
Three Flying Saucers In Broad Daylight

Posted by Kingfisher - 2008/04/25 21:56

This thread is a discussion about Three Flying Saucers In Broad Daylight video.
The first one looks like a cloud to me

=====

Re:Three Flying Saucers In Broad Daylight

Posted by heretic5 - 2008/05/10 07:47

Very interesting that you should make that particular comment.

One reason is that, although it seemed to me to be something similar to a cloud, it nevertheless seemed to me to be something else. The fact that we have different perceptions of what is supposedly the same thing, reminds me of one of the implications of the idea that we exist in a virtual reality. The idea, that we are in a virtual reality, has been spreading more quickly since 1993.

On the off-chance that this idea has not yet come to your attention, the details of it can be found at:

Wikipedia, overview

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simulism>

Nick Bostrom, 2002

<http://www.simulation-argument.com/>

Brian Whitworth, 2007

<http://www.newscientist.com/blog/technology/2008/01/vr-hypothesis.html?DCMP=NLC-nletterbanner&nsref=blogtech>

In addition to those arguments, one way to explain the apparent fact that space and time and mass and energy are quantized would be to say that their quantization is a result of the fact that the 3-D monitor, in which our virtual reality is displayed, has a finite spatial screen resolution, and a finite repetition rate.

However that might be, it remains that known virtual realities are not self-originated. If they were self-originated, then they would be natural realities, that is, realities without an originator. It also remains that known virtual realities are not self-sustained. If they were self-sustained, then they would have become natural realities which is a contradiction by definition.

So if it were the case that this were a virtual reality, then it would logically follow that there is an originator of this virtual reality. It would also logically follow that this virtual reality would have a sustainer. In the case that the originator of this virtual reality were to be a character in another virtual reality, then the ultimate sustainer would be the originator of the virtual reality in which all other virtual realities were nested.

An additional result, if this were to be a virtual reality, would be that it could be tailored to each character. That is to say, not everybody would necessarily experience the same version of this virtual reality. They would, if this were a natural reality; but not necessarily in the case that this were to be a virtual reality. This seems to be our situation in the particular instance of this video.

This list of consequences to this being a virtual reality is not complete. For instance, on the topic of UFOs, many aspects of that topic can be immediately understood if we suppose that this is a virtual reality. Ditto for visions, Fortean events, time travel, faster than light travel, and many additional topics which otherwise remain incomprehensible.

One interesting consequence is that this idea offers an explanation of why, when anything unusual happens, we immediately turn to the nearest person and ask, "Did you see that?" We do that as if we innately know that this is a virtual reality, and that we therefore might not all experience the same version of it.

Another very interesting reason that you should make that particular comment is that I recently discovered that the word "cloud" is sometimes used in the Bible to mean what we mean today when we use the term "UFO". For the details of this discovery, please see <http://greatriddle.flifree.com>

=====

Re:Three Flying Saucers In Broad Daylight

Posted by bertrand - 2008/05/10 21:45

Interesting thoughts and hypothesis in your nice answer to a quite common comment on a UFO-Video site. B)

I see rather the possibility of a construction like plato's cave around the earth to hide radio emissions from our sensors

than a complete virtual reality like in "The Matrix".
I would be quite complex to maintain this for centuries and for what reason?

At least our perception of the environment can be compared to a simulation, because it depends what our brain renders/interprets from its sensor data (eyes, ears etc).
That implies the question of the assumption of reality which Schrödinger describes with his famous cat thought experiment.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Schr%C3%B6dinger%27s_cat

Only when the box is opened, we can determine if the cat is dead or not. Everything else is speculation. He demonstrates that the perception of reality depends on the quality of the sensors.
It sounds even more like a paradoxon when you link it to the idea of a finite spatial screen resolution. :)

Einstein in a letter to Schrödinger:

Most of them {the physicists} simply do not see what sort of risky game they are playing with reality—reality as something independent of what is experimentally established.

regards

bertrand

=====

Re: Three Flying Saucers In Broad Daylight

Posted by heretic5 - 2008/05/11 07:13

bertrand wrote:
Interesting thoughts...{sniped}

Likewise. Thank you.

=====