

#1

Formal talk-30102006 morning day 1

Lila recording day 1, morning

21/10/2006

061021000

2 Hr 3 min

[Recording 1](#)

Y: Notes to bring up subjects in order. It's not finished, by any means. In fact, these discussions are meant to finish it to find out where the mistakes are, have a discussion, ask questions, find out that I don't know all the answers.

[0:30](#)

Bret: When we discussed setting this up a little while ago, you said, for us to sit quite, take notes for questions but not ask them.

Y: That's right. Otherwise, we'll never get through it if all of us ask questions. LG (Biljana).

B: I'll need an adapter Don maybe later on.

Don: I'll take a look. Bret, "Were you going to use your little dictation machine also?"

Bret: Ah, Yes. I am recording.

Y: We are going to record it twice just in case one of them breaks down.

B: OK, great.

Bret: We are recording now.

Y: Are you working?

Don: Yes.

[2:05](#)

Y: Well, OK then we'll go ahead.

My primary purpose here is to share with Biljana the Lila Paradigm for her own understanding. Secondly, to see what she might contribute to that. But nothing is required. You don't have to give anything.

B: Thank you, I'll try to do my best. I'll try to still to contribute something.

[2:54](#)

Y: So my idea is that we will work here for a couple of hours until around 11:00 o'clock. Take a three hour break and then work again from two o'clock to four o'clock in the afternoon. That doesn't mean that when this formal time is not being done that we can't talk. We can talk with anybody about anything. Whatever arrangement we want to have with each other. In fact, very often after formal things is when... the informal part is when things actually get done. Go for a walk, talk things over. Just like in Copenhagen. At the Bohr institute.

[3:51](#)

B: Yes and the *Peripatetics* school in ancient Greece. The Greek philosophers used to walk around and to discuss the essence of the universe.

Y: First I want to give a quick history of the Lila Paradigm.

4:15

When I was twelve years old in 1942 the war was on. My older brothers were all in the military services. My parents and I (I was the only one left) used to go for automobile rides before gasoline rationing started. And one Sunday we were up in the San Bernardino Mountains, beautiful mountains. And after a few hours I got tired of just looking at pine forests. And I said to my mother, would you turn the radio on?

5:06

That was a big new thing for us to have radio in a car. So she did and she tuned it in and it was a science program. And there was a story of bacteria and viruses. They had just understood viruses better. And it was a dramatization as if the bacteria and the viruses were talking and they were planning how they are going to get disease of themselves spread around especially with the humans. And I thought, "Isn't that something! Wouldn't that be something if that were really so."

5:50

But I was just thinking about it and then I thought, "Well, what if the molecules that those one called creatures, what if they could talk to each other or the atoms even. What if they could talk and interrelate."

6:12

And after a while I shared that with my parents who were very interested in everything. And they thought, "Well, no, that couldn't be."

6:24

But to myself I thought, "Well, maybe it might be." This was the beginning of the seed that lead to the Lila Paradigm.

6:36

The next thing that happened was nine years later when I was twenty one. And my university friend and I were talking things over. And we were studying Lao Tsu, the Tao Te Ching. And there was an example that Lao Tsu gave about a door. And he said, "The real uses of a door is the door way, not the door."

7:24

And what is he talking about? And I suddenly (I) understood that it's this potential that a doorway has because then you can put a door on it and close it, open it, but without the doorway, the door is meaningless. Well, understanding the essence of that, I had a realization and put that together with this idea about atoms being able to interrelate. And, of course, by that time I knew that there is the binding forces between the electromagnetic binding forces that attract different atoms with each other.

8:20

But then, years went by and now I am twenty nine years old and I said, "Well, what about... Why can't we figure out how you can line up these atoms so that they would be conscious?"

8:45

And I keep looking into that and found that everybody was trying to do that, but nobody was able to do it. And to this day, they still haven't done it. So I began working on that and began concentrating on... I gave up trying to arrange physical atoms in a pattern to make consciousness and instead started working on that which I already knew was conscious which was myself.

9:28

Well, while giving up on the body and the brain because they are made out of physical things I thought, "What is this subjective consciousness?"

9:45

This led me into the growth idea, of finding out who and what an individual is. I began doing a lot of therapy type work with people both receiving it and getting it. And then, I became professional therapist. But I noticed after many years that the people who knew who they were made rapid progress almost with any therapy. And the people that didn't know who they are, didn't no matter how you tried. It would be very, very slow progress.

10:28

Contemplating that is how I came up with the Enlightenment Intensive. How can we get people to experience who they are. Well, then there was years of developing the Enlightenment Intensive and working with thousands of people and training masters and all that bit and all the de-identification that was discovered. Separating from this, separating from that, and this and that, and this and that as I was talking about yesterday. But that still didn't answer what it is that the individual is, that it can be conscious.

11:13

And for a while I thought, "Well, that's what they are, an individual is consciousness." But that didn't work out in how the consciousness bridges over into dealing with the physical. And the long search through all the literature to see if anybody had any of that. Nobody had anything. David Chalmers wrote a book and some articles on the subject which I have here. And... but he didn't have any answers. In fact, I went to see him, exchanged letters with him. Talk with him several times.

12:15

And kept going back to my own outlook on it until I discovered that an individual is not consciousness. For example, if someone goes to sleep and then has dreams they're conscious in their dreams. But there is another level of sleep which is deeper in which they are not conscious. Do they cease to exist? The consciousness is gone. Do they cease to exist?

12:56

Well most people would say they don't, that they really still exist and they wouldn't think that they... When the consciousness returns that they were recreated although some people think that.

13:10

The people who do research on the brain think that there is a resonate field that the brain connections make and that resonate field is consciousness. And it is the individual. But... And when the individual's brain ceases to function the individual ceases to exist. And that they are the consciousness and that consciousness is that resonate field. Well I didn't find that satisfactory so I had to work out what is consciousness. And how is that different from an individual.

14:03

That took several years. The way I did it was to do self reflection on myself. And in the years of my natural meditation this clarified. Until I got to the point where I could ask myself a question on almost anything and I would suddenly know where did that knowledge come from.

14:38

So I had to work out what was fundamental about this knowledge. There is this example of... That I like to give, is, there is something that you know right now that

you are not conscious of. I am going to say what it is and then you will become conscious of it. But because you already know what it is. The knowledge is not consciousness. It's knowledge. Now I have called that direct knowledge. Now what it is, is your mother's maiden name. Now you're conscious of mother maiden name.

B: Yes, yes.

Y: But you must have already known what it was.

B: Yes.

[15:36](#)

Y: So consciousness and knowledge are not the same as I am using the term direct knowledge. Now there is something else that you don't know and no matter what... When I say what it is you won't know the answer. It's my mother's maiden name. And you're still not conscious of it because you didn't know. So there is a difference between being in a state of knowledge, of direct knowledge, and not being in a state of direct knowledge. With that information, I was able to put together the Lila Paradigm.

[16:32](#)

And that's a brief history. Since that got put together there has been refinements and it is difficult to state it. How do you get across what we were just talking about? I have tried to explain it in writing, to David Chalmers and Henry Stapp and David Finkelstein and on and on; and they didn't know what I was talking about. In writing. So it is a hard job to get the writing right especially since I am not a good writer. That's the history. Any questions?

B: No, I am grateful you shared this with me; it is insightful. Maybe later on I'll.

Y: Ok, now we're going to take up the current unfinished version of the

[17:38](#)

Lila Paradigm of Ultimate Reality

A Fundamental Paradigm Shift

I have used the term fundamental here because it is not just a little paradigm shift. Roger Penrose in a paper he wrote said that we need a radical change in our approach to physical theories. And without that radical change we will not be able to complete our task of understanding the universe and how it operates.

