#47S
Lila Recordings
Set 2: 10-11-06 to 12-11-06
061110000
1 Hr 52 min
Recording 47

Y: Ok, turn it on. So, Biljana.

B: Hm?

Y: You have anything this morning?

B: Just what I shared with you few minutes ago that the harmonic analyses or harmonic linearization which is used in non-linear circuits and in electrical engineering. And I have been teaching non-linear systems could be applied, at least the mathematical apparatus could be applied, in particle physics. I could recognize some of the equations. And one of these days, I plan to apply Baker's thinking when he's finding the number of non-physical individuals by applying it to the first crossover circuit. But I want to apply it, for instance, for the second crossover which is W boson. But since I don't know the wavelength, then I'll do the other way around. For instance, I'll equalize 2XN which is the number of circling around the circuit in one bit to equalize this with 2X plus K because now we don't know this harmonics, how they will fit together. This is not necessarily that it will be X plus 1 multiplied by the, for instance, the imaginary circumference of the smaller circuit which is actually 2N minus *pi* of [l]. Now [l] should be…because we have a 3 fork circuit, maybe 3. And then, 2XN is X plus M which will be the number of the circling around the middle circuit, 2N minus – I shall see now 2 *pi* of [l] or *pi* of [l] (?) another number. And then, finally when all this is done, to find not the wavelength because I'll apply this not to find the number of nonphysical individuals, but the other way around, for instance.
2:53
Y: Mm, yes.

B: I'll put the number…I'll replace the number of the nonphysical individuals, and then find the wavelength at least to see if this thinking is all right.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: Just for me. Just to check if I'm on the right track by applying what I know from harmonics and harmonical analyses in particle physics. Just for a rough estimation. Maybe I'll do this.

Y: Yes.

B: For instance, in this harmonic linearization, just the same as in ordinary non-linear systems, we do the linearization by replacing a part of the curve by a line, a segmented line,

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: And some of this thinking we shall use in applying Monte Carlo method for finding the… apart from Monte Carlo also for finding the size of the universe in our curve. So, this is linear linearization. Just the same as this linear optimization is done, in similar way, harmonic linearization could be introduced, harmonic linearization. And with dealing with particles, maybe this will be useful. At least the overall picture could be related somehow because I recognize some of the equations. We also have circling of illusionary information through the circuits. So we also have waves. Just the same, I have down here, "This analyses for 2 harmonics."

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: The same could be done, for instance, for 3 harmonics. And I wanted just to present the formula for harmonic linearization which is... In harmonic linearization we express the non-linear function by summarizing harmonics. For instance, the formula is...somehow, we have F of X, for instance. And it is sum of some members AN multiplied by cosine XN plus other members BN multiplied by sine ^XM which is something similar to what, at one point, we were suggesting for expressing the...

Y: (Acknowledges)
7:19
B: ...seemingly illusionary circling around the circuit and combining both the discrete nature of the process and the necessity to introduce sine or cosine because we have protection of moving of representative point around the circuit. So this is sine or cosine. So, this is the formula for harmonic linearization where this AN and BN parameters are 1 over 2 *pi* integral from zero to 2 *pi* N of X where N is the non-linear function cosine omega N…something like this. Maybe I am missing some parameter; but it is minor. Actually, the overall picture is like this; Or BN R1 over 2p integral from zero to 2p, N of X sine of omega N. So, this is, actually, formula for discretisation. And I have…

Y: Formula for…

B: For discretisation.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: For quantisation.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: For cutting the sine into discrete elements something like this. So, some of this might be useful. At least I'll try to do this

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: And just for my information to see if I'm on the right track to see whether the wavelength will be something at least in a (within) limits expected.

Y: The wavelength and the mass are directly related; the shorter the wavelength, the more the mass.

B: The more the mass. Uh huh. Ah hah! Yes. Uh huh. Yes, because...OK. Because it is related because the wavelength is reciprocal to frequency; and frequency is directly connected with energy.

Y: Yes.

B: The higher the frequency, higher the energy.

Y: Yes.
9:05
B: So they are related. So, maybe I'll try to do this although this is just a mathematical game. It is just to see whether, for instance, first of (?) myself I understand this good.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: I'll try to do the other way around for three harmonics. Only I hesitate…I'm not sure whether I should really introduce three unknowns here.

Y: In that printout of the fundamental constants…

B: Ah hah, yes. Maybe there we have the wavelength.

Y: There may be something there.

B: Maybe, I'll do it for the sake of simplicity although it is, maybe, not the right way with just introducing three harmonics in one bit although it is not the real picture. You know what is my dilemma? For instance, is it…for instance, I might introduce it one bit. This is one bit. And then I introduce the imaginary circling around the circuit...

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: ...around the biggest circuit with one sine. I think one bit. This is one bit of time and I have here the circling around the biggest circuit. Then I do it for two circles around the smaller circuit which is the second harmonic, and then with another amplitude, and then for three. But it is a great simplification because we don't know whether we have in W boson....we have just the right overlapping of these waves. But, actually, the correct way to do this is to suppose that we don't know the number. We don't know which harmonic is correspondent to the smaller circuit and to the smallest circuit. For instance, the situation is more likely to be we have one wave for the moving around the biggest circuit. Then we don't know the number of harmonics. It might be three, for instance, for circling around the smaller circuit, and maybe five for the smallest circuit.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: But the point is, we should have one bit here, and a correct fitting of all these harmonics because there is one bit when this situation would happen. Only, we don't know when this will happen, the number of wavelengths for the smaller circuit and for the smallest. And this is why in the equations, it is a system of equation now, and the

third one should be sum of equalizing this with…I shall see because here I have three different…three unknowns, actually. OK. This was just what I was thinking. And maybe at some point…Now this is another subject. At some point, maybe not today, I want to present to you what this mathematician in Macedonia was doing with large numbers because the connection with Lila might be that he always claims that all that exists are whole numbers. And he has developed a number of algorithms for factorisations of great numbers by big numbers. By big, I mean numbers with 60,000 digits, for instance. It requires a lot of computer, a large amount of computer time. And when we reach that point, maybe, it could be of use.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: And it's very...they are very witty, so to say. They are very intelligent. It's tremendous. They are so beautiful. So I might present to you at some point at least one algorithms of those which is very easy to understand. And it's tremendous.

Y: Now is all right.
15:00
B: Uh huh! Now? OK. So we shall need either the calculator or…maybe, the calculator is easier…or *Mathematica* here. For instance, he has found so called hyper or pentars (?). These are the operators he has discovered for factorisation of great numbers. For instance, for 13…for instance, let us suppose we have a really big number which is our situation, practically, with many, many, many digits, for instance, 60,000 digits.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: And now we want to find if this number is divisible by 13. Now the way to do it is divide the number and see whether it is divisible or not, whether 13 is a factor of this big number. But it is very difficult to do. It requires months, for instance.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: And so he has developed a method; and it is really beautiful. And I will demonstrate it now. For instance, let us introduce here a number which is divisible by 13. For instance, just multiply 13 by any four-digit or fifth-digit number. Uh huh. So, it is four five six. Uh huh. But it shouldn't be.

