

In Response to What the BLEEP Do We Know!?

Matthew Tingblad

What the BLEEP Do We Know!?, originally titled *What the #\$*! Do We (K)now?!*, is a narrative documentary featuring a photographer named Amanda whose life unravels as she discovers deeper truths about reality. The movie (henceforth, WTB) features interviews from various physicists and spiritual thinkers whose teachings are interwoven with Amanda's story.

Amanda's "Alice in Wonderland" journey is presented not as a fairytale but as reality for viewers to embrace, supported by the spiritual and scientific voices dispersed throughout its runtime. Many of the ideas are radical, and viewers are encouraged to "go down the rabbit hole," one that is distinctly New Age in its theology.

Although some elements of WTB are helpful, many of its ideas are erroneous or misleading. The goal of this paper is to analyze the message of WTB and to provide a critique of its main ideas, especially the notion that you create your own reality. In section 1, the movie's arguments and main ideas will be presented. Curiously, quantum physics is invoked for many of the movie's main arguments. So, for section 2, I will provide a brief overview of the science for those unfamiliar with its main concepts. Finally, I will offer my critique in section 3.

Section 1: A Summary of WTB's arguments and main ideas.

Before we begin, I wish to point out that although most of WTB's teachings are presented through the voices of scientists and spiritual thinkers, this section should be understood as a summary of the movie's teachings, not the speakers' teachings. I stress this because, from the end user's perspective, the *movie* teaches through its intentional use of cutting and splicing the raw

interviews. As we shall soon see, much of its teaching is deeply problematic, and I wish not to credit that against the teachers whose full interviews I (and other viewers of WTB) do not have access to.

The arguments and main ideas of WTB are difficult to summarize because its teaching is scattered and its reasoning is opaque. Rather than presenting a flow of argumentation with precision and analytical care, it appears to be more concerned about splashing bits and pieces of “chew on this” statements. As a viewer, I feel as though the movie left me with a pile of IKEA furniture pieces and no instruction booklet. I will attempt to work with these pieces to see what kind of furniture can be formed.

WTB begins with the idea of possibility. Quantum physics, the branch of physics concerned with the smallest pieces of matter, is said to be a physics of “possibilities.”¹ As the movie develops, it calls into question our confidence in what we know. True to its name, WTB begins largely as a project of deconstruction. For example:

- Our brain is said to have limitations.
 - It limits what we see to what we believe is possible.
 - The information it processes is far greater than the information we are aware of.
 - Our conscious perspective is entirely internal; we have no access to things outside of us.
- The notion of time is described as having oddities.
 - It’s a puzzle that we have epistemic access to the past, but not the future.
 - In quantum physics, time can move backwards.
- Matter is not what it seems

¹ What the BLEEP Do We Know!?, directed by William Arntz, Betsy Chasse, and Mark Vicente (2004; Gaia), accessed December 4, 2025, 0:03:55

- o Matter is mostly empty space.
- o Objects don't actually touch.
- o Matter is like a thought, made up of ideas, concepts, and information.
- o The concept of superposition in quantum physics shows that "When you ain't looking, it's like a wave, when you are looking, it's like a particle. When you're not looking, there are waves of possibility. When you're looking, then there are particles of experience."²

Yet, as in most cases of deconstruction, WTB is also about constructing something in place of what it took down. The movie claims that reality is internal, everything is one, religion (and especially the retribution principle found in religion) is false, you are emotions, and you are gods. Arguably, however, WTB's most significant point is that *you create your own reality* (YCYOR for short). This notion appeared more frequently than any other³ and is connected to many other notions in the movie, so it will be the primary focus for the remainder of this paper.

YCYOR could be taken in a moderate or radical way. Moderately, we might say that your patterns of thinking affect your mood, your stress (which has physiological health implications), and your perspective on life. This concept is relatively uncontroversial. However, WTB takes the idea further into more radical interpretations. Claims are made, such as:

- "Our mind literally creates our body."⁴
- "If you accept with every rudiment of your being that you will walk on water, will it happen? Yes, it will."⁵

² What the BLEEP Do We Know!?, 0:23:50

³ In my viewing, I counted over a dozen moments that implicitly or explicitly claim you create your own reality, more than any other appearance of other distinct ideas. The notion was also spread more evenly across the duration of the movie than any other.

