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| The Non-locality of Morphic Resonance  Abstract:  A midpoint between two extreme views on life, Rupert Sheldrake�s hypothesis of formative causation is founded on a holistic point of view, compromising between the reductionist Mechanistic viewpoint and the superstitious, unscientific Vitalist viewpoint. Through his concepts of morphic fields and a collective unconsciousness in nature he attempts to provide a solution to the enigma of the formative forces behind morphogenesis, instinct and memory. He describes morphic fields and their effects in the form of morphic resonance in great detail, but two key properties must needs be emphasized: they attract the systems under the influence (I.e.: biologically similar systems) toward characteristic forms and patterns of activity and that they are not subject to spatio-temporal decay. That is they do not diminish in magnitude over large expanses of time or space. Support for this theory comes in a variety of forms involving highly complex discoveries in the recent world of Quantum Physics. But, only One experiment has been specifically designed and conducted for testing the primary concept of the hypothesis of formative causation �the existence of a collective unconsciousness of a species. However, no experiments have been specifically designed and conducted with regard to the second point raised in his theory, claiming that morphic fields are not subject to spatio-temporal decay. This is what will comprise the focus of my experiment: testing the validity of the claim that morphic fields do not diminish when traversing expanses of space. This will be done be testing Sheldrake�s theories of a collective unconsciousness as done in the previous experiment but then also repeating the same procedure to incorporate aspects of spatial separation �at locations remote from the original individuals who were part of the first test and the first test location. If morphic fields do play a part, to the same extent, as they would be expected without the proximal separation, as claimed, then the theory is sound in this respect. However, if no effects from morphic fields can be detected, or if these effects are diminished or corroded in any way, then the theory is disproved. The implications of this hypothesis are far reaching into realms transcending the modern mentality towards science as they run in parallel with recent experiments of Quantum Entanglement. In my project there will be an emphasis on theory because of the lack of resources and the difficulty associated with conducting potentially decisive experiments for the existence of morphic fields within nature. In general it is difficult to separate morphic field effects from other known kinds of causation. However, the occurrence of morphic resonance effects observed from my experiment, and discussed in the theory of my project, would imply the existence of such fields and thus provide indirect evidence for their existence, hence the emphasis on theory and the diminished role of experimental evidence. This experiment focuses on investigating the following: the ability of typical House Mice (Mus musculus and higher classification, Rodent) to draw on their collective unconscious memory, when in each other�s proximity, is tested and a trend is established (here in California), this trend is then used in comparison to the relative ability of the same species to draw on the same memory at a new and isolated location somewhere in South Africa. The �instinct� established in the collective memory of the species house mouse is that of the memorization of a maze. This is in the form of a conditioned aversion. My experiment tests the theory that Morphic fields do not decay spatially.  Table of contents:  Section: Title:  1.  List of Figures  2.  List of Tables  3.  Introduction  4.  Literature Review: The hypothesis of Formative Causation  5.  The �Question�  6.  Hypothesis  7.  Prediction  8.  Materials  9.  Procedure  10.  Data/Results  11.  Discussion  12.  Conclusion  13.  Acknowledgements  14.  Recommendation  15.  Bibliography  16.  Links  List of figures:  1. Figure 3.1 �Mus Musculus  2. Figure 5.2 �Question?  3. Figure 8.1 � Some materials and tools used  4. Figure 8.2 � Materials in transit  5. Figure 8.3 � U.S. workstation  6. Figure 8.4 � S.A. workstation  7. Figure 9.1 � Plan view of fully assembled maze (U.S.)  8. Figure 9.2 � Picture of four cages of mice. (U.S.)  9. Figure 9.3 � Plan view of fully assembled maze (S.A.)  10. Figure 14.1 � �Pinkies� -Plan view  11. Figure 14.2 � �Pinkies� -Close up  12. Figure 15.1 � Some resources  13. Figure 11.1 � Graph, Mouse 1 - Illustrating relationship between the trial number and the time until completion  14. Figure 11.2 � Graph, Mouse 2 - Illustrating relationship between the trial number and the time until completion  15. Figure 11.3 �Graph, Mouse 3 - Illustrating relationship between the trial number and the time until completion  16. Figure 11.4 �Graph Mouse 4 (non-runner) - Illustrating relationship between the trial number and the time until completion  17. Figure 11.5 �Graph, Mouse 5 - Illustrating relationship between the trial number and the time until completion  18. Figure 11.6 �Graph, Mouse 6 - Illustrating relationship between the trial number and the time until completion  19. Figure 11.7 �Graph, Mouse 7 (pregnant) - Illustrating relationship between the trial number and the time until completion  20. Figure 11.8 �Graph, Mouse 8 - Illustrating relationship between the trial number and the time until completion  21. Figure 11.9 �Graph, Mouse 9 - Illustrating relationship between the trial number and the time until completion  22. Figure 11.10 �Graph, Mouse 1 (S.A.)- Illustrating relationship between the trial number and the time until completion  23. Figure 11.11 �Graph, Mouse 2 (S.A.)- Illustrating relationship between the trial number and the time until completion  24. Figure 11.12 �Graph, Illustrating relationship between U.S. mice maze times and trials  25. Figure 11.13 �Graph, Illustrating relationship between S.A. mice maze times and trial  List of Tables:  1. Mouse species used in this Experiment (U.S.) -3.1  2. Mouse 1 results (U.S.) -10.1  3. Mouse 2 results (U.S.) -10.2  4. Mouse 3 results (U.S.) -10.3  5. Mouse 4 results (U.S.) -10.4  6. Mouse 5 results (U.S.) -10.5  7. Mouse 6 results (U.S.) -10.6  8. Mouse 7 results (U.S.) -10.7  9. Mouse 8 results (U.S.) -10.8  10. Mouse 9 results (U.S.) -10.9  11. Mouse 1 results (S.A.) -10.10  12. Mouse 2 results (S.A.) -10.11  13. Multimedia database (U.S.) -10.12  14. Multimedia database (S.A.) -10.13    [Home](http://docs.google.com/home.html)][[Introduction](http://docs.google.com/introduction.html)][[Hypothesis](http://docs.google.com/hypothesis.html)][Procedure][[Data](http://docs.google.com/data.html)][[Conclusions](http://docs.google.com/conclusions.html)][Bilio/Links]  [2002 Projects](http://docs.google.com/AP2002/index.html)][[2001](http://docs.google.com/index.html) ][[2000 Projects](http://docs.google.com/AP2000/index.html)][[1999](http://docs.google.com/AP99/index.html) ][[1998 Projects](http://docs.google.com/AP98/index.html)] |