#44
Formal talk-07112006 Afternoon day19
Lila recording day 19, afternoon
08/11/2006
081106001,
1 Hr 03 min
Recording 44

Y: I was reading some more details about inflationary theory. They had a great deal of difficulty figuring out why the universe didn't make a lot of magnetic monopoles because some…a lot of the variations on the Grand unification theories.   One expected a lot of monopoles to form, and they never found them. There are as many as there are electrons. And you find electrons everywhere, but no monopoles. So they figured there must be something wrong with their idea. So they found a cure for it. And that was to have these monopoles form very slowly. And if they form slowly there would be few of them. Well, since then they still have not found even those few. The cure to make the monopoles show up less often and so there would be even fewer of them, is a thing called super cooling. You know, when you super cool… when you have water… Say, you have a tank of water and you cool it. If you don't cause any vibrations of the water, it will get colder than the freezing point; but won't turn to ice. It stays in the form of water; that's called super cooled water. If you have any vibration or motions in the water, the little crystals of ice will form. These are like monopoles, equivalent. This is an analogy for the formation of monopoles, these little crystals of ice. But if they super cool it, then there is no problem. But they couldn't cook it enough to get rid of all the monopoles from being formed. But the Lila Paradigm says how that is done. And how there is…It is due to the fragmentation of space into separate baby universes or even smaller. Just the little threes of three or four, and you have bounded space, not unbounded space like you get from a crossed over circuit, but bounded. And that acts as a form of super cooling so that it takes a long time for the sudden rush of expansion of the universe. It takes a long time, relatively speaking, 10^{-32} of a second which is a long time compared to 10^{-44} of second. And so it gradually…this process gradually happens. And the Lila Paradigm shows that you don't actually need any monopoles at all of the type of a three-dimensional monopole. Our monopole is not physical; it's non-physical. It is just a non-physical circuit. And we get a number of those; but they happen late. In other words, it's been a slow process before we start making circles and be that time at the same time there is a sudden explosion of space. There is an avalanche. Well, this fits. That's why our curve fits the corrected curve fairly close. But because of the fragmentation, our curve is lower down. You notice that when it's down in the flat part, it is lower than the grand unification. But that's because of the fragmentation of space and the fact that you don't…you have bounded space and the fact that the three-dimensional space becomes two-dimensional bounded space, and then one-dimensional bounded space. Anyway, I am just saying that the Lila Paradigm takes care of the problems of what they call super cooling. It's… super cooling means the motion slows down. Well, how much motion you're going to have with bounded space? Very little in fragmented space and bounded. And then it becomes two-dimensional, fragmented and bounded; and then it becomes one-dimensional. You are not going to have much vibration or magnetic monopoles forming which happens later. And there are these circuits. Anyway, if I had a couple of physicists for a couple of days, we could work out the details. So if any of your physicist friends want

to go on holiday to Australia, might let them know. Maybe they are coming to a conference, a physics conference in Sydney or Melbourne or Canberra, who knows?

B: Yes.

Y: Ok, you have been busy so you haven't come up with anything?

Darshana: Yeah, I didn't get her back soon enough. We thought it would be about an hour or maybe less. And it turned out that Namrata had all kinds of things to do.

Y: This is not the one I want. *Radical Theory*. Here it is. I got it. On page 12 of the *Radical Theory* there is a diagram of three-dimensional space, bounded. In our discussion so far I have not stressed much about the bounded space. But as you know on page eleven, the page before there is a one-dimensional space continuum; and it's bounded. And it's one LQ in extant. And then on page 12, you can go through a two-dimensional one and then a three-dimensional one; but it's still bounded. This is what I was indicating about the small crystals that are forming, you might say, or when they think that three-dimensions goes all the way back to this time when these things were happening. They think of it as a bubble. They don't know about this sort of thing, of bounded space. They think it is three-dimensional unbounded, no matter what. But the reason that I am pointing this out is that in explaining the Lila Paradigm to people, they should know about this sort of…kind of space. Now what if you go to four-dimensional space? Well, you could; but it breaks up into a one- dimensional space and a three-dimensional space. We won't go into the details at this point. I am just saying that…that, that must not be neglected in understanding the Lila Paradigm, this bounded space pockets, you might call them, pockets or areas or just lengths.

