

Conspiracy Theory: Biblical Methods of Evaluation

If someone we know is convinced of a conspiracy theory and wants us to believe in it as well, or if we are thinking about deciding to believe in a conspiracy theory, we should follow the Scriptural guidelines below for evaluating the relevant evidence. We should follow these helpful Biblical principles to see if we should adopt, or continue to hold to, conspiracies that may seem reasonable. If someone else attempts to convince us about conspiracies, or in case we are convinced and we attempt to convince others, the guidelines below should also prove helpful. The Bible commands: “Walk in wisdom toward them that are without, redeeming the time” (Colossians 4:5). If someone cannot or will not meet the following criteria, the conspiracy he is promoting is almost certainly false, and looking into it is quite likely a waste of time. If the conspiracy meets the criteria below, then it is more likely to at least potentially be worthy of consideration.

The overarching principle in evaluating a conspiracy is:

Have I followed Biblical principles for evaluating data?

Unfortunately, only a small percentage of the people who spend hours and hours learning about conspiracies and promoting them follow these principles. Before discussing the specific arguments for a conspiracy, we need to agree on what Scripture teaches about how to decide if something is true or not. If we don't have the same Scriptural presuppositions, debunking claims behind a particular conspiracy becomes a game of whack-a-mole; when one idea is shown to be false, another equally unverified idea is promoted; when that one is shown to be false, a third unverified idea is advocated; refuting that one does no good, because a fourth unproven claim is loudly proclaimed; and on and on we go. When discussing Biblical preservation (Psalm 12:6-7; Isaiah 59:21; Matthew 24:35) with an advocate of modern Bible versions, we should start with Scripture, for if we cannot agree on what God promised in His Word, we are not going to agree on how to evaluate manuscript evidence. If someone claims to be a Christian but believes in evolution, we should start by seeing if he is willing to agree on what Scripture says about creation (Genesis 1-2; Exodus 20:8-11). There is probably little value in discussing scientific data if the professing Christian is unwilling to submit to what Scripture reveals is the proper framework to look at facts. “And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead” (Luke 16:31). The same holds true for evaluating claims about conspiracy theories. What is the Biblical framework for evaluating conspiratorial claims? We need to agree on that first. If someone is not willing to

submit to Scriptural principles for evaluating information, then discussion of the details of a conspiracy will likely be fruitless. If someone disagrees with these Scriptural principles, then he needs to show, first, how these principles are not actually a necessary consequence of the infallible statements in God's Word. Only after we come to an agreement on the teaching of Scripture can there be any profit in looking at how data fit into the Biblical framework.

Consider, then, the questions below. If someone is promoting a conspiracy to us, if his conspiracy is true, he should readily be able and willing to answer the questions below before asking us to use up precious time in the limited lifespan the Lord has given us to look into his conspiracy. If we have adopted and are going to share a conspiratorial belief with someone else, we need to have answered these questions ourselves and be ready to explain our answers to the person whom we seek to convince.

Have the best arguments both for and against the conspiracy been carefully examined?

Proverbs 18:13: He that answereth a matter before he heareth *it*, *it is* folly and shame unto him.

Proverbs 18:17: *He that is* first in his own cause *seemeth* just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him.

Proverbs 14:15, 18: The simple believeth every word: but the prudent *man* looketh well to his going. ... The simple inherit folly: but the prudent are crowned with knowledge.

Deut. 13:14: Then shalt thou enquire, and make search, and ask diligently; and, behold, *if it be* truth, *and* the thing certain ...

Job 29:16b: [T]he cause *which* I knew not I searched out.

Isaiah 1:18: "Come now, and let us reason together ..."

John 8:44: "[T]he devil ... is a liar, and the father of it."

Proverbs 10:18b: "He that uttereth a slander is a fool."

1 Timothy 3:11: [They] must be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things."

1Cor. 13:4-7: Charity suffereth long, *and* is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.

One necessary consequence of the verses above is the question: "What are the best arguments you have read both for and against your conspiracy, and what logical, rational, evidence-based arguments convince you that the arguments for the conspiracy are stronger than the ones against it?" The command to "reason" in Isaiah 1:18 has the idea of the type of

reasoning that proves a point in a law court (Niphal of *yakach*, cf. Job 23:7, HALOT, BDB). The way that something is proven beyond a reasonable doubt in a law-court is the way we need to evaluate evidence for or against the conspiracy theory. If we fail to receive as true a just defense (Acts 7:56-57; Job 31:13-14), including a just defense against a conspiratorial accusation, we commit sin, and we cannot accurately evaluate whether a just defense against a conspiratorial claim exists unless we have carefully examined both sides of the claims we are spreading.

