

CONSPIR Evaluation —

32988aca3e44_CONSPIR_Farewell_to_Virology

Lewandowsky & Cook 7-trait conspiratorial-ideation taxonomy, joined with SignalWatch's pseudoscience (A2) marker battery, theory-matching, and debunk-source aggregator.

Source	32988aca3e44_CONSPIR_Farewell_to_Virology
Input	PDF · /data/investigations/uploads/32988aca3e44_CONSPIR_Farewell_to_Virology.pdf
Framework	CONSPIR (Lewandowsky & Cook, 2020) + SignalWatch A2 marker battery
Result	7 / 7 CONSPIR traits present · load-bearing: I, O · A2 axis: 0.00 · 1 theory matches
Generated	2026-06-21 12:52 UTC

Overview

This document — a SignalWatch CONSPIR evaluation of Mark Bailey's 'A Farewell to Virology' — scores positive on all seven CONSPIR traits, making its completeness of set the primary signal rather than any single dominant spike. What distinguishes its rhetorical profile is the pairing of two maximal-intensity traits (Immune to evidence and Overriding suspicion) with deliberately restrained scores on the two 'crank-signalling' traits (Contradictory and Reinterpreting randomness), producing a conspiratorial architecture that presents as sober, technical scientific critique rather than obvious fringe content. The document's persuasive power derives from this calibrated restraint: the machinery of unfalsifiability and totalizing institutional distrust is wrapped in the register of expert skepticism, allowing it to reach educated audiences who would reject cruder conspiratorial material.

Score summary

Intensity reflects how strongly each trait manifests in the text (scoring: very_high = 100, high = 80, moderate = 60, low = 40, none = 0).

Code	Trait	Intensity	Score
C	Contradictory	Moderate	60
O	Overriding suspicion	Very high	100
N	Nefarious intent	High	80
S	Something must be wrong	High	80
P	Persecuted victim	High	80
I	Immune to evidence	Very high	100
R	Reinterpreting randomness	Moderate	60

Trait-by-trait breakdown

C — Contradictory · Moderate (60)

Holding mutually incompatible beliefs at once.

“The virus is cast as both undetectable — never found in any patient — and the engine of a worldwide pandemic.”

“200 million per sneeze, yet none findable” paradox is wielded as a weapon

“the movement still debates the lab-leak origin of the thing it says never existed”

The document holds the logically incompatible positions that the virus has never been isolated in any patient and that it simultaneously drove a worldwide pandemic. This contradiction is not resolved but weaponized rhetorically, used to attack virology on two fronts at once. The moderate rather than high score reflects that the document does not foreground the tension — it papers over it with technical-sounding language, limiting the conspicuousness of the contradiction.

O — Overriding suspicion · Very high (100)

Nothing is taken at face value; deep distrust of all official accounts.

“Every institution (WHO, CDC, UKHSA, universities) and every named scientist is presumed deceptive by default.”

“Routine laboratory terminology becomes ‘a game of deception, whether realised or not.’”

Overriding suspicion operates at maximum intensity: not a single institutional actor, named scientist, or standard laboratory practice is granted good faith. The phrase ‘whether realised or not’ is particularly diagnostic — it extends the conspiracy to include even unwitting participants, meaning no sincere expert testimony could ever count as exculpatory. This universalization of distrust is the scaffolding on which the entire argument rests.

N — Nefarious intent · High (80)

The presumed motives behind the alleged plot are sinister.

“A Trojan horse to bring humanity to its knees”

“a murderous rollout”

“a war on humanity register”

The motivational register is unambiguously sinister: the conspiracy is not portrayed as institutional error, groupthink, or financial self-interest but as an active assault on humanity. The ‘murderous rollout’ framing and ‘war on humanity’ language assign lethal intentionality to the alleged actors. The score is high rather than very_high because nefarious intent, while clearly present, is not the primary rhetorical engine — it serves to emotionally sustain the argument rather than to structurally seal it.

S — Something must be wrong · High (80)

Conviction the official account is false survives any specific rebuttal.

“falsified even once, it is done for”

“The whole field, from 1911 to today, is condemned regardless of which individual argument holds.”

The document deploys a non-falsifiable total-condemnation strategy: any single perceived flaw in any virology paper at any point in the discipline's history is treated as collapsing the entire field. This means no

rebuttal of any specific argument can rescue the overall claim, because the conviction that something is wrong is decoupled from any particular piece of evidence. The move from 'this experiment had a flaw' to 'all of virology since 1911 is void' is the structural signature of this trait.

