

1
00:00:00,170 --> 00:00:07,528
good morning everybody I won't take much

2
00:00:05,309 --> 00:00:10,500
time to tell you how the global

3
00:00:07,528 --> 00:00:14,280
consciousness project data are achieved

4
00:00:10,500 --> 00:00:16,649
but basically it's a continuous report

5
00:00:14,279 --> 00:00:19,559
of data from something like sixty

6
00:00:16,649 --> 00:00:25,879
locations around the world where the

7
00:00:19,559 --> 00:00:30,960
data are random number generator trials

8
00:00:25,879 --> 00:00:33,089
the bottom line of the experiment really

9
00:00:30,960 --> 00:00:37,109
gives quite good evidence that there is

10
00:00:33,090 --> 00:00:42,570
some effect on these random number

11
00:00:37,109 --> 00:00:45,200
generators and we calculate that effect

12
00:00:42,570 --> 00:00:48,090
during periods of time when people are

13
00:00:45,200 --> 00:00:52,859
stimulated by some tragedy tragedy or

14
00:00:48,090 --> 00:00:53,579
maybe a celebration to feel the same

15
00:00:52,859 --> 00:00:55,079
emotions

16
00:00:53,579 --> 00:00:57,420
think the same kinds of thoughts in

17
00:00:55,079 --> 00:01:01,219
other words we're looking for global

18
00:00:57,420 --> 00:01:06,030
events to gather people together and

19
00:01:01,219 --> 00:01:08,129
then and when we look at repeatedly such

20
00:01:06,030 --> 00:01:11,010
events we find that there's a very small

21
00:01:08,129 --> 00:01:13,109
but ultimately quite impressive

22
00:01:11,010 --> 00:01:15,118
difference from what's expected from

23
00:01:13,109 --> 00:01:16,530
random number generators the odds

24
00:01:15,118 --> 00:01:18,868
against chance are on the order of

25
00:01:16,530 --> 00:01:22,349
trillion to one that we've gives as much

26
00:01:18,868 --> 00:01:25,650
deviation as we do now Peter been cell

27
00:01:22,349 --> 00:01:29,219
my friend and colleague who lives in

28
00:01:25,650 --> 00:01:32,009
Paris is the person has done more

29

00:01:29,219 --> 00:01:36,209
analysis on this data set than anybody

30
00:01:32,009 --> 00:01:38,400
else in the world and up till a year a

31
00:01:36,209 --> 00:01:40,739
couple of years ago he was pretty much

32
00:01:38,400 --> 00:01:42,359
convinced that there that the best

33
00:01:40,739 --> 00:01:44,879
explanation might be some sort of a

34
00:01:42,359 --> 00:01:48,030
field even though he couldn't describe

35
00:01:44,879 --> 00:01:49,349
it or write equations for it in the

36
00:01:48,030 --> 00:01:51,689
meantime he's been doing further

37
00:01:49,349 --> 00:01:55,199
analysis and has come to the conclusion

38
00:01:51,688 --> 00:01:58,828
that because there are a couple of

39
00:01:55,200 --> 00:02:03,990
factors that he really can't see any way

40
00:01:58,828 --> 00:02:07,649
for a consciousness effect to get to the

41
00:02:03,989 --> 00:02:10,280
bits and change them that we need a

42
00:02:07,649 --> 00:02:12,819
different kind of model he says a

43
00:02:10,280 --> 00:02:15,289

consciousness field can't penetrate

44

00:02:12,819 --> 00:02:19,579

exclusive-or we used to protect the data

45

00:02:15,289 --> 00:02:20,900

from bias and furthermore something that

46

00:02:19,580 --> 00:02:24,260

you might think of as a global

47

00:02:20,900 --> 00:02:28,189

consciousness isn't something that could

48

00:02:24,259 --> 00:02:30,979

have intention and that both of those

49

00:02:28,189 --> 00:02:33,590

are assumptions I think in any case he

50

00:02:30,979 --> 00:02:36,769

concludes that the GCP results must be a

51

00:02:33,590 --> 00:02:39,439

kind of goal or into or experiment or

52

00:02:36,770 --> 00:02:42,710

effect and gives some pretty persuasive

53

00:02:39,439 --> 00:02:46,490

