In one interpretation of quantum mechanics, this "telepathy" might be possible without any energy source. This is called the *Everett's Many-Worlds interpretation*, initially proposed in 1957, but which remains a contender for what could be called the philosophy of quantum mechanics[I might put an article on www].[1] The gist of this interpretation is that events in the universe are *not* predetermined, and many different futures are possible. That is, no one single future exists. In this interpretation of quantum mechanics, you exist at the present, but there are many possible futures for you, even a microsecond in the future. Microsecond by microsecond, each of these futures comes into existence in what could be called parallel universes. In each future, a version of you exists, but the situation you are in is slightly different in each one. This difference can become larger and larger over time.

If you can somehow influence which version of the future your consciousness evolves into, then in principle you could continuously "select" your favorite future, second by second. The idea of being able to do this selection is problematic, however, because the Many Worlds idea proposes that independent versions of your consciousness will evolve into *all* possible versions of the future, so that the ability to select a particular one is likely difficult or impossible.

But, if you could somehow make it more likely for your awareness to evolve into a future in which other people happen to accidentally have a thought or vision similar to yours, then you have "caused" telepathy, at least in your specific branch of the many possible universes. But, the telepathy is actually just a coincidence. You simply selected the universe in which the

[1] Hugh III Everett, "On the Foundations of Quantum Mechanics," PhD Thesis, Princeton University, 1957a, Reprinted in *The Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*, DeWitt, Bryce. S., and Neill Graham, (eds.), Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973: 3–140.

coincidence occurred. This should be thought of as an interesting detour in the philosophy of quantum mechanics, as opposed to a scientific hypothesis.

In theory, a form of telepathy can occur via quantum mechanics.

[summary of the idea here, then unpack mechanics]

A large system of particles, such as the human brain, is subject to random quantum fluctuations. To some extent, these random fluctuations might act as triggers that inadvertently assist with the creation of new ideas or visions. Because of the extremely large number of atoms in a human brain, the effect of quantum mechanics on our thought processes is not well understood. The reverse is also not well understood, as our thought processes seem to be able to affect quantum mechanics. For example, a single particle may be in an indeterminate state called a mixed quantum state, where the particle has two mutually exclusive properties at the same time. When an experimenter looks at the particle, the act of looking will force the particle to be definitely in just one of the two possible states. The act of looking causes the possibility of the other state to disappear. On the face of it, there's nothing particularly strange about this statement. However, due to *quantum entanglement*, other mixed quantum state particles that the experimenter never looked at and are far away, may also be forced into a single specific state at the moment that the experimenter looked at the first particle. In other words, when the experimenter looks at one particle, that particle is forced into a certain state, but other particles may be connected to or entangled with that particle, and those other particles will simultaneously be forced into a certain state, even if those other particles are not specifically near the original particle. This action at a distance, simply based on what an experimenter observes, could be a

basis for “telepathy.” Thus, the thoughts of one person could cause quantum effects in the brains of others.

Discarded drafts:

f the behavior of particles on the subatomic scale is any indication/has direct effects on the macroscopic scale we operate on, then, in theory, a form of telepathy might be possible due to quantum entanglement. In quantum mechanics, two independent/separate/distinct particles can influence each other if they become [linked/synced/paired] or "entangled." Once linked, a change in one particle's state can immediately affect the other—no matter the distance between them. Since brains are large systems of particles that are subject to random quantum fluctuations, if particles in two different people's brains become entangled, then their thoughts may be able to mutually influence each other and cause "telepathic" experiences. [insert details + caveats here] For multiple witnesses to have experienced the same event, like Levelland or Tic Tac, their minds may have connected in a way that allowed them to observe the same mental projection—like a telepathic transmission or a shared vision. In this scenario, one of the witnesses imagined an event and unintentionally "shared their screen" with others, allowing multiple people to watch the same movie at the same time, so to speak. Alternatively, several witnesses could have each made a selection of the same UFO "movie" with no "screen sharing" involved. Instead, their choices may have accidentally converged on the same reality, as proposed by the Many Worlds Theory. According to this interpretation of quantum mechanics, events in the universe are not set in stone, and many possible futures exist simultaneously in parallel to one another. On rare occasions, individuals might make choices that land them in the same version of reality where a particular event occurred, like a UFO stalling car engines or jamming radar. The shared aspect of this experience would be purely coincidental, however, as each witness just happened to [momentarily] drift into the same version of reality.

The concept in quantum physics that the act of observation can affect how the universe evolves suggests that this might be possible. However, —----------.

[caveats to this explanation]