Don: Like a little tetrahedron of space.

Y: Yeah, it is just a little tetrahedron of space. Or it could be extended on one side and so wouldn't be an equilateral because it could be a string of arrows going out. So I haven't included all those possibilities or even mentioned them. But in the thing that I am writing up, it will include that. Like this strange baby universe on page 28 where X is in…connected to a linear baby universe of X V •, M •, R; and it also in universe, a linear universe of W •, [I]. And some of that is common like A is experienced W •, [I] •, also. Taking somebody through those kind of exercises or examples, and I think there should be more of them, included in the discussion of how things evolve, the evolution of the universe. I am trying to decide whether we should go over this with more care. I don't think so. I think you have understood.

B: Yes.

Y: What…?

B: I want to present this in matrices. In matrices, we have two baby universes, one baby universe of three, W in state of knowledge of M in state of knowledge of R. And then other one, A in state of knowledge of W in state of knowledge of [I]. And then X…there will be like two quadrants that are empty. And then X is another one

which actually denotes originating itself in state of knowledge of the one universe and one more…

Y: Well, he's got…he has got this universe.

B: I have this universe which is G1.

Y: And he has this one.

B: And this one which is G2. And X originates itself into a state of knowledge of G1 and also originates itself into a state of knowledge of G2.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: It will be… although this is common (?) to this one.
15:30
Y: And this shares it in common with this one. This much is common for A and X.

B: (Acknowledges) This should be a separate universe because they are not in circuit.

Y: No, they are not in a circuit.

B: Ok, I might present this in matrices.

Y: So a little bit of that needs to be done in...

B: In order to have…

Y: So they can understand the stages that the universe goes through as we imagine…that it went through. I don't think it did, could have, any combination is possible.

B: Should this asymmetric be somehow be emphasized or not?

Y: Should what be emphasized?

B: The asymmetric of the pathways. For instance, if X goes through X V M, we have distant of one unit of time. And then another pathway is X W [I]. This is also of one unit of time; and we have one unit of space. But if we go this way X V M R...

Y: We have two units of time.

B: We have two units of time; and then it is an asymmetric which was somehow emphasized in this article of Seeley and… as if it has significants. Seeley and Baker, is it significant or not, this asymmetry? Maybe it is not; it is just another configuration.

Y: That Baker wrote or Seeley?

3

B: But it was in circuit; maybe it is difference. Yes, of course, it is a different.

Y: Well, when it's…

B: But in light of what they want to say.

Y: This is all very limited. It's not in a circuit.

B: Yes, yes. Maybe it is not of significants.

Y: But what I am saying is that it is significant for them to understand the evolution of the universe.

B: Yes.

Y: Because physicists, now with the new CERN accelerator being turned on, they are going to start to explore this area.

B: Yes.

Y: With their collisions.

B: Yes.

Y: And this will give them a way to understand it.

B: Yes, yes.

Don: Why is this an X • and this…

Y: Why is it a what?

Don: X •, here.

B: Because it originates itself; it is original.

Y: Yes.

Don: But that doesn't make it original (?).
18:29
Y: No, no, that's a mistake.

B: No one perceives it.

Don: That should be M • here.

Y: It should be an M •, but no X •.

Don: Ok.

4

Y: Like there is no A •.

Don: Right.

B: Yes, yes, because it is an origin.

Don: Just wanted to make sure I wasn't…

Y: Need a proof reader.

B: Yes, it is. Maybe this is one reason more to draw it differently, the same…the isomorphic graph of this one. This is why it is useful to view this arrangement as whole arrangements because X is the origin. It is the origin. And then we have this baby universe; and this baby universe, G1 (?) and G2 (?)
19:17
Y: A is also.

B: A also, A also.

Y: Ok.

