



RRH

Transcript Of Plenary Meeting

18 October 2022

BOD Of Rip, Ruin, And Hold LLC

Finance Insurance Real Estate

Your Loss Is Our Gain

Chairman Fink: This bi-annual meeting is called to order.

Fellow stakeholders, our purpose today, as per these bi-annuals, is to reaffirm our grand strategic goal and assess our progress and methods to get us there and beyond.

Ms Nudelmann, please refresh our memory as to our grand strategic goal.

Ms Nudelmann: We are the best tribe on earth, the most intelligent, the most capable, the most moral, passionate, and exciting. We have the best sense of humor. And we make the best comedians.

All: [titters of approval]

Ms Nudelmann: Were there a god, he or she would regard us as their vicar and proxy on earth. With partners we embrace from other tribes, we are by all rights of preeminent exceptionalism masters of the earth and of all creatures on, under, and over it. Our destiny is to dominate.

We resent every nation, every culture, every area of the earth we do not dominate. These are stones in our shoes. Therefore, our grand strategic goal is to march through and rip apart institutions, GOs and NGOs,

cultural tastes, acquired habits, and familial customs characteristic of tribes and nations we do not dominate – for example, Russians, Europeans, Chinese, Indians, Africans, and Americans – in order to seize and hold the wealth of and on their territories and to turn such of them as we approve for our servants into renters from us of everything they need to survive.

Beyond that, our grand strategic goal is to pursue the same outcome inside Eurasia, Southeast Asia, and the Middle East. We are not and will not be deterred from pursuing our grand strategic goal across the face of the earth.

Chairman Fink: Thank you Ms Nudelmann. Any objections or suggestions regarding Ms Nudelmann's statement?

All: [silence]

Chairman Fink: Alright then. Mr Weismann, please assess our progress and methods with respect to achieving our grand strategic goal.

Mr Weismann: Our progress is steady but slow relative to counterpressures building against it. Too many facts are getting into public awareness and circulation. Events are not helping us convince Russians, Europeans, Americans, and others, for example, that our intentions are benign.

We own the best propaganda generators, both GO and NGO, and they work hard for us because they are well-paid and even better promised. However, the electronically networked earth and personalities we have not yet de-voiced make it difficult to keep everyone on beam.

There is also the challenge of bought proxies staying bought and not getting greedy even when under threat of extinction. Human nature is what it is, apparently.

That said, our methods are working, if not as speedily as I wish. Therefore, I recommend we hold a steady course, albeit keeping our eyes open for opportunities to squash unapproved voices and their information streams. Our members in law enforcement and media could improve their results in this area.

Chairman Fink: Thank you, Mr Weismann. Any objections or suggestions regarding Mr Weismann's statement?

All: [silence]

Chairman Fink: Alright then, let's discuss. Our goal, progress, and methods are on the table as well as any other matters you wish to advance for our consideration. Yes, Mr Ishimoto, please

Mr Ishimoto: Can we count on continued buy-in from senior officials in the USG, especially SES types and their military counterparts?

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: I too have that question. If they can be bought by us, are they trustworthy. Might they turn on us? After all, our grand strategic goal is not widely attractive, to put it mildly.

Ms Finkelheim-Gupta: This is no time to doubt ourselves or our strengths. We have set our course, we only must stick to it or get confused.

Mr Al-Azir: I see no reason to doubt the stability of SES-type officials. We pay them well. Their children attend the same schools our children attend. They aspire to or have the same perquisites we enjoy. They won't give that up. And they know our procedures if they even think about turning on us.

Ms Lanny Kopfbaum-Jones: I agree. In any case, we have powerful tools to keep SES-types in line and through them their subordinates.

As we do on other fronts of our project, we can flood the work space of SES types and their military counterparts with black lesbians, transvestites, young amphetamine and cocaine apostles, and race, gender, sociology, social work, political science, journalism, art history, English, psychology, and psychiatry majors. These profiles automatically provide an aura of menace. We have shaped them well for this job over the years. They stop work and, more importantly thought, while conjuring an endless procession of petty crises and bureaucratic Gordian knots.

