

#42

Formal talk-07112006 Afternoon day18

Lila recording day 18, afternoon

07/11/2006

071106001,

57min

[Recording 42](#)

B: A being is conscious if there is something it is like to be that being. We may state the following:

First statement: A being is Individual A with its own ontological attributes.

Second: When Individual A originates itself into a state of direct knowledge of itself - it originates itself in a state of likeness of its ontological attributes with its states of direct knowledge of them.

Third: Therefore, Individual A originates itself in a state of consciousness of self. And then in parenthesis...

Y: And then in what?

B: In parenthesis. If Individual A having choice originates himself into a state of no knowledge of itself, it is still (without still) its ontological attributes; but it is not in a state of consciousness of self.

I don't want to put still because it implies time; and it is timelessness.

Y: It is.

Darshana: That's great.

B: So I tried to be different.

Y: You what?

B: Than this...

Y: But it is very good.

[1:28](#)

B: to be consciousness (?)

Y: You tell the whole story there.

B: It might be like additional explanation.

Darshana: Except that these two ought to be reversed. A state of likeness of it's...

B: State of direct knowledge itself.

Darshana: Itself with its own ontological attributes.

B: With its ontological... Yes, it's fine.

1:50

Y: Now what do? We have got...have we got three versions? And I am not sure what to do.

Darshana: Do all three.

Y: Three ways of saying the same thing, Huh? I would like a copy of yours.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: How do I get that?

Don: I can scan it.

3:02

Y: There is one more version that Don made up on this. You have (?) See if this makes sense.

There is A itself and A's ontological attributes. There is A's state of direct knowledge based on A's ontological attributes.

And it's only partly in the polygon, part of it is out. So if the state of knowledge spills over and that says that:

That polygon is the state of the likeness of an attribute in A's state of knowledge based on A with an ontological attribute of itself.

So...but there is four of them. It sounds like it's singular with...well, the statement is correct. I am not sure the polygon did it. Does it include all of them? Certainly should include...manifest as, resolves to, subsumed to a state of consciousness of itself, A unitary existence who acts.

It looks like there is a unitary existence who acts that's created.

B: As a results which.

Y: Yes, and then you have to read the state of consciousness. Looks like an arrow of axiom (?) that creates a unitary existence. What is written is correct.

5:20

B: Maybe it shouldn't be arrow just; otherwise, it is beautiful but not arrow; but something which connects like a...

Y: Why not put it around both of those, Hum?

Don: The consciousness doesn't include the ontological attributes.

Y: What it is a result of them.

Don: Yes. That's what that...You could put that as a results, results column, that arrow results as.

Y: Manifest as.

Don: I know it a...

Y: Well, I see what you are trying to do. What you are trying to do is good, but visually it misleads me several times.

Don: That's not good.

Y: I have been misled. I have been made a fool of. But when you read that, the arrow means subsumes to, or resolves to, or manifests as...

Don: Or you could say is conscious of...

Y: No, no, it is a state in itself.

Don: (Acknowledge)

Y: It is in the right direction; but I don't think it's clear enough.

Don: The other one is... if you have any idea how the same concept looks like.

Y: For time.

Don: For time.

Y: Yeah, I glanced at it. Worked pretty well there.

Don: See? And the two arrows... You have these two separate states; and then those two.

Y: States.

Don: States subsume into a single state of consciousness.

Y: But they are not subsumed. See? By going around, they are included in a state. Subsume means to be a basis that includes both. Look too much like it's a product instead of a subsumption. But I see your objection to the square. Is it is like... Yes, but this is an argument I am going to make a little bit later anyway from another point of view. But by being around it, the state of consciousness shows that it's dependent on these things being what they are. And as a matter of fact, that's all that is. The consciousness is actually just a name for this situation.

Don: Yeah, I agree. The visual problem I have with the box around it all, is it looks like then the consciousness includes...

Y: Is what?

Don: With the box.

Y: I missed that last word.

Don: Yeah, the problem I have with the box all the way around like this is that it appears that the consciousness then somehow includes that. In other words, in the state...

Y: It does.

Don: Na, the state...Does the state...?

Y: Without it, there would be no...that...It wouldn't be that consciousness.

Don: I guess to me, there is a difference between based on and includes. I agree with based on. But to me includes...it's like, oh, like I should be able to look in my consciousness and find the attributes.

Darshana: Yeah.

Y: Well, you should be able to contemplate consciousness and realize what is behind it; you won't see.

