#34
Formal talk-01112006 Afternoon day14
Lila recording day 14, afternoon
03/11/2006
061103001,
1 Hr 54 min
Recording 34

B: Fourteen. Then you go three, eighteen minus five is thirteen. Then it goes to this. Here we have this…twenty three…eighteen minus thirteen. Ah ha! It is not possible. I'll do this once again if we want this now, the whole picture because I have idea how Bellman Principle (equation?) should be applied to find the greatest Hamiltonian in the circuit. And now I know it. I have the whole idea. May I do it now?
1.4
Y: Yes.

B: Another chart because there is a mistake here.

Y: Please do.
3:56
B: I want to do it right. So this is important to go over all the steps, not to skip one because then you make mistakes. On purpose, I am putting some different numbers in order to make it visible. I have three, four, which is our case, are all ones but…to see the point five, nine, seven, two, four, ten. So this is the critical path method; but what should be done in our case will be like to…to turn this around and make it a cylinder. It will be cylindrical in order to have the circuit closed because once we find the critical path; it will have initial non-physical individual and final. But to make it closed, we should have a circuit. And I have made another drawing for this. This is like this. We have a whole network of great number of these which makes the problem difficult. Otherwise, we could find the Hamiltonian easily. But we have a whole network like this one which should be closed over a cylinder. And then we go from one event to another, from one event to another; and as we move through the algorithm, through the matrices, it will be done in matrices. Then we drop all which is past; and we have in mind only the remaining but assuring that the whole prehistory, the whole history of the system, is being mirrored embedded into the current referent agent. So in every step, we have a value of weight function, but algorithm which assures that so far this is the longest way possible because this was assured. There is another algorithm, LIS algorithm about this. But let me finish, first the critical path method. This is the critical path method. So these are, in the original method, these are events, the nodes are events, and the arrows are activities. And each activity has duration. For us, it will be all one time quanta. But in order to make it visible what critical path is, I want to do it with different numbers. And now first step of the algorithm is the *Fulkerson Rule* of numbering the events or nodes or non-physical individuals. We should label them like the 'who' attribute. So for instance, the first one should be one or zero. The beginning of the time will be zero. Now we intersect or we cancel or denote all the out-going activities out of this already labeled event. Then we label the next events beginning from left to right or from up and down just those events in which all the in-coming arrows are already cancelled. This is very important because once I didn't do it. I make a mistake. And if we have in mind that

4:39
we have 10^{23}, we have many, many, many. We have a complex network here. So this rule should be fulfilled. And now we see here, logically, I should put the label two B, ABCD as we are a custom to this event here to this agent. But I am not allowed because this arrow is not cancelled yet. This will run me into trouble later on. So I must not do this. The only agent in which all the incoming arrows are already cancelled is this one. So this one will be second and this is very important. At certain point, I had an idea in mind while going through the matrices in search for Hamiltonian. Whenever I passed a cell with one, which means the state of direct knowledge, I'll label it instead of one, two. I had a similar idea. But now I have the whole idea. This should be done like this because this is the algorithm. So this is the second one. Now according to the *Fulkerson Rule,* I cancel or denote all the out-going arrows; and I search for the event or agent in which all the in-coming arrows are already cancelled. So this is this one. So this will be the third one or C, A, B, C. Now I denote all the out-going arrows out of the last labeled agent. And now I search for the next one in which all the in-coming arrows are labeled. This is not this one.
7:04
Y: (acknowledges)

B: Because this arrow is not labeled yet. So…although it is upper and logically it comes first. So I see that the fourth…this should be the fourth because in this agent all the in coming arrows have been already labels or cancelled or denoted. So this is the fourth. Now, I cancel all the out-going out of this last label. And so this is fifth. I cancelled the out-going; and this is the sixth.

Y: Sixth.

B: And now the algorithm goes since are…in these agents, we have first the label. We have four different fields. First the label on the left. I have the earliest time of this event to occur. So this on the left side, I have the earliest time. I do know the time analysis, illusionary time. Ok, but time. We have here with capital T, I denote the time for the agents. And with small t, I denote the time for the out-going arrow or for the iterations or the states of direct knowledge and all direct knowledge. So I have, for instance, for the event number three, I have the earliest time possible. And I have the latest time possible. So down is the label for the event. And up is the earliest or the latest. So I have two time parameters for the agents; and I have four for the relations. And this is because relations have beginning and end or activities. They have beginning and end. The agents are just state; I mean a position in the project. But these are activities; and they have duration. So they have earliest beginning, earliest ending, latest beginning and latest ending. And in the parentheses I have the beginning event for an activity. For instance, this activity three, five, I have activity three, five which is from this agent to this agent. For this activity, I have beginning is denoted by the beginning agent. So I have earliest beginning. Then I have latest beginning; latest is the label for the final agent earliest. I mean this is earliest finishing. This is latest beginning; and this is latest finishing 3, 5, 5, 3. So there are four of them; but never mind. So here left, I have this earliest occurrence of an event. And on the right, I have the latest possible occurrence of an event. So I started from this one. In our case, we shall have, I repeat once again once 1, 1, 1, 1, imaginary time. So I have here, I go to the second. If I went to the third, then I will run into trouble because I don't have the information here. So I don't

