

Chapter 8: The misleading principles

In addition to the scientific evidence reviewed in the previous chapter, it is also useful to identify a few other principles that are quite effective for preventing someone from thinking on his own or forcing him to accept something he does not want. These mechanisms are unfortunately used on a massive scale. Knowing them, and then recognizing them when you are subjected to them, is the way to become aware that our choices are oriented. These mechanisms are essentially based on our emotions and are the perfect complement to the "scientific proofs" that comfort our intellect. Our mind is caught between our thoughts and our emotions. These mechanisms are the means by which we do not realize that a usurious system has corrupted the whole society. These mechanisms are also used so that you reject any path that would lead you to emancipation.

Misleading principle number 1: Emote strongly to spread a message.

Arouse a strong emotion, usually fear, disgust, shame or fright. Almost always, this emotion will be fed and amplified by a multitude of vile details. This abundance of details should be a warning signal for manipulation. The manipulator's objective is to create a very unpleasant feeling, so that the listener or viewer is receptive to a solution that would stop or avoid this discomfort. We would like the manipulator to stop, because it is so unbearable. Once the person has been traumatized, the intended message can be delivered. Their intellectual defenses have been overwhelmed by the emotional assault. The brain is available for any programming. This can be explained by the fact that when primitive man was subjected to danger, he had to take the first opportunity to escape. His survival did not depend on finding a thoughtful solution, but on being reactive.

What happens in the consciousness when one is under emotional attack? One tells oneself that one is, or someone else is, in danger, or in great pain. One needs to do something to relieve this stress. This implies a need to decide quickly, or at least that something must be done. But the enlightened approach is to first understand or feel that there is manipulation and first calm one's emotions. Then to evaluate the importance or seriousness of the danger, then to evaluate the proposed solution and see, if necessary, if there is not a better one.

This process of manipulation is so widely used that it is recurrent. In my youth I remember watching the revolution in Romania at the end of 1989 on television. The media began to describe a sick dictator who regularly sacrificed young people for their blood. We were shown some dark images of bodies lying on the ground. We

were told that it was a carnage in Timisoara where hundreds of bodies of opponents were piled up. They described it as a holocaust. Then a few days later, we were shown the trial of the dictator who was even shouted at by his advocate, and a few minutes later, he and his wife were sentenced to death and executed on the spot. Ouff, we were almost relieved that this monster was put out of action. This justice was tolerable for the whole political and media world and we stayed there. Then, a few months later, a journalist explained that he was withdrawing from the media scene because he had been misinformed about the events in Romania and did not want to repeat the misinformation he had given. He said that the pile of corpses was in fact a mass grave in a cemetery and that the dictator had nothing to do with them. And a few months later, we witnessed the first Gulf War against Iraq. And here we go again, a Kuwaiti woman testifies that the Iraqi army, when it invaded Kuwait, entered maternity wards and massacred infants in their cradles. For several days, the whole world was fed with this testimony, which was repeated over and over again on all the television stations. This testimony was completely false, but it was not known until much later, and the decision to go to war had won over Western public opinion.

All the wars of the West are justified by more and more lies. The attack on Libya did not escape this propaganda.

It is also worth noting that in the movies, we often have the hero who is subjected to an unbearable emotion that he can only relieve by accepting to act against his principles or the law. It is so frequent that it accustoms us to accept to act against our ethics supposedly for a higher interest. The end justifies the means.

But our civilization is losing its soul. The real purpose is shameful and hidden and the means are barbarian. This method of misleading is so effective and our indifference to these lies is such that we are subjected to it in many areas. To sell us all kinds of insurances, but also for new medicines against great perils, justified by statistical "scientific" studies. See the limiting principle of science n°5. The problem is that society has gone too far and the temptation to create these perils is too great. In order to sell or to have a belief accepted or to have an iniquitous law accepted, one can create fear from scratch. To illustrate this, it is difficult to give an example without causing cognitive dissonance in readers. I will therefore limit myself to an example of fiction. It is the one from Star Wars where the dictator Palpatine is also secretly the leader of the separatist rebellion. He provokes the events that justify passing the laws that give him all the power. When a savior shows up, doubt that he can also be your executioner.

Misleading principle number 2: the fear of ridicule.

The not yet awakened individual looks outside himself for what is inside. The look of others is more important than the truth. He sticks to the opinion of the number. Thus, in order to divert someone from a path to knowledge or truth, it is appropriate to stir up the feeling of ridicule if the person is looking in that direction. Indeed, the mind that knows only by the opinion of others is in a weak position, because deep inside it does not know. This ignorance is the foundation stone of ridicule. It is more comfortable to believe that one knows by following what others say than to accept

the weakness of not knowing. But as long as one has not made this path of humility, all knowledge is uncertain. It is once we accept that all we know is not in fact our own knowledge, that we realize that we cannot be sure of anything. We then experience humility. Then, one day, a life experience makes us discover or remind us what is true, what we can be sure of. Meanwhile, society reminds us that ignorance is a great weakness. This is not wrong, but it is also a necessity that we must experience. By reading Plato, you can discover the deep intellectual honesty of Socrates who asks to be explained the assertions he does not understand. It so happens that the ridicule turns against those who mock him, because he can explain what he doesn't understand, but they can't explain what they think they know. How do you consider someone who mocks someone else on these beliefs (proven or false)? I see two main cases: the one who knows but wants to remain the only one to know and ridicules to discourage access to his level and keep a superiority. This person is Machiavellian. The chapter on ruse-fiction deals with this type of person.

And also there is the person who doesn't know and mocks the one who does know or tries to know. This person is not only ignorant, but also lacks the lucidity and humility to admit it. But he has the pretention to judge the level of intelligence or common sense of others. Sadly for this person, the path to access the knowledge that he mocks will be harder than for others. For, in addition to his ignorance, he will have to acknowledge his lack of humility, and his lack of humanity towards others. He has put himself in a straightjacket.

To illustrate how the fear of ridicule is used, an example is the study of the causes of the collapse of the World Trade Center towers in New York on September 11, 2001. Some associations of people have conclusions with a good and explanatory argumentation. And among all their thorough work, there are factual elements such as the fact that the World Trade Center tower number 7 was not hit by an aircraft. There are also hypotheses that the aircraft that hit Towers 1, 2 and the Pentagon were drone-type aircraft, i.e. without a pilot on board. This is not possible for an airliner, at least at that time and still today. To ridicule the work of these associations, those who have the right to speak on the major media talk about these people as those who believe that no plane crashed into the World Trade Center towers. And this is quite efficient, because many people do not evaluate the investigative work and when others do, they can see the relevance of their analysis, but then come to ask other questions that bring dissonant or very embarrassing answers that one does not know what to do with. The conditioned reflex is then to cling to the lifeline thrown by the media that these people are ridiculous. They are then reassured that they no longer have questions without sure answers, and that they are not among the ridiculous people or the people who give credit to ridiculous people.

