

#43

Formal talk-07112006 Morning day19

Lila recording day 19, morning

08/11/2006

081106000,

1 Hr 46 min

[Recording 43](#)

Y: Ok. Turn it on. So we will start with Herr Professor Doctor. What have you got from overnight?

B: I was thinking what the next step in those mathematic we are building should be. And I was observing an example of simple circuits, for instance, one circuit of three which is the minimal number of arrows for a circuit to occur and another circuit of three. And then I present in them in matrices. We have A is in state of knowledge B; B in state of knowledge of C, C in state of knowledge of A and also for D, E, F. And when we establish a bridge between them or...if one of the non-physical individuals of the first circuit originates itself into a state of knowledge of another non-physical individual of the second circuit, then it is like a whole baby universe originates itself into a state of know of another baby universe. A whole universe originates into a state of knowledge of another baby universe or a whole society, or whatever, a family or whatever we call them. So we might...so our mathematics, since we have stated that we have a group of...the set of the arrangements or baby universes is a group, but when we observe the elements of the set as a whole arrangement. So this line of thinking is actually in continuation of this picture we have. So whether these circuits are connected with a crossover or a whole baby universe originating itself into a state of know of another baby universe or not, we could present this baby universes into one single matrix. And when we present the whole baby universe, which is a spanning Hamiltonian, at one part of the matrix, then the other baby universe, which is another spanning Hamiltonian at one part of the matrix, then the other baby universe, which is another spanning Hamiltonian, into the other quadrant of the matrix, then we have two quadrants which are empty which are fully empty. And now when a whole baby universe originates itself into a state of knowledge of another whole baby universe, then this is as if we put one in the...in one of the empty quadrants.

Y: Hummm.

B: And...so, for instance...and now it doesn't matter because since we have a circuit and practically every...each and every non-physical individual is in state of the other non-physical individual either through direct knowledge or indirect direct knowledge, they have common knowledge. Since this is the case, we could, so to say, catch the wave or ride the wave, whenever...on many different places wherever we want. So, this one in the empty quadrant could be put anywhere because, for instance, it is all the same.

Y: It doesn't matter which one.

B: It doesn't matter which one, yes, yes. Because...and it is very well visible on the matrices because the matrices are spread out, actually design of the situation. So for

instance, whether B puts itself in a state of knowledge of E or A puts itself, I need new pencils, whether B put itself in state of knowledge of F or C. Now I go always from G1 to G2 because this operation which should have name, for instance, crossover, or bridge or...But it is one directional always. It should be included into this new mathematics as or at least this which we are building as a special relation. It should have a name because there are many things to be said about this.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: So, for instance, C could originate itself in a state of knowledge of F or B to D or whatever. So on the matrix presentation, it is clearly visible. If we...for instance, these lines are showing the moving through the Hamiltonian. First we start for A. A is in a state of knowledge of B. We go diagonally. B is in state of knowledge C. We go up to C, then diagonally which is just as we jump to the...from the C column to the C row. And so we have Hamiltonian. Now if we want to establish a state of direct knowledge or crossover to the second baby universe, then this bridge will be put in this lower quadrant here, down. We should name this quadrants, for instance, north, east, or something like this. So whenever...if I put the one here, then it is like as I established a crossover from A to B. This is as if A originates itself in a state of direct knowledge of B. This is the other way around so these ones here are from G1 to G2. If we put one anywhere then the bridge is established because it catches the wave. This is for a...for the direction G1 originates itself. G1 being a whole baby universe, originates itself or puts a crossover to the G2. But the other way around is referring to this other quadrant here. So whenever we pick/put? one we are catching the wave.

7:55

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: Whenever we put one, we are catching the wave.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: But it should be stressed, in order to have merging of the circuits, this means if we want to make a whole new universe out of two baby universes, then both directions should be introduced. We should have origination from G1 to G2, and another one or another arrow from G2 to G1 because once we establish one, the whole universe G1 originates itself into a state of knowledge of the whole other baby universe G2. Then all, each and (every) one member of G1, is in a state of direct knowledge of each and (every) one member with every member of the other baby universe or society, but not the other way around.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: Not the other way around so...the matrices actually are showing. So there are several things here first we operate with whole baby universes, then a whole baby universe or society could originates itself into a state of knowledge of another whole baby universe. It could be applied for metabolic process of molecules or something like this when we have a whole arrangements. And the beauty of it is that it is fairly visible on the matrices. On the matrices we have whole. We have whole areas of the matrix, one area representing one Hamiltonian, another area representing

another baby universe. And if we have to establish a real crossover, this means to merge them two into one baby universe in which every individual will be in a state of knowledge of any other individual. Then we should have ones in both empty quadrants or even more for that matter because we could have a third, for instance, a third baby universe. And now these crossovers could be one-directional or two-directional. If they are two-directional, we have real merging of the two baby universes into one universe. For this operation, we should find a name for it in order to...Or maybe we could just name it the same because when we have one non-physical individual originating himself into a state of knowledge of another non-physical individual, this is just a special case of this general picture of what all baby universe originating itself in a state of direct knowledge or establishing a bridge or a crossover towards another whole baby universe.

Y: Yes, this is a special case.

B: It's a special case. And now we could introduce another operation in our algebra. And this is transitivity. Now we could establish because now transitivity is referring to whole baby universes which are the elements of our system. In our system the elements are not non-physical individuals, but arrangements of non-physical individuals. And, of course, one non-physical individual can be seen (?) as an arrangement as a special case of a whole arrangement. And this is very much in favour of the philosophy of Lila because it is now.

11:51

Y: Directional.

B: Yes, and it is joining together whole families, societies, universes. So, just one individual is needed.

Y: There is no limit. Well, there is a limit 'n;' but it could be huge.

B: Yes, it is huge. Yes, yes, it could be 10^{11} , a whole universe. And then, just one origination is needed in order for the whole universe all of the sudden to be in state of knowledge of all the other...of a huge...of a whole other baby, not baby universe, universe. They are not babies any more.

Y: And I am suggesting that it could be like *lokas*.

B: Aha! *Lokas*. Aha! Great.

Y: Or heavens.

B: Sanskrit.

Y: Heavens.

B: Aha, heavens.

Y: That this one is higher than this; this one is higher than that.

