



Renay Oshop
Skeptiko #345

1
00:00:11,890 --> 00:00:09,379
on this episode of skeptical we decided

2
00:00:16,340 --> 00:00:11,900
to just in a moment in time grab

3
00:00:20,029 --> 00:00:16,350
screenshot all of top 1000 people who

4
00:00:22,730 --> 00:00:20,039
have Twitter follower numbers people

5
00:00:25,340 --> 00:00:22,740
like Justin Bieber I had the most

6
00:00:28,519 --> 00:00:25,350
Twitter followers Oprah Winfrey was in

7
00:00:30,919 --> 00:00:28,529
there Dalai Lama was in there and then

8
00:00:33,049 --> 00:00:30,929
looked for the charts so the chance of

9
00:00:36,020 --> 00:00:33,059
the celebrities having that alignment of

10
00:00:37,280 --> 00:00:36,030
those planets is over 90 percent over 90

11
00:00:40,549 --> 00:00:37,290
percent of them are in that range and

12
00:00:42,470 --> 00:00:40,559
then of the control group it's 45

13
00:00:43,810 --> 00:00:42,480

percent and then you ran all these

14

00:00:46,130 --> 00:00:43,820

trials and when you run that through

15

00:00:49,639 --> 00:00:46,140

statistical analysis the odds of that

16

00:00:51,350 --> 00:00:49,649

just being chance is far less than one

17

00:00:53,660 --> 00:00:51,360

out of a hundred right that's a good

18

00:00:55,850 --> 00:00:53,670

summary so that was step one and then

19

00:00:59,330 --> 00:00:55,860

step two in that paper was to show a

20

00:01:01,580 --> 00:00:59,340

correlation so of your list of 86 those

21

00:01:03,590 --> 00:01:01,590

are spread across that fouls and

22

00:01:05,810 --> 00:01:03,600

rankings so you might have somebody they

23

00:01:07,940 --> 00:01:05,820

might be down in the thousand range like

24

00:01:11,300 --> 00:01:07,950

you just said and then the real stunner

25

00:01:14,450 --> 00:01:11,310

what you said is anyone of that 86 who

26
00:01:17,149 --> 00:01:14,460
happened to rank in the top 100 100%

27
00:01:20,030 --> 00:01:17,159
correlation between that and having this

28
00:01:22,039 --> 00:01:20,040
certain position of the planet kind of

29
00:01:22,550 --> 00:01:22,049
thing that's absolutely right that's

30
00:01:24,800 --> 00:01:22,560
what we've done

31
00:01:29,500 --> 00:01:24,810
wow that is that is pretty incredible

32
00:01:40,020 --> 00:01:37,730
[Music]

33
00:01:41,550 --> 00:01:40,030
welcome to skeptic Oh where we explore

34
00:01:43,920 --> 00:01:41,560
controversial science and spirituality

35
00:01:44,910 --> 00:01:43,930
with leading researchers thinkers and

36
00:01:47,670 --> 00:01:44,920
their critics

37
00:01:49,230 --> 00:01:47,680
I'm your host Alex Icarus and this

38
00:01:52,160 --> 00:01:49,240

introductions going to be a little bit

39

00:01:55,290 --> 00:01:52,170
of a long one because this story today

40

00:01:58,170 --> 00:01:55,300
is a long one interesting one

41

00:02:00,390 --> 00:01:58,180
it's about astrology it starts with me

42

00:02:02,760 --> 00:02:00,400
getting an email the kind of emails I

43

00:02:06,000 --> 00:02:02,770
love to get from a skeptical listener

44

00:02:08,520 --> 00:02:06,010
who's well informed is science oriented

45

00:02:10,859 --> 00:02:08,530
and is digging for more emails from a

46

00:02:12,300 --> 00:02:10,869
guy named Jonathan and he writes dear

47

00:02:14,130 --> 00:02:12,310
Alex I write you as a huge fan of your

48

00:02:15,780 --> 00:02:14,140
show out of all your guests it is dr.