The question above is clearly based on Biblical principles in these verses (and many other verses like them). If someone has read only arguments in favor of a conspiracy and not read arguments against it, or if he has read both pro- and anti- arguments but cannot refute the anti-arguments with compelling, rational, evidence-based reasons, then it is not wise to promote the conspiracy as true to anyone until Biblical methods of evaluation are first followed. Would you like it if you were on trial and only the prosecuting attorney was allowed to present his side? It is actually hurting someone, not helping him, and setting a bad example, if we indulge a failure to obey the verses above by entertaining, much less adopting ourselves, a conspiracy that is promoted to us if Scripture teaches that the one-sided way the conclusion has been reached is “shame and folly.” Nor should we do others’ homework for them; the person who is trying to convince us of the conspiracy needs to look into both sides of the evidence first, not promote it to us and lay the burden of evaluation on us while he is allowed to continue to promote ideas to us and others that he has not himself evaluated using Biblical principles, and, consequently, is highly likely to contain misinformation. Before someone tries to convince us of a conspiracy, he will need to follow Scripture’s teaching on the evaluation of evidence, and be able to give a solid answer to the question: “What are the best arguments you have read both for and against your conspiracy, and what logical, rational, evidence-based arguments convince you that the arguments for the conspiracy are stronger than the ones against it?”

If we are used to finding videos, memes, tweets, and who knows what else on social media, on video streaming websites, and other such sources and forwarding them to others without first following the Biblical principles set forth in verses such as those listed above, maybe it is time to reevaluate how we analyze information. Do we care about whether what we are forwarding is true or a lie? If we don’t care, have we told the people to whom we are forwarding the video or whatever that we don’t care if it is true or not? Have we thought about whether forwarding lies pleases God? If we do care about whether what we forward is true or false, what Biblical principles have we followed to make sure that what we are forwarding is true? How do we know that what we are forwarding does not contain slander or lies?

Along these lines, if the evidence for the conspiracy is not a written document, with clear, verified, reliable sources that we have checked, but instead a video or some other type of popular-level social media resource that is difficult to fact-check, looking into the conspiracy is unlikely to be worthwhile. If the source would not be allowed as a citation on a high school research paper, or it would not meet the citation requirements for even an unscholarly resource like *Wikipedia*, much less succeed in the back-and-forth dispute in a courtroom between opposing attorneys giving the best case they can and seeking to refute the best case made by their opponent, maybe it is time to “make search” and “ask diligently” instead of being “simple” and believing every word, resulting in “inheriting folly” instead of being “crowned with knowledge.” There are good reasons scholars publish medical *journals*, theological *journals*, academic *papers*, and so on instead of “medical YouTube videos,” “theological tweets,” “academic radio station interviews,” and the like. In a video it is easy to be swayed by whether the person speaking looks nice, has a winsome tone of voice, whether there is interesting music playing, a speaker is passionate, and other factors totally unrelated to whether the claims made are true or false. Scripture warns about unwisely following persuasive rhetorical techniques (1 Corinthians 2). If a conspiratorial video contains written sources that allegedly back up its claims, then skip the video and just look at and evaluate the written sources. A whole hour wasted watching a video could be much better spent evaluating factual data from carefully documented written sources for half the time. It is not logically impossible for a video to have useful information, of course, but it is highly unlikely for videos to be better places to go for facts than written, documented sources.

We should also be careful if someone says he is “just asking questions.” If he presents us with a conspiratorial video or a conspiratorial claim that he has not verified, “I’m just asking” is not a sufficient explanation for why he has failed to verify whether what he is forwarding and promoting to others is true or not. If someone possesses no factual basis for the questions he is asking, then his “I’m just asking questions” statement is a (possibly unintentional) rhetorical technique that seeks to sway people without evidence; one is supposed to move from the “I’m just asking” to concluding that the question asked actually points to truth after one gets half-way there with the question, although this is illogical and improper. Satan followed this questioning technique in Genesis 3. First, he “just asked a question”—“Yea, hath God said?” Then he drew the conclusion, “Ye shall not surely die,” after his meritless question brought doubt into Eve’s mind. Similarly, without actual evidence, questions such as: “What if people never really landed on the moon?” “What if shape-shifting reptiles control the government?” “What if governmental official X is really a paid communist agent?” “Is politician Y really a secret white supremacist?” “What if the Holocaust really did not take place?” “What if Big Pharma controls

