~I agree more with Charles Pigden’s point of view than I do with Neil Levy’s one. I agree with what Pigden says whenever he says that you should not automatically not believe conspiracy theories just because they deal with western governments or just because they are conspiracy theories. You should see what they are trying to say and treat them as individual ones when you are deciding whether or not to believe them. You should investigate them. I also agree with this one because I think that it is stupid to just say, “oh, this is a conspiracy theory, that automatically makes it not true.” What you have just said is what is definitely not true! The conspiracy theory, on the other hand, could very well possibly be true, it just needs more evidence before you can say it is definitely a true one. I do agree with this one, because  I think you should not just say, “oh, this is just a conspiracy theory, I do not believe this one”, just for that specific reason. I think they should be treated equally and investigated, just like regular ones. In a courtroom, suspects are “innocent until proven guilty”.

 In sort of the same way, conspiracy theories are taken seriously and investigated until they are proven to not be true. In Pigden’s article, he says believes that conspiracy theories are no different than regular theories, and you should investigate them, just like you would with regular ones. He also says, “For the concept of a conspiracy theory as it is commonly employed is a chauvinist construct. it is not to be understood in terms of governments generally, but in terms of *western* governments, and recent western ones at that.” On the other hand, I do not agree with Neil Levy’s point of view because Neil Levy’s main idea is that “epistemic authorities” have more rights to explain stories/theories than regular people do. Also, he says that people “overestimate their ability to explain/find fault in original/official stories“, and that they should not be so quick to judge original stories. Also, you should always believe the original story, even if it is a conspiracy theory, because it is more accurate than “alternative” ones; it is the “official” one. I do not agree with this theory because I do not know if you should always believe the original story, but I do believe that it is more accurate than any other one, simply because it is the original one. Also, I think that the “epistemic authorities” probably do have more rights to explain stories/theories, and they are probably more accurate than other ones would be if they tried to explain them.