The fear of ridicule is an almost universal principle: everyone is more or less sensitive to it. It can be associated with shame. Humans want to avoid it at all costs and are ready to do a lot to avoid it, including other ridiculous or shameful acts to hide the previous situation. This is the case of people who are in a position of authority but who do not have the legitimacy to be in this position. In practice, they

will assert with great confidence what they absolutely do not know. They are afraid that showing that they don't know will unmask them. This is the impostor syndrome. People who know about the impostor are enemies to the impostor, and the impostor will want to dismiss or silence them. Thus, an institution with a great reputation can quickly fall into total incompetence. If an incompetent is placed at its head, he will make the competent people flee quite quickly.

It then becomes possible to influence this institution. Large institutions can thus make absurd, even criminal decisions.

Misleading principle number 3: Repetition.

Repeat a false information many times and it will pass for true after a while. Example: From 2001 to 2003, it was repeated in all American media that America is in danger if we don't invade Iraq. The Americans believed it. Seen from France, we did not understand that the American people felt threatened. But we were lucky to have a president who was aware of the madness of invading Iraq and the media in France could not freely hammer this lie in unison. Alas, the following presidents did not spare us for Libya, Syria and other African countries.

Psychologists have studied the phenomenon of anchoring. When we are asked for an estimate, if you are subjected to a result before giving your estimate, this will unconsciously influence you and your estimate will tend to be closer to what was previously proposed. This is because this first result then serves as a reference point. For example, when a group of people is asked to estimate the price of a property, the price variations are much less important if the price asked by the seller is displayed or known.

Now, imagine you were at a new kind of music show with your family. You didn't like it. As you leave, someone close to you gives their opinion, and, oh surprise, they loved it and explain their enthusiasm. You are surprised, you say to yourself, ah yes, there was that good that I didn't see. Then, another relative approves and gives yet more reasons. You think, well, you didn't notice that either. Then another one. That's a lot and you wonder if you might have missed the show. Most people will accept the arguments of others and temper their opinion, many will even say it was good, to conform. Fashion works on these combined principles: anchoring and conformity. Something new is presented to you as something to be adopted and then as everyone else starts doing it, you do it too. Thus, when someone wants to instill a behavior or knowledge in you, it is important to arrive before you finish thinking about it and then repeat it. The more you repeat it, the more the reference becomes important, the deeper the anchoring. François-René de Chateaubriand, a French writer, said "Any lie repeated becomes a truth; one cannot have too much disdain for human opinions!" and understand the origin of the adage "Slander, slander, there will always remain something of it".

Misleading principle number 4: False flag operation.

Since man first settled down in our era, the law of the strongest has long prevailed. However, it was found that the system worked better if the population was

cooperative with power. Thus the resources for population control could be allocated elsewhere and the population became more enthusiastic and productive. This made countries more powerful and gave them the opportunity to dominate others. But the population became less and less motivated to serve as cannon fodder and to slaughter their neighbors. In the past, it was enough for the powers to declare war in order to extend their domination over their neighbors. But for some time, it has been necessary to convince the population to participate in the war effort and to remain cooperative. It was then necessary to create propaganda. And the basis of this propaganda is that we are the good guys and the others, who must be subdued, are the bad guys. In order to validate this strategy, the bad guy has to attack first. Everything is done to provoke and push the opponent to fall into the trap. But, sometimes the opponent has the same approach or is determined not to attack or is pacifist. Since war can be so profitable for some, it is unfortunately sometimes too tempting to fabricate the attack of the opponent you want to defeat. In order to do this, one must attack oneself by making the origin of the attack clearly visible. This is called false flag attack or false flag operation. The crudest example is to leave passports at the scene of the crime so that the nationality of the attackers can be identified immediately. It sounds ridiculous, but the anchoring effect under strong emotion far outweighs in efficiency to manipulate a population. Having the origin of a textile fiber from a piece of debris 8 months later is less spectacular for launching retaliation.

A slightly more sophisticated technique is to provoke war between two countries to weaken them both so that they are then at the mercy of a third. This third one being the origin of the attack with the flag of the first country on the second one.

"If you want to shoot your dog, say it has rabies." Again, doubt your executioner and don't give up peace until you have evaluated and tried everything.

Misleading principle number 5: The false opponent

"If we're going to be challenged, we might as well do it ourselves" said a successful businessman. This is very effective in business, but also in politics. Because you put yourself in a monopoly or dominant position. In France, in politics, for example, the party in power only represents a little more than 20% of the votes. But the other opposition tendencies are multiple: several workers' parties, several ecological parties, several anti-EU parties. Thus they are tired of explaining their differences rather than weighing in a common project. But the struggle is difficult because the false opponent has potentially the same opportunities for resources as the real opponent, but the false one also has the support of a dominant. Therefore, more access to the media, generous donors, communication professionals ... The real opponent has for him the sincerity. The purpose of creating a false opponent is to keep control of his opposition.

The false opponent thus serves the purpose of dividing the opposition forces, but there are other very effective tactics implemented with a false opposition. One is to divert attention. The false opponent will insist heavily, in order to appear to be in

frontal opposition, on minor points, while the fundamental points are ignored. Thus space is occupied, depriving the real opposition of attention. Another tactic is to have real abuses of power (such as the power of high finance) denounced by people who revolt you or have positions on other issues that you cannot follow. Thus, it is easy to mix up the right idea to be studied with the wrong things, and thus to discredit anyone who brings up a crucial subject. An example in the 19th century is Proudhon, who denounced the enslavement of workers by capitalists. He also criticized the emerging ideology of communism, where capitalists were replaced by the state. Proudhon foresaw that the worker would remain abused. And in any case the ruling power is complicit in this exploitation. Proudhon therefore wanted to limit the power of the state as much as possible. He advocated decentralized organizations and to associate the workers in the ownership of the production tool so that they are also remunerated and motivated on the profits. But what happened was that anarchist movements took up the idea of abuse of government authority and carried out many bloody attacks. Some investigations, which no one publicized, showed links between these assassins and rich bankers. Yet Proudhon was classified as an anarchist, thus turning the masses away from his ideas. And the powers that be in France, in the aftermath of these attacks, passed "scoundrel laws" restricting individual liberties for more government control over the people.

Another tactic behind the false opponent is infiltration to learn all about the opposition's plans and tactics. This is illustrated in George Orwell's novel 1984, where citizens who want to rebel meet the greatest opponent, Goldstein, who is actually the person in the dictatorial system in charge of re-educating or eliminating the opponents. Thanks to the false opponent, the real ones throw themselves into the lion's den.

