

**#40**

**Formal talk-05112006 Afternoon day17**

**Lila recording day 17, afternoon**

**06/11/2006**

**061106001,**

**1 Hr 13 min**

[Recording 40](#)

Y: You want to discuss that or do you...is that good enough?

B: I understand the point of view, and, yes, it is so. This is...you know, I always tell my students the dispute between Einstein and Bohr lasted 50 years. So it lasted for fifty years, the dispute between Einstein and Bohr. It was regarding quantum physics which I present on the first diagram. Then there is another one between Kronecker and Cantor, famous mathematicians. Cantor was in favor of continuous nature of the reality and Kronecker on discrete nature. He said, "God gives us only bricks." And this lasted for one hundred years. So we...It's not easy to resolve the way different individuals with their different choices see the same reality.

Y: See the same thing.

B: Especially when we have into picture such complex phenomena as quantum physics, continual or discrete nature of the present and past, of course, as we have here. These are long discussions; but thank you.

Y: Yes Einstein and Bohr never did...they never did resolve it.

B: Yes.

Y: And to this day, it is not resolved by the people who follow them.

B: I always have among students one is taking the opinion of Einstein and the other of Bohr. And they discuss; and it is very good. You have a successful session; but...and I am happy when they are so enthusiastic about the work. I take this a compliment always. And so, thank you for sharing.

Y: Do you have anything to share from?

B: Aha! What I was suggesting over the lunch although I am aware how rough picture this will give us. Actually the way to deal with integration, and I believe in order to have the size of the universe, we have to integrate the curve. No matter it is based on probabilities, and it is not explicitly given. Actually it is rarely...is explicitly.

Y: The what?

B: It rarely is explicitly given. I believe...in other...for instance, when you are dealing with quantum dynamics of the brain, you also have both randomness robustness of the system, five-dimensionality, having eleven billion neurons in the brain.

Y: Yes.

B: The calculations are based on probability and so on. But it doesn't mean end of the story. It is possible to find the integration once we agree what we shall do in order to find the size of the universe or age of the universe. Size of the universe, for instance, is the coordinate for space; and age of the universe is coordinate of time since we have taken this approach. Or an integration takes both into account. Now I am talking just to...try thinking (out) loudly actually.

Y: You were asking a linear graph.

B: Yes, in order to have...

Y: And there are some problems if we're treating n as...

B: Yes, I know the problem.

Y: As  $10^{23}$ ...

B: Yes.

Y: Then the first unit of time is  $10^{11}$ . Then to get...

B. It is impossible...

Y: To F3 it's  $10^{13}$ . So between...that's only a hundred... $10^{11}$ . Yeah, that's a hundred arrows...

B: Because what I was suggesting as I see it now, maybe later, we shall come to another idea...is to find the surface under the curve which is integration actually. And we might do it, for instance, by taking portions. And now let us see. Maybe once again we should look at the connectivity graph, also at Baker's paper in order to be sure what we are counting. The program, which will be done for Monte Carlo methods, we shall see the dimensionality is a problem. We stated and I am aware of it. The dimensionality of the problem is always into picture. But still we should do something. And then when we are using random numbers, every random number is an arrow. And it is actually...contributes to the size of the universe.

Y: So F...

B. So all the random numbers should be counted.

Y: F3 is about 4 times  $10^{15}$ . And F2 is about 5 times  $10^{11}$ . So that is a thousand arrows difference. So just to get...we need a thousand so each...

B: For rough. Even rough is...

Y: Each line.

Don: It's a thousand times arrows.

Y: Hum?

Don: It's a thousand times, not a thousand arrows.

Y: Yeah, I know that but...

Don: To go from  $10^{11}$  to  $10^{15}$ .

B: Maybe it was to take...

Y: It was  $10^4$ . It's ten thousand...

Don: Yeah...

Y: The difference between the two is ten thousand roughly.  $10^4$  is ten thousand. That's not the point if you make...on a graph... If you make each line...I don't know how many. That's five, that's ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty. So it is about a hundred lines. So each line would have to stand for ten arrows.

B: This one?

Y: Or a hundred arrow actually. So...but that means that all we could get on the graph would be this much.

