

#46
Formal talk-09112006 Afternoon day20
Lila recording day 20, afternoon
09/11/2006
091106001,
1 Hr 38 min
[Recording 46](#)

Y: Self...where the A is... originating itself in a state of knowledge of itself.

I want to check the wording and the diagram.

We have A itself,

I don't think that's any problem.

A ontological or its own attributes,

Then

A's state of direct knowledge based on A's ontological attributes,

I think that is all right, then

A's state of the likeness of a attribute in A's states of knowledge based on A with an ontological attribute of A itself.

I have two problems with that one. One is, which is minor, that it says,

An attribute

And yet all attributes are indicated by the diagram of the...what is that a parallelogram? No, it's not a parallelogram. Well, it is.

Don: It is partly. No, it's not a parallelogram. It's a...

B: Hexagonal.

Don: Hexagon, it's an extended (?)

Y: All right, that's a hexagon, Ok.

Darshana: We could just say:

Like all four attributes.

Y: A's

Darshana: A's state of likeness with all four attributes.

Y: Instead

Of an attribute.

Don: I had thought of just having it

Likeness of the attributes based on/with A's ontological attributes.

Y: What does Biljana say?

B: Ah, yes. Plural is better. Maybe:

Appropriate to know that...

Y: The attributes.

B: The attributes in a state of knowledge based on A with the appropriate ontological attributes of A itself.

Y: It would have to be

Appropriate

Otherwise, it just says anyone with any other one. And they are not alike.

B: (Acknowledges) Yes.

Darshana: Or

Each of the attributes with the corresponding or appropriate...

B: Corresponding, maybe.

Don: Yeah.

B: Instead of appropriate, corresponding.

Y: So write that in, Punita.

Don: How about this?

A state of likeness of each attribute in A's state of knowledge based on A with the corresponding ontological attribute of A itself.

Y: Right, that's good.

Darshana: Yes.

Y: That's the easy one to solve. My other, which is a major concern, is the...this comparison...this state of likeness...that state...I have said that what consciousness is. And you are not saying that.

Don: (Acknowledges)

Y: So, you're saying that this box down here is a state of A's consciousness of itself.

Darshana: I think he decided that that box was actually the combination of the consciousness and the knowledge. Didn't you say?

Don: Yes, that is what it is. That's what I believe it is. But the problem I had is what Yogeshwar just brought up. Is that we have defined consciousness as the likeness. We haven't defined it as the likeness with the knowledge and the states of no knowledge taken into consideration.

Darshana: Well, it's not is it? I thought that consciousness was just the original likeness. And if you combine the consciousness and the knowledge you have an overall state. But it is not a conscious state, I don't believe.

Y: It is a modified conscious state.

Don: But that is the consciousness state that we are aware of. As ...is my understanding.

Darshana: (Acknowledges)

Don: It is that one in the white box.

Darshana: That's because we are not distinguishing between conscious and knowledge in our overall state, perhaps.

Y: Well...

Don: I see it somewhat differently.

Darshana: It could be thought either way. It is up to you Yogeshwar, I think.

Y: A's state of the likeness. It's the state of the likeness is what consciousness is.

Don: But then, how does the knowledge and the no-knowledge enter into the picture as?

Y: Well, there is no knowledge in this case.

Don: No, in this case, there is not.

Y: A is in a state of knowledge of itself; and that's that.

Don: Yes.

Y: So in this simple example of self-consciousness...

Don: Well then, in matter then we run into a problem because we don't have a symmetry between the knowledge and...

Y: Well, we can take care of that when we get to it.

Don: Ok.

Y: That's what I am thinking. Now if I have overlooked something...Now you've got another note here which is labelling the dotted line, dotted area, the ellipse, A's direct knowledge of itself compared with it's consciousness of itself. I haven't even thought about that.

Don: I took that off of your diagram here.

Y: Yeah. Well, that's after I am explaining space. And I am not sure that it is involved here in consciousness. I think it does something else. That comparison is made because any combination of states or ontological attributes produces a...reduces to a state. But it would be a state.

B: Because if we have agreed that consciousness is likeness, then this likeness should also be recognised on this upper level where we have combine of state of knowledge and consciousness. We should somehow have likeness here also. Even though we name it an overall state of consciousness in which we have combination of consciousness and direct knowledge or something else. We should have, once again, or maybe not...just subsumption of the states. We have ontological attributes on one level, then direct knowledge of the ontological attributes on the same level, so to speak. And then we have likeness between them, likeness between them... which is consciousness.

Y: And then the consciousness...

B: Now, this is consciousness. This is consciousness, and this combined with the direct knowledge.

Y: That must be enlightenment.

B: Yes. And we have another state which is either enlightenment or how...we shall...

Y: There is a comparison.

B: Define it.

Y: But that comparison is covered by the likeness that is the comparison.

B: Is your problem?

Y: Direct knowledge of itself compared with consciousness of itself. In addition...

Darshana: Is your problem how to make particles individual without... You have to have knowledge be a part of it because otherwise it wouldn't be B •. It would just be dot.

Y: That's not a problem. It's a solution as it turns out. But when we are working on the self, there is on particles.

Darshana: Right. Well, my idea is that maybe the reason the particles are individual, each one is just that one. Basically it is based on 'whoness.' But it doesn't need knowledge of 'whoness' because you have the structure. It tells you it's just that one because it's got this arrow going to it.

Y: Yeah.

Darshana: So you don't really need to have knowledge of B's 'whoness' in order to get B be an individual particle of different.

Y: What you say may be true, but that's not the matter under discussion.

Darshana: We are trying to discuss what's this about self-consciousness.

Don: Well, to me the issue is: Does knowledge enter into a determination of the state of consciousness or is it solely based on the state of likeness.

Y: I think the consciousness is based solely on the state of likeness. However, there is another state here which is due to the unity of the...A's state of direct consciousness of itself and the conscious state that is the ellipse here, the dotted ellipse.

Darshana: A's state of direct knowledge of itself.

Y: A's direct knowledge of itself combined with its consciousness of itself.

Don: (Acknowledges)

Y: And...I suspect it has something that we have been calling enlightened, enlightenment state. It reinforces all four attributes. Consciousness. Direct knowledge is not consciousness. So what is that state? It's the truth; it is what it is.