Finally, the last major tactic is to divert attention. If a topic is coming up in the public debate and the government does not want it, it can arrange for a controlled opponent to generate a counter-fire to change the topic. This is how outrageous, racist, misogynistic, anti-Semitic acts appear from time to time, with a high media intensity. If some people talk about them with emotion and vehemence, it is not necessarily out of compassion for the victims, but to divert your attention from a sensitive subject.

Another example is the mafia. If you don't pay your tribute for security, your property will be destroyed. The mafia will commission someone to attack you, even kill you, to demonstrate their necessity.

A slightly more sophisticated technique is to provoke war between two countries to weaken them both so that they are then at the mercy of a third. This third one being at the origin of the attack with the flag of the first country on the second.

Misguided principle number 5: The false opponent

"If we're going to compete, we might as well do it ourselves," said a successful businessman. This is very effective in business, but also in politics.

Misleading principle number 6: the finger in the gear

The principle is to obtain consent for an unwholesome tenet that is increasingly difficult to get out of. Once the consent obtained, one can then ask for even more unwholesomeness, knowing that the person has already consented to something evil. The person is thus perverted and under the hold of the denunciation of what he has done wrong and of losing what he has already obtained. In a figurative way, one has made a pact with the devil, or, one sells one's soul to the devil. It's very tempting at first, but you don't realize what you're committing yourself to, you end up doing what you don't want to do, and it costs a lot to get rid of it. This principle is unfortunately very common in our society. For example, when something is given for free, or below its price, in trade, it is to put the consumer in a captive situation and to sell him later overpriced products or associated services. For tourists, you are offered a small trip to an island with handmade creations. But you are only entitled to return if you have purchased enough souvenirs. There are some companies that pay their employees very little, but if you rise in the company's pyramid, you get a significant salary increase. Progression is officially based on merit, but the merit is first to do more hours of service. So everyone has to work more to hope to progress but very few are chosen. If a promoted person decides to advance those below him using criteria other than hidden overtime, he risks losing the unpaid hidden overtime of everyone else. He will have the choice of either moving down the hierarchy and losing a very comfortable salary, changing jobs, or encouraging people to continue to conceal work offered to the company. You can of course replace "extra time" with a whole arsenal of practices that are recurrent in many organizations, such as "hiding product defects", "deceiving customers by statistical studies", "lobbying", "dumping", "racketeering by legal extortion or abuse of position of strength", "corruption", ... This system is reinforced by the theatrics of oaths in institutions and secret societies. You commit yourself in a very solemn way, in front of an audience, but often you don't know concretely on what. On the other hand, you see the privileges that you are going to obtain. In the Ancien Régime, a fiefdom was granted to the person who pledged allegiance to the suzerain. He had all the authority over a territory and the population living there, but he had to obey everything the suzerain could ask of him, in particular to wage war, that is to say to go and murder and subdue other people. In fact, the political regime in France today is still based on this principle. A caste, whose prime criteria for membership, is loyalty to the political party. Some of these people go before the voters to officially represent them. But in reality, no, they represent the party that has the subsidies and the media relations to have visibility. If the representative chooses to represent the people rather than his party and does not follow the party's voting guidelines, then he turns his back on the entire political party. Parties can use their network of influence to oppose a particular representative, even in private matters. The party introduces in the next election another candidate in front of him with the means of the party, the opponent will have to rely only on himself. Of course, some are allowed to play the role of the false opponent for some laws, whose voting result is acquired. But on the crucial laws, they are in line. Like the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty as a framework for the European Union or when almost 95% vote for the continuation of the war in Libya. It

is more comfortable to enjoy the splendor of the republic than to listen to one's conscience, one's fellow citizens, or to oppose the party.

Misleading principle number 7: flattery

All French people are warned about the risks of being flattered, because they learn at school the fable of Jean de La Fontaine, The Crow and the Fox. It tells the story of a crow who was holding in its beak a cheese that a fox wanted to eat. To do so, he has to make the cheese drop. So the fox flatters the crow's singing skills and invites him to sing. This he does. He opens his beak, the cheese falls and the fox retrieves it. "Every flatterer lives at the expense of the listener" is the moral of this fable. But have the French understood it well?

To take the example of the political parties in France, they, along with the influencers in the media, repeat in chorus the sweet melody that we are in a Democracy, that the people have the power... through their representatives... of the political parties. However, the opinion of the citizens is rarely asked in France. But when they were asked last time, the people "voted wrong": they said no to the European constitution. So the "representatives" corrected the choice of the French people by approving by an overwhelming majority the Lisbon Treaty, which takes up the essence of the constitution. Since then, the people are no longer consulted. Thus the people are left to choose the one who best gives the illusion during the election campaign that the people are represented. Even though some ideas may emerge, they are generally not voted on. When they are, it is according to the terms decided by the party in power. For example, there is effectively no protection in the Juvenile Protection Act of 2018, as discussed in the ruse-fiction chapter. The election is now used to choose our tyrant, or more exactly our gauleiter, the representative of a dictatorial, fascist and abusive regime. And the French like to be told and repeated that they are in a Democracy.

Another case of flattery is the counsellor. As the man in power cannot take the time or the discretion to analyze the needs, the stakes and the returns of the actions carried out in all his power perimeter, he surrounds himself with counsellors, specialized in economy, diplomacy, public opinion, ... Thus, all the action of the man of power is based on the information and analysis provided by the counsellor. The power of the counsellor is enormous. He is for the man of power the intermediary with his people and also with the other actors of the world. As early as the 16th century, Machiavelli, in his book "The Prince" where he theorizes how to become a good prince and stay in power, warns of the danger of this position. He insists on the fact that the interests of the counsellor are not those of the people nor those of the man in power. The counsellor has his own hidden interests. It is essential for the counsellor to last. He cannot antagonize the ruler at the risk of disappearing on the spot. Counsellors, says Machiavelli, are virtuosos in the art of flattery. The great perils are silenced by the counsellors. So it is advisable for the prince to find someone who will tell him his faults, his mistakes, his responsibilities without disrespecting him.

During the Cuban missile crisis in 1962, Kennedy felt powerless to make the right decisions because he had no possibility to know precisely the position of the Soviet opponent Khrushchev. Too many intermediaries were interfering in the dialogue. They decided to set up the red telephone. A device on the desk of each president of the two superpowers allowing direct contact.

In general, humans cannot stand to be reproached, they feel their integrity is under attack, and their reflexes to object come out. Similarly, they have a natural tendency to feel superior, which the counsellor will maintain. And this is very trapping, because feeling humble can hide the feeling of superiority on the one who does not know he is humble. Some people on the path of wisdom are very uncomfortable with compliments. They know that there is a danger in accepting them because it flatters their sense of superiority, and it is a long way to go to master it. The knowledge of these aspects of human nature allows to reinforce the leader in this idea of superiority, and, a flatterer can thus orient his decisions.

Misleading principle number 8: ownership, attachment.