Y: I multiplied it.

B: Yes, but it shouldn't be approximate. It should be correct.

Y: I used too many.

B: You used too many digits.

Y: Four?
16:48
B: Yes. No. Maybe, *Mathematica*. But it requires time. You know…

Y: This is correct.

B: It is correct? But it is on a degree. It should be a whole number.

Y: Well, that's a whole number.

B: Divide it by 13, and you will see.

Y: You said multiply by 13.

B: Yes, multiply. But it shouldn't exceed the capacity of the calculator. It should be in the limits of calculator in order to have a whole number. For instance, 13 by three five six for beginning; 13 by three five six.

Y: Three five six times 13.

B: You have something in the memory which is doing this.

Y: No. That's a whole number. It's four six two eight.

B: Four six…

Y: That just moves the decimal point.

B: Uh huh.

Y: It's expressed as a power.

B: Times 10 to…

Y: I can change that.

B: Yes, change that. Ah hah! OK. So to this, I put a zero here, then three nine, just three nine to be on the safe side; three nine, then 26, then 13, then another number. I want to create a big number which is divisible by 13 in order to show the point. So another one. For instance, another one, 13 by a four digit number. We have four six two eight three nine two six one three. Ah hah! Yes. What?

Y: What?

B: This one.

Y: Which one did you want?

B: 13.

Y: 13 times what?
19:14
B: Times some four digit number, four five six, yes. Five nine three one nine; three one nine. Now I (?) some number for which we know it is divisible by 13. For

19:18
instance, 65. 13, 26, just another one, and I'll finish. Or, maybe, this is enough. So for this number…this is a big number. And now, in order to divide it by 13, time is needed. But this algorithm allows, and it is done, for all the numbers for many of them, if not all. For instance, until 100, he divide this by a so called 'pentar' of this number. Pentar, which is…somehow he associates this operators with the number 5...

Y: (Acknowledges).

B: ...which also has meaning. So we divide this number into portions of 6 digits. And we have this. And now we just…once the number is cut into pieces, we summarise the parts of the number. For instance, to this one I add this one: three five nine three one nine. Then I add this one which is eight three nine two six one. And finally, I add this one which is four six two. Now I summarise these numbers. Could we do it? We have four six two, plus eight three nine two six one, plus three five nine three one nine, plus six five one three two six which is one million, eight five zero three six eight. Now, to check whether this number is divisible by 13, I divide by 13 and I get the whole number. So this divided by 13 is one four two three three six (142336). So instead of going through the process of dividing the number of 13 which requires a lot of computer time, and it's not elegant and so on.

Y: How did he ever figure that out?

Punita: (laughs)
22:34
B: And he has these numbers for each and every number. He is working on this with Yars (?). He has a great tables (?). And to know what this means, I shall give you just one fact. For instance, if you go to a security agency or something like this where it is important, the…you know the…
22:36
Punita: Encryption?

B: Encryption. Yes. Encryption. If you speed the time of the encryption, for instance, for (by) just one second it means millions of dollars, one second is millions.

Y: Yes.

B: For instance, they give you a number; and they have their own program. And they say, "My program does it for two minutes." And if you do it for one minute and 59 seconds, then this is a million dollars for you. (She laughs).

Y: Be right back.

Punita: Has he proved that? Is there a proof for this or is it just demonstrated?

B: But…he has proofs, yes.

Punita: (Acknowledges)

B: But when you demonstrate it, you know, it's so amazing.

Punita: I know…

B: Uh huh, yes. He…

Punita: But, you said for different numbers, he uses different systems?

B: Uh huh.

Punita: Like, is the fact that we're segmenting into groups of 6,

B: (Acknowledges)

Punita: ...is that dependent on 13, or what is that dependent on?

B: It is dependent on 13, yes.

Punita: OK.

B: It is like every number has a hidden period.

Punita: Uh huh. OK.

B: Which could be very useful for us, for instance, you know.

Punita: (Acknowledges)

B: Because we have period somehow.

Punita: But that then weakens a lot of encryption which depends on the difficulty of factoring numbers.

B: Yes, yes. Exactly. Exactly.

Punita: (Laughs, Acknowledges)

B: And he has not just this fewer cutting which he calls 'hyperpentar'. This is actually a hyperpentar for thirteen; this is hyperpentar for thirteen.

Punita: (Acknowledges).

B: But he has also, so to say, ordinary pentars.

Punita: (Acknowledges)

B: For instance, pentar of first degree; pentar of second degree; pentar of third degree which allow him to do the division by the number by beginning from the end and going to the…When we divide a number, we start from the beginning of the number. And then we cut the number and put down the digits. But you could do it

also with the number which is somehow associated with 13. And he named it ‘pentar of first degree’. With this pentar of first degree you go, for instance, pentar of first degree for 13 is four. And now, instead of dividing the number from the beginning by 13, you divide the number from the end by four.

Punita: (Acknowledges)

B: And you say, “Four in six is one. I have two to remember. I bring down two; I have twenty-two. Four in twenty-two is five. I have two to remember. And so, he cuts the number from the end to the beginning. This is pentar of first degree. Then he has pentar of the second degree. If I cut the number with the pentar of second degree, then I cut it in two digits. But then I have something to remember, to bring down. But when I find the hyperpentar which requires a procedure to find it, then I could just surely cut the number what I have done now.

Punita: (Acknowledges)

B: I have picked an easy to…an example which shows the point very easily. But otherwise, it is a whole theory he has developed. And he finds, this is, as if the numbers have a period, as if the number has a period.

Punita: (Acknowledges)

B: Every number has a period. And this is not the end of the story. You know, I have obtained the number. For instance, this one: four eight five zero three six eight. Now, once I found this number which mirrors the period of this number, which is hyperpentar of 13, now I could circulate. Now, I could go around. For instance, I could put this eight at the beginning and obtain another number which is eight four eight five zero three six. Now, let us divide this by 13. We have eight four eight five zero three six divided by 13, mistake? Is it four? No, this is one. Sorry...just to demonstrate, it is not. This was one, I believe, isn’t it so. So the number is one eight five zero three six eight. One eight five zero three six eight divided by 13. It’s a whole number. Now if I do a rotation of the digits of the number…for instance, I put eight at the beginning. I rotate the digits. Then I have eight one eight five zero three six. I have eight one eight five zero three six, divided by 13. Hum, I don’t know why? It should be…Ah hah hah hah! Ah hah! I should always have a whole assembles of six numbers. So, first I...was this one? Yes, one. First I add this here to have always ...cutting all the intermediate products of number should be cut into sixes, into assembles of six. So I have eight five zero three six nine. Actually, let us check. We have eight five zero three six nine divided by 13 is a whole number again. We have a whole number. So when we cut the result of this cutting, once again, we have the same procedure. So this number is divisible by 13. 13 is still factor of the number. And now I circulate the number. Now I put this nine in the beginning. I have nine eight five zero three six. Let us check. We have nine eight five zero three six divided by 13. It’s a whole number again.

Y: Magic.

