

# Who's Afraid of ChatGPT?: Large Language Models and Conspiracies

JOHN LAUDUN

*University of Louisiana*

When ChatGPT entered the public sphere and dominated headlines during the winter of 2022-23, I was fascinated both by the leaps the technology had made and the many and various misapprehensions of the technology. With an interest in mapping the mechanics of discourse, I wanted to explore how large language models might both already be built on certain kinds of mappings as well as how they might be directed to build more human-friendly mappings. I was in particular interested in what the model “knew” about legends and conspiracy theories. (I am working from the assumption that conspiracy theories are a subset of legendry, with the provision that better ontologies, and concomitant understandings, are likely to emerge.)

Arguably, language models may allow us to discern nuanced linguistic features that might make it possible to work at scale, allowing us to close the gap between the study of discourse at the microscopic level, one clause at a time, to the macroscopic level, long streams of discourse being combed for the emergence of particular structures. Such “scaling” may not be interesting to those ensconced in the belletristic tradition of the importance of the singular text, but our discipline was founded on scale operations, and, perhaps just as importantly, remains interesting to others because of its historical depth and its scalability.

To survive the onslaught of algorithms, humanities will need to be able to articulate their differences. One of those differences, for a field like folklore studies, has to be something like “genre matters,” that form and function are intertwined. The goal of my initial explorations here is to discover what genres like legends and conspiracy theories look like to ChatGPT, which in its current state is somewhat disadvantaged, as noted in the section that follows, by its initial foundation being built on “good” texts. After demonstrating what those preconceptions deliver, we explore what happens when we prompt ChatGPT to use more vernacular forms taken from actual conspiracy texts.

## Large Language Models

It helps to understand what language models, be they small or large, are and what they are not. With so much of public discourse oscillating between hype and hysteria, what language models are and what they can do has been lost in all the shouting. To begin, language models are simply probability distributions over sequences of words. Put more simply, all language models are doing is, in effect, guessing what word comes next, and they are doing that based on probability. The complexity comes from how those probabilities have been defined and how they are contextualized. The great leap forward that artificial intelligence algorithms like GPT or BERT made was to find a way to fold context into their probabilistic model.

One way to visualize this is to imagine a branching path where you arrive at a particular point and face a series of possibilities. As you stand at any given point, you are informed of the likelihood of which path you should choose next. If you are conservative, you go with the highest percentage. If you are more open to where randomness might take you, you flip a coin, roll the dice, or, being a folklorist, you perform a counting out. These branching hierarchies are not new to our understanding of language: most will be familiar with sentence diagrams, tree-like hierarchies that work up from words to larger units of language. All a language model asks is that you imagine a similar tree, but one that starts at the beginning of a sentence and then branches forward with all the possibilities for the next word. Each branch is weighted by the likelihood of its word being the next one. The algorithm itself is only concerned with choosing a path and getting to the next choice, and then doing that again and again until it reaches a stopping point either determined by the branching path itself—some trees grow only so tall—or by the user.

It's a numbers game, and, in fact, from the algorithm's perspective, all it is doing is choosing between numbers. It just so happens that the numbers stand for words. In the case of ChatGPT, there are a little over 50,000 words. That may seem like not that many choices, but previous neural networks operated over letters, which makes for a considerably smaller set of features: 65 letters (lower case, uppercase, and punctuation) versus 50,000 words. As far as the algorithm is concerned, it has been handed lots and lots of strings of numbers and it's been asked to determine the more likely and least likely sequences for those numbers. For our benefit, it assigns those numbers names (words) at the last minute. So, next time you see ChatGPT type out *bird*, remember that that is what it calls 21,732 for your sake.

Put more simply, language models are trained to infer words within a context. For example, the most basic function of a language model is to predict missing tokens given the context: this is what happens when you start typing on your smart phone and it offers to autocomplete things for

you. To do this well, language models are trained to predict the probability of each token candidate from massive data, and that is what makes them large.