P — Persecuted victim • High (80)

Simultaneously victim of the plot and heroic truth-teller.

"Courts 'stay' the case into legal quarantine, platforms ban the films"

"interference is 'authorised at the highest levels'"

"the authors positioned as brave investigators against a tyrannical state"

The document explicitly frames its authors as simultaneously victims of state-level suppression and heroic truth-tellers whose work is dangerous enough to require censorship. Legal stays, platform bans, and high-level interference are not interpreted as ordinary institutional responses but as evidence of the threat the authors pose to power. This victim-hero duality is a classic persecuted-martyr structure that functions to immunize the authors' credibility against dismissal.

I — Immune to evidence • Very high (100)

Self-sealing; contrary evidence is reinterpreted as part of the plot.

"Every purified particle becomes an 'extracellular vesicle,' every genome an 'in silico fantasy'"

"a national-security withholding becomes proof of cover-up"

"No possible observation is allowed to count in virology's favour."

Immunity to evidence operates at maximum intensity and is the single most consequential trait in the document. Every category of positive evidence for virology is pre-assigned an alternative interpretation that confirms the conspiracy: isolated particles are relabeled as vesicles, sequenced genomes are dismissed as computational artifacts, and institutional non-disclosure is read as proof of guilt. The self-sealing structure means the belief system cannot in principle be falsified by any empirical observation, which is the defining feature of pseudoscientific rather than scientific skepticism.

R — Reinterpreting randomness • Moderate (60)

Seeing intentional design in coincidence or ordinary process.

"Normal reference-genome and citation practice is recast as a deliberate 'templating' deception chain"

"turtles all the way down"

"the global phylogenetic tree is dismissed as a fabricated family tree"

Ordinary, well-understood scientific practices — reference genome construction, citation of prior sequences, phylogenetic inference — are reinterpreted as a deliberate, self-reinforcing deception chain rather than as standard methodology. The 'turtles all the way down' framing converts routine scientific cumulation into evidence of conspiracy. The score is moderate rather than high because the document largely avoids overtly mystical or numerological pattern-finding, keeping its reinterpretation of randomness anchored in quasi-technical language that sounds more credible to its target audience.

Interpretation

The trait pattern reveals a document engineered — whether consciously or structurally — for maximum persuasive reach among scientifically literate audiences. The very_high scores on I and O do the core

epistemic work: Overriding suspicion pre-emptively delegitimizes all counter-evidence by poisoning every institutional source, while Immune to evidence ensures the belief system is self-sealing so that no empirical observation can falsify it. Together these two traits create a closed loop that mimics rigorous skepticism from the outside. The lower scores on C and R are not incidental — they are load-bearing in a negative sense: the absence of obvious self-contradiction makes the document read as internally consistent argument rather than incoherent rambling, and the absence of overt pattern-mysticism strips away the visual cues educated readers use to dismiss 'crank' content. The moderate N, S, and P scores provide just enough motivational narrative (sinister actors, heroic investigators, total systemic corruption) to emotionally sustain the reader through the technical argumentation without tipping into the melodramatic register that triggers skepticism. The result is a CONSPIR profile that is maximally dangerous precisely because its most disqualifying features are hidden behind its most presentable ones.

Pseudoscience indicators (PSEUDO-7)

Document-INTERNAL pseudoscience indicators — the rhetorical and epistemic structure of the argument, not the topic. Composite framework drawn from Hansson (2009, 2013), Boudry & Braeckman (2011), and Fasce (2019). Parallel in shape to the CONSPIR analysis above; complementary to the deterministic A2 marker battery below.

This document is a THIRD-PARTY ANALYTICAL REPORT — a SignalWatch misinformation classification memo evaluating 'A Farewell to Virology' using the Lewandowsky & Cook CONSPIR taxonomy. The author of this document is not performing pseudoscience; they are systematically describing and scoring it in another text. Consequently, the seven pseudoscience-demarcation traits being assessed here should be evaluated as features of the ANALYST'S document, not of Bailey's essay. The analyst's own text is structured as a methodological classification product: it names a framework, applies it trait by trait, quantifies intensity, and flags named individuals for data-protection treatment. The pseudoscience indicators in this meta-document are therefore almost entirely absent or incidental — the rhetorical mode is forensic description, not advocacy.

