#55S
Formal talk
Lila Recordings
13/11/2006 PM
1 Hr 16 min
Recording 55

Y: …talked a little bit during the break and pretty well worked it out where she's decided it is going to need a program for some of it.

B: Yes. Shall I explain?

Y: Yes, please. Wait until he turns it on.

Punita: I just did.

Y: Good.

B: I believe the model shouldn't be too much simplified. So, we shall be sure that we are not losing some, maybe, important information. So instead of using the simplified model I presented this morning, actually, I'll redo the whole procedure for tau particle with this model in which we have circuit of n…and also this n will include K and the coupling constant of agents…

Y: little n?

B: Little n, yes. (Y acknowledges.) Then we shall have first crossover, second crossover and third crossover because tau particle occurs when this model is introduced into picture. And so we shall have per one beat of moving around the circles, X-times circulating around the greatest circuit which is X n-prime I have here. **[Recording time 1:48]** I have used symbol n-prime for the number of agents (Y acknowledges.) which is n-small actually. And then equalize how many times we go around the circles and equalize always two circuits, equalize the number of times needed to move around the circle for the one circle and for the second one and combining the largest with the smaller…the largest with the medium…the largest with the smallest which will be done in this manner. For instance, Xn-prime equals X plus 1n-prime minus F of three supposing the first four structure made of one arrow and two bifurcations is F of three and so on. Xn-prime is X plus KN **[Recording time 3:00]** minus F of four for the…which results from equalizing the largest circuit with the medium. And Xn-prime is X plus n-prime minus F of five which introduces now F5 into picture. But now, this is the basic model which could be used. We have here three equations and three unknowns which are X, K and n. And this could be solved. Also, we might not neglect the members which will come out of this model in order to have more accurate results, but now, another consideration. Since this F5, so-to-say, is of small probability in comparison, for instance, to the first crossover circuit or… it is somehow…

Y: But it's more arrows.

B: Yes. It was the reason actually for not including the fourth dimension into Lila Paradigm, isn't it so? --The small probability of F5-- because as you were saying when you have been introducing Lila that actually the fourth dimension decays into energy. So this is due to the small probability of… For instance, we have larger

probability for the first circuit to appear than for F6, for instance, although these considerations are all for this primordial pattern, how…this basic **[Recording time 5:10]** part of the curve which was the original pattern for the original pattern. (Y acknowledges). And now we are in the recursions. But still these considerations are still valid. So, my idea is – maybe I used too many words for a simple statement, I was to... I should like to propose that in the model for tau particle, we should maybe use not anymore F3, F of four, and F of five because it's maybe…it uses too much unjustified simplification into the model, but instead use the equations for the first crossover and maybe multiply it or square it, and so on, for instance, which is not so simple. It is R is arc co-sine of ½ (Y acknowledges.) *e* to the R squared over two where R is Q-squared over 2N squared.

Y: So what is the basis for your suggestion?

B: To introduce instead of F of four, to introduce this one, maybe squared or on the third or cubed because this is more accurate somehow, and because it will provide more accurate results maybe. Now, just one notion: This won't be so easy to do because we have here iterations. This is recursive process. The finding of R includes recursions. And finally I wanted to emphasize that we shouldn't neglect maybe the members now once we are trying to find tau. This is just first suggestion. (Y acknowledges.) I was thinking that maybe we should somehow introduce the real values for the probabilities for the first crossover into a circuit to appear because so far we have been working with simplified model.

Y: Hmm

B: Maybe, maybe not. If this gives good results, then OK.

Y: But there's a basis for these which is as you've said. This is like…

B: Yes, it is.

Y: …this fork?

B: Yes, it is this fork, yes.

Y: Yes.

B: Yes, it is a basis. OK, then this will simplify it.

Y: You see, it is these very formulas that I used to get the mass ratios (B acknowledges.) of these very particles: (B acknowledges.) the electron, the muon and the tau particle. So I think that is the essence of what gives… because it's a direct relationship between mass and the wavelength of the particle. (B acknowledges.)

B: Yes, great. Yes, it is. Yes it is. At one point, I was thinking to look once again over the way how n was obtained from the ratio of masses. I have it somewhere but…

Y: By Michael. (B acknowledges.)

