

# How to destroy any company or person on Earth (as long as they are criminally corrupt)

By Andre Pierson and Emily Watson

The feature film on Netflix called: *"The Corporation"*, and hundreds of thousands of University white-papers, drill down on the fact that a corrupt entity will infect all of the parts of itself. A dirty politician, company or organization only gets dirtier and more evil.

Like a tree, though, a large criminal corporation or entity can be easily toppled by simply using the fact that it's core is rotten and diseased; and by then gently pushing it over. Once off balance, it's own weight will cause it to crush itself. The bigger they are, the harder they fall. An IBM or a Google can be brought down with the same ease as a crooked neighbourhood gardener who is stealing from the neighbours. No matter the size, nor the billions of dollars they flaunt, a handful of well intentioned voters, or FBI agents, can wipe them out. Successful take-downs can receive the thanks of a grateful nation, law enforcement commendations and, sometimes, cash awards.

The only rule is: *The target must be corrupt!*

This will not work on a 100% ethical, non-political, non-human-rights abusing target.

In the case of a company like Gawker or Google, most Google executives and investors have a cult-like belief that they are “doing the bidding of a higher calling” and that they must “succeed at any cost” (Including murders). Google bosses believe that all who oppose their privacy abuse, spying, voter manipulations, bribery, stock market rigging and psychological warfare are “enemies”. Google uses the exact same culture of denial as Hitler and the SS used to rationalize the mass murders of Jews. Nobody inside Google believes that Google is evil because they are conditioned to think that way using Scientology-like “reinforcement messaging”.

HSBC bank ran money laundering schemes for criminal operations, corrupt politicians and drug cartels. HSBC staff knew they were doing evil but they thought they could get away with it.

Both companies have different corporate conditioning which enable their crimes, but both can fall just as suddenly and as hard as an Enron, a Solyndra or a Bear Sterns.

We are going to teach you how top “*Take Down Teams*” can wipe out any company and how you can do it too. Not only is it entirely legal for you to wipe out bad guys, but 200 million voters, cops, reporters and researchers will help you do it.

## **Your tools:**

### **#1- The Streisand Effect**

With this tool you will get the bad guys to promote their own destruction. The **Streisand effect** is the phenomenon whereby an attempt to hide, remove, or censor a piece of information has the [unintended consequence](#) of publicizing the information more widely, usually facilitated by the [Internet](#). It is an example of [psychological reactance](#), wherein once people are aware something is being kept from them, their motivation to access and spread the information is increased.[1] It is named after American entertainer [Barbra Streisand](#), whose 2003 attempt to suppress photographs of her residence in [Malibu, California](#), inadvertently drew further public attention to it. Similar attempts have been made, for example, in [cease-and-desist letters](#) to suppress [numbers](#), files, and websites. Instead of being suppressed, the information receives extensive publicity and media extensions such as videos and spoof songs, often being widely [mirrored](#) across the Internet or distributed on [file-sharing networks](#). [2][3]

[Mike Masnick](#) of [Techdirt](#) coined [4] the term in 2005 in relation to a holiday resort issuing a takedown notice to urinal.net (a site dedicated to photographs of urinals) over use of the resort's name. [5]

How long is it going to take before lawyers realize that the simple act of trying to repress something they don't like online is likely to make it so that something that most people would never, ever see (like a photo of a urinal in some random beach resort) is now seen by many more people? Let's call it the Streisand Effect.

— *Mike Masnick*, [5].