21:00
have all the information I need in order to determine the earliest possible occurrence of this event. So I must go to the second. I go by the *Fulkerson Rule*. So I go to the second one. And I see the earliest possible occurrence of this event is zero plus four; it is four. Now I go to the third. Into the third I have two in-coming arrows, the duration from this one, one three activity or A,B,C,D. Maybe we should label them. Zero plus three is three. From here, I have four plus nine is thirteen. So possibilities are three or thirteen for the earliest possible occurrence of this event. I must take thirteen because it is the largest possible way till now. And this will allow me to go to move through the matrices and always have in every agent a mirrored or embedded the longest possible way so far. This algorithm allows me. And all which are shorter will be discarded. So this is the third one. Now, I go to the fourth one. If I go to the fifth one, I don't have sufficient information because here this agent. The fourth agent has no earliest occurrence of time. So this is why I was compelled to label all the out-going arrows. I go to the fourth. In the forth, the earliest possible occurrence of the previous event is four plus seven; it is eleven. If I go this pathway, I have zero plus two is two. So one is eleven the other is two. I accept the largest so far. So it is eleven here. Now, I'll go to the fifth. To the fifth I have thirteen plus five; it is eighteen. If I go this way, I have eleven plus four; it is fifteen. Out of these two, I accept the larger so far; it is eighteen. And finally, I go to the final event. I have eighteen plus ten; it is twenty eight. So these are the earliest occurrences of the events. And now, in order to find the largest possible path or the critical path into this simple network, I must also fulfill these cells which are for the latest possible occurrence of those events. Now here, I accept the same time for the earliest possible occurrence of the event and for the latest possible occurrence for the event. Now, I go backwards from the sixth to the fifth. I have twenty eight minus ten; it is eighteen. Now, I go to the fourth. The latest possible occurrence of the next event is eighteen minus four; it is fourteen. Now, I go to the third; I must follow the numbers.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: I must follow the numbers; otherwise, I don't have all the information I need in order to determine this time. So I go from the fourth to the third. I couldn't go to this one. So to the third, I have eighteen minus five; it is thirteen. This is…Aha! The out-going. Now, I look at the out-going thirteen. So this is thirteen. Now I come to the second one. And I have fourteen minus seven; it is four. And finally, I come to one. Now, I have two out-going arrows here. So I could either accept four minus four is zero or thirteen minus three is ten. So I have two possibilities here. And in our network, we shall have maybe twenty. If one more, of course, but for example. And now, out of this, I will accept the minimal one. Now, when I am going backwards, I'm accepting the minimal. When I am going forward, I am accepting the maximal. Why? Because when I accept the minimal, I assure that the largest path which is following this one will finish before the final possible occurrence of the final event.

Y: What is the critical path?

B: Now the critical path is denoted by this event which do not have time reserved which have the same time for the first occurrence and for the final occurrence. So this one is of the critical path. I see because I have twenty eight, twenty eight. There is no time reserve here. Here I have time reserve in the fourth event. I have time reserve because between the first occurrence of the event and final occurrence of the event, there is three time quanta.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: I have reserve here. Here I have reserve so this is not the one of the critical path. But here, I don't have reserve so this is one of the critical path. So this activity or this relation is one of the Hamiltonian. So this is denoted as one of the Hamiltonian. And I was sure that this is the greatest because the algorithm does it. Now, I go to the fourth; it is not critical, I have reservation here. I have time reserve here. So the length is this one because we have thirteen; and thirteen there is no time reserve here. So the latest occurrence of the event and the earliest of the event are all of the same. So we must occur in the thirteenth time quanta. So I am sure this is one of the Hamiltonian.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: So this is all the Hamiltonian so far. This is all the Hamiltonian. Now, I go here because here also I don't have time reserve. I have four and four here. And finally I come here because also here I have four of four; but this also. So I have two of the same weight. I have two possible pathways with the same length. And this is three plus five eight plus ten twenty eight which is the maximum pathway possible. And here, I have four plus nine, thirteen plus five, eighteen, plus ten twenty two (? twenty eight). There are two pathways which are of the same weight. And so, if I put it into a cylinder, then it is closed Hamiltonian.
19:26
Y: I follow.