Darshana: Don't forget, it hasn't got anything left out of it. It's the...it's everything that is going on.

Y: Consciousness of truth which is enlightenment. That's pretty close.

B: May...?

Y: Yes.

B: Maybe it will help if we compare this state when we have a state of consciousness of self, of A, to the situation when we also have state of direct knowledge of A, but through the other individuals in circuit, to compare these two and see the difference.

Y: Well, that is very different. Now is A...is not in a state of direct knowledge of itself there, is that right?

B: It is not...

Y: It's not in a state of direct knowledge of itself.

B: Yes. It is in a state of indirect direct knowledge.

Y: Yes.

14:19

B: My idea was (?).

Y: Well, I think it is different.

B: It is different?

Y: Because there is...this doesn't exist.

B: Yes, it is different. But still it has some knowledge of self.

Y: Yes, he does.

B: Only through the other. And to see exactly what is the difference...

Y: But he is also in a state of no direct knowledge of himself. That would be different.

B: Yes, I know it would be different. I meant to see exactly...maybe...

Y: Well, I think that is...the difference is that he is in a state of direct knowledge of himself via the others. And he is also in a state of no-direct knowledge of himself. And those two are combined into a single state; and we can put a label on it.

Don: (Acknowledges)

B: But is there not also consciousness through the others? Now, since you introduce a new element and this is combining also the consciousness which was not existed in the previous picture, now you introduced into the picture another element besides the likeness of attributes and the states of direct knowledge. Now that you introduced consciousness...

Y: He is in state (?)

15:37

B: Isn't it also a new ingredient into the picture, a new state?

Y: Yes, he is in a state.

B: A new state combined with all this?

Y: Yes. He is in a state of consciousness of himself. And he is also in a state of no knowledge of himself which is combined with that...

B: Yes. Ok.

Y: It's combined with the state of consciousness of himself. And so it is a diminished...

B: It is diminished. Ok. The state of no knowledge diminishes.

Y: Wherein, this one...it's reinforced.

Don: If we took this and just substituted A for C, we would have something approximating that. Although...

B: Yes, exactly.

Don: Who knows what this is?

B: Yes, if we have A to B to A.

Y: I get your point.

Don: You know, it is just ...we get that no-knowledge and the combination somehow.

Y: Yes, I got that.

Don: Somehow.

Y: I have got it.

B: A to B to A.

Y: No, that's different.

B: Oh, I see the difference.

Y: Because in this one, A is in a state of knowledge of B. We have got to have at least C.

B: But C we replaced by A in order to see the point of having self...a state of consciousness of self and this one. My idea was to compare; and you explained...Ok you here...We have state of no knowledge which is different. But now, in the new picture when we introduce also consciousness which is now a new ingredient...

17:44

Y: Yes, consciousness of/for (?) itself...

B: We should put the finger on the differences exactly between this and this.

Y: And I said the difference is...that is conscious.

B: Yes, yes, I know.

Y: Of himself is somehow diminished...

B: Yes.

Y: In which respect? What would be the label? Correct label is a good question. I like the other one which is...

It's consciousness-knowledge.

I like the dash consciousness-knowledge of ones self for this one.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: But for that one, just consciousnesses.

B: Just consciousness.

Y: It would be consciousness no knowledge.

Don: But isn't that just ordinary consciousness? Both those factors are taken into account in ones earliest (?) experience.

18:41

Y: Is which one? We talked about two things.

Don: (Acknowledges) Either one. Whether it is consciousness-knowledge or consciousness no-knowledge, it subsumes to the single state we call ordinary consciousness whether it is dimmed or brightened. That is the conscious state one is in.

Y: Yeah. But one is a dim consciousness of yourself; and the other one is bright.

Don: Yes, that's just because of the elements that went into that projection.

Y: Yes, of course. And it's a matter of whether we want to put a label on it, or just describe it.

Don: (Acknowledges) To me that is consciousness. It takes both into account. And this other state without the knowledge is something like proto-consciousness. Or, that hasn't had it added in yet because we are never in that state.

Y: I see your point.

Don: At an Enlightenment Intensive, I get my enlightenment experience. I am conscious of that and people...everybody knows it because of the grin and everything. And when I am dull I'm...everybody knows that too.

B: Still consciousness of the...

Don: Still...and due to these two...the subsumption of two different underlying sub-states.

Y: Well, that's why I was favouring consciousness-(dash) direct knowledge; consciousness-(dash) no-direct knowledge... that combined state.

Don: I understand.

Y: But you just want to call it consciousness; and I don't.

Don: And have that underlying sameness be something else, proto-consciousness or unqualified, or something; some with some adjective on it.

B: Lower, lower kind of consciousness.

Don: Sub-consciousness.

B: Tacit.

Y: I think the sub-conscious is closer to direct knowledge.

Don: I know I am...

Y: It is a silent tacit knowledge.

Don: Yeah, but...to me, it's the state we are in...is this white box. I mean, that is what we are describing as consciousness, the end result of it all.

Y: Well, I have understood what you are saying. And repeating it isn't going to get me to forget (?) it any better.

21:50

Don: I apologize.

Y: I am going by what I subjectively experience. And you were talking about what you subjectively experience.

B: Yes. I am conscious that I am conscious.

22:07

Y: Yes. I was thinking of the word, "I am myself." I am a unitary existence who acts, not just a unitary existence or as (?)...Not just a unitary existence, but I'm unitary. But I'm a unitary. Is that what he is conscious of? Because we have two things: We have the consciousness of the content of this state of direct knowledge of himself which is a unitary existence who acts. But we also have the state itself, not its likeness, but its ontological self, but its state itself of himself. So I am a unitary

existence who acts. We have got two individuals there. I'm...I am and a unitary existence who acts combined into one or projected on each other.

B: Yes.

Y: We're seeing the same thing here somehow. That's interesting.

Don: Yeah, to me, on the one hand...

Y: We have stirred up a swarm of bees here.

Don: See? On the one hand, we are describing enlightenment; and on the other, we are describing ordinary consciousness.

Y: Yes. And it is enlightenment because it's on oneself. So it is reinforced. So there is two. There's...

