

From: Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]>
To: jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Proposal for a psi experiment
Date: Wed, 10 Aug 2016 11:08:00 +0000

True
But do you also see my point ?



Deepak Chopra

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]


[Super Genes: Unlock the Astonishing Power of Your DNA for Optimum Health and Wellbeing](#)

On Aug 10, 2016, at 7:06 AM, jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:

I see my validation question has worked its way in at the end

On Wednesday, August 10, 2016, Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]> wrote:
FYI

Deepak Chopra

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



[Super Genes: Unlock the Astonishing Power of Your DNA for Optimum Health and Wellbeing](#)

Begin forwarded message:

From: Deepak Chopra <[REDACTED]>
Date: August 10, 2016 at 4:52:16 AM EDT
To: "Stanley A. KLEIN" <sklein@berkeley.edu>
Cc: Wolfgang Baer <[REDACTED]>, Dean Radin <dradin@noetic.org>, Brian Josephson <bdj10@cam.ac.uk>, Henry Stapp <[REDACTED]>, Christopher Cochran <ccoehran@ucsc.edu>, "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, David Kaiser <dikaiser@mit.edu>, Jim Johnston <jimjohnston@orion-research.net>, "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, Bernard Carr <b.j.Carr@qmul.ac.uk>, "Stuart R - (hameroff) Hameroff" <hameroff@email.arizona.edu>, John Horgan <[REDACTED]>, George Johnson

<johnson@santafe.edu>, "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, "chris@ctmu.org"
<chris@ctmu.org>

Subject: Re: Proposal for a psi experiment

Matter Energy and information are human concepts
There is only experience and the knowing of experience in awareness .
This includes the experience of doing science .
Truth can never be experienced by a system of thought - scientific religious or theological or philosophical .
Theories are conceived in consciousness
Experiments are designed in consciousness
Observations are made in consciousness
Consciousness is fundamental , without cause and irreducible .
All minds are conditioned aspects of non local mind .
The conditioning of skeptics cannot be overcome by any experiment . Wolfgang - the understanding and knowing of gravity is in consciousness alone
Who are we trying to convince ?
Why ?

Deepak Chopra

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



[*Super Genes: Unlock the Astonishing Power of Your DNA for Optimum Health and Wellbeing*](#)

On Aug 9, 2016, at 10:37 PM, Stanley A. KLEIN <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Wolf, Thank you, Thank you,

One item you list, a good theory, is essential for success in convincing skeptics. Henry Stapp has provided that theory: a slightly modified Born Rule. The Born Rule has been tested by physics devices, but never with the quantum collapse involving a sentient observer. Namely, the von Neumann interpretation that Henry keeps emphasizing. If the Bem experiment is replicated with Henry's "Charlie Intervention" (see my posting that started this thread) that could not only demonstrate psi but also clarify which of the interpretations of QM will survive.

A second important ingredient is that the data collection should be done in a psi friendly environment as is demonstrated by the difficulty in replications when done by skeptics. And for convincing skeptics they would need to be involved in the design of the experiment. It would need encrypted communications among the relevant computers involved with the stimuli and data collection. So I really hope we can find a funding source and proceed with the testing. It can lead to many skeptics accepting psi and also clarify which of the interpretations of QM need to be abandoned.

Wolf, thanks again!
Stan

On Tue, Aug 9, 2016 at 7:15 PM, Wolfgang Baer <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Skeptics can be convinced and less statistical interpretation would help. so would a good theory

or alternatively if a series of experiments could show step by step improvements in the strength of the effect would be helpful.

So the experiment is worth doing since it has some improvements and if the statistics improve there is progress.

The price seem high. The equipment is trivial so its mainly operational costs, if done at a school they might be reduced.

Wolf

Dr. Wolfgang Baer
Research Director
Nascent Systems Inc.

