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**THE GANZFELD EXPERIMENTS**

**[Argument # 17: "Experiments that show evidence for psi must be replicable in order to count as evidence."](http://www.victorzammit.com/skeptics/winston.html" \l "top)**

**Corollary: "I won’t consider successful psi experiments as evidence of psi unless the results are replicated by other scientists and peer reviewed."**

**This is another category that skeptics tend to use to dismiss evidence. If they can’t it into the "anecdotal evidence is worthless category," then they put it into the "unreplicable category" (and by that they don’t just mean replicable by a few other scientists, but by every scientist in the world!).**

**WINSTON, OF COURSE “REPLICABLE” MEANS REPLICABLE BY EVERY SCIENTIST IN THE WORLD. USING GRAVITY OR MAGNETISM AS EXAMPLES; IF THEY ARE TRULY VALID SCIENCE THEY WOULD BE REPLICABLE ANY PLACE ON EARTH. YOU COULD NOT HAVE A SCIENCE CLASSROOM IN BANGLADESH FAIL TO GET MAGNETS TO WORK. “REPLICABLE” MEANS REPLICABLE BY ANY SCIENTIST IN ANY COUNTRY ON EARTH.**

**BUT YOUR COMMENT INDICATES THAT IF IT WORKS FOR A COUPLE OF SCIENTISTS THEN IT SHOULD BE ACCEPTED AS VALID SCIENCE. TWO SCIENTISTS TRIED THAT AT BRIGHAM YOUNG A FEW YEARS BACK. MAYBE YOU RECALL THE “COLD FUSION” FIASCO? NO ONE ELSE COULD REPLICATE THEIR RESULTS AND THEY MADE BRIGHAM YOUNG THE BUTT OF JOKES FOR YEARS.**

**I KNOW WHY YOU MADE THAT RIDICULOUSLY STUPID STATEMENT. IT IS BECAUSE YOU WANT TO CLAIM THAT THE RESULTS OF A FEW BIASED PSYCHIC INVESTIGATORS SHOULD BE ACCEPTED BY EVERYONE, EVEN THOUGH NO ONE ELSE CAN REPLICATE THEIR RESULTS. SORRY WINSTON, THAT KIND OF CRAP ONLY FLIES IN FANTASYLAND, NOT IN THE REAL WORLD.**

**While this standard may seem reasonable scientifically, it is usually just another tactic to try to raise the bar, because no matter how many times a successful psi experiment is replicated, they still will demand a never-ending higher rate of replication!**

**WRONG WINSTON. THEY DON’T HAVE TO RAISE THE BAR BECAUSE PSI EXPERIMENTS HAVE NEVER CLEARED ANY BAR WHEN TESTED UNDER SUPERVISED CONDITIONS; AND I DON’T MEAN SUPERVISED BY PSI RESEARCHERS WHO HAVE PROVEN THEMSELVES TO BE UNRELIABLE (AND WHEN I USE THE WORD “UNRELIABLE” I AM PUTTING THAT AS DELICATELY AS POSSIBLE).**

**(If the 2,549 sessions of the Ganzfeld and autoganzfeld experiments from 1974 to 1997 by different research laboratories which produced above chance results doesn’t count as replicable, then what would?)**

**WINSTON, EITHER YOU HAVEN’T BEEN KEEPING UP ON THE STATUS OF THOSE EXPERIMENTS OR YOU ARE IGNORING THE CHANGING STATUS OF THOSE EXPERIMENTS. SINCE I BELIEVE THAT YOU PROBABLY HAVE KEPT UP ON THEM, I CAN ONLY ASSUME THAT YOU DO WHAT ALL IRRATIONALS DO WHEN CONFRONTED WITH EVIDENCE THAT DISPROVES WHAT YOU SO DESPERATELY NEED TO BELIEVE - YOU SIMPLY IGNORE IT.**

