

#25

Formal talk-29102006 afternoon day9

Lila recording day 9, afternoon

29/10/2006

061029000

1 Hr 45 min

[Recording 25](#)

Y: Second son who has a doctorate in engineering, Dale Erik. And I ask him to use his computer to compute  $10$  to the 'e' to pi. So I didn't have a computer at the time. This was back in 1998. And so he did it. He did it in *Mathematica* and in *Mathcad*. And in *Mathcad* he said, "It wouldn't give an exact number."

So he forced it to make approximations to get the last digits. But he said, "There is a difference between *Mathematica*, the bottom one, and *Mathcad*. And I checked it when I got *Mathematica* on my computer. This is correct according to *Mathematica*, but *Mathcad* got this. I just thought you'd... just noted that it has very different answers.

B: Depends on the number of portions of pi and Di they are taking into account of the sequence. One over [I] factorial plus one over two and so on.

Y: Yes. Another odd and end here. Remember I was telling you that I went to see Jeffery Chu?

B: Yes.

Y: In 1998 and later he came out with a paper that incorporated a lot of things he and I were talking about.

B: Yes.

Y: This is that paper. Does she have a copy of this?

Don: I believe so. You gave it to me some while back.

Don: Yes.

Y: Do you have this?

B: No, I don't have this.

Don: I thought I gave it to you. But give me the name and I'll be sure.

Y: Just in case.

Don: Let me have the title, and I'll get it if it is not. *Network biology*, OK.

B: Understanding the cells functional organization. I have something on cells but not this one.

Don: Ok. I'll get it for you.

Y: It's very good I think. I read most of it.

B: Scale (----). Which reminds me, we haven't been talking networks actually. Fuzzy logic is connected to neural networks. It also maybe could be used although Yogeshwar always stresses this is discrete. This is not random and so on. But still...

Don: But the perception process is a fuzzy logic problem. The knowledge process isn't, the direct knowledge process.

B Yes.

Don: It is not. It is an important distinction.

B: Yes.

Don: The two realms...

B: Yes, yes. This is not a level. This is what I was wording as thought level because Charles mentioned at one point. He said...

Don: But thought level is fuzzy.

B: Fuzzy, yes.

Don: The direct knowledge level isn't, it's absolute.

B: Yes. Having this distinction in mind, I was stressing thought knowledge and so on. At a certain point when we were discussing intuition, sorrow. Neural networks is another opportunity.

Y: Neural networks is a whole world.

B: Neural networks if we come to that point which reminds me it is connected to fuzzy logic.

Y: Ok, do you have something you want to share with?

B: It is discrete. It is more discrete neural networks.

Y: Yes.

B: In neural networks, you have a network of relations of...

Y: You would think that they would be directed because it goes down the long axiom, action to the next cell. So it is one directional.

B: And here it is like a function which checks if some trigger has been triggered or some threshold has been passed. And then either it triggers connection or not. It's a

sum of weight factors. It is also interesting. It could be... the simulation could be done in terms of neural networks, for instance. And every note should be a certain state obtained in Monte Carlo method. And check somehow which doesn't exclude randomness from the picture but is the reality of science or whatever. Robustness.

Y: Robots.

B: Robustness, it is also important parameter actually showing the stability of the network. It sense how much you are allowed to wander around a certain value and still remain in allowed limitations. This is the robustness. The robustness means I have a circuit, electrical circuit or any system, biological or whatever, and then robustness shows how much I'm allowed to go around exact value and have an approximate value and still remain in domain for stability. Robust networks are those which allow me more freedom in certain... when choosing parameters. This is robustness network. If it is not robust, it is very sensitive to fluctuation. So it is very important parameter. And strictly speaking, you haven't said anything unless you come up with this parameter. If you want to... I mean to be appreciated with what you are presenting, you must have this parameter.

Y: Oh.

B: In a way... robustness is the system stable or it is not stable? Now we are talking about another level, for instance, don't say level of perception or whatever. So it's very important. Robustness, stability of the solution. For instance, when we are discussing, for instance,  $F$  of  $[I]$  which we do frequently.  $[I]$  factorial  $(N)$  to  $Y$  minus one.  $E$  to  $M$  over  $(N)$ . when I introduce recursions... Now I use the words recursions in the sense of recursions of iterations in this numerical analysis process, then I might include instability. I might include instability. So I have to have a means to measure it somehow or to check it at least. This is robustness, this might be robust or it might be very sensitive to fluctuation of initial parameters. This is what theory of chaos is. This is what they mean by butterfly effect.

Y: Yes.

B: It could put me into... It could throw me way into the edge of chaos, over into chaos. So this is the sensitivity of the system which is the inverse parameter of robustness. It is all the same sensitivity or robustness. There is a famous anecdote about Edward Lawrence who was one of the founders of Theory of Creative Chaos. A curve started to appear on his printer and he went to have coffee. Because he was in a hurry, he just put, as you are aware of showing me this letter of Dale, was the name, where you have these digits different. And because these digits are differential digits, you just cut the number and you say anyhow, I don't know this. And so he did. He entered just few digits and not the whole number because he wanted to have coffee. And when he came back he expected the curve to be similar to the one he was obtaining many times before. It was concerning the weather. But when he came back the curve was very much different. So this is butterfly effect, very, very small fluctuations in the initial condition might cause very big changes into the flow of trajectory. So this is why in complex systems, it is even more important.

Y: Anyway, if you don't have that, you can have it. (Hands her something)

B: Ok, thank you.

Y: All right. Do you have anything else you want to bring up before I go on?

B: No.

Y: Ok. I've got a few things that lead into what we were talking about. We were talking about the statement of our basic assumptions for the Lila Paradigm. And I want to talk about the word *Individual*. I've look in the scripture of the different religions of the east and west, and I can not find very much to do with the individual about the nature of the individual, and those individuals' relationship with God. First of all, I would like to say this. I made a note of this and a little drawing.

God is all of us. Satan is anyone of us or any number of us, less than all of us.

B: Great statement. Yes. Just one excluded and you have Satan.