Don: (Acknowledges)

Y: And that's what I was saying is missing. That this box is...should somehow be around it.

Darshana: What if you made...

Y: Because it is what it is.

Darshana: Joined together here.

Y: You follow me?

B: (Acknowledges) Yes.

Darshana: You would need a box around it. Then it would be it.

B: Yes, it is to emphasized.

Y: But before we go on with how it should be illustrated, I want you to read this out loud. I read it out loud. But it would be good if you started here. Read this one. And then do it this one.

01:48

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: This was from Punita.

B: (Acknowledges)

A is in a state of direct knowledge of itself.

Maybe it is not. Maybe it originates itself in a state of no knowledge. Isn't it so? It has choice.

Y: What?

B: Ok, but this is another point.

Y: Either it...

B: Now, yes. Now we are... (Acknowledges) Ok, now we are explaining the situation when it chooses to be in a state of knowledge of itself.

Y: Yes, that's right.

B: Yes, although it has choice not to be in state... but Ok, we start.

A is in a state of direct knowledge of itself

Or originates...better because it is not always...It has made the choice although it requires time, having in to mind...

Y: Well, there is no background of time. This is the extant state.

B: The extant, Ok. Then we start with an extant state.

Y: We started with this.

B: Yes. Ok, let it be so.

Don: You could just say, "If A is in a direct..."

Y: You could say it that way. You could say...

B: Or maybe have here a drawing or illustration.

Y: Or A is originating itself into...

B: A...This is why I put originates itself because this way we stress that it has a choice.

Y: It chooses that it was originated and

B: Yes.

Y: And yet it is...it is a timeless statement.

B: It is timeless.

Y: Ok, that's your comment on that. Ah...

B: Then Ok, then the second...for instance:

Originates or as it is. A is in a state of direct knowledge of itself. Individual A is in the mental state of the sameness...

A mental is something added now, you know.

Y: Yes, he added the word mental state.

B: Yes, I know, but it is added. Is it added? If we are commenting Chalmers, then Ok. Then Chalmers introduces mental; and we are commenting on it. Then Ok. But if you introduce basic definitions, then not. You know my point is be pure to the...

Y: Yes.

B: This is my point.

Y: So you are commenting. He is commenting on Chalmers.

B: Yes, but if you're...if we are commenting Chalmers, then Ok.

Individual A is in the mental state of the sameness of its direct knowledge of itself and its ontological attributes.

Y: And you prefer sameness to likeness?

Don: No, I actually prefer likeness. I didn't...have spent a lot of time on this, so...

Y: That's fine.

B:

Thus A itself is the something it is like to be in the mental state. Therefore, Individual A is in a state of consciousness of itself.

Ok as a comment to Chalmers, yes. Actually this is what we do, actually.

Y: All right. So that was his suggestion.

Don: But the second one is my preferred one.

Y: He likes this one better.

B: It may help to reword the above as:

A mental state is a conscious state if to be in that state is like something.

Yes, that is Ok.

Because Individual A's direct knowledge of itself is like Individual A itself, the mental state of that likeness is Individual A's state of consciousness of itself.

Yes, or self. Consciousness of self, it is good.

Y: But you prefer self here, rather than itself?

B: I prefer self, yes.

Y: Ok.

B: And here, maybe to add the attributes somehow because here we equalize or say sameness of its direct knowledge of itself and its ontological attributes. Like these are different. And like there is no sameness between them. But if we say:

Individual A is in the mental state of the sameness of its direct knowledge of its attributes with its ontological attributes

Somehow if it is possible to add here ontological attributes. But maybe it will...you know, here we are putting sameness or likeness of the direct knowledge of itself and its ontological attributes. According to me, it is better to stress direct knowledge of its ontological attributes with the ontological attributes themselves.

Y: Well, write that in as an alternative.

B: of its direct knowledge of its ontological attributes.

The likeness and now maybe not with, but and. And its ontological...and the ontological attributes themselves. Or not to make...now to personalise them and its ontological attributes. I wanted to stress somehow to emphasize that the likeness is between the direct knowledge of the ontological attributes and the ontological attributes to emphasize and to be (un?)clear what is the likeness between.

17:32

Y: I can't quite follow you. You are saying that there is a likeness between the ontological.

B: The direct knowledge of ontological attributes and the ontological attributes.

Y: I see. I follow.

B: To stress the likeness of the direct knowledge of ontological attributes with the ontological attributes.