**THE STATUS OF THOSE EXPERIMENTS IS THAT THEY HAVE PROVEN NOTHING EXCEPT HOW BIASED RESEARCHERS CAN BE WHEN THEY DESPERATELY WANT SOMETHING TO BE TRUE. THESE RESEARCHERS ARE NOT TRUE SCIENTISTS. SCIENCE DOES NOT WORK THAT WAY. WHEN REAL SCIENTISTS GET DISAPPOINTING RESULTS THEY DISCARD THEIR THEORY AND CONTINUE SEARCHING FOR ANSWERS. AND THEY NEVER DESIGN EXPERIMENTS THAT CAN BE PROVEN BIASED. THESE RESEARCHERS, WHEN CONFRONTED WITH TIGHT CONTROLS WATCHED THEIR SUPPOSED “RESULTS” DISAPPEAR.**

**SINCE YOU DON’T WANT TO TELL YOUR AUDIENCE, I WILL - THE INCREDIBLE RESULTS CLAIMED BY THE RESEARCHERS WHICH FAR EXCEEDED 50% (25% = CHANCE) WAS BROUGHT DOWN TO 27% WHICH WOULD BE WITHIN THE RANGE EXPECTED BY CHANCE RESULTS ALONE.**

**I DON’T BELIEVE THAT YOU WERE NOT AWARE OF THIS. I DO BELIEVE THAT YOU REFUSED TO ACCEPT THESE LATEST RESULTS BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT WHAT YOU WANT TO BELIEVE. YOU COULD NEVER, EVER BE A SCIENTIST WINSTON - YOU DO NOT HAVE THE HONEST INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY THAT IS REQUIRED IN THAT FIELD.**

**Nevertheless, the first problem with this is that just because something hasn’t been replicated doesn’t mean that it didn’t happen.**

**THAT’S TRUE WINSTON, BUT, UNTIL IT CAN BE REPLICATED, OTHERS ARE NOT OBLIGATED TO BELIEVE IT.**

**For example, if Track and Field gold medalist Carl Lewis breaks a world record, and other athletes can’t repeat it, that doesn’t mean that Lewis didn’t do it in the first place.**

**WINSTON, THAT WAS THEE “STUPIDEST” EXAMPLE I HAVE EVER SEEN. WHAT YOU JUST SAID DOESN’T EVEN MAKE SENSE. DON’T YOU READ THIS CRAP BEFORE YOU PUT IT ON YOUR WEBSITE? OBVIOUSLY NOT. IF YOU HAD TAKEN EVEN A MINUTE TO THINK ABOUT WHAT YOU JUST SAID, EVEN YOU WOULD HAVE SEEN HOW RIDICULOUS THAT LAST EXAMPLE WAS.**

**WHEN YOU MAKE STATEMENTS LIKE THAT LAST ONE, YOU MAKE ME FEEL LIKE I’M BEATING UP ON A RETARD. I DON’T LIKE THAT FEELING, SO START THINKING YOUR ARGUMENTS OUT FIRST BEFORE YOU PUBLISH THEM.**

**Likewise, if I won a slot machine jackpot or threw a quarter and it landed on its edge and stayed that way (this is possible but there are astronomical odds against it), but couldn’t repeat it again, it doesn’t mean that it never happened the first time.**

**WINSTON THESE EXAMPLES HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH REPLICABLE SCIENTIFIC EXPERIMENTS. THIS IS THE LOGICAL FALLACY OF FALSE ANALOGY.**

**Similarly, phenomena such as supernovas, balls of lightning, and comets are not replicable by us but are acknowledged to exist anyway.**

**WINSTON, YOUR CONFUSION IS GETTING EMBARRASSING. A SUPERNOVA IS A ONE-TIME EVENT. AFTER IT HAPPENS THE STAR IS FOREVER CHANGED. WHY WOULD YOU EVEN THINK THAT A ONE-TIME EVENT COULD BE REPLICATED? AS I STATED EARLIER, THAT DOESN’T MAKE ANY LOGICAL SENSE AT ALL. IT IS TOTALLY UNRELATED TO THE REPLICATION OF EXPERIMENTS USING THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD. MAYBE YOU SHOULD LIE DOWN FOR AWHILE.**

**Therefore, replicating the appearance of UFO’s or ghosts may not be possible because they are out of our control, but that doesn’t mean they never happen or don’t exist.**

**WINSTON, REPLICATING THE APPEARANCE OF UFO’S OR GHOSTS MAY NOT BE POSSILBE FOR ANOTHER REASON - THEY MAY NOT EXIST. IT IS THE DUTY OF THE CLAIMANT TO PROVE THAT THEY DO.**