B: Yes.

Y: Because they know what this one doesn't know.

B: This doesn't know. They remain closed.

Y: (Acknowledges) This will have other applications, many applications.

B: Yes, yes.

Y: Ok, go on.

B: So these are *lokas*. Ok, let us call them *lokas* or heavens whatever you say.

Y: We'll call them *lokas*.

B: *Lokas, lokas*.

Y: That way won't have trouble with...

B: Trouble, yes.

Y: With the Christians.

B: It's (?). And the operation are, the operation? State of direct knowledge as we have it because it could be just one origination; or it could be a bridge of many like this one.

13:30

Y: Yes.

B: I'm...we should...

Y: Yes.

B: ...think about it. So I have here another example of a whole arrangement, of whole *loka* originating itself into a knowledge of another whole *loka*.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: And these are my matrices. And we could...now we have another operation in our mathematic for which we know; it is transitive. Now we could introduce transitivity. So far we had associative law which is one ingredient, one condition in order to have a group. The second was complementarity. We have complementarity. We have complementarity graph...

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: ...which is potential towards of fully enlightened universe. And thirdly, we have identity element or neutral element.

Y: Neutral for Li groups.

B: Which is one, which is a fully enlightened universe.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: One made of all ones. And now we have another one. This is transitivity, and this transitivity. This was...this operation is not symmetric; it is asymmetric.

Y: It is.

B: Asymmetric.

Y: Ah.

B: It is not symmetric because G1 is in state of knowledge of G2. G2 is in state of knowledge of G3 through transitivity. G1 is also in state of knowledge G3, G3 being a whole universe.

Y: And that's automatic?

B: But not the other way around.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: So this operation is asymmetric. So we have now...all this could be presented by also called Boolean functions.

Y: Which I am not familiar with. I am familiar with...a little bit with Boolean algebra...

B: Yes.

Y: But not functions.

B: Yes. They're Boolean functions. Maybe today I'll try to find out.

Y: Ok.

B: Something more about (?)

16:02

Y: So number four is transitivity.

B: Transitivity, the operation being asymmetric. The applications could be on metabolic process and many other applications. And one point to be stressed is that it is very much in favour of philosophy of Lila.

Y: Yes, that's...

B: Just one individual could do a difference.

Y: And it works because one, it is directional. And two, that consciousness is involved or states of knowledge. It's not just a node and a connection.

B: Yes.

Y: A connection.

B: Yes, yes, yes, yes.

Y: I have something to add to that.

B: Yes.

Y: Punita was also asking about how selective attention works. Say, you have many, many, many, many, many. And these are connected like this. And there are millions and billions of them. They also should note that there is a complementary graph for all of those.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: Millions and billions and trillions of them. So we have our referent individual. We'll call him R for referent.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: Now, with regard to all this network of indirect connections, there are also in our state...there's all the states of no knowledge. And for most individuals on earth, the number of states of no knowledge are much higher than the states of knowledge. I've said because of the mistake of thinking that they might not survive, they are usually limited to one of two or three extant states of knowledge. What they do is they join into one that is a circuit that gives them indirect knowledge of all of this network. But because it is indirect knowledge, and he is not directly accepting all of these...

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: ...there is all of these states of no knowledge. So what he does for purposes of attention, he will accept that one. And with his other arrow he will be in the circuit. And with his third arrow, say, he accepts this one. So he has direct knowledge of this one; and direct knowledge of this one. And they don't have associated with them states of no knowledge. Follow that? Because he is directly in a state of knowledge of them, there is no state of no-knowledge associated with that particular connection or with this one, or for this one, for that matter. But all the rest are all these trillions of trillions of these states of no-knowledge which damp down the clarity, the certainty, of what he's...and makes it fade. His conscious states are faded by that because they are all included in the reduction process. But the ones that don't have that, they are clearer. And that's what we mean by putting your attention on something when you want to think about something. So those who have attention deficit disorder (ADD), they only have one, one for the circuit, and one for here. And that has...it jumps around. He changes from this. And he goes to this instead. And his attention is easily shifted. It is not like he doesn't have attention; they do have attention. But it is not stable; and so it jumps around. So they...in America and Australia, they have these women's magazines about Hollywood gossip, Hollywood

stars and things like that. And when they have a page, they have one short paragraph and a photograph. And that's one whole story. And that's all there is. And then there will be a different one, and a different one, and a different one. That's because they can't keep their attention very long to read a whole page on Brad Pitt. They just read two sentences. That's because they have limited capacity to put themselves into a state of knowledge of another. So they can only get one. But people like you can get five, ten, fifteen, twenty all at once. And you can keep it there because you get all of them in just one particular pattern here, and that you can hold. When you have all of them, nobody can interfere with you anymore because if you going indirectly connected this one, if you are using this one, this individual can cut you off from being connected to that one. So that's why you lose your attention; and it goes off. But when you are directly connected to it, nobody can interfere. So we have four arrows going to this pattern here of four; and no one can take your attention off of it. This is what is meant by one-pointed. One-pointed, what did Kripalu call it, Darshana?

Darshana: State.

Y: One-pointedness, the state of one-pointedness although there is four arrows in here. Well, say, you were able to accept a billion others in your extant situation for you. You could keep your attention on someone and just keep it there. Then you would be a wonder compared to a genius who has five or six like Beethoven or Mozart. Mozart conceived this whole thing at once. And then, he just had to write it down. That's how they do it.

Does that answer your question about attention?

Don: Yes.

Y: Ok. Then it's...this is just an extension of this, of what you were just talking about. This is a third order.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: Yours is second order; this is third order.

B: Third order. Great!

Y: Did you get this?

Don: Yes, I did. Thank you.

Y: She has got it in her notes.

Don: Yes.

Y: Without some kind of an explanation of this, I found that people don't understand how the Lila Paradigm can explain how their mind works. But when they see this, the two or three people that I have explained it to, they say, "Ahhh! I see how this complicated business works."

Now we go to some of the things from overnight. What Darshana and I were working on was ones that use Thomas Nagel's phrase, ones that use Chalmers' phrase and one of them that used the definition of consciousness that we were working on earlier. And I want to start with that one which is in black and white.

All that exists are large specific number of non-physical individuals each of whom originates itself into a separate non-physical state with regard to each.