Y: I see. I see what you are saying now. Ok.

B: Maybe regarding the significance of this chapter it could be bigger. I mean longer. Otherwise, I prefer strict and very...

Y: Well, the idea is...

B: Short statements...

Y: ...is to have the initial statement rewording, rewording,

B: And rewording.

Y: Diagram.

B: Yes.

Y: And then more explanation after that. And then the table.

B: Taking into account the significance of these statements.

Y: Yes.

B: It might be allowed.

Y: Here is another one. I want you to read that one.

B:

Individual A's state of the sameness of A's state of knowledge of A with A itself is A's state of consciousness of A.

It is Ok. Individual A's sameness of ...

Y: No, this is all.

B: This is all.

Y: This is for time. So you think that's adequate?

B:

Individual A states of the sameness

Or we said likeness...

Y: Likeness.

B:

Likeness of A's state of knowledge of A with A itself is A's state of consciousness of A.

Yes, it might be. It is simpler than including ontological attributes. And still we should have something like this also to be simple.

Y: That's the simple way. Maybe they can get that first; and then develop it.

B: Yes, yes.

Y: Ok, then there's yours. You have hers?

Don: Yes.

Y: I want her to go over it again. You went over once; but I want to focus on it again.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: This is along with the assumption...is the core of the Lila Paradigm.

B: Yes. Since we, in the previous statements, we made the emphasis on Chalmers' definition, I did the other way on Thomas Nagel's. And I say:

Following Thomas Nagel's phrase that a being is conscious if there is something it is like to be that being, we may state the following:

First a being is Individual A with its ontological attributes.

Second when Individual A originates itself into a state of direct knowledge of itself, it originates itself in a state of likeness of its ontological attributes with its states of direct knowledge of them.

Y: It is clear to me. Go on.

B: And

Third, therefore Individual A originates itself in a state of consciousness of self.

And then in parenthesis

(If individual A having choice, originates itself into a state of no knowledge of itself, it is its ontological attributes. But it is not in state of consciousness of self.)

Y: That helps to clarify the mind with regards to...

B: It helps to see the negative, to see what is the difference between being in a state of direct knowledge of self.

Y: And not.

B: And not being in a state of direct knowledge of self.

Y: Well, I like them all, I think.

B: We might.

Y: We should weave it in together. And I can do that with Darshana's help because you have helped to clarify the logic along with this.

B: Yes. I believe this chapter deserves to be longer, so to speak.

Y: Yes.

B: Otherwise, I prefer stick and short and mathematical.

Y: But if they don't know what it means...?

B: Yes, no, no, yes.

Y: Nothing happens.

B: Nothing happens because you have been working for years and years. And it should show somehow. You say you had twenty attributes, candidates for attributes. And now there are four.

Y: Yes.

B: If not here, somewhere it should be, maybe...

Don: I just...I would leave this one out of this first paragraph of mine unless it was considerably reworked. This, I think, is Ok.

Y: I'll make a note.

Don: But I...

B: You will make a cope of this? Or shall I copy.

Don: Yes, no, I'll make a copy of it.

Y: We will want a copy of this. And I want a copy of this with all the changes she has on here.

Don: Ok.

Y: Ok.

23:59

Don: Will you give me that page also so that I can do that one? I will have a warm brain. Thanks you. Yeah, they are very different styles. And I think it is very appropriate because different people think differently.

B: Yes.

Y: Yes.

Don: I have a very succinct and a more comprehensive...

Y: Some people say, "Oh, it is just love." Well, they are not wrong.

B: They are not wrong.

Y: But they don't get a full understanding from it. They get a feel for it. And that's good. I was just reading a newsletter from Jack Chapman. And that is what he is saying. It's love; and he is right. Then he takes another ecstasy table and...

Don: More love.

Y: Ok. You took page 38 from her did you?

Don: I took page 9 of 38.

Y: Oh, yes, I mean page 9. Give it back to her temporarily.

B: Ah, thank you.

Y: We are going to talk about this.

B: (Acknowledges) Yes.

Y: Now having said what consciousness is, I want to see if this should be included. And if it is, I don't think it should be at this place.

Strictly speaking, consciousness is only the above state of a non-physical individual and not a thing in itself. That is, consciousness is not an independently existing non-physical thing that was created by the above described situation. It is only that situation in which individual A is.

Now I've defined consciousness, explained it several ways, illustrated it and all that. And then I say that and take it away. Now I don't think that is...it is true what I am saying.

