Conclusion:

Opposition, in the form of data invalidity, to Sheldrake’s Theory of Morphic Resonance as it is represented in my experiment comes from two sources, one that opposes it on grounds that it is simply, false, and another that says it’s effects are so small they are not possibly noticeable with such a small sample size. However, I am confident that the chances that my results are coincidental, are not sufficient to prove it false. Agreed, my results are not entirely conclusive, beyond the shadow of doubt, but they are conclusive enough to defy regular possibilities and chances. It is obvious that it is more likely that my results arose from scientific theories rather than chance. There may be the possibility for labeling it as inconclusive evidence but the chances (being greater than 60%) tend towards the favor of the hypothesis. And so, if all is as it seems, we can say, somewhat inconclusively, but nevertheless we can say, the only variable being the spatial aspect, and there being little differentiation in trends between the U.S. and S.A.experimenats, then the theory of formative causation is ratified for it’s second point, along with my hypothesis, and are proven correct –truly, Morphic fields do not decay spatially.