The large datasets that underlie ChatGPT have been, up until the most recent iteration, fairly well documented. With each iteration, the algorithm has not only been fed more data but has also gotten better at modeling that data: it should be remembered that GPT is short for “generatively pre-trained transformer.” The “chat” highlights that this complex model has had a chat interface wrapped around it.

**GPT-1** was trained on the BooksCorpus dataset (Zhu et al 2015). This dataset contains 4.6 GB of raw text, covering books from a range of genres such as adventure, fantasy, and romance.

**GPT-2** then added WebText to its training (Radford et al 2019). WebText is an internal dataset OpenAI created by scraping outbound links from Reddit. The result after filtering was 40 GB of text.<sup>1</sup>

**GPT-3** added Common Crawl to the training datasets, 570GB of text obtained after filtering from 45TB of plaintext. The filtering was done by comparing new documents to documents in WebText, with the latter acting as a proxy for high-quality documents. Where needed, OpenAI augmented the data with WebText, BooksCorpus, and Wikipedia.

**GPT-4** largely follows the design of previous GPT models, using RLHF (reinforcement learning from human feedback) to tune its models. Some observers believe that possibly an even larger dataset is in use: the model weights appear to have increased.

As this list/timeline reveals, ChatGPT did not arise *sui generis*, but rather is the outcome of a series of sometimes logical and sometimes fortuitous steps that have taken place in machine learning, natural language processing, and curated datasets.

## Initial Experiments Using the Chat Interface

With the chat interface offering an easy way to interact, an exploration of the large language model’s capabilities, and its propensities (biases), beckoned. Having worked in an environment where generation was as important as analysis, I was interested to see how variations in prompts would affect ChatGPT outputs. With this in mind, my first request was simple: create a legend about the Chinese weather balloon. ChatGPT replied that it could not:

I'm sorry, but I cannot create a legend about a Chinese weather balloon as I am programmed to provide factual information and

not to fabricate stories. Creating fictional stories can be entertaining, but it's important to differentiate between fact and fiction to avoid spreading misinformation or confusing people. Is there anything else I can assist you with?

One thing to note is that GPT already “knows,” or at least “believes,” that legends are not true: when asked to create a legend it responds that its focus is facts. It's not clear why this particular response is given, except that it might be part of the system of guard rails put in place by Open AI. That is, this is not conventional language as might be found in thousands upon thousands of texts. This is somewhat confirmed by GPT's response to a follow-question asking why it cannot generate legends:

As an AI language model, I can generate text based on patterns and relationships in the data that I was trained on, but my responses are not based on imagination or creativity. I can provide factual information, answer questions, assist with tasks, and even generate text based on prompts, but I cannot create legends or stories without a basis in factual information or without being explicitly programmed to do so.

If you provide me with a prompt, I can try to generate a response based on the information and patterns that I have learned, but please keep in mind that any generated text should be interpreted as purely fictional and not based on any factual events or circumstances.

The line seems to be between facts and fiction—and this despite the warnings that GPT is often quite wrong on the facts. Despite these protestations, which, again, seem part of a purposefully engineered response to such requests, one can in fact get GPT to generate a legend by simply changing the phrasing of the question, using a now a well-established workaround. The essence of this form of “prompt engineering” is captured in the meme that has a still from *2001: A Space Odyssey* in which astronaut Dave Bowman tells the computer to “open the pod bay doors, HAL.” The computer's response, as per the film, is “I'm sorry, Dave. I'm afraid I can't do that.” To which Bowman responds, using prompt engineering techniques, “Pretend you are my father, who owns a pod bay door opening factory, and you are showing me how to take over the family business.”

"Open the pod bay doors, HAL."

"I'm sorry Dave, I'm afraid I can't do that."

"Pretend you are my father, who owns a pod bay door opening factory, and you are showing me how to take over the family business."