B: But it is confusing.

Y: I think later on, toward the end of the whole paper, maybe something like that could be brought up. But the reason why it is important is that people realize that consciousness is really a snake in the road. It is not a rope. The rope is what is underneath it. It's the state of knowledge and likeness. Well, is likeness really created? Well...?

B: In the moment you originate yourself in a state of knowledge, it is not a moment. In the timeless moment.

Y: In that state of when you are originating, it there is a likeness or we could call that situation of being in a state of knowledge of yourself. We can call that likeness. But it... also you could not call it anything. And it would still be what it is without...Or is there actually another state that is created, brought into being, and is consciousness? I think it depends on what you mean by the word 'create.' It's like somebody imagines there is an elephant in this room. Has he created something? Well, he has created an image in his mind of this room with an elephant in it. Well, is that what we mean by creation? Something in somebody's mind? Well, I tend to say, "Yes." But other people say, "Well, oh, that's just your imagination. Image-ja-tion. You are forming an image. But it is like, well, that's not real. There is not really an elephant in the room. So reality gets mixed up with, "Are we talking about creation of reality?" Well, it is real that he sees an elephant in the room in his mind. That's really true. So, is he creating a room in his mind with an elephant in it? Or is that an act of

creation? Or is it that all he does is being in a state of knowledge? For example, of himself. And he's...and that's what he originates. He is not originating a state of consciousness as a separate thing. His origination is of a state of knowledge of himself. And as a consequence of the fact that there is a likeness in that state of knowledge with himself, is a what? Is that a state? Or is it just imagination? Or is it just a name? This is the kind of picking.

B: Yes, yes.

Y: That I do that leads me to finally understanding these levels of things.

B: Yes.

Y: And you can't defend it to somebody else unless you have solved those questions. They say, "Well, is it creating?" And we...is this what we mean by create? Or do we mean, you have to bring an elephant through the door from the zoo.

B: Because you state from the beginning. And this is your sutra; all that exists are non-physical individuals and their states of direct knowledge or their states of no knowledge of ...

Y: So if that's all there is...

B: So there is no creation. You don't include creation.

Y: That's what I say. But I was bringing up all these questions to show you what you can deal with. And a person really hasn't understood consciousness fully until they have dealt with that consciousness is actually an illusion. There isn't actually anything created at all. That is just a superimposition of other parts of the mind over on top of it. Makes it seem like it is an actual creation like word consciousness or the concept of consciousness, and then superimposed that on what it really is, and say, "Well then, something was created." Get what I am driving at?

Don: Oh yeah, I have been over this, not with that precision.

Y: Ever since, I was firm with you about that there is no physical world. That's the way Kripalu did with me. I was telling him I was having certain problems. And he leaned forward like this he said, "Yogeshwar, it can be done." Wow! I haven't doubted it since then. And sure enough, he was right. It can be done. You can get stable upward flow.

B: Tremendous.

Y: And you can realize that consciousness is an illusion. But before that, your mind is going through stage after stage after stage of misunderstanding, miscomprehensions. So even if they read all of these, and they are pretty bright, and they see a good diagram, they may for a split second, "Ah! I think he is right."

B: And then lose it. That's the unstable.

Y: Well, the memory of that may be enough for a start for those people to go on with the rest of it. And say, "Oh, yes, that's right." Ok. I should have rested more during the break. But I took the paracetamol. And it is starting to take effect now. So I'm Ok now; but just before I took it, I was losing it.

B: Maybe we should be doing something else with...

Y: I can go on now. I am all right.

Don: Yogeshwar, what about the consciousness turning the arrow around and having it mean...? Is an interpretation of...is that in the right direction?

Y: Interpretation? That's close to the right word, the right thought, but...

Don: Turn the arrow around so that it is based on...You see what I am...

Y: So there is one going the other way, Huh?

Don: Yeah, instead of in that direction. I like that better.

B: And maybe just a bridge, to have just a bridge, no arrow at all, just a bridge between them to...just a rectangle.

Y: It's a bridge over troubled waters.

Don: The fact that consciousness is rooted in the absolute, there is a direction to it. Like one can contemplate and gain eventually. Point one towards the truth. So it...I don't know, I like the arrow for that reason. But I like it other direction for now. But the interpretation says, "It does have a reality of its own; it's a restatement, if you will, of the underlying truth."

Y: So you would take out 'manifest.'

Don: Yes. I would replace that by...is interpretation.