B: Yes. Can we find data for the...

Don: Ten to the eleventh, ten to the fifteenth. It is ten thousand times as many.

Y: Yeah, that doesn't matter.

B: Because I wanted to obtain the surface geometrically somehow. It is also...the computer should be engaged. For instance, we have point here; and we have the time coordinate was arch cosine. Isn't it so? Arch cosine for X boson this Weinberg-Solomon area, for instance.

9:11

Don: Yes, it's on the...

B: Yeah, but, and we should have measurement confirmed arch-cotangents. Aha! This is the space.

9:29

Don: Well, I have...we have formula for time it's about 10 space...

9:39

B: I have both.

Don: It's on the next page.

B: One formal was (arch cotangents) tangents, the other was arch-cosine for X as I remember.

9:57

Don: I don't have a point of accord.

B: Ok, but we could find, for instance, but this is very late, so to speak. It is 10 to the...

Y: My point, Punita, is that if you make each line stand for enough arrows, then you can fit it is on.

Don: Ok.

Y: That's all.

Don: Ok.

Y: So I was trying to figure out how many arrows each line would stand for to cover a difference of ten thousand.

Don: (acknowledges)

Y: And it is about a hundred arrows for one; but if you wanted to go another order of magnitude...

B: This is ten times.

Y: Yes. Then you are in real trouble.

Don: Yeah.

Y: You wanted this?

B: Yes.

Don: You still need this?

B: (acknowledges)

11:49

Don: This is the formula for (?) space and for the X boson.

B: Aha! Ah, this is the one.

Don: That's the one cut (?) down yesterday.

11:54

B: I find this in mine. I have it in mine. I have it?

Don: Yeah. So that is  $F_4$  divided by 3. Am I right? I don't know (?)

12:08

B: Yes.

Don: Is it, if I remember right?

B: Maybe it was, you know, if we estimate this and then we approximate. This is, for instance, 24 over third. So this is something else. And then we find the middle line in

a logarithmic scale will be here somewhere. We might find out. It will be too rough; and then...

Y: It will be rough; so if we...

B: Then find this one and multiply by this one. And this is...this is as if...for instance, if you have a surface like this one, if you take the middle line, then this surface is equal to this one. So this multiplied by this gives you the whole surface which is integration.

Y: I think if you work on it hard enough or adjust the value of n...

B: Yes.

Y: And illustrate the principle...

B: Yes, for a very small fraction.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: For a very small fraction for which we have data to compare and somehow see. Only we should...otherwise, what the problem should do is find small fractions of T which not necessarily TQ. It could be fractions of seconds or greater ones; and for each expected number, find the space coordinates and summarize them.

Y: I think there is a solution to it. But it will take bit to work it out. We have got the basic idea so that can be worked out eventually.

B: Yes. Although the dimensionality is a problem, we have stated it. We were aware of it. But still, you have come to the results. What I am saying is you had the same problem when starting the calculations and...

Y: But I will draw up a summary graph and say how I arrived at it and how I know which points by which means. And then I think somebody that wants to try to write a program for it could do it off of that. I think we will have a point here and a point there obtained by different means, not by a single equation like this.

B: Yes, yes, we should have this.

Y: Yes, I'll do that. I might not have it ready until after you leave. But I can email it.

B: Ok. Maybe later, yes.

Y: But I can email it to you. I'll try.

B: Now, we could just do it for portion of the curve, what we have, for instance. I was browsing through these papers also. For this X boson, we have the coordinates. And now I was trying to find out here...

Y: The problem is, is that...

B: For the T coordinates, I believe we have data. Isn't it so, for time coordinate?

Y: Yes, we have them. We have those.

B: But for the space, not always.

Y: I don't have an equation.

B: We have some of them based on connectivity, isn't it so?

Y: No, I don't think so.

B: Maybe not, but...Aha! But you...for instance, some...these are just two points...are given in this article with Seeley and Baker.

Y: Are based off the size or the magnetic monopoles. Some of them are based on the big bang curve, the slope.

B: Yes and the inflection point is...

Y: And the inflection...

B: Form network, complex networks.