**All it would take is one genuine case of a UFO or ghost to prove that they were real and possible.**

**WINSTON - AT LAST - YOU FINALLY GOT IT RIGHT! YOU ARE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT! AND THAT IS ALL WE HAVE EVER ASKED FOR.**

**As an unnamed law I found says: "If it happens once, then it must be possible."**

**WINSTON, JUST BECAUSE YOU READ SOMETHING YOU LIKE - THAT DOESN’T MAKE IT A LAW.**

**HOWEVER, ONCE AGAIN, I AM FORCED TO AGREE WITH YOU THAT IF SOMETHING HAPPENS EVEN ONCE, THEN IT HAS BEEN PROVEN TO BE POSSIBLE. A PERFECT EXAMPLE, BUT ONE WHICH I’M SURE YOU WOULD NOT ACCEPT, IS THE TRANSFORMATION OF INORGANIC ELEMENTS INTO THE BUILDING BLOCKS OF LIFE.**

**BUT THAT EVEN HAPPENED A SECOND TIME, IN 1953, WHEN STANLEY MILLER ACCOMPLISHED WHAT MANY CONSIDERED TO BE IMPOSSIBLE.**

**In fact, the very nature of psychic phenomena makes them not easy to replicate.**

**WINSTON, WHY IS THAT?**

**I DO NOT AGREE WITH WHAT YOU JUST SAID, NOR DO I BELIEVE YOU CAN PRODUCE ANY PROOF TO SUPPORT IT. BUT I WILL TELL YOU SOMETHING THAT IS IMPOSSIBLE, BY ITS VERY NATURE, TO REPLICATE AND THAT IS “IMAGINARY THINGS.” THESE ARE ALL THE THINGS THAT EXIST IN THE MIND OF THE TRUE BELIEVER WINSTON. WHAT THEY HAVE IN COMMON IS THAT NONE OF THEM CAN EVER BE PROVEN.**

**Dean Radin, Ph.D, Director of the Consciousness Research Laboratory at the University of Nevada, and author of The Conscious Universe: The Scientific Truth of Psychic Phenomena, lists 8 reasons why this is so:**

**"Psi effects do not fall into the class of easily replicated effects.**

**WINSTON, HE’S RIGHT ABOUT THAT; BUT NOT FOR THE REASON HE THINKS.**

**There are eight typical reasons why replication is difficult to achieve:**

**WINSTON, I’LL GIVE YOU ALL 8 AT ONCE: THEY ARE IMAGINARY.**

1. **the phenomenon may not be replicable;**

**WINSTON, IMAGINARY PHENOMENA NEVER ARE.**

1. **the written experimental procedures may be incomplete, or the skills needed to perform the replication may not be well understood;**

**WINSTON, THIS HAPPENS WHEN AMATEURS ATTEMPT SCIENCE.**

1. **the effect under study may change over time or react to the experimental procedure;**

**WINSTON, TELL HIM TO DESIGN BETTER EXPERIMENTS.**

1. **investigators may inadvertently affect the results of their experiments;**

**WINSTON - BINGO! WHEN SKEPTICS HAVE ENTERED THE PICTURE THIS IS USUALLY WHAT IS DISCOVERED.**

1. **experiments sometimes fail for sociological reasons;**

**WINSTON - THEY ALWAYS FAIL FOR “LACK OF EVIDENCE” REASONS.**

1. **there are psychological reasons that prevent replications from being easy to conduct;**

**WINSTON, TELL THEM TO FIGURE IT OUT. THEY ARE CLAIMING TO BE SCIENTISTS WITH “PHD’s”. SO FIGURE IT OUT.**

1. **the statistical aspects of replication are much more confusing than more people think; and**

**WINSTON, SO WHAT? TELL YOUR SCIENTISTS TO “UNCONFUSE” THE STATISTICS.**

1. **complications in experimental design affect some replications."**

**WINSTON - TELL THEM TO FIX THEM. I THOUGHT YOU SAID THESE WERE PHD SCIENTISTS?**

**WINSTON, THESE EXCUSES MAKE YOUR INVESTIGATORS LOOK MORE LIKE KEYSTONE COPS THAN ACTUAL SCIENTISTS.**

**The second problem with this argument is that successful psi experiments definitely have been replicated by different researchers and laboratories.**

