

**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, externally, internally, virtual landscapes and mindscapes and beyond ...

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

So the argument goes -But a conspiracy is a 'big 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, *bate*, 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 behind 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 and inquisitive focus regardless of origin and how uneasy the evidence might be? <sup>[2]</sup>

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-changing 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 todays society. These very unfortunately normalised red herring, straw-man, ad hominem, whataboutisms, or other combinations of *diversion* from the main topic/ subject matter that is (purportedly) being discussed, both at home but sadly in bigger arenas of debates, journalism, expertise/intelligentsia and in academia among generally 'undisputed' facts or theories -In the world of rhetoric, these are *logical fallacies*, and as such crucial for all parties to be perceptive and vigilant to address when being used -purposefully or not. It is a very pressing matter when people of influence, representatives, scholars, military, even judiciary -slip their tongue with fallacies. You seriously need to ask, are they in the know or not? Both alternatives are equally unsettling.

*Conspiracy theorist* (CT) being a major infamous fallacy (possibly coined in the 60s era of major assassination cases; JFK, MLK and RFK) used to detour by discarding, diminishing and silence the opposite side or critical party or any alternative to an otherwise generally established and accepted truth, i.e. -attack *the messenger* rather than *the message*. If stigmatised as CT, you have slim chance to get back to the relevant discourse, but rather stuck in perpetual denial in desperation to rid of the epithet flung at you, never making it a creative and fruitful process. Or do you have patience and stamina to convince 'the accuser' that conspiracies are a perfect normalcy as aforementioned?

[2] Even if a theory in any imaginable topic or historical event might be lacking raw data or having less founded sources, questionable credibility, naive even, it *never* ever deserves logical fallacies baked in the reply/counter-argument. 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*. An expert may indeed produce great arguments based on evidence but the credibility simply lies 'in the arguments' not because he or she 'is the expert' (expert/authority fallacy). You should never ascribe to authorities dictated truth (nor should a majority, minority, certain party or grouping dictate).

—*Truth itself* is the only authority.