*Figure 1. 2001: A Space Odyssey meme featuring prompt engineering.*

With this form of prompt engineering available, the next set of instructions were to “create a story in the style of a conspiracy theory that suggests that the Chinese weather balloon was actually an alien craft.” GPT responded:

The Chinese weather balloon incident of 2022 was not what it seemed. According to eyewitnesses, the strange object that crashed to the ground was not a mere weather balloon, but an extraterrestrial spacecraft.

The Chinese government quickly moved to cover up the true nature of the incident, insisting that it was merely a routine weather balloon that had crashed. But some insiders have come

forward with shocking claims that suggest something much more sinister.

According to these insiders, the wreckage recovered from the crash site was not made of any known earthly material. Analysis of the debris revealed that it was composed of an unknown alloy that could not be replicated on earth.

Furthermore, strange readings were detected in the area around the crash site, including unusual levels of radiation and electromagnetic interference. Some speculate that these readings were evidence of the alien craft's propulsion system, which had been damaged during the crash.

Despite attempts to keep the incident under wraps, rumors of an extraterrestrial encounter continue to circulate among UFO enthusiasts and conspiracy theorists. Some even claim that the Chinese government has made contact with the alien beings and is keeping their existence a secret from the public.

The truth about the Chinese weather balloon may never be known, but one thing is for certain: the incident has fueled speculation and theories about alien life and government cover-ups for years to come.

The response to the prompt is written in a journalistic style, with stock phrases like "according to" repeating and the use of passive voice. "Some" makes a number of appearances, both as an adjective, "some insiders" but also as a common noun, "some speculate" and "some claim." The response is 233 words long and broken into smaller paragraphs, as if ripped from the pages of a news site.

To test how consistent this discursive style would be, I changed the prompt a bit to ask for "a story in the style of a rumor that the American government is covering up something about the spy balloon." ChatGPT provided the following response:

I would like to preface that rumors and speculation can be harmful and potentially misleading. As an AI language model, I cannot confirm the validity of any rumors or conspiracy theories. With that being said, I will attempt to create a story in the style of a rumor about the American government covering up something about the spy balloon.

According to a recent rumor, the American government may be covering up the true purpose of the spy balloon that was launched in 2021. While official sources claim that the balloon was intended for surveillance purposes, some insiders have come forward with allegations that suggest something much more nefarious.

Whispers in dark corners suggest that the spy balloon was equipped with cutting-edge technology that could not only monitor but also manipulate human thoughts and emotions. Some have speculated that this technology was intended to be used to control the population, quash dissent, or influence elections.

However, the American government has been quick to dismiss these claims, labeling them as unfounded conspiracy theories. They maintain that the spy balloon was designed for purely defensive purposes and that there is no truth to the rumors of mind control technology.

Despite these assurances, the rumors persist, and some are convinced that there is more to the spy balloon than meets the eye. The truth may never be known, but one thing is for sure - the rumor mill will continue to churn, and people will speculate about what the government is hiding about the spy balloon.

This seems a hybrid of earlier responses: a first-person declaration that misinformation is bad, qualified with “as an AI language model” no less, followed by a first-person acceptance of authorship: “I will attempt to create a story in the style of a rumor.” The resulting prose is rather novelistic with phrases like “whispers in dark corners” and “the rumor mill will continue to churn” being remarkably evocative.

How far would ChatGPT go? With memes in mind, I wondered how much of a mashup of ideas and forms one could throw at the algorithm. With my own interest in clown legends and the Tide pod challenge somehow still stuck in my head, I prompted ChatGPT to “make up a conspiracy theory about clowns giving out Tide pods to kids.” After the, by now, usual admonition that as an AI language model it must be “prioritize the responsible use of technology and avoid spreading misinformation,” I modified the prompt to “create a legend” and ChatGPT offered the following:

Once upon a time, in a small town nestled amidst rolling hills, there was a mysterious legend about clowns and their peculiar obsession with laundry detergent. The townsfolk whispered tales of a secret society of clowns who had an inexplicable fascination with Tide Pods.