Y: That's right. That's all it takes. My guru says, "The whole world is one family." And that's the truth. But if you leave one out, you're in trouble. There'll be at least one fighting everyone else and everyone else fighting that one. So that's a form of so called individualism. I am not teaching individualism. I am teaching all of us, but you have to have an 'us'. So God is one and many. And that is some of the stuff I want to go into because it is so basic to the Lila Paradigm that I have addressed an ultimate reality that there is a large finite specific number of non-physical individuals. So we are making the basis of things an individual, non-physical amorphous God. You know amorphous.

B: Yes, amorphous, spread out.

Y: Spread out, even, smeared splat. Here we have got individuals though. I wrote this on the 6<sup>th</sup> of July 2000. It is called aspects of God.

The usual aspects of God are that God has the ability to create, God is all knowing, God is all loving, God is all powerful, God is completely good and God is one. There are other aspects of God that have not been stress since the council of Nicaea in 325AD. One possibility is that God is not only one but is also multiple. This aspect of God is mentioned in the first line of the Hebrew Bible as the first word used for God Elohim. The singular of this Hebrew word is El. Where as Elohim is the plural form. In modern times Elohim is usually translated as God singular. It is likely however that the author of the Book of Genesis did mean that God is both singular and plural. This is supported by verse 26 of the same chapter in Genesis. Which says, "Then god says, "Let us make man in our image after our likeness."

When the Queen of England says, "We are not amused." She is using the plural in the same sense, all though it is her speaking her view. She is speaking for the entire nation. She is the queen. And that is why she is called your majesty. Majesty mean big, magnitude. So one of the translations for Elohim is majestic. That God is majestic meaning big, but it means plural, many. Many and majestic and big are really different versions of the same thing.

It is unlikely that a number of local, tribal or Mythological Gods were meant by the use of us or our in this sentence. That is the sentence “let us make man in our image in our likeness.” It is more likely that what is meant is that God is plural in that God is composed of many but also singular in that God is one power. One goodness and one entity.

By one entity is meant a single unit.

For example a choir of singers is a single entity and is also composed of many individual singers. Further support of this view of God is found in the Christian Bible in John chapter 10. When Jesus was walking in the portico of Solomon in the temple and the Jews threatened to stone him for saying I and my father are one. The Jews said, we stone you because you are a man but you make yourself God. Then Jesus answers them, “Is it not written in your law, I say you are all Gods.” Jesus was quoting from Palm 82 verse 6. “I say you are Gods son of the most high all of you.”

That is when he was addressing the court of Divine individuals.

God said. “You are Gods sons of the most high, all of you.” Verse 1 of Palm the verse just before that Verse 1 of the same Palm 82. That is five verses earlier. Makes it clear who is speaking. God has taken his place in the Divine Council it say. “In the midst of the Gods he holds judgment.

Now God is the totality of all of them taken as one. And yet that taken as one totality is saying to them,

That “you are Gods son of the most high all of you.” Then he says, “Anyone of these Divine counselors can act in error as in verse 2 of this same Palm. God says, “How long will you judge unjustly and show partiality to the wicked.”

So God as a totality of all of them is saying “How long will you judge unjustly and show partiality to the wicked.” Partiality, singling out one or groups less than including everyone.

Oh, I just said that.

This means that all though an individual Divine Councilor may be subject to error, the true nature of the councilors taken as whole cannot error and is God as goodness, God as all power, and God as one.

So the true nature of the councilors taken as a whole can not error and is god.

In this passage it God as one that is addressing as the many Divine Councilors. Accordingly God is both the speaker and the listeners.

My guru wrote a marvelous song. You are. He is addressing God. “You are the speaker and the listener too.” It is a song he wrote called Non-duality.

Both are God, that is the speaker and the listener. Both are God, and neither was created.

So none of these Councilors are created.

While each God is a Divine Individual they are one in the each is the same as everyone else. Except for who each is. This sameness acknowledged my each of the others is Divine Love. God as one.

Then I go on to ask a question.

What is a Divine Councilor? What is one of these uncreated Gods? The Gods are invisible and can not be seen. One can only Divine the Gods by some others means than by perception. One can only believe whatever one chooses to believe God to be, and if one has chosen to believe that God is what God really is, one would have believed correctly. This can be said another way. One can only decide what God is, and if one decides correctly one will know what God is. Believing or knowing what God is, is not the same as consciously seeing God as in consciously seeing a tree. This is because God is not a physical thing. Physical things are visible, they can be seen. One can not see God either as one or as many. Physical things cannot create. That is they cannot originate they can only react to outside stimulus. The human organism or body is a physical thing therefore it cannot originate anything. If you can originate anything, such as a choice or and action you must not be a physical thing. You must be, then. Be something that is invisible since only physical things can be seen. It may be then that you are one of the Gods, one of the choir of Divine Councilors. When Jesus was addressing the crowd in the temple courtyard and saying. "You are Gods." It maybe that this is what he meant. And what God meant when he said to the Divine Counsel, "You are all sons of the most high all of you." You then would not then be a stimulus response physical machine, a human body. But one of the Divine invisible entities that can originate or create even though you maybe fallible and needing speaking to by God as one, and loved by God as one. God's nature then may be composed of all of us, fallible non-physical individuals who can be conscious and can originate choices, and actions, on the one hand. While on the other hand as a unity, God is the perfect loving oneness, goodness and power.

I am trying to do several things there. One is to let them know that God is one; but God is many. This is why I want individuals specifically stated in the basic assumptions of the Lila Paradigm. Is that it... The individuals should be addressed because very often like the verse you were quoting us of the *Isha Upanishads* doesn't mention an individual. It is taken for granted that an individual is saying it and is describing the state of an individual or any individual. That's their nature, but it is not specifically and expressly said to be. And I think that that is important. And you have all accepted my statement for the purpose of discussion that it includes individuals, a finite specific large number of them. But I'm trying to point out that this has not explicitly been pointed out in any scripture anywhere. And this is understood by many of those people who wrote those scriptures but has not been stated. My intention is to remove the mystery of God. The time has come. The mystery of God is that which we were just talking about. Jesus said it and they nailed him up on the cross. And who said, was it Russell? Who removes the face of pi shall not survive. Yes.