B: Yes. So this will be the algorithm for finding the Hamiltonian in matrices. I haven't got the whole idea. I have some pictures in my mind. For instance, to change ones into two, and then two into three in order to do something like this. But now, I have it. It should be like this, the critical pathway.

Y: You got that from?
21:23
B: From operations research, network planning, when you have activity. And there are different methods for this. For instance, this method is in cases when the time is deterministic. We know exactly what the time of the activity is. But when we are building a new project like we are doing now, for instance, and I want to do estimation how this project of Lila will last. And I say, "First we do the matrices; then we do the logic; then we do Monte Carlo; then we do this; and this, and this, and this."
I could make a plan, and then find a critical path, then decide how to go. But in this case, I don't know how any of these phases will last because we are doing this for the first time. And so in those cases, there are introduced optimistic times and pessimistic times and most probable times. So this is another method similar to this one. This is PERT's Method which means this is estimation review technique, problem and then estimate review technique, evaluation program review technique.
21:40
Y: Ok.

B: Also, I wanted, maybe, something to say about…this is…

Y: This needs some work. I made a mistake, you might say. You said you made a mistake.

B: (acknowledges)

Y: I got to fix my mistake too.

B: Yes, Ok. We shall work on it.

Y: Yes. There is Michael Baker's way of…that we have labeled this graph with some of his formulas. But the note that… it says, "This is the first crossover fork," is wrong. It should be the first crossover.

B: Yes.

Y: Which is what I said, yesterday.

B: Yes, it is fork in circle.

Y: Or in circuit.

B: In circuit.

Don: Then in the line above, he says, "First crossover circuit"

Y: It's the second.

Don: Yeah, it is second. Ok. Does it make a difference?

Y: In other words, we have a circuit and a crossover. Now watch this. You'll recognize this. We have one length, imaginary length L [I] or LQ. Which way do you want it? LQ or L [I]?

B: LQ, I believe.

Y: Ok, one length quanta. Now we have one length quanta because with only one crossover to get a square…one length quanta but these go to all of them. So it's little n. LQ is equal to one length, Planck length. The same is true of this one. So you have one LP, one LP orthogonal to each other. You have H bar. Now we have the times for these. But I am still not sure because when we have one, one crossover, you would expect that after a certain number of arrows, you would have one crossover after a certain…

B: You have here one length, isn't it so? No, here.

Y: I am not quite sure what you are saying. I say that these go to everyone.

B: Aha! Because I pictured as if I have here, for instance, here… one individual which is for all of them the same, but one referent. And then from here, I have forked here and here. I have one forked here also; and one length here.

Y: Yes. There is one length here; and there is one here and one here…

B, Yes, Ok.

Y: And one here. So you get n LQ.

B: Yes.

Y: And that's equal to one Planck length. And you get to same for this arrow, this one here.

B: Aha! Yes. For the other one, the same Ok.

Y: All right. And they're orthogonal to each other. So it is one LP on the side which is the quanta Planck constant, H bar over two *pi*.

Bret: Can I ask a question? I don't understand your diagram.

Y: You don't understand the diagram. You mean you disagree with it; or you don't understand it.

Bret: I don't understand it. I don't understand what you are drawing.

Don: I don't either, so.

Y: Hum?

Don: I don't either.

Y: Well, I went too fast then. I have nothing else to draw. You understand that?

Don: Yes.

Y: Now, this is an arrow. And this is an arrow, so now we have a bifurcated structure. Right?

B: Yes.

Bret: This is an arrow. You mean, this is an individual?

Y: This is an individual, yes.

Bret: Ok.

Y: This is an individual; and there is little n number of them.

Bret: All right.

Y: So, since this is an arrow, this is a bifurcated structure. Then we get one length quanta between here and here. But that's also true for this one. So you get another one here. And you get one for all n of them.

B: Yes.

Bret: In this individual's consciousness?

Y: Yes, but so is…everybody is conscious of…

B: They have a common…

Y: They are all conscious because they are all connected to each other. And they are all in the state of knowledge which is reduced into a state of consciousness of this length.

Bret: (acknowledges)

Y: So there is little n of these individuals. And so for this arrow, this one-dimensional arrow here, this 1-D there is n LQ. And n LQ is equal to one length, Planck length.

Bret: So for this individual here, there is this much?

Y: This individual…one LP of 1-D space units or n LQ. This is space unit; so he is in a state of consciousness of n of those little n of the space units.

Bret: This one individual is conscious of.

Y: One individual, yes. And it passes that along to everybody, everyone. And we have the same story all over again for the second-dimension. In this case, it would be the second. But each one is one. And it's the same thing again. But it's orthogonal; so we get n LQ which is one LP here. And for this one and for this arrow crossing over, we get the same thing one LP which is made up of n LQ. And they are orthogonal; so we have the square. And they can't get shorter than this. So this is why this is called *Heisenberg's Uncertainty Smear*.

