

#27

Formal talk-31102006 morning day11

Lila recording day 11, morning

31/10/2006

061031000

2 Hr 00 min

[Recording 27](#)

Y: You have something for us this morning before I take over for awhile?

B: (acknowledges)

Y: Or just an informal question? What's this? You want me to keep this?

B: Yes.

Y: So I can use that later on.

B: Yes, later on.

Y: Darshana, keep that.

D: Ok.

B: Few questions, maybe not (any) of them we shall discuss now. Just shortly. First I was...one is concerning measurement of the mass and angular momentum which I have read in Wheeler's book on gravity. Then there are other insights regarding the matrices, some conditions that could decrease the number of iterations, or the number of steps we are doing while searching to circuits in matrices just few conditions. And then the third question is concerning the state of direct knowledge as potential for consciousness, and this is closely connected to... with... we were discussing yesterday. So shall I leave this for the end or the beginning?

Y: Yes. You can leave that for now, but the other part you can.

B: So I was observing this formulas which are giving by Wheeler. And although they are applied on a larger scale in astrophysics actually, for a mass of planets, still the way of thinking might be of use for us. For instance, they have for mass. This is the Kepler's One, Two, Three law as they name it. For mass, we have 2π over the orbital period squared. And this is multiplied by the semi-major axis of ellipse

Y: By the what?

B: Of the ellipse

Y: By what of the ellipse?

B: The semi-major axis.

Y: Semi-major axis, yes.

B: Because of the movement.

Y: Yes, I understand. It is elliptical.

B: And it is cubed. So it could be of uses, maybe not maybe, yes. But still it, for instance, things are enables our thinking. Here...how this is obtained, at least how I understand it, if we have just a circle, the circumference is $2\pi r$. And the surface of it is πr^2 where r is the radius. So if we have ellipse, this is the same actually, but in state of having r multiplied by r we have A multiplied by B . So this is $AB\pi$. And we...if we have three dimensional elliptical movement, then the volume of this body will be A, A, A , so it is A^3 . So this is this semi-axis of ellipse because when we want to estimate the gravity or actually the mass, we have this into picture. And the other member of the formula is actually ω^2 . It is squared because there are like two waves which are orthogonal and this ω is $2\pi F$ where F is the frequency.

Y: The waves you are talking about are waves of what? The waves of motion?

B: Motion, yes, of the movement around. So this like a projection of, this is projection actually spread it out, it is circular actually.

Y: I understand.

B: And so maybe in a way this helps me thinking in terms of what we have been doing although on small scale. Somehow, maybe we can use it.

Y: I got the idea.

B: At one point, for us, for instance, F is NI , for us in our equations. F could be associated to NI . From this Planck equations, somehow, maybe I am wrong. Now later on the second question... On page 475 in Wheeler's book it is written.

Electromagnetism has the model. I count all the electric charge that is here.

And this is what we do actually and what we, I have recognized in the article which you have written with Seeley and Baker because he says, I come

Y: Yes. Some of my ideas I got from him.

B: Ah yes, Ok. And it is great because it explains a lot and it makes our task easier which you have done actually. I count all the electric charges here. I just find the volume. I know the length of the non-physical individuals once I associate length quanta to them and elementary time units. And then I just count the electric charges which you do actually when you are finding energy. You multiply the length by the length and you obtain energy. So this is a great statement. I count all the electric charges here. And he says, this is the model of electromagnetism. So here actually, I kind of applied Kepler's ...

Y: What he didn't have was an explanation for the electric charge. And that's what the monopole is supposed to do. The monopole explains why there is an electric charge. And t' Hooft says these monopoles are a result of what they call the Grand Unification Theory. And I say it is a result of the circuit, crossed over circuit arrangement.

B: Yes, this is the pole of the monopole.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: This is how I understand. This is the pole of the monopole and then so. And you showed me that the charge actually could be explained in centimeters. And it is actually in a sense perception of length. So if we apply this, then I apply this. This might not be true of course, but somehow it puts some light. If we apply to the Kepler's equation, M is $\omega^2 A^3$. We have here the spanning Hamiltonian. F is one over TQ because F is frequency where TQ is elementary time quanta, elementary time unit. And then we are supposed to count. To count the length of all the electric charge, that's here practically the length somehow. And this is maybe where we could introduce the picture of ours we have drawn while discussing. I don't want to say π being finite because finite is not finite, but movement around the circle, the circuit, while we don't have a circuit actually but discrete elements of it. So this is how we could apply this notion of ours. That sign could be explained; or the wave could be explained in discrete ingredients.

Y: I see what you are suggesting.

B: So if in this formula or a formula which is equivalent to this one, we apply our ω because ω is the angular (total?) does he say? $P^2 \pi$ over orbital period, this is ω actually. ω is the angular velocity. In finite elements, it could be described while observing the projections of the illusionary movement.

Y: He does that later on in the book.

B: Ok.

Y: And he calls it units of information.

B: Which they are.

Y: Yes, they are.

B: So this is how we could include this picture of ours of sign being explained in discrete elements of angular velocity. If we apply here M is 2π over elementary time units squared which is equivalent to 2π over orbital period squared. This is orbital period, the period is this one, and the frequency is... This period is $2\pi F$ while F is the frequency one over elementary time unit which we know. So we have M is 2π over elementary time unit squared multiplied by $(N)^3$ where (N) is the number of non-physical individuals in the circuit because he says. Maybe I am wrong because he says,

I count all the electric charge that's here.

And since we associate length quanta to the non-physical individuals in the circuit, then for us...

Y: I think your suggestion is on the right track. Yes.

B: Yes. And then since, when we were discussing this elementary monopole on a smaller scale, we concluded that the length of the circuit expressed in length quanta becomes the number of the non-physical individuals. And then the perception because in a sense they got common sense of time and space, once we introduce three dimensional space, then the length between any of them is the same. And here A is actually the length. And so if we replace (N) here, we have like a three dimensional monopole somehow. And the muss of it is this.

Y: Yes.

B: Or at least, it could help us understand what is going on.

Y: Yes.

B: And maybe a little more.

Y: I think the second recursion will give you a three-dimensional monopole.

B: Ah ha. The second recursion, not the third.

Y: Well, there's a first one; there is the original pattern.

B: Which is the circuit.

Y: And then, there's the first recursion; and there is second dimension; third dimension is the second recursion.

B: Yes.

Y: You have to have something to recurse.

B: Yes. And what recurses is this. If I imagine here a representative point which illusionary moves around the circuit, and I observe the projection of this movement, I obtain these discrete elements of sign.

Y: Yes. You are on the right track.

B: This was the first point. Now the second point is regarding matrices. In this matrices, I introduced L_i as rows. And each one in this L_i of cell $[i]$ one $[i]$ one to two and so on and so on and so on. So I purpose this to be denoted as $L [i]$ of $[i]$ $[i]$ $K J$ and so on. So these are rows, the ones are showing out-going arrows. And then we have L_a which are the columns or the known individuals. And the ones are denoting

the incoming arrows. So I have presented you even in my letters, the way how to find a spanning Hamiltonian.

