

---

Subject: What The Bleep Do We Know!?

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 22:52:36 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

After seeing the religious debate going on in the other thread, I decided to post this to add some spice to the mix

"What The Bleep Do We Know?" Is actually a film. It's pretty hard to describe, I guess the closest I can come is that it could be part documentary, part science film, part philosophy, part quantum physics. It has things about God, about science, about life. It has humor and a story which helps provide a framework for explaining things that most people are unable to explain. It's definitely not some cheesy school science flick. It has world famous actors and scientists, and a few parts come to mind that could even be considered R-rated

That's the best way I can explain it, sorry I didn't do a very good job lol...once you watch it, maybe you can offer a better explanation. They have a website at <http://www.whatthebleep.com/whatthebleep/> . Personally, what I like most about this film is that it makes you think, and that people at any level can understand it and get something from it that makes you ponder. Even if you suck at math and science you can understand the quantum physics and cellular biology. You may find yourself examining what religion is or is not. This film has literally changed some peoples lives, and/or the way they think about life and the universe.

Rules.

What? Rules? Yep...since I am sticking my neck out by providing this video\*, I ask a few things in return:

1. Do NOT talk about this until you have watched the whole thing. And I mean \*watched\* it...as in not skipping through it, or watching it while you are playing games. Actually watch it, and listen to it. If you are at all curious about the world,life,science, and spirituality, it will grab and hold your interest pretty quick, even if it makes you angry I have no interesting in seeing reviews like "OMG THAT MADE NO SENSE WHY DID blah blah THIS SUCKS". If you are the kind of person who barely absorbs the daily YouTube video or thinks YTMND is quality entertainment, then you probably shouldn't bother. Watch the film...you might have to even watch it more than once. Once you have watched it I'm sure there are many topics you would find open for discussion.

2. If you find this video interesting, PLEASE BUY IT. \*At the time that I saw it (actually until a few moments ago), I knew/thought that you could not purchase this video, as it was only available via private showings. Apparently now that I look at the website, you can buy it on Amazon, so technically, I probably shouldn't be providing it. I have noticed that it can be found on most torrent sites as well as usenet. My server runs an anonymous FTP daemon, and someone was kind enough to upload it, so I am passing the link along so that you can see it for yourself.

There is an "extended" version of this, called "What The Bleep Do We Know - Down The Rabbit Hole". It goes into even more detail, particularly in the areas of Quantum Physics and Space/Time. If there is interest in this, perhaps my mystery friend will upload this as well - all things are possible right?

And now, the link. You should right-click it, and "save as", and download it to your computer before you view it (I don't know if I have the bandwidth to stream it live, or even if media player supports ftp urls for streaming).

<ftp://ftp.the-ownage.com/pub/incoming/What.the.bleep.do.we.k.now.avi>

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 00:18:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Wow...I guess I underestimated folks here. I initially thought that not everyone was the type who sees more than 2 lines of text and "can't be arsed to read all that".

From checking the download logs I can see that:

\* 8 people clicked the download link (I guess the rest didn't even bother reading or scrolling down)

\* Of the 8 who clicked, only 3 people actually downloaded the complete file.

\* The other 5 people just streamed the file, and either skipped through it, or stopped viewing it after 60 seconds.

Oh well maybe the 3 that actually downloaded it will watch it and have something interesting to say (if they didn't just download it and then skim or delete it like the others did).

I guess it's sad but true that people these days have an attention span measured in seconds. Maybe I should slice it up into 1000 YTMND clips or post it on google video with the subject "LOL OMGBBQ TITS" and someone will be interested

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 01:59:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I just don't have the time to watch a movie. I wish I did but I only get like 10 minutes on here at a time.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 02:07:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I saw it when it came out on video.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?

---

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 02:26:21 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Blazer wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 20:18\* Of the 8 who clicked, only 3 people actually downloaded the complete file.

Although I was interested, I cancelled the download since it was around 700MB. I don't have the time, the stable connection, or the hard drive space, to download something that size.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?

Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 02:32:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Blazer wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 20:18Wow...I guess I underestimated folks here. I initially thought that not everyone was the type who sees more than 2 lines of text and "can't be arsed to read all that".

I started to read your post blazer, but after two lines of blue text, I couldn't even look at it anymore.. sorry

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 21:19:28 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I was able to download the whole movie during class, but so far, I've only been able to watch 13 minutes of it; it looks pretty interesting, so far.

When I get through the whole movie, I'll write whatever thoughts come to mind.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?

Posted by [jnz](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 22:27:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

i have started doenloading it sould be done in 30 miniuts, but i will watch it tommorrow, i am tired.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 22:34:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 22:07I saw it when it came out on video.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [z310](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 00:43:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I read your entire post, started downloading the thing, then thought "why the fuck do I care?" and canceled the download.

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 00:51:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

z310 wrote on Tue, 29 August 2006 20:43 I read your entire post, started downloading the thing, then thought "why the fuck do I care?" and canceled the download.

Strange to see someone brag about having no ambition or intellectual curiosity. I guess hanging out with your stoner friends is more your style. Don't worry you can always go to the Religion thread and do some useless arguing

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 00:57:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NeoSaber wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 22:26 Blazer wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 20:18\* Of the 8 who clicked, only 3 people actually downloaded the complete file.

Although I was interested, I cancelled the download since it was around 700MB.

Heh I guess I should have mentioned how big it was...I guess I figured that anyone who would be interested wouldn't care.

NeoSaber wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 22:26  
I don't have the time, the stable connection, or the hard drive space, to download something that size.

That's a pretty poor excuse. People often claim to not have the time/bandwidth/space to download something, yet I see the exact same people spend literally weeks downloading some latest MP3 album, game ISO, application software, or porn from limewire or some other crappy PTP service.

I cannot in good faith believe that anyone's hard drive has less than a gig of free space...my windows swap file is that large for crying out loud. As for stable connections and bandwidth, that's what download managers and accelerators are for. Even if you had a 56k modem, you could easily download it in while you are sleeping. I'm pretty sure if I had C&C3 up for download, or Renegade2, you would somehow magically find a way to get it

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [z310](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 01:26:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Blazer wrote on Tue, 29 August 2006 20:51z310 wrote on Tue, 29 August 2006 20:43I read your entire post, started downloading the thing, then thought "why the fuck do I care?" and canceled the download.

Strange to see someone brag about having no ambition or intellectual curiosity. I guess hanging out with your stoner friends is more your style. Don't worry you can always go to the Religion thread and do some useless arguing.