Darshana: If you carry it on to $A \rightarrow B \bullet$, $A \rightarrow B \bullet \rightarrow C$ though, you still get the combining of the knowledge and not enlightenment.

Don: That's right.

Y: It's not enlightenment; and it will be described differently. *I am*.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: Now, that is a projection of A's direct knowledge of itself compared with it's consciousness of itself. Hey, now the words fit!

B: (Acknowledges) You have comparison and likeness somehow.

Y: Parenthesis (self enlightenment).

B: Yes.

Y: Now, that may work. This may work with regard to the next one.

Don: Good, let's find out.

Y: We didn't do much changes.

Y: I am still not quite sure what projection is. But I can understand how, *I am* and a unitary existence who acts is a comparison which could be called a projection.

Matter: $A \rightarrow B$. We have A itself and A's ontological attributes. And we have A ontological attributes based on B's ontological attributes which are over here on some other piece of paper somewhere. B is not there. Well, B's up here, Ok. Then we have our hexagon, A's consciousness. It might me better if it were put up here. People are going to read down the paper.

A consciousness of a physical particle, A's state of the likeness of attributes in A's state of knowledge based on B with the ontological attributes of A itself.

B: Corresponding.

Y: Corresponding attributes.

Don: (Acknowledges)

Y: Of the...now the ellipse B •. Now there's a problem: A's state of consciousness of a physical matter particle, a proto-fermion. But they are not conscious of the B part. They are conscious of the dot part. But they are conscious that it is unique. Are they conscious that it is unique? Or do they just know that's unique? This is the problem that Spinoza has.

B: (Acknowledges)

Darshana: It has a unique place in the net that makes it unique. It has a unique place in the net because of everyone's arrows...

Y: Because of the structure, you are talking about?

Darshana: Yeah.

Y: But to B, it is not conscious of B as B or any attribute of B, of the 'who' B is, of the existence, unity, and ability to interact that could be true of just a dot. If we take the B out and make a bigger dot, it is a projection of A's direct consciousness of B compared with its consciousness of a physical particle.

Darshana: As long as there is no other particle in it, he is not going to have any difference because there is no other structure going...

Y: Yeah, but it will be that particle.

Darshana: If there is no other particle in the universe, will it still be that particle?

Y: Yes, I think so.

Don: I do to.

Darshana: I don't.

Y: And I think he is just what he is doing here which is correct, A's direct knowledge of B compared with its consciousness of A as physical particle.

Darshana: Well, it will be that particle; but will his consciousness include that particle?

Don: I think so. And I think it is necessary to get space.

Y: But is it B •? Or...

Darshana: But in space you have got a comparison in time; you got a comparison too.

Don: Yes, but there has to be the knowledge that this is different than this to compare them.

Darshana: It's the arrows that make it different.

B: And the 'who' also which is the attribute.

Y: Well, we'll get to that...

Darshana: OK.

Y: ...in an orderly managed procedure. And we'll see if it holds up or not. I am not sure about the order here. Commenting... A's state of consciousness of a physical matter particle proto-fermion that find A is a projection of A's direct knowledge of B compared with its consciousness of A, physical particle. So if we emphasize

a proto-fermion or a physical matter particle.

But we haven't said that it is a unitary existence that acts. That's not included here. And it should be included in the box, I think. That's what he is conscious of.

Don: So put that content in the box?

Y: I think so.

Don: Ok.

Y: I am going to see if it works.

A unitary existence that acts.

Now does the B belong in there?

Darshana: That is based on B. He would know that because he knows B. And he is conscious of the particle and a combination of them is (entirely) based on B.

Y: He knows the B and the two together.

Darshana: That is based on B.

32:11

Y: But B • doesn't say it is based on him (?). It's going to have to say that then.

That is based on B.

Now you have it based on B over here.

Don: To me...

Y: We should have separated the B from the dot.

Don: (Acknowledges)

Y: You were saying?

Don: Well, to me the difference between the hexagon and the box is in the hexagon is just a physical particle. In the box, it is a unique physical particle. It is that physical particle.

Y: In this example, in the hexagon it is *the* physical particle. It is the only one. It is the physical particle. Soon as you have another one, you have a different structure. And you've got a different...itself that particular one.

B: Well, we don't have another one.

Darshana: No.

Don: Yeah, but I still think the quality of being... that in the box, it is based B due to the knowledge of B that it is a unique physical particle. That, that's additive, what the knowledge adds.

Y: Not sure what the word you unique means.

Darshana: Not like any other.

Don: Yes.

Darshana: That's certainly true in case because there aren't any others.

Y: Not in this example.

B: There are only it is not in direct knowledge, of them.

Y: Say it a gain.

B: I say, there are, of course, other also non-physical individuals. But it is...A is in state of direct knowledge of this one which is a unique relation. It is a unique relation, A in state of direct knowledge of B.

Darshana: Right. Yes, it's the relation. Every relation is unique from one particular individual to another particular individual.

Don: But that is the state of knowledge.

Darshana: Of that individual.

Don: Yes.

B: Now we have consciousness plus.

Don: It is just another way of saying state of knowledge.

Darshana: Right. Each state of knowledge is unique.

B: Ah, yes, when you say state you...

Don: Yes, but...

Darshana: Which means that each particle is unique.

Don: But within the hexagon, we don't know that.

Darshana: True.

Don: And that's why the subsumption of the state of knowledge and the state of consciousness in the hexagon adds some quality.

Darshana: Yes, I agree, but not a conscious quality necessarily.

Y: I have a question. Does this line go on to the hexagon? I just can't see it.

Don: Yes. Yeah, it does.

Y: I can almost see it.

Don: Yeah. I'll...

Y: It is not obvious.

Don: I'll make it better. It does go on to the hexagon. I caught that ...someone else, but missed that one.

Y: Now, what is A's state of consciousness of a physical matter particle, a proto-fermion which *is* a projection of direct knowledge of B compared with its consciousness of a physical particle? It is pretty good, a unitary existence that acts that is based on B, big •. I am going to separate the B from the dot. It is based on B, • (B comma space Dot). I think that will work.

Don: My problem is still that I cannot in the description of the square, the white square, tell the difference between that state and the hexagon state.