B: Yes, OK. Then…

Y: I'm just telling you my concerns. (B acknowledges.) That I would hate to see you do a lot of work and then find out that the basis wasn't correct. It may be. I don't know. But I can't see removing the…Ah… I don't know enough about your way of approach to really talk about the mathematics. But I know that the mass and the wavelength are related.

B: Yes. I was thinking of it at one point somehow to simplify by looking at the way how mass was used. First of all, I'll develop, maybe, this model; and then we shall see.

Y: And if it doesn't work out, then you might go to other desperate means. (All laugh.)

B: Somehow, it will refine it.

Y: So.

B: Now my idea was-- It is very good. This is very good approach; but then I remembered that Lila actually states that the introducing of the fourth dimension is not somehow in the message of Lila or in the nature of Lila because – or the principles on which Lila is built once the physical is introduced into picture -- but rather, energy, that the fourth dimension somehow decays into energy because of the probability because the probabilities for such structures are very small. And this is why I thought maybe some other approach could be introduced. But actually this is fine. I'll start with this one and then…

Y: I don't think your logic is quite correct on…that… understanding what I was saying. And I want to clarify what I was saying earlier about why there's not a fourth dimension or a fifth dimension. (B acknowledges.) There are those dimensions; but they're not experienced in the consciousness of the observer as spatial dimensions. They're experienced as energy. And that puts the energy in the particles. **[Recording time 12:34]** That is, it's – or the mass, another way of saying the same thing if you just take the speed of light. So, those dimensions do exist; and they are a fundamental part of it. It's not a matter of their probability being low. It just means that a lot of arrows have to exist in order to expect one of them to exist because F4 and F5 have a lot more arrows to expect them to occur. And the number of arrows determines how much energy is involved. The more arrows per particle, the more mass or energy is in the particle and the shorter the wavelength is. The question I think you should be asking is, "Why is the wavelength shorter when the number of arrows is greater?" (B acknowledges.) That seems like a contradiction; but it's not.

B: Because the mass is larger.

Y: No, it's because one wave cycle. (B acknowledges.) You can… you crowd more arrows into it and makes it more massive or more energetic (B acknowledges.) for one wave cycle so that the wave cycle is not changing its form. In fact, the more arrows are involved, the shorter the wavelength becomes in terms of length. So we ought to work that out in terms of the circuit.

B: May I say something? (Y acknowledges.) When I was saying about the probabilities, what I had in mind was not this simple notion that instead of fourth dimension, we have energy, no. But I had in mind this picture. I had in mind that when we have the third… we have for the third dimension, we have three

crossovers. (Y acknowledges.) And these are the… I mean, the direct knowledge of, for instance, of this Individual here for the – which is one of the circuit for Individual A - combines with the consciousness of it as a physical particle, and so on, and so on. So we introduce the one dimension into the picture, then second dimension, then third dimension. But now for the fifth…for the fourth dimension, for the forth dimension, we should have a structure which has four bifurcated branches. But this one…and all of these are the point of bifurcation and also the referent Individual's consciousness where reduction takes place, are both of the same circuit as it is…as it is presented now. **[Recording time 15:36]**

For instance, this is a picture for the fourth dimension to be introduced. This is on one hand. On the other hand, for energy, we have one spatial dimension which is obtained by this picture. We have here one referent Individual and we have bifurcation with two orthogonal states here. And we have one dimension. And then… and then the second orthogonal dimension – which is energy or h-bar **[Recording time 16:48]** if these are Planck lengths (Y acknowledges.) – is also produced by a fork structure of two or of an arrow bifurcating into two states. And all of them are of the same circuit. And now, we have here, actually, we have first crossover, second crossover, third crossover, fourth crossover. And my idea was that the underlying pattern for energy and the underlying pattern for the fourth dimension are topologically the same. This was my idea. It was not just a simple notion that there is no fourth dimension.

Y: OK. I got it.

B: Yes. This was my idea.

Y: I got what you were saying. I still think it's the wrong way to go.

B: OK. OK.

Y: Let me make a suggestion now, (B acknowledges.) that if this arrow came to here (B acknowledges.) instead of to here…

B: It is all the same actually, but OK.

Y: No, it's not. This is one arrow (B acknowledges.) and…

B: You mean just one arrow?

Y: No, but they could be several arrows in here, (B acknowledges.) all right? And there could be several arrows here. (B acknowledges.) But that would be fewer than in this case because there's more arrows involved. (B acknowledges.)

B: And this is what I meant by…

Y: Ah, now, but wait.