B: So this is why this is G1, and this is G2. And these universes are perceived as physical; but the origin is not W B. So we have, and now we have, and in matrices this is clearly visible. It is...so actually if we observe this in terms of this group we have defined, maybe we should give it a name like Fute (?) or something in this field. We have four baby universes, four original baby universes. It should be differentiated.
19:57
Y: We have four?

B: We have one baby universe here which is W showing to [I], another V in state of knowledge of M in state of knowledge of R. These are clearly baby universes. And then, now conditionally, X originates itself in a state of knowledge of G daval (?) of G1 universe. And also A originates itself into a state of knowledge of G1 universe.
20:34
Y: Well, that's how many.

B: But X and [I]…

Y: But from X's…from X or using X as a referent, there is not four. And for A, there is one.

B: Yes, yes. But if we…they should be viewed also as universes for themselves.

Y: What I am saying is that you can't add them up because…

B: They are the source.

Y: Because they're of an individual being conscious.

5

B: Yes.

Y: And being in states of knowledge, and you can't take a God's eye view.

B: No, no, but in matrices or in this group, they should be viewed as baby universes because they are elements of this system. They are elements of the set in this set in which…for which we have defined this is a group. And we have defined associative law, inverse element, identity element, a now today transitivity in this set. They should be viewed as elements, as elements of this set. They are elements of this set. Maybe we should…

Y: Elements of…

B: Not maybe, but for sure, we should introduce anther level in which also consciousness will be introduced and in this…another level. Then X and A should have a special weight, a specific weight. They will be viewed as origins of the perception or referent points. Or it will be stressed that in their consciousness, the superposing of these universes takes place. But in the basic levels of matrices, they are universes. They are elements of the set. I am not…I am now speaking in terms of matrix.

Y: I can see them as elements of a set; but I can't see them as four baby universes because there is only in consciousness that there is the illusion of universes.

B: In this…Ok then, maybe at this basic level we should stress somehow… because when I was…I understand fully. And we should always have this picture in mind. But this morning when I was presenting this merging of circuits...

Y: I think what you have done there is correct. But what you haven't done is figured out exactly how to put this in a matrix. And I suggest you just go ahead and do it. And you will find out what you have to.

B: You know because…first of all, I have present in matrix the original arrangement. You have in your papers.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: In these, some of them are also in a position of X and A. They are…viewed as referent points in whose consciousness the perception of the arrangement takes place. They are in the same position as X and A. And we just presented them matrix. Maybe I…maybe the name should be changed. Maybe they shouldn't be called universes or *lokas*; maybe another name.

Y: We could call them elements.

B: Elements of the set. Then they are elements of the set.

Y: That I can understand.

B: Yes. In order to operate with them.

Y: Ok. In the end.

B: But it is useful to use this presentation because it could be seen...what is viewed as a physical particle and what not. So this origins are not…there is no non-physical individual in whose consciousness they should appear as physical. So they are like origins. In matrix this is not visible; but on another level of matrix which may be, I'll try to develop this.

Y: Good.

B: This…it should be stressed somehow.

Y: I think that can be represented somehow.

B: Yes, it should be…At several occasions, I have mentioned that it should be introduced into the picture. And this might be a three-dimensional matrix. And now it is even more visible. In this basic layer, they are all universes. I won't use this term if it is confusing. Then they are all elements. Then they are not *lokas* as well. I mean this is…

Y: They are not *lokas* until they are in consciousness.

B: Yes. So on this basic level this is just…that just essential presentation of the state of affairs. And this is not visible. But on the second layer which is actually the third-dimension of the matrix, we should see or maybe another matrix associated with this one in which this distinction will be made to know what is the origin and what are the particles which due to all the considerations.

Y: Or mapping, or projection.

B: Yes, mapping or projection. You know, when I was presenting the groups I have put in (?) like a chapter…mapping as something that should follow this. Mapping… One mapping…I have like a chapter mapping.
27:17
Y: (Acknowledges)

B: I had. So this slowly takes some shape. Slowly it could be seen what this mapping should be because once you introduce group. And we have done it. And I believe this is a breakthrough.

Y: I think so too.