Our manuals teach how to make most members of any institution chase ephemeral crises which devour time, money, and energy to no purpose worthy of the institution. Add a few race, war, and abortion demonstrators into the workspace of an SES type and most everyone there will be distracted from work of any kind, much less serving actual American national interests.

I don't see SES types as serious obstacles in the way of our project. Ms Goldblatt-Uluubolaye, we have FBI assets who can keep them on beam, right?

Ms Goldblatt-Uluubolaye: Sure we do. FBI own BLM and ANTIFA. We're inside every so-called patriot organization, organized crime family, drug cartel, drug gang, major media outlet, and other organized crime syndicates. FBI can make any misdirection or distraction we need for us to achieve our grand strategic goal. After all, RRH LLC benefit financially and operationally from these *associations* of ours.

CIA own more the overseas punishers such as ISIS, AQ and their splinter organizations, the Zelensky regime, the EC, and European, African, and Latin American organized crime families and their syndicates.

CIA as well as FBI also own every major media outlet in The USA along with many in overseas countries, to include majors in Five Eyes and Europe. So yes, either or both FBI and CIA can make happen any storyline we want out there, at least in the *Western* countries. RRH LLC also benefit financially and operationally from CIA's *associations*.

Ms Amin-Steinberg: CIA confirms.

Mr Weismann: So does DOJ benefit in those ways, albeit unofficially as from my mouth. I know where DOJ's heart beats. Still, it's easier to mess things up than it is to build them up, and, in the case where reality impinges on our grand strategic goal, reality is better placed to win there than we are. [It's always a question of legs.](#)

Chairman Fink: I think, Mr Weismann, that is why we aim to make or unmake reality before it makes or unmakes us.

Ms Nusbaum-Patel: I'm a little impatient and also frightened about that reality Mr Weismann mentioned. What can we do to accelerate success towards achieving of our grand strategic goal? I'd like to get there before, perhaps, we can't.

Ms Goldblatt-Uluubolaye: What's the matter with you, girl? You're being negative.

Ms Nusbaum-Patel: I'm impatient and a little frightened.

Mr Al-Azir: Well, let's think this through.

Our basic project is rip and ruin institutions – including nation states – so we can seize and hold their land and other wealth. When we detected obstruction, we reached into our asset bag to organize assassinations, IO campaigns, election fraud, small and large financial ruin, psychiatric

meltdown, school closure, family fighting, pandemic disease outbreaks, armed conflicts, and drug supplies, all to remove those obstructions.

We worked both sides of conflicts in order to shorten their duration and ensure a decisive outcome. Is that at least an accurate picture if not a plenary one?

All: [silence]

Mr Al-Azir: I'll take that as a, Yes.

When we encountered obstruction, our asset bag provided additional methods to achieve our strategic goal. Are we saying, perhaps, that we fear being unable now to overcome obstacles because our asset bag is empty, or not as effective as of yore? Are we out of fresh ways to rip and ruin organizations and institutions that have resisted so far our efforts to hold them? Are organizations and institutions gaining immunity, so to speak, to our actions, our methods, even rejecting our grand strategic goal? Have we somehow made them stronger by attacking them?

Ms Amin-Steinberg: I would hate to think that our methods are not working as well as they should or used to work. If that is true, why would that be?

Ms Lanny Kopfbaum-Jones: I'm not sure our methods are less effective than before. But I think someone has been making end-runs around our stories. They find ways to present events we initiate in ways we do not want them presented. I think also that as much as we rip and ruin organizations and institutions, people comprising them newly appreciate why they exist in the first place. That is a problem, getting them to like the ruin we rain on them. I grant you that.

Mr Rockefeller-Schwartzfleuger: We just need to work harder, insist more on the acceptability of unacceptable concepts and relationships,

hang more pride flags from churches and municipal buildings, increase taxation and rents on resisters, accuse more parents of child abuse and remove more children to state-financed facilities, license the privilege of procreation . . . among other measures. Bear down on the doubters until they affirm their personal meaninglessness.

Mr Weiss-Acosta: You are a hard case.

Mr Rockefeller-Schwartzenfleuger: You aren't?

Mr Weiss-Acosta: The measures you mention are domestic. What about overseas measures?