Y: Yes.

B: But in order to make it cheaper as you suggested, to make is cheaper or to decrease the number of steps, one condition should be introduced. And this condition is, first I check whether in the Li or the row I suggest a starting point for searching the Hamiltonian whether I have both one in Li and both one is La which will mean that this circuit will start in this particular non-physical individual and end this particular individual which does not solve the problem. I still have to find it. But if it is not fulfilled, then I am not searching at all. So I drop it. So this should be done. And each should decrease significantly the number of iterations. So this is first condition which should be done.

Y: The number of iterations per second, per unit of time?

B: Yes. So first I should check... I start with the first row as I do. I start with the first row and I check if this row is K. I check if it one Ok it is a possibility, then I go to the Kate column. So I go from Li to La and check if I have one there. If I have one there then there is for sure a circuit. But I still have to find it. And I have procedures to find it. If I go to the first one, I check in which La in which row, in which column it is. I search for the first one in this row then I check in which column it is. I find the appropriate row. Then I check for and so on and so on, it is explained in the letter I sent you. So this is condition which should be added. The other way to decrease the number of steps while circling around the matrices is to find a way, I call it to ride the wave. For instance, in this example I send you. There is a diagonal although it is not the main diagonal and once I catch this diagonal then I could just follow it because these are all members of the circuit. I follow it... until I bump into one in the reference La, in the reference column. I start from a reference Li or from a reference row. Then for instance, I say this, this, this, this is followed by F and F is here. And now I have caught (caught) the wave and I just ride the wave because it will lead me all along the circuit till it bump into the same reference La. Why is it so? Because it is the procedure, how the matrices work.

Y: Yes, I understand. All right.

B: So the third point. Just shortly I'll go over this, the third point.

Y: You carry on but I'll be right back. They can follow. I get the idea.

B: And I'll leave this for later, the state of direct knowledge. The third idea was that, for instance, somewhere for the smaller numbers of individuals the Poison distribution was taken as discrete elements, and... which is actually... this is the case all the way along. But in the first steps, this member E to M over (N) was not taken into account. And this has two-fold meaning this member. We have M of [I] is [I] square [I] factorial (N) to [I] minus one multiplied by E to M over (N). This has two-fold meaning. And so far, at least, I have seen the first meaning. And this meaning improves the accuracy. It improves the accuracy because we do recursion here, and once, and over and over again; we put M here as M once again. But this is just the

first meaning. The second meaning to this is a normalization factor; and E to some degree being under normalization factor is to be found in particle physics as well. And this normalization factor actually glues, so to say, the discrete elements together and makes the range. And once we have a range, we could apply Monte Carlo. So this means the curve continues and makes it array. It like joins together these members, like helps us.

Bret: Your wave on the matrix. I think it looks to me like that particular wave, that structure, will only exist if you happen to arrange the order of the individuals correctly.

B: Yes, I know.

Bret: So do you know some algorithm that will economically arrange them in a way so that they will show up that way? Because it is a great technique if there is one. That is one of the easiest pattern recognitions that you can think of.

B: Yes, I know, it is to search for members A of KK although this K will be varying. I believe it could be found. You search for KK's, for instance, somehow. Maybe it could be of interest. Sometimes you don't have just random situation; sometimes you have something you all ready have introduced, for instance, as in particles. And you arrange it sometimes, but it will still be helpful.

Bret: Another thought that I have is that it will show up if you have a circuit in that way. But it occurs to me if there are other circuits, maybe they will also show up in the same way in different parts of the matrix when it is arranged according to the match of the largest circuit.

B: Yes, there will be many of them.

Bret: The sub-circuits are crossovers.

B: Sub-circuits, yes,

Bret: There's an application.

B: I have explained that once we have introduced this member E to M over (N) in Poisson. It is not just to improve the recursions and the accuracy; but also it is making this discrete function somehow continual and enables you to have a range which useful for Monte Carlo because in particle physics also you have this member added. And it is explained as normalization factor. In particle physics, I have seen in this book, it is just like this one.

Y: Yes. I think that is sigma. It's called a cross section of the particle; and it shows the distribution of the probability of where the particle will be found.

B: Ah, yes. Sigma is standard deviation.

Y: Yes.

B: Ok, yes, exactly. Yes, exactly. This is the deviation, standard deviation.

Y: That's good. I hadn't put that together.

B: So the meaning is two-fold, to improve the accuracy and glue these discrete elements together. And finally this, I am sure this will be helpful. At least...maybe it is dead mouse as you mentioned. You know in Buddhism, they say this mind is Buddha. There is no Buddha outside this mind, mean the way seeking mind.

Y: Yes. I understand that.

B: Also Shakespeare says, "To be or not to be, that is the question." There is no other question but to be in state of direct knowledge or not to be in state of direct knowledge; and there is all that exists.

Y: Yes, that's all.

B: Yes, and I believe that it is significant. He says, "To be or not to be, that is the question." And I...ah ha! And then the arrow of Arjuna's you have been discussing in scripture class, plus the Arjuna's arrow. Now I want to talk. This and this is directly connected with what we have been discussing yesterday. For instance, we have been discussing the positive states of no knowledge.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: But there is just one ability to choose. It is not the case that we have ability to originate act to be in state of direct knowledge and then ability to originate and act to be in a state of no knowledge. This is not the case, what we have.

Y: Yes. You tell me what the case it.

B: The case is there is just one ability and just one choice. And once we exercise our choice, the other one is also exercised. Once I made the choice, all I act I () Caesar.

Y: That is a very good question; and I would be glad to discuss it.

B: This is like Arjuna's arrows released, and there is no... The choice he has been making both to be in state of direct knowledge or not to be in state of direct knowledge because I have made the choice to be in state of direct knowledge. At the same time, I make the choice to be in state of direct knowledge the very same timeless moment I choose to not to be in positive state of no knowledge. This is one and the same. If the arrows is the state of no knowledge, this is the state of no knowledge. So there is no ability to originate the act to be in state of no knowledge and ability to originate not to be in state of direct knowledge. There is just one choice. When I make this choice I make both. When I make the choice to be in state of direct knowledge at the same time I drop the choice. There is just one choice. I drop the possibility to originate acts not to be in state of direct knowledge. There is just one choice.

Y: Yes, in philosophy it's called Hopson's choice.

B: Hopsins?

Y: Hopsins or Hopshins. How do you say it, Darshana?

B: Hobsin.

D: H O B, it means that you either do that or you don't do anything, only one.

B: Yes. This is the arrow (portion?), isn't it so?

Y: Either you do that or nothing.

B: Yes.

Y: I am not sure that's correct. I'd be glad to talk about it. And as I was saying yesterday, by taking that as an assumption, later on I wasn't able to explain certain phenomena. Whereas, if I took it as two states, either the state of knowledge or the state of no knowledge, and that it is an actual state of no knowledge, that it's two different things, And that one is just switching between them. This is the state of knowledge. We'll call it K, instead of A. And this is the state of no knowledge. So you could switch like this. You're an electrical engineer; you know about electrical switches. Is it that, that there is a switching, and that its action consists of that act? Or is it that one ceases to do this and does this? And in my thinking, they are different. When I first started on it, I thought what you think now. But I think it is faulty.

B: I just wanted to de-identify myself at least for being so bounded to mathematical representation. In mathematic, it is definite. Clearly we have positive graph; and we have complimentary graph; and both have meaning. So in mathematics, yes. I just wanted, maybe, to go deeper into it, and not to be so much and not to stick so much to mathematical representation in a way to...

Y: Good, I am glad to hear it. It will save us a lot. But your wording of it... you see, it is a positive state of no knowledge because it has...it is different than nothing. You might say it is a positive state of a negative condition. And I think it does apply. But if it doesn't apply...if it...if the other is that way, well then, we have to change our assumption.

B: Well, no, just to have in mind that this is what we are dealing with at least in terms of assigning physical reality into it. Otherwise, it should stay, of course. It is the beauty of it. I was the one stressing so much positive state of negative. Only I was concerned by this picture we have drawn yesterday which became to complex in a way. Yesterday we introduced three pictures. One was no states and it is just non-physical individuals. And the other was positive arrangement of extant choices being made to be in state of direct knowledge. And the third one is the complimentary draft to this one which is the potential of the connections now being made, yet but potentials. So the picture became too complex.

Y: I agree.

B: This is why I was contemplating over it and...

Y: That step is faulty. This step is Ok.

B: Yes. A is...this is what I was trying to somehow to picture maybe with wrong wording, as you say. But this was somehow what I was stressing because this is not the...I had choice to do this and choice to do this. I have just choice. And once I made choice; I made choice.

Y: So all I have to give.

B: Collapse of the wave function has taken place. This is before the collapse. I mean now before conditionally speaking.

Y: All I have to offer is some metaphysical realities. So far as the mathematics is concerned, I have some skill but not much. I am not, although I had some training in physics; and I have exposed myself to a lot of physics. I am not a physicist. I am a metaphysician. And the Lila Paradigm, what it has to offer, is the metaphysics of what is behind the scene.

We had another chart of three states of knowledge, consciousness and physical. That is also wrong. It should be knowledge. And then the next step is we have... consciousness and physical are inextricably connected to each other. They both come together. If you have got one; you have got the other because the 'who' is gone.

B: Yes.

Y: So when you become conscious, perceive physicality.

B: Ok, great.

Y: They go together. And it is not three steps; it's two. So this is why it is important to go back over the fundamentals until things settle down. I'll talk for awhile now. I want to read the first sentence in the paper from the *Lila Paradigm of Ultimate Reality*, the section on fundamental paradigm shift.

We call the description of ultimate reality in quotes "a paradigm" because it involves a fundamental shift from the currently accepted physically based paradigm, to one that is metaphysical based.

Now I know that the people that you work for and with and teach are used to the physical paradigm. And they're not going to accept a Lila Paradigm right off. But I'll leave that up to you to deal with whatever way you see fit. That you're... But what I want to say is, is that I don't want to state what the Lila Paradigm is in the paradigm of physicality.

B: Yes, of course.

Y: I want to state it in the metaphysical realm of non-physicalness. And that is all I have to offer really. Then I say:

Instead of assuming that there is independently existing physical world out of which emerged biological forms, some of which are somehow conscious, we are proposing that a metaphysical reality exists out of which emerges consciousness of what appears to be the regularity of our physical universe.

So those two go together.

The emergence of consciousness and the appearance of regularities of a physical universe.

I changed the word from our to a physical universe. Now that's the paradigm shift. And it is fundamental. And so if we take a mathematics as you were saying...if we take a mathematics that is based on physicality and is suited and correct for physicality and try to apply it, we have to bend it. And anybody trying to understand it will still be in the old paradigm. So they have to shift paradigms. Then they can say Ah! I see this is different. You were realizing this overnight. That's why you were making notes. Let me give you an example that I hesitate to bring up again. But I think we have to get this clear between us.

In a non-directed graph instead of a labeled directed graph that is directed in the physical realm where you have a background of space and time, this works very well.

The literature is full of non-directed graphs. He keeps coming up with more books on the subject and more papers on it. I was looking at them last night; and there are just thousands of them on work that has been done because they are trying to describe what happens in the physical world. And that is right to do. But in the Lila Paradigm, there is no such thing. It doesn't exist at all. There is only directed relationships; and that's due to the assumptions being what they are. If the assumptions are correct, and if we assume for the moment that they are, then we only have non-directed graphs even if we have this that's also a directed graph. Now we can evolve this; we can have A arrow B arrow D arrow C. And we get a C • for A and a D • for A; and between those two physical particles in the appearance of consciousness of A's mind, we can get a non-directed graph situation. But this is all illusionary. The term *for* A is critical. The word *for* that is it *for* A, that this is a unit of space. Now I talked to Dr. Smart at the University of Australia, the National University in Canberra, whose father is the great mathematician and philosopher. And we argued about the word *for*. He said, "You can't have any *for* because reality is not...the mountain is there whether it is for the viewer of the mountain or not." The mountain is there anyway. So it is not there for the viewer. It is. And Einstein had this same thing. Although he had relativity of position in motion, he didn't take it all the way. So that, that relativity is absolute. Like Berkeley tried to do and couldn't solve because he was having created individuals in time. And so was Leibniz. But it's... *for* A; A is in a state of knowledge of B. That's what the word *for* means. It's simple.

B: It means 'who' actually.

Y: *For whom. A, the word for, for A. For 'who,' yes. For this specific 'who'.* Not just any 'who.' A is in a state of knowledge of B if A has acted to be in a state of knowledge of B. And that's what the word '*for who*' means. So in the Lila Paradigm, this is a tertiary situation; and it does not underlie the directed graphs. They imagine that this is underling this. And that may be true. And you are assuming that there is a physical universe. And you want to describe it and model it. That is the right approach to take. But I say that is not ultimate reality. That this is ultimate reality. So therefore, I think we can skip all the work that they're doing on non-directed graphs when we are addressing the level of knowledge. And we get all that out of just one paragraph that we have a paradigm shift here. And that is important to take that with you and to build that paradigm. And I want to talk to you about that just like I have been doing so that you realize that, that is what the Lila Paradigm is about. And it is not about anything else really. The rest...soon as you connect it to the physical, fine! Then use directed graphs. But you have to realize that underlying it is the directed graphs. The non-directed graph is what's behind the scene. Penrose thinks that what's behind the scene is the Platonic ideals, these patterns of relationships that are non-directed. And that's why his twister theory doesn't work.

B: Ah ha! Twister's Theory.

Y: Yes. Penrose has a Twister Theory.

B: Yes, I know.

Y: And he has been beating that drum for forty years.

B: Five dimensional.

Y: Yes. But he doesn't know what dimensionality is because he's got a misunderstanding. He thinks that this is relationship when this is, not only relationship, it is the only kind of relationship. This is an illusionary relationship. There is no particle; and there is no distance. There is only the relationship that we know about. It is amazing how complex this can be to understand it. And we are still working on it. May I go on?

B: Yes, yes.

Y:

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

I am defining physical that way because it covers all the definitions that they have in science. And it fits in with the definition in the Lila Paradigm. That is, if you observe it, then we have B • for A. So (for) this consciousness or this physicality, observing the physical thing is dependent upon...

That it could, using any means in principle, be observed by at least one conscious individual.

If it is not observed by one conscious individual, there is no physicality. So with that definition...and that fits the one or two explanations of quantum theory...that by Wigner and Von Neumann, they said, "That there must be conscious observation to collapse the wave function." I think Heisenberg thought so too. But he said, "I don't want to talk about it."

B: Yes, but he talked about it.

Y: He did. But Bohr said, "I'm not going to talk about it." But he talked all around it. And boy, did he talk! I read page and chapter after chapter of his convoluted English. It's as bad as mine.

The concept represented by the word metaphysical, on the other hand, is independently existing in material individuals that...

And cross out the word *can* twice, (Can, Can, Can.) so you have to take it out twice so that 'originally acts', not that '*can* originate'. And you were saying, "That an individual can choose to do this or to do that."
Well, I say, "That he does."

B: He does. He chooses. Pardon me.

Y: He does do it. He does not *can*. So that, it is always *fait accompli*. It is timeless. So it is what it is. 'Can' implies I have the ability and one of these days I'll get around to doing it. I am saying this different ways, not only for you but for their ears too and for the people that are going to be transcribing this, and for the people who are going to be listening to that and reading the transcriptions, and the people in Macedonia that you might let them listen to this sort of thing. And I am talking to them too.

So this metaphysical realm is independently existing in material individuals that originate acts. They also are capable of or they can be in conscious states...

They are not always in conscious states.

...and make comparisons.

Well, I think... 'and make comparisons' should come out and not be brought up at this time.

B: It is in physical.

Y: And put *and* before, *and* can be in conscious states. Now, I am saying this is... I am describing how I understand the Lila Paradigm. It might be right; it might be wrong. But this is what is being proposed. Next paragraph.

A philosophy in which there only exists physical things is called a Physical Monism.

It is a monism because all there is, is physical. There is no duality. There is no Cartesian misunderstanding of Descartes as you very correctly pointed out. That he was misunderstood. He wasn't a dualist.

B: No.

Y: He was actually a non-physical monist.

B: Exactly. I haven't come to that point; but that's true because he says later on, or his followers also say, "If a change in matter couldn't be done by origination from outside, and it changes period couldn't be done from origination outside, then we could conclude that all that exist is this origination."

Y: That's beautiful. That fits the Lila Paradigm also. That's why I think it's beautiful.

B: Yes, yes.

Y: Now, I think I should include that in this paragraph along with Berkeley.

B: Yes.

Y: I think Descartes. So this physical monism is...

There's only physical things and that somehow creates consciousness and the illusion of free choice and a philosophy in which there exists only immaterial individuals is called an immaterial monism.

Like Descartes and...

B: Berkeley.

Y: And Berkeley.

In the Lila Paradigm, only immaterial individuals exist. Therefore, it is an immaterial monism.

Now I have used the term immaterial there. Berkeley used it. He didn't use the word ideals or he used immaterial. I'm not sure whether most people consider empty space to be material or immaterial; but according to my definition, if you can be conscious of it, then it's material. It's a material relationship between one physical thing and another. So those that consider there is only space in which there is these energy fields, these sophisticated energy fields have got a wrong paradigm in their mind. They have got their paradigm; and they just have this space with...if you put a probe and measure what's at that point in space and write down a value...and the next one, and the next one, and the next one, and the next one, they get a gradient. And then they write down the formula for that gradient for those distances apart. (In) All modern physics, that's all they do. That's all they do. They describe everything that way, and nothing else including the Higgs fields for mass. And they are in big trouble; and it doesn't work. They can't get gravitation and electromagnetism in the same room. Now, I changed the next sentence.

This is true even though the immaterial...

And then I say, "Parenthesis (non-physical individuals)"

(non-physical individuals) often appear in the consciousness as if they were physical things.

B: Just consciousness?

Y: I'm going to take out their illusionary consciousness and say 'the consciousness as if they were physical things'. So they *appear*, and that has to be italicize, the word.

Philosophers call immaterial monism idealism.

Now, this is to take care of those philosophers who have already dismissed idealism. They have dismissed it after having studying Quinn and others. They just say, "No." And they have said, "An epistemology which is the study of states of knowledge and their relationships". They have dismissed epistemology and Idealism right out the door. But what I am saying here is that...

Philosophers call immaterial monism Idealism and theologians call it Theopanism which is God is all, the only reality, not Pantheism which is all things constitute what God is. So that is what a lot of physicists, who believe in God say, "Well, yes, well, God is every physical thing including the energy and the time and the space and the mass and all the particles and all the totality of all that is what God is."

Well, that's fine; that has almost got it. They just left the 'who's' out.

B: But there is not, for instance, in Gita, in *Bhagavad-Gita* Krishna says, "When I embrace all three worlds, what remains is me."

Y: Yes.

B: So he embraces the physical world, and then the spiritual world, then the third world which is of God and whatever. And he says, "When I embrace all of them, I am all of them, but not just all of them. I am more."

Y: Yes.

B: Even when I embraces all three worlds, all that exists is me.

Y: True, and a good quote. So the physicists leave out *who's* and have Pantheism; whereas, the Theologians call this immaterial monism Theopanism that God is the only reality. But they don't ...but they don't discuss what god is. They have given up on what the scholastics were trying to do which was to define God. And they say, "Well, God can't be defined, so we won't do that." We'll just say, "That God is the

only reality.

Well, that's correct; but it not very useful. And what Berkeley suggested wasn't very useful because you couldn't understand what physicality and illusion is, and couldn't understand what time and space and mass and matter are. And you couldn't use that information to free yourself from the illusion yourself. So we have ended up with George Bush as Emperor of the world. We deserve our fate. Ok.

Although all idealisms up to now...

And cross out including the immaterial monism of Berkeley in the 1700's.

Although all Idealisms up to now have not been able to account for the regularities that we perceive in the world...

That the various constants and laws and values and those regularities.

The Lila Paradigm does explain what matter, time, space, energy and mass are. What their underlying magnitudes are...

That is, constants are...

and

Cross out the word comparison.

and what consciousness is.

Because I was doing my dumb thing of throwing in something else that is true, but...

B: It's too early and...

Y: It's too early. And all they do is confuse the reader.

B: Great. We start form the essential, from the basic.

Y: Yes. And then fill in the details.

B: By then, I might tell you the right quote about Descartes.

Y: Yes.

B: Because I have it in my book, the right one, not just in my words, but the right one.

Y: Right out of the... He wrote in French, did he, or Latin?

B: In Latin, maybe.

Y: You have it in Macedonian.

B: In Macedonian.

Y: You want to get your book and so we can get this? Yes, I want that word for word.

B: Yes.

Y: Because most scientists think of him as a dualist, that there is this non-physical individual and there is this physical world. And how do you overcome that problem? How does one affect the other? It is inexplicable. And so they just call it the Cartesian catastrophe that dualism can't possibly be true. Well, that's right. It's not. They have not a dualism. There is only the non-physical use. And not only that, there really isn't brought into existence any relations when the word *for* is used. I used a definition, instead of a state of knowledge. And that's what is brought into existence. Well, is that a relation in how other people use the terms? No.

B: I have a whole chapter on philosophical directions and methodology for matter and consciousness. And first, I explain materialism then Idealism.

Y: Will you write this down, this translation when she translates it?

Don: Yes. We'll... we have it.

Y: Yes, I know.

Don: I will write it also.

Y: But I won't have that for a week or two or God knows when.

Don:
I will type it out.

Y: Materialism then Idealism then dualism then holism, then finally the quantum vacuum which is transcending the present state of affairs in quantum physics.

B: I read that in your mind consciousness.

Y: Yes, yes. I know. And now I skip this all; and I go to the dualism. It says

The third characteristic view which determines that relations between matter and consciousness is dualism. In this view matter and consciousness are two different ontological categories by which with humans are connected through the brain. Manifestation of the brain could be explained in a satisfactory way through the system in which they are manifested. They could not be explained through the... in this way even as complex and sophisticated as human brain is. For dualist the universe could be explained just as whole which is composed of two entirely separated and mutually not... When you couldn't put something under one...

Don: Exclusive.

B: When you couldn't derive something.

Y: Ah ha!

B: Not being possible to derive elements.

In philosophy of (Plato?)...

I'll come right down to Descartes.

Y: You said coming?

B: Yes. In philosophy of (Plato?) the expression for the highest Dualism is the one between the ideas and matter between the being and non-being. Rene Descartes stressed fully... I mean very strongly his... introduced the idea of the non... never to come in peace... What is the word? Ever... I'll put it ever discuss difference between the talking substance... There are two expressions in Latin like (res) this and (res) that. I couldn't remember now. Maybe I'll find it in Encarta Encyclopedia or Britannica. He has an expression in Latin for matter and Ideas. There are two different Ideas and expressions in Latin. One is soft and the other is hard, so to speak, one is matter and the other is the spirit. This point of view had difficulties to explain matter and consciousness. How they interact which is evident in human experience. Some of Cartesian (the school of Descartes) negated any interaction between them. They stressed that matter and consciousness are fully incapable of existing by themselves or by... To have possibility to impact one another, to influence one another and that every reciprocity between them is done just be God. So there is no dualism. Just God when he will cause a change in one of them... Causes at the same time change in the other.

Y: This is correct.

B: And I have another sentence. This is why I want to accent the emphasis. Some of the disciples of Descartes, of the followers of Descartes, had thrown away the idea of dualism in favor of monism of idealist. And they say, if just God cause changes in both then why not suppose that God is the only one that exist.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: If there is no interaction between them outside origination.

Y: Then you don't need.

B: Then you don't need both; and you need just the origination.

Y: God is doing it anyway. It says that too.

B: Yes.

Y: The question remains, "What is God?"

B: Yes.

Y: And that is what the Lila Paradigm says, what God is. Now...

B: Then I have Back *shanti chant, Ah chitta ah betta ah tattva* which is from *The Vedas*.

Y: Yes. Isn't this in your translated article *Mind/Consciousness* that has been translated?

B: My article.

Y: Your article.

B: (acknowledges) Yes, yes, it is there. It was presented at the conference about consciousness in Belgrade.

Y: Ah ha.

B: Maybe, I'll send you the copy of the proceedings it was presented in.

Y: If it's in English.

B: In English. They are all in English. And it is very nice. They are very, very beautiful articles that are presented; and organizer of this conference Professor Rakovitch is a very good friend of mine. And at certain point of time, I just want to present you his theory because it is on consciousness. He's an electrical engineer and he does mathematics in consciousness and in very beautiful way. For instance, I'll just give you a hint now and maybe at some other point.

Y: Ok.

B: He says, Professor Rakovitch, he says, "Delta T subjective. (The subjective notion of time) is Delta T objective (the time measured) over (and he now has in picture now something to do with theory of relativity of Einstein's and at that point... Ah ha that was another point I wanted to stress now I come to it.) So Delta T subjective is Delta T objective over one minus V squared over C squared while C is the speed of light.

Y: And V is velocity?

B: V is velocity, yes. And it could be expressed, as well, as Delta T subjective is T is Delta T objective measured over square root of one minus Epsilon Air. Epsilon over Epsilon Air, where...

B: What is Epsilon...is the electric constants of the brain? And Epsilon air is the electric constants of the brain and Epsilon electric constants of the surroundings? For instance, we have... He is very close to the Chinese explanation of consciousness and brain and functioning of human body when they say that all these energy channels in Chinese medicine scientifically speaking they are ultra slow... There is an electromagnetic field which is created around a stream of ionized particles. I might read it. And so in alternate states of consciousness, for instance,

near death experience or deep meditation. Then this which ultra slow wave of electro-magnetic field, this spreads outside the boundaries of the body and then in a certain moment there is a change of... This wave going from the surrounding of the brain which is dense to surroundings which is very subtle. So this is Epsilon Air, this is Air this is Epsilon. But this is done in very fast fluctuations which are of the degree of 10 to minus 13th of a second to be compared to relativistic effect. So when this wave passes the boundaries of the brain then it comes into a very subtle surrounding and it speeds up. But so much that the relativistic effect is visible. And then we have time dilatation. Dilatation change of time.

Bret: Dilate or dilute? Dilation or dilution?

Y: Dilation means an increasing or decreasing.

B: Dilate or dilute? Dilation or dilution?

Y: Dilation means an increasing or decreasing.

B: Yes, increasing or decreasing.

Y: Dilation.

B: Yes. I have a dictionary here and I can find.

Y: Einstein used it.

B: Yes but this is dilatation or dilation. So we have relativistic effects here. And this means, for instance, on Intensive, for instance, when someone is in mediation and he has a subjective feeling that something was lasting for three years maybe. In his experience, in his objective (subjective) experience but objectively this is just three minutes.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: Because this is a number which is zero point zero, zero, zero something. And so when we divide something with a number smaller than one which is much, much smaller than one the (dis?) becomes very great. So the subjective experience (and he has pictures) becomes spread out. So the subjective experience is much more time past than objectively measured and this is compared to Theory of Relativity because these are relativistic dilatations of time.

Y: I understand. Tesla was trying to do this. I think this is his follower... has done it.

B: Yes, very much so because his father was electrical engineer and in Belgrade, a great museum with all the discoveries of Tesla. And he is electrical engineer and he is very close to it. And, yes, Tesla was ponder about consciousness a lot and he was very...

Y: One of your hero's and another electrical engineer was one of my hero's, an American by the name of Howard Scott.

B: Great, very spiritual he was... Meditating he was sleeping...

Y: Tesla.

B: Sleeping just three hours during the night and he had many experiences.

Y: Remarkable. What a man. I read a biography of his; but it didn't mention that.

B: Which... Ah, they don't mention it.

Y: They cut out all the good part.

B: Yes. And there is so much of it. Now they are rediscovering his experiences.

Y: Ok. Shall we go on?

B: Yes.

Y: Well, now comes the difficult point, the basic assumption or axiom or premises. I still favor the two-line version.

All that exist is a large specific finite number of non-physical individuals each of whom originates itself into a number of separate non-physical states. |

And I put one line like in the *Upanishads*.

In regard to each different non-physical individual, an individual originates himself into a state of either direct knowledge or a positive state of no direct knowledge of that non-physical individual

I think that goes instead of period. Ah, is it one thing or is it two things? Is the state of no knowledge a state? And I was thinking last night why we were having a problem with this. And it is because we haven't carefully defined the word 'state'. So I looked it up in the dictionary and all the fourteen different definitions for state. But the best part for it is what I was explaining earlier that the word *for*... If the mountain is there for me, I am in the state in which there is a mountain there. And if I am not in that state, well, I am not in a state of knowledge of that mountain. But do I put myself, originate myself, into a state of no knowledge? So that is a state of me. This is A and this is A's domain in which states can exist. Now, there is not a little guy up here with this mind. It is not a mind; it's the A itself. And there is a state he can be in with a state of knowledge, say of himself. But does he just originate it so that this doesn't exist? And that's called the state of no knowledge.

B: State of no knowledge, or...

Y: Or do we have this?

B: State of no knowledge.

Y: State of no knowledge which is a state of him in either case. So is it that or this? And I think if we do it like racing that it has a subtle implication that it is across time.

B: Yes.

Y: Very good.

B: I told even yesterday when I told you, it is great. But it is difficult to grasp without introducing illusionary time into picture. When we say, "Ceases to exist," this means time. It was and then ceases to exist. It is time, the absence of state.

Y: But if we have this, that is the extant situation, and it is not referenced to this.

B: Yes.

Y: So we can have a state of no knowledge and a state of knowledge timeless. That's what I am saying. And that is the way Lila Paradigm has been designed. And I think it is right. All I meant to say is I am not absolutely sure. But I think it's right. And I think my uncertainty is what is left of my *sadhana* that I have yet to go. I have yet to go to get full liberation. And if I do that, then I'll be certain which way this knowledge or no knowledge is. But for now, I think for now this definition is correct. Now that said, let me read that second one again.

In regard to each different non-physical individual, an individual originates itself into a state of either direct knowledge or a (should it be positive state) (or a positive state of no direct knowledge) of that non-physical individual.

Y: Punita, what do you think? It's a word, positive help there?

Don: No, I don't think so.

Y: Well, that is what I was asking for, your opinion now. What about Bret?

Bret: Yes, although I am looking at a different aspect of it. I think that the problem comes from the use of the word 'state,' that it's not appropriate. And what I would say is...

Y: I didn't ask for that one. I am going to chop it right there and we can talk about it later.

But the word state is important. It's a state of an individual. And I think this communicates better than any other way that I have thought of it. The word 'for' does not communicate. It exists for me or I'm accepting it. But I am in a state of knowledge or a state of no knowledge is how I experience it. This is what goes on with me. Now, maybe I am just brain-damaged and therefore, I have a faulty way of perceiving; or maybe, it is true. That state is right, but depends, I think... a definition or clarification has to be made about what is meant by the word 'state.' I think this is difficult.

B: Which were these definitions you have mentioned you found about state?

Y: Well, one of them and the basic one is *condition* as a synonym.

B: Condition, ah, condition, either this or that.

Y: It is in this condition or it is in that condition. So it is a condition that one is in. I am in a condition of knowledge. Or I am in a condition of no knowledge. I would have to get the dictionary out and go over it for you; just get the Oxford there right on the edge.

B: Some how it's appropriate because condition means choice. Condition is like condition. If I'll be in state of direct knowledge or in state...condition of direct knowledge or condition of no knowledge.

Y: Well, that's... another way of putting it is one makes a choice. But that implies subtlety time. I am choosing this or I am choosing that. Or I can not make a choice. Well, that's not the case. You can't not make a choice.

B: You know when. Yes, I have something to say. You know if you say 'state.' It could be your invention. You are entitled to do your own wording because you are building a paradigm. So you say, "This is state."

Y: And this is what it means.

B: This is what it means.

Y: Yes, in this paradigm, it means this.

B: In this paradigm 'states' means this; and it is essential. There are other twenty meanings, but this is the twenty first. So you are not prone to this, you are not... It doesn't matter what they say, in a sense, for state.

Y: It doesn't matter; it should be somewhere in the neighborhood.

B: You could either invent.

Y: Look at this.

B: You could either invent new word or say what word means.

Y: This is the concise dictionary; and it has a whole column just on the word state where most words only have one line.

B: My dictionary is also rich; but I could check also.

Y: Condition, it says, "In which a thing is, mode of existence as determined by circumstances."

B: Mode of existence, it is good.

Y: Yes.

B: In a way.

Y: And the second meaning is organized political community like the state of Macedonia.

B: This is for George Bush now. George Bush, what about is fine?

Y: Yes, George Bush state, number three legislative body. Macedonia has a legislative body?

B: Yes.

Y: Or parliament? What's it called?

B: Yes, my student is the president.

Y: Ah ha.

B: He had three examinations.

Y: So, civil government. All right, one's rank or dignity is one's state, pomp arriving in great state. One or two or more variant forms within a single edition of a book, I didn't know that one.

B: Which one?

Y: If you have...this book, they change one page and went on printing. That is two different states. It's not important. And it goes on a lot to do with printing and building rooms. Statehood, of or for concerning with the state as in a political body.

B: Ah, state like United States.

Y: State University. In the United States, they have State University like University of California or California State College. Reserve of done on occasions of ceremony, a state visit. Khrushchev comes from a state visit. So that has to do with a political body. But what they mean... they are talking about something amorphous that's all of us. Put it together in a single unit can call it a state. But the best definition is condition in which a thing is, the mode of existence as determined by circumstances. Those are the two best meanings I think we have here.

B: Here was...have another one which is also good. And it says, "State is to declare firmly which is what I was saying, to declare firmly. You firmly declare this is so; and it is so. It is like a law. It is declare firmly; it is written. They say state: say, speak, express verbally or in writing, announce declare firmly.

Y: That's to state. That's a verb to state, to state something.

B: Ah, yes.

Y: You state it defiantly.

B: Yes, but just the same.

Y: But a state is what we wrote down, condition.

B: It is a firm declaration then. As verb it is declare firmly. As noun it is firm declaration.

Y: One declares, "On this day in 1947 that India is its own separate independent country."

B: Yes.

Y: Nehru.

B: Independent country, a state.

Y: It's independent; and he stated it firmly at this midnight hour. I heard that on the radio in 1947 when I was seventeen years old. And I remember Amelia Earhart when she crashed, the Aviatix, the female pilot flying around the world, Amelia Earhart.

B: I know I mention her.

Y: And she crashed and was never found.

B: Maybe I heard.

Y: I was seven years old. I remember Bonny and Clyde when I was four years old.

B: Amelia Earhart, I know how she looked with the round very beautiful.

Y: Yes.

B: Round face.

Y: Yes, she was a very capable woman. I am just saying how long I have been alive. How different the world is now, Bonny and Clyde in the depression.

B: State or no states.

Y: So, Punita, you take the period off the sentences in the statement of what the premises are. Take the periods off and a vertical line and then a vertical line like that and place like in the *Upanishads*. And then on the next sentence, you take the period off and put two vertical lines. But it has to be on a separate line. Begin on a separate line so we make it like *Upanishad*.

B: Sutra this valid is ...

Y: And then Stapp will pay attention.

B: This is a scripture. It should be.

Y: Ok. Now you want to comment on state? I would be glad to hear it.

Bret: You are working hard in other arena to remove sequencing, sequencing out of things...

Y: (acknowledges)

Bret: But state itself puts sequencing in here because you have got the individual and the individual's state. And individual's state is convenient for us when we attempt to figure out what that individual's consciousness is. But an individual is not in a state. I would read it as in regard to each different non-physical individual, an individual originates itself into direct knowledge or no direct knowledge of that different non-physical individual. It's not a state.

Y: Yes, I tried that a few years back; and while technically it would be correct because implied to most people that knowledge is a state, but I found that leaving it implied is not adequate. And so the burden of having the 'what you call sequencing' there, I think is worth it. It makes it longer; and they wonder what this state is. But the state...just to talk about knowledge doesn't say what has that knowledge or what is in that state of knowledge. Just like they talk about consciousness, Chalmers and Go Swami says, "I am consciousness." But they say, "I don't really exist. There is only consciousness." But nothing has it. Nothing is in that state. Consciousness as the word is a state. 'Ness' makes it a state. So they never ask the question "What is in that state?" And we end up with modern philosophy on consciousness and modern philosophy on physics that is trying to deal with consciousness when consciousness is not even basic because they won't even call it a state of something and find out what the something is. It's obviously oneself. But they never experience oneself. Or if they do, they will say, "If I write that I won't get any grants." So they are right; they won't.

Bret: I say you are conflating two things in that statement. One thing that needs to be said is that the individual originates direct knowledge or no direct knowledge of a different non-physical individual. And the second is that this is consciousness. You are not separating the two even though you are saying two things. And that conflation is why people trip over it and can't separate them.

Y: Well, I am not saying anything about consciousness in this.

Bret: This is the enter Lila Paradigm. And you just argued that the reason for putting in the word 'state' is because otherwise, you can't get...people don't get consciousness out of it. They leave out the 'who.' So you are attempting to say that. That's why you are keeping it in there.

Y: Yes.

Bret: You're putting... but you're hammering two things together on two different levels.

Y: No, but I am saying that knowledge is a state.

Bret: I say, "Consciousness is a state." Consciousness, if there is a state...

Y: So you're putting consciousness in the definition then.

Bret: No, I'm not. I am pointing out that you are and not noticing it. State implies an objective observer who sees that there's a state. A Lila individual is not in a state. The Lila individual chooses; and that's it a state if from an objective observer looking at that Lila individual and parsing that state they are in. State is in...

Y: Well, I don't agree with you. So the phrase means one thing to you and another thing to me. A state is an external viewer of it. No, either I'm...I know or I don't know. I'll think about it some more. Punita, you have anything to add?

Don: Well, I don't agree that a state implies an observer. Something can be in a state or not whether an observer looks at it or not like a traffic light. It's red or green. It's in that state regardless whether anyone looks at it or not.

Bret: Biomechanics says, "No" directly without an observer, there is no state.

Punita: I understand what you are saying, but that's not the reality.

Y: Well, I am saying there is. I am making a definition of what...that knowledge is a state. And the question remains is whether no knowledge is a state.

Don: I think it is. And I am with you that I am in a state without an observer. I am in a state.

B: But you rightly state...

Y: Saraswati used to be in a state too.

Don: All right, I am aware of that.

B: You say, "You originated itself," which resolves it. Isn't it so? You stress that an individual originates itself into a state. This is a whole thing.

Y: Yes.

B: So it is state this results in a sense.

Y: He originates itself into number of separate non-physical states.

B: This is stressed here. It is in definition.

Y: Then the next line I say what those states are, that they are states of direct knowledge or no direct knowledge.

B: In which you originate. I mean, there are non-physical individual originates itself. So it is stated.

Y: Anyway. I'll take it into further consideration.

Bret: An individual originates direct knowledge.

Y: Well, I don't agree right now. You do what you want. I am saying what I say, the Lila Paradigm is. That's what I finally told these people that were doing all kinds of major modifications on Enlightenment Intensives. You do whatever you want, modify it anyway you want, but call it something else. Don't call it the Lila Paradigm. Call it the Bret paradigm. I am saying that to you too. You can do whatever you want with it. But if you make major changes in it, then call it something else.

B: I'll keep it in its pristine form. I'm here to understand it in its pristine form.

Y: That's why I ask you to come for is to get it from the horse's mouth and not from.... He added things to the Enlightenment Intensive that all I could do was shake my head and say, "I am amazed!" Ok, I am going to read a little bit more.

In order to understand how this description of ultimate reality results in patterns of relations of the non-physical individuals that appear in the consciousness of each non-physical individual in those patterns as our common physical universe, it maybe useful that I first expand (I think it should be some other words there) on each phrase of the above description of ultimate reality.

And if you think that these expansions are useful or I could go directly into the attributes... which do you think is a better way...is to take these phrases and explain them and then kind of summarize it as the attributes?

B: It should say somehow in order to explain, but not to... what is the expression? I use this when you put water into milk.

Y: Dilute.

B: Dilute.

Y: Don't dilute too much.

B: Don't dilute too much. It should be a scripture; these are sutras. They should be firm and not diluted; and so they should stay as such in both, and then make distinction, make a jump which is visible. It is not just telling stories. This is something firm, essential. These are laws. So this should be firm and bold and, for instance, put here something...

Y: Ok. Let me give you an assignment, professor.

B: Yes. This is the language I speak.

Y: That overnight maybe you make a version of what you are talking about of clarifying what these two sutras are saying, these two lines are saying like I got all that exists and I go on and on and then a large specific finite number and then I go on and on.

B: It shouldn't be diluted for sure.

Y: So if you could put a brief version like you were saying concise explanation so that they will understand the verse better.

B: Could it be translated into Sanskrit? Could someone do this? Translate it into Sanskrit. And after, you put it you have Sanskrit version.

Y: Darshana could do it. But it would take two months.

D: Yeah right.

B: Ok fine. You know, it would be very beautiful to have it in English, and then in Sanskrit like verse and it is scripture.

Y: But first we have to get into English in order to translate it into Sanskrit.

B: But it shouldn't be like a story. It shouldn't be. It should be mathematics in the best sense of the word.

Y: Well, write me a brief summary; and then tomorrow we will talk about it.

B: Ok, do I have this? This one I do not have. I have the old version.

Don: That's the only... I have made an updated version of that.

B: No, no not the updated, just the basics to have something to work on it.

Don: The soft copy you should have it. If not, I can give it to you. I'll make sure this afternoon.

Y: You mean on this. Ok. That's a home work assignment this afternoon. We'll deal with basics a little bit more because we have to get into a better understanding of time. But to do that, we have to get a better understanding of what A, B, C is. We have been over it, but to sketchy. We have to go over it very carefully. And we'll do that this afternoon at 2:00 o'clock. Ok. I appreciate your cooperation.

Don: The definition of the Lila Paradigm in the first sutra says, "In regard to each different nonphysical individual" different, seems to exclude self-consciousness.

Y: All right, and it also excludes equivalent because they are equivalent. They are not identical; but they are different. And they are also equivalent. But I don't know how much of that should be taken out. Maybe the word different should be taken out of there because we are saying each.

Don: That was my suggestion because it seems to imply, "Oh, I can be in a state to you, to you..."

B: But not to me.

Don: Not to me.

Y: Take it out.

Don: Thank you.

Y: I thought of that this morning myself, but I didn't do it. I thought of putting in equivalent, but I take that out too because saying each, I think, is enough.

B: Is there any graphic symbol for Lila? This should be done. Like a graphic symbol. Like a brand, for instance, you know but graphical.

Y: Like what.

B: Like Om, you know, like Om and this is Lila. This means Lila. This is why I was putting Sanskrit into picture.

Y: What's wrong with matrix?

B: The matrix, Li and La, if you want so, yes.

Y: That's one possibility.

B: That's great. That's one possibility Li and La.

Y: And that has long in both cases, Li and La.

B: But we should find it in Sanskrit, the known and the knower in Sanskrit where it originates from. And having it in Sanskrit... and then I'll put here the sutra. And then this... I don't want to use brand, this symbol.

D: Logo.

B: Logo.

Y: Logo.

B: Logo, yes. But I want it to be ancient like Om, for instance.

D: In Devanagari, you mean.

B: In Devanagari.

D: Li, La.

B: Yes. In Devanagari, the language of Gods, Devanagari.

Y: She can do that.

B: And then you could put explanation for ordinary people who are not Gods. They are, but they still don't know. So you put explanation. But first it is like Moses giving his ten commandments. These are ten commandments in Lila. And it should be stressed.

Y: I see what you are saying.

Bret: I think we should use George Bush because if we can explain how, (that's) we can get through to anybody.

Y: Very good.

B: He could be here in this cells of the matrix. One cell...

Y: One cell for George Bush.

B: Revolution.

Y: Symbol for a large but finite number. Is there any mathematical symbol for a large finite...? I know they have for summation. They have sigma.

B: Sigma, yes.

Y: Instead of integral.

B: This is why I put always Greek letters for Lila. I use Greek letters.

Y: Capital (N) is your symbol so far for everyone.

B: Which one.

Y: Big capital N.

B: Capital (N) yes, it should be.

Y: It's a large and finite number.

B: The large and finite number.

Y: Yes.

B: In Greek. Lambda e lambda alpha.

Bret: What is the equivalent of the large capital N in Greek?

Y: Nu.

B: Ni like ni like this.

Y: Nu, that's N as anyone can plainly see.

B: () ni. We should find a Greek alphabet. We have here.

Y: Yes, we have Unicode. And it has (mole?).

B: States. She said state.

Y: What are you after, Punita?

Don: I was just looking for the Montel Williams.

D: Right over here. I was just doing the same thing.

Y: The Sanskrit dictionary is over there.

Don: The Sanskrit character for (N).

Bret: I would like to borrow a book. I don't know what book yet. I want to describe what it is. And you can tell me if you have one. I would like something that gives me understanding of current measurements as in these things exist and they exist in these ways. To some extent *Deep Down Things* does that. And I'm not finished with it. She's using that. Do you have another book that describes what currently is measures to exist? Although it may not it thinks it is talking about that, but does in fact talk about is currently measured to exist.

Y: That book that she borrowed on modern physics, and she could have the look at it. I don't think she is finished looking at it, *Modern Physics*.

B: Yes, I could give it to you for a few days or even look together. But I give it to you.

Y: It also has a meaning.

Don: Now the Sanskrit for Lila is a pretty set of characters.

Y: An upside down Omega.

Don: Close

B: So this should be the symbol.

Y: This is Devanagari.

B: We have this, then...

Don: Li.

B: Li then La and then, ah great.

Y: Here's Li.

B: Ah great. So this is Li and then La should be here somewhere.

Y: It's a long ways.

B: A long way, we should find it.

Y: It's not alphabetical.

B: This is La. This is Li and this is La. Isn't it so?

Don: Yes.

B: La.

D: Well, you need a little line that connects it to there.

B: So we have it. And then we have the matrix. We have the same as La...

Y: One of the definitions of La is the act of taking and giving. Taking and receiving.

B: Yes, isn't it amazing, the act of taking and giving. La

Bret: It is amazing! They always pick the right name. That is amazing.

Y: That is amazing.

B: And another fact Lakulisha.

Y: La ku li sha.

B: Has La and Li.

Don: And (K).

Y: And he knew that.

B: Ah and K (ku). And this sha, we shall to still to discover what sha is. We know K (ku), La, Li only Sha.

D: Well if we look up isha which is Lord. It's La, Ku, isha,

Y: And isha means personal God.

D: La Ku La Isha.

Y: It means God in the form of a person which means messiah. God incarnate, That God came down in the form of Christ. Of Jesus made it Christ. And that is what isha means.

B: So, I'll do this my assignment in writing. And it will be photographed because it is difficult to put this in computer so fast, to draw this.

Y: We'll work it around eventually and get it all computerized and everything.

D: Yes. Punita, haven't you got a Devanagari thing (font).

Don: Yeah, I can put it in Devanagari.

B: Ah ha! Great! Karuna is working on a website for Lila.

B: So this is great! We have a brand early on. Now, chip, we should build a chip. This is your idea.

Y: We need Tesla.