The possession of material things is a trap. All the things that we own and to which we have an emotional attachment are in fact ties that bind us to these things which then become burdens. This has been studied in psychology. If you are given an object, you will ask for a much larger sum to let it go than you would have had to pay to get it. As soon as something is yours, you want to keep it, you have adopted it. If this link is taken away from you, it will hurt. More pain than the real utility you are then deprived of. If it is stolen, the pain will be even greater. The problem is that you are willing to make a lot of concessions to keep this asset, including doing things that will harm you or others. For example, fighting against someone armed who steals from you. In fact, possessions are also a trap. For example, you study hard to acquire a comfortable professional and material situation for several years. Your salary is higher than the average in your profession. But, at any moment you must be available to a superior who sometimes abuses it. You would like to put him in his place, but you don't, because if you do, you will lose your position and your comfort, with no guarantee of getting it back. Whereas if you had known that the superior was abusing his power, you would not have accepted the job as a stooge, no matter what the salary.

Here is another situation: You are employed by a large company in its procurement department. You select a supplier that meets your needs and provides the best price. You could keep it that way, but you have the power to decide to go with another supplier, so you demand a lower price. You can hide behind the defence of your company's interests to justify this attitude. But what are the consequences of this abuse of power? In the first case, the supplier refuses. He loses the market and is forced to prospect elsewhere. He will probably put more effort into convincing your competitors to take his product that you know is the best. Maybe he'll have to close down for lack of customers. Maybe he will draw the consequences of your behavior of abusing a position of dominance. He may inform his network of your attitude. He may decide not to work with your company in the future. You have rejected the best.

In the future, he could be even more clearly the best, depriving your company of a competitive advantage for a long time. Now let's look at the case where the supplier, with a knife to the throat, accepts your price. The product was selected by you, a professional purchasing agent. It is therefore likely that his profit was not exaggerated, because otherwise another supplier would have been chosen. So you take away his share of the remuneration corresponding to the fact that he was better than the others. The supplier will have to invest less than expected, pay less to his employees who made the best product. The next product will most likely be less good, which will lower the overall level of your suppliers. Maybe the employees of your supplier are in a more or less direct way the customers of your company, who will not be able to buy anymore the products of your company. At a global level, all are customers and suppliers of each other. So the consequences for your company and the community are harmful. The truth is that your judgment is impaired by the fact that you get rewards for your abuse of power: justification of the usefulness and importance of your function, bonuses, salary increases and hierarchical ascension. The consequences on others and the community are hidden from your conscience. You have shark-like practices. You cannot see because you have assets, possessions to defend and develop.

You may think that you are not attached to material things. So here is the following scenario: you have saved, by hard work for many years and by depriving yourself of a lot, to build up a capital to ensure security in case of unforeseen events, or to buy, when you can, the house of your dreams, or to have facilities for you and your children. Now consider that the accumulation of this money has negative effects on other human beings. For example, your banker has used your money, in exchange for a fee, to buy all the food materials on the market and sell them at such high prices that many human beings can no longer feed themselves. The speculator chooses to burn some of the raw materials to avoid paying for storage or having them stolen. And he knows that he will not be able to sell everything given the price he asks. Faced with these actions, the community proposes to seize the food raw materials from this speculator. The problem is that he will go bankrupt and will not be able to return your money. The community asks your opinion. Do you accept? It's hard to give up all your savings. On a lighter level, would you agree to give up all your interest on investments in government debt, or even a discount on the capital? Because that is the problem in the reality of our world: bankers have tied a large part of savings to unjust government debts that are suffocating the community. In order to break the banker's enslaving system, we will have to give up our assets at least in part. Do we continue to impose excessive interest and taxes on ourselves or do you give up material assets? It's hard. Those who have nothing will have no difficulty in accepting a fair system even if they have to give up future interest on potential savings investments.

Misleading principle number 9: The Killer Detail

All misinformation uses mostly truthful information. You can verify most of them and they are intended to gain your trust and then give you false information. Conversely,

true information can be combined with errors to make it appear false. Erroneous reasoning can also be used to demonstrate a result that is still true. It is not because the logic is misused that the result is false. It is just still unproven. It is more reasonable not to accept a book, or a person as a reference in its entirety. It is also possible that some levels of understanding are not accessible to everyone. A wise approach is to accept that some of the things are wrong or incomprehensible without the general idea being wrong. People will sometimes focus on certain details without trying to understand the general explanation. On the other hand, some people will give total credit to certain absurd details because they are part of a reference book or author. It is reasonable to have some doubts about certain details even in a masterpiece.

Misleading principle number 10: submission to the authority figure

This principle is perfectly explained in Milgram's experiment: Milgram wants to know if a regular individual can be transformed into a real torturer. That is to say, to be able to freely choose to impose important sufferings that can lead to death. To do this, he recruited volunteers through classified ads, as an university researcher, to conduct a scientific study on memory, in exchange for a small fee. The experiment goes as follows: a volunteer must teach a list of words to another volunteer. One plays the teacher and the other the student. If the student gets it wrong, the teacher has to send an electrical impulse to the student. The more the student gets wrong, the higher the shock. The teacher is warned of the danger of strong impulses. The teacher cannot see the student, he is in an isolated room next door. The student and the teacher communicate through a microphone and a loudspeaker. This separation allows the teacher to hide the fact that the student is not actually receiving the shocks and that his reaction is a recording made by an actor that will be replayed identically for each teacher in the study. The victim's reactions are graduated and they increasingly alert the teacher to the severity of the pain. At the end of the pain scale, the student begs to be taken out of the experience, fears for his or her life, and then stops responding. If the teacher asks questions, a man in a white lab coat, who is observing the teacher, always gives the same answer, saying it is the experiment that wants this and invites him to resume the protocol. There is no argument to convince him to continue the experiment. If the teacher refuses to continue, he is told the same thing as for a question: it is for the needs of the experiment. At the second refusal, the experiment stops.

What happens is very instructive: In most cases the volunteer tortures his fellow experimenter, he realizes at some point that there is a problem but he continues, he questions himself and the scientific referent, but in general, he continues. He doesn't want to do it, but he continues. He fights an inner battle so hard that his discomfort is clearly visible on the videos of the experiment. And it ends up killing him 62% of the time. In other words, in 62% of the cases in this particular experiment, nothing can stop obedience to an authority figure.

Of course, this number is debatable and one cannot conclude that 62% of people are potential torturers. Other aspects are also at work and it is interesting to

study them. But it is important to identify two tendencies of human beings. The relationship of trust in authority is very powerful since it leads to do what is most unnatural for a living being: kill his fellow being without motive. To have succeeded in doing so for at least one volunteer is already an event in itself. Either one has come across a psychopath, or there is a weakness in the human being to be aware of. Having done it several times confirms the tendency to let oneself be controlled by an apparently non-binding authority. Whether it is 33% or 66% or 80% is not very important, because other parameters may allow us to adjust the desired rate. Indeed, if the volunteers had been made aware of the major importance of the opportunities of this experience, their determination would have been strengthened. They could also have been instilled with an emotional connection to the outcome, by saying that children were impacted. And remind them regularly during the experiment. It should be noted that the experience was not the result of psychological wear and tear that made the subject lose control of the situation or want to end it at all costs. In fact, he never controlled it, except for those who stopped immediately, that is to say a tiny minority. All the effectiveness of this submission rests on the American society of the time which idealizes science. The message repeated since childhood that progress is due to Science, Science cannot be wrong, you cannot understand it, it is too complicated for you, but scientists know and they are the best and the most intelligent among us.

Milgram is from the Yale University, which is a reference in the United States in 1963, date of the experiment. The gravity of the acts is possible by the blind trust and the disresponsibility, because in fact, the society learns to act with the only explanation, "it is scientific". So if science says so, it is good. The principle of the experiment is to be guided to do something according to a protocol and therefore his will is not activated. And the art of the authority figure is to make sure that the will is not activated. Hence the ambiguity of the scientific observer who does not dialogue with the volunteer. Of course, he does not abuse his position because he does not give him arguments to convince him. But at the same time, he avoids that the person starts to reason and thus takes back his power over himself.

It is worth noting a small trap that is set for the volunteer. He receives a small amount of money. It is a kind of implicit contract. The exchange of participating in what the other wants against a sum of money. In fact, it is the misleading principle of the finger in the gear. The volunteer is committed to something he does not know. Then the pain inflicted gradually increases. It is harder and harder to stop because he has to recognize that he has been wrong for a long time, yet he did not realize it. The inner struggle that takes place must probably be about the following questions: "Could I have done something wrong without realizing it? Would I not realize what is right and what is wrong? No, I am a good person who participates in Science".

The human being has natural difficulties to recognize that he has made a mistake. Be aware that if, in addition, someone uses the misleading principle of flattery, it becomes almost impossible to recognize his mistake. If the observer were to tell the volunteer that his action is brave and very useful, that he knows how to make good decisions, few would have given up before the end of the experiment.

On the other hand, we must also consider that the trap could have been much more powerful. By giving a significant amount of money at registration, such as a few days of wages. The person would then have had in mind to return the money if he stopped the experiment. Worse, he might not have been able to pay it back. This is the trap of the misleading principle of ownership (or possession). I hope you now understand that it is easy to increase the success of Milgram's experiment at will. And that with only a little money and flattery...

Now let's look at the use of slightly more powerful means. Fear is very effective. It is found in the misleading principle number 1: to arouse an emotion in order to spread a message. Imagine that before the experiment, the volunteer is terrorized, for example, by being shown that he has early signs of Alzheimer's disease. He is shown all the undesirable effects of this disease on him and those around him. It is explained to him how many people suffer from this pathology. And it is suggested that memory training is a very effective strategy to contain the development of the disease. It then becomes a priority, and even a duty, to carry out the type of experiment that is proposed to him. Those who do not complete the experiment become the exception.

In this way, the natural tendency of man has been completely reversed. Be aware that this power can give a feeling of total power and impunity. It is reasonable to think that some of those who have knowledge of it use it. So be very careful of an authority that uses fear or other misleading principles. In general, the final step to total control of human beings is to reinforce authority by fear and then by force. This is a dictatorship. Seen from the point of view of Milgram's experiment, it is to want to reach 100% of the volunteers who go to the end of the experiment and who kill their fellow being. To use the lever of fear, volunteers can be recruited from among the members of the authority figure or under his influence. For example, students at the end of their studies, or researchers, especially those who aspire to a new position. If the volunteer scientist stops the experiment, i.e. says no to another scientist in a position of authority, this will be interpreted as an act of defiance to the scientific authority. He may give up his career and he may be excluded from his social position that authority confers or makes him hope for. And if volunteers still refuse to go through with the experiment, a law can be applied to them and all the sanctions that follow for obstructing scientific progress. The ultimate sanction is to become the tortured of the experiment. You have the choice between executioner or victim. The only way left to fight against this powerful system is to denounce it. And a law that represses freedom of expression, especially in a democracy, is more than a warning signal, it is the initial event of subsequent abuses without limits.

In a rather pragmatic way, the power of the authority figure is abundantly used by the creation of scientific or medical committees financed by interest groups to justify very lucrative practices for them. It started with doctors recommending to take a cigarette instead of a candy to cut down hunger. There was also the practice, which still exists, of praising the benefits of fluoride for the teeth, whereas it is an industrial toxic waste, in order to sell it and introduce it into the drinking water networks.

How do we know if we can trust an authority figure? First of all, as far as possible, try to trust yourself. That is to say, make the effort to understand and verify what you are given. But, it is true that this is not always possible. So, there are some points to be careful about.

The person who is truly an authority in his field understands the complexity of the issues and at the same time sees the simplicity of the principles at work. This person can explain what he understands very clearly to any audience. He uses simple words to describe the essential principles if the audience is not from the field. And he can also discuss very subtle details with other specialists. To all questions, he checks his own answers and those of others. So he is also a hands-on person. He makes sure that his understanding remains valid to all the challenges that are presented to him. If necessary, he is able to question everything. This person has the experience of building knowledge and can therefore also delve into other fields than his own, because he will go to the essence of understanding. For example, he may do a review in another field to identify flaws, without necessarily succeeding in solving them.

Leonardo da Vinci, the archetype of knowledge and learning, said, "simplicity is the ultimate complexity" and "the greatest joy is the pleasure of understanding". That is why true authority is very enthusiastic about its understandings and wants to share them. He lifts you up. The impostor, conscious or not, tells you what to believe, uses negative emotions to dominate you (principle n°1), belittles you by his titles, the use of incomprehensible terms and loses you in his explanations when he deigns to give some. The genuine authority quotes others to give them credit for what they have provided. The usurper does so to justify himself and avoid explaining, and to exhibit his knowledge. The genuine authority informs about the scope and limits of his knowledge. Those who mislead you point out the limitations of others without regard for their contributions. False authority belittles or demeans you. It is not the title that tells you all this. Wrath is not a criteria either. For if you contradict or do not submit to a usurper, he can get very angry. And, genuine authority rebels against lies, abuse, waste of public money and irresponsibility when it has dramatic consequences.

And so, to conclude in one sentence, the authority that is not genuine will ask you to trust him and obey, while the true authority gives confidence to make the right decision.