[18:26](#)

So when I read that I quick sent him a version. I never heard a word. I think it was too radical for him. But if it isn't radical enough, it won't work. Because there is something wrong with our assumptions. So we have a fundamental paradigm shift. And now

We call our

'We' meaning us here.

call our description of Ultimate Reality a “Paradigm” because it involves a fundamental shift from the currently accepted physical based paradigm to one that is metaphysically based.

19:14

And when I say, meta-physically I mean that there is no physicality. There is nothing but the non-physical. That is metaphysical beyond the physical. And it is a form of non-materialism. Or you could call it non-physicalism. And that... the trouble with these in the past (I am not the first one to come up with this) Bishop Berkeley, the philosopher, science philosopher came up with this theory that it's God's mind

20:06

is the ultimate reality. That God's mind and God are the same thing. But... that, when one individual experiences some part of God's mind, this is it (pointing to the table and floor in his room). And that this is not actually physicality. It is really God's mind. Now I am taking the same approach. It is called Idealism now days. I am taking the same approach, but not from God's mind which is from the top down. In God's mind, Berkeley had everything; and in my approach it's bottom up. And what actually is, is non-physical individuals, a large finite number of them. And they are all non-physical; and that is all there is, and there is nothing else. What appears to be the physical is just combinations of those relationships... of those nonphysical relationships of those non-physical individuals.

21:34

Instead of assuming that there is an independently existing physical world out of which immerge biological forms, some of which are somehow conscious, we are purposing that a metaphysical reality exist out of which emerges consciousness of what *appears* to be the regularities of our physical universe.

21:58

The trouble with Berkeley's idealism or immaterialism as he called it, is that he could account for all the regularities except to say that, “Well, that's the way God's mind is.”

22:13

The reason this table is the way it is, is because it is that way in God's mind. And that doesn't account for all the regularities. You can explain, you can't make any calculate, you can't make any predictions, you can't establish what the laws are, you can't... All you can say is that God does it by fiat. Well, in a way, that is true. But then the question then is, “What is God?”

22:41

And I am saying that what God is, is the totality of each and every one of these non-physical individuals, the totality of it. With their power of choice, is what God is. And this is so radical that even my students can't accept it until I beat at them over and over again. And then they finally say, “Oh, he really means it.”

23:10

Well, I might be right and I might be wrong. I am not saying what I am saying is right. I have my personal conviction about it, and my personal experience about it. But I am not trying to get you to accept that it is true. I just want you to understand it. But I want you to understand it thoroughly, so that if you see any mistakes or contradictions in the logic, in the consistence of it, you say, “Well, Charles, this is, you've got an oversight here.”

23:52

On the other hand, you might also say, “Ah hah, I see how this could work in a single algorithm.” Ha hah. But it might. Or whatever you come up with, but that doesn't... I

am not asking for belief or conviction what-so-ever. That's a personal matter on your part.

24:18

Next paragraph

In this paradigm, the concept represented by the word 'physical' includes: independently existing matter i.e. that is material substance, located in space and time that could, using any means, in principle, be observed by at least one conscious individual.

24:47

Now that definition of physical is fairly important because later on I use it to differentiate and to clarify that physicality is a result of the act of perception.

25:08

The concept represented by the word 'metaphysical' is: independently existing immaterial individuals that can originate acts, be in conscious states, and make comparisons.

I use that statement throughout the whole rest of the paper to explain how the Lila Paradigm works. Now, before I go on, I'll just briefly state what the word Lila means.

25:43

It's a Sanskrit word and it is usually translated as the word... *As the phrase Play of the Gods*. That not technically as close a translation as it should be. It is made up of two Sanskrit words Li and La. The Li are the one who act and the La are their acts. So Lila is the acts of those who act. Or you could say those that can act. Course, if they act, they can act, so it is better to state it as those who act. Now according to our understanding anything physical can only interact. It cannot originate an act.

26:55

Now, Biljana, do you agree that that is true that something physical according to science can not originate an act? It only reacts and interacts?

27:09

B: Yes, according to science, yes.

Y: But that. Yes.

B: Ah.

Y: Yes, sorry, go on. But what?

27:20

B: In one of my letters I have mentioned to you... I had an opportunity to listen to the lectures by Ravi Gomatam who is a Brahmin who is a priest. Indian... But also a cognitive physicist and he gave a lecture on what is consciousness. And he made comparison then also with the teachings of Henry Stapp, which you...

Y: Teachings of what?

27:54

B: The scientific works of Henry Stapp. The one you were mentioning.

Y: Stapp, Henry, yes.

B: Maybe I am not pronouncing....

Y: He calls it Stapp. (v; stapp the a pronounced like the a in lap)

28:05

B: Ha, ha! Stapp, yes. OK. Henry Stapp. And Stapp... But also Ravi Gomatam they emphasized the different between physical and consciousness... between matter and mind.

28:26

Y: Yes.

B: By mentioning Gaudiya Vaishnava Vedanta which is an ancient Vedanta.

Y: Yes.

B: In which there is a strict definition. What is...

28:43

Y: There is a what?

B: Strict definition what is consciousness and what is matter.

Y: (acknowledge)

28:50

B: And he stressed a special aspect this Gaudiya Vaishnava Vedanta and this is Citta acitta.... Now let me remember. (*Bedha abheha achintya tattva. Bedha abhedha, bedha abhedha*)

(v: *bedha* meaning difference and *abheha* meaning identity or sameness, *achintya* meaning inconceivable)

29:15

Y: I am familiar with it.

B: Yes, yes *bedha. Abedha*, meaning not being able to see the reality and it is interesting that in the Macedonia 'betha' means poor, something poor. This actually originates I believe from Sanskrit. So by not being able to see the reality of things, we are poor. In a way. And what I wanted to say to come back to the subject is... He stressed what are the... actually... What are the attributes of consciousness, which are not attributes of matter. And those are that consciousness is... And it is fully according to... with what you have mentioned. That is that consciousness is... Has three attributes to it.

30:12

Y: Has what?

B: Has three attributes.

Y: Three.

30:16

B: Three attributes and these are *Causality*, unlike matter consciousness has causality as its attribute. Causality and then *Intentionality*. Causality, Intentionality and like... And it was the main point exactly which I could connect to science and to the teachings of Einstein, and of Neil's Bohr. It was, I am trying to remember were the exact word of Ravi Gomatam, Gaudiya Vaishnava Vedanta. It is like self aware some... It is capable of self reference. I'll remember the exact word... So these three

'self awareness', 'intentionality', and 'causality' are the attributes according Gaudiya Vaishnava Vedanta and for that matter at least as Ravi Gomatam mentioned it is according to Stapp's scientific works also. These three attributes are the ones that consciousness has and matter does not have.

31:47

Y: Yes, but that is dualism.

B: Yes, I know. Yes.

Y: And so to the problem.

B: You go deeper and...

31:57

Y: Of bridging the gap between the physical and this causative conscious is not answered; and they can't calculate any magnitudes what-so-ever from that approach. Stapp hasn't gotten one which he admits that he has not succeeded.

32:21

B: Yes, I used to think of matter and consciousness as... and according to the history of science and philosophy, that there are five approaches to consciousness in science, these are materialism which states that material is...

Y: Yes. We have read your paper.

B: OK.

Y: We can save time.

32:48

B: I wanted to stress the fifth one. Materialism, Idealism, Dualism, Wholeism and the fifth one is according to science and this is maybe where you meet science. Is Zero point filled theory in quantum physics.

Y: Yes.

B: Which says, "Yes, matter and consciousness are different. But still their origin is deeper.

