#53S
Lila Recordings
Set 2: 10-11-06 to 12-11-06
061112001
1 Hr 38 min
Recording 53

Y: Just a quick statement here with regard to the Planck length; and it's another equation. (B acknowledges.) The Planck length is F3 times K minus one, over K little n, times lq. That's another way of putting it. There's another way to state it – is that the Planck length lp is equal to the lambda sub Ce – that is the Compton wavelength for the electron – times K minus one, over K times little n. And there's one more; that the electric charge that is e plus or minus…the electric charge expressed as length is equal to the Compton wavelength of the electron, divided by K times little n. And the only place that you will find the electric charge expressed in terms of length is in the book on gravitation by Wheeler and Kip Thorne. On the inside back page is the handiest **[Recording time 2:50]** place for it. (B acknowledges.) OK. That was that. Did you have anything that you want to share this afternoon?

B: Now, next will be this tau particle, I believe; for the tau particle.

Y: When you're ready.

B: I'll do it one of those days. I'll start tonight. But maybe it will require…

Y: A lot of work?

B: Yes. Now I hesitate to use a shorter method which I have discovered while studying this muon. Since it is so successful, I am happy. I couldn't even believe that three digits are right and all the predictions are right and all…actually the line of thinking is correct. (Y acknowledges.) And this is all due to the beauties of Lila. And it is the real proof of the correctness. It's very strong. I mean, we had one done by Baker; and now this is like another. (Y acknowledges.) It's very beautiful. I'm happy. And now what I had in mind is, while looking at this, the relations, I see that actually the whole procedure, which I have done in six pages, could be maybe reduced to less. But maybe it will show not to be that successful. That, you know, maybe the tau particle requires some other approach. But still, since this appeared to be successful and done in two different ways, and it has supporting data and in measurements, I... While looking at it I see that instead of all these comparisons I have made – for instance, in building the equations, I have made a comparison of the largest circuit, (Y acknowledges.) which is 2N, with the smallest circuit, which is 2N minus N minus F of 3 and then another comparison of the largest circuits with the middle one, which is 2N minus F of 4. And now, I suppose for the second recursion and for the third crossover, which will bring us, hopefully to tau particle, the same procedure should be proceeded. But when we reduce all those equations, actually we got the situation as if, the same situation, as if we just have one crossover but with a fork with larger number of bifurcations.

Y: F5 for example.

B: Yes, so instead of…for instance for tau particle, instead of going through the whole procedure comparing the largest circuits with the smaller and then the largest with the even smaller one, then the largest with the smallest – instead of that, just one crossover could be,

for instance, imagined in order to do the calculations. Only the fork will be of 4 or of 5; of 4 because all the arrows **[Recording time 6:56]** or the errors are being counted. (Y acknowledges.) This is as if we have circuit, circuit, circuits, for instance, at one point, at one state of affairs when we expect tau to appear. And then we have also little forks. (Y acknowledges.) And then when a little fork, for instance, catches, so-to-say, a circle, then actually we have three crossovers. (Y acknowledges.) So, for instance, when I was pondering how to develop this procedure, the problem I had was, at one point, that I was picturing it – the illustration I had in my mind was I have, for instance, a sphere. And on this sphere one crossover is on the one side and the other is on the other side. (Y acknowledges.) But then I do not have equations because they are all the same. Or if I have three equations, they actually reduce to two. There is no additional information when you have two equal pathways. There is no additional parameter which will help you to find what you want to find. But when I have done the whole thing, I see now, and it happens to be OK, supported by measurement, that it could be done simply by this thinking. Simply by…it could be illustrating instead of having this complex picture in our minds, we just could imagine that there – because there are many of them. We are working with probability – that this is just one pathway with a fork structure with four, with four all together. (Y acknowledges.) So this is just the same as to have circuit because the equation shows us. These different procedures I have applied to muon…

Y: That's the magic of substates. (B acknowledges.) It's a substate of the circuit (B acknowledges.) and then they get, as you say, "one catches the other."

B: Exactly. They are like reduced. (Y acknowledges.) The same we have with our considerations when you were looking at these elementary structures, for instance. Now I'll repeat it with purpose, not for the sake of it but to stress something. I have a point. Maybe the same you are suggesting. For instance, A originates itself in a state of direct knowledge of B. And now A's state of direct knowledge of B compared with A's state of consciousness of B as physical particle combined, they reduce to an overall consciousness of A for B as a physical particle. This is another point that we now apply to the physical, to the particles.