B: Yes.
30:40
Y: And its space squared is energy. (?) divided which is Planck's constant…

B: Two *pi*.

Y: Planck's constant divided by 2*pi*. Right or wrong you understand it now.

$$\hbar = \frac{h}{2\pi}.$$

Bret: No.

Y: What I am saying.

Bret: I understood it up to certain point; and you didn't say something that seems true to me.   And after that, it was just balled assertions to me. I couldn't follow it because I…it leaves out some…

Y: Was it the second-dimension?

Bret: No.

B: No, the perception of the individuals' on the circuit.

Y: In the circuit.

B: They become all the…they…once this happens, this is perceived like one arrow. And all of them have a common perception.

Y: If you imagine this…

B: If you perceive like this, then it becomes clear. There is no just-one-individual in 'who' consciousness…

Bret: I am sorry. Are you telling me what it is that I don't understand?

Y: I am not telling you. I am telling you the answer. If you have this, this individual here will be in a state of consciousness of all of these.

Bret: (acknowledges)

Y: And if we take this around like this, then he is in a state of consciousness of all of them.

Bret: (acknowledges)

Y: But, you could say the same thing is true of this guy.

Bret: (acknowledges)

Y: So whatever one is consciousness of, they are all conscious of the same thing.

Bret: I have no problem with that.

Y: Well, I thought that was your problem.

Bret: No, no.

Y: Then the answer to your question, "Can you ask?" is "No." It's going to take too long. I am getting this across to her so she and her people can work on it if they want to. We can fight it out later. So my question is, "If we have…a certain number of arrows have to exist in the graph in order to expect a circuit with one crossover; and that's also true of this crossover."

B: (acknowledges)

Y: "Do we multiply the number? Do we just square that number?"

B: Yes.

Y: And you say, "No."

Don: No, I don't think so.

B: I say, "Yes," because it is based on probability. And based on probability, we got the first number for the perception of one-dimensionality. And then, it is the same number for the percept of the second…which is the same. It is the same picture, the same probability. And since we have the probability for the perception of 1-D, and we have the perception for the probability for 1-D for all the individuals in the circuit who share a common perception, this (end/n?) is multiplying. We multiply this by itself and this is squaring. We square it.
33:54
Y: This is how probabilities work.

B: Yes. It is how probability work. When we have probability of something and probability of something else, in our case, it is just the same.

Y: You multiply one times the other.

B: The same as one probability which is the fork of two in a circuit. This is appearance of fork of two in the circuit. And this (N/n?) is multiplying. This means I just have to square this probability because this is all in the same, the notion that they are orthogonal. It's in the geometry of the picture.
34:22
Y: Yes.

B: But in the level of probabilities, I have this picture of one-dimensional. And the second picture of one-dimensional and this (N/n?) is multiplying. So I square it. Yes.

Y: That is what I say too.

B: Yes, yes. And in order this picture to be clear, I tried to draw it the same picture on a ball. And this A might be of the circuit. This is the Hamiltonian. And I have the first crossover here.

Y: And all I said is that I corrected and say that makes…just one crossover will make one-dimensional.

B: Yes, and then I have the second crossover which makes it two-dimensional.

Y: One-dimensional. It makes it…if you take both of them into account.

B: I have a forked structure here. I have A; then I have one arrow to B and one arrow to the circuit. A could be of the circuit. It is all the same. Maybe this is confusing. A could be of the circuit. But in order to make the fork…the appearance of the forked structure more visible, I put it here. And I have a fork structure here; but A is in the circuit. The whole ball is the circuit for me in this picture. It could be of the circuit as well. So I have here…I have the first crossover. And maybe here should be 1-D. And then I have the second crossover. And this is the second length; and this length and this length are orthogonal.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: And this and this is energy or $\hbar$ ("**h-bar**") or…and because this perception is shared by all of the individuals through the circuit. It is N length quanta which is one length quanta.

Y: So then, we would take the first crossover and take the number of arrows we have for the first crossover which here is called fork. And we take this formula for the time of the (shell?) and square it.
37:39
B: One square, yes.

Y: And that would give us a great increase in the number of arrows and a great increase in the amount of time which would be the first recursion. I'll be right back.

B: We might ever confirm this two numbers and see the one that is the second crossover and the one which is the first crossover squared and compare.

Y: So what is our number?

B: We have the coordinates.

Y: Coordinates?

B: The coordinates…

Y: For the first crossover which is called here the crossover fork.

