



TESTCASE PASCALISM

Applying Pascalism to Framing, Media, and Power Interests



1. Introduction

These test cases are a moment of testing. I show how framing and conflicts of interest function in the Netherlands, not through theory but with concrete examples from public threads and newspaper columns. Everything I present is verifiable: LinkedIn discussions, columns in the national newspaper de Volkskrant, and the roles of the people involved.

The starting point is Pascalism: truth is only truth if it can be tested, and if it is willing to collapse the moment it proves false.

1a. What is Pascalism?

Pascalism is a radical truth-validation framework that I developed in 2025. Its principle is simple but strict: truth is only truth if it can be tested, and if it is willing to collapse the moment it proves false.

Core principles:

- Testability over belief – truth must be tested, not believed.
- Self-destruction as purity criterion – what cannot disappear when disproven is dangerous.
- Reproducibility – truth must be verifiable beyond individual convictions.
- No exceptions for power – politics, media, and institutions may not exempt themselves from testing.
- Destruction is validation – when a claim collapses under testing, it proves the test itself works.

Pascalism is not a philosophical theory but an operational testing mechanism. It can be applied to politics, media, institutions, and AI. Truth that survives the test endures; framing and manipulation collapse by themselves.

Important

This report is not an indictment but a test case. The purpose is to show how Pascalism works in practice: whether truth holds under pressure, or whether framing and falsehood collapse once they are tested.

Timestamps SHA256:

9f0a16a0b83b861375e223968d8701468de1a2356dae3569eef81b8d542a76c1

Registered at BOIP – i-DEPOT No. 155199

2. Case 1: Gaza thread - Diederik Samsom

Diederik Samsom wrote a column about Gaza. His tone was moral, collective, heavily charged. He spoke in “we”-language, as if all citizens were jointly guilty and jointly responsible.

This is framing: placing a moral burden of guilt on the public, thereby shifting responsibility from those in power to ordinary people. The debate becomes moral and emotional, but not testable. Anyone who contradicts it appears inhuman or cold. That is the core of framing: it shuts down contradiction.

Pascalist test: When I identified the framing as moral abuse, the discussion fell silent. The supposed truth did not withstand testing and collapsed. Exactly as Pascalism predicts: falsehood collapses.

3. Case 2: Responses in the thread, Intervention by the Operational Director of Eems Energy (Gasunie)

Notably, the operational director of the Eems Energy Terminal, part of Gasunie, actively engaged in the discussion. He repeatedly responded in a forceful manner and attempted to delegitimize my position (calling it “a-moral narcissism”). This is not neutral participation. Gasunie is directly dependent on billions in public funding allocated through climate and energy policy. A senior executive of this state-owned enterprise who intervenes in a moral framing debate is not acting from personal conviction, but from institutional interest.

This is not a neutral participant, this is a direct stakeholder.

Pascalist test: At the moment I pointed out this mechanism, the thread fell silent. The framing did not hold and collapsed once the hidden interests became visible. This is testability in action.

4. Case 3: Volkskrant - the absent disclosure

In de Volkskrant, Samsom’s column was published. His role as a supervisory board member of Gasunie was never mentioned, not in the first column, not in the second, not even after I directly confronted both him and the newspaper with this conflict of interest.

That omission is not a detail but a crucial concealment. It hides the fact that moral appeals and financial interests are intertwined here.

With this choice, de Volkskrant crosses a red line: from independent journalism into propaganda. This is a form of deception by omission, a direct violation of the Bordeaux Code, the international code of ethics for journalists, which requires that truth be presented in full and that essential facts must not be withheld.

Pascalist test: A truth that conceals interests makes itself untestable. By definition, it is impure and collapses under testing.

5. The mechanism of framing

What these cases show is a reproducible pattern:

1. **Shifting of guilt** – a moral appeal directed at citizens (“we are guilty”).
2. **Framing** – making criticism impossible by claiming the authority of emotion.
3. **Interest route** – the moral debate shifts toward climate and energy, legitimizing financial flows to companies such as Gasunie.
4. **Media coverage** – newspapers like de Volkskrant protect this process by failing to disclose crucial facts (roles, interests).

Pascalist test: A pure truth survives criticism and remains standing. Framing without purity collapses every time it is questioned.

6. Expected reactions – Pascalistically predictable

Because this report openly names the mechanisms, I also predict the reactions of the parties involved and of the state system. This makes the test case verifiable: if these reactions occur, they confirm the analysis.

1. Throwing back the framing

- The first reflex will be to attack the messenger. Not the content, but the person. I will be labeled as “extreme,” a “distorter,” or “unreliable.”
- This is not a refutation of arguments but an attempt to shift the debate from truth to reputation.

2. Neutralization through silence

- The most likely response from the media is to do nothing: no reporting, no analysis, just silence. Silence then becomes a strategy to make the problem disappear.
- That too is testable: whoever ignores the facts confirms the existence of a protective mechanism.

3. Spreading distraction

- Another tactic is to divert attention: introducing new themes, applying pressure through academics, opinion makers, or columnists without a direct link to de Volkskrant or Gasunie.
- It may appear as if no connection exists, but the timing betrays the intent.

4. Escalation – the hard measures

- If framing, silence, or distraction do not work, the pressure can escalate: character assassination, intimidation, or reputation execution.

5. Ridiculization through satire

- Not all satire is problematic: humor and critique are free expression.
- But when satire is deployed by media or political players to avoid substance and ridicule the messenger, it is no longer critique but neutralization.
- Pascalist test: genuine satire punches upward, at power. If satire only dismisses the messenger without substantive testing, it collapses as pure critique and is deployed by power as a tool of manipulation.

6. Legal pressure

- What a lawyer might still wave around: a defamation or slander claim, arguing that words such as “propaganda” or “moral abuse” damage reputation.
- But these are value judgments and fall under freedom of expression.
- In addition, a lawyer in the Netherlands can still deploy the classic SLAPP instrument, unlike in many other countries where it has already been banned. A SLAPP is not a procedure designed to win, but to impose costs and stress, with a price tag ranging from €50,000 to €250,000, often financed with public funds (taxpayer money). This makes it an effective tool of suppression within the Dutch system.
- **Pascalist test: this behavior too collapses, because a procedure that avoids substance and only intimidates confirms precisely the mechanisms exposed in this report.**

7. Broader pattern

This fits into a wider trend. In the Netherlands, new or dissenting voices are often not addressed on substance but neutralized—through framing, exclusion, silence, or escalation.

The system is not built on truth but on manageability. And framing is one of the instruments by which this is achieved.

Pascalist test: Truth is never afraid of contradiction. Systems that rely on framing are—and that very fear exposes their impurity.

8. Pascalist conclusion

The strength of these test cases is that everything is public and verifiable: the threads, the columns, the positions of those involved. Nothing is hidden.

That also means: whoever dismisses this as a lie makes themselves the liar. The facts are visible, retrievable, and testable.

This is Pascalism in practice:

- *Falsehood collapses the moment it is tested.*
- *Truth survives the testing.*
- *Everything that conceals framing or interests burns up in its own smoke.*

These test cases show that the façade is cracking. And that Pascalism is not only a philosophical principle but an operational instrument to make manipulation visible.

9. Appendix

Appendix 1a – Gaza column (de Volkskrant)

Description:

Column in de Volkskrant by Diederik Samsom about Gaza.

Moral form of address in "we"-language: responsibility is collectively placed on citizens.

His position at Gasunie is not mentioned anywhere.

COLUMN
DIEDERIK SAMSOM



Het gold voor Srebrenica en geldt nu voor Gaza: het is onvoorstelbaar dat het elke dag, in volle zicht, door mag blijven gaan

Van januari 1993 tot februari 1994 deed NCRV's actualiteitenprogramma *Hier en Nu* elke week verslag van het geweld en de mensenrechtenschendingen in het voormalig Joegoslavië, waarvan vooral de Bosnische moslims het slachtoffer waren. De uitzendingen eindigden consequent met een tekst over de gehele breedte van het tv-scherm: 'En nog altijd wordt er niet ingegrepen'. Drie seconden van woedende stilte, waarmee de programmamakers een oproep aan de regering deden om het geweld te stoppen. Vierenvijftig uitzendingen op rij.

Het engagement van de betreffende journalisten is later veel verhuisd. Niet onafhankelijk genoeg, opruiend zelfs. Een enkele politicus had het lef om de Srebrenica-genocide, waar een slecht bewaard en onvoldoende gemandateerd Dutchbat-bataljon moest toezien hoe meer dan achtduizend mannen en jongens werden vermoord, de NCRV deels aan te rekenen. Een gotspe. Niet de betrokken media, maar het te laat en halfhartig ingrijpen van Europese landen creëerde een inktzwarte bladzijde in de Europese geschiedenis, waar de generatie van mijn ouders mee zal moeten leven. Dat laatste is nog enigszins mogelijk met de wetenschap dat de Navo anderhalve maand ná Srebrenica wel ingreep en de Dayton-akkoorden afdwong met luchtaanvallen.