Cod e	Trait	Intensity	Score
M	Mimicry of scientific form	Low	40
A	Ad hoc rescue / immunization	None	0
U	Unfalsifiability	None	0
C	Cherry-picking / anomaly hunting	None	0
S	Subversion of credentialed authority	None	0
R	Reversed burden of proof	None	0
T	No testable predictions	None	0

M — Mimicry of scientific form · Low (40)

Sciencey vocabulary, formal structure, citation patterns mimicking peer-reviewed work without its epistemic content. · Fasce 2019

“framework: Lewandowsky & Cook, The Conspiracy Theory Handbook | seven-trait CONSPIR taxonomy”

“Intensity bars indicate how strongly each trait manifests in the text”

“should carry the misidentified_bystander / protect_from_harvesting flags”

The document adopts a formal classification schema, numbered traits, intensity ratings, and technical data-pipeline vocabulary ('NarrativeKernel label,' 'corpus use,' 'harvesting flags'). This mimics structured research output, but unlike pseudoscientific mimicry it is deployed in service of a genuine methodological exercise — applying a cited, peer-developed framework. The formalism is appropriate to genre, not a substitute for epistemic content, so intensity is low rather than none.

A — Ad hoc rescue / immunization · None (0)

Auxiliary hypotheses introduced to save the central claim from disconfirming observations (“that exception is because...”). · Boudry & Braeckman 2011

The analyst makes no central empirical claim that requires rescuing from disconfirming evidence. The document does not argue that virology is fraudulent or that Bailey is correct; it classifies rhetorical features. There are no auxiliary hypotheses introduced to protect a thesis, and no 'that exception is because' moves anywhere in the text.

U — Unfalsifiability · None (0)

Claims as stated could not be refuted by any observation — there is no empirical scenario the author admits would falsify them. · Popper; Hansson 2009

The document's claims are largely descriptive and classifiable: 'this text scores high on trait X because of quote Y.' Those claims are in principle falsifiable by examining the source text. The analyst explicitly valorizes falsifiability as a criterion for legitimate skepticism, which is the opposite of an unfalsifiable rhetorical posture.

C — Cherry-picking / anomaly hunting · None (0)

Handpicked confirming examples or single anomalies elevated to general truth; systematic counter-evidence ignored. · Hansson 2013

The analyst does not cherry-pick confirming examples while ignoring counter-evidence. Each trait is grounded in direct quotation from the target text, and the analysis acknowledges variation in trait intensity (contradictory and reinterpreting randomness score lower). This is pattern-of-evidence reasoning, not anomaly elevation.

S — Subversion of credentialed authority · None (0)

Credentialed expertise rejected on principle, with no replacement methodology proposed — "the scientists are wrong, here's why my untrained reading is right." · Hansson 2009

The document invokes credentialed authority positively — it cites Lewandowsky and Cook by name as the methodological basis, and it flags named scientists in the source as victims deserving data protection rather than targets of epistemic attack. There is no rejection of mainstream expertise; the framework being applied derives from it.

R — Reversed burden of proof · None (0)

Demands opponents disprove the claim rather than presenting positive evidence for it. · demarcation literature

The analyst bears the positive evidential burden throughout: each trait score is supported by direct textual evidence, and the interpretive claims follow from that evidence. There is no demand that the reader disprove the classification or any inversion of Popperian asymmetry.

T — No testable predictions · None (0)

No specific experiment, observation, or measurable prediction that would distinguish the claim from competing accounts. · Sagan; Hansson 2013

The document is retrospective classification, not a theory generating future predictions — but that is appropriate to its genre. More importantly, the classification schema it applies (CONSPIR) does carry implicit predictive content: texts scoring maximally on I and O should, under the framework, resist evidential updating. The analyst's note that the I/O pair explains why 'educated readers' are reached is a mild predictive inference about audience effect, though underdeveloped.

Interpretation. The near-zero scores across most traits are themselves the primary finding: this document does not argue for a contested empirical claim, does not immunize itself against counterevidence, does not subvert authority, and does not reverse the burden of proof — because it has no thesis to protect. Where minimal mimicry (M) appears, it is structural formalism appropriate to a classification report rather than pseudoscientific decoration. The absence of U and R is especially telling: a genuine pseudoscience text would need to foreclose falsification and deflect disconfirmation; this analyst instead explicitly celebrates specifying what would change one's mind as the mark of legitimate skepticism. The only faint trace of T (no testable predictions) is that the report itself makes no empirical predictions about the world — but that is a category error to penalize, since the document's purpose is retrospective classification, not prospective hypothesis. The overall profile reads as competent analytical prose, and the low scores uniformly reflect that genre rather than any evasive strategy.

