

Die Tricks der Gutmenschen.

Vorwort.

Ich habe das Verhalten der "Gutmenschen" etwa seit 1972 bewußt betrachtet. Zuerst ungläubig, erstaunt.

Heute bin ich der Ansicht: Die "Gutmenschen" können mit ihrem wahnhaften Weltbild und dem daraus folgenden Wahnverhalten heraus die ganze Welt zerstören. Wir Normalbürger müssen sie aufhalten und aus ihrem Wahnbild herausreißen.

Hier auf dieser Seite geht es zunächst einmal darum, mit welchen Tricks die "Gutmenschen" arbeiten, damit weder sie selbst aus dem Traumbild aufwachen und sie auch kein anderer aus ihrem Traum aufwecken kann.

Als zweites, und damit befasst sich diese Seite hier nicht, stellt sich nichtsdestotrotz die Frage, warum die "Gutmenschen" über 40 Jahre hinweg, fast bis heute, die Meinungshoheit in Politik, Schullehrplänen, Fernsehen und Presse gehabt haben.

Heute ist deren Meinungshoheit bei weitem nicht mehr so deutlich, das ist klar, denn nach 40 Jahren befallen die von den "Gutmenschen" geschaffenen höllenartigen Auswirkungen fast die ganze Gesellschaft, sodaß der Normalbürger zwangsläufig immer schneller aufwacht.

Die Tricks der Gutmenschen.

1. Teile davon auf Deutsch.

25 Regeln der Desinformation

Erstellt am 14. Juli 2012 von Stevenblack

de.paperblog.com/25-regeln-der-desinformation-394481/

Ausführlich, gut. Ich habe auch den deutschen Teil hier weiter unten eingestellt.

2. Sehr viel mehr auf Englisch:

The Gentleman's Guide To Forum Spies (spooks, feds, etc.)

By: a guest on Jul 12th, 2012 hits: 27,452 | pastebin.com/irj4Fyd5

Ausführlich, gut, mit einer Klickstelle zum Übernehmen auf den eigenen Rechner. Ich habe den Text weiter unten eingestellt.

1. Deutscher Teil, A

25 Regeln der Desinformation

Erstellt am 14. Juli 2012 von Stevenblack

Der folgende Text stammt – mehr oder weniger – NICHT von mir, ausgenommen einige Stellen, bei welchen ich mich "genötigt sah", den Text durch eigene Worte zu ergänzen. Er stammt aus einem englischen Dokument, daß den Titel "The Gentlemans Guide to Forum Spies" trägt. Also quasi, eine Art "Handbuch für Forum-Spione und (Regierungs-)Desinformanten"!

Es ist zwar immer noch etwas "holprig", aber einfach drüber hinwegsehen, bitte. Zwinkerndes Smiley

Nein, das war kein Zuckerschlecken. Aber es war die Arbeit wert, wie ich meine .. WER dieses Dokument verfasste, weiß ich nicht, aber ich vermute, es stammt aus einer (amerikanisch-englischen) Regierungsbehörde. Wie ich drauf komme? Zum einen, weil es auf "Cryptome" gespeichert wurde, die bekanntlich eine "Whistleblow Website" von John Young, einem der ersten Wikileaks Mitglieder ist. Und der übrigens immer noch seinem Altruismus frönt, indem er

unverdrossen dort ECHTE “Whistleblower Dokumente” speichert und hochlädt/sichert und Wikileaks aus persönlichen Gründen verlies, die seinem Altruismus zuwiderlief.

Wer es liest sollte sich fragen, WER sich solche, teils komplett schizophrene Überlegungen und Gedanken macht – und einige, dieser “Regeln” sah ich selbst, von diversen Politikern, Wirtschaftsleuten, aber sogar auch “B-Promis” angewendet. Diese “Regeln” stammen meines Erachtens von einem absolut bösen, durchtriebenen Geist, den man “zwischen den Zeilen” auch spüren kann.

Ich denke, es handelt sich hierbei um dieselben Implikationen, wie sie auch bei dem “umstrittenen Werk” der Protokolle der Waisen von Zion” aufscheinen – wer den Kontext versteht, wird dieselben Schlussfolgerungen ziehen. Völlig egal, wer es geschrieben hat, einige, wenn nicht alle dieser “Regeln”, werden in der Welt von heute angewendet ..

Und DAS war letztlich auch der ausschlaggebende Punkt, warum ich mir die ganze Arbeit “angetan” habe. Daß was du nicht kennst, kann dich verletzen, Wissen kann dich schützen ..

25 Regeln der Desinformation

Anmerkung: Die erste Regel und die letzten fünf (oder sechs, je nach Situation) Vorschriften, gelten in der Regel nicht direkt für die Fähigkeit der “traditionellen Desinformationskünstler”. Diese Regeln werden in der Regel direkt von der Führung, den Schlüsselspielern, welche die kriminelle Verschwörung planen, oder die Verschwörung vertuschen wollen verwendet.

1. Hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil. (Hör nichts schlechtes, sieh nichts schlechtes, sag nichts schlechtes).

Unabhängig davon, was sie wissen, sprechen sie nicht darüber – vor allem dann nicht, wenn Sie eine öffentliche Figur, Nachrichtensprecher, etc. sind. Wenn es nicht gemeldet wird, ist es nicht geschehen, und Sie müssen sich nie mit irgendwelchen Fragen und Problemen befassen.

2. Machen Sie auf ungläubig und tun sie empört.

Vermeiden sie Diskussion von Schlüsselthemen und konzentrieren sie sich stattdessen auf Randprobleme, die das Thema kritischer als einige der sonst sakrosankten Gruppen zeigt. Dies ist auch als das ‘wie kannst du es wagen!’ Gambit bekannt.

3. Fabriziere Gerüchte Händler.

Vermeiden Sie jede Erörterung und Diskussion von Problemen, indem sie alle Anklagen, unabhängig von Ort oder Beweismittel, als bloße Phantasiegerüchte und wilde Anschuldigungen behaupten. Andere abwertende, auch gegenteilige Begriffe, welche die Wahrheit ausschließen, können auch funktionieren. Diese Methode funktioniert besonders gut mit einer stillen Presse, weil es der einzige Weg ist, damit die Öffentlichkeit die Fakten durch solche "zweifelhaften Gerüchte" lernen kann. Wenn Sie das Material mit dem Internet verbinden können, verwenden Sie diese Tatsache, um es ein "wildes Gerücht" von einem "Haufen Kinder im Internet" zu verifizieren, die keinerlei Grundlage auf der Basis von Tatsache haben können.