B: Yes, yes. OK.

Y: By more arrows being involved on the higher dimension (B acknowledges.) and the higher F number…

B: Yes, the force…

Y: F four and five are going to have to be this way and couldn't be here. (B acknowledges.) So this makes their wavelength shorter. (B acknowledges.)

B: It is shorter, yes.

Y: …Which would be the inverse of the number of arrows involved in making this formation. You see, if it's F3, it's about 10 to the 15^{th} (B acknowledges.) arrows are involved. But an F4, it's about 10 to the 17^{th}. (B acknowledges.) And an F5 is about 10 to the 19^{th} arrows. (B acknowledges.) So I think that that forces this arrow to… so that the number of arrows that come from this point to here is greater. In other words, the number of arrows, somehow, **[Recording time 19:44]** either in**…** is going to have to be in the circuit because there's a lot of arrows in the circuit. From here to here makes that this arrow is going to have to join close here. So that it would have almost N or 10 to the 19^{th} arrows in the circuit before getting back to our original referent Individual. So that each one has more arrows going from here, and this has less. And the higher the F number, the more arrows have to be in the circuit in order to… and that decreases the wavelength of the particle which is the inverse or the opposite side. Here there's a lot of arrows; here there's few. So this determines the probability and this determines the wavelength. So this wavelength of the electron here is longer. Now, that's not thinking in terms of sine waves; but it is in terms of wavelength. And a sine wave is simply a description of a wavelength.

Now that's the kind of thing I'm thinking of that makes these F numbers primary and not just an *epi* or attached onto the end like you've done. This is a main part of the formulation, this times N and this is just an add on. **[Recording time 22:31]**

B: This is the circumference of the circuit.

Y: But you said that these are just…doesn't change the value much. Is that right?

B: I said that because of… I'll show you now why because, for instance, when I developed the model, I got members of this kind: F of three over F of four, for instance. (Y acknowledges.) And this is F of three is third square of…third root of N squared (Y acknowledges.) of…pardon, of 6N squared over fourth root…

Y: Twenty-four. **[Recorded time 23:24]**

B: …of 24N to the third. And now, I have found this number, third root of six over fourth root of 24 which is sum number. And then we have N… this was, I believe, this was numerator and this was denominator. And this is all multiplied by N. And somehow, I concluded that it could be neglected. Maybe it was not just this way, but ah…

Y: Yes, I know you did.

B: …I concluded that it could be neglected.

Y: And I don't think it can.

B: OK. Maybe it cannot; maybe it cannot because…

Y: Because they determine the mass; (B acknowledges.) and the mass determines the wavelength.

B: Yes. I don't remember the context in which they have been introduced. Maybe they shouldn't be neglected because Michael, in his papers, neglected one member of such kind and then I did the same. But now, since we have discovered a mistake in his paper, maybe his thinking is not to be followed fully, the basic, yes, but not fully.

Y: So, I think it's the number of arrows in the circuit that is determined by where the arrow… where the crossover arrow goes. Then there's the number of arrows to where it goes to, and then the number of arrows from where it goes to back to the original, the number of arrows from *here* to *here* and the number of arrows from here to here. (B acknowledges.) This number of arrows is the wavelength. You just multiply that times *lq* and you get the wavelength. And this gives you the mass. So they're opposite of each other. And then this would be a heavy one because it's a lot of arrows. This would be lighter. This would be lighter still.

B: Yes, yes… if this is mass, yes. And since we introduce mass as a resistance to movement…

Y: Yes.

B: …it itself…

Y: So in affect, it slows it down. (B acknowledges.) And if it slows it down, then the wavelength gets longer. (B acknowledges.) To get one cycle, it takes a longer period of time, more arrows.

B: Because this is actually just one origination, actually. But this is resistance to movement, somehow.

Y: Now…

B: But you know, for instance, now…sorry. If… it is all the same. OK. The considerations we had yesterday, this could go inside the circuit… about the definition of a crossover. But OK, maybe later on we shall…

Y: Well, I think you came up with a valid calculation yesterday. But I don't know how you arrived at it because, as I said, I don't understand the mathematics of what you were doing. I followed step by step, but I didn't know why each step was made. And I don't need to know. I think you got a correct answer because you were dealing with the right subject matter. But I can't follow topology. That's my inability and my lack of familiarity with it. So, I don't know what to do. (Both laugh.) I don't know.

