are you having fun

On Tue, Jul 12, 2016 at 11:54 AM, Rupert Sheldr=ke ███████████████████████████████ wrote:

Dear Jeffrey,

Thanks for the gra=h. Yes, its a fairly general shape, also seen in species frequencies etc. =till not sure how it might apply to morphic resonance. We would probably n=ed to discuss this when we meet in person.

I agree there are d=ep problems with, or aspects of probability.

I seem to make a=much sharper distinction than you do between coin flipping type probabilities and the probability fields of self-organising systems, like the leaves of oak trees. I=think there's an inherent difference between systems organised by external forces and by internal organising principles. The coin is moved entirely by external forces, whereas the developing leaf shapes itself, as does a so=p bubble, although in the soap bubble case surface tension can probably expla=n the form quite adequately. Simple physical explanations like surface tension fail when it comes to leaves although D'Arcy Thompson tried to extend them into the biological r=alm.

We are off for Canada tomorro= and away for 2 months on a remote island in BC. I hope still to be in email contact most of the time.

=upert

On 12 Jul 2016, at 16:47, jeffrey E. wrote:

<Screen Shot 2016-07-12 at 11.46.52=AM.png>

On Tue, Jul 12, 2016 at 9:41 AM, Rupert Sheldrake ███████████████████
███████████████████ wrote:

Dear Jeffr=y,

They could be probability fields themselves, you�=80�re right. When I first put forward this hypothesis I corresponded with Karl Popper, the philosopher of science, abo=t it and he thought morphic fields sounded like what he called propensity fie=ds, a very similar concept to your probability fields. The p=oblem is that when you

1

propose this idea to people they just can't grasp the idea of free-floating prob=bility fields. They ask "What are they made of?" It's true that it's also ha=d to answer the question of what are quantum probability fields made of. </=pan>

But there's a problem with trying to forc= all natural phenomena into the same shape of distribution that's come before. First of all, as with my own hypothesis, there's the problem of creativity: What about the first one? And secondly some probabilities are passive in the sense that they describe events that just happen, like coin tossing. Others are probability fields associated with self-organising systems, like developing plants. One kind of probability depends on external forces, the other on internal organisational principles.=C2�Morphic resonance only applied to the latter. <=u>

Best

Rupert

On 11 Jul 2016, at 13:49, jeffrey E. wrote:

why would they influence rather than a=tually just be a probability field themselves. . =C2� it also might be fun to think of " luck"=C2� as a morphic field . I think a strong=argument can be made that the power laws zipfs pareto =C2� are the proofs of morphic fields. . f=rcing all natural phenomoma into the same shape of distributi=n that has come before it its very very ele=ant. and as good a theory as any scientist can propose.

</=iv>

On Mon, Jul 1=, 2016 at 6:49 AM, Rupert Sheldrake ███████████████ wrote:

Dear Jeffrey,

Yes, I think Brian Josephson =s indeed rather scattered.

I don't think De=pak is interested in deep theoretical issues so I don't think you'll succeed in moving him toward= the study of probabilities. But I agree with you that it would be better if he stayed away from quantum phenomena which he doesn=E2��t know much about and which in relation to medicine and consciousness seem to=me to create a cloud of scientific-sounding rhetoric which obscures rather tha= illuminates the problems.

I'm all for the idea =f attractors, but I don't think mathematically so find it hard to grasp probability arguments. =/span>Although I think morphic fields are probability structures and work by influencing probabilities.

We leave for a remote island in British Columbia on Wednesday and I'll be away for about 2 months. But still in email contact most of the time. <=u>

Rupert

On 9 Jul 2016, at 10:53, jeffrey E. wrote:

he pointed me to brian jos=phson, seems scattered.? view? I m trying t= convince depak to move in the realm and study of probabiliti=s and stay away from quantum phenomena. . I think

2

nature= distributions pushing elements to be average , describes many processes.=C2� . it appears that morphing all local faces into on= (average) appears to be beautiful. . if things are distribu=ed on a bell live or normal curve, just looking at the distrib=tion could lead one to think there is a force pushing toward the middle.=C2� maybe gravity is just that, �=A0 . probability of all things being equally distributed. appe=ring as a pseudo force . (like centri=ugal force). the central limit theorem might answ=r many mysteries. . derivation of the power laws f=r example. zipf, pareto. .�=A0 if the distribtuions are the attractors. having even = distribution of esoteric traits like happinesss could lead one to belive=C2� that if the distribution wants to stay constant. as one =oint on the curve (the person) if they become happier, the pseufo force w=uld push someone else towards the average. . =C2� and yes - a few times depak and i roared with laughter.=C2�

On Sat, Jul 9, 2016 at 5:30 AM, Rupert Sheldrake ███████████████ wrote:

and can be hilarious too.

Glad to hear about your meeting. Deepak is good=company, has a broad vision,

Rupert

On 8 Jul 2016, at 21:18, jeffrey E. wrote:

depak chopra was here this mor=ing, a great fan of yours

--

�=A0 please note

--

please note

-=

=C2�   please note

-=

=C2�   please note

4

and