4. Verwenden Sie einen Strohmann.

Finden Sie oder schaffen Sie ein scheinbares Element des gegnerischen Arguments, das Sie leicht niederschlagen können, um sich selbst gut und den Gegner schlecht auszusehen zu lassen. Entweder ein Problem, oder Thema, das impliziert daß Sie es sicher einbeziehen können und auf Ihrer Interpretation des Gegners/ der Gegnerischen Argumente/der Situation beruht, oder wählen sie den schwächsten Aspekt, der schwächsten Anklage.

Verstärken Sie ihre Bedeutung und zerstören Sie sie auf eine Weise, die alle Anklagen, die echten und die fabrizierten zugleich, zu entlarven scheint, jedoch eine Diskussion über die echten Probleme vermeidet.

5. Ablenkung des Gegners mit Beschimpfungen und Spott.

Dies ist auch bekannt als der primäre “Angriff auf den Boten” Trick, aber es gibt auch andere Methoden als Varianten von diesem Ansatz. Belege Gegner mit unpopulären Titeln, oder Namen, wie “der ‘Rechtsradikale’, ‘Liberaler’, Linker’, ‘Terrorist’, ‘Verschwörungstheoretiker’, ‘der Militante’, der ‘Rassist’, ‘religiöser Fanatiker’, “ sexueller Perversling ”- und so weiter. Das macht etwaigen Unterstützern Angst, sie könnten mit demselben “Label” benannt und in Zusammenhang gesetzt werden, und so schrumpft deren Unterstützung und Sie vermeiden, sich mit etwaigen Fragen befassen zu müssen.

6. Hit and Run.

In jedem öffentlich zugänglichen Forum, machen Sie einen kurzen Angriff auf Ihren Gegner, oder die Position des Gegners – und dann hüpfen Sie davon, bevor eine Antwort möglich ist, oder sie ignorieren einfach jede Antwort.

Das arbeitet äußerst gut im Internet und Leserkommentar-Umgebungen, wo ein steter Strom von neuen Identität aufscheint, ohne sich erklären zu müssen, ohne Kritik, – vernünftig urteilend, machen Sie einfach eine Anklage, oder anderen Angriff, gehen sie nie auf die Erörterung von Fragen ein, und beantworten sie nie eine nachträgliche Reaktion, denn das würde den gegnerischen Standpunkt würdigen.

7. Fragemotive.

Verdrehen oder verstärken sie jede Tatsache, welche zur Annahme führt, dass der Gegner eine versteckte, persönliche Agenda betreibt, oder aus andere Gründen voreingenommen ist . Dies vermeidet Probleme zu diskutieren und zwingt die Ankläger/Gegner in die Defensive.

8. Auf Autorität berufen.

Beanspruchen sie diese für sich selbst oder verbinden Sie sich mit Autorität und präsentieren Sie Ihre Argumentation mit genug "Jargon" und "Fachsimpelei", um zu veranschaulichen, du bist derjenige der Bescheid weiß’, und sagen sie einfach , daß es nicht so ohne weiteres und ohne die Erörterung von komplizierten Fragen, oder konkreter Demonstration, oder der Nennung von genauen Quellen möglich ist

9. Stellen sie sich Dumm.

Egal, welche Beweise oder was auch für logische Argumentation angeboten wird, vermeiden sie die Erörterung von Fragen, mit Ausnahme von Dementis: denn diese können jede Glaubwürdigkeit, jeden Sinn haben, oder einen Beweis liefern, einen Punkt enthalten, eine Logik, oder eine Schlussfolgerung unterstützen. Gut mischen für einen maximalen Effekt.

10. Gegenspieler mit alten Nachrichten anklagen.

Ein Derivat des Strohhmann – in der Regel, in jeder größeren Angelegenheit von hoher Transparenz, wird jemand eine frühere Beschuldigung machen, oder welche bereits leicht behandelt wurde- was wichtig sein kann – als eine Art Investition in die Zukunft, sollte die Angelegenheit nicht so leicht zu fassen sein.) Wo es vorgesehen werden kann, erhebt sich für ihre Seite die Behandlung eines “Strohhmann Problems”, und lässt sich als ein Teil der anfänglichen Eventualitätspläne befassen. Nachfolgende Anklagen, unabhängig von ihrer Gültigkeit, oder ob neue Wege aufgedeckt werden, können in der Regel dann mit der ursprünglichen Anklage in Verbindung gebracht werden, und einfach abgewiesen als ein Aufguss ohne Notwendigkeit, die derzeitigen Probleme zu lösen – um so besser, wenn der Gegner mit der ursprünglichen Quelle beteiligt ist, oder wahr.

11. Richten Sie Ausweichlösungen ein und verlassen Sie sich auf sie.

Verwenden sie eine geringe Nebensache, oder einfache Bestandteile eines Sachverhalts, nehmen Sie die “hohe Beichte” und “bekennen Sie” mit aller Aufrichtigkeit, dass ein unschuldiger Fehler gemacht wurde, aber im Nachhinein haben Gegner die Gelegenheit ergriffen, um alles überzubewerten und eine

größere Kriminalität zu implizieren, welche aber “wirklich nicht so ist.” Andere können das in Ihrem Interesse verstärken, später – und sogar öffentlich dazu Aufrufen, “endlich ein Ende mit diesem Unsinn” zu machen, weil Sie doch bereits “das richtige getan haben.” Richtig getan kann das Zuneigung sichern und respektieren, um sauber ‘zu werden, sich’ zu Ihren Fehlern zu bekennen, ohne ernstere Probleme zu richten.

