1
00:00:09,330 --> 00:00:07,110
so Deborah did such a good job

2
00:00:11,070 --> 00:00:09,340
describing associate remote-viewing and

3
00:00:13,169 --> 00:00:11,080
talking about what it is and how the

4
00:00:16,859 --> 00:00:13,179
other set up one of the things that I

5
00:00:19,650 --> 00:00:16,869
first started thinking about is what's

6
00:00:23,429 --> 00:00:19,660
the most important part of the study is

7
00:00:25,170 --> 00:00:23,439
it the viewers and a lot of ARV research

8
00:00:27,990 --> 00:00:25,180
and a lot of remote viewing research

9
00:00:30,060 --> 00:00:28,000
focuses on the viewers my question is

10
00:00:32,790 --> 00:00:30,070
what's the role of the judges and

11
00:00:35,549 --> 00:00:32,800
doesn't make a difference and also how

12
00:00:38,760 --> 00:00:35,559
does the investment choice play into

13
00:00:41,370 --> 00:00:38,770

this this whole process before I get

14
00:00:43,740 --> 00:00:41,380
into the study let me first talk about

15
00:00:46,620 --> 00:00:43,750
the difference between prospective and

16
00:00:50,130 --> 00:00:46,630
retrospective studies retrospective

17
00:00:52,260 --> 00:00:50,140
studies that's where you take a gather

18
00:00:54,630 --> 00:00:52,270
data that's already been collected and

19
00:00:56,670 --> 00:00:54,640
you try to run some analyses over it so

20
00:00:58,950 --> 00:00:56,680
things like meta analyses or something

21
00:01:01,170 --> 00:00:58,960
that are typically a good example of

22
00:01:02,460 --> 00:01:01,180
retrospective studies the data is

23
00:01:04,439 --> 00:01:02,470
already out there we've already

24
00:01:05,999 --> 00:01:04,449
collected it so let's just look at it

25
00:01:07,640 --> 00:01:06,009
and see if we can see any trends in the

26
00:01:11,430 --> 00:01:07,650
data see if we can get information a

27
00:01:14,910 --> 00:01:11,440
prospective study on the other hand its

28
00:01:16,830 --> 00:01:14,920
previously designed configured the

29
00:01:19,469 --> 00:01:16,840
analysis methods they're all defined all

30
00:01:24,810 --> 00:01:19,479
this is set up before any of the data is

31
00:01:28,230 --> 00:01:24,820
is ever ever collected now why would you

32
00:01:30,660 --> 00:01:28,240
do a retro or prospective study with so

33
00:01:32,520 --> 00:01:30,670
much data available with so much

34
00:01:37,130 --> 00:01:32,530
information around why would we ever

35
00:01:39,990 --> 00:01:37,140
choose to do a prospective study well

36
00:01:42,120 --> 00:01:40,000
when you're making decisions for a

37
00:01:45,750 --> 00:01:42,130
retrospective study you have to decide

38
00:01:47,969 --> 00:01:45,760

things like hey what what which studies

39
00:01:49,560 --> 00:01:47,979
are am I going to include what are the

40
00:01:51,690 --> 00:01:49,570
different criteria I'm going to set up

41
00:01:53,730 --> 00:01:51,700
for the studies I'm going to include and

42
00:01:56,990 --> 00:01:53,740
those things that brings in an

43
00:02:01,859 --> 00:01:57,000
opportunity for more sources of bias

44
00:02:03,990 --> 00:02:01,869
within the study in addition when you're

45
00:02:05,999 --> 00:02:04,000
doing a prospective study it gives you a

46
00:02:08,070 --> 00:02:06,009
better foundation for exploring more

47
00:02:09,690 --> 00:02:08,080
factors that might be involved rather

48
00:02:12,030 --> 00:02:09,700
than depending on factors that might

49
00:02:13,349 --> 00:02:12,040
have been done in other studies and

50
00:02:17,220 --> 00:02:13,359
working from what other people have

51
00:02:18,510 --> 00:02:17,230
already defined the final thing that's

52
00:02:20,700 --> 00:02:18,520
really important

53
00:02:23,790 --> 00:02:20,710
about prospective studies is they allow

54
00:02:27,030 --> 00:02:23,800
for pre-registration within our field

55
00:02:29,610 --> 00:02:27,040
it's very important that we maintain the

56
00:02:32,310 --> 00:02:29,620
integrity of our data and the integrity

57
00:02:34,920 --> 00:02:32,320
of our studies one of the things that

58
00:02:38,430 --> 00:02:34,930
most of the sciences require or

59
00:02:39,990 --> 00:02:38,440
encourage is that you define everything

60
00:02:42,840 --> 00:02:40,000
and put all your information out there

61
00:02:44,460 --> 00:02:42,850
so pre-registering like somewhere like

62
00:02:45,930 --> 00:02:44,470
the Kessler labs where they have a

63
00:02:48,450 --> 00:02:45,940

pre-registration system

64
00:02:51,480 --> 00:02:48,460
you take your design you take your

65
00:02:52,890 --> 00:02:51,490
analysis method you determine what your

66
00:02:55,590 --> 00:02:52,900
sample size is going to be and you put

67
00:02:59,160 --> 00:02:55,600
it all in the registry before you ever

68
00:03:00,810 --> 00:02:59,170
do the study by doing this whenever

69
00:03:03,780 --> 00:03:00,820