B: We shall try several approaches.

Y: I think if you just look at what you've done, (B acknowledges.) I think you will sort it out. You don't need me. I think you can sort it out yourself until you're satisfied.

B: OK. Thank you.

Y: But Michael got a right answer by a wrong way and you got a right answer. But

I'm not sure that it's a right or wrong way. I don't know. I don't know how you got it. But it can't be a coincidence. And you keep trying to go off to find some other way to do it. And I think you were on the right track.

B: I shall go back to the basics. Yes. Yes. Great.

Y: OK. Is that enough of that for now?

B: Uh huh. Yes. Yes.

Y: OK. Then I'll do some stuff, some more of the same, sharing with you more of my experiences about the Lila Paradigm. We went over this once and we're going to go over it a little more – on the *Radical Theory.* **[Recording time 28:45]**

Page 26: *Chronology of Events*, Section 7

Even though the information model explains that the experience of time is actually due to extant, embedded conscious states being experienced as earlier and earlier memories, for ease of language in this section, a customary way of thinking about time as a preexisting background that progresses from early to late is used rather than working from the present backwards.

Bret seemed to be worried about it, doing that. And I looked at it some more and I can't find any problem with it, that the formulas all come out the same. Now maybe he knows something that I don't know. But if he does, he hasn't made it clear to me. All he has said to me is that he asked me if he has misunderstood. The answer to that is either 'yes' or 'no'. But that doesn't say, "Please tell me what I need to know." That would be different. OK. We'll go on.

Modern science assumes that the laws of physics, the equations of fundamental dynamics, remains the same as one goes back in time, even to the (quote) "instant of the beginning."

I can't figure out what's the matter with them. I haven't found anywhere, in any literature on Cosmology and Physics going back to the Big Bang history, that anybody considered anything except a slight drift of alpha, in the value of alpha, earlier in the earlier…go back further. And they don't consider that… well, they consider that the size of the radius of the universe gets smaller and smaller. But they don't consider that the speed of light might slow down because Einstein showed that it was all relative and the speed of light was not relative and it was the absolute. So, they used that as a base (B acknowledges.) of reference and build from there the speed of light. In fact, the way it is defined now in the Fundamental Constants… the speed of light – That's the wrong paper. The speed of light in a vacuum is exact; it's 299792458 meters per second, exact. In other words, they say, "We can measure the speed of light more accurately than anything else; and we'll just say that that is it; and everything else and all the other values are determined from that like the productivity of space and its susceptibility to electric static energy. And the permeability of it in terms of magnetism is somehow determined by the speed of light." **[Recorded time 32:46]**

And it's the other way around! It's the magnetic susceptibility of space; and it's electrical susceptibility of space that determines what the speed of light is. Well, they know that in principle. But when they go to develop a theory, they use the speed of

light as their basis. After all, it says here it's exact. And then they have the 'characteristics and impedance of a vacuum'. That's another way of saying the same thing. It is simply the square root of the ratio of the susceptibility to magnetism. And the electrical susceptibility determines what the impedance is to electromagnetic waves moving through space, that it's impeded by them. Otherwise, it would go infinitely fast. Well, the thing that they should ask is, "What determines this impedance to light?" And then they would find that the fundamental constants change their value in the very early universe. According to the Information Theory or the Lila Paradigm, at about 10 to the minus 31st of a second, the speed of light begins to slow. **[Recorded time 35:40]**