Now, in the paper that I am working on to post up on the Lila Paradigm website, I plan to use something like that almost/probably exactly because it is an assumption that, that is all that exists. And the next assumption:

Each non-physical individual with regard to each non-physical individual including itself, originates itself either into a state of direct knowledge of that non-physical individual or into a state of no direct knowledge of that non-physical individual.

There is the sutra. Now actually they should be called a sloka because it is a whole verse, verse one and verse two. Now we talk...Darshana and I were working, and the correlations that follow:

Because non-physical individuals originating states of direct knowledge and or states of no direct knowledge are all that exist, there is a background of time against which these originations are made or exist.

Might include a statement or part of a statement, time or space, or maybe also or energy.

The two following correlations are for the same reason, the indivisibility or unity of a non-physical individual.

Individual means indivisible.

Because the non-physical individual is an indivisible whole, its ontological attributes are all... and all of its states whether they are direct knowledge, no direct knowledge, or consciousness, or/are (?) aspects of a whole or perhaps a whole individual.

29:30

Now this is after the attributes have already been introduced in the second correlation here.

A non-physical individual's states of direct knowledge and no direct knowledge of other non-physical individuals include knowledge of those other non-physical individuals' states of direct knowledge and no direct knowledge of other individuals and so on.

It's so on, forever though. And so on finitely.

Darshana: Yes.

To know.

Darshana: So, on until all individuals that are done.

Y: So on until all others, yes.

To know a non-physical individual is to know its originations.

It's like the Bible when a man knows a woman. It is that kind of knowledge that is really being talked about. And the Bible, the writers of the Bible, knew this principle. How do I know is I knew them. They were my, one of them was my, grand uncle in a past life.

B: Really.

Y: Yes. His name was Noah. And he was my grand uncle. And my name was Almodad who is mentioned in passing in the Bible. And that's how I...one of the ways I know that they knew what they were talking about, that they were talking in esoteric language. Anyway, to go on. Correlation three.

Each of the states of knowledge of non-physical individuals had by a single non-physical individual is non-physically compared by that non-physical individual to itself. These non-physical comparisons produce states of consciousness that are reduce to a single state of consciousness of an apparent physical world. These comparisons and reduction both happen non-temporally for the same reason the unity of a non-physical individual. The non-physical individual is one state made up of many sub-states.

So this is kind of a quick overview. And then there will be some of the detailed explanations of consciousness and reduction given later on. Anyway if you find any problems of either understanding or think they are contradictions or something is left out, when you get...if you get an opportunity to reflect on it, I would appreciate having them. And that, Biljana, goes for when we are dealing by internet, e-mail, when we are sending papers back and forth to each other that we'll feel free to say, "I don't think complete, I think it is missing this, or I know it is missing something. but I don't know what."

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: Or I think you're clear wrong or this should be left out, and not take it as a negativity, but as a suggestion for improvement.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: Ok. Then we have Biljana's. It's spelled with a J or with a Y.

Darshana: Well, how did I spell it? With a Y?

B: With a J.

Darshana: Oh, good.

Y: That's how Macedonians.

B: Biljana.

Y: Biljana.

B: Biljana.

Y: Be jana.

B: Biljana.

Y: A very quick L. So the L blurs with the J.

B: Bil is lu of which is laugh. Lia

Y: Ah.

B: Just Lia, lu.

Y: Aha! That's close to Sanskrit. Anyway...if we are following Thomas Nagel's phrase, then what you have to say here? I think is correct. You extended it. So what I want to do is to put a short sentence ahead of time to say that Nagel and Chalmers were trying to explain consciousness and made a good start. But this is how the Lila Paradigm defines and understands consciousness. Ok?

B: Yes, yes.

Y:

So a being is Individual A with his ontological attributes, something like it is...
Something it is like to be that being is A state of direct knowledge of its ontological attributes. And then when Individual A originates itself into a state of direct knowledge of itself, it originates itself into state of likeness of its own ontological attributes with its state of direct knowledge of them, or into a state of the likeness of the attributes in a state of direct knowledge of its own ontological attributes.

Could be said either way. Do you favour one over the other?

B: No.

Y: So I can pick?

B: Yes, yes.

Y: Or should I include both?

B: Whatever you...

Y: Ok.

Therefore Individual A originates itself into a state of consciousness of itself.

And then, why did you add this parenthetical statement?

B: First of all, I had just a very short time between morning and afternoon session for this...

Y: Well, I think it's a good point.

B: And then, I wanted to stress that the Individual A could choose to be in a state of no-knowledge of itself.

Y: Yes.

B: It might be not known for the reader explicitly. It might.

Y: He might have forgotten.

B: Yes.

Y: Yes, so I think that's a good idea.

B: To differentiate between these states, to be in state of self knowledge and in self consciousness, in a state of consciousness of self, and not to be. You don't lose your ontological attributes. You just lose consciousness of self.

Y: Ok. Now we just read through that very quickly. And I understood it completely; and I think you certainly do. And I think you did.

Don: (Acknowledges) I think it is very good.

Y: Not only is it good, it's that...because we have working on this for a couple of weeks, it wasn't like that when we started. Is it not so? That now we are getting use to the paradigm?

B: Yes.

Y: And we can talk about a person originating itself into a state of knowledge. And we know what that is immediately. We don't have to say, "Oh, yes," remind oneself. And that's what it takes to begin to shift into a different paradigm especially one so fundamental a shift as this one. And so when one is explaining things to others or teaching them, actually teaching them, so that they get to that place where they get familiar with it. Any new mathematical system or new branch of science, they all have that same problem. Only this one goes even deeper because we are dealing... They are used to dealing with their conscious minds; and we are defining consciousness. And so it is particularly difficult. So you have to be patient with them and go over it this way and go over it that way. That is why I am thinking of having several of these statements. So let's go to Charles and Catherine when we were working late last night. It says:

Consciousness is the state a non-physical individual is in.

You got two in's there.

Don: That's correct.

B: In which? Is in, in which?

Y: But I think it should have a comma.

In which an attribute in a state of direct knowledge that non-physical individual is in is like an ontological attribute of that non-physical individual.

