

## **Cancer and Morphogenetic fields**

**Eli Erich Lasch, Berlin**

Let me start with a poem by a man called Harburg:

*Poems are made by fools like me,  
But only God can make a tree;*

*And only God who makes the tree  
Also makes the fools like me.*

*But only fools like me, you see,  
Can make a God, who makes a tree.*

So, who has created the fields: God or Man?

Or, as modern science claims, have they produced themselves, by a process known as self-organisation? WHO CARES? Only fools - like me.

Let me start with a statement: Western medicine has lost its fight against Cancer. Not only has the incidence of the disease skyrocketed over the last 10 years, but, according to the NIH <sup>1</sup>, the mortality rate too has increased by 7%. That happened despite an enormous input, both financial and human. So something is wrong.

Cancer seems to have taken the place which tuberculosis occupied in the 19th century. Contrary to current belief, tuberculosis was not conquered by an improvement in the living conditions nor by the advent of antibiotics. There was a quick and spontaneous decline in the 1880s that reduced the mortality by two thirds in less than a decade. The turning point, the only real change, was the discovery of the tubercle bacillus by Robert Koch in 1882, the realisation that tuberculosis was nothing but an infectious disease.<sup>2</sup> The disease was demystified. A disease lost its almost mystical powers because of a change in the belief system of that time and age.

So is it our belief system concerning cancer that is at fault? The answer to that question may well be positive. Let us take a look at the present approach and its background. Western biology claims that the form of our body is determined exclusively by our genes. This belief system has been adopted by the modern medical sciences which have their origin in the teachings of Virchow, the founding father of what is now called scientific medicine. According to this view, most diseases, including cancer, originate in the interior of the cells. Cancer is believed to be caused by the change in the genetic make-up of one cell - the appearance or activation of the so called oncogenic gene. This altered cell has now become the origin of a clonal cone, the cells of which replicate rapidly and try to take over the body of the host. A war between these cells turned rebels and the defence system of the body ensues - The bad guys against the good ones, the forces of chaos against the forces of order. This is something which supposedly occurs again and again in our body. Usually, our immune system (the defence mechanism) is victorious. When the cancer cells however gain the upper hand and overwhelm the immune system, cancer ensues. Chaos has been victorious and the first step towards the ultimate chaos, death, has been taken. Cancer is thus a direct mirror of our society. The criminals against the police forces. Asocial individuals against society, or the total reign of pure egoism, of individuals who think only of "self-determination" Another facet of this belief is that cancer cells are considered to be either

sick cells, invaders, like bacteria, or both, and must be eliminated. This is normally the task of our immune system. What we call clinical cancer, the appearance of a tumour, will occur only when the immune system is weakened and cannot fulfil its task. That is where modern medicine enters the picture and takes over. As cancer cells are considered to be malignant (out to kill the body) they cannot be healed and therefore have to be killed before they take over and fulfil their aim. Modern medicine also pursues a policy that has become known as scorched earth. It is the tumour that interests the oncologists, and not the patient. If the patient dies as the result of the treatment, it is just too bad.

The problem with this view is that it does not give the necessary answers. As I have said before, cancer does seem to have gained the upper hand, and there is nothing people fear more than cancer. A radically different approach claims that the form of our physical body as well as its integrity are determined by a morphogenetic or organising field. Here we have first to define what is meant by a field (especially a morphic one) and what are its properties. The term field was first introduced by Maxwell in the 1860s as a mathematical framework for electric and magnetic forces and activity. He was however still thinking in material terms, about something subtle called ether. Einstein went one step further by introducing the notion of non-material fields. Modern physics defines a field as a region in space throughout which a physical force may be exerted.<sup>3</sup> Whether the fields originate from matter or vice versa is a mute question. Where there is matter there exists a field and according to Albert Einstein the field IS the only reality<sup>3</sup>. Matter is only a result or rather expression of an extremely intense field. According to Gurwitsch and Sheldrake, morphogenetic fields are systems which organise matter, give matter its form.<sup>4</sup>

These fields are by definition non-material and non-energetic. They consist of pure information (whatever that may be) but seem to be dependent and in a constant interaction with matter. They give matter its form, but seem at the same time to be formed by it. The best analogy is the picture we see on our television screen. The picture is dependent on the electric current, but its outline is not. This is formed uniquely by the information supplied. Matter however is not the inflexible and unchangeable material which we believe it to be. Already Max Planck said: "In all my research I have never come across matter. To me the term matter implies a bundle of energy which is given form by an intelligent spirit" - in other words: by an intelligent(?) field.

If we now go over to biology and the human body we realise that the concept of form-giving is still one of the greatest mysteries in existence and not fully solved by genetic theory. We know that the genes carry the information for the formation of proteins. Each cell, however, carries all of the information - a fact which allows the possibility of cloning. So why do liver cells, for example, produce only the specific proteins which are necessary for the liver? Why is only that part of the genome activated and why does the liver have the form it has? This is not explained by the existing genetic theory. This is where the morphogenetic or form-giving fields come in. It is interesting to note that there seems to exist a blueprint or rather a matrix underlying all of creation. The leaves of the trees look very much like a human hand with its arteries and veins, the birds are the fish of the air and the fish the birds of the sea.