The term invoked Barbra Streisand who had unsuccessfully sued photographer [Kenneth Adelman](#) and Pictopia.com for violation of privacy.<sup>[6]</sup> The US\$50 million lawsuit endeavored to remove an aerial photograph of Streisand's mansion from the publicly available collection of 12,000 [California](#) coastline photographs.<sup>[2][7][8]</sup> Adelman photographed the beachfront property to document [coastal erosion](#) as part of the [California Coastal Records Project](#), which was intended to influence government policymakers.<sup>[9][10]</sup> Before Streisand filed her lawsuit, "Image 3850" had been downloaded from Adelman's website only six times; two of those downloads were by Streisand's attorneys.<sup>[11]</sup> As a result of the case, public knowledge of the picture increased substantially; more than 420,000 people visited the site over the following month.<sup>[12]</sup>

In November 2007, [Tunisia](#) blocked access to [YouTube](#) and [Dailymotion](#) after material was posted of [Tunisian](#) political prisoners. Activists and their supporters then started to link the location of then-President [Zine el-Abidine Ben Ali](#)'s palace on [Google Earth](#) to videos about civil liberties in general. *The Economist* said this "turned a low-key human-rights story into a fashionable global campaign".<sup>[13]</sup>

The French intelligence agency [DCRI](#)'s deletion of the French-language Wikipedia article about the [military radio station of Pierre-sur-Haute](#)<sup>[14]</sup> resulted in the article temporarily becoming the most-viewed page on the [French Wikipedia](#).<sup>[15]</sup>

A 2013 libel suit by [Theodore Katsanevas](#) against a [Greek Wikipedia](#) editor resulted in members of the project bringing the story to the attention of journalists.<sup>[16]</sup>

In April 2007, a group of companies that used [Advanced Access Content System \(AACCS\) encryption](#) issued cease-and-desist letters demanding that the system's numerical key be removed from several high-profile websites, including [Digg](#). This led to the key's proliferation across other sites and chat rooms in various formats, with one commentator describing it as having become "the most famous number on the Internet".<sup>[17]</sup> Within a month, the key had been reprinted on over 280,000 pages, had been printed on T-shirts and tattoos, and had appeared on [YouTube](#) in a song played over 45,000 times.<sup>[18]</sup>

In September 2009, multi-national oil company [Trafigura](#) obtained a [super-injunction](#) to prevent [The Guardian](#) newspaper from reporting on an internal Trafigura investigation into the [2006 Ivory Coast toxic waste dump](#) scandal, and also from reporting on even the existence of the injunction. Using [parliamentary privilege](#), Labour MP [Paul Farrelly](#) referred to the super-injunction in a parliamentary question, and on October 12, 2009, *The Guardian* reported that it had been gagged from reporting on the parliamentary question, in violation of the [1689 Bill of Rights](#).<sup>[19][20]</sup> Blogger Richard Wilson correctly identified the blocked question as referring to the Trafigura waste dump scandal, after which [The Spectator](#) suggested the same. Not long after, Trafigura began trending on [Twitter](#), helped along by [Stephen Fry](#)'s retweeting the story to his followers.<sup>[21]</sup> Twitter users soon tracked down all details of the case, and by October 16, the super-injunction had been lifted and the report published.<sup>[22]</sup>

In November 2012, Casey Movers, a [Boston](#) moving company threatened to sue a woman in [Hingham](#) District Court for libel in response to a negative [Yelp](#) review. The woman's husband wrote

a blog post about the situation, which was then picked up by Techdirt[23] and [The Consumerist](#)[24] as well as the [Reddit](#) community.[25] By the end of the week, the company was reviewed by the [Better Business Bureau](#), which later revoked its accreditation.[26]

In December 2013, [YouTube](#) user ghostlyrich uploaded video proof that his [Samsung Galaxy S4](#) battery had spontaneously caught fire. [Samsung](#) had demanded proof before honoring its warranty. Once Samsung learned of the YouTube video, it added additional conditions to its warranty, demanding ghostlyrich delete his YouTube video, promise not to upload similar material, officially absolve the company of all liability, waive his right to bring a lawsuit, and never make the terms of the agreement public. Samsung also demanded that a witness cosign the settlement proposal. When ghostlyrich shared Samsung's [settlement proposal](#) online, his original video drew 1.2 million views in one week.[27][28]

