

COMPILATION OF
RANDOM POSTS
BY A RANDOM ANON



Powerless against the Unpredictable

What is the thing ruling over the world? Is it the human ingenuity, the ability to enforce our will upon nature? Some people might think so. After all, we humans as a species have achieved so much already. But then... think about it. Did we really triumph over the nature?

We have developed so much technology in order to deal with the forces of nature. One might think that we have become masters over the nature already. But every day the nature demonstrates to us that we are wrong.

Think about all those planes which fell from the sky due to storms, all those homes destroyed by volcanoes and hurricanes, all those ships sunk by icebergs, all those starving people who lost their homes to the expanding deserts... I am sure that you can easily find many more examples yourself.

And you know the forces of nature quite well even from your own daily life - when a lightning strike causes an electricity blackout, when your internet connection slows down because the optic cables under the sea were damaged by the wild life, when your car gets damaged by falling hailstones.

We fool ourselves when we think that we rule over the nature. We fool ourselves even when we dare to think that we are able to defend ourselves against the powers of nature. But the nature demonstrates to us again and again that it still rules over our life and death... and it always will.

You never know if you won't get hit by a car next time you walk to work. But wait a minute, you say, how is that nature? It depends on your definition of the word "nature" I guess. But let me answer with another question: What else it is then?

You might say that it is the random chance, the statistical probability, the result of unknown factors, many small events which add up over time, the chaos theory ruling over the events which we do understand, yet cannot predict, because we can never have enough information to be able to do that. And I agree. And I include this into my definition of the word "nature".

But no matter what you call this thing, the result is the same - we are ruled by the unpredictable small details which get amplified over time into the chaos of this universe, which we will never be able to defeat. Some events we will never be able to predict no matter how much we understand the laws of nature, some things we will never be able to control, no matter how deep knowledge of their inner workings we have.

We are ruled over by unknown. We are powerless against unknown.

I believe that it is this unknown, which rules over our lives and threatens us every day with a sudden unexpected death, that all major religion refer to as God and many other people (including me) call it Fate.

It was quite recently that I realized how powerless I am against the Fate. I suddenly felt so insignificant, so powerless, that I have become fascinated by it.

And that's what it means to believe in higher powers I think. To believe in higher powers means to acknowledge that you are powerless against the Unpredictable, powerless against the Fate.

You might just as well start to believe in actual higher powers. In the end it makes no difference. The result is the same - powerlessness.

How the chan culture died

You might say that I don't know much about the very original chan culture either, and you would be partially correct. I don't know what 4chan was like in 2003. I have come across 4chan for the first time in 2006. My memories of that time are a little bit hazy, because I didn't pay attention to that website too much at that time. It was just another anime and hentai website to me.

My interest in 4chan has peaked in 2008 when I've read a lot about it on various web forums. I remember many people mentioning its "crazy community". That made me more interested and I have truly started to lurk properly and become a regular visitor there. I was pretty fascinated by its culture and so I have began to read lots and lots about its long history from various sources all over the internet. So yeah, I'm definitely no "originalfag", but I think that I have been there long enough to confirm that its culture has changed drastically recently.

From what I can tell, its culture has evolved less between the years 2003 to 2008 than between the years 2008 to 2019. Actually I'm quite sure that this big change lately took place between 2011 and 2015. And I should definitely not call it "evolved". It was not an evolution. The old imageboard culture has been completely replaced by a new one. It was a total and (I believe) somewhat forced replacement. The imageboard culture was replaced by stormfag culture. The chan culture died and stormfag culture took its place.

And the worst thing is that current chan users don't even know there have been a different chan culture before this one and consider their inferior new culture to be the original chan culture. They would not even believe you if you tried to convince them otherwise.

It was a genocide. A generation genocide. They didn't just replace our culture, they replaced us. And even more than that - they erased us from the pages of history. Quite fitting for stormfags.

As the newfags moved in, the oldfags have moved out. The true oldfags have moved to many different places on the web and mostly abandoned the imageboards. That emptied the place for the influx of even more newfags to take over the chans and crown themselves "oldfags" instead. But they are not oldfags. Most of them were about 10 years old in 2008, some even younger. Hell, some of them are even younger than the website itself.