arguments why that's the case among them

54

00:02:42,710 --> 00:02:49,939

for example looking back at data which

55

00:02:46,490 --> 00:02:52,640

we never analyzed for certain kinds of

56

00:02:49,939 --> 00:02:56,150

events for example the solstices and

57

00:02:52,639 --> 00:02:59,029

finding that the unexamined solstice

58
00:02:56,150 --> 00:03:02,360
periods did not show nearly as big an

59
00:02:59,030 --> 00:03:07,340
effect as the ones which we had selected

60
00:03:02,360 --> 00:03:09,740
to do analysis so the kind of counter

61
00:03:07,340 --> 00:03:11,599
arguments I think are pretty you know

62
00:03:09,740 --> 00:03:15,620
straightforward in a certain sense I

63
00:03:11,599 --> 00:03:20,389
think basically we're probably asking

64
00:03:15,620 --> 00:03:24,259
for too much to to conclude that we know

65
00:03:20,389 --> 00:03:27,319
how psy can or cannot work the

66
00:03:24,259 --> 00:03:30,519
assumptions that he makes about not

67
00:03:27,319 --> 00:03:33,919
being able to penetrate the x or or that

68
00:03:30,520 --> 00:03:36,710
intention has to be a part of the

69
00:03:33,919 --> 00:03:39,769
equation I think our vulnerable

70
00:03:36,710 --> 00:03:43,040
Jim carpenters first theory says we're

71
00:03:39,770 --> 00:03:45,110
basically doing something like psy all

72
00:03:43,039 --> 00:03:48,500
the time whether we're conscious of it

73
00:03:45,110 --> 00:03:50,690
or not but the real best argument is

74
00:03:48,500 --> 00:03:53,270
that there are quite a few things about

75
00:03:50,689 --> 00:03:56,569
the data elements of structure that

76
00:03:53,270 --> 00:03:59,080
simply don't fit very nicely into a goal

77
00:03:56,569 --> 00:04:02,419
orientation the formal prediction

78
00:03:59,080 --> 00:04:04,460
generally speaking will do so but what

79
00:04:02,419 --> 00:04:05,989
if we look at something different from

80
00:04:04,460 --> 00:04:09,950
the formal prediction which the

81
00:04:05,990 --> 00:04:12,650
experimenters have made in the case of

82
00:04:09,949 --> 00:04:15,859
9/11 data we had a effect but it was

83
00:04:12,650 --> 00:04:19,100
only point O three probability for the

84
00:04:15,860 --> 00:04:21,139
formal prediction on 9/11 it turns out

85
00:04:19,100 --> 00:04:24,479
that when we did a broader exploit

86

00:04:21,139 --> 00:04:26,728
exploration we discovered that the

87
00:04:24,478 --> 00:04:29,550
same effect that we're looking at

88
00:04:26,728 --> 00:04:32,329
persisted over three days a different

89
00:04:29,550 --> 00:04:37,249
kind of effect a different kind of

90
00:04:32,329 --> 00:04:39,930
variable not the subject of a prediction

91
00:04:37,249 --> 00:04:42,810
in other words a kind of independent

92
00:04:39,930 --> 00:04:44,509
measure also shows in effect even though

93
00:04:42,810 --> 00:04:46,769
there was no prediction and the

94
00:04:44,509 --> 00:04:48,598
experimenters had no intention of

95
00:04:46,769 --> 00:04:52,709
looking at that when the original

96
00:04:48,598 --> 00:04:54,149
prediction was made here is I think an

97
00:04:52,709 --> 00:04:57,000
interesting one I think we'll hear more

98
00:04:54,149 --> 00:05:00,709
about Burning Man later but in 2006 I

99
00:04:57,000 --> 00:05:02,819
decided to look at this interesting case

100
00:05:00,709 --> 00:05:04,829

which had been going on for quite a

101

00:05:02,819 --> 00:05:06,900

while had data for eight years and when

102

00:05:04,829 --> 00:05:09,688

I looked at the data I was I was

103

00:05:06,899 --> 00:05:11,938

startled there was a huge effect and

104

00:05:09,689 --> 00:05:14,689

again nobody was thinking about it there

105

00:05:11,939 --> 00:05:16,830

