

The Clean Water Experiment

June 13, 2009

This was our first attempt to clean up polluted water. We decided to start a very subtle measure: water's 'energetic footprint', as measured by Russian physicist Dr. Konstantin Korotkov's Gas Discharge Visualization (GDV) technique, which uses sophisticated technology to capture the tiny pulse of photons emitted by all living things by stimulating them into an excited state so that they shine millions of times more intensely than normal.

The GDV machine also can record the 'energy footprint' of liquids.

Korotkov and his team have carried out a great deal of pilot research on a great variety of biological liquids, showing that the GDV equipment is highly sensitive to changes in the chemical and physical contents of liquids — subtle changes that don't show up in ordinary chemical analyses.

The GDV machine examines the emission activity on the surface of the liquid — that is, its ability to retain important information from other molecules.

Dr. Schwartz, director of the University of Arizona's Laboratory for Advances in Consciousness and Health, and his team, including the excellent lab technician Mark Boccuzzi, have been photographing these energetic footprints of water.

There are extremely clear differences between the photographs of tap water and those of bottled mineral water. Tap water has a more diffuse image (like the sun under a lot of cloud cover), while mineral water has a strikingly clear image, like an intense circle of light.

Careful preparations

Before the experiment, Mark prepared four Petri dishes with tap water samples, and labelled them 'A', 'B', 'C' and 'D'. Once again, Mark and the rest of the scientific team would remain ignorant of which sample we chose.

He then had to photograph the images of the Petri dishes with their labels, plus take images of energetic footprints of all four with his GDV technology.

This is truly an international experiment, run with a lab and scientific team in Arizona, orchestrated by me and my team in London, UK, with THE CopperStrings web team in India, who have donated their time to our project.

Because of the large time difference (12 hours) between the lab and the web team, who must upload the images on our website, Mark had to prepare the samples five days before the experiment, in order to send us the photos in time.

The day before the experiment, I asked my youngest daughter to choose one of four pieces of paper, which contained A, B, C and D, and once she'd selected, we told our CopperStrings team which one to show on our site.

On the day of the experiment, our participants who'd registered beforehand, logged in and were given instructions by the use pages that automatically flipped over at the appropriate times.

Participants from every continent

We had registered participants from 79 countries and every continent, including people from numerous countries in Africa, the Middle East, Central America, and the Far East. Nevertheless, the largest group (more than half) were from the US, followed by Canada, the UK, the Netherlands, South Africa, Australia, Italy, Spain and Germany.

Our participants were shown photos of both the tap water and mineral water energetic footprints, to see the difference. When the experiment began, the Petri dish we'd chosen was revealed.

Our participants were asked to send an intention for the energetic footprint of the tap water to more closely resemble that of the mineral water.

Changed water

Afterward, Dr. Schwartz and Mark again took GDV images of all four Petri dishes. After they'd examined and compared all of them with the images from mineral water, they found that one photo more closely resembled that of the bottled water.

At that point, I un-blinded the study; the dish we'd chosen indeed looked more closely like the mineral water than any of the others.

Nevertheless, such a study is meaningless on its own, so we decided to try to replicate it later that month, at a workshop I was running for some 75 people at the ISSSEEM conference in Boulder, Colorado.

We ran an identical experiment in every regard but one – the four tap water samples were left in the Petri dishes for just a few days, not the five days as we'd done previously.

This time, when Mark and Gary examined these results, they did not see a significant difference in the photographs.

Many possible scenarios

So even though we got results the first time, we failed to replicate them. This could mean one of a number of possibilities:

- The first experiment was a fluke
- The second experiment was a fluke
- To get a result we need to leave the water in the dishes for five days, as we did the first time
- Leaving the water in the dishes for five days enabled bacteria to grow. The presence of bacteria – rather than our intention — changed the images

Until we repeat the study, we cannot say for certain that we had a robust effect.