12. Rätsel haben keine Lösung.

Aufbauend auf den gesamten Schirm von Ereignissen, die das Verbrechen und die Menge von Spielern und Ereignissen umgeben, malen Sie die komplette Angelegenheit als viel zu kompliziert, um sie zu lösen. Das veranlasst diejenigen, welche sonst im Anschluss an den Vorfall, bzw. an der Sache, beginnen würden nach Lösungen zu suchen, schneller das Interesse zu verlieren, ohne die wirklichen Probleme angehen zu müssen.

13. Die Alice im Wunderland Logik.

Vermeiden Sie die Diskussion von Fragen, indem sie zurückführende Überlegungen verwenden, oder mit einer scheinbaren deduktiven Logik agieren, die aber ohne wesentliche Fakten ist.

14. Verlangen Sie komplette Lösungen.

Vermeiden Sie Fragen, indem sie die Gegner herausfordern, das Verbrechen auf der Stelle vollständig zu lösen, ein Trick, der am besten mit Fragen der Qualifikation für die Regel 10 funktioniert.

15. Montieren Sie die Fakten zu alternativen Schlussfolgerungen.

Passen Sie die Fakten alternativen Schlussfolgerungen an. Dies erfordert kreatives Denken, es sei denn, die Tat/das Verbrechen ist mit Schlussfolgerungen für unvorhergesehene Möglichkeiten geplant.

16. Verlangen sie Beweise und Zeugen.

Wenn keine existieren, dann in der Tat, müssen Sie dieses Problem nicht anzugehen.

17. Das Thema wechseln.

Meist in Verbindung mit einer der anderen hier aufgeführten Tricks. Finden sie einen Weg, um in eine “Nebengleis Diskussion” mit umstrittenen Äußerungen einzulenken, in der Hoffnung, die Aufmerksamkeit auf ein neues, überschaubares Thema zu lenken. Dies funktioniert besonders gut mit Begleitern, die mit Ihnen über das neue Thema “streiten” und die Arena der Diskussion polarisieren, um weitere Diskussion um das Schlüsselthema zu vermeiden.

18. Den Gegner Emotionalisieren, bloßstellen.

Wenn alles andere nicht möglich ist, schelten und/oder verhöhnen Sie Ihre Gegner, und lenken sie diese in emotionale Reaktionen, die dazu neigen, daß sie dumm und übermäßig motiviert aussehen und was in der Regel ihr Material etwas weniger kohärent wirken lässt.

Nicht nur, dass Sie die Erörterung der Fragen in erster Linie vermeiden, aber selbst wenn ihre emotionale Reaktion das Problem behebt, können Sie weitere Probleme vermeiden, die sich bis dahin konzentrieren, wie ‘empfindlich sie auf Kritik sind.’

19. Ignorieren Sie präsentierte Beweise, fordern Sie unmögliche Beweise.

Das ist vielleicht eine Variante des ‘stumme Spieles’ Regel. Unabhängig davon, welches Material von einem Gegner in öffentlichen Foren präsentiert wird – behaupten sie das Material sei irrelevant und fordern sie einen Beweis, der für den Gegner unmöglich zu erbringen ist, (es kann ihn geben, aber steht nicht zur Verfügung, oder es kann etwas sein, wovon bekannt ist, daß es sicher zerstört wurde, oder zumindest zurückgehalten wird – wie etwa eine Mordwaffe). Um irgendwelche Probleme zu besprechen völlig zu vermeiden, kann es erforderlich sein, dass Sie kritisch gegenüber Medien oder Büchern sind und kategorisch als gültige Quellen bestreiten, bestreiten Sie auch, daß Zeugen annehmbar sind, oder bestreiten sie sogar, dass abgegebene Erklärungen von der Regierung, oder anderen Behörden, irgendeine Bedeutung oder Relevanz haben.

20. Falsche Beweise.

Wann immer es möglich ist, führen sie neue Tatsachen ein und/oder gestalten sie Indizien, um einen Konflikt mit den Präsentationen des Gegners herzustellen – als nützliche Werkzeuge, um sensible Themen zu neutralisieren, zu behindern oder aufzulösen.

Dies funktioniert am besten, wenn die Straftat eventuell mit einer Absicht konzipiert wurde, und man die Tatsachen nicht ohne weiteres von den Lügen trennen kann.

21. Berufen Sie eine Grand Jury, speziell befugte Staatsanwaltschaft oder jede andere Untersuchungsstelle ein.

Unterlaufen sie es (Prozess) zu ihrem Vorteil und neutralisieren sie effektiv alle sensiblen Fragen, ohne eine offene Diskussion. Sobald einberufen, müssen die Beweise und Zeugenaussagen geheim bleiben, wenn es richtig gehandhabt wird.

Zum Beispiel, wenn sie den Staatsanwalt in der Tasche haben, kann er sicherstellen daß eine Grand Jury keine nützliche Beweise hört und Nachweise versiegelt und nicht verfügbar für spätere Ermittler sind. Sobald einmal ein günstiges Urteil erreicht ist, wird die Angelegenheit offiziell als geschlossen angesehen. Normalerweise wird diese Technik angewendet, die Schuldigen für Unschuldig zu erklären, aber es kann auch verwendet werden, um ein Opfer mit Anklagen zu umrahmen.

22. Herstellung einer neuen Wahrheit.

Erstellen Sie Ihren eigenen Experten, Gruppe (n), Autor (en), Projektleiter(in) Führer(in) die bereit sind, neue Wege über wissenschaftliche, investigative, oder soziale Forschung oder Zeugnis zu schmieden, das zu einem günstigen Ergebnis kommt. Auf diese Weise, wenn Sie wirklich Probleme berücksichtigen müssen, können Sie dies herrisch(autorisierend) tun.

23. Erstellen Sie umfangreichere Ablenkungen.

Wenn die oben aufgeführten nicht zu arbeiten scheinen, um aus heiklen Themen abzulenken, oder zu verhindern, um unerwünschte Berichterstattung der Medien über Ereignisse aufzuhalten, versuchen sie aufsehererregendere Nachrichten (oder sie als solche behandeln) zu kreieren, um das Volk(die Massen) abzulenken.