was no hypothesis this is a

106

00:05:14,689 --> 00:05:18,900

retrospective analysis and the only way

107

00:05:16,829 --> 00:05:20,668

this could be explained by as an

108

00:05:18,899 --> 00:05:23,899

experiment or effect would be for that

109

00:05:20,668 --> 00:05:28,680

to be something like retro Kinesis I

110

00:05:23,899 --> 00:05:32,668

think and this is a result of one of

111

00:05:28,680 --> 00:05:36,569

Peters analysis a very interesting and

112

00:05:32,668 --> 00:05:41,668

important in the context of whether the

113

00:05:36,569 --> 00:05:43,649

global excuse me whether a I a goal

114

00:05:41,668 --> 00:05:47,370

orientation model can explain the data

115
00:05:43,649 --> 00:05:49,709
here in the darker line is our standard

116
00:05:47,370 --> 00:05:52,110
measure that's the prediction we always

117
00:05:49,709 --> 00:05:56,028
make it has to do with a correlation of

118
00:05:52,110 --> 00:05:59,370
the data from separate pairs of devices

119
00:05:56,028 --> 00:06:04,319
there's a independent orthogonal

120
00:05:59,370 --> 00:06:06,120
comparison that shows pretty much the

121
00:06:04,319 --> 00:06:08,810
same trend it has a smaller effect size

122
00:06:06,120 --> 00:06:11,278
because the Avernus is larger but it's

123
00:06:08,810 --> 00:06:17,300
again a completely independent kind of

124
00:06:11,278 --> 00:06:19,800
thing we have data that can be looked at

125
00:06:17,300 --> 00:06:23,129
with many different kind of questions in

126
00:06:19,800 --> 00:06:25,560
mind one that we can ask is does

127
00:06:23,129 --> 00:06:28,560
distance have any effect on the outcome

128
00:06:25,560 --> 00:06:31,468
of in this experiment and the answer is

129
00:06:28,560 --> 00:06:34,288
a kind of interesting qualified yes we

130
00:06:31,468 --> 00:06:36,629
can't we talk about distance we can only

131
00:06:34,288 --> 00:06:37,979
do a reasonable analysis where the

132
00:06:36,629 --> 00:06:40,170
distance we're talking about is

133
00:06:37,980 --> 00:06:45,000
the separation between pairs of re G's

134
00:06:40,170 --> 00:06:47,490
and that different that the effect is a

135
00:06:45,000 --> 00:06:50,879
function of the separation of these re

136
00:06:47,490 --> 00:06:53,160
G's I have a poster session by the way

137
00:06:50,879 --> 00:06:55,980
so I can explain these things in more

138
00:06:53,160 --> 00:06:59,340
detail this gets interesting because it

139
00:06:55,980 --> 00:07:02,069
happens only or mainly for the smaller

140
00:06:59,339 --> 00:07:04,409
what you might call local events this

141
00:07:02,069 --> 00:07:09,000
one I think is a beautiful analysis

142
00:07:04,410 --> 00:07:14,120
again from Peter Mansell we asked what's

143

00:07:09,000 --> 00:07:19,170
the relative what's the relationship of

144
00:07:14,120 --> 00:07:21,449
the effect size to the time of day so it

145
00:07:19,170 --> 00:07:23,790
turns out that when we're awake the

146
00:07:21,449 --> 00:07:26,389
global consciousness effect size is a

147
00:07:23,790 --> 00:07:29,430
little bit larger than it is when we're

148
00:07:26,389 --> 00:07:32,189
when we're awake it's larger than when

149
00:07:29,430 --> 00:07:34,819
we're asleep the peak is around

150
00:07:32,189 --> 00:07:41,149
dinnertime 5:00 or 6:00 in the afternoon

151
00:07:34,819 --> 00:07:44,250
the valley the least effect size comes

152
00:07:41,149 --> 00:07:46,589
3:00 in the morning and at the bottom of

153
00:07:44,250 --> 00:07:50,850
the graph or our control data which we

154
00:07:46,589 --> 00:07:54,569
have huge amounts and they show no such

155
00:07:50,850 --> 00:07:56,700
effect here's one that's sort of a kind