B: Russell. May I see just something I missed? Ah. Psalm. Since you mentioned *Isha Upanishad* at the beginning, he said, "This is whole that is whole."

Y: Yes.

B: When out of the whole, whole is taken, whole remains. Then what they mean by this is whole, and that is whole by that is that... That like *Tat Tvam Asi* (तत् त्वम् असि or तत्त्वमसि That thou art)

Y: The whole that is, all of us, you take out an individual and the whole is still left. There is still all of us. But he doesn't say it.

B: He doesn't say it, yes it is simply ( ) somehow he doesn't...

Y: Thus you have to apply it because there wasn't time. The people that tried to say it historically this has happen over and over again, they are killed. There was a group of Buddhists in what is now Bihar Province, in India.

B: Bihar. Bihar schools.

Y: Around Calcutta or now I think it is Kolkata. But anyway there was a group of about 800 of them. They had a teacher that taught them this and they believed it. And after a few years in came the population around them and they massacred every last one of those Buddhists. They killed them all. About two hundred years ago in China a similar thing happened. There was this group of monks and they said it explicitly what's in this. And about a few years later every one of them were massacred, killed and cut to pieces and chopped to little pieces. The people couldn't stand it especially the leaders of those people because they'd lose all political power. Whether that political power is clerical, that is in the church or whether it is in the government, they hate that god or the ultimate reality is multiple. So the scriptures are now written elliptically, indirectly. This has happened over and over again. This has also happened to me to some degree. The reason that I am not in South Australia now and why I am here is because the people around got upset. And they started spreading rumors that we were having infant sacrifices. That we were doing that and the whole thing then blew up. The Christians came at us, the political counsel, the local counsel people wanted to deny our building permits and so on. So I left. I said I am going to cut this right here. And I think it is the main reason why this is not popular published. It is only to people that have grown past the stage of my and our side against your side. The parapsychologist did publish one paper. But they are not separating people from others one group from another. So there is no Satan; there is no opponent. That's what I think. Now having said all this, I wanted you to have the background into the problems associated with using individuals, many as an ultimate reality

B: Maybe these two words Divine and divide having the same roots contains into it the information that Divine is also to be divided in a sense, to God not just one God but two Gods.

Y: An also the Latin word devote like devoted a devoted person. It came from Roma. There is a place you go to vote. When you want to support a piece, you go to vote. So the Romans would count the number of people in there and if there were enough people that the measure was past. But they were voting against the Christians. So the Christians were told not to go there. They devoted, so they were the devoted ones. They would go into the church instead of the plaza or the Roman circus or the Roman... I forget what they called it, the common plaza area.

Don: Agora?

Y: No, no, that's Greek.

B: I know what you are saying.

Y: It has a name.

B: Coliseum where the Senate used to go?

Y: Yes, that's right. That's where devote came from. So divine means it's covered up.

B: With divide?

Y: Yes. You can't see it. Anyway, I think now... I think, personally think that we may be in the last seven years of the end time. And now it's all right to go ahead and say it because it's all coming to an end anyway.

B: Let's hope you are right.

Y: Otherwise, we are in big trouble. I brought in the word positive state of no direct knowledge.

B: It means potential. That is why it is important because you are not in state of direct knowledge but you have potential to enter into state of direct knowledge.

Y: Ok. Now we can discuss some more. We discussed some, all that exists, but what is this existence thing? How is it different from non-existence? I've said that most people have this idea of a nothing. So nothing is existing and into this nothing something is going to come to exist. I think this is the wrong way to understand existence. That what these large specific finite number of non-physical individuals is, is what existence is. Nothing is to act to be in the state of no knowledge of them. And that is what nothing is. But they still exist. So existence is what is fundamental; it's not something that is created at the ultimate level. The ultimate basic level, the ultimate reality, *what is, is* and that is the individuals. And they weren't created; they are not in time; they have no matter, or spin, or charge, or anything. No mass. And this is the right way to think about it, is that *we exist. We're the basis*. And if we're the basis of everything, *that is what existence is*. It isn't well something that's created, existence doesn't really apply to it.

B: Because it will disappear.

Y: Yes. You got the correlation. So what does exist then? Well, does a relationship or a state of knowledge exist? And I haven't settled that question. So I think I would like your feedback on it. Whatever you have, any thoughts about it. That since you... But maybe it does exist, if it is not in time. But if it is in time, it can be thought of as being created. And then being uncreated by another choice. But that is a later time. And a later time, you create it again; and the next time you un-create it. This is all the affect of illusion and time. But if from the timeless point of view, does a state exist? I would say yes it does. So should we use the word exist one way, and then use it another way. Or is it we should, say... use a different word for the illusory existence. Maybe we should call it the created or the apparent created. I don't know what. So you say. I see you understood me. You are the first person that has understood that.

B: I am glad. First, which comes into my mind and mind is to be (suspended?). Where this verse is from sutra, Heart Sutra, the great Heart Sutra.

Y: Buddhist.

B: Buddhist. Form is emptiness, emptiness is form, all which is form is emptiness, and all which is emptiness is form.

Y: No individuals.

B: No individuals.

Y: In that statement. It applies to individuals correctly, but they don't say that explicitly. I am just making a point.

B: This is to be stressed which you mentioned. It should be. Maybe you have it here, that nothing is not nothing; but nothing is to be in state of no knowledge.

Y: Yes.

B: It is to be stressed.

Y: I think so.

B: Because nothing is not no existence in nothing non-physical. Individuals exist but they are in a state of no knowledge, in positive state of no knowledge. And, therefore, it is nothing.

Y: That is the correct way to look at it according to the Lila Paradigm. And it changes one's whole understanding of everything.

B: Yes, exactly.

Y: Now that's not included in here.

B: It is not that non-existence is opposite plane existence.

Y: No.

B: No, but again positive state of no knowledge is non-existence.

Y: Yes.

B: Which is to be stressed, which is great.