**WINSTON, ONE INCOMPETENT INVESTIGATOR REPLICATING THE WORK OF ANOTHER INCOMPETENT INVESTIGATOR DOES NOT QUALIFY AS SCIENTIFIC REPLICATION.**

**One famous solid example is the series of telepathy studies known as the ganzfeld experiments, in which subjects guess target images while sitting with ping pong ball halves over their eyes and listening to relaxing white noise designed to deprive them of sensory stimuli to heighten their intuition and psychic abilities. Dean Radin, in the same book quoted above describes the replicability of the Ganzfeld experiments:**

**"At the annual convention of the Parapsychological Association in 1982, Charles Honorton presented a paper summarizing the results of all known ganzfeld experiments to that date. He concluded that the experiments at that time provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate the existence of psi in the ganzfeld…….. "**

**"At that time, ganzfeld experiments had appeared in thirty-four published reports by ten different researchers. These reports described a total of forty-two separate experiments. Of these, twenty-eight reported the actual hit rates that were obtained. The other studies simply declared the experiments successful or unsuccessful. Since this information is insufficient for conducting a numerically oriented meta-analysis, Hyman and Honorton concentrated their analyses on the twenty-other studies that had reported actual hit rates. Of those twenty-eight, twenty-three had resulted in hit rates greater than chance expectation. This was an instant indicator that some degree of replication had been achieved, but when the actual hit rates of all twenty-eight studies were combined, the results were even more astounding than Hyman and Honorton had expected: odds against chance of ten billion to one. Clearly, the overall results were not just a fluke, and both researchers immediately agreed that something interesting was going on. But was it telepathy?"**

**Radin further elaborates on how researcher Charles Honorton tested whether independent replications had actually been achieved:**

**"To address the concern about whether independent replications had been achieved, Honorton calculated the experimental outcomes for each laboratory separately. Significantly positive outcomes were reported by six of the ten labs, and the combined score across the ten laboratories still resulted in odds against chance of about a billion to one.**

**WINSTON, TO DROP FROM 10 BILLION TO 1 DOWN TO 1 BILLION TO 1 IS A PRETTY STEEP DROP, WOULDN’T YOU SAY?**

**This showed that no one lab was responsible for the positive results; they appeared across-the-board, even from labs reporting only a few experiments. To examine further the possibility that the two most prolific labs were responsible for the strong odds against chance, Honorton recalculated the results after excluding the studies that he and Sargent had reported. The resulting odds against chance were still ten thousand to one.**

**WINSTON, FIRST IT WAS 10 BILLION, THEN 1 BILLION, NOW 10 THOUSAND TO 1. AT LEAST YOU’RE HEADING IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION.**

**Thus, the effect did not depend on just one or two labs; it had been successfully replicated by eight other laboratories."**

**On the same page, he then soundly dismisses the skeptical claim that the file-drawer effect (selective reporting) could skew the meta-analysis results in favor of psi:**

**"Another factor that might account for the overall success of the ganzfeld studies was the editorial policy of professional journals, which tends to favor the publication of successful rather than unsuccessful studies. This is the "file-drawer" effect mentioned earlier. Parapsychologists were among the first to become sensitive to this problem, which affects all experimental domains. In 1975 the Parapsychological Association’s officers adopted a policy opposing the selective reporting of positive outcomes. As a result, both positive and negative findings have been reported in the Paraspsychological Association’s annual meetings and in its affiliated publications for over two decades.**

**Furthermore, a 1980 survey of parapsychologists by the skeptical British psychologist Susan Blackmore had confirmed that the file-drawer problem was not a serious issue for the ganzfeld meta-analysis. Blackmore uncovered nineteen complete but unpublished ganzfeld studies. Of those nineteen, seven were independently successful with odds against chance of twenty to one or greater.**

**WINSTON, LET’S SUMMARIZE: FIRST THE ODDS WERE 10 BILLION TO 1, THEN IT DROPPED TO 1 BILLION, THEN TO 10 THOUSAND, AND NOW IT’S DOWN TO 20-1. MY QUESTION WINSTON, IS, WHAT HAPPENED TO THE OTHER 9 BILLION, 999 MILLION, 999 THOUSAND, 980?**