49

00:02:17,820 --> 00:02:15,790
Julie by shell and her rigorous

50

00:02:19,949 --> 00:02:17,830
methodology that has impressed me the

51
00:02:21,900 --> 00:02:19,959
most she clearly has a love of science

52
00:02:24,000 --> 00:02:21,910
and uses the scientific method to

53
00:02:26,760 --> 00:02:24,010
discover knowledge once thought

54
00:02:28,500 --> 00:02:26,770
undiscoverable in that vein I wanted to

55
00:02:31,350 --> 00:02:28,510
introduce you to the work of Renee

56
00:02:33,570 --> 00:02:31,360
awesome she's using her genius level

57
00:02:36,390 --> 00:02:33,580
mind and mathematical skills to

58
00:02:38,430 --> 00:02:36,400
investigate astrology and getting

59
00:02:40,470 --> 00:02:38,440
results like dr. Byles

60
00:02:43,710 --> 00:02:40,480
now Jonathan goes on but you get the

61
00:02:46,890 --> 00:02:43,720
gist of the email catches my attention

62
00:02:50,310 --> 00:02:46,900
I love Julie's work exactly as he said

63
00:02:53,130 --> 00:02:50,320

using scientific methods to unmask

64

00:02:55,259 --> 00:02:53,140

[h__h] scientific paradigms he doesn't

65

00:02:58,140 --> 00:02:55,269

say that I do and give us a better sense

66

00:03:00,229 --> 00:02:58,150

of what's really going on in these kind

67

00:03:03,090 --> 00:03:00,239

of Fringe areas that we think may be

68

00:03:06,660 --> 00:03:03,100

somewhat true but we can't really put

69

00:03:08,759 --> 00:03:06,670

our hands up astrology hey great fits

70

00:03:11,580 --> 00:03:08,769

into that category we all know it's

71

00:03:13,080 --> 00:03:11,590

[h__h] right well we all kind of think

72

00:03:14,250 --> 00:03:13,090

it's [h__h] we kind of think maybe

73

00:03:16,140 --> 00:03:14,260

there's something to it

74

00:03:17,910 --> 00:03:16,150

we know the ancient Chinese were into

75

00:03:20,430 --> 00:03:17,920

astrology and we have Vedic Astrology

76

00:03:23,009 --> 00:03:20,440

from India and then of course we have

77

00:03:25,380 --> 00:03:23,019

ancient Egypt and Babylon and a lot of

78

00:03:27,660 --> 00:03:25,390

history that somehow rolls into the

79

00:03:30,660 --> 00:03:27,670

astrology that we see today and gives us

80

00:03:33,630 --> 00:03:30,670

this sense that while this daily reading

81

00:03:35,330 --> 00:03:33,640

stuff that we read might not be true I

82

00:03:38,220 --> 00:03:35,340

think a lot of us have a sense that

83

00:03:41,039 --> 00:03:38,230

maybe there's something there that all

84

00:03:44,159 --> 00:03:41,049

these great traditions for thousands of

85

00:03:46,080 --> 00:03:44,169

years knew about now of course what also

86

00:03:48,350 --> 00:03:46,090

makes this so interesting to me is that

87

00:03:50,960 --> 00:03:48,360

when you turn to science

88

00:03:52,550 --> 00:03:50,970

and say hey from an observational

89

00:03:55,360 --> 00:03:52,560

standpoint we have a question is there

90

00:03:59,090 --> 00:03:55,370

anything going on here what you get is

91

00:04:00,740 --> 00:03:59,100

classic scientism opinionated dogma I

92

00:04:03,770 --> 00:04:00,750

wouldn't believe it even if it was true

93

00:04:06,020 --> 00:04:03,780

as an example you know after doing this

94

00:04:07,430 --> 00:04:06,030

whole Shahs listening to Joe Rogan who

95

00:04:09,650 --> 00:04:07,440

of course everybody knows and does this

96

00:04:12,170 --> 00:04:09,660

excellent podcast even though he

97

00:04:14,270 --> 00:04:12,180

sometimes can't get past this kind of

98

00:04:16,310 --> 00:04:14,280

inbred skepticism that he has but

99

00:04:18,530 --> 00:04:16,320

anyways he's got Neil deGrasse Tyson on

100

00:04:20,479 --> 00:04:18,540

the show one of the most famous atheist

101
00:04:23,030 --> 00:04:20,489
scientists of our time who everyone

102
00:04:25,220 --> 00:04:23,040
thinks is so smart I just I don't get it

103
00:04:26,930 --> 00:04:25,230
I don't think the guy is that smart

104
00:04:28,790 --> 00:04:26,940
I mean I've interviewed dozens and

105
00:04:31,160 --> 00:04:28,800
dozens of people on skeptical that I

106
00:04:34,610 --> 00:04:31,170
tell you just from an intellectual

107
00:04:36,830 --> 00:04:34,620
horsepower able duck handle issues seem

108
00:04:39,410 --> 00:04:36,840
a hell of a lot smarter than this guy

109
00:04:41,270 --> 00:04:39,420
but hey everyone's romanced with Neil

110
00:04:42,020 --> 00:04:41,280
deGrasse Tyson he's a great presenter so

111
00:04:44,420 --> 00:04:42,030
any because they're talking about

112
00:04:46,910 --> 00:04:44,430
astrology here's what they say then you

113
00:04:49,220 --> 00:04:46,920

go to the astrologers tables and they

114

00:04:51,830 --> 00:04:49,230

say oh this is the raine sign or this is

115

00:04:54,020 --> 00:04:51,840

a dry drought sign and they take the

116

00:04:56,030 --> 00:04:54,030

names of things and those names are what

117

00:04:58,220 --> 00:04:56,040

they interpret based on where the moon

118

00:05:01,430 --> 00:04:58,230

is the Sun is where the planets are and

119

00:05:03,440 --> 00:05:01,440

all whatever the angle configurations

120

00:05:06,200 --> 00:05:03,450

there are and each angle has a certain

121

00:05:09,470 --> 00:05:06,210

latitude over which they'll count it as

122

00:05:13,400 --> 00:05:09,480

a hit rather than as a miss and so this

123

00:05:15,710 --> 00:05:13,410

gives extraordinary capacity of the

124

00:05:26,990 --> 00:05:15,720

astrologer to tell you what's going on

125

00:05:28,909 --> 00:05:27,000

in your life so it's [h__\h] so classic

126
00:05:31,790 --> 00:05:28,919
Neil deGrasse Tyson he's mixing in some

127
00:05:33,470 --> 00:05:31,800
stuff that's probably true factual with

128
00:05:35,480 --> 00:05:33,480
just some [h__\h] crap that he's never

129
00:05:38,990 --> 00:05:35,490
investigated here to me is the

130
00:05:41,570 --> 00:05:39,000
scientific question about astrology is

131
00:05:44,060 --> 00:05:41,580
there a correlation between the

132
00:05:45,350 --> 00:05:44,070
positioning of these planets and events

133
00:05:46,010 --> 00:05:45,360
that are happening down here in the

134
00:05:49,159 --> 00:05:46,020
physical world

135
00:05:52,250 --> 00:05:49,169
that's it because look what science

136
00:05:53,960 --> 00:05:52,260
enters into a fringe area it has to work

137
00:05:56,779 --> 00:05:53,970
from the ground up right it has to work

138
00:05:58,610 --> 00:05:56,789

from observation to correlation to

139

00:06:00,050 --> 00:05:58,620

causation I mean it'd be great if you

140

00:06:01,890 --> 00:06:00,060

could start with causation and say hey

141

00:06:03,450 --> 00:06:01,900

we found these two things cause you

142

00:06:05,129 --> 00:06:03,460

each other now let's go out in the real

143

00:06:06,900 --> 00:06:05,139

world and find out all that stuff that

144

00:06:09,270 --> 00:06:06,910

happens but that's not usually the case

145

00:06:11,969 --> 00:06:09,280

take for example you know our buddy

146

00:06:13,980 --> 00:06:11,979

rupert sheldon right cambridge biologist

147

00:06:15,060 --> 00:06:13,990

does all this fringe stuff dogs that

148

00:06:16,770 --> 00:06:15,070

know when their owners are coming home

149

00:06:20,070 --> 00:06:16,780

but he also does this great thing with

150

00:06:21,779 --> 00:06:20,080

the steering thing right so this is that

151

00:06:23,879 --> 00:06:21,789

we have the sense that we're being

152

00:06:26,040 --> 00:06:23,889

stared at and he wanted to look at that

153

00:06:28,200 --> 00:06:26,050

so you start with the observation the

154

00:06:30,120 --> 00:06:28,210

observation here in that case on the

155

00:06:32,999 --> 00:06:30,130

steering phenomenon is that we have

156

00:06:35,340 --> 00:06:33,009

overwhelming anecdotal data if you go to

157

00:06:37,140 --> 00:06:35,350

people who do professional surveillance

158

00:06:38,520 --> 00:06:37,150

they say hey know if you're following

159

00:06:39,840 --> 00:06:38,530

somebody don't stare man back at the

160

00:06:42,060 --> 00:06:39,850

head they're liable to turn around if

161

00:06:43,409 --> 00:06:42,070

you go to spies if you go to undercover

162

00:06:45,450 --> 00:06:43,419

detectives I mean it's part of their

163

00:06:47,790 --> 00:06:45,460

training they say don't stare at the

164

00:06:50,400 --> 00:06:47,800

back of somebody's head so this for a

165

00:06:52,890 --> 00:06:50,410

trained biologists like Sheldrick says

166

00:06:55,920 --> 00:06:52,900

hey this seems to be occurring in the

167

00:06:59,159 --> 00:06:55,930

natural world let's go run a test and

168

00:07:01,350 --> 00:06:59,169

see if we find a correlation so the

169

00:07:03,240 --> 00:07:01,360

correlation would be if I stare at the

170

00:07:05,159 --> 00:07:03,250

back your head for this given time under

171

00:07:08,400 --> 00:07:05,169

these controlled conditions do you turn

172

00:07:09,990 --> 00:07:08,410

around that's the correlation and when

173

00:07:12,779 --> 00:07:10,000

you find that correlation like Sheldrick

174

00:07:14,760 --> 00:07:12,789

dud it should change people's mind

175

00:07:16,439 --> 00:07:14,770

people should go wow that's important

176

00:07:19,770 --> 00:07:16,449

that science now let's look for a

177

00:07:22,110 --> 00:07:19,780

causation let's look for a physics kind

178

00:07:25,080 --> 00:07:22,120

of explanation for what might be going

179

00:07:27,000 --> 00:07:25,090

on but you don't deny the correlation

180

00:07:28,909 --> 00:07:27,010

because the correlation is this really

181

00:07:31,409 --> 00:07:28,919

important part of this process so

182

00:07:34,439 --> 00:07:31,419

similarly if you will now let me switch

183

00:07:37,740 --> 00:07:34,449

back over to astrology so for astrology

184

00:07:40,290 --> 00:07:37,750

the scientific question is is there a

185

00:07:41,790 --> 00:07:40,300

correlation between the planets Sun star

186

00:07:45,060 --> 00:07:41,800

whatever being in this particular

187

00:07:47,460 --> 00:07:45,070

position and then events happening in

188

00:07:49,560 --> 00:07:47,470

the physical world if there is that

189

00:07:51,180 --> 00:07:49,570

correlation then we would have to

190

00:07:53,250 --> 00:07:51,190

investigate further and figure out what

191

00:07:56,700 --> 00:07:53,260

the causation is but we'd be down the

192

00:07:58,830 --> 00:07:56,710

track of saying that astrology has some

193

00:08:00,570 --> 00:07:58,840

realness to it so you know I was kind of

194

00:08:03,480 --> 00:08:00,580

getting on Neil deGrasse Tyson earlier

195

00:08:06,360 --> 00:08:03,490

but it's over and over again he seems to

196

00:08:09,300 --> 00:08:06,370

kind of miss that point because that

197

00:08:11,940 --> 00:08:09,310

question has been asked for a long time

198

00:08:13,350 --> 00:08:11,950

and the results of it have been mixed I

199

00:08:15,660 --> 00:08:13,360

mean sometimes people have found that

200

00:08:17,190 --> 00:08:15,670

correlation sometimes they have it

201
00:08:19,170 --> 00:08:17,200
you don't get any sense of that from

202
00:08:21,600 --> 00:08:19,180
what he talks that's because what he's

203
00:08:24,630 --> 00:08:21,610
really doing is just promoting a

204
00:08:26,820 --> 00:08:24,640
particular worldview this status quo

205
00:08:28,560 --> 00:08:26,830
keep everything going the way it is kind

206
00:08:30,360 --> 00:08:28,570
of worldview and it's disguised and

207
00:08:32,310 --> 00:08:30,370
people like Joe Rogan who is a super

208
00:08:33,600 --> 00:08:32,320
smart guy but they don't just catch on

209
00:08:36,690 --> 00:08:33,610
to that part of the game and it just

210
00:08:39,990 --> 00:08:36,700
kind of slips past but it's not gonna

211
00:08:43,560 --> 00:08:40,000
slip past us today I'm skeptical

