#3
Formal talk-21102006 Evening day 1
Lila recording day 2, evening post session
21/10/2006
061021000
20 min.
Tape 3

B: About the positive state of not choosing.

Y: I am really…

B: You are entitled to choose, to not be in a state of direct knowledge and it is of the same quality as the choice to be in the state of direct knowledge in a way.

Y: It was my answer.

B: I understood your answer and you were right. The world is based on the choices of direct knowledge.
:33
Y: Yes.

B: When I choose to directly… To have direct knowledge of another non-physical, then something happens. If I don't choose (it), happens or (it does) not happen? It also happen because I have chosen not to be in a state of direct knowledge.

Y: Cause it doesn't lead to consciousness.

B: Hum?

Y: It doesn't lead to consciousness.

B: This has to do with this pictures. In this picture the white we could put the sign… We could equalize this with being in a state of direct knowledge. And the black could mean to be… to choose not to be in a state of direct knowledge.
1:20
But they both bring information. But, of course, information is not reality.

Y: They do bring information. We agreed.

B: I understood. I understood when I ask the question as well. I am just…

Y: You are pointing things out.
1:40
B: Yes.

Y: Now.

Bret: You could turn it around (?)

B: How?

Bret: We all have to stand…

Y: I was going to stand behind you.

Bret: Please sit down.

B: OK.
2:13
Y: Is that Macedonian?

B: Which one?

Bret: The back ground picture.

B: Ah, the background picture. No, no. I have found a (site?) everything about Macedonia.

Y: Bret, hand me those glasses right there. These are my computer glasses.
2:44
B: As I have written to you in one of my letters at master's degree… at master's level. I teach Gödel's theory as part of self referential systems. I named the subject *Self Referential Systems*.

Y: acknowledges
3:02
B: Probably I was inspired by your writings as well because I don't know anywhere in the world where a subject is entitled self aware… Self referential systems. And this includes theory of chaos, Gödel's theory of incompleteness, fractal geometry, and part of relativity. This I added.

Y: Who am I?
3:25
B: Gödel's law of incompleteness--

Y: You got the question right.

It's a mathematical attempt to answer the eternal question of, who am I.

Y: I will be right back.
3:50
Bret: You seem to be picking up the concepts rapidly. Is there anything you are not certain of right now? That you are not certain of? You seem to be picking it up very well.

B: I am sure it is still to be learned. For this, I am sure.

Bret: Of things you haven't heard certainly, but of the things you have heard.
4:12
B: I have a good idea of them. So this is my inner feeling, but I don't know. There are levels and levels to be reached, I am sure. But to make the next step, for instance, to build the algorithms, it should be the real exam, I believe. It should take… And what Charles said actually…
4:44
Maybe it should be done because I have ideas how to define space… or at least ideas… Although I have mentioned it should be maybe four dimensional or three dimensional matrix. But how to find new concepts? This is the real question, not to describe an algorithm that is an existing one. It should be done. Maybe not today, maybe in a year, but it is possible. And I have ideas. But how to define new concepts, there is a gift.

I won't read the whole thing, although it is beautiful, because it is too long maybe. Maybe we could do it in parts, in several sessions. It is too long to do it in one stretch.
5:35
Y: But try to in your verbal…

B: To explain? Yes.

Y: Connect wherever you can to self reference, to the Lila Paradigm and "who am I."

B: Yes, yes. There are logical… There are paradoxes in science that are due to self reference. These were known already to Greek philosophers. For instance, Epimenides, who was a Greek philosopher, he defined a very famous now conundrum or what is the English word for a paradox? He says, "All people from Crete are liars; but Epimenides is a liar too…"
6:21

Y: The message on the other side of this paper is not true.

B: How?

Y: You have a piece of paper; and it says, "The message on the other side of this paper is false."

B: On the other side is false, yes. This reminds me, there is a dialog between Platon (Plato) and Socrat (Socrates). Platon says, "Everything that Socrat says is a lie." Socrat (Socrates says, "Platon (Plato) spoke truthfully. What Platon (Plato) spoke is true." And finally this could be… All these notions yours, these (Cretons?), all (Samial?) could be reduce to one sentence. I lie. I lie. I don't speak the truth. I lie. This is a self reference which is a paradox.
7:28
Y. A paradox.
B: For something to be a genuine paradox, two conditions should be fulfilled. There should be a self reference, and this is I. I is a self reference; I am thinking of myself. And negation, because if I say I speak truly… I speak the truth. There is just self reference, but no negation. So this is not a paradox. In other… or if I say, "Charles is lying." This is also not a paradox. There is negation here, but not self reference.
8:11
And it should be OK. Maybe Charles is lying really. So in order for this to be a genuine paradox, it should include self reference plus negation. This is maybe why I insist on this positive state of choosing not to be in direct knowledge because it has also been (included?)

And also this morning if you remember when we were discussing the complimentary graphs after the session, the graph is showing some connections. And this is… for instance, the state of the universe.
8:51
Y. Acknowledges.

B: This is the arrangement of our universe. This is the state of evolution that our universe is in. Is there any information in the complimentary graph of this one? Which is the complimentary graph? The complimentary graph is all these connections are not existing in this complimentary graph. And all the non-existing connections in the original graph are existing in the complimentary graph. So for this graph…

Y: Yes, I remember.
9:31
B: This one. So, for this arrangement of the universe as a whole, for instance, there is a certain state of affairs. There are 10 to (e) to (P) non-physical individuals; and they form (what?) more relations. This is the state… the present state of the universe. But there is a complimentary state to it in which the connections that exist in this does not exist in this one.
10:01
This is also of importance. Because the information they bring in manifestation at least is the same as the information brought by this picture.