B: (Acknowledges)

Don: And thus...I mean one could add a part of the square, white square, state a particular particle.

Y: Well, you said that it is a projection.

Don: Yes.

Darshana: And a comparison of these two.

Don: Yes, but what does that result in that is different than what we had in the hexagon?

Darshana: You know that that particle is based on B; you know that.

Y: It's that knowledge.

Don: So should we say a particular physical matter particle.

Darshana: Or that one.

Y: I call it that, I said

A unitary existence that acts that is based on B, •.

Don: That is...Ok, so the B-ness of it is the...

Y: I have got that in the box. Oh! That's what you have got there.

Don: Yeah. So the B-ness. So...

Y: The that-ness.

Don: Ok, yeah, the that-ness. In the description it will read

A's state of consciousness of a physical matter particle based on B.

Darshana: I don't think that's right though.

Y: That's what you have over here.

Darshana: Yeah.

Don: Yes.

Darshana: Because it's not a new state of consciousness. It is just combination of the knowledge and the consciousness.

Don: Yes, but it is still...the words should differ from what we are saying over here.

Darshana: Oh yeah, definitely.

Don: Somehow.

Darshana: It has to be different?

Darshana: Yeah.

Don: We have to have added something; otherwise, they are going to be conflated.

Darshana: Very true.

Y: Well, we could take the 'based on B' off over here.

Don: Out of the box? Oh, the based on...

Y: I am considering that.

Don: Well, no, that's the state of knowledge based on B which is correct, based on B.

Darshana: Yes, that's correct.

Y: So then, it should be all right.

Don: (Acknowledges)

Darshana: Except maybe for the state of consciousness because that is what is confusing. Here is the state of consciousness; this is a combination.

Y: I can't hear you.

Darshana: Here is the state of consciousness; but here is the combination of the state of consciousness and your state of knowledge.

Don: (Acknowledges)

Y: Yes.

Darshana: We know that it is based on B. That is the only difference.

Don: So is...for the ordinary guy sitting in bar watching his footy game, is this his state of consciousness or is this one that we are describing?

Darshana: Well, if he is accepting B its...Well, his state of consciousness and knowledge mixed in this.

Don: But...

Darshana: And it is a part of it, his knowledge is part of it.

Don: I know that; but just what are we going to call it?

Darshana: A combined state. The B combined state.

Y: I called it a unitary existence that acts that is based on B.

Darshana: Is the state of it the particle?

Don: I am talking about the state. To me we are describing ordinary consciousness with this box.

Darshana: I don't think so because most people aren't aware of their knowledge very much; it is so in the background.

Don: Yes, but they still know that, that is a particular particle.

Darshana: Yes, but I think because of the structures we will have to talk about that later.

Y: What structure?

Darshana: Well, there isn't one yet.

Y: A arrow B.

Darshana: After you get $A \rightarrow B \bullet \rightarrow C$ you have.

Y: But we are not there.

Darshana: I know, so never mind. So I can't answer you till we get there.

Don: I think it is...inherent in the subsumption is that identity of the ordinary state of consciousness is not (?). It's that one.

Darshana: I still disagree.

Y: And you want to call it something?

Don: Well, I just...that...

Y: You want to call it ordinary consciousness?

Don: I think that is what we are describing.

Y: How is that different from consciousness?

Don: Well, that's where I had the problem with it originally. And that's why I thought this had to be called a proto-consciousness or something to differentiate it. Or...

B: For instance, when you have...

Don: Basic consciousness.

Y: We'll take her.

B: When you have a direct knowledge...but you don't have any now. You don't work anymore on another human being. You have just what I am now, the difference

between 'who I am' and 'what I am.' Maybe shows something, the difference between 'who I am' and 'what I am.' Maybe, maybe not.

Don: What I wrote up yesterday, Yogeshwar, about...I thought it would work...about the projection of this difference is this quality. I have handed you a little sheet.

Y: (Acknowledges)

Don: It said that the projection of the difference between who A is and who B is in B's state of knowledge projects into consciousness as the uniqueness of that particle.

Y: Yes, and I think that's exactly what this says.

A unitary existence that acts that is based on B.

That's the uniqueness quality.

Don: I agree. It is just a matter...if we call this ordinary consciousness, what is this? Or if this is ordinary consciousness? To me, this one...the box describes ordinary consciousness, so.

Y: Or overall, ordinary...

Darshana: You see ordinary (sounds)...

Y: Sounds so ordinary.

Don: I am just using that to identify what we are talking about. It is not an enlightened state or anything other than...

B: Yes, yes. But higher than just...

Y: That's why I was suggesting...

B: ...the basic level.

Y: Consciousness dash knowledge. You could put a label on it; but it could be called overall or projected knowledge.

Don: Overall.

Y: Or projected.

Darshana: Overall state.

Y: Overall is a good possibility.

Darshana: Overall is good.

Don: Overall is one. I considered that.

Darshana: If you have an ordinary guy in the bar, he is conscious of many, many particles. He only has maybe one of two knowledge states of his own. Now that's the important.

Y: First you have to get into no man's land. And then you can isolate this situation. It makes up a lot beer particles.

Don: I have familiarity with that aspect of it.

Y: Ok.

Don: Overall is good.

B: Overall, yes, like higher than ordinary.

Y: Overall works for me too.

Don: (Acknowledges)

Y: Could you fix these up?

Don: Yes.

Y: And then tomorrow, we will go at it. And maybe we will get it.

Don: Yes, and I'll...

Y: And then we can worry about the next one.

Don: Yeah. Well, I am going to apply, then, those principles to the next one.

Y: To time.

Don: Yeah. And then we can look at that.

Y: Yes, right.

Don: And I think then it does come out because then we have...

Y: We'll do that then.

Don: Yeah. As I said, these are sub-states of consciousness, if you will, the hexagons

Y: Yes.

Don: And they combine into an overall state of consciousness.

Darshana: Overall state of consciousness or overall state of consciousness plus knowledge. See? We are having overall state is one thing; overall state of consciousness is another.

Don: I think it is just overall state of consciousness. We'll work...when we get to that tomorrow, we can work on it.

Y: Right, Ok.

Don: Thank you.