⁴ What the BLEEP Do We Know!?, 1:14:40

⁵ What the BLEEP Do We Know!?, 0:36:19

- “Your consciousness influences others around you. It influences material properties. It influences your future. You are co-creating your future.”⁶

The logic and philosophical rigor necessary to establish YCYOR cannot be underestimated. It is a radical claim that runs counter to our common beliefs, as WTB admits.⁷ How are these radical notions defended? This is where some assembly of the IKEA furniture pieces is required, using the aforementioned concepts and a few other “chew on this” statements splashed throughout. To my understanding, the relevant pieces intended to form a cumulative case for YCYOR are:

1. Quantum theory is a theory of possibilities.
2. Your conscious observation causes matter to collapse from waves of possibilities into actuality.
3. Reality is internal.
4. The moderate view of creating reality is true.
5. Water molecules change their molecular structure according to how you speak to them.
6. You are god.
7. Try it out and see for yourself.

Apart from 6 and 7, these points may not seem to have much, or anything, to do with YCYOR in a radical sense, but they are as close as I could find to arguments in support of it. An uninformed viewer may think the opacity stems from the complexity of physics and/or quantum mechanics. True, there are complexities and many counterintuitive notions in the micro world.

⁶ What the BLEEP Do We Know!?, 1:31:15

⁷ What the BLEEP Do We Know!?, 0:26:12

However, the arguments for YCYOR are opaque because they are, at best, half-baked single premises. In section 3, I will attempt to bake the ideas the rest of the way and see if they come out edible. Before that, however, some clarity is needed regarding quantum physics and what it tells us about the universe.

Section 2: A Brief Overview of Quantum Physics

For many, quantum physics (also known as quantum mechanics) calls to mind science fiction tropes, such as teleportation, time travel, and alternative universes. However, as previously stated, quantum physics is the branch of physics concerned with the smallest particles of matter, such as atoms, electrons, and quarks. The reason it is often used as a plot device in science fiction stories is that the quantum realm (i.e., the subatomic world) behaves in very mysterious and unexpected ways that force us to rethink long-held notions of how we assumed the world to be. The mysterious nature of quantum physics, then, along with clever use of “technobabble,” can be used to make the plot of your science fiction story do what you want it to do (or, as we shall see, allegedly support New Age ideology). Regardless, quantum physics is not science fiction. Physicists have worked in this field since the 1900s, and today it is used almost everywhere in modern technology.

To understand quantum mechanics, consider Newtonian mechanics. Under Newtonian mechanics, objects behave predictably. For example, we can know what will happen if I throw a rock at a glass window. Given enough information about the toss, we could know the momentum of the rock, its spin as it flies through the air, where exactly it will strike the glass, how the glass shatters, how the impact will affect the rock’s trajectory, and so on. In short, Newtonian

mechanics is deterministic. If we have enough information, we can predict how the future will play out.

Most physicists believe that quantum objects, such as photons and electrons, are not deterministic in this way. For example, if a light photon vibrating diagonally (or, more precisely, having diagonal polarization) flies through a vertically oriented calcite crystal, it will change its vibration to be either vertical or horizontal. This change cannot be predicted with certainty, yet most physicists believe they know everything there is to know about the photon, implying that the change is random. However, predictions can still be made. The closer to a vertical polarization the photon is before passing the calcite crystal, the more likely it will switch to vertical polarization rather than horizontal polarization, and vice versa.

This curious behavior of the photon is one of many examples in which inherent randomness and degrees of predictability are evident in quantum objects. It leads to a critical point we will return to later in this paper: quantum physics is largely a study of probabilities. Even with complete knowledge, scientists can't determine things with certainty as they theoretically could for a rock tossed at a window. Instead, they are dealing with random activities and probability calculations.