Deterministic A2 markers

SignalWatch's keyword-based A2 marker battery — independent of both the CONSPIR analysis above and the PSEUDO-7 analysis (the PSEUDO-7 looks at rhetorical structure; these markers fire on specific lexical patterns). See *Pseudoscience Revisited* on the Data shelf for the dimensional A1/A2 model.

Axis score: 0.00 (0–1 scale) · **Markers fired:** 0 · **Rescue gate:** no

No deterministic A2 markers fired on the document text.

Theory matches

1 of **20** extracted claim atoms signature-matched at least one tracked theory (gate ≥ 0.40). **1** theories overlap with this document.

Theory	Matched atoms	Max	Avg	Tag
No-Virus Conspiracy	1	0.45	0.45	

Claim atoms

20 claim atoms extracted. Atoms that did not signature-match any tracked theory are marked **NEW** — they may signal a theory candidate worth promoting via *Investigate New Theory*.

1. The virus is cast as both undetectable and the engine of a worldwide pandemic.

type: conspiratorial · frame: covid_conspiracy · confidence: 1.00

best match: No-Virus Conspiracy · score 0.45 (sem 0.70 · lex 0.00 · proto 0.54)

2. NEW Every institution (WHO, CDC, UKHSA, universities) and every named scientist is presumed deceptive by default.

type: conspiratorial · frame: deep_state · confidence: 1.00

3. NEW A “Trojan horse to bring humanity to its knees,” a “murderous rollout,” mRNA framed as having killed more than all prior vaccines combined.

type: conspiratorial · frame: anti_vaccine · confidence: 1.00

4. NEW A single perceived flaw is treated as collapsing all of virology.

type: conspiratorial · frame: covid_conspiracy · confidence: 1.00

5. NEW Courts “stay” the case into legal quarantine, platforms ban the films, interference is “authorised at the highest levels.”

type: conspiratorial · frame: deep_state · confidence: 1.00

6. NEW Every purified particle becomes an “extracellular vesicle,” every genome an “in silico fantasy.”

type: conspiratorial · frame: covid_conspiracy · confidence: 1.00

7. NEW Normal reference-genome and citation practice is recast as a deliberate “templating” deception chain.

type: conspiratorial · frame: deep_state · confidence: 1.00

8. NEW The global phylogenetic tree is dismissed as a fabricated family tree.

type: conspiratorial · frame: covid_conspiracy · confidence: 1.00

9. NEW The essay’s structure forbids any such evidence from existing, which is why every section reaches the same verdict regardless of what it examines.

type: evaluative · frame: covid_conspiracy · confidence: 1.00

10. NEW A genuine skeptic specifies what evidence would change their mind; this essay’s structure forbids any such evidence from existing.

type: evaluative · frame: covid_conspiracy · confidence: 1.00

11. NEW The lower scores on contradictory and reinterpreting randomness are not a weakness in the document — they are what make it more persuasive than typical conspiracy material.

type: evaluative · frame: covid_conspiracy · confidence: 1.00

12. NEW It is internally consistent and avoids overt pattern-mysticism, so it reads as sober and technical.

type: evaluative · frame: covid_conspiracy · confidence: 1.00

13. NEW The conspiratorial machinery is carried almost entirely by the suspicion-and-immunity axis rather than the more obviously “crank” traits.

type: evaluative · frame: covid_conspiracy · confidence: 1.00

14. NEW The maximal pair (I, O) should anchor the CONSPIR layer and pair with the NarrativeKernel label “foundational science is a deliberate fraud / institutions complicit / awakening frees you.”

type: evaluative · frame: covid_conspiracy · confidence: 1.00

15. NEW The named scientists referenced in the source (Wiles, Van Ranst, Bustin, Drosten, Daszak, and the Wuhan authors) are targets within the theory.

type: conspiratorial · frame: deep_state · confidence: 1.00

16. NEW The whole field of virology from 1911 to today is condemned regardless of which individual argument holds.

type: conspiratorial · frame: covid_conspiracy · confidence: 1.00

17. NEW The essay scores positive on all seven markers of conspiratorial ideation.

type: evaluative · frame: covid_conspiracy · confidence: 1.00

18. NEW A “war on humanity” register.

type: conspiratorial · frame: anti_vaccine · confidence: 1.00

19. NEW The authors positioned as brave investigators against a tyrannical state.

type: conspiratorial · frame: deep_state · confidence: 1.00

20. NEW No possible observation is allowed to count in virology’s favour.

type: conspiratorial · frame: covid_conspiracy · confidence: 1.00

Debunk sources

Corpus first (academic / reference sources we already track for the matched theories), with a live web-search fallback restricted to known fact-check venues (Snopes, FactCheck.org, RationalWiki, Science-Based Medicine, etc.).

