

Dirty tricks of conspiracy deniers

- Introduction -
- List of tricks -
- Misunderstanding science -
- Poisoning the well / the flat Earth gambit -
- Dismissing conspiracy theorists as psychologically defective -
- Hypnosis / brainwashing by bad association -
- Focusing on strawmen or weak arguments -
- Running away from debate -
- Big tech censorship -
- Why does any of this matter? -

Introduction

There is an army of people out there whose goal is to make you automatically trust mainstream narratives on all topics and dismiss all others even as possibilities to explore (and you - as a reader of this site - do not like being such a mental slave, right?). To accomplish this, they have given up all pretense of fair play and are just throwing all the dirty tricks they can find at you. It's a war - only for the mind space instead of physical territory; and in war, everything is allowed (or so they think). So far, the anti-conspiracy cult leaders seem to be winning the war. Their traps are varied and numerous; a person that's not careful is likely to fall into at least one,

and become a victim of the cult. They seem to have gained a lot of grunts during COVID, in particular. Grunts that went around social media, doing the jobs of the higher-ups by - usually - repeating their tricks. This article is my attempt at reclaiming the lost souls, before they fall too deep into the anti-conspiracy swamp and become YouTube influencers attacking conspiracy theories (ugh). And - of course - to convince the conspiracy theorists that we are on the right side of history and keep them around. Hopefully by exposing the shady behaviors of the cultists and showing that the conspiracy-denying emperor is bare - we can begin tipping the scale towards our side, and win the war in the end. So let's go:

List of tricks

Misunderstanding science



Also seen - for example - [here \(archive\)](#) (MozArchive):

Science denialism comes in many forms: climate change deniers, people who are anti-vaxxers, who believe COVID is a hoax, that evolution isn't real, and who think the Earth is flat.

And [here \(archive\)](#) (MozArchive):

The U.S. has a science problem. Around half of the country's citizens reject the facts of evolution; fewer than a third agree there is a scientific consensus on human-caused

climate change, and the number who accept the importance of vaccines is ticking downward.

And [here \(archive\)](#) ([MozArchive](#)):

On hot button topics such as climate change, vaccines, and genetically modified foods, science denial is rampant—and it crosses party and ideological lines. What are the psychological forces that lead people to disbelieve scientific consensus? Is science denial worse than it's ever been?

Okay, that's enough; you can find hundreds more with a similar theme if you really want to. All these sources assume that “*science*” is some kind of an oracle that “*says*” a particular belief (such as climate change or certain COVID narratives) which you're then supposed to accept to be a good scientific and rational boy / girl. Now let's contrast that with what science is in reality. From our beloved [NASA \(archive\)](#) ([MozArchive](#)):

Science is . . . Observing the world. Watching and listening Observing and recording.

See? Nothing about certain beliefs being scientific, and certain not. They even tell you that...directly!

Science is not just a tidy package of knowledge.

So, anytime a mainstream shill tries to call you un- or anti- scientific because you deny their pet theory or agree with a “*conspiracy theory*”, you can send them to NASA for the corrective lesson. Hey, let's confirm this with a [dictionary \(archive\)](#) ([MozArchive](#)):

The observation, identification, description, experimental investigation, and theoretical explanation of phenomena

Again, nothing about science “*saying*” something and requiring you to “*accept*” it. The modern Orwellian redefinition of science as “*something that says*” is just an attempt by authoritarians to claim it as a vehicle for spreading their pet theories, or burying undesirable ones. And since science radiates an aura of respect, it would obviously be the first target for thought control attempts. But the real definitions actually make it clear that **science cannot reject any theories apriori** - not even “*conspiracy theories*” - as long as the proper methodologies are followed. Or in the words of William James (archive) (MozArchive), founder of Society of Psychical Research, who studied (among other things) mediums (and discovered results he could not conventionally explain):

Science means, first of all, a certain dispassionate method. To suppose that it means a certain set of results that one should pin one's faith upon and hug forever is sadly to mistake its genius, and degrades the scientific body to the status of a sect.

Degrading “*the scientific body to the status of a sect*” is exactly what the anti-conspiracists are doing. All while historically, science has been about people questioning and eventually toppling the prevailing views; usually, many competing theories were around at the same time. This has happened in physics, biology, everywhere; and is still happening when you actually look into the journals instead of relying on media coverage (the mainstream media is almost entirely controlled by the authoritarians). When Darwin came around to challenge Lamarck, no one screamed about the alleged destruction of science. It was simply accepted as something natural; but if the authoritarians were in charge, we'd be stuck with Lamarck forever (not that I think Lamarckian views are somehow worse; in fact they are having a resurrection these days

([archive](#)) ([MozArchive](#)) - just showing an example of the perils of "scientific" authoritarianism).