With Darshana this morning, we were discussing a similar sequence which leads to Fibonacci because every next is containing all the rest, as Darshana has pointed out in her papers. (Y acknowledges.) But my idea is something else now. I want to stress something else. Since we have... as you mentioned, since we have all these substates actually combining, somehow they are combined already in this little structure. And when this structure catches the circle, then it is like a crossover because we have reduction of different substates all of a sudden.

My idea is, once you have a fork structure attached to a circuit…this one is also the circuit. Then it is the whole, so-to-say, imaginary because we have no time; always timelessness. The timelessness is behind the picture. But seemingly, the whole history is projected into the system just the same as when you have a whole arrangement of non-physical Individuals in states of direct knowledge of each other when you just attach another one, when just another one just originates itself outside this universe to a state of direct knowledge to any of these Individuals of the universe, then all of a sudden, we have reduction of all the pre-history, so-to-say, of the system, (Y acknowledges.) of all their already built-in states of consciousness. (Y acknowledges.) And it is the same with the particle. So, instead of going through all of this procedure which was necessary for the first time and I needed this to check my thinking to see if this is the right track, I did it on purpose in two different ways to see whether the thinking is OK. If the second procedure gives the same results as the first procedure then this

means something. And it shows to be the case. But now, since we have some confirmation that this line of thinking is OK, and it leads to a measured value of a particle, then, it could be simplified. Maybe it won't be so successful for the tau particle…

Y: Intuitively, I think it will work. (Biljana acknowledges.)

B: But if it will work, it is very simplifying of…it will be very simple then to do it. It will be very simple because instead of going through all these circuits, the larger, the smaller, the smallest, we just go through the one which is, actually, probability for fork structures which are little forks, actually.

Y: Yes. That's all it takes. **[Recording time 14:22]**

B: That's all it takes. And then it, hopefully, hopefully, maybe tau particle has something else in it which we don't see for now. But since you have so many, now, evidence for the… and strong support... For me, this is strong support; this is very strong support for Lila. (Y acknowledges.) Hopefully this will work also for tau.

Y: I'd like to go back to this one. (B acknowledges.) We were talking about 'why two'.

B: 'Why 2N'; yes.

Y: And I think that 2N applies with two crossovers and with three crossovers. But I'm not sure that it applies with just one crossover although Michael Baker did one; and he said it has to have two. (B acknowledges.) So, what are these?

B: This is maybe naïve thinking, I don't know, but my thinking was since we once establish a common knowledge by having all these nonphysical Individuals and their relations (Y acknowledges.) in circuit, it somehow reinforces, and so on, and so on, that actually in this way we lose, so-to-say, the seemingly…this circling having direction. This circling having direction loses its meaning because somehow they all share common knowledge. There is not that B originates in state of direct knowledge of A, but also A is in state of direct knowledge of B; also, B/ C, C and D.

Y: That's true because they are all connected.

B: They are all connected. And so, the degree of nodes is not two anymore. The degree is the number of arrows leaving this node, or agent. But it is four actually. For every node, instead of two, we have four channels for information. But I know this is maybe…

Y: Yes, I see what you are asking. I don't think it's settled yet of 'why two'?

B: Yes. Because it could be any to anyone, so it is not so straight forward.

Y: OK. So what do you want to do now? I'm going to threaten you with more Yogeshwar writing. (All laugh.)

B: Great. This is great.

Y: And the *Radical Theory*. The present form of the theory was inspired by John Wheeler's

suggestion that information is fundamental to the physics of the universe; and by David Chalmers' speculation that information may be truly fundamental with two basic aspects corresponding to the physical and the phenomenal features of the world. So David Chalmers is a dualist. It's interesting that later on he proved that dualism can't work.

B: It cannot?

Y: It cannot by his philosophical proof.

B: OK, he was thinking.

Y: But… Wheeler also states that, that on which the laws of physics are based cannot also be physical. And Chalmers argues that conscious experience must be nonphysical. Now, in the next section, there's an error. And I want to point that out because there are several errors in the Radical Theory, and this is one of them.

An Overview of the Theory
We propose that the fundamental reality that underlies both the physical world and conscious experience is a number of nonphysical agents. Each agent has three qualities. 1. Intrinsic uniqueness, or 'whoness' – that is, the agent is itself and not any other agent; 2. The individual initiative or ability to act. And number 3. It has existence.

Now so far we're all right, no mistake yet. (B acknowledges.) But we're about to make it. The first two qualities are agent specific; and the last one is common to all agents. **[Recording time 20:36]** Now here there's a compilation of several ideas all in to one. But in the diagram you can see I've included existence, existence, existence for agent A, agent I, and agent W. And that they're common to all of them. Yes, that's true; but so is ability. But the whoness isn't. So that's one mistake. And the second mistake is that… Who is noting that there is a commonness of this existence? It says that, "this realm is common to all agents. Who isn't conscious of that? Who knows it?" Nobody! It's the reader, or the author. (P laughs.)