B: And so once we have done it… when we have realized that our system is made of arrangements of universes, not just of non-physical individuals, then this opens the whole new field. And in this field, first we define the initial conditions, associative law, and so on and so on. Existence of fully enlightened…

Y: So it would take some work to represent this.

B: Yes, and now it is clearly visible that the next step is somehow mapping and even what this mapping should be. So this should be the mapping which will show in reference to which non-physical individual the notion of physicality takes place due to all the considerations we have earlier: unitarity of the non-physical individuals, subsumption, all the sub-states, and so on. So, next step will be to determine the origins, or the referent non-physical individuals.

Y: Yes.

B: Because they differ from the…

Y: They are both reference and origins.

B: Yes, they are both references…

Y: It is that new idea.

B: Yes, on the basic level, they are all elements of set. Then we shouldn't call them baby universes although…Couldn't be the case that one single non-physical individual is a baby universe by itself? It still has its basic attributes. Existence; it has identity who; somehow maybe it could also view as baby universe. But Ok. But maybe these are just terms, maybe this…But what should be stressed is on the basic level, these are all elements.

Y: Yes.

B: Yes. And now once we have this mapping, we shall think carefully what we map into what. In all these considerations, we have this morning about how this…

Y: Projection.

B: Projection. How this chart Don was presenting would be. It would be clarified because it will have outlines. It will have clear definitions.

Y: Which is ultimate reality and which is a projection.

B: Yes, which is ultimate reality and which is a projection. Yes, because X and [I] and A, they belong on this chart to ultimate reality. But these are projections. These are not projections. They are also non-physical individuals, but the perception of them.

Y: Yes, by X and Y.

B: Yes, by X and Y. So X and Y is…are here in a more valuable position, so to say, conditionally speaking. They are…on the second level. It…their superiority will be visible. It should be visible, somehow, conditionally speaking. They are all non-physical individuals that…And then we shall have clear presentation. And then we shall maybe check…Ok it is…always it is by injection when you have…by injection is that…is a certain sort of mapping which includes into itself two other different source of mapping which are surjection and injection.
32:27

8

Don: Injection.

B: And injection. (surjection and injection) The mere fact that a set is a group assures is a guarantee that it is by injection. It is both injection and surjection. And what does it mean? Is when we have injection just one line goes from one step to another. So we have here…

Don: One to one.

B: One to…not yet one to one. By injection is one to one, but just one, yes. But, for instance, this one is not a projection of…of no origin. If these are origins and these are the images, there are images which are not seen by anyone which is not possible in terms of Lila, clearly. You couldn't have…which now sheds more light on Lila itself, of understanding of Lila. Not Lila itself, but of understanding of Lila because the mere fact that this baby universes form a group, this mere fact is a guarantee that there is no injection in Lila. There is no injection; it couldn't be. And what is injection? Injection is when you have, for instance, images without an origin.

Y: Aha!

B: Which is not possible. You have known…an element known, but not knower.

Y: But no origin.

B: Which is not possible and which is a great insight. It is a great. This is why these baby universes are elements of a group because this is not possible. This is…it is not possible to have an image without an origin.

Y: Yes.

B: This is another point. This is great!

Y: That is a consequence of the assumption of the Lila Paradigm.

B: Yes, yes. So the mere fact that we have groups is a guarantee that no injection is possible. But the mapping is always by injection. This means both should be fulfilled, injection and surjection at the same time. And the second one, surjection is…you could have two lines in two mapping into one. For instance, two individuals in state of knowledge of one individual it is allowed. But empty elements are not allowed, empty images without an origin. This is source of the mapping; and this is the result. So we have not empty images, images without an origin.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: So this should be stressed. So the mapping should go. Now the mapping is showing itself what the mapping will be. In the mapping, the images should be what is image in Lila Paradigm. And these are…they remain non-physical individuals. But they are viewed in the consciousness of the non-physical individual who is referent or in whose consciousness the combination of sub-states happens is somehow an origin. It is the…this…the origin of the mapping because the projection

happens this way. This will resolve the arrow we have been discussing this morning, in a way. Maybe it is not the same thing. It should be clarified further but…but it is projection. And it should be stated. We had…they are very simple arrangement of three denoting time. But we should also...but we should be able to do the same thing for greater assembles, for greater baby universes. And in order to do this, we should have clear mapping. We should know what is the origin and what are the images, conditionally speaking. They are still…they are…we should differentiate on another level. This will be just projection, for instance. And the non-physical individuals are on the same…maybe even deeper level than the level of matrices where…will be the origins of this one. We should have different levels because one thing is to perceive them as physical.