Another critical feature of quantum physics concerns Heisenberg's uncertainty principle. Simply put, this principle claims that there are complementary properties in quantum objects, and the more precisely you know one property, the less precisely you can know the other. The reasoning behind this principle is complex, but part of the issue is that when we conduct experiments to measure a quantum object's property, the measurement irreversibly changes the object. Importantly, it is not our conscious *knowing* of a measurement that causes the change. We can run quantum measurements and disrupt the system without knowing the results until long

after the fact.⁸ The change comes earlier, at the moment of the experiment. As the physicist Michael Raymer puts it, any form of measurement we conduct causes the quantum object to leave a “permanent trace” on something, such as an electron bouncing off a sensor, causing it to vibrate.⁹

One may wonder: if these discoveries about objects in the quantum realm are true, and if these quantum objects make up our observed physical universe, why don't we observe the same phenomena in our macro world of rocks and windows? It is because the randomness and unpredictability of quantum objects “even out” when there are so many of them at the macro level. Think of flipping a coin repeatedly and tallying the results, updating the average as you go. After a couple of flips, you may find that the coin lands on heads 63% of the time and tails 37% of the time. But the more you flip the coin, the closer your average will reach 50% heads and 50% tails. Now, consider that there are trillions of atoms on a single speck of dust. Although there is randomness and unpredictability down there, the difference is negligible from our perspective.

At this point, one may wonder if the inherent randomness and the uncertainty principle are epistemic problems rather than metaphysical problems. In other words, is our lack of knowledge regarding the properties and future predictions of quantum objects related to the insufficiency of our measurement devices, or is it related to the actual nature of quantum objects? In the early days of quantum physics, many scientists believed it to be the former. Today, however, physicists tend to lean toward the latter.

⁸ The physicist Allan Adams makes this point in his MIT lecture on Quantum Physics on YouTube, published by MIT OpenCourseWare. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TkJ_WgruM2g. 0:58:23.

⁹ Michael G. Raymer, *Quantum Physics: What Everyone Needs to Know*, What Everyone Needs to Know (Oxford University Press, 2017), 76.

The story of this shift in thinking relates to another phenomenon in quantum physics. In certain experiments, we find that two particles are somehow correlated, or “entangled.” Specifically, when one particle is measured, the other instantaneously adopts a correlated state, even if the two particles are separated by a great distance. A casual thinker may be inclined to suppose that by measuring one particle, instructions are sent to the other, explaining their correlation. However, this view doesn't work because it requires faster-than-light communication, which physicists are unwilling to accept. Alternatively, Einstein supposed that particles contained prewritten instructions for how each was to behave. (Consider, for example, a pair of gloves sent to Alice and Bob, who reside in two different rooms. The gloves are “prewritten” to be a pair for left and right hands. So, if Alice receives a glove for the right hand, she can know that Bob’s glove is for the left hand, and vice versa.) However, a handful of experiments post-Einstein, known as “Bell tests,” have shown that the math doesn’t work out for any “prewritten instructions” theory. This insight supports the standard Copenhagen interpretation, which claims that these two entangled particles share a single “quantum state” described by a probabilistic wave function. When a measurement is made, the wave “collapses,” and definite properties are established for both particles. This may be difficult to understand, but my point is that the Copenhagen interpretation implies that our lack of knowledge regarding the properties and future predictions of quantum objects is indeed related to the actual nature of quantum objects, not the insufficiency of our measurement devices. Insofar as we can’t know such-and-such property of a quantum object, it’s because such-and-such property has no definite value.

Despite the fact that most physicists, it seems, adhere to the Copenhagen interpretation, there are other possible interpretations beyond the failed “prewritten instructions” theory. The

Bohemian mechanics theory (a.k.a., the pilot-wave theory) claims that there is some instantaneous non-local physical influence that explains the quantum entanglement. This theory allows us to hold that entangled particles have definite properties. By allowing particle properties to always have definite values, the notion of realism is preserved, but at the expense of locality. A third, more radical interpretation that seeks to preserve both realism and locality is the Many-Worlds Hypothesis. This view claims that for every quantum measurement, the universe splits into separate, non-interacting realities, one for each possible measurement result. Under this view, realism is preserved because all of the possibilities of the wave function are actual. Locality is also preserved because the correlations are explained by branching universes rather than the instantaneous collapse of a wave.