Misleading principle number 11: language control

It is possible to influence an individual by controlling the concepts he manipulates. And a human uses words to manipulate concepts. So, to divert the true nature of a concept, we will associate to the word it identifies other notions that will generate other meanings. Its meanings can be so horrible or ridiculous that the word can then be abandoned or replaced. George Orwell, in his novel 1984, speaks of Novlangue: the dictatorial system uses a language with few words, the aim being to minimize the concepts that the people know so that they do not think too much and react mostly emotionally. Lacking words, the regime's criticisms are complex to

formulate and to communicate. Here are some examples of words that have been hijacked in the French language. The word "race" is associated with racists. These people denigrate others on the basis of physical characteristics. Since those who control people's minds want this to stop and/or remove words from the language, they need to show through the language that this is wrong. They want the word "race" to be assimilated to racism. They want to use "ethnicity" or "country of origin" to say that racism is wrong and that we are all the same race. But this definition corresponds to "species". It is also possible that highly racist manipulators, as seen in the ruse-fiction chapter, are trying to remove these subtleties from the language so that we cannot clearly denounce their practices.

Another wonderful word that is disappearing from the French language is the word "revisionism". It has a meaning similar to that of the word improvement, but adds the fact that one starts from an acquired state. The word designates a commitment to search for erroneous hypotheses and erroneous reasoning from which derive the conclusions, laws or knowledge of an historical period. Scientific progress or the updating of knowledge is achieved through revisionism. The word has been replaced by "negationism". Thus, today, the one who seeks the improvement of a knowledge is qualified as someone who denies it all together: "new hypothesis, facts, reasoning, conclusion" can no longer be practiced. It is difficult for me to give you more explanations about the origin of this transformation, because a law published on July 13, 1990 in France forbids the formulation of the revisionist point of view which was at the origin of this law. So I cannot tell you why it is not negationist but just revisionist. Perhaps someone from a country with Freedom of Speech can do that.

Another interesting term to study is the word "anti-Semite". This one is quite recent in the history of the language, since it appears in the second half of the 19th century. Its etymology comes from "anti" which means against and from "Shem" which is an ancestor of Abraham, from whom the peoples from which the Jews, Christians and Muslims are descended. Semitic, refers to a group of languages spread in the Middle East, mainly Arabic.

However, the definition has been associated with hostility to Jews. Hostility based on religion, race, or rather, one must say ethnic origin. It should be noted that the Jewish race is not unique. There are, among others, Caucasians (the Ashkenazim), the same lineage as most Europeans, but also Sephardim of Iberian origin and Ethiopians with dark skin. Following the persecutions they suffered in the first half of the 20th century in Europe, a sympathy of the European population, and French in particular, did not want to see these persecutions repeated. It was frowned upon to be anti-Semitic, then devilized, then condemned by the law. Now, however, we have reached an opposite extreme. It is no longer possible to express the slightest critical opinion. Even if the criticism concerns opportunistic interest groups. Otherwise, the sentence falls: "anti-Semitic". The consequence is that the person who is critical can no longer express himself in the public arena. It is an immediate, total and definitive censorship. However, in France, no one is offended when people oppose practices that impose women to cover their face for religious reasons. Laws

are even passed to regulate this in the public space. The penetration of the Church of Scientology in the film industry is regularly highlighted and no one thinks of condemning this information. The person labeled anti-Semitic cannot even justify himself, because he represents the ultimate abomination. They must disappear from the public arena. This word is so powerful that some people have not resisted the temptation to use it for people with a new idea when it is disturbing. This is the situation faced by Etienne Chouard, who militates for a refoundation of democracy. He successfully argues the importance of not having the constitution written by the representatives who decide the laws, because he sees the constitution as a means to ensure the control of the laws promulgated by the representatives. He also argued for the necessity of a citizen-initiated referendum as a necessary tool for a democracy. But it was easier to label him an anti-Semite than to debate with him on the weakness of the foundations of democracy in France. Thus, with a word, some people can decide what shall be discussed or not in the public debate. In fact, a mental programming has been introduced in the minds of the French: "if you are told that someone is anti-Semitic, you shall not try to listen to what he says". This could be called collective hypnosis. And it is quite spectacular to observe when you are conscious.

Misleading principle number 12: change the input data

This is illustrated by the popular expression "the dice are loaded from the start". It should not be forgotten that sometimes unexpected results or incomprehensible decisions are made not by an error in reasoning, but by rigged data. Often this happens through the corruption of reference institutions. We have seen that this can be done by the misleading principle number 2, the fear of ridicule, but we will also see that it can be done by the principle number 16: the hidden agreement which includes corruption. We must be aware that much of our information comes through the media, which is controlled by a small number of people. In the chapter on the war in Libya, you will discover some of the facts that are hidden from you or given to you in a biased way so that you accept a false conclusion.

Misleading principle number 13: the progressive method (finger in the gear revisited)

This is a method used to get someone to adopt something that he really doesn't want. First you state that you intend to do something that is accepted, and then you go in the opposite direction, step by step, each step being a small enough change that the person who has to accept it does not find the will to back out of the whole thing that was done before. This is, for example, the story of the frog that is put in water and gradually heated until it is scalded. If it had been put in boiling water, it would have made violent attempts to escape. But here, it gradually goes numb and cannot find the will and strength to get out of the pot.

Misleading principle number 14: attack the messenger to reject the message.

When one is in error or in denial, it is sometimes difficult to face the truth that someone is telling. The way out is then to challenge the person who is holding the

truthful idea rather than placing oneself on the ground of ideas, which would involve challenging the person in error. And this is quite easy to do. First, because nobody is perfect, and second, because it is easy to slander someone. Restoring the truth, rebuilding a reputation is much more time consuming than smearing it. Many principles of misleading are available to smear, such as number 12, the manipulation of language, by associating the person with banned or shameful notions. Principle number 2: fear of ridicule, can then be used to make those who support or would support the messenger feel ashamed. All of these are repeated many times as stated in principle number 3 of repetition, so that some of it remains in the minds of the uninformed.

Beware, the reverse is not true. Someone with a bad reputation does not necessarily tell the truth. Moreover, one cannot completely distinguish the message from the messenger. A truth must be incarnated by a man who tries to put these truths into practice. Thus, in an unhealthy society or organization, one makes sure that people who have access to compromising information have identified weaknesses that would serve to soil them if they revealed this compromising information for the organization. So, it is good not to stop at slanders. The individual who has had weaknesses may eventually show great courage and try to express a message that is useful to the many and disturbing to the people who are slandering him.