Now the reason for that is that the size of the largest circuit gets smaller because we've been taking arrows out as we're backing up in time. Or if you want to work forward in time, all the Individuals or almost all of them have been connected into the circuit. So the speed of light doesn't increase very much. Every time you throw another arrow in, it becomes a crossover instead of joining into the largest circuit. So, adding more arrows doesn't add anything that they can tell because there's not many arrows being added. The net sum per second is…about 10 to the 45th arrows are being changed per second. Remember, we're talking *as if* time existed per second. And half of them are being changed to adding more arrows and the other half of that 10 to the 45th arrows are being taken away because we're keeping a balance there at **[Recording time 37:20]** the edge of chaos. So, they don't get any net change in the speed of light. If they measure it, it measures the same day after day, month after month, year after year, decade after decade, century after century. Well, they haven't had that many centuries to check it. But the so called speed of light in a vacuum now is fixed. But as you go backwards in time and you take out arrows, you've got a lot of crossovers. There's about 13 of them for every arrow in the circuit. So you're going to take out 13 crossovers and one arrow out of the circuit. Well, one arrow out of the circuit isn't going to change the speed of light very much because it has little n, or n-prime, if you like, arrows in it. So it would just be one divided by n. So you have to go quite a ways back in time. And I've figured out that at 10 to the minus 31st of a second, the speed of light begins to noticeably slow. And at about 10 to the minus 32nd of a second, time and space begin to fragment, both time and space, because when you get earlier than 10 to the minus 32nd, the curve… the avalanche is going backwards or falling to pieces. And it's not an avalanche; it's a shattering. A fragmentation process takes place. And mass and energy cease to exist all together. (B acknowledges.) So they have these charts worked out for the very early universe that say what the temperature is. Well, you get back, there's no motion. So the temperature, you can't say it's absolute zero, it doesn't apply. There is no such thing as temperature, hot or cold or anything else. There's no motion. There's no gravity because it's just a time arrow and a three bifurcation here and there. So of all… **[Recording time 40:08]** all this has come apart. And at about 10 to the minus 40th of a second, space ceases to exist. So now the space curve is flat and time is getting shorter and shorter and shorter and shorter and shorter. You keep taking more arrows out until you get at 10 to the minus 44th of a second. Five times ten to the minus 44th, **[Recording time 40:38]** you take one arrow out and there isn't any two arrow pair. So time itself ceases to exist. There is no time what-so-ever in anybody's consciousness. But if you weren't thinking that these phenomena are in the consciousness of nonphysical Individuals, then you have to have a background instead, a background of time going on, a background of space, in order for things to happen in it. But when you're dealing with Individuals, you don't need those.

Now I'm saying a lot of things that you know already. (B acknowledges.) But I'm putting it together in a package because if you're talking to scientists, if that should happen, I want you to know how I see it. And you can at least say, "Well, Berner says this is how he sees it."

Concerning the beginning of time, science has no comment to make. And even if they make one, they don't amount to anything. So there's still no comment. In this Information Paradigm, that beginning didn't just happen. It was caused by agents as a whole, placing themselves in states of direct knowledge. And that started the beginning of time. It was caused by these agents. It wasn't caused by what they think of as God. Nor even what the Lila Paradigm defines as God. It was started by Individual agents making choices, period. And this validates Individuals. This is the whole based on one truth-- is that we have the power. **[Recorded time 43:11]**

And when you present that to somebody and they get the idea, they apply it to themselves, that they have this power of choice. And that enables them to gradually evolve and improve and grow. It is the opposite of what both religion and science are saying. Religion says, "God's doing it all. He created you and made you, and made your... and if you think what you are is not a spirit but a body, he made the body."

Well, depending upon your definition of God, but in the Lila Paradigm, it's the Individuals that make those choices, that taken collectively is God at work. But it is because it's not God as a being, but God as a truth, as a principle, you might say. And these Individuals are the ones that act, the *Li,* the knowers. And you don't want to get trapped on the 'lee' shore. (P laughs.) Bad joke, huh? (Y laughs.) OK.
The following is a summary of the physical phenomena produced in the consciousness of the agents as their collective choices to be in a state of knowledge increase, starting with the first moment of time and ending at the present time although that is not what, in my estimation, took place. It wasn't that we were all somehow created without any states of knowledge but had the ability to do so and then started doing so; and everything is evolving. Nor was it created so that we had no reason to go one way or the other, so we just made random choices. And so we have our bell curve in the middle. I don't think it was that way. I think the question is invalid.

"How did it start?" is not a valid question given the assumptions of the Lila Paradigm that there is no time; it's an illusion. (B acknowledges.) So it wasn't started either in the middle or in the end or in the beginning. It's just what it is. It's just whatever the extant choices are. And given that, you can make whatever calculation or figuring you want to make.

The numbers in graph B, C and D are coordinated with the numbers that head the paragraphs. Did you have any comments so far (B acknowledges.) or questions, either one? I might be right and I might be wrong; but it's what I'm saying. (A lot of papers being rustled) **[Recorded time 46:52]**

Yes, here's that graph. And here they have temperature; and temperature goes from now… This is now, (B acknowledges.) and time goes back all the way here and temperature gets hotter and hotter and hotter and hotter. So when they're doing the Grand Unification Theories which apply from about here on back, their assumptions are incorrect. They think that the constants of space, time, temperature, (and) energy stay the values that they are, that it's just a matter of contracting down to a singularity. And it's compressing all this energy tighter and tighter and tighter.