Mr Rockefeller-Schwartzenfleuger: Good question. If we've learned anything from our success in the so-called Ukraine, it is that cutting off liquids, gases, and electricity quickly rip and ruin organizations and institutions up to and including [nation states](#).

We are on the verge of owning outright not only Europe – the northwest peninsula of Eurasia – but Great Britain as well.

As for the rest, we can sever just about any line of communication we want to sever. Monopolies are easy to build when no one has will to oppose their building. Corrupt institutions are easy to fracture when no one inside them has memory of or will for their purpose, to decide whether that is still important or not. Keeping an unneeded institution or mission in rump operation is a splendid way to disorganize other institutions and missions connected to the rump one.

Mr Weiss-Acosta: We see now that someone does have will – and means – to oppose a monopoly building. Turns out there are people not convinced that paying rent conduces to their pleasure more than owning property does. And some of these appear to have more than enough means to make their point. What do you plan to do with them?

Mr Rockefeller-Schwartzenfleuger: You're thinking of Russians and Slavs generally, also likely Sub-Saharan Africans. Answer: get rid of them.

Ms Nusbaum-Patel: How?

Mr Rockefeller-Schwartzenfleuger: Pandemics, along with panic-campaigns driving all-of-population medication for, allegedly, prophylaxis, treatment, and therapy against real and imagined pathogens

Ms Amin-Steinberg: Oh, Jesus!

Ms Nudelmann: Actually, that's not far-fetched . . . the pandemics and medications part. We have encouraged that project through numerous GOs and NGOs.

Mr Bing-Gates: Correct. We've already trialed this. It works great as long as we control comm lines to gin up hysteria, panic, compel medicinal intakes, and prevent nullifiers from reaching comm lines. The necessary gene sequencing is pretty much completed. Truth be told, today anyone with some brains and a little equipment can do the biochem in their garage.

Chairman Fink: OK, this mass medical method is added to our asset bag. Also, I think we should be able to trust US and allied combined armed forces to execute, upon our command, full-spectrum blockade on the comms of any country or combination of countries who put themselves between us and our grand strategic goal. At this time, our control of US GO and their NGO networks is weakest at the Defense and Energy Departments. This situation is intolerable.

By the way, our success broadcasting race and gender confusion in institutions, especially schools, is remarkable. As so often happens, Psychiatrists and Psychologists Lead The Way! My compliments to our

team for great accomplishments towards our grand strategic goal by inoculating children and their parents against recognizing simple reality they all see.

Also to be commended are the red-diaper parents and grandparents who reared us and made our work easier than it otherwise would be. They induced American schools and parents to keep lowering academic, cultural, social, religious, and moral standards to accommodate mass entrance of American Afro-Carbs to post-secondary schools and then private and advanced public primary and secondary schools.

We may note that the more prestigious and wealthy the private or public school, the easier it is for us to fill that institution with ideas which and persons who rip and ruin it so we can seize and hold it and, more importantly, the children present there.

Now, I've spoken enough, who would like to continue our discussion? Ms Goldberg-Jackson, please

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: It turns out there is at least one other power commanding armed force that is even more effective than the one we command, the American and allied force. This is a development we did not anticipate, as I recall.

Ms Nudelmann: No, we did anticipate it, they just hid it from us, their power's depth, resilience, and morale. We did not see those assets. It was their fault for hiding it. Typical of Russians.

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: Or, perhaps we were overconfident? Arrogant even . . . perhaps? In any case, would you concur, Ms Nudelmann, that describing The USA as the greatest military force in history is at least mildly hyperbolic? I mean, perhaps on their own recognizance, and with acquisitions proper for current conditions – global electronic envelop –

US Armed Forces would be at least a peer of any other country's Armed Forces.

But that is not the case. US Armed Forces are under-matched, under-manned, under-gunned, under-resourced, under-learned, under-thought, and under-appreciated. Civilians in both Executive and Legislative branches have made that happen. US Armed Forces are also stymied professionally, at every turn, by ignorant, greedy, arrogant civilian bosses, by members of congress, and by torrents of civilian lawyer-lobbyists and judges. Who commands and controls those factors impinging on military affairs? Not military professionals. Then there are – by civilian order – US Armed Forces working without a feeling of having really *won* a war since 1945. That fact helps neither recruitment nor retention.