212
00:08:45,990 --> 00:08:43,570
hopefully but back to my story right so

213
00:08:47,850 --> 00:08:46,000

I contact Jonathan and Rene's work

214

00:08:49,980 --> 00:08:47,860

immediately has my interests because I

215

00:08:52,860 --> 00:08:49,990

investigate a little bit further I look

216

00:08:55,230 --> 00:08:52,870

up and Rene has published in the journal

217

00:08:58,080 --> 00:08:55,240

for scientific exploration which I know

218

00:08:59,640 --> 00:08:58,090

is a very good journal I've had editors

219

00:09:01,380 --> 00:08:59,650

of the journal on this show I've had

220

00:09:03,810 --> 00:09:01,390

people who have published in the journal

221

00:09:05,820 --> 00:09:03,820

on this show and I know from talking to

222

00:09:07,800 --> 00:09:05,830

them that it's not only an excellent

223

00:09:10,410 --> 00:09:07,810

journal that's brave enough to tackle

224

00:09:13,320 --> 00:09:10,420

these controversial areas of science but

225

00:09:15,120 --> 00:09:13,330

it's also a hard journal to get into in

226

00:09:17,130 --> 00:09:15,130

fact I know you know referring back to

227

00:09:19,080 --> 00:09:17,140

dr. Julie Burchill she's told me that

228

00:09:21,000 --> 00:09:19,090

she's published in several academic

229

00:09:24,090 --> 00:09:21,010

journals and that the review process for

230

00:09:26,220 --> 00:09:24,100

JSC journal scientific exploration was

231

00:09:28,620 --> 00:09:26,230

by far the hardest review process that

232

00:09:30,240 --> 00:09:28,630

she went through so it's a real deal and

233

00:09:32,460 --> 00:09:30,250

when I saw that she had published there

234

00:09:33,900 --> 00:09:32,470

my interest was piqued and I really

235

00:09:36,120 --> 00:09:33,910

wanted to go forward with the interview

236

00:09:39,300 --> 00:09:36,130

but I still had in the back of my mind

237

00:09:42,390 --> 00:09:39,310

these questions concerns about astrology

238

00:09:44,460 --> 00:09:42,400

being mostly [\h__\h] so I set up the

239

00:09:46,440 --> 00:09:44,470

interview with Rene and at the same time

240

00:09:48,780 --> 00:09:46,450

I said why don't we do a reading because

241

00:09:51,180 --> 00:09:48,790

let's be clear Rene isn't just an

242

00:09:53,520 --> 00:09:51,190

astrology researcher she's also a

243

00:09:54,960 --> 00:09:53,530

practicing astrologer so she provides

244

00:09:57,000 --> 00:09:54,970

that service people pay her for that

245

00:09:58,860 --> 00:09:57,010

service I paid her for that service with

246

00:10:01,560 --> 00:09:58,870

the understanding that I would use it in

247

00:10:04,050 --> 00:10:01,570

the show as part of this exploration of

248

00:10:05,820 --> 00:10:04,060

astrology and astrology research so

249

00:10:08,010 --> 00:10:05,830

we've got everything set up and then we

250

00:10:10,890 --> 00:10:08,020

went ahead and did the reading and the

251
00:10:13,470 --> 00:10:10,900
reading was not very good not very good

252
00:10:14,910 --> 00:10:13,480
at all and some of the things that

253
00:10:18,150 --> 00:10:14,920
really concerned about the reading was

254
00:10:19,950 --> 00:10:18,160
not only was it not accurate but Rene

255
00:10:21,990 --> 00:10:19,960
seemed really uncomfortable with the

256
00:10:24,750 --> 00:10:22,000
fact that the reading wasn't kind of

257
00:10:27,180 --> 00:10:24,760
working out I wasn't I was like hey I

258
00:10:28,530 --> 00:10:27,190
get that these things aren't perfect and

259
00:10:29,240 --> 00:10:28,540
that they don't always work and there

260
00:10:31,400 --> 00:10:29,250
was this

261
00:10:33,380 --> 00:10:31,410
about the time of my birth and whether I

262
00:10:35,240 --> 00:10:33,390
had that right which I didn't and I

263
00:10:36,230 --> 00:10:35,250

later confirmed by getting a copy of my

264

00:10:38,900 --> 00:10:36,240

birth certificate

265

00:10:41,000 --> 00:10:38,910

but the whole reading was making me

266

00:10:43,070 --> 00:10:41,010

question the idea that you can really

267

00:10:44,960 --> 00:10:43,080

give somebody the time and place your

268

00:10:47,930 --> 00:10:44,970

birth and they can start telling you all

269

00:10:49,790 --> 00:10:47,940

these precise things about your life and

270

00:10:51,530 --> 00:10:49,800

what's going to happen in the next 90

271

00:10:53,630 --> 00:10:51,540

days or a couple years or any of that

272

00:10:55,310 --> 00:10:53,640

stuff so I was in this space I wasn't

273

00:10:56,900 --> 00:10:55,320

put off by Renee's reading and I was

274

00:10:58,580 --> 00:10:56,910

ready to move on and do the next

275

00:11:01,160 --> 00:10:58,590

interview we had scheduled to really

276

00:11:03,770 --> 00:11:01,170

talk about her research but the email

277

00:11:06,590 --> 00:11:03,780

exchange we had after that reading

278

00:11:08,510 --> 00:11:06,600

changed everything so Renee freaked out

279

00:11:10,520 --> 00:11:08,520

she goes oh my god that was such a

280

00:11:12,530 --> 00:11:10,530

terrible reading please don't publish it

281

00:11:14,180 --> 00:11:12,540

I don't want to do any more interviews I

282

00:11:18,020 --> 00:11:14,190

should have never done this I'm out of

283

00:11:19,910 --> 00:11:18,030

here so I was I was surprised I was

284

00:11:21,470 --> 00:11:19,920

really surprised because again during

285

00:11:23,630 --> 00:11:21,480

the reading I said hey this is no big

286

00:11:26,000 --> 00:11:23,640

deal I've had medium readings from

287

00:11:28,760 --> 00:11:26,010

really good mediums that didn't go well

288

00:11:30,140 --> 00:11:28,770

and yet I still believe there's after

289

00:11:31,550 --> 00:11:30,150

death communication and I believe

290

00:11:34,160 --> 00:11:31,560

there's people who can facilitate that

291

00:11:36,110 --> 00:11:34,170

so this doesn't matter all that much to

292

00:11:38,300 --> 00:11:36,120

me let's talk about the research but

293

00:11:40,010 --> 00:11:38,310

Renee was in freakout mode and the more

294

00:11:42,800 --> 00:11:40,020

I talked her through email the more

295

00:11:45,500 --> 00:11:42,810

pissed off I was getting pissed off

296

00:11:47,930 --> 00:11:45,510

because if you got the goods if you've

297

00:11:49,760 --> 00:11:47,940

done the research you ought to be able

298

00:11:52,730 --> 00:11:49,770

to suffer the slings and arrows that

299

00:11:56,090 --> 00:11:52,740

come with being uncut in edge science

300

00:11:58,450 --> 00:11:56,100

now as I say that there's another side

301
00:12:03,500 --> 00:11:58,460
of me that wants to highlight how

302
00:12:07,970 --> 00:12:03,510
freaking difficult this crazy biological

303
00:12:11,329 --> 00:12:07,980
robot scientific materialism stupidity

304
00:12:14,360 --> 00:12:11,339
makes it for people to endure to

305
00:12:16,520 --> 00:12:14,370
persevere to push their research forward

306
00:12:20,030 --> 00:12:16,530
when it goes against this kind of dogma

307
00:12:22,100 --> 00:12:20,040
and I think I suspect that's what was

308
00:12:23,510 --> 00:12:22,110
going on with Renee but still I don't

309
00:12:26,450 --> 00:12:23,520
cut her any slack hey if we're gonna

310
00:12:29,000 --> 00:12:26,460
push this edge we gotta expect the

311
00:12:30,770 --> 00:12:29,010
pushback and we gotta push through it so

312
00:12:32,480 --> 00:12:30,780
I went back to Jonathan the guy who

313
00:12:34,160 --> 00:12:32,490

originally turned me on to Renee and we

314

00:12:36,170 --> 00:12:34,170

had a long talk and I told him exactly

315

00:12:37,670 --> 00:12:36,180

what happened and I told him the same

316

00:12:39,560 --> 00:12:37,680

thing I told her an a hey I'm going

317

00:12:41,840 --> 00:12:39,570

ahead with the show and if you want me

318

00:12:42,889 --> 00:12:41,850

to do the show with just your crappy

319

00:12:45,109 --> 00:12:42,899

reading

320

00:12:47,660 --> 00:12:45,119

then I'll do that if you want to come on

321

00:12:49,579 --> 00:12:47,670

and explain yourself and stand up for

322

00:12:50,389 --> 00:12:49,589

your research then maybe we'll have a

323

00:12:53,389 --> 00:12:50,399

different show

324

00:12:57,079 --> 00:12:53,399

now fortunately Rene came around and I

325

00:12:59,590 --> 00:12:57,089

think we had a darn good interview about

326

00:13:03,769 --> 00:12:59,600

what I think is some incredibly

327

00:13:06,730 --> 00:13:03,779

important research concerning astrology

328

00:13:10,850 --> 00:13:06,740

there is no doubt she's super smart

329

00:13:12,970 --> 00:13:10,860

super capable she's using AI big data

330

00:13:16,369 --> 00:13:12,980

very sophisticated statistical

331

00:13:19,129 --> 00:13:16,379

techniques very solid science to bring

332

00:13:19,699 --> 00:13:19,139

forward a new picture about what's going

333

00:13:21,590 --> 00:13:19,709

on here

334

00:13:23,269 --> 00:13:21,600

one that you'll never hear Neil deGrasse

335

00:13:25,639 --> 00:13:23,279

Tyson talk about because he's a boob

336

00:13:28,100 --> 00:13:25,649

anyways if you really just want to as

337

00:13:29,809 --> 00:13:28,110

Jonathan said in that opening email

338

00:13:33,079 --> 00:13:29,819

discover knowledge once thought

339

00:13:34,460 --> 00:13:33,089

undiscoverable here you go oh one more

340

00:13:36,530 --> 00:13:34,470

thing as you're listening to this

341

00:13:38,840 --> 00:13:36,540

interview it starts again in kind of an

342

00:13:40,340 --> 00:13:38,850

unconventional way because but the first

343

00:13:44,900 --> 00:13:40,350

time in my conversation with Rene

344

00:13:47,090 --> 00:13:44,910

getting on Rene for backing out of this

345

00:13:49,519 --> 00:13:47,100

initial interview and I think I pushed

346

00:13:52,790 --> 00:13:49,529

her pretty hard but to her credit she

347

00:13:55,790 --> 00:13:52,800

withstood it and then we eventually got

348

00:13:58,579 --> 00:13:55,800

into the interview that we both wanted

349

00:14:01,970 --> 00:13:58,589

to have here's my interview with Rene Oh

350

00:14:04,129 --> 00:14:01,980

a shop you published in JSC you must

351

00:14:05,869 --> 00:14:04,139

have taken a lot of criticism because

352

00:14:07,879 --> 00:14:05,879

that's part of the process but maybe you

353

00:14:09,829 --> 00:14:07,889

did it maybe you snagged the whole thing

354

00:14:11,780 --> 00:14:09,839

past him maybe they never asked really

355

00:14:14,269 --> 00:14:11,790

hard questions they were just bamboozled

356

00:14:15,949 --> 00:14:14,279

by the data I don't know but I tell you

357

00:14:18,590 --> 00:14:15,959

what I didn't have those questions going

358

00:14:20,660 --> 00:14:18,600

in like I say I was totally on board

359

00:14:22,489 --> 00:14:20,670

because I've interviewed several people

360

00:14:24,049 --> 00:14:22,499

that are published in the GAC and

361

00:14:26,090 --> 00:14:24,059

they've also always told me hey it's

362

00:14:27,650 --> 00:14:26,100

really hard you know the the reviewers

363

00:14:31,220 --> 00:14:27,660

are really tough and this and that so

364

00:14:32,780 --> 00:14:31,230

again I had that assumption but no Rene

365

00:14:34,610 --> 00:14:32,790

I don't I don't have that same

366

00:14:36,619 --> 00:14:34,620

assumption about your work so now that's

367

00:14:37,939 --> 00:14:36,629

where I'm at anyone who listens to the

368

00:14:40,850 --> 00:14:37,949

interview is going to know that the

369

00:14:42,889 --> 00:14:40,860

reading wasn't good but who cares it's

370

00:14:45,410 --> 00:14:42,899

just one individual reading what I'm

371

00:14:48,410 --> 00:14:45,420

trying to figure out is this research

372

00:14:50,780 --> 00:14:48,420

worth anything is the second part of

373

00:14:53,720 --> 00:14:50,790

that and when the researcher can't stand

374

00:14:56,390 --> 00:14:53,730

behind their research well then you know

375

00:14:59,180 --> 00:14:56,400

that just raises a lot of red flags

376

00:15:02,150 --> 00:14:59,190

what I expressed to you was you know my

377

00:15:05,120 --> 00:15:02,160

bias based on my experience was

378

00:15:07,490 --> 00:15:05,130

everyone thinks they're 95% you know all

379

00:15:09,530 --> 00:15:07,500

the psychics think they're 95% all the

380

00:15:11,750 --> 00:15:09,540

mediums think they're 95% and you're

381

00:15:15,590 --> 00:15:11,760

telling me you think you're 95% you know

382

00:15:17,150 --> 00:15:15,600

what you're not 95% and no one's 95% but

383

00:15:19,340 --> 00:15:17,160

that doesn't take away from the fact

384

00:15:20,000 --> 00:15:19,350

that it might be real so here's the

385

00:15:24,320 --> 00:15:20,010

question

386

00:15:27,440 --> 00:15:24,330

whole thing is I have no doubt that

387

00:15:29,510 --> 00:15:27,450

astrology works but does it work in the

388

00:15:31,220 --> 00:15:29,520

same way that Tarot works does it work

389

00:15:33,710 --> 00:15:31,230

in the same way that reading coffee

390

00:15:37,010 --> 00:15:33,720

grinds work in that the individual

391

00:15:38,390 --> 00:15:37,020

person is connecting to extended

392

00:15:39,680 --> 00:15:38,400

consciousness realm so if we don't

393

00:15:41,570 --> 00:15:39,690

really understand what they are but

394

00:15:44,660 --> 00:15:41,580

we'll just put that name on it is that's

395

00:15:46,730 --> 00:15:44,670

what's happening is astrology a means

396

00:15:49,520 --> 00:15:46,740

for the person who's doing the

397

00:15:51,830 --> 00:15:49,530

individual reading to connect with this

398

00:15:54,200 --> 00:15:51,840

extended consciousness and bring forth

399

00:15:57,310 --> 00:15:54,210

information is that what's happening or

400

00:16:00,380 --> 00:15:57,320

is there some real physical

401
00:16:03,680 --> 00:16:00,390
materialistic really connection between

402
00:16:07,490 --> 00:16:03,690
the layout of these planets in these

403
00:16:10,130 --> 00:16:07,500
stars and what's going on I don't want

404
00:16:11,930 --> 00:16:10,140
to misrepresent the show one way or

405
00:16:13,790 --> 00:16:11,940
another I'm not an advocate for an

406
00:16:16,550 --> 00:16:13,800
astrology but I'm not here to debunk

407
00:16:19,370 --> 00:16:16,560
astrology and your research in ways that

408
00:16:21,410 --> 00:16:19,380
it shouldn't be but tell me why someone

409
00:16:25,130 --> 00:16:21,420
who's skeptical of your research should

410
00:16:26,810 --> 00:16:25,140
have confidence in it so let me

411
00:16:28,280 --> 00:16:26,820
interject something here so we're having

412
00:16:29,930 --> 00:16:28,290
this conversation Renee and I I'm

413
00:16:31,640 --> 00:16:29,940

telling her some of the problems I had

414

00:16:34,130 --> 00:16:31,650

had with the way she handled things and

415

00:16:35,750 --> 00:16:34,140

I'm very very skeptical of her research

416

00:16:37,670 --> 00:16:35,760

but I'm trying to figure out whether we

417

00:16:39,260 --> 00:16:37,680

should go ahead with the show and I'm

418

00:16:41,750 --> 00:16:39,270

being pretty hard on her but it then at

419

00:16:43,280 --> 00:16:41,760

some point we switch over and we start

420

00:16:45,050 --> 00:16:43,290

talking about her research so let me

421

00:16:47,090 --> 00:16:45,060

just give you we talked about it in

422

00:16:49,100 --> 00:16:47,100

length in this interview what the

423

00:16:52,190 --> 00:16:49,110

research is but it might be helpful here

424

00:16:53,600 --> 00:16:52,200

to kind of understand big-picture what

425

00:16:55,850 --> 00:16:53,610

we're talking about two pieces of

426

00:16:59,630 --> 00:16:55,860

research that Renee did that are really

427

00:17:02,540 --> 00:16:59,640

fascinating one is she looked at Twitter

428

00:17:04,610 --> 00:17:02,550

followers she took this idea that there

429

00:17:07,430 --> 00:17:04,620

is this planetary alignment that would

430

00:17:08,540 --> 00:17:07,440

suggest that some people are more likely

431

00:17:11,990 --> 00:17:08,550

to be fame

432

00:17:14,180 --> 00:17:12,000

followed celebrity types than other

433

00:17:15,560 --> 00:17:14,190

people right so that's something you

434

00:17:18,020 --> 00:17:15,570

could test see if there's a correlation

435

00:17:19,430 --> 00:17:18,030

and that's what she did the other thing

436

00:17:22,730 --> 00:17:19,440

that she did which is really interesting

437

00:17:24,710 --> 00:17:22,740

she said there's this Mercury retrograde

438

00:17:26,210 --> 00:17:24,720

thing that's been around for a long time

439

00:17:28,550 --> 00:17:26,220

people have talked about that

440

00:17:30,170 --> 00:17:28,560

hey people kind of go nuts and can't do

441

00:17:32,450 --> 00:17:30,180

mental functioning the way that they

442

00:17:35,690 --> 00:17:32,460

normally do when this thing happens and

443

00:17:38,060 --> 00:17:35,700

she did some research on that trying to

444

00:17:41,990 --> 00:17:38,070

correlate it with common spelling airs

445

00:17:44,570 --> 00:17:42,000

in this huge database of Amazon comments

446

00:17:45,980 --> 00:17:44,580

again a very clever bit of research that

447

00:17:48,680 --> 00:17:45,990

you'll hear a lot about but I want you

448

00:17:50,870 --> 00:17:48,690

to at least have big-picture view of

449

00:17:53,750 --> 00:17:50,880

these two pieces of research that we

450

00:17:55,100 --> 00:17:53,760

talked about as this goes out ok back to

451

00:17:57,890 --> 00:17:55,110

the interview here goes

452

00:18:00,110 --> 00:17:57,900

well again I want people to tear it

453

00:18:02,960 --> 00:18:00,120

apart with a fine-tooth comb that is

454

00:18:05,570 --> 00:18:02,970

what happened at JSC I did rewrite it

455

00:18:07,880 --> 00:18:05,580

three times and it was awesome

456

00:18:11,030 --> 00:18:07,890

experience I learned a lot from it and I

457

00:18:13,340 --> 00:18:11,040

appreciate the JSE all the more for that

458

00:18:15,770 --> 00:18:13,350

it may be some potential criticisms that

459

00:18:19,250 --> 00:18:15,780

you're likely to hear so I spoke with

460

00:18:21,200 --> 00:18:19,260

one person that I am I feel very

461

00:18:23,240 --> 00:18:21,210

confident in the research and I feel

462

00:18:26,120 --> 00:18:23,250

very confident in the process that

463

00:18:28,190 --> 00:18:26,130

they've gone through with JSC again the

464

00:18:30,200 --> 00:18:28,200

journal for scientific exploration that

465

00:18:31,760 --> 00:18:30,210

I keep saying I have this high regard

466

00:18:33,950 --> 00:18:31,770

for and he pointed out a couple of

467

00:18:36,320 --> 00:18:33,960

things he said number one there's no

468

00:18:38,180 --> 00:18:36,330

huge red flags in the research as it

469

00:18:40,040 --> 00:18:38,190

stands because if you want to talk to

470

00:18:40,940 --> 00:18:40,050

the JSC editors number one they're not

471

00:18:42,680 --> 00:18:40,950

going to talk to you

472

00:18:45,740 --> 00:18:42,690

they've done their thing and they're not

473

00:18:47,720 --> 00:18:45,750

going to come in and kind of answer

474

00:18:49,580 --> 00:18:47,730

those kind of questions but number two

475

00:18:52,820 --> 00:18:49,590

if they did answer those questions what

476
00:18:55,370 --> 00:18:52,830
they'd say is based on the data that we

477
00:18:58,520 --> 00:18:55,380
have from her and her representation of

478
00:19:02,210 --> 00:18:58,530
it yes that's what we analyzed we can't

479
00:19:04,310 --> 00:19:02,220
analyze whether or not she really did it

480
00:19:06,860 --> 00:19:04,320
exactly the way that she said she did it

481
00:19:09,890 --> 00:19:06,870
but it and that's where replication

482
00:19:12,230 --> 00:19:09,900
could would come in so do you agree with

483
00:19:13,940 --> 00:19:12,240
that and number two what about this

484
00:19:16,190 --> 00:19:13,950
issue of replication what about someone

485
00:19:18,560 --> 00:19:16,200
who says ok that's all well and good

486
00:19:21,200 --> 00:19:18,570
what she's written there but without

487
00:19:21,800 --> 00:19:21,210
replication we don't really know if it's

488
00:19:24,740 --> 00:19:21,810

real

489

00:19:28,250 --> 00:19:24,750

I would worship the feet of anyone who

490

00:19:31,760 --> 00:19:28,260

would want to take that project on I

491

00:19:34,670 --> 00:19:31,770

would seriously I would love it if it

492

00:19:39,140 --> 00:19:34,680

were attempted replication I hope it

493

00:19:42,260 --> 00:19:39,150

would come back the same as what I put

494

00:19:44,960 --> 00:19:42,270

out there but it may not that's the

495

00:19:46,640 --> 00:19:44,970

point of replication I want replication

496

00:19:49,160 --> 00:19:46,650

I would love a replication please

497

00:19:51,200 --> 00:19:49,170

replicate me ah anyone out there

498

00:19:53,180 --> 00:19:51,210

listening how would someone go about

499

00:19:56,030 --> 00:19:53,190

replicating your work I was in the

500

00:19:57,110 --> 00:19:56,040

methods and materials my approach it's

501
00:20:03,830 --> 00:19:57,120
all laid out there

502
00:20:05,690 --> 00:20:03,840
I have available all of my data in the

503
00:20:07,970 --> 00:20:05,700
form of screenshots because I took the

504
00:20:11,150 --> 00:20:07,980
data from Twitter at a particular

505
00:20:15,050 --> 00:20:11,160
snapshot in time so they could totally

506
00:20:18,350 --> 00:20:15,060
just follows at the steps a doozy and

507
00:20:22,400 --> 00:20:18,360
the methods and materials of the Twitter

508
00:20:26,240 --> 00:20:22,410
paper for example really I put out the I

509
00:20:29,570 --> 00:20:26,250
released the datasets and I release had

510
00:20:32,480 --> 00:20:29,580
the methods and materials ok another

511
00:20:35,060 --> 00:20:32,490
this isn't a red flag per se but the

512
00:20:36,980 --> 00:20:35,070
other thing that that my friend said is

513
00:20:39,590 --> 00:20:36,990

you know one thing that kind of just

514

00:20:42,520 --> 00:20:39,600

doesn't totally sit right is I don't see

515

00:20:45,290 --> 00:20:42,530

any missteps here I see just kind of a

516

00:20:47,210 --> 00:20:45,300

you know oh this is just what we set out

517

00:20:49,220 --> 00:20:47,220

to do and we did it and it all came out

518

00:20:51,260 --> 00:20:49,230

great he said in my experience research

519

00:20:51,910 --> 00:20:51,270

never works that way what do you respond

520

00:20:54,560 --> 00:20:51,920

to that

521

00:20:57,680 --> 00:20:54,570

are we talking particularly about the

522

00:20:59,540 --> 00:20:57,690

Twitter paper oh I suppose cuz that's in

523

00:21:02,120 --> 00:20:59,550

JSC but I'd also like to talk more

524

00:21:05,350 --> 00:21:02,130

broadly about the Amazon misspelling one

525

00:21:08,180 --> 00:21:05,360

because that's interesting as well yeah

526

00:21:13,220 --> 00:21:08,190

you had two totally different divergent

527

00:21:18,740 --> 00:21:13,230

experiences with Twitter in the JSE that

528

00:21:22,610 --> 00:21:18,750

was remarkably lockstep it was where we

529

00:21:26,810 --> 00:21:22,620

were studying in class a particular

530

00:21:28,940 --> 00:21:26,820

ancient role in astrology and my teacher

531

00:21:31,100 --> 00:21:28,950

looked at me and said hey we should test

532

00:21:34,100 --> 00:21:31,110

this with Twitter can you do that like

533

00:21:35,100 --> 00:21:34,110

yeah and so we just and we did it and it

534

00:21:37,110 --> 00:21:35,110

was fairly lot

535

00:21:41,070 --> 00:21:37,120

that now mercury retrograde as you can

536

00:21:43,410 --> 00:21:41,080