Of course, authoritarians using science as a cover have always been around ([archive](#)) ([MozArchive](#)), and they always brought disaster with them - *“In 1847 Semmelweis, who was an obstetrician, (a doctor specializing in childbirth), published evidence that when doctors washed their hands before examining or treating patients, the mortality rate for women in his birthing ward in Vienna, Austria, was greatly reduced”; “Semmelweis had become clinically depressed when his work was rejected and he started behaving oddly. He was lured by another doctor into an insane asylum in Vienna. Realizing it was a trap, Semmelweis tried to get out, but was held and badly beaten by guards and placed in a straightjacket. He died two weeks later, most likely from injuries he suffered during the beating”*. The peak of "scientific" authoritarianism is murder of the dissidents. Today, it happens to be the anti-conspiracy community playing that role and holding science and humanity back. You'd think people would finally figure out to not fall for their tricks, but somehow they don't. Funnily, when they accuse anyone who refuses to bow down of *“science denial”*, they end up being the actual science deniers because they deny that popular theories can be questioned - when it's the **essence of science** to do so. Again, science **cannot reject theories - not even conspiracy theories - apriori**. Appeals to *“scientific consensus”* appear every so often in the authoritarian publications as an excuse for rejecting theories; about that, I will just quote Michael Crichton ([archive](#)) ([MozArchive](#)):

I want to pause here and talk about this notion of consensus, and the rise of what has been called consensus science. I regard consensus science as an extremely pernicious development that ought to be stopped cold in its tracks. Historically, the claim of consensus has been the first refuge of scoundrels; it is a way to avoid debate by claiming

that the matter is already settled. Whenever you hear the consensus of scientists agrees on something or other, reach for your wallet, because you're being had.

Let's be clear: the work of science has nothing whatever to do with consensus. Consensus is the business of politics. Science, on the contrary, requires only one investigator who happens to be right, which means that he or she has results that are verifiable by reference to the real world. In science consensus is irrelevant. What is relevant is reproducible results. The greatest scientists in history are great precisely because they broke with the consensus. There is no such thing as consensus science. If it's consensus, it isn't science. If it's science, it isn't consensus. Period.



You need to accept
neo-Darwinism!
Climate change!
GM food! mRNA
vaccines! Moon
landing! Bat soup!
You science denier!!



No.

Poisoning the well / the flat Earth gambit

This is when the conspiracy denier picks the least serious, weakest, or most "out there" conspiracy theory to insert inside the box with all the others and dismiss them together. It is like releasing a skunk into the zoo to prevent people from checking out all the other animals. Some examples (archive) (MozArchive):

Other Truther Theories: Chemtrails, Shapeshifters and reptilians are real, Trump is a puppet, moon landing was fake, "space junk is a fraud."

Reptilians thrown together with very sane beliefs about Trump and the moon landing. And the space junk thing? Who cares? I've never even heard about it before. Clearly, no one seriously discusses this so including it is yet another attempt to poison the well. Another example (archive) (MozArchive):

Is Elvis still alive? What happens in Area 51? Who really killed JFK? And are our politicians and leaders in fact shapeshifting reptilian humanoids?

Again, the reptilians poison the questioning of Area 51 and JFK. Let's give one more (archive) (MozArchive) for good measure, since it is quality:

Readers React: Anti-vaxxers are like flat-Earthers. There is no vaccine 'debate'


Saying there is a vaccine debate is analogous to saying there is a flat-Earth debate.

An even better one (archive) (MozArchive):


But the recent rise of flat earthers, anti-vaxxers and climate change skeptics seems to

have caught people's imagination and fueled wariness of science.


Vaccine and climate change skepticisms poisoned by the association with the flat Earth. The conspiracy deniers know that if a person dares to research a really well supported conspiracy theory (such as the 9/11 demolition theory or the moon landing hoax), they will forever be free from the mainstream mental chain. So they have to prevent that by making it seem like all non-mainstream ideas are ones with little merit (like FE and reptilians). Of course, the antidote to that is to realize that the alternative box doesn't even exist; all it means is "not from the so-called 'elites'". Just because something is "not from the so-called 'elites'", doesn't mean it's suddenly worth caring about. Among the pile of ideas there will ones with widely varying levels of quality. So examine each one on its own - something this gambit is trying to nip in the bud.



**ALSO EARTH IS FLAT
SPACE NO EXIST
SKY IS BIG DOME
SHOW ME DA CURVE**



**This is silly, you guys
are just insane**



Dismissing conspiracy theorists as psychologically defective

According to [this site \(archive\) \(MozArchive\)](#), people believe in conspiracy theories because they have these psychological traits:

- *“paranoid or suspicious thinking”*
- *“eccentricity”*
- *“low trust in others”*
- *“stronger need to feel special”*
- *“belief in the world as a dangerous place”*
- *“seeing meaningful patterns where none exist”*

Here is the problem with explaining the prevalence of conspiracy theories through mental defects: **it only works if we are wrong**. See, if our paranoia, distrust or pattern detection prevents us from eating cancer-causing GM food and / or injecting poisonous COVID vaccines - then we won! Our psychological traits worked for our benefit; while your blind trust in the benevolence of so-called "elites", herd mentality, and total unawareness of what happens around you have failed you. This is why - in the end - we need to **discuss the evidence**; the last thing the conspiracy deniers want to do. And when we do, it will be clear that the head-in-the-sand style psychology isn't doing the mainstream shills any favors (I could drop a few *“died suddenly”* cases here, but let's be nice...). Anyway, there are [many \(archive\) more \(archive\) \(MozArchive\) sites \(archive\) \(MozArchive\)](#) that try to dismiss conspiracy theories because of alleged psychological flaws of their proponents. But I want to cover one more specific one

([archive](#)) ([MozArchive](#)), since it brings up interesting things:

Humans have evolved to have cognitive biases, said Bastiaan Rutjens, a psychology professor at the University of Amsterdam. This brain tool was useful when we were hunters and gatherers, he explained. Noticing danger and distrusting our senses helped us survive.

