5. Ensure that the critical intervention is given just too little time, so that the arguments appear incoherent.
6. Agree to research the topic in depth, so as to introduce a delay.
7. Encourage submission of the project through a body which already has an overload of projects for consideration.
8. Encourage submission of the project at a time when budgetary allocations for the following period have already been decided.

9. Condemn with facts which cannot be countered without getting them from some physically distant spot.
10. Organize the critical meeting in a place just too far away (in terms of travel funds) to permit people critical to the project to participate.
11. Ensure that the proposers are asked to present the project to an audience in places to which they do not have the resources to travel, particularly by stressing the importance of a "regional" focus — if they can manage it once, repeat the request for another region until finances run out.

12. Offer too much money; this leads to acquisition of staff and equipment not essential to the project, complacency, and possible arousal of more interest in the fringe benefits of working on the project than in its original objectives.
13. Offer too little money.
14. Encourage the proposers to request funds at the same time as requesting approval when it is known that the project will be rejected for budgetary reasons (even though general approval or sponsorship would be sufficient, probably, to ensure that the funds could be obtained from other sources).
15. Encourage the proposers to request extensive funding, when this is liable to ensure its rejection as "exaggerated"; or excessively modest funding, when this is liable to ensure its rejection as "unrealistic, inadequate, and ineffective."

16. Recommend that proposal be first discussed informally with the person when the latter is irritated by contacts which have been initiated formally; or alternatively, recommend formal contact when the person prefers contacts to be first established informally.
17. Ensure that, when the proposer has to meet people critical to the approval of the project, he is subjected to some form of culture shock which will antagonize him, disturb his poise, or make him appear gauche, (e.g., he is forced to wait long past the appointed hour, obliged to discuss generalities as a lengthy preliminary, fails to make provision for a bribe considered normal in his interlocuter's culture, etc.)
18. Ensure that there is a wide difference in age and life style between the proposer and people he has to meet who are critical to approval of the project, in order to establish the proposer's image as a cheeky youngster or an out of date fuddy-duddy.
19. Ensure that the proposer entertains people critical to the approval of the project in a manner liable to cause offence or boredom which will reflect on the proposer's judgement, (e.g., ensures errors based on dietary...
restrictions such as taking a vegetarian to a steak house; on moral principles, such as taking a puritan to a strip joint; or musical taste, such as taking a musical puritan to a discotheque, etc.)

20. Ensure that the committee getting the project is overfed and over-supplied with liquor and excessive hospitality to make effective work impossible.

E - Use of intellectual differences and comprehension

21. Interpret the terms used differently from the sense in which they were intended - by the proposer - commonly understood

22. Ensure that the proposal is written at a technical level which is either inevitably incomprehensible to the person reading it, or as an alternative, is an insult to his intelligence.

F - Use of image, competence and presentation

23. Criticize the proposers as incompetent or qualified.

24. Assert that the person or organization is not representative or qualified.

25. Condemn proposal as irresponsible - "just when we were beginning to sort things out".

26. Discredit the proposer by locating "true facts" about him which are irrelevant to what is proposed.

27. Structure the setting in which the proposal is presented such that the proposer appears to be criticizing past actions (or reactions) of his audience, or appears to be wasting time on the need for negligible minor improvements.

28. Ensure that the critical presentation is made in a setting in which irrelevant characteristics of the proposer will antagonize the audience (e.g., presented by a person of Jewish extraction to an audience with Arab sympathies, by a Hindu to a loyal Moslem audience, by a woman to an audience from anti-feminist cultures).

29. Ask for a written report when the proposers are unlikely to be able to structure it according to the required style, but avoid it if the written report is liable to be too well prepared and convincing.

30. Ensure that the proposers do not get the opportunity to present the project to an audience if they have skilled and persuasive orators at their disposal; alternatively, ask for such a presentation if they have little experience of oral presentation.

31. Ensure that, when the proposers have assembled a team prepared to argue all the facts, the audience is composed of persons liable to be antagonized by eggheads. Alternatively, assemble an audience of tough (hostile) experts when the proposers are only prepared for a non-expert audience.

32. Encourage written submission of the project in the form of a stencilled document when an offset or printed (professional) document is normal. Alternatively, encourage submission of a deluxe document when the latter is liable to excite suspicion.

33. Ignore.

34. Pay great attention, go through all the motions, receptions, etc. After the person or organization, and do nothing.

35. Decorate the organization making the proposal — i.e., praise initiative rather than follow it up.

36. Use public relations machinery to disguise inaction or minimum action.

37. Overpraise the project so that other people become suspicious of ulterior motives.

38. Encourage the proposers to lobby those who are irrelevant to the project, or definitely hostile, and avoid pointing out to them those who are likely to be powerful supporters.

39. Ensure that there are fudges in protocol on the occasion of the presentation with regard to the number of seats available, the allocation of seats to VIPs, who is introduced (or not introduced) to whom, etc., in order to build up hostility to the proposers.