all the members of Congress and assassinates everyone who tries to destroy its profits?” or “What if the earth is really flat?” are no more worth asking than “What if I don’t really exist?” or “What if I don’t have a brain?” or “Did you really kill your last wife and bury her in the backyard? I’m just asking.” Unless there are sound reasons to think the questions have merit, the questions are meant to introduce doubt where there is no valid basis for skepticism. Therefore, if we have sound reasons, we should produce them; if we do not, then skip the evidence-free questions and all other manipulative rhetorical methods. Believers should follow Proverbs 14:15, 18; 18:13, 17, etc. to determine what is factual in the real world, not the technique of Satan in Genesis 3. And if someone seeks to produce doubt by “just asking questions,” politely ask him to produce actual evidence instead of following a rhetorical technique employed by the serpent to mislead our first parents. Satan’s rhetorical technique was successful with Adam and Eve, and such techniques are often effective in producing persuasion today—but this should not be so.

Christians also need to be sure that what they are forwarding or promoting does not contain slander or lies. Just because someone is a politician in Washington, D. C. or is the head of a medical school and is on an FDA board, or runs a big company, or holds very different beliefs from ours, does not mean we get to slander or lie about him or her. Michael the archangel was not even willing to slander or lie about the devil! This holy archangel would not employ “speech that denigrates or defames, *reviling, denigration, disrespect, slander*” (BDAG; Jude 9; 2 Peter 2:11), even against the head of all wicked beings, Satan himself. We do not get to say someone who is the head of a company is plotting to assassinate people, or a politician is engaged in an action because he is being bribed by the secret cabal, unless we have clear proof of the kind that would stand up in court of law. Slander is still evil, and still a sin, even if the person we are slandering is himself demonstrably evil. We don’t even get to slander the devil. We don’t get to slander anyone. Scripture condemns receiving and countenancing evil reports (Proverbs 29:12), even if they fit well with our strong confirmation bias for or against something. John the Baptist reproved Herod for his illicit marriage—an undeniable fact (Matthew 14:3-5)—not for unproven or uncertain claims. We do not get to make up things we cannot prove about the motives or actions of others (1 Corinthians 13:5-6). We must think the best of others. It is part of love (1 Corinthians 13:4-7), and we must love even our enemies (Matthew 5:44). Furthermore, if we believe and spread slander about someone who is not evil, we also violate the command directed to a pastor, but applicable to every Christian, to be “a lover of good men” (Titus 1:8). If the members of a corporate board are not guilty of what a conspiracy accuses them of, we cannot lie about them, even if they are all wicked. If there are one or more righteous men on the corporate board, who would recoil in horror from what the conspiracy accuses them

of doing, the sin is all the greater. If someone does not even know the names and the roles of the people running companies he certainly must not be willing to accuse them of all kinds of evil deeds. Slandering the wicked is a grave sin; slandering the righteous doubly so. That political liberals frequently misrepresent and slander conservatives does not make slander acceptable. Nor does the fact that unregenerate conservative politicians and talk radio stars slander liberals make their slander acceptable. Slander is still evil. If we have evidence that the cure for a particular disease is somehow successfully being suppressed world-wide by a company or a group of companies and their executives, then we must “Produce [our] cause ... bring forth [our] strong *reasons*” (Isaiah 41:24), openly setting forth the clear evidence that would stand up in court. If we do not have that evidence, we must stop slandering the CEOs of these companies. Charity does not think unproven evil but believes the best of others (1 Corinthians 13:4-7). The people supposedly running the conspiracy are beings who were created in God’s image, and we do not get to slander them, even if their political persuasions, cultural practices, and other ways of living are different—or even objectively far more worse and far more sinful—than ours are, thanks to God’s unmerited grace to us.

Is the conspiracy logical?

If the conspiracy involves logical contradictions, it cannot be true. If the conspiracy collapses under simple rational questions, it is not true. Furthermore, if the people promoting the conspiracy do not live as if they actually believe in the conspiracy, then we have good reasons to doubt the conspiracy. Consistency is a necessary, although not sufficient, mark of truth.