Y: This means to understand that is to accept that everyone is. Rather than they are created beings and allowed to exist under certain conditions. That was the main point on that movie we saw last night. It's that you accept others rather than saying you are allowed to be a certain way. You have to follow our rules and follow the church's teaching. And then you will be allowed to be... You will be accepted instead of saying, "You are, no matter what, you exist," even if people say. "You don't exist," and pretend to themselves that I am in a state of no knowledge of them. Then they are in that state. But those...they still exist. To say they still exist is to be in a state of knowledge that they exist. And so, therefore, you are in a positive state, no matter what you do. You wrote something else?

B: It was referring to this further explanation of form is emptiness. Maybe, I'll repeat it and maybe...because form... form is something which is created and which changes form. What makes the form to be form is its impermanence, it's attribute of impermanence.

Y: Yes.

B: But it have to be emptiness in order to be able to change the form itself. It should be empty. If it is stiff, if it is like a rock, it couldn't change. So it must be emptiness. So form is emptiness.

Y: Yes, that is to say that form is an illusion.

B: It is created.

Y: It doesn't actually exist.

B: Yes. It is created and will disappear. But in order to be created in it to disappear, it should be empty. And if we assume the other way around, that form will not disappear; but if it will not disappear, this means it is eternal. And eternal is just emptiness. So either way it is emptiness. So form is emptiness.

Y: I would say it lacks illusion. In other words, you see through the illusion. That's empty.

B: That yes. This is what they do, yes.

Y: It is empty in terms of what we usually think of as something.

B: Yes, it is not what we think. Yes, yes. And Suzuki, Chandra Suzuki, he defines nirvana. He says, "Nirvana is to see things all the way through." When you are able to see things all the way through to the emptiness, then you are in nirvana. Nirvana is to see things all the way through.

Y: Yes. Nirvana literally means not moving like when the flame of a candle quits moving, it's still. So when the mind has seen all the way through, then it is still. This is nirvana which is another name for samadhi.

B: Yes. And *vana* meaning is roots, forest.

Y: *Vana* means forest.

B: Does it apply to this nirvana?

Y: Nirvana means no forest.

B: No forest, nothing to disturb you. No forest.

Y: So my recommendation for understanding what existence is, is us as we truly are. That is... existence is not something that is created or uncreated. So maybe we need two levels of existence or something.

B: Shall we read this 'all that exists?'

Y: Ok. If you're...

B: And then explicitly state this statement because at least it helps me; and it will help others.

Y: All right, I'll read it.

B: State of... All right. Ok.

Y: This means that nothing...all that exists. This means that nothing else exists except non-physical individuals and their states of direct knowledge and states of no direct knowledge.

So there I have said that both exist.

B: Yes.

Y: But there is two kinds of existence there. There is... anyway let's go on.

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

reality is not only an ultimate reality, it is the only reality. This is not to suggest a solipsism in as much as that which is behind the illusory appearance of the physical objects are real independently existing nonphysical individuals. So I have not made that point in there about existence, that it is us that exists; and the states are derivative from our exercising our ability. But if they are taken non-physically, not in time, you could say that they exist. But if you take them as in time, they were created; and later they are uncreated and then created.

B: Then you are wrong.

Y: Then it's an illusion like the snake and that's not said here. So that needs to be fixed up.

B: Maybe a way to add something like explicitly stating that non-existence is not opposed to existence. Nothingness is not non-existence; but rather to be in state of no knowledge is nothingness.

Y: Something like that, yes. Now we've got this on recording and this will be transcribed and so...

B: To start with, if non-existence...non-existence is not opposed to existence. And nothingness is to be in state of no knowledge.

Y: Yes. Now...

B: Now, second point was to think about the difference between existence as it is and existing states and so on.

Y: Yes.

B: Because states are originating from the ability to act which is another attribute than existence. So this is different.

Y: So there's apparent created existence.

B: Yes. Created existence.

Y: So it seems like the states have been created; and then they are uncreated if it is in time. But when it is not in time, you understand, it not in time; those states do exist.

B: Yes.

Y: So the opening statement, "All that exists" this means that nothing else exists except non-physical individuals and their states of direct knowledge; it's correct if taken a-temporally. Not in time.

B: Yes, it should be stressed because, otherwise, the states of knowledge and their existence, there illusory existence, I mean, they really do exist; but this is another attribute. States of knowledge originate from the ability to act which is another

attribute than existence. So when we state nothing else exists except non-physical individuals, this exist is referring to attributes of existence. But when we say their states of knowledge also exist, we are meaning something else. Now this is referring to another kind of exists.

Y: Right.

B: Which is referring to their other attributes which is ability to act. So this should be stressed right away somehow. Maybe...

Y: Well...

B: Later on it is said, "You couldn't say 'all at once.'"

Y: We... Yes. That's right. That's why we're talking it over.

B: Yes. Yes.

Y: And ah... And the order has to be correct, right and everything.

B: Yes, the order. Maybe in their states of direct knowledge originating form, their attributes of ability to act...

Y: Yes. Make that note so even if the wording might be changed, the meaning will be there.

B: Maybe here... Yes, because we clearly state, "This means that nothing else exists except non-physical individuals," which is correct because non-physical individuals have attributes of existence. But then we say, and there are states of direct knowledge also exist but this existence is different. It is originating from their ability to act. So right away after this, we could make this distinction. Right away, this is beautiful, OK. But then we should make the distinction right away to differentiate between exists, which is a basic attribute, and existing states of direct knowledge originating from ability to act.

Y: Yes.

B: So maybe we could state here and not make it too large. We could not say anything all at once. We could state, "Those states of direct knowledge and states of no direct knowledge." This shouldn't be in parenthesis because this is of same value.

Y: Equal.

B: They are equal so there is no point to diminish this in any way. I believe it shouldn't be diminished as it is secondary.

Y: It not. It's the same.

B: It's not. It is the same. So maybe parenthesis should be erased. And now we should state, "These plural states of direct knowledge and states of no direct

knowledge originate from the essential attribute of non-physical individuals of ability to act.”

Y: Which is described in detail later, the ability to act.

B: Yes, I know.

Y: You can't say it all at once.