Y: Well...and some of them are based off of the Grand Unification Theories, the numbers that they gave. And, of course, the start point, it was zero; and one for the amount of space. There was no space. And then there was one unit. And then we can probably go two units. But that would be...How do you figure out how many? How much space is...will be from how many arrows? That is the problem. And we have the problem of summing the different baby universes or not. Anyway, I'll put it all down. And then you can take it from there. I don't think it is a problem. It is just a problem of taking it step by step. And maybe some day we'll have a basic mathematics so that we can with a single mathematical statement generate the entire space curve including all the fractionation of it. Maybe...it won't be exact; but it will illustrate the principle.

B: Maybe a separate problem will be done for any portion of the curve, you know, different because the dimensionality of the...

Y: (acknowledges) Yeah.

B: So one problem to estimate this portion; then another one to estimate this portion.

Y: That's right.

B: Although the philosophy is the same.

Y: The one that dominated by the F formula would be one. One that is dominated by circuit will be another and many circuits. And then when the circuits coalesce into one circuit, then there will be another program for that. And then when we are

talking about crossovers and having one and two and three-dimensions, then there would be a program for that. I think that's doable. Ok. I have something else I want to do because I am thinking of also trying to rewrite what we have been over. And I would like to go over some of it some more so I can rewrite that part too. In the *Lila Paradigm of Ultimate Reality* on page 5 at the bottom, there is the attributes of individuals. The first attribute I have got here is existence. But thinking about it, I thought I should really write something about what is meant by attribute in connection with non-physical individuals. It is like describing God. Well, we are describing the undividable aspects of a non-physical individual. I think I should also say some thing about when...why these attributes have been selected rather than other possible ones. As a matter of fact, I did select maybe fifteen of twenty over the years; but they didn't work out. They also didn't seem to me to describe my own personal experiences of myself. That you want to give all kinds of attributes to individual if you considered them to be a human being, a body, a mind, and a soul, and all how the brain works and all that, and how to describe all the attributes of all those things. So you would have to have hundreds of attributes of an individual. And then show how they interact with each other to produce a human being. Whereas, here there is only...that it is just... these four is enough to base an entire universe off of including consciousness. So something along that line. Now the one of them that survived. It was the attribute of existence. And it says here.

That non-physical individuals were not created; they are assumed to just exist.

I think I could say a little bit more about that. That...first of all, to break that into two sentences and...It isn't the assumption that they just exist that makes them be in existence; it is that they are. They're the basis of everything. And they weren't brought into existence.

They are completely non-physical unlike the souls, spirits, minds of Bishop Berkeley, or the monads of Gottfried Leibniz which were created.

They weren't created. But I didn't mention there that they imagine, both Leibniz and Berkeley, imagine that they were created by God. These spirits and minds that Berkeley suggested, that those minds and spirits are created by God. Or the monads were created by God. Not only, were they created by God, but God created and infinite number of them. And I don't point that out there. But, of course, I discuss that some place else that earlier that there are a certain number. But I am not writing here what I have in mind for this paper.

B: Yes.

Y: Or a chapter is not something that is made for professional people but for the interested armature or the interested average educated human being. I am writing for them to give and overview or an outline of the Lila Paradigm in the non-technical but comprehensible way. So that is why I keep talking about adding some things. Whereas, if we were going to write a technical paper, we would want to make the statement briefer because they can understand the ramifications of just a few sentences that there was...it's a finite...a bare description of the assumption and a little bit of explanation. But for this I am thinking of going on a bit more to explain it.

Individuals that were created implies that at some time the individuals did not exist, were then created and existed from the time of their creation. Thus created individuals are located in time. But then, being located in time is a physical property.

Now, I don't think most people, most educated people would realize that being located in time is a physical property. What they think about physical property is something that you can touch and makes a sound when you knock on it. So I think some more would have to be said about that, that time is a physical property.

Since a non-physical individual in this paradigm were not created, they are not located in time which includes the present.

Now, I was noticing, Bret, in your presentation that you use the present as if it were the same as the extant. Whereas, how I am using the term present time in regard to the Lila Paradigm is that it is a fiction and illusion.