Let us say that the conspiracy theory requires that a secretive group is manipulating the media worldwide and killing all those who seek to expose them. If the leading advocate of this theory has an extremely popular social media channel, sells many books and reaps huge profits from them, and lives a comfortable life in a fancy neighborhood without any significant fear, one must explain why the worldwide cabal is powerful enough to control news networks all around the world but cannot or chooses not to stop this ardent conspiracist from exposing their secret deeds the way a Stalin or a Mao would, by having him quickly disappear into an unmarked grave. If simple rational questions about how such a conspiracy is even possible have no satisfactory answer, the conspiracy cannot be true.

Again, suppose that if, assuming a particular conspiracy is true, the world population or the population of the United States will precipitously decline in the near future. However, the person promoting the conspiracy is not living like there will be a corresponding drop in real

estate prices, is not selling his house and moving into a rented unit, nor is taking any of the actions that would be obvious preparatory steps for the disaster that is allegedly coming. In such a situation, he is not living like the conspiracy that he is promoting is true. It is one thing to retweet misinformation, something else to live like the tweet is actually true. If the person promoting the conspiracy says that Big Pharma is assassinating everyone who exposes it and is openly promoting this alleged fact on videos with huge numbers of views, and yet has not hired many well-armed bodyguards, nor has hired someone to taste his food or drink from his cup before he partakes (Nehemiah 1:11; 2:1), maybe he does not really believe what he is saying, and very likely we should not believe in his conspiracy.

Are there conflicts of interest among those promoting the conspiracy?

Evaluating conflicts of interest is part of one's neighbor coming and trying what is asserted (Proverbs 18:17) and part of what is checked in the reasoning of a law-court (Isaiah 1:18). If the person asking you to reject scientific medicine for his alternative ideas is trying to get you to buy his special remedy, or to give him money for his book that has the real cures, etc., we have extra reason to be suspicious. Any real or even potential conflict of interest must be disclosed by article authors in a reputable medical journal. If a journal publishes something and then discovers an undisclosed conflict of interest—such as when the *Lancet*, years ago, published a study claiming that certain vaccines caused autism, but then withdrew the article after discovering the undisclosed and immense conflict of interest issues through the massive profits the article's author would make if these claims were believed, and that the article's information was unverifiable—the article is withdrawn,¹ and the fact that it even got published at all is viewed as shameful and harmful to the journal's reputation. If someone has affiliate links on his website, Amazon and other companies require the affiliate to disclose that he will make money if someone clicks through his link to purchase a product. If someone is casting doubt upon a mainstream scientific treatment and pointing us to an alternative unconventional nostrum, while refraining from clearly disclosing that he will make money if you follow his advice, his actions are unethical and call his claims into serious question. If all real or even potential conflicts of interest are not openly and plainly disclosed by the person promoting the conspiracy, a significantly higher level of skepticism is required in evaluating what the proponent of the conspiracy is arguing for.

Does the conspiracy theory produce extraordinary evidence for extraordinary claims?

¹ Barrett, Stephen, "Lancet Retracts Wakefield Paper," <https://quackwatch.org/autism/news/lancet/>.

Groups of people certainly can conspire together to do things. In Genesis 37:18, Joseph's brothers conspired together and ended up selling Joseph into slavery and concealing his kidnapping. The servants of king Amon conspired against the king and slew him (2 Kings 21:23). More than forty people conspired against the Apostle Paul, intending to kill him in Jerusalem (Acts 23:13).

However, the grander the scale of the conspiracy, the broader the range of goals it intends to produce, and the larger the number of people that must be involved for the conspiracy to work, the more likely it is to fall apart. Joseph's brothers were one family, and they had one specific evil deed in view. They were able to successfully hide their sin for years (until God exposed it, as recorded later in Genesis). The servants of king Amon also had one specific evil deed in view—assassinating the king—but they were not able to conceal it, as the people of the land found out who had plotted against the king and slew them all (2 Kings 21:24). The “more than forty” who had conspired against Paul were not able to keep the secret, for the Apostle found out about the conspiracy and escaped. Forty people were not able to keep a secret—someone blabbed, or was overheard, or otherwise was unable to conceal the conspiracy.