Y: As what?

B: As physical particles, or fermions. And the other thing is they still have origin, each and (every) one of them. They still have an origin in whose image they are. And this origins or the real non-physical individuals should be presented on another layer.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: It will be like a structure with several dimensions. For instance, on the basic level we have the non-physical individuals; this is the basic level. Then we have another level higher on which we have baby universes. We have arrangements. And this second level...on this second level some of the non-physical individuals from the first layer will be just a dot. Meaning…

Y: Just a what?

B: Just a dot. I mean just a universe of one for now. They are still like baby universes, but elementary baby universes of one.

Y: I understand.

B: We shall have some of them. And then should be…and then, for instance, one of them originates itself on the basic level in a state of knowledge with a non-physical individual from the baby universes which are larger. This is the projection of it. And now we have a third level. Now we have a third level where we present the projections. On this third level, these non-physical individual in whose consciousness the subsumption the sub-states takes place and also of consciousness because now we have into picture consciousness, both together with states of direct knowledge.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: Now on this third level it will be clearly visible that these ones are fermions or are perceived as physical, into the consciousness of the origins. We should differ…like in our example here. This is A, this is X, and this is W in state of knowledge of [I] which are perceived as particles in the consciousness of the origin. Now these are just projections from the previous level. And here also, this is W…V in state of knowledge of…V • in state of knowledge of M • in state of knowledge of A •. So on

this third level projections or the in-coming set will be made just of dots. Of these V •, M •, R •, of physical particles and the origins will be favoured ,so to speak in…will be the source set because this is in consciousness, this source individuals. I mean projections of individuals, they are all non-physical individual but in these sources they will be sources. And this will be used as particles.

Y: I am going to throw in a further problem on this. We could consider this one…if it is the referent individual.

B: Ah, yes.

Y: Then you have this.

B: Yes, yes, you are right. And then…

Y: Or if…

B: Then even more this is this.

Y: Yes.

B: And now this…and how to build…? Maybe…this is true, yes.

Y: It is true. But it adds another layer of…

B: Another layer up til (?)
43:41
Y: Or this would be one here, and one here, and one here, depending on which referent individual.

B: Ah, yes. It might be the same level somehow, not a higher. Why this should be higher?

Y: Not higher.

B: Not higher but…

Y: That would be responsible for how each viewer views the universe from their position. Like you are sitting on that side of the table viewing and I am on this side of the table viewing.

B: Yes, yes.

Y: Darshana.

B: Maybe at least…illustration…just one illustration of this sort should be presented.

Don: Yeah… along the same lines I am thinking the projections are in terms of a referent individual. We have an extant situation, a projection of space in terms of A's consciousness.

11

B: Yes.

Don: With some arrangement and a projection of time…

B: Yes.

Don: Which is some arrangement with respect to A. But then we can sum those if we have this matrix representing…that represents space from the point of view of A. Perhaps when we get to a circuit, we can start summing or otherwise doing operations on those projections.

Y: All they have to be is just connected, just like this connection. And so, X and A are going to be both in a state of consciousness of this dot and this dot.

B: Yes.

Y: So if you projected X's on top of A's, you would get a common universe to that degree. But it would be at different times. So they wouldn't be at the same time; but they would be conscious of two particles. But they would be at different times, one in the past and the other in the past of the other.

Don: Now it is certainly worth exploring.

B: Yes, yes, you agree too.

Don: Yeah, no I, yeah.

Y: It's this kind of detailed problem that is going to have to be worked out in order to describe what is happening in the early universe before the curve takes off where there is…This is very limited; and most individuals are not conscious of anything. They are just letters.