The fact that there are various interpretations brings out an important point to make about science in general: As much as we may assume or wish for science to be entirely empirical and fact-based, science is inescapably wrapped in philosophical questions.¹⁰ For example:

- Science explains things, but what exactly is an explanation, and how does science explain?
- Science seeks to identify laws of nature, but how does one identify if something really is a law, compared to just some accidental feature of our world that could have been otherwise?
- Science speaks about causes. But, as David Hume famously inquired, how does one identify a cause over against a mere event taking place after another?

¹⁰ For a deeper exploration of philosophical issues in science, see Alexander Rosenberg and Lee McIntyre, *Philosophy of Science: A Contemporary Introduction*, Fourth edition, Routledge Contemporary Introductions to Philosophy (Routledge, 2020).

- Science works with observed phenomena, but often we must propose unobserved things to make sense of the observed things. How, then, do we demarcate between good science and bad science?
- Science is meant to lead toward the progress of understanding. But how do we tell the difference between scientific progress and mere shifting from one belief to another?
- Science is meant to help us reach conclusions about the nature of this world. But what about the problem of underdetermination, that is, the fact that we will never be able to observe every single possibility that could potentially invalidate our theories? When are we ready to jump to a conclusion? Furthermore, what happens when two different conclusions are both equally supported by the observations we make?

As we can see, science is at the mercy of how we work out philosophical questions that govern its process. This is especially the case for quantum particles, which we cannot observe with the naked eye. I stress this because there are times when WTB claims to be firmly supported by scientific fact, when in fact it is steeped in philosophical interpretations and assumptions about how much science can actually tell us. That is simply inevitable given the nature of science.

With a working grasp of science and quantum physics, let us proceed to evaluate WTB.

Section 3: A Critique of WTB

As already mentioned, the teaching of WTB is scattered, and its reasoning is opaque. Some concepts, like the weirdness of time or that all is one, don't seem to contribute to the movie's overall message beyond giving it an enchanting New Agey vibe. While these and other autonomous "chew on this" statements deserve some chewing (and spitting out), we will focus

our attention on the six arguments in support of YCYOR from section 1. (Unless otherwise specified, we will take YCYOR in a radical sense.)

1. Quantum Theory is a Theory of Possibilities.

I take this first point as an argument for YCYOR because the movie opens with this statement, shortly before presenting its opening questions, such as “Why do we keep creating the same reality?” But how does YCYOR follow from the claim that quantum theory is a theory of possibilities? Consider the following:

1. Quantum theory is a theory of possibilities
2. Therefore, YCYOR.

Clearly, more work is needed to make the argument valid. Were this argument to be made valid, we would end up with something like this:

1. Quantum theory is a theory of possibilities
2. Quantum theory describes all of reality
3. Therefore, reality is identical to possibilities (1&2)
4. Possibilities imply that you have control over them
5. Therefore, YCYOR (3&4)

To clarify, we must treat 1 and 2 as identity claims so that 3 is a valid conclusion. There doesn't appear to be any other way that 1 could lead to 5. Now that we have a deductive argument that is (at least arguably) valid, are the premises true?

Premise 1 is, at best, misleading. Quantum theory is *not* about possibilities. As we have seen, it is about *probabilities*. Consider again the fact that a photon's polarity after passing a calcite crystal is probabilistic. Either option is “possible,” but the possibilities are not always

equal, they are not possible in the sense of choices laid before us, nor should “possibilities” be taken as an identity statement with quantum theory.

Premise 2 is debatable. Although quantum theory concerns the subatomic particles that make up physical matter, one can only say that quantum theory describes all of reality if physical matter is all there is to reality. I expect the physicalist worldview would not be readily accepted among the teaching of WTB, given its deep affinity with spiritual notions.