Now this is how I described to Darshana as a description of the experience I have on a regular basis. That's how I think of it. That's how I...but that's just my way. So in other words, put another way:

A non-physical individual in a state of direct knowledge of some non-physical individual is also in a state of consciousness of any attribute of that non-physical individual in its state of direct knowledge that is like an ontological attribute of itself. What this state of conscious is, is the non-physical individual's state of the likeness of the attribute of its state of knowledge with its ontological attribute.

That might be more closely associated with the diagram like this sort of thing. And then again, in other words:

A non-physical individual's state of the likeness of one; and attribute of non-physical individual in its state of knowledge with two; one of its own ontological attributes is a state of knowledge of an attribute in its state of knowledge.

So what he's conscious of...what the content of his consciousness is of, is of an attribute in its state knowledge. But what his conscious state is, is what was said before. And another way of putting it:

I know that what...I know what that attribute of a non-physical individual in my state of direct knowledge is like, is like an attribute of my being equals consciousness of that knowledge attribute.

That is another way that I say it. In fact, it was the way when I first realized consciousness was. I conceived it like that. Or another way of stating it is:

A non-physical individual in a state of direct knowledge of some non-physical individual is also in a state of likeness of any attribute of the non-physical individual in its state of direct knowledge. That is like an ontological attribute of itself. This state of likeness is a state of consciousness of the attribute in its state of knowledge.

I think we'll get a pretty high percentage when most of these are being used. You're frowning.

Don: I somehow...think there is a difference between the way that Biljana has put it and the way you have put it. And I can't put a...my finger on it as a study.

Y: Well, is that she was presenting a Negel view which is the one of being? And that is slightly included in this next to last one.

I know what that attribute of a non-physical individual in my state of direct knowledge is like. It's like an attribute of my being. So therefore it's something to be like. As far as I can tell, they are just two ways of saying the same thing.

Don: Ok, I...

Y: With different words. So...using different concepts that bunch the basic underlying concepts of knowledge in...group them in different way in a different order. But you were telling me that.

Don: Well, I...I have to look at it. I...

Y: Good.

Don: I just want to study it.

Y: And so, when you look at it like that, there is a little frown of, "What is this saying?"

Don: Well, I haven't resolved...

Y: Those arrows of concentration on the command centre back in the brain. And it shows on the forehead. What is this?

Don: Maybe it is just a difference of emphasis that I am getting.

Y: Yes, it is. And as far as I can tell, they are all valid. Now, we are going to have another go at applying Thomas Negel's and Chalmers'. Here is some attempts.

I know what that attribute of a non-physical individual in my state of direct knowledge is like. It is like an attribute of my being. There is something that it is like to be an individual with that attribute. I am an individual with that attribute. Then there is something that it is like to be that individual with that attribute that is in the state of knowledge I am in. It's like being me with my attribute. Since the attribute I am being is something that it is like being that attribute in my state of knowledge, I am in a state of knowledge of that attribute in that state of knowledge I am in.

46:42

I think different people would rap their different structured minds around different ones of these. They would say, "Well, that one is right; and that one is just confused." Then in another way: this is Chalmers' restatement of converse (?) with a development of the Lila Paradigm.

1. The mental state is Individual A's state of knowledge of Individual A's four attributes of existence, unity, acts and who A is.
2. For individual A to be in that mental state is like something. It is like A's four ontological attributes of existence, unity, acts and who A is. Therefore, Individual A's origination of a state of knowledge of those attributes due to the likeness of those attributes to Individual A's ontological attributes and to A's

being a unity also produces for Individual A a mental state of consciousness of those attributes.

Convoluted compared to the other ones. That's because we are trying to develop statements that are not really adequate to the job. Nagel's and Chalmers are not adequate. They don't have the underlying truth that's included in them. These are... been...kind of being...to weave them together. And they are not as clear; they are correct but not as clear. I think an article that attempts to do this might get published by the Journal for Consciousness Studies.

B: Yes.

Y: Which, I have about twenty issues of. And I know the publisher slightly. I meet him at a meeting of consciousness conference in Tucson Arizona because is a real go at understanding what consciousness is. We could e-mail one to Chalmers. "Hey, Dave, what do you think of this?" He is in Canberra, just a three hour drive, at the University there. He is an Australian.

B: Oh.

Y: He was also a Rhoades Scholar and went to Oxford. And now, he is quite well-known.

Darshana: You and Biljana could stop by his office and see if he was willing to talk.

Y: I think he would think that we are ganging up on him, getting him from both sides. Then they get defensive. And, Punita, do you still cross out your first one?

Don: Yes. Actually we could leave it in. I have plenty of opportunities to be misunderstood. Then he could publish it.

Y: Ok. But the second one, you still feel has some merit? I think it does.

Don: Yes, I do.

Y: And Darshana thought, although I haven't had chance to take a really good look at it, that your one of your diagrams there...I think it was this one, has real merit.

Don: No, I think it is the one that I just handed out this morning that she was referring to. It has the dark...

Darshana: No, I was referring to that one. Only I like your new one even better.

Don: Ok, Oh, Ok. So both.

Y: So, I think you are on to a right track on this. I'll have to look at it on projections. But it has a double meaning for arrows.

Darshana: Mine does. Oh, his does too.

Y: Well, he has arrows too.

Darshana: Oh, all right.

Y: And she has another use for arrows.

Don: Yeah, the direction of arrows there. I...I have tried them both ways and I haven't settled it. So...but if you think the idea has merit? It's worth working on?

Y: This is what she did...is that she wanted to have these lines with arrows showing that the collapse of the wave function goes this way from consciousness. As consciousness occurs, there is a likeness collapse or the reduction of the matrices, vector states. But I think that is a mistake to show that. But I'll have to think about these arrows. And then there is this arrow which has a different meaning.

Don: That's the critical one, I think.

Y: Ok.

Don: This is how we look at it.

Y: So we'll have some feedback later on about that. Ok, that's what...I have bored another time by going over the same material. But familiarity builds the paradigm. And I think it is beautiful. Do you want to look at this now? And listen to his explanation?

B: Yes, if he wants.

Don: Well, this is incomplete. But they're some ideas that I wanted to introduce here. And the base thing is that the content of consciousness is a projection of the underlying states of likeness, states of knowledge and the comparisons.

