

# *Mirage of Dissent:*

## *The Mechanics of Controlled Opposition*

**Joel F. Carberry**

2023

### **Introduction**

1. In the halls of governance, one always hears an echo of dissent. From democracies to despotisms, below the Nile of all regimes stirs an inundation of malcontents, men whose unchecked dissatisfaction with the system coalesces into a formidable threat. While some federations silence these rumblings with vulgar displays of power, to which Jacques de Molay's smoldering corpse will attest, the most menacing among them recognize the risks inherent in such drastic measures. Though effective in the short term, crucified dissenters become martyrs, galvanizing even greater opposition.

2. Rather than beheading hostile actors, sophisticated states use a calculated approach that walks the checkered path between authority and tyranny: **controlled opposition**. Therein, true outlets for enmity become indistinguishable from their manufactured counterparts, deceiving detractors into serving the very system they oppose. With these tactics, the line between authentic revolutionaries and state-sponsored discord blurs, dissidents are delegitimized, and personal liberty becomes a casualty, murdered to reinforce the regime's façade of stability.

3. Controlled opposition can be either inherent from a group's inception or a stratagem by external forces to camouflage their subversion. This phenomenon is a manifestation of power dynamics, where apparent opposition emerges not to challenge the system's authority but to shepherd the masses into embracing it. Herein, we will delve into the intricacies of controlled opposition tactics, exposing their multifaceted nature and the mechanisms through which they alter the trajectory of dissent.

### **Selective Exposure and Narrative Avalanches in Mainstream Media**

*"We'll know our disinformation program is complete when everything the American public believes is false."*

- William J. Casey

4. The mainstream media's power lies in its lies. These platforms serve the state as powerful tools for executing controlled opposition, dominating the information landscape through sheer volume and ubiquity, as it is impossible for any independent news sources to keep up with their output. But the dominance of MSM content supersedes its volume. MSM outlets have established their position as primary sources of information for a significant portion of the population. For many, their stories are as authoritative and reliable as one's own experiences. The rapid production of information coupled with consecrated authority allows MSM to practice **selective exposure**.

5. Selective exposure is the practice of choosing which stories to print and which to ignore. Superficial narratives designed to capture fleeting attention are paraded prominently, always at the expense of issues that could disrupt established power structures. The intentional suppression of stories inconvenient to the current regime ensures that dissenting viewpoints are confined to the fringes, silenced by omission. The pervasive notion that if an event isn't covered by MSM, it holds lesser significance or might not even exist, makes selective exposure effective.

6. MSM sources claim many things—some of which are even true—but they do not claim to be unbiased. This is no accident; an activist image must be projected for selective exposure to function. About fifty percent of the MSM outlets align with one side of the political dichotomy, while the remainder align with the other. Purposeful polarization filters all issues through the lens of an established political framework, not only reporting the text but also imbuing subtext. The censor smoke and mirrors seduce you into believing the argument to moderation fallacy: the truth lies in-between two opposing viewpoints. Due to selective exposure's limited perspective, you're conditioned to accept the official narrative and believe that the available solutions have been exhausted by the experts.

7. In the lead-up to the 2003 invasion of Iraq by the United States and its coalition, MSM outlets played a central role in getting public support for the foreign war campaign. They offered a platform for government officials and self-styled experts to disseminate a narrative: Iraq was in possession of dangerous weapons of mass destruction, representing an imminent threat to international security. Selective exposure framed the debate not around the question of whether Iraq indeed possessed WMDs but rather focused on the appropriate response to their alleged existence.

8. Despite being a powerful weapon, MSM cannot use selective exposure by itself; deliberate attempts to censor certain information backfire and increase public awareness instead, as Barbra Streisand learned the hard way. Knowing the limitations of selective exposure, the media applies a **narrative avalanche** tactic as a supporting maneuver. In manufacturing a narrative avalanche, MSM takes a calculated risk covering dangerous truths, casting a semblance of journalistic integrity by engaging with reality. Then, a rapid cascade of content crushes the truth, burying significant stories beneath a cavalcade of countless narratives that align with the intended agenda.

9. While information that tarnishes a repressive regime's image may capture a few discerning eyes, the subsequent sand drift transforms such data into grains in the dune. Even if you manage to exhume these obscure truths, the majority's response is apathetic dismissal. The narrative avalanche has preconditioned the public to perceive these revelations as isolated instances, just what the propagandists aim to accomplish.

