



1
00:00:07,519 --> 00:00:05,300
good morning everybody I won't take much

2
00:00:10,490 --> 00:00:07,529
time to tell you how the global

3
00:00:14,270 --> 00:00:10,500
consciousness project data are achieved

4
00:00:16,640 --> 00:00:14,280
but basically it's a continuous report

5
00:00:19,550 --> 00:00:16,650
of data from something like sixty

6
00:00:25,870 --> 00:00:19,560
locations around the world where the

7
00:00:30,950 --> 00:00:25,880
data are random number generator trials

8
00:00:33,080 --> 00:00:30,960
the bottom line of the experiment really

9
00:00:37,100 --> 00:00:33,090
gives quite good evidence that there is

10
00:00:42,560 --> 00:00:37,110
some effect on these random number

11
00:00:45,190 --> 00:00:42,570
generators and we calculate that effect

12
00:00:48,080 --> 00:00:45,200
during periods of time when people are

13
00:00:52,850 --> 00:00:48,090

stimulated by some tragedy tragedy or

14

00:00:53,569 --> 00:00:52,860

maybe a celebration to feel the same

15

00:00:55,069 --> 00:00:53,579

emotions

16

00:00:57,410 --> 00:00:55,079

think the same kinds of thoughts in

17

00:01:01,209 --> 00:00:57,420

other words we're looking for global

18

00:01:06,020 --> 00:01:01,219

events to gather people together and

19

00:01:08,120 --> 00:01:06,030

then and when we look at repeatedly such

20

00:01:11,000 --> 00:01:08,130

events we find that there's a very small

21

00:01:13,100 --> 00:01:11,010

but ultimately quite impressive

22

00:01:15,109 --> 00:01:13,110

difference from what's expected from

23

00:01:16,520 --> 00:01:15,119

random number generators the odds

24

00:01:18,859 --> 00:01:16,530

against chance are on the order of

25

00:01:22,340 --> 00:01:18,869

trillion to one that we've gives as much

26
00:01:25,640 --> 00:01:22,350
deviation as we do now Peter been cell

27
00:01:29,210 --> 00:01:25,650
my friend and colleague who lives in

28
00:01:31,999 --> 00:01:29,220
Paris is the person has done more

29
00:01:36,200 --> 00:01:32,009
analysis on this data set than anybody

30
00:01:38,390 --> 00:01:36,210
else in the world and up till a year a

31
00:01:40,730 --> 00:01:38,400
couple of years ago he was pretty much

32
00:01:42,350 --> 00:01:40,740
convinced that there that the best

33
00:01:44,870 --> 00:01:42,360
explanation might be some sort of a

34
00:01:48,020 --> 00:01:44,880
field even though he couldn't describe

35
00:01:49,340 --> 00:01:48,030
it or write equations for it in the

36
00:01:51,679 --> 00:01:49,350
meantime he's been doing further

37
00:01:55,190 --> 00:01:51,689
analysis and has come to the conclusion

38
00:01:58,819 --> 00:01:55,200

that because there are a couple of

39

00:02:03,980 --> 00:01:58,829

factors that he really can't see any way

40

00:02:07,639 --> 00:02:03,990

for a consciousness effect to get to the

41

00:02:10,270 --> 00:02:07,649

bits and change them that we need a

42

00:02:12,810 --> 00:02:10,280

different kind of model he says a

43

00:02:15,280 --> 00:02:12,820

consciousness field can't penetrate

44

00:02:19,570 --> 00:02:15,290

exclusive-or we used to protect the data

45

00:02:20,890 --> 00:02:19,580

from bias and furthermore something that

46

00:02:24,250 --> 00:02:20,900

you might think of as a global

47

00:02:28,180 --> 00:02:24,260

consciousness isn't something that could

48

00:02:30,970 --> 00:02:28,190

have intention and that both of those

49

00:02:33,580 --> 00:02:30,980

are assumptions I think in any case he

50

00:02:36,760 --> 00:02:33,590

concludes that the GCP results must be a

51
00:02:39,430 --> 00:02:36,770
kind of goal or into or experiment or

52
00:02:42,700 --> 00:02:39,440
effect and gives some pretty persuasive

53