B: And you could circulate, circulate, circulate. For instance, if you lost a digit...somehow during the transfer this digit was lost, I could still generate the number by knowing this procedure.

Y: Huh.

B: So this secures the transfer.

Y: So this might apply to the Lila Paradigm.

B: Yes.

Y: To show the pattern of the structure. If it's circular, then it's going to run the circuit, maybe.

B: Yes, yes. And actually…

Y: So...

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: We will have big numbers.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: But that it works in five says that five is one of the fundamental patterns of relations. Like, the smallest crossover circuit is five arrows.

B: Yes. And this is his claim. He somehow differently came to this. And he always claims the (that) nature is discrete. And the central number is five. And this is why he names this, 'Operator's Pentar' from the Greek word for five.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: And also he has 'quintars' which are similar to those, pentars and quintars. Quintars is also five, but in Latin.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: And so it is great; it is amazing. For instance, he wants to put all the operators, all these pentars and quintars, in a memory of a computer. And this is as if you have a logarithmic table. For instance, before Briggs (Henry) and Napier (John) developed their logarithmic tables, table of logarithms...

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: It was very difficult to find roots of the numbers.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: The cube root, the fourth root, and so on, it was very difficult. But once we had the logarithmic table, it became easy. So the same way it could be done with these operators. For instance, a hyperpentar for 13 is six. And once we know this, we just cut the number.

Y: Yes.

B: And do whatever we want to do. But in order to build such tables, years are needed to have for every number its pentar. For instance, for 13 it is six. But for some number, the period could be of 23 digits.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: So this number should be cut in pieces of 23 digits in order to do this. But this is amazing. This is really a great discovery.

Y: It is amazing.

B: Yes.

Punita: It points to some underlying order.

Y: Yes.

Punita: And that's (laughs)…

B: Yes, yes. For the numbers.

Y: Yes.

B: An underlying order for the numbers.

Y: Yes. And for, at that...our number system has an underlying order to it.

Punita: Uh huh.

Y: And that should be described by the Lila Paradigm.

Punita: Uh huh.

B: Yes, great! He will be amazed to know about Lila. He is very much in favour of his thinking. And also he's transforming these numbers into another number systems. And he does the same in another number systems with basis five, for instance.

Y: Well, he could go to Bangkok; and go into the big bank there. And for one second, he could come out a millionaire. (Laughter)

B: Yes, yes.

Y: They made a movie like that.

B: (Laughs). For breaking the codes.

Y: Double ‘O’ seven, 007 Sean Connery. (Laughter) They had just one second to...

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: ...switch all the money.

B: (Laughs)

Y: But this shows, as you said, it’s underlying order.

Punita: Uh huh.

Y: And that’s the mathematics that I said would be the Lila Mathematics, digital. So he’s got a correct insight.

B: It is amazing, you know. This is amazing.
35:18
Punita: (?) (Laughs)

Y: Yes, it is. I’m amazed.

Punita: (Acknowledges)

B: It’s so beautiful because so many beautiful things come out of it. And he also uses his method for factorisation of polynomials. For instance, if you have 136X squared plus 35X plus 10 plus 3X, he somehow...he converts this mathematical formula into a number. And then…for instance, we are suppose to divide this by X plus one. He turns this into number; and this into number. For instance, this is one three six three five three; something like this. And he applies his method also for polynomials.

Y: That number tells you what the underlying order is. The system that he uses to turn it into a number...

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: ...shows you what the underlying order must be.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: So his system is getting closer to the truth of…

B: The nature of it.

Y: Yes.

B: Yes. Great!

Y: The underlying nature.

B: To the real nature of the number.

Y: Yes.

B: For instance, here if we turn this number into a number system of 13 with basis of 13. Then we have just whole numbers somehow.

Y: Yes. But they have to be prime numbers.

B: Yes, prime numbers.

Y: (Acknowledges).

B: He has a theory for prime numbers; a whole theory. And he is able, which is actually also worth millions, by having one prime number to find the next one which was not done.

Y: Hm.

B: You have a prime number...

Punita: (Acknowledges)

B: ...and you never know when the next one will appear especially when we have thousands of digits. It's very difficult to find the next prime number. And for a long time in mathematics…

Y: They use prime numbers to decrypt.

B: To decrypt, yes.

Y: Uh huh.
37:50
B: It is a theory.

Y: Yes. I'm trying to figure out five. But why five times two? Why five times two? Makes ten. 10 to the *e* to the *pi.*

B: To the *e* to the *pi.* Yes.

Y: So it's five times two to the *e* to the *pi*. Now, five is a prime number.

B: Exactly.

Y: But ten's not.

B: But once you establish a circuit...

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: ...isn't it the case that I have a connection or relation of every individual to the other one, but also the other way around? So it becomes doubled, which is 10 because…

Y: You mean the difference between the knower and the known?

B: Yes. The knower…

Y: So you could do it from the known point of view or from the knower's point of view.

B: Yes, since they are in the circuit now.

Y: And that makes 10.

B: It is the same reason for which in Baker's example, he discovered that he should take 2N.

Y: Yes. Why 2?

Punita: (Acknowledges)

B: Because when we have a circuit, we have A to B, B to A; C to D, D to C. Once we have circuit, we have something like this, actually.

Y: My explanation is that what a relationship is...is founded on two individuals.

B: Yes.

Y: That's the basic relation. It's not…

B: Yes, I...Yes.

Y: It's not 3. You have this one and this one; and you have that relation.

B: Yes. But…

Y: But it's not [shows her] like *that*. This is made of two of these.

B: But in a circuit, you still have that many relations.

Y: Times 2.

B: Not times two, the same because for every dot, we have one arrow.

Y: There's one relation.

B: For one, one arrow; for one, one.

Y: That's right.

B: We have so many relations as we have dots.

Y: That's right.

B: But if we take into account that once the information becomes common…

Y: Yes.

B: …then we have all these double relations. We have A to B; we have B to A; A to B, B to A because they have common knowledge now.

Y: I don't see your 'because'.

B: Yes. It's not…Yes, because…

Y: I can imagine that. I can give you some abstraction level.

B: Yes. Yes. It is not necessary. So because...it means…because then we have all these other connections also. I have a…I remembered now. I'll show it to you. Maybe it will give us inspiration. When I was participating a conference on harmony…

Y: Harmony.

B: Harmony.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: It is also connected with chaos (She laughs). Because harmony...

Y: (Laughs)

B: ...is the other way, the opposite of chaos. And there were very beautiful presentations.

Y: Sounds like Ava's program. (Others laugh)
42:36
B: And now I'll show you. There was a girl there. And I planned to present Lila to her because she's preparing her PhD now in…somehow in these big networks in fractal theory. And also she has participated (in) Intensives; and she's very spiritual. At mechanical engineering faculty in Belgium. Now I'll present you her presentation at the conference which is very much in favour of this. But Nuridin (?)...Nuridin is the name of the man who did this. He has done the whole theory. And she has some insights. For instance, she has discovered some insights for 23. And at the conference, I told her about all this; and she was very much interested. I'll show…

Punita: When I was young, these books of number puzzles where you could do like...