Bret: Do you understand what I said in that paper?

Y: Well, if you are implying that I didn't or...

Bret: No one seems to be conscious...

Y: ...or I would be talking like that.

Bret: According to Lila. I have this experience. And according to Lila I have an experience as complex as this one unit of time in the past. And another one, another unit of time in the past, but I have not such experience.

Y: But you what?

Bret: I have no such experience. I do not have an experience of the past. Lila says that I must because...

Y: Yes, I was talking about your statement about present time, not about the past. I am talking about...

Bret: An experiment...

Y: That present time exists.

Bret: (acknowledges) If the theory says knock this and this together, and you will see a light. And I knock this and this together, and I don't see a light; then the theory is wrong.

Y: Well, if I say what present time is, and then you use it in some other way, then I know that you haven't understood what I have said or else you disagree with it. And I don't know which.

Bret: Ok.

Y: And I can't tell by what I have read. But I will look more carefully.

Bret: Ok.

Y: I am saying here that I use the term "present" in quotes because it is not really... The individuals don't exist in present time. It's *as if* they were; but they are not because if you just... But then I have to say that they exist independent of time. Otherwise, they can't get the difference between existence and being in present time. They are not the same thing. And I wonder sometimes, maybe you have made that differentiation. It is not easy. I say next sentence...

The (quote) "existence" of a non-physical individual is treated here as an attribute of that non-physical individual; and it has nothing to do with time.

Especially since time doesn't exist. All that does exist... all that exist are just the individuals and their states. And that's all there is, no present time let alone no past. And I am trying to just get a person that reads this to have an understanding that... to grasp the paradigm, they have to grasp that there is what does exist ultimately and what is a fiction, a seeming but doesn't exist. And that existence applies only to the individuals which includes, of course, the states they are in since that's part of what they are.

Being completely non-physical these individuals are also not located in space

And this is not a common realization and yet I just throw it away in one sentence.

Being completely non-physical these individuals are not, also not located in space.

So I am just stating it but I am not explaining it.

Not at a specific distance from anything.

Most people haven't and you have realized that when we are talking about space there is no absolute space. There is only distance between any two somethings; and that is all there is. Well, that's not explaining that to them; it's just stating it. Then I throw in there is no background of space as if they were capable of putting two and two together without an explanation.

In addition a non-physical individual is not energy, charge, or mass, has no quantum spin.

Most people would give say... give up at that point.

Is not physical matter, they would understand that, most people.

B: Maybe as you are mentioning Berkeley and Leibniz, you should also mention Einstein because he is always associated with time. When time comes into picture and the relativity of time, then Einstein is introduced.

Y: Ok. He talked about space/time too.

B: Yes.

Y: And in our beginning, you can take an arrow and treat it as a time quantum or a space quantum, a single arrow as if they were. Then you have got space/time.

Consciousness will be defined a little later, let it suffice to say that it is only each of these non-physical individuals that can be conscious.

Again it is to brief a statement for most people, that they never thought about the fact that when they are not conscious that what it is...is that they have this ability to be conscious whether they are conscious or not, is not an important thing. It's there... that they can be conscious; and then the correlation that since they can be conscious, they are not a physical thing. Now Chalmers and two or three other authors wrote several hundred pages stating that if it is conscious, it is not physical. That you can't...there is no way to show that the physical can produce consciousness or can be in that conscious state. And I don't explain any of that.

B: Oh, yes, the hard problem is this.

Y: I explain, yes. I explain a little bit in the next paragraph.

There is some strong first person evidence for the actual existence of these non-physical individuals.

Although David Chalmers never states that there are non-physical individuals what he thinks, and I know from talking to him personally, is that when you have a fundamental particle like an electron or a quark, that there is a non-physical aspect of that electron that is consciousness. So that the electron which is physical has the...an added faculty not to be conscious but of consciousness. That it is just conscious without any explanation about where it comes from. And he says, "Yes, that's true. I am just assuming that this is so because nothing else makes sense." He says that, "The electron or the quark is conscious; and it's a new element to be considered, a new ultimate reality." And he considers consciousness to be an ultimate. He doesn't think that it is made out of consciousness; it is made out of pattern of particles. He thinks that certain thoughts are made out of patterns of these conscious particles.