B: Yes. Right. Maybe it state, but again states of knowledge. This 'exists' is not the same as you emphasized.

Y: Yes.

B: And they are created. No. And their originated states of direct knowledge originating from their ability to act. But just put here 'originated states of direct knowledge.' Maybe it is also origin... also implies time in a way because you have origin and a stream.

Y: Yes.

B: And then originated, but somehow... or they're no, no, not to... ontological somehow. Something which... or essential somehow. And they're...

Y: Yes. They're ontological; they exist no matter what.

B: Yes. They exist no matter what. They are ontological. They are essential. And maybe later on explain what we mean by ontological which is done, of course, which is done. Maybe ontological, meaning essential because they originate from the ability to act which is different than existence. Ontological.

Y: I have not gone on in this paragraph about 'all that exist' said that... Well, I have said one sentence here that as the rope lying on the road in the twilight may be seen as the snake. So there are non-physical individuals; and their patterns of relationships with each other are seen as physical objects. But I don't come right out and say that there isn't any time; there isn't any matter; there isn't any space; there isn't any energy at this point because I am saying all that exist. But I am not saying... I am saying all there is are these individuals. But will a person understand that that means that, therefore, there isn't any tables and chairs and houses and planets and suns?

B: And way to do it in ... with using a minimum wording, you know. Using way to do it and not spoil the whole thing is maybe to say with each other of illusionary time, illusionary space and illusionary energy.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: Just to stress out.

Y: Put a note there about illusionary.

B: Illusionary, and then repeat this three times. Thrice.

Y: Yes.

B: Illusionary time, illusionary space, and illusionary energy, so just with using minimum words.

Y: I think that is enough though or they will say, "Wait a minute here!".

B: Illusionary time, illusionary space, illusionary energy, and here ontological state.

Y: Because people's mind keeps putting back the illusion and they don't know it.

B: Ah, yes.

Y: Because they say, "Well, you mean there isn't any real time?"

B: When does it begin? To stop having time?

Y: Ok. Let's try going on now to the next, 'A large specific finite number.' We discussed this some; but let's read what the sentences say.

By fixing the number of non-physical individuals, we fix the number of possible states of direct consciousness out of direct knowledge and no knowledge that can exist. In addition to this, we can by measurement determine the average number of actual states.

Now, I am wandering off the subject there. I should be explaining the large specific finite number. Instead I am making comments about fixing the number as if we say, "Well, let's just call that number such and such." Well. we are not calling it. We, by measurement, we can determine the number of individuals by making some measurements of the world like we can measure pi, and we can measure 'e.' But I don't think I should be making this point. I shouldn't be discussing (K) at this point. What I say is true, but it says:

In order for the equations for the magnitudes for the universal constants to match their observed value measurements, the number of non-physical individuals (N) needs to be quite large.

Well, all that's true. But it's not really explaining what is meant by a large specific finite number.

B: You are introducing probability and introducing illusionary time and illusionary space while they are not used to this thinking. It's too early.

Y: And I think my whole comment there is... it is out and it should be replaced.

B: Or maybe stressed differently. It's too early to introduce this into picture.

Y: It should be introduced, but not here.

B: Not here, because it will... makes you think time and space exist.

Y: Yes. So that's a big... just put an X through there and...

B: Maybe stress it differently. What does 'a large specific finite' mean?

Y: Yeah, what do those words mean in this context? That is a very large number, not why there has to be, but just that there are. I could even say that it is thought to be of the order  $10^{23}$  number of individuals. And that the specific... it's just one particular number and no other number of individuals, and this number is finite. Something along that line....

B: Yes. But, you know there is a difference between  $10^{23}$  which is finite and  $10$  to  $E$  to  $P$  (pi) which is... I mean finite means something else. I mean integer. This is integer...

Y: Yes.

B: which is what we are searching for, finite specific number which is integer. And this is not an integer. It couldn't be integer at least to current understanding of pi and e.

Y: Not the way it is done now. Yes, that's right.

B: Yes, I know according to the current understanding of pi and e. So if you... It is a difference, but it will be un-serious to put here  $10^{23}$  without...

Y: Just say that.

B: But without mentioning measurements and that it has been done according to contemporary science, and all the means of science we are applying here, this and that and these are the modern...

Y: We should just say that it is thought to be of this order of magnitude and leave it at that. It's a large number; it's specific and it's finite.

B: Maybe you could stress which fully... not fully, but something like this, which is greatest degree matches the scientific measurements in quantum physics. Or something like this to be stressed somehow. Maybe in parenthesis to give it weight. You know if you to be supported by what you do, years and years you are drawing diagrams making simulations, magnitudes, traveling and...

Y: And this is just one box full. I have got another one in my closet.

B: I could imagine.

Y: And not only that. When I left Adelaide and came here, we took three file draws and threw them in the tip... of notes. These are the best of them.

B: So maybe just stress, maybe in parenthesis.

Y: I see what you are saying.

B: This is strongly supported by the newest measurements in quantum physics and particle physics.

Y: Just write, mention support. And write  $10^{23}$ .

B: Mention support. This is supported by strong evidence of all up to date... How to say most advanced scientific techniques or measurement. It should be stressed.

Y: Put  $10^{23}$  right there. That's it Ok. Next one, 'from non-physical individuals.' I went on about that a lot.

Since we are assuming an ultimate reality that underlies the appearance of a physical universe, and the process of us observing that universe, that of which that ultimate reality is composed, the individuals must be non-physical.

Now is that logic?

B: Yes, you could not have, as you say, always relations or relata. You couldn't relation non-physical but relata physical.

Y: Then why haven't smart people like Jonathan Searle and David Chalmers realized that? They... David says, "Consciousness is non-physical."

Then why does he think that some part of his brain is in this non-physical state of consciousness? But a physical brain is in a state of non-physical... or at least his mind, which is a physical mind, has non-physical consciousness. They haven't put two and two together.

B: Yes. This is the hard problem actually.

Y: The hard, yes. The hard problem of consciousness because he even states that anything physical can't produce non-physical consciousness.