So the common existence of unique agents can be thought of in at least three other ways. All the agents make up a single realm of existence, this one; or each agent is in many states as there are agents, each of those states being a state of nonphysical relation to a different agent. In other words, any one of an agent's states is a first person relation with some other agent.

And that is valid that this one can exist for me, if I'm W or if I'm A. This one can or can not be in a state of knowledge of the existence of I. That's true. But the first statement is that 'all of the agents make up a single realm of existence'. That's not true.

Number three. Each agent is in as many states as there are agents. Each of those states being informed by a different agent. In other words, the content of any one of an agent's states is information based on some particular agent. That is correct.

In the third paradigm, the agents are all called states of information. This information paradigm is the most useful in formulating a theory of consciousness. The conditions under which an agent is conscious of information from one or more of its states of information are given below.

4

Now, otherwise I've already explained that I don't like the term information as compared to direct knowledge. But these first two paradigms I've put in here, but haven't really invalidated them. So it would better if I don't include them at all (B acknowledges.) in the first place. My thinking was/is to show that there is no God's eye view like Berkeley and Leibniz had. They had all this being a common realm of God.

And then this comes to a very tricky point. This connects to a tricky point. And that is that: Is God a being or is God not a being according to the Lila Paradigm?

Well, yes and no. (B acknowledges.) Since God is the totality of all of us and we are being, then we would say that God is being. But is God a being? No. God…that state of the totality of each of us is not a being; but it is made up of beings. So you could say it has being; but it's not a being. Now this may sound like an arguing over angels. And it is. But it's important because people have a misunderstanding of God. God is not a being. But God is all of us and we're all beings. So you could say that God is being but is not a being. So the totality is not being. So I haven't made that point in any of the papers that I've written. But I thought I ought to pass it along because if my chronology of the end time is correct, and it may not be, but if it is correct, come about July of 2012, the mystery of God is going to be revealed to the entire world.   And that's going to be included in it. And it's my prediction.

Now, if somebody makes predictions and they're wrong, then they should not be considered to be a prophet. But if they're right, then you could put them, well, at least a junior grade prophet that God is not a being with a beard (B & P laugh.) or a nonphysical being either. I know this is heresy I'm speaking. But I'm speaking it because I am firmly personally convinced that it is so.

Each agent is in one of two states. Well, I don't think we need to go on with that part.

This is pretty good stuff in this *Radical Theory*, (B acknowledges.) *The Origin of Time*. I'd like to go over diagram 6 on page 9.

Diagram 6. We have the entire arrangement; and then we have a sub-arrangement. And that sub-arrangement is: A's embedded state of consciousness is a square that is around W ●. And agent A's single state of consciousness of the present moment includes I ● (dot) with a memory embedded in the present time; that is: that's when A has the memory. And if he remembers it, then he is remembering it in present time. (B acknowledges.) But it's of…it's a memory of W ● having existed.

Now to me, these two diagrams are clear. Now, when you read them, was it clear to you what I was talking about, about time?

B: Yes.

Y: But hardly anybody says that. Hardly anybody gets that.

Punita: I thought it was clear. (P&B laugh.)

Y: Well, you two are not hardly anybody. Most of them just give a glazed…glazed eyes and no comprehension. They don't even 'not' get it. Just nothing happens.

B: Maybe additional example for what the present moment is. But it will just add to the confusion because then it also implies time into the picture. It should be always stressed it is timelessness but still…

Y: This gives the illusion of time in the consciousness of A. So I think maybe the text just needs to be modified; and I think that's quite true.

OK. We go on. What do we go on to? There's *Space* and then we go onto Diagram **8 [Recording time 31:24].** And we have a bounded three-dimensional space. Now is it clear from the diagram that there's no space outside of that tetrahedron? Tetra? That's right?

Punita: Yes. It's a tetrahedron.

Y: …has five sides.

Punita: Twelve sides.

Y: It does? (P acknowledges.) One, two, three, four for the bottom. (P acknowledges.) OK, tetrahedron. You were saying?

Punita: Well, it just might be useful to graphically show that this is a solid because for a long time, I looked at this and just thought it was configurations of lines…

Y: that was flat.

Punita: …on a two D plane.

Y: Aha.

Punita: And when there was…

Y: I drew it. So I knew what I was thinking.

Punita: Yes, but I…

Y: But it didn't work.

B: Maybe shading.

Punita: So I'm just saying, I looked at that and for a long time, I had to translate that into, "OK, there's space but…"

Y: All right. So once you did that, did you think that it was this enclosed bounded space inside of three-dimensional space unbounded?

Punita: No, I got that concept, the bounded space. But it's a hard one.

Y: And that's as far as it goes. It just goes as far as this solid is. And outside of that there is no outside.

6

B: Yes. There's no space outside.

Punita: But I think it would be good to explicitly state that. (B acknowledges.) That, that solid tetrahedron is all space.

B: Yes. It is a very high level of abstraction (Y acknowledges.) to which people are not accustomed and should be stressed, that it is the only space that exists, this space. That there is no space within the background of time-space, of space-time, but it is…

Y: And to tell them that normally people don't experience bounded space. That it's unbounded…

B: Yes. Either everything is space...

Y: Is it clear that, say from Z to F, that there's a continuum of space? Although it may be just one lq in length, that it is continuous over that distance. Do you follow my question? Is it continuous? It is continuous, I say, even though it's not made up of segments of units. This would disagree with Aristotle.

B: With who?

Y: Aristotle.

B: Aha. Aristotle, yes.

Y: How do you pronounce it?

B: Aristotle. (Laughs) If you want pure Macedonian – Aristotle. (Yogeshwar laughs.) But in my English, Aristotle.

Y: He disagrees. He says in order to have a continuum, it has to be made up of segments. (B acknowledges.) In other words, it has to be dividable.

B: But then you should bump into Zeno's paradoxes. **[Recording time 35:20]**

Y: Yes. And he did. (All laugh.) He hit nose right against the wall.

B: Yes, yes. Because you…

Y: And so I say that that's not true. That that's because there is discrete – ultimate, discrete, smallness. (B acknowledges.) But that is a continuum from Z to F or from O to F or O to P or Z to O.

B: Indivisible in sense; indivisible (P acknowledges.)

Y: Yes, it can't be divided and so therefore…but it's a continuum in the consciousness of W. I think that could be made clearer.

B: Yes, continuum. The continuum is not the sequence of something, but indivisibility… more.

Y: But Aristotle said it has to be dividable. And then they're all laid end to end and that makes a continuum. So I think he had half the idea right. But the other half was wrong.

B: This dispute lasted for hundred years. So it couldn't be so easily resolved between Kronecker and Cantor.

Y: So what I have to do is explain nonphysical continuity.

B: Yes. Nonphysical continuity. This is different than a sequence of something because continuum means continuous, to continue something. You start with something, then continue with something.

Y: Yes, but he imagined taking the integral of it or integrating it so that it was a continuum of those pieces.

B: What? Uh huh.

Y: Aristotle…

B: Ah, Aristotle; yes.

Y: …said these are made up of tiny segments. (B acknowledges.) But it's all integrated into one continuous line extent.

B: Aha, yes. This is more indivisibility, isn't it so? At least to be explained, you could use this. That it is indivisible.

Y: Yes, it's indivisible; and it's not made up of sections.

B: …of discrete elements.

Y: Yes. This one is an ultimate length. (P acknowledges.) This is one Planck length. OK…I'm just talking it over to see what troubles you guys have run into.

B: This should be stressed because there are years and years of study on your part. But it should be visible here somehow.

Y: Yes, it should be.

B: At least with one sentence.

Punita: I got the concept. I mean, I had to think about it a bit. I got the concept. But I do think that this is where the concept of continuity is introduced into consciousness.

Y: Yes, it is.

Punita: It is the basis of that concept itself; that it's indivisible, I would say. **[Recording time 39:00]**

8

Y: Yes, I agree.

Punita: It's continuous. So I think it needs some more explanation. I'm just not quite sure what it should be. I'm with you that there needs to be… (B acknowledges.)

Y: It just needs more.

B: It's a very subtle point. People never even consider the concept.

Y: And we'll do it. It can be introduced even before the three-dimensional phase. It can be introduced here. It says, "One D space continuum of one lq extent." And that is a continuum; but it can't be broken down any further. (B acknowledges.)

OK. Now, over to the next section. Section 4 *The Circuit*. Now notice that sometimes an arrow, say from B to C, sometimes is a crossover. And then in the lower left hand one, B to C is in the circuit. (B acknowledges.) What effect is this going to have on anything? On measurements, or on what one is conscious of…

B: Yes. It has a great effect. I mean in sense that, you know in several occasions I started this line of thinking and I tried to show that a crossover is not always what we perceive as a crossover in a plane. But rather, we should define what crossover is. For instance, for me this is crossover; and I'll explain in what sense. And this is very important once we are building mathematic. Because, Don, if you remember…yes, if I put here, if this Individual − A for instance − we have a whole baby universe, G1; another baby universe G2. The first baby universe originates itself into a state of knowledge of the other baby universe. But not every Individual know about the other's one or in state of overall consciousness where they should be included. For instance, G1 looks as a whole arrangement is in a state of knowledge of G2. But G2 is not in a state of knowledge of G1. Now we are looking at them as a whole universe because these are elements of our matrices later on. And then, if one of the Individuals from G2 originates itself into a state of knowledge of the whole universe of G1 − meaning actually, underlying logic behind it is, it originates itself into a state of knowledge of just one Individual. But this means now he knows all the other Individuals… Not only this, but we should see if only this one which is not so obvious also means… OK, maybe it means just circuit. Maybe we are just establishing circuit, not yet crossover. But when you look at the whole picture, if we transform it somehow by means of presenting as a morphic graph to the previous, we might discover that not every crossover is clearly visible as in plane. You know, what is my… my idea is, for instance, I have this simple crossover. But then if I pull it like this, first of all like this, then like this, then like this, then it becomes the circuit and this one becomes crossover. What was circuit becomes crossover; what was crossover becomes circuit.

Y: Correct.

Punita: Yes. We all agree. (All laugh.)

B: Maybe not when you have… (Laughs)

Punita: Yes. It depends on the topology.

B: Yes, yes, yes. So we should be very careful in defining what crossover is (P

9

acknowledges.) because there is a morphic presentation, very simple pentagram. Pentagram – for instance, this pentagram is a morphic with a pentagon. Here we have crossovers, but here we have none. We do not have. (Y & P acknowledge.) And we have just… If I pull out this one, for instance, like this, then like this, then like this, then like this …then visually, I have crossover here, visually. So these plane pictures are very deceiving. (P acknowledges,) They are very…

Y: Yes. It should be very precisely defined.

B: Very precisely defined, or always three dimensional. This is why I always try to introduce either spheres or we have only definition on time, these errors **[Recording time 45:06**]…because you have different perspective then.

Punita: I think what we need is a mathematical definition of it. And I think one thing **[Recording time 45:14]** here is that you have two directed paths through the same node.

B: Yes. Because, you see, when you have a circuit… (P acknowledges.) Now I could have a small, seemingly small (P acknowledges.) which is all in the same as you say; it is continuum. We just have this small crossover. But then … Or we could have this one which is like more obvious crossover; (P acknowledges.) but they're of same weight. There is no difference between them.

Y: Yes. No different.

B: And also this one, this connection which is also… for instance, this A, B, A to B part of the circuit; A to B crossover. It could be the other way around. (P acknowledges.) What is crossover might be the circuit. So it should be defined in terms of what happens in the consciousness of Individual, or anyhow or somehow, but to be distinguished. (P acknowledges.)

Y: I agree.

Punita: Yes.

Y: That answers my question of, 'Does it effect if… sometimes it appears to be a crossover and sometimes it doesn't?' (B acknowledges.) This… Draw this one. Can that be drawn any other way?

B: Yes, it could be. This and this and this and this… And then this which is the same and seemingly no crossover.

Y: But the connections are the same.

B: The connections are the same. Or it could be like this and then this, you know?

Y: In the case of the example here going from B to C, it's in the circuit. And in this one, it's a crossover. (B acknowledges.) And it's not in the circuit. Where these, this is the same.

B: Aha. But you see, this could be drawn this way, you know; this one. We have this one, then this one. Then this is like a crossover – although made of two – and then this one is all

part of the circuit. What was crossover is now circuit. What was circuit is now crossover, made of two, but still.

Y: Good. (B laughs.) You've answered. Now I'm going to go on. Page 14, Diagram 10 where A is in a state of a sequence of time going around the circuit. But it is, all of them are, in present time, same present time. But each of them have a different history. (B acknowledges.) Is that clear? **[Recording time 49:00]**

B: Yes.

Y: That they have a different history. And it's a different particle with one in their memory one time unit back. Whereas, another one has it in their memory two time units back.

This is connected with Feynman's *Sum over Histories.* (B acknowledges.) And also right now Hawking is working on this; so that you get a different history for each one. And each one, therefore, has a different position in space also. And it has a different history of how they got to appear at that place with respect to the others. And this is responsible for the general theory of relativity (P acknowledges.) and the special theory of relativity.

That's a whole realm that could be developed. I haven't developed it. I was more intent on just trying to say, "Here is one area that could be worked on." But if you have any people who are interested in the special theory or the general theory, (B acknowledges.) they could take that realization, that, yes, they are all in present time, but they have a history. It's different for each Individual in the whole network. And it should work out and explain why the general theory is the way it is and explain gravitation.

Punita: Yogeshwar, on this conceptually, without introducing space…I have a problem with the common time zero. I understand it with general relativity and the difference in history and how they are with different. I can account for it that they are in different place and space, thatall makes sense; and how that bears on general relativity. But just without the background of time, I always have a difficulty…without the background of space, of having a difficulty putting them in the same common time.

Y: Well, it was so difficult to try to explain, I didn't include it (P acknowledges and laughs.) because you have to show the locations in space. Then when you're talking about a memory, (P acknowledges.) you're talking about a change of location which is motion.

Punita: Yes. Not that all I…

Y: We haven't forgotten about motion and… But motion only works if there is at least one circuit.

Punita: But I'm saying, the way I understood the common time was through understanding relativity and the relationship in space, and then I put them in common time.

Y: I see. Hmm. I thought it was because they were…each have a history of the same length.

Punita: I see the different histories…I…

Y: Hmm.

11

Punita: I'm just telling you what the problem I had…

Y: I guess what I'm trying to do here is see where the problems are (P acknowledges.) and see what I can do. Sometimes I think I can solve them and sometimes, maybe not.

Punita: Yes, so I can't explain common time to people without moving it into the frame of relativity.

Y: Which I took up in the next diagram of the *Common Time Sequence*. OK. We've already talked about equation one. Motion actually is discussed in the next section, *Circuit Space and Motion*. But it is so convoluted statements that even I have a hard time following what I wrote. **[Recorded time: 53:50]**

B: May I say something regarding relativity?

Y: Yes.

B: Two points. Maybe it will help, maybe not. But still when we are here… For instance, very simple way to explain relativity of time is: I have one rocket, for instance, moving at two hundred thousand kilometers per second and another one which is moving by the speed of light which is three hundred – or it is a beam simply – three hundred thousand kilometers per second. But for both observers, for both in this rocket and this rocket, the speed measured of the beam… For instance, let it be a beam, not a rocket but rather a beam of light. For the one who is in the rocket, the measured speed of light would be hundred thousand kilometers per second according to classical view of Galileo's and the others. (Y acknowledges.)

Y: But not according to…

B: But not according to Einstein. (Y acknowledges.) So one way to understand this… So we have contradiction here. On one hand, according to classical theory, we measure speed of this beam to be hundred thousand kilometers per second. But for the observer, the speed of light should also be three hundred thousand. So, only way for him to measure three hundred thousand is to expand the second; to expand his second. His previous second – his X second, so to say, should be expanded three times so that he will measure hundred thousand for his first X-second, hundred thousand for his second X-second and hundred thousand for his third. And finally, now, when his second is being expanded, now he measures three hundred thousand kilometers per second… So his second should be extended. **[Recording time 56:26]** Show his time and the other time is not the same. The only way to do this is to change his perception of time. (P acknowledges.) And this sheds clear light on the relativity of time and on the illusionary nature of time because this is confirmed and supported by measurements; (Y acknowledges.) so it is so. So it is very simple example which shows not just the relativity of time, but the illusionary nature of time. (Y acknowledges.) This is one point. And there is another one.

[Recording time 57:04] It is that when people are reading about theory of relativity or watching movies, and so on, they always say that the time passes by slower for the observer who moves. But it is not correct because who moves? Who is moving and who is in rest? It depends on the frame of reference. Actually, this is wrong interpretation of original Einstein statement. Original Einstein's statement was that time passes slower for the one who is doing

his measurement at one point. Now this is perception of space. So it is not correct to say the one who is moving. For instance, this is the paradox of twins. One twin is on the earth and the other goes to the moon. And the one who goes to the moon is still young; but the one at the earth gets old because the one who is moving, for him the time passes by slower. It is not the case.

But original statement of Einstein is that time passes slower for this one who is doing the measurement in one point in space. And now, having this in mind… If we have, for instance, two rockets and they are emitting signals every second so every second we have one signal from rocket A, then the second second, another signal, and so on. Every second we have a beep. And the same is true for B. B is also emitting signals every second. Now, A is receiving signals from B, not every second but every one point two seconds which means that actually, seemingly, like B is the one for whom the time passes by slower although A is making the measurement is one point. Where is the paradox here? Now taking into account Einstein's notion that the younger will be the one who is doing the measurements in one point, seemingly it is contradiction. Also, the same is for B. B is emitting signals every second, but B is receiving signals from A every one point two seconds. Now, here there is…unconsciously we include into picture…we don't differentiate between who is referent here which is very important, regarding Lila for instance. (Y acknowledges.) Who is referent here? If you just look at a picture, like from a point a view of God as you say, (Y acknowledges.) then you never got the answer because you should have a point a view… Just like you mentioned Paul Davis who imagined he's **[Recording time 61:10]** the electron moving and then he has a different perspective. Then you resolve time, space, movement (Y acknowledges.) when you have a referent point. When you look at it like this as…the same with these crossovers. When we look at they are in a plane, there is no solution. But when you put in another perspective, in space or you put yourself at the place of some Individual, then you change the perspective. Then what is small becomes big, and the other way around. And then you see not just the illusionary nature of space and time, but also you find solutions for problems like this.

Y: That's another way of saying, God is all of us. But God is not a being. (B acknowledges.) It's not a particular view point.

B: Yes, exactly. There is no point of view of God.

Y: And this shows…

B: And this shows.

Y: …it.

B: Yes. Because if I… The referent point here says B; and this resolves the problem. B is the one who still emits…is casting these signals every second – tang, tang, tang, tang; and A is measuring the signals from B, first at one place and then to another. So A is doing its measurements along a line of a synchronous clocks **[Recording time 62:50]**; so all is for B. And if it is all for B then still stays the statement that the time passes slower for the one who is doing measurements at one place because for B it is the one place from which we have signals every one second. And for A who is measuring at the line of a synchronous watch is a signal from B, B being referent, these are coming every one point two which means B is the one who is…for B the time stays one second, not one point two. So B remains younger

because all happens is B is a reference. I don't know if I was clear.

Y: That's clear to me. (P acknowledges.)

B: So first when you look at this, you think, "How is it possible? A is measuring now A should be the younger one. What is it? There is a paradox. (Y acknowledges.) But when you perceive that A is measuring those signals but if you fix B as referent, then for B still further on the seconds are every second and this one point two is illusionary for B. One point two is something which A is measuring along a line of synchronous clocks which are not at the same time. So B still…

Y: When I was 8 years old, before I could read, my father use to read the science section of the newspaper out to me. (B acknowledges.) And he read this explanation. And I said…

B: Aha…this one?

Darshana: No. The first where his brother goes into… **[Recording time 64:48]**

Y: No, this one.

B: Ah, this.

Y: He read that one and I said, "No, that's not right." (Laughter) He just thought I was a kid that couldn't catch on. But I couldn't make that work. This is obviously correct.

B: Yes, yes. This is great example. I was also searching for years until I find perfect examples.

Y: And that's the way you teach it now. OK, we go on. On page 20, diagram 14. I'm trying to give an argument about why space is three dimensional and doesn't go down to two dimensions or one dimension. The argument here is not correct, as the note says. Did you include that note, that marginal note? I had a note that said, "This argument in this paragraph is incomplete."

Punita: Yes. I put that in there.

Y: In handwriting?

Punita: No, it's in…there.

Y: Aha. Good. And the reason why it's incomplete is because there can be one-dimensional and two-dimensional space. But they're in the original pattern and – I should say, 'the crossover of the original pattern' makes one-dimensional space. The second one, second crossover makes two-dimensional space and that is in…two-dimensional space exists in the first recursion. But in the third crossover, in the second recursion you can't have less than three-dimensional space. And that's why that is so. I just realized this the day before yesterday when she was showing her wave theory. **[Recorded time: 1:07:36]**

This thing about the relative strength of forces is correct; and why nobody doesn't get excited about it I can't understand.

All right. I want to go over, on page 23, the section on the *Biological Forms* to see if there's anything left out that I wanted to add.

Most people, especially scientists, claim that what it is that they are is a human body. Some, mainly neurobiologists, **[Recording time 68:40]** think that what they are is some functioning of the brain. Others, including philosophers, think that what they are is consciousness itself. Some others think that what they are is a soul, a spirit that leaves the body at death. And it moves around in space and progresses through time.

Like Michael, for example, when we were discussing the Lila Paradigm, he says, "Well, I believe that I'm a spirit and when I leave my body, I'm going to leave earth and go some place else. But can I travel at the speed of light?"

B: He's faithful to himself. (Laughter)

Y: So I told him, "Well, only souls can't go faster than the speed of light. But as a spirit you could get an idea that you were somewhere else and you would just be there. But as what you truly are, you realize you're not anywhere anyway."

He goes, "Ahhhhh." (Laughter) He didn't like that one. He thought he was wild till he met me.

Some think that the self does not exist, that it is an illusion of a functioning brain or mind. In this information paradigm we have assumed that what one really is, is a nonphysical agent in an existential realm with many other such agents.

