

# Conspiracy-Theoretical Accusations are *Ad-Hominem* Red Herrings\*

Simon Kramer<sup>†</sup>

December 22, 2022

## Abstract

When accused of arguing by implicit or even explicit appeal to conspiracy theory or even practice (typically in the physical or virtual presence of a potential mob), counter at the meta-level of the discourse with the question why this (typically unsubstantiated) accusation should be (it is not) a valid argument at all (to which your opponent will be unable to give a logically valid answer). Then win the argument (and any ensuing court case) and unmask your opponent as an argumentative impostor (a copy cat parroting pseudo-arguments) or even manipulator (attacking you *ad hominem* if not defaming you in *dolus eventualis*) by asserting that any conspiracy-theoretical accusation is an *ad-hominem* red herring and thus a self-defeating, a pseudo-argument. Double down with the proof of your assertion provided by this note here. Or, more briefly, respond to the accusation by requesting an apology and citing this note.

**Keywords** *ad hominem* · applied logic · conspiratorial accusation · fallacious or manipulative argumentation · penal law · psychosociology · red herring · self-defeating argument

*The Emperor has no clothes! Elementary, my dear Watson.*

## Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Self-defence brief with proof	2
3	Conclusion	3
	Bibliography	4



---

\*democratic decision support for the logically-inclined citizen and rule-of-law-abiding civil servant—cite as:

S. Kramer. *Conspiracy-Theoretical Accusations are Ad-Hominem Red Herrings*. Self-Defence Brief. SK-R&D Ltd liab. Co (Civil Intel & Civic Tech). December 22, 2022.  
<https://www.simon-kramer.ch/papers/red-herrings.pdf>.

**bundle** <https://www.simon-kramer.ch/papers/red-herrings.zip> (pdf, hash, cite, qr-code, contact)  
**signature** [https://www.simon-kramer.ch/papers/red-herrings.zip\\_sha512\\_rsa-signature.bin](https://www.simon-kramer.ch/papers/red-herrings.zip_sha512_rsa-signature.bin)  
**public key** <https://www.simon-kramer.ch/puks/simon.kramer@sk-rnd.ch.pem> (certified, expires)  
**donate** <https://buy.stripe.com/cN23d64r0eHQeUEeUV> (contact for mention from CHF 100)  
**licence** <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>  
**endorse** contact for mention as expert or representative signatory  
**translate** <https://www.deepl.com/translator/files>

<sup>†</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3665-7568>  
[simon.kramer@sk-rnd.ch](mailto:simon.kramer@sk-rnd.ch)

## 1 Introduction

Conspiracy-theoretical accusations, that is, accusations of being a conspiracy theorist [1], are among the most frequent and devastating accusations abused as admissible arguments in public discourse. The present note debunks this abuse and provides a brief instruction with a proof of efficacy for the self-defence of the accused and thus-defamed citizen in dysfunctional public debates and non-dysfunctional (logical [2]) judicial courts.<sup>1</sup> (Illogical jurisdiction is arbitrary jurisdiction, which violates the very purpose of law, namely the prevention or else repair of arbitrariness and thus injustice and ultimately the state of nature [3]. Such violation should be a crime *ex officio*.) We thus apply a formal-logical rather than an empirical method, and leave research on the history of the weaponisation of pseudo-argumentation to historians [4, 5]. As main references, we use [6] and [7] wherever possible, and [8] or else [9] otherwise. Any definitions should be looked-up there, also due to their ephemeral nature in our times (e.g., definitions of pandemic and immunity). The note has been typeset with L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X, the classic for typesetting print-ready manuscripts in the exact sciences. All Web-links are actionable (clickable) hyperlinks in the PDF-version of this note. All hyperlinks have been checked for liveness on the date imprinted on the cover page here. The main thought sketches of this note first appeared in public through the author’s Twitter-account.<sup>2</sup>

## 2 Self-defence brief with proof

### 2.1 Instruction

When accused of arguing by implicit or even explicit appeal to conspiracy theory or even practice (typically in the physical or virtual presence of a potential mob), counter at the meta-level of the discourse with the question why this (typically unsubstantiated) accusation should be (it is not) a valid argument at all (to which your opponent will be unable to give a logically valid answer). Then win the argument (and any ensuing court case) and unmask your opponent as an argumentative impostor (a copy cat parroting pseudo-arguments) or even manipulator (attacking you *ad hominem* [10] if not defaming [11] you in *dolus eventualis* [12]) by asserting that any conspiracy-theoretical accusation is an *ad-hominem* red herring [13] and thus a self-defeating, a pseudo-argument. Double down with the proof of your assertion provided by this note here. Or, more briefly, respond to the accusation by requesting an apology and citing this note (see the first footnote on Page 1 here).