Y: So, by using the concept and term projection, you're...it's like Plato's project of the ideal onto the cave wall, that...that projections don't have any independent existence; but it has a kind of experiential existence. So I think this has promise because this parallels the Lila Paradigm.

Don: (Acknowledges) It has a bases in Plato's cave. I was thinking of that. There is for them, there is actual figures back there.

Y: And using the concept which is well-known in philosophy, and to a lot of other of projection.

Don: And it has a rigorous mathematical definition.

Y: Or has a...like a slide projector also because the image is just a projection from a reality. So the way people think about it.

Don: Well, that's why I felt it would communicate to both. People go to the movies and mathematicians.

Y: And mathematicians, and philosophers, everybody but the physicists.

Don: No, and physicists too, that they use projections.

B: Yes, yes.

Don: Because mathematics is very basic.

Y: They have mathematical projections. They are getting close to it.

Don: And so, I thought as we move into rigor...

B: Yes.

Don: That we might more rigorously define that projection.

Y: So this projection is like the second order that you were talking about.

B: Yes, agreed.

Y: So go on, I...

Don: I just...

Y: just couldn't wait to say that.

Don: The projection is of the overall state. Now I wanted to redraw this in light of your diagram that took into account both the comparisons between the states of knowledge and...Do you have the coloured one there? Yes. See? It is based on this.

Y: The overall.

B: The overall which includes the comparisons of states of knowledge and consciousness.

Y: Yes, there's two of those, this one and this one.

Don: Yeah.

Y: And they're compared in this.

Don: Now, isn't there also a blue around B?

Y: For whom?

Don: For A because it...just like you have here, here, that is a state of knowledge for (?)

56:57

Y: Or is there (?) also one that include B?

Don: Yeah, in blue.

Y: Yes. That would be another one. I just didn't draw that one because it wasn't apropos to space particular. Maybe it is, though.

Don: Oh, it is because it's that sub...that dependency of these states on this one that puts them in the same time.

Y: Yes, I didn't show the time sequence.

Don: Yeah, Ok.

Y: And I didn't mention it in the text either.

Don: Well, I was doing one of these for time.

Y: But to be complete, it would have to have all that.

Don: Yeah. Well, I am going to do this.

Y: And this would be like two of those.

Don: Yeah, Ok. So I am going to incorporate these other things. But these are likeness. You know these trapezoids here are the consciousness, if you will, the states of likeness. The round is a state of knowledge.

Y: The states of knowledge.

Don: And then, we'll have this.

B: The overall.

Don: The overall.

Y: And then the consciousness of...

Don: The consciousness.

Y: Consciousness dash knowledge?

Don: Yeah, that will be this yellow one which will replace this. This has got to encompass it all.

B: (Acknowledges)

Don: And then the content of the overall state of consciousness is a projection of that one.

Y: And that's what's talked about here.

Don: Yes.

B: Great.

Y: So, Doctor, if you would look at those and give any comments or suggestions. It's getting as we used to say, "Hairy." It's a bit like...I admit that this is so complex that it...you probably need colour to differentiate it. It is easy to look... for me to look at this than even to look at this.

B: Sure.

Y: But then, this is going to be even more complicated when you do space.

Don: Yeah. I think what we will have to do is simplify.

Y: Yes and assume that they remember the previous. And in fact, we might say, "Remembering what time is;" then we can go on to space in the diagram.

Don: I started on this version for time. I just didn't have time to get it done. One question and your thoughts. The direction of this arrow...

B: (Acknowledges)

Don: This way, its consciousness is based on that.

B: With me right now.

Don: But, my preference is to turn it around. Is it that consciousness is a projections of that?

B: Consciousness is a projection.

Y: I like that better.

B: Based on.

Y: A projection.

Don: Yeah. See? It's a matter...and what I'll probably do is figure out how to arrange this so that this reads in the other direction. But I wanted the reading to tie to the concept. A's state of consciousness is a projection of the subsumption of da, da-da, da-da. That ties the visual together with the rest.

Y: I like that.

Don: I'll rearrange for that to happen. Now, I also incorporated into this, since it is a time diagram, one unit of time. So makes it explicit. See that, Yogeshwar?

Y: One unit of time. Yes.

Don: And I would do a similar thing for the space diagram so that we have one unit of space. Does that?

Y: Yes, that's fine.

Don: But I just...we are talking about time. It's not clear in all this what the unit of time is. And so I thought making it explicit was...

B: Yes, and emphasize that we have dots here.

Y: We get what?

B: We have dots. We have dots because this is illusionary time.

Y: Right.

B: Maybe it's too early for them to conceive.

Y: But this is...

B: Time when we are speaking timelessness.

Y: Dot, particle and particle.

B: Yes.

Y: Yes.

B: When we have particle and particle, then we have illusionary unit of time.

Y: There, and this would be there.

Don: That's down here.

B: Aha! Yes, it is down here.

Y: Ok.

Don: So those are concepts, you know, it was time to bring out. Now, I wrote up something on projection. Handed out, to see if this kind of terminology makes sense.

B: This is just to give an idea how the term projection might be used to explain the content of consciousness? If the concept has merit the wording should be worked on. Content of consciousness, the perception of time is a projection of the embedded relationship between two sub-states of knowledge, the perception of space, but also consciousness. Aha! Consciousness, the content of consciousness. The perception of space is a projection of the difference between 'who' each individual is in a state of knowledge.

Yes.

Y: That will require reflection.

Don: But do you think it's worth pursuing?

Y: I'll have to reflect on it before answering. It might be...

Don: Because again, it ties into our concept of a projection. And we're starting to break it down. How the underlying...

Y: Well, in principle, it is worth pursuing.

Don: Reality.

Y: Whether how you stated it, I am not sure of.

Don: Just to tie specific facts of reality in Lila to appearances in consciousness.

Y: Yes. That I agree with.

Don: Ok.

B: Is it helpful to break...first to have two diagrams, you know, just with the states of knowledge and circles, and then with trapezoids and consciousness. And then join them together or not. It will split the whole idea, maybe. It will...in a negative way. Maybe, it is not good.

Don: I don't know.

Y: But if you could show that one is a projection of the other.

B: Yes, like a sequence. And then join them together and emphasize that this should be viewed as one and the same.

Y: You could even draw it like a projection with dotted lines.