Ah, that is carrying on that first error that I mentioned about there being an existential realm. Well, in one way of understanding it, yes, we all exist. But it's not a realm because a realm implies it's all in present time. (B acknowledges.) It implies that; (P acknowledges.) it doesn't say that. It just says existential – they exist. But everybody who reads it thinks I mean a realm that is not only in present time but is somewhere in space, or includes a space automatically (B acknowledges.) like the realm of King Dracula. Was there a Dracula? Yes, he was a historical character, wasn't he? (B & P acknowledge.)

Punita: Drago.

B: Huh?

Y: The Count.

Punita: Drago.

Y: Drago.

Punita: Yes, yes. Romania.

Y: All right. Well, this raises a question. "What is the relationship of these nonphysical Individuals to human bodies, to living biological forms in general, and to souls?" The answer to this question is rooted in the ability of each nonphysical Individual to be in a state of no knowledge, **[Recording time 72:06]** deny its information states based on other agents and

15

itself. If an agent denies its information states based on itself, it has no consciousness of itself as it really is – an uncreated eternal Individual with an ability to deny itself access to its information states or to not do so. That is, to not locate in time and space; it is not energy, mass or matter; cannot be destroyed or changed; and is not a thought, a mind, an idea, an ideal form, or any other such thing.

I think what I'm trying to do there is good. And I plan to do it with diagrams and more development but without denials and without non-denials and non-information states (P acknowledges.) but according to the current labeling system.

If that agent that is in the state of denial of its information states based on itself is in a giant circuit system, it is conscious of itself as an Individual entity with Individual initiative that is conscious of a three-dimensional physical world in which it is located here and now.

Yes, that's true. But he will also be in a state of knowledge that he's not. (B acknowledges,) And the two together make what we call spirit. He thinks he's located here and at this place that he's viewing from, and that he is there now, and he is non-physical. So, that's what a spirit is. (B acknowledges.) So I haven't made that clear. (B acknowledges.) **[Recording time: 1:14:19]**

That agent has memories of having previously existed or having acted and had that action affect the physical world of which it is conscious and, of having had its location and other apparent physical characteristics affected by physical forces.

In other words, the self the agent is conscious of being is like a physical thing – is what I meant. Its being is like a physical thing except that it is conscious and can act or originate acts.

But he's a physical thing… He's conscious of being a physical thing that is conscious and can be capable of originating acts. So, that's not what he is. He's not located; he's not a physical thing.

The agent's experience of itself as that which can be affected and which might – like the physical things of which it is conscious – be destructible, gives the agent a reason to make determinations in order not to have that (quote)"Self" be affected or possibly destroyed and thus, the beginning of neurotic behavior. (P laughs.)

Punita: It's all down hill…

Y: …from there on. (Laughs)

Through its memories, the agent is conscious that certain of its acts appear to produce results that contribute to its welfare. Most of those acts produce results by giving other agents reasons for making certain determinations which, if made, are perceived by the original agent as physical events in the physical universe that contribute to the agent's supposed welfare. **[Recorded time: 1:16:31]**

Y: Now I was talking about that today in this satsang, (P acknowledges.) this very thing-- that they were looking out for their survival. And these people have been doing this meditation for quite a while. That means they still have got themselves confused with the spirit instead of

living as an unlocated in time or space, nonphysical matter of any kind, shape or form. (B acknowledges.) That's because they're still dependent on their sense faculties. Not just their sense organs, but their sense faculties. They carry their faculties with them. And to get over that they have to do this divine sound uniting until all that is cleared up. I'm not going to say that in this paper (All laugh.) without listing their names. (Laughter) But since I won't list their names, they are all right.

Well, I'm out of puff. But it's quite valuable to me to read this to you and then get your feedback (P& B acknowledge.) because it helps me to revise it and to see what to stress more, what to leave out, what to change the wording as, and that sort of thing. So it's quite useful to me to have this discussion.

Punita: One little point, Yogeshwar. On the previous page, page 23, it says, 'an uncreated eternal Individual'. 'Eternal' to me implies in time.

Y: It's what?

Punita: Implies that it's in time.

Y: Yes, it does to me too.

Punita: And so I…

Y: Darshana assured me, and I looked it up in the dictionary and it does both. It says *not in time* and *in time*. (D laughs.) And I thought, "Well that's handy."

Punita: Yes, I go back to the guy on the street. 'The 'eternal, you know… Oh, I'm going to go on forever. I'm going to be...

Y: That's horrible. (P acknowledges.) I'm going to have to be this boring spirit. (P laughs.) And the whole universe is going to run down after trillion of years …and I'll still be there with nothing even to lean on! (P laughs.) I mean what worse hell could there be? (P acknowledges.)

Darshana: Timeless or a-temporal, or something like that.

Punita: Yes, a-temporal or something.

Y: A-temporal we ended up with in the next paper.

Punita: OK.