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Abstract

This thesis analyses the phenomenon of conspiracy theory, using the assassination of President John F. Kennedy as a case study. Doubt is the root cause of conspiracy theory, stemming from both the innate biases all humans exhibit, and a traumatic experience – in this case the assassination of JFK. This thesis argues that conspiracy theories are created and take hold because of a predisposition toward conspiracy theory, a misinterpretation of a central piece of evidence, such as the Zapruder film, and agency panic, where dispossession causes one to feel as if their agency is under threat. Conspiracy theory can provide believers with many emotions which appear to the individual to not be available elsewhere, namely closure, comfort, control, and a sense of leisure.

Using the assassination of JFK, this thesis examines the role of conspiracy theory in modern American society. It weighs up the benefits of conspiracy theory, such as it is an example of free speech and it can aid transparency, with the negatives: that it can possibly cause harm to its adherents and their dependants because of a belief in ends justifying the means. The conspiracy theory of David Lifton and how he came to form his ideas, and how Oliver Stone’s movie JFK forced a huge document release will also be examined. The study of conspiracy theory itself is oft bifurcated. Humanities scholars tend to look at the implications of conspiracy theory on society. On the other hand, those which have a background in social sciences usually focus on what causes people to accept and believe in conspiracy theory. Conspiracy theory, however, is a complex issue, and this division leaves one with an incomplete picture. By taking an interdisciplinary approach, one can better understand both why conspiracy theory is so prevalent and how it became that way.
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Introduction

In May 2013, USA Today published the results of a poll that had been repeated, in varying guises, for fifty years. Conducted by Associated Press-GfK it concluded that a clear majority, 59 percent, of Americans still believed that there had been a conspiracy to assassinate President John F. Kennedy in November 1963.¹ In the years since, the events surrounding the death of President Kennedy have become the subject of the archetypal ‘conspiracy theory’ - endlessly debated and never definitively resolved. The seductive appeal of the idea has been registered consistently since the mid-1960s and it is necessary to go back to December 1966 to find a poll indicating that fewer than 51 percent of Americans believed in it.² In recent times, some commentators had begun to speculate that belief in the conspiracy has been slipping, but “the full blown media saturation that greeted the 50th anniversary six months later in November suggested otherwise.”³ Every media outlet offered its own view on the assassination, drawing on the opinions of scholars and the well-rehearsed accounts of eyewitnesses. The big question was “will we ever truly know what happened?” Interest peaked on 21 November 2013, the day before the 50th anniversary, as Secretary of State, and one time Democratic presidential nominee, John Kerry declared that he has “serious doubts that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone”.⁴

That one so high up in government could believe a conspiracy theory seemed to rattle many cages. Kerry’s comments were given far more gravitas and were considered groundbreaking. For talk of conspiracy theory to reach all the way to the top of the nation’s government by turn excited and appalled Americans. It has always been acceptable, almost expected, that those in the creative arts—Alec Baldwin, Oliver Stone, and Richard Belzer, for example—had to have these opinions, the assumption being, perhaps, that we should not expect such people to know better.⁵ The sceptical minority perhaps assumed that only the stupid, the powerless, the uneducated believe in conspiracy theories. Yet, Kerry was in fact not the first politician of national standing to declare an interest in the Kennedy conspiracy theory: two Democratic nominees for President had done the same (Bill Clinton and Al Gore), and he will probably not be the last.⁶ The allure of conspiracy theory is felt at all levels of the hierarchy, from grass roots to the pinnacles of power.

The subject of this thesis is the phenomenon of conspiracy theory in American culture and politics. By using the 1963 assassination of President John F. Kennedy and the numerous conspiracy theories surrounding it as a case study, it will analyse: how people become conspiracy theorists, why people resort to conspiracy theory, and what role conspiracy theory has in modern American society. The core argument is that conspiracy theory satisfies an innate human craving. Whether the purpose of conspiracy theory is to explain an individual event or how the world
works, conspiracy theory enables the believer to answer previously unanswerable questions in a manner both acceptable and understandable to the individual. A necessary by-product of democracy protected by the right to free speech, conspiracy theory will always exist regardless of how fantastic its claims or fanatical its adherents.

This thesis asks how and why conspiracy theory exists, and takes a focused line of inquiry into matters which have typically been left untouched by humanities scholars. Previous works in the study of conspiracy theory are divided between the social sciences and the humanities; but this thesis, being non-discriminatory, will provide the environment for an investigation both thorough and unique. Before beginning, however, it is important to establish a workable definition of the term ‘conspiracy theory’.

The definition of ‘conspiracy’ is grounded in its application within the rules of law. “The crime of conspiracy requires ‘an agreement between two or more persons’ that results in ‘either an unlawful act or a lawful act by unlawful means.’” This is simple enough—likewise a conclusion over the term ‘conspiracy theorist’ can be reached relatively easily because, by definition, a conspiracy theorist is someone that believes in and/or creates and circulates at least one conspiracy theory—but ‘conspiracy theory’ is more complex due to its etymology and synonyms.

The first significant recorded use of ‘conspiracy theory’ in modern parlance was in a book review written for *The American Historical Review* in 1909; however, because of the work of Richard Hofstadter, the term has been used interchangeably with ‘paranoia’. When Hofstadter wrote his seminal essay *The Paranoid Style in American Politics* in 1963 neither were favoured. German philosopher Karl Popper had written about conspiracy theory, stating in a 1959 essay that the “adoption of conspiracy theory can hardly be avoided by those who think that they know how to make heaven on earth”, but Hofstadter chose to use paranoia because “simply ... no other word adequately evokes the qualities of heated exaggeration, suspiciousness, and conspiratorial fantasy that I have in mind.” By 1971, when David Brion Davis and Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab published important books on conspiracy theory, the terms were being used interchangeably. In the introduction to *The Fear of Conspiracy*, Davis points out the flaw in Hofstadter’s selection, writing that “The word ‘paranoid’ is ... highly misleading unless we acknowledge that we all have our paranoid moments, and that the fear of conspiracy is sometimes reasonable and may also serve important social functions.” Even so, Davis valued Hofstadter’s essay highly enough to include it in his anthology as the opening piece, and for good reason too, as it still has its merits today, especially in setting parameters for a definition of conspiracy theory.

The crux of Hofstadter’s theory still stands today, namely his observation that conspiracy theorists believe that everything takes place because of “a vast and sinister conspiracy ... [with]
gigantic and yet subtle machinery of influence”. Conspiracy is pictured by such people “as the motive force in historical events.” (emphasis in original) From this foundation, scholars have tried to define conspiracy theory with surprisingly conflicting results.

Political scientist Michael Barkun, for example, described it as: “the belief that an organization made up of individuals or groups was or is acting covertly to achieve some malevolent end.” Not all conspiracy theories have a malevolent end, however, and the subjective nature of malevolence means that a negative conspiracy theory to one person may be positive to another. For example, it could be argued, and it indeed has been, that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt knew about the 7 December 1941 attack on Pearl Harbor before it occurred. By itself this is a malevolent conspiracy theory; however, this knowledge has been extrapolated out into a notion in which FDR needed to stifle isolationists who were preventing the nation from entering the Second World War. As the war was fought against fascism and its many variants, seen in hindsight as the ultimate evil, it has become another incident where ends justified the means. Conspiracy theorists now see Pearl Harbor more as another case of government deceit (albeit for the greater good), as opposed to what was argued in the 1940s: that it epitomised why the United States should not have entered the war. By this logic, the conspiracy theory assumes not a benevolent form, but possibly an acceptable one, and certainly not a malevolent one. Barkun’s definition, therefore, is not as far reaching as is needed for a study of conspiracy theory.

David Aaronovitch, a British journalist, has written that conspiracy theory is “the unnecessary assumption of conspiracy when other explanations are more probable.” This does not hold true either because it leaves no room for conspiracy theories which have turned out to be true - a constant issue when studying the subject. For example, before the revelations about the National Security Agency’s PRISM surveillance program in June 2013, it was highly probable that the U.S. government was keeping tabs on some people’s internet usage and/or phone records. Furthermore, it could have been argued that it was necessary to think that was the case, especially as the official story was that nothing of the sort was happening; hence, the conspiracy theory that the government is keeping tabs on everyone and everything, one which has existed for a very long time, is nothing of the sort in Aaronovitch’s book. By using the benefit of hindsight the legitimisation process of conspiracy theory is removed, which indicates that all conspiracy theorists know that what they are arguing is false, unnecessary and improbable, but that they continue anyway. This thesis posits that this is not the case, which is why Aaronovitch’s definition has to be discounted.

Kathryn S. Olmsted, professor of history, writes that conspiracy theory is “a proposal about a conspiracy that may or may not be true; it has not yet been proven.” Whether it is
This thesis examines responses to the assassination of John F. Kennedy, arguably the archetypal American conspiracy theory and what John McAdams, associate professor of political science, called “the iconic conspiracy theory.” (emphasis in original)\(^{17}\) The phenomenon of conspiracy theory existed before 1963 – as Davis and Lipset and Raab conclusively proved – but it had a more marginal place in American life. In the words of Robin Ramsay it consisted of “the John Birch Society and a handful of old time anti-Semites and American Hitler freaks.”\(^{18}\) The assassination of JFK changed the stature of conspiracy theory. An apparently common feeling of disillusion in the aftermath of the release of the Warren Report led to a grass roots network of amateur conspiracy theorist researchers. As Olmsted points out, “Many of these “amateurs” were women. In the past ... most of the theorists tended to be men. But with the Kennedy assassination, the field was open to ordinary, untrained researchers—and to women.”\(^{19}\) It was these early conspiracy theorists that changed the stigma of conspiracy theory, people like Oklahoma housewife Shirley Martin “who got in her car and drove down to Dallas with her four children in tow and knocked on the doors of Dealey Plaza witnesses to interview them with her pad and pencil”\(^{20}\). It was clear by the end of 1966 that a subculture of conspiracy theory had been fashioned where little had previously existed.

An advantage of the existence of the conspiracy theory subculture is that it is a blatant exercise of free speech. Constitutionally protected by the First Amendment, the freedom of expression is the backbone of American, and a true democratic, society. Conspiracy theory for the most part, though by no means always, is a way in which powerless individuals and groups can acquire a voice against a powerful group (usually the government). That these people still exist and can manufacture careers out of being conspiracy theorists without being silenced is a positive, even if what they are spouting is vitriolic and abusive. That a notorious conspiracy theory loudmouth like Texas radio host Alex Jones—the organiser of many rallies and protests in favour of the 9/11 Truth movement, amongst other things—has not been arrested and/or silenced in any fashion would appear to indicate that we are operating in a climate in which free speech still applies.\(^{21}\) This thesis will argue that if conspiracy theory is the price of free speech, then it is worth putting up with it for the greater good. If conspiracy theorists were not allowed
to discuss their opinions in any form then those deprived are not just those not authorised to communicate, but also those which are not able to take note of the ideas of the silenced. It makes no difference whether those put forward are homophobic, sexist, racist, violent, or any other form of bigoted ignorance, free speech protects every single one of them. This does not mean, however, that it operates on a par with all of the masses of other information out there; one should continue to be vigilant and measure new information independently to protect against bias. We should always be, as Jesse Walker writes, “deeply, deeply skeptical ... of our fearful, fallible selves.”

Conspiracy theory is considered to be problematic and solutions and suggestions have been repeatedly drawn up and redrafted on how best to deal with it. For example, Professor Cass Sunstein, a member of the first Obama administration, co-authored a paper at Harvard Law School with a fellow professor, Adrian Vermeule, titled “Conspiracy Theories”, throughout which they call conspiracy theorists “extremist groups.” Astonishingly, they concluded that the “best response consists in cognitive infiltration ... Government agents (and their allies) might enter chat rooms, online social networks, or even real-space groups and attempt to undermine percolating conspiracy theories by raising doubts about their factual premises, causal logic or implications for political action.” This was a dramatic overreaction. The most effective way to calm the paranoia of conspiracy theorists is not to send government agents to spy on them. Conspiracy theory is certainly widespread and needs to be investigated and understood, but does it need to be dealt with as Sunstein and Vermeule premised?

Some scholars, like John Fiske, have claimed that conspiracy theory should always be championed because it allows “disenfranchised subjects an opportunity to narrate their place within a system that renders them powerless.” This approach wipes the slate clean and completely negates any responsibility (and any need to understand conspiracy theory); is the conspiracy theory sexist, racist, homophobic etc.? If it is, it matters not because this group’s way of obtaining a political voice is using a conspiracy theory and their right to be heard is more important than any repercussions. Aside from this view being exceptionally patronising and juvenile, the issue remains that every conspiracy theory has a victim, intended or otherwise, and that their rights are equally important. Conspiracy theory, as Mark Fenster has written, can be just as effectively “used to promote oppression as it can be made to advance democratic or emancipatory politics—it might be part of a white supremacist’s novel, it might raise real questions about historical or present day efforts by the state or powerful private interests to suppress democracy or oppress minorities, or it might make fantastic, unproven and unprovable allegations.”
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The manipulation of conspiracy theory by the government of Nazi Germany showed how conspiracy theory could reveal underlying hatreds and prejudices which could be mobilised for wicked political objectives. The Judaeo-Bolshevik conspiracy theory embraced and then perpetuated by that regime was undoubtedly the most influential instance of conspiracy theory in the 20th century and the precursor to the Final Solution. By combining two contradictory ideas - equating Judaism with Communism and vice versa - the Nazi party created a malleable enemy that symbolised whatever it needed to crusade against next. All of it done, it was claimed, to ensure the purity of the Germanic Volk. For the most part, this conspiracy theory encountered only indifference. Hatred of communists and Jews was a constant throughout consecutive party manifestos. Yet, during their journey to power, as the Nazi Party strolled to electoral victories in 1932 and 1933, many Germans voted for Hitler despite their Jewish policies, not primarily because of them. It is because of the Holocaust and its foundations within conspiracy theory that some people are justifiably very hostile to the whole idea of conspiracy theory.

That a conspiracy theory can be a contributing factor behind the death of millions sullied its reputation from then on. By understanding why people have such extreme perceptions about the world, events and organisations surrounding them this thesis hopes to shed some light on how beliefs are undertaken, upheld and reinforced. Incidentally, because something is not considered to be respectable does not mean that it should not be studied, as Barkun has written: “Failing to analyze [conspiracy theories] will not keep some people from believing them”.