Don: (Acknowledges)

Y: Yes.

Don: Yeah, well, it might be, you know, have dotted lines instead of an arrow here. But what...?

B: Because the time you spend on it, it is not visible here. And for them, it will be just a...You know, it is better...the whole process which was going on in your brain in order to produce that. It should be visible somehow in order to help others.

Y: Yes.

B: Because when you look at this, all of the sudden, you don't differentiate between circles and trapezoids. It is not clear that it is different. In some diagrams, it is not different. Here every single form has a meaning.

Y: A deep meaning.

B: But not...a deep meaning, but not to the mind of the reader. So it should be emphasized. First a picture with circles which are states of direct knowledge, then, which is part of this one; then another one with trapezoids which are states of...

Y: Consciousness.

B: ...consciousness and likeness. And then join them together into one and emphasize this is to be viewed as one.

Y: See? This is the teacher talking.

Don. Yep. Because really...

B: Yes.

Y: Because you have to think of the student.

B: Yes, yes, not in every diagram, this has meaning. Some...it is very deep meaning into it; but it is not visible to the reader. Sometime the one who draws it, it makes it look beautiful. He says, "I put rectangular figure and circle here." But, in this case, it has deep meaning and should be stress.

Don: Well, it really needs a Power Point presentation.

B: Hum?

Don: I'll do a Power Point presentation. Really because that's really just slide by slide.

B: Ah! Yes. Slide by slide, and then join them together.

Don: But what, I think, like for the first diagram of self, I'll break them down.

Y: Yes.

Don: Ok, and then we see them all separate so people can get that concept.

B: Yes.

Don: But then, perhaps in the second ones...

Y: The second one on matter.

Don: Well, the second one is time. No matter.

Y: Matter and then time.

Don: Yeah, then matter and then...But as I get on to time and space, start pulling things out. And say...

Y: Simplify it, but still use the assembly projections system.

Don: Well, it will take some work. But I guess if we can just get agreement on the direction, first of all...

Y: Yes, this may take a month or two. So don't worry about it because time...It doesn't all have to be done by this afternoon. You can see the feedback happens. And then you say, "Well, we need this." And then we can get rid of that. This is always happens for a production model.

Don: Yes, I am very aware of this.

Y: Ok. Of the process.

Don: Ok. Thank you.

Y: All right. You have anything else for me?

B: No, no.

Y: There is one more thing we can take up this morning. That would be a change of pace. Going through my notes...this is a letter I wrote to David Chalmers. Here's another title for the Lila Paradigm, *A Pluralistic, Monistic Idealism*. Well, I'll try anything. Huh? You see the diagrams that I have drawn trying to see the different effects. This says, "Attention." This was when I was working out what I was explaining this morning. Yes, this is an interesting subject to me, the subject of free will. And in the Encyclopaedia Britannica is says:

[1:12:38](#)

Free will in humans, the power or capacity to choose among alternatives, or to act in certain situations independently of nature, social or divine restraints. Free will is denied by those that espouse any of various forms of determinism. Arguments for free will are based on subjective experience of freedom, on sentiments of guilt, on revealed religion, and on universal supposing of responsibility for personal actions that underlies the concepts of law, reward, punishment and sentience (?) in theology. The existence of free will must be reconciled with Gods Omniscience and goodness in allowing man to choose badly, and with Divine Grace which is allegedly necessary for any meritorious acts. A prominent feature of modern existentialism is the concept of a radical perpetual and frequent agonizing freedom of choice. Jean-Paul Sartre, for example, speaks of an individual condemned to be free even though his situation may be wholly determined.

They're still going around in those kinds of circles and so is Peter Forest. I was talking to you about, about trying to deal with his guilt about feeling responsible for his son. And how can there be evil if God is good and all there is, is God? Well, I think the Lila Paradigm deals with these questions. That the basic assumptions give

into each of ourselves the power. And yet it shows how we are all interconnected in community; and how that interacts with our states of knowledge of each other and therefore, the content of our consciousness, without doing anything bad to anyone. Nothing ever happens to a non-physical individual. That non-physical individual while the content of his consciousness and his states of knowledge may be something from a certain perspective, are just horrible. But that's because they are deluded into thinking that the content of their consciousness and their states of knowledge are anything other...have a reality other than just that. They're not...they are just...conscious is just a state, an illusionary state. And states of knowledge are just states of knowledge. They are not just the ultimate reality which is the individuals themselves. Nothing happens to them. So no bad act is ever created; or there is no good act either. And this is how it looks from the point of view of someone that has accepted everyone.

B: Yes, yes.

Y: You see. You see this whole thing is just a monster's activity. But it's all free will; and there is nothing wrong with any of it. It's all Ok. This is what leads to samadhi. How much of this to include in a book, I am not sure. I know not to go on about it very long with regard to a short paper. But in a book, there is room for some discussion about this.

Darshana: And if you do, it ought to include that quote out of the *Bhagavad Gita*. Abandon all Dharma. Take refuge in me alone, grieve not.

Y: And you won't grieve anymore. You will be the permanent end to pain.

1:16:25

B: Ah! Yes. My karmani desa (?) It was all your karma. I knew it in Sanskrit. This ah... my karmani (?) it was something. It is Krishna saying, "All your actions give to me."

Darshana: Yeah. All your bad acts... actions, all your good actions.

B: My esavani karmani (?) All your actions give to me; and this is all you should do. My esavani karmani (?)

Darshana: Yeah, in other words, being in a state of knowledge of everyone, let them make their own choices.

B: Yes, yes, I like this very much.

Y: And Jesus.

B: My esavani karmani (?) Hey! long time I haven't remember that.

Y: Jesus said it another way.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: He says, "You're forgiven."

B: Aha! Yes. Even more you are not obliged even to give me your actions. Mi eservani karmani (?) Hey I love this, you know; it remembered me.

Y: Just a little bit of Lila history. When Dr. Baker and Dr. Seeley and Dr. Lucas who was another one of my students, in 1991 we were ready to print that booklet on "The Basis of Physics."

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: And we thought this would really revolutionize the world. Well, in a way, yes, but they are still developing. But John Lucas suggested that the local newspaper ought to be told about this discovery.

B: Yes.

Y: I said, "Well, if you want to go ahead and write something up and give them a press release." And this is it.

