

**NR\_key\_name:** 3EFC4141650B1D078625640000232ABF

**SendTo:**

**CopyTo:**

**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**

**BlindCopyTo:** CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB

**From:** Robalini @ aol.com

**DisplayFromDomain:**

**DisplayDate:** 12/14/1996

**DisplayDate\_Time:** 12:50:08 AM

**ComposedDate:**

**ComposedDate\_Time:**

**Subject:** The Konformist: Final Dots on Rushkoff  
Jan and Dianne, Dave and Maggie, two people who start at each others throats but soon become madly involved. Can we add Douglas Rushkoff and Robert Sterling to that list? But seriously, Mr. Rushkoff has shown he is a good sport, and I appear to have been hasty in my merciless ripping of the dude. Unedited (as below) hesure seems to make sense. Incidentally, I never believed that Mr. Rushkoff was a CIA agent, as some have written to him. On the other hand, he certainly smells like BATF to me. Subj: Re: Dot connecting Date: 96-12-03 09:55:16 EST From: Douglas Rushkoff Thanks for the kind response. I don't take offense at much, because I usually see the words of others as some other part of a shared brain battling out an issue. At least 90% of the criticism leveled against me comes from the "other" side, meaning the enforced consensus folks. Thus, my forced and early departure from CNet, and their reframing of my CIA/Drugs piece to their world view. They wouldn't even run the piece I gave them before it (at least not in its current form), about Paul Garrin and a network of alternative nameservers meant to dismantle the Internic. The thought-facism I'm trying fight (along with you) is the facism induced by fear. I think most news media contains the subliminal message "be afraid". When I do, occasionally, question the rants on the Internet, it's usually because the ones I'm questioning call into question an entire line of inquiry. Sometimes I even think that the most ridiculous assertions are planted by the other side, as a way of discrediting an entire discussion. I also believe that when a guy like me -- who has some minor level of fame and credibility -- appears to move to the fringe, that "they" take notice and seek to discredit him, both among the righteously paranoid and the foolishly allegiant. Believe it or not, at first I thought you might be a "they," trying to scare me away from alternative sources of information, and trying to scare alternative voices away from me. Just another example of connecting too many dots, I'd say, and letting it generate paranoid delusions. But a barrage of "what's the frequency rushkoff?" email messages can do that to a guy. best, Douglas Your points are well taken. I think some of the more exotic and bizarre theories of JFK, for example (I'm talking about stuff like "umbrella man" knocking JFK out with drugged darts and the non-existent photos of the Secret Service agent turning around in the limo and shooting him) are created to make people laugh at any belief at conspiracy in that case. Also, there was rumors all summer about Clinton being seconds away from indictment and that he was going to leave office, much less run again. I never bought them for a second. Sherman Skolnick, no slouch, was actually touting this stuff, and I called him up to question it, since it looked like a blatantly fraudulent planted story. Skolnick seems incredibly genuine, and I don't think he was intentionally passing lies; he claims he got it from high level sources, a claim I wouldn't dispute. I think that upper sources passed knowingly bogus info to him and others

**Body:**

**recstat:**

**DeliveryPriority:** N

**DeliveryReport:** B

**ReturnReceipt:**

**Categories:**