Conspiracy theory is unceasing; it is both historic and current. Despite President Barack Obama’s Hawaiian birth certificate having been made public early into the existence of the ‘Birther’ conspiracy theory, the rumours that he was really born in Kenya and therefore ineligible to be President persisted. This conspiracy theory was another in a long list which stretched back to the beginnings of the nation; as political scientist James T. LaPlant wrote in The New York Times “At the dawn of our republic, there were fears of the Illuminati and Freemasons. ... In the 1800s, we witnessed an anti-Masonic party and fear of Catholics as part of the concern over foreign and subversive influences. The 20th century gave us Red scares in the 1920s and 1950s with the particularly ugly right-wing McCarthyism and attacks on politicians, civil servants, members of the military and ordinary citizens as foreign Communist agents.” As conspiracy theory has been ever present in the United States it further indicates that it is a perpetual issue. The Kennedy assassination illustrates this, as dramatic fluctuations in the popularity of JFK conspiracy theories led to the matter being officially addressed by the government several times since the assassination itself. From the Warren Commission in 1964, through to the last declassification of assassination related records by the Assassination Records Review Board in conjunction with the
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National Archives in 2017; it is likely that interest will persevere. This thesis seeks to understand how and why conspiracy theory begins, and what role it plays in modern American society. If the phenomenon of conspiracy theory can be understood, perhaps it might be possible to reconcile its impulses with democratic values - especially that of free speech - so that we might avoid future humanitarian disasters founded on illogic and unreason.

Chapter one of this thesis discusses how conspiracy theories are created. The innate biases we hold as human beings constantly influence our judgement; the chapter will, to this end, examine how these cause the formulation of conspiracy theory. Arguing that these biases mean we all have the attributes required to be conspiracy theorists, the chapter will then look at the next step: how doubt is created within an official narrative. Finally, to better understand how one devises a new conspiracy theory, David S. Lifton’s suggestion that JFK’s body was altered between Dallas and Washington D.C., will be analysed as a micro case study. Arguably the most bizarre conspiracy theory found in JFK assassination literature, analysis will offer an important reflection on how circumstance can provide the tools for conspiracy theory.

In chapter two, the question asked is why conspiracy theories are created. To make for a more complete line of inquiry, analysis will be divided into two sections. The first will ask why people resort to conspiracy theory and the second what need or desire conspiracy theory can fulfil which is not found elsewhere. Within these boundaries, the chapter will analyse: how essential interpretation and misinterpretation is to conspiracy theory; how the way conspiracy theorists present evidence is a clever tactic to convince the uninitiated and themselves; and how dispossession, or ‘agency panic’, a term coined by Timothy Melley, can influence someone to resort to conspiracy theory.

Chapter three will scrutinise the role played by conspiracy theory in modern American society. Occasionally branching out from JFK conspiracy theories, the analysis will seek to examine the extremes of conspiracy theory, how it takes its toll on its adherents and those around them, and how conspiracy theory is a necessary by-product of democracy. Protected by free speech, conspiracy theory will, as has been argued throughout, never disappear from American culture so long as the United States is a democracy.
How are conspiracy theories created?

Conspiracy theories start because of doubt in authority. This holds true throughout JFK assassination conspiracy theory literature, as every conspiracy theory started with doubt about a part of the case as narrated by authority, be it the Dallas Police Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Secret Service, the Warren Commission, or any of the other official bodies that played a role in explaining the death of President John F. Kennedy. This chapter will examine how conspiracy theories are created, and how the doubt necessary at the beginning of the process is uncovered.

As doubt can occur both consciously and subconsciously, the first section of this chapter will analyse the pre-existing biases exhibited by all humans. This will include: the search for patterns when attempting to understand why things have happened; the ‘availability heuristic’, where past experiences influence one’s judgment; the ‘hindsight bias’, where one reconstructs the past to fit a current situation; and the ‘post hoc fallacy’, where if A happened before B, then one assumes that A caused B. These biases, it will be argued, are instrumental in the formation of doubt, whether individually or collectively.

The chapter’s second part will introduce two distinct divisions into the JFK conspiracy theory community: the first is between the branch focused on the events in Dealey Plaza, and those on the life and connections of Lee Harvey Oswald; and the second is conspiracy theorists active before the 1970s and those that have become conspiracy theorists in the post-Watergate era. Using this concept, the chapter will look at how the magnitude of an event influences the creation of doubt; in this case, it is how people were affected by it being the President who was killed. To this end, the concepts of: national trauma, proportionality bias, the preference of design (as opposed to randomness), pre-existing narratives, and prejudice and how these influence the thought processes will be looked at.

Finally, the chapter will go into detail on the first and second wave of JFK conspiracy theorists, examining how doubt was created within both groups. This will culminate in a micro case study of David S. Lifton, a conspiracy theorist, which bridges the aforementioned divide, and his body alteration conspiracy theory as put forward in his book, *Best Evidence*. This will give a greater understanding as to how conspiracy theorists are first drawn to conspiracy theory because of doubt in authority.

*Doubt from Biases*

When attempting to explain why something has happened, humans search for patterns. If a similar event has occurred previously for a known reason, then it is often assumed that it has
caused the most recent episode too. This is a logical, but simplistic, way of interpreting the complex relationship between correlation and causation. When an event does not happen for the reasons expected, doubt creeps in and a person becomes more willing to dismiss an official explanation and return to the tried and tested analysis. This doubt can be created both consciously and subconsciously because of life experiences and naturally occurring biases. When this is combined with a significant distrust in authority, such as misgivings about the bona fides of the media or the government, then conspiracy theory is a likely resolution. Humans “have evolved to seek out patterns in the world and attempt to generate explanations for why things happen.”

We instinctively recognise these patterns with little to no evidence of a connection between the dots, and it appears that, as explained by science writer Michael Shermer, there are two types of mistakes: a Type I error - “believing something is real when it is not” - and a Type II error - “believing something is not real when it is.” We make far more errors of the Type I variety than Type II as explained by natural selection: “you are out in the wilderness and the wind causes some nearby bushes to rustle. Moreover, you have been told that there are several hungry tigers in the area and know that they create the same type of rustling sound. You are faced with a simple choice – do you decide that the rustling is due to the wind and stay put, or conclude that it might well be a tiger and run away?” If you assume it is the wind when it is a tiger then your Type II error has probably cost you your life; however, if you guess that it is a tiger, even if it turns out not to be, then you run and give yourself a chance of survival. The result of our evolution is that we “are belief engines, evolved pattern-recognition machines that connect the dots and create meaning out of the patterns that we think we see in nature. Sometimes A really is connected to B; sometimes it is not.”

Human beings continue to struggle to discern between patterns that exist and mere coincidence. There have been numerous examples of conspiracy throughout American history, so at once it would appear that conspiracy is commonplace, part of a pattern, and a likely conclusion. We are affected by revelations about previous conspiracies because of the ‘availability heuristic’, which is “the tendency to assign probabilities of potential outcomes based on examples that are immediately available to us, especially those that are vivid, unusual, or emotionally charged”. The availability heuristic is the reason why many people screamed conspiracy when Martin Luther King, Jr. and, months later, Robert F. Kennedy were shot and killed in 1968. Conspiracy theory advocates would have heard of (or were already believers in) JFK conspiracy theories, thus recalling the controversy surrounding that episode and the similarities with the King and RFK slayings. From this, a pattern is created which links these traumatic events together, and it is not too distant a step to choose the same culprit behind all three. The problem thus becomes recognising an actual conspiracy, because the predetermination to search for patterns skews
perception. Take the example of movie director Oliver Stone. In 1991, on a publicity tour for his latest movie *JFK*, Stone told *Time* magazine that: “These three leaders [John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Robert F. Kennedy] were pulling out of the war in Vietnam and shaking up the country. Civil rights, the cold war itself, everything was in question. There’s no doubt that these three killings are linked” – these simplistic similarities and the final assassins’ bullets link the three. An innate love of patterns and the availability heuristic combined in this instance to make them appear associated; furthermore, the ‘hindsight bias’, the next bias that will be looked at, heightened the affect.\(^7\)

The hindsight bias is “the tendency to reconstruct the past to fit with present knowledge.”\(^8\) The Kennedy assassination was given a greater meaning for Stone because of the Vietnam War and his personal experience there, divulging in the same interview that “I began to distrust the government through my Vietnam experience, when I started to see the degree of lying and corruption that was going on. When I came back from the war, I began to redefine the way I had grown up. ... I had heard the Oswald stories, but I had honestly been defeated by the size of the literature, and I didn’t see its implications in my life, as to how it affected the beginning of the Vietnam War.”\(^9\) The hindsight bias is exemplified by the second wave of JFK conspiracy theorists who, like Stone, began investigating the assassination as a result of the disclosures of the 1970s. Government revelations during that decade uncovered, amongst other outrages: Watergate, improper conduct by the intelligence agencies (spying on dissident groups, attempting to assassinate foreign leaders such as Cuban Premier Fidel Castro), the hideous Tuskegee syphilis experiment (where the Public Health Service improperly treated rural African American men to study the progression of the disease), and “that President John F. Kennedy was probably assassinated as a result of a conspiracy” according to the House Select Committee on Assassinations (HSCA).\(^10\)

The HSCA, which ran from 1976-1979, based its conclusion solely upon acoustics evidence which was later rebutted by a National Research Council panel in 1982; nonetheless, a new band of JFK conspiracy theorists had already been mobilised.\(^11\) Hindsight bias shaped a desire in a large number of people to look back to locate the moment when the country lost its collective innocence. Most eyes fixed on Dealey Plaza and, for a generation of conspiracy theorists, researching the assassination became a form of catharsis, as Norman Mailer said in 1992: "Since the assassination of John F. Kennedy, we have been marooned in one of two equally intolerable spiritual states, apathy or paranoia.”\(^12\) The next bias which will be examined is ‘post hoc ergo propter hoc’, also known as the ‘post hoc fallacy’.

The British experimental psychologist Bruce Hood describes the post hoc fallacy in the following way: “We naturally see the world in terms of causes and consequences, so when
something happens we assume that some causal event preceded it and start looking around for candidates. The problem is that we often identify causes that are not responsible." This is a trap which can create the doubt needed for conspiracy theory to flourish and there are numerous cases in JFK conspiracy theory literature. One of the most repeated is that Oswald’s presence in the Soviet Union led to Francis Gary Powers’ U-2 spy plane being shot down.

This story, an example of the post hoc fallacy, has attracted a reasonable number of subscribers. For just over a year between 1957 and 1958, Lee Harvey Oswald was a radar operator in the Marines and stationed at the naval air station in Atsugi, Japan, the home of the then secret U-2 spy plane. Late in 1959, he left the Marines, journeyed to Moscow and defected to the Soviet Union. When he renounced his citizenship he told the American embassy that he would disclose all he knew about the Marine Corps and radar to the Soviets. Six months later, Powers was shot down over Soviet territory. The claim that Oswald gave the Soviet Union enough information on the U-2 to shoot one down looks interesting on the surface. A pattern could be drawn between the dots presented—Oswald worked on radar at the base which U-2 planes flew from, he said he would tell the Soviets what he knew, a U-2 was shot down not long after—and the post hoc fallacy gave added meaning to the former claims because of the latter; so, it is easy to see how this could create some interest in Oswald, his trip to the Soviet Union, and what he learnt whilst in the Marines. However, on closer examination, there was nothing to it: Yuriy Nosenko, a defector from the Soviet Union in the late 1960s, told journalist Gerald Posner in 1992: “We had better information already coming from KGB sources than [Oswald] could ever give us ... our intelligence on the U-2 was good and had been for some time.” Vincent Bugliosi added to this that: “Oswald was never in a position to know anything about the operation of the spy plane ... [because] the U-2 project, per a secret U.S. intelligence report declassified on January 14, 1971, was under the CIA’s Joint Technical Advisory Group (JTAG).” The report says that there “were no Navy [which includes the Marine Corps] personnel assigned” and that “JTAG was obviously not a part of the [Atsugi] Naval Air Station complement.” Furthermore, Oswald did not have access to the classified area in which JTAG air activities (including radar control of flights) took place. The report goes on to say that “There is no information to indicate, nor is there any reason to believe, that [Oswald] obtained factual knowledge regarding JTAG and its mission ... This applies also to ... the U-2.” If an event precedes another we usually deem that the former caused the latter. Sometimes it does, and sometimes it does not. This reasoning is not always correct, but because it is ingrained it is considered to be plausible without reviewing the variables which surround the events; therefore the post hoc fallacy can be a contributor in the creation of doubt and the conception of conspiracy theory. The next section of this chapter will look at how the magnitude of an event can inspire doubt in a narrative.
Doubt from Trauma

The second wave of JFK conspiracy theorists that were brought together in the post-Watergate atmosphere of the 1970s were produced within a climate where intense scepticism had metamorphosed into the default attitude. In the words of Francis Wheen: “it seemed a reasonable working assumption [in the 1970s] that there was indeed a clandestine collusion between vested interests which thought themselves above the law. If the Central Intelligence Agency had tried to bump off President Fidel Castro in the 1960s, then why not President John F. Kennedy?” The origins of the first wave were slightly different. This section will examine how the first wave of JFK conspiracy theorists came to doubt the official story. Starting with how the assassination symbolised the end of an era and left space for the doubt on which conspiracy theory flourishes.

When Senator John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts won the 1960 presidential election by 303 Electoral College votes to 219 he was the youngest president ever elected to office at just 43 years old. He was a veteran of World War II, a Pulitzer Prize winner, and the first president to be born in the twentieth century. During his Inaugural Address, realising that he symbolised the coming-of-age of the next generation, Kennedy said that: “the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans-born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace”. Even after the catastrophe that was his first year, there was a sense that the country was moving forward; this was highlighted by the resolution of the Cuban Missile Crisis in October 1962, and a slow, yet apparent improvement of relations between Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev and himself. So, on 22 November 1963, when that torch was extinguished the outpouring of grief was comprehensible.

This national trauma caused by the tragedy was not unique, however, as very similar incidents occurred in the immediate aftermath of the assassinations of Abraham Lincoln, James Garfield, and William McKinley; in fact, this type of reaction is not even unique to the United States. The death of Diana, Princess of Wales in a car crash in Paris on 31 August 1997, and the assassination of Benazir Bhutto in Rawalpindi on 27 December 2007, received comparable reactions in the United Kingdom and Pakistan respectively. Indeed the similarities do not stop there as both also sparked conspiracy theories. The difference between these events and the assassinations of Lincoln, Garfield and McKinley, wherein lies the mystique and synonymous yearning to hunt for a conspiracy, appears to be a lack of final justice for the culprits. Kennedy assassination conspiracy theories seem to have had more gravitas than the examples of Diana and Bhutto, however, because of the interesting juxtaposition between the failure to bring Oswald to trial and “The commission of inquiry—appointed in part to provide a trial substitute and lay
doubts to rest about the crime” which “ironically provided additional fuel for speculations about
the event.”