B: Ah! Yes, yes, I have read.

Y: And they make...that makes a certain thought.

B: They define seeons (?). Seeons as particles which are carriers of consciousness, elementary particles, seeons.

[37:37](#)

Y: That is one of the names for them...

B: (acknowledges) There are others. Ah! I remember now Dennett so defined.

Y: Dennett.

B: Dennett in *Consciousness Explained* in Paradise explained.

Y: A pattern of particles. And he claims that he is not conscious. He says he's...

38:04

B: Ah! He names this particles memos (?). I remember now. Memo elementary particle of consciousness memo...

Y: (acknowledges)

B: Well, like memory but then the same problem, only on a smaller scale.

Y: Yes. Well, I do the same thing but at a more basic level. I say one has the ability to place oneself in the state of knowledge of another individual or oneself, and that is just...I am saying that ultimate reality.

B: (acknowledges) Yes. You make a jump, so to say.

Y: So David Chalmers argues I think correctly for the non-physicality of consciousness. We the authors of this paper suggest that, that which can be in a non-physical state of consciousness would also be non-physical.

Well, Chalmers doesn't go on to say that, he just considers this state of consciousness to exist by itself. It is not anyone in a state of consciousness or anything in a state of consciousness. It's not even the particle like an electron is in a state of consciousness. There is consciousness; and there is a particle. And there is somehow associated by bridge that he always wanted to find some connection between, but not that the electron itself is what is conscious. That the consciousness just exists, but to me when you say the condition of being conscious has to be the condition of something. I have argued about this before about the *relata* is in the state of the relation. So you have to have both.

Since most people claim they have first person conscious experience, they would be the non-physical individuals assumed above.

At this point I want to wipe out Punita's chart where we have the man standing and the body and the brain, the part of a brain and that...And go into an explanation of that. I think this would not only be necessary for the average educated person that is interested in more, but this would be important for scientists and philosophers to understand what I am talking about. And then I am going to accuse them directly... I am going to be an accuser of them and saying that...When you can think about yourself, you think you are this or you think you are this, or you think you are this, or some think you are this. And a few think you are this. And as far as most of you would be the spirit, and none of you unless you were a practicing Buddhist or practicing yogi would get this far, let alone this and this, you would have to be a student of the Lila Paradigm or be a complete siddha. A siddha yogi, or yogini. Well, I think that explanation belongs...when I am clarifying that the existence aspect and when I have eliminated all of these, and described how one is not that and given a more thorough description of what each one of these is. Then say, what exists is this non-physical existence.

B: Yes.

Y: Another first person experience that most people claim that they have is that of originating acts. At least sometimes,

They don't originate acts all the time,

Since according to modern science, the physical only reacts and does not originate acts, a person cannot be physical.

Well, I think I would develop that more. Give an example that...and discuss this question of free will at this point and how fundamental that argument is, about either you have free will or you don't have free will. Early in my teaching career when I was about twenty three years old and I started teaching about this sort of thing, I was giving the people this argument that it's free will or it's not free will. And that if it's not free will, then you are determined whether you will decide whether it is free will or not will. And so there is no use in discussing it because the matter is already settled. But on the other hand, in case it is free will and you...and you don't think carefully and you decide that you're fully determined and that happens to be wrong, then you have made the biggest mistake you could possible make. And so, therefore, we had better think about this carefully. Then I would go on for an hour or so talking about all the different ramifications of it. I thought a short version of such thing, and tie that in to the existent attribute. And then bring it down again and summarize it by just saying, this is the...How something that is non-physical could possible exist because most people consider that if something exists, it is physical. So that they have to admit a new possibility that there is...consider the possibility that there can be a something that exist, but it is non-physical. Like we imagine God to be, for example, and on an on making a fuller development of these things not...This is designed pretty much to be as brief as possible in order to get to the technical part. But I am going to cut most of the technical part out of here and just put a table at the end that says, the Lila Theory predicts this. And this and this measurement or that can be checked by measurement.