Inmiddels zijn we in Gaza getuige van een nieuwe schandvlek, ditmaal donkerder dan Srebrenica, of zelfs Rwanda, en op het blazen van mijn generatie. Bij die genocide, tussen april en juli 1994, kun je jezelf met enige hypocrisie wijsmaken dat die zich grotendeels aan ons zicht voltrok, en al was gestopt voordat de VN voldoende moraliteit bij elkaar had geschaapt om in actie te komen.

De catastrofe in Gaza voltrekt zich echter nu al bijna twee jaar in het volle zicht van de wereldgemeenschap. Het is inmiddels ondraaglijk en onvoorstelbaar dat het elke dag door mag gaan, zonder dat opeenvolgende misdaden tegen de menselijkheid een strobreed in de weg wordt gelegd.

Natuurlijk was de wereld in shock na de afschuwelijke pogrom door Hamas op 7 oktober 2023. De video's van de terroristen die lukraak in kibboetsen en supermarkten omstanders doodschooten, en er zijn nog veel engere beelden, trekken al het bloed uit je gezicht. Israël had en heeft het volste recht op zelfverdediging en meer dan dat. Er is in Europa terecht veel begrip voor de existentiële bedreiging die Israël wederom heeft ervaren, en waar het een eind aan wil maken. Maar wat er na 7 oktober heeft plaatsgevonden, is niet beperkt gebleven tot zelfverdediging of tot zelfs maar de ruimst mogelijke uitleg van de preventieve variant ervan: voorkomen dat je wordt aangevallen. Internationale experts hebben maanden geleden al vastgesteld dat Israël genocidaal geweld pleegt in Gaza. Sindsdien nemen de bewijzen en de ellende alleen maar toe. Veelzeggend is dat geharde hulpverleners, met veel ervaring in bloedige conflictgebieden, ontsteld verklaren dat de situatie in Gaza ook hun voorstellingsvermogen te boven gaat.

Israël heeft zich, nadat ontkenning niet meer werkte, nu toegelegd op de tactiek van het 'betreuren en onderzoeken' van de ernstigste gruweldaden – zoals het gericht doodschietsen van Palestijnen bij voedselafhaalpunten. Die verdediging is niet houdbaar in het licht van de vele dagelijkse moordpartijen. Inmiddels bevestigt de Israëlische regering zelf haar intentie tot etnische zuivering, met haar plannen voor een concentratiekamp bij Rafah, van waaruit Palestijnen slechts zouden mogen vertrekken wanneer ze de Gazastreek verlaten. Hoeveel bewijs is er nog nodig?

We kijken ernaar. En doen helemaal niets. Europese ministers van Buitenlandse Zaken lieten zich deze week van hun meest impotente kant zien. Na een dag vergaderen verklaarden ze dat de humanitaire situatie in Gaza 'gemonitord zal worden'. Het continent met de grootste mond over het belang van de internationale rechtsorde, draagt die nu zelf ten grave. De geschiedenis zal er niet mild over oordelen.

Waarom laten we blinde razernij prevaleren boven recht? Is het ons historisch schuldgevoel dat hier opspeelt? Kunnen we niet bevatten, laat staan veroordelen, dat een land dat ontstond uit de as van de Shoah, nu overgaat tot het uithongeren, vermoorden en verdrijven van een volk? Of grijpen we niet in, omdat de geslachttoferde mensen niet op ons lijken? *Hier en Nu* bestaat niet meer, maar ik hoop dat er programmamakers zijn die nog een keer hun stille woede willen inzetten. Het mag van mij ook dagelijks.

Diederik Samsom is natuurkundige en oud-politicus. Hij schrijft om de week een wisselcolumn met Heleen Mees.

Appendix 1b – Gaza thread (LinkedIn)

Description:
Public discussion on LinkedIn in response to the Gaza column.
The moral framing is identified as moral abuse.
After this testing the thread falls silent = collapse.

Diederik Samsom · Following
Activist, Politician, Strategist en Ondernemer voor een duurzame toekomst
2mo · 2mo

It is now unbearable and unimaginable that it is allowed to go on every day, without successive crimes against humanity being put in the way.

Show original · Translation settings

Her gold voor Srebrenica en geld nu voor Gaza. Het is onvoorstelbaar dat het bloed, in volle zicht, door mag blijven gaan

211 comments · 142 reposts

Reactions

Like · Comment · Repost · Send

Add a comment...

Most relevant

- Pascal Becker Hoff** · You
I understand your moral anger Diederik. But it is not our war.
Yes, it is terrible what is happening in Gaza, on both sides. But we don't change that. We have no power, no influence and no guilt.
When you shout from your safe chair what "we" should all do, it feels more like self-exaltation than real compassion.
Compassion is fine. But making people feel guilty while they are outside of it?
Stop this moral narcissism.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 32 replies · 510 impressions
- Diederik Samsom** · Author
Activist, Politician, Strategist en Ondernemer voor een duurzame toekomst...
Our economic relations with Israel give us influence. And the historical context makes us very involved.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 55 replies
- Pascal Becker Hoff** · You
Diederik Samsom Diederik, your column was moral, not legal. You spoke of "us" and moral failure, not of treaties or influence. Now that you shift the conversation, you confirm my point. Moral accusations without distinction quickly become moral narcissism. Public voices must stop manipulating.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 960 impressions
- Pascal Becker Hoff** · You
Pascal Becker Hoff moral narcissism? Morally bankrupt our cabinet, EU and the UN you mean.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 5 replies
- Diederik Samsom** · Author
Activist, Politician, Strategist en Ondernemer voor een duurzame toekomst...
Pascal Becker Hoff you write 'we have no power, no influence, no guilt'. I responded to that. With arguments that are more than just legal (historical context, economic relations)
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 7 replies
- Pascal Becker Hoff** · You
I agree that moral bankruptcy is clear. And at the same time, they are directing us to be. A form of control. What touched me in this is how public voices translate that failure into "society", as if we collectively fall short. I put my finger on Samsom.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 743 impressions
- Pascal Becker Hoff** · You
Diederik Samsom Diederik, my point was not about treaties, but about how public voices put moral guilt on "us", while we can do nothing. That may feel good, but it doesn't solve anything. That's where moral narcissism lies: it's only about the good feeling you get from saying that something is bad.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 771 impressions
- Pascal Becker Hoff** · You
Pascal Becker Hoff our country ignores international treaties, court rulings and acts of violation of international law.
We just influence.
We don't want to take it, because 40 billion in investments outweigh human lives.
One day we will swing 'never again'
My one grandfather and grandmother were in a camp because they refused to be selective as doctors.
My other grandfather was an Englandsvaarder and fought together with my English grandfather for our freedom, but also for a dignified existence for everyone.
This is our war too. Because if we allow this, who will stand up for us if we are next?
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 4 replies

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Project Director Eems Energy Terminal
2mo · 2mo

My point was not about treaties, but about how public voices put moral guilt on "us", while we can do nothing. That may feel good, but it doesn't solve anything.

It is also a sophisticated form of moral framing, a safe way of steering public opinion. Not a clear moral compass, but social influence disguised as a moral appeal.

Your grandparents were in a war that directly affected the Netherlands. One fought as an Englandsvaarder, the other was imprisoned in a camp. Their actions had meaning, because it was their country, their struggle. That does not apply to this war. It doesn't affect us in that way.

It only becomes bitter when stories like that are used to make people feel guilty. That's where moral narcissism lies: it's only about the good feeling you get from saying that something is bad.

If this was really our war, we wouldn't write empty morally unnecessary words for a good feeling.

Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 800 impressions

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Pascal Becker Hoff it is our war because we send weaponry. So in my opinion it may be our war, we are complicit. I am ashamed to death.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 4 replies

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Thank you for your vision. Shame is pure than words that only serve to make ourselves feel moral. But real shame leads to action, not to public self-flagellation or moral denunciation of outsiders. And about those weapons: these are decisions of states, embedded in international interests. Not a civic choice. Not even a pure choice of country. But still, this conflict is not ours. And public voices need to stop pretending that they are.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 402 impressions

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Pascal Becker Hoff special point of view. Which conflicts are ours?
Almost everything is embedded in international interests these days
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 4 replies

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Empathy is different from co-deciding, fighting or taking responsibility. We can be touched by the conflict, without it becoming our conflict. Humanity is valuable, but that does not make it a moral imperative for "us" as a society to be accountable. Being internationally intertwined is different from being morally responsible. States act, but citizens do not automatically bear collective guilt. That distinction is important.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 461 impressions