See? Your primitive, caveman brain still has “*cognitive biases*” that make you believe “*conspiracy theories*”. The advanced, civilized human, holds only the right thoughts infused into him by the self-proclaimed experts from the ruling families.


“Cognitive biases were helpful in our ancestral past, but they are not useful today,” Rutjens said.


And why exactly? Has danger disappeared from the world? Humans are the most dangerous animals. But regardless, there are still falling trees, bears running around, poisonous plants, cold weather and a myriad other things that can kill us. Succumbing to a head-in-the-sand style psychology isn't useful in any possible world. Anyway, let's move on to the really juicy quotes:

From the anti-vaccine movement to the belief that the earth is flat, there seems to a growing distrust of science and institutions, and experts say it's difficult to come up with an antidote to the erosion.

Experts now have less power than they used to because the traditional gatekeepers of knowledge have been lifted through social media, he explained.

Hahaha. They hate us cause they can't control us! Our alleged psychological defects boil down to not wanting to be domesticated human-doggies.





By the way, in the paper Growing a Bayesian Conspiracy Theorist: An Agent-Based Model (local), it is shown that a person can become a conspiracy theorist without being afflicted by any kind of mental defects. The computer model (based on the way real people work) shows that people's beliefs will end up all over the place depending on who and / or what they come in

contact with, regardless of their psychology.

Given the fact that agents update their beliefs in a Bayesian manner, their cognitive system can be described as rational and entirely reasonable.

As such, we show that extreme beliefs such as conspiracies could emerge through entirely rational processes.

Of course, the authors are still mainstream cucks and dismiss conspiracy theorists as “*objectively mistaken*” and “*extreme*”, but we should admire them for being able to step out of their comfort zones and actually explore the possibility that a conspiracy theorist can emerge without reference to mental defects. The answer is yes, and the “*conspiracy theorists are crazy*” dismissal is dead on arrival!

Hypnosis / brainwashing by bad association

From <https://www.npr.org/2021/03/02/971289977/through-the-looking-glass-conspiracy-theories-spread-faster-and-wider-than-ever> (archive) (MozArchive):

Garland also is skeptical that the Sept. 11 attacks were carried out by 19 al-Qaeda terrorists – even though they were. She doesn't believe that former President Barack Obama was born in the United States – even though he was. And she believes, falsely, that the coronavirus is just "another strain of the flu."

“*Falsely*”. “*They were*”. “*He was*”. Next up <https://www.apa.org/news/apa/2020/conspiracy-theories> (archive) (MozArchive):

About half of Americans believe in at least one disproven conspiracy theory (Oliver, J. E. & Wood, T. J., American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 58, No. 4, 2014)

“Disproven” (btw, the paper itself doesn't say this; yeah I've checked). And finally https://www.voanews.com/a/usa_fbi-director-concerned-about-qanons-potential-violence/6204582.html (archive) (MozArchive):

QAnon started out in 2017 as a baseless, online conspiracy theory that falsely claimed then-President Donald Trump was secretly battling a “deep state” cabal of Satan-worshipping pedophiles.

“Baseless”. “Falsely”.

You get the drill. Anytime the conspiracy deniers mention a conspiracy theory, they strike it down with the relevant adjective (or more than one); and the opposite for the mainstream theories. Being exposed to such associations hundreds of times, eventually, your brain begins to attach the concept of conspiracy theories to falsity and mainstream theory to truth. This might be their strongest tactic of all; there is no analysis involved in being flooded with adjectives, so the strategy bypasses all rational faculties. Pretty much infecting you with the associations they want present in your brain. Wikipedia does this all the time, too. But now that I have reminded you of it, you are immunized. Hey, a vaccine that actually works :D.

Focusing on strawmen or weak arguments

We will cover two topics here: COVID-19 and the moon landing; though this applies to every single conspiracy theory out there. Let's start with corona (archive) (MozArchive):

- *Hydroxychloroquine, an antimalarial drug, is a cure-all drug for the coronavirus.*
- *COVID-19 vaccines plant a tracking chip in your body.*
- *Certain flu vaccines carry the coronavirus instead.*
- *Wearing a mask increases your chances of getting COVID-19.*

No one claimed HCQ is a cure-all, just that it works. **UPDATE December 2025:** let's check out some alternative medicine / conspiracy sites to confirm:

- <https://wikispooks.com/wiki/Hydroxychloroquine> (archive) (MozArchive) - says that hydroxychloroquine “*was found to significantly lower the disease's case fatality rate*”; mentions some dangers
- <https://stopworldcontrol.com/cures/> (archive) (MozArchive) - says that it needs zinc to work properly, so clearly not a lone "cure-all"
- <https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2020/08/jail-fauci-massive-international-study-shows-countries-early-hcq-use-79-lower-mortality-rate-huge-talking-120000-american-lives/> (archive) (MozArchive) - does not describe it as a "cure-all", but does mention an 80% lower COVID death rate in countries where it's used
- https://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/ciencia3/ciencia_coronavirus84.htm (archive) (MozArchive) - only says that it is effective, instead of a "cure-all"
- <https://greenmedinfo.com/content/covid-19-treatment-controversies-hydroxychloroquine-natural-remedies/> (archive) (MozArchive) - says that it is safe, doesn't shill for it and considers "natural remedies" better
- <https://www.faim.org/rapid-viral-recovery> (archive) (MozArchive) - only mentions HCQ in passing

- <https://vitamindwiki.com/pages/covid-19-doctors-not-allowed-to-use-treatments-that-work-dr-mccullough-video-and-transcript/> (archive) (MozArchive) - no "cure-all" or even "cure"; does mention an 85% effectiveness stat though
- <https://www.naturalnews.com/2024-09-27-hydroxychloroquine-did-not-kill-thousands-of-people.html> (archive) (MozArchive) - no cure all or even cure at all; only attacks a BS study that attempted to debunk it
- <https://pjmedia.com/matt-margolis/2020/08/07/theres-a-mountain-of-evidence-that-hydroxychloroquine-is-an-effective-treatment-for-covid-19-n763953> (archive) (MozArchive) (most relevant link picked from the many they have about this topic) - again, no "cure all", only says it's effective

By the way, these websites were **not cherry picked**; they were what resulted from a friend's Kagi (regular engines find fucking nothing about this; the last two list entries were from sites I already knew) search for *"hydroxychloroquine for COVID"* - I only skipped forums or sites I figured weren't related to alt med or conspiracies. As we can see, **the "cure-all" only exists inside the official cultists' minds**. Is it so hard to actually visit a few conspiracy websites to check what they actually think? No; the official shills are simply utterly shameless, exaggerating the claim to the highest possible extent so that people think it's "too good to be true" and just dismiss it completely. Also, if you check out the [Wikipedia hit piece](#) (archive) (MozArchive) on this topic, you will see that most (I'd say all aside from that "stop world control" one, where it's obvious from the domain name) of the alt-med / conspiracy ones are a lot more neutral though they don't even pretend to be. Funny how that works.

Moving on, that tracking chip claim is very rare. We have to realize that for any conspiracy topic, some people will come up with highly "out there" theories. These might still have merit,

but honest media outlets should use the strongest, most popular and developed theories as examples. The usual conspiracy theory in terms of the vaccines is that they've been designed to hurt and / or kill people. It's the one stated by experts like [Michael Yeadon \(archive\) \(MozArchive\)](#), [Sherri Tenpenny \(archive\) \(MozArchive\)](#) and [Shankara Chetty \(archive\) \(MozArchive\)](#). I've collected [plenty of evidence](#) for it, too.

About the latter two claims, I've literally never heard of them - and I've done hundreds of hours of research for my [Corona report](#). Usually people say that masks just don't work. Of course, the best supported conspiracy theories are completely missed in this article - such as faking the [case](#) and [death](#) statistics.

Let's now see how the shills handle moon landing conspiracy theories. First of all, what's the strongest argument for the moon landing being a hoax? From [Debunking Skeptics](#):

1. NASA's inability to send men to the moon today means they could not have in 1969

The strongest argument here is that if NASA can't go to the moon today after 40 years of technological advancements, then it certainly couldn't have in 1969, plain and simple.

Boom. Easy, and kills the entire moon myth in one sentence (but please read the entire argument). None of the "why do people still believe moon landing conspiracy theories?" turds the media shits out every so often bother to touch this argument. That alone should make you question their honesty. Let's list some examples:

- <https://www.history.com/news/moon-landing-fake-conspiracy-theories> [\(archive\)](#)
[\(MozArchive\)](#) - no mention

- https://www.voanews.com/a/usa_millions-still-believe-1969-moon-landing-was-hoax/6172262.html (archive) (MozArchive) - no mention
- <https://www.space.com/12814-top-10-apollo-moon-landing-hoax-theories.html> (archive) (MozArchive) - no mention
- <https://www.timeslive.co.za/sunday-times/lifestyle/2019-07-20-5-reasons-conspiracy-theorists-still-believe-the-moon-landing-was-a-hoax/> (archive) (MozArchive) - no mention
- <https://science.howstuffworks.com/moon-landing-hoax.htm> (archive) (MozArchive) - none here either

What **do** they mention? The *“There aren't any stars in the background”* argument which Debunking Skeptics says explicitly not to use. *“The moon landing is fake because Stanley Kubrick filmed it”*. Wow! No one actually says this. First we prove it's a fake, then some people try to find out who's responsible - but it's not relevant to proving the fakery itself. Maybe we will never know who did it, but the hoax evidence will still stand on its own. The *“The American flags appear to “flap” in the breeze”*, for which the excuse that it was physically moved is given. But they won't show you the actual footage so you can judge for yourself if their explanation works:



Other covered arguments like *“No Crater at Landing Site”* and *“The “C” rock”* are - again - minor ones. Though even the C rock is portrayed weakly because it doesn't mention the C on the ground. In my opinion, the foundations of moon hoax shouldn't be the photo analysis arguments; they are just too dependent on interpretation most of the time, and require skill in the relevant discipline. On the other hand, argument number #1 is easily understandable by even children, and irrefutable. Yet the mainstream always focuses on the photo analysis because they can whip out a mildly believable excuse and prevent you from digging deeper. But hey, if the conspiracy deniers love the photo analysis arguments so much, why don't they touch this one? Literally proving there to be an artificial light in the photos. Another strong argument that's completely ignored are the deaths of Apollo One astronauts.

The conspiracy deniers have clearly never heard of the debate rule to only attack the opponents' arguments in their strongest forms ([archive](#)) ([MozArchive](#)). Actually, they reverse it here by **completely ignoring** the strongest or even average arguments and attacking the weakest ones or

ones no one makes. As if that wasn't enough, they also can't resist adding jabs like “*cure-all*”. All of this is designed to make you think that conspiracy theorists only have a few easily dismissible ideas - because well, they are uneducated or psychologically deficient. The well thought out arguments are never ever covered or even mentioned. The conspiracy sites are not being linked to prevent you from reading the opposing views in their own words. Of course, the goal is to keep you inside that comfortable mainstream box - and you don't do that through a honest portrayal of your enemy. The deniers just flood you with hundreds upon hundreds of those shitty "debunking" (really dismissal) pieces (a single media site will usually have several with the same theme) - according to the idea that an often repeated lie becomes the truth. And all search engines aside from Mojeek will give those the preferential treatment. Also see Wikipedia's attitude towards conspiracy theories.

Running away from debate

Try to find me a debate between a prominent moon landing skeptic and a proponent. The only one that seems to exist is this five minute one from 2002 between Bart Sibrel and Phil Plait - which can't really be called a debate. But even there, Plait manages to admit that NASA's policy is to “*ignore it*” (“*it*” = the moon landing hoax theory). Since then, it's been complete silence on the part of the official story supporters. **UPDATE December 2025:** in this Bart Sibrel interview, starting from 2:44:45, Joe Rogan says he's been inviting anyone to come and debunk Sibrel, but no one ever came. Then he asks him if he's ever debated anyone on this topic, and Sibrel responds that no one ever tried to. And if you watch the entire interview, it will be obvious as to why. Starting from 3:04:48, Sibrel confirms that he **would** debate somebody if Rogan managed to drag him in. But no one is coming!

Members of the FDA and CDC refused to debate a team of scientists [\(archive\)](#) [\(MozArchive\)](#) on the issue of vaccine safety. Steve Kirsch is still trying [\(archive\)](#) [\(MozArchive\)](#) and failing to find willing interlocutors.

David Griscom - a physicist from AE911 Truth - wasn't able to find a qualified opponent [\(archive\)](#) [\(MozArchive\)](#) willing to defend the official story publicly. In fact - searching around - I cannot find a single time a 9/11 demolition theory proponent has been debated.

A trend appears to be emerging. The conspiracy deniers have big mouths by themselves (especially when protected by the entire media complex) - but when a challenger appears, they all scatter. All they can muster is shouting expletives and throwing tomatoes from the sidelines, but are too cowardly to step into the ring. Then, they pathetically claim [\(archive\)](#) [\(MozArchive\)](#) that they just don't want to legitimize [\(MozArchive\)](#) conspiracy theories by giving them a platform. Ha! **UPDATE:** heh, thanks to the Hotez saga, we have two more sources [\(archive\)](#) [\(MozArchive\)](#) saying it directly:

There are many reasons why serious scientists should reject these invitations. One is that it gives liars and deceivers legitimacy.

By just appearing with these people, you give them a stature that implies they're equivalent, and they're not.

And another [\(archive\)](#) [\(MozArchive\)](#):

When scientists refuse these “debates,” the other side gets the opportunity to say that they are turning them down for fear of being challenged. [...] But these reactions are

preferable to giving them a platform.




The reality is - if the deniers were actually confident in their beliefs - they would have no problem taking on the conspiracy theorists. If our ideas are as stupid, as insane, as easily dismissible as they claim - they should be happy to embarrass us on the big stage. Actually, **the conspiracy deniers have already shown that they do not mind butting heads with their opponents if they perceive them as weak** - as proven by the avalanche of many hours long debates with flat Earthers available on YouTube. Suddenly, the official cultists are not worried about “*legitimization*” of alternatives - because they know they can easily crush them, which actually **delegitimizes** them in the minds of the debate watchers. The “*legitimization*” excuse only comes up when they are worried they are going to lose. And that is why they avoid anyone other than the flat Earthers, which is the equivalent of beating up kids on the playground. They are the most pathetic of cowards. But - if they ever grow spines - us conspiracy theorists are waiting in the ring :D.

