

#17

Formal talk-27102006 morning day7

Lila recording day 7, morning 1 session

27/10/2006

061027000

1 Hr 31 min

[Recording 17](#)

Bret: Everything it would take forever.

Y: Possible choices are constrained by the following. If you can think of some that are not on here, I would appreciate it if you would just add them on because I may have missed some. I would just like to read through them.

1. One can not choose to be in a state of knowledge of a non-existent, non-physical individual.
2. One can not choose to be in a state of no knowledge of a non-existent, non-physical individual.
3. There are an exact finite number of non-physical individuals.
4. One can not choose to be in a state of knowledge of another of whom one is in a state of knowledge.
5. One can not choose to be in a state of no knowledge of another of whom one is in a state of no knowledge.
6. One can not by a single choice, choose to be in a state of knowledge or a state of no knowledge of more than one non-physical individual. (That is by a single choice)
7. One can not choose to be in a state of knowledge or no knowledge of any part or parts of a non-physical individual (it's all or nothing.)
8. There are no other types of choices.

Now that is a big one. There is no other choices than between a state of knowledge and a state of no knowledge. You can't choose to have a dish of ice-cream.

It's alright now you can turn it off. (Refers to one of the recording recorders.)

OK so if you find anymore that I have missed, let me know about it. OK, now Biljana.

B: So this is actually how I have imagined the start of this new mathematics. We are to build by postulates by axioms. And this is why this morning I mentioned to you that the first stage in this building a new mathematics should be to build something like a set of rules, of course, and something that will resemble which will be similar to what Spinoza has done.

Y: Similar to?

B: Spinoza.

Y: Spinoza, yes.

B: Spinoza. It is like a pattern for this mathematics which will arise from this. And it is very similar to what I have had in mind because as far as this it should be clear.

Y: And the theoretical physicists would call it boundary conditions.

B: Boundary conditions, exactly. Pity I don't have this Spinoza's book because it is a mathematic but still on a lower level just like a pattern which will still to be drawn, to be done strictly.

Don: The name of the book?

B: Spinoza it is... I don't know.

Y: He has written two or three books. They are hard to find. I think the thing to do would be to look in *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

B: Ah, yes, maybe.

Y: Under Spinoza, and that would give you an outline of his philosophy.

Don: Ok.

B: It would helps us a lot because he builds a whole building and it is very sophisticated on some rules. And it is like mathematics. It is a first step towards mathematics. And in some ways, it is mathematics. So in this direction was my thinking this night maybe in a way.

Y: Well, you go on.

B: To make things more rigorous. For instance, at the very start I will come back to the very simple arrangement of two, of three individuals being in a state of knowledge, being in a state of knowledge of B and being in a state of knowledge of C. But I hope now this will be seen from a parallel world, perhaps or maybe not. We say A is in a state of knowledge of B and B is in a state of direct knowledge of C. And this is actually A being in a state of direct knowledge of C and having memory of B:

Y: Well, that is a conclusion that comes out of the rule that says that A is in a state of knowledge of all states of knowledge that B is in.

B: Yes, yes.

Y: And then you can get consciousness out of it. You can get memory, time but there's an in between state of the rules that I have given. Rule one that any state of knowledge that one is connected to, is in, is included in your state of knowledge of that one. And the same is true for B here. And the same is true for C if it were, but it's not. So I am saying that is one step. And then consciousness and comparison and those things are another step and a different order of rule. Don't put all your rules in one level.

B: My point was something else. This was just an introduction to my question.

Y: Well, I was adding something. Ok go ahead.

B: My question was or my thinking now. When we have then A in a state of knowledge B, and B in a state of knowledge of E.

Y: Of what? Of A.

B: Of A. A is in a state of knowledge of B, and B is in a state of knowledge of A. This means if we just mirror this previous picture to this situation, it means that A is in a state of direct knowledge of A and having memories. But you added consciousness, time of B: So we should differentiate when we should try to build this mathematics or maybe even in these basic rules.

Y: Yes.

B: Between being in a state of knowledge ...

Y: There is a non-mathematical explanation. This is Love.

B: OK. Great! A state of love. And I was thinking, if you remember I posed a similar question but maybe in another wording at the very first session. We should differentiate between the situation A being himself reference state, being in an enlightened state, because till now I haven't seen that we differentiate between this and this in wording.

Y: They are different?

B: They are different, I see, but they should be... This difference should be seen, it should be explicit.

Y: I didn't even include this point.

B: You have this one in your arrangement of 26, you have...

Y: Yes, but I didn't do it in this terms, I have just A, B: It's in this one.

B: Yes, you have it in this one.

Y: But it is only partly, because I haven't included the no knowledge state. And that is a whole development that hasn't been made yet.

B: Ah.

Y: Cause it affects everything.

B: Yes, it is seen.

Y: Yes. OK, go on then.

B: My point was we call this state of self knowledge, this self reference of A to A and we call also this state of direct knowledge A being in a circuit and circuit ending in A.

Y: It is direct knowledge.