Y: (Acknowledges)
43:27
Punita: ...one two three four five six seven eight nine, then multiply it by 11. And you'd get like one one one one one…different things like that...

B: (Acknowledges)

Punita: ...and it fascinated me.

B: This is based on the fact that hyperpentar for eleven...

Punita: (Acknowledges)

B: ...is two. So if you have, for instance, if you have numbers which are, for instance, one...Let me see…and the same for three. For instance, we have eleven multiplied by seven eight nine. It is eight six seven nine. Let us add, for instance, twenty-two thirty-three. And now if I...the hyperpentar is two, this means what we have done, we have cut the number for thirteen in pieces of six. Now we cut in pieces of two, or four for that matter because this is the period. So we could use four times this or K times the period. And so, if I add this eight six seven nine...I have two two three three plus eight six seven nine. We go to number ten thousand nine one two, divide it by eleven; it's a whole number. Divided by eleven, it is nine nine two which is fantastic. And you could do whatever you want once you know hyperpentars. And so, this girl I have mentioned, she has done it for 23. Somehow she found it in structures in nature, that this number is important. And this is also important in Nuridin (?) theory. I have to…found… (takes time looking for something)...Kepler's Harmony. It is also beautiful, Kepler's Harmony. It shows that the distance between the planets in solar system is based on Fibonacci. And it was shown; it was on the same conference. The author is also very good friend of mine, a professor in astrophysics. He is also great. He has also made presentations. Hmm. Where is this? (Still looking for something) I will present it maybe later. But…just a quick paper. (Reads names of papers while she still looks for a specific paper)
45:15

Metaphysics, Psychological, *Astrologics, Harmony of Third Dimension, Body Structure, Spirit, and Soul and Ratio*.

47:02
He found some

Kepler's Classification of the Polyhedrons.

You know this famous structure?

Y: (Acknowledges)
47:30
B: of Kepler's. Newtonian bodies (?); *The Harmony of Spheres*. But they know the exact…they find, for instance, the volumes of this. Ah, this is Copernicus. Here is how it is found. *Motion of the Circle*. This is the picture.

Y: Mm. Yes.

B: Once you do this spheres around this bodies (?), the ratio of the radiuses of this bodies is the same as the ratio of the moving of the planets around the sun.
48:10
Y: Hm.

B: And this is amazing. You have first…first you have tetrahedron.

Punita: Hedron

B: …tetrahedron. Then you put it into a sphere. Then around the sphere, you put this one. Then around it a cube, and so on. And then, this is also important; and this is based on fact which is…I have a model. I have given my students to do a model, and to find Hamiltonian. Then, in this figure, it is dodecahedron. It is made of 12 pentagons. Three-dimensional...

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: ...body made of pentagons. And it also is part of the picture of the solar system. So, all of them are surrounded by a sphere. We have first, for instance, we have first which is dodecahedron made of triangles. Then it is surrounded by a sphere. Then around this sphere, you have a dodecahedron made of pentagons.

Y: (Acknowledges).

B: Then you surround it by a sphere. Then around this sphere, you have octagon. Then around this sphere, you have cube. Then around this sphere, you have tetrahedron. And then when you measure the radiuses of this bodies, you got Fibonacci sequence and the distance of the planets in solar system; one point, another point. If you transform this into a musical note, you got a perfect harmony. You got an accord which is a perfect harmony. It is very good for the ear. And this is what they mean by 'music of spheres.' They have...

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: And they have the exact data which is amazing. He has found the exact data. He is very good. He is teaching astrophysics in mechanical faculty in Belgrade. Kepler Johannes, *Epitome Astronomiae Copernicanae.* It's amazing.

Y: This work was first started by Pythagoras.
51:11
B: Uh huh. So this is, *Years of Study*, Alexander Tomich, Professor of Physics, Astro and Biophysicist, People's Observatory, Belgrade. Now (?) Natashiemishish. Ah hah! I wanted to see the…Where is it? Where? Properties, Hm.
(Biljana goes looking for something).

Y: I think she ditched me!
51:40
Darshana: Also I had an idea. We may have discussed that already. I don't know.

Y: No. I don't think we did.

B: *Self Similarity as Harmonic Principle of Counting System*.
52:38
This is something similar. She has found periods in countings in a counting system, number base. And she has this power to perceive. It is very beautiful. She's got this power of Ancients. She is doing this in DNA.
52:47

Plasma: *Table of Multiplies of 37*.

And she is finding…you see 27 which is the number when the first circuit appears.

Y: (Acknowledges).

B: *Number of Forms*.

She has found this 27 to be very important in the field she's researching, Microbiology, or what is it?

Variation of 37.

Then she has
53:40

Quadratifying and Form of 37 (?) *Quadratic*, *Semi Quadratic*.

She draws something from this. This is with 11.

Punita: (Acknowledges)
54:24
B: I told her that in 11 the hyperpentar is 2. *37*, again. And she is finding some periods of the numbers which is very much connected with this what Nuradin is doing. Uh huh. Ahhh! Yes.

The Coupling Constant. *Fine Structure Constant*.

It is connected somehow with who…with Fibonacci. This is Fibonacci Ratio.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: It is connected with Fibonacci. This is great!

Golden Mean.

Ah hah! The Golden Mean because it is connected with Fibonacci in sense that we associate the Coupling Constant with K which is the average number of connections. And in this, so to say, when you are finding the…it is like finding a mean, somehow.

Y: (Acknowledges)

Darshana: Have you got that magazine article on how the fractals divide up into groups of 10?

Y: Yes, I showed it to her.

Darshana. Ah hah!
56:24
B: *37* again. Work, logos (?) Wisdom, Hackmak (?) from Kabila (?) (She laughs).

73 and 37.

These are…she finds, somehow here, connections; but this for Coupling Constant. This is amazing! We should associate this with the K, somehow.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B:
Fine Structure Constant.

So the Coupling Constant…maybe K is 14 somehow? K…OK, it's in a specific… square of 14 minus one over 2 is the Coupling Constant; 1.37. (Yogeshwar goes out of the room) And also, square of 41 plus one over…Isn't it beautiful? Pure beauty.

Punita: Yes.

B: There is also a presentation on pentagrams.

Darshana: Uh, Biljana...

B: (Acknowledges)

Darshana: ...is there a way that fractals and the Fibonacci Ratio are related?

B: Uh huh. Yes, yes.

Darshana: I'd be very interested in that if you have any information.
58:35
B: Uh huh. Yes, yes. This is actually Natashaf's (?) work. She stresses Fibonacci. And Fibonacci we find in DNA in the, as I said previously, in the distance of planets in solar system; in many, many, many ways.

Darshana: And how is it related to fractals?

B: We shall look at Natashaf's paper.

Darshana: Ok, Ok, I'd like to do that later on.

B: (Acknowledges)

B: I'll show you now another picture, relation of fractals with pentagons and pentagram. And we have stressed several times that 5 is very important in Lila.

Darshana: Very important.

B: And now you see. But there are other...I will repeat this. I have said once, but it should be repeated in other connections with graphs of 5.
59:32
Harmonia (?)…About 5

We have presentation.

Darshana: (Acknowledges)

B:
Fractal Hierarchy (?)
59:36
This is about the solar system. But now I'm looking for this pentagram. Rubin (?)Yugasakodvich. He also…he's Yugasakodvich. He's Serbian. He's finding correlations of art and science (Yogeshwar returns back into the room) about pentagram, Yogeshwar. About pentagram, this is. You have Fibonacci here. You see, this is Fibonacci.

Y: Yes.

B: This is Fibonacci. And this is the way how to construct it. It is the way how you construct it.

Darshana: Yes. I've seen that somewhere. Did you show that to us or…it might have been someone. Oh. Maybe you mailed us or e-mailed us.
1:00:51
B: Ah, maybe. Ahhh! Maybe, maybe. I remember now, yes because it is also connected with Genomics (?). It is also connected with astronomy. There is a special definition of a genome (?) what was the name? It was known even in 16th
60:54
century. It is for every figure, you find the one which has, which is like…I should look at it more closely. You find another associated figure which brings you to a whole…to a self-similarity, actually. To a self-similar figure which is, for instance,
61:30
twice (?) big. And…so to see the complementary picture to the original one, in order to get the bigger one self-similar to the reference is called, somehow, genome or something like that. It was the name for it. And this Fibonacci number arises from this procedure. For instance, you find Fibonacci here in a perfect harmony of the art.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: Pieces of art from...this is also Fibonacci. The Parthenon in Greece. This is the way how to find Fibonacci.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: And these are…this is beautiful. This is….they all converse towards this one. You see? You have here. These sequences of numbers and they all lead to Fibonacci.

Darshana: (Acknowledges).

B: To the Mean, Golden Mean of Fibonacci. These are the figures I was trying to explain. For instance, if I have original figure like this triangle and I'm looking for a perfect self-similar figure of it, the figure which is self similar to each one. You see? This is same figure. If you rotate it, you obtain the same one. And now there is a procedure how to do this in different figures. For instance, this one, the smaller one, is as big…Is in the same ratio as the bigger one. And the formula for this is A towards B is just the same as B towards A plus B.

Darshana: (Acknowledges).

B: For instance, in my book, this cut is done due to Fibonacci. So the ratio of this length towards this length...

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: ...is the same as this length towards the…

Punita: Diagonal.

B: The sum of them.

Punita: Oh, the sum.

B: If this is B…this is B, this is A, B to A is the same as A to A plus B

Punita: (Acknowledges)

B: And this is the Golden…

Darshana: That reminds me of Yogeshwar…

B: …the Golden Mean.

Darshana: When you first started talking about Lila and you kept saying, "I am to you as you are to us"…

Y: Uh huh.

B: Ah. Great! Yes.

(Everyone laughs)

B: Yes.

Darshana: Something like that, anyway.

B: Yes, yes. Very great! And you have Fibonacci in pentagram. And in pentagram it is: this towards this is Fibonacci sequence is a Golden Mean. Also in violins, in musical instruments, you have perfect harmony. If the violin is built such a way that this is B, this is A. So B to A in violins is...or fiddle…What is that?

Punita: A violin.

B: Is the same as this one towards the sum of them, of the sum. Here are fractals.

Y: My guru Kripalu…

Darshana: There's the fractals.

B: There's the fractal in Fibonacci.

Darshana: Ah, Ok. That's it.

B: This is the picture and this is Mandelbrot, you know. This is the connection.
65:10
Darshana: I love that picture.

B: You have fractal; you have Fibonacci.

Darshana: I want that page. (Darshana laughs).

B: I'll copy it to you.

Darshana: OK. Thank you.

Yogeshwar: My guru...

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: ...Kripalu, was a professional Indian musician before he became Swami. And he wrote 2 volume book, 800 pages. And it's all about this. And he shows how it's based on yoga.

B: Ah hah. (Laughs)

Y: And so, underlying all of this is the basic relations that exist between us. So *we* are the music of the spheres.

B: Uh huh. Yes; exactly. Great!

Y: She wants this one?

Darshana: Yes.

B: The whole thing. I'll give you the whole presentation.

Darshana: OK. Thank you.

B: It's so beautiful. This is the violin. Mandelbrot. And this one, this one in the background is Mandelbrot.

Y: Uh huh. Yes, I see it.

B: Which I have in my book also.

Darshana: Ahhh. Oh, yes. (Laughs)

B: The Mandelbrot set. And it was known even in 17th century.

Punita: (Acknowledges)

Darshana: Wowwwww.

B: …and it was discovered by a monk. Nights and nights he was doing these estimations, estimations. Even with computer it takes hours, which work in nanoseconds, and he was doing on foot (by hand). And different pentagrams in nature…And this is from the…You know this? This is…OK, these are constellations of stars: Begososundram and Aviez Cleodis. This is the backwards moving of Venus, the imaginary backward moving of Venus in the sky. Egypt. It's in Macedonian though, but (Laughs)…
67:04
Darshana: That's OK.

B: …the pictures are beautiful.

Darshana: Yeah.
67:45
B: Ah, I wanted to ask you something about Satan; but it is not time now, about the Satan in matrices. (She laughs). This is Leonardo.

Y: (Acknowledges)
68:08
B: (?) says something in another language) Also here…Darshana, here you have also Fibonacci and fractal.

Darshana: Aha. Good.

B: This is the connection, Fibonacci and fractal.

Darshana: Oh. Very Good. OK. That...I really want that page.

B: *Fractals and Chaos*. And these are their churches in the famous Da Vince Code. The famous movie now and book.

Punita: (Acknowledges)

Y: Oh, yes.
68:56
B: The distance of the churches is a pentagram. Usan (?) Arcadie I Evo (a face, lips (?)

Y: Who did this?
68:56
B: Both Yulaian Vasilievich Sokhotski, who is a mathematician and also a painter; at least he's very much into art. And Liliana Stephanoska, she's a very good friend of mine. We use to…we were in elementary school together. She's a mathematician; and she teaches at technological faculty in Skopje.

Y: (Acknowledges)
69:45
B: We have the same mentor. The same mentor Protonavanich (?)

Y: Ah hah.
69:45
B: She's (?)

Y: Yes. In Sanskrit, Ritam, 'The Divine Order'…that's showing through all of that. I did a whole slide show on that myself.

Punita: (Acknowledges)

B: Ah hah.

Y: On Divine Order.

B: (Acknowledges).

Y: I was just looking up the Fermi Coupling Constant. You were talking about the W and X… And they don't have the Compton wavelength of the W particle.

B: (Acknowledges)

Y: But they have the Fermi Coupling Constant. I don't think it's useful when it's…it's under…you have this…This. It's under the Electro Weak section.

B: Uh huh. Yes, yes, yes, because the boson is carrier of the weak force.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: Great. I'll try to do it. But, for instance, is it allowed to take this approximation that we have three…that we have these clear situation which is not correct, actually. We have one…harmonic of one for the biggest circuit; of two for the second; and of three for the third. But it might not be the case.