Misleading principle number 15: urging frustration

This practice consists of presenting a problem or injustice that people can identify with. Usually a scapegoat is identified and a detailed study of its negative aspects is proposed but there is no analysis of the multiple possible causes of the problem. The inefficiency of what is known to solve the problem is also presented. The whole thing is strewn with vindictive phrases that do not refer to anything concrete, such as "We can no longer accept this", "it must change". "It's scandalous". The effect is powerlessness, discomfort and frustration. The one who has listened becomes moody and irascible. The French media uses these methods in abundance. But I don't believe that it is reserved to France. The main purpose of this practice is to redirect the frustration to get your consent for something else. It addresses your emotional side to avoid the rational side. For example, at the economic level, a cigarette manufacturer in the United States, after the First World War, wanted to expand its consumer base by also reaching women who did not smoke at the time. A public relations agency hired actresses to stand at the forefront of a major event and light their cigarettes while expressing feminist demands. The newspapers, paid for this, headlined: "They light torches for freedom", explicitly making smoking an act of militancy for women's emancipation. The frustration of the lack of equality was redirected to the addiction to cigarettes. The commercial success exceeded expectations. But that's not all, it is also used in politics to pass laws that have the real purpose of blowing up health, ecological, equity or personal freedom protections. References to a frustrating problem are usually mentioned in the preamble, but the requirements of the law are quite different. This is what we

saw in the Ruse-fiction chapter with the law in France of 2018 with the title "protection of children" which extends the possibilities of actions of pedophiles. The public opinion has its emotional side finally relieved because something is being done for children, but as the rational side is not involved, it does not ensure what has actually been decided.

To come back to the main subject of this book, that sooner or later we will end up in a cataclysmic war, we have already had in France the creation of these frustrations to go to war against Libya in 2011. To convince public opinion to go to war, it is strategic to succeed in reaching women, representing half of the population. To do this, it is necessary to maintain a regular climate of feminist protest and to exacerbate it with big frustrations. And, when the time comes to redirect it to the target to be shot, like Gaddafi in 2011. Thus the media spread on the news, stories that Gaddafi had a harem, and that the women of the harem were there under constraint and raped by Gaddafi. It was also rumored that Gaddafi was using mass rape against his population by providing viagra to his army...

In another field, we are told how harmful certain foods are, especially in large quantities, that it has impacts on health, and sometimes extremely serious. I can accept this, I can see that in America, there is a serious problem at this level and that France is on the way to follow. I am also concerned about the way things are presented to us. First, we are told that everything has been tried to curb this phenomenon. Then we are told that the problem is actually the greed of industrialists who will stop at nothing, even if it means poisoning us. And finally, we are told that the only thing that really works is to tax these unhealthy products so that consumers buy less of them. But, due to respect for freedom, we can't protect the working classes, who are the most affected, from the greedy industrials. Yes, all this may be true. But there are other aspects to perceive. To tax again and again to tax by all means, to satisfy the greed of others, who are perhaps moreover the owners of greedy agri-food industries. This greed is expressed by the means of making the community contract irrecoverable debts and to make them pay by taxes. Also, I invite you to check what the taxes already put in place are used for. For example, in France, where a tax has been put on sodas and very sweet foods, is the money collected used directly to compensate the problem? Is there any additional action on obesity or diabetes prevention funded by the tax? Are these taxes subsidizing healthy, but expensive, products to restore balance and give consumers an alternative to harmful products? This also raises the question of who has the power to decide which product is favored and which is penalized. Consensus may be reached for sugar, but it is very easy afterwards to add another food to the blacklist. Who is legitimate for this? Who knows that a product is really harmful to enough people, whatever the quantity? Is it fair that reasonable people who are not negatively affected by sugar have to pay for those who abuse it? Have there been any arrangements made to end the tax once the problem is solved or rebalanced? Have there been any precautions taken to repeal the tax if it proves not to solve the problem despite initial hopes? It is reasonable to consider these aspects before believing that taxing is good when it is for a good cause. A good cause makes sure

that it does not create problems and that it solves them. Don't forget that to tax is to impose. For one thing, these taxes cost us money and our freedom of choice. And if you believe that taxing is the solution, some people will take advantage of it to generate other frustrations that will make you or others suffer, and that will bring them money that you will give through taxes or tolls. The end of the road is to have no choice and all your money confiscated. Isn't that the definition of slavery? And that is very frustrating. You have to realize it to break free. Having a choice between two problems is not a choice. With sugar, you have a choice between morbid obesity and the imposition of tax and your food. You lose in both cases. There is probably a problem elsewhere that you are not addressing. Here, it may be greed.

Sometimes the solution is elsewhere, by acting on another problem, which we know is virtuous to work on, and which indirectly, will solve other problems. Do you have any idea how many problems would be solved with peace in the world?

Another more subtle example is global warming. It reveals a paradox of our civilization. Most people accept that carbon dioxide is the cause of global warming. However, this increase is directly linked to the increase in human activities based largely on combustion energy. They have been developed since Denis Papin in the 17th century. They are mature technologies but they emit carbon dioxide. In our increasingly competitive society, the emergence of alternative technologies to these combustion technologies is difficult. Without economic advantage, the competition is lost. The basic precautionary principle would have us move toward a little degrowth. But the foundation and engine of our society is growth. Less growth would lead to serious crises (mass unemployment, chain bankruptcies, ...) and the impossibility to pay back our debts. Without questioning the model, we cannot hope for a decrease in carbon dioxide emissions. The community that would decide to abandon fuel energies would be led to disappear economically if it did so within a framework of free trade with its neighbors. To do so would require protections. The consequence of this is that ecological concerns are not sufficiently taken into account. Or that it is too difficult to do so individually or collectively. A lot of frustration is generated. A lot of people publicly stir up that frustration and call for something to be done. And everybody agrees that something needs to be done.

This is a great opportunity for a financier who needs more and more money to grow his wealth: impose targeted taxes. Even if it is beyond the realm of possibility for some, it is acceptable because something has been done that we promised to do. It's even great, because it generates new frustrations that can be used later. This is how the Yellow Jackets crisis in France was born in late 2018, when the state, in its desperate attempt to pay the interest on its debt, found an excuse to serve itself on the backs of already overtaxed French motorists. Many French people work far from their place of work for reasons of property costs, itself based in France on the ability to go into debt. The increase in fuel prices justified by the environmental impact has hit them hard and new increases were announced. No alternative to taking their gasoline car is possible for many of these people. The government was put under pressure by this movement and had to partially backtrack. See now the weakness in

which the government stands: it backs down on ecology, a subject on which however "something must be done!" and has alienated many car-dependent French people.

Imagine if the government really attacked the roots of evil like free trade or monetary power. Can't you see that it would be easy for the holders of these roots of evil to redirect all the frustration on the government, which would precisely adopt a dignified attitude. Be aware that it is in the interest of certain pressure groups to stir up these frustrations. Is it not war, or death, the last resort to relieve unbearable frustrations? Are we in a position to make a wise decision when we are in the hands of many frustrations?

Personally, I free myself from these frustrations by following Gandhi's maxim: "Be the change you want to see in this world". That is, to take concrete action. With this approach, if you are right, you will serve as an inspiration to others and if you are wrong, you will learn from your mistakes. Doing something is not about lobbying to impose a law on others. Doing something is acting, experiencing, sharing, improving and agreeing collectively on what good practice is. Doing something, by acting oneself, frees the conscience and frustrations dissipate. Then, good practices can eventually be written into laws or standards.