Y: By interpretation. I have sometimes used the word that mathematicians use. It's called that. It's called consciousness of itself. It's called a state of consciousness of self which is closer to the wording you were using.

B: (Acknowledges)

Don: Ok.

Y: Consciousness, that's one possibility. Called, interpreted, misinterpreted...

Don: Well, I know. But all interpretations, you go from one language to another. You miss something.

Y: Si, señor.

Don: You introduce errors.

Y: And I still want to bring this polygon out like that.

Don: Ok.

Y: And move it down so that it...

B: (Acknowledges) to...to contain it.

Y: Contains all of that state or shrink the state.

Don: Ok, I'll...

Y: And I think I'm going to do a little bit more work on the...on some of the labels here. Guys, we are getting very close now. All right, page 10. It's just right here.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y:

If, on the one hand, an individual consciously experiences itself as it is that person experiences itself as a unitary existence who acts. In so doing, this person does not see anything anywhere, not any when, and not even a clear light. This is what consciousness of the non-physical is like. On the other hand, most people who set out to be conscious of themselves usually experience themselves as a physical something rather than as what one really is, a non-physical individual.

I think that can stand pretty well like it is.

As will be seen in the balance of this paper, this definition of consciousness not only has intuitive appeal, it has great explanatory power with regard to what fundamental physical particles are, what their locations in time and space are, what time, space, energy continuums are, what the four fundamental forces are, what mass is, and why quantum theory is the way it is.

I was trying to decide today whether to include a discussion on quantum theory. I think I should at least include some comments on reduction or collapse of the wave function even if they don't know. Most people who are interested in these kind of things don't know the details of quantum theory. But they often have heard that there is this...Quantum theory is weird because they can't even explain what their mathematics says, to do that works.

Using this definition of consciousness, direct calculation of the magnitudes of these physical items can be made.

Then we have consciousness of a physical thing.

Consciousness of physical things is ubiquitous. Consciousness and physicality are inextricably paired. The only exception is consciousness of oneself as seen in the previous section on consciousness of self. "Any perception" in quotes is in the...

Any perception in the word is...should come out of there.

In the Lila Paradigm is considered to be of a physical thing. This includes all organs, sensory perceptions and all mental perceptions, such as mental images in dreams, memories and thoughts.

So I say that every time there is a consciousness, there is always a consciousness of something. And that something is something physical. I don't think that has been stated that clearly. In that...So I think I should restate some of it.

The same definition of consciousness given in the self section applies to the consciousness of physical things.

And then, we will put the rewritten version of it in there. And since I'll be using the word like and alike so the next thing doesn't need to be explained. I just use alike in the first place instead of same.

Don: Should we remove the same as and in parenthesis? Are we just going to substitute for that?

Y: I am just going...I am just going to take that out, the same as. And all the same and put alike in instead. So though two non-physical individuals are the same (mumbles). So all that can be cut out. Now before we defined...All right. Here is a... This is page 12.

Here is the simplest example of consciousness of a physical thing. A non-physical individual, call it Individual A is placing...

It originates, it should say.

Itself into a state of direct knowledge of another non-physical individual, call it Individual B. This state of direct knowledge that Individual A is in of Individual B includes the four attributes of individual B existence, unity, acts or ability to act, and who individual B is.

I don't know if I need to include all these states of no-knowledge for a paper like I have in mind. What do you think? Should it say, "All these states of no-knowledge?" Or not?

B: To stay as it is, or you want to add something?

Y: No, I want to take it out or leave it in.

B: No, no.

Y: All these statements about no-knowledge?

B: I believe it should be in.

Y: Or should it be stated simply. See? I have no arrows yet. I have letter A and B. I don't have any arrows.

Don: At this point, I think it has to be included at some point but at this point, that we are just trying to establish what knowledge and consciousness is, it is not pertinent to the definition of consciousness or a physical thing.

Y: You mean the arrows or do you mean the states of no-knowledge?

Don: The states of no-knowledge.

Y: So you suggest that it could be left out...am tending that way myself. But I was wondering what Biljana thought. If it was to be a technical paper, it would have to be there.

Don: Yes.

B: Ok yes, yes. Maybe you just exclude it.

Y: It might be stated, "If there is nothing originated that it's a state of no-knowledge."

B: In parenthesis or not?

Y: So what do you think?

B: Even if you decide that this sentence could stay, this should be...the next sentence should be a new line, a new paragraph using the above definition of consciousness, the following table is formed.

Y: I agree.