E-mail [REDACTED]

On 8/8/2016 8:17 PM, Deepak Chopra wrote:

Agree with Dean

Deepak Chopra



[*Super Genes: Unlock the Astonishing Power of Your DNA for Optimum Health and Wellbeing*](#)

On Aug 8, 2016, at 6:21 PM, Dean Radin <dradin@noetic.org> wrote:

> to become convincing to the world's skeptics ...

My reluctance is based on repeatedly seeing that hardcore skeptics are never satisfied with improved methods. It doesn't matter to them who conducts the experiments, even if they do it themselves. E.g., in the case of the Schlitz-Wiseman experiments, I set up the experimental infrastructure for two of those studies, and I was the principal analyst for two of the resulting datasets.

Even with the striking outcomes, Wiseman did not change his mind at all about the possibility of psi, even though he was one of the investigators and knew first-hand that the results weren't some sort of trick or artifact. Witnessing that and similar examples have taught me that if one is wedded to an *a priori* position it doesn't matter what the actual outcome is or who reports it -- it just isn't convincing. It's never enough. Bayesian statistics tell us why.

That said, such a demonstration *might* influence a more open-minded skeptic. So if \$90K were found to do a collaboration, I would be willing to oversee such a project, but I'd ask one of our other scientists to actually run it. I'm personally more interested in blazing new trails.

best wishes,
Dean

- Dean Radin, PhD
- Chief Scientist, Institute of Noetic Sciences noetic.org
- Co-Editor-in-Chief, *Explore*

On Mon, Aug 8, 2016 at 12:32 PM, Stanley A. KLEIN <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Dean,

Let me begin with some background. I joined the American Association for Psychical Research (in New York) about 40 years ago. After a few years my membership lapsed, but I visited them again last year since my cousin live two block from them. I point this out to try to convince you that I'm totally aware of your comments on replicability. The problem, as you are aware, is that there have been way too few experiments done in the collaborative manner I have in mind. Your paper:

"Of two minds: Sceptic-proponent collaboration within parapsychology"
Marilyn Schlitz, Richard Wiseman, Caroline Watt, and Dean Radin

in 2006 comes close to being in the direction of the collaboration for what is needed and I'd be delighted to send anyone interested in a copy of that paper. I'd love to chat with you on how that sort of project can be done even better to become convincing to the world's skeptics. One shouldn't give up hope. You would be the main beneficiary of such a project so I'm baffled by why you seem reluctant to do it. Right now I guess finding the approximately \$90,000 to support your efforts seems to be the main obstacle. I can fund myself and I'm not sure about Henry Stapp). With Henry's new suggestion (Charlie's presence) that could totally revise our understanding of quantum mechanics I would think that funding should be easy to find. So my suggestion is that we need to keep an open mind on the the replicability topic and do Henry's experiment.

best,
Stan

On Mon, Aug 8, 2016 at 10:45 AM, Dean Radin <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Stan, let me remind you that the presentiment experiments have all been *independently replicated* many times in many labs around the world. While Bem/Radin/Bierman are names associated with these studies, we are not the only ones reporting these outcomes.

Thus when you say that "they weren't done with the careful oversight needed to convince an open-minded skeptic like me," what you *mean* is that you personally need to see this outcome for yourself. I.e., you do not trust what anyone else reports. And it wouldn't matter what sort of oversight might be applied by others. You still wouldn't believe it.

I don't blame you for feeling that way. I have spent a great deal of time replicating experimental results that others have reported that I wouldn't have believed either unless I saw the results first-hand. E.g., as an extreme example I never believed any reports about PK spoon-bending, even reports by close friends who I had no reason to distrust. Then one day I [bent the bowl](#) of a large soup spoon with a gentle touch. It took that personal experience to overcome my prior disbelief.

So I understand the reluctance, but I'd appreciate it if you were clearer about the source of your resistance (your *a priori* belief). The published experimental literature is vast. The evidence is far more than what a few people have reported in the last few years.

best wishes,
Dean

- Dean Radin, PhD
- Chief Scientist, Institute of Noetic Sciences noetic.org



--

please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of

JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved