

#22

Formal talk-28102006 morning day8s2
Lila recording day 7, morning 2 session

28/10/2006

061028001

56 min

[Recording 22](#)

Y: By another approach and this is a different approach, it says it is by Charles Berner and Catherine Draut.

For a long time people have been attempting to discover the essential truth about our universe, the universe which includes our experience of consciousness and free choice. The thesis presented here enables one see how two apparently conflicting approaches to this endeavor, that of religion and that of science, are both describing the same fundamental reality. The essence of the thesis is that a non-physical ultimate reality (God) exists which transfigures itself to appear as a physical universe.

You know the term transfigure?

B: Yes.

Y: Like one day Jesus climbed up on top of Mount Tabor in the Holy Land. And he took two disciples with him, and then he transfigured. After, a cloud came and God spoke and said, "With you I am well pleased," because Jesus was doing it correctly. And he transfigured, that is all his clothes became shinning bright and his body became like that also. This is the first stage of the divine body and it is called the transfiguration. And it comes when you recognize every individual in your body and your clothes as being a divine individual with the power of choice. So the essence of this thesis is that a non-physical ultimate reality (God) exists which transfigures itself to appear as the physical universe.

The nature of that reality and the way in which it is transfigured to appear as a universe consistent with the measurements of science constitutes a radical new paradigm. Due to the unfamiliarity with the ideas of this paradigm, we begin with a discussion of three of its main assumptions including how these assumptions agree with or contradict some commonly held assumptions in religion and in scientific traditions.

Actually it says including how these assumptions agree with or contradict some commonly held assumptions in religious and scientific traditions.

1. It is common today for religious people to think God made me meaning that they think of themselves as a human body created by God. Most scientists are also lead into thinking of themselves as human bodies because science discounts anything other than the observable visible world. Anything else must be only an idea which is the product of the mind which in turn is the product of the brain which is physical. On the other hand, religious traditions and theologians usually say that an individual is not a human animal body but the soul, the spirit, the Atman, the psyche, the Anima, the Ka, a divine entity that transcends matter, energy, time and space. This new paradigm presented here is in agreement with that last view. In the paradigm, it is assumed that

an individual is a non-physical entity. The non-physical is a divine individual. What one really is, is the one who can be conscious, who experiences being in a body or going to heaven when the body with which one has... was associated, dies. Jesus said in John 6:34 quoting God as God spoke in Psalm 82 verse 6. Jesus and God said, "You are all Gods." Plural. We are all really non-physical individuals that have the divine power to choose.

All right, that's the first assumption. The second assumption.

2. Most modern religious traditions are monotheistic holding that there is a single divine being while earlier in our history it was common to have a pantheon of Gods. Yet many religions that later came to emphasize either multiple or the unitary nature of God originally held that God was not only single but one and many. The Hebrew word for God used in the first verse of the Bible is Elohim rather than El, the singular term. Elohim means both God as one and God as many. See an article by Feynman 1976.

In Genesis, Chapter 1 Verse 26, God says, "Let us create man in our image." In the paradigm presented here, God is both single and multiple. God as one is the single power, exercised by God and many non-physical Divine individuals which we really are. The concept of God is both singular and plural is similar to the concept of an orchestra, a whole which is made up of many players. God is one non-physical power; and God is many non-physical individuals which individually exercise that power.

That's the second assumption. Third assumption.

Science is the main influence in teaching that only the non-physical (error should say - physical) universe exists and that all things including life, consciousness, and thoughts like "God" are products of the physical world. And that therefore God is just an idea. Many religious people assume that although God created the world, the universe now exists separate from God. The paradigm presented here states that the non-physical Divine individuals are the basis of everything. It is indeed God that creates the physical universe, God as all of us. We non-physical divine individuals collectively create this universe. However, the universe is not separate from us. God as both singular and plural is manifested as this created universe and does not manifest otherwise. In other words, God both as the one power and as us non-physical Divine exercisers of that power transforms itself, or transform itself or ourselves to appear as this world. Quote "In the beginning God, as one and many Elohim, created heaven and earth." We, the non-physical Divine individuals, are the basis of the physical rather than the other way around.

That's the third assumption. Then I launch into the details of the Lila Paradigm. So that puts a stress in a different way but says the same thing made just for Christians and Jews. I don't know how this should be presented. Or maybe it should be presented many different ways. In a book one way, in a magazine article another, in a technical journal another, in a mathematical journal another, in a physic journal another. Bla de bla. And a movie by Mel Gibson. A TV series. I don't know. Or maybe just as it says in the Bible. When the Messiah comes the second time, he speaks the truth so clearly that it just wipes out all the untruth in just one swoop of the side of his tongue. That's what it says there. I don't know. OK. Now anybody have anything to offer?

Don: Biljana, on your diagram that you were doing earlier with the tubs, could we go back to that?

B: Yes.

Y: You had a diagram.

Don: Yes. This screen that it is projecting on... what does that represent?

Y: The physical world.

B: This picture here this is... ()

Don: I know... what... this is... What does this correlate to in the world?

B: The world is this one.

Don: Yes, but what is this whole thing? What is the screen?

B: I say this is illusionary. I say illusionary; it is just a way to present it to be more clear.

Don: I understand. But is that like the field of consciousness that it is projected on? I just want... I am trying to understand it.

B: In a way, yes, because... Not just the screen, but the whole three-dimensional illusionary space.

Don: But is it consciousness?

B: It is consciousness because now we could add the sameness.

Don: Yes, I do see that.

B: This is why it could be said that it is consciousness.

Bret: I don't think she drew it so that that plane has any significance other than she is relating her way of explaining from the paper.

Don: Does it have any significance particularly.

B: The main significances is, yes, to make it more clear and to allow this sameness which is consciousness. For instance, this is just knowledge. But the sameness is consciousness. And whether to say it... to have this sameness illustrated, we need another dimension and this another dimension could be done like this one.

Don: That's like...

B: Ah ha! You have this.

Don: Well.

Y: You should look at this and see.

B: Yes, yes, this is like tomography, we were talking this morning.

Don: Yes.

B: It is like taking intersections.

Don: See, when we are talking about the math, this is one math because this is the states of consciousness... states of knowledge.

B: Yes, states of knowledge.

Don: This is the comparison.

B: Yes, but these... you have done... this is here... done planary, in the plane.

Don: I understand.

B: And now, these sameness which is added as a new quality to just knowledge and creates consciousness are drawn out into another dimension.

Don: Three dimensional. Yah, but this distinction here is between the state of knowledge and the state of consciousness. And then, this is the other mathematics that occurs to get from knowledge to consciousness. And that was what I thought was what was happening here.

Y: Darshana would you turn the heater on. And bring my...

B: In a way, yes.

Don: But this is clearly the sphere of consciousness, the... which is...

B: Which makes it sphere of consciousness are these sameness.

Don: Yes, well, it is not the sameness but the comparison.

B: The comparison, yes. The comparison whether it is the same or not.

Don: (acknowledges)

B: This is the quality added to knowledge in order to become consciousness.

Y: Also, this is compared to that. So there is two kinds of comparisons going on.

Don: Ah ha.

Y: There's () to get consciousness, and there is another one which is of the states of knowledge are being compared.

Don: So this comparison.

Y: Or being subsumed into a single state of knowledge.

Don: So this comparison here also occurs which...

Y: Produces that.

Don: Yes, but... So that.

Y: But it does that only when these take place. So there's a subsumption of them on the level of direct knowledge. And then there is a superposition on top of that, of the consciousness which is generated by this. And she is showing that this way and I am showing it by a bunch of words.

Don: Well, that was the intent here to consciousness that results.

Y: Yes, I have got that.

Don: OK, but...

Y: It just doesn't show that sequence. She is trying to show the sequence.

Don: Yes. Well, I looking at, how I can redraw this to incorporate... I just want to get clear what the intent is here. And I think it is similar.

Y: Oh, yes, it shows the same thing. She has used colors here to separate everything.

B: (We have three indications and this is the whole picture?)

Don: Yah, I don't have color. But the important thing here is that we do have this comparison here and both these comparisons and this subsumes.

B: The whole picture is a third; there is a third to it.

Y: Yes, that's correct.

Don: That's important, I missed that.

Y: That's what I had missed too. That's why I brought it up today.

Don: Good, that's why... Yah, that helps a lot.

Y: OK.

Don: So those (we get into) the mathematics (we) the comparison we have a subsumption of this and that.

B: It could be done also linearly this intersection. It could be stated explicitly that we have all these subsumptions. We have B in state of knowledge of C, B in state of knowledge of D. These two are subsumed. For instance, one subset...

Don: It's like I have here. This is just () here.

B: And then we have another which is B is in state of knowledge of C and D. These are separate subsets. And the third one, actually the same you have, but also combinations of these. These with these.

Don: Yah, that's these here.

B: Ah ha! You have it all! OK.

Don: Now, he's got to do one for the face also but.

B: From A to B to C to D. I wanted to ask you about... ah... Are we finished?

Don: Yah. I just... Would you like me to try draw this?

B: Yes, yes, great if you.

Don: With the three dimensional view.

B: (acknowledges) This three will be great.

Don: I won't get a chance tonight but I will.

B: I could...

Don: No, I have a photograph of it thank you. Color photo.

B: I wanted to see here. It is clear to me how circuits could occur. But how the branch occurs? Is it just linear or if it? If we... For instance, we are finding random numbers and we see how (K) to B C is followed to C is D is followed and we go, go, go, in a circle, the circuit is closed. But when do we have bifurcation?

Bret: No, no, the randomness decides both the origin and the end. It is not automatically true that the next arrow is added to the last individual.

B: (acknowledges)

Bret: So, for instance, consider here.

B: Ah, yes, because it is a ranged. A ranged is B to F. This is one a ranged, B to F, another range is C to D. This is another range.

B: Yes, yes. Great! This is a subject for a doctorate thesis to be done, to do all the F2, F3, all the probabilities done on basis of assimilation process.

Don: Yes.

B: Yes, Yes. Every arrow belongs to a range.

Bret: This one does not involve any of these. He simply hasn't drawn all of these other arrows. He only drew the change in the system rather than repeat this because I don't see this... these letters in this previous diagram at all. So this is not a complete representation of what is happening, ()

Y: This is assumed. And then the next arrow was between two that were not in here.

Bret: That's right. So actually this diagram should be this plus this. There is no connection between them. She was looking at this and thinking that each arrow came from the last chosen individual and therefore make would make a circuit...and wondering where the branches came from.

Y: No, no. It's random.

Bret: So I'm pointing out that even though this doesn't show that, that's why it doesn't show that. You didn't happen to draw it in.

Y: So you were finished?

Don: Yes. We have just done something else.

Y: All right. Now, Bret, you had something.

Bret: I have two things.

Y: This should be interesting.

Bret: It occurred to me that the choice of which three crossovers an individual uses as a reference for three dimensional space may change. There is no reason that it has to be the same three crossovers in the comparison of sub-states. Therefore, motion may involve the comparison of reference frameworks essentially.

Y: I would have to think about that.

Bret: And then the question following out of that is, well, why does an individual chose a particular three crossovers as their frame of reference regardless of any()?

Y: Why would they?

Bret: Because the choice is made.

Y: Choice made for a reason is not a choice.

Bret: I accept that. However, an individual does choose because everything else is compared to that.

Y: Yes, it is true that they can choose to choose something that there is a reason to do. But they can choose not to.

Bret: You and I are talking about two things. I understand you are not happy with the language I am using. But you are not referring to what it is that I am actually talking about right now.

Y: Well, you're right. But I have a different intent than you do. My intent is for us to find a common language so that you're not talking Chinese and I am talking Orangian. So that we have... So when you use a word choose, it means the same thing to me. Or when... So some body has got to decide which way we are going to do it. And since I am the old man, then I am trying to clarify what a word means. And that... I am inviting you to use it in that sense because you're going to end up with a different language and partly different paradigm as a result.

Bret: If you already have decisions about how words should be used, perhaps you should offer the suggestion as to what word I should be using in light of what I am saying instead of simple telling me the one that I am using is wrong. I am trying to actually say some concept.

Y: Well. I am going by the usual meaning of the word choose.

B: What word shall we use subsumption, for instance, reference or word that doesn't exist yet, in this context?

Y: As I said, after your first remark, I would have to think about it.

Bret: OK.

Y: So go ahead. But I reserve the right to comment.

Bret: An individual in resolving the sub-states into some experience of a physical world does refer to three crossover arrows or four crossover arrows, some set of crossover arrows to provide the experience of space that the physical world occurs in. There may be hundreds of thousands of crossover arrows. Yet that individual in a certain circumstance selects some subset of them. It isn't necessarily true that the same sub-state is used in the comparison of all the sub-states. In different sets of sub-states, a different set of arrows may provide the reference that offers the background for the physical world, in that sub-state.

Y: I agree it doesn't matter.

B: What doesn't matter?

Y: Which ones he chooses.

B: It does matter. It matters because the individual does resolve the consequences of that sub-state in light of the ones that are preferred.

Y: And there is where we differ. I'm saying... when I say it doesn't matter... I mean you'll get the same number of dimensions regardless of which of those of the same patterns you chose as long as it is the same pattern forgetting the number of dimensions.

Bret: Yes, for the number of dimensions. But you may not get the same arrangement of space and distance between particles and therefore physical location.

Y: Ok. That's clear.

Bret: So it may matter which arrows in particular in a sub-state happen to be the ones that provide the reference for space. And the different spaces subsumed from the different sub-states may provide the experience of motion. And that leads to the question, "Is there some state-able rule that allows us to specify which particular arrows will provide the background of space in a given sub-state?"

Y: I don't think so. Unless I'm not seeing something which is entirely possible that what you're saying is the cause of motion or is the reason for motion is probably a tertiary factor in motion. Certainly secondary factor, not the primary one. And the reason I am saying that is that it doesn't really matter which set of arrows is being considered because all of us in the circuit are conscious of all of them. So I think you would get something more like an averaging effect of all of them with the pattern of arrows that come out from any of them averaged together to give you a background average. That's why (K) shows up in the universal constants.

Bret: I disagree. You perceive the physical world from a different perspective than I do. There must be some observable difference in how we resolve the states.

Y: Yes, there are differences.

Bret: There has to be.

Y: But I said there is an average. And the measurements that we make, which includes our conscious observations, are made up of an average of the whole circuit and all the crossovers. It's subsumed in each one of us in consciousness unless you have a separate baby universe which is connected by just one arrow. You may be in such a state; and then it would be true. But we are entitled to disagree. I don't see how we can ever resolve it with facing up to two different understandings except to talk them out. You are giving your view; and I am giving mine. If we are talking about very small non-circuit structures what you are saying it true.

B: Yes. And an additional arrow does the reduction of the wave. Isn't this so? You have a separate baby universe and we have the greater Hamiltonian. This is the Hamiltonian which provides, for instance, the state of affairs in the universe today.

Y: Yes.

B: And there is a separate universe. And then one additional arrow does the reduction of the wave, the collapse of the wave function.

Y: Yes. So you get a different value.

B: So all at once, this one who had another perception joins together the perception of the others. And for him this is reduction of the wave function.

Y: Any arrow does that.

B: Any arrow does that, yes, of course. And this is why they have all one and the same perception which was the difference.

Y: That's what I am saying; and he is saying...

B: This is seen by each individual the same. And so this is why the three dimensional space for me is the same as the three dimensional space for you.

Y: But you have a little universe here with just one observer...

B: There is one observer who is observing differently and for him... And Ok. It is... and so no matter... at one state of affairs he...

Y: He will see one motion.

B: He will establish a direct connection with any of the individuals of the greater circuit. And all at once, there is a reduction.

Y: And they have to accept him.

B: Yes, yes.

Y: Then he is in this circuit.

B: And he is in this circuit. And this is the reduction. And this is the wording here you are using in terms of quantum physics. And this is to be understood in order to understand this. For instance, at the first reading I was wondering what reduction means to him, to whoever, to you or Seeley. And then I have realized this...what I am trying to explain. I am not trying to say anything new, just to clarify.

Y: I wrote most of this with the help of Seeley and Baker.

B: Yes, this is how they... this is the way they use the word reduction as far as I can...

Y: In quantum physics.

B: In quantum physics, and once I understood this, I understood what they are trying to say here in terms of particles because in terms of Lila Paradigm we are discussing

this through all this sessions. But in terms of particle... for instance, he says, "The reduction of MQ creates a bionomic? time series." This is clear to me once I perceived this. He says, "The reduction of MQ by 7B, whatever 7B is, it is a certain asymmetry which creates actually motion." Isn't it so?

Y: I am not sure that, that is a complete satisfactory definition of motion. If that is part of a circuit, yes. But if it is not it...

B: Yes.

Y: They're not all at the same time.

B: They should be part of a circuit; this is why I always joined.

Y: Right so. This is out of date. It doesn't say that.

B: Ok, Ok. My point was what reduction does mean in terms of quantum physics. Once I established a new arrow, a new state of direct knowledge doesn't matter which one it is, the reduction takes place. Then all the possible choices existed before this are resolved. All of the sudden, I have a common space time knowledge or whatever perception is included.

Y: Yes. So you read this last night?

B: I read, yes, I read it. It was very insightful.

Don: A lot of differences.

B: Yes, a lot of differences. Still, you know, it gives some idea. Ah ha! they have Fi also. These are ...

Don: You know, I seem... the problem of motion, if motion is derivative of time.

Y: Yes.

Don: That if we modeled the appearance of the passage of one unit of time in a simple circuit situation.

B: It would be helpful.

Don: And got that clear. Then it might aid to understanding motion.

Y: Yes. Yes, that is what I was trying to show you in that diagrams yesterday.

Don: But this is for time... What one unit of passage of time, appearance of passage of time, would look like.

Y: But by my drawing the sub-states, you're suppose to realize that from the previous arguments, that that includes time.

Don: (acknowledges) Well, I can see that that includes time. But I just again I would like to very explicitly state from this sub-state to this sub state is the perception of one unit of time so that we have a clear agreement on if we can allow...

Y: Fine, I am all for it.

Don: Because it is a much simpler problem than motion.

Y: All of it should be clear.

Don: But it is just a much simpler problem than motion and motion is derivative of that.

Y: Yes, but they have to understand the time first, then understand... and space in order to understand motion which is what Bret is trying to do.

Don: Well, I would like to get time pinned down first.

B: Into the circuit.

Y: Well, pin it down.

Don: OK.

B: May I say something else which might be important. For instance, the moment the circuit is closed, then the arrows don't have meaning any more.

Bret: I don't think that's true.

B: So the moment... It is true in terms of introducing physics into picture, but not in terms of Lila Paradigm.

Y: It can be done both ways. You can consider this one as one arrow or as many. And this is the basis of the theory of relativity as it turns out.

B: Yes. So this is why I emphasize. This is important in terms of introducing physics into picture, but not in terms of Lila Paradigm. In terms of Lila Paradigm, the directed graph becomes undirected. Isn't it so? Isn't it so?

Y: I don't know for sure. I have heard you say that several times.

B: Yes, I have said that because all of the sudden it is... I could say the perception of A to B is the same as the perception B to A. The length becomes... Ah! I found something which was the fifth point I'd forgot this morning which clarifies this, you know, which clarifies what they have seen here. This is what I was pointing out yesterday.

Bret: I think you are making an assumption, Biljana, which may not turn out to be true.

Y: I sense that too.

B: Based on what I had reading here.

Y: I had a big argument with Baker and Seeley over this very point.

B: Ah! it is visible here and you see here when I was pointing...

Y: It is not the same thing to be known as to be a knower. Those are different.

B: Because they are thinking in terms of physics, that's why.

Bret: There is another aspect too.

Y: That's right in terms of physics. You're right. But in terms of the ultimate reality, it's wrong.

B: Ok. Great! I am all for the ultimate reality.

Bret: No, there is another aspect too. In terms of physics too, it seems very likely that you're making an assumption that is incorrect. And here is why.

B: But this is what makes you... It is what makes you... it makes it difficult for you to understand the concept. I don't say you don't understand it; but in your way. In terms what the picture we are building together because you say... because you are so much bounded to this perception.

Bret: You don't know what I am going to say yet.

B: Ok. Don't. This is why I don't want to discuss this. What I want to discuss is here... I was stressing out that it should be 49, you see. I was stressing out it should be 7 because there are 7. The perception become common for all of them. They are 7 and the length is 7 for each of them. So the overall length is 49 and this here in same wording. Maybe both I and they are incorrect. It might be true. But in away it helped me understand what they are trying to say.

Y: Yes.

B: They have said this in the same wording. They have 8 multiplied by 8. Ah ha, here. Also each observer are in the connect from circuit. This is where maybe I made a mistake, reduces every observer's reduction of 8 L quanta giving the experience of 8 squared L quanta or 64 L quanta. This repeats again to give A third. It was somewhere else. I am not implying that this does not matter; it matters. But in terms of physics. This is how the wave appears. If I don't have this in mind, the direction of the arrows, then I shouldn't have a wave which I do. So this implies direction. This implies, direction, direction, direction.

Y: Yes. That right.

B: And this is what I was trying to do with this drawing. In this drawing. I have the representative point being here. Then I have this length. Then I have the representative point of this length.

Y: Yes. That's right.

B: And this is directed. But in terms of understanding what common knowledge of time and space is, it is not direct. Here it was given in the same wording. The same wording that once the reduction takes place, then all of the sudden, they have a common knowledge of space time and the length is 64. And it was stressed that it was 64 because it includes the knowledge of one individual of itself. Sorry I didn't underline, I will find it.

Y: I think I have put my finger on what the problem is. There is a difference between knowledge held in common and a common situation of which everyone has knowledge. If everyone has the same knowledge, this is common knowledge how the word is being used, but they're all separate. Each one of them has a separate state of knowledge. It is not a state of knowledge of which everyone is connected to. In other words, there is no relationship that exists by itself and that one can join up to. The relationships are always states of individuals, separate individuals. This is the same point as saying there is no God's eye view. There is no Archimedes point. It is just an idea. And I think this is the basis of our trouble here...is which way is it.

B: I fully agree and it is marvelous and this is basics of Lila. What I was trying to understand is particle physics. And in order to understand this, I use this way of thinking and I find it helpful.

Y: I agree. But that doesn't mean that to be known is the same thing as knowing. Physically it may be equivalent but underlining a non-directed graph is a directed graph, not the other way around.

B: OK.

Y: You agreed with me on that. I wrote you in a letter about it. And now you are saying othe wise.

B: No, no, I fully agree, I am just trying to understand the particles. This was what I was doing this morning. And I found it helpful if I think of the reduction of the wave function this way. This is the way that they are using the word reduction. This is what I am saying. And this is why I also stressed in regard to physics to differentiate from the basics of Lila.

Y: Yes, the basis of Lila.

B: I never said in my letter ()

Y: There is a reduction, it takes place but it is in terms of knowledge. Whereas, there is another one called consciousness and that reduction takes place. That's the physical level, but that's all illusionary.

B: Yes.

Y: Ok. Well, maybe we're not in trouble after all.

B: No, no. Not at all, I am going way ahead in... I anticipated you will come to the point to explain what is quark, tau, anti-tau. And in order to be able to understand this, we should understand reduction. The reduction as it is used in the physics in terms of particles not just in terms of Lila.

Y: Reduction takes place in the non-physical realm.

B: I know, yes, I fully agree.

Y: So how can I explain an illusion?

B: But if you... but this is what you are doing when drawing the magnitudes.

Y: As I said in my comment about mindful universe to staff. I said, "There is no physical reduction. That is a mistaken idea. There is no delay between the possibility and the extant." They say there is these possibilities. And there is coherence. And it last for a little while until the wave function expands. And then the probability gets so thin that it can't happen; and the reduction takes place after a delay. Especially the nerve doctors, they think that this is a nerve process. And the reduction happens and then you become conscious. We have a problem; and we haven't over come it yet. I think we are not... It's a matter of terminology. It's like you believe that there really is a physical reduction.

B: No, no. Not at all. Not at all.

Y: Then what are you trying to understand?

B: I am trying to relate to contemporary physics. This I am trying to do. If we stay in the realm of philosophy, I am fully agreed. And it will make my task very easy here and I will be all content. And I will have no problem at all because this is what I do.

Y: But in terms of physics.

B: But what I am... what my concern is... I don't know enough about particle physics. But I want to contribute here as well not just in artificial intelligence, and so on, and so on, which I can. Monte Carlo, I know; Monte Carlo I teach.

Y: You know what the collapse of the wave function is? Do you? Schrodinger equation?

B: Yes. This is what I am trying to do.

Y: Ah Ha!

B: If you are satisfied with me just joining here in discussion... this is... It makes my task very easy here and I am fully satisfied. And I will enjoy until the end of my stay.

Y: Yes.

B: But if you want something more.

Y: No, I am not asking for something more. I just want to point out that all the theoretical physicists have no idea what reduction is.

Y: Yes, but in order to negate them, I must understand them. This is my point. In order to be able to say Charles Berner is right and Guth is not right, I must understand Guth's point of view.

Bret: And be able to explain it in Guth's terms to. And be able to explain it in Guth's or he won't be able to listen.

B: Because my doctoral candidates will see it like this and they will be asking me questions. And they should defend their thesis in front of an assembly. And I should defend them also.

Y: I understand your point.

B: Because one thing... For instance, maybe...

Y: I'll have to think about it because it is an important point. Can you do it? Can you explain reduction to them in their terms when they don't know what reduction is themselves in their own terms? I find that hard to believe. They all admit they have no idea what is reduction. They don't know what causes it. Even Stapp doesn't know. He is saying it is an individual purposely making a choice. And that comes very close to the truth. But that's the Lila Paradigm.

Bret: But nobody else understands anything either. What instead we have is a proposal from someone of a structure we can use to predict what is going to happen; and we try and we find...

Y: Which works, but they have no idea why.

Bret: out that it works. That's distinct from understanding. The understanding comes when the person is willing to accept the idea and connect to it. But in the meantime the peer review stuff that goes in print is the statement of the mechanism that is used along with the numbers that show it could be considered. And then the person is willing to consider it. So there is those two different steps. And we need to satisfy the one of being able to put in paper in Guth's terms, for instance.

Y: Well, I get your point and I think it... Your point is clear. And yours the same point. Maybe that's my problem is that I don't do that. And so, therefore, they don't publish papers. They listen politely sometimes and go some place else. I don't know if that bridge can be crossed.

Bret: Dave Barry is a humorist and he wrote a column about his irritation at scientists spending billions of dollars on the invisible particles. And he had one line in there.

He said, "I can believe in atoms because physicists have demonstrated that they can use them to vaporize cities." You have to talk in some way that convinces them in their world or they won't pay attention.

Y: Well, what if you vaporize the scientist with the truth?

Bret: Because the truth is voluntary, they'll only get the truth if they want it. And they won't get it until they do, and so it can't be forced.

Y: That's right. But maybe you can't get them to do that. Maybe they have to do it. So, therefore, it is pointless to present it to them.

Bret: And yet how does one? People publish books, people get people interested; then they can talk to them. There is a several step process; and you may need to dangle the bait.

Y: Well, I'll have to think about that. I mean the point you are making is right. And hers is right; but she won't get a single grant if she doesn't do this. And she won't have any students or any university or have any benefits. But can it be done. Are you selling out a truth? Are you compromising? Or do...

Bret: The doctrine of expediencies.

Y: Yes.

B: If the Buddha can do it, why can't we.

Y: I am not sure the Buddha succeeded even with one student. Even his first and best student, Ananda, had a distorted view of what Buddha was teaching. Well, I am going to think about it.

B: OK. Maybe we shall stick to Monte Carlo method and not interfering with particles.

Y: Quantum physics.

B: It will be a great loss because for me there is a difference whether I'll define a doctoral thesis. The title of this thesis will be, "Hammer of wrong... Hammer of Pearl's model of quantum dynamics of brain." And three chapters will be devoted to information paradigm of Charles Berner. Or I'll say to them, "Your thesis will be on Lila Paradigm." Whatever the consequences, the discussions, the probability is that some member of the committee will say, "I do not agree or it is too speculative," as this guy has said.

Y: Yes, that is Finkelstein.

B: So this is the difference. And what I want to do is to do it for Lila Paradigm. This thesis will be Monte Carlo simulation on the probability of a structure which is probability for energy to appear before a structure of four dimensional space appears in terms of Lila Paradigm. And it is a great doctoral thesis.

Y: I see.

B: I don't want this to be just part of somebody else's theory, for instance, Hammer or Pearl's model of consciousness.

Y: I got yah.

B: It is minor importance.

Y: But if we do it in Lila Paradigm, we just do pure Lila Paradigm.

B: Then let us speak to simulation, Monte Carlo method because it could be related very easily to matrices. And here, there is no question I could not answer.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: And maybe we should do it and it make my tasks easier. And maybe I will be more useful this way because there is no question I could not answer maybe not today, maybe in three days. But I know I have all the ingredients needed in order to do this. Monte Carlo I teach, so it is easy for me to understand and do it. And maybe not interfere with tau, anti-tau which I am very interested in but I could not contribute.

Y: I tell you, I think I have got an answer for me.

B: Yes.

Y: It's my original intent (is) to share with you the Lila Paradigm.

B: Yes, I am very grateful. I understand.

Y: I'll share it in every way that I know how. What you do or don't do with it, is in your hands.

B: OK. Thank you so much. And then my view is I'll also do the same. I'll contribute in every way I could do it. And this is what I am trying to do it. Then Ok, I'll proceed.

Y: So be it. Ok, time for a break.