**Thus while some ganzfeld studies had not been published, Hyman and Honorton agreed that selective reporting was not an important issue in this database.**

**Still, because it is impossible to know how many other studies might have been in file drawers, it is common in meta-analyses to calculate how many unreported studies would be required to nullify the observed effects among the known studies. For the twenty-eight direct-hit ganzfeld studies, this figure was 423 file-drawer experiments, a ratio of unreported-to-reported studies of approximately fifteen to one. Given the time and resources it takes to conduct a single ganzfeld session, let alone 423 hypotheitcal unrepoted experiments, it is not surprising that Hyman agreed with Honorton that the file-drawer issue could not plausibly account for the overall results of the psi ganzfeld database. There were simply not enough experimenters around to have conducted those 423 studies.**

**Thus far, the proponent and the skeptic had agreed that the results could not be attributed to chance or to selective reporting practices."**

**Another skeptical argument against the ganzfeld studies is sensory leakage. Radin addresses this as well:**

**"Because the ganzfeld procedure uses a sensory-isolation environment, the possibility of sensory leakage during the telepathic "sending" portion of the session is already significantly diminished. After the sending period, however, when the receiver is attempting to match his or her experience to the correct target, if the experimenter interacting with the receiver knows the identity of the target, he or she could inadvertently bias the receiver’s ratings. One study in the ganzfeld database contained this potentially fatal flaw, but rather than showing a wildly successful result, that study’s participants actually performed slightly below chance expectation………**

**WINSTON, IF THIS STUDY HAD THE ADVANTAGE OF KNOWING THE IDENTITY OF THE TARGET, HOW DO YOU EXPLAIN THAT THIS STUDY’S RESULTS WERE ACTUALLY BELOW CHANCE? HOW COULD THAT EVEN BE POSSIBLE?**

**Despite variations in study quality due to these and other factors, Hyman and Honorton both concluded that there was no systematic relationship between the security methods used to guard against sensory leakage and the study outcomes. Honorton proved his point by recalculating the overall results only for studies that had used duplicate target sets. He found that the results were still quite strong, with odds against chance of about 100,000 to 1."**

**SO WINSTON, NOW YOU’RE SHOWING THAT THE ODDS AGAINST CHANCE ARE REBOUNDING. LAST TIME THEY WERE 20-1, NOW THEY’RE BACK UP TO 100 THOUSAND TO 1. THIS IS LIKE A ROLLER COASTER RIDE.**

**Where skeptic Ray Hyman disagreed with Charles Honorton was in the role of randomization flaws affecting the ganzfeld results. However, as Radin points out, the consensus of the experts on meta-analysis is against Hyman’s hypothesis:**

**"A similar concern arises for the method of randomizing the sequence in which the experimenter presents the target and the three decoys to the receiver during the judging process. If, for example, the target is always presented second in the sequence of four, then again, a subject may tell a friend, and the friend, armed with knowledge about which of the four targets Is the real one, could successfully select the real target without the use of psi.**

**Although these scenarios are implausible, skeptics have always insisted on nailing down even the most unlikely hypothetical flaws. And it was on this issue, the importance of randomization flaws, that Hyman and Honorton disagreed. Hyman claimed that he saw a significant relationship between randomization flaws and study outcomes, and Honorton did not. The sources of this disagreement can be traced to Honorton’s and Hyman’s differing definitions of "randomization flaws," to how the two analysts rated these flaws in the individual studies, and to how they statistically treated the quality ratings.**

**These sorts of complicated disagreements are not unexpected given the diametrically opposed conviction with which Honorton and Hyman began their analyses. When such discrepancies arise, it is useful to consider the opinions of outside reviewers who have the technical skills to assess the disagreements. In this case, ten psychologists and statisticians supplied commentaries alongside the Honorton-Hyman published debate that appeared in 1986. None of the commentators agreed with Hyman, while two statisticians and two psychologists not previously associated with this debate explicitly agreed with Honorton.**

**In two separate analyses conducted later, Harvard University behavioral scientists Monica Harris and Robert Rosenthal (the latter a world-renowned expert in methodology and meta-analysis) used Hyman’s own flaw ratings and failed to find any significant relationships between the supposed flaws and te study outcomes. They wrote, "Our analysis of the effects of flaws on study outcome lends no support to the hypothesis that ganzfeld research results are a significant function of the set of flaw variables.**