All right. Now the next attribute of unity. I didn't have unity included in my original work. And because the lack of that, I couldn't figure out how we could deal with the process of reduction. But then I...a few years later I said, "Well, when I am conscious, I am in one state of consciousness. And in there, things are embedded in that consciousness." For example, when looking you see this body embedded in the framework of the window which is embedded in the framework of the trees... And then the water out there, and then some more trees, and then the sky, and there are all...One is embedded inside the other. But there is only one state of consciousness or it. Then I read an article by David Chalmers about unitarity of consciousness. But then I thought he didn't go any further with it...Then that just consciousness is unitary, but I went further and say, "Well if I am the one that is conscious; and I am multiple, then I would have multiple consciousness." But I must be unitary. Then when I did that, then all the numbers began to fall in place. I could deal with reduction and how you could have a ratio because a ratio in mathematics is two things, one thing over the other normalized to the denominator. But an individual is in a single state of what that ratio is. In other words, we have the ratio. And those two are merged into a single state. It is like...is like one plus one only this time it is this

divided by that. And this divided by that is actually equal to this divided by that unless you merge the two and get a statement of the value of that ratio. If you...Well, you know what I am talking about. So some of that explanation, besides stating that each of us is indivisible, and therefore is labeled a non-physical individual...It is to brief for the purposes I have in mind. And then we want to change this acts to ability to act. Thanks to Biljana.

And attribute of a non-physical individual is, is that they originate acts

So should I say, ability to act or originates acts. No, there was a reason for this to be the states rather than the action.

All acts reduce to only one kind of act.

That is enough to make people climb the wall. You mean all I can do is just be in a state to know or state not to know of someone? I can't walk across the room by my own free will? I don't...they don't even think all that through. I would have to bring that out. It is only somebody like you who immediately says, "Oh, I see what he is getting at."

All acts reduce to only one kind of act. A non-physical individual originates an act by either originating itself into a state of direct knowledge of a non-physical individual, or originates itself into a state of no direct knowledge of that non-physical individual.

Which is clear...

B: Here a comma should be, isn't it so? A comma.

Y: Comma.

Each non-physical individual so acts with regard to each non-physical individual including itself. This attribute of non-physical individuals is not a thought, nor a mental process; it is an absolute, non-physical, primary, ability to so act.

That word absolute is used after consideration. It is one of the few absolutes there is. The absolute only exists in the non-physical realm. So it is an absolute ability to do so. Or just like God acts by fiat. He doesn't think, "I shall do this," and then it's done. It's *it*. It's not an intention or any mental process. It's not a goal; and then you fulfill the goal. It is the act and the state are being non-temporal, are one and the same thing. There is no this-follows-that. It might appear to do so but that is being deceived.

So it is absolute non-physical and primary ability.

That is it is the first ability to so act. And it is the only ability to so act. One way or the other, but anyway, it is not a thought or a mental process, this ability to act.

The act of placing itself in a state of direct knowledge of a non-physical individual and being in that state, are two ways of saying the same thing.

And I should stress that it is not being in time with regard to that.

The state of direct knowledge or no direct knowledge of a non-physical individual is a completely non-physical state and is not located in time or space and does not take time or space or energy.

But it does have its limitations. And I don't mention those eight limitations. I...we handed around the other day that you can't do this and you can't do that because you can't be in a state of knowledge of someone that doesn't exist. And I should mention something about that, I think, at this point, not the whole list of eight; but just that there are limitations. There are boundary conditions.

The phrase state of direct knowledge referred to here is a state of a non-physical individual which it has placed itself wherein it knows a non-physical individual. It is the state from which consciousness of things appears. This state of direct knowledge is not itself perception; it is not itself consciousness; it is the result. And it is not result of any perception.

I wonder how much more I should say. I have said things before earlier in the article about what direct knowledge is.

A state of direct knowledge can only be based on a non-physical individual as it really is, not on something other than it really is.

There is a big question here...is...what if you put yourself in a state of direct knowledge of a part of an individual, just of his existence attribute? Can you do that? And I say, "No." If you try you will get a thought. You will have the thought that they are the existence attribute. But you won't be in a state of knowledge of their existence attribute. You will have a thought which is a secondary mental phenomenon. It's not an absolute. It is the thought of those words, the meaning of those words. That individual's existence attribute. It is either in those words or just the concept of that. And concept is not a state of knowledge of it.