Is it possible for a handful of gang members to successfully conspire to kill someone in their neighborhood? Unfortunately, the answer is “yes.” Is it possible for a group of people to successfully hide the miracle plant that cures all cancer, so that the only place you can find out the truth and get the cure is from Miracle Plant, Inc. for \$399.99? Highly unlikely. To successfully suppress a cure for a disease that strikes family members and loved ones around the world would require a conspiracy comprehending approximately 150 countries, thousands and thousands of medical hospitals, medical colleges, doctors, nurses, competing companies trying to develop a better product and drive their opposition out of business, nonprofits, government agencies, banks who need to write the checks to all the people allegedly getting bribed or paid off, vast numbers of shareholders who are in on the scheme if the companies are publicly traded, etc. These people have competing interests; some of them do not talk much while others have big mouths; some are unethical while others have high moral standards; the list is very, very long. To think that such a phenomenally large number of people could successfully keep a secret for any length of time requires an extraordinarily high burden of evidence. So an extraordinary claim—a conspiracy that requires an extraordinarily large number of people to keep a secret, or even many secrets, for an extraordinary period of time—requires an extraordinary burden of evidence. In a court of law, if a lawyer wants to argue that his client did not steal a backpack at the gas station, but the video footage really shows his evil twin taking the backpack, an alter-ego

who looks just like him because there is a vast conspiracy of people who have high-tech face-modelling technology to help the Illuminati control the world, and one of them took the backpack and then planted it in his client's car, where it happened to be when the police arrested him, he will need to have some extraordinary evidence to support his extraordinary claim, or the simpler solution—the client stole the backpack—is what will meet the standard of “reason” (Isaiah 1:18). If Miracle Plant, Inc., does not have extraordinary evidence, the possibility that there is no cure for a disease is much more likely than the possibility that thousands and thousands of people are successfully conspiring to suppress the disease's cure. Furthermore, the person making an affirmative case always has the burden of proof—if someone is asserting the existence of a conspiracy, the burden of proof lies upon him to establish it, rather than the burden resting upon those who are skeptical of the conspiracy to disprove it. We cannot disprove the possibility that tiny green elephants ride floating magic carpets and dance waltzes on Jupiter's moons, while using advanced technology to avoid detection by humans, but the person who asserts that the green elephants are doing this needs to positively prove his assertion before we can rationally believe it.

Does the conspiracy require me to think more highly of myself than I ought to think?

The Bible's “love chapter” indicates that “charity vaunteth not itself” and “is not puffed up.” Scripture warns a man must “not ... think *of himself* more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly” (Romans 12:3), a principle applicable to all areas of life. If a conspiracy requires us to believe something that scientists or experts in the relevant field overwhelmingly reject, we need to have very strong evidence before we adopt this conclusion. If we think that a conspiracy-backed mechanism for causing disease is correct, although mainstream science strongly affirms the contrary, we need to remember that, unless we are experts, we know far less about biology and medicine than those do with whom we disagree. If we are going to adopt assertions about biology when we would fail an introductory biology course unless we spent lots of time reviewing, we need to be humble enough to recognize that biologists, medical doctors, and others with vast expertise are much more likely than us to avoid mistakes and make correct evaluations in their fields of knowledge. It is not logically impossible for the vast majority of airplane engineers to be wrong about something while we are right about it, even though we know next to nothing about how to design airplanes, but it is highly unlikely, and it would be a much better idea to fly in a plane designed by the airplane engineers rather than one that we designed based on videos we watched on YouTube. It is not logically impossible for the vast majority of cell biologists, professors in medical schools, and infectious disease researchers to be wrong about something pertaining to medicine, while we are right about it as non-experts, but it

is highly unlikely. We are wise and health-promoting to humbly recognize this fact as we evaluate conspiratorial claims about disease or the body, and prioritize what an association of physicians or a health department advises above what a body builder or a rapper or talk show host on a viral YouTube video says is good for us.

Is looking into this conspiracy redeeming the time?

We should also be much less likely to spend time looking into a conspiracy someone promotes to us if, in the past, this person failed to follow these Biblical principles. If we sacrificed precious time in the past to evaluate someone's conspiracy, or asked this person simple questions about verifying it, and he or she either refused to answer the simple questions or ignored the contrary evidence and continued to believe what fit with what he was already predisposed to think, one use of time is probably more than enough. If someone promotes a conspiracy to us, ignores contrary evidence that we share, and then a few months or weeks later does the same thing all over again with another video or other similar sort of resource, we have little reason to think that we are doing the best with the time God has given us by watching another video from a person who does not know how to evaluate evidence or refuses to take the time to evaluate evidence.