Y: Ok. I like that digital whole number system.

B: Amazing.

Y: I think it…that as we…it's closely connected to the Lila assumptions. Just how, I don't know. I leave that up to you. (She laughs). Can we look at one thing?

B: Uh huh. Yes.

Y: Did you get any of these updated?

Punita: The diagrams, oh yeah.

Y: Thank you for that.

B: Ah. Thank you.
73:00
Punita: (?)

B: Uh huh.

Y: You happen to have just all the right background. (Everyone laughs) Exactly right.

B: I am glad.

Y: We were working on this yesterday.

Punita: Matter?

Y: I'd like to go through it again.

B: Beautiful.

Y: And I would like to discuss this question…
74:00
B: Another one? (Discussing something with Punita). Oh OK.

Y: …of the term 'time'. I think I agreed with the diagram for the most part. But as I mentioned before, I'm worried about the word 'projection'.

Punita: (Acknowledges).

Y: Not that it's wrong but it's misleading because it implies that there is another…

B: Realm.

Y: Ability which is called, 'the ability to project one thing on the other.' And there's not. What it really is, as described in the Lila Paradigm, it's due to the attribute of unity.

Punita: (Acknowledges)

Y: And that unity merges two states. (Punita acknowledges). Or a state and an anthological attribute. So I think we're multiplying or adding a term that's unnecessary.

Punita: OK.
75:57
Y: I think the concept of projection is, as I understand it, is correct. But…and it would be useful in explaining *in addition* to the initial grasp. But in the beginning that (?) to grasp something that they think is fundamental as an addition to the unitary affect. And it's not really an addition; it's a consequence of it. As you have said, 'with the projection of A's direct knowledge of itself compared with the consciousness of itself. But how does that comparison come about and why does it come about? It comes about because of the unitarian (unitary) nature of an individual. And that is the fundamental point. Neither the comparison nor the projection is fundamental. It's just like adding the phrase that I added yesterday, 'self enlightenment' is a – while we have this, this is another name you can call it.

Punita: (Acknowledges)

Y: Just another way of putting it...which is useful. And using projection is useful. And using comparison is useful. But they're all a consequence of something more fundamental which is the diagram; what the diagram itself shows. However, I don't know really what to do about it because, take Darshana, for example. I've explained this to her for the last 10 years. And she didn't get the whole picture until last night when she talked to you about it.

Punita: (Acknowledges)

Y: And suddenly she got it. Well, she listened to your explanations which are from the point of view of projection. But now she's not interested in projection because she's understood what went behind it. (Everyone laughs). So, how many lead-ins do we need to suit each person? (Laughs) The ways of explaining it. She got it because of her background. I don't know what was her mental process.

Punita: (Acknowledges)

Y: But if we broke it down, it would probably be a different way of looking at it. And mine is different again. I just said, "Well, it's obvious." (Everyone laughs).

B: How could you *not* see it?

Y: How can you miss it?!

Punita: It follows that (?) (Everyone laughs)

Darshana: Yeah. Really.

Y: So, I'm just sharing with you my reflections on what we're up against here. I think this is a pretty good diagram. But, Darshana was staying up late giving a simplified version. She doesn't see any need for projection. Now, she's gone back to one I used 12 years ago. (She laughs) (Everyone acknowledges)

Darshana: Really?

Y: Yeah. You see this is in the Radical Theory.

Darshana: Oh, yeah.

Y: Oh, yes. That's right. Now, this is the present moment, she says. And this is a memory as a part of the present moment. And this was the point that Bret was trying to say.

B: Yes. That there's…

Y: And he was trying to tell me his big discoveries to correct my misunderstanding. And I just didn't want to bite that approach after I said no about 4 or 5 times. So, I think we'll just go through it systematically after those opening comments...

Punita: (Acknowledges)
81:10
Y: ...and start with self. We have A's anthological attributes. (Biljana acknowledges). OK. We have A itself. OK. We have a state of direct knowledge based on A's ontological attribute. (Biljana acknowledges). OK. And you've changed it very well to 'ability to act'. OK. And we have a state of the likeness of each attribute in A's state of knowledge based on A's corresponding ontological attribute of A itself. Excellent. (Biljana acknowledges). That's my comment. (Biljana acknowledges). Now that may be enough with just a correlation. But Darshana was able to understand this to her satisfaction by going to this next step of the dotted ellipse which is…

Darshana: Actually, I did that with *time*. I don't see how it's necessary with *self* because you only have one consciousness.

Y: Well, you haven't drawn up one for *self*.

Darshana: No, I didn't do that.

Y: So, I can't…
82:12
Darshana: But it would just stop with that because that is your (?)

Y: Well, that's what I said. I said that might be enough.

Darshana: Yeah. It seems like that.
82:14
Y: 'Because the state of consciousness'…If the word consciousness was included in this part, (Darshana acknowledges) then that says the whole thing without the projection.

Darshana: Last night you told me that but if you're dealing with this, it's not a good example of the projection because it's already a state of consciousness.

Punita: I...

Y: But this has the advantages, 'I am a unitary existence who acts', which combines the state of knowledge and the state of consciousness.
83:10
Punita: And that's what that dotted line alluded to (?). (Biljana acknowledges).

Y: And that's what the ellipse is about.

Darshana: Right (?) She says a couple of words at same time as everyone else.

B: (?)
83:14
Y: And I like that because it sets them up (Punita acknowledges) for the next thing. The next one on *matter* and on *time* and on *space*.

Darshana: Yeah. True.

Y: And, and, and, and, and, and.
83:34
B: (?)

Y: So, 'A's state of consciousness of itself is a projection of A's direct knowledge of itself compared with A's consciousness of self…self enlightenment.' So I'm torn whether at this point to introduce the projection because the concept may be useful later. But so is the prospect of the reduction of state of knowledge in a state of consciousness.

Punita: Uh huh. Yeah.

Y: It implies what…down here. (Biljana acknowledges). But maybe we should just have that on one diagram and then have the next diagram have that plus this.

B: Uh huh. Instead of saying projection, show what is projection.

Y: You show it here and then you show the projected version of it here. In other words, you have all this without this part. (Biljana acknowledges). But put consciousness in here. And then do it again, all of that again, with this added to it because this will help them to grasp it if they haven't already got it. So we get the best of both worlds. (Yogeshwar laughs) He doesn't think so.

Punita: OK. Can I say something now?

Y: You can say something.

Punita: OK. The purpose of the diagram, as I understand it, is to communicate what consciousness is to the typical reader. Is that…

Y: That's not quite…

Punita: OK. Well, what is it then? What are we…who are we addressing?

Y: Well, I don't know what a typical reader is from listening to that. But I would say it's somebody who is more or less interested in the…from reading the first page (Punita acknowledges), and they were…have some education.

Punita: Yes. (Yogeshwar acknowledges). That's the typical reader. That's who'd be interested in it and…

Y: But the second thing that's left out is the text. (Punita acknowledges). There's the text goes with this.

Punita: Yes.