24. Kritiker verstummen lassen

Wenn die oben genannten Methoden sich nicht durchsetzen, sollten sie erwägen den Gegner aus dem Verkehr zu ziehen, eine runde, endgültige Lösung, so dass die Notwendigkeit, die Probleme anzugehen vollständig entfernt wird. Das kann durch deren Tod, Verhaftung und/oder Haft, Erpressung geschehen, oder die Vernichtung ihres Charakters durch die Ausgabe von Erpressungsinformationen, oder sie zerstören ihn nur finanziell, emotional, oder sie beschädigen schwer seine Gesundheit.

25. Verschwinden.

Wenn Sie ein Schlüsselhalter von Geheimnissen, oder sonstwie übermäßig unter Beobachtung sind und Sie denken, es wird zu heiß – “räumen sie die Küche”, um Probleme zu vermeiden ..

Quelle und Originaldokument: “The Gentlemans Guide to Forum Spies”, siehe oben.

1. Englischer Teil, A:

COINTELPRO Techniques for dilution, misdirection and control of a internet forum.

There are several techniques for the control and manipulation of a internet forum no matter what, or who is on it. We will go over each technique and demonstrate that only a minimal number of operatives can be used to eventually and effectively gain a control of a 'uncontrolled forum.'

Technique #1 - 'FORUM SLIDING'

If a very sensitive posting of a critical nature has been posted on a forum - it can be quickly removed from public view by 'forum sliding.' In this technique a number of unrelated posts are quietly prepositioned on the forum and allowed to 'age.' Each of these misdirectional forum postings can then be called upon at will to trigger a 'forum slide.' The second requirement is that several fake accounts exist, which can be called upon, to ensure that this technique is not exposed to the public. To trigger a

'forum slide' and 'flush' the critical post out of public view it is simply a matter of logging into each account both real and fake and then 'replying' to prepositioned postings with a simple 1 or 2 line comment. This brings the unrelated postings to the top of the forum list, and the critical posting 'slides' down the front page, and quickly out of public view. Although it is difficult or impossible to censor the posting it is now lost in a sea of unrelated and unuseful postings. By this means it becomes effective to keep the readers of the forum reading unrelated and non-issue items.

Technique #2 - 'CONSENSUS CRACKING'

A second highly effective technique (which you can see in operation all the time at www.abovetopsecret.com) is 'consensus cracking.' To develop a consensus crack, the following technique is used. Under the guise of a fake account a posting is made which looks legitimate and is towards the truth is made - but the critical point is that it has a VERY WEAK PREMISE without substantive proof to back the posting. Once this is done then under alternative fake accounts a very strong position in your favour is slowly introduced over the life of the posting. It is IMPERATIVE that both sides are initially presented, so the uninformed reader cannot determine which side is the truth. As postings and replies are made the stronger 'evidence' or disinformation in your favour is slowly 'seeded in.' Thus the uninformed reader will most like develop the same position as you, and if their position is against you their opposition to your posting will be most likely dropped. However in some cases where the forum members are highly educated and can counter your disinformation with real facts and linked postings, you can then 'abort' the consensus cracking by initiating a 'forum slide.'

Technique #3 - 'TOPIC DILUTION'

Topic dilution is not only effective in forum sliding it is also very useful in keeping the forum readers on unrelated and non-productive issues. This is a critical and useful technique to cause a 'RESOURCE BURN.' By implementing continual and non-related postings that distract and disrupt (trolling) the forum readers they are more effectively stopped from anything of any real productivity. If the intensity of gradual dilution is intense enough, the readers will effectively stop researching and simply slip into a 'gossip mode.' In this state they can be more easily misdirected away from facts towards uninformed conjecture and opinion. The less informed they are the more effective and easy it becomes to control the entire group in the direction that you would desire the group to go in. It must be stressed that a proper assessment of the psychological capabilities and levels of education is first determined of the group to determine at what level to 'drive in the wedge.' By being too far off topic too quickly it may trigger censorship by a forum moderator.

Technique #4 - 'INFORMATION COLLECTION'

Information collection is also a very effective method to determine the psychological level of the forum members, and to gather intelligence that can be used against them. In this technique in a light and positive environment a 'show you mine so me yours' posting is initiated. From the number of replies and the answers that are provided much statistical information can be gathered. An example is to post your 'favourite weapon' and then encourage other members of the forum to showcase what they have. In this matter it can be determined by reverse proration what percentage of the forum community owns a firearm, and or a illegal weapon. This same method can be used by posing as one of the form members and posting your favourite 'technique of operation.' From the replies various methods that the group utilizes can be studied and effective methods developed to stop them from their activities.

Technique #5 - 'ANGER TROLLING'

Statistically, there is always a percentage of the forum posters who are more inclined to violence. In order to determine who these individuals are, it is a requirement to present a image to the forum to deliberately incite a strong psychological reaction. From this the most violent in the group can be effectively singled out for reverse IP location and possibly local enforcement tracking. To accomplish this only requires posting a link to a video depicting a local police officer massively abusing his power against a very innocent individual. Statistically of the million or so police officers in America there is always one or two being caught abusing there powers and the taping of the activity can be then used for intelligence gathering purposes - without the requirement to 'stage' a fake abuse video. This method is extremely effective, and the more so the more abusive the video can be made to look. Sometimes it is useful to 'lead' the forum by replying to your own posting with your own statement of violent intent,

and that you 'do not care what the authorities think!!' inflammation. By doing this and showing no fear it may be more effective in getting the more silent and self-disciplined violent intent members of the forum to slip and post their real intentions. This can be used later in a court of law during prosecution.

Technique #6 - 'GAINING FULL CONTROL'

It is important to also be harvesting and continually maneuvering for a forum moderator position. Once this position is obtained, the forum can then be effectively and quietly controlled by deleting unfavourable postings - and one can eventually steer the forum into complete failure and lack of interest by the general public. This is the 'ultimate victory' as the forum is no longer participated with by the general public and no longer useful in maintaining their freedoms. Depending on the level of control you can obtain, you can deliberately steer a forum into defeat by censoring postings, deleting memberships, flooding, and or accidentally taking the forum offline. By this method the forum can be quickly killed. However it is not always in the interest to kill a forum as it can be converted into a 'honey pot' gathering center to collect and misdirect newcomers and from this point be completely used for your control for your agenda purposes.