see in the material I've put up on my

537

00:21:47,070 --> 00:21:43,420

website regarding it and it has not been

538

00:21:49,860 --> 00:21:47,080

published yet it has only been released

539

00:21:53,039 --> 00:21:49,870

in steps when you say Mercury retrograde

540

00:21:54,690 --> 00:21:53,049

are you talking about the Amazon yet so

541

00:21:56,039 --> 00:21:54,700

briefly summarize what that experiment

542

00:21:59,130 --> 00:21:56,049

is and then please continue

543

00:22:01,950 --> 00:21:59,140

sure fundamental question hey if there's

544

00:22:04,760 --> 00:22:01,960

this thing called my Curie retrograde we

545

00:22:08,430 --> 00:22:04,770

should be able to see it in things like

546

00:22:10,590 --> 00:22:08,440

increased tech support cows don't you

547

00:22:12,210 --> 00:22:10,600

educate because people are having more

548

00:22:14,310 --> 00:22:12,220

problems more mistakes more

549

00:22:16,830 --> 00:22:14,320

misunderstandings things associated with

550

00:22:19,169 --> 00:22:16,840

mercury retrograde well how do we

551
00:22:21,930 --> 00:22:19,179
measure such things without access to

552
00:22:25,440 --> 00:22:21,940
for example Verizon's tech support call

553
00:22:27,570 --> 00:22:25,450
records so how can we get public data on

554
00:22:29,549 --> 00:22:27,580
mistakes what does that even mean and

555
00:22:32,400 --> 00:22:29,559
then I happened just during that time

556
00:22:35,730 --> 00:22:32,410
come across Stanford's public repository

557
00:22:39,900 --> 00:22:35,740
of big data sites fascinating place to

558
00:22:43,490 --> 00:22:39,910
go explore and I think it it's just

559
00:22:45,930 --> 00:22:43,500
called that you can just google that and

560
00:22:47,070 --> 00:22:45,940
Stanford repository of big data

561
00:22:50,220 --> 00:22:47,080
something like that

562
00:22:53,370 --> 00:22:50,230
and anyway they had all of the Amazon

563
00:22:58,680 --> 00:22:53,380

reviews from the inception of the review

564

00:23:02,669 --> 00:22:58,690

system in 1996 to mid 2014 that's what

565

00:23:05,190 --> 00:23:02,679

twenty years no 18 years and so on

566

00:23:08,250 --> 00:23:05,200

that's a lot of data in contemporary

567

00:23:11,520 --> 00:23:08,260

terms so what's in there in terms of

568

00:23:13,409 --> 00:23:11,530

mistakes there's now I would say just on

569

00:23:16,970 --> 00:23:13,419

the face of it there's no record in the

570

00:23:20,520 --> 00:23:16,980

data set for example of of fixing

571

00:23:22,970 --> 00:23:20,530

misspellings what we do see is a

572

00:23:27,260 --> 00:23:22,980

dampening if you go into the data of a

573

00:23:29,850 --> 00:23:27,270

downward pair of spelling mistake rates

574

00:23:33,900 --> 00:23:29,860

that might be consistent with better

575

00:23:35,640 --> 00:23:33,910

spelling mistake catchers you know the

576

00:23:36,270 --> 00:23:35,650

software that catches your spelling

577

00:23:39,210 --> 00:23:36,280

mistakes

578

00:23:42,600 --> 00:23:39,220

anyways sorry so there you can see I

579

00:23:45,030 --> 00:23:42,610

went through tons maybe 20 iterations of

580

00:23:46,320 --> 00:23:45,040

that Renee let me interject because you

581

00:23:47,530 --> 00:23:46,330

were kind of on the line of kind of

582

00:23:48,910 --> 00:23:47,540

explaining it at a high

583

00:23:51,100 --> 00:23:48,920

and then we kind of you kind of got

584

00:23:53,200 --> 00:23:51,110

sidetracked into Irish and that's an

585

00:23:55,870 --> 00:23:53,210

interesting little aspect of it so but

586

00:23:58,930 --> 00:23:55,880

back to the big picture story so you get

587

00:24:02,490 --> 00:23:58,940

this big data set and your idea is hey

588

00:24:05,560 --> 00:24:02,500

you know here is actually a log of

589

00:24:09,310 --> 00:24:05,570

mistakes that is measurable if I can

590

00:24:11,980 --> 00:24:09,320

somehow do this massive spell check on

591

00:24:14,110 --> 00:24:11,990

that and see if there's more spelling

592

00:24:16,570 --> 00:24:14,120

errors on these certain dates and then

593

00:24:18,790 --> 00:24:16,580

if I can go ahead and not only do that

594

00:24:20,740 --> 00:24:18,800

looking back and kind of a data mining

595

00:24:22,630 --> 00:24:20,750

way that people don't like but then if I

596

00:24:24,640 --> 00:24:22,640

can also predict that going forward and

597

00:24:26,710 --> 00:24:24,650

saying okay I've looked at this much of

598

00:24:29,170 --> 00:24:26,720

the data and yeah that pattern seems to

599

00:24:31,210 --> 00:24:29,180

exist now without looking forward let me

600

00:24:33,790 --> 00:24:31,220

predict what days are going to be more

601
00:24:35,650 --> 00:24:33,800
prone to spelling errors and let me see

602
00:24:37,540 --> 00:24:35,660
if that plays out am I getting this

603
00:24:39,760 --> 00:24:37,550
right and then yeah I think that's what

604
00:24:41,830 --> 00:24:39,770
I said that's right and I went through

605
00:24:44,350 --> 00:24:41,840
tons of mistakes on that one maybe

606
00:24:47,040 --> 00:24:44,360
because I was doing it on my own and I

607
00:24:49,270 --> 00:24:47,050
wasn't coming from any great

608
00:24:52,480 --> 00:24:49,280
astrological principle from a thousand

609
00:24:55,180 --> 00:24:52,490
years ago I just was going into the data

610
00:24:59,290 --> 00:24:55,190
and saying show me data is there a

611
00:25:04,030 --> 00:24:59,300
periodic regular cyclic increased during

612
00:25:09,190 --> 00:25:04,040
Mercury retrograde and using kind of

613
00:25:11,620 --> 00:25:09,200

classical Fourier transform I I found

614

00:25:14,890 --> 00:25:11,630

out oh my gosh there is there is this

615

00:25:18,820 --> 00:25:14,900

regular periodic increase during Mercury

616

00:25:21,760 --> 00:25:18,830

retrograde up to 17 percent not always

617

00:25:24,060 --> 00:25:21,770

17 percent but there there is this

618

00:25:27,580 --> 00:25:24,070

regular periodicity

619

00:25:30,400 --> 00:25:27,590

then I used linear regression model to

620

00:25:33,820 --> 00:25:30,410

find the exact coefficients of when is

621

00:25:35,950 --> 00:25:33,830

it 17 percent per word increase in

622

00:25:37,870 --> 00:25:35,960

misspelling rate I don't reckon

623

00:25:41,110 --> 00:25:37,880

retrograde and when is there still a

624

00:25:45,400 --> 00:25:41,120

Mercury retrograde increase but at maybe

625

00:25:48,400 --> 00:25:45,410

at five percent per word likelihood

626

00:25:51,310 --> 00:25:48,410

increase I own and using the linear

627

00:25:54,330 --> 00:25:51,320

regression model with the AI I found

628

00:25:59,700 --> 00:25:54,340

that a model that works really well is

629

00:26:01,330 --> 00:25:59,710

one that employs all the planets are

630

00:26:06,070 --> 00:26:01,340

retrogression

631

00:26:08,350 --> 00:26:06,080

and there's a beautiful interaction

632

00:26:11,560 --> 00:26:08,360

there now mercury retrograde just being

633

00:26:13,540 --> 00:26:11,570

one of them but I believe when those

634

00:26:16,150 --> 00:26:13,550

retrogression is in Uranus Neptune or

635

00:26:18,850 --> 00:26:16,160

Pluto and also retrogression in mercury

636

00:26:22,120 --> 00:26:18,860

that's when it's at its highest but when

637

00:26:25,600 --> 00:26:22,130

there's only one of those it's less than

638

00:26:29,740 --> 00:26:25,610

that how do you get at the old causation

639

00:26:31,480 --> 00:26:29,750

versus correlation thing so you know the

640

00:26:33,370 --> 00:26:31,490

big complaint that everyone has

641

00:26:35,800 --> 00:26:33,380

immediately when they look at astrology

642

00:26:37,960 --> 00:26:35,810

is that your data mining right so every

643

00:26:40,600 --> 00:26:37,970

year one of these skeptical

644

00:26:42,970 --> 00:26:40,610

organizations presents this ha ha here

645

00:26:46,030 --> 00:26:42,980

is the zodiac sign that is the worst

646

00:26:48,160 --> 00:26:46,040

driver right and one year it's Capricorn

647

00:26:49,780 --> 00:26:48,170

and the next year it's Sagittarius and

648

00:26:53,170 --> 00:26:49,790

what they're just doing is taking the

649

00:26:55,240 --> 00:26:53,180

huge database of claims that are made

650

00:26:57,040 --> 00:26:55,250

against their insurance for accidents

651
00:26:59,260 --> 00:26:57,050
and then their data mining looking

652
00:27:00,370 --> 00:26:59,270
through that and saying which one fell

653
00:27:03,520 --> 00:27:00,380
into this group and they're reporting

654
00:27:05,230 --> 00:27:03,530
that as if that means anything and then

655
00:27:07,240 --> 00:27:05,240
they're coming back and saying see this

656
00:27:09,760 --> 00:27:07,250
is what people do they just date a mine

657
00:27:12,010 --> 00:27:09,770
and then they report it as there's some

658
00:27:13,690 --> 00:27:12,020
kind of causation rather than there's

659
00:27:16,720 --> 00:27:13,700
just some correlation which there always

660
00:27:18,940 --> 00:27:16,730
is in the data you totally I'm saying

661
00:27:20,290 --> 00:27:18,950
but I just want to under I just want to

662
00:27:22,810 --> 00:27:20,300
lay that out there for other people to

663
00:27:24,640 --> 00:27:22,820

understand how do you respond to someone

664

00:27:27,250 --> 00:27:24,650

who says how do we know you're not just

665

00:27:28,720 --> 00:27:27,260

doing the same thing yeah we might be

666

00:27:32,230 --> 00:27:28,730

talking about something that is

667

00:27:37,870 --> 00:27:32,240

happening at the same time as Mercury

668

00:27:38,260 --> 00:27:37,880

retrograde each year you know for 18

669

00:27:40,210 --> 00:27:38,270

years

670

00:27:42,070 --> 00:27:40,220

um but hold on that's not really my

671

00:27:44,440 --> 00:27:42,080

point I mean I'm just I'm giving I'm

672

00:27:46,810 --> 00:27:44,450

giving you a live question there which

673

00:27:49,360 --> 00:27:46,820

is and the answer is because that's what

674

00:27:51,040 --> 00:27:49,370

my [h__\h] research shows is that that's

675

00:27:53,470 --> 00:27:51,050

why you did all these fancy statistical

676
00:27:55,390 --> 00:27:53,480
analysis is because you kept running it

677
00:27:57,730 --> 00:27:55,400
over and over and over again with

678
00:28:00,670 --> 00:27:57,740
different dates over time and it

679
00:28:03,160 --> 00:28:00,680
wouldn't repeat if the skeptics ran that

680
00:28:05,620 --> 00:28:03,170
and they ran it for 20 years and every

681
00:28:07,510 --> 00:28:05,630
year the same astrological sign came up

682
00:28:09,400 --> 00:28:07,520
and saying yet Sagittarius worst drivers

683
00:28:11,020 --> 00:28:09,410
Sagittarius worst drivers well then they

684
00:28:13,090 --> 00:28:11,030
would have something but what they're

685
00:28:14,720 --> 00:28:13,100
making a joke of is when one year at

686
00:28:16,340 --> 00:28:14,730
Sagittarius in the next year

687
00:28:18,289 --> 00:28:16,350
Capricorn in the next year it's Gemini

688
00:28:20,870 --> 00:28:18,299

well then that shows that it really is

689

00:28:24,770 --> 00:28:20,880

no pattern and there's no meaning to it

690

00:28:28,580 --> 00:28:24,780

yeah right that's that's right and that

691

00:28:30,200 --> 00:28:28,590

this is something that's sustained by

692

00:28:32,539 --> 00:28:30,210

definition I was looking for something

693

00:28:38,900 --> 00:28:32,549

that was sustained through the entirety

694

00:28:41,000 --> 00:28:38,910

of 18 years and that happened during

695

00:28:43,640 --> 00:28:41,010

Mercury retrograde and I just want to

696

00:28:47,180 --> 00:28:43,650

point out that you brought up causation

697

00:28:49,700 --> 00:28:47,190

and I'm not speaking to causation in my

698

00:28:51,620 --> 00:28:49,710

research at this point I would love to

699