Very few conspiracy theorists were active prior to the release of the Warren Report
on 24 September 1964, and the majority of those that were were writing from a European and
left-wing perspective.

Thomas Buchanan wrote the first conspiracy theory book on the JFK case: *Who Killed
Kennedy*? Buchanan was an expatriate American living in Paris, and published his work in London
in May 1964, four months before the Warren Report was released. The second book was *Oswald:
Assassin or Fall Guy*? by German-born American Joachim Joesten, and was also published abroad,
this time in Joesten’s native Germany in June 1964 (although it was available in the USA shortly
afterwards). What these works had in common was that both authors were at one time members
of a communist party, both played down Oswald’s devotion to left-wing causes, and both decided
that Kennedy’s assassination was a vast right-wing plot. By doing this, Buchanan and Joesten had
fitted the Kennedy assassination into their pre-existing personal narrative. It was inconceivable to
them that a left-wing loner had committed this act; hence, to protect their beliefs, they
envisioned that it must have been a right-wing conspiracy. The Warren Report highlighted many
basic errors in both Buchanan’s and Joesten’s books. For this reason, fellow JFK conspiracy
theorists thoroughly read the Warren Report and its 26 supporting volumes. From this starting
point they formed small study groups, compared notes with one another and discussed ideas
openly so as to not be caught out. Hence, it was not until 1966, just under two years after the
Report’s publication, that there was an explosion in JFK conspiracy theory literature, most notably
the bestsellers *Rush to Judgement* by Mark Lane and *Inquest* by Edward Jay Epstein.

The traumatic nature of the assassination had little to do with the creation of doubt
regarding the official story, in actual fact it was a lack of a sense of justice which was denied the
American people because of the death of Oswald at the hands of another assassin, Jack Ruby, in
conjunction with the imperfections of the Warren Report. For example, the Commission was not
conclusive on the time Oswald took to perform the assassination, saying “that the three shots
were fired in a time period ranging from approximately 4.8 to in excess of 7 seconds” – it was
really 8.4 seconds. This combination both gave people a hunt for justice and a place to look with
ample examples of mistakes and lapses. That it was Oswald and not a cabal that deposed
Kennedy can also be a problem for people who are leaning towards conspiracy theories, the
‘proportionality bias’ is one reason for why this is.

Proportionality bias is where individuals prefer to associate major events with equally
major complex causes. Kennedy’s assassination is an example of how one man can change the
course of world history. Oswald, a wife beater who could not hold down a job and had delusions
of grandeur, takes his $21.45 mail-order rifle to work and shoots the most powerful man in the
world, for reasons unknown, as he drives past the building. In a letter to the *New York Times* in February 1992, historian William Manchester wrote of the proportionality bias that “if you put the murdered President of the United States on one side of a scale and that wretched waif Oswald on the other side, it doesn’t balance. You want to add something weightier to Oswald. It would invest the President’s death with meaning, endowing him with martyrdom. He would have died for something.” (emphasis in original) That it was Oswald that killed Kennedy is outlandish on the face of it; hence, it can be empathised as to why some conspiracy theorists are affected by the proportionality bias, reject outright the concept of the lone assassin and move on to what they believe resembles an acceptable force to remove JFK.

The available rejoinder is that some studies have “found that Americans accepted conspiracy as an explanation not to balance the proportionality of cause and effect but because they believe collusion integral to a successful assassination. ... Visions of conspiracy enabled men and women to understand the tragedy as more than a simple twist of fate.” Quite possibly, the conscious reaction is one of assigning design, whereas the subconscious is a rejection of disproportionality. This would make sense when considering the analysis from psychiatrist Willard Gaylin: “Our brain has developed a capacity to create for us a world of our own making and imagination. Very few of us live in the real world. We live in the world of our perceptions, and those perceptions differ dramatically according to our personal experiences.” Or, to put it simply, as per another psychiatrist, David Rothstein: “In the absence of an explanation, or in the absences of an explanation acceptable and believable to the person involved, it becomes necessary to generate one.” Sometimes, individuals cannot understand how and why something happens, so they sculpt a reason that fits their preconceptions. Occasionally, as we have seen with Buchanan and Joesten, this fits into a pre-existing narrative because it is easier to continue down the mental path already forged by an individual than to re-evaluate and start afresh; hence why doubt in the official personally contradicting narrative appears.

The notion of a malleable personal narrative juxtaposed with a necessity to fashion an understandable scenario offers another, but not a competing, explanation for conspiracy theory. This is illustrated most effectively by analysing conspiracy theories from opposite ends of the political spectrum. Revilo P. Oliver, who was a professor at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and a founding member of the right-wing John Birch Society, wrote in a 1963 article titled ‘Marxmanship in Dallas’ that Kennedy’s death was a Communist conspiracy. The Kremlin, through their agent Lee Harvey Oswald, had JFK killed because he had ceased to be useful. The polar opposite of this view was one of the many promulgated by New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison in the late 1960s. Garrison, in an exclusive interview with *Playboy*, said that Oswald was “a right-winger, who would be more at home with *Mein Kampf* than *Das Kapital*.” Hence,
Oswald was a fascist and killed Kennedy, a left-wing president in Garrison’s mind, because he was opposed to the radical socialist positions he was taking, such as detente with the Soviet Union. Oliver’s doubt comes from the idea that as Oswald was a supporter of Marxist-Leninism he must have been working for international communism and therefore the Kremlin. Garrison’s comes from the idea that JFK was a left-wing president, so he cannot have been killed by a left-wing assassin; Oswald must have been a right-wing assassin pretending to be left-wing to delegitimize all left-wingers. Both assumptions are basic, but it is basic principles from which doubt is often created. These two extremes beautifully highlight how the assassination has been manipulated into a pre-existing narrative. Rather than following the evidence to see where it leads, both Oliver and Garrison led the evidence into their own conclusions and ascribed blame for the assassination to another group which they were not associated with and, notably, one which they perceived as the enemy. Section three of this chapter will analyse by what means doubt is created in a narrative, looking at both waves of JFK conspiracy theorists and the different approaches they took to their conspiracy theories.

The Difference between Waves

The simplest starting point for a conspiracy theorist who has doubt about the official story is to reject everything that the authorities say or give out. By doing this, any conclusions and the evidence presented to support them instantly become objects of suspicion as they are perceived to be, quite possibly, part of a cover-up. Nothing is above uncertainty. If proof of a conspiracy does not materialise from the copious amounts of declassifications of documentation since 1963, then the truth is being withheld. As Peter Knight has written: “the lack of evidence of a conspiracy can itself be taken as evidence of a conspiracy ... The infamous backyard photos of Oswald confirm that he was indeed the lone gunman? Then they must have been faked. According to the vast majority of participants the autopsy report is accurate? Then the President’s body must have been switched on the way back to Washington. ... Nothing is certain, everything can be reinterpreted.”33 This is the most basic starting point for conspiracy theory, but it is not a position held by the majority of JFK conspiracy theorists. There is a small collective of conspiracy theorists who hold to the principles of a conspiracy theory worldview, such as David Icke and William Milton Cooper. For the most part, however, conspiracy theorists live in a world of incredible contradiction, whereby the conspiracy was so perfect as to succeed and leave no obvious trace of itself, except for things that can be found in the Zapruder film or 26 volumes of the Warren Commissions.34 When a conspiracy theorist doubts what the authorities are reporting then they are free to translate and reframe the event in a way which makes it easier to understand both its causes and its consequences.
JFK conspiracy theorists have uncovered doubt in two distinct areas: the events in Dealey Plaza, and the life and connections of Lee Harvey Oswald. Other books on closely related topics exist, but the vast majority, numbering hundreds, fall into one or both camps. The latter category – Lee Harvey Oswald’s connections – was given prominence by Jim Garrison’s investigation in the late 1960s. Before then, books were mainly written in an attempt to understand what happened in Dealey Plaza.

The questions that early conspiracy theorists wanted answers to were all to do with the assassination itself. They readily cited contradictions from the Warren Commission and other sources like the Dallas Police Department which would disagree with the official conclusions and reinforce the doubt of the critics that something untoward had occurred. To take a few examples from one of the first JFK conspiracy theory bestsellers, _Rush to Judgement_ by New York attorney Mark Lane: “To conclude that ‘no credible evidence suggests’ that shots came from any place other than the Book Depository is to ignore the evidence of Miss Mercer, Bowers, Price, Holland, Deputy Constable Weitzman and the railroad yardman who spoke with him.” “[At] least two bullets must have been fired to inflict the wound to the President’s throat and all the wounds suffered by Governor Connally.” “The Dallas authorities told the press later that day that the weapon found on the sixth floor was a 7.65 German Mauser.” In these sections, Lane has compared or is about to compare discrepancies between witness testimony and early reports from the weekend of the assassination with the Warren Report. For early conspiracy theorists, it was these differences which created doubt. Consequently, it was perceived that the best way to resolve the situation was to go back and investigate the events of that day. In so doing, a suitable conclusion may be reached or, at the very least, the official line would be rejected.

The various conflicts initially found by the first wave of conspiracy theorists, whether resolved or not since, are still repeated in the literature of the later waves of JFK conspiracy theories. Take, for example, the claim of Julia Ann Mercer, with which Lane references and begins his book. On the day of the assassination, Mercer told the Dallas County Sheriff’s Department that that morning she was stuck in a traffic jam and as she was going past the grassy knoll she noticed a pickup truck up on the curb. When she passed it, one man took a gun-case from the rear of the truck and disappeared behind the knoll. Furthermore, she later identified the driver as Jack Ruby. As explained by Gerald Posner: “Subsequent investigation revealed that the truck, which had stalled, belonged to a local construction company; it had three men inside, and they did take tools from the rear of the truck to fix it. They were under constant surveillance by three Dallas policemen, and all of them left when another truck arrived to push the stalled vehicle away.” Yet, Mercer’s claim is repeated in later conspiracy theory texts, such as _Crossfire_ by Jim Marrs and _On the Trail of the Assassins_ by Jim Garrison. There were clearly profound
discrepancies and contradictions resulting from the different investigations conducted by the Dallas Police Department, the Secret Service, the FBI, and the Warren Commission. It is rare, if not impossible, that any investigation of a crime can happen without such incidents. The conspiracy theorists felt that they were not explicitly accounted for, so they would keep asking about them until they got answers. They remain in conspiracy theory folklore because the conspiracy theorists still believe they have not been answered or they have rejected the answers given to them. The issue is that these questions do not blatantly lie; rather, they use well-crafted half-truths to input doubt into the official story. Mercer did say she saw a gun-case on the grassy knoll on the morning of the assassination, and she did later say that one of the men was Jack Ruby. Mercer is chosen as believable by conspiracy theorists like Lane, Marrs and Garrison because her story contradicts the official story, not because it has any specific ring of truth to it. If enough instances of contradictions between investigations or within a specific investigation can be discovered and established then the conclusion that Kennedy was killed by Oswald will fall, leaving room for an acceptable conclusion to take its place. Factoids, especially in the form of hypothetical unanswerable questions, are employed by all conspiracy theorists to convert people, to seemingly stump those opposed to their position, and to deflect criticism of their stance. This tactic is also exhibited by the second group of JFK conspiracy theorists formed by the Jim Garrison investigation in the late 1960s. Since Garrison, the assassination itself has become less important as it appears that the public want to know why it happened, not how it happened.

The enquiry into the assassination conducted in New Orleans by Jim Garrison began in late 1966 and ended on 15 August 1974 with the death of Clay Shaw, the businessman he had accused and tried as a member of the conspiracy to kill JFK.\(^3\) Already mentioned was Garrison’s belief that Oswald was a fascist and that he killed JFK because of his hatred of his politics; however, this was not the only theory he announced to the press in those eight years, and it was not the theory which he appeared to have settled on by his own death on 21 October 1992. To Garrison, Dealey Plaza did not matter. It was not important to find out how it happened and to try to expose flaws in the story as the first wave had done, that could be done after the conspiracy had been uncovered, and maybe then the conspirators would let him in on the details. Edward Jay Epstein, who wrote a book about the case, Counterplot, said in an interview for Robert Stone’s 2007 documentary Oswald’s Ghost that “Garrison helped elevate the Kennedy assassination from: ‘a forensic puzzle’, to: ‘was there a grand political motive where the bullets didn’t really matter’. Where what really mattered was: who benefited? Did Lyndon Johnson benefit? Was it to keep the Army in Vietnam? Was there a grand social purpose?”\(^4\)

Garrison’s doubt was created by associations and connections. Disregarding the actual events of the assassination, Garrison fuelled his doubt in the official narrative by reinterpret
individual pieces of evidence and introducing his own meaning onto them. Bugliosi described this fallacy as applied to people: “if A knows B and B knows C, then A is meaningfully connected to C, which of course is a non sequitur. In fact, the theorists go beyond the above equation. Not only is A connected to C, but whatever nefarious deed C has done (all the more so with B), A must have done also. (Actually, conspiracy theorists frequently go beyond A-B-C into D, E and F.)”41 Linking one person or piece of evidence to another through fatuous reasoning became integral to JFK conspiracy theory thinking because of Garrison. Take, for example, how Garrison linked Oswald to Ruby and finally to Shaw, the person he put on trial for Kennedy’s murder. As recounted by Epstein, “Garrison announced to the press that he had found the entry “PO 19106” in both Oswald’s and Shaw’s address books, and that the number ... was a code that, when deciphered, produced Jack Ruby’s unlisted telephone number, WH 1-5601, and “no other number on earth.” ... Starting with the “scrambled” number 19106, Garrison “unscrambled” it (by choosing the nearest digit, then the farthest, then the nearest, etc.) to produce the number 16901. ... The next step was to subtract the arbitrary number 1300 from 16901,” and it went on.42 This example shows how illogic is fundamental to the creation of conspiracy theory and how JFK conspiracy theory had changed through Garrison. Even the most laughable notion can begin with a grain of truth, in this case that the same five-digit number was in both Oswald’s and Shaw’s address books. Extrapolating and expanding upon a piece of evidence is how the topic of our micro case study, David Lifton, got involved in the Kennedy assassination.