you're whenever some people whenever

70
00:03:06,080 --> 00:03:03,790
someone wants to evaluate the quality of

71
00:03:09,480 --> 00:03:06,090
your study they can go back and look at

72
00:03:11,220 --> 00:03:09,490
the free registration data compare what

73
00:03:13,230 --> 00:03:11,230
your results were and see how well you

74
00:03:16,320 --> 00:03:13,240
stayed within the parameters that you

75
00:03:20,220 --> 00:03:16,330
originally defined you can define things

76
00:03:23,580 --> 00:03:20,230
like your your criteria for significance

77
00:03:25,650 --> 00:03:23,590
and if you change any of that you define

78
00:03:27,690 --> 00:03:25,660
all that whenever you finish or whenever

79
00:03:30,150 --> 00:03:27,700
you put your final report in there so by

80
00:03:33,120 --> 00:03:30,160
doing this what we're doing is we're

81
00:03:37,890 --> 00:03:33,130
adding integrity to our data which is so

82
00:03:40,500 --> 00:03:37,900
important within our field so let me

83
00:03:43,440 --> 00:03:40,510
tell you now about our study this was a

84
00:03:45,960 --> 00:03:43,450
really typical ARV study we did

85
00:03:47,910 --> 00:03:45,970
something we just took exactly what they

86
00:03:49,910 --> 00:03:47,920
were doing in the silver futures markets

87
00:03:52,560 --> 00:03:49,920
that they did back in the eighties and

88
00:03:55,950 --> 00:03:52,570

the only variation we had on it is we

89
00:03:57,960 --> 00:03:55,960
had three viewers instead of one but we

90
00:03:59,670 --> 00:03:57,970
had one we had the viewers we had one

91
00:04:02,100 --> 00:03:59,680
judge we had an investor and we had a

92
00:04:06,030 --> 00:04:02,110
court a coordinator they were all

93
00:04:08,100 --> 00:04:06,040
extremely experienced ever all the

94
00:04:10,050 --> 00:04:08,110
viewers had experience in reviewing had

95
00:04:12,660 --> 00:04:10,060
done it in other and had it done ARV and

96
00:04:15,480 --> 00:04:12,670
other times the judge was very well

97
00:04:16,800 --> 00:04:15,490
established in fact these people were in

98
00:04:19,170 --> 00:04:16,810
this room but they don't even know that

99
00:04:21,240 --> 00:04:19,180
they were part of the same study nobody

100
00:04:24,350 --> 00:04:21,250
knows everyone was blinded to who was

101
00:04:27,930 --> 00:04:24,360
involved with the study we used one

102
00:04:29,550 --> 00:04:27,940
stock for the investment throughout what

103
00:04:31,170 --> 00:04:29,560
we did is selected a stock at the

104
00:04:33,330 --> 00:04:31,180
beginning and we did it randomly

105
00:04:34,710 --> 00:04:33,340
we were looking for something that was

106
00:04:36,240 --> 00:04:34,720
volatile we didn't care if it was going

107
00:04:40,080 --> 00:04:36,250
up or down or anything we just wanted to

108
00:04:44,100 --> 00:04:40,090
change a lot during week what we do is

109
00:04:46,620 --> 00:04:44,110
we target the viewers on a Saturday and

110
00:04:50,100 --> 00:04:46,630
say tell us what you're going to see

111
00:04:51,900 --> 00:04:50,110
next Friday the viewers would do their

112
00:04:54,330 --> 00:04:51,910
viewing and returning information to our

113
00:04:56,760 --> 00:04:54,340

coordinator by Sunday night the

114
00:05:00,660 --> 00:04:56,770
coordinator would take it use a RV

115
00:05:04,680 --> 00:05:00,670
studio with which never just define use

116
00:05:07,680 --> 00:05:04,690
a RV studio to get to targets to targets

117
00:05:09,750 --> 00:05:07,690
and all the viewer data to the judge the

118
00:05:12,900 --> 00:05:09,760
judge would look at it make a decision

119
00:05:15,600 --> 00:05:12,910
on which photo matched the coordinator

120
00:05:19,260 --> 00:05:15,610
will get the information back randomly

121
00:05:22,020 --> 00:05:19,270
using random.org determine which stop

122
00:05:23,850 --> 00:05:22,030
which image would represent an up Sauk

123
00:05:27,630 --> 00:05:23,860
than which image would represent a down

124
00:05:30,210 --> 00:05:27,640
stock we then make the investment Friday

125
00:05:32,370 --> 00:05:30,220
we'd run through the week Friday we'd

126
00:05:34,830 --> 00:05:32,380
resolve the investment and the viewers

127
00:05:38,160 --> 00:05:34,840
would see that the target picture that

128
00:05:40,140 --> 00:05:38,170
actually matched what actually happened

129
00:05:43,170 --> 00:05:40,150
in the market they never saw up a decoy

130
00:05:44,610 --> 00:05:43,180
image in this study it was all designed

131
00:05:46,740 --> 00:05:44,620
to make money we're a nonprofit

132
00:05:49,710 --> 00:05:46,750
organization at the Rhine we were trying

133
00:05:52,620 --> 00:05:49,720
to generate some funds unfortunately in

134
00:05:54,270 --> 00:05:52,630
this study we did not make money we

135
00:05:55,950 --> 00:05:54,280
actually lost a bit of money but it

136
00:05:57,480 --> 00:05:55,960
wasn't because there was a problem with

137
00:06:00,120 --> 00:05:57,490
the viewing or the judging or any of

138
00:06:03,330 --> 00:06:00,130

that process it was because we're

139
00:06:05,700 --> 00:06:03,340
nonprofit organization we were limited

140
00:06:08,370 --> 00:06:05,710
in the way we can invest our funds and

141
00:06:11,340 --> 00:06:08,380
the investment company we were working

142
00:06:14,460 --> 00:06:11,350
with told us well let me they told us

143
00:06:16,500 --> 00:06:14,470
that we could do one thing and that was

144
00:06:19,020 --> 00:06:16,510
we weren't able to short the stocks so

145
00:06:21,450 --> 00:06:19,030
anytime there was a down prediction we

146
00:06:23,040 --> 00:06:21,460
couldn't make the down predictions so it

147
00:06:24,900 --> 00:06:23,050
ended up that we lost little money we

148
00:06:26,640 --> 00:06:24,910
did the evaluation as if we could make

149
00:06:28,590 --> 00:06:26,650
all the investments and we would have

150
00:06:31,680 --> 00:06:28,600
made probably about 5% increase in about

151
00:06:35,160 --> 00:06:31,690
12 weeks so there were 12 weeks of the

152
00:06:38,160 --> 00:06:35,170
study that's the basis of the study and

153
00:06:40,920 --> 00:06:38,170
that's about it so not nothing ok the

154
00:06:43,790 --> 00:06:40,930
interesting thing was actually the

155
00:06:48,270 --> 00:06:46,409
nobody in a study knew that this was

156
00:06:49,890 --> 00:06:48,280
going on except for me and I was not

157
00:06:52,920 --> 00:06:49,900
involved with any of the process of

158
00:06:54,450 --> 00:06:52,930
doing the reviewing there was an

159
00:06:57,030 --> 00:06:54,460
additional judge and an additional

160
00:06:59,400 --> 00:06:57,040
investment instrument this was a

161
00:07:02,250 --> 00:06:59,410
prospective study that was trying to

162
00:07:03,780 --> 00:07:02,260
determine how the judges compared to

163
00:07:05,610 --> 00:07:03,790

each other is the judge in how to

164
00:07:08,760 --> 00:07:05,620
important as a judge in the process is

165
00:07:12,629 --> 00:07:08,770
the investment choice important in this

166
00:07:14,520 --> 00:07:12,639
process so every Sunday night whenever

167
00:07:17,070 --> 00:07:14,530
the coordinator would get back all the

168
00:07:20,190 --> 00:07:17,080
viewers data and the targets and send

169
00:07:21,810 --> 00:07:20,200
them to the judge I would get the same

170
00:07:25,740 --> 00:07:21,820
information and I'd send it to another

171
00:07:28,200 --> 00:07:25,750
judge that so there were two judges but

172
00:07:30,150 --> 00:07:28,210
each judge knew there might be a second

173
00:07:32,190 --> 00:07:30,160
judge but mainly for a backup in case

174
00:07:34,110 --> 00:07:32,200
they couldn't do it one week they both

175
00:07:36,120 --> 00:07:34,120
thought they were the primary judge for

176
00:07:38,129 --> 00:07:36,130
the study they both thought that they

177
00:07:39,779 --> 00:07:38,139
were responsible for the investment they

178
00:07:42,180 --> 00:07:39,789
didn't know that we were invest in it

179
00:07:44,010 --> 00:07:42,190
nobody knew the stock nobody except for

180
00:07:47,940 --> 00:07:44,020
me and the investor knew what the stock

181
00:07:50,670 --> 00:07:47,950
was and using the same protocol that I

182
00:07:53,670 --> 00:07:50,680
picked the original stock we picked a

183
00:07:57,990 --> 00:07:53,680
second control stock to compare and see

184
00:07:59,520 --> 00:07:58,000
if there was a variation on this so both

185
00:08:01,860 --> 00:07:59,530
like I said both judges thought they

186
00:08:05,339 --> 00:08:01,870
were the primary judge the way we

187
00:08:08,100 --> 00:08:05,349
analyzed this is the results of the

188
00:08:10,980 --> 00:08:08,110

judges were compared I wasn't interested

189
00:08:13,260 --> 00:08:10,990
in how the viewers did there are so many

190
00:08:14,700 --> 00:08:13,270
studies on the viewers we gave them

191
00:08:17,400 --> 00:08:14,710
their feedback so they could get their

192
00:08:19,589 --> 00:08:17,410
own information on how well they did but

193
00:08:22,230 --> 00:08:19,599
was interested in how the judging

194
00:08:24,659 --> 00:08:22,240
compared so the judging data was

195
00:08:27,210 --> 00:08:24,669
compared for not only to see how they

196
00:08:29,460 --> 00:08:27,220
did with the main investment target but

197
00:08:32,779 --> 00:08:29,470
also with the control investment target

198
00:08:40,290 --> 00:08:32,789
and the results where the judges were

199
00:08:42,079 --> 00:08:40,300
extremely different looking at between

200
00:08:44,400 --> 00:08:42,089
the judges there the judges used

201
00:08:46,949 --> 00:08:44,410
different one of the things about this

202
00:08:49,050 --> 00:08:46,959
study is that everyone involved was so