I will download it tonight.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 04:03:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Blazer wrote on Tue, 29 August 2006 20:57I cannot in good faith believe that anyone's hard drive has less than a gig of free space...my windows swap file is that large for crying out loud. As for stable connections and bandwidth, that's what download managers and accelerators are for. Even if you had a 56k modem, you could easily download it while you are sleeping. I'm pretty sure if I had C&C3 up for download, or Renegade2, you would somehow magically find a way to get it.

I'm not claiming I absolutely don't have the room on my hard drive right now. It's a 40GB drive and currently down to 7GB. I began rationing space once it dropped below 10GB. Filling 1/10 of the remaining room with one file doesn't appeal much to me.

For my connection, my router is a pain in the ass that randomly corrupts throughout the day. If I bypass it, my ISP always seems to cut me off if I download a large file for more than an hour. When downloading, the connection needs constant attention. I can't just let it run while I sleep, otherwise it'll take me weeks and I probably still wouldn't have it all.

Could you lower the video's resolution or something to bring down the file size? If the file was around 300MB or less I'd be willing to download it. I could probably clear 300MB to make room for it, and I have been willing to put up with 300MB downloads occasionally in the past, even if they take me a few days of doing nothing else.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [xptek](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 05:32:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

From the small clip I saw on Google Video, this looks very interesting.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 05:34:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Just finished watching the whole movie all the way through.  
Let me just say that what Neo said about quantum physics is mostly right, based on what most of the "experts" in that movie said.

It was humorous to listen to a deaf woman talk, though.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Scythar](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 15:39:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Blazer wrote on Tue, 29 August 2006 20:57

I cannot in good faith believe that anyone's hard drive has less than a gig of free space...my windows swap file is that large for crying out loud

Mwahah, 1.6Gb free here, 30Gb max. I don't want to upgrade because I want a SATA drive, but that means new mobo, which means new CPU, GPU and RAM (I'm on Socket A Athlon XP3000+ with 6800 GT 256Mb AGP, and I want to move to newer socket/PCI-E). Yeah, I'm waiting for CPU price drops and then upgrading, but we DO exist

Anyway, downloading now, ETA 1h 40m.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Scythar](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 20:36:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Finished watching, fascinating video, thanks for the download Blazer! I've been very interested of all this stuff lately, after watching The Elegant Universe by Nova.

Oh...

That blonde woman who makes a lot of comments throughout the film....I swear, she reminds me of Christopher Judge (Teal'C from SG-1). No kidding.

Gah, double post, sorry about that.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 21:43:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

first of all i am going to brag. and then i am going to tell blaser that the video can be streamed. then someone will post, and put me in my place.

1)it is normaly faster but i was downloading alot of other things.

2)Blaser, the video can be streamed

3) when someone posts with a faster speed.


i thought the movie is very interesting, i havn't watched it all yet though. quantum physics rocks!  
lol

### File Attachments

---

1) [fast.JPG](#), downloaded 477 times





---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 21:49:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---



I'm not vouching for the credibility of this site, but it's an interesting read nonetheless.

[http://skeptico.blogs.com/skeptico/2005/04/what\\_the\\_bleep\\_.html](http://skeptico.blogs.com/skeptico/2005/04/what_the_bleep_.html)

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 21:54:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

bah, that site was like those stupid moon landing sites trying to disprove.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [futura83](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 22:14:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

sounds interesting.

i have a 70 GB hard drive to myself, broadband, and alot of free time im downloading it to watch a bit later.

dan, you make mine sound slow. mine is downloading at a rate of about 370 KB/s

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 23:06:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Wow, I watched it and was kinda confounded. So I'm going to watch it again, but the points at the end (which I forget now, wow, this thing was really confusing) were good.

OT:

I get ~70 KBPS so shush anyone who's got higher. (Living in a retirement town in the middle of nowhere = teh suxorz)

I take ~48 Hours to reconnect to my ISP.

And somehow, I'm still online!

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 23:07:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Downloading, also helplinux - Crop often?

---

Beat you.

## File Attachments

1) [no crop.jpg](#), downloaded 445 times

The screenshot shows the 'Renegade Public Forums' website. At the top, there is a banner for 'Command & Conquer Renegade' featuring game characters. Below the banner, the forum title 'Renegade Public Forums' is displayed, along with navigation links for Private Messaging, Members, Search, FAQ, User CP, and Logout. A welcome message for user 'Oblivion165' is visible, noting their last visit on August 30, 2006. The main content area is titled 'Forum' and lists several discussion categories:

- General Discussions**
  - General Discussion**: General discussion of Command & Conquer Renegade. Moderator(s): Doitle, icedog90, warranto.
  - Politics / Hot Issues**: A forum to participate in discussions about politics and to debate issues not appropriate for the General Forum. Moderator(s): Doitle, icedog90, warranto.
- Renegade Discussions**
  - Mod Forum**: Your place to talk about Mods, look for help on how to make a Mod, to recruit talent for Mod teams or ask questions about the mod tools. Moderator(s): Doitle, YSLMuffins, icedog90, warranto.
  - Tactics and Strategies**: A place to come and discuss tactics and strategies for Renegade. Moderator(s): Doitle, icedog90, warranto.
  - Clan Forum**: Your center for Clan talk, Clan recruiting and a place to dish out the Clan challenges. Moderator(s): Doitle, icedog90, warranto.
  - Renegade Community News**: Topics here will appear on the news for [RenegadeCommunity.com](#). You can comment on the news articles here. Moderator(s): Crimsor.

The browser's address bar shows 'http://www.renegadeforums.com/'. The taskbar at the bottom includes the Start button, several application icons, and the Avant Browser window.

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 23:26:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NeoSaber wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 00:03

I'm not claiming I absolutely don't have the room on my hard drive right now. Its a 40GB drive and currently down to 7GB. I began rationing space once it dropped below 10GB. Filling 1/10 of the remaining room with one file doesn't appeal much to me.

So you have 7GB free, and cannot consider downloading 700MB, watch it, and then delete it? You are basically saying here that if your machine drops below 6GB of free space for 24 hours, it will explode?

NeoSaber wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 00:03

For my connection, my router is a pain in the ass that randomly corrupts throughout the day.

What kind of router do you have? I've never seen one that randomly corrupts data...are you sure that your RAM isn't bad, or maybe even your hard disk is getting errors?

NeoSaber wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 00:03

If I bypass it, my ISP always seems to cut me off if I download a large file for more than an hour.

How do you bypass your router?

NeoSaber wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 00:03

When downloading, the connection needs constant attention. I can't just let it run while I sleep,

Sure you can...as I said there are many download managers like GetRight, ReGet, and even ftp programs like FlashFXP, Bulletproof FTP, etc...that automatically reconnect and resume a transfer if its interrupted.