Big tech censorship



If you can't refute, dismiss, or devalue it in any way - just pretend it doesn't exist. This has actually been done for a very long time, but went up to eleven during corona. I will show you a simple example right now. Here are the Google (Startpage lifts Google results) and Bing (Qwant lifts Bing results) search results, side-by-side for the query “*Christchurch shooting was faked*”:



who espoused racist and anti-immigrant views, which were detailed in a manifesto ...

➤ [https://www.smh.com.au/worl...](https://www.smh.com.au/world/christchurch-attack-was-a-false-flag-conspiracy-theorists-claim-20190318-528139.html)

Christchurch attack was a 'false flag,' conspiracy theorists claim

Mar 18, 2019 ... Days after the slaying of 50 worshippers in two **Christchurch**, New Zealand mosques was live-streamed on social media, the platforms are now ...

➤ [https://www.independent.co.u...](https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/twitter-suspends-dozens-of-white-nationalist-accounts-that-spread-christchurch-shootings-conspiracy-theory-manifesto-posted-by-brenton-tarrant-before-the-christchurch-shooting-20200711-528139.html)

Twitter suspends dozens of white nationalist accounts that spread ...

Jul 11, 2020 ... accounts that spread **Christchurch shootings conspiracy** theory ... manifesto posted by Brenton Tarrant before the Christchurch shooting, ...

➤ [https://ctc.westpoint.edu/chris...](https://ctc.westpoint.edu/christchurch-attacks-livestream-terror-in-the-viral-video-age)

The Christchurch Attacks: Livestream Terror in the Viral Video Age

Abstract: In the space of 36 minutes on March 15, 2019, it is alleged that Brenton Tarrant, an Australian far-right extremist, fatally shot 51 people in two ...

➤ [https://www.buzzfeednews.co...](https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/amy-keiser/the-eerie-absence-of-viral-fakes-after-the-new-zealand-mosque-shooting)

The Eerie Absence Of Viral Fakes After The New Zealand Mosque ...

Mar 15, 2019 ... A security official stands guard outside the Al Noor mosque in **Christchurch**, New Zealand. This is the latest edition of The **Fake** Newsletter from ...

 christchurch shooting was faked 

Web News Images Videos Settings

[https://www.smh.com.au/world/oceania/christchurch-attack-was-a-false-flag-conspiracy...](https://www.smh.com.au/world/oceania/christchurch-attack-was-a-false-flag-conspiracy-theorists-claim-20190318-528139.html)

Christchurch shooting conspiracy theorist...
March 18, 2019 — 11.37am Share Normal
text size Larger text size Very large text
size Days after the slaying of 50
worshippers in two Christchurch, New
Zealand mosques was live-streamed on
social media, the platforms are now being
peppered with untrue claims that the
attacks were "false-flag" events.

<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-53861456>
Christchurch shooting: Gunman Tarrant wa...
The man who killed 51 people at two
mosques in New Zealand in 2019 had plans
to target a third mosque, his sentencing
hearing has heard. Brenton Tarrant also
planned to burn down the mosques ...

<https://themillenniumreport.com/2019/03/new-zealand-mosque-false-flag-exposed-reasons...>
New Zealand Mosque False Flag Exposed, ...
False Flag Mass Shooting Hoax at the
Christchurch, New Zealand Mosque The
mosque mass shooting on March 15, 2019
clearly fits the exact same pattern as
Dunblane and Port Arthur, as well as
Columbine, Sandy Hook, Las Vegas and
Parkland.

<https://jermwarfare.com/conversations/max-igan-christchurch>
Max Igan on the coverup of the Christchur...
Podcast Max Igan on the coverup of the
Christchurch massacre By Jerm 14 Jan
2023 Updated: 11 Jun 2023 The
Christchurch mosque shootings (or
massacre) occurred on 15 March 2019 in
Christchurch, New Zealand. The official
story goes as follows.

<https://forum.davidicke.com/index.php?/topic/7205-christchurch-new-zealand-shooting...>
Christchurch New Zealand shooting faked ...
1) Silver car by mosque door entrance
registered to an intelligence agency (I ran a
plate check) mysteriously disappears half
way through video knocking over a road
cone put in place, and has NEVER been
mentioned by the media, police etc since. If
this was a member of the public etc, where
is their story??? This should have been a
main story.