Y: What does it have to do with Gödel?
10:18
B: It has a lot. And this is why these pictures are shown here because he always gives… When he gives a theorem he… For instance, the theorem Gödel… But we go much ahead, you know… There is thinks to learn, to understand, before we get to this point. What is a non-theorem? Yes. He also… He always asks himself… In Gödel theories, the meaning of theorem is not the same as in mathematics. Theorem in Gödel theory, every line which is achieved, which is obtained by logical sequence of allowed loss. Mathematical loss with allowed rules.

Y: Yes.
11:14
This is Conway's *Game of Life*. In John Conway's *Game of Life,* he has certain arrangements or something. It could be non-physical individuals. And he gives us the rules for going from one state of affairs to another. He gives rules. For instance, in his initial program *Game of Life* he gives three rules. If you have such and such neighbors, then such and such.

Y: Yes.

B: So we go to another picture. And then by applying another rule to another picture, then another to another to another…

Y: So.
11:56
B: So all of these are legitimate states; not only the final one, is a legitimate state. But… and the theorems s in mathematics… as in (quantum theory?) mathematics. But all these steps are legitimate because they are built on initial state which is legitimate and on the rules which are also legitimate. So all of these are theorems. This is theorem, this is theorem, this is theorem, this is theorem, this is theorem, not just the result. And what is non-theorem is a question.

Y: OK.
12:36
B: So, the Gödel theorem is deal with… So these are the pictures. These are showing a recursive recursion… recursive processes.

Y: What?

Don: Recursive.

B: Recursive process.

Y: Recursive.

B: This is self referential process, for instance, in programming.

Bret: We use recursion a lot; he understands recursion.
13:01
B: Oh, OK. I won't carry on. I am making a point. There is also in programming. So what is a non-theorem? Because finally… Now I will skip all and come to the end. Gödel is… This is self reference; this is one (hand?)…

Y: Drawing?

B: Finally Gödel will come to a point when he will be able define with mathematical rules, not just a statement. This was possible for the Greek philosophers. And all these jobs are based on this considerations.
13:54
But He succeeded in something more. He succeeded defining with mathematical rules and with mathematical means the self reference and negation by introducing two ingenious ideas. But we need time to come to this.
14:15
Finally, when he did all this (which was not possible for hundreds of scientist and mathematicians between himself (among themselves) who wanted to do so but were not able to do) he succeeded in it. He succeeded in defining mathematically a self referential statement. A statement which will speak of itself in mathematical terms by it own means. Not by outside intervention. But, by its own means.
14:55
And finally when he reach that point by introducing these ingenious ideas which I'll mention later on, he succeeded in defining by mathematical means a theorem which states…and I say once again, theorem is each one of these lines.

Y: acknowledges.
15:24
B: It is not as the theorem is in mathematics. It is all lines which are obtained by definite (strictly defined) rules, by legitimate rules. So finally, by doing this process, he was able to define a theorem which states, "I am not a theorem."

Y: What.

15:49
B: There is a theorem which states, "I am not a theorem." This is the same as you say, "What is written on the page is not true."
Y: I see what he is doing.
16:03
B: I is self reference and not a negation. So… But this is done with mathematical means. And this I present here. And for this, I need many tools. For instance, for instance, just for instance. He… what he did was… but we are skipping a lot. It is difficult to understand when we skip a lot.
16:33
The (MU) thought is also interesting when you were talking about the first person experience, and when I mentioned to you that there are scientists belonging to the stream (school) of hard artificial intelligence. They give this example. In this example and MU, MU, of course… in this example, there are several things. He comes to a very simple statement in which he gives a number. He associates a number to these statements. For every statement, he… first he converts into a number by a certain rule. For instance, we have here a puzzle and we are supposed to reach something. This is the MU puzzle.
17:42
For instance, the initial axiom is MI. We start from an initial axiom; it is MI. And all this is done in a very simple system, (form logical system) in which we have just three symbols, M, I and U. So this is very simple. We have just three M, I, U. And we have (four) rules. And according to these rules, we are able to build another statements.
18:14
For instance, the first rule states, "If you have M X where X is a sequence of symbols, of allowed symbols. For instance, M U U. This is an allowed statement in this system. Then it is possible to do M mixes. The rule allows us to build another legitimate sequence of M X X. This means from this M E U I U I U, we might build M I U I U I U I U. We double the sequence. This is a legitimate sequence and so on and so on. There are four of these statements. And then our task is to obtain MU by using this statement. (By using these rules), we are suppose to (our objective is to) find a sequence MU.
19:15
Shall I go into detail? Because it is not so easy to explain.

Y: We are out of time now.

B: It requires time.

Y: Yes.

B: It requires time in order to be understood well.

Y: I think it does; and we should take more time some other time.

B: OK. Maybe that when we are thinking about…

Y: I am not well enough.
19:36
B: OK. Then, maybe some other time.

Y: But I see the way you are going, what is going to happen.

B: OK.
Y: OK.

B: Thank you.

Y: So it is informal time now. And we can do whatever. And tomorrow, hopefully, we will deal with time and space. That will be harder.
20:13
B: OK. Great.