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Pascal Becker Hoff very kind that people still take the trouble to try to refute so much nonsense in a paragraph. In my opinion, you cannot refute stupidity/fillness or holding on to false sentiments and ideas. If you really think this is a war between two people on the basis of equality, you are really not aware as far as I'm concerned.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Pascal Becker Hoff Well, morally bankrupt? "We", "us", why do you pretend to be able to talk and judge for everyone? I don't feel morally bankrupt at all. I think some feel morally superior and want to show that by speaking out in the way in and under this posting and in this thread.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Hi Pascal Becker Hoff, please stop the chatter about "on both sides". A genocide is going on in Gaza, also known as genocide. Hamas (and not innocent women and children) carried out the attack on Israel, Israel kills Palestinians indiscriminately. Hamas has killed about 1500 people, Israel has now killed ~ 50,000 people. And moreover, a multiple of them have been driven out and their habitat razed to the ground.
Israel is emphatically exterminating the Palestinians unilaterally. That is why an arms embargo for the time Minister of Israel has been issued by the International Supreme Court. So there is no question of proportionality at all: Israel is simply committing genocide.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
I think you confuse conviction with truth. What you call stupidity is really your inability to test outside your own frame of mind. Exacty what dogma is. You show yourself not only as a dogmatist, but also as a moral narcissist. Call it moral dogmatist. Thanks for illustrating my point. And very kind that we have come up with a new word with meaning together.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 531 impressions

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
You ask why we pretend to talk and judge for everyone, but use 'you' yourself and also judge. You confirm exactly the pattern that you are criticizing.
To be clear: I only speak from my own perspective. Not a morally elevated position, but an attempt to remain clear in a conversation that often clouds, through assumptions and caricatures that are intended to neutralize dissenters.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 536 impressions

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Pascal Becker Hoff My "you" concerned two people, whom I addressed directly in my response.
Reading back the reactions, my earlier reaction is more towards Diederik Samsom than to you.
I actually agree with you: I responded to a single reaction of yours, in which you in turn responded to Mr. Jan Stuijver.
To be clear: the use of "us" and "we" in an argument with a personal view is usually a generalization and condemnation based on, in this case moral values, with which I absolutely do not identify.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Pascal Becker Hoff we can do is vote for the right party in October. That should be our moral duty.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Project Director Eems Energy Terminal
2mo · 2mo

Who do you think 'we' are? Netherlands? The Netherlands can do enough with economic sanctions and a complete halt to deliveries of military equipment. What we can also do is show courage, by not always looking away and giving very superficial meaningless reactions to the unprovoked violation of human rights. Trying to make a pact at the level of political leaders and/or the EU to deal with Israel. We don't do that, because we are afraid that we will antagonize Trump. Diederik Samsom does not show moral narcissism, you show amoral narcissism.

Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Your reaction is fierce, but misses what matters to me. I am not advocating indifference, but warning against something else: shifting collective blame to all citizens.

Of course, the Netherlands as a country can make choices. But this is not our war. Anyone who demands sanctions from "the Netherlands" acts as if we as a population are morally responsible for what happens elsewhere. That is not a fair analysis. That is political pressure.

When the Netherlands was involved in wars in Iraq or Afghanistan, no one called for sanctions against us. Why should the moral rules suddenly be different now?

That is morally inconsistent. No country is superior to the rest. Not even ours.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 504 impressions

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Project Director Eems Energy Terminal
2mo · 2mo

Pascal Becker Hoff I don't understand from Diederik's words that he blames the citizens collectively. It seems more logical to me that, given his political work, he is more likely to address politicians. Provided I am also very reluctant when it comes to participating in wars, but I find the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan incompatible to what is happening in the Gaza Strip. Firstly, there is no trace of a strong Palestinian regime and secondly, the bloodshed, the dead are mainly and mainly civilians. Palestinian citizens have become the target of the current rules in Israel. That is why genocide is spoken of.

Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Samsom does not use the word 'guilt' literally, but does shift responsibility to the people. This is evident from these sentences: "It is unimaginable that it is allowed to continue every day, in full view." "In the meantime, we are witnessing a new stain of shame in Gaza." "The catastrophe in Gaza is unfolding... in full view of the world community." "We are looking at it. And do nothing at all." "History will not judge it mildly." "Why do we let blind rage prevail over justice?"
In all these sentences, he speaks of "we" and "our" passion, and he attributes guilt. In this way, he places moral responsibility on society for a conflict that is not ours and that should never be. That is not analysis, but control through language.
It's terrible there, on both sides. But not our struggle. Moral narcissism soothes the conscience, clouds truth.
Truth is only truth if it allows itself to be tested. Samsom's version is closed. She does not tolerate contradiction and does so purely morally. That is not neutrality and not an invitation to think, but moral influence. A closed truth is never pure, but always manipulative.
Framing at this level is dangerous.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 634 impressions

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Pascal Becker Hoff don't you do the same thing you are reprimanding someone else for?
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
I see you.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 723 impressions

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Project Director Eems Energy Terminal
2mo · 2mo

You feel addressed by Samsom and then push it away from you as your choice. You can read from Samsom's words that he speaks to the citizens, but it seems obvious to me that he speaks to politics. In addition, we live in a democracy and we deserve the government we have. In other words: as a population we are indeed jointly responsible for the choices our governments make. The fact that we as a Dutch society have become increasingly dismissive of Muslims and have shown this in the elections by giving the PVV more and more power and influence, makes us as a population partly responsible for the attitude that our government is now taking.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
To say that "we are increasingly rejecting Muslims" is not an analysis, but a moral condemnation of millions of people. That language comes straight from the mouths of public speakers who consider themselves morally elevated and thus give their followers a purpose.
That is not solidarity. That is moral narcissism: profiting yourself as good by dismissing others as bad, and placing yourself above the Muslim who supposedly needs our help.
The Muslim does not need us. The system you defend has systematically taken away their morality. This is how moral narcissism is maintained: Good citizens help morally destroyed Muslims. For the good feeling.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 385 impressions

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Project Director Eems Energy Terminal
2mo · 2mo

So the rise of the PVV as a party, which leaves no opportunity unused to trample Islam and thus Muslims into the ground, do you think is not a sign of increasing intolerance? I do not put myself above the Muslim, I turn against people who think they are morally superior to Muslims.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Project Director Eems Energy Terminal
2mo · 2mo

Your opposition to moral superiority towards Muslims goes right to the core. That's the problem.

You can see the same attitude in Diederik Samsom's column about Gaza: not doing justice, but showing moral leadership, at the expense of ordinary people, here and in war. It puts bad blood without a truth test. A sophisticated form of moral manipulation, visible in Samsom's column, and made visible in this conversation. Silence is consent.

You say: "We deserve our government." But what you really mean is: whoever votes PVV is guilty of genocide and the exclusion of Muslims. Perhaps unintentionally, but the image is handed to you. Politics feeds the judgment. You say it.

Moral narcissism in action. To maintain division and hatred. Instability is crucial for power.

This is how the conversation shifts from Gaza for a judgment about our society. Not to solve anything. Not to settle morality. But with power, but with each other.

And that is exactly what keeps politics going: a society that fragments itself, in the name of good. While they watch. Their wallets will fill up anyway.

Pure truth can be tested. Test their truth, and it will burn.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 335 impressions

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Project Director Eems Energy Terminal
2mo · 2mo

Quote: "whoever votes PVV is guilty of genocide and the exclusion of Muslims." I don't say that and it's not handed to me. I do say "whoever votes PVV is to blame for the exclusion of Muslims." I say that because the PVV proclaims it clearly and thus presents itself very strongly. If you vote for the PVV, you want (for whatever reason) to get rid of Muslims in your own environment and you have a strong negative opinion about the culture and religion of Muslims in general.

In line with the PVV program, look at the PVV's unconditional support for Israel. Look at the stigmatization of people who are critical of Israel: they are effortlessly and unreservedly called anti-Semites.

The fact that almost the whole world looks away when Israel raze Gaza to the ground and chases or kills its citizens, that is a form of narcissism. Not the fact that you resist that.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
You say: those who vote PVV are to blame for the exclusion of Muslims. That is clear. But the pattern remains: making citizens accountable for state policy through their vote.
Analysis becomes moral positioning. And the discussion about Gaza dangerous: She is shifting from solutions to public outrage.
Politics: big words, no help. Only rhetoric, no action. As long as it sounds.
That is not solidarity, that's branding.
We no longer test language. Compassion and judgment are intertwined. Sentiment drives. And who steers, rules.
Samsom started this thread. Has tested. Fall silent. Received support, but party leader Frans Timmermans remained silent. Diederik Samsom: this is the club you want to belong to?
This is how moral leadership ends: not by being wrong, but because it does not tolerate contradiction.
And those who no longer bring lies are left behind.
It is not our war. But politicians want it to feel that way, so that they can wash their hands off it.
As long as we don't dare to test that, burns every call to humanity in its own smoke.
Are they worthy of this moral leadership? Let their truth stand the test or burn in the same smoke.
Morals require sharpness. But also control.
Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 487 impressions