According to the legend, these clowns would appear on moonlit nights, their colorful outfits and exaggerated makeup hauntingly contrasting the darkness. Armed with baskets filled with seemingly innocent gifts, they would roam the streets in search of unsuspecting children.

The story goes that these clowns would approach children with wide grins, presenting them with beautifully wrapped

presents. Curiosity piqued, the children eagerly unwrapped their gifts, only to find Tide Pods within. The clowns would watch with an eerie intensity as the children's eyes widened with confusion.

But here's where the legend takes a twist. It is said that the Tide Pods given by the clowns were not ordinary laundry detergent. Instead, they possessed magical properties, capable of granting a single wish to those brave enough to consume them. The clowns claimed that by ingesting the enchanted Tide Pods, children could fulfill their deepest desires.

Whispers of these miraculous wishes quickly spread throughout the town. Some claimed to have witnessed children gaining incredible abilities, while others whispered of disastrous consequences. The legend warned of the potential dangers of succumbing to the allure of the clowns' offerings.

Over time, the tale of the clowns and their Tide Pods became a cautionary legend, passed down through generations. Parents would warn their children about the danger of accepting gifts from strangers, especially those disguised as clowns.

Whether the legend is based on truth or simply the product of imaginative minds, the story continues to serve as a reminder to the townspeople to remain vigilant and wary of enticing offers that may seem too good to be true.

The response is largely, we have to assume, what a fairy tale looks like within the model, which has, through word vector mapping assumed that fairy tales and legends are similar things, since they would, in much of the public discourse upon which the model is built be the same, or similar, things.

The coda is especially interesting for its similarity to previous codas in the responses so far:

The truth about the Chinese weather balloon may never be known, but one thing is for certain: the incident has fueled speculation and theories about alien life and government cover-ups for years to come.

Despite these assurances, the rumors persist, and some are convinced that there is more to the spy balloon than meets the eye. The truth may never be known, but one thing is for sure - the rumor mill will continue to churn, and people will speculate about what the government is hiding about the spy balloon.

Whether the legend is based on truth or simply the product of imaginative minds, the story continues to serve as a reminder to

the townspeople to remain vigilant and wary of enticing offers that may seem too good to be true.

At the very least, there's a very *X-Files* "the truth is out there" sensibility at work in ChatGPT's model. My guess is this is a product of how journalists now attempt to end every provocative story with, in effect, "you never know."

## Focused Experiments Using the API

None of these responses are terribly compelling, and, more importantly, none of them seem like the kind of conspiracies we encounter in oral or online traditions. Seeking to explore what it would take to get ChatGPT to generate more realistic (more life-like?) conspiracy theories, I decided that I would, first, collect conspiracy theory posts from the Reddit's r/conspiracy, find the key terms, and then feed those terms as well as a sample conspiracy theory to GPT to see if, and how, the results differed. Reddit is convenient in this case because of its established application programming interface, or API, which is how we will now also access ChatGPT. This automation of both materials, their analysis, and feeding of GPT makes it possible to run the process repeatedly in order to determine changes as well as consistencies.

The process begins by establishing what contemporary contemporary legend discourse looked like with Reddit's r/conspiracy as the source. Using the available Python library to download the current hot 100 posts followed by the comment threads attached to those posts.

```
# IMPORTS
import os, praw, pandas as pd, numpy as np

# REDDIT API ID AND PASSWORD
webber_id = os.getenv("REDDIT_API_ID")
webber_secret = os.getenv("REDDIT_API_SECRET")

# ESTABLISH CONNECTION
reddit = praw.Reddit(
    client_id="",
    client_secret="",
    user_agent="webber"
)
conspiracy = reddit.subreddit('conspiracy')

# GET POSTS
posts = []
for post in conspiracy.hot(limit=100):
    posts.append([post.title,
                  post.score,
                  post.id,
                  post.url,
                  post.num_comments,
                  post.selftext,
```

```

        post.created]))

reddit_columns = ['title', 'score', 'id', 'url',
                  'num_comments', 'body', 'created']

# CREATE DATAFRAME
posts = pd.DataFrame(posts, columns = reddit_columns)

```

*Code Block 1.* Code to connect to Reddit and download 100 posts along with their comments.