B: Yes, if we multiply the coordinate for the time by the duration of the time unit, the elementary time unit of illusionary time, then we get the probability, the probability, the expected number in the time quanta, and then square. And if the diagram is done for logarithms, this square should be doubled because logarithm of A times A is 2A.

Don: (acknowledges)

B: In the…this should be doubled, double length in time quanta on the diagram.

Don: And it is not on this…

Y: The first crossover, I can give you the number of arrows first. You can write this down for the first crossover. It is 1.56545919 times 10^{23}.

B: This is F of? No, F but A.

Y: Yes, this is…it is not an F, it's…

B: Yes, yes. It is the other…

Y: It's a .9 or no, that's for the circuit. But this is just after F29. And the time for that is 1.81079539 times 10^{-32} of a second.

B: The first crossover.

Don: Can you repeat that number please?

Y: 1.81079539 times 10^{-32}.

Don: Thank you.

Y: And I am going to square that. And it doesn't work. So I'll have to take the number of arrows which I get here, 5,6,5,4,5,9,1,9 times 10^{23} squared. So that gives us the number of arrows. You can write this down 2.45066248 times 10^{48}. And we have to multiply that then…

B: 46. 10^{46}.

Y: By 10^{46} yes. And we have to multiply that by the value…

B: TQ.

Y: For TQ.

B: Time quanta. TQ

Y: Times 1.57079633, What?

B: Exponent of 0, one. No, this is acceptances; this is time; this is the time. Isn't it so? This is something else, acceptances.

Y: All right. Read back to me the last number.

Don: The second crossover number of acceptances?

B: The first crossover square.

Y: The first crossover…

Don: The first crossover squared.

Y: 1…squared, yes.

Don: 2.450

Y: 2.450

Don: 66.

Y: 66.

Don: 248 times 10^{46}.

Y: 248 times 10 to the what?

Don: 46.

B: 46.

Y: I want to multiply that by 1TP.

B: At that time, you have been accepting Planck time for time unit. But still.

Y: That's the number of squares here. And I want to change that. I have to get that. We didn't fill out our table. Imaginary time, yes, times 1.157255195 times 10^{-55}. Ah! Now we got it right!

Don: So what has to happen?

Y: Hum? I multiplied the length. How much time is in one time quantum times the square value of how many arrows there would be? You read it to me.

Don: Yes.

Y: And so the number of arrows and each arrow represents a time quantum which is simply Planck time divided by the square root of 2N. So, do you want me to tell you the value of the time quantum?

Don: If I am going to…

Y: What?

Don: Well, I just need to know what to put in the table here. So, if it goes in the table, I need to…

Y: Ok, what goes in the table is the result.

Don: (acknowledges)

Y: It's 2.83604189 times 10^{-09} second which is the beginning of a Steinberg/Salam phrase transition at that time. So that's an extra column to show the calculation. Well, no, it's the calculated time.

Don: Of the second recursion.

Y: To start.

Don: For the second crossover, that is…

B: For the second.

Y: The second crossover, yeah.

Don: First recursion.

Y: First recursion, unbounded 2-D space and W boson shell. And the Lila calculated result is the one that you just copied down.

Don: (acknowledges)

Y: And you got under the science calculated or measure result. But that which you have there is for how big the universe is at that point. I haven't told you what the time is. Now I am going to tell you what the time measurement is. It is in that chart that I showed you, Chart D. That was 46, 10^{-46} or 10 to the 46^{th} for the number of arrows.

Don: Yes.

Y: Aha! Yes, that's correct. That is the phrase transition. (And this is the other part?) 46, yes. So that's the Weinberg-Salam phrase transition. And that is when it begins, right there which is 46.

Don: Should I put that description in the event?

Y: Yes.

Don: Column. The Weinberg-Salam phase transition.

Y: Say, "It starts, start of."

Don: One quick question on the second crossover, "Did those have to originate from the same individual?"

Y: No, it could be any individual in the whole circuit because they are all in the same state of consciousness.

Don: Ok. That's fine. That helps.

Y: Because when that information gets around to all of them, each one of them, the information comes in the form of direct knowledge. But each one of them forms their own consciousness. And those two merge and form the two-dimensional space for that and for each and every individual separately.

Don: Yes.

B: This picture?

Don: Yeah, that's good because that makes a big difference in the probabilities.

Y: It does?

Don: A specific one verses any.

B: It is forked structures.

Y: So those are all knowledge. Nobody gets anybody else's information or consciousness. They get the knowledge, the direct knowledge indirectly. They get the same knowledge; but they don't get what is in their consciousness. And what is in their consciousness is the orthogonality at that time because the time is squared which is…time is orthogonal at that point. So the time though is actually linear…but the same arrows taken orthogonally are space. But the arrows that it took to make that tells you how much time must have gone by, or apparent time, to make that be the case because, at least, she and I agreed that you multiply the number of arrows for one crossover against…to have another crossover.