B: Yes, I know. I am pointing out we should put a different name to this enlightened state of something like this. If we want to build a new mathematics.

Y: I agree. So you are putting down what needs to be done.

B: Yes. I am putting down what need to be done.

Y: Yes, I agree.

B: And this maybe would lead to this notion of groups, if we come to this, and maybe... what was the name of... When you have a group like this here, this neutral element.

Don: Identity element.

B: Identity element.

Y: (acknowledges) In Lie groups.

B: In Lie groups. Not just Lie groups, in order for a set to be a group there are three rules to be fulfilled. One of them is each element of this set... The set as a whole should have a neutral element.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: Remember

Y: I remember. Now I remember.

B: One X is X one is X. So this one is a neutral element.

Y: Yes.

B: So this operation is like something like this maybe, depends on what our base of operations should be. So this was one point. Here I just wanted to note. I know it actually is not to be maybe considered.

Y: Yes but.

B: If we have the illusionary background of space/time this is important to stress, then on the very first session when I have written down that A is in state of direct knowledge of B ●, and B ● in a state of knowledge of C ●, might be a subset of A being in a state of knowledge B: By this I meant in this subsumption if you say of state of knowledge due to unitarity of the non-physical individuals. This might have

been a perception of future or something or on some level, you know... I stress once again, in the illusory background of space/time. This is why I always joint to this a circuit. This is somehow connected to the circuit. I always... To every graph I add this because this is quite different dot at...

Y: With a circuit it's different. You should be able to do both. You should be able to do it with a circuit connected and without because it is two different worlds.

B: Yes, and this is a different spot at the connection curve. And the curve merges into (datas?) curve. It's a different spot. It's quite different probability.

Y: Yes, it is. And you have bound time and bound space. Whereas, when you become connected to the circuit, it becomes unbound. So things are very different. So you should get familiar with both of them.

B: Ah, yes. It is unbounded. But then it is also common sense of space and time. This is what I had in mind. So this is a different level than this basic level, I want to stress I am aware of this.

Y: OK.

B: So this could be an (optional?) future this one idea. And the other is since we have this attribute of unitarity of non-physical individuals, then when a non-physical individual is in a state of knowledge of another non-physical individual, but then at certain point of time it stops to be... Not of time...Of illusory space/time...of... in another state of affairs it is not in a state of knowledge of that particular individual. Then maybe some feeling of lost and sorrow, I repeat on a different level, and in the illusory background of space/time (like a cure?). For instance, I also wanted to ask you, maybe this is connected, when we were talking about the body, the human body and in regard to Lila Paradigm. What happens with our choices when the body dies? But this is different. Maybe something of this.

Y: Yes, I see what you're asking there.

B: So this was like explanation, what I meant by this. Of course, this is seen... It is obvious this can not be a subset of this one, but in ordinary sense of thinking. But if you take into account all this, it is like optional future because we have an optional past in illusory background of space/time. But not for the future.

Y: It is in the realm of thought.

B: In the realm of thought, yes, this is what I am trying to stress, some how. Then another point or question. Here on the sixteenth page of Radical Theory we have a diagram 12. And in this diagram, we have seven individuals forming a circuit, arrangement of a circuit. And then we have a first crossover and this causes (the) notion of space, of one dimensional space. Strictly speaking when taking into account (the) essential definition of one dimensional space, the sense of one dimensional space occurs in consciousness of individual W, and it is between Z and F. But since we have a circuit of seven length quanta, and somehow we still

introduce some notion of space and time into our picture, so we have according to explanation given, we have all this arrangement of seven now becomes like one arrow. We treat is like one arrow, and all the sudden... although strictly speaking the notion of one dimensional space occurs between Z and F. Now we treat the distance between any non-physical individuals to be 7 LQ. This is how it is written here. For instance, the distance [I] and Q is not the original notion of one dimensional space which is between Z and F. It is something else, but still it is L and LQ. So any individuals, any two individuals in this circuit now having common sense of space and time, one dimensional space, because we have one crossover, they all have distance of 7 length quanta. If it is so then once again A to A should also be 7 length quanta. This state of direct knowledge which is not state of enlightened. Because this is so, if we build mathematic (it must be?) understood in this way. Since once we...

Y: Yes, in the consciousness of A it would be 7 Q.

B: It would be 7 L Q.

Y: Yes, it would.

B: If it is so, then this formula should be clearly not $n(K) - 1$ but $n(K)$ and this should be solved.

Y: Yes, but in the diagram this arrow does not exist.

B: It doesn't exist, I don't say it exists. I say, this distance between [I] and Z and the distance between [I] and [I] is one and the same thing. In this line of thinking. The distance between [I] and Z is the same as the distance between [I] and [I]. And then the (over all?), it opens up questions, and then the (over all?) length is not 42 as it is written here, which was derived 7 multiplied by 6. having in mind... not taking into account (8 to A) but it is 7 multiplied by 7 it is 49. Here it is written you see, the magnitude of the space formed by each crossover arrow is now n multiplied $n - 1$ L Q in this example 7 multiplied by 6 L Q and it is 42, but I am pointing out that it might be 49.

Y: It might be. When I wrote this I wasn't aware that this acts as one arrow in a circuit.

B: But it is written at certain point of time. It was written, this is due to the circuit acting as if it were a single arrow going to each agent so that not only F but also every other (fermion?) apart from (Z •?) is in the end of the (limp of fy case?)

Y: In that case I think my logic is incorrect.

B: This one?

Y: Yes, to get 42.

B: Yes, it should be 49.

Y: Yes. I think you're right.

B: Because, this clarifies of question which have arose previously because it will be solved once and for all that. For instance, this other formula should be also not... Now this is another point I have stressed. I should like to stress out if we are aiming to be strict. We have not n multiplied by (K) minus one. We were discussing this question. This is minus one because the arrow from the circuit is excluded. But even if it is excluded in the end, it should be added, plus one. Even if we agree that this arrow from the circuit is excluded. Now I am discussing the formula on page 15 which is another one.

Y: Yes.

B: This is time, illusionary time, and this is illusionary distance or space.

Y: Yes.

B: So it should be $(K) n$ still.

Y: Not minus one.

B: Not minus one or if we agree that this arrow from the circuit is excluded because. OK the circuit is one arrow. Then this one arrow should be added at the end. Or at the end, all these distances should be added.

Y: I am not satisfied that either you or I have stated it correctly. I can remember now going back and forth this way, that way, and I am not sure... I think my logic was correct on both sides. But what I was explaining was not clear, on each side, with the minus one, without the minus one. Do you count the one in the circuit as one side of the bifurcation? We need a bifurcation and this goes in the circuit. So does this one count or should it be left out. We'll come up against this when we are trying to understand motion. The same problem.

B: Maybe I brought up to many questions. I have put many things all at once.

Y: Well, this is the brain storming that we need to do. I agree with you that it needs to be addressed, but we have to resolve it systematically and build our way through it because, at least for me, I have to take it orderly with no confusions left behind or possibilities. So we can settle it one way or another step by step. Brainstorming. Otherwise, you just say, "Well, this is wrong and this is wrong and you are probably right. But what do we do about it?"

B: Yes, I was thinking about it and... For instance, I have come to the conclusion... at least this formulas used... I don't... It was the sequence of events, I believe.

Y: Let me give you more excuse.

B: Then and this...

Y: Listen to this. I am going to give you one more excuse. It is difficult for me now with my difficulty. And so it is hard for me to preserve through, step after, step after step. It is not due to Alzheimer's; it is due to being distracted by very difficult pain. So I may not be able to do it. So I leave it up to you guys. If you work it out, I think I can follow it.

B: Yes.

Y: But how to put the words is difficult for me. To explain my grasp of it because by grasp is not linear. So I am asking for forgiveness in this regard. OK, now I have said what I have had to say. You say what you have to say.

B: Actually what I wanted to say is, I have left in the midst of so many questions raised.

Y: And not answered.

B: I have some answers.

Y: You have suggested some answers.

B: Yes.

Y: And I think probably rightly but I can't be sure because I can't do what I need to do.

B: I wanted to conclude just that. Now, I am positive. I was thinking about it maybe several hours during the night that this formulas used in this final picture of your curve joining the standard big bang curve are correct. And it is all clear to me now that they are correct. There is no confusion anymore, (k_i) minus one or (k_i) it's $n(K)$ over P halved $(\pi$ over $2)$. It is the first, I couldn't find it right now, but it was in the sequence of events. This chapter, particle theory. The second one is in (K) over K_n squared over P halved $(\pi$ over $2)$. And the third is $n(K)$ cubed over P halved $(\pi$ over $2)$, and this is all correct, this is correct and all clear.

Y: And that is how the recursion work, the recursions, that the result of the recursions.

B: Result of recursions.

Y: Yes.

B: So at least this is clarified.

Y: You have satisfied about that.

B: Yes.

Y: OK. Anything else before I go on? First there is another thing I...

B: Ah, yes, there is something else.

Y: I will just mention that *Radical Theory* paper was written in 1998, which is nine years ago. And things have changed. And that paper has not been changed. So if I were you I wouldn't spend too much time on it, to say this is what he was really trying to say...

B: Yes, yes.

Y: Not knowing what you know now. OK, now you have something else.

B: I was drawing pictures of all the non-isomorphic graphs made of 5 because we were discussing this.

Y: Fine.

B: Then in order to make it simpler, I have neglected the directions.

Y: Yes, because you can reverse them.

B: Yes. If I take into account the directions, then many other configurations will arise.

Bret: It is just a binary number.

B: Yes.

Bret: Two to the fifth power of each geometry.

B: So I have this one, this one, this one etc. But all of them are... At the first moment we are introducing the F of 5 expected number of graphs of 5, it is of no importance which configuration is taken into account because maybe it is not at that point. But later on when we introduce tau and anti tau particles into the pictures, when we have connections with all of those graphs, with the cross circuit, then it will matter because not all of them are tau particles. Then the number of those different non-isomorphic graphs will become of importance.

Y: Yes.

B: So maybe this whole picture should be divided by 21 because probability just one.

Y: It is more complicated than that. If you knew more about particle physics, it would... because when you have say a tau particle or a muon particle, there is a thing called the sigma which is called the cross section of the particle. And there is another factor which is the decay pathways. And these are various path ways. Some of them are viable pathways. And there are a certain percentage of the particles for will decay through one pathway where they become an electron plus a muon and the other one it becomes a muon first and then becomes three electrons. There's various pathways of decay. And these are going to effect that, what that is. Some of them that won't work at all or will be undetectable or have not physical

signature at all. And other ones will and that will enable you to make calculations that match the measurements of the different pathways of decay. Verstehen?

Bret: Some.

B: Which reminds me, just one short question and we shall proceed. Which is in the line of this thinking, and actually you may be answer how Lila Paradigm explains that, since you have said in the circuit. Once we have crossover in a certain configuration, one is positron and the other is electron. But the electron... the positron decays very quickly or not decays very quickly or not decays very quickly but...

Y: No, They don't decay at all.

B: I know, but they are rarely to be found actually.

Y: The positrons? Yes.

B: Maybe they are on the other side of the galaxy.

Y: It is a billion to one. For every billion electrons, there is about one positron.

B: So in terms of Lila Paradigm because once we introduce and arrow we have plus and minus so the other plus is somewhere in the galaxy or...

Y: First of all, to have an electron you have to have...

B: Yes Tri-dimensional. This is why...

Y: So this is an electron. This is an electron but only one positron.

B: (acknowledges)

Y: Well, that accounts for three to one. But then that three to one goes times (N) divided by... You have to work that out. I have not done it. I know the problem, but one of your graduate students needs to do that, a post Doc. And then you get the Nobel Prize for that.

B: You will. Thank you.

Y: So that's a good question, partial answer. But there is more to it than that.

B: Ok, Ok. I know it's not linear; of course, it's not linear. So the questions are not.

Y: Why are there so few anti-particles in the universe? And it's about a billion to one. Is that it for this morning?

B: Yes.

Y: OK. First thing, we'll have my introduction to another paper. This paper is called *An Example of a Theory of Truly Everything Made Possible by an Exploration of*

Non-physical Elements Allowed by a Change in Philosophy of Science. So I am suggesting a change in the philosophy of science. This use to be my telephone number. Now I don't have any telephone. Introduction

In the broadest sense, science is the discovery of what exists. However, in the search for what is, scientists have found it necessary to narrow science in order to make it more reliable using physical measurement as the final referee. (speaking to Biljana "You know the word referee?") While limiting the final judgment of truth to physical measurement has brought about the reliability of science to an acceptable level, we may have by excluding the study of fundamental realities that can not be directly measured, thrown out the theory of everything 'baby' with our current scientific approach 'bath water'. Recent research indicates that a broader approach encompassing un-measurable elements may be required if we are to succeed in formulating a theory of everything. A truly complete scientific theory should not only unify physics but should also explain such things as consciousness and its causes, the basis and origin of biological life and what a conscious individual really is. And ultimately, even the meaning of existence to be included. Our current criteria for a reliable scientific theory are two. One the theory must be testable by physical measurement and number two the theory should explain better, be simpler, and be more fundamental than whatever theory that it is meant to replace.

I was allowed a total of six minutes to present this entire paper. Needless to say I didn't get very far.

B: To explain the universe.

Y: What addition to this criteria could be made, without sacrificing the reliability of modern science? That would allow the inclusion of whatever fundamental un-measurable constituents of reality maybe necessary to explain everything that exists. Here is a proposal for such an addition. The un-measurable, the un-perceivable, the non-physical of one kind or another should be allowed as assumptions in our scientific approach, provided that any theory built on or including such elements must logically lead to descriptions of physical phenomena that can be experimentally tested.

So they should allow un-measurable and un-perceivable and even non-physical things of one kind or another as long as a logical procedure leads you to elements that describe physical phenomena that can be measured and checked. So if it follows from these un-measurable and invisible things logically. Quantum theory does that. They have this whole Hilbert space of infinite possibilities of dimensions of space, the super position of possibilities. This is all just ideas in fairy land. But they are not saying that they are doing that. They are not saying let's change our philosophy of science to include this formula. Because if they open that door in going to walk Alt, the old one, God in one description or another. Not quite finished.

Several scientists and philosophers have made suggestions, many of them recent which this proposal for broadening the sphere of science to include the un-

measurable could permit to be seriously considered as elements of a true theory of everything. Some examples are... and I would like to read all the examples.

1. Gottfried Leibniz in 1714 posited the existence of many unique monads located in the present and at places in space which are conscious and can originate actions and have memories. And I sight the part of his *Monadology* paper that he wrote. Due to the interaction of these monads, they are conscious of a world which is our world although he doesn't give any formulas. That is because he thought there were an infinite number of them. And that is why he invented the infinite calculus. He was trying to deal with that problem. Then Newton developed another way of doing it... is the one we use.

2. John A. Wheeler in 1979 stated that the basis of physics cannot be physics indicating that something other than the physical world must underlie the physical world. Wheeler in 1990 also suggested that information must be fundamental. "We take seriously," he said, "the theme of it from bits". That you get an it from bits. You have never heard that saying by him? Well, you have now.

The two points together that Wheeler has made suggest that underlying everything physical, there must be some sort of non-physical information. And he did mean that. He said that even after 1990.

3. John Searle is a philosopher at UCLA in Berkeley.

B: I know Searle.

He said in 1997 that information is not a physical reality but a mental phenomena dependent on observers and interpreters without which physical things are empty of information and are meaningless.

Y: Well, that's also true.

B: *The Chinese Room* by Searle

Y: What?

B: *The Chinese Room* by Searle.

Y: Yes, he had an article on that in Scientific American *The Chinese Room*.

4. Roger Penrose in 1996 has called for a "Radical upheaval" in the very basis of physical theory because he can find no consciousness in the current physical theory. He also proposed in 1994 the Platonic ideal realm as an element of a theory of everything.

Y: And that's our pattern of sub-states in the overall giant network. These patterns are these ideals that get projected into the consciousness on the cave wall of the people that are strapped against the other wall of the cave and (says?) that human

beings and they just see the projection of the ideal from the eternal sun is projecting through the ideal down to the cave wall opposite and here is the human being just seeing the projections and they don't know what is going on.

5. David J. Chalmers in 1995 points out that consciousness is not derivable from the laws of physics. He also suggests that consciousness must be other than physical. He said this in 1996 and comments that abstract information may be fundamental to both the physical and to consciousness.

And it is. He calls it abstract information. I call it states of knowledge, direct knowledge.

6. Henry Stapp in 1996 says that there must be an agent that indexes out of all possible coherent quantum vectors states, a single state, actualizing that state so that it is physically manifested to an observer. And that this agent is the felt psychological I (I, me). This 'I' cannot be that which is itself a physical manifestation and thus measurable because if that were so, in order for it to exist so that it could do the indexing, it would have to first be actualized by some 'I' and so on ad infinitum.

7. Jonathan Shear

Jonathan Shear is a physicist and a psychologist he has a double doctorate, and he is also the top of the Maharishi Mahesh Yogi... he's what do they call them? They wear the caps; the ones that are suppose to be able to fly.

Catherine: (Karmapa,)

Y: No, no, no.

B: They are hoping.

Y: He is supposed to be some kind of theta or something. Anyway...

Jonathan Shear he's a professor of philosophy at the University of Virginia. He lists as one of the possible approaches to resolving the hard problem of consciousness, the assumption that both consciousness and physical matter emerge from a common further base.

I talked to him about this one time because he is a yogi and I'm a yogi and so we had that in common.

In other words, one assumes, he says, the existence of a reality other than either the physical or consciousness that underlies both of them.

We are almost finished now. In each of these seven examples that I have given, that which cannot be physically measured, is suggested as an element of or as a basis for a theory that might be better and more deeply explain our world than any of the present physical theories. Most of these suggestions are incorporated in the following example of a theory that meets the criteria for reliability, including the

suggested additional criteria that, I said, they should allow the invisible and the unmeasurable to lead to calculable and testable physical things.

A basic assumption is developed in enough detail in what follows, for some simple explanations of fundamental phenomena to logically emerge, resulting in precise testable predictions for some fundamental physical values.

And then I lay out the usual blather. So I have given different introductions to the subject.

B: It is beautiful when you state that in contemporary physics, they don't deal with these deep questions.

Y: When I say what?

B: That in contemporary physics they do not deal with these deeper questions.

Y: In what.

B: In contemporary.

Y: They don't deal with it.

B: They even explicitly... even though it is not so shallow and superficial... But still, for instance, Niels Bohr mentions in Copenhagen interpretation, no deep reality.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: His theory is known as no deep reality. He says, "Does the contemporary physics give results? Yes, what happen down there, I am not concern with. The formulas are correct, I am seeing this way."

Y: That's right.

B: But actually many were not satisfied with this explanation of Bohr, and they have said, he has stopped the development of physics for fifty years because maybe someone should have appeared who will find out what is happening down there.

Y: It's interesting that his close friend Heisenberg, he said, "I have seen that level. I saw it". But he couldn't say it.

B: He is actually saying it in *Physics and Metaphysic*, his book.

Y: Yes, I have it over there.

B: He is capable. And Schrodinger

Y: I have his little book too.

B: Great, because he is great really. Schrodinger is closest to you.

50:30

Y: He

B: To Lila Paradigm Schrodinger.

Y: He gets close.

B: I don't remember who else you said about the collapse of these coherent states of possibility as you state, the collapse of Schrodinger wave function. He says, "Now we know that the moon is not there when we are not looking at it."

Y: And Einstein said, "Oh, yes, it is."

B: Yes, great, great. You said, "Yes, it is, even though no one is looking at it."

Y: That's because they had limited... When they considered it observer, it was always a human being, not a divine individual. OK. I am going to try an experiment. I am going to talk to you about motion in two different ways. Neither argument is complete. I want you guys, all three of you, to help to solve this problem. It looks like Halloween. We have a circuit. We have two crossovers. I just thought of something. Maybe the crossover should go here.

Bret: You are welcome. That one was quick.

Y: From another individual. Anyway, I am trying to show that the distance between A ● and D ● is going to change due to this configuration.

Bret: From, change from what.

Y: I'll show you. In this sub-state, in the orange here, of this particular, sub-state that includes Q the observer, the key observer. We have a bifurcation, and each one of these forms a bifurcation with Q P. So we get two different... We get an amount of space. Now what is the distance between A ● and B ● due to that? And how is that different from the one that includes C?

Now these are all in present time, on the one hand, but looking at these sub-states, we have a different time of each one. Then we have D ● to push it one more. So then what is the distance between A ● and D ●? And how is that affected by the different times of these sub-states because all of these are conscious of each one of these situations as sub-states or bigger sub-states or bigger sub-states. So you are getting a temporal effect from that but yet they are all in the same present time.

So I am thinking that A ● and D ● are moving, discrete motion. So I think something along that line is probably valid. That is one approach. I am going to give another approach.

So we have a unit of space here. Actually, it is from the dot, to the dot. Now we do this again. Now we have another one. Now if this is connected in a circuit in some way or through these perhaps, and including the rest of them, do we get a two dimensional space? If this is one L Q and this is one L Q, do we get two dimensions out of this, somehow?

Bret: I thought this was one L Q.

Y: Yes, it is, but it's one L Q twice, isn't it. It's one L Q for Q and one L Q for A.

Bret: That's a question you're asking, not a decision we've made. Isn't that the question you are asking, do we get???

Y: I am just saying this is an approach that might... Something along this line in general. Take it in the broad sense, might do it. One L P Planck length times one L P another Planck length is \hbar . That is Planck's constant over as you say P two. π over 2, is \hbar . So that is this area is \hbar , is energy that is... Two dimensional space is the smallest unit of energy if it is one L Q by one L Q. One L Q as I have explained is n times L P rather L Q I am talking about this as one L... Planck time should be L P by L P. Am I getting senile or is it just something else. One Planck length by one Planck length and that is made out of n L Q by n L Q. This is explained in my *Commentary on Mindful Universe*. You ever get a chance to read that, but you just read it, reading. What I am explaining about one quanta an... He is talking about it being smeared out. But this is not due to an uncertainty. This is due to a certainty and I am defining Planck's constant definitively in terms of length. But this is energy also. So squared length is energy. So when we go from the linear one dimensional, for one crossover, to two dimensional with two crossovers of a circuit, we are going from one dimensional space and we square it. That is why I was saying something here, I don't know what. I don't know whether it is due to another crossover and the consciousness that is produced by another crossover from a different source makes any difference or not. And they get merged together and that makes them be a right angle in a different way. I don't know. So I am just giving hints about different approaches to it. If you guys don't have a copy of my *Commentary on Mindful Universe*... don't you have it on your website? I know it is on this one. It is on this computer hard drive. I don't think you have it, do you?

Don: You will soon.

Y: OK. But I am asking for real help in this case. And if we can solve this problem, I think we will solve it with all physics that are open. And some of them are like Stapp and Chu and Finkelstein and Penrose and even Hawking and some of his assistance. I think they would be open to it. Then they get into the argument between to, G 't Hooft and those mathematicians. What was their name? The ones that talk about free will. You haven't read that article yet from the *New Scientist* magazine. You need to do that or we are going to have to sit down together and do it.

B: OK.

Y: Because that type of person is open and have the ability to appreciate the meaning and understanding space in terms of the Lila Paradigm. So if we could get

that because it ties right in to quantum theory in a very calculable way. If you take that actual measurement of one L P and you take one L P squared you get a value of 10 minus sixty sixth of a centimeter.

B: How much?

Y: 10^{-66} with numbers.

B: H bar?

Y: Centimeters and this is the area of energy but it is expressed in terms of length and area rather than in terms of Coulomb or any other measurement for energy. Curbs is it.

Don: (It's)

Y: This is given in the book *Gravitation* by Wheeler. I am not going to repeat 800 pages to show how that is done. But it is briefly mentioned in the *Entropic Principle*. That book over there. Since I don't know how much longer I am going to live, I have to state these things the uncertain parts of the Lila Paradigm. To say this is what I am thinking about it, and the details need to be worked out. If you want to do it, fine. If you don't want to do it, fine. But I find it interesting.

Any questions that I might be able to answer?

Bret: Yes. State, just state what the problems you want to solve are.

Y: I want to describe motion in terms of the Lila Paradigm. I think I have described energy in terms of the Lila Paradigm and why the recursion makes it squared, and makes it energy. And then what happens when you cube it? Well, I think what we get is mass, that is what I think. But I want to check... You guys to check those things to see if my suspicion is correct or not.

Bret: Is this a second problem or the same problem phrased in a different way? What is your intent?

Y: They are all part of the same problem.

Bret: OK.

Y: Of dealing with space. He was asking the question this morning about space. Is it (K) minus one or is it just K? For example, that is part of the same problem. And what you have to do is think it through in terms of individuals and states of knowledge and states of consciousness. States of knowledge underlies the physical measurement. When you get consciousness, you're getting measurement of the physical. So if you want to know how it works from measurement of the physical, you have to do it in terms of direct knowledge. That is the truth that underlies it. That is the un-measurable. Like if you try to count the number of non-physical individuals. It is not that they are not a finite number, but it is uncountable because there is not a way that you can count. David the father of Solomon said, "What are you doing,

Solomon?”

He said, “I am going to do a census so I can collect taxes. I need to count the number of people in Jerusalem”.

And David said, “You stupid boy. Do not count the people because they are non-physical. They are uncountable. And therefore, you should not tax them. You should not have a census for taxing. That is all a materialistic approach. You should treat these people as non-physical individuals.”

The Bible is just full of those statements from one end to the other. Some of those people knew what they were talking about.

Don: There is this question that relates to that. So in *Radical Theory* and it states A and Q are fourteen length quanta apart, and our unit here was 7 length quanta. And to me, it relates directly to the motion problem cause we were talking about.

Y: Don't count on any of this business about space being right. I think it is the best go I could give it at the time. The plane was waiting, we had to fly around the world and going to these conferences and I said, “Well, fine I will do it the best I can right off.”

Don: No, I understand

Y: The part about space is not necessarily right it. Some of it probably is, but feel free.

Don: I just wondered if I had missed something because it relates to that problem and I just wanted you to clarify it. Thank you.

Y: I think it is related to it. My head was beginning to spin. That is because the previous work was not laid out well enough. Well, after I came back from the around-the-world trip, we were gone six months, I said let's go back to the beginning and take it step by step. And now you have found me still in that process.

Bret: You said, this is an experiment. What is the experiment? To find out whether we work together? Do you have more constrains on what you want us to do?

Y: It's an experiment to see if you are willing to put up with the uncertainty. I have been giving you more or less certainties up to this point. But now we are in the uncertainty thing that I have been sweeping under the carpet. I am pulling it out from under the carpet now. There is often... Well... The space is the big 'merde' under the carpet. You know 'merde' French?

Bret: Yah.

Y: OK.

Bret: You want us to work on it now?

Y: If you are willing to. I haven't gotten any statement except by you, that you are willing to work on it. And you hinted at it.

Don: I certainly am. In fact I some weeks ago, I had an insight into what is motion while I was walking home once from scripture class. But ah...

Y: OK.

Don: And it goes right along those lines. But it is not something to do with sub-states of consciousness. So when you diagramed it out, it looks obvious, but I don't... It's not something I could explain.

Y: But you have to have it in a circuit. Otherwise the particles are not in present time. But the old position is in the past. So the particles each time have to be in present time in their "new location." And their other position is in the past. That is how we see motion. Actually, you don't see anything move. It is just here and then it's there. This is Zeno's paradox. Discrete units of motion, you get all the way to the wall in one hop when the distance, half the distance to the wall each time the arrow comes.

B: Which paradox.

Y: Zeno's.

Don: So the arrow never gets to the wall.

Y: So when the length between the head of the arrow and the wall is less than $L/2$ or even $L/4$ would do, then the next step it is there. Everybody knows that the arrow gets to the wall. But it is not a paradox if you have a discrete unit of space that there is nothing shorter than. So what about you? Do you have any interest in helping me to do this or...?

B: I am hoping that I am showing my interest. It is not visible. I should do it somehow else. I have crossed half the planet earth to come here. I believe this is something that should be recognized somehow.

Y: OK. So if you want, we are starting on the second week. We can brainstorm now and different people can start working on something and show to each other what ever you come up with.

B: My only concern is you have mentioned that this book is 800 pages and this other book is so and so on. And I have not read it. This is my only concern. Otherwise, everything that I know, I shall present it to you. And if it is useful, OK. If not, I'll try to gather some more knowledge, and I am sure I'll have to do.

Y: When I say work on it, it can be as long as you want to take. It could be weeks, months, years, decades. It is just working on it, I don't expected it to be solved in a few minutes. That is why it might be better if we worked on me presenting some more things that I already have.

[Searching for documents--]

I think that if you could... I have a copy of *Mindful Universe* print out.

Don: *Mindful Universe* is one there; there should be copies of the commentary also. It is all just together. There is a DVD of everything that I could do.

Y: I want the part where it is talking about smeared out in the *Mindful Universe*, and I have a long comment.

B: (Roger Speros?).]

Y: If in an arrangement the arrow [I] to Z is included a second dimension appears in [I's] consciousness producing a two dimensional space area one L Q by one L Q see diagram 1B: Thereby.

B: This is the one we were discussing, isn't it?

Y: From individual [I] there is one, two, three arrows. So if in an arrangement the arrow [I] Z is included, a second dimension of space appears in [I's] consciousness producing a two dimensional space that is one length quanta by one length quanta. See diagram 1B: Ah, here is diagram 1B: There it is. And this is this length by this length. So now we have it squared. Then I say, also produced by the two dimensional template, he calls them templates I call them sub-states. In the consciousness of all n (little n) non-physical individuals in and connected to the circuit are n L Q by n L Q that is n L Q squared units of two dimensional space. This is the minimum area of time space of smearing of uncertainty. I have uncertainty and smearing in quotes because in the Lila Paradigm, you have neither uncertainty nor do you have smearing. And is equal to one squared Planck length. One L P squared which is \hbar or h divided by 2π . Planck constant expressed as an information area of 2.6×10^{-68} meters squared. I gave it to you in centimeters so it was minus 66. But in meters it is minus 68 meters squared. If in an n times 10 to the 23^{rd} non-physical individuals ultimate reality about 1.9×10^{23} choices to know directly are made, one could expect to appear in the consciousness of the non-physical individuals in such a network of knowledge that one such area h over 2π . Or stated another way, there are extant about (and she corrected the spelling) 1.9×10^{23} states of knowledge the non-physicals in that network would be conscious of an uncertainty of the magnitude of h over 2π unless someone acts to be in a state of knowledge of an individual at the sum point. The sum point is reference individual W in our example. But W is there so it is sum. And it is never uncertain. So in the Lila Paradigm there is only uncertainty about a possible future. But in the extant situation there is never an uncertainty, it is always exactly what it is. Go on. That would actualize for that individual W , the content of the arrangement as an apparent physical phenomena two proto-fermions one L Q of bounded one dimensional space apart, this (inters?) smearing, the so called Heisenberg uncertainty shrinks to 0 in the classical approximation. Thus, this approximation pares the smeared out state down to single un-smeared classical state. I think that's him talking.

Don: Yes.

Y: Yes. The Heisenberg Uncertainty I say in my paradigm is only the uncertainty of what choice a non-physical individual might make. So it just simplifies quantum

theory, just very easily, and explains everything that takes place in the so called mysterious and hidden realm of, that's behind it. David Bohm tried it, with his pilot theory but his theory is physical. He had an underlying physical pilot wave that took care of everything. Well, this is non-physical and accounts for the timeless aspect experiment that it happens instantaneously etc. and it solves the observer problem and the collapse problem and on and on. You were going to say...

B: I wanted to say that this smearing that they are recognizing in that theories, in a way... at this stage of Lila Paradigm... regarding... explaining all this, quantum situations, I don't say it is profound and actually gives the basics for future investigation, and it is profound and I believe it is the right way to do things in physics and also in consciousness and so on. But at this stage, probability introduced in Lila Paradigm is somehow mirroring their smearing, their uncertainties. Isn't it so? Because now in picture, we have probabilities. And this is which brings it into picture some kind of uncertainty because something that is probable is uncertain.

Y: That's why I was not satisfied with Michael's solution no matter how elegant it is. It is infinite calculus, an approximation, and that's why we want an algebra that is infinite.

B: Yes, but I will tell you about this, about this finite algebra. This was first point. Second point was that once you multiply the number of individuals in the circuit, either by L Q or by P Q, somehow in a way you introduce physicality into the picture of non-physical individuals doing things. And then everything is explained. You know when you have the basic picture which is correct.

Y: Yes.

B: It is perceived by direct knowledge and so on and so on. And it is correct. But still somehow in Lila Paradigm at this stage, we are dealing with physicality when introducing T Q and L Q because L Q is in centimeters T Q is in seconds. So physicality is somehow present.

Y: Physicality is present because time and space are in consciousness. And any time you have consciousness, you are always conscious of something physical.

B: Yes, I am well aware of it. But also my concern is that we shall bump into the same wall they are bumping into.

Y: Exactly! And the way to avoid it, is not to deal with P Q and L Q or T Q and L Q, but to deal with states of direct knowledge.

B: Yes.

Y: And you need a symbol for that to make it mathematical. You just put that whole phrase in a symbol.

B: Yes, I was trying to do. You see here.

Y: That is what you were doing there.

B: You see, I was trying to do something.

Y: The reason I put this in here was trying to talk to Stapp in terms that he would say, "Well, it does connect to the physical physics."

That's the only reason. But our mathematics that we developed should deal always in terms of states of knowledge and their combinations.

B: This is why I was stressing even the first session because I was aware of it. That, for instance, at this point, my contribution could be in the field of artificial intelligence regarding Lila. This is why I presented Gödel way of thinking because this is something I could contribute. I could contribute at spot.

Y: I got that from your letters.

B: Ah, yes. But in order to deal with quantum physics while I, at least for four hours, I teach students so on and I have ideas but still I recognize the smearing. I recognize the probability. Here I am afraid I'll have to gain knowledge from the physicist. And this knowledge is already smeared. Somehow it is uncertain.

Y: Well, you are right about.

B: If we start from another point of view which is due to discrete mathematics, artificial intelligence we could do it now. And this was why I was suggesting if we are suppose in this three weeks...