#21
Formal talk-28102006 morning day8s1
Lila recording day 8, morning 1 session
28/10/2006
061028000
1 Hr 02 min
Recording 21

Y: I think Biljana has some overnight work to download. So we'll do that first if you would.

B: So last session, we were brainstorming about pi to find somehow a way to have both a circle which leads us to pi and finiteness and discreteness which is the real background of Lila. So I was thinking of it and I have drawn this picture which show that we could have a wave and still have finiteness. So sine could be obtained by this. And now we have our finite pi, so to say. We have sine and bold we have finiteness. And once we have this discrete illustration of what is going on, once we establish time continuum or space continuum in Lila, then this will give us great opportunities. This could also be in… I haven't got markers in different colours… it could be done in illusionary three dimensional space/time continuum and it is great. I believe this will great us; this will give us great opportunities. I have written what this should have been… this might be… Some formulas like this could be used. But we should think more of it where F is ne.

Y: This is omega?

B: Omega, yes. This is ne; this is ne in quantum physics. We have the energy of a photon. It's H ne where H is Planck constant. And which is actually a way to express the discreteness of the energy packages. Isn't it so?

Y: Yes.

B: So this is frequency, and we have clearly frequency here, which is the…

Y: Wave length.

B: Yes, the wave length I… What is the word when we have one over another?

Bret: Ratio.

B: Ratio? Not ratio.

Bret: Comparison?

Darshana: Fraction.

B: Fraction, not fraction. A and one over A.

Bret: Inverse.

B: Inverse, yes, inverse which is the inverse of the wave length. And it's great! Maybe we will come up with something else, maybe not. Maybe this is not exactly sine and E cubed. But we are close to it. Once we have the picture… this creates great opportunities because now I have another insight. Here into this wave and other one could be… You know, between these spaces we shall see either they are… I believe they are one T Q, one elementary time unit. But I have seen in your previous article with Baker and Seeley that you consider elementary time to be not one time Q but one Planck time.

Y: Yes. Well, that was the first publication. Then I realized that there is an imaginary or an element underlying this one arrow instead of two arrows. There is one time quanta, I called it. That's to make it fit with Hawkins's work where he has imaginary time and imaginary space.

B: Now, I have got another idea. The one is when we will come to this point, to have a ratio of masses, of rest mass and so on. And rest mass is connected with differentiation of distances or of lengths. And so on and so on. I have pictures of all this also. I will come to this later on. So at this point, this will be useful. We might have three dimensional…

Y: It seems like your combining the complementary in one graph. You have both waves and digital.

B: Yes, both waves and digital. And I have a third one, you see. There is third one here. I have one here, another one there, and a third one in a third dimension.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: I have three of them. But also this could be expressed… I need this and another one. For instance, we have… We might have this expression. We have sine here. We have one wave here, one wave and then another wave between the spaces. Between the spaces another wave which could be…

Y: What wave is that?

B: We shall see. For instance, when you have a crossover, you have difference… Maybe here the wave length is the same, but it couldn't… It might be not the same.

Y: In quantum theory, Feynman calls it amplitude. You know the term amplitude.

B: Ah, yes, this is it.

Y: That's amplitude. OK. And this is a phase. But what is the orange?

B: The orange is… once I take advantage of discreteness of the sine, then I have open space to… this is interwoven to this. It is embedded into this. It is different presentation.

Bret: Not superimposed on the same value ( ).

B: Not superimposed, but it is in different fragments of time. I have one here and another one. Let us say with different amplitude and different wave length which are the main attributes. And then, this is discretely. This is discrete, this is discrete. And, for instance, it could be presented if it is accurate enough with the time distance of two time quanta, for instance. And at each time quanta, I could have another one between these discrete elements.

Y: And that would be the limit.

B: That would be the limit. If I want the a third one then I could take three T D and have three waves.

Y: Are these to big? Or are they all right? I got lots of them.

B: Ah, OK. I was thinking in terms of quantum physics. I see what is, this and electron positron (counter?)

Y: No, just the markers.

B: Yes, thank you. So isn't it an idea which could be useful?

Y: A lot of mathematics has been developed in terms of waves. And that is why a lot of mathematicians like to work in terms of waves instead of matrices, but I think… Is this going to combine both?

B: The matrices have another approach I was thinking about it. The matrices is…

Y: Well, maybe there is no mathematics yet that combines both. I think if we saw beneath it, beneath the time and the space, the knowledge units of direct knowledge, we could derive the waves and the matrices and see what is behind the mathematics of both. I think that could be.

B: I'll come later on to this.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: Now, I was thinking about something else. To draw… I was thinking about something else…

Y: I see AUM.

B: AUM yes, yes. I this I use to distinguish for another ( ).

Y: OK.

B: To show the decay of four dimensional structure into energy and why it is so. So the first reason, as far as I understand, why the four dimensionality decays into energy is because of the probability… because the structures which lead to energy are of greater probability than the structures which lead to 4 D. To four dimensionality. And we know exactly what it is.

Y: I don't understand your terms there quite. Are you going to explain it?

B: For instance, this is a sub-structure or a smaller Hamiltonian circuit which leads to four dimensionality. It's it so? This is a four structure which will lead me to four dimensionality.

Y: Yes. Four, five, or six whatever.

B: Yes, I have this circuit and this circuit

Y: That would make a muon.

B: By the way, I also have noticed at point which you are writing in this paper. You had different perception of what one dimensionality is and what two dimensionality is.

Y: That's correct.

B: Yes, and I have seen this. This is great it helped me a lot because here you and maybe some of these two other…

Y: Baker and Seeley.

B: Baker and Seeley, because it is easier for the mind to understand when you see a circuit of arrows. You say this is one dimensional. When I have orthogonality, then this two dimensional although orthogonality is not to be so easily recognized when it is drawn like this one.

Y: That's right.

B: This is my third point. I have pointed out this also. At least it is ah… It will be useful for people to understand what orthogonality is. For me it is clear because we have the picture underlying it. It is orthogonal, but when you see it in planar presentation it doesn't seem orthogonal. So it could be… although this is imaginary, it could be illustrated in such a way that orthogonality could be visible, and not lose nothing of the information in it. This is third point. But now back to this one.

Y: You would have to explain that to me. I don't fully understand. I see what you are driving at but not...

B: I'll do, I need time to have all these pictures done.

Y: OK, take you time.

B: Now here, we have… Here we have a four dimensional structure. And we know the probability of this structure to appear.

Y: Yes.

B: And this probability. The probability of this structure to appear which is probability of 4D when connected. This is a fork of five actually which is connected to a larger circuit. Maybe we have not this yet explicitly. But the idea is it could be done, since we have all the elements. And now once we have the probability for 4D structure, we could see in terms Lila alone not mixing temporary physics into it. In terms of Lila alone, it could be shown that this probability is lesser, is smaller than the probability of this structure which is energy.

Bret: Which structure is energy?

B: This structure in which I have this is, maybe this should be to the, as you mentioned, it should be also, it should be connected to the circuit. So this is like this actually. And this is like this. In order to have distance or one dimensional space, I need this and this in perception of a non-physical individual. So I have one dimensional space. Then I have in perception of another individual which is actually in the perception of all the individuals in the circuit because all of these are connected to the circuit. So to the perception of each individual of the circuit, we have perception of another one dimensional length. And then these two are energy according to Lila.

Y: Yes.

B: But ah, and according to physics…

Y: Yes.

B: For that matter because we have one Planck length and another Planck length

Y: That's correct.

B: is whatever. It is energy. So this is also a structure in Lila Paradigm and this structure is more probable, is of greater probability, than this structure. And this is why 4D is decays to energy.

Y: All right, you are suggesting that it is more probable.

B: I 'm suggesting.

Y: I would have to look into it to see if it really were.

B: Yes. I believe it should be so because it will be convincing.

Y: If that were true, it would be.

B: It will be convincing because it will be done in terms of Lila Paradigm alone. If we prove this to be correct, there is no physics into this picture involved.

Y: I understand that.

B: It is fully based on Lila Paradigm.

Y: I'll give you another example that if we take this three, this is more probable than the four.

B: Ah ha, which is the same! I was thinking of it also. You see, I have this picture. I reduce this picture to one dimension less and then I have shown another picture here which shows that for the creatures in two dimensional time/space continuum which are, we know which they are, they are these structures in the perception of any one individuals into the circuit. This is what this is, just another way of expressing it. For these individuals having this perception, the third crossover is kind of energy because for them to be able to jump out of their own limitations, they need energy. So this is… this picture… how four dimensionality decays into energy, reduced to one dimension less showing just for illustration if not else, that in the perception of the individuals having sense of two dimensionality the appearance of three dimensionality is kind of an (anich?).

Y: You say that is another way of saying what I was telling here?

B: Yes, this was another way. If it is difficult to understand because it involves four dimensionality into picture. Yes, this is.

Y: This is easy for me to understand.

B: OK, great.

Y: But you have to have another way for people.

B: Because for you this is orthogonal. But for people seeing and thinking in terms of planar representation this is not orthogonal.

Y: No, it's consist… but it is orthogonal.

B: It Is, I know it is. And once you have this, it is great! But it should be maybe visible.

Y: I see your point as long as see that there is two ways of presenting the same thing.

B: Yes, two ways of presenting.

Y: The people think I am funny; and I think they are funny.

B: And another point. This and this are actually in a way the same, you know, because we have here one, two, three, four. And we have here one, two, three, four. This is why four dimensionality decays into energy because it is the same thing. It is the same. This graph and this graph are isomorphic.

Y: Yes. OK.

B: Difference in probability causes the structure to decay. Not possibility to have four dimensionality is that the probability is smaller than the probability to have energy.

Y: That fits with quantum physics, but we're doing it in terms of Lila Paradigm. And then say, "Well, that's what the quantum physics say."

B: What the quantum physics says.

Y: Yes.

B: But it should arise all from Lila Paradigm, and it does. And it is a great thing. It does. We just need to show which is not still done in Baker's paper. Or maybe it is at some other point that the probability for this to happen is lesser than the probability for this to happen. Otherwise there is no reason why we shouldn't have four dimensional picture. Why not four dimensional? Four dimensionality is not unknown in science. In string theory, they have eleven dimensions.

Y: Yes.

B: But we should show that in terms of Lila Paradigm, it is… and using just the means of Lila Paradigm, then the probability for this to happen is lesser than the probability for energy. In a sense it is the same thing because we have this here.

Y: Plenty of markers all the colours you want. (Unwraps a pack of coloured marking pens)

B: I want to say something about this. We have the standard big bang curve, and then we have the curve in Lila Paradigm which starts at Planck time. But this starting the curve of Lila Paradigm which merges into standard after inflation is done; this starting at one Planck time introduces uncertainty into the picture.

Y: Introduces what?

B: Introduces uncertainty into picture. Uncertainty. Heisenberg's uncertainty.

Y: Uncertainty.

B: Uncertainty because Planck time is derived from uncertainty. Planck time because uncertainty principle of Heisenberg says, we either have momentum or we have position. And this is Planck constant. But Planck constant is directly connected with Planck time and Planck length. So once we introducing Planck time, we are introducing the uncertainty principle into Lila which is like, you know, smearing of Lila. It is introducing uncertainty into what is finite. Lila is based on finite.

Y: That's true. However, the reason I did that.

B: Yes, I know the reason…

Y: Is so they could see the connection to the physical. Otherwise it is just some remote mathematical…

B: Speculation.

Y: Graph theory, idea that has nothing to do with anything.

B: Yes, I know. It was just a point I wanted to make.

Y: So you are right about that. But you're saying we should develop it purely and then add the connections to the physical right.

B: Yes.

Y: All right, I agree. I've got something about that to show too this morning.

B: And then fourth point I wanted to make is which I did in a way. We should draw the pictures and I'll (think of that?) in such manner that orthogonality should be clearly visible. In kind of an illusionary 3D presentation, you know. When showing energy, for instance, we should have a picture like this one. If I have a picture like this one… this could be, for instance, shadowed or somehow beautifully done. We have this. And once we have this… first of all, the thinking will be easier for us but also for readers because what is implicitly known to you is not known to us. And so if I have a picture like this one, then I have… I have, for instance, I have distance here, distance here. This is perception of length in this individual which is connected to the circuit. The circuit could be… where are this other mark I don't know. You known this is Hamiltonian. We have Hamiltonian like this and now, illusionary it goes to another dimension although it is the same you known but the perception is different and now…

Y: Because everyone is in a state of knowledge of everyone else's state of knowledge.

B: Yes.

Y: The arrows don't have to come.

B: I know, I know.

Y: From a single individual.

B: Yes, I know.

Y: To be orthogonal

b. It is like this, yes, I know, great!

Y: I was telling (nevius?) these guys.

B: This is great! But you know it is easier when you see it in pictures.

Y: Yes, I understand.

B: Like this isn't it. I have this and I have this. And then we have a clear notion of what energy is. Isn't it so in terms of Lila?

Y: I think so.

B: I have… and these are all connected. The picture should be…this should be… I was drawing this, this morning… like this because all these should be connected to the circuit. All these and this is the circuit. Hamiltonian. And this should be shown like this. Now, orthogonality is visible. And still you don't lose anything in the in the basis of Lila. We don't lose anything… This is the… although this is, of course, illusionary 3D… Finally, it is drawn on plane so it is.

Y: Comprende. Darshana does.

B: At least it might help us.

Y: Yes, I think it as far as we've gone; I don't see any whole in it. I'll have to think to be sure that we haven't overlooked something. But we came up with this last night when she came back from her walk. Then I had been thinking and this is the result that once you have one subsumption of two consciousnesses, you get a continuum either of time or of space, 1D space depending upon the arrangement of the connections. But when you get that continuum, then you have to allow for waves, not just digital. So it should combine both the digitally and continuity. And that is what she's done here along with an understanding of energy and it's relation to space where you take one dimensional space squared. This maybe has something to do with the square root of minus one. Just how they use that, I am not sure.

B: It has to do, yes, because this is now that you made that point it is great because in Gauss plane this is orthogonal. And this is where from I come in a way. We have here, for instance, a function or a system W which is complex. It has a real part of it plus [I] imaginary part of it. This is how it is expressed. If I stress here the module of W, this is W A to minus (yot?) imaginary part, over (yo?) part. And here is the real part and this is [I] multiplied by imaginary part.

Y: Now, how does that relate to this?

B: It is related to your notion that it could lead to the perception of what is square root of minus one. This is what I am explaining.

Y: Right, that this is orthogonal to that. The one coming from here is orthogonal to this one. So did you take one as a referent?

B: Yes.

Y: Which is this…? You call real?

B: Yes.

Y: And then the other one becomes imaginary.

B: Yes. It will be thus too many insights. We could take advantage of this. I'll come back to it. I just wanted to stress something else.

Y: Yes.

B: Which is important and which was also inspired by your remark last time when I have drawn this. Here this is strictly determined. This is, for instance, one length quanta, this is two length quanta, this is three length quanta. Actually they are sine of this, and this is including more and more individuals into the information flowing through the circuit. For instance, when the information… illusionary because we introduced into the picture time quanta.

Y: Yes.

B: Otherwise, it is instantaneous. The reduction is instantaneous.

Y: Right. But it appears to take time.

B: Even though it appears to take time, so this is this one. Then when the information comes to this is this one. Then when… although actually… this is the projection of it. Now the third one because what is the magnitude of this one? The magnitude of this one is the projection of moving of the illusionary information through the circuit. So the first one is this one, the second one… the projection of the second one. You know… I'll draw another picture. May I? We have.

Y: If you don't want lined paper, we have unlined paper.

B: OK. It is better to take advantage of the lines.

Y: OK.

B: We have this and we have illusionary moving of the information through the circui, by taking one arrow and then two arrows, then three arrows, then four, then five. And what is the length of this discrete elements? Is exactly this.

Bret. That is exactly the idea that I had yesterday. You didn't let me finish saying.

B: (acknowledges) we started the discussion.

Y: So.

B: Yes, it is. So we have here the projection of the moving. After one TD, we have projection of this. And this is exactly this. Then after 2D, we have not 2D but projection of this, over the axis. And this is the second one. So if this is A one, this is A two. And then the representative point… let us name this representative point. We have representative point moving through the circuit. And now the third one is the third one and so on. This is A three, the fourth one, and the fifth one. Maybe could be missed.

Y: Yes. Your name goes on the paper too Bret.

B: And then, we also have projection of this on this.

Y: You heard that.

Bret: (acknowledges)

Y: Good.

B: So this other projection could be represented here because yesterday at the evening, you mentioned something about pi being finite.

Y: OK. I think it opens up a whole connection between the current mathematics that describe the quantum realm and the Lila Paradigm. Now there is something I would like to say that you are calling for… describe it in terms of Lila Paradigm. And then connect it to the physical. Physicality comes from the projection that is the observation. So there is the observer and there is the observed. And that the observer is conscious of something that appears to be physical which is really another individual. So if we want to develop a pure explanation before going through that consciousness connection to the… which is consciousness and physicality are inextricably part of the same thing. Then we want to describe the fundamental structure in terms of states of direct knowledge and states of no direct knowledge. And we want to do that first. In my diagram here, I have taken out everything but just one box here of consciousness. That's an after effect. What you should do is try to understand the rest of it in terms of states of direct knowledge. It says A state of direct knowledge of B, this, which is being pointed at includes direct knowledge of B's state of direct knowledge of D which is this and direct knowledge of B's state of direct knowledge of C.

Now here's a rule. If states of direct knowledge or for that matter, states of no direct knowledge, are in the domain of an individual, that is their states of that individual, every combination of states of direct knowledge are subsumed to each other. In other words, this one, for example, and this one become another state of direct knowledge. And this one and this one also combine. And this one and this one also combine. And each one produces a state of direct knowledge that is unique. That is this; and this is different than this combined with this, or this combined with this. So you have to have those states of direct knowledge.

Just realize what they are and then take the consciousness of those which is due to the likeness or sameness of whatever elements are the same as those of A. And that produces consciousness that excludes the 'whos' here. And so you get this consciousness.

The advantage of this way of approaching things is that there is no question about A being conscious of the difference between D ● and C ●. If you deal in terms of consciousness as in say these are combining consciousness are combining, then there is no identification of the consciousness of this particle. He's just a dot and the identification of this particle; it is just a dot in terms of consciousness. And you combine consciousnesses. You would be combining a dot and another unidentified dot. But individual A is in a state of knowledge of the ‘who’ they are. So he has in the state of knowledge, the knowledge of their difference. And that knowledge is had in its combined form, in its compared form, in the knowledge realm rather than in the consciousness realm. Consciousness only comes about because of the likeness of an attribute of an individual with the individual’s domain it is. That is a secondary effect. The combining of states of knowledge takes priority. And then the consciousness of that, those various combinations are made, based upon all the information. And including the ‘whos’ but excluding the ‘whos’ in the consciousness. Do you get what I am driving at?

Bret: I think so.

Y: So our description with all the rules apply only to the states of direct knowledge and there combinations that are then responsible under the consciousness definition effect for the different kinds of consciousness. Hah!
I was up all night on that.

Bret: There are three levels of math. The Lowest math is the knowledge math which will be completed and consistent by itself although it doesn’t explain everything. But then the consciousness math is built on that because it is completely subject to it. And then on top of that, we build the physical math.

Y: You have that down?

Bret: Yah.

Y: Now if you had gotten your own party together, you could be the one who said he said it first. But I am glad that we all see the same thing. That means we’ve got it. And this goes along with what you were saying is that it should be… Lila should be pure.

B: Yes.

Y: And consistent within itself. And then we project in consciousness; and then we get the physical.

B: Yes.

Y: So we are all saying the same thing.

B: May I combine just this, this?

Y: You go right ahead. That is what I got all these markers here for and all the paper.

B: With this notion of mine to have always three dimensionality, you know, just to be illusionary three dimensionality. For instance, this is how we (close?) down at first place. It is inspired by your, of course. But I think if we could express it like this, you know. I have… I am trying to do it three dimensionally, so this will be an ellipse. And I have this, and I have this, and I have this. And these are tau… These come from…

These… I have a tub here, and a tub here, and they are making a fork. And these is actually… and I have this.

Y: What is this?

B: I need time to. And this proceeds here. And then I have this. I'll draw it once again. And then I have this larger circuit. This comes from here. This is better if… This is my first attempt, so I will do it better. I have here and here. And these are like… and this is A, this is B, this is C, this is D. In other words, this forked structure… Yes, this is A in state of direct knowledge of B: But this is like a tub. It is three dimensional.

Y: Like a what?

Bret: Tub.

Y: Tub.

B: Tub. Yes, tub. Three dimensional and this is smaller and this goes… B is in a state of direct knowledge of C in a state of direct knowledge of D which are smaller tubs. And if it is all projected, on a monitor, I get A in a state of direct knowledge to B, B in state of direct knowledge of C and D. So A is the greatest tub. This comes to B, this is C and this is D. And this is B: This is B, C, D, and all these projected although they should fit into B… So this projects into the largest circuit. This B here, B projects into the smallest circle. And this and this are projected into this one. But it could be done three dimensionally, in three dimensions.

Y: I get the idea. It almost looks like a magnetic monopole drawn.

B: (acknowledges)

Y: (Sound from camera) So what's developing? When you're devising a new paradigm, you have to devise language to hold in common. You have to devise symbols and presentations, the different approaches, and agreed upon definitions. Establishing a new paradigm and then the leaders of that have to be lead in order of sequence so they are not being explained at something they are not prepared to be explained to about because they don't have the definitions that go before. People spend seven, eight years at universities going through the previous steps so that they are caught up with the current research. Well, when you have a radical new paradigm like this, we have to be patient with people and lead them gradually from where they are to where we want them to be. OK. You got more thought.

B: No, no, no, improving this tubs. It is like this, and this arrows.

Y: That's the monitor?

B: That's the monitor. They have this C D, the projection of B and the projection of A. A, B, C, D and then the sameness could be shown easily, the sameness.

Y: The sameness.

B: Because here we couldn't present it because it is the third dimension.

Y: That's why the consciousness dimension.

B: For instance, we could have the four attributes for A presented like rays. Who, unity, existence, ability to act. And these are A's, A, A, A, A, and these are B's attributes.

Y: Attributes. OK. Now, for something completely different. On this hand calculator, there is a random generator, approximately random.

B: Yes, quasi.

Y: And I used it to using a code for the numbers that come up for which of the 26 letters. See each board number code comes up randomly. And that means that an arrow is going from J. And then I would do it again, and another one it would come P. See how I did it. And I made this whole thing starting here. First was C arrow T and then (N) arrow [I] and then A. This is how they came up randomly. And I just kept accumulated total going like this. And this is, is ah… I was looking when a circuit would show up. When the different forms and patterns would show up just to have a feel for what goes on.

Bret: How long ago?

Y: Oh this.

Bret: Not last night, for instance.

Y: About twelve years ago. Well, the Lila Paradigm earnestly started sixteen years ago. The red line shows the new arrow being added. The new arrow is always in red.

B: This is called simulation in optimization methods.

Y: Say it louder.

B: Simulation. You simulated a problem.

Y: Yes, instead of a computer, I did it with a random generator and a pencil.

Don: Can I say one thing on expectation value? If you ran 50 of these and then took like where a specific pattern came in and in one it would be after so many arrows…

Y: That would be a way to check it.

Don: Well, that's what they mean by expectation.

Y: Yah.

Don: If you average all the simulations.

Y: Exactly.

B: It is done in simulation. It could be done with matrices. This is, then I know what we should do with matrices because I was thinking of it and thinking of it. This could be done with matrices.

Y: Yes, this is very hard to do.

B: Supported by this simulation methods. I'll show it to you what the simulation methods do actually. You have come to it by your own.

Y: This is one way. But there's other ways.

B: Because, for instance, if in optimization theory, if you want to find out if another, for instance, clerk or I don't know the words cashier, the one at the big super markets.

Bret: Cashier.

B: Cashier.

Bret: Monte Carlo.

B: The Monte Carlo method. This is actually, this could be supported by Monte Carlo method. When you are trying to find out whether to hire another cashier based on the observations how many buyers.

Y: Yes, we could check say Baker's analysis by using this approach.

B: By simulation. This is what this doctorial candidates could do.

Y: Didn't he eventually do that?

Bret: Hum.

Y: Adding an arrow randomly?

Bret: All my simulations have this as their base. Yah. This has been worked out for years in my programs.

Y: Yes. Years after I did this. I had not computer in those days. All I had was this.

B: So once again we… you establish these symbols randomly. Is it so or how? How it is done? By random numbers because you could have, for instance, if you are producing random numbers, you might find some which is not in the ( ).

Y: I started at A and it is the lowest number; then B, C, D, through the alphabet. And I just assigned them the.

B: You produced this random numbers by the calculator and denoted the first four to A; then the next two to.

Y: No. I wrote this down first. And I said A is the lowest number. This number is the lowest number.

B: They are raising.

Y: Then if it is in that area, then I say the arrow is going to go from A.

B: Ah, ah yes, yes.

Y: Then I'll press the other one and it says, “This number comes up.” So I say, “Ok, the arrow goes to J.”

B: This is exactly how the Monte Carlo method.

Y: Yes, that’s how. You know, I do it with a ten dollar calculator.

B: Like Michael Heimar. Great! This is wonderful!

Y: And I see that the point where the first circuit came in was a lot earlier than I thought. But it was a very small circuit.