Y: And it has to fit the text. So the definition of consciousness doesn't include projection. (Biljana acknowledges).

Punita: Yeah. Leaving out projection for the moment…

Y: All right.

Punita: OK. The elements on the diagram, that white box that says, 'I am a unitary existence who acts', that is what we're trying to describe to the reader. The reader knows that they're conscious. They have some experience of 'I am conscious'. And to me, that is what that white box should represent on all the diagrams.

Darshana: I *just* wrote that down. (Darshana laughs). Oh yeah. OK.
87:25
Punita: OK? And so, I feel that that should be an element on the diagram because that is what we are trying to communicate to people. The (?) that says, "I am conscious." OK. I'm conscious of a table. I'm conscious of this hand over here and this hand over here. But that's what we're trying to describe to people. So, I feel that that is what that box represents and we should always describe its contents. Now, how that consciousness is constructed is up in that dotted oval. The person who is conscious isn't conscious of who he is and existence or acts, states of knowledge; any of that.

Y: Yes, but this is us. This is this. (Biljana acknowledges).

B: May I say something?

Y: We're talking about someone who *is* in a state of consciousness of themselves. It's one thing to be conscious of being conscious, but it's another thing to be conscious of yourself.

Punita: Yes. OK. And it's at... the problem then we have with sequence where we're going here. The typical reader is not self-enlightened. And…

Y: Well, no they're not and they won't understand this until they at least have a momentary unstable self-experience. (Punita acknowledges). They won't know what this means.

Punita: But, I felt it would be easier to start with *matter*. That's because people know that they are conscious of it.

Y: Well, I've been torn about that myself.

Punita: OK.

Y: In fact, in the earlier version it was…I did *matter* first. (Punita acknowledges). And then did *self* because it's harder for them to talk themselves into accepting yourself.

Punita: But even so, even talking about self, consciousness of self as you described it, a person does not see anything anywhere; not any when; not even a clear light. This is what consciousness of the nonphysical is like. And so for me, I thought the box for 'consciousness of self' should be either blank or perhaps that or, worse, that. But to match the text again. It's not even a clear light. It's not even anything anywhere.

Y: Well, then they're going to think they're conscious of an arrow…

Punita: Well, that's why…
90:00
Y: (?) coming out of the back of their head.

Punita: I like…that's my preference right there. (Yogeshwar laughs). And then we describe it. 'I am a unitary existence who acts'. But that's...then that matches the text. The graphic…what the person sees in consciousness.

Y: OK. I got your point now. And I know you have more details on this. But before I do that I want to hear her comment. (Punita acknowledges).

B: Ah, just one point. If the dilemma is whether to explicitly state, 'this is the projection', or not and actually the dilemma is whether to keep the picture clear and pure, actually, without adding anything which is not (?) logical into it; or, at the other side, to have a reader who will easily understand it. So this is our dilemma. And this could be resolved if we, for instance, leave the picture as it is, but then add explicitly which actually, in other words, maybe Don was also suggesting to explain that this whole process is timeless. Projection by itself implies a hidden notion of time because it is a process to project something…

Y: And it's another process to project…
91:52
B: It's another process. In this respect it is not (?)logical. But it is done purely to make the process...not the process but the whole perception of state of consciousness of self closer to the reader. Just stress the projection is just for a, how to say (?) (She laughs) reasons. It is just to make the picture clearer. I have written something last night. May I bring it?

Y: Uh huh.

Y: (Talking to Punita after Biljana leaves room looking for her paper) I think that there's a typo (Punita acknowledges) that you missed.

Punita: Uh huh; A few.

Y: There it is. The word, 'I am a', 'I am *a* unitary existence who acts'. Otherwise, you said like an Indian speaking there.

Punita: (Laughs) "I am unitary existence." (They both laugh).

Y: You sound like Amrit.

Darshana: "I am conscious being."

Y: "I am am." (Everyone laughs)

Punita: Yeah. I understand the consequence of the unity; and I think that's very important. How to…just how to get that in there. That this just isn't a process because I don't like that, introducing the process, either.

Y: It's not a process.

Punita: I know.

Y: As she says, 'it's timeless'. But…well, let's see what else she has to say about it.

Punita: One way I thought about explaining the projection just like in a projection TV. You have red, green and blue light. (Yogeshwar acknowledges). And they combine into yellow, white and the other colours. That's not in time. And that's how these various things combine into a single thing here.

Y: Yes, that's true.

Punita: It's timeless…

Y: So, that's why I say we don't have to get it all in one diagram. There will be a text.

Punita: Uh huh. Yes.

Y: And that text may be several pages (Punita acknowledges) because this is the essence of the Lila Paradigm. Without the consciousness and knowledge resolution, you don't have the operators to do what's necessary to account for this. (Punita acknowledges).

(Biljana returns).

Y: OK.

B: It is regarding *time*, so later. It is regarding *time*. I have written something about…

Y: You didn't show us this.

B: Uh huh. It's funny, but since I have… (Yogeshwar laughs, then Biljana laughs). First of all, this I…actually I wanted to show it to you at breakfast, not at session. Even though it's funny, but still, it is another subject.

Y: Satan.

B: Shall we see it now…

Y: So you made the matrices.

B: I made the matrices; but there is a question. For instance, you said if one individual is out then it is Satan. But this one individual out, in terms of matrices…for instance, it means a whole row of zeros and a whole column of zeros. (Yogeshwar acknowledges). This is a whole, for instance, nonphysical individual which is somehow out of the notion. But if we have just one zero, this is a picture like this one where we have just one arrow missing. And Satan is N squared. So the number of arrows is N squared, N factorial minus one. Is it also (Yogeshwar acknowledges) Satan when we have just one relation missing? God is perfect; He couldn't be diminished in any way. So this is clearly God. But when we have not a whole individual which is a loner expelled from it…

Y: But this is the neutral…

B: the neutral

Y: It's the neutral matrix. And it's a reference.

B: OK. This is actually just…I thought about it and I…

Y: OK. I want God. (Punita acknowledges)

B: I really, I have written here, 'the answer to this is *no peti*'

Y: It's what?

B: This is the answer Buddha use to say – or say nothing – (Yogeshwar acknowledges) when somebody asks whether the universe exists or whether the universe does not exist…*no peti*; this is not the way to ask questions.
97:02
Y: That that's not edify.

B: Yes. Yes. I have written something. But I don't want to interrupt your discussion with Don.
97:10
Punita: Well, (?) matter what we're going to do. If we can do that, fine.

Y: We have plenty of time.
97:40
B: This is actually for this structure. A is in state of knowledge of B in a state of knowledge of C. So the whether to deal with it or to introduce to someone who is, for instance, looking at this structure for the first time, is, we could say, 'A is the referent individual. A is its ontological attributes; A is its states of direct knowledge because ability to act are originations. No time on this basically, it is timeless…it represents timelessness'. This is...I don't know whether I would represent it. It really is not relevant. For instance, I have a question here. It appears that exercising the ability to act which is originating act brings about illusion because it introduces consciousness which is illusion. It is as if although it is just seemingly. It is as if when we exercise our ability to act which is actually a step towards God and towards (Yogeshwar acknowledges) the self-enlightened, a fully enlightened universe in which everyone is in a state of knowledge of everyone else. We…to this pure…although it is not pure. But we add, somehow, element of illusion which is consciousness. But it is not so actually because in this original picture of just one individual who is not in state of knowledge with any other individual, actually there are states of no knowledge included.
97:58
Y: Yes.

