
From: jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2016 2:22 PM
To: Rupert Sheldrake
Subject: Re: fields

free floating probability fields. It's too woo--- probability itself could encompass what you are suggesting. be what you are looking for. why do things tend toward the middle. why do heads and tails eventually come up equally, ? if there are many many heads in a row, is it your " field" that is causing the next flips to most likely have more heads than tails. when soap bubbles form their shapes. in the past it was believed it was due to surface tension. not true, it is due to the fact that is the " most likely (read , probable) ensemble of things . no more no less.

I do not write emails often so , sometimes they are a bit too short to be fully comprehensible to anyone but me. sorry . regarding the power laws. it is not all natural phenomenon but many, zipf's law , continues to elude a derivation, though many have tried for years. but there is empirical data in wild abundance. . creativity is part of the law, it says that the creative happens , and it happens only infrequently. . and out of the many creative things that do happen a smaller number get copied but the first ones to replicate often form shape quickly . your fields could spring into existence quickly . I would argue that a bell curve is the graphic representation of your field theory.

On Tue, Jul 12, 2016 at 9:41 AM, Rupert Sheldrake <[REDACTED]> > 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. </pan>

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 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. 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 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 =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 <[REDACTED]> 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 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 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 happiness 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 & [REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]> wrote:

Glad to hear about your meeting. Deepak is good=company, has a broad vision, and can be hilarious too.

Rupert

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

depak chopra was here this morning, a great fan of yours

--

◆=A0 please note

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

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

--

please note

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

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please

notify us immediately by

return e-mail or by e-mail to <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com> , and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved
=/div>

--

=C2◆ please note

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

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com <<mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com>> , and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved

</iv>

-=

please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of JEE
Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com <<mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com>> , and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved