



The Truth Movement Comes of Age

by

Miri

on

[Miri.AF](#)



There's a quote I like that embodies the maturation journey we must all undertake in life, which goes: "the opposite of innocence isn't guilt. It's experience."

That's why we say children are 'innocent' - not because they never do anything wrong - sometimes even seriously wrong - but because they lack life experience. When someone lacks experience in a field - any field - they are an 'innocent' in that regard, and the more they learn about something, the more relevant abilities and skills they develop regarding it, the more that innocence wanes away.

That is the stage the 'truth movement' as a collective seems to be reaching, and I think it is an excellent (and inevitable) development. Innocence is an essential stage, and has much to recommend it - optimism, hope, trust, faith - but it also has obvious risks and downsides (why all cultures have special rules and frameworks to protect the most innocent of all, children), such as naivete, gullibility, and the tendency to trust the wrong people.

When I first joined the, shall we say, 'conspirascene' (hey, I like that!) in around 2012, my impression



was that - whilst I met many phenomenal people "in the trenches", doing incredible work - it was, at the higher levels, dominated by a few 'big names' - those with the big platforms and high profiles - and then people who followed and supported them. I was happy with this at first, as a newbie who still had much to learn, but gradually, started to find it a bit limiting and frustrating, especially when I started having some clashes with some of these big names (hard to believe, I know...) who seemed to see themselves as the absolute arbiters of activism and "truth": that they weren't interested in any meaningful contribution from those who supported them, just in being hailed as heroes.

There were certain people I started to become more than a little suspicious of, and wondered if they might have motives beyond the philanthropic for being so involved, but what I quickly learned was that to air such suspicions - using the very same capacity for questioning and critical thought that had enabled me to become a 'conspiracy theorist' in the first place - was verboten.

"Stop questioning or scrutinising others or examining their motives!" Was the repeat outraged admonishment I would receive. "You're dividing the movement!"

I dislike this phrase only a little less than "[you're not an expert](#)", so I think it's time to give it the same sort of dressing down...

First of all, here's a shocker of a bombshell for you: *I am divisive*. And so are you. By nature of having opinions - any opinions at all - and expressing them, you are therefore a powerful divisive threat to everyone (several million if not billion) people who don't agree with you. If the nature of your opinions are especially controversial or provocative (for instance, say, "vaccines aren't safe and effective"), then you are REALLY divisive.

"Stop expressing your views and arguing and contradicting others!" I could very well beseech you. "You're dividing humanity!"

Since, surely, our shared humanity is a more significant and meaningful shared category, than any very loosely defined social or political group we might belong to?

If you think it's ridiculous that you should be censored as a "divider of humanity" for sharing your opinions, then you must stop telling other people they're "dividing the movement" when they air theirs.

First of all, this so-called 'movement' is the most loosely defined in all of history, containing people ranging from Anna "don't talk about tap water" Brees (she says only complete lunatics and cranks think tap water is contaminated), to those who believe we live in a simulated holographic reality and are just fictional characters in a glorified computer game. This "movement" ranges from people who only 'awoke' in the last 18 months, to people who have been down the rabbit hole for fifty years or more. It contains people with wildly different views, interests, and opinions to each other, which they argue about, endlessly, on any conspira-forum you might care to visit.

And so they should. That is the nature of living in a free and open society, that it is full of a wide and eclectic array of people who see the world extremely differently. Sometimes they agree on things. Often they don't. This is as it should be. What we should be encouraging is the continuity of free and open debate over any and all subjects, because that is the only way we get to the truth. No subject - including people - should be a taboo that we cannot question, because remember, the truth doesn't fear investigation: only lies (and liars) do.

Which leads me to the main body of the article: the allegedly "divisive" nature of questioning whether people's motives for certain kinds of activism are always wholly honourable.

In the first instance, we can easily answer that with, "no, they're not". It is a matter of plainly obvious fact that all significant anti-establishment movements are ALWAYS infiltrated by said establishment. "The best way to control the opposition is to lead it ourselves", so said Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.

So, there are always establishment assets lurking amongst the ranks of anti-establishment



movements. How do you think the establishment would prefer you to react to this fact?

1. Be scrupulous and vigilant in who you trust, asking questions, examining motives, and maintaining a healthy scepticism, or;
2. Immediately and without question embracing into your trust every slick newcomer who says some of "the right things", completely irrespective of their background or real motives.

It's obvious which reaction serves the establishment best - and yet this is precisely what the "don't question or scrutinise anyone, you're dividing the movement!" brigade relentlessly remonstrates.

I repeat again: the truth doesn't fear investigation, so what is the problem with examining someone and asking them a few pertinent questions, if their motives are noble? There is no problem with that, obviously. I experience the tedious refrain ten times a day (or often feels like) from people, who believe they're really being super-smart and cunning here (didn't think of this one, did you!), that, "well how do we know YOU'RE not controlled opposition?"

You know by doing exactly what I'm advising you to do: use your critical thinking capacities, do your due diligence, and come to your own conclusions.

I have no issue with someone investigating my "motives" or whether I am being manipulated by some shady forces to push a nefarious message, because I know what such an investigation will conclude.

That's not to say I like any allegations of "shill", "controlled opposition" etc (which anyone with any kind of a platform inevitably has to deal with) - obviously, nobody does - and so I will, where appropriate (e.g., if someone is disseminating outright lies) defend myself. Yet I do not fear people asking such questions, nor do I wish to quash their right to do so, because that's yet another form of [thought-policing and gatekeeping](#), both of which I am very much against, as they are such deadly enemies of the truth.