Don: Yeah. Yeah, but you're defining the operations that will sum or whatever these different projections for the different individuals…to…I think…

Y: Well, there is a mathematical model, somehow, to do that.

Don: Yeap.

Y: She is working on it.

Don: Yeap, but then the space/time of the early universe is…could come out of that in a coherent pattern.

Y: Yes, it would.

B: Yes, yes, it will be easily recognisable.

Y: But you are watching how a mathematician takes an approach to something. She works a little bit on this, a little bit on that, until something happens because she is

clarifying in her own mind what needs to be clarified step by step, and just keeps clarifying, clarifying, clarifying. And then it's Oh! We forgot about this. We have to go do that, and clarify this, and clarify that. And then eventually, you get it or you say, "Can't be done that way." It's a matter of focusing as we were talking about one-pointedness.

Don: Well, you are welcome to try your ideas out on me going forward. You know after you leave, you are welcome to try your ideas out on me with the matrices and so on.

Y: So there is a connection between matrices and mapping?

B: Yes, it could be found. There is…you know, when you solve an equation or a system of equations, that's, in a way, mapping. Mapping is when you have elements here. For instance, these are X and so on and so on, and you have a mapping into F of X.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: The mapping is actually a function. Mapping is a function; and then you have… you obtain Y which is F of X. And then you could have an inverse mapping. For instance, you have the image. I have a perception of particle. And I ask myself in whose consciousness this image of particle appears. I could do the other way around; and this is inverse function.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: I have function; and I have inverse function.

Y: So all you are doing is re…is expressing it another way.

B: Yes.

Y: With a different background, you might say or…

B: Yes, yes. But it opens up possibilities, the different presentations.

Y: Yes, that's why it is done.

B: Yes. Just the same as graphs helps us so much. The same this…because this insights maybe couldn't be seen. They could be, but very difficultly.

Y: Yes, but we get so…we get so complex with graph. After awhile you…it's just like this.

B: You lose track. And this is all spread out. This is spread out. And even if you do as you suggest, Don has suggested different planes, differently design, when it is all spread out, then it helps you going (go) deeper. At least it is a methodology, at least it is a methodology (?).

Y: I will just read this paragraph.

> If however any agent non-physically acts to be in the state of knowledge

This is on page 27.

> of another non-physical individual, the first physical 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 4.66 times 10^{11}.

You don't have to have the plus 1 there.

> of their information states. So that the one of the agents in the non-physical realm can be expected to be conscious of at least one proto-fermion existing at the agent's own present time.

So that…it sounds like it says that an agent has his own present time. That's not quite correctly stated. It should say, that this…the existence of this one particle although it is not anywhere, is the referent. You could call it his present time. That is, he is conscious only of this particle and that is all he is conscious of. It is a present time or it becomes a present time in a future structure that's going to happen. So you can see that's written wrong; and it has to be improved.

> As produced from an arrangement of two arrows such as A W [I].

So in that case, there is two particles and [I] becomes present time; and W is one unit of time in the past W •.

> Thus one agent, agent A in the example is conscious of one time quanta of time having passed from zero time when W • existed to the present time when [I] • exists. Since zero time is a result F2 non-denials and F2 TQ is equal to one Planck time, zero time is set equal to one Planck time.

I don't know if that makes sense. I think it doesn't which is about 5 times 10^{-44} of a second. I don't think that should be times zero. I think it should be one Planck time, of time.

> And the time after one TQ has elapsed, one Planck time plus one time quanta.

I think all that's wrong.

> Which, in the example, is Agent A's present time.

Such confusions as that, that I wrote ten years ago, could contribute to why this paper on *Radical Theory*...although it was distributed, several hundred copies of it were distributed to selected people at conferences...that should and were interested in this kind of thinking. Why I got no real response from it, is because of such confusions and a lack of clear wording of presentation and of technical accuracy. So I am just saying that I am not really blaming these other people. And I am not even blaming myself. I did as well as I could. Under the circumstances, it seemed like a

good idea at the time; and I had my own confusions. Now, I probably still have some; but I have fewer of them. So I think we ought to just keep going ahead and eliminating.

B: Yes.