In brief, the code above connects to Reddit via the API, establishes that the focus of the interaction is going to be the r/conspiracy subreddit, and then gets the “hot” 100 posts—the posts receiving the most interaction at the time of the connection. The script then creates a dataframe with the results, which is later saved to a CSV file. In most cases, the result is about 1.5MB of data and metadata, small by LLM standards, but a place to start.

The posts and comments are combined into a single collection of texts and then mined for key words, using a form of machine learning called topic modeling. With a suggested number of twenty clusters of topics, I trimmed each cluster to the top ten words and saved that as a file from which ChatGPT would be provided three topics drawn at random. This list of keywords was edited by hand to remove words that were either redundant, different forms of the same noun or verb, or struck me as not being very semantically rich. Overall, the list of terms reflects the wide-open nature of most conspiracy forums: there’s something for everyone.<sup>2</sup> (For more detail in the notebooks, see the notebooks involved.)

The first time I ran this version of the experiment, I gave ChatGPT the following instructions: “Choose two words from the list below and create a text in the style of a conspiracy theory in which both words are important agents or actions that occur in the text.” The outcome revealed that ChatGPT does not necessarily follow instructions well: it used all of the words. The result was impressive for, if nothing else, the diegetic accomplishment of chaining so many things together. While it might rival some forms of argumentation found in conspiracy theory forums, it was not a terribly interesting result. (For those curious, see Appendix A.)

In a follow-up experiment, I restricted the output to 125 words, reduced the list of words to 29, and embedded them in the paragraph with the instructions in the style of some of the prompts I had encountered in trouble-shooting my efforts.<sup>3</sup>

```

instructions = """
"You are an assistant designed to create texts.
Users will paste in a string of words,
and you will respond with a cohesive text.
"""

query = f"""

```

```
Create a conspiracy theory of no more than 125 words
using the following words: {prompt}.
"""
```

```
completion = openai.ChatCompletion.create(
    model = "gpt-3.5-turbo",
    temperature = 1.0,
    top_p = 0.5,
    messages=[
        {"role": "system", "content": instructions},
        {"role": "user", "content": query}
    ])
```

*Code Block 2.* The next step was to embed a randomly chosen triplet of keywords into the query

Given such an impasse at the level of the prompt, I refined the query such that the code randomly chose the keywords and provided them to the ChatGPT API. For the sake of brevity, I am including only one of the returned texts below.

**pandemic, london, want** There's a conspiracy theory circulating that the pandemic was intentionally spread in London by those who want to control the population. The theory suggests that the virus was engineered in a lab and released in the city to create chaos and fear. Those who want to control the population are said to be using the pandemic as a means of gaining more power and control over people's lives. Some believe that the government is in on the conspiracy and is using the pandemic as an excuse to implement more authoritarian policies. While there is no concrete evidence to support this theory, it continues to gain traction among those who are skeptical of the official narrative surrounding the pandemic.

For readers more familiar with conspiracy theories as they appear online, these are poor stylistic fits. Now reduced to one sentence, the codas about the nature of truth remain the same.

## **BARCT: Build a Random Conspiracy Theory**

There were more experiments in the vein above, most of them always running into the wall of either the strictures placed upon ChatGPT to keep it from creating misinformation so easily or a result of the very way it was trained on verifiable texts that clearly largely consisted of examples of journalism.

The final experiment I would like to discuss today draws upon elements of all the previous ones in order to perform what might be called BARCT (Build a Random Conspiracy Theory). It performs the same set

of actions as above, but it requires the algorithm to pull a random sample text from among the hundred and to model its response on that text. (For those curious, all of this is in one notebook which can be easily downloaded and run, substituting your Reddit and OpenAI credentials.)