Premise 4 is more or less stated in the movie when it says, “Quantum physics calculates only possibilities. But if we accept this, then the question immediately becomes: who [or] what chooses among these possibilities to bring the actual event of experience? So we directly, immediately see that consciousness [i.e., you] must be involved.”¹¹ This premise is patently false. Again, quantum physics is about *probabilities*, and no one needs to ask who or what chooses the side a die lands. But even if quantum physics is about possibilities, recall that the “possibilities” of quantum physics are possible in the sense that specific outcomes could take place given certain initial conditions, not in the sense that the outcomes are laid before an agent of some kind to make a selection.

As we have seen, the argument that “quantum theory is a theory of possibilities, therefore YCYOR” is false in its only premise, invalid, and attempts to validate it introduce even more false premises. I can think of no way to salvage this argument.

¹¹ What the BLEEP Do We Know!?, 0:28:23

2. Your conscious observation causes matter to collapse from waves of possibilities into actuality.

Once again, it is unclear how this point implies YCYOR. Allow me, once again, to fill in the gaps to get as close to a valid argument as I can:

1. Your conscious observation causes matter to collapse from waves of possibilities into actuality.
2. While making your conscious observations, you choose how these possibilities collapse.
3. These possibilities comprise the totality of your reality.
4. Therefore, YCYOR.

Once again, premise 1 is, at best, misleading. The idea stems from the fact that *measuring* a particle in a quantum state causes it to collapse into a particle with definite properties. Although the writings of quantum physics frequently use “measuring” and “observing” interchangeably, the former is a superior choice of words. Observing implies a revelatory conscious experience, whereas measuring does not. As we have seen, the measurement causes these waves to collapse, not the conscious knowing of the measurement. (Note also that this explanation assumes the Copenhagen theory, which remains in competition with other aforementioned theories that reject the antirealist notion on which premise 1 relies.)

Premise 2 is entirely unsupported. Even under the Copenhagen interpretation, nothing in quantum physics even vaguely implies that the observer’s choice or preference affects the way in which quantum systems collapse.

Premise 3, once again, depends on physicalism. So it shares the same challenge as premise 2 from the previous argument. But even if physicalism is true, the “possibilities” exist only at the quantum level. Recall that the many “possibilities” of quantum states are negligible in

the macro world that we experience. This is important because YCYOR hinges on experience, and we do not experience the wave collapse phenomenon at our macro level. In the movie's own words, "superheroes use superposition with the world being potential strips of reality until we choose. Heroes choose what they want. Being in many places at once, experiencing many possibilities all at once, and then collapsing onto one."¹² This statement sounds as though it stems from a comic book rather than a sophisticated scientific conclusion. To the movie's credit, it admits that.¹³ Ironically, the movie uses special effects to show the speaker of that quote demonstrating what he claims to be possible (being in many places at once), rather than just filming the person doing it without special effects.

We have seen, then, that the second argument for YCYOR is as erroneous as the first. Its only premise is false, it is invalid, and other premises we may add to make the argument valid are, at best, on shaky grounds.

3. Reality is internal.

When WTB claims that reality is internal, it means that reality is located within your private conscious experience rather than "out there" in the real world, if such a world even exists.

How might this lead to YCYOR? Let's consider this argument:

1. Reality is internal.
2. Your internal life is your conscious life.
3. Therefore, reality is your conscious life (1&2).
4. You can control what you are conscious of.
5. Therefore, YCYOR (3&4).

¹² What the BLEEP Do We Know!?, 0:24:32

¹³ What the BLEEP Do We Know!?, 0:23:30

Premise 1 is a more radical notion than the misunderstood notions of quantum theory in the previous two arguments. The main support for this notion comes from the fact that our concept of reality arises from our first-person, conscious observer standpoint, receiving input through our senses. As one speaker put it, “there were philosophers in the past that said, ‘look, if I kick a rock and I hurt my toe, that’s real... and that means that it’s reality.’ But it’s still an experience, and it’s still this person’s perception of it being real.” Philosophers *in the past?! That the external world exists is the dominant view of philosophers throughout all of human history, including the present!* What, may I ask, causes my experience of pain when I hurt my toe against a rock, if not the rock? To be sure, there are some challenges in epistemology in showing that reality exists outside my conscious experience, but many solutions exist, and most philosophers today are committed to one or more of them. A thorough discussion of this matter is beyond the scope of this paper, but suffice it to say, to deny the external world is a radical move and should be rejected on the weight of decades of work in the field of epistemology.