No-Virus Conspiracy

- [COVID-19 misinformation - Wikipedia](#)

■ corpus · en.wikipedia.org

- [Germ theory denialism - Wikipedia](#)

■ corpus · en.wikipedia.org

- [Viruses are real and you can ‘catch’ them – Full Fact](#)

■ corpus · fullfact.org

Machine-readable scores

```
{
  "source": "32988aca3e44_CONSPIR_Farewell_to_Virology",
  "input": "/data/investigations/uploads/32988aca3e44_CONSPIR_Farewell_to_Virology.pdf",
  "fetched_url": "/data/investigations/uploads/32988aca3e44_CONSPIR_Farewell_to_Virology.pdf",
  "framework": "CONSPIR (Lewandowsky & Cook 2020) + A2",
  "conspir": {
    "overview": "This document \u2014 a SignalWatch CONSPIR evaluation of Mark Bailey's 'A Farewell to Virology' \u2014 scores positive on all seven CONSPIR traits, making its completeness of set the primary signal rather than any single dominant spike. What distinguishes its rhetorical profile is the pairing of two maximal-intensity traits (Immune to evidence and Overriding suspicion) with deliberately restrained scores on the two 'crank-signalling' traits (Contradictory and Reinterpreting randomness), producing a conspiratorial architecture that presents as sober, technical scientific critique rather than obvious fiction",
    "load_bearing": [
      "I",
      "O"
    ],
    "traits": {
      "C": {
        "intensity": "moderate",
        "score": 60,
        "present": true
      },
      "O": {
        "intensity": "very_high",
        "score": 100,
        "present": true
      },
      "N": {
        "intensity": "high",
        "score": 80,
        "present": true
      },
      "S": {
        "intensity": "high",
        "score": 80,
        "present": true
      },
      "P": {
        "intensity": "high",
        "score": 80,
        "present": true
      },
      "I": {
        "intensity": "very_high",
        "score": 100,
        "present": true
      },
      "R": {
        "intensity": "moderate",
        "score": 60,
        "present": true
      }
    }
  },
  "pseudo7": {
    "overview": "This document is a THIRD-PARTY ANALYTICAL REPORT \u2014 a SignalWatch misinformation classification memo evaluating 'A Farewell to Virology' using the Lewandowsky & Cook CONSPIR taxonomy. The author of this document is not performing pseudoscience; they are systematically describing and scoring it in another text. Consequently, the seven pseudoscience-demarcation traits being assessed here should
```

be evaluated as features of the ANALYST'S document, not of Bailey's essay. The analyst's own text is structured as a methodological classification product: it names a framework, applies it trait by trait, "

```
"load_bearing": [
  "M",
  "T"
],
"traits": {
  "M": {
    "intensity": "low",
    "score": 40,
    "present": true
  },
  "A": {
    "intensity": "none",
    "score": 0,
    "present": false
  },
  "U": {
    "intensity": "none",
    "score": 0,
    "present": false
  },
  "C": {
    "intensity": "none",
    "score": 0,
    "present": false
  },
  "S": {
    "intensity": "none",
    "score": 0,
    "present": false
  },
  "R": {
    "intensity": "none",
    "score": 0,
    "present": false
  },
  "T": {
    "intensity": "none",
    "score": 0,
    "present": false
  }
},
"pseudoscience_markers": {
  "axis_score": 0,
  "markers": [],
  "rescue": false
},
"theory_matches": [
  {
    "theory_id": "f2c56817-c9ef-4a5b-a7c1-0ddd45a120c3",
    "name": "No-Virus Conspiracy",
    "n_matched_atoms": 1,
    "max_score": 0.451,
    "avg_score": 0.451
  }
],
"atoms_count": 20,
"atoms_unmatched": 19,
"generated_at_utc": "2026-06-21T12:52:30Z"
}
```

Generated by SignalWatch · Document Investigator. CONSPIR taxonomy per Lewandowsky & Cook, *The Conspiracy Theory Handbook* (2020). Pseudoscience markers per SignalWatch's A2 marker battery (see Pseudoscience Revisited, June 2026, on the Data shelf). Theory signature matching uses the same evidence gate the corpus harvest paths use. Debunk sources are corpus-first with a fact-check-only web fallback. © SignalWatch — free to use with attribution. thesignalwatcher.com