B: Isn't it due to the unitary nature of a non-physical individual?

Y: Individual, you can't carve them up.

B: Yes, it is individual.

Y: Yes.

56:16

B: Couldn't be in a state of direct knowledge (?)

Y: It's all or nothing. But it is tricky because it has to be as they actually are. You can't just accept them without accepting their states that they are in. That is part of what they are. And it goes with them. And this is why rule one applies.

And rule one is in the above meaning of state of direct knowledge. And is also...It also includes any states of direct knowledge and states of no direct knowledge that the known non-physical individual is placing itself in

Or in you could say in which it is placing itself. They use to write that way. They used to say don't use prepositions at the end of a sentence. You have to have it earlier. You can't say individual is placing itself in. You have to say in which an individual is placing itself. And Winston Churchill says, "Well, that's something! That's a state I will not up with put," which is totally silly to listen to somebody say, "I will not..." Instead of I will not put with it... Instead of saying.

Don: I will not put up with.

Y: I will not put up with; I will not up with put. And after that everybody started doing it the other way putting the prepositions at the end.

This rule is because what a non-physical individual is includes the origination of states. He has the ability to do them, so if he does them he is in that state. So he is... what he is, is that which did it, and is doing it and is the state. The ramifications of these important rules are applied in later sections.

B: Yes, yes, because what ability to act is, ability to act, you act, you exercise your ability; otherwise it is not ability. So it includes the states, also not just some a morph ability to act.

Y: Yes, that's right. And grasping that is what enables a person to differentiate themselves from time that they are not in time. When they realize that, their ability to act is not something that you decide to do, and then you do.

B: (acknowledges)

Y: The ability to act is the result; and that's it.

B: Includes timelessness.

Y: That's right.

B: And unitarity also?

Y:?

B: And also unitarity.

Y: Yes.

B: Because unitarity is... You could associate to space somehow and ability to act with time although it is all.

Y: It is so. It is very helpful. I would like to do one more before we end doing this for today. "Who."

"Who" in quotes an individual is, is an important attribute of a non-physical individual. People who have not had the experience that they are themselves is a particular

specific are not 'who' enlightened. 'Who' enlightenment is so easy that it made a living for 500 enlightenment masters around the world because it is valid to have a direct experience of yourself as a particular 'who.' It is a self enlightenment experience. And it's not difficult. But for somebody who has not done that, they have difficulty understanding this point. That which originates acts so that it is placed in states of direct knowledge or states of no direct knowledge of non-physical individuals is who an individual is. Well, that's to say that's one of the statements of who an individual is. From a second or third person point of view or from God's eye view, or from Archimedes point who the individual is, is which one the individual is. But for the non-physical individual itself the first person experience who it is, is self evident and is a non-physical attribute of me, or the one that I am. They don't even have to differentiate themselves from their body in order to do that let alone personality, or part of their mind etc. They just have to realize I am this one, and for the moment not even think about what it is that they are. That makes it very unstable; but still they have that instantaneous experience of which one that it is that they are. I am me. And they are very happy about it. And then they get half way through explaining it to their partner, and it is just a memory then. They lose it because they don't know what it is that they are. And what it is that they are. There is many stages of enlightenment. Each time you de-identify from one or another of these, till you get all the way through, till you de-identify from states of knowledge, you are in a state of state of knowledge, but you are not that state, a particular state of knowledge. So when you differentiate yourself from that, then it is stable. And that is what we were talking about yesterday in the scripture class about the stability and how that stability is achieved. I don't think that enlightenment intensives are fit to go beyond this point, this point right here of spirit. They are not efficient or any shoeshine or anything like that, are effective going past this point. But if you want to de-indentify from these so you realize that you are not them, it's better to do your solo meditation, and even better to do natural meditation in the surrender to God state. So I don't think people who...some people have...In California there's some people...I know one of them who came to the first enlightenment intensive that I gave. His name was Kenneth Fry, a very intelligent boy. He was a boy at that time. And now thirty three years later, he taking he is taking two, three or four enlightenment intensives every year for the last thirty three years. Did you every meet Ken Fry?