NeoSaber wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 00:03

Could you lower the video's resolution or something to bring down the file size? If the file was around 300MB or less I'd be willing to download it. I could probably clear 300MB to make room for it, and I have been willing to put up with 300MB downloads occasionally in the past, even if they take me a few days of doing nothing else.

I didn't do the original encode, so I'm not sure. The main reason it's so large is because its a full length film and not just some 20 minute video clip.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 23:28:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hydra wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 01:34

It was humorous to listen to a deaf woman talk, though.

You are religious and yet you make fun of people with disabilities...nice to know there are slots reserved in heaven for people like you

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 23:31:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

help-linux wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 17:43  
2)Blaser, the video can be streamed  
3) when someone posts with a faster speed.

Good to know that it can be streamed. I know that my server can handle the upstream, I just didn't know how much downstream speed you would need to watch it without rebuffering.

P.S. If I download it at home I get 625KB/s. If I download it at work, over 3MB/s

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [z310](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 23:45:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Blazer wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 19:26NeoSaber wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 00:03  
If I bypass it, my ISP always seems to cut me off if I download a large file for more than an hour.

How do you bypass your router?

Not use the router?

And thanks for the movie man - it's so far really interesting.

I'm going to watch it time after time, though. It's just so damn confusing to me.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 23:47:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Blazer wrote on Thu, 31 August 2006 00:31help-linux wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 17:43  
2)Blaser, the video can be streamed  
3) when someone posts with a faster speed.

Good to know that it can be streamed. I know that my server can handle the upstream, I just didn't know how much downstream speed you would need to watch it without rebuffering.

---

P.S. If I download it at home I get 625KB/s. If I download it at work, over 3MB/s

that was number 3 lol, although depending on the server traffic i have had nearly 1 Mps:  
(this the bit-rate on this pic went over 1Mps but it went down at the last miniut)


remeber this is a personal conection.

### File Attachments

---

1) [lol.JPG](#), downloaded 356 times





Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [z310](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 02:12:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OK, I actually now finished the movie and I don't think I need to watch it again. I also think I have a new view on life, Blazer. Thanks.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 02:25:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You might find it useful to remind yourself once in a while. When I get back from dinner, I will tell you all a story about myself that related to the concepts introduced in this film.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [z310](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 02:26:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Cool.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [xptek](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 03:07:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Finally got around to watching it. Very interesting stuff.

Now back to trying to move this can with my mind.

(Yeah, shut up.)

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 03:27:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Blazer wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 19:26 Sure you can...as I said there are many download managers like GetRight, ReGet, and even ftp programs like FlashFXP, Bulletproof FTP, etc...that automatically reconnect and resume a transfer if its interrupted.

I have a download manager. The problem isn't that if I get interrupted I have to start over, the problem is that when I get interrupted I have to physically reset my router to make it reconnect to my modem. I could start the download, walk away, and in five minutes my router glitches and stops working. It's like I'm offline. Until I pull the power on it, it won't reset and work again. If I just plug into my modem, instead of going through the router, my ISP has this nasty habit of cutting me off during large downloads. I can get chunks of a file, then my modem disconnects and I have to get everything working again to get the next chunk.



About two weeks ago, I downloaded a 300MB file. It took 3 times longer than it should have because I kept having to reset my router, or connect to my modem directly, or reset my modem and my router, etc. After all that for a 300MB file, a 700MB file looks impossible to me.

Although, after reading that link warranto posted, I'm a little more intrigued to see if this video is really that bad. Originally I thought it would just be a rehash of everything I've read about quantum physics, but if that site is even half right, it might be worth watching just to laugh at it. I'll see if I can work up the will download something twice the size of that last file... that thing was a nightmare.

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 05:46:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Why don't you complain to your ISP about getting cutoff? I would try replacing your router too, but it sounds to me like the problem could just be your ISP, or your connection. Do you have a cable modem, or DSL? Either way you should be able to complain to them about your service and they will come out and do a line check for free. You shouldn't have to put up with crappy service if you are paying the same price as people who have no problems.

As for the film, I didn't say everyone would agree with it, in fact I figured it would even make some people angry, or even amused...it all depends on how open-minded you are. Either way, it will make you think, which is the main thing that I like about it.

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Sniper\\_De7](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 12:56:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, I remember watching this while browsing through somewhere. I found it pretty interesting. I guess I'll rewatch it after i get back from school

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 20:53:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OK, my story...

Keep in mind that part of the premise of this movie was to show you that (possibly/probably) you are/can be addicted to your emotions, positive or negative. They also put forth that you can break the cycle of your emotional addictions by consciously deciding to do so. If you force yourself to respond a different/better way to a situation or stimulus, eventually that will become your natural response. This is a short story of something I went through and did to myself back in 1998 that serves as an example of this in action.

So... it was February of 1998 and I was living with my then-boyfriend at his parents' house. I had graduated from high school the previous June and was working at a great, fun job for shit pay. So, we ended up breaking things off (ok, he dumped me, I only tell you this because it's relevant) and I was left at a job not making enough money to even afford an apartment. So, I had a friend who had moved to Wyoming to live with her parents about a year before. She was tired of living with her parents and suggested that I move up there and we could get a place together. I debated this for a few days and decided to do it. So, within the next couple of weeks, I packed up most of what I owned into my 1986 Toyota Corolla (my first car -- paid in full and I had just got my license the month before) and with my aunt to help me make the drive, we took off. My friend had found a small house with all utilities paid for \$425/month to rent and signed us up. (Did I mention the cost of living there was insanely low? We didn't even have state income tax because the mining industry made enough money to support the state in their taxes)

So, here I am with no job, one friend, very little money, and about 3 weeks to go before our first rent check was due. I don't know what I was doing or when I decided this, but I looked at my situation and realized that I was giving myself a huge opportunity. This time was a very pivotal time in my life. Freshly graduated from high school, in a new state... no debt, no obligations. At this point in time I could set my path in life.

I decided that one of my goals was to change myself. Considering the horrible breakup I had just suffered and was getting over, and the fact that I hated school and was never one of the "popular" ones, I was shy and quiet. There were reasons for this... please don't interpret that as bragging or whatever, it's just a fact... I was a lot smarter than most of my classmates and school went way to slow for me. Whenever I spoke, I was asked things like "How did you know that? How do you remember those things? How can you do that?" and I was also treated like crap for the same reasons -- people thinking I was showing off, or whatever. So I learned to just shut the hell up and quietly finish my coursework.