Pascal Becker Hoff · You
Project Director Eems Energy Terminal
2mo · 2mo

Framing and manipulation continue. See the symbiosis between politics, conflicts of interest and media. de Volkskrant Diederik Samsom
<https://bit.ly/471yrf>

De exacte dag is natuurlijk niet vast te stellen, maar ergens die jaar komt die dag dat de CO2...
De exacte dag is natuurlijk niet vast te stellen, maar ergens die jaar komt die dag dat de CO2-afstoot voor het eerst...

Show original · Translation settings
Like · Reply · 109 impressions

Collapse replies

Add a reply...

Blur: all names and profile pictures of non-public participants have been blurred. Only the name of Diederik Samsom (public figure and board member of Gasunie) remains visible.

Appendix 2a – Energy column (de Volkskrant)

Description:
Column in de Volkskrant by Diederik Samsom on energy and climate.
Once again a moral appeal directed at citizens.
Here too, his Gasunie position remains unmentioned.

COLUMN
DIEDERIK SAMSOM



Het nieuwe kabinetsoel voor offshore windenergie 'realistischer'? Ammehoela

Zes jaar geleden adviseerde ik u vanaf deze plek om alvast 25 maart 2027 prominent in uw agenda te noteren, want dat belooft een buitengewoon feestelijke dag te worden: de eerste dag ooit waarop er méér duurzame energie dan extra energievraag bijkomt. Op die dag heeft de wereld dus voor het eerst sinds 1760 minder fossiele brandstoffen nodig dan de dag ervoor.

Zes jaar geleden was er daarvoor nog een heel lange weg te gaan, want de wereldwijde energievraag nam toen vier keer zo snel toe als de hoeveelheid duurzame energie, dus ik zou er zomaar een paar jaar naast kunnen zitten, zo luidde de winstwaarschuwing. Wie weet wat er in de wereld allemaal nog zou gebeuren.

In zes jaar tijd hebben we vervolgens een pandemie, een oorlog en Trump voor de kiezen gekregen. Je kunt je voorstellen dat de wereld wel wat anders aan zijn hoofd heeft gehad, dan zorgeloos een paar zonnepanelen neerleggen. Mijn voorspelling zit er dus inderdaad een paar jaar naast. Die feestelijke dag komt namelijk twee jaar eerder!

Huh? Jazeker, ondanks covid, Oekraïne en Amerikaanse gekkigheid is de groei van duurzame energie de afgelopen jaren alleen maar versneld. Het gaat dus dit jaar al gebeuren. De esactie dag is natuurlijk niet vast te stellen, daarvoor is de wereldgemeenschap te grillig, maar ergens dit jaar komt die dag dat de CO₂-uitstoot voor het eerst in de moderne geschiedenis begint te dalen. Een mijlpaal waarvan we lang vreesden die nooit te zullen bereiken.

Dit heuglijke moment is overigens geen

reden tot verpozen. Niet alleen duurzame energie is aan een opmars bezig, klimaatverandering helaas ook. Als de mensheid de race met het klimaat alsnog wil winnen, zal de CO₂-uitstoot hierna heel snel moeten dalen. De ontwikkeling van duurzame technologie moet dus nog harder gaan.

En gelukkig gaat het hard. Adembemend hard. Alleen al in de maand mei van dit jaar werd er in China maar liefst 900 vierkante kilometer aan zonnepanelen neergelegd. Dat zijn 7 duizend panelen per minuut, 24/7. In dit tempo produceert China volgend jaar meer schone zonnestroom dan de gehele elektriciteitsvoorziening van de EU. Ook andere duurzame bronnen gaan als een speer. De komende vier jaar wordt er naar verwachting wereldwijd net zoveel windvermogen bijgeplaatst als in de afgelopen zeventig jaar bij elkaar.