**10.** Selective exposure and narrative avalanches push on the public a curated series of accounts that appear to have a limited number of possible responses, while the true breadth of possibilities remains shrouded. As the people navigate this maze of information, riddled with the contradictory claims of opposing factions, they will wrongly believe that the truth lies somewhere within the established ideological spectrum, subverted and unable to think for themselves.

## **Astroturfing in Social Media**

*“The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society.”*

- Edward Bernays

**11.** The series of tubes we call the internet lessened the stranglehold that mainstream media held on the narrative. In days past, if a schizophrenic’s opinion threatened consensus reality, it could only be communicated through a cardboard sign on the side of the road. Online, every apostate is free to post his critiques of The Party, not solely because information-gathering projects like DARPA’s LifeLog persist under different names but because individual opinions have been rendered obsolete. Most social media websites are state media websites, masterminded by mega-corporations that censor posts they deem against their terms of service, which are of course selectively enforced. Even still, it is not possible to censor every post on every website, which is why the controlled opposition tactic of **astroturfing** has become prolific.

**12.** Astroturfing, *n.* Promoting a message while disguising its origin, making it appear as though its inception were an organic result of public opinion. Astroturfing is carried out on the internet via chatbots, computer programs designed to propagate specific narratives and churn out repetitive posts across social media platforms. To blunt the bronze of artificial influence, CAPTCHAs were introduced as barriers to thwart bots. In response, programmers managed to devise algorithms that can surmount nearly any challenge-response test, leading to the current predicament. Chatbots are set to generate an aeolian storm of posts on forums with the intent of tricking you into believing that hundreds or perhaps thousands of users on a given forum hold a specific set of beliefs.

**13.** But chatbots can’t fool everyone, as even the most advanced artificial intelligences tend to have robotic speech patterns. Moreover, mainstream social media websites that allow users to view a specific profile can reveal that a poster is a bot; chatbots often lack the extensive posting history of a legitimate user. Consequently, professional astroturfing employs real people operating numerous sockpuppet social media accounts, as demonstrated in the infamous American PSYOP known as Operation Earnest Voice. The psychological operation allowed United States operatives to deploy sockpuppet accounts on foreign websites to spread propaganda, appearing to originate from within the targeted country using virtual private networks.

**14.** These sockpuppets are convincing to the untrained eye, utilizing profile pictures of paid actors and employing native slang in their posts. Sockpuppet accounts engage in interactions that mimic genuine discussions, but they are orchestrated by a single source. A puppeteer will use his sockpuppets to have a back-and-forth argument with himself, creating the illusion of spirited

debate. Overseers can simultaneously use sockpuppets alongside bots, assuming direct control over a bot's operations and interjecting with a human post when others become suspicious.

**15.** In criminology, the Routine Activities Theory posits that crime occurs when a trifecta converges: 1) the presence of a motivated offender, 2) the presence of a suitable target, and 3) the absence of a capable guardian. The state is motivated; the populace is vulnerable. There is nothing to stop rogue organizations from deploying similar tactics to those seen in OEV on us besides man-made laws—meaningless words on a page that failed to prevent the enacting of the Patriot Act or the annulment of the Magna Carta. Suspicions already arise regarding how Eglin Air Force Base managed to amass over 100,000 visits to Reddit in 2013 despite having fewer than 3,000 personnel. By simulating grassroots support, these fabricated accounts create the appearance of public discourse while locking discussions into scripted narratives, eroding the foundations of both informed decision-making and participatory democracy.

## **Gatekeepers and Absurdist Agents as Public Figures**

*“The Press succeeded in the magical art of producing names from nowhere within the course of a few weeks. They made it appear that the great hopes of the masses were bound up with those names. And so they made those names more popular than any man of real ability could ever hope to be in a long lifetime. All this was done, despite the fact that such names were utterly unknown and indeed had never been heard of even up to a month before the Press publicly emblazoned them.”*

- Adolf Hitler

**16.** Using the powers of mainstream media, chatbots, and sockpuppet accounts, the state astroturfs agents of influence into popularity. Puissant entities employ these agents to maintain control over the proletariat, capturing their thoughts and forcing them in line with the desired agenda: the preservation of the state. One form of this dominance is manifest in the **gatekeeper**.

**17.** Gatekeeping involves the vilification of critical information. Consider a problem with three interconnected issues. The gatekeeper will critique the first two issues, earning credibility amongst his assemblage. Yet, when the time comes to confront the disruptive third issue, the gatekeeper downplays its significance, dismisses it as irrational, paranoid. This dupes the audience into believing that delving further into this third facet is unreasonable, even heretical.