Don: Yes, but the difference is between whether we are talking about from a single individual crossing over or from any individual crossing over.

B: This is the picture. We equalize this with this one.

Y: There's a problem.

B: I have written here on yesterday. And this is a forked structure in terms of probability. And these are crossovers in the circuit in terms of probability.

Don: Yes.

B: And it might be different.

Y: That's what he is suggesting.

B: Yes, yes, this is what I am putting into words.

Y: And I think not because this take place in each and every individual. The consciousness takes place in each one. And so they have to be in the state.

B: What shall we?

Y: I don't know.

B: Ah! No. You are right because what shall lead us is the…Now, I conditionally speaking, the physical background. In this case, the non-physical background what shall lead us is not probability, but the physical background or better non-physical background. And non-physical background… If non-physical background says, "I could realize this and this." Then we are right. Then probabilities are multiplied.

Don: Yes.

Y: Well, either that is correct or it is not. I don't think it…if what I was saying is true, the probabilities are multiplied is right. But the original calculation of the probability for one crossover, are you saying that, that is affected?

Don: No. No, I'm just saying that there is a different probability if we just consider probabilities for this occurring than for this. And this is much less likely, than this because here we can choose anyone of n individuals.

B: Yes.

Don: And here, we have to choose a specific one out of that n.

B: It is rarely to be find. This is rare. This is more rare than this one. This is more frequent.

Don: (acknowledges)

B: But still we…what leads us is the explanation.

Y: But the probability that we got from the F formula…

Don: Now, if we are squaring this, this makes sense.

Y: Yes.

Don: Do you agree?

B: Yes, I agree.

Don: And this is much higher.

B: Yes, what will be leading us is the non-physicality behind it, the explanation of it. And the explanation says, "This…the probability for one crossover…and the first crossover in the circuit gets me to the perception of one-dimensionality. Then the second crossover gets me to the probability for another.

Y: So what we did was simply take it for one crossover, multiply it by what it would be for another crossover from anyone.

Don: Yeah, and that is…

Y: That's the number we just used.
Don: Yes. That's that.

Y: For this would be higher.

Don: Much higher.

Y: Yes. That was that same discussion I had with Michael Baker, the last one. His wife took the child and ran away.

B: What was her name?

Y: Monica.

B: I saw her.

Y: You know about Monica?

B: There was an incident in the Croatian magazine about his work with you when he visited former Yugoslavia…

Y: I see. Yes.

B: There was an interview. And there was a picture Baker and Monica.

Y: Big tall girl.

B: So, I know.

Y: Ok. Now, I understand what you were saying.

Don: Thank you.

Y: Ok. Well, what I am saying is…is that on this graph, I show this line here going like this. But actually, all that should not be there for the…this is the recursion we were just talking about. We just calculated the position of that dot. So the graph… This second recursion starts at that point. So the recursion only begins at the time that it is projected from the second crossover happens. And that's the one we calculated. So this graph goes like this and like this. And it ends about here. And that is all it is.

B: It is twice as big which is squared.

Y: Or maybe, it ends right here. Do I say something? Chero confinement.

B: Chero confinement.

Y: And I have a formula for it there.

B: CN squared.
Y: C is K I think it's…

B: KN squared.

Y: Yeah, it stands for K. At that time I made this graph, I was using C instead of K. Yes, it goes from here to here. That's…at that point the Chero Confinement means that quarks are confined to their own space. So what I want to do is to calculate this point, and then this point, and then this point. And to get them for time is one thing, but we have to get their location in space. But first, I would like to go back and get… Tthe numbers I gave you were based upon this formula here?

B: Yes, I have written.

Y: You remember that.

B: Yes. I have written it once again.

Y: Yes. It's not just 2 N.

B: It is *pi* here also? *pi*
58:48
Y: (Half?) *pi*

B: And also one half…

Y: One half.

B: Ok, this one should be used and checked.

Y: But Wanniski just wanted to throw away the two. He just didn't want to bother with the one half.

B: (acknowledges)

Y: With two. Oh, well, you know. And I said, "What kind of physicist are you?" He says, "Well, that's the way we do all of physics. We don't worry about these little details." It's the price. He worked at CERN.

B: (acknowledges)

Y: I don't know what he is doing now. But that was ten years ago. Ok. Now…

B: This is the graph we have in *Radical Theory* or not?

Don: That one? Do we have this one, Yogeshwar?

Y: No, you may not have it either.

Don: No, I am saying, "Do we have it?" I was saying.

Y: I have it.

Don: I know you do. I can see that.

B: We should obtain it once again.