156
00:07:54,569 --> 00:07:59,759
of logical argument you know when you

157
00:07:56,699 --> 00:08:04,409

think that psy is something like regular

158

00:07:59,759 --> 00:08:07,589

stuff modelling shows that some there

159

00:08:04,410 --> 00:08:09,510

may be some percentage of true negative

160

00:08:07,589 --> 00:08:11,819

outcomes in other words even though we

161

00:08:09,509 --> 00:08:14,849

predict and we'll be the outcome will be

162

00:08:11,819 --> 00:08:17,099

a positive deviation it turns out that

163

00:08:14,850 --> 00:08:20,460

within the database about two thirds

164

00:08:17,100 --> 00:08:23,820

show that about one-third show and no

165

00:08:20,459 --> 00:08:27,359

question null effect and about I'm not

166

00:08:23,819 --> 00:08:31,110

that many of about 17% show the null

167

00:08:27,360 --> 00:08:36,379

effect and another 17% show what you can

168

00:08:31,110 --> 00:08:39,389

think of as a kind of true negative so

169

00:08:36,379 --> 00:08:42,689

maybe we could say there's sign missing

170

00:08:39,389 --> 00:08:45,990

but I'm not sure that if you go that far

171

00:08:42,690 --> 00:08:48,870

that you'll be able to sustain an

172
00:08:45,990 --> 00:08:51,659
argument that a goal orientation or

173
00:08:48,870 --> 00:08:55,669
experimenter effect is false false

174
00:08:51,659 --> 00:08:58,230
ultimately so I think there's definitely

175
00:08:55,669 --> 00:09:00,568
something going on with the experimenter

176
00:08:58,230 --> 00:09:03,389
we after all we create the experiment

177
00:09:00,568 --> 00:09:05,099
and we know things like in physics that

178
00:09:03,389 --> 00:09:08,610
light is a wave or a particle depending

179
00:09:05,100 --> 00:09:10,980
on how you ask the question but I think

180
00:09:08,610 --> 00:09:12,899
the it's pretty pretty clear from a lot

181
00:09:10,980 --> 00:09:15,709
of experiments and the people here are

182
00:09:12,899 --> 00:09:19,370
familiar with that the experimenters is

183
00:09:15,708 --> 00:09:24,688
involved in creating part of the subtle

184
00:09:19,370 --> 00:09:27,419
effects as well and in any case I come

185
00:09:24,688 --> 00:09:29,669
to the conclusion ultimately that there

186
00:09:27,419 --> 00:09:33,539
are lots of aspects of the GCP data

187
00:09:29,669 --> 00:09:36,299
which aren't compatible with either kind

188
00:09:33,539 --> 00:09:38,039
of experiment or effect instead for

189
00:09:36,299 --> 00:09:41,750
those we need something like a field

190
00:09:38,039 --> 00:09:45,299
like model apologies for the

191
00:09:41,750 --> 00:09:47,360
misalignment so unbalanced I think we

192
00:09:45,299 --> 00:09:50,938
have to understand that psy is neither

193
00:09:47,360 --> 00:09:55,079
just an experiment or effect goal

194
00:09:50,938 --> 00:09:56,879
oriented nor is it necessarily what we

195
00:09:55,078 --> 00:10:00,289
might think of as the nominal source

196
00:09:56,879 --> 00:10:03,438
it's not either/or but I think both

197
00:10:00,289 --> 00:10:03,438
thank you

198
00:10:06,460 --> 00:10:15,889
Thank You Roger okay we have time for

199
00:10:08,779 --> 00:10:19,399
questions Roger do you have you compared

200

00:10:15,889 --> 00:10:24,470
the effect sizes of the GCP would say

201
00:10:19,399 --> 00:10:27,169
other goal-oriented experimenter sigh to

202
00:10:24,470 --> 00:10:28,639
get a sense of this seems like the field

203
00:10:27,169 --> 00:10:30,529
effect it would be sort of a different

204
00:10:28,639 --> 00:10:34,399
kind of effect in therefore the the

205
00:10:30,529 --> 00:10:35,870
effect sizes might be different yeah and

206
00:10:34,399 --> 00:10:37,909
we haven't actually done any kind of