40. Encourage the proposer's organization to issue a communiqué or other document on the project when it is known that this will be considered a breach of procedure, irresponsible and premature by the body reviewing the project; or alternatively, avoid suggesting such a communiqué when the reviewing body's or its members' interests are likely to be turned off by it.
44. Invite a charismatic celebrity (particularly of the luscious female variety) so that the tone of the occasion is changed and the presenter of the proposal is made to feel that the presentation is an arid exercise by eggheads.

H - Use of organizational structure and procedures

45. Appoint a commission to consider it.
46. Ask for a written report.
47. Refer the matter to some other department or body.
48. State your interest, but that you are too busy, "come back next year."
49. Ask for the project to be reframed, especially with the inclusion of key words like "development" and "environment.
50. Refuse to "recognize" the person or organization.

51. "The matter is under study, and we will report on it shortly. Until then it would be better to do nothing."
52. "We are acting on the matter together with the appropriate authorities."
53. "We are appointing" an expert to look into this matter."
54. Organize a meeting with the proposers and structure the meeting so that either they can say nothing, or what they say can be interpreted in such a way as to support the status quo or one's own program — i.e., write up the report to reflect one's own views. Talk to them and respect one's own views.
55. Agree, with reservations, then jump on the program at the first excuse — "I-told-you-so".
56. Fund several projects simultaneously so that they nullify each other.
57. Refuse to receive documents, or, having received them, pigeon-hole them.
58. Ensure that the machinery to consider the project is split into sufficient jurisdictional areas so that the project must either be split into two (or more) or considered by separate departments and therefore becomes a victim of jurisdictional and administrative problems — and loses its coherence.
59. Wait for a permanent change, or temporary absence, of the responsible person, if the newcomer is liable to react more unfavorably, or, alternatively, speed up the submission if the outgoing person will react more unfavorably.
60. Obtain the recommendation or support of a body or person in disfavor or whose credibility is low prior to submission, or, alternatively, ensure that such a body transmits the project on to the next phase, (kiss-of-death)
61. Attempt to tie the project into the general framework of a broader program which will probably be abandoned shortly, or have its non-essential projects eliminated.
62. Inject the project into a setting fraught with political issues so that it will be seized upon by one side or the other as a pawn in negotiation, and dropped as a concession when a compromise solution has to be reached.
63. Ensure that the project is associated with an empire-building faction within the bureaucratic structure so that it will be rejected or restricted by those outside the empire, or alternatively, associate it with the latter so that the empire builders will consider it a threat.
64. Encourage the proposers to rewrite the project in terms of a broader program framework when the approving body requires specific projects, or alternatively, to rewrite it as a more specific program when broader implications have to be stressed to ensure approval.
65. Suggest that it would be more appropriate to submit the proposal via a particular representative body, when it is known that the latter is unable to reach unanimity on any issue.
66. Ensure that the proposal is submitted to everybody but the right one, so that a strenuous attempt is seen to have been made.
67. Ensure that the proposal is initially submitted too low down the hierarchy so that it lacks status when it is then submitted to the appropriate person higher up the hierarchy, alternatively, submit it too high up the hierarchy so that it is rejected as an imposition when it is finally referred down to the appropriate level.
68. Ensure that the proposal is rejected by showing that it has already been tried by experts in the matter, and "experience" shows that it does not work.
69. Ensure that the proposal is eagerly accepted for future study, then delay notification of the negative response for as long as it is possible to maintain the illusion that a bit of patience in working through the proper channels is the best solution — despite the progressive loss of relevance of the proposal as the months go by.
70. Suggest the need for a pilot or trial project when the proposal does not merit it; alternatively, encourage haste and avoid a pilot project when one is essential for final success.
71. Ensure that the proposers have to interact with two departments, or a two-official team, one of whom appears in favor and encouraging, the other hostile and discouraging. The encourager can then blame every setback on the "lack of cooperation" of the discourager, and the discourager can "reinterpret" every advance as temporary, and only due to the abnormal weakness of the other. In this way the proposer is always kept uncertain and will finally give up from frustration.
72. Suggest that it would be inadvisable to propose a new project at this stage, because it might "cock the horn" and prevent programs on a number of related issues currently under review.
73. Ask for a detailed elaboration, and financial estimates when this requires unavailable or scarce resources; or, alternatively, fail to request such an elaboration when its absence will ensure rejection at a later stage.
74. Suggest that a complex computer study or data collection project would be worthwhile as a preliminary, when the answers are already known and such a project would be considered a waste of scarce resources.

