

GASLIGHTING

by Miles Mathis

First published October 17, 2022

This is in response to [a piece by C. J. Hopkins](#) republished at *Zero Hedge* today. It is entitled “Gaslighting of the Masses”. Funny, because Hopkins is gaslighting you while teaching you about gaslighting. I want to use his article as a game for us. A teaching aid, if you will. You need to start by reading it. It is short and goes fast. As you read, look for the almost buried disinfo. I will tell you what it is in a moment, but first I want you to try to spot it yourself. It will be good practice. It may be slightly difficult for some of you, because Hopkins is pretty good at his job. I have said before that controllers of the opposition generally tell at least 80% truth while spinning you the other 20%. Hopkins and his group (who we will look at in a moment) know their audience is pretty smart, since they were specifically assigned the project of trying to capture my audience—which includes some of the smartest people out there. So in this particular piece, Hopkins is nearer 95% truth. There are only a few buried lies here, though they are big ones. Hopkins hides them not only within a field of truths, he hides them beneath his authoritative voice and self-assurance. So go give a look-see and then come back. I will meet you down below.

OK, did you find them? Here is the first big one:

Among the best-known and most dramatic examples are the [Patty Hearst case](#), Jim Jones’ [People’s Temple](#), the [Manson family](#), and various other cults. . .

Hopkins is selling those events as real, as you see. That is his main job here, and all the rest is just frosting. The thesis of gaslighting is just a frame for that. Everything else in the paper is just him telling you what you already know. There is no new information there, though he wants you to think he is being revolutionary. So he talks like a tough guy and includes some of the juiciest bits of the past years. But that isn’t what the article is really about. The article is about almost invisibly reselling those three events as real. He is replying to [my papers](#) on [those events](#) without responding to me directly. He can’t approach me or [my papers](#) head-on, since they are way too strong. So instead [he takes the events as given](#) in the interior of a paper that seems to be about something else.

He does it again on something even bigger:

They sound exactly like Holocaust deniers pathetically asserting that there is no written proof that Hitler ordered the Final Solution ... which, there isn't, but it doesn't fucking matter. Of course Hitler ordered the Final Solution, and of course they lied about the "vaccines."

That one should have been even easier to spot, since Hopkins does a very poor job of cloaking it. He needs to just work it in almost invisibly, but he has failed to do that. It sort of leaps off the page, since nothing really leads into it or out of it. He doesn't sew it into the garment, he just sort of glues it on like a ragged patch. He doesn't just tip his hand to us there, he actually drops all the cards on the floor and allows himself a frustrated curse as he does so. As if he isn't happy he was ordered to include that here. But I'll tell you a secret: he would be even less happy having to counter [my papers](#) on [Hitler](#) directly. That is out of his pay grade, and anyone else's.

I had never heard of Hopkins, but you can see how I knew he was an agent immediately. So I went to the linked website [The Consent Factory, Inc.](#) for more proof. It wasn't hard to find. The title was the first clue. Is is another obvious example of gaslighting, since he is just admitting to your face he is working at a Consent Factory. [We saw a similar project under the title OBEY.](#) You are supposed to think these titles are tongue-in-cheek, I guess, or directed at their opposition, but it is much simpler than that. They actually want you to make that excuse for them going in, when you first read the title, since if you make an excuse for them to start, you will keep doing it. You are being trained to look away.

Right under title, we get the all-seeing eye. It was that or a delta or a phoenix or something. Then we click on "about" to find this:

Consent Factory, Inc. is a market-leading provider of post-ideological consulting services to private and public sector clients throughout the developed (and in some cases developing) world. Experts in the fields of behavioral and psychological conditioning, we offer an extensive range of individually-customized strategic-planning and project-implementation services . . .

Wow. Talk about in-your-face. They are "experts in behavioral conditioning". Are you really going to just pass by that? Are you going to buy the hedge this is just satire, when it clearly isn't. It is the old double-fake. He is basically admitting he is CIA and then going, "Oop, just kidding!"

Then we check who is recommending Hopkins' books. Matt Taibbi of *Rolling Stone* is a big fan. That is the Matt Taibbi who argued 911 was *not* a false flag and that conspiracy theorists were insane. Max Blumenthal is another supporter. He has worked for *The Nation*, *Alternet*, *Daily Beast*, *The New York Times* and *Media Matters* (David Brock's baby). If you think he is a revolutionary you need serious help from Mars.

Then we check the links out of that page to "other interesting websites". Hopkins links you directly to DARPA and CIA and RAND and WEF, but you didn't think that was suspicious? He links you to James Delingpole, who I only had to read for about 30 seconds before [he began selling Ole Dammegard](#) as "the world's greatest expert on false flags". So we have James pegged. [See here](#), where I out Dammegard as one of the world's most transparent frauds. His misdirection is some of the

clumsiest I have come across. Besides, everyone knows Dammegard isn't the world's greatest expert on false flags. I am. In that last link you will see Dammegard selling the Breivik event in Norway as real, [while I prove it is a false](#) flag. So does this web of agents that include Hopkins and Delingpole ever link to me? Of course not. They have to pretend I don't exist.