When ask what physicists, theologians and psychologists in general think of this discovery, Mr Berner replied, "That it is difficult for them to assess it. Only a rare academic would risk a comment about a discovery that was partly out his or her specialty. If enough people hear about this discovery a few qualified experts will step forward and give their views. No journal of physics, psychology or theology will publish our materials. What is needed is a new discipline that embraces and even transcends both science and religion."

B: Yes.

Y: And then for more information, John Lucas's telephone number, 1991.

B: It was published? It was in papers or not?

Y: Yes, it was in the Mount Barker something or other.

Don: And his phone rang off the hook.

Y: They were afraid not to publish it. It is just a little paragraph announcing that we discovered what an electron really is and what its mass and charge are. Nobody paid any attention to it at all. What he said was correct.

B: As you said, their attention has possibility just for short. This is the capacity for their attention...

Don: Yeah. And that was it.

Y: If want something to do at night, what is this about. And here is a summary; I think you might be interested. You can have that if you want.

B: Ah, thank you so much. The Play of the Gods.

Creation: By knowing some of the other Gods, we become conscious through them of the others that they know.

You know what this universe is? A whole universe should originate itself into a state of knowledge of another whole universe. Isn't it the same?

Y: That it is.

B:

By knowing some of the others God, we become conscious through them of the others that they know.

Y: Yes.

B: We need just one arrow, Arjuna's arrow, in order to know all that Gods know.

Y: And a lot of people work that way. They have one arrow and if anything goes other than what they want, they just pull it in. And they go to sleep and unconscious; and then they try it again. Well, not to bad this morning. Opps!

B: I survived.

And by that via, experience others appearing to be units of matter in a complex network of time/space and energy. Creation.

Evolution: By knowing more and more of the other Gods, we gradually evolve the network into stars, galaxies, planets, and eventually bodies with which some of us non-physical God individual identify.

Ah, it is great, the paradox, stars, galaxies, planets, and eventually bodies with which some of us non-physical God individual identify.

Completion: If we continue knowing more God's until everyone knows everyone else, a perfect symmetry in the relationships between us will form dissolving the illusion of the physicalness of the world and exposing that it is really us.

You know, the...this morning when I...I was pondering in very similar...you know, lines of thinking because here when you just look at this, it is not that this baby universe is in...There are connections. It is not enough to just have one arrow connected to one baby universe with another. It is not enough; you have still have empty spaces in the matrix. You should have the other way around also.

Y: Yes.

B: Symmetry, a perfect symmetry in the relationship because I have written here, it is asymmetric; it is asymmetric, but it should be symmetric. In order to have...

Y: Restore the symmetry.

B: To have unity.

Y: I was going to save the world with this. That's when I was into saving the world. Now, peace. If it saves the world fine; if it doesn't fine; everything is all right. I don't know, Punita, what you remember when you wrote this. It is not dated, so I don't know when you wrote it. It was some while ago.

B: (Acknowledges) You are just Einstein. This is the view of Einstein. He doesn't like probability. He was always against quantum physics because of its probability.

Don: (Points something out)

B: Aha, beauty.

Don: Now, I was just thinking about this as something to bring up to you. And it has to do with the same thing that I was thinking about there. If...in the graph theory in a scale free network moving the distribution of nodes from the Poisson distribution over to a power law distribution, that is...You explain in terms of preferential attachment.

Y: Yes.

Don: And so, I was wondering if you had any thoughts on what that preferential attachment was. Like one thing I propose here is based on the number of in-bound or out-bound arches, the degree. But another thing, just looking at attention, it would appear that having an indirect connection increase having the probability for a direct connection to a node.

Y: It does. In Biblical terms, it is called Jacob's ladder. Even though it is full of illusion due to the indirect connection because you are still in the state of no knowledge of them, it is still better because partial truth and eventually it...The whole thing snowballs; and everybody will rush to the end. We could be getting close.

Don: Yeah but just in terms of explaining like on our graph how we get from this distribution.

Y: Yes.

Don: To this one, if we just say, "Well, if a person is...Individual A is in this situation , Individual A is more likely to attach to C than to D.

Y: Yes.

Don: Though that indirectness.

B: Yes.

Y: Yes.

Don: That would be enough to get us from here to here.

Y: But it would have to be the A, B, C.

Don: Yes. Yeah, but that's why...if you accept someone who is...you know, you have got someone out here like this...

Y: But the final goal that I was talking about is that we are all up here. We are all this way so the line moves back this way when everyone starts to accept everyone.

Don: Yes.

Y: Ok.

Don: Yeah, yeah, but...

Y: I am not arguing with you. That is a good. That is a valid reason for it being skewed.

Don: I am just trying to explain it as we look here at network theory in correlating it to the underlying reality making our acceptance of another. You know, because...you know they are in scale free networks in life. They have this form, this power law distribution. And it is a consequence of the likelihood of attaching to a node you are already indirectly attached to and so increasing like that. Am I making sense here?

B: Yes, yes. It is most probable to attach to something you already know partially.

Don: It's the probability also...would it be the degree of out-bound arches? So one is more likely to accept Christ than Joe at the bar?

Y: Well, if that is what you see happening, there are a lot more Christians than there are drunks.

Don: Well, people don't go around worshipping drunks usually. Very few do.

Y: Well, a lot of drunks are actually fairly available.

Don: Yeah.

Y: My mother was one of them.

Don: But again, it would be a way of correlating with the network evolution mathematics.

Y: Yes.

Don: With the underlying reality of Lila.

Y: The Messiah is like a Jacob's ladder.

[1:28:54](#)

Don: But I open (?) an tractor that one would prefer.

Y: That's just another way of saying the same thing. That's the way you see it.

Don: Ok.

Y: And that's a valid way.

Don: Thank you.

Y: I just thought you would be interested in that.

Don: Thank you.

Y: And I heard what you had to say about it. And I think we'll use it. Now, here is one. This is the essence of George Berkeley with regards to Lila Paradigm. Born in 1685, died in 1753.

Immaterialism is denying that there is any possibility of inert mindless material substance.

So he says, there is no possibility mindless inert material substance.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: Berkeley fundamentally...his fundamental view was that for something to exist, it must be either.