203
00:08:51,720 --> 00:08:49,060
experienced and so well steeped and

204
00:08:53,790 --> 00:08:51,730
remote viewing and with an ARV protocol

205
00:08:56,220 --> 00:08:53,800
I didn't want I was trying to make money

206
00:08:56,980 --> 00:08:56,230
with this I didn't want to try to tell

207
00:08:58,810 --> 00:08:56,990
them do it then

208
00:09:00,579 --> 00:08:58,820
wäôre don't do that one this method

209
00:09:02,320 --> 00:09:00,589
don't use that method I said use

210
00:09:04,840 --> 00:09:02,330
whatever you're most comfortable with so

211
00:09:06,730 --> 00:09:04,850
the viewers used multiple methods there

212
00:09:09,100 --> 00:09:06,740
was a variety of different ways that the

213
00:09:11,500 --> 00:09:09,110

viewing was done judging was the same

214
00:09:13,389 --> 00:09:11,510
way one of the judges was using a very

215
00:09:15,490 --> 00:09:13,399
intuitive process another one was using

216
00:09:18,010 --> 00:09:15,500
a very structured score based process

217
00:09:19,570 --> 00:09:18,020
but that's not exactly what I wasn't

218
00:09:21,940 --> 00:09:19,580
trying to determine which one was better

219
00:09:25,269 --> 00:09:21,950
I was just trying to determine is there

220
00:09:28,449 --> 00:09:25,279
a difference within judging well one of

221
00:09:31,660 --> 00:09:28,459
the judges actually kind of hit a planet

222
00:09:33,160 --> 00:09:31,670
chance 50% right across the board half

223
00:09:36,240 --> 00:09:33,170
right and half wrong for what they

224
00:09:39,880 --> 00:09:36,250
predicted the second judge though

225
00:09:42,760 --> 00:09:39,890
actually did really really only got one

226
00:09:45,699 --> 00:09:42,770
correct out of eight sessions that they

227
00:09:48,639 --> 00:09:45,709
judged now I say this is the primary

228
00:09:50,590 --> 00:09:48,649
judge though hit four weeks in a row

229
00:09:52,329 --> 00:09:50,600
that might not see much four weeks out

230
00:09:54,220 --> 00:09:52,339
of twelve it doesn't seem like it's very

231
00:09:56,350 --> 00:09:54,230
good Ian other weeks too but hitting

232
00:09:57,820 --> 00:09:56,360
four weeks in a row is a pretty good

233
00:09:59,380 --> 00:09:57,830
score it's only it's something like a

234
00:10:02,139 --> 00:09:59,390
six percent chance you're gonna get four

235
00:10:06,819 --> 00:10:02,149
weeks in a row what we're talking about

236
00:10:09,850 --> 00:10:06,829
though missing it was nine weeks in a

237
00:10:12,519 --> 00:10:09,860
row that the second judge missed and did

238
00:10:15,000 --> 00:10:12,529

not get the correct investment did not

239
00:10:18,880 --> 00:10:15,010
pick the correct investment direction

240
00:10:21,160 --> 00:10:18,890
that's a very significant score in the

241
00:10:24,010 --> 00:10:21,170
wrong direction it's what we call sign

242
00:10:27,699 --> 00:10:24,020
missing right so there was a very strong

243
00:10:30,100 --> 00:10:27,709
sign missing component to this when I

244
00:10:32,410 --> 00:10:30,110
compared two judges on each of the

245
00:10:34,060 --> 00:10:32,420
investment targets and I looked at them

246
00:10:36,750 --> 00:10:34,070
on a price on the main investment that

247
00:10:39,370 --> 00:10:36,760
we're actually investing in there was a

248
00:10:41,319 --> 00:10:39,380
significant difference between the

249
00:10:43,389 --> 00:10:41,329
judges and the judges were obviously

250
00:10:46,389 --> 00:10:43,399
being influenced by the primary

251
00:10:47,650 --> 00:10:46,399
investment the control investment they

252
00:10:53,980 --> 00:10:47,660
scored a chance both of them across the

253
00:10:57,220 --> 00:10:53,990
board so the conclusions here are that

254
00:10:59,829 --> 00:10:57,230
the judges could be evaluated in a

255
00:11:02,019 --> 00:10:59,839
similar way that viewers are evaluated

256
00:11:03,490 --> 00:11:02,029
we should consider very experienced

257
00:11:05,170 --> 00:11:03,500
judges judges have been doing for a long

258
00:11:06,970 --> 00:11:05,180
time that have been using this method

259
00:11:09,189 --> 00:11:06,980
and have been having we have to evaluate

260
00:11:10,840 --> 00:11:09,199
what their success rates are and

261
00:11:13,720 --> 00:11:10,850
evaluate whether

262
00:11:17,319 --> 00:11:13,730
how they are interacting within ARV

263
00:11:20,259 --> 00:11:17,329

projects they varied significantly but

264
00:11:22,600 --> 00:11:20,269
only on a target investment which tells

265
00:11:25,090 --> 00:11:22,610
me that the target that we set for the

266
00:11:26,769 --> 00:11:25,100
investment did have an influence in the

267
00:11:28,269 --> 00:11:26,779
control investment if we just pick any

268
00:11:31,449 --> 00:11:28,279
other investment occur out of the Hat

269
00:11:34,960 --> 00:11:31,459
we're less likely to have an influence