**18.** The influence of gatekeepers extends beyond information control. They are trained thespians who maintain an aura of reason, honesty, and open-mindedness. By cultivating credibility and then endorsing the core values of the current regime, they discourage any thoughts of rebellion or radical change. Their measured approach lulls the public into somnambulism, preventing the living dead from digging into deeper layers of gnosis that threaten the existing power structure.

**19.** Gatekeepers, if used alone, would actualize the Streisand effect. It is therefore necessary to conjure forth their antithesis: the **absurdist agent**. Regular disinformation tactics render reality unknowable by blending elements of truth and falsehood to contaminate the oasis of information, but the absurdist is a specialized disinformation agent whose provocative persona attaches itself to

any authentic truths he advocates. Rather than relying on logos, the absurdist employs pathos, parodying his enemy's ideology. This serves a dual purpose: it casts an unrelenting shadow of doubt over both the agent's assertions and his receptive audience.

**20.** The absurdist aims to mold the public perception of himself into that of a court jester, a living caricature. Where there is an issue replete with three intersecting points of interest, the absurdist asserts that an unrelated fourth factor is relevant. He promotes factual information for extended periods, only to abruptly pivot and retract his statements. He makes wild assertions without any evidence, and he also champions data that are obviously false. He subjects himself to a series of humiliation rituals that castrate his character. Once the absurdist has established himself as cognitive dissonance incarnate, his persona discredits everything he touches, and anything he utters can be summarily dismissed as the ramblings of a madman.

**21.** The mainstream media manipulates interviews so that ordinary individuals appear unhinged, an effortless task when reporting on absurdist agents. Instead of presenting a balanced and comprehensive view of his ideas, the media focus solely on his most bizarre and senseless aspects. This selective portrayal curtails any valid or thought-provoking insights he might have expressed, further solidifying the perception that he is a purveyor of insanity, that you're become the fool for entertaining his ideas.

**22.** The absurdist enables the state to discredit any idea that poses a threat. He's a conduit who leaks real information so that the public perceives it as false. Dark occultists practice predictive programming, believing that warning the victim before committing an act against them absolves the perpetrator of culpability. Their underlings hand the absurdist a script, and it's as if the words were dictated by the Devil. The agent warns the public of impending unethical operations, but nobody could be reasonably expected to believe him. And as we bury our dead, the culprits yell, "I am innocent of this man's blood, it is your responsibility!"

## **Controlled Political Parties in Representative Democracies**

*"However [political parties] may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government, destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion."*

- George Washington

**23.** In America, the entire spectrum of options for dealing with any political problem is distilled into a binary choice: the Republicans and the Democrats. These two major parties ostensibly exist in a state of diametric opposition, and this is how the tactic of **controlled political parties** should make them appear. But the fundamental structure of the political system—from the formulation of policies to the architecture of party platforms—is curated to advance a singular agenda, perpetuating the illusion of choice while safeguarding the overarching interests of the entrenched elites. Behind the rhetoric and campaign slogans lies a uniformity of purpose: both parties are designed to uphold a pre-established framework. This framework ensures that regardless of which

wig occupies the spotlight, the broader narrative remains within fixed boundaries that avoid overthrowing the established order.

**24.** Elections within the United States are an exercise in Luciferian theater, a spectacle that appears to respond to popular will. Yet, electoral outcomes remain as predictable as the rising sun. This manipulation doesn't hinge on the fabrication of ballots; instead, the art of controlled political parties transcends vote tabulation. Selective exposure tactics amplify the voices of the favored Republican and Democratic candidates while muting the rest. Access to influential circles is a privilege bestowed solely upon those deemed fit for office by the Camarilla, further bolstering the blockade against those considered outside agents. But perhaps the biggest concern is financial, as the courtesan we call the state always sells herself to the highest bidder.

**25.** Corporate behemoths use a network of affiliates to funnel financial contributions into the coffers of political campaigns on both sides of the synagogue. Eminent names in the corporate world—Goldman Sachs, General Electric, Blackstone Group, etc.—execute maneuvers to ensure their money is lapped up by both Republican and Democratic candidates within the same calendar year. *Res ipsa loquitur*, those outside the established duopoly are denied influence; only individuals amenable to the system's architects can ascend to power.