00:02:46,480 --> 00:02:42,710
arguments why that's the case among them

54
00:02:49,930 --> 00:02:46,490
for example looking back at data which

55
00:02:52,630 --> 00:02:49,940
we never analyzed for certain kinds of

56
00:02:56,140 --> 00:02:52,640
events for example the solstices and

57
00:02:59,020 --> 00:02:56,150
finding that the unexamined solstice

58
00:03:02,350 --> 00:02:59,030
periods did not show nearly as big an

59
00:03:07,330 --> 00:03:02,360
effect as the ones which we had selected

60
00:03:09,730 --> 00:03:07,340
to do analysis so the kind of counter

61
00:03:11,590 --> 00:03:09,740
arguments I think are pretty you know

62
00:03:15,610 --> 00:03:11,600
straightforward in a certain sense I

63
00:03:20,380 --> 00:03:15,620

think basically we're probably asking

64

00:03:24,250 --> 00:03:20,390

for too much to to conclude that we know

65

00:03:27,310 --> 00:03:24,260

how psy can or cannot work the

66

00:03:30,510 --> 00:03:27,320

assumptions that he makes about not

67

00:03:33,910 --> 00:03:30,520

being able to penetrate the x or or that

68

00:03:36,700 --> 00:03:33,920

intention has to be a part of the

69

00:03:39,760 --> 00:03:36,710

equation I think our vulnerable

70

00:03:43,030 --> 00:03:39,770

Jim carpenters first theory says we're

71

00:03:45,100 --> 00:03:43,040

basically doing something like psy all

72

00:03:48,490 --> 00:03:45,110

the time whether we're conscious of it

73

00:03:50,680 --> 00:03:48,500

or not but the real best argument is

74

00:03:53,260 --> 00:03:50,690

that there are quite a few things about

75

00:03:56,560 --> 00:03:53,270

the data elements of structure that

76

00:03:59,070 --> 00:03:56,570

simply don't fit very nicely into a goal

77

00:04:02,410 --> 00:03:59,080

orientation the formal prediction

78

00:04:04,450 --> 00:04:02,420

generally speaking will do so but what

79

00:04:05,980 --> 00:04:04,460

if we look at something different from

80

00:04:09,940 --> 00:04:05,990

the formal prediction which the

81

00:04:12,640 --> 00:04:09,950

experimenters have made in the case of

82

00:04:15,850 --> 00:04:12,650

9/11 data we had a effect but it was

83

00:04:19,090 --> 00:04:15,860

only point O three probability for the

84

00:04:21,130 --> 00:04:19,100

formal prediction on 9/11 it turns out

85

00:04:24,469 --> 00:04:21,140

that when we did a broader exploit

86

00:04:26,719 --> 00:04:24,479

exploration we discovered that the

87

00:04:29,540 --> 00:04:26,729

same effect that we're looking at

88

00:04:32,320 --> 00:04:29,550

persisted over three days a different

89

00:04:37,239 --> 00:04:32,330

kind of effect a different kind of

90

00:04:39,920 --> 00:04:37,249

variable not the subject of a prediction

91

00:04:42,800 --> 00:04:39,930

in other words a kind of independent

92

00:04:44,499 --> 00:04:42,810

measure also shows in effect even though

93

00:04:46,760 --> 00:04:44,509

there was no prediction and the

94

00:04:48,589 --> 00:04:46,770

experimenters had no intention of

95

00:04:52,700 --> 00:04:48,599

looking at that when the original

96

00:04:54,140 --> 00:04:52,710

prediction was made here is I think an

97

00:04:56,990 --> 00:04:54,150

interesting one I think we'll hear more

98

00:05:00,700 --> 00:04:57,000

about Burning Man later but in 2006 I

99

00:05:02,809 --> 00:05:00,710

decided to look at this interesting case

100

00:05:04,820 --> 00:05:02,819

which had been going on for quite a

101
00:05:06,890 --> 00:05:04,830
while had data for eight years and when

102
00:05:09,679 --> 00:05:06,900
I looked at the data I was I was

103
00:05:11,929 --> 00:05:09,689
startled there was a huge effect and

104
00:05:14,679 --> 00:05:11,939
again nobody was thinking about it there

105
00:05:16,820 --> 00:05:14,689
was no hypothesis this is a

106
00:05:18,890 --> 00:05:16,830
retrospective analysis and the only way

107
00:05:20,659 --> 00:05:18,900
this could be explained by as an

108
00:05:23,890 --> 00:05:20,669
experiment or effect would be for that

109
00:05:28,670 --> 00:05:23,900
to be something like retro Kinesis I

110
00:05:32,659 --> 00:05:28,680
think and this is a result of one of

111
00:05:36,559 --> 00:05:32,669
Peters analysis a very interesting and

112
00:05:41,659 --> 00:05:36,569
important in the context of whether the

113
00:05:43,639 --> 00:05:41,669

global excuse me whether a I a goal

114

00:05:47,360 --> 00:05:43,649

orientation model can explain the data

115

00:05:49,700 --> 00:05:47,370

here in the darker line is our standard

116

00:05:52,100 --> 00:05:49,710

measure that's the prediction we always

117

00:05:56,019 --> 00:05:52,110

make it has to do with a correlation of

118

00:05:59,360 --> 00:05:56,029

the data from separate pairs of devices

119

00:06:04,309 --> 00:05:59,370

there's a independent orthogonal

120

00:06:06,110 --> 00:06:04,319

comparison that shows pretty much the

121

00:06:08,800 --> 00:06:06,120

same trend it has a smaller effect size

122

00:06:11,269 --> 00:06:08,810

because the Avernus is larger but it's

123

00:06:17,290 --> 00:06:11,279

again a completely independent kind of

124

00:06:19,790 --> 00:06:17,300

thing we have data that can be looked at

125

00:06:23,119 --> 00:06:19,800

with many different kind of questions in

126
00:06:25,550 --> 00:06:23,129
mind one that we can ask is does

127
00:06:28,550 --> 00:06:25,560
distance have any effect on the outcome

128
00:06:31,459 --> 00:06:28,560
of in this experiment and the answer is

129
00:06:34,279 --> 00:06:31,469
a kind of interesting qualified yes we

130
00:06:36,619 --> 00:06:34,289
can't we talk about distance we can only

131
00:06:37,970 --> 00:06:36,629
do a reasonable analysis where the

132
00:06:40,160 --> 00:06:37,980
distance we're talking about is

133
00:06:44,990 --> 00:06:40,170
the separation between pairs of re G's

134
00:06:47,480 --> 00:06:45,000
and that different that the effect is a

135
00:06:50,870 --> 00:06:47,490
function of the separation of these re

136
00:06:53,150 --> 00:06:50,880
G's I have a poster session by the way

137
00:06:55,970 --> 00:06:53,160
so I can explain these things in more

138
00:06:59,330 --> 00:06:55,980

detail this gets interesting because it

139

00:07:02,060 --> 00:06:59,340

happens only or mainly for the smaller

140

00:07:04,400 --> 00:07:02,070

what you might call local events this

141

00:07:08,990 --> 00:07:04,410

one I think is a beautiful analysis

142

00:07:14,110 --> 00:07:09,000

again from Peter Mansell we asked what's

143

00:07:19,160 --> 00:07:14,120

the relative what's the relationship of

144

00:07:21,440 --> 00:07:19,170

the effect size to the time of day so it

145

00:07:23,780 --> 00:07:21,450

turns out that when we're awake the

146

00:07:26,380 --> 00:07:23,790

global consciousness effect size is a

147

00:07:29,420 --> 00:07:26,390

little bit larger than it is when we're

148

00:07:32,180 --> 00:07:29,430

when we're awake it's larger than when

149

00:07:34,810 --> 00:07:32,190

we're asleep the peak is around

150

00:07:41,140 --> 00:07:34,820

dinnertime 5:00 or 6:00 in the afternoon

151

00:07:44,240 --> 00:07:41,150

the valley the least effect size comes

152

00:07:46,580 --> 00:07:44,250

3:00 in the morning and at the bottom of

153

00:07:50,840 --> 00:07:46,590

the graph or our control data which we

154

00:07:54,560 --> 00:07:50,850

have huge amounts and they show no such