David Lifton and the Body Alteration Theory
Conspiracy theory can start with a simple question and escalate into a full blown counter-narrative. Our natural obsession with patterns and our innate biases mean that a tiny fragment of doubt can be speculated on and extrapolated hastily into a conspiracy theory. David S. Lifton and his bestselling book, Best Evidence, are good examples of how a new conspiracy theory can begin because of doubt, how this doubt can take hold, and how the pattern seeking logic of conspiracy theory operates.43

Fifteen years in the making, Lifton’s theory was created by what he considered to be a line of best fit. Puzzled by how the head-snap in the Zapruder film, as he perceived it, clearly showed a bullet coming from the front when the autopsy said all shots came from the rear, and how the account of JFK’s wounds given by the doctors that tried to save his life in Dallas did not match those noted by the physicians that performed the autopsy in Maryland. Lifton rectified these issues when he discovered an FBI document written by two agents, James W. Sibert and Francis X. O’Neill, Jr., who were present at the autopsy. On page three is the following line: “[On receipt of the body at Bethesda] it was ascertained that the President’s clothing had been
removed and it was also apparent that a tracheotomy had been performed, as well as surgery of the head area, namely in the top of the skull.” Lifton knew there had been no surgery performed on the head in Dallas, only a tracheotomy, so he drew the conclusion that somewhere between Dallas and Bethesda “somebody had performed ‘surgery’ on President Kennedy’s corpse.” By leaving no room for coincidence, stress, chaos, confusion and inability, by believing there to be a perfect conspiracy, the grain of truth which Lifton had unearthed had been surgically altered into a conspiracy theory.

As was exhibited at the beginning of this chapter, finding and creating patterns where none exist is a standard human trait. It was a Type I error which led Lifton to subjectively validate the FBI report and find corroboration for what he wanted to conclude: “I was exhilarated, terrified. ... My instinct had been correct. There was no contradiction.” Any opposing evidence to Lifton’s position he ignored or discarded because it was deemed a part of a cover-up or not genuine. Common sense was thrown out, and Lifton joined the stars which shone brightest through his telescope creating his own constellation. Lifton’s route to this distinctive conspiracy theory was different to the first wave of JFK conspiracy theorist because his doubt was a product of influence by another conspiracy theorist.

In 1964, whilst he was still a student at the University of California, Los Angeles, Lifton attended a lecture on the assassination presented by Mark Lane which had a profound influence. Shortly afterwards, Lifton went and bought all twenty-six volumes of the Warren Commission and started his own research. UCLA dismissed him in 1966 because his fixation on the Kennedy assassination caused him to abandon his studies.

Lifton was not interested in politics before Lane’s lecture and he was ignorant about the assassination, he only knew what Lane told him. Lane, on the other hand, had had an interest in politics before the assassination, was mortified by JFK’s death and was hired by Oswald’s mother, Marguerite, as his defence attorney, all of which inevitably drove him to try to find more to it than Oswald. Lane learnt about the assassination, read the Warren Report and highlighted discrepancies along the way. Lifton was only exposed to Lane’s version of events, which had become dogma for him by the time he read the Warren Commission. In other words, the doubt which is central to the conception of conspiracy theory was created for him by the lecture. It was from this position, a starting point of doubt through conspiracy theory, that Lifton began researching.

This chapter has argued that conspiracy theory starts because of doubt in authority. The creation of doubt is influenced by the innate biases we all have, the enormity of an event and how that event is resolved. Conspiracy theories dealing with the assassination of President Kennedy exhibit...
these tendencies in both the first and second waves, and the pre- and post-1970s movements. Seeds of doubt in the official story began either as a result of considering the events and their resolutions to be fanciful, or because of the discrepancies and mistakes found within or between investigations. As it has been demonstrated that doubt is the source of conspiracy theory, the next chapter will analyse why people resort to conspiracy theory and what need or desire it fulfils which cannot be found elsewhere. This is bound up with the process by which evidence can be presented, interpreted and misinterpreted.
Why are conspiracy theories created?

On 29 March 1981, a plaque – which is still there to this day – was unveiled by the Elm Street entrance of the former Texas School Book Depository. It consists of three paragraphs, the last of which reads: “On November 22, 1963, the building gained national notoriety when Lee Harvey Oswald allegedly shot and killed President John F. Kennedy from a sixth floor window as the presidential motorcade passed the site.”1 The emphasis on ‘allegedly’ has been added in the intervening years by pilgrimaging conspiracy theorists who have scratched around the word with whatever implement they had to hand. So much is contained in this act of defiance: time, money and dedication – for a lot of people it is as close to fighting back against the establishment as they will come.

No more than 300 feet away from the plaque stands the infamous grassy knoll, complete with stockade fence which another gunman or men are alleged to have shot from behind. The fence has had to be replaced “roughly every five to seven years” since the assassination because visitors have taken to levering off a souvenir board or two as a memento of their trip.2 Those who do not want their own piece of the fence take the time to mark the reverse side with a message – these range from the everyday ‘name plus date’ format to those of a conspiratorial nature naming culprits from all sides of the conspiracy theory spectrum: the CIA, the FBI, the Soviet Union, Cuba, etc. – creating a type of documentation of alternative social history. As the 50th anniversary of the assassination approached in 2013 - and with it the imminent scrutiny of the entire world - the city of Dallas invested a lot of money in a major restoration project for Dealey Plaza. On their list was creating a way to reduce the amount of money spent on replacing the fence and, to this end, a black chain-link barrier was put in place on its backside.3 Surprisingly, there was no outcry and, curiously, it was barely mentioned on conspiracy theory websites – so either there was widespread indifference or the restoration project went by unnoticed. After all, one need not have visited Dealey Plaza to be a JFK assassination conspiracy theorist; one merely requires access to the internet or a library.

This chapter will examine why conspiracy theories are created. The ‘why’ of conspiracy theory is just as important as the ‘how’ because of the commonplace presence of conspiracy theory in American society. In the media, when any mention is made of a subject entertained by conspiracy theorists it is inevitable that equal time – to tell a captive audience what really happened – will be vociferously demanded. By asking why, one can continue and enhance an understanding of conspiracy theory.

The most efficient way to answer why conspiracy theory is created is to split it into two sections: why people recourse to conspiracy theory and what need or desire it fulfils. Primarily,
conspiracy theories are created because they provide people a lens through which they can shape the world to fit their ethics and circumstance. Conspiracy theory can make complex events understandable and in doing so it supplies an escape from everyday life. Moreover, conspiracy theory can be a captivating leisure activity akin to cinema or literature, accepted as writ due to ignorance, persuasion and/or misunderstanding. The creation of conspiracy theory is made easier because one does not need to be personally linked to an event to become a conspiracy theorist. Michael Shermer noted this when he wrote that humans tend to see patterns “whenever the cost of making a Type I error is less than the cost of making a Type II error.” Therefore, if one has no reason to doubt the veracity of a claim, due to no imminent danger for example, then it is unlikely that they will.

An ever widening gap between event, location and conspiracy theorist has wrought more explanations as to why JFK conspiracy theories are created, which has in turn led to their generalisation. As previously noted, in the early days, it was likely that one became a conspiracy theorist either because of contradictions uncovered in the various investigations, an idolisation of the late JFK and a need to find a meaning in his grisly demise, or a combination of the two. As time progressed and the holes, gaps and mistakes in the official record were slowly and painstakingly closed, sorted and corrected by investigation after investigation, often with little fanfare or notice by the conspiracy theory community, the reasons to venture down the conspiracy theory rabbit hole grew in number. The unique nature of the Kennedy assassination conspiracy theory had gone. The reasons for suspicion had turned out to have no sinister connotations. People were now drawn to the subject for the same vast swathe of reasons they were drawn to any conspiracy theory. Either a misunderstanding of a central issue related to the event in question which implies that the official story is flawed; because they were persuaded by another committed conspiracy theorist; or because they are experiencing what Professor Timothy Melley has termed ‘agency panic’. Melley outlined this as “intense anxiety about an apparent loss of autonomy, the conviction that one’s actions are being controlled by someone else or that one has been “constructed” by powerful, external agents.” Consequently, this chapter will examine how a predisposition to conspiracy theory due to past experience can lead one to accept a new conspiracy theory – related or not.

**Predisposition**

Sometimes, people resort to conspiracy theory because they are predisposed to the idea. It is therefore more likely that one would believe a new conspiracy theory if one had already accepted a conspiracy theory in the past. This means that a believer in a JFK conspiracy theory is far more probable than someone who is not a conspiracy theorist to believe in another, different
conspiracy theory. In 2011, Canadian journalist Jonathan Kay noticed this, writing in his book *Among the Truthers*, that if one were to “Scratch the surface of a middle-aged 9/11 Truther ... you are almost guaranteed to find a JFK conspiracist.” The beliefs of conspiracy theories, whether contradictory or not, mutually support one another.

This assertion is supported by numerous psychological studies. In 1994, American psychologist Ted Goertzel showed that “People who believed in one conspiracy were more likely to believe in others”, and, more recently, research released in 2012 by Michael J. Wood, Karen M. Douglas and Robbie M. Sutton from the University of Kent concluded that “perhaps the most consistent finding in the work on the psychology of conspiracy theories is that belief in a particular theory is strongly predicted by belief in others – even ostensibly unrelated ones.” One can reasonably conclude that predisposition is a reason why someone creates or resorts to conspiracy theory. This is even the case with those which appear to be self-sufficient. Take, for example, the conspiracy theory that the Kennedy assassination was committed by organised crime.

According to a 2013 poll by the History channel, 27 percent of JFK conspiracy theorists considered the assassination to be a mob hit. Yet, organised crime has rarely, if ever, been accused of being behind 9/11, the death of Marilyn Monroe, or allowing the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, which are all popular complimentary conspiracy theories. Superficially, the claim does not support similar theories; hence, new conspiracy theories would not also emanate from a worldview where the Mafia is the global or national force. Instead, the next conspiracy theory adopted could almost come from anywhere, since it is not the conclusions which provide mutual authenticity. According to Wood, Douglas and Sutton, ostensibly unconnected conspiracy theories support one another because “the fact that one massive, sinister conspiracy could be successfully executed in near-perfect secrecy suggests that many such plots are possible.” Moreover, they add that “Over time, the view of the world as a place ruled by conspiracies can lead to conspiracy becoming the default explanation for any given event – a unitary, closed-off worldview in which beliefs come together in a mutually supportive network”. Interestingly, the researchers from Kent also found that this bias extends to contradiction and incompatibility. They asked participants about Princess Diana and found that the more they thought she had “faked her own death, the more they believed she was murdered.” In the next study the questions were about Osama Bin Laden and they discovered a similar pattern, in that the more they believed he was dead before the raid on his compound, “the more they believed he is still alive.” So, one reason why people may resort to conspiracy theory is because they already believe in an alternative or a competing conspiracy theory, hence they are predisposed to the idea and ready
to entertain and accept the possibility of an additional belief. The next reason to be examined is misinterpretation.

**Misinterpretation**

A simple misinterpretation is another reason as to why many people resort to conspiracy theory. This is no more evident than with the controversy surrounding the so-called head-snap in Abraham Zapruder’s infamous home movie. When characters are shot in the movies they fall in the opposite direction from which the bullet came, which is an oversimplification but also a principle generally considered to be correct. So, when the Zapruder film was first screened on national television in March 1975 and an audience of millions saw Kennedy’s head and whole body snap violently backwards and to the left, it is understandable that a common misinterpretation was of a shot coming from the right-front, the area of the grassy knoll.

This mistake was echoed by conspiracy theory literature. Mark Lane, for example, wrote in *Rush to Judgment* that “So long as the [Warren] Commission maintained that the bullet came almost directly from the rear, it implied that the laws of physics vacated in this instance, for the President did not fall forward.” The screening of the Zapruder film on Geraldo Rivera’s *Goodnight America* on Thursday 6 March 1975 was watched by millions and, as Peter Knight wrote, it “became for many Americans visible proof, if not of a conspiracy, then of evidence that their government had lied to them.” Many now thought there was a conspiracy; yet, the result of this whole episode stems from misinterpretation. As Gerald Posner has written: “Without an understanding of the medical evidence or the physics involved, it appeared as though the President reacted to a bullet fired from the front.” Misinterpretation is a simple and uncomplicated reason for why someone resorts to conspiracy theory.

Surprisingly, the Warren Commission did not deal with the issue of the head-snap at all. In 1966, an assistant counsel for the commission, Wesley J. Liebeler, said “It is only since the critics have raised this point that anybody has ever looked at it closely”. The conclusions in the Warren Report were drawn from the medical and ballistic evidence, which indicated that the shots came only from above and behind, so the commissioners and staffers were blind to what conspiracy theorists saw when they watched the Zapruder film.

In fact, the first time the head-snap was addressed was during the Garrison probe as a result of the district attorney’s repeated showings of the film – six times in two days. James Phelan, a journalist covering the trial, explained that the head-snap occurred because of the ‘jet effect’, which was where the skin, bone and brain matter that followed the bullet out of the massive exit wound on Kennedy’s head created a huge amount of power, forcing it in the opposite direction. This explanation, however, was not given by author Robert J. Groden and
comedian Dick Gregory, Rivera’s guests who narrated the film on television, and we cannot be sure that they knew of it at all. Instead, Groden and Gregory presented their interpretation of how the head-snap is “completely consistent with a shot from the front right.” To a large extent it was this high profile screening of the Zapruder film and the accompanying commentary which forced the Rockefeller Commission and the HSCA to examine the cause of the head-snap – the former agreed with Phelan but asserted in addition that it was possibly the result of a neuromuscular reaction; the latter decided it was the neuromuscular explanation.

Misinterpretation can cause somebody to resort to conspiracy theory, especially when their misinterpretation is a product of popular consensus or being presented with a one sided argument. To this day, conspiracy theorists write as if all the HSCA did was conclude that there was a conspiracy, forgetting the discussion of the head-snap and often declining to mention the far more detailed analysis completed by the Rockefeller Commission. For example, Groden’s 1990 bestseller High Treason, co-authored with Harrison Edward Livingstone, does not bring up either revelation.

Picking and choosing facts highly influences the impressions which people acquire from a first time exposure to conspiracy theory. This method, referred to as confirmation bias, is also how conspiracy theory can doggedly persevere for an individual, contrary to popular opinion and overwhelming contradictory evidence.

Reinterpreting facts is how some conspiracy theorists, such as James H. Fetzer and Groden’s writing partner Livingstone, have accepted the official conclusion on the head-snap but still believe in a conspiracy. To them, this all makes sense: of course the Zapruder film supports the lone gunman hypothesis because, they argue, the Zapruder film has been altered. This completes a full circle for the infamous home movie. Having once been presented as the finest evidence of a shot from the front and therefore an untouchable cornerstone of a conspiracy hypothesis, to now being seen as a fundamentally unreliable document which must be explained away or ejected from the historical record for a conspiracy to have been possible. In doing this, Fetzer and Livingstone are opening the door for the most bizarre, uncorroborated and previously unusable eye- and ear-witness testimony. Surprisingly, this farfetched theory is gaining believers and the ‘alterationists’, as they are called in the conspiracy theory community, are growing in number, mainly because of their pervasiveness on the internet. This is highlighted by the recent flurry of books in time for the 50th anniversary that contain some alterationist stances, including The President and the Provocateur by Alex Cox, a British conspiracy theorist. This leads us to the next reason why people resort to conspiracy theory: being convinced by others.
**Persuasion**

A person may resort to conspiracy theory as a result of being talked into believing. Chapter One exhibited that we are born with the innate biases which allow us to become conspiracy theorists, but that is not to say that we are born as conspiracy theorists. Every so often, people are legitimately convinced by a conspiracy theory, whether it is through the way the conspiracy theory presents evidence or because the conspiracy theory is considered culturally acceptable.