207
00:10:35,870 --> 00:10:41,060
formal in comparison like that but I I

208
00:10:37,909 --> 00:10:43,490
think it's clear that the global

209
00:10:41,059 --> 00:10:45,679
consciousness effect is really small

210
00:10:43,490 --> 00:10:48,669
it's about one third of a standard

211
00:10:45,679 --> 00:10:51,649
deviation on average so that means that

212
00:10:48,669 --> 00:10:55,939
great many of the trials you make will

213
00:10:51,649 --> 00:10:57,649
show no effect it's a good question but

214
00:10:55,940 --> 00:11:01,880

it's very difficult to ask because we

215

00:10:57,649 --> 00:11:06,679

have at least nominally maybe millions

216

00:11:01,879 --> 00:11:08,389

of people involved and different you

217

00:11:06,679 --> 00:11:13,549

know positive and negative kinds of

218

00:11:08,389 --> 00:11:15,590

circumstances and what I'd like to talk

219

00:11:13,549 --> 00:11:19,639

with you sometime about how one might go

220

00:11:15,590 --> 00:11:22,509

about making that comparison I think

221

00:11:19,639 --> 00:11:26,210

that the distinction between the field

222

00:11:22,509 --> 00:11:31,549

effect and the experimenter effect is a

223

00:11:26,210 --> 00:11:34,700

false dichotomy not only is I so you

224

00:11:31,549 --> 00:11:36,289

I think you massaged it a little bit by

225

00:11:34,700 --> 00:11:39,379

saying there there appear to be both

226

00:11:36,289 --> 00:11:42,649

effects I'd go a step farther and say

227

00:11:39,379 --> 00:11:46,029

both effects are the same thing in that

228

00:11:42,649 --> 00:11:49,039

when you have a stochastic process and

229

00:11:46,029 --> 00:11:52,639

you apply intention to it you're

230

00:11:49,039 --> 00:11:56,329

essentially programming a Sai system so

231

00:11:52,639 --> 00:11:58,759

your intention is that the global

232

00:11:56,330 --> 00:12:02,570

consciousness project should work to

233

00:11:58,759 --> 00:12:05,689

measure global events and so it does so

234

00:12:02,570 --> 00:12:08,629

you genuinely are measuring global

235

00:12:05,690 --> 00:12:10,790

events and field effect but you're doing

236

00:12:08,629 --> 00:12:15,289

it because you've mentally programmed it

237

00:12:10,789 --> 00:12:17,089

to do so as the experimenter and I don't

238

00:12:15,289 --> 00:12:19,219

think there's a dichotomy here I don't

239

00:12:17,090 --> 00:12:21,410

think there's a problem well in

240

00:12:19,220 --> 00:12:24,250

I have to agree with you in large part

241

00:12:21,409 --> 00:12:27,019

but I'm a little worried about the

242

00:12:24,250 --> 00:12:29,389

unfalsifiable 'ti of that kind of

243
00:12:27,019 --> 00:12:32,899
extension if you allow yourself to go

244
00:12:29,389 --> 00:12:34,698
that way when you stop this this is the

245
00:12:32,899 --> 00:12:39,259
challenge of sigh we don't know where

246
00:12:34,698 --> 00:12:41,838
this is and I've got several experiments

247
00:12:39,259 --> 00:12:43,759
in which I programmed machines to

248
00:12:41,839 --> 00:12:46,850
produce a certain effect and then those

249
00:12:43,759 --> 00:12:50,480
machines did it mm-hmm were the

250
00:12:46,850 --> 00:12:52,909
experimenters of course were the

251
00:12:50,480 --> 00:12:56,269
machines experimenters yeah that's

252
00:12:52,909 --> 00:12:59,828
another question yeah I feel a little

253
00:12:56,269 --> 00:13:03,110
bit obliged to defend Peter pencils

254
00:12:59,828 --> 00:13:07,458
conclusion that there can be no global

255
00:13:03,110 --> 00:13:10,240
fields effect and his major and one of

256
00:13:07,458 --> 00:13:13,369
his major arguments you didn't show here

257

00:13:10,240 --> 00:13:16,879