Bret: I don't remember.

Y: You know Fry's electronic part? He owns it. But he got to about this level, and couldn't get any further because the structure of the enlightenment intensive unless you have a master who is beyond you can't get you over that. And so he just kept... He has kept getting deeper and deeper insights. But insights are not direct experiences of the absolute. So, I am not sure what all to say more about who here. But I think something is called for. So those are four attributes of a non-physical individual, existence, unitary, acts and who. But then I can say one could conceive of different ways of describing an individuals attributes. By conceiving of them differently but they are not effective for what follows to define consciousness for example. There are very useful for that. So that's all the farther I wanted to take this today. It helps me to read it to me and then throw in the thoughts that I am getting. And then when I redo it and make these additions give you copies, then you can feed back to me again what you think and what you think doesn't apply. And do that

two or three times. And then we'll have something to put on my website. Not the one that you know about, not natural meditation, but on Lila Paradigm one. And that's different from your universities website which is more technical professional type thing. Is that agreeable?

1:17:12

B: Yes, yes.

Y: Otherwise, they'll kick it off. If they put this kind of stuff, it sounds like you are trying to start a revolution. The Macedonians say we have had enough revolt/revolution.

B: October revolution. November or whatever. The Russian was October revolution and ours is October...

Y: Ok, anything else you would like to talk about this afternoon? Have a debate? No debates, Ok. I am feeling a little better. And I think it is this new medicine she took me... She took the ginseng out. There was quite a bit in there, actually. I think Angel has been adding it each time she made a new batch. She added a little more to the formula. And it puts me into a healing crises. And it's hard to do anything else but just concentrate on the healing crises. It's helping with the swelling of the lymph nodes. Ok. Then tomorrow we'll go over some more of that drawing on space and do a little bit more of this and whatever you come up with or anything that you would ask that I should talk about more. If there is anything more of that in any of these papers and I'm going to go through my other notes again and see if there is anything else by me or Baker or Wineki or Seeley that you might want to have copied or talk about. And we will just keep doing that for another week. And we will be finished. And you'll be in Sydney having a party.

Don: On the beach.

B: (?)

Don: On the beach.

Y: And then go home and put your coat on.

Don: Yogeshwar, are you going to talk about spin?

Y: I was looking for (Braden?) Wineki's paper on spin. He did the best job of it. He's a quantum physicist. So he just looked at the Lila Paradigm and just wrote this right out. And I haven't seen the paper. I think I am going to have to find it. I have got another box full of folders full of notes. And somehow it didn't get into this box. So if I could find that, if not I'll just say few words how I would put it. Even the quantum physicists say it's a figure of speech. It's not like something that is spinning around and around in space.

B: Yes, yes, it is true, it is something.

Don: Yeah, I understand that it just a matter of getting some idea of what your thoughts how it relates to the Lila Paradigm.

Y: Yes. Ok. I'll see if I can find Wineki's. Dr. Wineki, and Dr. Seeley and Dr. Baker it is.

1:11:26

B: Ok. Yesterday I was reading about spin in his book, in (?) book quantum.

Y: One day I took all my diplomas and degrees and I put them on a fire and burned them all up. And I don't claim any.

B: Suzuki was named man of no title; this just a man.

Y: No titles.

B: Man of no titles which is the highest state possible. Man of no titles.

Bret: I would appreciate it if you would all read that more closely...

Y: I will.

B: (acknowledges)

Bret: I see a direct contradiction between experience and what Lila says must be happening.

Y: She did read it.

B: Yes, I'll read it once again. Yes, I need to go differ.

Y: I will read it; it's right on top. But isn't it nice to be misunderstood? It erases karma to be misunderstood. At least Lakulisha says so. He says...He takes two whole chapters to describe it; it is so important.

Bret: I am not here for sadhana; I am here to do Lila.

Y: Still if you are misunderstood. it is good for your karma whether you're here for it or not. See you have got misunderstood again.

B: Thank you.

Bret: It is not...