

**our innate need to conspire** The only difference between a conspiracy theory and its opposite, is that the latter, is either based on total cluelessness of it being the first, or worse, a conspiracy to hide the fact that it is.<sup>[1]</sup>

If you look up Conspire in a dictionary it says - 'two or more' come together and 'breathe'. Con-with, together and spirare-to breathe, spirare, also suggesting-spirit.

Our life journey start at birth - Our first breath. We breath with family and friends, playing, running and laughing. We get curious. We ask questions. We start school. We learn to engage socially through language, written or spoken, but also unspoken via subtle gestures and expressions. We learn symbols and deeper meaning and engage in philosophical and existential query. We continue to cooperate, innovate and debate in university and higher learning, work places, climbing the hierarchical ladder. We compete, we struggle, we strategise, we achieve and thrive, we lose - we win, a career in sport, business, industry - locally and globally. We travel the world, external, internal, virtual landscapes and mindscapes and beyond ...

This is *-to breath together* - The intrinsic life experience, with other beings, animals and nature.

So the argument goes -But a conspiracy is an 'evil plot' - Yes, with a negative connotation added e.g. -cronyism, corruption, secret oaths, secret hand shakes, power-struggle, greed, envy, espionage, cartels and mafia, hate, conflict, wars etc.

However, 'conspire' itself does not differentiate or define good or bad. There has to be a word put adjacent to it, a describing factor, - what is the underlying *creative* or *destructive* nature? A conspiracy to steal, to commit fraud, to trick and deceive, to hurt, to murder? Or, conspiracy to love, to share, to co-create? Or indeed perhaps you see other dichotomies or factors at play.

The question that needs to be put out there -hopefully through your own inner free drive to perceive, discern and deduce by critical and logic thinking; -Is it a 'good or a bad' conspiracy? Is it through morally sound or more dubious reasons? Is it with closed doors or via transparency? What are the motives? The goal? What are the means? Have you any part in it? What conspiracy-theory have you deduced by yourself to be most credible, most trustworthy, what evidence and sources do you base it from? Are you listening to 'experts' blindly accepting, or with a critical focus?

Thus, given above natural and -normal- conspiring life, it folds perfectly under One mans agenda too. Indeed to make two you must have one (inter-changingly and paradoxically, to create one life, it takes two). To breathe is our cause and effect for survival. It is the first we do and the very last, and in between we spire a lot. We transpire, inspire, aspire, respire and expire. The system we are born into and part of is a vast conspiring sphere whether we like it or not and it is clear we can't see all aspects of it, even if we consciously and eagerly are trying.

[1] I'm using a bit of sophist phraseology to indeed pinpoint the *sophistry* being too prevalent in media. These very unfortunately 'normalised' red herring, straw-man, ad hominem, 'whataboutism', or other combinations of *diversion* from the main topic/ subject matter that is (purportedly) being discussed -at the dinner table or the bigger arena of debates, journalism, expertise or in academy among generally 'undisputed' facts or theories. In the world of rhetoric, these are *logical fallacies*, and as such very important for all parties to be perceptive and vigilant to address when being used -purposefully or not. *Conspiracy theorist* being a major infamous one (possibly 'coined' in the era of major assassination cases; JFK, MLK and RFK) used to detour by discarding, diminishing and silence the opposite side, attack the messenger (and not the message) or critical party or any alternative to an otherwise generally established and accepted truth.

Even if a theory in any imaginable topic or historical event might be lacking raw data or with less founded sources, questionable credibility, naive even, it *never* ever deserves logical fallacies baked in the reply. They should always come as rebuttals with evidence, relevant quotes, documents, more irrefutable statistics, science etc, very dry, laconic even and honest and with *respect* to the subject matter and *opponent*