33:15

Y: Yes. They are all saying that there is an origin deeper and behind... Behind quantum theory, but they are not bridging it. And that is what the Lila Paradigm claims to do. What I was asking you, is that, is it true that physical things on their own cannot originate acts? Originate causatively. They only react; atoms interact with each other and react.

B: Yes exactly.

Y: OK, then, I just want to finish this page.

34:05

A philosophy in which there only exist physical things is called a physical monism, and philosophy in which there exist only immaterial individuals is called and immaterial monism. In the Lila Paradigm only immaterial individuals exist therefore it is an immaterial monism.

34:34

Now you don't have much room for Idealism in your... You have a chart in your work that you...

B: I have.

Y: You have.

B: May I draw you the chart? And where is the idealism?

34:52

Y: Well, you can but we have all read it. But you want to explain it along with it.

B: It is, maybe... It is very much connected with what you have said regarding Berkeley and so on. Maybe just shortly.

35:13

B: Yes. It is based on Schrodinger's equation which states that for a quantum particle, or whatever, a quantum system, we only know the possibilities and the probability for each possibility to take place. For instance, if it is a particle and we are searching for its energetic state, we might say that it is in energetic state C.

Y: A which state?

B: Some energetic state.

Y: Energetic.

35:52

B: Energetic state. We might say it is energetic state C1 and probability for it to happen is, for instance, A or and this or in science or mathematics is plus. It could be another energetic state C2 and the probability for it is B. Or C3 might happen and probability for it is C and so on and so on. I just want to explain the questions in this chart and to tell you where is the place for idealism there in science also. Into a space time which is spreading out in the form of a probabilistic wave equation. So in the moment, we do the measurement. Then out of all these possibilities, one is realized; one takes place. For instance, this one.

Y: Yes. I understand that.

36:55

B: And I like your explanation. But later on we shall come to this. So there are indications that it might be a problem with the measurement. So our first question asked is, "Is the measurement a problem in science?"

Y: Yes, that's part of your graph, your chart.

37:24

B: I'll do it just quickly. So, two possible answers. Two answers are possible. No, the measurement is not a problem in science. Or, yes. If we agree that the measurement is not a problem, then we agree with classical physics, in which it might be a problem. But this problem is taken into account in a strictly determined way. So it is not a problem actually. Or we might agree with quantum logic where we agree actually with Von Neumann, who was a genius.

Y: In the early thirties.

38:08

B: Yes. What he says basically is, "No, the measurement is not a problem."... Everything is OK with quantum physics, with quantum mechanics. What is not OK is our incapacity to think in quantum logical way.

Y: We can't understand it.

38:34

B: Yes. What we need to do is build a logic... Maybe this is where Lila Paradigm might find place. We should develop a capability to think in quantum logical way. And then all these problem will not be problems any more. But we might agree that, yes, the measurement is a problem in science. If we agree that measurement is a problem, then next question asked is, "What kind of problem it is? Is then the measurement interaction between the observer and the observed?" Is this the problem, the kind of problem the measurement is? Is the measurement special interaction between the observer and the observed? Here again we might say yes or no. Both branches are very interesting because Einstein is here and Bohr is here, and idealism is here. If we say no, the measurement is not a problem. Then there are still chances that quantum physics might be (a) complete science. There are still chances.

Y: It might be what?

40:00

B: That quantum mechanics might be a complete science as Einstein didn't agree, as we discussed yesterday. Einstein never agreed. So the next question is... Here there is still hope it might be complete. So the next question to ask is, "Is quantum mechanics complete? Is it complete description of the reality? Or is it in reality something that does not exist in quantum mechanics." So here once again we have two answers. We might say, "No, it is not complete." Or we might say, "Yes, it is complete." If we say, no, it is not complete, then we have to say what is it that is missing.

40:54

So Einstein is here, Albert Einstein is here. He never agreed to the completeness of quantum mechanics. He never accepted the probabilistic character of quantum mechanics. Actually in 1926 he wrote a letter to Max Bohr in which he stated, "Yes, your quantum physics is amazing; it is impressive! I am really impressed and so on. It is marvelous, but my little finger tells me it is not complete yet. Mainly I am convinced that the old one (meaning God) does not play dice."

Y: Alt.

41:39

B: The old one. In German, the letter was in German. So it became the very famous saying into science. And what Einstein basically said is, "No, your quantum mechanics is not complete. Something is missing." And what is missing are hidden variables. Once you know those hidden variables, once you find those hidden variables, then only these equations of yours, the most famous Schrodinger's equation will not have probabilistic values anymore. It will become deterministic. It is probabilistic only because you don't know everything.

42:24

It is as if I say, "If I have a book written in Chinese and I don't know Chinese, but I see that these paragraphs are separated and I... These resembles... It is like a drama." And I say, "I am seventy percent sure this is a drama. But I don't know for sure because I don't know Chinese."

42:58

Y: The Chinese room puzzle.

B: Yes, I know. You mentioned Searle. And Searle is defining the Chinese room. This is only to illustrate that the results are probabilistic only because we don't know everything. Once we find these hidden variables, and maybe this hidden variable is the discrete mathematics you are mentioning, then we... This won't be a (mystery?) anymore. This values won't be probabilistic anymore.

Y: I understand.

43:33

B: They should be deterministic. So this is Einstein and David Bohm. There is more to say, to say to this, but maybe later on. David Bohm is one of the most famous disciples of Einstein and he wrote several best sellers in science like *Science, Order, and Creativity* is a book written by David Bohm. The another one is *Implicate Order*. Implicate not Implicit which is to be emphasized because the order according to Bohm is implicate. It implicates something; it is not just implicit, something which is opposite to explicit. It is implicate; it is very meaningful. He sees reality as layers and layers and layers of order. So the kind of order...

Y: Yes, I have read Bohm's book.

44:29

B: OK. So this is this hidden variable theory of Einstein's. But we might say, "Yes, the quantum mechanics is complete. Everything is quite OK with quantum physics. What is not OK is our understanding. Namely our understanding should be that all these possibilities exist and they exist in separate realities. There is one reality for all these possibilities. So all of these possibilities create a universe for its own." So this is not science fiction, but this is... This comes from scientist. From Hugh Everett, then Paul Davies, I had an opportunity.

Y: Most scientists are in this box right now. There multi universes.

45:26

B: Many world interpretation. And here idealism. This is what I wanted to say. If we agree first of all... Yes, measurement is a problem, then, yes, of course, measurement is a special interaction between the observer and what he observes. Then the next question asked is, "What kind of special interaction is this? If the observer is involved, is his consciousness involved?" So here is where consciousness takes place now days. So the next question asked is, "Is consciousness involved?"

46:08

Is consciousness involved in physics? Maybe here is the answer of whether the physical objects can act on their own. So next question asked is, "Is consciousness involved?" Here also we also have two answers possible, yes and no. If we say no, we agree with Niels Bohr and Copenhagen interpretation.

46:37

Y: Which interpretation.

B: Copenhagen interpretation because Bohr was from...

Y: Yes.

B: Denmark. And this Copenhagen interpretation was in power in physics for more than fifty years, for more than half a century in science.

Y: Yes.

46:55

B: And what he states basically is no deep reality. Actually Bohr says, "No deep reality." He says, "Does the quantum physics give results? Yes, it is obvious that it gives results."

47:11

The computers, the lasers technology, the processors, everything is based on quantum physics. So these equations are all correct. They have been checked thousands and thousands of times. And they give results.

47:25

"And what happens down there is not of my interest. It doesn't have to interest me." He says, "What is not in quantum mechanics is not in reality. The quantum mechanics is the complete description of reality."