Premise 4 is also objectionable. Our conscious experience can be controlled, but only to a degree. We can, for example, choose to think or imagine certain things. But, generally speaking, we cannot control the conscious input we receive from our senses. If I see a red ball in front of me, I cannot make that sensory experience become something else. I may be able to ignore what I see, or give myself a mental picture of something else, but the sensory experience is still there, and still part of my total conscious experience. Many more examples from any of the five senses could be given.

As we have seen, it will be very difficult to conclude YCYOR from the already bad starting point that reality is internal.

4. The moderate view of creating reality is true.

WTB tends to provide evidence and examples supporting the moderate view of YCYOR. Consider, for example, the fact that negative thinking can increase stress, which in turn raises one's heart rate, tenses the muscles, and quickens breathing. These body functions may even have long-term physiological effects. WTB gives its own examples of how thinking affects us physiologically, such as how lustful thoughts cause sexual arousal, or how chemicals related to consciousness in the brain can deposit in our cells. But to move from these points to the conclusion that you create your own reality is unwarranted. Moderate YCYOR claims far, far less than the radical version. To jump from the former to the latter would be like saying that since I can throw a basketball 15 feet, I can throw *anything* 15,000 feet. It's a hasty generalization, and an extreme one at that.

The only way to make this jump is to claim that there is no difference between the moderate and radical views of YCYOR. I see no reason to think they are the same. Such a claim is spurious, and the movie never seems to argue in that direction.

Whenever we speak of abilities, we don't assume the abilities are unlimited, nor should we. For this reason, argument 4 should be rejected.

5. Water molecules change their molecular structure according to how you speak to them.

At first glance, this argument appears irrelevant to YCYOR. However, WTB gives special attention to this matter, presenting what I take to be the most formulated argument in the movie. Here is how the argument is presented in full:

1. Water molecules change their molecular structure according to how you speak to them.

2. The thought or intent is the driving force of the change in water's molecular structure.
3. 90% of our body is water. (It is actually around 60%.¹⁴)
4. "If thoughts can do that to water, imagine what our thoughts can do to us."¹⁵

While this isn't a full-fledged argument for YCYOR, the movie seems to present it as close enough. Almost immediately following the provocative question of point 4, it says, "If you accept with every rudiment of your being that you will walk on water, will it happen? Yes, it will."¹⁶ The fact that this radical statement is spliced right after the water molecule study speaks volumes.

We have already covered in the previous argument that you can't move from a specific instance of ability (like changing water's molecular structure with positive thinking) to a broad set of abilities (including the ability to walk on water). But the issue goes deeper: The notion that water molecules are affected by speech comes from a study by Masaru Emoto, as the movie points out.¹⁷ His study on water is considered pseudoscience.¹⁸ It should not come as a surprise, then, that the mention of Emoto's study was a scripted part of the movie rather than something spoken by one of the scientists who were interviewed. Additionally, the study only claims that thoughts affect the apparent beauty of how water crystalizes when frozen. Even if this were true, it's hard to see how such a fact would get us anywhere close (or "close enough") to full body control (let alone YCYOR). At best, we could say that 60% of your body would look nice under a microscope if you were frozen solid. That's a steep price to pay, since you would also be dead!

¹⁴ U.S. Geological Survey, "The Water in You: Water and the Human Body," U.S. Geological Survey, last modified May 22, 2019, <https://www.usgs.gov/water-science-school/science/water-you-water-and-human-body>

¹⁵ What the BLEEP Do We Know!?, 0:35:24

¹⁶ What the BLEEP Do We Know!?, 0:36:19

¹⁷ What the BLEEP Do We Know!?, 0:33:25

¹⁸ For example, see William Reville, "The Pseudoscience of Creating Beautiful (or Ugly) Water," *The Irish Times*, February 17, 2011,

<https://www.irishtimes.com/news/science/the-pseudoscience-of-creating-beautiful-or-ugly-water-1.574583>

6. You are god.

If it is true that you and I are gods, then it is easy to see how YCYOR could be true. Gods create reality, so if you are god, you create reality.