,
Y: Difficulties, confusions, confusions about words, diagrams that produce less, PowerPoint, systems, and so on. But we can't be expected to develop every branch of science with the Lila Paradigm. So I think you should focus on what is clear to you and what you feel qualified to develop. And I will do what I am qualified to develop. And our helpers around here can contribute what they are good at. And we will we see what we come up with. It may be far enough along the line that we'll get a real response. It may not be; and we may have to do it over again after a year; and do it over again after another year if I am still around to do it over after another year, and if the world is still around to do it over after another year.

B: Six years. Just one point, if I could say it now.

Y: Yeah.

B: It is great! And I am very enthusiastic. And I believe Don is also and so on. I was thinking since we go this way, starting from Lila and branching to different whatever, whenever, where ever it brings. At least for me, it brought me; it brought me to Monte Carlo method or to chaos, or to Gödel or to matrices and so on. Maybe one…at least one or two sessions, we could start the other way around because with your help it might bring us to another insight.

Y: Starting from where, for example.

B: From Gödel, for instance because you mentioned…

Y: Ah, yes.

B: What is more...what you…where you feel most confident at. And Gödel is full of logic, for instance, there is logic.

Y: I would like to see your development of that.

B: Yes.

Y: So…

B: Yes, you know, I'll do my…I'll do a development. But since I don't have many time…much...I don't have time here very much.

Y: Yes, I understand, but you wanted…You said, one or two sessions on something?

B: Yes, I said I might start…just the same as we start here from Lila. And then we have insights belonging to different areas. Then we might do it the other way around start from Gödel. I'll start to present you Gödel Theory; and you'll have insights

regarding Lila. You say A here. We could include Lila in this and this and this way. Then second step, we could include Lila this and this. It is like going inductive way or deductive.

Y: Yes.

B: There are two…

Y: Because all I know about his theory is that he shows that it can't be done mechanically or by an arithmetic system.

B: Yes, but there is more to it. It is whole logic into it.

Y: Right. And you want to work on relating that to the Lila Paradigm.

B: It is one thing…

Y: Starting with his theory.

B: Starting with his theory.

Y: Good idea.

B: Because it is one thing if I do it alone once I am back, and it is another thing if we all…if three of us think of it and come with other ideas, articles, charts.

Y: Ok. We'll do that tomorrow morning then.

B: Ok great, great! Because I was thinking, for instance, yesterday I start thinking over applying theory of…the same which was done with X boson. I was thinking how I could do it with this W boson. But...and I could do something instead of introducing one equation with one variable as Michael has done, I could introduce three variables. For instance, the circle... We have two crossovers at that point when W boson appears. And then I have three circles practically. I have one circle, second circle, third circle and I could do the equations for… We have…for one bit of time, I have X circling around the biggest circuit. Then X plus K around the smaller circuit, and then X plus M around the smallest circuit. And I could do this; but then I realized that it is not enough. I'll need the Compton wavelength, the wavelength from another kind of articles. So this is not actually my field. I could do it, but it is not actually my field.

Y: But you should start from what you are good at.

B: I should start for what I am good at; and that is Gödel's Theory.

Y Ok.

B: And it will have depth, not just juggling with…I could do this and present to the students. And they will say, "Oh, this is nice." But this is all I could do. It is not the

way to deal with something that is new paradigm, presenting to the world something significant.

Y: I agree.

B: Significant.

Y: Ok, we'll do that tomorrow morning. And I am feeling a little better this afternoon than this morning. And I would like to end now if we could.

B: Ok.

Y: And then we will work on that in the morning.

B: Yes, and I'll look for you this. You wanted for the identity element.

Y: Yes.

B: Yes, I'll do it.

Y: This is short paragraph or two maybe with some drawings because you have mentioned it twice. And I am really impressed with it; and I think it is a good way to communicate the Lila Paradigm, one of the important parts of it. As I mentioned because without that, we don't have any hope of doing better.

B: Ah yes, yes. By all means.

Y: Yes, it is just a mathematical…

B: Known.

Y: Proof of it.

B: Ok, thank you.

Y: Ok, we'll do that.