Which of course allows us to peg the whole list at Consent Factory as CIA fronts:

OffGuardian
ZeroHedge
Dissident Voice
The Grayzone
Rubikon
OVALmedia
Matt Taibbi
Glenn Greenwald
Catherine Austin Fitts
Gunnar Kaiser
Mathias Bröckers
Det Poetiske Bureaus
Neue Debatte
Ron Paul Institute
Geopolitics & Empire
Demokratischer Widerstand
Children's Health Defense
Charles Eisenstein
Mercola
Lew Rockwell
Anthony Freda
Trish Wood
Cory Morningstar
Unlimited Hangout
Come don Chisciotte
John Stepling
Vanessa Beeley
Global Research
Winter Oak
Tessa Lena
Margaret Anna Alice
Nevermore Media
Mark Crispin Miller
Jerm Warfare
Clifton Duncan
Meghan Murphy
Signs of the Times
The Automatic Earth
21st Century Wire
Mittdolcino
Aube Digitale
Le Saker Francophone
Giorgio Agamben
James Delingpole
The Fire Online
Steigan.no
Apolut

IM-1776
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
The CIA
Rand Corporation
World Economic Forum
Situationist International
Swiss Policy Research
Consortium News
In This Together
Architects for Social Housing
Western Rifle Shooters
Tablet Magazine
Poetry Foundation
Book of Ours
Multipolar
Pandata
Edward Curtin
The Polemicist
UbuWeb

Still don't believe me? OK, I will do another one. *The Polemicist*. On his front page he quotes Malcolm X on truth. One problem: [the whole Malcolm X story was a hoax](#). Not only was Malcolm not interested in the truth, he was just another CIA actor.

Notice that *Poetry* magazine is on that list. Seems out of place, doesn't it? It's not, since *Poetry* has been a CIA front from the beginning. See [my paper on Hemingway and Pound](#) for more on that. Ditto for Situationist International, which [has always had CIA written all over it](#).

How about Whitney Webb's *Unlimited Hangout*. That's the in-your-face title again, isn't it? Telling you the truth while pretending it is a joke. No, the place is an actual **Unlimited Hangout**, just as it says. You can tell that just from Webb's name. The Queen was a Webb, so the new King is, too. And Whitney is the same sort of name Webb is. Whitney Webb is both a Whitney and a Webb. The name couldn't be a bigger clue if it was Spencer Stanley or Stuart Rockefeller. I can judge Webb by one article alone: [her 911 anniversary article in 2021](#). It is the weakest of weak brews, though it had twenty years to steep. Webb is where Naomi Wolf was about a decade ago, saying that we need to ask questions. Yeah, Whitney and Naomi, I think that goes without saying. Except that some of us were actually asking them 15 and 20 years ago, not just saying they needed to be asked. **We were also answering them definitively**. There is a big difference, as you can see if you read her paper closely. It has almost zero content, because she refuses to address even one fact. She doesn't get anywhere near the question of a false flag or a fake of any other kind, her only implications being that the event was *used* for nefarious purposes. So she is playing the worst sort of rear guard here, being only a few steps beyond Matt Taibbi and his sad attempts to trip up those walking ahead of him. Although people like me *solved* this crime many years ago, Webb is making herself look brave by timidly suggesting maybe, just maybe, we should begin questioning it. That's her whole assignment in a nutshell.

One of Webb's fellow writers there is Riley Waggaman, who comes out of *RT*. *RT* is just a spin-off of Radio Free Europe, being our CIA voice overseas, often pretending to be Russian. Again, Controlled Opposition. In a similar mold we find Matthew Ehret, Senior Fellow at the American University in Moscow. Do you think he is a revolutionary? American University was started by George H. Bush and Robert Kriehle, the Loctite billionaire. He was also on the board of the Heritage Foundation. So American University is just another CIA beachhead in Russia. It is also proof that Putin and Russia

aren't our enemies, because if they were, it—and the Moscow International University—would now be closed. Putin would have told all our agents to take a hike. From what I could discover, that has not happened. You may also want to check out [this research](#), which is even more damning to Ehret.

The OffGuardian is just as easy to blow the cover of, and it took me less than a minute. Their first heading word is UKRAINE, so I clicked on that. The second article offered is by Edward Curtin, entitled “[Only Adult Children Still Believe US Propaganda](#)”. The first sentence of that is:

It should now be quite clear to any reasonable person that the Biden administration is hell-bent on destroying Russia and will risk nuclear war in doing so. It has already started World War III with its use of Ukraine to light the final match.

The usual fear porn, the same thing we get from all the other mainstream and “alternative” outlets. Curtin is only missing the mushroom cloud and the scary music. As you see, that *is* US propaganda. Curtin is repeating mainstream propaganda in his first sentence, under a title that makes you think he will do the opposite. That is the very definition of gaslighting.

None of my readers, who are as reasonable as they come, believe Biden is hell-bent on destroying Russia or that there is *any* risk of nuclear war. They know this whole story is staged to get your eyes off the vaccine genocide and the ~~inception~~ acceleration of tyranny. It is the biggest of eyes-off events, and it was the only way they could continue to increase fear after all the fake Covid panic. They could not let fear begin to subside, because then your head might clear and you might revolt immediately. Only by keeping you debilitated with ever-rising fear could they hope to keep you corralled for a bit longer, and the nuclear war bugaboo was the only thing left that fit that bill, other than an invasion by killer aliens.

So, as you see, *Off-Guardian* blows their own cover in less than a minute. That is why the CIA is in their own sort of panic. They have literally tens of thousands of sites like this linked together, some opposing the others, but each and every one of them is like this: a transparent mind-fick. You can't teach people what gaslighting is on one page and then gaslight them on the next. Or not when I am around to point out the contradictions.