Likewise, if we ask questions about Biblical methods of evaluating information, and the response is personal attacks, getting offended, or other irrational reactions, it is not very likely that it is a good use of time to look into any more conspiracies with such an individual.

There are things that God commands us to do that are very important—among these are reading, studying, memorizing, meditating upon, and observing to do according to all that is in His Word; preaching the gospel to every creature; having family worship; spending serious time in prayer; being faithful to all the services in God's house; etc. If we are not doing all these things, then other activities that are not essential—such as investigating or promoting a conspiracy—are sinful uses of time. Someone who does not regularly memorize Scripture has no business watching conspiratorial videos on the Internet. If we do not spend time meditating upon God's Word, then we need to get off social media and start practicing the basics of the Christian life. If our conversation on the Lord's Day is not about the risen Savior, Jesus Christ, but is about worldly politics and worldly conspiracies, then we need to reevaluate our use of tongue and time. If we do not even spend serious time reading and studying the Bible, but we do make the time to learn about conspiracies, we are wretchedly misusing the limited time God has given us to use in His service on earth. Stop wasting time and start redeeming it!

Furthermore, if there is not extraordinary evidence for a conspiracy, we should consider whether looking into it is a waste of time. It is more important for a Christian to know the

themes of the infallible revelation in the books of Zephaniah, Matthew, or Isaiah than to know about conspiracy theories, even on the assumption that they are true. If we are not full of God's Word and are prioritizing highly putting everything that it clearly commands in practice, then we are not redeeming our time properly when we are watching videos on conspiracies. Watching that video needs to be the best use of that portion of our life—time we are never going to get back again, and for which we will give an account at the judgment seat of Christ. Of course, if it is true that everyone is soon going to be dropping dead from a medical conspiracy headed by the Antichrist, then it would be wise to avoid the Antichrist's trap to save our family and our own life. But unless something like this is clearly true, we are wasting our time, time that could be used on something profitable.

Are Biblical patterns of authority followed by those spreading the conspiracy?

Someone who ignores (or even worse, refuses to follow when asked) the Biblical principles that children need to take what their parents say very seriously (Proverbs 2), that women are more easily deceived while having an amazing ability to nurture (1 Timothy 2:11-15), and that God sets the pattern of going to the head of the household, the man, to deal with the rest of the family (Genesis 18:13), to instead follow Satan's pattern of going to the woman to influence the man (Genesis 3; 1 Kings 11:3-4), or to turn children against their parents' beliefs to then win the parents over, is also not going to find his or her attempts to spread conspiracies well-received. There may be some situations where the head of a household recognizes his wife is very knowledgeable in medical matters—say if a godly construction worker marries a lady who is a godly research professor of virology. But the Bible never teaches that men are supposed to just follow their wives on matters of health, politics, or other issues. Many women are extremely intelligent; Deborah was even a wise judge (Judges 5)—but Deborah's leadership was exceptional and, in the context of the book of Judges, constituted an illustration of the decline in the leadership strength of men. Men, and fathers, are commanded by God to lead, and the Biblical pattern of approaching the head of the household needs to be followed if we are attempting to convince others of the truth of a conspiracy for the glory of God, at the very least if the home is a Christian home with believing parents and children. We should follow God's example in Genesis 18, not Satan's pattern in Genesis 3.

Summary

In summary, before encouraging anyone to adopt a conspiracy theory, please consider:

Have I followed Biblical principles for evaluating data?

These principles include:

Have the best arguments both for and against the conspiracy been carefully examined?

Is the conspiracy logical?

Are there conflicts of interest in those promoting the conspiracy?

Does the conspiracy theory produce extraordinary evidence for its extraordinary claims?

Does the conspiracy require me to think more highly of myself than I ought to think?

Is looking into the conspiracy redeeming the time?

Are Biblical patterns of authority followed by those spreading the conspiracy?

If the conspiracy passes these evaluative tests, then there may be something to it. If it fails these tests, it should be ignored. If the person promoting the conspiracy to us has not taken the time to follow these Biblical tests, kindly ask him or her to follow Scripture before promoting conspiracies, and tell him that after Scripture is followed, we may have time to talk, but not before that time. Then, instead of watching the video on the conspiracy, behold the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, by the illumination of the Spirit, in the infallible Word (2 Corinthians 3:18).

Faithsaves.net