47:43

But actually, no. Deep reality is not that superficial as if it might sound because it is not that he is not interested in what happens down there; but what he states by his remark "no deep reality" is there is no reality outside the observer. The quantum particle by itself has no position, nor velocity, if there is not an observer to put the frame of reference.

48:16

Once I put the frame of reference, I give attributes to these physical particle. So this is what actually "no deep reality" means. And this is... There is another description. Maybe later on I'll describe this. It requires definition of what is... what are objective properties, subjective properties, contextual properties, and informational properties of material objects. We have...

48:52

Always when we mention some of these physical objects, we should be aware of whether we are dealing with contextual properties of these material objects or with their informational properties. What we should do is be sure that we are dealing with their informational properties. An informational property is why something is here for. And this is very much in favor with your work.

Y: It's close. It's close.

49:27

B: We must know how. Yes. We must know why something is there for. We must know what is its informational property. And its informational property is why it is here for. Otherwise, we are dealing with only contextual properties. And when we are dealing with contextual properties, then we have no real idea... We have no the proper idea.

50:05

This reminds me of your remark yesterday at the lecture when you said, "Sound, we perceive sound only because we don't... We are not able to see the whole

arrangement. This is why the things appear physical to us because we are not able to see the whole picture.”

Y: (acknowledges)

50:26

B: The whole picture... Our incapability to see the whole picture makes them physical. And makes them... This is dealing actually according to Ravi Gomatam at least. This is dealing with subjective and contextual properties. And because we are dealing with contextual properties of the physical objects, we have probabilities,

51:04

And we have the dualistic nature of light because the light appears as multiple of particles once we have big hole through which we bomb these particles. When we make this hole very tight, then we have interference and waves. So the context in which we put light, gives them (self?). So we are obviously dealing with contextual properties of the material properties and not with their informational properties.

51:51

We don't know why light is here for. We don't know the purpose of light. We don't know its informational property, its purpose. And because we don't see the whole picture and because we don't see the whole picture, we don't have the clear idea. We say, "It might be a set of particles or it might be a wave." Its nature is dualistic; but Einstein never agreed. And David Bohm never agreed. He said, "How could it be? It is either a particle or it is either a wave."

52:30

We don't know because we are putting it in context which by themselves give the results. The context in which we put the material objects give the result. So we are dealing with ourselves, not with the things we are observing.

Y: Yes.

52:52

B: And the final rectangle, the final theory is Neo-idealism. And this is where Berkeley comes. They say, "Yes, measurement is a problem, of course. Yes, measurement is a special interaction between the observer and what is observed. And yes, the consciousness is involved because the observer is conscious. When I take a stone and throw it away and break the window, then I won't say the stone breaks the window. I'll say me, the conscious observer; I broke the window. The consciousness behind the material object broke the window."

53:44

As you said, the material objects by themselves, they could not create acts. The consciousness behind the material object create the acts. But this is... We could not say, "It is not know in science." It is know in science in a way. And finally this is Neo-idealism. And Neo-idealist actually say not that consciousness is involved, but everything that exists is consciousness. There is nothing else but consciousness. Berkeley says, "This room exist only when I enter into it. When I go out from the room, it ceases to exist. It exists only when I am in the room."

54:34

Goswami Goswami (Amit Goswami) is here. And you mentioned him yesterday and his book *Self Aware Universe*. He says, "The whole evolution goes through the absolute; and the whole evolution is going to total consciousness. Everything is conscious, everything is God."

54:59

The matter in this table, as you mentioned, this is just particular manifestation of my consciousness. The consciousness comes first and the matter is second. It is only responding to it. This is just a particular manifestation. This is very close to the Buddhist view when they say, "Form is emptiness; emptiness is form. All which is form is emptiness, and all which is emptiness is form. Form does not exist without emptiness and vice versa."

55:42

The main quality of form is that it... at particular point in time, it ceases to exist. It is impermanent. The form is impermanent; and the emptiness is eternal. But if the form... The form has to be empty in order to change. Otherwise, it will be stiff. It will never change. And to change is the informational property of the form. So the form has to be emptiness; and the emptiness has to be form. If the form is not emptiness, it will exist forever. And what exist forever you just emptiness. So form is emptiness. The form has to be emptiness. So even intellectually, we might explain this saying form is emptiness, emptiness is form. And this is Neo-idealism.

57:01

Y: Alright, you have shown us where the Lila Paradigm might be fit in. But the Lila Paradigm goes beyond that. For example, in this case, you have a space and a time background that is automatically implied. But they don't deal with it. They don't show how the selection process of which possibility is manifest in the Schrodinger's equation. What does the selecting? Or you could put it another way. What collapses the wave function? Also, in the Lila Paradigm, we have explanation of what space and time are so that this doesn't become just a general idea, but a specific calculable result. The... I think the few... we work through enough examples, you will see that the Lila Paradigm undercuts all of it. It even undercuts all the religions in that it goes to what's beyond it, what's behind it. And this... your summary here, has shown me where your thinking has progressed. And it's beautifully done. But I want to take you that next one.

Now let's try to finish this page.

59:04

Though all idealism up to now, including immaterial monism of Bishop Berkeley in the 1700's, have not been able to account for the regularities we perceive in the world: the Lila Paradigm does explain what matter, time, space, energy and mass are. What their underlying magnitudes or constants are, what comparison, consciousness are, and what non-physical individuals that can be conscious are.

The paradigm shift, therefore, is fundamental and goes from the physical to the non-physical.

59:55

Now that's my introduction. And I am saying there is a fundamental, big paradigm shift. And I am not trying to fit into science, philosophy, or religion. It's radical; it's dangerous because it threatens each and every person's position that is otherwise if they take it seriously. So who was it that says, "When you first present a new paradigm that they... at first they ignore you; and then they laugh; and then they accept it." But this helps me to see where your thinking is. I suggest what we do is take these up one by one; and then you ask questions about anything that is not clear.

1:01:18

According to the Lila Paradigm what is the Ultimate Reality?

Bishop Berkeley's idealism defines ultimate reality as God's mind (the immaterial); whereas, we define Ultimate Reality more precisely.

In the Lila Paradigm Ultimate Reality is assumed to be the following:

This is a rewording (by the way) that I just recently did.

All that exists is a large, specific, finite number of non-physical individuals, each of whom originates itself into a number of separate non-physical states. In regard to each different non-physical individual, an individual originates itself into a state of either direct knowledge or a state of *no* direct knowledge of that non-physical individual.

1:02:17

And I say, "That's all there is; and that's all that is necessary to understand everything. Now, it is either right; or it's wrong. But I want you to understand it, so that you can make an understanding judgment about it."

1: 02:40

In order to understand this description of Ultimate Reality and how it results in patterns of relations of the non-physical individuals that appear in the consciousness of each non-physical individual in those patterns as our common physical universe, it may be useful that I first expand on each phrase of that description of Ultimate Reality.

The first phrase is.

All that exists..." This means that nothing else exists except non-physical individuals and their states of direct knowledge (and states of no direct knowledge).

1:03:27

Like the no direct knowledge was when we were working on my mother's maiden name. I am going to tell you what it is so you won't be any longer lacking the knowledge. Hawkens.

(Top of page 2)

The conscious states that we are in are really only patterns of relations of us non-physical individuals which are just states of direct knowledge based on each other. As a rope lying on the road at twilight may be seen as a snake, so are the non-physical individuals in their patterns of relations with each other are seen as physical objects (both as fundamental particles and as macro objects) in relationships with each other of time, space and energy.

Well, that says... I am saying that we get time, space and energy from the relationships or as you were calling it, the context, the relationships between us.