Y: No, that is just for my reference to remind me of things because it has all these… You put it on the web, and it will be all these mistakes. And this is the curve starts here. It doesn't start down here. And it says, "Start of first recursion." That is not right. I imagined that the whole thing would be recursed, right from time zero. And that would be recursed here. But it is not so. It is only from the time that the second crossover occurs. From there on, it is recursed. Maybe that's right; and maybe that's wrong. You are looking at me wondering.

B: I am wondering because once we have more arrows into the picture everything will be faster, so to say, illusionary faster.

Y: Oh, yes. Yes, because here we are up to a millionth of a second instead of 10^{-32} of a second. We don't have any numbers that big to describe it. To say minus 32 of a second, well, this is just a millionth of second. This is…particle physics is in here. This is where the weak force and the strong force become separated. And the bosons get formed. That's why the monopole actually… at the first place where we have it here is that 10^{-36} of a second.

Don: 10^{-32}

Y: That's…the strong force separates from the weak and the electromagnetic force. That's where the strong force separates. And that's called the Guth/Steinhardt phase transition. But they don't know that because they think time doesn't get fragmented and the speed of light doesn't slow down because…and a certain…If you keep going backwards here, the circuits get smaller and smaller. And so time goes slower and slower; the speed of light goes slower. So C gets smaller and smaller. But they figure it all stays the same. But I account for where the time should be for the separation of the strong force from the weak force, the electro weak force it's called and, of course, gravity.

B: In this handwriting of Baker, we have Lambda F is…

Y: What are you writing?

B: Now I try to relate to what you have been saying. And I…

Y: To what Baker said?

B: To what Baker having had in this handwriting. He has lambda F here equals C. I believe this C is the speed of life, of light. And this is one length Plancked over one Planck time. And Lambda, in our case, is the wave length we obtain by illusionary moving through the circuit.

Y: Oh, I see what you doing.

B: Isn't it so?

Y: You are doing it in terms of wave lengths.

B: Yes, yes. So lambda F this helps me. So lambda F is C. It is one length Plancked, Planck length over one Planck time where lambda is this moving, (?) which we denoted as discrete elements.

1:04:08

Y: What I did in this table is I wrote out what the value of K is 12.7. Then I imagine as we go back and the circuit gets smaller and smaller fewer and fewer arrows.

B: Ah! They are fewer and fewer. Great! Great!

Y: Fewer and fewer. K gets smaller and smaller.

B: (acknowledges)

Y: Then I figured out how many would be in that circuit. How many individuals and arrows would be in the circuit. This is *pi* over 2. If that is correct, I had to correct my cross out and then on down here. So the show…you were talking about how fast or slow things go. But K gets small, little n gets smaller and smaller until it gets down to 7. And then it…the circuit falls apart.

B: Yes.

Y: And then we don't have common time except very rarely.

B: We have baby universes.

Y: In fragments. Fragment…baby universes of fragments.

B: Yes. This is great.

Y: So we can't go by the Grand Unifications back further than the first circuit and expect them to match because they are assuming three-dimensional space, and that Alpha, that is K, and the speed of light will remain the same and the value of gravitational constant stays the same. It's not true of any of them. And they go back in time and the big bang line way, way, way back. They go back before there was any time in their concept. So don't try to make those fit. Just say, "Well, that's their mistake." This is…we're making enough mistakes of our own. So I am just trying to outline two or three days more work. So in the first recursion, we don't want to square anything that doesn't come after the first crossover. The second crossover is where you get the recursion. But we want to get the time for the third one. And I have got KN cubed T [I].

B: Yes.

Y: For the amount of time. So if you multiply K times n and cube it, I get…and multiply it by…that's how many arrows that would be in effect in the reduced conscious state of the individual and each and every individual in or connected to the circuit. And multiply that times what one arrows' worth in the way of time before a second circuit (?)
1:07:42
Don: That's the third crossover.

Y: Yes. This is the third crossover.

Don: It is K times n the total cubed.

Y: Cubed, yes. Both of them are in a parenthesis and cubed parenthesis.
Don: Yes. And that's small n?

Y: Small n. But n is known, now, because it is known to at least…

B: n, it is n minus n over E to K. n small n. This one.

Y: Yes. I want to look at another graph of…I also thought it might have to be normalized by dividing by *pi* over 2, for…

B: Ah, yes, to have it one.

Y: Instead of just Kn cubed, it might have to multiply by 2 and divide by *pi*.

B: Yes, because they are spreaded out over *pi* over 2.

Y: Yes. More recently I thought that…and it goes better with their estimated age of the universe. I have got the age of the universe somewhere. This gives a calculated from Lila, age of the universe.

B: I have seen it somewhere in your papers, in your writings. The age of the universe it give. I have seen it. Ah! You have in the paper with Seeley and Baker.