CONCLUSION

Remember these techniques are only effective if the forum participants DO NOT KNOW ABOUT THEM. Once they are aware of these techniques the operation can completely fail, and the forum can become uncontrolled. At this point other avenues must be considered such as initiating a false legal precedence to simply have the forum shut down and taken offline. This is not desirable as it then leaves the enforcement agencies unable to track the percentage of those in the population who always resist attempts for control against them. Many other techniques can be utilized and developed by the individual and as you develop further techniques of infiltration and control it is imperative to share then with HQ.

1. Englischer Teil, B ***Twenty-Five Rules of Disinformation***

Note: The first rule and last five (or six, depending on situation) rules are generally not directly within the ability of the traditional disinfo artist to apply. These rules are generally used more directly by those at the leadership, key players, or planning level of the criminal conspiracy or conspiracy to cover up.

1. Hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil. Regardless of what you know, don't discuss it -- especially if you are a public figure, news anchor, etc. If it's not reported, it didn't happen, and you never have to deal with the issues.
2. Become incredulous and indignant. Avoid discussing key issues and instead focus on side issues which can be used show the topic as being critical of some otherwise sacrosanct group or theme. This is also known as the 'How dare you!' gambit.
3. Create rumor mongers. Avoid discussing issues by describing all charges, regardless of venue or evidence, as mere rumors and wild accusations. Other derogatory terms mutually exclusive of truth may work as well. This method which works especially well with a silent press, because the only way the public can learn of the facts are through such 'arguable rumors'. If you can associate the material with the Internet, use this fact to certify it a 'wild rumor' from a 'bunch of kids on the Internet' which can have no basis in fact.
4. Use a straw man. Find or create a seeming element of your opponent's argument which you can easily knock down to make yourself look good and the opponent to look bad. Either make up an issue you may safely imply exists based on your interpretation of the opponent/opponent arguments/situation, or select the weakest aspect of the weakest charges. Amplify their significance

and destroy them in a way which appears to debunk all the charges, real and fabricated alike, while actually avoiding discussion of the real issues.

5. Sidetrack opponents with name calling and ridicule. This is also known as the primary 'attack the messenger' ploy, though other methods qualify as variants of that approach. Associate opponents with unpopular titles such as 'kooks', 'right-wing', 'liberal', 'left-wing', 'terrorists', 'conspiracy buffs', 'radicals', 'militia', 'racists', 'religious fanatics', 'sexual deviates', and so forth. This makes others shrink from support out of fear of gaining the same label, and you avoid dealing with issues.

6. Hit and Run. In any public forum, make a brief attack of your opponent or the opponent position and then scamper off before an answer can be fielded, or simply ignore any answer. This works extremely well in Internet and letters-to-the-editor environments where a steady stream of new identities can be called upon without having to explain criticism, reasoning -- simply make an accusation or other attack, never discussing issues, and never answering any subsequent response, for that would dignify the opponent's viewpoint.

7. Question motives. Twist or amplify any fact which could be taken to imply that the opponent operates out of a hidden personal agenda or other bias. This avoids discussing issues and forces the accuser on the defensive.

8. Invoke authority. Claim for yourself or associate yourself with authority and present your argument with enough 'jargon' and 'minutia' to illustrate you are 'one who knows', and simply say it isn't so without discussing issues or demonstrating concretely why or citing sources.

9. Play Dumb. No matter what evidence or logical argument is offered, avoid discussing issues except with denials they have any credibility, make any sense, provide any proof, contain or make a point, have logic, or support a conclusion. Mix well for maximum effect.

10. Associate opponent charges with old news. A derivative of the straw man -- usually, in any large-scale matter of high visibility, someone will make charges early on which can be or were already easily dealt with - a kind of investment for the future should the matter not be so easily contained.) Where it can be foreseen, have your own side raise a straw man issue and have it dealt with early on as part of the initial contingency plans. Subsequent charges, regardless of validity or new ground uncovered, can usually then be associated with the original charge and dismissed as simply being a rehash without need to address current issues -- so much the better where the opponent is or was involved with the original source.

11. Establish and rely upon fall-back positions. Using a minor matter or element of the facts, take the 'high road' and 'confess' with candor that some innocent mistake, in hindsight, was made -- but that opponents have seized on the opportunity to blow it all out of proportion and imply greater criminalities which, 'just isn't so.' Others can reinforce this on your behalf, later, and even publicly 'call for an end to the nonsense' because you have already 'done the right thing.' Done properly, this can garner sympathy and respect for 'coming clean' and 'owning up' to your mistakes without addressing more serious issues.

12. Enigmas have no solution. Drawing upon the overall umbrella of events surrounding the crime and the multitude of players and events, paint the entire affair as too complex to solve. This causes those otherwise following the matter to begin to lose interest more quickly without having to address the actual issues.

13. Alice in Wonderland Logic. Avoid discussion of the issues by reasoning backwards or with an apparent deductive logic which forbears any actual material fact.

14. Demand complete solutions. Avoid the issues by requiring opponents to solve the crime at hand completely, a ploy which works best with issues qualifying for rule 10.