### 2.2 Proof

Let us set the stage (logical context) for our psycho-socio-logico-legal drama, and then proceed with the help of the elementary-logical principle of (nested) exhaustive (and disjoint)<sup>3</sup> case analysis [2]. We use the principle in the following schematic instantiation: from (Stake  $\wedge$  Competition)  $\Rightarrow$  Conclusion, (Stake  $\wedge$  Cooperation)  $\Rightarrow$  Conclusion, and  $\neg$ Stake  $\Rightarrow$  Conclusion deduce Conclusion, where  $\neg$  is negation (means “not”),  $\wedge$  is conjunction (means “and”), and  $\Rightarrow$  is implication (means “implies”).

#### 2.2.1 The stage

Suppose that there is a matter of dispute between a proponent and an opponent of the matter in some (physical or virtual) social context. Further suppose that the proponent implies or even points out the mere existence or even the names of people co-responsible for the matter by appealing to the common knowledge [14] in that context of—or by furnishing evidence for—that co-responsibility. Furthermore suppose that the opponent opposes the proponent by accusing the proponent of falsely claiming that there be a conspiracy in that matter of those allegedly co-responsible for the matter. Thus, the opponent attacks the proponent in person (*ad hominem*) rather than the proponent’s *position* with respect to the matter (and thus attacks with a *non sequitur* [15]) by accusing the proponent implicitly or even explicitly of spreading or even construing a conspiracy theory (and

---

<sup>1</sup>Losing the court case implies obtaining evidence for the dysfunction (ineptitude or corruption) of the corresponding court and thus (more) evidence for a court of appeal for not only the defamation but also that dysfunction.

<sup>2</sup><https://twitter.com/nremark0>

<sup>3</sup>disjointness is not necessary (but aesthetically desirable) for deduction by disjunctive case analysis

thus of being a conspiracy theorist, that is, a practitioner of sick mental or even social activity, a person *non grata* because mentally ill of paranoia [16], a paranoid, an invalid member of society, to be outcast). Note that the opponent must have a personal stake in the contested co-responsibility. Otherwise, the attack is not only arational (though psycho-logical) but also stupid (self-harming).

### 2.2.2 No joint stake

For suppose any one of them has no stake in the contested co-responsibility. Hence, there is no common (neither conflicting nor shared) interest in the matter, and thus the opponent's (pseudo-)argument is **irrelevant** to the matter (there is no competition and no cooperation, respectively, and thus the matter is none of the opponent's business). And even if the accusation were justified, it would only be the business (so to say) of a proper psychiatrist, who however would not make it.

### 2.2.3 Joint stake

Alternatively to Section 2.2.2, suppose both of them do have a stake in that co-responsibility.

**Competition** Further suppose the proponent and the opponent compete in the matter under co-responsibility. However, any competitors strive for information asymmetry between each other, with each one trying to get an edge over the other in terms of competitively useful information (trade secrets, secret services, etc.). Any competitor can thus be vacuously accused of conspiring against the other by anyone (including by any other competitor). Hence, the argument is **trivial**.

**Cooperation** Alternatively to competition suppose the proponent and the opponent cooperate in that matter. However then the argument is **nonsensical**, since attacking a business partner face to face on stage is indefinitely self-harming. (Attacking business partners behind their back may make machiavellian materialistic sense, but only in a short term of cooperation and competition in *different* matters, since in the long term the attack is increasingly likely to be discovered.)

## 3 Conclusion

In conclusion, the opponent's (*ad-hominem*) argument is irrelevant or trivial or nonsensical, and thus a red herring (in any case). Its main (psychosocial) purposes are: first, to obfuscate co-responsibility if not culpability, second, to obfuscate a lack of factual arguments or an ineptitude of logical argumentation, and third, to outcast the proponent (by means of a cheap speech act involving manipulative associations of proximity) into an out-group of socially undesirable people (mentally ill of paranoia) in the perception of a (virtually or physically) present potential mob. The act is at least mobbing and at most a genocide-enabling tribal tactic. The effectiveness if not efficiency of the tactic is directly proportional to the size of the group of self-designated good people (the mob of goodies) relative to the size of the group of designated bad people (the baddies), and to the degree of inflation of the (eagerly signalled) value (including virtue) system of the goodies. The system is sealed and made totalitarian by means of a taboo that prohibits calling the true baddies by their proper name, namely pseudo-virtuous mob of democracy-perverting hypocrites.<sup>4</sup> The taboo is introduced by mob herders, who prescribe it through the make-believe of the rule of a law (e.g., codes of conduct) more virtuous (protecting the feelings and face of even lawbreakers) than—and thus insinuated above—even human rights. This is the postmodern perversion of democracy as well as subversion of the rule of any law with a remaining grain of truth and justice through the weaponisation of the female ego of the woke ochlocracy [18] by their own kakistocracy [19, 20].