So, I'm at this crossroad and I decide that I don't like my social personality. I lacked self-confidence, but I had seen people of all shapes and sizes be liked. So I decided that I was going to go "out there" and pretend that I was "the shit". (Yes, "the shit" was the term at the time, and that's what I told myself) I was going to go to my job (at Taco Bell, no less) and pretend that I was this confident, friendly, outgoing person and that I was awesome and what-have-you. So, that's what I did. And I was amazed at how quickly people warmed up to me, talked to me, and liked me. It didn't take long before I was no longer pretending I was "the shit"... I actually WAS "the shit" and being more outgoing became natural to me. I ended up switching jobs when an opportunity came up to be an assistant manager and then main manager of the local Domino's Pizza and made a lot of friends, had a lot of parties, and had a great time.

So, this story of mine serves as my example of how, through the power of your own thought, you can do anything. You can train yourself out of your old responses to situations.

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 21:17:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Crimson wrote on Thu, 31 August 2006 21:53 I was a lot smarter than most of my classmates and

school went way to slow for me. Whenever I spoke, I was asked things like "How did you know that? How do you remember those things? How can you do that?" and I was also treated like crap for the same reasons -- people thinking I was showing off, or whatever. So I learned to just shut the hell up and quietly finish my coursework.

i am the same exact situation, me and the17doctor we are both in the same class in year 10.

it usally was when i answer a question with a little more detail then the teatcher wanted and well all i get then is "shut the fuck up" and "fuckin dickhead". i don't participate in lessons at all now. teachers dont even care.

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [futura83](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 21:24:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

like the way in year 9, our french teacher gave up on him. LOL

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 21:30:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

that different i was generally crap at french.

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 21:36:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Heh, not to take away from your story, but just to compare that to my own school experience.

I was nearly the same, except I didn't care enough to bother to shut up. Heck, I still have no friends, still considered to be "shy and quiet". But, I also decided to act like I was not a loaner. However, for me it's a stress filled job, and exhausts me the more I have to act.

But, the point I'm trying to make is that it does works, even when you fake it. I now work at a law office, people actually think that I'm outgoing and sociable. Even if you don't actually WANT to make a difference, if you act like you do it can still "work".

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Nightma12](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 21:58:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

help-linux wrote on Thu, 31 August 2006 16:17Crimson wrote on Thu, 31 August 2006 21:53I was a lot smarter than most of my classmates and school went way to slow for me. Whenever I spoke, I was asked things like "How did you know that? How do you remember those things? How can you do that?" and I was also treated like crap for the same reasons -- people thinking I was showing off, or whatever. So I learned to just shut the hell up and quietly finish my coursework.

i am the same exact situation, me and the17doctor we are both in the same class in year 10.

it usally was when i answer a question with a little more detail then the teatcher wanted and well all i get then is "shut the fuck up" and "fuckin dickhead". i don't participate in lessons at all now. teachers dont even care.

classic! sounds like my school

teacher asks for an example of an OS.... i give Linux... im told to STFU -.-

EDIT: just ot keep this on topic, im downloading the movie now to see what i think

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 22:24:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

i think it is stupid how poeple are intimidated by smart poeple.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [futura83](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 22:33:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

it's most probably as they cant understand what we're saying

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [z310](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 22:51:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Great story, Crimson. I'll be thinking about it this year at school.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 23:28:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The good thing is, as you get older, your intelligence becomes more of an asset than a burden. I'll still never know the right way to answer the question about "How do you do that?"... of course the real answer is "Because I'm smarter than you!" but I've settled for "I don't know, I just do" for now.

At this particular time, I am still mostly extroverted socially, but I am an introvert and I thrive on alone time and solitude at least once or twice a week. I don't always get it, sharing my house with two boys and two houseguests (who are moving out the weekend after next).

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [futura83](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 23:36:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Crimson wrote on Fri, 01 September 2006 11:28The good thing is, as you get older, your intelligence becomes more of an asset than a burden. I'll still never know the right way to answer the question about "How do you do that?"... of course the real answer is "Because I'm smarter than you!" but I've settled for "I don't know, I just do" for now.

i know the feeling. it's basically what i say to people when they ask me how i knew something.  
]

btw, has anyone learnt to trust instincts? cos there have been times when i'd have an instinct about something, but think it's not right. then, ironically enough, i find out my instinct was right and what i did wasnt.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 23:43:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

the17doctor wrote on Fri, 01 September 2006 00:36Crimson wrote on Fri, 01 September 2006 11:28The good thing is, as you get older, your intelligence becomes more of an asset than a burden. I'll still never know the right way to answer the question about "How do you do that?"... of course the real answer is "Because I'm smarter than you!" but I've settled for "I don't know, I just do" for now.

i know the feeling. it's basically what i say to people when they ask me how i knew something.  
]

btw, has anyone learnt to trust instincts? cos there have been times when i'd have an instinct about something, but think it's not right. then, ironically enough, i find out my instinct was right and what i did wasnt.

---

i don't, i never "feel" or get an instinct so i would not know.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 23:45:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I almost always regret not going with my instincts. Especially in poker.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 23:48:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Crimson wrote on Fri, 01 September 2006 00:45: I almost always regret not going with my instincts. Especially in poker.

lol

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sat, 02 Sep 2006 05:03:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I got around to downloading the video. Download went really well too, no router glitches or anything. A small miracle.

The video itself was rather lame. I didn't see any scientific merit in it. Half the video seems narrated by that crazy cult woman who has no credibility. The video makes claims about quantum physics that aren't scientific at all. I have issues with the scientific validity of quantum mechanics to begin with, but the video went into a whole new realm of crap. I'm not even sure it's fair to call some of that stuff quantum physics. Probability waves became a part of quantum physics because scientists lacked the ability to accurately test particle waves. It's not a profound way to look at reality, it's a limitation of science.

There was one line in the movie that really caught my attention. It's something along the lines of "What is the only planet in the Milky Way, that has habitation, that is steeped in the enormous subjugation of religion?". How would anyone be able to answer that question? The premise demands we compare civilization on Earth to civilizations on other planets. How the hell could anyone do that? We don't even know if life exists or not. There's no basis for the question to even be asked. I think it's that crazy cult leader posing the question so I guess I shouldn't be surprised at the stupidity of it. Is this the theological premise the the movie makers were following? That religion has made Earth worse than all the other civilizations in the galaxy? As if its credibility wasn't shot to hell already with the claim about natives not seeing ships.

To compound that is the hypocrisy of saying religion is bad because it makes theological claims, and then to turn around and make theological claims. It's almost like those conspiracy videos about the 9/11 Pentagon attack. It violates its own 'ground rules', but hopes the viewer doesn't realize.

Getting past the junk science, the attempts to confuse people about theology, and the crap like natives not seeing ships, the rest of the movie could probably be categorized as "blatantly obvious". What's insightful about changing who you are with conscious effort? Isn't this the premise of self help books? Nothing new there. Overall, this is probably one of the worst things I've watched. The more I think about what was presented, the worse it all seems.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sat, 02 Sep 2006 15:49:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

this films target-audience has "no" scientific knowlage so anything will do. they dont care as long as they make money, in the case of the download, they didn't

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Sat, 02 Sep 2006 16:54:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NeoSaber wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 01:03  
The video itself was rather lame. I didn't see any scientific merit in it.