B: Something else that came into my mind which is illusionary. About, but you mentioned solipsism actually. It might be solipsism that...at one point, when I was having a correspondence with a very great philosopher and he is very intelligent in Belgrade, who is doing quantum physics as well. He says, "There is no true justification for me to go from the subjective to the objective." He says, "Whatever you do remains in the realm of subjective," which is non-physical actually.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: It was when I wrote to him about this argument. I was telling you outside the session about Descartes saying *cogito ergo sum* which means just sum, which means I exist. (I think therefore I am).

Y: Therefore.

B: I exist. I think I exist essentially means I exist. This essential I exist.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: If I exist, then God who created me also exists. If God exist then the visible reality, the manifest reality, the reality that he created also exists because God will not deceive me. And so in this paradoxical way, he introduced materialism into science by mentioning God which is paradoxical itself. He needs God in order to introduce materialism in Cartesian coordinate and all of this which he introduced.

Y: Descartes. So do we need to say anymore to this sentence?

Since we are assuming an ultimate reality that underlies the appearance of a physical universe and the process of us observing that universe that of which that ultimate reality is composed, the individuals must be non-physical. That must be non-physical because the ultimate reality that underlies the appearance of the physical universe and the process of us observing it, that of which the ultimate reality is composed, the non-physical individuals must be non-physical.

B: Yes, it is stressed.

Y: What?

B: You need to stress it more somehow.

Y: Somehow.

B: Maybe.

Y: It just, they read that and they go on.

B: Yes, yes. They just forget.

Since we are assuming an ultimate reality that underlies the appearance of a physical universe and the process of us observing that universe that of which that ultimate reality is composed, the individuals must be non-physical.

Y: I think that sentence is incomplete.

B: Since we are assuming an ultimate reality that underlies the appearance of a physical universe and the process of us observing it that universe that of which that ultimate reality is composed, the individuals must be non-physical.

Y: It's logically correct. But it's that going to.

B: We should...we have concluding... We are concluding that ultimate reality must be non-physical. If this is conclusion this non-physical as a word should be recognized here once again. We should justify this conclusion.

Y: Yes.

B: It is not justified, it is, I mean, but not exactly. Must be non-physical. So with this non-physical is a word should be found somewhere here because they recognize here physical. We introduce them with physical and then come with conclusion on non-physical. It should be stressed maybe once again, this ultimate reality being non-physical. Or maybe, just one word as I always suggest not to spoil the whole thing which is very excellent actually. Since we are assuming a non-physical ultimate reality, nonphysical should be twice. Conclusion non-physical on basis of what? On basis of non-physical ultimate reality. Maybe just this word because this seems like not justified enough because we couldn't come up with non-physical as a conclusion on the basis of a physical universe. It is not clear enough, maybe on first reading. Later on, it is, but maybe not on first reading. And just to say, since we are assuming a non-physical ultimate reality that underlies the appearance which is stressed just because it is justified of a physical universe and in the process of our observing it. The process of us observing it is non-physical. But the world in its appearance is physical although it is not physical. That of which that ultimate reality is composed, the individuals, must be non-physical. So we have non-physical twice.

Y: I follow. Then I clarify what non-physical means. By non-physical is meant that which exists but cannot be observed. However, it is only the non-physical which can be conscious. Now, I think I changed the subject matter when I start with however. And I think that's a mistake. I think it should be by non-physical is meant that which cannot be observed. It's another point to say.

B: Yes, another, not however. Point however the raised and then capital, it is only the non-physical which can be conscious. And now it is a Sutra.

Y: Yes. Good.

B: It is only the non-physical which can be conscious. It's a statement, firm statement.

Y: Ok. Now since we're trying to explain non-physical individual, the whole phrase:

I take up the term individual to use because the non-physical individuals cannot be divided. That is, each is not composed of the parts; a non-physical individual is a unitary whole. Even so a non-physical individual has various attributes.

So is that enough to say about the indivisibility of the individual? It may be. It may not be; I can't tell.

B: The term individual is use because non-physical can not be divided.

Y: Do we need an illustration to show that you can't cut them in half? Or are these people considered to be intelligent enough.

B: It's too early. I believe it will. What is Neptune doing? It will put water.

Y: Yes.

B: It is to... You know, you put water into milk it will...

Y: Dilute it.

B: Dilute it.

A non-physical individual is a unitary whole. Even so a non-physical individual has various attributes. But these attributes cannot be divided from the individual. They make up what and who a non-physical individual is.

Y: That's not too bad.

B: Yes, yes.

Y: Then I launch into another aspect about it for a whole paragraph.

One might ask where did the non-physical individual come from or from where? If you wanted to use that kind of English. They were not created. Therefore, they have not come from anywhere or from anything. They just exist as God is thought of as just existing.

We had this long discussion about existence and I am trying to apply that to individuals.

There was not a prior nothing into which the non-physical individuals were created. Unlike the monads of Leibniz and the spirits of Bishop Berkeley which were to have been created by God, the non-physical individuals in our paradigm are not created. There is some existence that is created. It must be in time and thus physical because there must have been a time before it was created. If some existence is created by God or by anything, it cannot be an ultimate reality. The physical things only react. Physical things only react. The individuals in our paradigm can originate states to be in. Therefore, those individuals cannot be physical.

Now, it seems to me that I should say in that sentence, "Physical things only react; individuals in our paradigm do not react. They originate states to be in. Therefore, they can not be physical."

And yet they might think, "Well, I react to things," but not as a non-physical individual they don't, but they don't know that.

So it can be either way whatever you think is best there to put in whether it should be. Physical things only react; the non-physical individuals in our paradigm do not react. They originate states. They originate states; therefore those individuals cannot be physical. There's another way of putting that all together. It is that physical things only react; individuals originate states. Or physical things do not originate actions, the non-physical individual do. In our paradigm, therefore, they cannot be physical.

B: Maybe in parenthesis after physical things only react.

Y: Put it.

B: In parenthesis, they do not originate.

Y: Physical things.

B: Yes, physical things only react in parenthesis; they do not originate.

Y: Right.

B: To use minimal wording because it is all this.

Y: Because of all this is right.