Y: That's the calculated value, yes, the estimated from physical evidence. I have it on present age of the universe.

B: History of the size/radius of the universe. This one or…

Y: That's an old one. You notice the formula is different. If you look at the…

B: Yes, the notion of dimensionality is different.

Y: Yes.

B: You have the circuit to have one-dimension and crossover the second (?)
1:11:03
Y: (?) I ran into the same trouble yesterday at the same time. I just start shuffling papers like some kind of robot that doesn't know what is going on. Just put it through the least circuit.

Don: Can you tell me where on our chart the…

Y: Speak louder.

Don: The third crossover and second recursions, where on here that they should go?

Y: This should go in the next to the last box, that is, the one that is in the last box, should be moved up. See I…

Don: (digging?)
Y: The original… but it says original pattern.

Don: (acknowledges)

Y: Cross out the original pattern. Put three-dimension now…

Don: Three-dimensional.

Y: This, see you're down to the original pattern. We got the next recursion and we have the next recursion. It will be the bottom of that one.

Don: Ok, so this stays, one-dimensional original pattern stays.

Y: No, it is not one-dimensional; it's no-dimension.

Don: Zero dimensional (?) Original pattern.
1:12:50
B: Original pattern.

Y: Original pattern.

Don: Ok. And then after that comes…

Y: Comes the first recursion, and the now that applies to that; then the now of the second recursion.

B: (acknowledges)

Don: Ok. So…

Y: What is…?

Don: I am confused.

Y: Then the one I just gave you is the now of the third recursion.

Don: (acknowledges)

Y: But I haven't given you where the third recursion starts.

Don: Ok. I was just trying to get the order sorted out here. So it looks like the…where I now have the first recursion up there has to come after the now in zero-dimensional. You see, up here I have first crossover, right here. Ok.

Y: I can barely hear you. It is like you are off in a distant place. And there is just floating going on. If I go with that, it is very pleasant; otherwise I have to fight it. And then I can almost follow you. But I have a choice between using my will and surrendering. I choose surrendering. If I can't do it in a surrendered state, I won't do it at all. But I did last up to this long. There is forty minutes left. I am sorry; but you can use it whatever way you want. If you think it through, I think you will come up with something.

Don: Yeah, that's…can we talk about it because I think….?

Y: Because something I told you about the original pattern wasn't right. It was right; and you crossed it out. You crossed it out because I told you it was wrong. You can uncross it.

B: (acknowledges)

Y: That is the last thing I can remember.

Don: Ok, thank you. Biljana is…I am just looking at order for…we have first recursion. Looking at this figure here, this must come before the third recursion which is Kn squared over…

B: Yes, second recursion is nK squared over *pi* over half. The third recursion is nK cubed over *pi* over 2.

Don: So they will come after here.

B: And the first recursion is this one. This is the first.

Y: There is a difference between the start and the not start… and the end which is the now.

Don: (acknowledges) The start of the first recursion is here at two squared.

B: Yes, first original pattern. Then nK over *pi* half.

Y: The end of the first recursion.

B: And then this squared.

Y: Of end of the original pattern.

B: Yes. Not here, here.

Y: But if you were always squared, was the time of the first crossover that would be the start of the first recursion?

B: Only Wanniski gives. I don't want to bother you now.

Y: Rather than calling them recursions, we either call them the phase transition.

B: (acknowledges)

Y: And then, if you want to put parenthesis about a recursion.

Don: Ok, I'll put together what I understand; and tomorrow I give it to you.

B: It is actually, I believe, it is correct in *Radical Theory* in sequence of events.

Don: Ok.

B: There…this formulas are given, only they should be over *pi* over 2.

Y: I didn't take Paracetamol this afternoon.

B: Oh. Aha!

Y: Sunday, I'll do that.

Don: You have that *Radical Physics*? (?)

B: Chronology of events?

Don: (?)

B: Twenty eight.

Don: Ok, so. So we'll put some times…these are the events, and we'll put…See that's the end of space time from one crossover there.

B: Start of one crossover here somewhere, start crossover.

Don: Yeah. Here is the first crossover started from the first crossover, first (?) first circuit.

B: This is nK over *pi* half.

Don: Yes.

B: And this is squared and start of the unbounded space from the second crossover. Or the Weinberg-Salam phase… Aha! This…I was having this in mind. You have here the third space time continuum, continues up to Kn (?) over *pi* half.

Y: I am coming back about.

Don: Yeah, that's here. That's…but that's the G boson.

B: Original (crew?) is (up two?). (durational?) Two crossover monopole is up to Kn squared over *pi* half.

Don: (acknowledges) Ok, so there in *Radical Theory…*

B: Theories, yes, maybe the numbers...

Don: Ok good. That's better.