Bear in mind that, as HL said, the science is explained in such a way as to attempt to be understandable by people who have no grasp of science already. It's pretty hard to explain subatomic physics to folks who are not used to thinking about things that they cannot see with the naked eye and hold in their hands.

I think this clip of the "double-slit experiement" (it's not something that was in the film you watched), is a good "dumbing down" so that anyone can understand it:  
[http://www.whatthebleep.com/trailer/DS\\_sm2.wmv](http://www.whatthebleep.com/trailer/DS_sm2.wmv)

(EDIT: the clip above is 11.2MB)

That very experiment shows exactly how much we do not know about how subatomic things work, since we learn by observing the behavior of things, its hard for us to figure something out if the results are changed by observing or measuring.

P.S. Even though you were mysteriously somehow able to download the 700MB movie with no problems, your previous experiences you describe still lead me to suggest that you contact your ISP and get them to fix your connection...although you should consider that perhaps it is already fixed, and you just proved it. Maybe since you believed it was broken, you stopped trying to do anything that you thought would fail. Kind of ironic, because one of the themes of the film you



watched, was about how people set their own barriers

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Scythar](#) on Sat, 02 Sep 2006 17:46:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Does anyone know how exactly do they do the observing? A link to some nice info would be appreciated, quantum physics is such a buzzword right now that it's tougher to find answers than I expected.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sat, 02 Sep 2006 19:07:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Blazer wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 12:54 Bear in mind that, as HL said, the science is explained in such a way as to attempt to be understandable by people who have no grasp of science already. It's pretty hard to explain subatomic physics to folks who are not used to thinking about things that they cannot see with the naked eye and hold in their hands.

Maybe my standards are too high, but the book *The Elegant Universe* was written for people who don't understand this stuff, yet it still went into decent detail about things like the double slit experiment, probability waves, and the uncertainty principle.

Blazer wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 12:54 I think this clip of the "double-slit experiment" (it's not something that was in the film you watched), is a good "dumbing down" so that anyone can understand it: [http://www.whatthebleep.com/trailer/DS\\_sm2.wmv](http://www.whatthebleep.com/trailer/DS_sm2.wmv)

(EDIT: the clip above is 11.2MB)

That very experiment shows exactly how much we do not know about how subatomic things work, since we learn by observing the behavior of things, its hard for us to figure something out if the results are changed by observing or measuring.

The clip makes a huge leap that is probably the biggest fault in the movie as well. It equates measuring to observing. When you observe, you "take in" your surroundings. When you measure, you go and interfere with your surroundings. An observer doesn't send something at the particle to interfere with it, but if you want to measure it, you have to shoot something back at it in order to mark its position.

On a macroscopic scale, you shine a light on a brick to examine it. On a subatomic scale, what can you shoot at a particle that won't mess it up? The smallest, most delicate object you can shoot at it is another subatomic particle. It's equal in force and disrupts the experiment. That's where the uncertainty principle and probability waves come from. If you leave it alone, you get a wave pattern, but if you interfere with it you get a particle pattern. You can't test what causes wave patterns because the test isn't "delicate" enough. Scientists then rely on probability waves as an

untestable explanation of how wave patterns form. That's probably my biggest gripe with quantum physics. If the theory claims to be untestable, then its not science.

Blazer wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 12:54P.S. Even though you were mysteriously somehow able to download the 700MB movie with no problems, your previous experiences you describe still lead me to suggest that you contact your ISP and get them to fix your connection...although you should consider that perhaps it is already fixed, and you just proved it. Maybe since you believed it was broken, you stopped trying to do anything that you thought would fail. Kind of ironic, because one of the themes of the film you watched, was about how people set their own barriers

I know my problems are not fixed. I waited for my router to glitch in the morning before downloading it so it would be freshly restarted before I began. You're server must be insanely fast or something because I got the whole file in 35 minutes. Didn't give my router enough to glitch again or my ISP time to cut me off. About an hour later, the router glitched again.

It did seem a little ironic to me though.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 03 Sep 2006 01:37:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NeoSaber wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 20:07  
The clip makes a huge leap that is probably the biggest fault in the movie as well. It equates measuring to observing. When you observe, you "take in" your surroundings. When you measure, you go and interfere with your surroundings. An observer doesn't send something at the particle to interfere with it, but if you want to measure it, you have to shoot something back at it in order to mark its position.

take the speedo on your car for example when you look at are you interfering with the speed of the car? you are observing the speedo.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Sun, 03 Sep 2006 02:44:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NeoSaber wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 15:07  
Maybe my standards are too high, but the book The Elegant Universe was written for people who don't understand this stuff, yet it still went into decent detail about things like the double slit experiment, probability waves, and the uncertainty principle.

I used to have that book (strangely, someone stole it), and I agree it is written very well.

NeoSaber wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 15:07

The clip makes a huge leap that is probably the biggest fault in the movie as well. It equates measuring to observing. When you observe, you "take in" your surroundings. When you measure, you go and interfere with your surroundings. An observer doesn't send something at the particle to interfere with it, but if you want to measure it, you have to shoot something back at it in order to mark its position.

The film specifically says that we do not know how to be an "inside" observer (observe something without affecting it). You don't have to shoot something at a particle to detect it, but you do have to interact with it in some manner, like allowing it to pass through something that has a measurable effect of its passing, etc.

NeoSaber wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 15:07

On a macroscopic scale, you shine a light on a brick to examine it. On a subatomic scale, what can you shoot at a particle that won't mess it up? The smallest, most delicate object you can shoot at it is another subatomic particle. It's equal in force and disrupts the experiment. That's where the uncertainty principle and probability waves come from. If you leave it alone, you get a wave pattern, but if you interfere with it you get a particle pattern. You can't test what causes wave patterns because the test isn't "delicate" enough. Scientists then rely on probability waves as an untestable explanation of how wave patterns form.

Who says you have to "shoot something" at a particle to detect it? You are basically debunking the double slit experiment because you say they are firing a stream of particles at the single-particle projectiles in order to detect them and thus altering their behavior. Maybe you should publish this in the American Journal of Physics, to let all the other scientists in the world know why they are wrong

I think what you are failing to consider is that when there are NO DETECTORS, and we simply fire a SINGLE PARTICLE at a time through two slits, you get an interference pattern, which begs the question of, what the hell is the single particle interfering with? The only answer we have been able to come up with that works, is "itself", which sounds crazy but don't forget we have proven that a single particle can be in two locations at once.