The issue surrounding the Kennedy assassination is that the concept of conspiracy is inextricably linked due to cultural factors. It is the classic conspiracy theory and (because it is culturally acceptable to be of the mindset that there are so many riddles and mysteries that we will never know what really happened) people are more open to being convinced. The terms ‘grassy knoll’ and ‘magic bullet’ have become synonymous with conspiracy theory. Like the ‘-gate’ suffix which the Watergate scandal has gifted to the lexicon for whenever there is a scandal, grassy knoll is now being used to denote an issue which is unaccountable. When Princess Diana was killed in a car accident and white paint from a Fiat Uno was found on the limousine it was written that “The Uno is Diana’s grassy knoll ... an aspect of her death that, until the driver is found, cannot be explained.” If it is considered that the JFK assassination has mysterious issues at its core which cannot be made clear, then resorting to a conspiracy theory to find an explanation is a far greater possibility.

In *Reclaiming History*, Vincent Bugliosi wrote that “over 95% of the books on the [JFK] case happen to be pro-conspiracy” - he was (and still is) correct. Even before the Warren Report was written, people were screaming that it was a conspiracy. Indeed, polls have consistently shown that over half of the American population believe there was a conspiracy. The Kennedy assassination is - as author John McAdams has said - “the iconic conspiracy theory.” (emphasis in original) For this reason, conspiracy is a possibility subconsciously entertained by the vast majority of Americans. Hence because of the stigma, just one book, one internet website, or one documentary may convince and cause somebody to become a conspiracy theorist.

The way evidence supporting a conspiracy theory is presented is designed to overwhelm and engulf the audience. Hofstadter described this process: “The typical procedure ... is to start with such defensible assumptions and with a careful accumulation of facts, or at least what appear to be facts, and to marshal these facts toward an overwhelming “proof” of the particular conspiracy that is to be established.” This is how every conspiracy theory book, film, etc. works. Colossal amounts of information are shown, sometimes repeatedly, such that a reader/viewer concludes that everything has been touched upon, that there are no holes, and thus it must be the truth. David Aaronovitch describes this “as death by footnote.” Conspiracy theory masquerades as history and mimics academia to such a degree that people consider it reputable.
and believe in the stories presented within – not because they are subversive or alternative, but because no other explanation exists anymore for the new believer. By reducing competing arguments, conspiracy theory appears to be logical.

Video sharing websites have been transformed into the best and quickest way to showcase the latest JFK conspiracy theory to a large audience and to try to persuade them of the ‘truth’. The alterationists mentioned earlier have acclimatised superbly to this new medium, typing ‘Zapruder hoax’ into YouTube gives 16,800 results. Included in this morass are presentations from a three day long conference – ‘The Zapruder Film Symposium’ – which was held at the University of Minnesota in 2003 and organised by Fetzer. Although split up into 68 parts, the conference has been viewed thousands of times, with Fetzer’s presentation tipping the scales at an average of almost 12,000 views over four parts. This may not be a great deal when compared to a certain sneezing baby panda which has over 190 million views, but this sect, which did not exist pre-1998, has managed to become a sizeable proportion of the JFK conspiracy theory community by appearing to be an academic school of thought.

Quite clearly, the Zapruder film was not altered or fabricated by a gang of conspirators, and there are so many reasons why the alterationists are preposterously wide of the mark that there is very little point in going into – not least an unbroken chain of possession. Thanks to the internet, however, a farfetched theory has managed to find a receptive audience and has been efficiently spread through the conspiracy theory community. Even filmmaker and celebrity JFK conspiracy theorist Oliver Stone has pledged his support for the alterationists. In an interview on 5 November 2013, Stone said that the Zapruder film “was taken by the CIA and the Secret Service and it was altered a bit, I think. Erm... There’s a lot of evidence to that effect. You have to; you’re getting into scientific now. But the Zapruder film, even now, is the best signpost. It’s the timing, it’s the timing. It shows you—how do you call it?—the timeframe of the assassination.”

If one was to stumble across Fetzer’s presentation on YouTube and sit through all four parts without knowing the details of the case then it is likely that one would walk away believing that the Zapruder film was altered. Conspiracy theory can be persuasive, especially when it is emanating from an ex-academic who knows how to deliver an efficient lecture. Persuasion is one reason why people resort to conspiracy theory. The final sole reason why people resort to conspiracy theory we will be examining is agency panic.

**Agency Panic**

The term ‘agency panic’ was coined by Timothy Melley of Miami University, who described it as an “intense anxiety about an apparent loss of autonomy, the conviction that one’s actions are being controlled by someone else or that one has been “constructed” by powerful, external
agents.” Melley went on to say that one of the most important functions of agency panic “is to sustain a form of individualism that seems increasingly challenged by postwar economic and social structures." Conspiracy theory solves agency panic by restoring control, in an oblique way, to the conspiracy theorist.

Dispossession—whether it is the loss of a political voice, of personal possessions, of a job, of health, or of a loved one—is the likeliest cause of agency panic because when any of these events occurs it can look as if one’s autonomy is being challenged and/or lost. To protect what one perceives remains, one begins to have “radical doubts about how knowledge is produced and about the authority of those who produce it”, therefore trust is only afforded to themselves and (probably) those close to them, but they repeatedly question outsiders. Conspiracy theory acts as a boundary because “it develops from the refusal to accept someone else’s definition of a universal social good or an officially sanctioned truth.”

Examples of agency panic from Kennedy assassination conspiracy theory literature are most apparent in those who were once fervent Kennedy supporters. Thomas Brown explains the sentiments of this group in JFK: History of an Image: “the president personalized the abstraction of the nation-state, [therefore] his murder was often felt as an assault on the nation itself. For that reason, the assassination aroused elemental, almost primitive feelings of vulnerability before mysteriously malevolent forces.” Kennedy supporters were dispossessed of their leader, their symbol of hope, mix in “a highly selective and tendentious reading of history” and the “claim that at the time of his death, Kennedy was evolving into an economic radical ... a critic of the cold war ... and an egalitarian” then “the calamity of Kennedy’s death was not merely that it cut off his personal growth but that it thwarted a “lost opportunity” for fundamental change in the United States”; hence the feeling of dispossession from the United States that should have been but was denied by the assassination. Taking this concept further, to this group of people (such as Lane and Garrison) “it was simply unthinkable that Kennedy could have been killed by an isolated misfit of vaguely pro-Communist sympathies. He must have been murdered by insidious right-wing forces that hoped to benefit from his death.” (emphasis in original) This conspiracy theory worldview is “based on a naively optimistic faith in America as an exceptional nation, a beacon of light to the world, that would otherwise have remained innocent and uncorrupted if it had not been for the [events in Dealey Plaza.]” For this to exist, one has to ignore the history of presidential assassinations within the United States, and that the problems which hit Presidents Johnson and Nixon - social upheaval and the Vietnam War — “were merely a continuation of problems in which the Kennedy administration was deeply embroiled.” Thus, agency panic can only be solved by conspiracy theory if one is willing to rewrite large tracts of the accepted narrative and fly in the face of commonly held belief, both of which conspiracy theorists do.
Rewriting history is an aim of conspiracy theory, because history explains why the nation or group are in the situation they are in at the present. By changing the official history, the accountability of current concerns is placed into the hands of the enemy. Oliver Stone, for example, argues in the movie *JFK* that had Kennedy lived, the Vietnam War would not have escalated the way it did under Johnson and Nixon. It is impossible to know for certain what Kennedy would have done; the furthest one can legitimately go is, as per George Lardner, Jr.: “There was no abrupt change in Vietnam policy after J.F.K.’s death.” Stone, on the other hand, needs the Vietnam War to be a motive for his killers of Kennedy. To do so, he has to rewrite history to fit his own view, thus he finds consolation in his created counter narrative.

Avoiding the consequences of a lone gunman and finding solace in one of the vast number of competing conspiracy theories about how and why JFK was killed make it abundantly clear that “the assassination was never fully digested by the generation that lived through it.” This only serves to indicate further that dispossession and subsequent agency panic is one of the reasons why people resort to it. Conspiracy theory does not force people to deal with reality; they can live in their own world, their own story. Should one be unable to accept that Kennedy was murdered by Oswald, then conspiracy theory offers them a chance to shift into an alternate universe where he did not do it, it was the military industrial complex, or the CIA, or Lyndon Johnson, or all of them. Agency panic leads people into a zone of insecurity and conspiracy theory offers a way out; hence, agency panic is a means by which people can resort to conspiracy theory. In truth, people can be killed by a nobody for no apparent reason, but that is not a satisfactory ending, as it offers no closure. It “is only narrative that promises a reason for early death; reality offers no such assurance.” In the next part of this chapter, we will examine what need or desire conspiracy theory fulfils, looking first at closure.

**Closure**

Investing in a conspiracy theory and becoming a conspiracy theorist provides the believer with a personal sense of closure which is not immediately attainable through a story from authority. It does this because it challenges the official narratives which are incomprehensible to the conspiracy theorist. Through conspiracy theory, all questions can be answered in a manner which accepts the ethics and circumstance of the believer. If it does not answer a query directly, then it does so rhetorically with another question, because conspiracy theory does not need to provide a clear alternative as the explanation is merely a consequence of maintaining an existing worldview. If part of a conspiracy theorist’s thesis is dubious due to a lack of sufficient and/or contradictory evidence then this can be remedied by greatly expanding what they already have with hearsay and conjecture, and by refusing to acknowledge any contradictory evidence. An example of this
tactic is exhibited by those that wish to point the finger at organised crime for the JFK assassination.

The belief that Jack Ruby killed Oswald at the behest of organised crime – a story which at first glance does not appear beyond the realms of possibility – demands that questions are sidestepped or ignored continuously so that the conspiracy theorist keeps their belief intact. The case usually starts with the concept that Ruby did it so that Oswald would not expand on his “I’m just a patsy!” statement and expose the conspiracy. For this to be the case, it has to be forgotten or put to one side that Oswald had been interrogated for almost 12 hours, plenty of time to go into detail on how or why he was a patsy. The same goes for the bizarre way that Oswald eventually met his end via Ruby’s revolver. It looks like coincidence and happenstance so mindboggling that it would have to be considered the most perfect conspiracy ever to have been acted out without a trace of evidence surfacing in the aftermath. Yet, most conspiracy theory texts take it as dogma that it was a conspiracy, finding method in the madness, and ignore the roles of people like postal inspector Harry D. Holmes, for example, who quizzed Oswald about how he managed to get the rifle mailed to Dallas, which pushed Oswald’s transfer time back by an hour and 20 minutes. Holmes is left out because otherwise he would have to be labelled as a member of the conspiracy or explained away. Neither has to occur if his story is not mentioned. It is a simpler position, and the point of the conspiracy theory is to make the complex simple and to make everything understandable. 40

Convoluted issues are broken down and changed into elementary language which can be readily understood by the conspiracy theorist and communicated without the need for specialist training. Oswald killing Kennedy for seemingly inexplicable reasons, and then in turn being killed by Ruby before he admits his guilt or he can explain why, because Ruby was a confused man with delusions of grandeur and organic brain damage which rendered him unpredictable and in possession of a fierce temper, is unsatisfactory and not easily elucidated. The conclusion given by the ‘Mafia did it’ conspiracy theorists is rigorously protected and competing evidence is explained away because the conspiracy theory has become symbolic of the conspiracy theorist’s worldview and their self-attributed personal reputation. If the conspiracy theory did not make sense to them, then the world would not make sense to them, they would be living in a disordered, chaotic universe, the thought of which is extraordinary and would have undesirable consequences with which they would be obligated to deal. To this end, the preference is to remove coincidence so that it does not factor. That way, everything happens for a reason and, ultimately, the doubt which is created so that there is space for a conspiracy theory to operate is eviscerated and the problems that once existed are solved, giving a feeling of closure and, the next topic, comfort.
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Comfort
Conspiracy theory, even the most malevolent, can provide a sense of comfort closely linked to closure. By presenting the image that everything is solved and thus a seemingly irrational event has been given a preconceived sense of rationality, the believer will likely feel that order has been restored to the world. There are no unknowns and there is not anything which is unknowable, because everything happens for a reason and that reason can always be determined. This puts a comforting design back into the world and negates the need for acts of randomness to explain anything – everything is still as it was before the conspiracy, the worldview of the conspiracy theorist is upheld.

If one believes that a conspiracy was behind the death of President Kennedy then two positions are held simultaneously. First, that the United States was attacked by either a foreign nation or by a fifth column of some kind. And, second, that whoever put this dastardly scheme into action can be defeated; they are the epitome of evil, but good can triumph once again. It is this line of thought which keeps design central to conspiracy theory: everything happens for a reason, which is understandable to the individual espousing the conspiracy theory. Moreover, this worldview alone can be the basis why one may lean toward conspiracy theory in the first place. If the official story consists of a culmination of random events, then doubt can surface as one deems there to be some design to the madness, which typifies the desire to find patterns highlighted previously. Psychiatrist David Rothstein writes: “the idea of conspiracy may seem to some to offer more order and predictability in the universe, since it would involve a group acting on rational motives in a manner understandable to the average man. While the idea of a lone assassin, acting from irrational, apparently unpredictable, motives would seem more threatening and would appear to leave the universe more random and capricious.” This is a utopian belief. Good plays off against evil, with the conspiracy theorist retaining the hope that the evil can be superseded by the good which they see themselves as portraying. To this end, conspiracy theory can provide its adherents with a comfortable sensation of knowing what is going on and why – which only religion can rival. The next section will be on how control is restored to the individual by adopting a conspiracy theory.

Control
Conspiracy theory can provide the believer with a sense of control. By convoluted illogic, conspiracy theorists cling to the hope that the evil causing things to happen—in the example we have chosen, this is the Mob—will eventually be replaced by the group to which the conspiracy theorist sees themselves as belonging. They perceive their faction as the force for good which will
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someday ascend to the position of power and rightfully rule the resulting utopia. When we look at somebody like G. Robert Blakey, chief counsel and staff director of the HSCA, this makes sense.