Admittedly, it is unclear whether this argument is actually used to support YCYOR in the film. The statement appears close to the end of the WTB, so it could be that one's godhood is derived from YCYOR, rather than the other way around. If that is the case, YCYOR cannot be supported by one's godhood since that would be an obvious case of circular reasoning. But if one's godhood is an argument for YCYOR, what reason might we have to substantiate such a claim? As far as I could tell, the movie doesn't say. If "you are god" is not derived from YCYOR, then it appears to be simply stipulated. Given the claim's radical nature, the burden of proof lies strongly on WTB to show that we are gods. With nothing to back the claim, we can conclusively reject it.

7. Try it out and see for yourself.

One of the speakers in WTB claims to have experienced reality-creating moments that confirmed YCYOR for him.¹⁹ Later, he encourages his listeners to do the same.²⁰ So, even if all the other arguments for YCYOR fail, what do we make of personal testimony?

Curiously, no examples are given from this speaker (or any speaker, for that matter)! Given how ungrounded we have found YCYOR to be, I find this troubling.

Life is already full of small coincidences and occasional big ones. Often, we don't notice them until we are looking for them. This is related to a psychological phenomenon known as the Baader-Meinhof Phenomenon, a cognitive bias in which a person notices certain words,

¹⁹ 0:42:45

²⁰ What the BLEEP Do We Know!?, 1:28:12

concepts, or objects more frequently after becoming more conscious of them.²¹ A typical example is when we buy a new car and start noticing the same make and model on the roadways more often. Furthermore, we have already seen that WTB seems to confuse moderate cases of YCYOR with radical cases. In the case of non-coincidental experiences supporting YCYOR, I worry that the examples reported by advocates of YCYOR would merely be examples of its moderate form. But as we have seen, moderate YCYOR does not get us anywhere close to the radical YCYOR of the movie.

For these reasons, I propose we take personal testimony for YCYOR as false *prima facie*. We should expect strong, specific examples and evidential confirmation to think otherwise.

Final Remarks

As previously stated, YCYOR appears to be the core theme and teaching of WTB, which is why we spent our time critiquing it. Along the way, however, we have found that other New Agey statements, such as “you are god” or “everything is internal,” are also lacking. While not all matters of the movie were discussed, we have seen enough to know that WTB is riddled with problems. Had more time been spent, we would also have found that the movie is flawed in its reasoning about the notion that all is one, its analysis of emotions, and its critiques of church and religion.

It could be argued that my response has been, largely, a strawman argument. In other words, I recreated the opposing argument in a way that is easy to defeat. However, it cannot be said that I am “recreating” an argument if there was no argument from which to begin. Had WTB provided clear arguments for its core theme that you create your own reality, I would have gladly

²¹ Pacific Standard Staff, “There’s a Name for That: The Baader-Meinhof Phenomenon,” *Pacific Standard*, July 22, 2013, <https://psmag.com/social-justice/theres-a-name-for-that-the-baader-meinhof-phenomenon-59670/>.

used them. Instead, I found half-baked arguments, mainly in the form of single premises in desperate need of further construction before they could even get off the ground. I could have simply left the arguments in their immature form and dismissed them outright. Instead, I decided to do the lifting for WTB, building out their arguments in a deductive fashion, and I did so in the best way I knew how.

My conclusion is that the argumentation from WTB is, modestly put, horrendous. Not only are its arguments invalid, but the steps necessary to make questionably valid arguments out of them are riddled with false and/or misleading premises. It takes only one error for a deductive argument to be fallacious. We have seen that it is hard to find steps in their argumentation *lacking* errors.

At the beginning of this paper, I chose to shorten *What the BLEEP Do We Know?! to* WTB rather than its full acronym, WTBDWK. This wasn't because I wanted a shorter acronym.

I'll let you complete that half-baked argument on your own.