00:28:54,620 --> 00:28:51,630

get there but at this point we are

700

00:28:57,610 --> 00:28:54,630

talking about the first step causation

701
00:29:00,860 --> 00:28:57,620
studies as I understand it and that is

702
00:29:02,980 --> 00:29:00,870
correlation right and I think that term

703
00:29:05,060 --> 00:29:02,990
and we should add that that term is just

704
00:29:08,390 --> 00:29:05,070
misused and misunderstood by people

705
00:29:10,250 --> 00:29:08,400
right it's become such a trite axiom

706
00:29:12,590 --> 00:29:10,260
that that people lose sight of it it's

707
00:29:14,659 --> 00:29:12,600
like exactly what you said you know a

708
00:29:18,169 --> 00:29:14,669
really good correlation it's carefully

709
00:29:22,070 --> 00:29:18,179
done is definitely a pointer towards

710
00:29:24,740 --> 00:29:22,080
causation so what axiom was supposed to

711
00:29:27,049 --> 00:29:24,750
point out is that a poor correlation

712
00:29:29,690 --> 00:29:27,059
like I was just saying about the fact

713
00:29:32,180 --> 00:29:29,700

that you can data mine out with one

714

00:29:33,799 --> 00:29:32,190

years of data which astrological sign is

715

00:29:36,590 --> 00:29:33,809

the worst driver well that's really a

716

00:29:38,810 --> 00:29:36,600

very poor correlation right so maybe you

717

00:29:42,560 --> 00:29:38,820

can expound on that yeah there's going

718

00:29:49,010 --> 00:29:42,570

to be some sign that is the worst driver

719

00:29:50,990 --> 00:29:49,020

for a year or a month or a day and even

720

00:29:53,299 --> 00:29:51,000

for a decade there's going to be someone

721

00:29:58,299 --> 00:29:53,309

at the peak at the top of that histogram

722

00:30:01,159 --> 00:29:58,309

you know Sun signs and and driving

723

00:30:04,580 --> 00:30:01,169

accidents yeah this whole idea of

724

00:30:07,130 --> 00:30:04,590

causation is huge I mean even in

725

00:30:09,110 --> 00:30:07,140

medicine it you know does it's a huge

726

00:30:11,690 --> 00:30:09,120

thing to show that something causes

727

00:30:13,850 --> 00:30:11,700

something else but yeah the first step

728

00:30:17,169 --> 00:30:13,860

is to show a correlation and we showed

729

00:30:19,190 --> 00:30:17,179

that in the twitter paper pretty well

730

00:30:23,600 --> 00:30:19,200

subsequently in the Mercury retrograde

731

00:30:26,600 --> 00:30:23,610

we showed it too and then also showed an

732

00:30:28,400 --> 00:30:26,610

AI prediction engine can be built from

733

00:30:31,460 --> 00:30:28,410

it that's really accurate too

734

00:30:34,460 --> 00:30:31,470

using standard measures of AI one thing

735

00:30:36,140 --> 00:30:34,470

we might want to do just for sake we

736

00:30:37,700 --> 00:30:36,150

kind of gloss over the Twitter thing

737

00:30:40,550 --> 00:30:37,710

maybe you just want to explain at a high

738

00:30:43,820 --> 00:30:40,560

level what the Twitter experiment set

739

00:30:48,350 --> 00:30:43,830

out to do sure thanks yeah

740

00:30:51,050 --> 00:30:48,360

there's this sutra in sanskrit from a

741

00:30:52,820 --> 00:30:51,060

book from a thousand years ago well

742

00:30:57,140 --> 00:30:52,830

understood to be a thousand-year-old

743

00:31:01,070 --> 00:30:57,150

text that says that when these

744

00:31:02,930 --> 00:31:01,080

particular planets are in squares to

745

00:31:05,450 --> 00:31:02,940

each other and went that 90 degrees to

746

00:31:10,370 --> 00:31:05,460

each other that the person is more

747

00:31:12,980 --> 00:31:10,380

likely to be famous that you can

748

00:31:13,940 --> 00:31:12,990

interpret their charge as being bad of a

749

00:31:16,460 --> 00:31:13,950

famous person

750

00:31:18,760 --> 00:31:16,470

okay so again breaking it down to kind

751

00:31:22,220 --> 00:31:18,770

of a six-year-old kind of thing the

752

00:31:23,650 --> 00:31:22,230

astrological chart is based on the

753

00:31:26,990 --> 00:31:23,660

position of the planets and the stars

754

00:31:29,390 --> 00:31:27,000

when you take your first breath there's

755

00:31:31,690 --> 00:31:29,400

this Vedic Astrology that's been around

756

00:31:34,850 --> 00:31:31,700

for a long time and it has all these

757

00:31:36,260 --> 00:31:34,860

axioms and ideas about what to do and

758

00:31:38,240 --> 00:31:36,270

you say one interpretation is hey when

759

00:31:39,980 --> 00:31:38,250

these two things are at this particular

760

00:31:41,900 --> 00:31:39,990

position that means the person's going

761

00:31:44,510 --> 00:31:41,910

to be famous right so go ahead continue

762

00:31:46,970 --> 00:31:44,520

with the story yeah I think more exactly

763

00:31:50,200 --> 00:31:46,980

that in the exact words of the Sanskrit

764

00:31:53,240 --> 00:31:50,210

that the person has a lot of followers

765

00:31:55,490 --> 00:31:53,250

followers and so we were just chewing on

766

00:31:57,890 --> 00:31:55,500

that idea of followers and we're like

767

00:32:01,400 --> 00:31:57,900

well what does that mean nowadays to

768

00:32:03,920 --> 00:32:01,410

have a lot of followers Oh Twitter the

769

00:32:07,070 --> 00:32:03,930

Twitter is a numerically accessible

770

00:32:09,140 --> 00:32:07,080

accessible way to find out how many

771

00:32:11,960 --> 00:32:09,150

followers a person has and it's

772

00:32:15,530 --> 00:32:11,970

different from theme or exactly like

773

00:32:19,120 --> 00:32:15,540

Leonardo DiCaprio has a lot of Fame but

774

00:32:22,760 --> 00:32:19,130

not a lot of followers why is that why

775

00:32:26,300 --> 00:32:22,770

do some people who not relate anything

776

00:32:29,690 --> 00:32:26,310

else than a Twitter celebrity have a lot

777

00:32:31,280 --> 00:32:29,700

of followers but not a lot of fame so

778

00:32:33,920 --> 00:32:31,290

you know it's a very it's an interesting

779

00:32:36,230 --> 00:32:33,930

thing and you can you can tell that in

780

00:32:38,090 --> 00:32:36,240

Leonardo DiCaprio's chart if I recall

781

00:32:41,180 --> 00:32:38,100

correctly he does not have this

782

00:32:45,350 --> 00:32:41,190

signature this astrological

783

00:32:47,600 --> 00:32:45,360

signature for hi followers but he does

784

00:32:49,460 --> 00:32:47,610

have it for fame now you got to realize

785

00:32:50,960 --> 00:32:49,470

there I mean that's kind of problematic

786

00:32:53,780 --> 00:32:50,970

because what a lot of people would

787

00:32:56,630 --> 00:32:53,790

suggest is that one social media

788

00:32:58,850 --> 00:32:56,640

platform does not really is not

789

00:33:00,830 --> 00:32:58,860

indicative of the number of followers I

790

00:33:04,490 --> 00:33:00,840

would I would think that Leonardo

791

00:33:07,100 --> 00:33:04,500

DiCaprio has a lot a lot of followers in

792

00:33:09,710 --> 00:33:07,110

them in the general sense so I think

793

00:33:11,240 --> 00:33:09,720

that actually doesn't really fit with

794

00:33:14,270 --> 00:33:11,250

your research because I think your

795

00:33:16,820 --> 00:33:14,280

research methodology is is is good but I

796

00:33:19,760 --> 00:33:16,830

don't think it fits with that that part

797

00:33:22,640 --> 00:33:19,770

so tell folks what you did in terms of

798

00:33:25,040 --> 00:33:22,650

defining your followers group versus

799

00:33:27,950 --> 00:33:25,050

your non followers group and then how

800

00:33:32,210 --> 00:33:27,960

you did your analysis yeah thanks that

801
00:33:35,200 --> 00:33:32,220
was a fascinating process where we

802
00:33:40,130 --> 00:33:35,210
decided to just in a moment in time grab

803
00:33:43,760 --> 00:33:40,140
screenshot of top 1,000 people who have

804
00:33:46,550 --> 00:33:43,770
Twitter follower numbers people like

805
00:33:48,860 --> 00:33:46,560
Justin Bieber I had the most Twitter

806
00:33:52,670 --> 00:33:48,870
followers Oprah Winfrey was in there

807
00:33:55,010 --> 00:33:52,680
Dalai Lama was in there and really all

808
00:33:56,480 --> 00:33:55,020
of them just and we chose a thousand

809
00:33:59,030 --> 00:33:56,490
because that was the only number

810
00:34:00,980 --> 00:33:59,040
available was the top 1000 so we

811
00:34:03,890 --> 00:34:00,990
screenshotted that in a moment in time

812
00:34:06,620 --> 00:34:03,900
and then fed in that data into a

813
00:34:10,220 --> 00:34:06,630

spreadsheet and then looked for the

814

00:34:13,639 --> 00:34:10,230

charts when it online and not for charts

815

00:34:15,680 --> 00:34:13,649

of the Dalai Lama Oprah Winfrey Justin

816

00:34:17,180 --> 00:34:15,690

Bieber so I don't know and some of them

817

00:34:19,280 --> 00:34:17,190

did you be able to get more information

818

00:34:20,600 --> 00:34:19,290

like birth time and birthplace and did

819

00:34:22,850 --> 00:34:20,610

you figure that in when you couldn't

820

00:34:24,710 --> 00:34:22,860

when you didn't did you just leave it

821

00:34:25,369 --> 00:34:24,720

out I mean how did you do that yeah

822

00:34:29,119 --> 00:34:25,379

exactly

823

00:34:31,669 --> 00:34:29,129

I so CNN for example it has a high

824

00:34:34,580 --> 00:34:31,679

number of Twitter followers but we could

825

00:34:37,280 --> 00:34:34,590

there's no birth chart for that so all

826

00:34:39,950 --> 00:34:37,290

the businesses were tossed out all the

827

00:34:42,500 --> 00:34:39,960

people we could not find accurate birth

828

00:34:45,070 --> 00:34:42,510

times for we tossed out now how do we

829

00:34:49,930 --> 00:34:45,080

know it's accurate there's actually

830

00:34:53,419 --> 00:34:49,940

astrological research sites that have

831

00:34:54,649 --> 00:34:53,429

reputations behind them such as Astro

832

00:34:57,289 --> 00:34:54,659

databank and so we

833

00:35:01,190 --> 00:34:57,299

Astra databank a lot and they're very

834

00:35:04,010 --> 00:35:01,200

good at recording how how they know the

835

00:35:07,579 --> 00:35:04,020

birth information so we only I used

836

00:35:12,020 --> 00:35:07,589

those Twitter accounts whose owners we

837

00:35:13,339 --> 00:35:12,030

had very good astronomical data for you

838

00:35:16,160 --> 00:35:13,349

have any reason to believe that that

839

00:35:18,980 --> 00:35:16,170

would have skewed the data in one way or

840

00:35:22,839 --> 00:35:18,990

another yeah for example there's a lot

841

00:35:26,240 --> 00:35:22,849

of Saudi Arabian princes or something

842

00:35:29,599 --> 00:35:26,250

royalty who were in that top 1000 for

843

00:35:32,720 --> 00:35:29,609

whom we do not have good birth data or

844

00:35:35,569 --> 00:35:32,730

any birth data so they had to be tossed

845

00:35:41,299 --> 00:35:35,579

out so absolutely there's a geographic

846

00:35:43,490 --> 00:35:41,309

skew skewing there's even a time skewing

847

00:35:47,510 --> 00:35:43,500

like for instance you know there's only

848

00:35:50,390 --> 00:35:47,520

there's said these were mostly American

849

00:35:53,120 --> 00:35:50,400

celebrities or some European celebrities

850

00:35:55,569 --> 00:35:53,130

for whom we could get the birth data now

851

00:36:00,200 --> 00:35:55,579

check this out the way we got a

852

00:36:02,859 --> 00:36:00,210

comparison group to compare whether this

853

00:36:05,870 --> 00:36:02,869

incidents of this ancient

854

00:36:08,000 --> 00:36:05,880

thousand-year-old idea of what should be

855

00:36:10,579 --> 00:36:08,010

seen in a chart to show a lot of

856

00:36:14,900 --> 00:36:10,589

followers to show whether there's a high

857

00:36:19,160 --> 00:36:14,910

incidence of this combination in the

858

00:36:21,500 --> 00:36:19,170

celebrity group 86 only 86 people how do

859

00:36:24,640 --> 00:36:21,510

you know how do we show that

860

00:36:28,880 --> 00:36:24,650

well we developed a Monte Carlo

861

00:36:33,589 --> 00:36:28,890