Darshana: Your point about who and what, he does distinguish if you have $A \rightarrow B$ because...

B: Yes, yes.

Darshana: What is the same; who is different. So that's...

B: Yes. Identity and quality.

Darshana: Yeah.

Y: Now did you have anything you wanted to bring up this session?

B: No. I remembered then previously it was a question. Experience directly the other human being. And I have an idea to go back. Enlightenment on the other human being and being conscious of the other human being. But then I remembered then we have crossed that actually. It was my idea in the bedroom when I made that statement.

Y: I was thinking of anything else on what you know, what you are expert at and its tie in's with Lila, other than what you discussed this morning. Did you have anything else or not? If not, I have got something else.

B: We haven't finished Gödel if this is one way to proceed. The other may be about Einstein, Podolsky, Rosen experiment, to recognize, for instance, when I introduce contextual properties.

Y: Which properties?

B: Contextual properties of material objects.

Y: Contextual.

B: And informational properties. Now, we should decide in terms of Lila, for instance, when this mistake begins. When do we mix them? At which particular moment in science, we mix informational properties of particles? For instance, which is why they are here for, and they're contextual properties which is the context in which we put them with our experiments.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: At a certain point in science, we made this mistake, this confusion. And maybe we should decide when this happens. For instance, when we are measuring this table with a meter, this is a clear comparison of the proto, so to say; Proto product or what is it. We have like...like an example of a meter which is held in Paris in this, and this observatory under the pressure of one atmosphere. And we say, "This is our measurement. This meter is one meter for all."

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: So this is a clearly defined system. And then when we are comparing this meter with this table, we say this table is long two meters. And this is a clear statement, two meters. We don't have here any confusion. But when we introduce a conscious observer into the picture, then the problem begins. And maybe we should exactly state.

Y: Well, I thought that it was implied here that there is a conscious observer. Otherwise, there is just a stick next to a table and there is no measurement.

B: Yes, the comparison itself includes the consciousness element.

Y: Yes.

B: Maybe we should talk more about this Einstein, Podolsky, Rosen experiment then. Although generally...a general statement could be made that when we make an assumption for the non-physical nature of consciousness, the problem is resolved as a general statement.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: We could make it more particular, more determined, maybe by introducing this Einstein, Podolsky, Rosen experiment, and where is the mistake, where is the paradox.

Y: Good.

B: And whether it is a paradox at all.

Y: That's a good idea.

B: So in this Einstein, Podolsky, Rosen experiment in the interpretation of David Bohm which is slightly closer to what an average reader would understand, the original experiment of Einstein is slightly different. So in David Bohm interpretation, we have two particles, two photons, for instance, which were in interaction. And they are going apart one from the other at the speed of light.

Y: But they are already entangled.

B: They are already entangled, yes. This means they are described with one and single proxy wave, one in the single Schrödinger's equation of a Proxy wave.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: And as Amrit Go Swami calls them in his *Self-Aware Universe*, he has names for them; the one is Joe and the other Moe. And now the experiment...and now this *Gedankenexperiment*, which is a thought experiment, says if we measure Joe after a year, Moe is one light year distant, 101 light year distant somewhere in the Milky Way galaxy. And when we measure Joe, for instance, and we measure that its spin is plus one half, then because the overall angular moment should be one, we know all at once that Moe minus one half. And this is the reduction of the wave.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: We know it was Einstein's thinking. And he said, "You claim that quantum physics or quantum mechanics is a complete description of reality. If it is so, you should explain how is it possible for Moe...still we have a proxy wave, still it is superposition of possibilities for which we have probabilities, either it is A C 1 or it is B C 2 and so on." And this collapses only when you do the measurement.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: So on one hand, you still have the proxy wave for Moe which is one light year distant. And on the other hand, you know that its spin is minus one half although you haven't measured it. How is it possible? "You don't explain," he says to quantum physicists. "Therefore, I conclude that your quantum physics, no matter how impressive and magnificent, and so on, is not complete."

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: So it was his argument. So it was done in 1930. It was *Gedankenexperiment* by Einstein, Nathan Rosen, and Boris Podolsky, Einstein, Podolsky, Rosen experiment.

Y: Yes.

B: But then in the sixties, a scientist from CERN, Bell, this is from whom the Bell tolls. Bell, he was wondering. He was impressed by Einstein's thinking somehow from CERN. And he wanted to confirm his notions to...He was designing the experiment in order to confirm Einstein's viewpoint. But when he did so, he discovered that Einstein is not right. And what was Bell's experiment? He designed an experiment in which he took, he somehow arranged, a setup for an experiment, in which we have two protons. And they are...so this is not anymore *Gedankenexperiment*. It is an actual experiment. And this two protons are going one apart from the other in opposite directions by the speed of light. And we have a crystal... a (?) made of crystals on the destination points. For instance, one is the green one and the other is the blue one. And now we measure what we state when the experiment is done... is whether on the both side, the green side and blue side, we have a hit or a miss. Or what is the opposite of...?

55:58

Don: Miss.

Y: Miss.

B: That is whether we have hit or miss.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: And this is what we measure. And now...for instance, if both crystals are in vertical position on the both destinations for the green photon and the blue photon, we have 100% hits. And it is stated by experiments, 100% hits. Now this is the first setup of the experiment. The second setup of the experiment is the one...is, for instance, the blue one is in horizontal position, the crystal at the destination point and the other one is still in at vertical position. So the position between the two of them is vertical and horizontal. And we hit the protons. They go apart. They hit the destination crystals. And we measure and conclude that we have now 100% misses, 100% misses. In the first case, we 100% hits; in the second setup, we have 100% miss. Now the third setup of the experiment, we have at the green destination point, we have still vertical position on the crystal; but on the blue destination, we have a position of the crystal which is under the angle Alpha. And now we have not anymore clear situation. Now we have one...for instance, we have $\frac{1}{4}$ of the overall number of the hits, $\frac{1}{4}$ errors. This means, for instance, if we hit...for instance, 16...16 hits, we have here for the upper...for the one proton, we have positions. We don't have now...we don't know the particular situation. We know just the overall whether it is hit or miss. This is the point. This is the great point actually. We have either hit or miss; we don't know exactly. So, for instance, we have vertical, vertical, vertical, vertical, vertical, vertical, vertical, vertical. They should be mixed horizontal (?) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12... For instance, 12 out of 12, $\frac{1}{4}$ is three.