It may interest you to know that even if they place a detector at only one of the slits, the interference pattern still disappears. And the experiment does not have to be done with the "smallest" particles, it has been demonstrated with neutrons, atoms and molecules as large as carbon-60 and carbon-70. Another interesting experiment shows that there is a similar effect by using slits in time (which can be measured without tampering) instead of space:

<http://physicsweb.org/articles/news/9/3/1/1?rss=2.0>

NeoSaber wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 15:07

That's probably my biggest gripe with quantum physics. If the theory claims to be untestable, then it's not science.

Dude, that's everyone's gripe with quantum physics, including the scientists. It is the closest we have come so far to explaining the world...nobody is saying this is how it is and that's that...even if it was 100% provable, measurable, etc, most people still would not believe it, since most people seem to rely upon the biophysical way in which we perceive the world and are unwilling to consider that things they cannot see are real.

Whether you agree with the concepts in the film or not, you have to admit that it at least made you think about things, which was my only goal in exposing people to it.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 03 Sep 2006 03:17:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

/me waits for the second movie.

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 03 Sep 2006 04:52:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Blazer wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 22:44I used to have that book (strangely, someone stole it)

That's a bizarre thing to steal.

Blazer wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 22:44The film specifically says that we do not know how to be an "inside" observer (observe something without affecting it). You don't have to shoot something at a particle to detect it, but you do have to interact with it in some manner, like allowing it to pass through something that has a measurable effect of its passing, etc.

"Shooting a particle" was a generic example of how even the smallest measurement is interference at a quantum scale.

The film may say we don't know how to observe, but it offers no evidence of that. What it shows is that we lack the ability to measure and test. That's the opposite of observation.

Observation is passive, and does not interfere with what is being observed. It gets controlled by what it observes. Light bounces off a rock and arrives at my eye. I observe the rock but my observation is completely at the mercy of the light and the way it bounced off the rock. The observer has no control over anything. It merely detects what information is sent to it. The observer is the one who receives information, and the observed is the one controlling that information. The video is getting those points mixed up, and leading to claim that consciousness can be a controlling force by observing things. If anything, all they show is that consciousness is helpless because everything else controls it.

Blazer wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 22:44Whether you agree with the concepts in the film or not, you have to admit that it at least made you think about things, which was my only goal in exposing people to it.

I suppose...

Hmm... if I'm an observer of the video, and the people on it are the observed, and I was effected by it, yet they don't even know I exist... does that prove my point? Did the very nature of the video prove them all wrong?

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Scythar](#) on Sun, 03 Sep 2006 08:52:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NeoSaber wrote on Sun, 03 September 2006 00:52

The film may say we don't know how to observe, but it offers no evidence of that. What it shows is that we lack the ability to measure and test. That's the opposite of observation.

Observation is passive, and does not interfere with what is being observed. It gets controlled by what it observes. Light bounces off a rock and arrives at my eye. I observe the rock but my observation is completely at the mercy of the light and the way it bounced off the rock. The observer has no control over anything. It merely detects what information is sent to it. The observer is the one who receives information, and the observed is the one controlling that information. The video is getting those points mixed up, and leading to claim that consciousness can be a controlling force by observing things. If anything, all they show is that consciousness is helpless because everything else controls it.

I don't see how measuring is the opposite of observing, it's all about the same thing: sensing the information we receive from the object after a force is applied to it, either directly by us or not. Even if measuring means the part of the process where we apply the force and not the Sun for example (through photons), I still fail to see how it's the opposite. It's the same thing in the end. It's not possible to measure/observe/analyze something without a force affecting the target. We can't even prove the existence of something without there being a force that effects it.

Quote:

Hmm... if I'm an observer of the video, and the people on it are the observed, and I was effected by it, yet they don't even know I exist... does that prove my point? Did the very nature of the video prove them all wrong?

I'm not sure what point you mean, you've had a lot of points in this topic. Can you clarify this one?

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Sun, 03 Sep 2006 18:16:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Blazer wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 22:44Dude, thats everyones gripe with quantum physics, including the scientists. It is the closest we have come so far to explaining the world...nobody is saying this is how it is and that's that...even if it was 100% provable, measurable, etc, most people still would not believe it, since most people seem to rely upon the biophysical way in which we perceive the world are are unwilling to consider that things they cannot see are real.

That's a really interesting "concept", especially when taken in with the other active thread at the moment.. If you can believe quantum physics even though you acknowledge that it is unprovable, unmeasurable and that most people are unwilling to consider that things they cannot see are

real... then why the big fuss about "an imaginary person in the sky"...

Ironic, really... I guess we all just choose which imaginary things we want to believe in.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 03 Sep 2006 19:49:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Scythar wrote on Sun, 03 September 2006 04:52 I don't see how measuring is the opposite of observing, it's all about the same thing: sensing the information we receive from the object after a force is applied to it, either directly by us or not. Even if measuring means the part of the process where we apply the force and not the Sun for example (through photons), I still fail to see how it's the opposite. It's the same thing in the end. It's not possible to measure/observe/analyze something without a force affecting the target. We can't even prove the existence of something without there being a force that effects it.

Observing and measuring certainly go hand in hand, and everyone is capable of both, but they are opposites of each other. Think of it like the difference between active and passive sonar. Passive sonar, like observing, just hears whatever is sent to it. If nothing is sent, it can't hear. Active sonar, like measuring, sends out a ping to detect things. Then you hear, or observe, the return signal.

Measuring is certainly pointless without observing. However, it is not the act of observing that causes interference, it's the act of measuring. The observer only sees what the observed "allowed" it to see. The observed is the one sending the information back, and has the "control" of reality.

Scythar wrote on Sun, 03 September 2006 04:52 I'm not sure what point you mean, you've had a lot of points in this topic. Can you clarify this one?

The video claims that an observer controls reality. I observed the people on the video. However, I didn't change the people, they changed me by making me think they are crazy. Everyone on the video who was observed remains completely unaffected by me. They transmitted information to me, via the video, not the other way around.

My point is that an observer is the helpless pawn of the observed. The nature of a video/movie/etc is that you send information from the observed to the observer. No information is returned, so the observed is the one in control. Since the people claim observers control reality, yet the video itself shows the opposite, they are proven wrong by the means they used to communicate their message.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?

Posted by [Scythar](#) on Sun, 03 Sep 2006 21:30:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NeoSaber wrote on Sun, 03 September 2006 15:49

Think of it like the difference between active and passive sonar. Passive sonar, like observing, just hears whatever is sent to it. If nothing is sent, it can't hear. Active sonar, like measuring, sends out a ping to detect things. Then you hear, or observe, the return signal.