What does this say? Density…that…the density gets more and more dense as you go back further and further in time. And this is time. And these are when they say the different particles are created. And that is partly correct. There's some created here that are marked here as being created. See, you've got W and Zed and X and Y particles. But they belong up in here and so do some of these. But this is a summary of very close to how science sees the early universe.

I just want to get (rustling papers)… What happened to my graphs? I'm thinking I filed them away. Yes! And we were looking at this. It didn't start like this, nor… It is like this now. But if we add a total of more and more arrows, this graph will move like this. And over the next thousand or so years, I expect that to happen. But I don't expect it to go to here. I expect this to go to here somehow and the whole thing does whatever it does. And we'll be so far into what now appears to be chaos. All this seems like chaos to us now because we're not accepting enough others. But those who do like this number of Individuals which is very few of them, they are not in chaos because they are accepting so many billions and billions of others. And trillions and trillions of others, they are accepting. And that enables them to see the order. And the very act that they're being in that state is what puts the order into the seeming chaos to these guys. (Makes tapping noise with his finger) This is the average person right here.

OK. Now we've got some graphs. Now we can go ahead. As indicated in graph B… (Noise of papers rustling) I have graph B here some place. [**Recorded time 52:00]** Here's one graph B; it's an early one when I was trying to figure out which curve it follows. Space goes down to zero here. And then, as time continues, back to there.

Page 27: Nonphysical realm may be collectively not denying up to a total of F2. That's this part here. **[Recording time 52:34]** So when 4.7 times 10 to the 11^{th} states of direct knowledge exist, they produce time, such as… So if AW or LR…none of those are time although each agent with a non-denial is conscious of a unit of physical matter, in this case, such as W ● or R ● (proto fermion). If, however, any agent physically acts not to deny one more information state…

B: Non-physically

Y: Hmm?

B: You said physically. Non-physically

Y: Non-physically acts, yes. The first physical event, the first *event,* can be expected to occur in the consciousness of one agent. This event is a fragment of time in a baby universe. It occurs if the agents are not denying at least 4.7 times 10 to the 11^{th} plus one other information state so that one of the agents in the nonphysical realm can be expected to be conscious of at least one proto-fermion existing at the agent's own present time as produced from the arrangement of two arrows such as A arrow W arrow I. Thus one agent, agent A in this example, is conscious of one time quanta of time having passed from zero time to W, existed in the present time when I dot existed. Since zero time is the result of F2 non-denials and F2 time quanta are equal to one Planck time, zero time is set equal to one Planck time, about five times 10 to the minus 44^{th} of a second. And the time after one time quanta has elapsed is one Planck time plus one time quanta which in the example is A's present time. **[Recorded time 55:29]**

I think that's wrong and I mentioned that when we read it before. And now I have something further to say about it given all our background now. That, at this point when there's fragmented time, it should say, "The time that has elapsed is one Planck time, or zero Planck time, up to one Planck time has elapsed. And time quanta don't exist; it's imaginary." But when you get to a circuit and a crossover goes across the circuit, you get little n Planck times. So at that point, you don't use the square root of 2N.

B: Ah hah! Planck times, not time quanta.

Y: No time quanta, you just use Planck times now. (B acknowledges.) You can use time quanta if you want to. If you figure out what time quanta are which is, take Planck time and divide it by the square root of 2N, and then multiply it by the square root of 2N to get back to Planck time again. All that tells you is about what goes on back in this realm. This is where imaginary time and imaginary space might be considered to exist. But Planck times exist here according to the F numbers. But soon as you get up to the first circuit and the first crossover, then the amount of time involved is multiplying…

B: Ah hah! Yes, KN

Y: KN Planck times for every crossover. Now I think that may affect your calculations.

B: Yes, I'm thinking of it. I'm thinking of it.

Y: And if it does, and I think it does, I can only apologize for not having all my papers up to date. But I've been doing other things (P laughs.) like meditating. So, I'll apologize and not **[Recording time 58:16]** explain any further. I just…that they're not as… you can tell everything is confused and not up to date. But that's the way things evolve and I trust it will keep evolving. I'm taking a little break while you think about it. I'm just sitting here taking a break.

