

*Sony Post them on /  
Web site to my response.*

**Kevin Sharpe**

---

**From:** Albert G Fonda [afonda@crashex.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, 31 August 2003 4:01 AM  
**To:** kevin.sharpe@tui.edu  
**Subject:** FROGS AND GOD  
  
**Categories:** New

Dr. Sharpe:

As you probably know, your article <FROGS AND GOD>, with a subtopic <The Universe and Downward Action> just appeared as Metanexus Views. 2003.08.27.

I am a fellow, but not frequent, contributor to Metanexus. I'm also an engineer who understands automatic transmissions and heater controls, and it's from that viewpoint that I'd like to address not non-locality, but Downward Action.

Basically, I say there is no such thing.

You surely recall Aristotle's Four Causes - - Material, Efficient, Formal, and Final. However, Aristotle's term was *\*aitia\**, an explanatory factor. This gives "cause" two meanings: bottom-up, or proximate, cause, and top-down, or, distal, cause. Hume said all "cause" was merely attribution; but the more distal the cause, the more it may be regarded an attribution and not an "actual" attribute.

When a block of stone becomes David, the sculptor has persistently chipped away everything which was not David; but it is an Aristotelean stretch to contend that the Form caused the sculpture.

Considered in more detail the artist repeatedly compared the unfinished work with his plan, and with each comparison took further action to reduce the difference. In the hand of the artist, the chisel physically caused each chip in turn to depart. The sculptor stopped when the difference between concept and actuality reached zero, and David appeared. But David Unseen did not literally (or proximally) cause David Seen.

The element of negative feedback is what causes the illusion of top-down causation. Driven by available energy, feedback works in the automatic transmission to sense speed to make oil flow to move pistons to release some bands and tighten others to shift gears and upshift as the speed of the car increases.

But a home heating system controlled by thermostat is a simpler example. Because there is feedback, differences are reduced gradually to zero, but it is not the differences as such which cause the effects. Driven by available energy, the furnace heats the house; the set point and the switch merely start and stop the heating.

No closed loop has a starting point but in the eye of the observer; clouds cause rain but, driven by available energy, evaporation of that rain causes clouds. The closed loop is a process which controls its elements to

produce bottom-up a result in a process which the observer habitually (Hume's term) calls top-down. Top-down causation is attitudinal; it is an attribution and not an attribute.

The chips do not fly off the stone because David has not yet appeared. They fly off because chisels fracture stone. Just so, seemingly top-down causation is actually a complex of bottom-up causations, which persist until a difference which is amplified is reduced to zero. The set point of the feedback loop, the value from which the feedback signal is subtracted, is in turn caused from the bottom up by other events, in a vast network of cause and effect.

But what caused the artist to attack the stone, and the homeowner to adjust the thermostat? That gets us straight into determinism and free will.

One view (by far the most popular) is basically Wonderful Me; I am irrefutably aware that my will is free, but not irrefutably aware that all effects have causes; so free will trumps determinism.

So it would, if the conflict were genuine. But (I say) it is not; it is attitudinal. When you are all that there is of anything, and are aware of it, then all that it does is yours, including the portion which comes to your attention; within which some options (intentions; rehearsals of possible motor actions) prevail and others fail. Consciousness does not observe this process; consciousness IS this process.

The result is, and this is not the oxymoron some would see it as, deterministic free will. Bottom-up causation accounts for Wonderful Me. Any distinction between how the ball bounces and how we live and breathe and have our being is a fiction; the barrier is not genuine, it is a failure to comprehend a commonality. Reject the Wonderful Me hubris, and the top-down problem evaporates.

The chips do not fly off the stone because David has not appeared. They fly off because of how chisels affect stone, and the chiseling persists because the artist has a vision, and that is because of the cascade of neurological events, including truly free will, in the mind of the artist. Each and every one of these happenings are bottom-up; top-down does not appear but as an attitude in the mind of the observer. An aitia, an explanation; not a cause but a consequence.

That's my basic message. I am not ruling out intervention as such, and I agree with you that if it occurs it should have a means of acting. Whatever the acting is, however, must be from the bottom up. There is no such thing as top-down causation, so the task of explaining it does not exist.

QED.

A. Granville Fonda

## Kevin Sharpe

---

**From:** Joseph R Myers [josrm@lexcominc.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 28 August 2003 1:56 PM  
**To:** Kevin Sharpe  
**Subject:** Science and Spirit  
**Categories:** New

Dear Dr. Sharpe,

It is my belief that we do have the capacity to develop a scientific approach to the recognition of matter of another level, a level that can not be encountered with physical devices of any kind.

It has been my dedication to establish reincarnation on such a basis.

At this time I am 81 years old. My older brothers have passed on but both of them, one, a pioneer in nuclear power plant design [ executive nuclear power plant design engineer for PG&E ], the other, director of research for United States Steel Co. Calif. lab., examined my findings and approved their validity.

Perhaps you will examine my findings on web site [www.reincarnation2002.com](http://www.reincarnation2002.com)

My approach demonstrates that there is another level of matter that preserves the pattern of the individuality and enables the individual to reappear by reincarnation. Only another level of matter that is more enduring of the physical body could enable such to take place. You will be interested to see great scientists, musicians, political leaders, etc., who have reappeared and again distinguished themselves.

Please read the lecture describing the basis for the research before looking at the pictures.

I should very much appreciate a response from you.