True, but a passive sonar i.e. the observer, also has had a "ping" sent, just not by the observer itself, but some other entity. There's always a "ping", or in other words, a force that's applied to the observed, before it can be observed.

I think I got your point though, it's of course possible to separate the two, I was just confused by the "opposite" -word, as I consider observed as the opposite of observer....depends of the point of view.

Quote:

The video claims that an observer controls reality. I observed the people on the video. However, I didn't change the people, they changed me by making me think they are crazy. Everyone on the video who was observed remains completely unaffected by me. They transmitted information to me, via the video, not the other way around.

My point is that an observer is the helpless pawn of the observed. The nature of a video/movie/etc is that you send information from the observed to the observer. No information is returned, so the observed is the one in control. Since the people claim observers control reality, yet the video itself shows the opposite, they are proven wrong by the means they used to communicate their message.

Good point. On the other hand, do they \*really\* have the control over us, the observers of the video? They certainly can't make all of us react in the way they wanted to. In the end, it's us, the observers, who make the choice - consciously or unconsciously - of how we want to react to the video. Isn't it the observer that always gets to say the last word in how it observes the world?

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 03 Sep 2006 23:18:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Scythar wrote on Sun, 03 September 2006 17:30 True, but a passive sonar i.e. the observer, also has had a "ping" sent, just not by the observer itself, but some other entity. There's always a "ping", or in other words, a force that's applied to the observed, before it can be observed.

If force is applied to the observed, it becomes an observer of that force, and is therefore effected by it. Then it can take control, making itself the observed again, by changing the information being sent from itself. For example, stealth aircraft get "pinged" by radar, but they modify it so the radar tower doesn't see a proper return signal. The stealth aircraft, acting as the observed, manipulates its outgoing "information" to convince a radar tower that it isn't really there. The aircraft has the control because it has better manipulation of outgoing information than the radar tower does. It



forces others to believe what it wants them to believe by controlling the way it is observed.

It's also possible for the observed to generate the force itself. If a star explodes, the shock wave it makes will destroy any observers around it. If a light bulb turns on, the light it generates allows observers to see it. Etc, etc.

Scythar wrote on Sun, 03 September 2006 17:30 Good point. On the other hand, do they \*really\* have the control over us, the observers of the video? They certainly can't make all of us react in the way they wanted to. In the end, it's us, the observers, who make the choice - consciously or unconsciously - of how we want to react to the video. Isn't it the observer that always gets to say the last word in how it observes the world?

When I say "control" I mean it a little bit figuratively. As the saying goes "information is power". The observed is the one who gets the chance to modify information. The observer just has to accept the information given. I don't mean accept as in "agree with". I mean it more like "absorb".

The people in the video may not be able to convince us, but only because previous bits of info we've received over our lives leads us to distrust or question the info they have provided. At the same time, we may be convinced because the info we've accumulated over our lives has led us to accept the information received as valid. It's the information we received over the course of our lives that forms our willingness to accept/decline future information. It's the sum of everything we've observed that determines our reactions. We're constantly being effected by everything around us and it influences everything we think. I should probably be working on stuff for RA:APB right now, but you sent out "information" (your post), that made me react to it. You exercised a degree of control over me. Even if I ignored you and didn't respond, the act of ignoring is still a reaction. It's taking me forever to write this because of spell checks and revisions for the sake of clarity. I only do that because previous information I have received indicates that I should take care in what I write.

We might be able to decide how we view the world, but in that case we are being both observed and observer at the same time. As the observed, we send ourself an opinion about the information. As the observer, we accept our opinion. Even then, we're still basing that opinion on the information sent to us over our life.

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Mon, 04 Sep 2006 00:02:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

help-linux wrote on Thu, 31 August 2006 16:17 Crimson wrote on Thu, 31 August 2006 21:53 I was a lot smarter than most of my classmates and school went way to slow for me. Whenever I spoke, I was asked things like "How did you know that? How do you remember those things? How can you do that?" and I was also treated like crap for the same reasons -- people thinking I was showing off, or whatever. So I learned to just shut the hell up and quietly finish my coursework.

i am the same exact situation, me and the17doctor we are both in the same class in year 10.

it usually was when I answer a question with a little more detail than the teacher wanted and well all I get then is "shut the fuck up" and "fuckin dickhead". I don't participate in lessons at all now. teachers don't even care.

Welcome to my world... (I hate my school)

@ Nightma12:

Interestingly, Linux is mentioned on a poster in my school's ICT (I wrote IRC the first time round, I think it's a sign...) room...

Going back on topic:

It was well presented, the "strange girl" was simply used to illustrate how it affects day to day life I suppose. The average person will probably not care unless it affects their day to day life...

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?

Posted by [Scythar](#) on Mon, 04 Sep 2006 15:30:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NeoSaber wrote on Sun, 03 September 2006 19:18Scythar wrote on Sun, 03 September 2006 17:30True, but a passive sonar i.e. the observer, also has had a "ping" sent, just not by the observer itself, but some other entity. There's always a "ping", or in other words, a force that's applied to the observed, before it can be observed.

If force is applied to the observed, it becomes an observer of that force, and is therefore effected by it. Then it can take control, making itself the observed again, by changing the information being sent from itself. For example, stealth aircraft get "pinged" by radar, but they modify it so the radar tower doesn't see a proper return signal. The stealth aircraft, acting as the observed, manipulates its outgoing "information" to convince a radar tower that it isn't really there. The aircraft has the control because it has better manipulation of outgoing information than the radar tower does. It forces others to believe what it wants them to believe by controlling the way it is observed.

The problem I have with that is this: "Then it can take control, making itself the observed again...". The problem is, it *\*WILL\** take control, not "can". It has no choice, it always works in a predictable way, that's what it was built for by humans, it's a machine.

But we're not much different. It's much tougher to predict how human acts, but if we could read a person's memory and past experiences, not from brain alone but also genes, and had the knowledge to process the information, I'm sure we could predict exactly how the person will act in different situations. We could know how a person "decides" to modify the information he receives, after which he, the observed, no longer has control of any kind - he is completely predictable.

In fact, looks like *\*nothing/nobody\** is in control, everything we do is based on the first interaction of observers/observed ones when the universe was created.

Quote:

It's also possible for the observed to generate the force itself. If a star explodes, the shock wave it makes will destroy any observers around it. If a light bulb turns on, the light it generates allows observers to see it. Etc, etc.