59:12

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: So $\frac{1}{4}$ are misses. So we have here vertical, here vertical, and here horizontal and all the others are the same position. So this is the picture. So this is a miss; and this is a miss; and this is a miss. So we have three misses out of overall number of 12. And we state this situation. Ok for angle alpha of the position of the receiving crystal at the destination point of one of the protons, why...in this situation, I have $\frac{1}{4}$ misses. Now the fourth position is the other way around. We have a vertical position at the blue destination; and we have a position under the same angle Alpha, for the second position for the green destination. And now we repeat the experiment. And we once again because it is fully symmetrical position, we have $\frac{1}{4}$ of misses once again. And now the final setup of the experiment, the fifth setup, we have both.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: We have angle alpha on the green destination. And we have the same angle alpha on the blue destination. So first position, the two of them are vertical 100% hits, one is horizontal the other vertical 100% miss, one is under angle Alpha the other is vertical $\frac{1}{4}$ mistakes. Now the symmetrical situation the blue is vertical the green Alpha $\frac{1}{4}$.

Y: $\frac{1}{4}$.

B: And now when the both are under Alpha, now if we apply the classical thinking of Einstein's, now here is the point. When we apply the classical thinking of Einstein who observes these two objects as separate objects, not intertwined...

Don: Entangled.

B: Not entangled. He says, "You have to be able to explain this." So we should expect that now in this fifth situation when we angle Alpha on blue side and angle Alpha on green side that we should have $\frac{1}{4}$ plus $\frac{1}{4}$ it should be one half misses. But because we have just two possible situations, it is either a miss or a hit. There is no other alternative. So miss of the miss will be hit. Miss of miss will be hit. So some of these misses will be cancelled because miss of the miss will be hit, because we have miss on this side and miss on this side, $\frac{1}{4}$ misses and $\frac{1}{4}$ misses. One of these are cancelled. So actually, the actual expected number of errors should be lesser than $\frac{1}{2}$ it will be $\frac{1}{4}$ for the blue destination plus $\frac{1}{4}$ for the green destination; it is one half. But since we have miss of the miss is a hit, and there are no other possibilities, then expected errors should be one half. This is the Bell's number, pardon, this is what Bell expected. But now when the experiment has been exercised, had been done and also repeated many times, hundreds of times on different laboratories and different universities, and the result was always the same. They found out the errors are not...The number of errors is not $\frac{1}{2}$, but it is $\frac{3}{4}$ or something matching. So this is the Bell's inequality. The Bell's inequality is many times over done. (Repeated / confirmed). So we have $\frac{3}{4}$ of inequalities. And now how should we explain is the case that we have? Somehow they are still entangled. This means that we are working with contextual properties. So the set of experiments actually...the set of experiments for seems (foreshadows) the results. The results are due to the way how the experiment is designed. But this clearly means that we work with contextual properties. This is not the way to deal with this question.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: Or is it something else? Or is it Einstein? Einstein's argument was how is it possible? Joe is...Joe as spin plus $\frac{1}{2}$ and Moe should have spin of minus $\frac{1}{2}$. This is not in question. Both Bohr and Einstein and everyone else is agreed in this point that the overall angular moment should be zero. But it is not possible because Moe is not measured due to quantum physics. Either quantum physics will say, "I am not right," or something is missing, maybe the hidden variables. Maybe the information in some hidden variables which was Einstein's view will give the explanation. Or Einstein's says, "Otherwise, I must presume that the information of Joe somehow comes to Moe by the speed greater than the speed of light." Which according to Einstein is impossible. This means his theory of relativity is not correct. So this was how...this was Einstein's thinking. He says, "Is it the case that the information about state of Joe somehow reaches Moe on the other part of the galaxy or in the Andromeda, instantaneously?" This means that the speed of light is...that there is super luminal leek, as they call it, a super luminal leek, a leek of the information which escapes the speed of light.

Y: That means non-physical.

B: That means non-physical, exactly. And this is actually the pilot wave somehow in non-locality discussed by David Bohm. So this introduces non-locality which is non-physicality actually because physicality states...puts limit on the speed of light. And we...if we introduced non-local ...possibility non-local exchange of information, then we introduced non-physical actually. This is pilot wave as I understand it.

Y: A non-physical observers and non-physical consciousness.

B: Yes, yes. And now it was...this was in the sixties. And now, even this is not the end of the story yet.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: The experiment of Aspect (Alain) who is French physicist, and he has book of 900 pages in which this experiment have been repeated in different...

Y: In various ways.

B: In various ways. There were waves which are interrupted. The beam of the waves was interrupted by everyone hundredth...one hundred thousand of the second. And it doesn't allow the super luminal leak of the information. The speed of the interruptions of the wave is so to swift that it does not allow that the information from one point could super luminally, this means by speed greater than the speed of light, to reach the other particle. So it was repeated, repeated, repeated in many different ways. And always with the same result that the Bell's inequality whether it is $\frac{1}{2}$ or some other, is many times over them.(repeated)

Don: Repeated.

B: Over.

Don: Repeated.

B: It is (exceeded). It is not $\frac{1}{2}$ but it is $\frac{3}{4}$ or so on. Exceeded.

Don: Exceeded, yes.

B: Exceeded.

Y: So you get an inequality.

B: Yes. And now this is aspects experiment also some other physicists have done it. This is the revival of Einstein, Podolsky, Rosen. But now there is some new element into the picture. And it is the question whether we have here just as in the case of Turing's test, whether we have here a conceptual error in the setup of the experiment because when we put the experiment as Bell designed it, when the setup is according to Bell, then we have just comparison of the overall state. We don't have exactly what happens. And the Herbert, you probably know him. in...he has written a book *Quantum Reality*. I'll remember his sir name (Nick). He has given many experiments there. It is this twins argument. For instance...

Y: Witon?

B: Herbert.

Y: Not Witon?