And how exactly is the original chan culture different from the current one you ask? Well, it's many individual things, but also the overall atmosphere there was different. The old culture was definitely more nihilistic, while the current one is full of stormfag nazi nonsense. The old generation was also definitely way more creative, inventive and fun. The current generation is far less fun. The only thing the current generation can think of is politics. If you removed all politics from their brain, they would be completely empty. The old generation was more anarchy loving - not in political sense, but in the "let's cause mayhem just because we can" sense. They loved chaos and destruction for the sake of fun. That's what the whole chan thing was all about to them - the opportunity to be creative, inventive, random and fun. The current generation is not like that. They don't cause mayhem for the sake of fun and randomness, they do it to achieve their political goals. And that is something the old generation would frown upon, because we knew that political ideals destroy the fun.

But the current generation is so absorbed into politics and knows little of fun that it would not be even possible to explain this to them. They don't even want to make their own fun, they expect the fun to be delivered to them in a box ready to use, like everything. That's why this people will rather pay money for overpriced and oversimplified videogame than to go make their own fun in some creative way. People of this generation completely lost the ability to be creative and want to consume "fun" via visual media in the same way they order pizza. They would not understand my generation. They would not understand that we spent countless hours inventing countless original ways to have fun.

They would not be able to understand our way of thinking. And I can't understand theirs. I don't understand why are they so dull and obsessed by politics. They love to claim that they are the better generation. They always talk bullcrap like "the Generation Z is better than Millennials". And their reasoning? They think that they are better because they have "the right political opinions" and we have the "wrong" one.

Well, let me tell you this Gen Z - You are not better. You are the worse generation. You are not even able to invent your own kind of fun and expect all fun to be delivered to you by corporations and media like some kind of a hamburger. And what's even worse: You can't even communicate your ideas in any other way than by using memes created by somebody else. Without your memes and infographics, you would not even be able to express your opinions. You know that you would sound like a bunch of retards if you had to write something original by yourselves. This demonstrates how simpleminded your generation is. You are an inferior generation.

Why pay2win games fail at being fun

I would argue that games which give their players unfair advantages over other players for money (known as pay2win games) not only fail at being fun, but also fail at being games, they fail at the original purpose of games.

First of all: Why do people play games? I guess the answer is different for everybody, but all those different reasons often (if not always) converge into some sort of escapism. Games have always been one of the main ways to escape reality. Especially people who were not successful in reality could escape into any of the diverse game worlds and find success there instead. It didn't matter that in reality you are working for minimal wage and people usually don't even remember that you exist - in some game you could have been a top class paladin, respected and admired by other players for your skills.

But now they let you to bypass the game mechanics for money and they give you unfair advantages, which you can use to triumph over other players with higher skills. But that is a problem, because it directly ties success in the game to your real life success. The better job you have in real life, the more money you can spend on the game and get even more powerful in it. There is no way that you can get into the top ranks in these games without spending a significant amount of money. So suddenly you can be successful in the game only if you are also successful in the real life.

So where is the escapism in that? There is none. You cannot escape reality in these games, because those games are directly tied to reality.

And for me that means that they fail at their primary purpose and therefore there is no reason for them to exist.

Why do memes appeal to simple minded

Did you notice that the more simple minded people are the more memes they post? I have noticed this recently. The frequency of memes posted by a certain user is inversely proportional to their cognitive abilities. The lower the IQ (or age) the higher amount of memes posted in a given time. The higher the IQ (or age) the lower amount of memes posted by this particular user.

Why is that? Well, I think the answer is pretty obvious. Re-posting memes does not require any original thoughts, it doesn't require forcing your brain to think of a problem in a novel way, it doesn't require any personal take on things. It doesn't require thinking, originality nor any kind of

personal self-expression. It doesn't require making something new yourself. It's only about using something that somebody else has already made. The only thing you have to do is to click few times and re-post something that you got from somebody else. It's a monkey task.

When you realize this, it is much easier to understand why /pol/ boards are full of memes. This is why essentially every reply on /pol/ boards contains a ton of re-posted info-graphics, memes and highlights of various people's quotes taken out of context. It's because users of these boards aren't capable of anything more.

Why copyright over any digital media is a nonsense

All digital data are just numbers, a series of 1's and 0's, a long string of digits - in other words any digitalized media are just large numbers. If you digitalize a movie for example, you basically turn it into a large number.

But if those data are just large numbers, how can you claim copyright over them? It is equivalent to trying to patent the number 10 and then require everybody who uses the number 10 to pay you royalties.

Imagine if everybody patented a number and then schools would have to pay these patent trolls for being allowed to use those numbers to teach kids math.

Ridiculous, isn't it? Well, the copyright of any digital media is just as ridiculous, since if you digitalize something, it becomes just a number.

So claiming copyright of any digital data is basically just a number patent trolling.

No one can own digital media, because you cannot own a number. Because you didn't create that number. That number always existed. It is part of the Universe. You merely wrote that number down. If you digitalized your movie, then what you did was just writing down a large number that under some circumstances can be used to reconstruct your movie.

But does that mean that you own that number? Does that mean that you can claim ownership rights over that number? Of course not! That would be insane!

That would mean that anybody could claim ownership of any number by simply writing it down!

Would you really want to live in such a world? Well, you do live in such a world.

Copying any digital data is never a theft. You are not removing anything from anybody, you are merely making a copy of a number. Just because that number can be used to reconstruct a copy of someone's movie, doesn't mean that person can restrict you from using that number.

The concept of ownership makes sense only in terms of physical items. Extending it to the realm of ideas and numbers is pure madness. It is an unjust system and can potentially cause many unforeseen consequences.

Reply to common criticism of my anti-copyright article

"That is irrelevant. With copyright we are promoting progress."

That is a silly argument, that promotes an unjust law system in order to boost "progress". The laws should be about justice, not usefulness.

"By your logic, a (presumably english) book should not be copyrighted simply because it uses the same alphabet and therefore at the core is the same content. However, this is not true. Sure, all data at its core is just numbers, but that doesn't change the fact that it is the organization of these numbers that create something that isn't just numbers. Whether that be an mp3 file, or a movie, or a pdf file."

But those things ARE just numbers.

The number 1337 is also a unique organization of digits 1, 3 and 7. Does that mean that I can copyright the number 1337 now?

"You also mentioned that ownership of something digital is insane because it isn't physical, except it is. You have a hard drive, on that hard drive is the physical data. On a dvd, is a physical representation of data. On an SD card you have a physical representation of data. The servers you're accessing this site from have a physical representation of the data being transmitted to your screen, which also is a physical representation of the data being interpreted from bits to pixels to light. So theoretically one could use your logic to say that DVDs aren't physical, as they contain a string of ones and zeros. Might I also remind you that binary is quite literally a representation of the flow of electricity in your computer, which is also a physical thing. You seem to imply data is somehow imaginary, when it is physical."

Of course all information must be represented by something physical in the real world. I wasn't implying that data are literally un-physical.

But there is one big difference between data and what we usually call physical items. Data can be easily copied. You can copy a movie with few clicks, you don't have to make another identical movie yourself in order to have a copy. While if you break your phone, you would have to either buy a new one or make one from scratch yourself (pretty hard, isn't it).

Of course 3D printing kinda blurs this distinction between data and physical items, but so far you can't 3D print all of the items you use every day, so let's not go too deep into that.

Maybe in the future the distinction won't exist, but we aren't there yet.

The point is: By copying a movie you aren't taking away anything from anybody, so it should not be considered "theft". Because the term "theft" was referring to the act of taking away something from someone in pre-digital age. It simply doesn't match to the act of copying some data. That is twisting of the original meaning in order to fuel corporate agenda.

"Using a Data Capacity Converter, we will see that the average 4.7GB/120 Min DVD is $5.0466e+9 \times 3$ bits of info. Each unique dvd has its own unique string of bits. ie: shitty movie #1 starts out like d1V4sdSv2s4dsS2CsDCv4s.. Every copy of that dvd uses the same string. shitty movie #2 starts out like vf8d4v6df168d135df1d5f13d5f.. Both those strings are 15139800000 characters long."

"tl;dr: It's sorta like a bar-code or serial number that is so long, that there will never be a reason for anything to use the same number to ever represent anything."

That makes no difference. How long must a number be to be large enough so people can patent it? 100 digits long? 1000 digits long? A million digits long? A billion digits long? What is the magic length that allows you to patent a number? And why the hell should be long numbers treated differently from short numbers? It is the same thing - numbers. So there is no reason to legally treat them differently. How would you justify that? That's literally a double standard.

"Ask the patent office. It's their decision. I can imagine that how you use the "number" plays into things: If you enter the number into a viewer, or execute it as an executable, and/or it's set up to be executed and watched in this way, then it loses its mathematical meaning."

So if I make a copy of a movie, but never watch it (instead I use the data as a seed for a random number generator or something), then everything is fine? But that would mean that if I ever get sued for copyright infringement, then the cops would have to prove that I watched the movie, not just that I made its copy. I have never heard about any case where this would happen.

"Because larger numbers are much rarely used by mathematicians."

So what? That doesn't change the fact that at its core there is no difference. If I write down a long random (in other words pretty rare) combination of characters and I will be the first one to type it in this way, then does that mean that I can copyright it now and I can sue everybody who would by any chance ever type the same combination of characters?