B: Thank you. You have mentioned you have more approaches towards finding N, the number of nonphysical Individuals. One was through crossovers and bifurcations. It is excellent. It is beautiful. The other one is through ratios. It is…I have it also. For the third one, maybe this mistake will require some more thinking, maybe. Maybe it is still valid, but it is just small n. Even though, if we, for instance…

Y: They are not much different than the first though…

B: Yes. They are not much different.

Y: One, two, three, four, five places; there's no difference.

B: And this is the third one although there are some mistakes, but even…

Y: There's more. (B acknowledges.) You can get it from the electric charge, the magnitude of the electric charge.

B: Maybe from this G you were finding or G…

Y: Hmm?

Punita: Big G?

B: From the Big G, the…

Y: From Big G.

B: From gravity. Or you do the other way around; you use N for G.

Y: Well, if I can derive…

B: Ah yes! Yes. I could go the other way.

Y: You could go either way. (B acknowledges.) You just solve for N is all…

B: Once we agree that the others are… OK, yes. There are others also. **[Recording time 1:00:29]**

Y: But using 10, *e* and *pi* gives the most digits easily (B laughs.) because you can calculate what those (B laughs.) values are.

B: It is basic and it is non dependant of contemporary **[Recording time 60:48]** physics and their measurements.

Y: That's right.

B: This is what makes it pure; it is pure Lila number. (Y acknowledges.) And the others, we could play around this way and that way. (Y acknowledges.)

Y: So the circuit is a big deal. (B acknowledges.) It's a big deal for the numbers and the calculations. (B acknowledges.) It's also a big deal for the Individual because if an Individual is not in or connected to a circuit, their consciousness is so limited. They're…I use to think that the Hindus and their early myths were wrong. But now I think they're right, that they thought you were in a past life you were an elephant. And then you were a duck, and then a worm, and then an ameba. (B acknowledges.) And then going back, a molecule, and then an atom, and then a fundamental particle, and then you've become an F1 (B laughs.) or an F2 or F1.

B: A loner.

Y: You're not any of those, but you've become in a position of that much consciousness, not very much. You just…an F1 is only conscious of a proto-fermion not located in space or time, or it has no energy or spin or anything, or mass. It's really boring. (P and B laugh.) Well, if there's one attached to not being bored, that's a hard one to get over, (B laughs.) to not be bored. And to be a full fledged liberated one, you have to get over that one. But it's not easy. That's why they say that, "Lila is the Play of the Gods, that they're just playing." And why do they play? "For fun! For fun!" Well, they don't play for fun. They interact and it is fun. But they're not doing it in order to get fun. (B acknowledges.) They do it because they have the ability to do so. And that's the only reason that it happens. (B acknowledges.) That statement itself can lead you to liberation. **[Recorded time 1:03:35]**

OK. So the circuit is really important. And all these measurements are made assuming that there's three-dimensional space, there's circuits; (B acknowledges.) Alpha never changes; these particles all exist. (B acknowledges.) When they went back, in principle, it's to the point of the Big Bang. They got lost at the point of singularity. And they couldn't figure out what was…what determined the nature of the Big Bang. OK. I'll go on now for a little bit, if it's OK.

Now, Point 3 (B acknowledges.) If there are about 10 to the 14th non-denials existing, or arrows, I'll say, about two thousand one hundred agents out of all N agents are each conscious of one Planck time having passed. Well, that's not true because I've changed that. They will be conscious of 10 to the 14th or thereabouts. We have to divide 10 to the 11th. I'll do that some other time. But it would be about a thousand Planck times having passed at this point. That's 10 the 14th. That's 10 to the 11th. So, it's about a thousand…from that agent's own private past to its present. Thus time is still fragmented. And all of these separate fragments of states of consciousness of time, if they were all summed which they actually are not, the time would be about 1.2 times 10 to the minus 41st of a second. That's right there.

At this stage it's highly unlikely that any one agent would be the basis for more than two agents of consciousness of a proto-fermion. So any agent would probably not appear as a proto-fermion in different baby universes. Nor would the proto-fermions have mass, energy or be located in space. So they're wouldn't probably be any common… at this point, there are no common experiences. To do that, you'd have to have a three arrow structure, two of them coming together and then an arrow going out. And they would experience this proto-fermion in common at a time, (B acknowledges.) at the same time. And ever since, so the story goes, they've called it present time.

Punita: At the only time, at that point.