15. Fit the facts to alternate conclusions. This requires creative thinking unless the crime was planned with contingency conclusions in place.
16. Vanish evidence and witnesses. If it does not exist, it is not fact, and you won't have to address the issue.
17. Change the subject. Usually in connection with one of the other ploys listed here, find a way to side-track the discussion with abrasive or controversial comments in hopes of turning attention to a new, more manageable topic. This works especially well with companions who can 'argue' with you over the new topic and polarize the discussion arena in order to avoid discussing more key issues.
18. Emotionalize, Antagonize, and Goad Opponents. If you can't do anything else, chide and taunt your opponents and draw them into emotional responses which will tend to make them look foolish and overly motivated, and generally render their material somewhat less coherent. Not only will you avoid discussing the issues in the first instance, but even if their emotional response addresses the issue, you can further avoid the issues by then focusing on how 'sensitive they are to criticism.'
19. Ignore proof presented, demand impossible proofs. This is perhaps a variant of the 'play dumb' rule. Regardless of what material may be presented by an opponent in public forums, claim the material irrelevant and demand proof that is impossible for the opponent to come by (it may exist, but not be at his disposal, or it may be something which is known to be safely destroyed or withheld, such as a murder weapon.) In order to completely avoid discussing issues, it may be required that you to categorically deny and be critical of media or books as valid sources, deny that witnesses are acceptable, or even deny that statements made by government or other authorities have any meaning or relevance.
20. False evidence. Whenever possible, introduce new facts or clues designed and manufactured to conflict with opponent presentations -- as useful tools to neutralize sensitive issues or impede resolution. This works best when the crime was designed with contingencies for the purpose, and the facts cannot be easily separated from the fabrications.
21. Call a Grand Jury, Special Prosecutor, or other empowered investigative body. Subvert the (process) to your benefit and effectively neutralize all sensitive issues without open discussion. Once convened, the evidence and testimony are required to be secret when properly handled. For instance, if you own the prosecuting attorney, it can insure a Grand Jury hears no useful evidence and that the evidence is sealed and unavailable to subsequent investigators. Once a favorable verdict is achieved, the matter can be considered officially closed. Usually, this technique is applied to find the guilty innocent, but it can also be used to obtain charges when seeking to frame a victim.
22. Manufacture a new truth. Create your own expert(s), group(s), author(s), leader(s) or influence existing ones willing to forge new ground via scientific, investigative, or social research or testimony which concludes favorably. In this way, if you must actually address issues, you can do so authoritatively.
23. Create bigger distractions. If the above does not seem to be working to distract from sensitive issues, or to prevent unwanted media coverage of unstoppable events such as trials, create bigger news stories (or treat them as such) to distract the multitudes.
24. Silence critics. If the above methods do not prevail, consider removing opponents from circulation by some definitive solution so that the need to address issues is removed entirely. This can be by their death, arrest and detention, blackmail or destruction of their character by release of blackmail information, or merely by destroying them financially, emotionally, or severely damaging their health.
25. Vanish. If you are a key holder of secrets or otherwise overly illuminated and you think the heat is getting too hot, to avoid the issues, vacate the kitchen.

1. *Englischer Teil, C*

Eight Traits of the Disinformationalist.

- 1) Avoidance. They never actually discuss issues head-on or provide constructive input, generally avoiding citation of references or credentials. Rather, they merely imply this, that, and the other. Virtually everything about their presentation implies their authority and expert knowledge in the matter without any further justification for credibility.
- 2) Selectivity. They tend to pick and choose opponents carefully, either applying the hit-and-run approach against mere commentators supportive of opponents, or focusing heavier attacks on key opponents who are known to directly address issues. Should a commentator become argumentative with any success, the focus will shift to include the commentator as well.
- 3) Coincidental. They tend to surface suddenly and somewhat coincidentally with a new controversial topic with no clear prior record of participation in general discussions in the particular public arena involved. They likewise tend to vanish once the topic is no longer of general concern. They were likely directed or elected to be there for a reason, and vanish with the reason.
- 4) Teamwork. They tend to operate in self-congratulatory and complementary packs or teams. Of course, this can happen naturally in any public forum, but there will likely be an ongoing pattern of frequent exchanges of this sort where professionals are involved. Sometimes one of the players will infiltrate the opponent camp to become a source for straw man or other tactics designed to dilute opponent presentation strength.
- 5) Anti-conspiratorial. They almost always have disdain for 'conspiracy theorists' and, usually, for those who in any way believe JFK was not killed by LHO. Ask yourself why, if they hold such disdain for conspiracy theorists, do they focus on defending a single topic discussed in a NG focusing on conspiracies? One might think they would either be trying to make fools of everyone on every topic, or simply ignore the group they hold in such disdain. Or, one might more rightly conclude they have an ulterior motive for their actions in going out of their way to focus as they do.
- 6) Artificial Emotions. An odd kind of 'artificial' emotionalism and an unusually thick skin -- an ability to persevere and persist even in the face of overwhelming criticism and unacceptance. This likely stems from intelligence community training that, no matter how condemning the evidence, deny everything, and never become emotionally involved or reactive. The net result for a disinfo artist is that emotions can seem artificial.

Most people, if responding in anger, for instance, will express their animosity throughout their rebuttal. But disinfo types usually have trouble maintaining the 'image' and are hot and cold with respect to pretended emotions and their usually more calm or unemotional communications style. It's just a job, and they often seem unable to 'act their role in character' as well in a communications medium as they might be able in a real face-to-face conversation/confrontation. You might have outright rage and indignation one moment, ho-hum the next, and more anger later -- an emotional yo-yo.

With respect to being thick-skinned, no amount of criticism will deter them from doing their job, and they will generally continue their old disinfo patterns without any adjustments to criticisms of how obvious it is that they play that game -- where a more rational individual who truly cares what others think might seek to improve their communications style, substance, and so forth, or simply give up.

- 7) Inconsistent. There is also a tendency to make mistakes which betray their true self/motives. This may stem from not really knowing their topic, or it may be somewhat 'freudian', so to speak, in that perhaps they really root for the side of truth deep within.

I have noted that often, they will simply cite contradictory information which neutralizes itself and the author. For instance, one such player claimed to be a Navy pilot, but blamed his poor communicating skills (spelling, grammar, incoherent style) on having only a grade-school education. I'm not aware of too many Navy pilots who don't have a college degree. Another claimed no knowledge of a particular topic/situation but later claimed first-hand knowledge of it.

8) Time Constant. Recently discovered, with respect to News Groups, is the response time factor. There are three ways this can be seen to work, especially when the government or other empowered player is involved in a cover up operation:

a) ANY NG posting by a targeted proponent for truth can result in an IMMEDIATE response. The government and other empowered players can afford to pay people to sit there and watch for an opportunity to do some damage. SINCE DISINFO IN A NG ONLY WORKS IF THE READER SEES IT - FAST RESPONSE IS CALLED FOR, or the visitor may be swayed towards truth.

b) When dealing in more direct ways with a disinformationalist, such as email, DELAY IS CALLED FOR - there will usually be a minimum of a 48-72 hour delay. This allows a sit-down team discussion on response strategy for best effect, and even enough time to 'get permission' or instruction from a formal chain of command.

c) In the NG example 1) above, it will often ALSO be seen that bigger guns are drawn and fired after the same 48-72 hours delay - the team approach in play. This is especially true when the targeted truth seeker or their comments are considered more important with respect to potential to reveal truth. Thus, a serious truth sayer will be attacked twice for the same sin.