155

00:07:56,690 --> 00:07:54,570

effect here's one that's sort of a kind

156

00:07:59,750 --> 00:07:56,700

of logical argument you know when you

157

00:08:04,400 --> 00:07:59,760

think that psy is something like regular

158

00:08:07,580 --> 00:08:04,410

stuff modelling shows that some there

159

00:08:09,500 --> 00:08:07,590

may be some percentage of true negative

160

00:08:11,810 --> 00:08:09,510

outcomes in other words even though we

161

00:08:14,840 --> 00:08:11,820

predict and we'll be the outcome will be

162

00:08:17,090 --> 00:08:14,850

a positive deviation it turns out that

163

00:08:20,450 --> 00:08:17,100

within the database about two thirds

164

00:08:23,810 --> 00:08:20,460

show that about one-third show and no

165

00:08:27,350 --> 00:08:23,820

question null effect and about I'm not

166

00:08:31,100 --> 00:08:27,360

that many of about 17% show the null

167

00:08:36,370 --> 00:08:31,110

effect and another 17% show what you can

168

00:08:39,380 --> 00:08:36,380

think of as a kind of true negative so

169

00:08:42,680 --> 00:08:39,390

maybe we could say there's sign missing

170

00:08:45,980 --> 00:08:42,690

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

171

00:08:48,860 --> 00:08:45,990

that you'll be able to sustain an

172

00:08:51,650 --> 00:08:48,870

argument that a goal orientation or

173

00:08:55,660 --> 00:08:51,660

experimenter effect is false false

174

00:08:58,220 --> 00:08:55,670

ultimately so I think there's definitely

175

00:09:00,559 --> 00:08:58,230

something going on with the experimenter

176

00:09:03,379 --> 00:09:00,569

we after all we create the experiment

177

00:09:05,090 --> 00:09:03,389

and we know things like in physics that

178

00:09:08,600 --> 00:09:05,100

light is a wave or a particle depending

179

00:09:10,970 --> 00:09:08,610

on how you ask the question but I think

180

00:09:12,889 --> 00:09:10,980

the it's pretty pretty clear from a lot

181

00:09:15,699 --> 00:09:12,899

of experiments and the people here are

182

00:09:19,360 --> 00:09:15,709

familiar with that the experimenters is

183

00:09:24,679 --> 00:09:19,370

involved in creating part of the subtle

184

00:09:27,410 --> 00:09:24,689

effects as well and in any case I come

185

00:09:29,660 --> 00:09:27,420

to the conclusion ultimately that there

186

00:09:33,530 --> 00:09:29,670

are lots of aspects of the GCP data

187

00:09:36,290 --> 00:09:33,540

which aren't compatible with either kind

188

00:09:38,030 --> 00:09:36,300

of experiment or effect instead for

189

00:09:41,740 --> 00:09:38,040

those we need something like a field

190

00:09:45,290 --> 00:09:41,750

like model apologies for the

191

00:09:47,350 --> 00:09:45,300

misalignment so unbalanced I think we

192

00:09:50,929 --> 00:09:47,360

have to understand that psy is neither

193

00:09:55,069 --> 00:09:50,939

just an experiment or effect goal

194

00:09:56,870 --> 00:09:55,079

oriented nor is it necessarily what we

195

00:10:00,280 --> 00:09:56,880

might think of as the nominal source

196

00:10:06,450 --> 00:10:00,290

it's not either/or but I think both

197

00:10:15,880 --> 00:10:08,770

Thank You Roger okay we have time for

198

00:10:19,390 --> 00:10:15,890

questions Roger do you have you compared

199

00:10:24,460 --> 00:10:19,400

the effect sizes of the GCP would say

200

00:10:27,160 --> 00:10:24,470

other goal-oriented experimenter sigh to

201
00:10:28,630 --> 00:10:27,170
get a sense of this seems like the field

202
00:10:30,520 --> 00:10:28,640
effect it would be sort of a different

203
00:10:34,390 --> 00:10:30,530
kind of effect in therefore the the

204
00:10:35,860 --> 00:10:34,400