Y: That's the only time there is.

Punita: But I mean when those two arrows come together and there's one out, that's the only time.

Y: Yes. That's the only time. And they don't even know that anyone else is conscious of it.

B: Yes. There's another only time. (All laugh.)

Punita: Yes. True

Y: And, there's no space. They're conscious, but they are conscious of something. But they're not viewing it. So it's not a viewing. It's just a consciousness which is nearer to touch. That's why the touch sense is so simple, (B acknowledges.) the structure of touching. And the touch came first in terms of time illusion. (B acknowledges.)

Now we go on to number 4. That's this point. This is where… **[Recording time 68:37]** If about F3 or about 3.6 times 10 to the 15th arrows existed, the sum time duration would be about 4.1 times 10 to the minus 40th of a second. Now some people doing the Grand Unification Theories have figured out that that's when the gravity began, the first graviton existed which is…this is F3. I think this is drawn in

the wrong place. The space begins here. (B acknowledges.) This is an old graph as I've said to begin with, not that one but this one. (B acknowledges.) Space should begin there.

B: F of three here, ten to the minus 40

Y: Ah hah!

Punita: Paragraph 4. (B acknowledges.)

Y: So that's F3. (P acknowledges.)

B: F3…

Y: Yes, OK, as long as it's F3.

B: 3.5 ten to the 15^{th} arrows

Y: And one three-arrow arrangement could be expected that's either linear or bifurcated. An example of a linear is that which produces consciousness where A of two time quanta having passed…That's not correct.…and consciousness for both agents A and W of one time quanta having passed from a time when I ● existed to a present in which F ● existed. That is not correct. This drawing is wrong. There needs to be a fork like this going the other way. So you can see why nobody thought very much of my paper because it has a lot of conceptual errors in it and rightly so, that they would think that. That's why I'm going to redo it all, God willing. Right now God's going to have to keep me alive if he wants me to do it. But I'm sharing it with you, just in case.

B: No, you will do it.

Y: Besides, I wanted to share it with you because you could grasp it. I'm going to have to call it quits for the day.

B: Yes. Thank you so much. It's beauty.

Y: But we have tomorrow and the next day and a half a day. (B acknowledges.) And we've gotten further than I thought we would…so...with our work. So we'll get even further in that period of time even if I might have to cut it short here or there. (B acknowledges.) My idea is to give you enough so that you can even catch my errors and straighten it out.

B: OK. Thank you so much. It is a great honor to be listening to this beautiful perception of absolute.

Y: So now you have to pass the problem of combining these fragments with the circuits. (B acknowledges.) In a way, I think you've got it on one way, (B acknowledges.) but then you worry about it.

B: Uh huh. Yes. Maybe I'll go back to my way. (B laughs.) Maybe this is good enough.

Punita: You know one thing, Yogeshwar, about this section that I always have a

problem with is this time…here. And it says, “If the fragments were summed, which they actually are not, the time would be 10 to the 41st.” I just always have a problem with that conceptually.

Y: Oh, I can believe it. (B laughs.) I don’t think I should try to explain it to you because I think it should be changed.

Punita: OK.

Y: If you want to work it out, you work it out. And I can do it, God willing.

B: Always should be stressed the illusionary time.

Punita: Well, there just has to be a consistent…

B: Yes, it should be…

Punita: From a certain point, we have a time.

B: There’s no time and all of a sudden, we have time, yes.

Punita: Yes, but there’s still… there must be a way to envision that and present it…

Y: There is.

Punita: …that doesn’t have the conceptual problem.

B: Yes. Yes, also for the speed of light because this will be like a painful… for the physicist. (B laughs.)

Y: The speed of light is just a circuit and a crossover. That generates one Planck time and it generates one Planck length, the same crossover arrow. (B acknowledges.) That’s when…but the speed of light gets slower when the number of arrows in the circuit are less. Then it’s shrinking. But when you get back to the place where there’s no circuit, then we have work to do. (P acknowledges.) OK.

Punita: There just has to be a way to present it (Y acknowledges.) that’s consistent.

Y: Yes, yes. I agree. I said to Darshana a hundred times, “It’s a matter of what order to present it in.” You can’t say it all in the first sentence.

Punita: No. (Laughs)

B: Yes. It should be …

Y: OK.

Punita: Thank you.

Y: I’ll just leave my mess here for a little while.

B: Yes. Thank you.