B: No another one. I'll remember Herbert, Herbert, I'll remember. He disappeared. And they claim he went to alternative reality because he knew so much about aliens. Herbert, he is very interesting, very interesting. But this is another story. So in his book, he gives different examples. For instance, this is the same as we have twins. We have twins; and we just know that their neutral attributes are the same. If one has blue eyes the other has blue eyes. If one has black hair the other one also has black hair. Black skin, black skin. But...and the moment one is born, all of the sudden, we have reduction for the other one as well although the other one is not born yet. Since we know they are identical twins, the moment one is born, by the mere fact that we know that they are identical, we, all of the sudden, we have somehow likeness here and consciousness. All of the sudden, we know that the other one is also...has also blue eyes and black hair although he is not born yet. I haven't come to the point yet. There is another point. This explanation of Roger Penrose about the bowls, I have presented it in the past (?)

[1:11:48](#)

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: We have two bowls, one is white and one is black. My friend has the one; and I have the other one. They are closed in boxes. I don't know which is which. Then my friend goes to London; and he opens his box and says, "I have the black one." Instantaneously, there is a reduction of the wave; and I know that mine is the white although I haven't opened the box. And now the possible mistake or error, perceptual error, in the setup of the experiment is the thinking like this one. The Einstein's view is I have two decks of cards. This is analogous situation to ours because in our situation we have different probabilities for different events, possible outcomes of the situation described by Schrödinger's wave equation. And Einstein's view is I have one deck and another deck of cards. Now it is as if Bell says, if I pull out one deck...one card, then it won't affect the other, the card pulled out from the other deck. This is Einstein's thinking which is classical thinking. When I pull out the...a card from the deck A, this does not affect in any way the pulling of the card of the other deck B which is Einstein's way. He says. "When I measure Moe, it doesn't affect Joe." But Bell's thinking in setup of experiment is when, I pull out a card from deck A, this does not affect the overall comparison of the two.

Y: He says, it's...

B: It says...

Y: It does or doesn't?

B: The setup of experiment is done as if Bell states, as if. He has setup an experiment. But many claim that there is a conceptual error in his experiments. And in order to explain where this error lies to point the finger to the error, where the error is, they say, "It is as if Bell says," because he doesn't know exactly what happens.

He knows just the comparison. He says, "It is a hit or it is a miss, we don't know what happens to each and (every) one of them." We don't know the whoness, so to say; of the...we don't know which is which. We just say, "This is a hit or this is a miss." We don't know the exact situation. And so they say, "It is the same as if Bell says," as if Bell claims when I pull out a card from the one deck, it does not affect the final comparison of the two.

Y: Ok, does not?

B: Does not.

Y: Ok.

B: So this might be a conceptual error in the setup of the experiments because we don't have a final list of all the possible situations which bring to difference, to miss...to have a miss, to have a...to have this 1/4 of errors.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: Or it is another...It is further on explained. For instance, I pull out a card and it is red. And then another one and this is black. For instance, the reds are ones and the blacks are zeros. And A is pulling out the cards and it has sequence one, one, one, one, one, one. Six ones, and then B is pulling out decks for the...from the other...cards from the other deck. This is fully separate so the probabilities are not mixed. So B has one, zero, one, zero, one, zero. And now we say, "The number of arrows is one half because here we have, one, one is hit."

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: This is miss; this is miss; and this is miss. We have three misses. So the overall number of misses $\frac{1}{2}$. But this is as if we somehow say one is preferred, has preference over zero.

Y: Aha!

B: It is...we don't put equal weight to them. It is as if we say, "One is right and zero is wrong." But why red is right and zero is wrong?

Y: You could say anything.

B: You could say anything. You could say anything so everything happens just in your head. This is the...you could say anything. You say, "Error," but it is not actually error. It is just in your head. This, this...so they could not distinguish what is the head and what is in reality. This is the final conclusion.

Y: Very good.

B: In other words, we don't know when we start working with...dealing with contextual instead of information where is exactly this moment to point the finger. When we start dealing with contextual, with the context which we ourselves design, the context which...the context in which we put the experiment for sees (for

shadows), the results is due to the context. It is not due to the particles themselves. It is due to us. It is due to our setup of the experiment. And this is Einstein, Podolsky, Rosen experiment.

Y: I am connecting it to the Lila Paradigm where we say, so to speak, "It all in the head of this one, and this one, and this one, individuals." It is all determined by them except the existence of the individuals. So we avoid all of these problems. All these question are transcended in the Lila Paradigm unless we have a logical error. In other words, we are not following logically our assumptions. If we don't follow them exactly there can be a mistake. But if we do follow them logically, we are including the observer and the observed, the known and the knower. So we don't have contextual, on the one hand, and...

B: Informational...

Y: So it is not a matter of setting up a separate experiment and observing structure over here to observe this.

B: Yes. There is no...

Y: So, it's...

B: There is no act of observation and the observer.

Y: Yes.

B: There is separate...there is no separation between the act of observation and the observer.

Y: That a good way...best way to put it. Very good!

B: This is a good point, excellent, actually.

Y: (Acknowledges) It is. Many years ago, the fifth of March, 1990, when we were just starting out with the Lila Paradigm, we were going to put together a little magazine called the Rainbow Bridge between the absolute and the material world. And this was an article on beta decay and neutron structure. Publish by...in the Journal of the Centre for Sacred Science. That was the idea to save the world. There is an article *Lila Model Description of Neutron and Beta Decay* by Baker and Seeley. It was based upon my work.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: In fact, I did all the diagrams for them. And it...this is the abstract. I will just read the abstract, not the whole article. It would be two weeks learning just this.

The Lila model is used to describe what happens behind the scenes in the quantum realm during the beta decay of a neutron. A description is given of a proton-lepton quark, and how it becomes a quantum electron/positron pair or quark. A proton meso-quark is described and how it becomes a quantum meso-quark and then a

meson. It is noted that anti-particles always occur at a point of symmetry and most do not occur in the physical realm. The basis of motion is described and used to show why energetic particles are ejected from the beta decay. It is predicted that in physical realm, the proton is stable.