En voor de sombermannen die sippen dat je dan geen stroom hebt in een windstille nacht, de productie van batterijen vertienvoudigde in de afgelopen vijf jaar en de kosten daalden sinds 2010 met 90 procent. Batterijen zijn daarmee op dit moment de snelst groeiende commerciële technologie op aarde. Die batterijen overbruggen stroompieken en dalen van enkele uren, voor de grijze windstille winterweken is er waterstof als energiedrager. De projecten die daarvoor in Europa op de tekentafel liggen en deels al worden gebouwd zullen die schone brandstof met een factor 25 vergroten tussen nu en 2030. Overal doet de vooruitgang je duizelen.

Behalve dan in Nederland. Daar besloot de regering deze zomer om de doelstelling voor offshore windenergie voor de komende vijf

ten jaar met maar liefst 30 procent te verlagen. Ze legde uit dat dat nodig is omdat de Nederlandse industrie langzamer dan gedacht overschaakt van fossiele brandstoffen naar schone elektriciteit of waterstof en noemde het nieuwe doel 'realistischer'. Ammehoela.

Een paar weken eerder had minister Sophie Hermans haar pogingen om de Nederlandse industrie te verduurzamen gestaakt, nadat de coalitie haar budget had geplunderd. Dat realisme is dus niets anders dan een zelfgecreëerde werkelijkheid. Erger nog dan deze drogredenering is dat zulke strapatsen de concurrentiekracht van Nederland grote schade toebrengen. Wie langer blijft hangen in fossiele brandstoffen, blijft langer afhankelijk van dure en onbetrouwbare import van elders. Niet voor niets beveelt Mario Draghi in zijn rapport *De toekomst van Europese concurrentiekracht* aan om de verduurzaming van de energievoorziening en industrie juist te versnellen.

Enige tijd gold het energie- en industriebeleid van deze coalitie als een beleidsterrein dat nog enigszins ongeschonden uit de destructieve formatie was gekomen. De WVD was er maar wat trots op. Een jaar Schoof blijkt helaas net lang genoeg om ook dit dossier op de brandstapel met vastgelopen dossiers te laten belanden. Nederland stelt het feestje dus nog even uit.

Diederik Samsom is natuurkundige en oud-politicus. Hij schrijft om de week een wisselcolumn met Heleen Mees.

Appendix 2b – Energy thread (LinkedIn)

Description:
Public discussion on LinkedIn in response to the energy column.
The interest route and manipulation through moral appeal are explicitly identified.
Responses follow briefly, then silence sets in = collapse.

The screenshot shows a LinkedIn post by Diederik Samsom, a Dutch politician, discussing a cabinet goal for offshore wind energy. The post includes a link to a news article titled "Het nieuwe kabinetsdoel voor offshore windenergie 'realistischer?' Ammeboela". The post has 1,136 likes, 167 comments, and 61 reposts. Below the post, there are several replies from Pascal Becker Hoff, who is identified as a member of the 'the gluh project'.

Post by Diederik Samsom:
Of course, the exact day cannot be determined, but sometime this year will come that day when CO2 emissions will start to fall for the first time in modern history. A milestone that we long feared we would never reach.

Article snippet:
Het nieuwe kabinetsdoel voor offshore windenergie 'realistischer?' Ammeboela

Reply by Pascal Becker Hoff:
Again the same play. A moral column that appeals to citizens: "more realistic? Ammeboela."
But behind that moral appeal is a state-owned gas/energy company that needs billions. The administrator writes, the citizen pays. That is a conflict of interest, even if it was not intended that way. The de Volkskrant also bears responsibility: publishing without naming those interests is manipulation.
This is not called leadership. This is called shifting blame: from top to citizen, from power to people. Moral abuse.
Pure truth can be tested and survives. The test here is simple: does someone speak as an independent conscience, or with an interest that is not named? That fails here. And a truth that fails is impure, therefore corrupt.
I remember a LinkedIn thread in which moral abuse and blame shifting was completely dismantled: <https://bit.ly/47wa7D>

Reply by Pascal Becker Hoff:
Het is inmiddels ondraaglijk en onvoorstelbaar dat het elke dag door mag gaan, zonder dat opeenvolgende...
Het is inmiddels ondraaglijk en onvoorstelbaar dat het elke dag door mag gaan, zonder dat opeenvolgende misstanden tegen de...

Reply by Pascal Becker Hoff:
By remaining silent, you fail the test again.
A truth that does not stand the test has the right not to exist.
This test works both National and Universal.

Together, these appendices provide the verifiable basis of the test cases.

Pascal Becker Hoff
October 2025
© Pascal Becker Hoff. Personal use is permitted.
For publication, reproduction, or commercial use, please
request prior permission.