270
00:11:38,800 --> 00:11:34,970
on that now the judges methods can't be

271
00:11:42,850 --> 00:11:38,810
evaluated in this study and also this

272
00:11:44,290 --> 00:11:42,860
was an exploratory study this and so I

273
00:11:47,309 --> 00:11:44,300
don't think that we can really make

274
00:11:50,350 --> 00:11:47,319
conclusions on this but this prospective

275
00:11:52,870 --> 00:11:50,360
methodology that we've used is something

276
00:11:55,360 --> 00:11:52,880
that can be used for future studies to

277
00:11:57,040 --> 00:11:55,370
determine how judging is important how

278
00:11:59,710 --> 00:11:57,050
the investment choice is important and

279
00:12:02,439 --> 00:11:59,720
how it contributes I would recommend

280
00:12:06,009 --> 00:12:02,449
that regressions be run across these

281
00:12:08,170 --> 00:12:06,019
types of factors in the future to

282
00:12:14,420 --> 00:12:08,180
determine the strength of each of them

283
00:12:30,889 --> 00:12:14,430
within a study thank you

284
00:12:38,639 --> 00:12:34,110
I'm sorry to say that your description

285
00:12:41,879 --> 00:12:38,649
was when you got to the second hidden

286
00:12:47,519 --> 00:12:41,889
procedure was almost incomprehensible to

287
00:12:53,189 --> 00:12:47,529
me because you're partly your discussion

288
00:12:54,720 --> 00:12:53,199

of results the the the tables didn't

289
00:12:59,970 --> 00:12:54,730
seem to correspond to your verbal

290
00:13:02,220 --> 00:12:59,980
description of the judges having a

291
00:13:05,730 --> 00:13:02,230
different performance on the targeted

292
00:13:11,939 --> 00:13:05,740
investment and null performance on the

293
00:13:13,230 --> 00:13:11,949
control investment I it wasn't it wasn't

294
00:13:15,749 --> 00:13:13,240
clear to me where this control

295
00:13:17,579 --> 00:13:15,759
investment was coming from your initial

296
00:13:19,740 --> 00:13:17,589
descriptions that seemed to imply that

297
00:13:23,879 --> 00:13:19,750
the second judge was working on a second

298
00:13:26,519 --> 00:13:23,889
on the other investment instrument given

299
00:13:28,470 --> 00:13:26,529
that also get with to investment

300
00:13:30,720 --> 00:13:28,480
instruments how did you manage to pick

301
00:13:33,449 --> 00:13:30,730
only one feedback picture at the end of

302
00:13:37,679 --> 00:13:33,459
each week so okay thank you York I

303
00:13:40,710 --> 00:13:37,689
wasn't clear let me clarify so there was

304
00:13:44,240 --> 00:13:40,720
only one investment instrument used for

305
00:13:46,710 --> 00:13:44,250
the for the project both judges were

306
00:13:49,740 --> 00:13:46,720
pricing for that same investment

307
00:13:52,290 --> 00:13:49,750
instrument I had a control investment

308
00:13:54,480 --> 00:13:52,300
instrument that I used it was post study

309
00:13:56,910 --> 00:13:54,490
I evaluated the control investment

310
00:13:58,470 --> 00:13:56,920
instrument with both judges as well so

311
00:14:01,019 --> 00:13:58,480
it wasn't like one judge for one and one

312
00:14:03,420 --> 00:14:01,029
judge for the other no both judges had

313
00:14:05,280 --> 00:14:03,430

the same target to pick the investment

314
00:14:08,100 --> 00:14:05,290
and they didn't know the investment

315
00:14:10,559 --> 00:14:08,110
instrument anyway but the investment

316
00:14:12,360 --> 00:14:10,569
instrument was intentionally picked to

317
00:14:15,720 --> 00:14:12,370
be just a single investment throughout

318
00:14:18,809 --> 00:14:15,730
the whole project does that help a bit

319
00:14:20,550 --> 00:14:18,819
okay thank you really interesting and

320
00:14:24,499 --> 00:14:20,560
I'd like to see replications in

321
00:14:26,610 --> 00:14:24,509
continuation it seems to me though that

322
00:14:28,290 --> 00:14:26,620
and I'm I'm

323
00:14:31,560 --> 00:14:28,300
you know out of this field but it seems

324
00:14:34,890 --> 00:14:31,570
to me you missed the main point and that

325
00:14:38,700 --> 00:14:34,900
is you've treated both cases as if they

326
00:14:42,000 --> 00:14:38,710
were independent judged criteria and we

327
00:14:44,550 --> 00:14:42,010
know that there's psy in the remote

328
00:14:47,250 --> 00:14:44,560
viewing we are pretty sure that they're

329
00:14:49,500 --> 00:14:47,260
psy in the judging right but there's

330
00:14:53,220 --> 00:14:49,510
also psy and running the experiment

331
00:14:56,040 --> 00:14:53,230
right and so you as the experimenter are

332
00:14:58,230 --> 00:14:56,050
probably doing some sort of manipulation

333
00:15:00,810 --> 00:14:58,240
of this whole thing and I don't think

334
00:15:03,300 --> 00:15:00,820
you can look at it as just two judges

335
00:15:05,880 --> 00:15:03,310
doing their things with two investments

336
00:15:07,470 --> 00:15:05,890
so I guess I get your point and the