Blakey, a professor of law, is an expert on organised crime. Before heading the HSCA he had worked for Robert Kennedy in the attorney general’s organised crime unit and had advised on, designed, and drafted the legal language of the 1970 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) which severely hindered organised crime’s operations in the United States. In a 1979 press conference discussing the release of the Final Report of the HSCA, Blakey declared that “I am now firmly of the opinion that the Mob did it ... It is a historical truth. This Committee report does not say the Mob did it. I said it.” (emphasis in original) Since then, Blakey has been bombarded with input and interpretations from both sides of the lone gunman/conspiracy divide, yet he clings to the assertion that the Mob killed JFK and got away with it. To Blakey, the Mob is the evil in the world and he has spent his life working on removing their power and influence. The sense of control and the restoration of order and justice this provides is why somebody as knowledgeable of how organised crime works as he is believes “that the murder of Lee Harvey Oswald by Jack Ruby had all the earmarks of a gangland slaying.”

Whereas, as Bugliosi writes: “About the only similarity between Ruby’s killing of Oswald and a mob hit is that mob killings are nearly always accomplished by use of a handgun. But of course, most homicides, period, are committed with a handgun.” By making believers like Blakey feel that they are masters of their own destiny – or at least providing the possibility that one day they could be if the evil holding them back is removed – conspiracy theory becomes an essential pillar of their belief system. Finally, belief in conspiracy theory can be a leisure activity and provide enjoyment.

Leisure

It may not be the sole reason why somebody resorts to conspiracy theory, but the fun people have when reading about, researching and studying one is certainly an important factor. Conspiracy theory is the ultimate piece of storytelling: one creates or buys into a narrative which can be personally dictated and narrated. They can live in it and be the hero, if they crack the case. A full cast of characters can be chosen, both good and evil, and an ongoing plot can be formulated.

Conspiracy theory taps a popular appetite for intrigue and mystery, like any film or television thriller. The reputation of conspiracy theory, especially one like the Kennedy assassination, is built upon foundations of mystery. It is considered that the case has a genuine puzzle at its core which could be cracked if one invests enough time and rearranges the pieces properly. The conspiracy theorist assumes the role of a character like Sherlock Holmes or Miss
Marple, determined to solve the mystery. The difference between conspiracy theory and film and television is that the latter are disassociated experiences, whereas conspiracy theory is very active. One watches and follows the line of thinking and adventures of Holmes, but one cannot influence them. With conspiracy theory, one can alter the story and manipulate any element as desired; in this regard, conspiracy theory is more akin to video games in which the player can decide the storyline through their characters’ actions.

This being said, a conspiracy theorist can also use conspiracy theory as a disassociated, remote leisure activity: reading books on the subject, listening to the radio, watching television programmes, going to the movies. These conspiracy theorists may not do their own research and it may not become an obsession, but they will still tune in for a new instalment whenever they desire. Conspiracy theory is not always people searching with a sense of duty to find the conspirators – it can be just a fun activity which provides a thrill.

Conspiracy theory is complex. People can create conspiracy theories because of reasons ranging from wanting a bit of fun to having a full blown existential crisis - no one reason we have analysed has a monopoly. Some factors are more important than others, however. Agency panic is incredibly significant to an understanding of why conspiracy theories are created. If somebody is marginalised and/or dispossessed by society or life experience then they are more likely to turn to conspiracy theory as a way to retain a voice and maintain a form of stability in their lives. When this occurs, conspiracy theory becomes a conflict with authority: the official version versus the alternative reading. The dispossessed and the marginalised manipulate doubt in a narrative to retell how key events happened, so that they conform to their perception of the present day situation and what they recognise as the important issues.

Dispossession can come in many varieties as conspiracy theory does not always stem from minorities that are either not represented or underrepresented in government. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., JFK’s nephew, for example, believes that Oswald did not act alone in his uncle’s assassination. Kennedy, Jr. graduated from Harvard, he is a practicing attorney, he has a political voice (often featuring at Democratic rallies and being asked to endorse candidates like Hillary Rodham Clinton), he co-hosts a nationally syndicated talk radio programme, and he comes from an extremely wealthy family. The most apparent way that Kennedy, Jr. experiences dispossession is through the early and tragic deaths of numerous family members; hence, the point is that even the rich and powerful can be disposessed in some way and resort to conspiracy theory. Agency panic can affect everybody regardless of income or social stature.

Conspiracy theory giving closure, comfort and control back to the conspiracy theorist is also central. It is far more tolerable to associate JFK’s assassination with a complex plot – he died
for something, people wanted him dead, people die for a reason, everything happens for a reason – than to say we do not know why Oswald killed Kennedy. That his motive will never be known for sure is considered so appalling, such an abnegation of responsibility by the authorities, that it has been a foundation of conspiracy theory since Oswald was shot by Ruby. “Even people like me can’t, with any assurance, explain his motives”, wrote John McAdams, a lone gunman theorist. For this reason, JFK conspiracy theory can end up as the simple trigger question: can one man kill another for no apparent motive? JFK conspiracy theories answer this question in the negative, always giving an understandable motive to their cabal which they believe carried out the assassination. This is important because it soothes the believer and allows them to continue on in their own worldview, the conflicting thoughts having been resolved, they attain the sense of closure, comfort and control.

Conspiracy theory is created because it reassures the believer. Agency panic is resolved, conflict created by misinterpretation or being persuaded by another conspiracy theorist is disentangled, closure, comfort and control are restored, or stress is relieved as one finds time for leisure. In the third chapter, the role which conspiracy theory plays in modern American society will be analysed. It will weigh up whether the pain, distress and anguish that conspiracy theory can cause can be accepted as a necessary by-product of democratic society.
What role does conspiracy theory have in modern American society?

Conspiracy theory has existed throughout American history. Emanating from all levels of the power hierarchy, it will continue to come from the grass roots for as long as the United States remains a democracy. Government conspiracy theory, on the other hand, exists regardless of democratic principles. In totalitarian and undemocratic systems, conspiracy theory becomes the privilege of authority. Any unsanctioned grass roots anti-authority conspiracy theory can and most likely will result in harsh disciplinary action by the state. In the United States of America, one is allowed to talk about and spread the most heinous and malevolent anti-government conspiracy theory possible. The believer can organise a group of fellow believers, purchase a protest permit and march to the site of a national tragedy all the while proclaiming how the government caused it. Various different 9/11 Truther groups, for example, have been allowed to march through Manhattan to ground zero.¹

That conspiracy theorists can believe what they want, say what they want, and protest freely without the fear of reprisal, demonstrates how sacrosanct the right to free speech is, as protected in the First Amendment to the Constitution. This chapter will argue that the role that conspiracy theory plays in modern American society is that of a check for the balance of democracy. It will be shown that conspiracy theory is undoubtedly a problem, occasionally a very serious one, which can be harmful to conspiracy theorists and non-believers alike; however, it exists unimpeded in modern America because of the necessity of a far greater good.

The right to free speech is elementary to democracy. When someone is told what they can and cannot say, then the censor is, as John Stuart Mill wrote in his famous essay, ‘On Liberty’: “robbing the human race; posterity as well as the existing generation; those who dissent from the opinion, still more than those who hold it.”² This chapter will argue that conspiracy theory, through free speech, can help people learn about positions contrary to their own, which is an important universal thought experiment. Furthermore, one is able to comprehend that there are others who think differently, and that their own position might not be as widely respected as initially thought. This teaches people not to be afraid to hold unpopular opinions and beliefs – a further positive of a conspiracy theory which will also be analysed. Lastly, conspiracy theory can aid the transparency process. This chapter will include a micro study on Oliver Stone’s 1991 film JFK, both its conspiracy theory and how it helped get thousands of JFK assassination related files open to the public.

By looking at the dark side of conspiracy theory, the endeavour is to weigh up against the positives and to highlight where discrepancy and vigilance are needed. Conspiracy theorists often operate from the principle that the ends justify the means, but this can prove dangerous and
harmful to both themselves and others. Just how will be analysed, and so will how their beliefs
can affect their economic and personal wellbeing.

The polemicist Christopher Hitchens once wrote that conspiracy theory is “an ailment of
democracy. It is the white noise which moves in to fill the vacuity of the official version.” It is
without question that conspiracy theory can be a problem, sometimes a serious one. However, it
is a necessary by-product of democracy which is nowhere more epitomised than in the
democratic need for free speech.

Free Speech
Conspiracy theory is born of the principle of free speech. It benefits modern American society by
exemplifying this notion. In some sense, it is a litmus test for democracy – an undemocratic
society results in no conspiracy theories being formed at the grass roots level. In undemocratic
societies, conspiracy theory is a privilege of the powerful. For example, in Nazi Germany it was
exclusively the domain of the government and used as a political tool. On the odd occasion that a
conspiracy theory begins at the bottom, it is seen as a form of resistance and disciplinary action is
taken by the state. In a totalitarian system, there can only be one source of information – the
government – and for this reason, grass roots conspiracy theory cannot function. Democracy, on
the other hand, is founded on the code that everyone has a voice. Censorship not only harms the
censored, but also the enforcer because they are deprived of hearing other opinions. That
conspiracy theory is allowed is imperative to democracy, as Rosa Luxembourgh once wrote:
“freedom is always the freedom of dissenter.”

That conspiracy theory exists, even if it is extremely racist, sexist and/or hurtful, is
essential to democracy; for free speech also covers the freedom to offend. As Salman Rushdie
has written “What is freedom of expression? Without the freedom to offend, it ceases to exist.”
Should conspiracy theories about the Kennedy assassination or 9/11, for example, be censored
then it is impossible to know that the law will not be applied to cover up a real conspiracy. It is
arguable, if not certain, that if the Nixon administration had the power to censor reports and/or
the investigation into the Watergate break-in, then it would have done. For example, Bob
Haldeman, Richard Nixon’s Chief of Staff, was told by Nixon to get the CIA to stop the FBI
investigation into the source of funding for the burglary. When one considers the alternative, it
becomes quite apparent that one would rather live in a country where arrests are made for
corruption, than in one where arrests are never made for corruption.

It is always worth testing what one believes against a possible opponent and their
arguments – questioning why they believe something and what evidence is required to prove it.
This would be impossible without free speech.
It is insufficient to reply that one believes something because they have been told so; as Carl Sagan wrote in *The Demon Haunted World*: “the cure for a fallacious argument is a better argument, not the suppression of ideas.” Informing a conspiracy theorist that one just knows that Kennedy was not killed in the way they describe is tantamount to saying that no consideration has been put into how one has come to that position, that all of their work has been done by others.

Some conspiracy theorists, for example, state that the Mossad, the Israeli intelligence service, used the CIA and the Mob to kill Kennedy because, they say, he was pushing back against Israel’s nuclear program. How can one be sure that this is not the case, that there was no Jewish conspiracy to kill JFK? The theory affirms that Jack Ruby was born Rubinstein, was Jewish, and had ties to organised crime which was run, in their opinion, by Meyer Lansky, who was also Jewish. Newspapers in Jordan and Saudi Arabia speculated that Lyndon Johnson ordered the assassination on orders from the Mossad. How can one prove that this was not the case or that it was not, as Michael Collins Piper asserts, organised by the then recently resigned Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion? Not by declaring that one just knows it is wrong, but in the same way that other conspiracy theories are made redundant, by understanding what happened and testing the theory in the places where conspiracy theories often fall down, such as Dealey Plaza. Piper, for example, does not have any discussion in his book about the assassination itself, continually making statements like “Pinning down the truth of precisely what happened in Dealey Plaza will never be possible”. Taking on thought experiments such as this serve to refresh the understanding one has of a scenario, a theory, or an event. It is always time well spent as one may find that there are holes in their own theory which need addressing, as well as those in their opponents. This strengthening of a position, or rejection and acceptance of the other side if it is considered to be based on better evidence, is impossible without free speech as, opposition to the official version would not be present.

Free speech gives people the right: to be able to think for themselves, to investigate for themselves, and to publish their own findings. Conspiracy theory does this often, as it takes the difficult position of going against popular consensus and not standing with the majority – it teaches people to not be afraid to hold unpopular beliefs. This is important because sometimes the noblest positions are those taken against the majority. One, therefore, needs to learn to not rely upon the security of consensus, to question whether one is sure of one’s own views, and to ask if because everyone else believes it that means you should too.

That conspiracy theorists can make statements, write books, and promote movies which go against the official line is important to both the conspiracy theorists and everybody else because it is free speech in action. The question is simple: which is more important, free speech
or the end of conspiracy theory? In the previous chapters, it has been shown that conspiracy theory has always existed and that it will always exist in a democracy; hence the only way to be rid of it is to rule it illegal and punish those which promote it. In doing this, however, one loses the right to the freedom of speech, which is far more vital than any conspiracy theory. Free speech, the right to say what one wants when one wants without the fear of reprisal, is essential for the democratic process to work. Noam Chomsky quite rightly said that: “If we don’t believe in freedom of expression for people we despise, we don’t believe in it at all.” Democratic societies need the freedom of expression. The space left by the official version should be questioned. Doing so is essential because no entity is above lying to further their own agenda. This would not be possible if free speech was censored; hence, the greater good of democracy is more important than silencing conspiracy theory. Conspiracy theory can teach people not to be afraid to ask unpopular questions, to hold unpopular beliefs and to ferret out the truth against powerful institutions like the government; the latter is what the next section will be on: transparency.

**Transparency**

A surprising by-product of conspiracy theory is that it can aid transparency, and Oliver Stone’s conspiracy theory turned movie, *JFK*, superbly highlights this. By attempting to conclusively prove an alternative history, proposed by conspiracy theory, incorrect, governments on occasion will release documents to the public. *JFK*, for example, played an important role in the opening of thousands of sealed files which otherwise would have had to have been pried loose by Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests or declassified by the agencies themselves in due time, a process which neither the CIA nor the FBI are known for. To better understand how *JFK* helped transparency, it is important to grasp how and why the film caused so much of a stir when it was released on 20 December 1991; to this end, this section will start with an overview of the arguments caused by the movie.