In August 2014, it was reported that a guest house in [Hudson, New York](#), had a policy that "there will be a \$500 fine that will be deducted from your deposit for every negative review of USGH [Union Street Guest House] placed on any Internet site by anyone in your party and/or attending your wedding or event." [29] The policy had been used in an attempt to suppress an unfavourable November 2013 [Yelp](#) review.[30] Thousands of negative reviews of the policy were posted to [Yelp](#) and other review sites.[31]

In January 2008, The [Church of Scientology](#)'s unsuccessful attempts to get Internet websites to delete a video of [Tom Cruise](#)

speaking about [Scientology](#) resulted in the creation of [Project Chanology](#).[\[32\]](#)[\[33\]](#)[\[34\]](#)

On December 5, 2008, the [Internet Watch Foundation](#) (IWF) [added](#) the [English Wikipedia](#) article about the 1976 [Scorpions](#) album [Virgin Killer](#) to a child pornography blacklist, considering the album's cover art "a potentially illegal indecent image of a child under the age of 18".[\[32\]](#) The article quickly became one of the most popular pages on the site,[\[35\]](#) and the publicity surrounding the censorship resulted in the image being spread across other sites.[\[36\]](#) The IWF was later reported on the [BBC News](#) website to have said "IWF's overriding objective is to minimise the availability of indecent images of children on the internet, however, on this occasion our efforts have had the opposite effect".[\[37\]](#) This effect was also noted by the IWF in its statement about the removal of the URL from the blacklist.[\[38\]](#)  
[\[39\]](#)

In June 2012, [Argyll and Bute Council](#) banned a nine-year-old primary school pupil from updating her blog, [NeverSeconds](#), with photos of lunchtime meals served in the school's canteen. The blog, which was already popular, started receiving an immense number of views due to the international media furor that followed the ban. Within days, the council reversed its decision under immense public pressure and scrutiny. After the reversal of the ban, the blog became more popular than it was before.[\[40\]](#)

In April 2016, it was revealed that officials at the [University of California, Davis](#), including Chancellor [Linda P.B. Katehi](#) paid consultants at least \$175,000 to scrub the internet of stories about Katehi and the administration's involvement in the [UC](#)

[Davis pepper-spray incident](#). News of the payments brought the event back into the news, adding to negative press in the wake of revelation about Katehi's involvement on outside boards. On April 27, 2016, [University of California](#) President [Janet Napolitano](#) removed Katehi from her post and placed her on paid [administrative leave](#) pending an investigation into possible violations of university policies.[41] Following the investigation, Katehi resigned on August 9, 2016.[42]

In May 2011, [Premier League](#) footballer [Ryan Giggs](#) sued Twitter after a user revealed that he was the subject of an anonymous [privacy injunction](#) (informally referred to as a "super-injunction" [43]) that prevented the publication of details regarding an alleged affair with model and former [Big Brother](#) contestant [Imogen Thomas](#). A blogger for the [Forbes](#) website observed that the British media, which were banned from breaking the terms of the injunction, had mocked the footballer for not understanding the effect.[44] *The Guardian* subsequently posted a graph detailing—without naming the player—the number of references to the player's name against time, showing a large spike following the news that the player was seeking legal action.[45]

A similar situation involving super-injunctions in England and Wales have occurred, involving [Jeremy Clarkson](#). [46] Since January 2016 an unnamed celebrity couple have also used an injunction to prevent media in England and Wales reporting events which have been featured in foreign media and on the internet.[47]

In January 2017 New York State police arrested Joseph Talbot on Dec. 29 in Wayne County and charged him with driving while



intoxicated. Newspaper owner and editor Ron Holdraker says Talbot bought nearly 1,000 newsstand copies at \$1.25 each. The story of his attempt to buy physical copies of the news but it still being posted to the internet made the news. [\[48\]](#)

The Streisand effect has been observed in relation to the [right to be forgotten](#), as a litigant attempting to remove information from search engines risks the litigation itself being reported as valid, current news. [\[49\]](#)[\[50\]](#)

**Stay Tuned For Part Two...**