I'm asking, what do we really have if we don't really have a peer-less military force to help us declare our grand strategic goal legal much less make and hold it as legal? Russia just enlarged her sovereign territory by over 100k km² while our – I mean this organization's – armed proxy force can't fly without getting shot down, can't protect their military or civilian infrastructure, can't keep their president safe in his capitol city, and can't occupy territory unless Russia and her allies don't want to hold it for the time being.

Ms Nudelmann: You tread heavily.

Mr Al-Azir: Yes, Ms Goldberg-Jackson, you tread heavily. Perhaps a little too heavily.

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: We have a grand strategic goal. I believe in it and I want to help accomplish it. I believe facing facts rests among the best ways to do that.

Mr Weismann: I'm not sure facing facts is the best way to accomplish our grand strategic goal. I prefer to imagine things I want as facts and work from there to make them facts.

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: I understand. So do I. There are facts besides facts we imagine as facts and work from there to make facts. Such facts – external to our imaginings – touch upon our imaginings. They act as dynamic boundaries, force vectors to our imaginings, if only to indicate where breaches opening towards fresh facts are indicated.

Mr Weismann: Your words are unconvincing. You seem to be wandering in linguistic circles without getting us anywhere near our grand strategic goal.

Mr Steinberg: Let me see if I can help. Among our most successful methods is manipulating language. We have ways to condition people to think that, so to speak, when we say *cold* we mean *hot*. We call our murder and mayhem assets *freedom fighters*, and we can condition people to believe they *are* freedom fighters. For example, we have conditioned people to assume that when we say someone is an *activist*, that means they are *friendly, beneficent, on their side*.

Of course, there's always the danger that, working to manipulate others by manipulating their language, we can imbibe the manipulated language ourselves and thereby lose *our* ability to see and think. We can become like a drug-pusher ingesting the product he sells.

That said, as Mr Weismann says, this is one way – propaganda – we throw what we imagine into reality. We give our activities benign names and news coverage.

However, as Ms Goldberg-Jackson says, while our activities respond to facts already present and also create new facts by way of our imaginations, our grand strategic goal remains constant.

Chairman Fink: This is an interesting philosophical question.

Does pursuing our grand strategic goal, throwing our imaginings into factual reality, and looping those realities back into our imaginings, obstruct or otherwise hinder us on the way to accomplishing our goal?

Is something *out there*, as people say, intractable and impervious to our methods, perhaps even holding our grand strategic goal in derision, or at least keeping us ever at a distance from it, no matter how much we continuously close with it? Is our grand strategic goal asymptotic relative to us? Are we asymptotic relative to it?

Mr Rockefeller-Schwartzenfleuger: Not if our grand strategic goal is permanent chaos rather than a definite, defined outcome. I think this is a reason most of our members are women, envious and resentful women, just *because* in fact, our grand strategic goal – and the only one we have a hope of accomplishing – is a condition of permanent chaos. Women especially, when on their own devices, excel at conjuring permanent chaos, and the more envious and resentful they are, the sooner and more widely they bring it on.

Let's face it, if we could accomplish a definite, defined outcome – for example, seizure and stable ownership of the earth and all her all wealth – the terms of our grand strategic goal, its progress and methods, would preclude our being content with that accomplishment, suspending our actions, and entering upon some state of peace with which we are unacquainted and by which we would feel oppressed.

No, we don't want to dominate every nation, every culture, every area of the earth through the stabilizing effect of owning them. That's a perverted man's way. We want to dominate the nations etc. by throwing them into a state of permanent chaos. That's the perverted womanly way. We see its workings almost earth-over nowadays. The more women

thrust and are thrust into executive and legislative roles, the more the chaos is complete. Energy on its own, absent channels of purpose, burns out everything around it, including itself.

I think we should be clear about this. We're not looking for an *outcome*. We're looking for a *dissipation*. We want to give whomever we allow to remain not a relief of peace but a burden of worry. We'll take their wealth along the way, but let's face it, causing and seeing others suffer needlessly in scenes of chaos is our real joy.

Ms Nudelmann: Well spoken. I think we can handle that. So – am I grasping this clearly – our grand strategic goal has less to do with wealth we end up owning – we already have all of that that we can use pretty well sewn up – and more to do with ensuring others cannot lay hands on what we have or develop new wealth for themselves to have and use.