B: Which resolves the paradox…

Y: Which is what?

B: Which resolves the paradox, somehow. The illusionary paradox I introduced here.

Y: Uh huh, I see.

B: My idea was that it might be paradoxical that when we have just a universe of a state of affairs in which each and every individual is just with…it's alone, so to say. It's a loner with no states of direct knowledge to any other individual. If this represent God – a fully enlightened universe in which (Yogeshwar acknowledges) everyone is in state of knowledge of everyone else – then this state of affairs when we have zeros – zero, zero, zero, zero, zero, zero (Yogeshwar acknowledges) , no connection between the non-physical individuals, or we have lack of space of knowledge (Yogeshwar acknowledges) – is Satan. Or even Satan squared because we have also; we are missing also the connections. (Yogeshwar acknowledges). And it seems, that**(?at) [Recording time 100:52]** first time, paradoxical when the first origination takes place. Which is somehow the greatest secret, so to say, of all. The greatest – this is, for instance, explained or deal with in *Perennial Philosophy of Huxley*. Or in Meher Baba's *God Speaks*. Or in **(?any esoteric) [Recording time 101:30]** teachings, the greatest mysteries of the universe is how out of nothing something appears. This step is crucial. How out of manifested manifestation began. (Yogeshwar acknowledges). And so this is this first samskara of Meher Baba. (Yogeshwar acknowledges). It is always the greatest mystery. And it remains unexplained. How all of sudden out of nothing something appears.

Y: Yes. I read his book twice.

B: Yes. At least twice, actually.

Y: Can you imagine reading that twice? (laughs).

B: Ohhhhh. I have reading it once for 16 hours unceasingly. Reading, reading, reading, reading. (Yogeshwar acknowledges). When something was not clear I went back.

Y: Over and over.

B: Over and over; even though his approach is full of repeatings (repetition). (Yogeshwar acknowledges). Even though, I read it and read it. And then I went to such…I couldn't put in words. In such great state of consciousness. In such state of laugh, understanding…It was incredible. And then day after this a friend came – a girlfriend – came from India and brought me a…

Punita: Rudraksha?

B: brought…

Punita: Rudraksha beads?

B: Yes. Yes.

Y: Mala.

B: Mala, but with a – not mala…

Y: With a picture of…

B: A necklace with a picture of Meher Baba. Which was given to her by his closest disciples. It was incredible because it happened just one in my life, my friend to bring me such present (Yogeshwar acknowledges). And just once in my life that I read this book so…in this manner; 16 hours unceasingly without break. And it was great. So, my idea was: Seemingly it is paradoxical then that we have a state of affairs – I don't want to say 'at the beginning'. There is no beginning. But a state of affairs in which we have just **(?)[Recording time 103:42] numbers** and no connections with them. According to what we have been now talking so far, in regard of matrices…which is actually just a mathematical game, nothing else. I don't want to, at this point and in this type of discussion, to denote some deeper meaning to it. It has operational meaning. Later on when we will want to present Lila to broader audience and to educated audience, we shall – and to support it with the scientific data, then yes. Then it will have meaning. But, at this pure pristine representation when we have just the greatest mysteries and the greatest secret, so to say, of the mankind presented, then I shouldn't mix matrices at this point. But in terms of matrices this is Satan, so to say. We have no connections. We have just states of no knowledge. And then all of a sudden, seemingly because there is no time – it is timelessness – we have the first origination. The first nonphysical individual originated state, in a state of knowledge of another nonphysical individual. Which is act of, on another level it is act of love. It is a step towards God. Although very far away, towards a fully enlightened universe.

And so it is paradoxical that this also brings – it is not paradoxical, it is manifestation out of unmanifested by fiat, or whatever you say, the first…initially, the first origination of sleeping God who wants to know himself is done. It is also in Arabic teachings. It is also stressed in very beautiful words by Abun Nerabi. **(Please check. Not sure where quoting him stops.)[Recording time 106:00]** Who says, "God…The first command." This is the first God's command. This is the first command given by God. The first origination. The first nonphysical individual originates itself in the state of knowledge of another nonphysical individual. It is real. It is the Ultimate Reality. And it should be real and pure. But at the same time, the unmanifested comes into picture. Because at the same time, by doing this first origination – and rightfully. And it is of greatest importance that you also, at this moment, bring into picture not just the state of direct knowledge which is something very pure, which is the pristine state of affairs, but also state of consciousness which is illusion. Because with this very first origination of God also his shadows appear. The shadow of God – or *maya* – or it's manifestation. So out of the unmanifested – by desire, as it is described in **(?)[Recording tune 107:06]** – manifested comes into world. Because this is the desire. But desiring in the most beautiful meaning of the word; like *eecha*. Not desire *duka* – which is binding, which is negative connotation – but *eecha* which is one of the attributes of Shiva. It is *eecha* **(?) [Recording time 107:40]** *eecha*. What is the word? It is the first origination, the first impulse of a sleeping God who wants to mirror Himself in His creation. So it brings about, yes, a step towards God – a now awakened God, a God who is conscious of Himself – but also it brings about consciousness which is illusion. Although the greatest of all…I mean the one which is closer to the pure state of enlightened state, but still it is illusion. So with this same origination, which is paradoxical, with this same first origination both, a step towards awakened God comes into picture and illusion which is the manifested universe. And in final instance, this is what we have in Kartsutra. 'Form is emptiness, emptiness is form. All which is form is emptiness and all which is emptiness form'.

Y: Well. (Biljana laughs). Well said.

B: And then I have…later on I'll describe it to you. I have basic level 2 which is A in a state of knowledge of B and then have A in state of knowledge of B in state of knowledge of C.

Y: Yes. You're doing it. (Biljana laughs).

B: This is about the first origination…And I have added, Buddha would say, "*no peti, no peti*" in **(?Parli/pali)[Recording time 109:26]** language, '*no upa eti'*. 'This is not…that is not so'. The very instant you bring a word, you put it into words, you lose the Truth…

Y: Yes. Of course. (Punita laughs)

B: …because it is lost. (Biljana laughs).

Punita: Yep. That's the problem. (laughs).

Y: Well. I want to take a break now. And…but this is beautiful how you grasp it. And that, after all, was my purpose here.

B: Thank you.

Y: And you're putting it in your own words.

B: Yes. Yes.

Y: And that's even better. And then we'll work out some examples. (Biljana acknowledges). And then you will teach somebody else. (Biljana laughs). And then the world will be alright. (laughter). This afternoon we'll do some more (Punita acknowledges) on this. Darshana and Don are having kittens. (Darshana laughs).

Darshana: At least that's not true. (laughter) We know I'm not having…

Y: OK. So, we'll do that then.