And as I explained, you can't say "if" a star explodes. The stars *will* explode. They don't explode spontaneously, there's always a reaction involved (star runs out of fuel), and if you can measure the star and everything that affects it, you can predict when it happens. Light bulbs don't just turn on all of a sudden either. Someone turns them on, and with an unimaginable amount of knowledge and processing power, you could predict when it turns on.Quote:

Scythar wrote on Sun, 03 September 2006 17:30 Good point. On the other hand, do they *really* have the control over us, the observers of the video? They certainly can't make all of us react in the way they wanted to. In the end, it's us, the observers, who make the choice - consciously or unconsciously - of how we want to react to the video. Isn't it the observer that always gets to say the last word in how it observes the world?

When I say "control" I mean it a little bit figuratively. As the saying goes "information is power". The observed is the one who gets the chance to modify information. The observer just has to accept the information given. I don't mean accept as in "agree with". I mean it more like "absorb".

And again, the observed doesn't "get a chance". He is bound to modify it or not modify it based on his observations that happened earlier in life.

Quote:

The people in the video may not be able to convince us, but only because previous bits of info we've received over our lives leads us to distrust or question the info they have provided. At the same time, we may be convinced because the info we've accumulated over our lives has led us to accept the information received as valid. It's the information we received over the course of our lives that forms our willingness to accept/decline future information. It's the sum of everything we've observed that determines our reactions. We're constantly being effected by everything around us and it influences everything we think. I should probably be working on stuff for RA:APB right now, but you sent out "information" (your post), that made me react to it. You exercised a degree of control over me. Even if I ignored you and didn't respond, the act of ignoring is still a reaction. It's taking me forever to write this because of spell checks and revisions for the sake of clarity. I only do that because previous information I have received indicates that I should take care in what I write.

And I agree with this part. You didn't have a choice any more than I do now. (actually, I don't know myself well enough to be sure whether or not I'll post this, we'll see in a while I guess)

Quote:

We might be able to decide how we view the world, but in that case we are being both observed and observer at the same time. As the observed, we send ourself an opinion about the information. As the observer, we accept our opinion. Even then, we're still basing that opinion on the information sent to us over our life.

And since we base that opinion on earlier events, it isn't really a "decision", it's a reaction.

So, looks like we agree on this whole thing, causality for the win and all that.... what was the problem after all?

Oh, and the quotation hell was NOT fun at all. Geez.

More edit. Since we seem to believe everything is based on cause and effect and the lack of a real choice...how about the beginning of the universe? There was a state in there where there had not yet been any causes or effects. Maybe a real choice is only possible in a state like this. Maybe the first something really had a real choice, not an illusion of choice, and so life was born. The question is, is this first something still capable of making real choices? A real choice is when you can decide to be or do anything you ever desire, so isn't that a definition of God? Does God exist? Whoo, check out the way I got God dragged into this again

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Mon, 04 Sep 2006 20:30:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Scythar wrote on Mon, 04 September 2006 11:30The problem I have with that is this: "Then it can take control, making itself the observed again...". The problem is, it \*WILL\* take control, not "can". It has no choice, it always works in a predictable way, that's what it was built for by humans, it's a machine.

You're right, "can" was a bad word choice on my part. The observed will modify information. It's not really a conscious act, although if you have consciousness you can probably change the way you modify information... based on the sum total of the information you've received. I've messed with people before by planting careful phrases in what I write, triggering specific thoughts in their head, and directing a debate exactly where I want it to be. However, I can only do that after I receive enough "information" from them to know how they think. Cause and effect again.

(Plus I feel like a manipulative jerk whenever I do that... so I don't do it often.)

Scythar wrote on Mon, 04 September 2006 11:30More edit. Since we seem to believe everything is based on cause and effect and the lack of a real choice...how about the beginning of the universe? There was a state in there where there had not yet been any causes or effects. Maybe a real choice is only possible in a state like this. Maybe the first something really had a real choice, not an illusion of choice, and so life was born. The question is, is this first something still capable of making real choices? A real choice is when you can decide to be or do anything you ever desire, so isn't that a definition of God? Does God exist? Whoo, check out the way I got God dragged into this again

While I was writing my last post, I realized we got to an issue of "First Cause" too... where's Thomas Aquinas when you need him.

Interesting though how one minor change in focus alters so much. By claiming observers control reality, the video concluded "we are all gods" if I remember correctly (I already deleted it). By shifting the focus to say the observer is controlled by reality, we get left with the premise of a supreme being, or first cause. It seems to be the unavoidable conclusion of the concept.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Mon, 04 Sep 2006 22:03:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

msgtpain wrote on Sun, 03 September 2006 14:16Blazer wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 22:44Dude, thats everyones gripe with quantum physics, including the scientists. It is the closest we have come so far to explaining the world...nobody is saying this is how it is and that's that...even if it was 100% provable, measurable, etc, most people still would not believe it, since most people seem to rely upon the biophysical way in which we perceive the world are are unwilling to consider that things they cannot see are real.

That's a really interesting "concept", especially when taken in with the other active thread at the moment.. If you can believe quantum physics even though you acknowledge that it is unprovable, unmeasurable and that most people are unwilling to consider that things they cannot see are real... then why the big fuss about "an imaginary person in the sky"...

Ironic, really... I guess we all just choose which imaginary things we want to believe in.

Exactly. People can believe in god, which they obviously cannot see or touch, yet they will refuse to believe in an explanation of the universe that involves things they cannot see or touch. It makes me wonder, what sort of explanation WOULD they believe, or expect?

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Mon, 04 Sep 2006 22:09:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

z310 wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 23:17/me waits for the second movie.

It looks like someone uploaded it. It's twice as long though so double the size At least its in two chunks.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [z310](#) on Tue, 05 Sep 2006 03:30:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

<3

I think I'll watch it in a couple days, though. I can't seem to think straight recently; damn that bud!  
lol

When I finish watching it, I'm going to try and make posts of what I've observed in the movie.

I wonder if I'll hit pitch black in the rabbit hole.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Thu, 07 Sep 2006 02:35:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I always wondered if i would see flubber again.

### File Attachments

1) [flubber.jpg](#), downloaded 270 times



---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [z310](#) on Fri, 08 Sep 2006 00:08:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Flubber became sexy. Anyways, I'll watch the movie this weekend - I have too much work at the moment.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 22 Oct 2006 00:41:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

z310 wrote on Thu, 07 September 2006 20:08 Flubber became sexy. Anyways, I'll watch the



movie this weekend - I have too much work at the moment.

I apologize for not having watched it yet. I'll get to it as soon as I feel I can; I'm overwhelmed with work and I can't seem to think straight for reasons I don't know. :thumbsdown:

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Sun, 22 Oct 2006 01:15:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Somehow I think an apology is completely unnecessary when you have no audience that gives a damn.

No offense, by the way.

---

---

Subject: Re: What The Bleep Do We Know!?  
Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 22 Oct 2006 01:35:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

None taken. And I just felt the need to since I gave my word--something to do with integrity.

---