and it did it goes as follows

258
00:13:13,370 --> 00:13:20,289
these aren't G's all over the world that

259
00:13:16,879 --> 00:13:25,930
they have a slight misalignment in times

260
00:13:20,289 --> 00:13:30,708
if you and he did a reanalysis trying to

261
00:13:25,929 --> 00:13:33,588
get all these timing exactly the same

262
00:13:30,708 --> 00:13:36,258
and if you do that so you shift the

263
00:13:33,589 --> 00:13:37,879
signals of each of these oranges a

264
00:13:36,259 --> 00:13:40,789
little bit so that they now they're

265
00:13:37,879 --> 00:13:42,769
simultaneously and if you do Orenda

266
00:13:40,789 --> 00:13:46,698
analysis then the whole effect

267
00:13:42,769 --> 00:13:49,639
disappears that shows to me that in some

268
00:13:46,698 --> 00:13:51,469
way there cannot be a feel and at least

269
00:13:49,639 --> 00:13:54,579
that's his conclusion that cannot be

270
00:13:51,470 --> 00:13:58,819
filled because why would that be so

271
00:13:54,578 --> 00:14:01,159

dependent of the the accidental

272

00:13:58,818 --> 00:14:04,669
misalignment in time of the orange

273

00:14:01,159 --> 00:14:07,669
cheese that that's just crazy and I

274

00:14:04,669 --> 00:14:10,429
should add that he is a he was a strong

275

00:14:07,669 --> 00:14:13,849
believer and a supporter of global

276

00:14:10,429 --> 00:14:18,138
fields so his conclusion is against his

277

00:14:13,850 --> 00:14:22,209
own worldview so I think his conclusion

278

00:14:18,139 --> 00:14:27,500
is correct so please comment on that I

279

00:14:22,208 --> 00:14:28,938
have I have no doubt that I I really

280

00:14:27,500 --> 00:14:29,620
love what Peters been doing all these

281

00:14:28,938 --> 00:14:31,209
years

282

00:14:29,620 --> 00:14:35,259
to revealed a great deal about the data

283

00:14:31,210 --> 00:14:38,710
but the models that he uses are as he

284

00:14:35,259 --> 00:14:41,830
will say and you know very simple field

285

00:14:38,710 --> 00:14:44,379
models so seems to me to be entirely

286

00:14:41,830 --> 00:14:47,770

possible you have a more let's say

287

00:14:44,379 --> 00:14:53,740

robust in the sense of powerful field

288

00:14:47,769 --> 00:14:56,980

model that can affect not just this one

289

00:14:53,740 --> 00:15:00,159

second synchronised moment in time but a

290

00:14:56,980 --> 00:15:03,670

period around that time I I'm not I

291

00:15:00,159 --> 00:15:08,199

don't want to spend time now debating

292

00:15:03,669 --> 00:15:10,120

our link but let's talk about it hi I'm

293

00:15:08,200 --> 00:15:12,129

really sympathetic with the global I'm

294

00:15:10,120 --> 00:15:17,259

like the x-files I want to believe in

295

00:15:12,129 --> 00:15:18,519

the global field but whatever I look at

296

00:15:17,259 --> 00:15:21,250

those small effect sizes

297

00:15:18,519 --> 00:15:24,069

I keep thinking that there I want them

298

00:15:21,250 --> 00:15:28,240

to be bigger and I keep thinking that

299

00:15:24,070 --> 00:15:31,089

may be unintentional influences on our

300
00:15:28,240 --> 00:15:32,620
energies are very similar to intentional

301
00:15:31,089 --> 00:15:34,930
influences such that there are some very

302
00:15:32,620 --> 00:15:36,070
few skilled people and they're the ones

303
00:15:34,929 --> 00:15:38,799
who are basically dragging the effect

304
00:15:36,070 --> 00:15:42,700
and everyone else has zero effect what

305
00:15:38,799 --> 00:15:45,759
do you think about that I'm not exactly

306
00:15:42,700 --> 00:15:47,800
sure what the bottom-line question is

307
00:15:45,759 --> 00:15:49,000
it's the bottom line question is do you

308
00:15:47,799 --> 00:15:51,849