As far as I can see, there is no error in the paper; and it is still that way. And it is a prediction. The current field theories predict how long it will take for a proton to decay. Usually protons don't decay. But they predicted that after 10 to 15 (10^{15}) years, that is about 3000 billions years, protons should decay. But when they did a measurement test, they took a huge vat of purified water and observed every molecule of water in it and to see if any proton decayed. It would be a certain radiation come out of it if it did decay; and they had these detectors. Thousands of them all around this huge underground tank in a salt mine in Minnesota. And that...so by taking so many, it would be the same as waiting a long time, so many hydrogen atoms.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: So the time came and went and there was no proton decay. They said, "Well, figure some more, maybe its 10^{18} ." They waited for that another year. No proton decay. They did that two or three more times, no proton decay. And they dropped the whole thing quietly. But this...at the same time that they came out and tried to do that with their field equations, we were predicting that the proton is stable and never decays. That's using the Lila Paradigm. And this is the article on that. And I made all these relationships. This is inside here...is the physical realm. That's the proton with the three quarks.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: The up quark, down quark, and the down quark (bottom? quark). While this is all the Lila that's behind it the pattern of relationship that makes a quark an up quark and a down quark and what the various connection would be between the individuals and then showing the beta decay process, step by step. (Just?) get a pi minus meson and this is the break down. From what we had, the result is you get an anti-neutron neutrino, (?) and an electron and some quarks. And that's exactly the predicted and measure reaction that takes place if one were to break down according to the standard particle knowledge. Nothing ever became of it.

[1:27:37](#)

B: Amazing.

Y: That's it. This is what became of it, never got further than that.

B: It is amazing, it's amazing.

Y: They were making a living, big family.

B: Maybe we should go through it step by step, through this article. You know, to understand it, fully.

Y: Well, I don't know if you have somebody who knows particle physics. Then we might do it. But if they don't know particle physics rather well, it would be a waste of time between us, I think. I don't mean to shut you out of it. You are welcome to read it.

B: Thank you.

Y: But I don't think I am capable physically to maintain the...it would take a couple of weeks. And we wouldn't do anything else. Remember, I showed you a piece of paper the other day about the connections in the ear and the connection in the eye.

B: Yes, yes. It was great!

Y: Connections in the tongue. Well, this is the Lila explanation behind each one of those nerve connections.

B: Maybe this student who is working with metabolic processes of molecules he will know more.

Y: To go with that should be the nerve connections. I have it in another folder somewhere.

Don: Ok.

Y: And I'll...just so you can say a little note on it, a little note on it, pair this with the nerve connection drawings. 1999 on the 13th of September, I wrote this. And I'll just read the first paragraph. I found this paper. It was never finished. But it has a different beginning.

Introduction:

Modern science holds that the only reality is matter particles enduring through time and related across space. Science holds that this independent material reality is the basis of everything, including living being that somehow can be conscious and appear to have the power of choice. The Lila Paradigm is meant to supersede this fundamental belief of modern science. Also the Lila Paradigm is meant to supersede the tenants of religious belief, the most basic of which is that there exists a single creator God or a single Divine principle that is the source of everything, including being that can be conscious and have some power of choice. The Lila Paradigm replaces these beliefs by reversing the sequence so that the individual beings that can be conscious and have some power of choice are the basis of everything. These individual beings appear in each other's consciousness as matter particles and the relations of time, and space between the matter particles are determined by the choices of all these individual beings.

So it is another approach to the same thing. Do you know if Namrata finished coping off all those papers? Ok, I'll try to give this to her on Sunday when she is coming here. There is another thing I have tried to do was to carefully break down in terms of Lila the fine-structure constant α , also known as a electromagnetic coupling constant. And I give the standard formula for alpha, standard calculations for it; and it is one over 37.0359998

Then I show that, that's a ratio of the electromagnetic energy to the energy inherent in mass. This is the formula for the electromagnetic energy which is the speed of light times the electric charge squared. And its ratio, that ratio to $(2h)$, where h is Planck's Constant.

Or said another way, the ratio of the electro static energy of repulsion between two elementary charges separated by one Compton wavelength that is ratioed to the rest energy of a single charge. And you get the electric charge squared in ratio to h bar, over the mass of an electron times the speed of light divided by the mass of an electron times the speed of light squared which is also equal to electric charge squared over h bar over c .

Just reducing this equation to this.

Or there is another way of saying it. The coupling of the electromagnetic field of any elementary particle carrying electric charge E that's equal to the Compton wavelength divided by Kn . K little n . So α is defined as $2\pi K E$ or electric charge squared, divided by the energy of a photon times the wavelength of the photon. α is a dimensionless electromagnetic coupling strength.

So this is kind of a study on the subject of α which is so important because it determines the value of K . Actually it is K that determines the value α ; but we can't measure K without a long count. I had to count how many arrows a relationship does each individual in existence have. It would be a long count. And then take an average and...so I have some, some few things like that. And what I am going to do... and I am setting them aside, having them copied; and either you will take them with you or they will be mailed to you.

B: (Acknowledges) Thank you.

Y: It takes about, by air, it takes about ten days. And by ship it takes three months. That's just to get to the port in Bosnia on the sea. And then it has to go by mule back over the mountains to get to Macedonia. Oh, they have roads now.

B: In Bosnia there is just one port.

Y: There is just one port?

B: In Crete.

Y: It is just a narrow spot on the Adriatic.

B: Neum, called, Neum.

Y: Here I have an article on linear motion. Oh, I said I was going to get to the subject of motion. And maybe tomorrow, maybe the next day.

B: Ok, tomorrow, yes.

Y: It's a big subject.

B: For speed and time.

Don: Well, can I scan that.

Y: No.

Don: I tried.

Y: I don't like to do that of things that I might change all over the place. I haven't reviewed it for two years. I think I already showed you this one.

B: Oh, yes, aha, yes it is great! Just one individual taken out is Satan.

Y: This says (?) God is all of us.

[1:37:20](#)

B: God is all.

Y: If one of them is left out, what's left is Satan.

B: This is great.

Y: So we count all the charges, not leave any out.

B: Ah, yes.

Y: Like (?) John Wheeler?

B: Wheeler, yes.

Y: So that's it for today.

Don: Thank you.

B: Thank you so much.

Y: I am doing a little better today too. I stop eating so much oil. Cut that down. I liked it. I like to eat it; but I think I am addicted to oil. So I have put it over there.

B: Great.