We have to keep anyone not of us *cold, barefoot, poor, hungry, and pregnant*, as the old saying had it. Am I getting the drift?

Mr Steinberg: I think you are.

Chairman Fink: Any doubts?

All: [silence]

Chairman Fink: All right then. Be it noted that our grand strategic goal contemplates the condition of those we leave alive rather than our own condition *post* our goal-accomplishment. Their condition will be *dissipation*.

Mr Weiss-Acosta: Felicitously, our current progress and methods conduce to that condition. Linguistic perversities, gender confusions, sodomy and pederasty, high-handed and burglarious taxations, personal immodesty and rudeness, fear of plain speaking, incessant and

ubiquitous propaganda to make the false seem true and the true false, packing courts with malicious judges and lawyers, demoralizing engineers, war-fighters, theologians – and their schools – rewriting histories, de-policing cities and tolerating criminality, flooding towns, cities, and cultural institutions with psychotropic drugs . . . these methods of ours already produce conditions of dissipation we have just clarified as our grand strategic goal.

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: All these successes also drain the pool of those who might join us and help us, or if need be, protect us.

Ms Nudemann: Oh come on! Why are you so negative?

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: Not negative, just mentioning a fact consequent upon our success as just mentioned.

Chairman Fink: Ms Goldberg-Jackson is correct. We must deal with consequences of success as well as with instances of failure. Everything is on the table at our bi-annuals. In this particular, among us and our members, can we ourselves sufficiently procreate to restock our numbers and abilities? Can we groom new members from stocks outside our own?

Mr Al-Azir: I volunteer.

Mr Rockefeller-Schwartzfleuger: Not without hiding the fact that we are . . . that we are cloning ourselves, so to speak. Our project propaganda goes the other way, that procreation is evil. That would be a vividly vivid hypocrisy to promote. Furthermore, since most of us are women and our men are not rapists – we are conservatives, traditionalists regarding such things at least, aren't we Mr Al-Azir? – and since most of us are beyond the age of safe child-bearing, it would seem that grooming would be the most effective way to restock our numbers and abilities.

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: It were also well to remember that organizations debilitate over time, and ours is an organization after all. An unusual one, but an organization. I have watched a volunteer food bank morph into a business and then into a racket.

Mr Al-Azir: Do you accuse us of being racketeering criminals?

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: What do you think?

Mr Weiss-Acosta: I concur that grooming is our surest means of restocking our numbers and abilities. This raises Ms Goldberg-Jackson's question? Perhaps we should consider forming schools and institutes for that purpose. Soros does that, with mixed results.

All: Ditto Gates.

Mr Weiss-Acosta: Schools and institutes inbreed. Over relatively short durations their products are uniformly mediocre at best. At macro scale, this works to our benefit. At micro scale it works to our detriment.

Look at Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Tufts, Columbia, Dartmouth et al. We expect the opposite of intelligent and competent from them since about 1970. In fact we depend on graduates of those schools being cannon fodder for us on our way to achieving our grand strategic goal. Comrade Lenin might describe their faculties and graduates as useful idiots. Good for us in one way, not in some others.

So, if we get into founding schools and institutes, I suggest we start with no more than two, make them truly prestigious, shut them down after, say, twelve years, and found one or two more with entirely different people all unrelated to previous schools we founded. This would be an ongoing activity. Otherwise, we become a sort of large-scale one pony act.

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: I like that idea. If I may, I'd like to work some thoughts around it . . . ?

Chairman Fink: Please

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: Vladimir Putin – I know, hold on, let me finish, please – is on record blaming Lenin, not Stalin, for Russian sufferings in the 20th Century, including the collapse of the USSR. He mentions certain of Lenin's decisions as causation for conflict in the borderlands – Ukraine – today. Stalin, indeed, consistently and to this day, ranks #1 in Russian polls of people Russians most revere in their history. That's one data point.

After the Bolshevik time (Lenin, Trotsky) and during the Soviet time (Stalin, to 1991), Russia and her Eastern European satellites produced Georgy Zhukov, Ivan Konev, Rudolph Nureyev, Sviatoslav Richter, Lola Astanova, Xaver Varnus, Katica Illenyi and siblings, Evgeny Svetlanov, and Khatia Buniatishvili along with engineers, mathematicians, scholars, diplomats, artists, homemakers, and scientists many and distinguished. That's another data point.

Stalin founded and encouraged technical, military, artistic, diplomatic, and industrial schools and universities to supply industries and institutions which enabled The Red Army to drive The Wehrmacht to Berlin and beyond. That's another data point.

Bolsheviks promoted activities we do: sodomy and pederasty, abortion, racial and sexual libertinism, transvestism, promiscuity, murder as a judicial proceeding, destruction of churches, single-parent households. Many of our parents and grandparents are or were Bolsheviks, their sympathizers, or their collaborators. To this day, most Bolshevik-minded people are from Jewish families. Like them, we too promote – for others – ripping up religious and cultural institutions, traditional domesticity, good manners and other refinements, communication processes that

benefit others, etc. We call ourselves neo-conservatives, yet our actions are not novel. They have a Bolshevik tinge. We are conservative about things we want to do and that our parents and grandparents wanted to do. That's another data point.

Mr Lehman-Morgan: Your point?

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: Good question. My point is that we are talking about governing when our grand strategic goal is about seizing and holding wealth. How do we want to govern land and wealth we seize? Who does the governing once we reach our grand strategic goal, which does not contemplate governing? Even dissipation by conjuring chaos has to be made, which implies governed. Evolution, after all, is directional, teleologic. How many creatures are *not* bilaterally symmetrical?

Mr Lehman-Morgan: I thought we all assumed that once we own everything no governing will be needed because no one else can get their hands on power or means to grab it. We are safe, they are in dissipation and having to rent from us everything they need.

Mr Weiss-Acosta: Indeed, we had assumed that.

Mr Al-Azir: Of course we had. What could be easier? Once we reach our grand strategic goal, who can oppose us? And with what?

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: It's not a matter of what can someone else do to us. It's a matter of what can we avoid doing to ourselves. By winning we lose because we have no one left to work on, to fight. No wealth to seize and hold. We all know Heraclitus, don't we?

Ms Amin-Steinberg: Yes, an hoary figure of obsolete and irrelevant history.

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: Oh? Yet let us be mindful. Will we give tickets to those set for dispatch so they come in an orderly fashion instead of all at once?

Mr Rockefeller-Schwartzenfleuger: We've been over that. Pandemic. We're all safe.

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: And the industries we need to maintain our standard of living even though we do not personally work them? That's a governance problem more than an ownership problem. Do we know how to do that?

Mr Rockefeller-Schwartzenfleuger: Our servants will do that. It's not like this is a new kind of social arrangement.

Ms Goldberg-Jackson: True, it's not new. Sustainable is another question. I suggest we think more about governance and then talk about that.

Chairman Fink: I agree. Ms Nudelmann

Ms Nudelmann: OK, personally I think this governance issue can wait until we are nearer to achieving our grand strategic goal – and so can the recruitment issue – but so be it, post-success governance heads the agenda of our next bi-annual meeting.

Ms Goldblatt-Uluubolaye: I think that's a good idea. For one reason, we already have income distribution to consider – a governance issue – and a lot more need for that begins when we achieve our grand strategic goal.

Chairman Fink: As long as we own the land and wealth of planet earth, I think we can work out the governance issues to our satisfaction. If I hear

no objections, I will declare a success and bring this bi-annual meeting to a close.

All: [silence]

Chairman Fink: Very well. I declare this meeting a success and bring it to a close. Our next bi-annual meeting will be on . . . Ms Nudelmann . . .

Ms Nudelmann: April 1, 2023

Chairman Fink: Let's make that April 2, 2023. Any objections?

All: [silence]

Chairman Fink: April 2, 2023 is the date of our next bi-annual meeting. Although most of you did not participate in the discussion, you heard it and are no doubt pondering its imports.

Please accept my thanks and thanks from one another for making our project a success. We focus on our grand strategic goal and realities impinging on our approach to it.

Rip, Ruin, And Hold is our name and our passion. Go to it, my eager friends!

The foregoing is fiction.

The following is not.