Blessings,

Joseph R. Myers, P.E.

## Kevin Sharpe

---

**From:** Carl S. Helrich [carlsh@goshen.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 28 August 2003 6:20 PM  
**To:** kevin.sharpe@tui.edu

**Categories:** New

Dear Professor Sharpe:

Over lunch I read your article on frogs and such (METANEXUS). I appreciate the issues you raise. I am probably in somewhat the same boat with you.

I wrote an evaluation of Polkinghorne's thoughts for Zygon a couple of years ago and am at least familiar with some of John's ideas. I am probably less of Peacocke's, although I used his book in a class a number of years ago. I have not read the most recent, but heard him in Chicago last May.

I am frankly uncomfortable with the two extremes. I do not like the idea that we shall be able to nail down, in an ontological sense, the connection between God and us. I go along with George Ellis that God's interaction with us is through our thoughts. But I am, as Polkinghorne would put it, unpersuaded that we can nail that down in quantum theory or otherwise. On the other end I am equally uncomfortable with waving our hands at the ceiling saying that there is something beyond what we presently understand. I think that is true, but the term emergent answers no questions that we should ask.

The problem may be somewhere in the question of information. But we know very little about that at this time. We do not have an information theory for far from equilibrium systems, which is what the brain is.

As scientists we have an obligation to stick with the science as long as we can. I do not think that is yet exhausted. But I also suspect that the place we have not yet looked is in the concept of measurements made by ourselves on ourselves. I said this in a Zygon article in quantum mechanics. I tried to say it very carefully then and only said anything because I was asked to. I preferred to hint and drop it. I believe this is the basic area into which you are stepping with your thoughts.

The article was fun. yes, heaters can be infuriating. Anything with toggle switches can be. But there are a lot of toggle switches.

Peace, Carl Helrich

Carl S. Helrich, Ph.D.  
Professor of Physics

Goshen College  
1700 South Main Street  
Goshen, Indiana 46526

Phone: (574)535-7302  
Secretary: (574)535-7305  
FAX: (574)535-7509

*Answer on page*

**Kevin Sharpe**

---

**From:** Martin Fricke [mfricke@adelphia.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, 29 August 2003 10:53 PM  
**To:** ksharpe@OIScienceSpirit.com  
**Subject:** Frogs and God  
**Categories:** New

Dear Dr. Sharpe,

I've just read your interesting article "FROGS AND GOD", hosted by Metanexus Online.

One nit I'll pick is your comment: "Experiments have confirmed its existence as predicted in theory: change the spin of a particle and observe what happens to a sibling particle: it alters its spin at exactly the same time (Sharpe 1993)."

It would be more in tune with our present understanding of the experiments related to Bell's Inequality to say that the spin of neither particle was determined until one was measured. Nonlocality manifests itself not by changing an existing spin of one to change the other, but by being able to determine the distant, say "second", particle's spin by measuring that of the first one. (Mathematically, prior to measurement, the state vector was not an eigenfunction of the spin operator.)

Martin

*Answer on page*

## Kevin Sharpe

---

**From:** Robert Keefer [robert.keefe@pcusa.org]  
**Sent:** Sunday, 5 October 2003 9:11 PM  
**To:** Kevin Sharpe  
**Subject:** "Frogs and God"  
**Categories:** 1. Learners

Dear Kevin:

In late August a paper you wrote was distributed by Metanexus, "Frogs and God." You described a model for God's action in the world, using nonlocality to solve the problem of how can God act in the universe from "outside" the universe without adding to the total energy of the universe.

I appreciate your getting me thinking about a problem I had not considered. I have assumed – and continue to assume – that God works within the universe and in ways other than sending information alone. Yet the cognitive dissonance that assumption creates with the first law of thermodynamics did not start ringing until your paper. Thank you.

\* However, I have two questions about your argument. The first is your comparison of the brain with the universe as the highest of levels that interact with each other. I realize that when you write "brain" you mean in fact the nervous system as a whole, but I wonder about the appropriateness of limiting the analogy even to the nervous system. Would it not be more appropriate to compare the universe to the entire organism? Perhaps you wish to avoid the use of the word "mind," but that is how ordinary people refer to the level of activity where decisions are made. "Mind" may then be a property of the whole organism, not merely the nervous system. That is how a decision expressed in the neurons becomes your arm conveying the tea cup to your mouth. I'm thinking this because Aristotle described the "soul" as the form of the entire organism.

\* My second question has to do with your use of nonlocality to describe the means by which God sends information into the universe and it comes from ignorance. In quantum physics, is nonlocality ever a phenomenon across levels? For example, the spin of one electron affects only the spin of its complementary positron, correct? (If not, please correct me.) If that is correct, then how does nonlocality describe the transmission of information from the highest level of the universe to a lower level?

Or I can restate my question this way. The transmission of the information that I have given this electron such a spin, resulting in its partner having the opposite spin, uses no energy. This transmission is at one level; my having given it this spin – or changed its spin – is the action from a higher level to a lower. The action across levels – my changing the spin of the electron – does require energy. So using nonlocality to transmit information does require energy, does it not?

It's been a while since I have thought about these matters, having been focused elsewhere of late. Yet I would enjoy reading your response, or hearing it when I see you in a couple of weeks.

Peace to you!

Bob

Robert A. Keefer  
 Cincinnati, Ohio

"Miraculum est ignorantiae Asylum" -- from Bishop John Wilkins, 1638