They are not particles that is the non-physical individuals. They are not part of a relationship or combinations of anything; nor are they everlasting. They are... they, being non-physical, are not in or of time. Thus, they do not durate through time. Now in English, everybody knows what duration means. And I have turned it into a verb.

B: Durate.

Y: Durate.

B: Dura what is the origin? Dura is the spinal cord. It is something with maybe evolutionary force. Dura.

Y: The Dura matter...

B: Dura matter, yes.

Y: are nerves.

B: The nerves.

Y: Part of the nerves.

B: Maybe something can be origin. Dura.

Y: Then this works... The next sentence works pretty well.

They are as Gods. They are ultimate reality, simple, straight forward, clear, hard to accept, but clear. Each non-physical individual is equivalent to every other non-physical individual in what it is. However, they are different in who it is that each is.

And that leads into the next section.

B: Shall we wait for Punita?

Y: He's looking in the dictionary. You're looking for durate are you?

Don: Well just dura means hard, the Latin h a r d.

Y: Means hari?

Don: Hard. Durability is the quality of being durable.

Y: So last a long time.

Don: Hard, unyielding.

B: Unyielding

Y: So he durates.

B: Unyielding, unthinkable.

Y: Well, they are not in time or of time. And they do not durate through time. But it seems like we are enduring time and suffering. But when you are in Samadhi, you don't durate. You don't suffer in nirvana.

B: You indurate time. Yes, you are...

Y: So it's right.

B: Subjected to time, is to be subjected to suffering.

Don: It's true.

Y: But she threw the tablets in the water in the movie. She finally threw her addiction tablets. She was addicted to these tablets and she threw them away.

Now each of whom...

If we may go on. I, at first, had 'whoness' as an attribute; but this is wrong. And the reason why whoness is wrong is because everyone has whoness.

B: So it couldn't be something general?

Y: There is no difference. Yeah.

B: So it couldn't be general.

Y: No. It has to be something specific to that individual. So it's who that individual is. Rather than whoness now whoness is a quality of all right. And they all have whoness. So you could say, "They all have uniqueness." That's why I don't use the word unique because it doesn't specify which one it is. It is just that they have this quality of being different, but not indicating the difference. So to me anyway, the word unique is incorrect. It should say who each is.

B: Unique is something general just something general.

Y: It shouldn't be something general. It should be specific for each individual.

That which differentiates one non-physical from another is who each individual is. The one that is in states of direct knowledge and no direct knowledge and the one that originates itself in those states is who that individual is. According to our paradigm who each of us is, is one of these non-physical individuals. Thus each of us is not a human body.

So this is a...really should be a separate paragraph starting with according. I think it is a good thing to say; but it is not defining. Who A is or who B is, is one thing and to say that who we really are is one of these who's. But I think that is important that be added so you could put a paragraph symbol next to the word according.

B: Yes, I did.

Y: Ah, you did make a distinction. So should anything else be said about who says which one is? Or as we used to say, "Which, which?"

B: Well, maybe, I am thinking in terms of computer scientist. For instance, here 'and' 'or' but then it is better because 'and' 'or'... it might be in state of direct knowledge or... But if it is not good, it doesn't look good 'and' or'...

Y: In the sentence.

B: I am not suggesting, it doesn't look very good. But it is a possibility the second sentence, the one that is in state of direct knowledge 'and' 'or' no direct knowledge.

Y: Either way, I think it is all right.

B: Either way because 'and' is bolder and includes 'or' in a way not in computer science.

Y: It is implicit.

B: It's implicit, yes.

Y: Now where am I?

...originates itself into a number of separate non-physical states. Each of us is (has the ability to) act to originate oneself in a state

Ability to act

These are the only kind of acts.

(Of acts or act) the only kind of act one can make.

B: One ability, but many acts.

Y: Say it again.

B: I said, "One ability, but many acts."

Y: Only one kind of act or only one kind of act.

Don: This is the only kind of act.

B: This was good. I was just answering your question. You ask whether act or acts.

Y: Yes, I can't tell the difference in number.

B: Which of us is has the ability to act. This is a verb to act. This is not a noun to be plural.

Y: So it is only one kind of act. So it is correct.

B: Yes.

Bret: Act is an event that puts it in time. The ability to originate oneself into a state doesn't specify that it happens in time. It could just be. Well, it isn't necessarily in time. As a matter of fact, it's not. This act is non-physical.

B: Yes, but using the word act places it in time.

Y: It does what? Places it in time.

Bret: Without tripping over it.

Don: I don't agree.

Y: You do or don't.

Don: Do not.

Bret: To act implies you might not act and you compare the two.

Y: I see what you are saying, but I don't know enough about syntax and language to be able to comment. I have heard a couple of other comments here.

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

These acts plural... These what is wrong here... are... These acts are... The (re) is missing. So it should say:

These acts are non-physical acts and thus are not in time. They're not even instantaneous nor do they follow one another time being an illusion of sequence.

I think that it's all right to put that there.

B: Yes.

Y: So we'll do a little bit more here.

So he originates itself into a number of separate non-physical states but in regard to each different non-physical individual

This is the second sutra second line of the sloka.

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

And there is no 'and; in there. It's either. It's not either and.

B: The sign of quoting should be added here. Quote end of quote.

Y: Ah ha!

B: Otherwise, it is perfect, I believe.

Y: You're right. Then I say, "One of the attributes of a non-physical individual..."

... it is the ability to originate itself into states of direct knowledge or of non direct knowledge of any non-physical individual.

Now up above I said each of us *is*. And I give an alternative of *has* the ability to act to originate oneself into a state.

B: It is great.

Y: What's great?

B: To stress *has*. Each of us *is/has* the ability to act. It is essential attribute. It is embedded into its basic attributes, I mean.

Y: Well is he ability? Or does he have it? Or do they mean the same thing?

B: ( ) is the ability. *Is*, is closer, therefore, it is outside parenthesis. Yes he *has* applies. '*Has*' adds something into a picture which is essentially clear... essentially pure something which was essentially pure and minimal in the best sense of the word minimal.

