

# Pastry ordinance

## TEFLONRABBIT ARTICLE No.188

Unique Identifier:47183851-3f57-4910-8847-b7ff27e7f093



### Madness in Method

Friday, April 1, 2022 - 09:30

[PDF Version](#)

Aroma

Image not found or type unknown



60

Rumness

Image not found or type unknown



30

Subscription Only

Off

**"Regulatory Framework means the regulatory instruments issued by the Authority from time to time including any revisions and amendments made to them" - lawinsider.com**

[Perception management](#) [Politics](#) [Abraham Lincoln](#) [Sales](#) [Commercial Terms and Conditions](#) [Bovine Excretia](#) [Leaders](#) [Media](#) [Social Engineering](#) [HR](#) [Bad practice](#) [Competition](#)

Any organisation inhabiting a particular industry is compelled to operate according to guidelines which can be understood by the consumers of their product or service. The comprehension of these guidelines by all involved does not represent an

optional methodology, but a fundamental necessity. To ensure that consumers are afforded informed choice, organisations must adhere to a shared set of operating criteria. Conforming to this shared professional philosophy conventionally requires that the organisations subscribe to (or at least pay lip service to) some form of regulatory framework.

Due to the nature of commerce, regulatory frameworks are frequently flouted by organisations that consider deviating from this shared operating criteria as an acceptable risk. This ideological subversion gives rise to principles which detract from the integrity of the industry. This can be summarised with such tired clichés as;

- It's easier to gain forgiveness than permission
- The price is whatever the market will bear
- If you don't like the conversation, change the subject
- Never accept "No" as an answer

All of these principles have been embraced by organisations who consider positive outcome as the only motivating factor in any given negotiation. One of the most commonly seen examples of this practise can be seen during interviews with professional politicians. No politician would ever engage with any interviewer on a transparent basis. Doing so would render them vulnerable to ambush in the form of unexpected questions which could well damage the credibility of their narrative. In turn this damage will undoubtedly lead to the reduction of their status in the political party. Consequently, it becomes obvious to anyone observing the interview that the politician isn't making any effort whatsoever to address the issues raised by the interviewer. Instead they are analysing the content of the question to identify the most accessible rejoicing segue. In the absence of an identifiable window to hijack the narrative, many rely on stock methods to subvert the flow of conversation in their favour. For example:

That's a good question and one which we shall answer - at the appropriate time - which is not now. At this time, we feel that there is greater value in addressing ...

While this method has become increasingly popular due to demonstrable gains in narrative delivery, it completely eradicates any support from anyone employing critical thinking. It is therefore only catering to the lowest common denominator. The delivery of such a method is predicated on the idea that the vast majority of individuals are not critical thinkers. Instead they are marginalised as easily lead ideologues who would undoubtedly make for excellent theatrical hypnosis subjects. This has become 'business as usual' for political parties, public relations advisors, commercial analysts, think tanks and basically any organisation that perceives 'nudge theory' or contrived narratives as effective communication.

Basically what we're talking about is mind control and profiting from it. Success is achieved by loading specific parts of the following 1858 formula from the famous lifestyle guru Abraham Lincoln.

You can fool all the people some of the time and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time.

Good old Abe fairly knew his stuff and he'd be writhing in his grave if he knew how far certain groups have gone to deconstruct his conceptual analysis of the confidence trick. Working toward a solution based on the advantages of not fooling any of the people any of the time, would logically represent the most effective direction. This would be the exact opposite direction from that chosen by the vast majority of commercial entities. Instead we live in times where transparency is trumpeted as an admirable quality but is actually considered to be an acute disability. The thinking behind this pole shift appears to be entirely centred on the aggressive sales mindset. Fooling as many of the people, as often as possible appears to be the desired outcome of every commercial entity from weapons manufacturers to healthcare providers.

So what can the human race do in terms of countering such a disastrous trend?

That s a good question and one which deserves an answer - at the appropriate time ...