effect sizes might be different yeah and

205
00:10:37,900 --> 00:10:35,870
we haven't actually done any kind of

206
00:10:41,050 --> 00:10:37,910
formal in comparison like that but I I

207
00:10:43,480 --> 00:10:41,060
think it's clear that the global

208
00:10:45,670 --> 00:10:43,490
consciousness effect is really small

209
00:10:48,660 --> 00:10:45,680
it's about one third of a standard

210
00:10:51,640 --> 00:10:48,670
deviation on average so that means that

211
00:10:55,930 --> 00:10:51,650
great many of the trials you make will

212
00:10:57,640 --> 00:10:55,940
show no effect it's a good question but

213
00:11:01,870 --> 00:10:57,650

it's very difficult to ask because we

214

00:11:06,670 --> 00:11:01,880

have at least nominally maybe millions

215

00:11:08,380 --> 00:11:06,680

of people involved and different you

216

00:11:13,540 --> 00:11:08,390

know positive and negative kinds of

217

00:11:15,580 --> 00:11:13,550

circumstances and what I'd like to talk

218

00:11:19,630 --> 00:11:15,590

with you sometime about how one might go

219

00:11:22,500 --> 00:11:19,640

about making that comparison I think

220

00:11:26,200 --> 00:11:22,510

that the distinction between the field

221

00:11:31,540 --> 00:11:26,210

effect and the experimenter effect is a

222

00:11:34,690 --> 00:11:31,550

false dichotomy not only is I so you

223

00:11:36,280 --> 00:11:34,700

I think you massaged it a little bit by

224

00:11:39,370 --> 00:11:36,290

saying there there appear to be both

225

00:11:42,640 --> 00:11:39,380

effects I'd go a step farther and say

226

00:11:46,020 --> 00:11:42,650

both effects are the same thing in that

227

00:11:49,030 --> 00:11:46,030

when you have a stochastic process and

228

00:11:52,630 --> 00:11:49,040

you apply intention to it you're

229

00:11:56,320 --> 00:11:52,640

essentially programming a Sai system so

230

00:11:58,750 --> 00:11:56,330

your intention is that the global

231

00:12:02,560 --> 00:11:58,760

consciousness project should work to

232

00:12:05,680 --> 00:12:02,570

measure global events and so it does so

233

00:12:08,620 --> 00:12:05,690

you genuinely are measuring global

234

00:12:10,780 --> 00:12:08,630

events and field effect but you're doing

235

00:12:15,280 --> 00:12:10,790

it because you've mentally programmed it

236

00:12:17,080 --> 00:12:15,290

to do so as the experimenter and I don't

237

00:12:19,210 --> 00:12:17,090

think there's a dichotomy here I don't

238

00:12:21,400 --> 00:12:19,220

think there's a problem well in

239

00:12:24,240 --> 00:12:21,410

I have to agree with you in large part

240

00:12:27,009 --> 00:12:24,250

but I'm a little worried about the

241

00:12:29,379 --> 00:12:27,019

unfalsifiable 'ti of that kind of

242

00:12:32,889 --> 00:12:29,389

extension if you allow yourself to go

243

00:12:34,689 --> 00:12:32,899

that way when you stop this this is the

244

00:12:39,249 --> 00:12:34,699

challenge of sigh we don't know where

245

00:12:41,829 --> 00:12:39,259

this is and I've got several experiments

246

00:12:43,749 --> 00:12:41,839

in which I programmed machines to

247

00:12:46,840 --> 00:12:43,759

produce a certain effect and then those

248

00:12:50,470 --> 00:12:46,850

machines did it mm-hmm were the

249

00:12:52,900 --> 00:12:50,480

experimenters of course were the

250

00:12:56,259 --> 00:12:52,910

machines experimenters yeah that's

251

00:12:59,819 --> 00:12:56,269

another question yeah I feel a little

252

00:13:03,100 --> 00:12:59,829

bit obliged to defend Peter pencils

253

00:13:07,449 --> 00:13:03,110

conclusion that there can be no global

254

00:13:10,230 --> 00:13:07,459

fields effect and his major and one of

255

00:13:13,360 --> 00:13:10,240

his major arguments you didn't show here

256

00:13:16,869 --> 00:13:13,370

and it did it goes as follows

257

00:13:20,280 --> 00:13:16,879

these aren't G's all over the world that

258

00:13:25,920 --> 00:13:20,290

they have a slight misalignment in times

259

00:13:30,699 --> 00:13:25,930

if you and he did a reanalysis trying to

260

00:13:33,579 --> 00:13:30,709

get all these timing exactly the same

261

00:13:36,249 --> 00:13:33,589

and if you do that so you shift the

262

00:13:37,869 --> 00:13:36,259

signals of each of these oranges a

263

00:13:40,780 --> 00:13:37,879

little bit so that they now they're

264

00:13:42,759 --> 00:13:40,790

simultaneously and if you do Orenda

265

00:13:46,689 --> 00:13:42,769

analysis then the whole effect

266

00:13:49,629 --> 00:13:46,699

disappears that shows to me that in some

267

00:13:51,460 --> 00:13:49,639

way there cannot be a feel and at least

268

00:13:54,569 --> 00:13:51,470

that's his conclusion that cannot be

269

00:13:58,809 --> 00:13:54,579

filled because why would that be so

270

00:14:01,150 --> 00:13:58,819

dependent of the the accidental

271

00:14:04,660 --> 00:14:01,160

misalignment in time of the orange

272

00:14:07,660 --> 00:14:04,670

cheese that that's just crazy and I

273

00:14:10,420 --> 00:14:07,670

should add that he is a he was a strong

274

00:14:13,840 --> 00:14:10,430

believer and a supporter of global

275

00:14:18,129 --> 00:14:13,850

fields so his conclusion is against his

276

00:14:22,199 --> 00:14:18,139

own worldview so I think his conclusion

277

00:14:27,490 --> 00:14:22,209

is correct so please comment on that I

278

00:14:28,929 --> 00:14:27,500

have I have no doubt that I I really

279

00:14:29,610 --> 00:14:28,939

love what Peters been doing all these

280

00:14:31,200 --> 00:14:29,620

years

281

00:14:35,250 --> 00:14:31,210

to revealed a great deal about the data

282

00:14:38,700 --> 00:14:35,260

but the models that he uses are as he

283

00:14:41,820 --> 00:14:38,710

will say and you know very simple field

284

00:14:44,370 --> 00:14:41,830

models so seems to me to be entirely

285

00:14:47,760 --> 00:14:44,380

possible you have a more let's say

286

00:14:53,730 --> 00:14:47,770

robust in the sense of powerful field

287

00:14:56,970 --> 00:14:53,740

model that can affect not just this one

288

00:15:00,150 --> 00:14:56,980

second synchronised moment in time but a

289

00:15:03,660 --> 00:15:00,160

period around that time I I'm not I

290

00:15:08,190 --> 00:15:03,670

don't want to spend time now debating

291

00:15:10,110 --> 00:15:08,200

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

292

00:15:12,120 --> 00:15:10,120

really sympathetic with the global I'm

293

00:15:17,250 --> 00:15:12,130

like the x-files I want to believe in

294

00:15:18,510 --> 00:15:17,260

the global field but whatever I look at

295

00:15:21,240 --> 00:15:18,520

those small effect sizes

296

00:15:24,060 --> 00:15:21,250

I keep thinking that there I want them

297

00:15:28,230 --> 00:15:24,070

to be bigger and I keep thinking that

298

00:15:31,079 --> 00:15:28,240

may be unintentional influences on our

299

00:15:32,610 --> 00:15:31,089

energies are very similar to intentional

300

00:15:34,920 --> 00:15:32,620

influences such that there are some very

301
00:15:36,060 --> 00:15:34,930
few skilled people and they're the ones

302
00:15:38,790 --> 00:15:36,070
who are basically dragging the effect

303
00:15:42,690 --> 00:15:38,800
and everyone else has zero effect what

304
00:15:45,750 --> 00:15:42,700
do you think about that I'm not exactly

305
00:15:47,790 --> 00:15:45,760
sure what the bottom-line question is

