the rung on the ladder shall come up, how you have already planned to place your foot and what the subsequent step would be.

If everything you believed pleasurable were known and located on your road map of life, any unpleasant, disagreeable or worse thing likewise marked, you would all logically seek the pleasant and avoid the negative. Consistently and predictably. All of you do this, all the time you are awake. It is logical. What would life become for you if everything were pleasant and pleasurable all the time? Extend this to everyone you know; what would humanity resemble if there were nothing negative, by the definition of pleasant you choose?

There would be no surprise.

Do you wish to be bored with joy?

You map your path and you set your controls to allow latitude of deviation, in some places and in some cases. Some road markers are fixed, because they are fixed by you. Some aspects of certain episodes are left open while the remaining parts are free to be played out, as circumstances arise and you choose within them. As you traverse the path of life, you might have allowed segments of it to be entirely unscripted, unstructured and loose.

You will set your Guardian Angels and Guides to your preferences and they will intervene only as you choose, request and allow it, so we do say, they do not intervene. If you instruct them to do certain things, that is not intervention, that is follow through and compliance.

Along comes the sense of mystery, unknown and concern, Choice looms and uncertainty hangs like a cloud, heavy and unrelenting upon you. You have just lost something or someone valuable, or some aspect of your life activity. A job, a spouse or a child. What shall you do?

At these moments, you ask for guidance and predictions. Accuracy along with them, for in this, you extract comfort, yes? Relief, pleasantry and goodwill will come back.

Life on Earth has the interesting aspect of sleep cycles, where you are able to confer with your guides, your plan and your life every step of the way. You return and awaken and forget you did this, not because you cannot remember by someone or something else's choice, but by what YOU select.

The prediction of the day or week or month, given to you awake and alert, can be changed by you asleep and at home. You have and you will. To supply a date to you, in an accurate prediction, leads you towards the boredom of joy, the disappointment of certainty.

To give you negative information you have included, will do what? We offer it shall not make you glad and if accurate, will cause you to flee what you believe will happen, that you do not like. Flee where? You will fall asleep and reset your plan; you already included the negative and once asleep and at home, you will understand again precisely why you did. Then you shall return to it and thus, you know of the experiences of returning to an abusive spouse, or tyrannical boss or unpleasant teacher.

Ask not for too many a prediction and be not concerned with accuracy, for what you have allowed yourself to choose, you should choose and what you should do will occur to you at all times, in all moments. Follow your thoughts and look inside yourself for the route.

Be well.

© 2014 Patrick De Haan CPCU

No part of this document may be reproduced without written permission.

Inquiries: patrick@theamendment.net