All of this is implied by Rupert Sheldrake's theory of the morphic fields which, however, has still to be proved. We seem to know something about the action of these fields but have up till now no idea what they really are. Here I want to go back to the example of the picture on the television screen. The contents of the picture is dependent on energy but its outline is non-energetic. It is pure information, originating in the human mind.

It is in a certain way ironic that we who live in the "age of information" do not really know the meaning of this term. Neither can we define concepts such as thought or knowledge . We know that we think, we know (or think we know) that we know, we "know" these concepts exist but we can neither define nor measure them by physical means. If we go back to the root of the word information we realise that it means form-giving, that which gives form. Information seems thus to be something non-material or even spiritual.

Allow me here to digress for a moment: Modern physics has come to the conclusion that it has no idea what the world really looks like. To quote the greatest physicist of our time, Stephen Hawking: "We have no idea how the world really is. All we do is building up models which seem to prove our theories." <sup>5</sup>

The psychologist Lawrence LeShan even speaks of alternate realities <sup>6</sup>. The question therefore is: Is the world the way it is or is it the way it is because we create and recreate it constantly? To quote an old cabalistic saying: "Man is obliged to create his world every day anew". The question therefore is: Is the world the way it is or is it the way it is because we create and recreate it constantly?

If we take a book or a tape and try to analyse them by material means we get results like paper, printer's ink etc. which have nothing to do with the real nature of the book or the tape. In these examples, it is clear that the book or the tape are the carriers of information which without them would not be in our reach. To make it simpler: Without a carrier, information does not exist for us. It may exist "somewhere" but for us it is not accessible. A classic example is the burning of the famous library in Alexandria. This library is supposed to have contained manuscripts thousands of years old. These manuscripts were burned and the information lost.

If we now go back to the subject of this paper we come to the conclusion that trying to define the nature of morphic fields by physical means is a contradiction in terms and therefore impossible. Using cabalistic terminology these fields are the blueprints of creation, an intermediate stage between the divine vision and creation - the organising principle. While on the one hand these fields are connected with the Divine, the ineffable, they are on the other hand intimately connected with matter and energy. And this is the only way we can recognise them. Without matter/energy there would be no field for us to grasp and without the existence of a field there would be nothing but chaos: what the Bible calls *tohu vabohu*.

This is where religion and science can meet. According to the Hebrew Bible, God is the conscious end of the organising principle, the originator of the blueprint of creation. The one who calls Himself "I am what I am and shall be what I shall be". Or: "there shall be, that which shall be" - in other words - JHVH" <sup>7</sup>. In the cabalistic literature these fields are expressed as the Tree of Life, the connection with the Divine is called Kether and the one with matter Malkhut. <sup>8</sup>Being a blueprint, these fields are on the one hand nothing but a construct, and therefore not measurable by physical means, but at the same time nothing would exist without them One could also put it in the following way: As God is beyond definition, so are these fields. They don't do anything, but give structure to matter by just being. They don't create anything but allow creation to happen. We may also use here the term "interface". This could be another way of looking at the Tree of Life: A connection between God and man, God and his creation. The Bible says that God made man in his image - his image being the matrix, the mould into which man was poured. The Kabbala

speaks about Dvekut: stickiness or adhesiveness. How did Jesus put it? I and my father are One. God, the spirit is one side, and Jesus, the man, the other one. From this angle the answer to the question why does our universe exist at all, is however, because GOD wanted it to exist. The fields are but HIS tools.

In his paper Jens Jerndal<sup>9</sup> cites Harold Burr as being one of the pioneers in the research of morphogenetic fields.<sup>10</sup> The L. fields described (and measured) by Burr were however of an electrostatic nature, and here I have to bring up the question I once asked Popp when he claimed that light was the organising factor of the cells<sup>11</sup>: whence does the light, or in this case, the field, have the necessary knowledge? If we however accept that the electromagnetic waves are but the carriers of that which we call information, and that this information is of divine origin, the question becomes superfluous.

A wonderful example of the possible influence of these fields has been published recently by "The Sciences", the organ of the renowned New York Academy of Sciences. In their issue of March/April 1999 they describe an experiment by a team of Canadian and Italian investigators<sup>11</sup>. In this experiment, mice were subjected to enough radiation to kill the blood-making cells in their bone marrow. They then injected some of the mice with bone marrow cells and some with genetically tagged neural stem cells. The first group reacted as expected in cases of bone marrow transplantation. To their greatest astonishment, the neural stem cells, however, also started to produce blood cells and kept on making blood as long as the mice were alive. If we remember that blood and brain cells emerge from different germ layers in a developing embryo - brain cells from the ectoderm and blood cells from the mesoderm - this observation goes against everything we have believed up till now and cannot be explained by current genetic theory. It would however fit in very well with the theory of form-giving fields: These cells which were not yet completely differentiated were put in an environment governed by a field which told them to produce blood cells and complied. This experiment suggests therefore very strongly that it is the fields that are responsible for the activation of that segment of the DNA which fits each specific organ.

After this long detour, we can now try to define a causation of cancer that is different from the accepted one. If we take a close look at cancer cells we realise that they are not sick cells but young and primitive ones. The more primitive they are, the more invasive and malignant is the tumour. Primitive cells mean non-differentiated ones similar to the stem cells mentioned previously. They can also be seen as embryonic cells and share many of their characteristics. They lack for example the "stickiness" of adult cells and can therefore migrate to different parts of the body. These cells are not only healthy, they are super-healthy, and seem to be omnipotent and immortal. While in a tissue culture a "normal" cell will reproduce itself only a few times and then die, a culture made out of cancer cells will reproduce itself for ever. There are now tissue cultures in existence which go back to a cancer in the forties of this century. This is also the reason why cancer cells are not recognised by the immune system of the body. The immune body recognises and destroys only "non-self" or sick cells while cancer cells are "self" cells that have escaped the guidelines of the body and "decided" to become immortal.

This is exactly the reason why the prevailing point of view has up till now failed in controlling cancer.

As a spiritual healer, I usually work on the level of the morphic fields. When many years ago, I was confronted for the first time with a case of breast cancer I was astonished to realise

that there exists a defect in the field overlying the tumour - a kind of hole, an interruption of the field. Not only that, but a cool "breeze" seemed to be coming out of that defect. While any other disease and especially pain and inflammation feels "hot", cancer gives a feeling of "cold". This is something which I have found in over ninety percent of cancer cases and which most of my students, as well as some journalists, have felt as well.

This would fit in very well with the observations of the spiritual surgeons of the Philippines.<sup>13</sup> Before they approach a patient they "scan" his body and claim to see the tumour as a black hole. They then try to close this hole by the power which resides in their hands and minds. The interesting part of the story is this: once this defect has been closed, the tumour has disappeared. The question now is, has it been dematerialised or have the cells reverted to normal? I know that after all the negative propaganda which has been circulated in this country about these healers you may have problems accepting this, but I have observed it very critically and so have many objective investigators. It also corresponds well with my own observations.

Let us now try and fit everything together. If, as recent experiments suggest and as Sheldrake claims, the differentiation of the cells is directed by morphic fields<sup>14</sup>, the opposite may well be also true, and the absence of the organising field will cause the cells to revert to their original, primitive, non-differentiated and omnipotent form and become, what we call cancerous cells. When I try to explain this to my patients, I like to give the example of a classroom, and the chaos which will result when the teacher is absent. These cells have nobody (or rather nothing) to direct them and therefore grow wild. They have nothing to limit them, and therefore know no boundaries. They become "uncivilised" and thus cease to be part of the functional community which makes up our bodies.

According to this approach, cancer is not a disease of individual cells but of the organising field. This would also explain the general symptomatology of cancer, the accompanying anorexia and weakness which usually lead to a state of emaciation, the real cause of death. The question is why this is caused only by cancer and not by benign tumours. It cannot be the tumour itself, as it is often not bigger than a benign one, which has no accompanying symptoms of this kind. This could however be explained by the existence of a defect in the organising field. If we consider the field not only as an organising factor, but, as Max Planck puts it, something which "bundles the energy", then a defect in the field will allow the energy to escape - the patient "bleeds" constantly, but energy instead of blood. The more he bleeds, the weaker he becomes until he literally bleeds to death. This, I believe, is the "cool breeze" which I feel.

The aetiology, the question of the why and how such a defect occurs must stay mute. Is it a kind of suicide, the giving away of the reins of the body? Could it be that this field is negatively influenced by the electromagnetic fields which exist all around us? Is it a physical cause, like radiation, or an emotional one? Or maybe, as I believe, multifactorial? But in order to advance, we have first of all to recognise it for what it is and not continue to bark up the wrong tree.

#### *Bibliographical Notes*

1. Scientific American, Vol. 276, 1997
2. David Lorimer (ed), *The Spirit of Science*, Floris Books, Edinburgh, 1998

3. Capra Fritjof, *The Tao of Physics*, Flamingo Edition, London 1983
4. Sheldrake, Rupert, *A New Science of Life*, Blond & Briggs, London, 1981
5. Boslough, John, *Stephen Hawking*, Universe Avon Books, New York 1985
6. LeShan, Lawrence, *Alternate Realities*, Ballantine Books, New York, 1977
7. The Hebrew Bible, Exodus
8. The Zohar
9. Jerndal, J. Proceedings of the 13th Continental Meeting of the S&M Network, Potsdam, 1999
10. Burr, Harold Saxton, *Blueprint for Immortality*, Neville Spearman, London 1972
11. Popp, personal communication
12. The Sciences, vol. 39/2, p. 6, New-York, 1999
13. Personal communication.
14. Sheldrake, Rupert, *The Presence of the Past*, London, 1988
15. Bischof Marco, *Biophotonen*, Zweitausendeins, Frankfurt a. M. 1995

*Prof. Eli Lasch is Director of the Kahuna Healing Centre in Berlin. This paper was presented at the Network Continental Meeting in Potsdam in May this year.*