**26.** Controlled political party tactics combine disillusionment with optimism to make the public accept the status quo. As citizens invest their hopes and dreams into the political process, they are led to believe that their chosen party will bring a better tomorrow. When the umbra of disappointment looms as this tomorrow never comes, blame shifts towards the opposing party and the labyrinthine corridors of bureaucracy. This is not a flaw but rather the essence of the system's design—a perpetual cycle of unmet pledges and finger-pointing that fuels public disillusionment and, concomitantly, allows for a surge of hope that the party of allegiance will finally surmount the competition next time.

**27.** The people are always left yearning for that one last opportunity to usher in the changes they desire within the confines of legitimate elections. Yet, with each recurrence of this cycle, realization falls short of expectation. And each time this occurs, the political landscape becomes increasingly charged, ready to crack like thunder. Adherents of the Republicans and Democrats become embroiled in bitter rivalries, blaming each other for civilization's woes, and the disenfranchised strata of society find themselves caught in the crossfire. The mainstream media further fan the flames, framing every political issue through the lens of these factions, narrowing the spectrum of viable solutions to societal dilemmas down to blue and red. As Noam Chomsky once wrote, "*The smart way to keep people passive and obedient is to strictly limit the spectrum of acceptable opinion, but allow very lively debate within that spectrum.*"

**28.** Despite the glaring ineptitude of the system, we're conditioned to perceive any change originating from outside its scope as objectionable. The prevailing dogma insists that alternative forms of governance are inherently flawed, tainted, inferior when juxtaposed against our sanctified democracy. Schools, workplaces, and government institutions instill this image in our impressionable minds, imparting ominous warnings of the horrors that would accompany the introduction of a novel governmental paradigm. This transmutes such an idea into an apparition reminiscent of Emmanuel Goldstein, sowing fear and trepidation at its very mention. The

overarching intent is to coax us into a state of compliance akin to a well-trained canine, poised to bark when confronted with critiques of the system: “Yes, democracy may bear its imperfections, but its excellence remains unparalleled!”

**29.** Once we are ensconced in the belief that democracy is irreplaceable, our avenues of dissent are circumscribed, limited to internal struggles within the system’s prescribed political parties. We align ourselves with a political faction that appears to represent at least a portion of our interests, believing we are at least doing something to resist. The triumph of the controlled political party tactics lies in the apparent rebellion that is, in fact, an obedient participation in the system’s preordainment. Thus, alternatives that exist beyond the boundaries of the ballot box are never explored, daring whispers of operating outside the sanctioned channels remain muffled, and the prospect of self-governance remains a dormant dream.

## **Infiltrators and Saboteurs in Reactionary Movements**

*“COINTELPRO is the FBI acronym for a series of covert action programs directed against domestic groups. In these programs, the Bureau went beyond the collection of intelligence to secret action designed to ‘disrupt’ and ‘neutralize’ target groups and individuals. . . . the Bureau conducted a sophisticated vigilante operation aimed squarely at preventing the exercise of First Amendment rights of speech and association, on the theory that preventing the growth of dangerous groups and the propagation of dangerous ideas would protect the national security and deter violence. Many of the techniques used would be intolerable in a democratic society even if all of the targets had been involved in violent activity, but COINTELPRO went far beyond that. The unexpressed major premise of the programs was that a law enforcement agency has the duty to do whatever is necessary to combat perceived threats to the existing social and political order.”*

- The Church Committee

**30.** Despite the system’s best efforts to turn inevitable eruptions into controlled explosions, radical movements form outside the control of the government. Some of these movements, due to their potential to disrupt existing power structures, are met with the brute force of state repression, burned to the ground the same as Waco in 1993. The majority, though, are subjected to a more insidious fate: they are co-opted or sabotaged through the strategic deployment of special agents. Centralized movements operate through hierarchical structures, where authority cascades from the eye of the pyramid to the base. Top-tier leaders dictate the course of action; lower-level members execute their orders under the supervision of intermediaries. Hierarchical systems, with their clear lines of authority, are vulnerable to **infiltrators**.

**31.** Infiltrators are clandestine actors who embed themselves within a group with the explicit aim of dismantling it from the inside. Infiltrators are effective at any level of an organization, monitoring activities and reporting them to the authorities or searching for information that facilitates character assassination of important group members. But infiltrators are no mere spies. These agents exploit ideological differences, personal conflicts, and financial vulnerabilities within the movement to create internal divisions, weaken its cohesion. Infiltrators practice bad-jacketing—the act of forging evidence to suggest that a legitimate revolutionary is cooperating with law enforcement. The outcome of successful bad-jacketing is either banishment or murder at

the hands of one's own comrades, adhering to the standard operating procedure of executing a traitor before an enemy.

**32.** Surveillance, character assassination, and bad-jacketing serve as the opening salvos in the infiltrator's subterfuge. Positioned within the organization's intermediary levels of leadership, the infiltrator manipulates its actions by purposefully misinterpreting or distorting orders from higher-ranking members. This leads the lower levels to carry out actions that are counterproductive or self-destructive, leveraging the organization's structure against it. The infiltrator's most dangerous potential emerges when he ascends to the zenith of the organization. From a position of command, he can reshape the group's core policies and objectives, transforming the movement into a husk of its former self, rendering it harmless or even beneficial to those in authority.

**33.** While centralized movements offer clear points of susceptibility to infiltration tactics, their decentralized counterparts, such as leaderless resistance, demonstrate remarkable resilience to co-optation. Enter the **saboteur**, a specialist in the art of tarnishing a movement's public image, employing a strategy of attention-grabbing theatrics engineered to generate adverse publicity. These agents engage in false flag operations, adorning themselves in attire emblematic of the organization they seek to implicate, and then proceeding to stage provocative or violent acts.

**34.** In the early 1960s, geopolitical tensions between the United States and Cuba were akin to a powder keg. Following the ill-fated Bay of Pigs Invasion, the US Department of Defense proposed a plan that would light the fuse of a *casus belli*: Operation Northwoods. As written in the unclassified documents, "*The desired resultant from the execution of this plan would be to place the United States in the apparent position of suffering defensible grievances from a rash and irresponsible government of Cuba and to develop an international image of a Cuban threat to peace in the Western Hemisphere.*" To fabricate these 'grievances,' it was suggested that saboteurs sink ships of Cuban asylum seekers at sea, use plastic bombs to maim Cuban refugees in America, and build replicas of Cuban fighter aircraft to be piloted by saboteurs and used to harass US civil air.

**35.** In instances where a decentralized movement lacks a recognizable uniform or emblem, the saboteur and his handlers prepare by disseminating a manifesto in advance of committing the false flag operation. This manifesto claims responsibility for the actions committed in the name of the targeted movement. These tactics possess the versatility to target not only entire movements but also their specific ideas or principles.

**36.** There persists a belief that infiltrators and saboteurs belong to a bygone era, that operations like COINTELPRO were terrible mistakes that modern governments would never replicate. Unfortunately, the unforgiving truth is that secret operations worldwide continue to employ such tactics. Disconcerting is the predictability of the sequence of events that unfolds each time. The government executes an unethical operation, veiled in secrecy. Subsequently, a vehement and resolute denial emanates from the highest echelons of power, forcefully asserting that no such operation has transpired. In tandem with this denial, the media rushes to brand those who dare to suggest otherwise as conspiracy theorists. Finally, as time grinds on and the public's interest naturally wanes, the government quietly releases a statement acknowledging the operation's



existence. By that point, however, it has become a relic of the past, entombed in the annals of history, irrelevant to the present.

## **Summary and Conclusion**

**37.** Selective exposure controls what the public sees; narrative avalanches bury dangerous stories beneath the dust. Astroturfing pretends to come from individuals but comes from organizations. Gatekeepers hold information back; absurdist agents discredit information. Controlled political parties create false dilemmas. Infiltrators kill us from within; saboteurs kill others while masquerading as us.

**38.** The ultimate objective of this subversion is to obliterate the concept of informed consent, making us tolerate conditions that would otherwise be intolerable. In a healthy society that prioritizes the well-being of its citizens, controlled opposition is unnecessary. Mechanisms of control only become necessary when the state schemes to ransack the nation's treasury, exploit its workforce into the depths of impoverishment, and replace its native identity with a gray, alien influence—actions that in conventional circumstances would catalyze a *coup d'état*.

**39.** We confront an ultimatum: to stand as men, resolute in our principles, or to fade into the shadows as automatons, surrendering to the artifice of controlled opposition. Let it be understood that the call to resist these encroachments is not a choice but rather a solemn duty thrust upon us, a moral imperative that brooks no compromise. And although this resistance may lead to the battlefield, its inception takes root in the ethereal realm of our collective thought. Only by peering through the mind's eye can we penetrate the mirage of dissent enshrouding our media, public figures, government institutions, and even our reactionary movements.

**40.** My sole contribution has been a word of caution: transcend your programming and reclaim your humanity, or remain a battery powering the machine's subjugation.