**Acknowledgements** I cordially thank Dr. iur. Milosz Matuschek<sup>5</sup> and LL.M. Philipp Kruse<sup>6</sup> for feedback on drafts of this note and dedicate it to them for their work for freedom and justice.

---






<sup>4</sup>This is not argumentation by (*ad hominem*) name-calling but proper (though not unique) name-calling by way of a conclusion of a logical argumentation. This is to break the above abusive taboo [17, Article 36, Paragraph 4].

<sup>5</sup><https://www.miloszmatuschek.de>

<sup>6</sup><https://www.kruse-law.ch>

## Bibliography

### Books

- [2] J. Zahnd. *Logique élémentaire. Cours de base pour informaticiens*. PPUR, 1998 (2006).  (P. 2).
- [6] *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. URL: <https://www.britannica.com> (P. 2).
- [7] E.N. Zalta and U. Nodelman, eds. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu> (P. 2).
- [8] *Wikipedia*. URL: <https://www.wikipedia.org> (P. 2).
- [9] *Wiktionary*. URL: <https://en.wiktionary.org> (P. 2).
- [17] *Bundesverfassung der Schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft vom 18. April 1999 (BV) (Stand am 13. Februar 2022)*. Swiss Confederation, Jan. 2000. URL: <https://www.fedlex.admin.ch/eli/cc/1999/404/de>. FR  · IT  · RM  · EN  (P. 3).

### Chapters in Books

- [1] S.A. Reid *et al.* In: *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Chap. Conspiracy Theory. URL: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/conspiracy-theory> (P. 2).
- [3] A. Munro *et al.* In: *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Chap. State of Nature. URL: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/state-of-nature-political-theory> (P. 2).
- [10] In: *Wikipedia*. Chap. *Ad hominem*. URL: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ad\\_hominem](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ad_hominem) (P. 2).
- [11] B. Duignan *et al.* In: *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Chap. Defamation. URL: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/defamation> (P. 2).
- [12] In: *Wiktionary*. Chap. *Dolus Eventualis*. URL: [https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/dolus\\_eventualis](https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/dolus_eventualis) (P. 2).
- [13] In: *Wikipedia*. Chap. Red Herring. URL: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Red\\_herring](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Red_herring) (P. 2).
- [14] P. Vanderschraaf and G. Sillari. In: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. by E.N. Zalta and U. Nodelman. Chap. Common Knowledge. URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/common-knowledge> (P. 2).
- [15] N. Rescher and M.L. Schagrin *et al.* In: *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Chap. Fallacy. URL: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/fallacy> (P. 2).
- [16] A. Augustyn *et al.* In: *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Chap. Paranoia. URL: <https://www.britannica.com/science/paranoia> (P. 3).
- [18] In: *Wikipedia*. Chap. Mob Rule. URL: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mob\\_rule](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mob_rule) (P. 3).
- [19] In: *Wikipedia*. Chap. Kakistocracy. URL: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kakistocracy> (P. 3).
- [20] In: *Wikipedia*. Chap. Negative Selection (Politics). URL: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Negative\\_selection\\_\(politics\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Negative_selection_(politics)) (P. 3).

### Other Sources

- [4] Fox News. *Tucker Carlson: We were shocked to learn this*. YouTube. Dec. 2022. URL: <https://youtu.be/PAiRmhXvJHs> (PP. 2, 4, 5).
- [5] R.F. Kennedy Jr. *Tweet on [4]*. Twitter. Dec. 2022. URL: <https://twitter.com/RobertKennedyJr/status/1604139690629730304> (PP. 2, 5).

**Proof Tree Map**

no stake	stake in competition
	stake in cooperation

Robert F. Kennedy Jr on [4] (source: [5])





SK-R&D LTD LIAB. CO