think it could be the case that the

309
00:15:49,000 --> 00:15:53,950
stein enos of the effect size is because

310
00:15:51,850 --> 00:15:55,480
you have skilled people who don't know

311
00:15:53,950 --> 00:15:57,459
their skill this is unintentional psy

312
00:15:55,480 --> 00:16:00,480
who are basically producing the entire

313
00:15:57,458 --> 00:16:04,689
effect and it's washed out by a ton of

314

00:16:00,480 --> 00:16:07,629
well aren't in the context of the idea

315
00:16:04,690 --> 00:16:09,880
that it's an experiment or effect there

316
00:16:07,629 --> 00:16:12,519
are a few of us who know a great deal

317
00:16:09,879 --> 00:16:15,580
about it and most of us people think we

318
00:16:12,519 --> 00:16:20,919
don't have any personal experiment or

319
00:16:15,580 --> 00:16:21,940
effect potency but in terms of all those

320
00:16:20,919 --> 00:16:23,829
people out in the world they're

321
00:16:21,940 --> 00:16:25,089
completely unconscious of you know the

322
00:16:23,830 --> 00:16:28,120
why this would be people who are skilled

323
00:16:25,089 --> 00:16:29,290
at unintentional psy so in other words I

324
00:16:28,120 --> 00:16:32,769
guess I'm drawing a parallel between

325
00:16:29,289 --> 00:16:34,208
intentional PK like like at the pair lab

326
00:16:32,769 --> 00:16:36,399
right you have people who are skilled at

327
00:16:34,208 --> 00:16:38,019
an intentional micro PK and maybe

328
00:16:36,399 --> 00:16:39,819

there's a rule that there are some

329

00:16:38,019 --> 00:16:41,799

people who are skilled at unintentional

330

00:16:39,820 --> 00:16:43,660

PK

331

00:16:41,799 --> 00:16:46,438

I don't think I can answer the question

332

00:16:43,659 --> 00:16:49,299

and I'm not sure I understand it but

333

00:16:46,438 --> 00:16:52,808

basically the intentional sigh in the

334

00:16:49,299 --> 00:16:57,609

lab is also an extremely tiny effect and

335

00:16:52,808 --> 00:17:00,159

it it's attached you might say to only a

336

00:16:57,610 --> 00:17:04,179

few people about 15% in the pair right

337

00:17:00,159 --> 00:17:05,949

data set there may there may be a

338

00:17:04,179 --> 00:17:07,240

tremendous amount of unconscious sigh

339

00:17:05,949 --> 00:17:09,579

going on in the part of the

340

00:17:07,240 --> 00:17:15,788

experimenters that set up the whole

341

00:17:09,578 --> 00:17:18,519

operation I guess yeah okay hi there I

342

00:17:15,788 --> 00:17:21,879

just want to read something in response

343
00:17:18,519 --> 00:17:23,908
to your co-authors quote global

344
00:17:21,880 --> 00:17:31,528
consciousness does not have intention I

345
00:17:23,909 --> 00:17:35,440
just hear from the Yoga Sutras and

346
00:17:31,528 --> 00:17:39,240
nothing can be predicated apprecia which

347
00:17:35,440 --> 00:17:39,240
is global consciousness in yoga theory

348
00:17:40,679 --> 00:17:45,909
except as a corrective negation no

349
00:17:43,569 --> 00:17:48,668
positive attribute process or intention

350
00:17:45,909 --> 00:17:51,039
can be affirmed of it I said no

351
00:17:48,669 --> 00:17:53,230
intention can be affirmed of it though

352
00:17:51,038 --> 00:17:55,028
it is behind all the activity of the

353
00:17:53,230 --> 00:17:57,130
road so I just want to submit that does

354
00:17:55,028 --> 00:17:58,960
these great thinkers from millennia I

355
00:17:57,130 --> 00:18:02,440
have been like chewing on this stuff

356
00:17:58,960 --> 00:18:06,909
daily and maybe they be useful those

357

00:18:02,440 --> 00:18:07,298

stuff thank you all right Thank You

358

00:18:06,909 --> 00:18:09,060

Roger

359

00:18:07,298 --> 00:18:11,960

as you know

360

00:18:09,059 --> 00:18:11,960

[Applause]