1:04:44

The description that we are making of Ultimate Reality is not only an Ultimate Reality; it is the only reality. This is not suggesting a solipsism in as much as that which is behind the illusionary appearance of the physical objects are real, independently existing non-physical individuals.

1:05:15

So there is no physical world. But it's not a solipsism because there really is something that does exist. And somehow (not yet explained), we perceive others partially to such a degree that we... it appears to be a physical world, when what it really is, is us.

Now, the next phrase.

“... a large specific finite number...”

1:06:02

That's right out of the... what I said, Ultimate Reality is. This is the next phrase.

By fixing the number of non-physical individuals (N), we fix the number of possible states of direct knowledge and of no direct knowledge that can exist (N^2),

Which is (N) squared.

In addition to this, we can, by measurement, determine the average number of actual states of direct knowledge for non-physical individuals (K),

Which in graph theory is called (K). In directed graph theory it is called (K).

1:06:45

and, thereby, we fix the value of most of the universal constants.

Just from knowing (N) and knowing (K) we can fix and calculate directly from those two values the universal constants. Not all the constants, but all the universal constants because (N) and K are universal.

1:07:11

In order for the equations for the magnitudes of the universal constants to match their observed values (measurements), the number of non-physical individuals (N) needs to be quite large, of the order of 10 to the 23rd (10^{23}) and needs to be an exact number, and the average number of states of direct knowledge per non-physical individual (K) needs to be near 13.

Later on I'll show how those numbers were arrived at.

I recognize those. (Talking to Biljana about her mathematical shorthand.)

B: This is how I explain to myself the formula later on.

Y: Yes.

B: Because there are (N) non-physical individuals and (K) are the numbers of relations.

Y: The average number.

1:08:12

B: The average, OK. The formula is dealing with the average if it is here. And then as I remember, we have (N) because every individual might be connected with (K) minus one (K-1) although maybe (K) if it is aware of itself.

Y: If you include yourself which you should do as I wrote you.

1:08:42

B: But in the formula it is $(N)(K)$ minus one. Then this is spread out. May I show you here? I have it here. This is how I came to P squared over six. If we have one individual in relation to another... this is one. If we have one individual in relation to two other individuals, then the possible connections between is, this to this, this to this, this, this, and this. This is four, and this is two squared. If we have one individual connected to three others, then this... the relations could be A is in direct knowledge of B, B in direct knowledge of A, B C, C B, so these are ...

Y: It is a lesson in combinatorics.

1:09:50

B: Yes. So these are two, four, six, and this three, nine. So this is three squared. If they are four, then this to this, this to this, this to this, this to this. We have one by one, then two, then three combined, this and this, this and this, this and this, and this four, this makes one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve plus four is sixteen. And this is four squared. So because we have dealing with one individual spreading his relations over the others, then we have one over one squared. Or we might have this one: one over two squared. Or we might have this one: one over three squared. Or we might have this one: one over four squared and so on. And this leads to P squared over 6.

1:10:51

But as Baker takes, he takes this for P half which is approximately the same. Maybe there is another sequence leading to this. I have to find out. And so if we apply this to this one, then this is actually... If we take the average spreading out of the relations, it is over three squared. And so the formula goes to $(N)(K)$ minus (N) over P . And this is two. This two goes there. This is how I explained this formula you have here.

Y: (acknowledge)

1:11:53

B: This is the one here. Ah ha! Yes, this is the one. And we have (N) here then we have $(N)(K)$. This is $(K)(N)$ minus (N) . This is over P ; and now we have these because when we have this spreading of the relations of the individuals to other individuals, then all of these could also be or not... could also be spread out. And this gives us the dimension, the depth to which we go. And this is where from comes this dimension.

Y: Where what?

B: Where from whence comes this...

1:12:51

Y: Comes this...

B: Where from comes the... this is the depth to which we are going.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: So this is how the formula is derived.

Y: That's how Michael did it. Ah! Baker.

1:13:09

B: Yes. I have derived the other formulas here. I mean they are derived by him. I have just explained to myself how it is done. And there are some minor mistakes done by... For instance, here should be G not Q. But we should go through the whole material. It is obviously G because here is G. We have this and this and this and G, this and this and this and G and so on.

Y: That is a coping error that got... difficult to... the originals were difficult to read.

1:14:00

B: To read. Also here, there is a mistake, when he goes... Now I have to read the whole thing. These are the directed edges. He goes from I to J and then this, because this is undirected connection. There are in between many other individuals, many other nodes. And these other nodes are [I] one [I] two [I] three. So we should begin from [I]. [I] is [I] one to [I] two, then [I] two to [I] three, then [I] P minus one. So here should be [I] and here [I] one. This should be corrected. This should be [I] is [I] one to [I] two, then [I] two to [I] three. Do you see the final one? The final one might be J.

Bret: Yep.

B: And then should be [I] is [I] one.

Bret: Context.

1:15:20

B: The first, but the first is [I] one which goes to [I] two, then [I] two to [I] three, then [I] three to [I] four and so on. And it finishes with [I] P minus one to [I] P and [I] P is J.

Bret: (acknowledges)

B: [I] is [I] one and [I] P is J.

Bret: Just context, he saying [I] and he is saying [I]. He could say [I] one and then he would say [I] one. But he is just... His choice of labels.

B: OK, maybe. But it is not symmetrical. But OK.

Bret: Not symmetrical. I may be wrong. It's the first that I've seen it.

1:16:03

Y: This was written in 1991 by Dr. Michael Baker who is a student of mine, who was at the time. Also who worked on the Lila Paradigm was Dr. Douglas Seeley who got his doctorate on complexity theory and network theory. He was part of this although it is not mentioned in this. Dr. Seeley and as Michael mentioned Dr. Zekeres did the original paper on connectivity in a directed graph which is... He is with the University of Adelaide. Adelaide is a city in the middle of Australia.

1:17:00

I would like to carry on here. And you can unload this stuff on us as we go along. We were just... I'll just mention how I got the value for (K) of near 13. It's based on the electromagnetic coupling constant, *alpha*, the thing that determines the magnitude of the force of attraction between one unit of electric charge and another. The coupling constant is *alpha*. And by understanding the Lila Paradigm, it immediately becomes

apparent why that is true. But if I don't give you the background, it won't become apparent. It took me seven years to figure it out about what is the value for (K), the average value to make the whole universe have a coupling constant of the same value. And it also says how the value of *alpha* has increased gradually as time has progressed which is... They recently have found to be the case after I had predicted it. The next phrase of...

1:18:38

“...of non-physical individuals...” Since we are assuming an ultimate reality that underlies the appearance of a physical universe and the process of us observing it, that of which that ultimate reality is composed, (the individuals) must be non-physical. By ‘non-physical’ is meant ‘that which exists but cannot be observed;’ however, it is only the non-physical which can be conscious.

David Chalmers agrees with that statement. If it's physical, they can't find any way in which the physical can be conscious.

1:19:21

The term individual is used because the non-physical individuals cannot be divided.

I have tried various words, agents and entities and all kinds of things, nodes. And I have settled on individual because it doesn't beg the question; and it says that they are undividable. That is...

i.e., each is not composed of parts. A non-physical individual is a unitary whole.

1:19:55

This turns out to be very important. The unitaryness of an individual. It explains reduction in quantum theory. It accounts for how we experience the universe the way we experience it through our perceptions. And it accounts for the creation or the apparent creation of consciousness out of knowledge. And that's the one I want to get to you on it. I think you have yet to get the depth of.

A non-physical individual is a unitary whole.

Even so, the non-physical individual has various attributes but these attributes cannot be divided from the individual, they make up what and who a non-physical individual is.