1. Use of prospective supporters and opponents

75. Give resources and attention to dissenting groups within the proposer's group, so as to split the leadership, support and coherence of arguments.
76. Give resources, praise and attention to those expressing contrary views.
77. Recommend that an international proposal should be submitted to national governments via the national member bodies of the proposer's organization when it is known that there is little understanding of the project's significance at this level; alternatively, ensure that it is submitted at the international level when it is known that there is a powerful lobby prepared to act at the national level, but that international coordination is weak.
78. Undertake the same tactics when dealing with state and federal or local and state agencies.
79. Lobby the proposer's supporters, particularly national member organ-
izations, and suggest to them how
unwise the project is at this
particular stage.
J — Use of superficial response,
decoy and here
50. State that it already forms part
of your program (whether you are
doing anything about it or not).
51. Have a meeting on the topic, but do
not do anything about it.
52. Pass a resolution.
53. Call for a day or a year of remem-
brance or celebration — as a token.
54. Suggest action or programs — par-
specifically in distant parts — as evi-
dence that something is being done.
55. Offer the proposer a job on a dif-
f erent project.
56. Suggest that the person write a book,
S4.
57. Call for a day or a year of remem-
brance, or of a "positive" manner in annual
reports, and draw attention away
from the actual budget for it.
58. Start the program in an ambitious,
positive way and then terminate it on
the first excuse.
59. Express admiration for the insig-
thific, superficial or irrelevant achieve-
ment, and ignore real achieve-
ments or real problems which the
program has failed to solve.
60. Arrange for alternative meetings or
projects so as to attract away the
appropriate people at the critical
moment.
61. Receive a person, agree to do some-
thing about it so that the person
leaves satisfied, then do nothing or
support opposing programs.
62. Agree to act as intermediary to tran-
fer a message or draft to the respon-
sible body in time for a critical meet-
ing and fail to do so — while inserting
one's own proposal in its place.
63. Suggest to people in the chain re-
viewing the project that their career
advancement might be affected by
approval of the project, or of a
proposer coming from the program's
organization.
64. Suggest to the proposing organiza-
tion that funds could be guaranteed
for another project, if efforts on the
initial project were abandoned.
65. Focus criticism on "picky", minor
details, drawing attention away from
the major content and substance of
the proposal.
K — Use of technical matters
66. Swamp the proposer with "relevant"
demands that prevent him from ac-
complishing anything effective.
67. "Misplace", or fail to distribute, or
imply that relevant documents have
not arrived, at the critical moment.
68. Fail to reproduce or translate suf-
ficient relevant documents so that
only specially selected persons have
copies and others are not in a posi-
tion to evaluate their contents, and
they are offended or annoyed by
being so deprived - or develop the
view that the documents are there-
fore unimportant.
69. Ensure that, when the proposers are
to make an oral presentation, the
quality of the foreign languages inter-
pretation is low (to the point of
making arguments ambiguous), or
that interpreters in key languages, or
covet the specialized vocabulary,
are unavailable. Alternatively make
use of highly intelligent interpreters
to make common sense arguments
trivial, to the point of being inor-
ding, or to make general arguments
inlent, inconsistent, or in-
coherent.
70. Ensure that the audio-visual equip-
ment is out of order or incompatible
when the case is highly dependent on
information in charts and other
graphic displays, or, alternatively, en-
sure that the personnel operating the
equipment are incompetent (e.g.,
that slides are shown in the wrong
order or upside down).
71. Ensure that the final report of the
meeting at which the proposal is
presented either ignores or de-
emphasizes that proposal or stresses
the negative arguments concerning it.
If the report and its recommenda-
tions have to be approved by the
meeting in a final session, ensure that
there is little time available so that
any protests will appear niggle-
1. — Use of project personnel
72. Offer the proposer a job doing what
he suggests but ensuring that he
works with constraints which will
ensure that nothing is achieved.
73. Appoint an incompetent to run
the program or two incompatible com-
petent people so that one will under-
mise the efforts of the other.
74. Supply funds, personnel and
machines for a program in such a way
that nothing can be achieved.
75. Give them enough rope "to hang
themselves".
76. Encourage the appointment of per-
sons who will be more concerned
with the prestige of the program than
with its effectiveness.
77. Collaborate enthusiastically by offer-
ing the services of all the wrong
people, particularly the deadwood in
one's own department or in those
with which one is in contact.
78. Supply generous support, but make
it a condition that the project take
on many assistants (for whom jobs
cannot be found elsewhere) whose
personal objectives are to avoid work
and any form of responsibility.
M — Use of strong arm methods
79. For the sake of completeness, it
should not be forgotten that, in
extreme cases, projects can be
subvert using a wide range of bribe,
blackmail, threats of vio-
ence, etc.
N — Use of information
80. Fail to make available the list of
other people known to be interested
in such a project, or other informa-
tion which could facilitate its ap-
proval.
81. Select facts from the proposal and
summarize them to give weight to
opposing conclusions.
82. Transfer a mass of documents on to
the appropriate body when it is
confused by anything more than a
summary, or a summary when it is
annoyed by the absence of detailed
documents.
83. Encourage submission of the project
through a body which already has an
overload of projects for con-
}