bootstrapped comparison group Jafra no

862

00:36:36,529 --> 00:36:33,599

no the Jacobin another Ephron 1979 and

863

00:36:40,390 --> 00:36:36,539

his Stanford PhD paper developed this

864

00:36:43,250 --> 00:36:40,400

really cool system where you can build

865

00:36:45,380 --> 00:36:43,260

comparison groups you can build a

866

00:36:47,720 --> 00:36:45,390

comparison group from something called a

867

00:36:50,029 --> 00:36:47,730

Monte Carlo bootstrapped system which is

868

00:36:52,609 --> 00:36:50,039

where it's okay that these are mostly

869

00:36:57,470 --> 00:36:52,619

European and American celebrities that

870

00:37:00,829 --> 00:36:57,480

were not including the Arabic group for

871

00:37:03,490 --> 00:37:00,839

example it's it's not bad because the

872

00:37:07,640 --> 00:37:03,500

comparison group is that same

873

00:37:08,490 --> 00:37:07,650

distribution of places times so if I

874

00:37:09,960 --> 00:37:08,500

understand this

875

00:37:12,540 --> 00:37:09,970

the only way you can really get the

876

00:37:14,640 --> 00:37:12,550

astrological data that you need to test

877

00:37:16,230 --> 00:37:14,650

out this sutra and this positioning of

878

00:37:17,550 --> 00:37:16,240

the planets is you have to go to this

879

00:37:20,309 --> 00:37:17,560

website what was the name of the website

880

00:37:22,829 --> 00:37:20,319

again Astro data being which you've

881

00:37:25,109 --> 00:37:22,839

found to be reliable in terms of getting

882

00:37:26,880 --> 00:37:25,119

so anyways you take your thousand off of

883

00:37:28,680 --> 00:37:26,890

Twitter you pare it down and the way

884

00:37:31,020 --> 00:37:28,690

that you did and you wanted to put 86

885

00:37:33,150 --> 00:37:31,030

and you say okay we have these 86 now we

886

00:37:34,440 --> 00:37:33,160

want to compare that with probably not

887

00:37:36,420 --> 00:37:34,450

the correct term but basically your

888

00:37:38,520 --> 00:37:36,430

control group and then you say okay so

889

00:37:39,900 --> 00:37:38,530

since our asked your database is where

890

00:37:41,730 --> 00:37:39,910

we're getting the data we want to get

891

00:37:44,099 --> 00:37:41,740

the same data from that how do we start

892

00:37:45,780 --> 00:37:44,109

selecting people out and not bias our

893

00:37:47,700 --> 00:37:45,790

selection where we just take hand

894

00:37:49,020 --> 00:37:47,710

picking out ones that'll kind of give us

895

00:37:51,720 --> 00:37:49,030

the result we have and then you say you

896

00:37:53,460 --> 00:37:51,730

looked at this guy who did this Stanford

897

00:37:55,109 --> 00:37:53,470

PhD and he said yeah there's a way to do

898

00:37:57,120 --> 00:37:55,119

it using this Monte Carlo this

899

00:37:59,339 --> 00:37:57,130

randomization kind of thing where you

900

00:38:01,440 --> 00:37:59,349

can kind of get a good data set for your

901
00:38:02,640 --> 00:38:01,450
control group so now you do that you

902
00:38:04,380 --> 00:38:02,650
have your so how many do you wind up

903
00:38:06,420 --> 00:38:04,390
with your your control group and was I

904
00:38:07,200 --> 00:38:06,430
right that you have 86 and then what do

905
00:38:09,150 --> 00:38:07,210
you do from there

906
00:38:11,339 --> 00:38:09,160
yeah and the control group I believe

907
00:38:14,010 --> 00:38:11,349
there's five thousand four hundred and

908
00:38:16,050 --> 00:38:14,020
sixty you can find that exact number in

909
00:38:20,250 --> 00:38:16,060
the paper and what we did was just

910
00:38:22,829 --> 00:38:20,260
generate these theoretical charts which

911
00:38:26,940 --> 00:38:22,839
were constructed from randomizations as

912
00:38:31,620 --> 00:38:26,950
you say of the earth x places and dates

913
00:38:34,530 --> 00:38:31,630

of the celebrity group so we mixed them

914

00:38:38,250 --> 00:38:34,540

all up constructed these five thousand

915

00:38:41,520 --> 00:38:38,260

four hundred or so comparison group

916

00:38:43,530 --> 00:38:41,530

charts and these are sort of theoretical

917

00:38:45,720 --> 00:38:43,540

people that we can compare the

918

00:38:48,630 --> 00:38:45,730

celebrities to him and the point there

919

00:38:52,170 --> 00:38:48,640

is that we can say hey there's not a

920

00:38:54,240 --> 00:38:52,180

skewing because the celebrity group tend

921

00:38:55,200 --> 00:38:54,250

to come from the LA area at the Los

922

00:38:56,640 --> 00:38:55,210

Angeles area

923

00:38:59,849 --> 00:38:56,650

maybe there's something special about

924

00:39:01,770 --> 00:38:59,859

the Los Angeles area well that's in the

925

00:39:05,460 --> 00:39:01,780

comparison group maybe there's something

926
00:39:08,720 --> 00:39:05,470
special in the planets from 1964 well

927
00:39:11,700 --> 00:39:08,730
hey that would be in the constructed

928
00:39:13,940 --> 00:39:11,710
comparison group as well so this is a

929
00:39:17,730 --> 00:39:13,950
very nice technique this bootstrap

930
00:39:19,290 --> 00:39:17,740
technique to to reduce all of those

931
00:39:22,329 --> 00:39:19,300
concerns that there's something

932
00:39:28,179 --> 00:39:22,339
anomalous in 1964

933
00:39:30,789 --> 00:39:28,189
in Los Angeles or in 8 a.m. or whatever

934
00:39:34,150 --> 00:39:30,799
kind of special qualities are in that

935
00:39:37,239 --> 00:39:34,160
small celebrity group we can recreate

936
00:39:39,969 --> 00:39:37,249
those in the comparison group so I

937
00:39:42,219 --> 00:39:39,979
thought it was a really appropriate and

938
00:39:44,349 --> 00:39:42,229

helpful approach to constructing that

939

00:39:45,779 --> 00:39:44,359

comparison group that's excellent I

940

00:39:47,949 --> 00:39:45,789

think people will be very interested

941

00:39:48,939 --> 00:39:47,959

skeptical listeners especially be very

942

00:39:51,039 --> 00:39:48,949

interested in those kind of little

943

00:39:53,049 --> 00:39:51,049

nitty-gritty details so hence that's

944

00:39:55,929 --> 00:39:53,059

where you get those bootstrap things so

945

00:39:58,599 --> 00:39:55,939

you can throw this data set at it and

946

00:40:01,839 --> 00:39:58,609

say give me a random data set that kind

947

00:40:05,170 --> 00:40:01,849

of controls for these variables that

948

00:40:07,209 --> 00:40:05,180

might be skewed in my data set that I

949

00:40:09,819 --> 00:40:07,219

want to look at and make sure that it's

950

00:40:11,709 --> 00:40:09,829

equally representative of the larger

951
00:40:13,539 --> 00:40:11,719
group and it does that very cool and

952
00:40:16,449 --> 00:40:13,549
then so what are the results that you

953
00:40:18,989 --> 00:40:16,459
get out of that sure well we looked for

954
00:40:22,390 --> 00:40:18,999
incidents of this astrological

955
00:40:25,299 --> 00:40:22,400
arrangement from a thousand years ago is

956
00:40:28,959 --> 00:40:25,309
it higher in the celebrities the twitter

957
00:40:31,499 --> 00:40:28,969
celebrities then in this huge general

958
00:40:33,429 --> 00:40:31,509
populace what was the astronomical

959
00:40:36,729 --> 00:40:33,439
relationship again in a way that people

960
00:40:39,759 --> 00:40:36,739
would kind of understand it sure it is

961
00:40:43,359 --> 00:40:39,769
that the planet with the highest degree

962
00:40:45,759 --> 00:40:43,369
like you put up an astrology chart which

963
00:40:48,249 --> 00:40:45,769

is really a birth astronomy chart and

964

00:40:50,559 --> 00:40:48,259

you look at the doobies there's going to

965

00:40:53,049 --> 00:40:50,569

be a little degrees next to each of the

966

00:40:57,939 --> 00:40:53,059

planets that describes how many degrees

967

00:41:00,400 --> 00:40:57,949

in 30 degrees that planet has passed

968

00:41:04,569 --> 00:41:00,410

through to get into that sign really

969

00:41:08,949 --> 00:41:04,579

that constellation so even an astronomer

970

00:41:12,039 --> 00:41:08,959

will say that say moon is at 20 degrees

971

00:41:14,609 --> 00:41:12,049

Pisces right now and sure enough you

972

00:41:18,279 --> 00:41:14,619

know it's a it's just an astronomical

973

00:41:22,509 --> 00:41:18,289

observation how many degrees a planet is

974

00:41:24,939 --> 00:41:22,519

in a constellation so the planet with

975

00:41:27,099 --> 00:41:24,949

the highest number of degrees and the

976
00:41:29,229 --> 00:41:27,109
planet with the fifth highest number of

977
00:41:31,779 --> 00:41:29,239
degrees should be at 90 degrees to each

978
00:41:34,599 --> 00:41:31,789
other that's what the suture predicts

979
00:41:35,740 --> 00:41:34,609
yeah and as you just explained that is a

980
00:41:38,230 --> 00:41:35,750
very measure

981
00:41:39,880 --> 00:41:38,240
Herbal yet back there really isn't gonna

982
00:41:41,740 --> 00:41:39,890
be like you said you could put an

983
00:41:43,990 --> 00:41:41,750
astronomer and take open your telescope

984
00:41:46,210 --> 00:41:44,000
and without that person believing in

985
00:41:48,580 --> 00:41:46,220
astrology they could tell you whether or

986
00:41:51,610 --> 00:41:48,590
not that relationship between those two

987
00:41:53,350 --> 00:41:51,620
planets and their movement exists or

988
00:41:55,840 --> 00:41:53,360

doesn't exist right absolutely

989

00:42:00,510 --> 00:41:55,850

completely calculable completely

990

00:42:04,330 --> 00:42:00,520

hands-off no interpretation in any of

991

00:42:07,510 --> 00:42:04,340

the Twitter study none just applying

992

00:42:11,200 --> 00:42:07,520

that Sutra looking for that Sutra and we

993

00:42:15,750 --> 00:42:11,210

found absolutely its incidence I believe

994

00:42:20,920 --> 00:42:15,760

it's 76 out of 86 in the celebrity group

995

00:42:23,110 --> 00:42:20,930

and in the huge comparison group five

996

00:42:26,170 --> 00:42:23,120

thousand four hundred charts the mean

997

00:42:28,330 --> 00:42:26,180

was in the forties like forty six or

998

00:42:31,060 --> 00:42:28,340

something like that forty five forty

999

00:42:33,880 --> 00:42:31,070

four is something like that and moreover

1000

00:42:36,340 --> 00:42:33,890

the standard deviation was you know

1001
00:42:38,200 --> 00:42:36,350
seven or something and so you could you

1002
00:42:40,780 --> 00:42:38,210
know in the normal curve that is

1003
00:42:44,590 --> 00:42:40,790
generated from that standard deviation

1004
00:42:47,890 --> 00:42:44,600
and that mean you find that the p-value

1005
00:42:52,960 --> 00:42:47,900
of getting the celebrity chart incidents

1006
00:42:57,160 --> 00:42:52,970
is like 0.001 or something the chance of

1007
00:42:59,770 --> 00:42:57,170
getting the celebrity incidents given

1008
00:43:03,420 --> 00:42:59,780
the distribution as found in the general

1009
00:43:08,170 --> 00:43:03,430
population model of the comparison group

1010
00:43:10,420 --> 00:43:08,180
is is very low so that was step one to

1011
00:43:14,200 --> 00:43:10,430
show that there is indeed a higher

1012
00:43:16,720 --> 00:43:14,210
incidence a statistic that we can say

1013
00:43:18,910 --> 00:43:16,730

with statistical confidence that there's

1014

00:43:21,550 --> 00:43:18,920

a higher incidence in the celebrity

1015

00:43:24,100 --> 00:43:21,560

group of this ancient signature than in

1016

00:43:26,830 --> 00:43:24,110

the general population so the chance of

1017

00:43:29,050 --> 00:43:26,840

the celebrities having that alignment of

1018

00:43:30,610 --> 00:43:29,060

those planets is over ninety percent

1019

00:43:33,670 --> 00:43:30,620

over ninety percent of them are in that

1020

00:43:36,610 --> 00:43:33,680

range and then of the control group or

1021

00:43:38,950 --> 00:43:36,620

just not control group that the random

1022

00:43:40,870 --> 00:43:38,960

group it's in forty five percent and

1023

00:43:42,490 --> 00:43:40,880