What I see happening at the moment, however, and very encouragingly, is a rapid acceleration in the maturity and shedding of innocence of the truth community, and that potentially shady people, who would have been uncritically hailed as heroes in the past, are getting a bit more scrutiny and scepticism than they bargained for.

The ruling classes are deeply contemptuous of the rest of humanity, normies and conspiraquacks alike, and think we are all extremely stupid, easy to manipulate, and straightforward to deceive.

They have prepared many deceptive layers of the Matrix to dupe and control us, and the mainstream media is just the first and most transparent layer. Once people see through that, the malevolent social engineers have many other duplicitous mind-games with which to mislead and control you, and one of their favourites is giving false hope - so-called 'hopium' - in the shape of saviour messiahs and heroes that they manipulate and control.

It has always been thus, and as master 33rd degree Mason, Albert Pike said, "*when the people want a hero, we shall supply him.*"

Pike elaborated, "*We always give the public their heroes. We give the heroes to every faction and then people, once they hear them say all the right things, we give releases to them, because he or she speaks for 'me'. That's how we rationalise it, and we sit back and re-guide it again. We say go here and do that, and they do it. We give our power to the authorised heroes.*"

This has worked pretty well for them in the past, but I sense a sea-change, and an "adulging-up" of many attitudes. Instead of the uncritical acceptance and hero-worship "conspira-stars" had been treated to in the past - starry-eyed celebrity worship of the type that is common to teenage girls at pop concerts - a healthy scepticism is starting to emerge, and a reclamation of one's own personal power.



"It's very nice that you've come along and are saying some of the right things, and we appreciate that," the attitude is increasingly becoming to would be "stars". "But many of us have been at this for years and have been very busy and active in that time, getting the word out and making a difference. We have not been sitting around helplessly, waiting for a hero to come along and save us. We've been too busy saving ourselves. Please do join us in the fight - but we aren't going to worship you."

This is a much more appropriate and mature attitude, and represents the evolution of the 'truth movement' from more fledgling and innocent to more established and adult, and this is an excellent development. We need to shed our innocence and rise into our adult power, and that means not looking for super-human heroes or ultimate saviours.

Of course, many people do great work and it's important to acknowledge that and to express appreciation (I will even reference work by people I believe are "controlled" if it's good - I don't have to agree with everything about them to recognise valuable work). Yet, they are just people - just fellow, flawed human beings - who don't have "all the answers" (nobody does) and don't deserve legions of fawning disciples (again, nobody does - we can appreciate other people and their skills without being sycophants). There's another quote I like, which goes, "don't walk in front of me, I may not follow. Don't walk behind me, I may not lead. Just walk beside me and be my friend."

That's how adults should approach relationships with one another, and anyone who craves "hero-worship" and being put on a pedestal where they are beyond reproach, is not to be trusted, whether they are "controlled opposition" or not.

The ruling classes have invested a lot into farming us into being psychological children who stay stuck in the starry-eyed teenage stage, where we worship our "idols" - pop stars, actors, athletes etc. - and then bring that idolising into adulthood, expressing the same uncritical devotion to "experts", "leaders", etc. It's keeping us frozen in a kind of arrested development, transferring the total trust a young child has in its parents, to alternative "[daddies](#)" instead.

This is why the ruling classes blithely assume they can infiltrate the truth movement - and all anti-establishment movements - with their "heroes" and "saviours" and these people will be immediately accepted and worshipped.

However, if there's one good thing about psychopaths (and there is only one), it is that they consistently underestimate their prey, so full of contempt for us are they. It has not occurred to the ruling classes that the last two years have caused, not just a mass "waking up", but a mass "adulthood up", too, and the tricks they used to control the alternative scene in the past, may be rapidly losing effect.

The establishment infiltrates anti-establishment movements in order to control them, by utilising "[limited hangout](#)" tactics to send you down what are ultimately dead ends, e.g., "sure, the Covid vaccines are dangerous... but all other vaccines are safe". It also encourages you to invest all your faith in "heroes" who will save you and the world, so you feel abdicated of the responsibility to do anything yourself.

So, these people are dangerous and destructive and I certainly won't play into the establishment's hands by doing exactly what they would want us to do in the face of such infiltration: "don't question these people! Don't scrutinise them! Don't think! You're being divisive!"

Well, I do question. I do scrutinise. I do think. And I am divisive. *That's why I'm a conspiracy theorist.* I'm not going to suddenly detach myself from these abilities, leave my conspira-hat at the door, every time some slick new performer comes along saying some of "the right things".

Of course, some of these people are the real deal, and as such, have nothing to fear from being transparent and accountable. And yes, it's annoying to have your motives questioned if you're genuine, but it should be entirely expected, in a world so saturated in deception, red herrings, and double-crossings. Telling people who have suffered such egregious betrayal in the past from



"authorities" and "experts" lying to them, that they should not retain a healthy scepticism now, is a form of gaslighting. We should trust you just because you say you're trustworthy and the real deal? Guess what - that's what all dishonest deceivers who so brutally betrayed us in the past said as well.

Our inalienable right to be sceptical and ask questions is sacrosanct and is essential to maintaining transparency, integrity, and trust. Eternal vigilance really is the price of freedom - and the truth (and those who tell it) really do not fear investigation.

We don't need heroes. We don't need saviours. We need friends, supporters, and allies - because we're not kids any more. Children wait for superheroes to save them, because they lack the life experience and consequent power to save themselves. We have that power - and now we are really starting to rise into it.