306
00:15:48,990 --> 00:15:47,800
it's the bottom line question is do you

307
00:15:51,840 --> 00:15:49,000
think it could be the case that the

308
00:15:53,940 --> 00:15:51,850
stein enos of the effect size is because

309
00:15:55,470 --> 00:15:53,950
you have skilled people who don't know

310
00:15:57,449 --> 00:15:55,480
their skill this is unintentional psy

311
00:16:00,470 --> 00:15:57,459
who are basically producing the entire

312
00:16:04,680 --> 00:16:00,480
effect and it's washed out by a ton of

313
00:16:07,620 --> 00:16:04,690

well aren't in the context of the idea

314

00:16:09,870 --> 00:16:07,630

that it's an experiment or effect there

315

00:16:12,510 --> 00:16:09,880

are a few of us who know a great deal

316

00:16:15,570 --> 00:16:12,520

about it and most of us people think we

317

00:16:20,910 --> 00:16:15,580

don't have any personal experiment or

318

00:16:21,930 --> 00:16:20,920

effect potency but in terms of all those

319

00:16:23,820 --> 00:16:21,940

people out in the world they're

320

00:16:25,079 --> 00:16:23,830

completely unconscious of you know the

321

00:16:28,110 --> 00:16:25,089

why this would be people who are skilled

322

00:16:29,280 --> 00:16:28,120

at unintentional psy so in other words I

323

00:16:32,760 --> 00:16:29,290

guess I'm drawing a parallel between

324

00:16:34,199 --> 00:16:32,770

intentional PK like like at the pair lab

325

00:16:36,390 --> 00:16:34,209

right you have people who are skilled at

326

00:16:38,010 --> 00:16:36,400

an intentional micro PK and maybe

327

00:16:39,810 --> 00:16:38,020

there's a rule that there are some

328

00:16:41,790 --> 00:16:39,820

people who are skilled at unintentional

329

00:16:43,650 --> 00:16:41,800

PK

330

00:16:46,429 --> 00:16:43,660

I don't think I can answer the question

331

00:16:49,290 --> 00:16:46,439

and I'm not sure I understand it but

332

00:16:52,799 --> 00:16:49,300

basically the intentional sigh in the

333

00:16:57,600 --> 00:16:52,809

lab is also an extremely tiny effect and

334

00:17:00,150 --> 00:16:57,610

it it's attached you might say to only a

335

00:17:04,169 --> 00:17:00,160

few people about 15% in the pair right

336

00:17:05,939 --> 00:17:04,179

data set there may there may be a

337

00:17:07,230 --> 00:17:05,949

tremendous amount of unconscious sigh

338

00:17:09,569 --> 00:17:07,240

going on in the part of the

339

00:17:15,779 --> 00:17:09,579

experimenters that set up the whole

340

00:17:18,510 --> 00:17:15,789

operation I guess yeah okay hi there I

341

00:17:21,870 --> 00:17:18,520

just want to read something in response

342

00:17:23,899 --> 00:17:21,880

to your co-authors quote global

343

00:17:31,519 --> 00:17:23,909

consciousness does not have intention I

344

00:17:35,430 --> 00:17:31,529

just hear from the Yoga Sutras and

345

00:17:40,669 --> 00:17:35,440

nothing can be predicated apprecia which

346

00:17:45,899 --> 00:17:43,560

except as a corrective negation no

347

00:17:48,659 --> 00:17:45,909

positive attribute process or intention

348

00:17:51,029 --> 00:17:48,669

can be affirmed of it I said no

349

00:17:53,220 --> 00:17:51,039

intention can be affirmed of it though

350

00:17:55,019 --> 00:17:53,230

it is behind all the activity of the

351

00:17:57,120 --> 00:17:55,029

road so I just want to submit that does

352

00:17:58,950 --> 00:17:57,130

these great thinkers from millennia I

353

00:18:02,430 --> 00:17:58,960

have been like chewing on this stuff

354

00:18:06,899 --> 00:18:02,440

daily and maybe they be useful those

355

00:18:07,289 --> 00:18:06,909

stuff thank you all right Thank You

356

00:18:09,050 --> 00:18:07,299

Roger