One: be perceived or Two: be the active being that does the perceiving.

That is minds or spirits,

Which will

That is use their will

and perceive.

So he says there are two kinds of existence: that is, if it perceived and that which perceives it. So he is close; but he is partly wrong. Then he says:

Material only exists in the mind of the perceiving immaterial spirit.

That is the essence of Berkeley, right there. I was disappointed to find out that he considered that when something is perceived that...He explains it by saying, that it's the mind of God one is perceiving. Well, this is partly correct. According to the Lila Paradigm... is that this whole network of states of knowledge and states of no knowledge is like the mind of God, and that one connects to it and is aware or conscious of all the patterns as the physical realm. And then I wrote a thing here called Enlightenment.

Enlightenment is consciousness of a state of direct knowledge of yourself as you truly are.

That's out of the manual.

B: Yes, it is the manual.

Y: That's when I wrote it. And this was typed up and put in the manual. But McTaggart was a philosopher. Interesting name, his name is John McTaggart Ellis McTaggart. Just like a Scotsman to be called McTaggart McTaggart. I find his stuff useless. He was supposed to be an idealist. I am just going through these notes to see if there is anything that we have missed that would be important to talk over. You can see how much I have been over it all. This is right out of the Sanskrit dictionary. First of all, it is a long i. Li long i is not Liela. It is leela. So it is a long i and a long a. So it's Lila (leela) and in Sanskrit there is no accent. There always say everything equally accented.

B: Equanimity.

Y: Lila is a female noun, and it means play, sport, diversion, amusement, pastime, mire sport, mire play, child's play, ease, or facility in doing anything. So it's the ability to do anything is the base underlying meaning of Lila. Anything that can be done the Li and the La can do it.

B: Yes, and it is also correct not just for individuals, but for whole universe.

Y: Yes.

B: Which this *Mathematica* shows. This is not enough; this also should be true.

Y: And it is.

B: Yes.

Y: One can do that. It's up to F.

B: Yes.

Y: But he can be in a state of knowledge of anyone, doesn't matter which one. But if it was some loner out here, and he did that one, not much would happen. So something seem like a big glorious deal, the light of the universe turn on or ah, it's just another guy.

B: In to the circuit.

Y: The root meaning of Li is to cling or press closely, merged. It is from the root re, that is R sub dot long i. And La is to take or receive to obtain. The act of taking or giving, to undertake to begin. Those are the various meanings of La. It is the receptive.

B: The receptive.

Y: That which is known.

B: Shiva and Shakti.

Y: Shiva and Shakti same thing.

B: They are both omniscience, so to say. They are both everything; but in their infinity. In their one Omnipotence, they choose to be a male or a female aspect; but they are both, both.

Y: Yes, this is in the separated form. You put them together you get Lila.

B: Lila, yes.

Y: And that's your true nature.

B: Yes.

Y: You are both. You can give or receive.

B: Known and the knower.

Don: Can't separate the dot and the arrow.

B: Hum?

Don: You can't separate the node and the arrow.

B: (Acknowledges) Yes.

Y: These are some of the patterns of connections that form the different sense organs in the brain, the base pattern of them. Like this is vision and that reflects. That is based upon the threes of the patterns of Lila. This is the olfactory; it's like this, simple. It was the earliest to evolve as a sense of olfaction. This says taste; this is how the tongue works, the nerves in the tongue and in the eye. What does this say?

B: Hearing.

Y: Hearing.

B: Plus equilibrium.

Y: Yes.

B: Sensory motor.

Y: And here I am writing out the patterns. And this is touch, very simple. The whole subject of the biological forms and all that I have not developed very much. That is just the beginning (?) at that kind of thing. Ok. Here is another attempt to try to...

[1:39:59](#)

B: Aha!

Y: This is B himself; and this is the actual C; and this is the state A gets in to the various states. But then, I got to leave... just started leaving this out and just talk about this. But it really gets into a tangle. You see some of this in Radical Theory. It's not clear enough.

One perceives a physical thing; one knows a relation; one perceives or observes say an electron. One does not perceive say a beam of light. You can't see light like you can't see space. Ok, that's that folder. So we don't have to go through that again. We brought out Punita's idea about scale free type of pattern of connections. But why should someone make such choices?

Don: Survival.

Y: Ok. Then we are on the same page.

Don: Yeah. And that's why people don't go too far.

Y: Yes.

Don: And why it stays.

Y: Because they think they cannot survive because they think they're something that was built rather than being the Ultimate.

B: They are closing somehow.

Y: Yes.

Don: Even if just...

B: They don't want an unknown.

Don: Attachment to any state and not wanting to...

B: Ah, yes.

Y: Yes.

Don: Have a transition...

B: (?)

[1:43:02](#)

Don: To another state. Yeah, so it's...

Y: I'll show them; they can't cut me off. I cut off before they cut me off. That happened just yesterday.

Darshana: Twice. It happened with me too.

Y: Yeah, but you came back.

Darshana: I was just getting the emotional feel and reflecting in it, I think.

Y: Ok. We'll take a break now.

(End of formal session)

B: Ok, thank you. By contemplating, discovered the connection between the unmanifested and the manifested. So the desire is the connection between unmanifested and manifested. For instance, Picasso who does not paint is not Picasso. He's the...you paint, you know, your desire to do it. I mean in positive connotation, to create is the connection between unmanifested and manifested. This is how God created the world out of desire. Your picture does not exist; but your desire makes it exist. So the desire is the connection between unmanifested and manifested. Ah! Yes, it is desire.

Darshana: A knows C; but A doesn't know C, so A desires C.

B: (Acknowledges) Yes, yes. Yes, that should be included. By...

Y: It works negatively to like, "I don't want to be sick." And so one tries to not be ill or in pain. And as a result, one is in pain because one is attached to not having the pain. My attachment, I have two attachments: one is to share the Lila Paradigm and the other one is to watch the world fall apart because I figure it is time for that, for the dissolution at the end of a *Kalpa*.

B: Ah, yes, in 2012, as you mentioned.

Y: Yes, just five more years.

Don: We gotta get busy.

Darshana: Right after the...

B: Ah, yes...to settle our things.

Darshana: After our article is published, it will fall apart in five years.

B: Or just postponed the article and go to sleep; and then, it is illusion.