

Dr. Emoto's Other Experiment

Dr. Emoto's experiments demonstrating how thought energy affects water crystals has become rather famous. Less known is another experiment he conducted using sealed jars of cooked rice. Not only is it another powerful demonstration of the affects of thought, it also shows the gap between how scientists and intuitives assign meaningfulness to positive and negative energy.

In this experiment, Dr. Emoto sealed cooked rice in three jars. The first jar was given to school children who were instructed to say pleasant words to it. The second jar was also given to school children, but they were instructed to say harsh words to it. The third jar was set aside and ignored. After a few weeks, the rice in the first jar looked as fresh as the day it had been sealed. Rice in the second jar had a little bit of mold. To everyone's amazement, the rice in the third jar was completely rotten.

There is a bit of a gap in how scientists view this experiment and how intuitives view it. Most intuitives focus on the difference in the first and second jar and how harsh words caused the rice in the second jar to become moldy. But a theoretical mathematician doing statistical analysis and collecting data is going to look at this exactly the opposite.

Most mathematicians rarely approach a problem head on. They usually go in the back door. For instance, if we asked the odds of two people in a group of 40 having the same birthday, we might think it would be a ratio of 40/365. But, a statistician would ask, what are the odds *against* two folks having the same birthday, which is 364/365. With this calculation, odds break even with only 23 people and rise to 99% with only 57 people.

When collecting data on the rice experiment, statisticians will see the jar of rotten rice as most meaningful, because it was the control or the norm. What they will investigate is what caused the rice in the other two jars to not rot. So, the fresh rice in the second jar will be more meaningful than the few grains of moldy rice. And, there's the gap in meaningfulness. Intuitives will see that negative energy caused some of the rice to mold in the second jar. Physicists will see that negative energy kept most of the rice fresh compared to the control jar, which was completely rotten. In other words, negative energy was useful and served a purpose.

Let's delve a little further into how physicists view energy by using the analogy of a standard light bulb that is powered by AC, or alternating current. The AC energy runs equally positive and negative about a neutral line of reference. So, a physicist does not see negative energy as being bad. It serves a useful, balanced purpose.

Think about yin / yang. It is a perfect balance of energies. It came from the description of the sunny and shady sides of a mountain. But it's one mountain, not two separate things. And this is the way a physicist looks at the energy that caused some of the rice in two jars to remain fresh. It's a holistic, balanced approach.

But, how do intuitives view these different energies? They look at the third jar of rotten rice as normal too. They know that there is an over-abundance of negative energy in the world. The meaningfulness of the rice in the first jar is that it is incumbent on us to magnetize and draw in as much positive energy as possible.

Intuitives know that the meaningfulness of the second jar is that folks can live off negative energy for a long time, but doing so has side-effects. In a scientist's context, all energy is useful and they don't understand the preference for positive to the exclusion of all negative because that would make the lights go out. Intuitives understand how energy works on a living system. The analogy of how energy works on a light bulb is a static model.

As Dr. Emoto's rice experiment shows, the gap between how physicists and intuitives view and use positive and negative energy has a lot to do with the fact that they are using the same word,

energy, for different things in different contexts. The energy that powers a light bulb is not the same energy that affects the rice.

An interesting side note. Several folks have repeated this experiment on YouTube. Most all of them left out the third jar. Without the third jar, scientifically speaking, the experiment is useless because there is no control aspect to monitor. You'll see a third component in placebo studies too, where one group receives medication, one group receives a placebo and one group receives no medication. Scientific analysis of this type always requires a third dimensional aspect. Less can be verified by simply studying a purely dualistic system that has no neutral point of reference.

Some content excerpted from [The Sage Age – Blending Science with Intuitive Wisdom](#)

© 2008 MaAnna Stephenson

Content may be used freely with proper credit and a link to www.SageAge.net