**In other words, everyone agreed that the ganzfeld results were not due to chance, nor to selective reporting, nor to sensory leakage. And everyone, except one confirmed skeptic, also agreed that the results were not plausibly due to flaws in randomization procedures. The debate was now poised to take the climactic step from Stage 1, "It’s impossible," to Stage 2, "Okay, so maybe it’s real."**

**SORRY WINSTON, THAT IS ONE STAGE THAT IS LATE - VERY LATE.**

**Even after the successful replicable series of ganzfeld experiments, further replicability was found in the computer-controlled autoganzfeld experiments, designed to be even more efficient and controlled than the original ganzfeld experiments. This time though, two magicians who specialized in mentalism were brought in to check the protocals for cheating loopholes, as Radin describes:**

**"In addition, two professional magicians who specialized in the simulation of psi effects (called "mentalists" or "psychic entertainers") examined the autoganzeld system and protocols to see if it was vulnerable to mentalist tricks or conjuring-type deceptions. One of the magicians was Ford Kross, an officer of the Psychic Entertainers Association. Kross provided the following written statement about the autoganzfeld setup:**

**In my professional capacity as a mentalist, I have reviewed Psychophysical Research Laboratories’ automated ganzfeld system and found it to be provide excellent security against deception by subjects.**

**The other magician was Cornell University psyhcologist Daryl Bem, who besides coauthoring a 1995 paper on the ganzfeld psi experiments with Honorton, is also a professional mentalist and a member of the Psychic Entertainers Association."**

**Radin summarizes the results of the autoganzfeld experiments as follows:**

**"The bottom line for the eleven series, consisting of a total of 354 sessions, was 122 direct hits, for a 34 percent hit rate. This compares favorably with the 1985 meta-analysis hit rate of 37 percent. Honorton’s autoganzfeld results overall produced odds against chance of forty-five thousand to one."**

**WINSTON, THE ODDS ARE HEADING BACK DOWN AGAIN.**

**Further replications beyond the ganzfeld and autoganzfeld experiments include the following:**

**"The next replications were reported by psychologist Kathy Dalton and her colleagues at the Koestler Chair of Parapsychology, Department of Psychology, University of Edinburgh, Scotland. The Edinburgh experiments, conducted from 1993 through 1996 (and still ongoing), consisted of five published reports and 289 sessions using an improved, fully automated psi ganzfeld setup. It was based on Honorton’s original autoganzfeld design and implemented in stages first by Honorton, then by psychologist Robin Taylor, then by me, and finally by Kathy Dalton.**

**While only the 1985 meta-analysis, the autoganzfeld study, and the Edinburgh study independently produced a hit rate with 95 percent confidence intervals beyond chance expectation, it is noteworthy that each of the six replication studies (after the autoganzfeld) resulted in point estimates greater than chance. The 95 percent confidence interval at the right end of the graph is the combined estimate based on all available ganzfeld sessions, consisting of a total of 2,549 sessions. The overall hit rate of 33.2 percent is unlikely with odds against chance beyond a million billion to one."**

**WINSTON THAT IS A QUADRILLION TO ONE! THOSE ARE ABOUT THE SAME ODDS YOU COULD GET IN VEGAS ON THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.**

**Finally, at the end of the chapter, Radin concludes what the findings of the ganzfeld experiments and others before it suggest:**

**"Now jointly consider the results of the ganzfeld psi experiments, the dream-telepathy experiments of the 1960s and 1970s, the ESP cards tests from the 1880s to the 1940s, Upton Sinclair’s experiments in 1929, and earlier studies on thought transference. The same effects have been repeated again and again, by new generations of experimenters, using increasingly rigorous methods. From the beginning, each new series of telepathy experiments was met with its share of skeptical attacks. These criticisms reduced mainstream scientific interest in the reported effects, but ironically they also refined the methods used in future experiments to the point that today’s ganzfeld experiments stump the experts."**

**WINSTON, THE ONLY PEOPLE WHO ARE “STUMPED” ARE PEOPLE WHO DON’T UNDERSTAND HOW EASILY STATISTICS CAN BE ABUSED AND HOW EASILY RESEARCHERS CAN BE FOOLED BY PARTICIPANTS WHO ARE LESS THAN HONEST.**