1. Englischer Teil, D **How to Spot a Spy (Cointelpro Agent)**

One way to neutralize a potential activist is to get them to be in a group that does all the wrong things. Why?

- 1) The message doesn't get out.
- 2) A lot of time is wasted
- 3) The activist is frustrated and discouraged
- 4) Nothing good is accomplished.

FBI and Police Informers and Infiltrators will infest any group and they have phoney activist organizations established.

Their purpose is to prevent any real movement for justice or eco-peace from developing in this country.

Agents come in small, medium or large. They can be of any ethnic background. They can be male or female.

The actual size of the group or movement being infiltrated is irrelevant. It is the potential the movement has for becoming large which brings on the spies and saboteurs.

This booklet lists tactics agents use to slow things down, foul things up, destroy the movement and keep tabs on activists.

It is the agent's job to keep the activist from quitting such a group, thus keeping him/her under control. In some situations, to get control, the agent will tell the activist:

"You're dividing the movement."

[Here, I have added the psychological reasons as to WHY this maneuver works to control people]

This invites guilty feelings. Many people can be controlled by guilt. The agents begin relationships with activists behind a well-developed mask of "dedication to the cause." Because of their often declared dedication, (and actions designed to prove this), when they criticize the activist, he or she -

being truly dedicated to the movement - becomes convinced that somehow, any issues are THEIR fault. This is because a truly dedicated person tends to believe that everyone has a conscience and that nobody would dissimulate and lie like that "on purpose." It's amazing how far agents can go in manipulating an activist because the activist will constantly make excuses for the agent who regularly declares their dedication to the cause. Even if they do, occasionally, suspect the agent, they will pull the wool over their own eyes by rationalizing: "they did that unconsciously... they didn't really mean it... I can help them by being forgiving and accepting " and so on and so forth.

The agent will tell the activist:

"You're a leader!"

This is designed to enhance the activist's self-esteem. His or her narcissistic admiration of his/her own activist/altruistic intentions increase as he or she identifies with and consciously admires the altruistic declarations of the agent which are deliberately set up to mirror those of the activist.

This is "malignant pseudoidentification." It is the process by which the agent consciously imitates or simulates a certain behavior to foster the activist's identification with him/her, thus increasing the activist's vulnerability to exploitation. The agent will simulate the more subtle self-concepts of the activist.

Activists and those who have altruistic self-concepts are most vulnerable to malignant pseudoidentification especially during work with the agent when the interaction includes matter relating to their competency, autonomy, or knowledge.

The goal of the agent is to increase the activist's general empathy for the agent through pseudo-identification with the activist's self-concepts.

The most common example of this is the agent who will compliment the activist for his competency or knowledge or value to the movement. On a more subtle level, the agent will simulate affects and mannerisms of the activist which promotes identification via mirroring and feelings of "twinship". It is not unheard of for activists, enamored by the perceived helpfulness and competence of a good agent, to find themselves considering ethical violations and perhaps, even illegal behavior, in the service of their agent/handler.

The activist's "felt quality of perfection" [self-concept] is enhanced, and a strong empathic bond is developed with the agent through his/her imitation and simulation of the victim's own narcissistic investments. [self-concepts] That is, if the activist knows, deep inside, their own dedication to the cause, they will project that onto the agent who is "mirroring" them.

The activist will be deluded into thinking that the agent shares this feeling of identification and bonding. In an activist/social movement setting, the adversarial roles that activists naturally play vis a vis the establishment/government, fosters ongoing processes of intrapsychic splitting so that "twinship alliances" between activist and agent may render whole sectors or reality testing unavailable to the activist. They literally "lose touch with reality."

Activists who deny their own narcissistic investments [do not have a good idea of their own self-concepts and that they ARE concepts] and consciously perceive themselves (accurately, as it were) to be "helpers" endowed with a special amount of altruism are exceedingly vulnerable to the affective (emotional) simulation of the accomplished agent.

Empathy is fostered in the activist through the expression of quite visible affects. The presentation of tearfulness, sadness, longing, fear, remorse, and guilt, may induce in the helper-oriented activist a strong sense of compassion, while unconsciously enhancing the activist's narcissistic investment in self as the embodiment of goodness.

The agent's expression of such simulated affects may be quite compelling to the observer and difficult to distinguish from deep emotion.

It can usually be identified by two events, however:

First, the activist who has analyzed his/her own narcissistic roots and is aware of his/her own potential for being "emotionally hooked," will be able to remain cool and unaffected by such emotional outpourings by the agent.

As a result of this unaffected, cool, attitude, the Second event will occur: The agent will recompensate much too quickly following such an affective expression leaving the activist with the impression that

"the play has ended, the curtain has fallen," and the imposture, for the moment, has finished. The agent will then move quickly to another activist/victim.

The fact is, the movement doesn't need leaders, it needs MOVERS. "Follow the leader" is a waste of time.

A good agent will want to meet as often as possible. He or she will talk a lot and say little. One can expect an onslaught of long, unresolved discussions.

Some agents take on a pushy, arrogant, or defensive manner:

- 1) To disrupt the agenda
- 2) To side-track the discussion
- 3) To interrupt repeatedly
- 4) To feign ignorance
- 5) To make an unfounded accusation against a person.

Calling someone a racist, for example. This tactic is used to discredit a person in the eyes of all other group members.

Saboteurs

Some saboteurs pretend to be activists. She or he will

- 1) Write encyclopedic flyers (in the present day, websites)
- 2) Print flyers in English only.
- 3) Have demonstrations in places where no one cares.
- 4) Solicit funding from rich people instead of grass roots support
- 5) Display banners with too many words that are confusing.
- 6) Confuse issues.
- 7) Make the wrong demands.

Cool Compromise the goal.

- 9) Have endless discussions that waste everyone's time. The agent may accompany the endless discussions with drinking, pot smoking or other amusement to slow down the activist's work.

Provocateurs

- 1) Want to establish "leaders" to set them up for a fall in order to stop the movement.
- 2) Suggest doing foolish, illegal things to get the activists in trouble.
- 3) Encourage militancy.
- 4) Want to taunt the authorities.
- 5) Attempt to make the activist compromise their values.
- 6) Attempt to instigate violence. Activism ought to always be non-violent.
- 7) Attempt to provoke revolt among people who are ill-prepared to deal with the reaction of the authorities to such violence.

Informants

- 1) Want everyone to sign up and sign in and sign everything.
- 2) Ask a lot of questions (gathering data).
- 3) Want to know what events the activist is planning to attend.
- 4) Attempt to make the activist defend him or herself to identify his or her beliefs, goals, and level of commitment.

Recruiting

Legitimate activists do not subject people to hours of persuasive dialog. Their actions, beliefs, and goals speak for themselves.

Groups that DO recruit are missionaries, military, and fake political parties or movements set up by agents.

Surveillance

ALWAYS assume that you are under surveillance.

At this point, if you are NOT under surveillance, you are not a very good activist!

Scare Tactics

They use them.

Such tactics include slander, defamation, threats, getting close to disaffected or minimally committed fellow activists to persuade them (via psychological tactics described above) to turn against the movement and give false testimony against their former compatriots. They will plant illegal substances on the activist and set up an arrest; they will plant false information and set up "exposure," they will send incriminating letters [emails] in the name of the activist; and more; they will do whatever society will allow.

This booklet in no way covers all the ways agents use to sabotage the lives of sincere and dedicated activists.

If an agent is "exposed," he or she will be transferred or replaced.

COINTELPRO is still in operation today under a different code name. It is no longer placed on paper where it can be discovered through the freedom of information act.

The FBI counterintelligence program's stated purpose: To expose, disrupt, misdirect, discredit, and otherwise neutralize individuals who the FBI categorize as opposed to the National Interests. "National Security" means the FBI's security from the people ever finding out the vicious things it does in violation of people's civil liberties.

1. Englischer Teil, E

Seventeen Techniques for Truth Suppression.

Strong, credible allegations of high-level criminal activity can bring down a government. When the government lacks an effective, fact-based defense, other techniques must be employed. The success of these techniques depends heavily upon a cooperative, compliant press and a mere token opposition party.

1. Dummy up. If it's not reported, if it's not news, it didn't happen.
2. Wax indignant. This is also known as the "How dare you?" gambit.
3. Characterize the charges as "rumors" or, better yet, "wild rumors." If, in spite of the news blackout, the public is still able to learn about the suspicious facts, it can only be through "rumors." (If they tend to believe the "rumors" it must be because they are simply "paranoid" or "hysterical.")
4. Knock down straw men. Deal only with the weakest aspects of the weakest charges. Even better, create your own straw men. Make up wild rumors (or plant false stories) and give them lead play when you appear to debunk all the charges, real and fanciful alike.
5. Call the skeptics names like "conspiracy theorist," "nutcase," "ranter," "kook," "crackpot," and, of course, "rumor monger." Be sure, too, to use heavily loaded verbs and adjectives when characterizing their charges and defending the "more reasonable" government and its defenders. You must then carefully avoid fair and open debate with any of the people you have thus maligned. For insurance, set up your own "skeptics" to shoot down.
6. Impugn motives. Attempt to marginalize the critics by suggesting strongly that they are not really interested in the truth but are simply pursuing a partisan political agenda or are out to make money (compared to over-compensated adherents to the government line who, presumably, are not).
7. Invoke authority. Here the controlled press and the sham opposition can be very useful.
8. Dismiss the charges as "old news."

9. Come half-clean. This is also known as "confession and avoidance" or "taking the limited hangout route." This way, you create the impression of candor and honesty while you admit only to relatively harmless, less-than-criminal "mistakes." This stratagem often requires the embrace of a fall-back position quite different from the one originally taken. With effective damage control, the fall-back position need only be peddled by stooge skeptics to carefully limited markets.
10. Characterize the crimes as impossibly complex and the truth as ultimately unknowable.
11. Reason backward, using the deductive method with a vengeance. With thoroughly rigorous deduction, troublesome evidence is irrelevant. E.g. We have a completely free press. If evidence exists that the Vince Foster "suicide" note was forged, they would have reported it. They haven't reported it so there is no such evidence. Another variation on this theme involves the likelihood of a conspiracy leaker and a press who would report the leak.
12. Require the skeptics to solve the crime completely. E.g. If Foster was murdered, who did it and why?
13. Change the subject. This technique includes creating and/or publicizing distractions.
14. Lightly report incriminating facts, and then make nothing of them. This is sometimes referred to as "bump and run" reporting.
15. Baldly and brazenly lie. A favorite way of doing this is to attribute the "facts" furnished the public to a plausible-sounding, but anonymous, source.
16. Expanding further on numbers 4 and 5, have your own stooges "expose" scandals and champion popular causes. Their job is to pre-empt real opponents and to play 99-yard football. A variation is to pay rich people for the job who will pretend to spend their own money.
17. Flood the Internet with agents. This is the answer to the question, "What could possibly motivate a person to spend hour upon hour on Internet news groups defending the government and/or the press and harassing genuine critics?" Don't the authorities have defenders enough in all the newspapers, magazines, radio, and television? One would think refusing to print critical letters and screening out serious callers or dumping them from radio talk shows would be control enough, but, obviously, it is not.

Schlußwort.

Anstelle eines Schlußwortes ein Lied von Reinhard Mey: Heimatlos.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=4cAEAtkuTF0

Heimatlos Reinhard Mey --- mosidosi 17 Videos --- 36.918 Klicks am 19.2.2013

Sämtliche Angaben ohne Gewähr. Eingefügt am 23. Februar 2013

- agriserve -

Laufendes-2013-137

Die Tricks der "Gutmenschen"

ab dem 24. Februar 2013 bis 24. Februar 2013

Agriserve GmbH

Zum Schäferköppel 200

60437 Frankfurt

agriserve2000@yahoo.de

www.agriserve.de

Holz-, Getreide-, Biomasse-Heizungen

Entwicklung, Beratung, Herstellung

Geschäftsführer: Karlfried Cost

Probonocontramalum.de/Laufendes-2013-137.html