Y: You tell me what 'has' means. He possesses it?

B: Not possesses. The way I understand it, it is... '*Has*,' has an intrinsic... it is his intrinsic nature to have this ability to act. It is his intrinsic nature, something which is not to be divided from him.

Y: (acknowledges) So how is that different from he *is* that.

B: It is not different. Therefore *is*, is primer *has* is in parenthesis,

Y: I see. I understand now how you understand it. You have explained to me how you understand the word *has*.

B: It is how I understand it. It is something which is not to be divided from him; it is his intrinsic nature.

Y: Ok.

B: That has the ability. You could not take it from him. If he possesses it, you could take it from him, but no he *is*.

Y: But then I make an awful statement in the next sentence. Strictly speaking one does not *have* the ability. One *is* the ability. What one *is*, *is* the ability to originate ones self into such states. Now...

B: Because if you understand *have* as a relation, then you need *relata*. Once again, I don't want to introduce confusion.

Y: So is it a subpart of him, but in-dividable.

B: Yes, intrinsic is the right word.

Y: Then, I think that sentence should be struck. Take it out.

Don: Which sentence?

Y: Strictly speaking. Strictly speaking one does not have the ability. It's a point, a fine point that depends on how one understands the word *have*.

B: Then our (age?) just has not the whole sentence. You should just delete *has* and we shall have each of us *is* the ability to act to originate oneself into a state.

Y: Well then, I should take out the last sentence in that paragraph.

B: They are not even instantaneous. Which one?

Y: No, we're strictly speaking.

B: Ah ha, strictly speaking one does not have the ability what one *is*, *is* the ability to originate oneself into a such state. Just erase *has* from here.

Y: I know you want that out, but.

B: Yes, yes, in regard to what you were saying.

Y: But you understand *have* to mean its and intrinsic inseparable part.

B: In light of your writings, but maybe generally it could be understood differently. So if it is ambiguous...

Y: What do you favor?

Don: I would just eliminate the *has* and I would underline or put in bold *is*, and delete strictly speaking.

Y: What would you do, anything?

Bret: I have no preference.

Y: Ok. Then we'll take out the *has*. It will be a *has been*.

Don: Are we deleting the strictly speaking?

Y: No, we're going to keep that in; and you can underline or italicize the word *is*.

B: And this, "into a state" we have stated this, the first time we were reading this material. We stated that it should be *into* instead of *in*. Is it correct?

Don: Yes.

Y: Yes, into.

B: Ah, you have it. Ok, into.

Y: Next paragraph.

The idea of direct knowledge is new.

Now, I think we should spend a lot of time on this subject because it is this one that is going to carry the weight of the Lila Paradigm, what we mean by direct knowledge. If we can get that concept across and get our levels of direct knowledge, consciousness physical and

B: Enlightenment.

Y: Self-enlightenment.

B: Self-enlightenment, yes.

Y: If we can get these definitive so people have them all matched together. In fact they don't even think about the one in knowledge and so they're clear. Maybe we might take a table or drawing of chart or something that shows the level.

Don: What levels, Yogeshwar? I missed that.

Y: Direct knowledge, what it is, the consciousness levels, differentiating the two, and then the physical which is a consequence of the consciousness level, the appearance of the physical level so that they had these differentiated and not run together. But the idea of direct knowledge is a new idea that is as using it as a narrowly defined use of the word knowledge. This is why it is called direct knowledge. To differentiated it either from either ordinary knowledge which I call data or from indirect knowledge. Now, I think probably including indirect knowledge at this stage is a mistake. I have got too much in one sentence to differentiate it from ordinary knowledge and clarify that in a sentence and then mention indirect knowledge and clarify that. Otherwise, it's putting two things together at once and it's too much for people.

B: And this oblige you. This is an obligation for you to later on describe indirect knowledge.

Y: Yes.

B: It is obligation.

Y: Yes.

Direct knowledge as its name implies not arrived at through a process of perception.

See, now I am clarifying ordinary knowledge,

but by fiat, by originating oneself up into a state of direct knowledge of a non-physical individual, is what direct knowledge is.

Y: I found that if that is clear to people, they are very validated. It brings them out like nothing I have ever seen in any therapy or any technique or anything else that if they realize that they can choose to be in a state of direct knowledge of someone, that it's up to them that they originated (they might be wrong) but they did it. It's a tool in their hands. And it's a validation and it's granting a being of them. It's accepting them. So it is also good for the person that says it to them because you're accepting them. You're being in a state of direct knowledge that they have the power to be in a state of direct knowledge of other individuals.

B: Yes, you acknowledge their free will, their freedom.

Y: That's right. And people are so battered down that this brings them new life and an unlimited source of capacity and power. They see it when they see it their lives change.

Bret: What is George Bush doing that is different than this?

Y: George Bush what?

B: I am serious. What is George Bush doing that is different from originating self into a direct knowledge of... You said it could be wrong. So what is the difference?

Y: What is wrong with George Bush is that he doesn't know who he is.

Bret: All right.

Y: That's true of a lot of people. But he also then has identified himself with a holy man. He thinks he is Christ.

Bret: Ok. That's what is wrong with him. But is this different...is what he is doing different from originating himself into a direct knowledge of another?

Y: No, but he is also originating himself into a state of no direct knowledge. And he has done it in such a way that he behaves the way he does. Now I don't say he did that out of any particular purpose. I think he...he is doing it innocently. Just, well, I'll try this. First of all, he was a drunk, a serious drunk, an alcoholic. And then, one day in church, he got religion as they say and he became a different man. From one perspective, he was possessed by the devil that he connected to someone who is denying almost everyone and has all kinds of mental mechanisms. This is what we know as Diablo or the devil, the evil one. And it is the best friend of the ego. Duryodhana represents the ego.

B: Duryodhana, yes, I know him well.

Y: We know too well. Ok this is enough for me for today. We are going to take quite awhile, I feel, on this subject of knowledge, direct knowledge, working this out. If we do this, we'll have the basis for all the rest of it to fall into place. Ooh la la!

B: Thank you. This is Chu's paper.

Y: Dr. Chu.