

# Free Agreement Speech

13 June 2020

Or should it be agreement-free speech? The battleground topic of the era, among others.

*Q: Esteemed Committee, can you please offer us your perspective, analysis and advice on this topic?*

C: We are pleased to be asked and hope to explain to the benefit of readers.

Often have we explained how human actions and movements commence with thought. Expressing ideas is but another manifestation, just as a dog barks, tiger roars and bird chirps.

Your communications as a soul are always open for observation. You may know anyone's thoughts and they may know yours.

Physical body incarnates who telepathically communicate can close off, limit and restrict access to some thoughts, block partially others and also allow free access to the remainder.

We need not explain to humans how humans prefer it.

*Q: If our energetic beings, our souls, have no thought or communication restrictions, why do humans?*

C: By choice. The physical abilities humans possess suit the environment humans occupy. Humans did not have to develop speech, it was chosen.

*Q: Who made the choice?*

C: Several classes or types of entity; the soul incarnated or to be, of course plus the guides of that soul, along with the larger collective of souls involved with Earth.

*Q: Was telepathic communications ability chosen removed or reduced?*

C: No, it has retreated due to low use. The earlier days and phases of human presence on earth were vastly different; lengthy interaction and exchanges of ideas were not suitable, useful or often possible in an environment where constant movement allowed few quiet moments most humans now take for granted. No written language existed, complex concepts served no purpose initially but use of sound did.

*Q: Why doesn't mankind increase telepathic communication use now?*

C: Why don't most humans learn to speak another language, begs the same answer. The effort versus the return are seen as far out of balance. It is not worth the work.

*Q: Why does the idea of censorship and restriction dominate the way it does nowdays? It never did to this extent.*

C: Humans are coming out of tighter restrictions into looser and eventually, long into the human future, a zero restriction communication environment.

*Q: Tighter restrictions?*

C: Today, s/he who has been restricted can much more easily find a way to announce that has happened. Not long ago, before widespread use of the internet existed, a voice was silenced and few people ever knew it.

*Q: Isn't a restriction on free speech really just physical control?*

C: Of course.

*Q: The rights of free press, speech, religion, peaceful protest and government complaints are all grouped together in the USA. I've always thought this is because each of these items is just a piece of the same overall thing.*

C: They are, these several items were channeled to the founders of the USA who insisted on their inclusion in founding documents.

*Q: Why does the concept still generate controversy today? It seems that well more than two centuries are sufficient to iron out wrinkles.*

C: Control. Humans adore control.

*Q: Who is controlling whom?*

C: You are all doing it to yourselves.

*Q: I don't see how I am controlling what other people say, write and eventually do.*

C: What receives attention grows; what is ignored, shrinks. This is a universal law, just as exist in physics or thermodynamics. The great illusion of reality —time— exists in specific and defined ways for humans. It is an illusion but for a human on Earth, where time is a concrete, solid reality as Earth rotates and the sun glows.

The limits of time create the concept of opportunity costs, doing "A" means less "B" or vice versa. A choice costs the chooser the chance to do something else. Study leading to the better exam score costs the student pleasure of fun.

Humans have limited time for consumption of ideas; drawing attention draws wealth. Control of means, methods and wealth is a natural human, Earth learned & taught method.

Attention among humans is drawn through sight and sound.

When interest A perceives mental energy output from B which might crowd out, limit or otherwise lessen what C would otherwise see from A, steps to lessen B's influence are taken. C will dedicate time, A and B will compete for it. The use of force is always in the human mix.

*Q: Can you provide a specific example?*

C: A cult or religion.

*Q: So why the debate in the third decade of the twenty first century?*

C: Access. It has become possible for nearly all information to be provided for others to listen, read or watch. This is now flourishing across Earth. This provides great opportunity and equally large threats.

*Q: Why threats?*

C: Wealth and power arrive together, the one generates the other initially and both typically develop in tandem. At some point, wealth loses consumptive value and becomes a symbol, monument thus image. S/he who controls significant wealth by comparison to the majority in the wealth possessor's society, will increasingly see the wealth as automatic, a given and perceives not from it, the ability to eat again upon feeling hunger. S/he rather sees control over ways others respond to offers of wealth.

Implicit in this process is communication.

When position thus control encounter disagreement or opposition, you all know quite well what happens.

The exercise of control is habit forming, and triggers basic human responses. The fight or flight effect, reproductive behavior, nutrition, bodily functions and many voluntary acts. Included is exercise and imposition of control.

Curtailing communication, by restriction or replacement, typically enhances ability to assert dominance.

*Q: Religion is just a label for a set of ideas and beliefs, so why did it need protection?*

C: The protection means against threats to communication. Immediately following the right of communication, the USA's founding documents preserve self protection as a right. S/he who curtails your communications will threaten and use force, if necessary. If encountering reverse force is seen likely, the initial approach is not made.

*Q: I can hear the complaints already.*

C: These basic notions of unrestricted communication and self defense ability to protect it, have become a problem in the age of the internet. The founding documents of the USA were not prepared with a view to physical personal protection as the priority, although through history this is what was seen and is most certainly a positive benefit. It was not the priority.

Mass communication at that time was solely written. It was not possible to speak directly to fifty thousand people in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century. Today almost anyone can speak around the globe to millions and millions, and instantly, written words optional.

*Q: Why don't we see direct action to stop speech?*

C: You do see it, if the press chooses to report it.

*Q: Do counter-measure and disinformation play a role?*

C: The principal role. Neutralization is equally effective, far less obvious. If you watch a news report, it is possible this information is offered as either accurate or to operate as an intentional reversal, with an eye to diluting to the point of neutralization, the eventual effect.

Allow us an example; recently several police officers in the USA Minnesota city of Minneapolis murdered a man; anger flared. The effects of protests, violent mobs and riots have generated more anger. In order to counter the message, the murder victim's older criminal record is discussed. The information does not change the murder, however is offered to lessen, re-direct and change the flow of behavior.

*Q: Overall, is free speech growing and improving?*

C: At an admirable rate, with growing pains.

*Q: How do we get around this, or should we?*

C: Any event and news which draws your attention, does so for a reason. If you are a custom, antique and restored motorcycle fan, your attention will be drawn to cancellation of such a show or announcement of a new one. When a news item not your hobby, profession or personal interest is offered, you will feel an immediate attraction, or it will not draw you closer. In some cases you will dislike it.

Your attraction either positive or negative, means you are giving off telepathic energy and drawing energy to yourself also. This is outstanding; keep this at the top of your mind for the next step.

Sometimes and typically you will not feel strongly drawn towards it, or just pushed away. Recognize this as something your guides recognize being not relevant, generating this sensation to help redirect what time you will apply to things which matter more.

Returning to the next step, recovering that item you have at the top of mind; as soon as you believe you know enough to form a somewhat visible picture; ask yourself where you might locate news about the same event which might be different, in either fact or viewpoint.

Acknowledge that other viewpoints, reactions and responses are wrong for you, to the same extent yours are wrong for someone else.

Do not in the interest of agreement, dilute, water down or back up from what you believe and do not ask, expect or insist upon anyone, by way of criticism, disapproval, condemnation that they do the same.

The strength of a wall might derive from uniformity of its bricks; the strength of a human society is the opposite. Humans must break the addiction to control. Events are coming which shall render this compulsion asunder.

*Q: Esteemed Committee, thank you.*

C: You are welcome, young man.