Let's analyze the Google results one by one:

- EU vs Disinfo ([archive](#)) ([MozArchive](#)) - Just the name already sets us up for what's coming. From their About page ([archive](#)) ([MozArchive](#)): *“Using data analysis and media monitoring services in 15 languages, EUvsDisinfo identifies, compiles, and exposes disinformation cases originating in pro-Kremlin media that are spread across the EU and Eastern Partnership countries.” [...] “Our team is also heavily involved in public and government outreach. We brief and train EU institutions, Member State governments, journalists, and civil society organisations, and regularly speak at international conferences”*. So, it's a website dedicated to hunting down the so-called "Russian disinformation" and training governments to do the same. Of course - as the anti-"disinformation" site - it dismisses the notion that the Christchurch shooting was faked. All we have learned about the alternative views is that they are *“disinformation”*.
- The Sydney Morning Herald ([archive](#)) ([MozArchive](#)) - From Encyclopedia Britannica ([archive](#)) ([MozArchive](#)): *“The Sydney Morning Herald, daily newspaper published in Sydney, Australia's oldest and one of its most influential papers”*. We wouldn't expect this mainstream paper to challenge mainstream narratives, and of course it doesn't. In fact, the entire piece is focused on mocking and dismissing conspiracy theories, and uses many of the tricks listed here (couldn't pass the chance to execute the standard flat Earth / Qanon smear). We still haven't learned what the conspiracy theorists actually think.
- The Independent ([archive](#)) ([MozArchive](#)) - Whining about the white genocide theory and salivating over more censorship for "racists". The so-called *“Independent”* refuses to do an independent investigation into anything. Next.

- [Combating Terrorism Center \(archive\) \(MozArchive\)](#) - It should be obvious we're not going to find what we want there from the name alone, and that's exactly what happens. Ctrl+f for *“faked”* or *“staged”* brings 0 results. I did not want to read another shady piece whining about *“conspiracy theorists”* and trying desperately to associate them with terrorism. I wanted to learn whether the Christchurch shooting was faked (my exact query!), and I couldn't find that out at the anti-terrorism center. Actually, the article isn't even about this specific attack at all, but some other - so Google totally ignored the user's wishes here in order to push a general narrative.
- [Buzzfeed News \(archive\) \(MozArchive\)](#) - Heh, this one is really funny. Check this quote: *“and even the reliably vocal conspiracy theorists aren’t touting the usual “this shooting was staged by the government” fake”*. Actually, we are :D. Obviously, there is no analysis of that theory here.

From none of the five results do we get an examination of the idea that the Christchurch shooting was faked. But we learn to hate *“disinformation”*, *“conspiracy theories”* and love censorship. Now compare to the Qwant (Bing) results:

- [The Sydney Morning Herald \(archive\) \(MozArchive\)](#) - Repeated, see above.
- [BBC News \(archive\) \(MozArchive\)](#) - Just a regular news report, no mention of fakes, or even complaining about conspiracy theories, etc. This is already better than Google, which can't even muster having such "neutral" results. But see this:
- [The Millennium Report \(archive\) \(MozArchive\)](#) - Interesting title - *“New Zealand Mosque False Flag Exposed, Reasons for the Hoax Revealed”*. Wow! Am I dreaming? Do we actually get an investigation into the staged shooting theory here? Yes, we indeed do. Actually, the authors say that *““Everything points to a real mass shooting*

that did occur, but a fake video was also produced as a separate psyop before the terrorist attack even took place.”” - which is an interesting claim I've never seen anywhere else. Either way, it is a true conspiracy result - one that you will never ever see at Google. Which makes Bing and its proxies already infinitely superior.

- [Jerm Warfare \(archive\) \(MozArchive\)](#) - *“Max Igan on the coverup of the Christchurch massacre”*. Yes, it's indeed another conspiracy result, covering a different hoax theory, I guess: *“For the purposes of my conversation with Max Igan, what matters is the “by a lone gunman” bit, which is an outright lie, Max argues”*. Bing - Google 2:0 so far.
- [David Icke forum \(archive\) \(MozArchive\)](#) - I shouldn't have to introduce David Icke to anyone who's even mildly interested in conspiracy theories. Anyway, this is a thread from his forum where they discuss the various Christchurch hoax claims. 3-0 to Bing; end the match, referee - this is getting embarrassing!

Now, I am not here to tell you what happened or didn't happen at Christchurch, nor what the implications are, etc. I am not convinced of any particular version myself (though I realize the official story is full of holes). That's something you will have to investigate for yourself. The point is, Bing lets you do that, and Google does not. Now you might be asking: isn't Bing also big tech (Microsoft)? Sure, that's correct. But there is a reason why the so-called "elites" do not bother to censor it with the same scrutiny, and that reason is this:

Google	bing	YANDEX	Yahoo!	DuckDuck...	Baidu
<u>93.12%</u>	<u>2.77%</u>	<u>1.15%</u>	<u>1.11%</u>	<u>0.51%</u>	<u>0.49%</u>
Search Engine Market Share Worldwide - May 2023					

It would simply require too much effort for too little gain. Believe me or not, but I have a lot of experience doing search engine testing, and I have **never once** seen a conspiracy result appear on Google. I am sure they have a big team working on improving the algorithms and manually delisting the results, because a (general) AI simply can't get 100% accuracy like this. Remember - also - that Google doesn't just hide conspiracy content completely, but also pushes certain narratives as the first results for specific queries. This can even be seen with the Christchurch issue, where irrelevant results were clearly manually inserted - like the terrorism one, which has zero to do with the query. There is no way to do this without human analysis of each relevant topic. Anytime a new important event happens, the Google employees have to gather and immediately start killing the conspiracy results while shoving us official propaganda. And the so-called "elites" can't afford to duplicate this kind of effort for Bing - an engine with less than 3% usage.