yeah you ran all these trials and when

1024

00:43:44,350 --> 00:43:42,500

you run that through statistical

1025

00:43:47,020 --> 00:43:44,360

analysis the odds of that just being

1026
00:43:48,370 --> 00:43:47,030
chance that you just the null hypothesis

1027
00:43:49,780 --> 00:43:48,380
that it just hey it just happened that

1028
00:43:52,300 --> 00:43:49,790
way is

1029
00:43:53,770 --> 00:43:52,310
far less than one out of a hundred right

1030
00:43:55,720 --> 00:43:53,780
thank you yeah

1031
00:43:58,000 --> 00:43:55,730
that's a good summary so that was step

1032
00:44:01,480 --> 00:43:58,010
one and then step two in that paper was

1033
00:44:02,800 --> 00:44:01,490
to show a correlation all right so it's

1034
00:44:05,380 --> 00:44:02,810
one thing to show a high incidence

1035
00:44:08,020 --> 00:44:05,390
that's actually kind of neat in itself

1036
00:44:10,870 --> 00:44:08,030
but it's not yet a correlation where

1037
00:44:15,070 --> 00:44:10,880
what we would want to see in step two is

1038
00:44:18,190 --> 00:44:15,080

that as the follower numbers for a

1039

00:44:23,560 --> 00:44:18,200

Twitter account increases the likelihood

1040

00:44:26,050 --> 00:44:23,570

of having this incidence increases - so

1041

00:44:29,200 --> 00:44:26,060

there's a positive correlation that as

1042

00:44:32,980 --> 00:44:29,210

follower numbers increase the likelihood

1043

00:44:35,880 --> 00:44:32,990

of the holder of that that Twitter

1044

00:44:38,650 --> 00:44:35,890

account having this astronomical

1045

00:44:41,560 --> 00:44:38,660

configuration at Birth increases as well

1046

00:44:43,660 --> 00:44:41,570

why is that important well we talked

1047

00:44:46,600 --> 00:44:43,670

earlier about the Mercury retrograde

1048

00:44:49,470 --> 00:44:46,610

study and how important it is to show

1049

00:44:53,740 --> 00:44:49,480

correlation as a first step for

1050

00:44:57,580 --> 00:44:53,750

causation studies oh just it's important

1051
00:45:01,360 --> 00:44:57,590
to to show correlation does you know

1052
00:45:03,760 --> 00:45:01,370
that's even out there in general science

1053
00:45:05,590 --> 00:45:03,770
that's the first thing people do is show

1054
00:45:08,740 --> 00:45:05,600
a correlation I get that and we can take

1055
00:45:10,320 --> 00:45:08,750
this off if it's distracting but I kind

1056
00:45:12,700 --> 00:45:10,330
of don't get but that part of it I mean

1057
00:45:15,310 --> 00:45:12,710
the correlation you showed in that first

1058
00:45:17,620 --> 00:45:15,320
part in terms of someone rising in the

1059
00:45:19,210 --> 00:45:17,630
ranks I mean they can rise as much as

1060
00:45:21,370 --> 00:45:19,220
they want their chart is either going to

1061
00:45:23,380 --> 00:45:21,380
be there or not be there so whether or

1062
00:45:25,110 --> 00:45:23,390
not they rise to a level of come on to

1063
00:45:27,550 --> 00:45:25,120

your radar doesn't seem to be

1064

00:45:29,800 --> 00:45:27,560

significant in what you're measuring in

1065

00:45:31,900 --> 00:45:29,810

terms of the the you know the

1066

00:45:33,700 --> 00:45:31,910

correlation so there's a lot of people

1067

00:45:35,460 --> 00:45:33,710

out there that like he said there's 45

1068

00:45:38,590 --> 00:45:35,470

percent of people in your control group

1069

00:45:41,280 --> 00:45:38,600

have that they might be rising stars on

1070

00:45:45,100 --> 00:45:41,290

Twitter in the future you know who knows

1071

00:45:47,020 --> 00:45:45,110

isn't that fascinating they might not be

1072

00:45:51,070 --> 00:45:47,030

though and the reason why it might be

1073

00:45:53,440 --> 00:45:51,080

because of the chart the highest that

1074

00:45:56,650 --> 00:45:53,450

very highest tail as it's called of the

1075

00:45:58,510 --> 00:45:56,660

correlation is you know people like over

1076
00:46:02,460 --> 00:45:58,520
Wimpy's people like Justin Bieber people

1077
00:46:03,530 --> 00:46:02,470
have a very tippity top of the the

1078
00:46:05,870 --> 00:46:03,540
pyramid

1079
00:46:08,420 --> 00:46:05,880
therefore how many followers you have in

1080
00:46:11,660 --> 00:46:08,430
your Twitter account in that top tail of

1081
00:46:14,060 --> 00:46:11,670
the correlation they all have this

1082
00:46:15,860 --> 00:46:14,070
ancient signature so if I understand

1083
00:46:18,410 --> 00:46:15,870
correctly then I misunderstood I

1084
00:46:21,280 --> 00:46:18,420
apologize what I hear you saying now is

1085
00:46:25,310 --> 00:46:21,290
that then you kind of reanalyzed your

1086
00:46:27,140 --> 00:46:25,320
8686 celebrities and you said okay now

1087
00:46:29,120 --> 00:46:27,150
is there a correlation in terms of their

1088
00:46:32,060 --> 00:46:29,130

total number of followers and again

1089

00:46:34,790 --> 00:46:32,070

you're saying the the high tip of the of

1090

00:46:36,380 --> 00:46:34,800

the followers are they more even

1091

00:46:37,700 --> 00:46:36,390

strongly correlated i I didn't think

1092

00:46:39,410 --> 00:46:37,710

that be that significant since you're

1093

00:46:41,900 --> 00:46:39,420

already above 90% I don't know how you

1094

00:46:43,280 --> 00:46:41,910

could have you how far you could go but

1095

00:46:45,080 --> 00:46:43,290

you're saying yeah even the top ones

1096

00:46:47,120 --> 00:46:45,090

it's a hundred percent and then it there

1097

00:46:48,860 --> 00:46:47,130

is a correlation where it tails down on

1098

00:46:50,660 --> 00:46:48,870

the number of followers right is that

1099

00:46:53,930 --> 00:46:50,670

what you're saying that's exactly right

1100

00:46:57,140 --> 00:46:53,940

yes and that was step two and an

1101
00:46:59,990 --> 00:46:57,150
important in its own right to not just

1102
00:47:02,780 --> 00:47:00,000
show okay high incidence in the general

1103
00:47:05,750 --> 00:47:02,790
celebrity group yay that's that's pretty

1104
00:47:08,900 --> 00:47:05,760
cool but let's go further as following

1105
00:47:11,390 --> 00:47:08,910
numbers go up so too does this incidence

1106
00:47:14,390 --> 00:47:11,400
so that people at the bottom of the

1107
00:47:17,690 --> 00:47:14,400
thousand top 1000 Twitter followers I

1108
00:47:21,940 --> 00:47:17,700
only have this incident 56 percent of

1109
00:47:24,230 --> 00:47:21,950
the time now you go up into the top 500

1110
00:47:28,750 --> 00:47:24,240
followers Twitter followers they have it

1111
00:47:30,950 --> 00:47:28,760
at 70 percent you go to the very top 100

1112
00:47:33,320 --> 00:47:30,960
people with the highest Twitter

1113
00:47:36,200 --> 00:47:33,330

followers they have it a hundred percent

1114

00:47:37,790 --> 00:47:36,210

of the time so of your list of 86 again

1115

00:47:39,920 --> 00:47:37,800

that started with a thousand and you

1116

00:47:42,200 --> 00:47:39,930

pared it down to 86 because some of the

1117

00:47:43,910 --> 00:47:42,210

people being followed our CNN or

1118

00:47:47,000 --> 00:47:43,920

Infowars or something like that that you

1119

00:47:48,770 --> 00:47:47,010

can't even kind of there's no person

1120

00:47:51,290 --> 00:47:48,780

associate there's no astrological data

1121

00:47:53,900 --> 00:47:51,300

associated with it so then you pare that

1122

00:47:56,120 --> 00:47:53,910

down you might have put 86 and then so

1123

00:47:58,940 --> 00:47:56,130

of those 86 though those are spread

1124

00:48:00,800 --> 00:47:58,950

across that still spread across that

1125

00:48:03,140 --> 00:48:00,810

thousand rankings so you might have

1126
00:48:05,330 --> 00:48:03,150
somebody yeah even though it's 86 they

1127
00:48:07,460 --> 00:48:05,340
might be down in the thousand range like

1128
00:48:10,820 --> 00:48:07,470
you just said and then the real stunner

1129
00:48:13,970 --> 00:48:10,830
what you said is anyone of that 86 who

1130
00:48:16,670 --> 00:48:13,980
happen to rank in the top 100 100%

1131
00:48:17,530 --> 00:48:16,680
correlation between that and having this

1132
00:48:19,700 --> 00:48:17,540
certain

1133
00:48:22,250 --> 00:48:19,710
position of the planet kind of thing

1134
00:48:24,140 --> 00:48:22,260
that's absolutely right that's what that

1135
00:48:28,820 --> 00:48:24,150
is that is breeding croaking so how many

1136
00:48:33,140 --> 00:48:28,830
does that represent I think it's 12 over

1137
00:48:35,240 --> 00:48:33,150
the 86 yeah that's that's significant so

1138
00:48:37,160 --> 00:48:35,250

check out our paper and see what you

1139

00:48:40,070 --> 00:48:37,170

think and please give it a shot I've

1140

00:48:43,880 --> 00:48:40,080

replicated right now and see if it still

1141

00:48:45,710 --> 00:48:43,890

holds or if I was a one-off and you know

1142

00:48:48,050 --> 00:48:45,720

just on that particular day at that

1143

00:48:51,980 --> 00:48:48,060

particular hour when we took that

1144

00:48:54,710 --> 00:48:51,990

snapshot of the top 1,000 the final kind

1145

00:48:57,080 --> 00:48:54,720

of criticism might be that okay that

1146

00:49:00,050 --> 00:48:57,090

happened but it was something in that

1147

00:49:02,390 --> 00:49:00,060

snapshot alone so let's take a few more

1148

00:49:05,510 --> 00:49:02,400

snapshots and like I said every step is

1149

00:49:09,770 --> 00:49:05,520

in the methods and materials it's not

1150

00:49:12,230 --> 00:49:09,780

too hard computationally and I'd love to

1151
00:49:14,750 --> 00:49:12,240
give any support to anyone out there if

1152
00:49:17,990 --> 00:49:14,760
I can to replicate it

1153
00:49:20,090 --> 00:49:18,000
I'm all for replication efforts I think

1154
00:49:22,430 --> 00:49:20,100
that would be the next thing here with

1155
00:49:23,690 --> 00:49:22,440
the Twitter paper no fair-minded person

1156
00:49:25,250 --> 00:49:23,700
could ask for anything more than that

1157
00:49:27,560 --> 00:49:25,260
Renee excellent you've acquitted

1158
00:49:30,230 --> 00:49:27,570
yourself very well and I'm glad we have

1159
00:49:32,420 --> 00:49:30,240
this follow-on conversation very glad to

1160
00:49:34,820 --> 00:49:32,430
talk with you like I said it's it's an

1161
00:49:37,580 --> 00:49:34,830
honor to be on your show I really

1162
00:49:39,260 --> 00:49:37,590
enjoyed it thanks again to Renee Asha

1163
00:49:41,390 --> 00:49:39,270

for joining me today on skeptic oh

1164

00:49:43,400 --> 00:49:41,400

there's really only one question to tee

1165

00:49:45,440 --> 00:49:43,410

up from this interview do you think

1166

00:49:48,140 --> 00:49:45,450

there is a correlation between certain

1167

00:49:50,480 --> 00:49:48,150

planetary alignments and physical things

1168

00:49:53,210 --> 00:49:50,490

that happen down here on earth do you

1169

00:49:55,730 --> 00:49:53,220

think Renee's research moves us towards

1170

00:49:58,820 --> 00:49:55,740

coming to that conclusion based on the

1171

00:50:00,680 --> 00:49:58,830

statistical analysis of her data so let

1172

00:50:02,540 --> 00:50:00,690

me hear your thoughts of course the

1173

00:50:06,650 --> 00:50:02,550

place to do it is through the skeptical

1174

00:50:08,720 --> 00:50:06,660

forum or at skeptic Oh calm SK EP tik Oh

1175

00:50:11,260 --> 00:50:08,730

calm and there you can download of

1176

00:50:13,280 --> 00:50:11,270

course all the 350 previous shows and

1177

00:50:14,270 --> 00:50:13,290

subscribe to the newsletter and do some

1178

00:50:16,580 --> 00:50:14,280

other cool stuff

1179

00:50:18,290 --> 00:50:16,590

all the usual podcasting stuff so please

1180

00:50:19,970 --> 00:50:18,300

do that please share the show tell your

1181

00:50:21,380 --> 00:50:19,980

friends about the show and please stay

1182

00:50:23,780 --> 00:50:21,390

tuned because I have some more great

1183

00:50:27,600 --> 00:50:23,790

episode's coming up that's it for this