*JFK* tells the story of a conspiracy behind the assassination of President Kennedy. It is told through Jim Garrison, the infamous district attorney of Orleans Parish, played by Kevin Costner, and his attempts to find the real killers. The movie culminates in the trial of Clay Shaw, who is found not guilty of being part of a conspiracy to kill JFK, as charged by Garrison. The script was based primarily upon Garrison’s book *On The Trail of the Assassins* and co-written by Oliver Stone and Zachary Sklar, Garrison’s editor. Stone also purchased the rights to *Crossfire* by Jim Marrs because, as Patricia Lambert has written, it was “an encyclopedia of assassination theories, which enabled Stone to draw on a wealth of information without spending more money on rights to other books.” It is clear that for a movie to be adapted from such questionable books and to have been so successful that the expertise of Stone – who in the five years previous had directed
**Platoon, Wall Street, and Born on the Fourth of July** – played a huge role. The other is that it caused a stir from very early on as the media caught wind of the project, which boosted ticket sales. A copy of an early draft of the script somehow found its way into the hands of George Lardner, Jr. of *The Washington Post*, who wrote a scathing review published on 19 May 1991, seven months before the film was released. From then on, Stone was public enemy number one and the controversy continued well into the next year.

The complaints were, as historian Robert A. Rosenstone noted in a 1992 article, “based on two notions: that a historical film is no more than a piece of written history transferred to the screen and thus subject to the same rules of historical practice; and, second, that a fact is a fact and history is little more than an organized compilation of such facts.” Stone had carefully pieced together a very clever movie which blurred the line between fact and fiction. Old footage was mixed in with new pieces shot in a similar style so that it was difficult for one to tell the difference. Furthermore, Stone took liberties creating composite characters, events and locations, which caused his critics to wax lyrical, for example, about how Kevin Bacon’s character Willie O’Keefe or Donald Sutherland’s X did not really exist. This was strange as “Drama demands the invention of incidents and characters”, Rosenstone also wrote, “because historical events rarely occur with the kind of shape, order, and intensity that will keep an audience in its seats.”

The issue is more how far one is allowed to drift from what they perceive to be the truth whilst still holding the line of argument that they have created for themselves. A movie may not be subject to the same rules as written works of history, for one there is not enough time, even in a 205 minute marathon like *JFK*, hence the need for composites, but the methodology one uses to form conclusions can be questioned in the same manner. Stone has as much right as anybody to make a film about a controversial issue. Like any conspiracy theorist, he is protected by free speech, but for that same reason the holes in his theory can be exposed like any other conspiracy theory. Jim Leavelle, the Dallas police detective to whom Oswald was handcuffed when he was shot by Ruby, summed the movie up when he said that it “got the city right and the person killed right, but there’s not much else that’s correct.”

The mistakes which Stone accepts as facts are similar to those of the pre-1970s JFK conspiracy theorists: the head-snap, and Ruby’s alleged mob connections, to name just two, probably because the first book he read on the assassination was Garrison’s.

It was argued by some, like film critics Roger Ebert and Pat Dowell, that Stone just wanted to make a movie, and to view it as just a movie, not a revision of history. Well, as a movie – and just a movie – *JFK* is interesting; it is engaging and it draws the viewer into its world. It is all one could ask for from a director at the peak of his powers, but this was not what Stone wanted *JFK* to be seen as and he said as much: “What I hope this film will do ... is remind people how much our
nation and our world lost when President Kennedy died, and to ask anew what might have happened and why”, “We did a lot of homework”, “Everything that we have in there we stand behind” (emphasis in original), “I’m shaping history to a degree” (emphasis in original), “Who owns reality? Who owns our history? He who makes it up so that most everyone believes it. That person wins.”19 Stone is a superb film director and amply managed to create the counter myth he desired.

It was understandable, therefore, that some audiences walked away believing JFK to be accurate. According to an NBC poll taken within two months of the release, 51 percent believed the hypothesis presented in JFK verbatim.20 “I was so taken by this movie ... Because I’m sick of this government. It’s such a joke. Like, we elect these people” said one student from a group that New York Newsday arranged to go and see the film. Another said that “I always thought Oswald was just a nut and another nut shot him ... That’s basically what I was taught. But now I’m convinced it was a plot.” One echoed the main outrage felt after watching the film “Why should I have to wait until 2039 or whenever it is to find out the truth? Why can’t something be done?”21 It turned out that something was done, as on 26 October 1992, in response to public outcry, Congress passed ‘The President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992,’ which ordered the release of all assassination related documents.22

The act created the Assassination Records Review Board (ARRB), which operated from 2 October 1994 to 30 September 1998. The board did not investigate the assassination but instead released or postponed for release (for a maximum 25 years from the act’s inception) all withheld documents relating to the assassination “so that the public could draw its own conclusions.”23 At a best guess, the amount of documentation, not including the Warren Commission and HSCA files, held in the JFK Assassination Records Collection at College Park, Maryland is now “around five million pages.”24 Including the Warren Commission and HSCA, the documents take up approximately 2,000 cubic feet of space in total. About five thousand full pages were postponed under the 25 year mandate “because the agencies involved said they contained information pertaining to national security and, in much fewer cases, personal privacy, and they recommended and requested that the release date for these pages or this information be postponed until 2017, and the ARRB agreed with the recommendation and so voted.”25

Conspiracy theory can on occasion aid the democratic process of transparency. The majority of these documents would have taken longer to be released if it were not for Oliver Stone’s conspiracy theory manufacturing a climate in which disclosure was possible. Admittedly FOIA requests had been reasonably successful before the ARRB. For example, 92 percent of Warren Commission documents had been released by 1992. So conspiracy theory’s contribution to Warren Commission transparency was only the remaining eight percent, which is still eight
percent more than would have probably been extracted had it not been for the ARRB and JFK. By causing such a public outcry, even if it was through half-truths, Oliver Stone’s movie increased the vast swathes of JFK assassination literature that people can wade through. Furthermore, if it was not for JFK, then some of the most skilled books on the assassination would not have been written. For example, Gerald Posner’s *Case Closed* had already been rejected by Random House in 1989 and 1990, but was reconsidered and accepted due to the renewed interest in the assassination, and Patricia Lambert’s masterful analysis of the legend of Jim Garrison, *False Witness*, would not have been worth attempting as Garrison had been all but forgotten outside of assassination conspiracy theory circles before Oliver Stone. Therefore, something can also be said for the high profile controversy created by conspiracy theory paving the way for much needed top quality scholarship. Conspiracy theory can aid the democratic process of transparency because it can cause a groundswell of outrage which forces the government to address the issues raised by releasing documentation – and this is a very important positive for the role of conspiracy theory in modern American society. In the next section we will examine the negative aspects which conspiracy theory can cause or contribute to.

**Ends and Means**

The first negative aspect that this chapter will examine is how the unimpeachable faith which conspiracy theorists have can lead one to do intolerable things because, to them, the ends – which amount to uncovering the conspiracy they envision – justify it. For the most part, Kennedy assassination conspiracy theorists are viewed as representing the moderate wing of conspiracy theory. Believers hold conventions, write books and update websites, but that is it – it is extremely rare for them to stage large protests in the streets like 9/11 Truthers do, the only one in recent memory is Alex Jones’ demonstration at the 50th anniversary memorial in Dallas. The reasoning for this lack of action is that, as Peter Knight has written, the assassination is no longer a live political issue. However, when a conspiracy theorist encounters someone who does not believe in their idea and who is willing to ask questions and debate about the minutiae of the assassination they take up a defensive position. In this situation, conspiracy theorists believe that the ends justify the means, so they make threats and appear to be willing to do socially unacceptable things to defend the integrity of their beliefs.

Conspiracy theory prevents an uninhibited rational discussion of events for the fear that believers will assume it to be an attack upon their personal belief system. In Kennedy assassination studies, subscribers to the lone-gunman theory are often the targeted. David Von Pein, the operator of several lone-gunman websites, wrote he has “never been contacted (or threatened with bodily harm) in person by one of the conspiracy kooks, but one nutjob did post a
message on an Internet newsgroup in 2009 that seemed to suggest he'd like to bomb my house”. 29 Author of Case Closed, Gerald Posner, said that nowadays he gets accused “of being part of the plot (or at least part of some massive cover-up)’, but that “after the publication of the hardcover edition of Case Closed, my wife, Trisha, and I, received threats so severe that ... a police investigation was temporarily opened up to look into whether those making the threats were just mouthing off or were truly posing an immediate danger. [In addition.] My publisher, Random House, received a large package of dead fish.” Posner added that he has “never had as vitriolic and abusive reaction to anything I published as happened when I concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald alone killed JFK.”30 This is not a universal experience—Professor John McAdams, the owner of The Kennedy Assassination Home Page, said that he gets “two or three ... [e-mails] a day, with a few being rather abusive, some of the rest simply asking for information, and a good number (perhaps half) simply complimenting my site”—but it does show how the defence of belief can intensify when faced with disagreement.31

It is not only people that feel Lee Harvey Oswald assassinated JFK alone and unaided who are singled out. Those whom conspiracy theorists consider to have been involved with or knew about the conspiratorial plot are also threatened. Oliver Stone’s muse, Jim Garrison, arrested Clay Shaw – a respectable New Orleans businessman – on 1 March 1967 for conspiring to murder John F. Kennedy. For the next seven years, until his death in 1974, Shaw “received death threats in the mail. Almost all of his money had been drained. He had been unable to find a job. And he had experienced devastating humiliation.”32

The only evidence Garrison found that supported his assertion was a product of his imagination. The conspiracy theory he was advocating at the time was a fantasy and this lack of substance was reflected by the jury in the 1969 trial deliberating for just 54 minutes over the ‘not guilty’ verdict.33 In addition to the unscrambling of numbers found in address books that we discussed in chapter one, the attack was based upon “three operating principles. One, anything that supported his conspiracy theory du jour—no matter how far-fetched and lacking in credibility the story was, no matter how the information was gained—is to be believed. Two, everything is fair in love, war, and a criminal prosecution. And three, “propinquity” (i.e. geographic proximity) suggests an incriminating connection.” (emphasis in original)34 Garrison’s record before his Kennedy investigation was not squeaky clean—he had arrested numerous homosexuals charging them with “being homosexual in an establishment with a liquor license”—but he had never taken such cases to trial, dropping them when someone outside of his office noticed the illegality.35

With Shaw, however, when it was suspected that he did not have any hard evidence, Garrison either claimed that some benevolent power – often the Pentagon or the CIA – was obstructing his investigation, or he created his own facts.
On Jim Garrison’s orders, the district attorney’s staff drugged, hypnotised and bribed witnesses, and coerced them into testifying against Shaw. One witness, Perry Raymond Russo, a 25-year-old insurance salesman from Baton Rouge, Louisiana, was injected with sodium pentothal before being interviewed and, just four days later, underwent recovered-memory therapy via hypnosis in an attempt to retrieve the repressed episodes Garrison claimed that he had. On both occasions Russo was suggestively given information pertaining to the case while he was in a subconscious state. He was allowed to testify at the trial because Garrison kept these processes a secret and Russo genuinely believed he had seen the things ‘revealed’ by the drugs and hypnosis.\(^{36}\)

In the name of a conspiracy theory, Garrison forwent prosecutorial standards and the law. He had abused his elected position and the power that came with it, and he did so because, to him, it was forgivable. If he had found, prosecuted and convicted the real killers of President Kennedy, he thought nobody would mind that he had bent the rules a bit. The ends justified the means; all of the wicked acts – drugging, bribing, hypnotising, lying, coercing – had to happen because it would get to the truth which Garrison knew existed. In an early interview he had outlined his philosophy when investigating the Kennedy assassination: “Black is white. White is black. I don’t want to be cryptic, but that’s the way it is.”\(^{37}\) In other words, he was right, everybody else was wrong, and he did not care who he stepped over to prove it. This rigid view led Garrison to prosecute an innocent man and hound him until his death with claims of perjury and corruption. Due to the concept of ends justifying the means, conspiracy theory gives permission for people to do things which otherwise would not have been considered beneficial. When the philosophy of ends justifying the means is combined both with conspiracy theory and power, it leaves room for awful things to happen.

Garrison is the most extreme example of a case in the Kennedy assassination. Others have been accused, but more often than not it is by a conspiracy theorist without any significant standing, so the accused does not end up in police custody like Shaw. For example, David Atlee Phillips, a former CIA agent, won a libel suit against the British newspaper *The Observer* which had serialised portions of Anthony Summers’ 1980 book *Conspiracy*. Summers had accused Phillips of knowing Oswald and, through some means, of having a hand in the assassination.\(^{38}\) And George Hickey, a Secret Service agent riding in the follow up car situated directly behind the President’s, was accused of accidentally firing the fatal shot in the 1992 book *Mortal Error* by Bonar Menninger.\(^{39}\) Upon the release of the paperback in 1998 Hickey sued and the case was settled on undisclosed terms.\(^{40}\) Since their deaths, however, the claims against Phillips, Hickey, and Shaw have all been repeated.\(^{41}\) Conspiracy theory justifies these actions because, the adherent believes, the end justifies the means.
It is rare for people to be accused by name, as conspiracy theorists often point the finger at faceless organisations and government agencies. This says a lot about how specificity is not essential for conspiracy theory to flourish, and how the worst excesses occur when individuals are singled out. Conspiracy theory can cause harm to others thanks to the conspiracy theorist’s belief that they are absolutely justified in their actions. The next section will be on how conspiracy theory can harm the conspiracy theorists themselves.

**Harm**

Conspiracy theorists perceive their group, culture or nation as needing to be saved from impending doom, hence leaving one in a never-ending fight against the forces of evil. This worldview can be harmful to its devotees. This section will examine how conspiracy theory is problematic because of the damage it causes – both economically and personally.

First, it is harmful to one’s finances to be a conspiracy theorist. For this reason, conspiracy theory could be considered a luxury. New expensive JFK conspiracy theory merchandise comes out every year: books, magazines, pamphlets, journals, DVDs – it costs a lot of money to keep up with the abundance of new opinions and theories. The conspiracy theory business is so lucrative that some have questioned whether those which gain from it have a vested interest in not concluding their investigation into the assassination. Echoing this, Knight wrote that conspiracy theorists “often have a personal investment in keeping research going—not to mention a financial investment in prolonging the process of inquiry, with the proliferation of convention speaking and web merchandising funding the amateur research network.”

One of David von Pein’s websites has a list of the “books, videos, DVDs, and other miscellaneous products associated with President John F. Kennedy and members of his family.” The list, described as “fairly comprehensive when it comes to the major books and videos that have been produced,” numbers over 650 items with prices ranging from $4 to well over a $100 for the rarer, out of print collectibles. To own all of the items on von Pein’s list would set one back at least $2,600, probably more. Conspiracy theorists often fight between themselves about the minutiae of their theories, referring to books one or other have not read as evidence of an incomplete inquiry. To be a well-researched, successful JFK assassination conspiracy theorist one has to have access to thousands of dollars worth of material, which only heightens the feeling that conspiracy theory is a luxury and damaging economically to the conspiracy theorist.

Conventions are held yearly in Dallas by rival organisations: ‘JFK Lancer’ and the ‘Committee on Political Assassinations’ (COPA). Both hire prominent researchers from the conspiracy theory community to be on panels or to give presentations. These researchers charge for their time and occasionally their travel and expenses, hence ticket prices for the conventions
are often rather substantial – between $150 and $350.\textsuperscript{45} The conventions themselves are filled with stands of conspiracy theorists attempting to sell their own merchandise at special “convention only” prices, so one may end up spending vast sums in a weekend in order to be up-to-date.

The constant turnover of material which conspiracy theorists use to undertake their research has to be continually supplemented with newfound interpretations – concluding is not possible without having the big picture: books are bought, conferences are attended and money continues to be outgoing.

In addition to financial aspects, conspiracy theory can be damaging to a believer’s wellbeing. The most helpful example departs from the JFK assassination case study and ventures into alternative medicine. Conspiracy theorists claim that alternative medicine and its practices “are allegedly known to be valid by authoritative institutions but are suppressed because the institutions fear the consequences of public knowledge or have some evil or selfish motive for hiding the truth.”\textsuperscript{46} The anti-vaccination movement is one of the foremost examples. Anti-vaccination conspiracy theorists allege that vaccines are harmful and that those responsible for them know this but continue with distribution because either they have too much to lose, they do not care, or because it is all part of a grand evil scheme.\textsuperscript{47}

The vaccine most campaigned against continues to change, currently it is MMR (measles-mumps-rubella). There are still strands and cliques committed to dealing with other varieties, but the focus has been on MMR since a 1998 paper claimed it causes autism or autistic disorders. The paper “was later found to be seriously flawed, and … has been retracted by the journal that published it”; however, the conspiracy theory, and its devastating consequences, continue.\textsuperscript{48} These three preventable diseases routinely manifest in outbreaks in the United States, and since 2008 there have been at least 650 cases of measles diagnosed.\textsuperscript{49} For example, in Kansas in 2013 there were 175 cases of measles reported, the majority “of the people who contracted the virus had not been vaccinated.”\textsuperscript{50} In the San Diego area in 2008 an outbreak was traced back to an unvaccinated seven year old, and all of the 12 people it was transmitted to “were not vaccinated either because they were younger than one – the minimum age for measles inoculation – or because their parents declined to have them vaccinated.”\textsuperscript{51} Conspiracy theory can put adherents, their dependants and their communities at great risk – a risk which no person would ever conceive of taking unless they were utterly convinced of their position. Once again, conspiracy theory rationalises and discards risk and puts the believer and others at risk of dangers which they are blissfully unaware of.

To be fair, it should be noted that the anti-vaccination conspiracy theories are at the extreme end of the conspiracy theory spectrum when it comes to activism. Due to constant
campaigning, it is a relatively common conspiracy theory with a large numbers of subscribers. The high profile nature of the 1998 paper has led to the common misconception that parents have to make an extremely difficult decision which comes down to perceptions of risk and chance. Most people know what autism is and what effects the disorder has; whereas it is likely that one does not know how measles, mumps or rubella are transmitted or the results of contracting them. The vaccine has been linked with autism by the media in the late 1990s and by the anti-vaccination movement ever since; furthermore, the news that the study was found to be fraudulent was not carried as widely or for as long as the news that vaccines might cause autism. Hence, parents may seemingly be left with a very unfortunate but misinformed question: would one prefer their child to have an increased chance of getting autism and no chance of contracting measles, mumps and rubella, or not?

As with every other conspiracy theory, anti-vaccination comes down to doubt in authority. The medical and pharmaceutical industries have made some grave errors—proscribing thalidomide to pregnant women to relieve nausea and morning sickness, for example—so it is understandable that if there is even the slightest possibility that the MMR vaccine causes autism, then it needs to be removed. That the paper used to reinforce claims about vaccine safety was withdrawn because the study was fundamentally flawed and dishonest, yet the movement still continues, shows how conspiracy theory exists within its own vacuum. It also shows that conspiracy theory, at its most extreme as exemplified by the anti-vaccinationists, can cause harm to adherents and those close to them.

Conspiracy theory continues to be problematic in the United States. It cannot be doubted that it can lead to deplorable things, both harmful to the conspiracy theorists and to others. For example, Jordan Ghawi, whose sister, Jessica, was killed in a mass shooting in a cinema in Aurora, Colorado in July 2012, was contacted by conspiracy theorists “saying that I was a crisis actor, that this was a government false flag operation, ... [that] the government is out to pull the wool over our eyes ... [and] mislead us to let Obama take away gun rights.” The abuse was so bad that Ghawi even received a death threat.52 That conspiracy theorists justify this type of action by believing that they are completely in the right is troubling and leads most to conclude that conspiracy theory needs to be dealt with in some way.

The freedom of expression, however, is more important than attempting to nullify conspiracy theory, even in its most abhorrent form. The greater good of democracy overrides any desire to silence those pushing theories of conspiracy. The lack of conspiracy theories beginning at the lowest level of power, the grass roots, is a good indicator of an undemocratic society; hence, it stands that conspiracy theory is a check for the balance of democracy. Freedom of
speech is far more important than conspiracy theory, and freedom of speech can only exist in a democracy; therefore, conspiracy theory must continue uninhibited.
Conclusion

Conspiracy theory should be allowed to continue unimpeded because it is a by-product of democracy and therefore, at least in the United States, protected by freedom of expression. Conspiracy theorists are rightly able to disseminate any number of conflicting counter-narratives. This thesis has sought to understand how and why conspiracy theory begins and what role it then plays in modern American society. The phenomenon has been addressed so that it can be better understood and reconciled within the processes of democracy. Conspiracy theory will always be there. If a course for eradication of conspiracy theory was ever put into practice then free speech will be lost, along with democracy. It is imperative, therefore, that the United States learns to live with conspiracy theory and all its implications.

This conclusion will look at: any the implications of the findings of the present thesis upon the study of conspiracy theory itself; whether any recommendations for future research can then be made; any limitations that were uncovered during the process; and what the overall significance of understanding conspiracy theory might be. To put things in context, however, it is first necessary to reiterate this work’s findings to date.

The phenomenon of conspiracy theory can and should be accepted within the processes of democracy. It has been shown that conspiracy theory can begin for many reasons. The innate biases present within all human beings and a constant search for agency, especially when an individual or individuals feel dispossessed, show that belief in conspiracy theory is possible for anybody and everybody. Should any of these elements then combine with doubt regarding an official narrative or an established form of authority, such as the media or the government, conspiracy theory is born. Doubt can result from misinterpretation, persuasion or a predisposition to conspiracy theory. A conspiracy theory begins with this doubt, as individuals attempt to restore or reassert whatever they believe is sanity in their personal narrative, thus providing themselves with agency. This process suggests that conspiracy theories will likely always exist in the United States.

Moreover, it was shown that conspiracy theory is a necessary by-product of democracy, despite its negative qualities. It can be a cause of terrible events, as conspiracy theorists often subscribe to the philosophy that their given ends justify all necessary means. It is very much hoped that these more extreme instances can be tackled individually, within the rule of law, since conspiracy theory itself must be left untouched. This is because it can aid the process of democracy in two distinct ways: firstly, by pushing for transparency, as this can sometimes lead to
the release of classified documentation into the public sphere, which would otherwise have to be 
pried loose by lawsuits. Secondly, and most importantly, conspiracy theory is an example of free 
speech, which is sacrosanct, and indeed the main article of the First Amendment to the United 
States Constitution. Any attempt to curb conspiracy theory would necessitate an invocation of 
censorship. Conspiracy theory, for all its problems, is a by-product of democracy. Trying to curtail 
it would cause serious damage to the latter, which is demonstrably more important than 
conspiracy theory. Nonetheless, there are some ways that scholars can look to discredit most 
dangerous types and, moreover, understand conspiracy theory both as a phenomenon and what 
it explains about the United States.

The findings of this thesis are such that the notion of conspiracy theory can and should be 
understood better and not simply expelled to the margins. Too often in the study of conspiracy 
theory, the author or authors take it upon themselves to work out how to deal with conspiracy 
theory. This usually results in demonization of both conspiracy theory and conspiracy theorists, 
and an all too brief discussion over whether there is a proper or acceptable way for society to be 
rid of it.¹ The paper by Cass Sunstein and Adrian Vermeule, which was discussed in the 
introduction, is just one attempt in a long line of wrongheaded solutions to cure conspiracy 
thorists. By this thesis showing that conspiracy theory can affect most anybody, and at almost 
any time, it is hoped that these somewhat hysterical overreactions appear less in studies of the 
phenomenon of conspiracy theory. Especially in the light of the implications the subject has for 
freedom of expression and democracy.

That conspiracy theory is protected by freedom of speech does not mean, however, that 
it should be allowed equal time, all of the time, because that depends entirely on the place, time, 
scope, and the opinions of the regulating body. If one were to write an in-depth history of the 
Kennedy assassination, for the layman, then, at the very least, one would have to include a 
discussion of the more popular conspiracy theories, because of the cultural standing the event has 
– this would be entirely acceptable. If such a book were to be written by Michael Collins Piper, 
then one should not be surprised if it is hugely antisemitic and includes overt references to a 
global Zionist conspiracy. However, it is entirely the choice of publishers whether they want to 
publish these types of books or not, and it is further the choice of readers as to whether they wish 
to read them or not – no restrictions should be put in place to prevent either. If one were writing 
a medical guide on vaccinations for first time parents which included an in-depth discussion of the 
beliefs of anti-vaccinationists, framed as a straight choice between autism or measles, mumps and
rubella for their newborn child, then the author should not be surprised that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention turns down the option to endorse it. This would not be a case of discrimination against the conspiracy theorist, but the exercising of the right of the CDC to refuse to put their name to something they do not believe in or could in anyway support. Similarly, if one were writing a school history textbook, which includes Heribert Illig’s Phantom Time Hypothesis – which states that the years between 614 AD and 911 AD did not happen – then it would be understandable if schools declined to use it for curriculum or study purposes. The point is that beliefs should not be forced upon non-believers. To this end, conspiracy theory is essential as a check to see whether free speech still exists. If they have not been forced to be quiet or change their beliefs, then it is a good indication that freedom of expression is allowed.

This study was based upon uniting ideas from both the social sciences and the humanities for a study of conspiracy theory. Doing this allowed ideas and reasons for how and why conspiracy theory occurs to be mutually supportive and more useful overall. Recent works on conspiracy theory, such as David Aaronovitch’s Voodoo Histories and Kathryn Olmsted’s Real Enemies, have provided an overview of the history of conspiracy theory and why in each individual case they blossom. The latter examined the United States; the former had a far wider lens and looked at Europe too. These studies originated in journalism and the humanities, which meant that while it was pointed out that gaps and mistakes in, for example, the Warren Report led to a slew of conspiracy theories, no explanation was given as to why someone might challenge authority in this way. The same can be said of the 2013 book The United States of Paranoia by Jesse Walker, the editor of Reason magazine. Walker writes how the chosen conspirators are essential to understanding the anxieties of the believer at the time, and that conspiracy theories should be seen as a form of folklore, but he neglects to mention psychology until the epilogue, at which point 330 pages have passed and it appears to be irrelevant to his discussion.

From the psychological point of view, there are no books solely on its application to conspiracy theory, which is discouraging because there have been some superb experiments done on the topic – for example the 2012 research from the team in Kent which was referenced and applied in Chapter Two. The 2011 book by Michael Shermer, The Believing Brain, has a chapter on conspiracy theory. Shermer used the 9/11 Truthers as his case study, a movement which was built out of the disillusion felt with the Bush administration’s decision to fight the Iraq War. This is not mentioned, however, and Shermer takes several pages to dismantle 12 selected claims that there was a conspiracy, all of which are done through the application of psychology and logical thinking – hence, he covers the how, not the why.
Assimilating ideas from both fields was exceptionally useful when analysing conspiracy theory in this thesis because both sides affect one another. It gave an effective starting point to begin to examine how conspiracy theory and democracy coexist.

Debate over conspiracy theory is extensive and ongoing. To build upon the current understanding more interdisciplinary, collaborative work needs to be done between the social sciences and the humanities. Splitting down the middle makes for bifurcation and an incomplete picture whenever one ventures into the study of conspiracy theory. There are some excellent researchers within both disciplines who have some very intelligent ideas, but it will be difficult, if not impossible, to come to a well rounded conclusion unless input is given, received, appreciated and understood by both fields. The sociological and psychological aspects of conspiracy theory exist, as does the affect of history and politics on the mind of the conspiracy theorist. To look at just one side is to analyse within a bubble. Continuing the united approach exhibited here will greatly enhance how conspiracy theory is perceived and how it is to be approached from within democracy.

This thesis delved into two dense schools of study, for that reason the limitations, which became apparent as the study progressed, need to be considered. The conspiracy theorists that were mentioned, discussed and whose theories were analysed, were given a voice through their published works, what others had written about them, and any recordings of public appearances that were available on the internet. This often provided more questions than answers, as was the case when David Lifton and his body alteration conspiracy theory were investigated in the first chapter. A fruitful future avenue of research would be to conduct interviews. Interviewing Lifton would provide greater insight into his thought processes and experience. Time was a pressing factor throughout, so the methodology that was used to best understand how and why Lifton, Oliver Stone, Jim Garrison, Mark Lane, Revilo Oliver, Robert Blakey, Robert Groden, Dick Gregory, Jim Fetzer, and Jim Marrs became conspiracy theorists was necessary and did in fact provide a focused line of inquiry. Restriction to these sources also meant that the study could be accomplished in the allotted period. Therefore, it suggests the possibility to expand upon this subject for future doctoral work by interviewing the many still living first and second wave JFK conspiracy theorists.

The overall significance of this study on conspiracy theory is that it has been effective in combining what is known through the social sciences and what is known because of the humanities. It is hoped that the academy builds upon this work and that some collaborative
approach be achieved in the future, because it is only through an endeavour of this kind that a comprehensive study of conspiracy theory can be fully achieved. This thesis has shown that anyone, indeed everyone, is capable of initiating or subscribing to some sort of conspiracy theory. The biases we exhibit as humans are fundamentally irrational and geared to creating patterns. When this is combined with a sense of doubt – which could be established by a perceived loss of agency amongst other things – then it is far more likely that belief in conspiracy theory will be established. Furthermore, it is for this reason that the United States cannot be rid of conspiracy theory, it will exist for as long as circumstances allow. Free speech, an indispensable aspect of living in a democratic society, protects it, and democracy cannot function without free speech. Conspiracy theory must be allowed to remain a part of American society; as to suppress it, to attempt to eradicate it, would have truly unthinkable consequences.
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