The situation gets worse for the other engines once you realize that Yandex and Baidu aren't really used outside of Russia and China, respectively. So the usage percentages for Google will

be even higher in European countries. This probably makes the so-called "elites" not want to bother with anything but Google. It was never about catching absolutely all fish, but only the vast majority - which the so-called "elites" have succeeded in. They know that a person who's tech aware enough to ditch Google has already escaped the trap, and would also leave Bing if they detected the same kind of censorship there. So the so-called "elites" would rather focus their efforts on where they actually matter - which is the 90+% of regular people that will never leave their Google-shaped cage. By the way, there is an even better engine in terms of fishing out conspiracy results - namely Mojeek. It gives ones such as these:

christchurch massacre Archives - The Unshackled

<https://www.theunshackled.net>

[/tag/christchurch-massacre/](#)

In this second part, Richard Wolstencroft discusses the atrocity that **was** committed in New Zealand ...

See more results from www.theunshackled.net »

The Media's Coverage of Christchurch is Disgusting | Sparta

<https://www.spartareport.com/.../03>

[/the-medias-coverage-of-christch...](#)

... and he knew the best **way** to do it **was** to ... **Christchurch Shooting** Fake News Mainstream Media terrorism Trigger Warning Radio

See more results from www.spartareport.com »

Turkish man in custody after deadly 'terror' attack

greeknewsondemand.com/2019/03/18

[/turkish-man-in-custody-afte...](#)

... TRUTH about all these " **shooting** " , just look at how FAKE the **Christchurch**, New Zealand **shooting was** by click [HERE](#)

NZ Christchurch Mosque shooting staged | Jew World Order
<https://www.jewworldorder.org/nz-christchurch-mosque-shooting-staged/>
... **shootings** took place on March 15th?
Nope! ... 9 NEWS were a day early writing up their fake news of NZ **Christchurch's shooting**.
See more results from
www.jewworldorder.org »

Christchurch Shooter's Video & Audio Examination
<https://crazzfiles.com/christchurch-shooters-video-audio-examination/>
The removed " Windshield **Shooting** " video segment shown in this post, **was** removed by Face Book for violating their ...

Jew World Order :D. Now that's a result you will probably never find in any other engine. Nor most of the other obscure ones, to be honest. Therefore, this is the search engine I recommend for researchers. Anyway, here's your exposition of the Big Tech magical disappearing acts...but, this is just the beginning. I have only covered the search engines. TBD Facebook, Twitter, etc...

Why does any of this matter?

Do you like living? Do you like living with dignity, or as a piece of trash? The future of humanity will depend on whether the anti-conspiracy mindset spreads far or is curbed soon. This is why I wanted to whip this article out quickly. Consider these facts:

- NASA faked the moon landing, [stealing over a hundred billions dollars \(archive\)](#)

(MozArchive) from the taxpayers and proving to themselves that scams on that level are viable.

- The twin towers were blown up, killing hundreds of people.
- The Smoleńsk / Warsaw massacre showed that entire governments can be murdered and absolute circus shows performed later to explain the mass murders. It was also made clear that countries traditionally considered enemy can actually work together in certain cases.
- COVID showed that the conspiracy goes quite deep, and can involve all kinds of institutions.
- The GM food conspiracy mass poisoned us and hid the dangers. Though it wasn't entirely successful. But, GM foods are still around and being produced.
- Wars (like the current Ukraine war) are made up for joke reasons (such as “*denazification*”) and continued to scare people, increase surveillance, censorship, hike prices and kill plebeians off. Edit: I wrote a big piece explaining the foundations of war.
- More generally, schools teach us all the mainstream versions of events and that obedience is a virtue.
- Capitalism teaches us that we need to fight for survival and our position in the group at all times and that our neighbor is our competitor in that fight.
- We are also told that politics and voting are our only ways to affect anything - and these are actually designed in a way that allows no real change to come from them.

I could continue but you get the drill. All of these are - guess what - parts of a **massive worldwide conspiracy** by the ruling psychopaths, to abuse you and keep power. Even though they have enough influence at various institutions to run scams like the moon landing or COVID, the conspiracy still can't work without the belief of a regular person like you and me. I

mean, consider the factor by which we outnumber the criminals even if we take into account the lower ranks. And so, perhaps **the piece of the puzzle they need the most is convincing you that none of this is real and everything is going great.** That's where the media, the pseudoskeptical organizations, and the youtube shills come in. Annoyingly, they have also managed to recruit a lot of regular people to regurgitate the nonsense (on places like Twitter, Reddit, etc...), becoming useful idiots that work against their own interests. What the anti-conspiracy cult really seeks to do, is to **hide their own crimes**, of course. And the lower ranks cover for the higher, often unknowingly. But since they **cannot justify themselves by evidential, logical or ethical means**, they need to resort to the tricks. Anything so that you don't "*perceive, think, act*". But since the tricks have now been exposed, you **will** do that now, right? Hopefully, we will be able remove the criminals from power, and create a sane world.



[Back to the front page](#)