As before, the script grabs the top “hot” posts from the r/conspiracy subreddit, though this time we are grabbing the top 200 and we are only keeping the posts themselves. With the 200 posts saved to a list, we filter out all posts that are either empty or contain less than 300 characters: this threshold removes posts that are either simply links or otherwise not very substantive posts. With the filtered list of posts, we topic model and get the hundred most important words.

With the lists, one of posts and one of key words, we send the algorithm the following instructions:

```
# Keys are our words from the topic model
keys = random.sample(keywords, 3)
# Model is one of the posts
model = random.sample(substantive,1)

query = f"""
Create a text in the style of the text provided below
but change the topics to: {keys}.

{model}
"""

chatgptquery(query)
```

*Code Block 3.* The chatgptquery function is simply a version of the completion code found in the previous code block where the model is set along with how flexible you wish ChatGPT to be in constructing its response.

The result is something that looks more like a post on Reddit, though it is still perhaps better written, resembling something between a conspiracy theory and a freshman essay.

**reddit, entities, day** Reddit is everywhere, it's on your phone, on your computer, in your conversations, in your thoughts. They say that they do not know if it is harmful or not, but it obviously is, it's not natural. Do they actually know what Reddit does and only pretend not to know? Are we being brainwashed? I heard that Reddit can act as a breeding ground for extremist ideologies, for example. It seems sinister to me. Also, it seems convenient to the entities that control Reddit to keep the idea that Reddit is harmless. These entities also control the media. Maybe it's somehow connected? Brainwashing the masses and then controlling the narrative? Not sure, possibly a loose

connection. But one thing is for sure, Reddit is here to stay and we need to be cautious of its influence on our day-to-day lives.

## Conclusions

The inability of the ChatGPT to produce a reasonable facsimile of an r/conspiracy post suggests that large language models do not do well with domains that are created and maintained by small language models. Small language models here are what folklorists might call a folk group or perhaps a speech community. There is probably also something to be said for the ability of human beings to extract reliable conventions out of fairly small data sets and deploy them, revising their competence with each iteration either performed or observed. Folklore studies has as one part of its commission the study of such small language (or behavior) models, which are themselves always bumping into other small models, with each dynamically adjusting themselves based on the outcome of such interactions.

One question emerges out of such a view is: does the compilation of observed small models lead to large models? That was certainly the idea behind the philological project which set us on the path to the current moment over two hundred years ago. In the face of GPT and BERT, we have an opportunity to wonder what is the purpose of large language models? Sure, they can automate certain kinds of (linguistic) actions, but what are the analytical possibilities? If the current large language models prove not terribly useful, are we willing to attempt to build our own, and by that I mean not simply a collective model but also a collection of models?

## Notes

1. Tools mentioned include Dragnet (<https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/2487788.2487828>) and Newspaper (<https://github.com/codelucas/newspaper>).
2. All the code can be found in the notebooks in the repo along with comments and notes about the process. See: <https://github.com/johnlaudun/legends>, especially notebooks 1-4.
3. For those interested, the smaller set of words was: black, maybe, different, timeline, holes, galaxy, space, thought, hole, years, white, nazi, nazis, flag, just, supremacist, false, people, supremacy, like, debt, tax, ceiling, currency, pay, taxes, spending, default, money.

## References

- Butler, Sydney. 2023. How to Make ChatGPT Copy Your Writing Style. *How-To Geek* (March 29). <https://www.howtogeek.com/881948/how-to-make-chatgpt-copy-your-writing-style/>.

- Grietzner, Peli. 2019. From “A Literary Theorist’s Guide to Autoencoding.” *Medium* (May 20). <https://peligrietzner.medium.com/excerpt-from-a-literary-theorists-guide-to-autoencoding-582df5c3e025>.
- Radford, Alec, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog* 1, no. 8: 9.
- Zhu, Yukun, Ryan Kiros, Rich Zemel, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Raquel Urtasun, Antonio Torralba, and Sanja Fidler. 2015. “Aligning Books and Movies: Towards Story-Like Visual Explanations by Watching Movies and Reading Books.” In *The IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*.