1:20:54

For example, true attributes, he has the attribute of who they are and what. And yet you can't pull the 'who' and the 'what' apart. It's like a quark. You can't pull a quark apart from another quark, pull far enough and you get more quarks.

One might ask, “Where did the non-physical individuals come from?” They were not created; therefore, they have not come from anywhere or anything. They just exist as God is thought of as just existing.

1:21:35

Now, both Berkeley and Leibniz in his *Monadology* said that they are created by God. But I say, “This is not so. That you are not created, you are not in time. You are the basis of everything. Time and creation come from you.”

There was not a prior nothing into which non-physical individuals were created.

The concept of nothing is something that is held by us.

1:22:10

Unlike the ‘monads’ of Leibniz and ‘spirits’ of Bishop Berkeley, which were to have been created by God, these non-physical individuals in our paradigm are not created. If some existence is created, it must be in time and thus physical because there must have been a time before it was created. If some existence is created by God or by anything, it cannot be an ultimate reality.

So anything that we create by our choices of how we interrelate with each other by knowledge that can be put there or removed so it can't be (non) physical.

1:23:09

If some existence is created by God or by anything, it cannot be an ultimate reality.

And so anything we make is not ultimate. We are uncreated and we are the ultimate.

1:23:22

Physical things only react, the individuals in our paradigm can originate states to be in, therefore those individuals cannot be physical.

How do you like my logic there?

B: Excellent.

Y: I'll leave it there.

1:23:48

They are not particles or relationships...

They these non-physical individuals are not particles or relationships

or combinations of anything, nor are they ever lasting – they, being non-physical, are not in or of time and thus do not durate through time.

I made up the word durate.

1:24:17

They are as God, they are Ultimate Reality. Each non-physical individual is equivalent to every other non-physical individual in ‘what’ it is; however, they are different in ‘who’ it is that each is.

1:24:36

Now we are spelling out some of the attributes of individuals. The way I have done this is by my own self-inspection, working with others as I covered before and finding out what they discover about themselves. Then all that, then I figured out what is it that science is missing and philosophy is missing and religion is missing and then purposefully constructed individuals with certain attitudes (attributes) to see how it would work. And I... Not attitudes, attributes.

1:25:17

They have certain attributes. And then it didn't work out, so I kept changing the attributes until it would work out. I just went through that cycle over and over and over and over, year after year. I spent a whole life time on this process. And that's how I found out which one would work. It wasn't just self inspection. For it to work and to match the measurements that we make in the world, took doing that. So I am

honestly saying that, "I cheated." I just tried this one, tried that one, tried this one. I tried consciousness,

1:26:08

for example. An individual has (is) an attribute of his consciousness. It's not true. Therefore, I had to work out something that would be attributes of and individual from which consciousness could be derived.

1:26:28

Alright, next one, next phrase of the ultimate reality description...

"...each of whom..." That which differentiates one non-physical individual from another is 'who' each individual is. The one that is in states of direct knowledge

(the one that *is* in states of direct knowledge)

and no direct knowledge and the one that originates itself in those states is who that non-physical individual is. According to our paradigm, who each of us is, is one of these non-physical individuals, thus each of us is not a human body, a brain, a part of a brain, a resonant oscillation of a brain neuron circuit, a mind, a part of a mind, a personality, an ego, a psyche, subtle soul, or spirit located in space or time, or any physical thing.

1:27:31

I have got a whole folder here of things labeled 'Biljana might be interested in these.' This, the list, starting here, that we just went over, an illustrated list. We are not a body, not a head, a brain; and we are not these. These are the ones you should look at.

B: These I also agree with.

Y: We are not a space. What?

1:28:05

B: I mean, ah, I also agree with you, of course. This is... when I wrote this *Space/Time*, I didn't say I agree to it. I agree with you, actually, that it is something most essential.

Y: But most people like you would think that you are a spirit.

B: No, this is...

1:28:28

Y: A spirit is located in...

B: In space and in time.

Y: Space and time. But you are not most people. So, this one says not in a space. A lot of Buddhist think there is a clear space or a clear light. Well, that's the stage that they have gotten to. All the followers of Buddha have been gradually going downhill since the day of Buddha. He got it all. But a lot of the Buddhist think that they are space. And the ones that get over that think that they are at 'now.' And this is not consciousness. You get over being consciousness Gotama.

1:29:22

And a lot of the people who translate from Sanskrit think that they're consciousness. But they are not consciousness. And the Vedanta has got it right; but they are mistranslating it because they have misunderstood the Sanskrit.

1:29:43

And then there are these two. You are not a comparer which is consciousness one in a relationship to consciousness two. We'll get into this later. And this is you are not knowledge. You can be in a state of knowledge or a state of not knowledge; and you have a choice about it. But you are not knowledge itself. Anyway, I thought you guys might be interested in this.

1:30:19

B: Yes. Yes. It reminds me of Shri Ramana Maharishi who said, for the words, for the speaking he says, the word is the forth... polluting... What is the word? Fourth...

Don: Distortion.

B: Yes, distortion of the truth, of the ultimate reality.

Y: Yes.

1:30:45

B: And he says, something like this, he says, first is, I don't remember,,, the mind or ego then brain, then mouth, something like this now, I'll remember later.

Y: He is one of my hero's, Ramana Maharishi. He is a wonderful meditator... inspiration to me. And still is.

B: He is great.

1:31:13

Y: He had this complete. He is totally differentiated from any identity. But what he didn't have is what I was talking about yesterday. The power, the shakti, to go with that de-identified state. Remember yesterday in our satsang? And that's what he didn't have. And that's what I am still working on myself... is that process uniting with everyone, is what it comes down to.

So, I just thought that we could do a little more.

1:32:13

The next phrase,
(top of page 3)

"...originates itself into a number of separate non-physical states..."

Now we get into the meat of things here.

Each of us is (or 'has')

In quotes" because it can be said either way.

the ability to act to originate oneself in a state (it should say *into* a state). These are the only kind of act one can make.

1:32:53

We have free will. And this is the basis of that free will although it takes many forms of acts. It comes down to originates oneself into a state. And I specify a little bit later which one. But the point is that one has free will.

1:33:15

You received from us, Biljana, you received those papers from us about free will. There's an article from the *New Scientist* about a debate between the two mathematicians and the physicist. The physicist is worked out that there is something behind quantum theory; but it is totally determined. So, therefore, there is no free will. And then these mathematicians just two weeks later prove that there is free will behind it.

1:34:07

And the Lila Paradigm says, "Yes, it is fully... what is behind it is fully determined, but it is determined by... the power of choice of the non-physical individuals determines it.

1:34:20

B: I don't have these.

Y: You didn't get those papers to her?

Don: Yes, I did.

B: No.

1:34:24

Don: You didn't receive them?

B: No.

Don: No, they were definitely from me.

B: Yah, I will take it on fresh.

Y: Alright.

Don: I'll bring them to you.

Y: We'll have them this afternoon.

B: Huh, huh, OK.

1:34:36

Y: But, I think this is highly significant, that they have the mathematics that goes with it to prove free will if you make an assumption that there is uncertainty. If there is free will, there is uncertainty. And If there is uncertainty, there must be free will.

1:34:53

But 't Hooft, the physicist, says, "No, it's all predetermined how everything is going to come out." And this doesn't prove that he is wrong. It just proves that if you accept uncertainty, then you have to accept free will. And obviously, if you have free will someone is liable to choose anything. They'll choose to be in a state of knowledge or they will choose to be in a state of no knowledge. They can do either one. And so it is uncertain. That's the meaning of free will... is that you have a choice. And I think most people don't argue with that. They all want to have a choice. The physicist

when they come up against it, if you push them on this question, they will say, “Oh, I don’t deal with that, I deal with numbers.” But some of them are sincere seekers; And I would like to talk to them someday.

1:35:58

The next sentence says.

The non-physical individual originates the act of being in a state, nothing or no one causes oneself to act, oneself is a sole cause. Thus oneself has free will to act in regard to putting oneself in a state. This act is a non-physical act made by a non-physical individual, and there is not any other source of action.

1:36:37

So I am saying that all action in the universe, every interaction that takes place between any quark or lepton everywhere always is only those acts.

These acts a non-physical

Are it should say are

are non-physical acts and thus are not in time.

Too bad spell checks doesn’t catch ‘there’s’ like that.

They are not even instantaneous,

Ah ha. The acts are not instantaneous cause they are not at a time.

nor do they follow one another, time being an illusion of sequence.

“In regard to each different non-physical individual,

The next phrase says...

1:37:33

an individual originates itself into a state of either direct knowledge or a state of no direct knowledge of that non-physical individual.

Now in the rest of what I have written so far, very little has been made of this second state, the state of no direct knowledge. But it has a big effect on what you are conscious of. For example, A is in a state of direct knowledge of B and B is in a state of direct knowledge of C. But A is in a state of no direct knowledge of C. Rather than putting an arrow there and crossing it out to show, just leave it off. So through B it turns out A is conscious of C as a physical thing which I have called C ●, a physical thing.

1:38:56

But in that consciousness is not only his consciousness of a physical thing as based on C, but it also it is affected by the state of no knowledge of C that’s in C ●. In C ●. So not only is the ‘who’ left out, but instead of seeing or being conscious of C ● (that is an individual piece of matter) just as being absent a ‘who’ in its consciousness, A has no consciousness of who this is.

1:59:54

It also, so to speak, the brightness of it is cut down by being in a state of knowledge through B. And that state of knowledge is counteracted to some degree by the state of no knowledge that A is in of C. So that it dims it down. Instead of everything looking like bright glorious celestial heaven, it looks like this world. And that turns out to be very important especially with regards to yourself.

1:40:41

A is in a state of no knowledge of itself here. So one's consciousness of oneself is nonexistent in this example. If there is a whole circuit of connections, then one is conscious of oneself alright; but one is also in a state of no knowledge of oneself. And that affects the consciousness of it so that you even... You say, "Well, yes, I am here and I am some place. And I do exist; but what am I?" The state of no knowledge is affected you. Conscious of yourself until you accept yourself like... as you are and you are in a state of knowledge... direct knowledge of yourself. Then you're this wonderful complete Divine individual.

1:41:41

I just thought I'd throw that in because I don't deal with it in anything that I have written so far.

OK. We have a few minutes left. We'll go a little further. I am lost. Where were we?

B: In regard.

Y: In regard? Yes.

Bret: No, I think the last sentence...

Don: They are not even instantaneous.

Bret: The last sentence of number four.

B: Ah, yes.

1:42:18

Y: [reread from earlier.

They are not even instantaneous nor do they follow one another. Time is an illusion of sequence.

“In regard to each different non-physical and individual originates itself into either a state of direct knowledge or a state of *no* direct knowledge of that non-physical individual.

One of the attributes of a non-physical individual is that it is able to originate itself into states of direct knowledge or of no direct knowledge of any non-physical individual. Strictly speaking, one does not *have* the ability, what one is, is the ability to originate oneself into such states.

1:43:06

The concept of 'has' means that there is you over here and you have it. You have... like I have this marking device. It's pickiness about language. But the concept is important. As long as it's had (has), then it's separated from you a little bit. Whereas, if you think of it as I am that ability, now you are getting closer to your own truth because you are still thinking a thought 'I am that.' Well that got to be gone beyond too. But at least it is in the right direction. So, I use *is* instead of *has* usually.

B: May I ask something?

Y: Yeah.

B: This is wonderful and very beautiful; and really it is... it sheds a great light and so on. But you have mentioned that not to be conscious is the same ability actually.

[1:44:20](#)

Y: Yes.

B: It is the same ability. But then, if I choose not to be conscious, this choice of mine shouldn't be inferior in any sense. It shouldn't be inferior when I choose to be conscious or to be in direct knowledge.,,

Y: Yes.

[1:44:45](#)

B: of somebody else, of some other non-physical individual. And then, I am in the state of direct knowledge of all its choices and all its abilities to act.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: Then, isn't it just the same if I choose not to be conscious of that other non-physical individual and all its choices?

Y: Say you're not.

B: Is it not the same information? If I choose to be in direct knowledge, I'm at the same time in direct knowledge of all its abilities to act, of all its choices. But is it not the same with the case when I chose not to be conscious, not to be in direct knowledge of this same individual with all its (cases)?

[1:45:38](#)

Y: If I am understanding your question.

B: Is it all the same information? Why this is superior to this? Why?

Y: I am not saying it's superior. I am just saying it's different.

[1:45:48](#)

B: But in a way, it is superior. It is superior when I am conscious, when I am in direct knowledge of myself; it is superior.

Y: I am just saying that it is like.

[1:46:02](#)

B: Or if I am in direct knowledge... if in indirect knowledge, knowing this circle (circuit) creates the feeling of space and the feeling of time. I mean when the circle (circuit) is closed, this is present time. Or if there is bifurcation, this is space.

Y: That's right.

B: And this circle (circuit) creates the common sense of now and a common sense of space.

Y: Yes, that's correct.

1:46:28

B: Yes. But why this is inferior in a way.

Y: I am not saying anything is inferior or superior.

B: Yes. But this state of arrows when I am in indirect knowledge doesn't make me enlightened.

Y: If you wanted... Well, yes, but you're assuming that enlightenment is superior. It's different. You are asking the ultimate question. Is what is this all about?

1:47:00

B: Yes. It is strictly mathematically, you know, when I have a certain arrangement which the present state of the universe is, a certain arrangement of non-physical individuals...

Y: Yes.

B: and their choices. What is left, and this is the state of not being in direct knowledge of the other individuals for which I have chosen not to be in direct knowledge, this is the same information. Now I speak mathematically.

1:47:38

Y: No, it's the same for whom? For God's eye view or for A?

B: Yes, I know same for 'who.' This is the question. But...

Y: If you take God's eye view.

B: Then what is evolution? Then evolution is already... then absolute is already here. Then...

Y: In one respect, that is true.

B: Yes.

Y: And as a position of someone who is completely liberated, that's how they live. A completed Siddha is completely liberated. They are in that state.

B: Yes.

Y: And that state is *Samadhi* where it doesn't matter.

1:48:19

B: But, I, who have not chosen to be in state of direct knowledge of many non-physical individuals, I am also in the same state because this is my conscious choice, because I have chosen not to be conscious of all those non-physical individuals of which I am not conscious.

Y: OK.

B: I am in the same position as the fully enlightened.

Y: I'll give you another answer. That one didn't work. The answer is... is that in the Lila Paradigm I say that the ability that A has is the ability to also be in a state of no knowledge. And it is true no knowledge.

B: Yes.

Y: It's not the same information; it is nonexistent. So far as A is concerned, there is no God's eye view. There is not Archimedes point.

[1:49:16](#)

B: Yes. This I know.

Y: I might be right or I might be wrong. I just... ? I want you to understand what I am saying is that I have given A that ability to cut off. Otherwise, if he can't cut off, he doesn't have any ability.

B: But, yes, I understand.

Y: I can understand you not liking it.

B: No, No.

Y: I just want you to understand it.

[1:49:51](#)

B: I am here because I like it very much. This is why I am here. I am trying to do my best. I am trying to be able to understand what is coming next. This is why I am asking you.

Y: You're right to. And my answer is...is that A has, is given that ability; and I don't... In the theory, it does. But I believe one actually does have the ability to be in a state of no knowledge by choice.

[1:50:21](#)

B: Yes.

Y: With no... that the information is gone. Information is next to God; it isn't God.

B: So, I have the ability to choose. But if I choose to be in state of direct knowledge, I choose to accept existence of the other.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: The other attribute of this.

[1:50:51](#)

Y: That the other has that ability. Or you can...

B: But if I choose not to be in state of direct knowledge of its existence. The existence is not negated by this.

Y: No it is not changes what-so-ever. But for you, you have no knowledge of it.

B: But this is my conscious.

Y: This is what?

B: To be in state of no knowledge is my conscious choice.

1:51:20

Y: Yes... No, it's not.

B: It's due to my ability to choose.

Y: It's a choice. I don't know about a conscious choice.

1:51:25

B: OK. Because consciousness doesn't exist out of the choices. I was aware while I mentioned it. I was aware of it. But if I choose not to be in state of direct knowledge, I choose... I do not negate the existence. I just choose not be in state of direct knowledge. But this doesn't diminish me in anyway. I know it is according to your...

Y: No, you're not diminished.

B: I know I am non-physical.

Y: Because you're not knowledge.

B: I am not touched in anyway.

Y: Yes, because you are not knowledge. Your ultimate reality isn't knowledge. That's the last one here. So if you are unchanged.

B: I understand, yes.

1:52:25

Y: You still have the ability.

B: I do recognize this questions of mine are just rewording of the other questions asked in the history of...

Y: Yes, it's a valid question. It's a good question. You are the first question who has ever ask me. These guys are terrified to ask me questions like that. But my answer may be right; or it may be wrong. But do you understand what I am saying?

B: Yes, yes.

1:52:55

Y: OK, have another one?

B: No.

Y: OK. We'll go on then. I am lost again.

Bret: The idea of direct knowledge is new.

Y:

The idea of direct knowledge is new. This is why it is called 'direct' knowledge, to differentiate it from either ordinary knowledge (data) or indirect knowledge.

1:53:25

It is interesting; in Sanskrit, they have separate words for it. *Vidya* is gathered information, or gathered knowledge. But *jnana* is the state of direct knowledge, *vidya* and *jnana*.

B: *Vidya* is what in comparison to *jnana*? What did you say, *vidya* is?

Y: *Vidya* is perceptual knowledge, gained. It is information you learn.

B: Ha, direct, you said direct. *Jnana* is direct knowledge. Because in Macedonian... in Slavic language, *vida* is to see, is to see *vida*, the word in Russian.

Y:

1:54:20

Direct knowledge, as its name implies, is not arrived at through a process of perception, but by fiat, by originating oneself into a state of direct knowledge of a non-physical individual. The direct concept includes that nothing nor anyone can intervene in one being in that state of *direct* knowledge.

1:54:47

Now here A is in a state of direct knowledge of B; but it has indirect knowledge of C. But at any moment, so to speak, B could choose not to be in a state of knowledge of C; and A is affected. A's knowledge state is affected; it loses knowledge, indirect knowledge of C.

1:55:14

So when somebody puts up something like that, that's what they are doing. I am stopping. But if you have direct knowledge, nothing can stop you. Accept yourself, but that's your choice. So that's what I am saying they're about. This goes through a network of trillions... 138 billion trillion others. And they can all do it. And that happens all the time when I move my hand like this. It's changing for you what you see. I am lost again.

1:56:00

B: The word 'direct knowledge'.

Bret: The word 'direct knowledge', as it

Y: The direct concept?

B: The word 'direct knowledge'.

1:56:16

Y:

The word 'direct knowledge', as used in this paradigm, does not mean 'consciousness.' One can 'directly know' something and at the moment not be conscious of it; but one could bring it to one's consciousness a moment later; whereas, if one were not in a particular state of direct knowledge, one could not bring it into one's consciousness no matter how hard one tried.

1:56:45

One is in a state of direct knowledge only by fiat (by one's own origination) and not by a perceptual process. By indirect knowledge is meant, as the phrase indicates, knowledge obtained by or through a means. As used here, indirect knowledge means it was obtained through (or by way of) another non-physical individual. That is, if non-physical individual B is originating itself into a state of direct knowledge by its own fiat of non-physical individual C and, nonphysical individual A, by fiat, is in a state direct knowledge of B, and if B's state of direct knowledge of C is included in A's direct knowledge of B, A will be in a state of direct knowledge of B and, by way of B, A is also in a state of *indirect* knowledge of C. But, here we are in danger of falling into an illusionary snare of thinking that A is in a real state of indirect knowledge of C;

1:58:02

A is in a unreal state of indirect knowledge.

whereas, A is only in a state of direct knowledge of B and B is in a state of direct knowledge of C.

There is really no such thing as indirect knowledge. It is just a name. It's an idea. It's not an ultimate reality.

1:58:26

Yes, one can call this arrangement 'indirect knowledge,' but it is actually only A and B in direct knowledge states. These two direct knowledge states are analogous to 'seeing the rope poorly at twilight' and the so call indirect knowledge is analogous to the illusion of 'seeing a snake' instead. The state of no direct knowledge that one originates oneself into is a positive state of no direct knowledge.

1:59:00

Well, there's a positive state.

B: This is what I ask you. This is what I ask you. This is the same what I ask you. Because I... what I ask you is actually that when I choose to be in... Not to be in state of direct choice, it is a positive state of no direct knowledge.

Y: Yes.

B: This is what I wanted to say, but I said it in other words. It is also a positive state.

Y: It is a state; that is, it exists. It's not a negative, or the absence of knowledge of direct knowledge. It is...

B: It is a positive state of no direct knowledge.

1:59:43

Y: So, that's what you meant.

B: So, this is why I stressed it couldn't be inferior in any sense.

Y: Not in that sense. I understand now what you are saying. There is no problem.

B: Yes, yes. I like your answer that absolute is not knowledge. This is, maybe, the answer that absolute is not knowledge. Knowledge is, maybe, as you say, nearest to the absolute. But it is not absolute itself.

Y: Yes.

B: This is what I was saying.

Y: So we both got something out of it.

2:00:14

In what follows, we will describe the attributes of the non-physical individuals. This is followed by a description of the ways these individual combine through their relations that form consciousness of self and the compositions that form the appearance of consciousness of micro physical objects in time and space. Finally, a few examples are given of computations, linked to direct graph theory and combinatorics of the magnitudes of the physical constants in various apparent physical values.

(top of page 4)

We'll stop there.

2:01:00

Now, we have a couple of minutes before we end this morning formal session. Got in any other questions or anything?

B: No, I shall read this once again, later on. Thank you so much.

Y: And I appreciate your information that, while I got ninety percent by reading your... to hear it right from you, I got another ten percent. Both of us have spent a whole life time accumulating this information. And here's a folder I have. It's labeled "might be of interest to BP." You were asking why ten to the e to the π . Why ten? And I said, "I don't know."

Well, here's one article that puts a little light on it. These are ten. It just happens naturally. So there's a couple of articles on that. I'll leave this folder with you for a day or two. And you can look at it, whatever part you want to look at.

2:02:34

B: OK, thank you. It is wonderful.

Y: But it's... there is information... There is papers by Seeley and papers by... more things.

B: I didn't expect this answer.

Y: I didn't either.

B: Fractals, this is what I do. This is what I have in my book, fractal theory. This is why this is so close to me.

2:02:57

Y: Ha hah.