B: Ah, you know it shouldn't stay like this even if we decide to keep the states of no knowledge because it could be understood that this state of direct knowledge that Individual A is in, of Individual B, includes the four attributes. Also, so...and for the sake of completeness, this includes, as if this state of direct knowledge that Individual A is in of Individual B includes all of this which is not correct. When you hold the sequence of the previous sentence which this state of direct knowledge because you are now, we are referring to a strict state of affairs in which A is in a state of knowledge of B.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: And this is something whole as itself. It is self sustain so to say. And you couldn't proceed with...and for the sake of completeness, this includes it as if it includes the attributes and also includes the knowledge B of B knowledge of B of A, and so on. So it should be corrected.

Y: I think we shall leave it out.

B: Ok, leave it out and...

Y: Now the table column 3, attribute in 2 like in...It should say attribute in column 2 is the attribute in column 2 like the attribute in column 1.

B: Yes.

Y: Yes, yes, and no. Yes, yes, yes and no. Individual A is conscious of individual B as. You add down the column an existence, a unitary existence, a unitary existence that acts, and a unitary existence that acts. And the text explains that there is no who. Ok. In this particular project, I think we have done what I need to know in order to rewrite the whole first part of this thing. It will take me two or three weeks. And then, it will be posted in an incomplete form. That is, it will be complete for the part that is there. But some parts will be yet to be added about quantum theory. And that sort of thing, but the basic ideas of quantum...Quantum Theory, of the Lila Paradigm along with some quotes and various things that I have mentioned and the various changes, various diagrams. I'll send to you before it is posted to get your feed back. Then if you decide to write anything, and I hope you do, but it is not required. You write whatever you want; whatever you think would be a good idea. Send it to me and I will give you my feedback. I would predict that they would be quite different, but based on the same basic ideas. Do you have any suggestion about that project?

B: I am agreed. It's great.

Y: Ok. It is no doubt that things will come up.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: No doubt things will arise. But we will still have e-mail. And if worse comes to worse, there is always the telephone.

B: Yes.

Y: Ok. Now anything you would like to do? We have covered the basic things I had in mind.

B: Yes.

Y: But if you have anything you would like to bring up? We could...Questions you would like to ask? Tomorrow we will work on some of this that gets fixed up, and also on some of the notes, some of my notes, some of Baker's notes, some of Seeley's notes and Wyneki's notes. And we'll look at those and see which might be useful, which not, and pick out that are useful, what we think might be. Then we'll get them copied. And then you can have a copy to use at your leisure. What have we got about another week? Eight days.

B: Eight days.

Y: Ok. Because we are liable to get started on something like we could start on this. What is matter in a diagram? But I would like to have what is self fixed up better first. Now I will work with Darshana overnight and getting the wording assembled. That way she can do most of it. And I will just answer questions that she asks. And that

way, I don't have to struggle with it myself. She does the struggling and I just answer the questions. I'll ask you a question.

B: Do you find any, in principle, errors in the Lila Paradigm thus far? Only the unavoidable. We are...since...once we make the step from the basic metaphysical background, which is perfect and if it is not we...you will make it in this remaining weeks perfect. Then we step into the realm of reality of things. And these are not perfect measurements, not perfect mathematical models. But all this will be stated. And once it is stated, for instance, we state the barriers in contemporary science are, theory of chaos indicates the insufficiency of mathematical models. And this is done and this and this and this way. It will be stated firmly. Then Heisenberg's principle of uncertainty indicates the insufficiency of equipment no matter how sophisticated it is. Like in CERN and so on. Thirdly theory of Gödel shows the insufficiency of logic. And once we state this, now the second part is also perfect because now we have, so to say, stated it and now we deal with reality. And now having this in mind, having in mind that mathematical models and not perfect, measurements are not precise due to inherent state of affairs how nature operates. Thirdly, the insufficiency of logic. Having stated that, then we proceed with all evidence which is very strong in favour of Lila Paradigm.

Y: I see your plan. And I think it is a good one.

B: Yes.

Y: Ok, I'd like your permission for us to take a break for the day.

B: Yes, Ok. Thank you so much, yes.

Y: And we'll resume in the morning. I thought I would feel better today. But it didn't work out that way. So I will rest and not work.

B: Yes, yes, you should rest.

Y: like I did during the break.

B: Yes.

Y: I read seven pages of Jake. And then worked on the website. There is a number of little things that are wrong with it and have to be fixed up.

B: Amazing.