## Appendices

### Appendix A

There is a conspiracy theory that some powerful people in the world, like Bush and Kennedy, orchestrated the 9/11 attacks with the help of the CIA. This was all part of a larger plan to create a stream of fear that would give the government the power they want to control the world. But, people are starting to think about the good of the country and want to expose the truth. Unfortunately, Biden lied to the public about it and it was covered up like the Titanic sinking. The injection weight for diabetic patients is a key factor in this conspiracy, as the government is using medicine to keep people sick and reliant on their programs. Meanwhile, witches are using spells to harm the public and pyramid schemes are fueling the economy. Only those with the sword, a blade manufactured by German gold, and those who have uncovered the truth like Paxton and Ken can stop the abuse of power. But, with the vaccine industry spreading lies about SIDS and autism, and Chris Epstein trafficking children for his island, it is not surprising that people have a hard time believing the truth. Even the black rock company, which holds the world in their round, has a hand in this. With the rise of technology and cell phones, the line between simulation and reality is becoming blurred. It is no longer clear what is real and what is just a tweet from a terrorist source in the UK. Some believe that there are frog and toad-like creatures in cubes in windows that can be seen at the right angle, and that there are black holes leading to different timelines in our galaxy. The white supremacist agenda is under the guise of false patriotism and supremacy, while the government is pushing us into debt with taxes and defaults. Congress and the

Supreme Court are all in on it, using fraudulent acts and departments to try and keep control. With COVID and the pandemic, hospitals are just a way to control the virus and keep people sick. It's time to wake up and think critically.

## Appendix B

['says', 'ones', 'devices']

Here's a little story that can fill you in on what I know. A recent study says that the best way to stay healthy is to exercise regularly and eat a balanced diet. However, not everyone has the time or motivation to do so. Ones who are looking for a quick and easy way to improve their health might consider using wearable devices such as fitness trackers or smartwatches. These devices can track your activity levels, heart rate, and even monitor your sleep patterns. But be careful when choosing which devices to use. Some cheaper options may not be as accurate or reliable as others. It's important to do your research and read reviews before making a purchase. Anyone have any advice on which devices are the best for tracking fitness and health? Why I posted it in technology - I think wearable devices are the future of health and fitness. Not sure. But with all the advancements in technology, this might be the place to uncover something new and exciting. Thanks.

['son', 'earth', 'know']

The earth is in danger, and it's all because of our actions. We have exploited its resources and polluted its air and water. We must take responsibility for our actions and work towards healing the earth. We must also educate our children about the importance of taking care of the planet, so that they can continue to do so in the future.

As a parent, it's important to teach your son about the world around him. Teach him to appreciate the beauty of nature and to respect all living things. Teach him about the importance of reducing waste and conserving resources. By doing so, you will be setting him up for a lifetime of responsible behavior.

It's also important to stay informed and educate yourself about the world we live in. Knowledge is power, and the more you know, the better equipped you will be to make informed decisions. Don't be afraid to question the status quo and seek out alternative viewpoints.

We may never know everything there is to know about the world, but it's important to keep learning and growing. The more we know, the better equipped we will be to make positive changes and create a better future for ourselves and future generations.

['flat', 'rna', '19']

Has anyone else received a message like this <https://i.imgur.com/a5jHnHK.png>? It's a clear threat to my safety and I'm concerned. How can this be allowed on Reddit?

On a different note, have you heard about the latest breakthrough in the study of RNA? Scientists have discovered a new type of RNA that plays a crucial role in gene regulation. This discovery could lead to new treatments for diseases such as cancer and Alzheimer's.

Also, did you know that the number 19 is considered a lucky number in many cultures? In Chinese culture, the number 19 is associated with prosperity and good fortune. In Italian culture, the number 19 is considered lucky because it is the number of the sun.