
From: Rupert Sheldrake <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2016 3:54 PM
To: jeffrey E.
Subject: Re: fields

Dear Jeffrey,

Thanks for the graph. Yes, it's a fairly general shape, also seen in species frequencies etc. Still not sure how it might apply to morphic resonance. We would probably need to discuss this when we meet in person.

I agree there are deep 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 soap bubble, although in the soap bubble case surface tension can probably explain 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 realm.

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

Rupert

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

<Screen Shot 2016-07-12 at 1.46.52 AM.png>

On Tue, Jul 12, 2016 at 9:41 AM, Rupert Sheldrake <[REDACTED]>
<mailto:rsheldrake@clara.co.uk> wrote:

Dear Jeffrey,

They could be probability fields themselves, you're right. When I first put forward this hypothesis I corresponded with Karl Popper, the philosopher of science, about it and he thought morphic fields sounded like what he called propensity fields, a very similar concept to your probability fields. The problem is that when you propose this idea to people they just can't grasp the idea of free-floating probability fields. They ask "What are they made of?" It's true that it's also hard to answer the question of what are quantum probability fields made of.

But there's a problem with trying to force 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 must 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. Morphic resonance only applied to the latter.

Best

Rupert

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

why would they influence rather than actually just be a probability field themselves. . it also might be fun to think of "luck" as a morphic field = I think a strong argument can be made that the power laws zipfs pareto are the proofs of morphic fields. . forcing all natural phenomena into the same shape of distribution that has come before it its very very elegant. and as good a theory as any scientist can propose.

On Mon, Jul 11, 2016 at 6:49 AM, Rupert Sheldrake [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Jeffrey,

Yes, I think Brian Josephson is indeed rather scattered.

I don't think Deepak is interested in deep theoretical issues so I don't think you'll succeed in moving him towards the study of probabilities. But I agree with you that it would be better if he stayed away from quantum phenomena which he doesn'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 than illuminates the problems.

I'm all for the idea of attractors, but I don't think mathematically so find it hard to grasp probability arguments. 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.

Rupert

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

he pointed me to Brian Josephson, seems scattered? view? I'm trying to convince Deepak to move in the realm and study of probabilities and stay away from quantum phenomena. . I think nature's distributions pushing elements to be average, describes many processes. = it appears that morphing all local faces into one (average) appears to be beautiful. . if things are distributed on a bell curve or normal curve, just looking at the distribution could lead one to think there is a force pushing toward the middle. maybe gravity is just that, . probability of all things being equally distributed. appearing as a pseudo force = (like centrifugal force). the central limit theorem might answer many mysteries. . derivation of the power laws for example. zipf, pareto. . if the distributions are the attractors. having even a distribution of esoteric traits like happiness could lead one to believe that if the distribution wants to stay constant. as one point on the curve (the person) if they become happier, the pseudo force would push someone else towards the average. . and yes - a few times Deepak and I roared with laughter.

dir="ltr">[REDACTED] On Sat, Jul 9, 2016 at 5:30 AM, Rupert Sheldrake <mailto:rsheldrake@clara.co.uk> > =rote:

and can be hilarious =oo.

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

Rupert

On 8 Jul 2016, at =1:18, jeffrey E. wrote:

depak chopra was here this morning, a great fan of =ours

--

please =ote

The information contained in this communication =s confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute =nside information, and is intended only for the use of the =ddressee. It is the property of JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure =r copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly =rohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received =his communication in error, please notify us immediately =y return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and destroy this =ommunication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. =opyright -all rights reserved

--

please =ote

The information contained in this communication =s confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute =nside information, and is intended only for the use of the =ddressee. It is the property of JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure =r copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly =rohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received =his communication in error, please notify us immediately =y return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and destroy this =ommunication and all copies thereof,

including all attachments. =copyright -all rights reserved

--

please =ote

The information contained in this communication =s
confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may
constitute =nside information, and is intended only for
the use of the =ddressee. It is the property of
JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure =r copying of this
communication or any part thereof is strictly =rohibited
and may be unlawful. If you have received =his
communication in error, please notify us immediately =y
return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and
destroy this =ommunication and all copies thereof,
including all attachments. =opyright -all rights reserved

--

please =ote

The information contained in this communication =s
confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may
constitute =nside information, and is intended only for
the use of the =ddressee. It is the property of
JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure =r copying of this
communication or any part thereof is strictly =rohibited
and may be unlawful. If you have received =his
communication in error, please notify us immediately =y
return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and
destroy this =ommunication and all copies thereof,
including all attachments. =opyright -all rights reserved

=