Misleading principle number 16: the concealed agreement

The concealed agreement is the ultimate means of circumventing any rule accepted by all the participants. It gives a decisive advantage to at least one of the concealers. It takes various forms. The cartel allows a cake (often a market) to be shared between a limited number of players, the aim is to prevent any new entrant from taking a share. It is a monopoly shared by several players. We have the abuses of a monopoly with the illusion of freedom of choice. Many commercial sectors are in this case. I will give only a few clues to find them: all of them make a lot of money, there are no disruptive innovations that could change market shares, customers or users are dissatisfied and captive, prices are high, quality deteriorates over time, it is readjusted according to the crises induced.

Another form is corruption. The decision-maker has a hidden interest in favoring one contender over another. This is a very frequent case because of the opportunities it represents, such as a politician who votes for a law, a buyer in a company or an administration who places an order, a judge who makes an arbitration, a journalist who favors a point of view, an investigator who gives up certain possibilities... Variety is also found in the form of arrangements: money, drugs, benefits in kind, return of services, network solidarity...

Another form of hidden agreement is the conspiracy. A group of people act in the shadows because their goals are not avowable. The exposure of their actions and objectives would cause the conspiracy to fail. The plot ends when it is revealed. Therefore, few people need to know the real objectives, even though many people are involved. For this, other strategies are used, such as bribery, buying, lying,

flattery... thus many people may be working towards an objective of which they are unaware, with most limiting themselves to selfish objectives.

Where virtue disappears, the hidden agreement spreads. In the West, we have laws against monopolies, cartels and corruption. But these laws do not prevent them and many people realize this fact. This is not surprising from my point of view, since virtue is slowly disappearing in the West. The French child protection law of 2018, is just one example of the strength of pedophile power networks. The conspiracy can only be suspected but the lack of virtue is real. Accepting that one lives in a non-virtuous world and that one is part of it is truly disturbing. Purchasing managers or "cost killers" virtually put a gun to the head of other company managers or farmers to rob them of as much of what they have as possible. They want to transfer the fruits of other people's labor into their own pockets, that's theft. If they don't comply, serious injuries to the company result, even death. These "killers" regularly take action to make an example. Farmers commit suicide every day, really. To believe that one does this for the sake of the company is a conscious or unconscious lie, but above all it reveals a lack of virtue. But these people are perceived in our society as useful and successful.

Probably, your company suffers from this kind of method and unfortunately makes others suffer from it. It is a lack of virtue to tolerate these practices at the community level. But who could alert us to these practices? The media? But, at least some of them, belong to those who excel in this kind of non-virtuous practices. Why do these "killers" come to invest in chronically loss-making media, at least in France. Don't they also have other non-virtuous practices to keep silent about? Isn't this a candidate for a conspiracy situation? Why do they make so much fun of those who denounce them? Definitely, it smells more misleading through fear of ridicule than virtue. To all those who laugh at conspiracies, I advise you first to accept the chronic lack of virtue in our society, and then the probable consequences.

Misleading principle number 17: the inversion

The ultimate misleading is the total inversion of references. What is believed to be true is false and the false, nasty, absurd is considered true. It is very difficult to realize this. And there is not necessarily a malicious intent behind this misleading. A belief can emerge for various reasons and gradually lead us to a total certainty. And sometimes, this kind of certainty has calamitous consequences. For example, man has long believed that the sun revolves around the Earth, as well as the other planets. Ptolemy had even succeeded in predicting the trajectories in circles around the Earth with reversals thanks to equations. The certainty was total, for more than a millennium. Until some revolutionary minds proposed something else...at the risk of their lives. To question such certainty is destabilizing for everyone. It implied to say that the Earth is round, so that some must walk upside down. It is particularly destabilizing for the authority figure, who ensures stability in society. Its role is to say, this is true, this is false, this is real, this is not. And suddenly, the authority figure has to say: I was wrong, I was the reference, but it was wrong but I remain the reference.

This is not easy. It is even impossible when it enjoys other advantages such as power, money, reputation, sufficiency...

The inversion can also be used knowingly to mislead. Thus, the wolf, hungry, to enter the sheepfold will disguise himself as a sheep. He cannot show what he is, otherwise he will not be opened. Someone who wants to harm you or take advantage of you will not approach you by expressing his real intentions. Let's take the example of a group of castaways on an island where resources are very limited. One of the key elements for their survival is solidarity. But, one person in the group is selfish. He takes more than his share of the food supply. Another person notices this and reminds him of the importance of solidarity in the situation they are in. The selfish man, in order to continue his crime and not be discovered by the others, convenes the whole group and denounces the person who surprised him by name. He complains that he has been prevented from eating, that he has the right to a share like everyone else, he lends to the wise man who unmasked him with the intention of expecting more for himself. He makes a diatribe on the gravity of selfishness in this situation. Faced with such fervor the others support him and exclude the wise man. They would later learn the error of their ways. The lesson of this story is to be wary of the one who shouts the loudest and victimizes himself. He may accuse the person most likely to expose him of his crime.

Free trade, and sometimes democracy, are inversions used to hide the law of the jungle, which is the law of the strongest.

Finally, the inversion is hidden behind the enormity of a lie, of a situation. The victim refuses to conceive the abomination that is being done to him. This is for example the case of false flag operations. Leaders massacre a part, possibly a large part of their own, to traumatize the rest of their people and to send the message that as a civilized person we must attack the enemy who has done this atrocity. This works because the manipulated cannot conceive of this level of Machiavellianism. It would imply that their authority figure is a completely false reference. The individual would then be lost. It is easier to laugh at this idea. And not listen to or silence those who raise it. This can also happen to a sincere statesman who is chosen for example in a government to give the illusion that the government is sincere. It will take him some time to understand and eventually resign. It can also be the president's closest counsellor who is in fact his worst enemy. All the information that the president receives is then biased, he must recognize that he has been fooled and that some of his past decisions are a betrayal of his ideals and his country. He must then re-examine all his past decisions.

Yet, there is good will in him. The effort required to face the truth is colossal. Flattery is an additional obstacle. This was the experience of U.S. President Woodrow Wilson after the creation of the U.S. Federal Reserve: "I am a most unfortunate man. I have unconsciously ruined my country. ..."

But when one realizes that the principles of misguidance are abundantly used and that what we thought to be true is unfortunately based on evidence built on illusory beliefs, we face a moment of great disappointment and even despair. But this is an extraordinary opportunity to experience what Socrates did. You understand that

you know nothing. It may seem painful, confusing, but remember that our universe is made of duality. You experience one of the poles of knowledge and that is the one of ignorance. And in contrast, later on, you will experience knowledge. You will know because you have already experienced ignorance. And what is handed to you on a plate with the label "true" is not the pole of knowledge.