337
00:15:09,480 --> 00:15:07,480
experimenter effect is something that

338
00:15:11,970 --> 00:15:09,490

I'm very familiar with and I do

339
00:15:13,800 --> 00:15:11,980
everything I can to step out of the

340
00:15:16,410 --> 00:15:13,810
process but you can't of course you

341
00:15:17,970 --> 00:15:16,420
can't but what I what I was not involved

342
00:15:20,490 --> 00:15:17,980
with the coordination I was not involved

343
00:15:22,650 --> 00:15:20,500
with moving things around yes I was

344
00:15:25,470 --> 00:15:22,660
taking the information and sending it to

345
00:15:27,120 --> 00:15:25,480
this judge as a second judge I we did

346
00:15:28,710 --> 00:15:27,130
pick the second instrument but second

347
00:15:30,780 --> 00:15:28,720
instrument was randomly chosen just like

348
00:15:34,350 --> 00:15:30,790
the first one was so I wasn't involved

349
00:15:36,750 --> 00:15:34,360
in any sort of anything related to the

350
00:15:39,030 --> 00:15:36,760
second instrument except for the final

351
00:15:40,410 --> 00:15:39,040
evaluation yeah that's when I did my

352
00:15:42,750 --> 00:15:40,420
final evaluation I could have been

353
00:15:44,850 --> 00:15:42,760
detecting the data this was already

354
00:15:46,620 --> 00:15:44,860
collected at that point though so of

355
00:15:48,270 --> 00:15:46,630
course the experimenter affects always

356
00:15:50,250 --> 00:15:48,280
something in there if you've got an idea

357
00:15:51,870 --> 00:15:50,260
how to take me to take you out yourself

358
00:15:57,200 --> 00:15:51,880
out of the experiment I'm happy to

359
00:16:03,780 --> 00:16:01,140
thank you very much I think the bottom

360
00:16:06,090 --> 00:16:03,790
line here is you're making a point about

361
00:16:08,760 --> 00:16:06,100
the importance of judges no matter how

362
00:16:12,270 --> 00:16:08,770
the variations are that were overlaid on

363
00:16:15,120 --> 00:16:12,280

all this in my own informal arv work

364
00:16:19,020 --> 00:16:15,130
I've gotten to the point where the

365
00:16:22,290 --> 00:16:19,030
judges I select are only people that

366
00:16:25,020 --> 00:16:22,300
have an artistic drawing aesthetic

367
00:16:27,870 --> 00:16:25,030
background those are the ones I use and

368
00:16:30,330 --> 00:16:27,880
as far as these scales you have liked at

369
00:16:32,190 --> 00:16:30,340
art scale I've thrown away number seven

370
00:16:35,820 --> 00:16:32,200
because you've got too much analytics in

371
00:16:38,280 --> 00:16:35,830
there and I've used only the sketches

372
00:16:40,140 --> 00:16:38,290
that are provided and not the verbal

373
00:16:42,090 --> 00:16:40,150
descriptions make it very simple and

374
00:16:45,020 --> 00:16:42,100
easy for the judge to look at and

375
00:16:48,150 --> 00:16:45,030
evaluate so it's picture to picture

376
00:16:50,640 --> 00:16:48,160
forget the analytics and this is what I

377
00:16:53,520 --> 00:16:50,650
find to be the most effective procedure

378
00:16:55,770 --> 00:16:53,530
for evaluating Arabi targets where you

379
00:16:58,500 --> 00:16:55,780
have two comparators comparisons to make

380
00:17:01,200 --> 00:16:58,510
and and that could very well be get Dale

381
00:17:03,270 --> 00:17:01,210
and I know that when you do viewings I

382
00:17:05,820 --> 00:17:03,280
know that you're very visual and you're

383
00:17:08,010 --> 00:17:05,830
very drawing oriented and perhaps that

384
00:17:09,870 --> 00:17:08,020
influences what you how you see the

385
00:17:11,730 --> 00:17:09,880
judging to be most important other

386
00:17:13,350 --> 00:17:11,740
people who do more text-based they may

387
00:17:15,120 --> 00:17:13,360
find that it's better to look only at

388
00:17:16,920 --> 00:17:15,130

the text rather than at the view at the

389
00:17:20,310 --> 00:17:16,930
drawings and it does depend on how

390
00:17:22,110 --> 00:17:20,320
artistic the drawings are and how the

391
00:17:23,670 --> 00:17:22,120
judges relate to it one of the things

392
00:17:25,500 --> 00:17:23,680
that you're bringing out that I didn't

393
00:17:27,720 --> 00:17:25,510
talk about in here because it was kind

394
00:17:29,250 --> 00:17:27,730
of out of scope but this led me to the

395
00:17:32,790 --> 00:17:29,260
to the concept and I think never

396
00:17:35,400 --> 00:17:32,800
mentioned it as well so much of what we

397
00:17:37,800 --> 00:17:35,410
do not only in remote viewing but across

398
00:17:42,240 --> 00:17:37,810
the board in parapsychology is based on

399
00:17:44,610 --> 00:17:42,250
targets and judging and how much of our

400
00:17:47,600 --> 00:17:44,620
research is focused on target selection

401
00:17:50,370 --> 00:17:47,610
and judging in a pairing of these two

402
00:17:52,080 --> 00:17:50,380
qualities in this case it was very

403
00:17:54,810 --> 00:17:52,090
important that the judging was very

404
00:17:57,150 --> 00:17:54,820
important in the process and it does

405
00:18:00,210 --> 00:17:57,160
make me think more about the judges and

406
00:18:02,430 --> 00:18:00,220
how they relate to the target sets and

407
00:18:04,860 --> 00:18:02,440
how they can pick from viewers

408
00:18:06,900 --> 00:18:04,870
information viewers like you said some

409
00:18:08,700 --> 00:18:06,910
people use photo people to use drawings

410
00:18:11,280 --> 00:18:08,710
a lot some people will even go into

411
00:18:14,940 --> 00:18:11,290
paintings some people will actually just

412
00:18:16,770 --> 00:18:14,950
do text how can one judge evaluate all

413
00:18:18,660 --> 00:18:16,780

this different information it's

414
00:18:20,790 --> 00:18:18,670
important for us to start thinking in

415
00:18:23,340 --> 00:18:20,800
terms of choosing target sets and

416
00:18:26,070 --> 00:18:23,350
judging and comparing these together and

417
00:18:27,540 --> 00:18:26,080
pairing the processes together I don't

418
00:18:30,120 --> 00:18:27,550
know if that helps to address your

419
00:18:31,620 --> 00:18:30,130
question - thank you garrets running

420
00:18:32,220 --> 00:18:31,630
back up here again yes it's the eye oh

421
00:18:35,640 --> 00:18:32,230
it's open

422
00:18:37,380 --> 00:18:35,650
yes follow-on question so you gave a

423
00:18:38,520 --> 00:18:37,390
good argument as to why this should be

424
00:18:41,340 --> 00:18:38,530
prospective

425
00:18:43,320 --> 00:18:41,350
if it were retrospective might that

426
00:18:45,130 --> 00:18:43,330
alleviate some of the problems that we

427
00:18:48,220 --> 00:18:45,140
were just talking about with the

428
00:18:49,860 --> 00:18:48,230
if it were retrospect well then you

429
00:18:52,180 --> 00:18:49,870
still have the effect of the original

430
00:18:54,640 --> 00:18:52,190
experimenter right that we would have to

431
00:18:56,020 --> 00:18:54,650
but it's that's historical they did what

432
00:18:57,850 --> 00:18:56,030
they did now you're gonna just have

433
00:19:00,430 --> 00:18:57,860
judges look at it and see what the

434
00:19:02,110 --> 00:19:00,440
judges say you do bring another sort

435
00:19:04,000 --> 00:19:02,120
other potential sources of bias when

436
00:19:05,920 --> 00:19:04,010
you're making more decisions and what

437
00:19:07,420 --> 00:19:05,930
data to choose and how to include it and

438
00:19:09,670 --> 00:19:07,430

there you're still making more decisions

439
00:19:11,830 --> 00:19:09,680
so you're introducing more potential

440
00:19:14,170 --> 00:19:11,840
bias points in the process different set

441
00:19:17,050 --> 00:19:14,180
of problems yes okay it's a different

442
00:19:19,690 --> 00:19:17,060
set of problems I just have a general

443
00:19:22,000 --> 00:19:19,700
comment I as I hear about these

444
00:19:23,130 --> 00:19:22,010
descriptions of these ARV experiments I

445
00:19:26,770 --> 00:19:23,140
realize that

446
00:19:30,250 --> 00:19:26,780
apparently photos are used using a photo

447
00:19:31,570 --> 00:19:30,260
yes source and so on in our remote

448
00:19:34,900 --> 00:19:31,580
viewing experiment that was so

449
00:19:37,720 --> 00:19:34,910
successful where we made $260,000 30

450
00:19:42,370 --> 00:19:37,730
days in the market we use physical

451
00:19:44,380 --> 00:19:42,380
objects and so from the intuitive side

452
00:19:47,110 --> 00:19:44,390
when people get their feedback where

453
00:19:49,180 --> 00:19:47,120
they get to feel the object and turn it

454
00:19:52,720 --> 00:19:49,190
around and really you know again into

455
00:19:55,600 --> 00:19:52,730
contact with it I recall in the judging

456
00:19:58,510 --> 00:19:55,610
process that there were lots of comments

457
00:20:00,160 --> 00:19:58,520
about the tactile sensation of the

458
00:20:03,550 --> 00:20:00,170
target they were going to see and so on

459
00:20:06,280 --> 00:20:03,560
so so I tend to have a bias that a good

460
00:20:09,820 --> 00:20:06,290
way to go is forget the pictures but

461
00:20:11,860 --> 00:20:09,830
actually it handled the objects I agree

462
00:20:12,970 --> 00:20:11,870
with you completely that real targets

463
00:20:15,730 --> 00:20:12,980

things that you can actually feel

464
00:20:18,490 --> 00:20:15,740
engaged more of your senses the

465
00:20:20,740 --> 00:20:18,500
convenience of having emailed targets

466
00:20:22,720 --> 00:20:20,750
and images going around sometimes

467
00:20:24,880 --> 00:20:22,730
outweigh it because our viewers and

468
00:20:26,440 --> 00:20:24,890
judges are all over the world they were

469
00:20:28,540 --> 00:20:26,450
literally all over the world for this

470
00:20:32,440 --> 00:20:28,550
project but thank you for your comments

471
00:20:35,620 --> 00:20:32,450
yeah to house last comment that's the

472
00:20:38,020 --> 00:20:35,630
problem is that particularly into volume

473
00:20:39,190 --> 00:20:38,030
finding additional objects that are

474
00:20:40,600 --> 00:20:39,200
enough different from one another that

475
00:20:43,240 --> 00:20:40,610
you used before it gets really

476
00:20:44,550 --> 00:20:43,250
challenging plus the storage of them can

477
00:20:48,030 --> 00:20:44,560
be get in

478
00:20:49,680 --> 00:20:48,040
mountable right so from a functional

479
00:20:52,890 --> 00:20:49,690
perspective objects are actually very

480
00:20:54,690 --> 00:20:52,900
very good what is it what does it seem

481
00:20:58,530 --> 00:20:54,700
short says new new whatever it is new

482
00:21:01,230 --> 00:20:58,540
something or other but from a practical

483
00:21:03,540 --> 00:21:01,240
perspective they become unwieldy very

484
00:21:05,850 --> 00:21:03,550
quickly I want to address what Dale said

485
00:21:08,190 --> 00:21:05,860
and what you said here in so let me go

486
00:21:11,430 --> 00:21:08,200
there first so when I when I teach ARV I

487
00:21:14,250 --> 00:21:11,440
put a strong emphasis on target target

488
00:21:15,720 --> 00:21:14,260

selection target paring and all the

489
00:21:17,580 --> 00:21:15,730
different dynamics you have to take into

490
00:21:19,590 --> 00:21:17,590
account to get a good target match and

491
00:21:21,570 --> 00:21:19,600
if you don't do that you're inevitably

492
00:21:23,220 --> 00:21:21,580
going to screw things up right so it's

493
00:21:24,090 --> 00:21:23,230
very important and that's an emphasize

494
00:21:27,090 --> 00:21:24,100
your point and we've had that discussion

495
00:21:29,490 --> 00:21:27,100
before Dale's case viewers almost

496
00:21:33,060 --> 00:21:29,500
universally produced both verbage and

497
00:21:36,210 --> 00:21:33,070
sketchy and so the challengers why can't

498
00:21:37,980 --> 00:21:36,220
judges judge verbage and sketching both

499
00:21:39,240 --> 00:21:37,990
I mean if viewers can produce and judges

500
00:21:41,640 --> 00:21:39,250
should be able to evaluate them as well

501
00:21:44,030 --> 00:21:41,650
there are certain rules that involve the

502
00:21:46,980 --> 00:21:44,040
judging process and that is that

503
00:21:49,170 --> 00:21:46,990
generally sketching is the is the

504
00:21:50,910 --> 00:21:49,180
highest and most successful way of

505
00:21:52,440 --> 00:21:50,920
matching things but you can't ignore the

506
00:21:54,150 --> 00:21:52,450
verbage but you do have to take it you

507
00:21:56,640 --> 00:21:54,160
know the jury's out on some of the

508
00:21:58,230 --> 00:21:56,650
things they say one thing I do say about

509
00:22:00,950 --> 00:21:58,240
this is that there are viewers who only

510
00:22:04,680 --> 00:22:00,960
produce text there are viewers who

511
00:22:07,110 --> 00:22:04,690
mostly only produce visuals and then

512
00:22:08,910 --> 00:22:07,120
there's those who produce both by far

513
00:22:11,040 --> 00:22:08,920

the hardest ones to judge are the ones

514
00:22:13,110 --> 00:22:11,050
that only produce text and usually they

515
00:22:15,780 --> 00:22:13,120
are verging on impossible to judge in

516
00:22:18,060 --> 00:22:15,790
many cases so you at least need the

517
00:22:20,940 --> 00:22:18,070
sketches and when Dale says he gets

518
00:22:22,770 --> 00:22:20,950
people who have these you know right

519
00:22:24,690 --> 00:22:22,780
brain artistic kind of talents that's

520
00:22:26,760 --> 00:22:24,700
very valuable not message because of the

521
00:22:28,350 --> 00:22:26,770
artistic element because they have they

522
00:22:30,000 --> 00:22:28,360
are there they live in the world of

523
00:22:31,680 --> 00:22:30,010
pattern recognition and shapes and that

524
00:22:33,300 --> 00:22:31,690
and that's where they they come

525
00:22:36,180 --> 00:22:33,310
invaluable it's because their perception

526
00:22:37,590 --> 00:22:36,190
is oriented towards the most successful

527
00:22:40,830 --> 00:22:37,600
kinds of results that you get from an

528
00:22:44,040 --> 00:22:40,840
ARV so I think what you're emphasizing

529
00:22:46,020 --> 00:22:44,050
is the importance of the judge and the

530
00:22:47,760 --> 00:22:46,030
importance of the judge being able to

531
00:22:49,950 --> 00:22:47,770
judge related to the targets that are

532
00:22:51,330 --> 00:22:49,960
being selected and being able to work

533
00:22:54,000 --> 00:22:51,340
with the viewers and all across the

534
00:22:56,190 --> 00:22:54,010
board the judge is really a very key

535
00:22:58,169 --> 00:22:56,200
element here and I think Deborah study

536
00:23:00,690 --> 00:22:58,179
and this study make a pretty

537
00:23:04,710 --> 00:23:00,700
clear that judges should be focused on

538
00:23:06,690 --> 00:23:04,720

at least as much as the viewers data so