**Thus from all this, it is indisputable that we have solid scientific and statistical evidence that one of the most successful and controlled series of telepathy experiments in history, the ganzfeld experiments, were definitely replicable.**

**WINSTON, THEY WERE DEFINITELY REPLICABLE BUT ONLY IF CONDUCTED IN THE SAME SHODDY FASHION AS BEFORE.**

**Radin’s book describes many other replicable psi experiments as well, including ESP, clairvoyance, remote viewing, and psychokinesis.**

**WINSTON, THAT SOUNDS LIKE A GOOD BOOK TO READ - AFTER I HAVE READ EVERY OTHER BOOK EVER PRINTED.**

**So I highly recommend it. The book, The Conscious Universe: The Scientific Truth of Psychic Phenomena.**

**YOU HAVE READ WINSTON WU’S ESSAY ON THE GANZFELD EXPERIMENTS. HERE IS THE OPPOSING VIEW TAKEN FROM “THE SKEPTIC’S DICTIONARY.”**

**IT CAN BE FOUND ON THE WEB AT** [**WWW.SKEPDIC.COM**](http://WWW.SKEPDIC.COM)**.**

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

**THE SCIENCE SEGMENT**

**Moons large ones are spherical. Smaller ones are not, and may, in fact, be captured asteroids.**

**Lunar escape velocity is only 5,000 mph.**

**earth 1**

**mars 2**

**jupiter 63**

**saturn 59**

**uranus 27**

**neptune 13**

**dwarfs 4**

**total 169**

**largest moons diameter (miles)**

**1 ganymede.jupiter 3,278**

**2 titan.saturn 3,200 (mercury = 3,030!)**

**3. callisto.jupiter 2,983**

**4. io.jupiter 2,255**

**5. moon.earth 2,160**

**6. europa.jupiter 1,942**

**7. triton.neptune 1,681**

**Proper Motion motion "across" sky, not toward/away from Earth.**

**Plasma (electrified gas) = 99.9% of the Universe = 4th State of matter.**

**Pulsar (also called a neutron star) is the remnant which resulted**

**when a massive star collapsed and went supernova.**

**The remnant star is planet-sized and spins incredibly fast.**

**Quasars Distant young galaxies that emit immense quantities of**

**light and/or radio waves.**

**Saturn's rings Pulverized material that cannot form into satellite due to Saturn's gravitatinal pull.**

**Rings are frozen and very thin (less than 100' wide).**

**Solar wind (stream of ionized gas particles) speed = 2 million mph.**

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

**THE ARENA GOES ABROAD**

**India is about to institute a ban on smoking in public places, including bars, restaurants, hotels and hospitals, the Wall Street Journal reports. The ban, which begins Thursday, is being greeted warmly by health officials, with skepticism by smokers on the ground. “Such rules are made and broken every day," one said. “The ban will have no effect on me.”**

**The Indian public regularly scoffs at laws impinging on their freedom, routinely disobeying traffic signals and urinating in public. The government has attached a $5 fine to the smoking ban, and hopes to raise it to $25. In a country where per-capita income averages $1,000, that could make a difference, but smokers were nonchalant. “I'll smoke at home, particularly in my bathroom,” one said.**

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

**FAMOUS QUOTES**

**EPICTETUS (55 - 135) 80 years.**

**He was a Greek Stoic philosopher. He was probably born a slave at Hierapolis, Phrygia (present day Pamukkale, Turkey), and lived in Rome until his exile to Nicopolis in northwestern Greece, where he lived most of his life and died. His teachings were noted down and published by his pupil Arrian in his Discourses. Philosophy, he taught, is a way of life and not just a theoretical discipline. To Epictetus, all external events are determined by fate, and are thus beyond our control, but we can accept whatever happens calmly and dispassionately. Individuals, however, are responsible for their own actions which they can examine and control through rigorous self-discipline. As part of the universal city that is the universe, human beings have a duty of care to all fellow humans. The person who followed these precepts would achieve happiness.**

**HIS QUOTE:**

**"We must not believe the many,**

**who say that only free people ought to be educated,**

**but we should rather believe the philosophers**

**who say that only the educated are free."**