#23
Formal talk-28102006 afternoon day8
Lila recording day 8, afternoon
28/10/2006
061028002
1 Hr 57 min
Recording 23

An area that---------

B: Discussion with maybe later. For instance, all that exists, Ok, yeah, are non-physical individuals and their choices.

Y: Yes.

B: And there are then circles and so on. But, for instance… and… Ok, everyone has its own subjective view of the world which is not to be confused with anyone else's.

But still we share a certain sense of time and space. For instance, you are viewing this room from a different angle than I am which makes us different in choices. But still we all share the same perception of the room in a sense.

Y: In a sense.

B: In a sense, I know in a sense. I know I don't confuse cat with the one that looks at the cat. But I was thinking about it. Is this something like underlying sub-graph which is undirected? I don't want to add anything to this picture. This picture is perfect and it is in the basis of everything, just non-physical individuals and their choices. But on a different level, on a level of thought.

Y: On the level of what.

B: Of thought.

Y: Thoughts.

B: I remember you differentiating this level at a certain point when I was first discussing sorrow and so on when a certain number of connections are lost, for instance. For instance, when body dies and so on, a certain emotion of loss and sorrow is being experienced. So when we were discussing this point, you mentioned the level though. So I was using this term.

My idea was for a question. When we are still sharing a certain perception of space and time which is same for me and you, for instance this room, although viewed differently, in a sense. Is this a graph to which we are all connected or is this and underlying in-directed graph? This is what I was thinking maybe.

Y: I consider them to be one in the same.

B: It is one in the same. Well, while I was discussing I realized that. It is one in the same actually; it is one and the same.

Y: Ok. Then I'll go through my routine here. I found another paper. In fact I found two. This one is called *Using a labeled diagraph in modeling the sub-straight of physical phenomena.* That's entirely different than the one I read this morning about science and religion and God and Elohim and all of that. 1995 When I was living in Canberra. I was trying to write a paper that scientists would pay attention to. Didn't work. But I think it will put another slant on my understanding of the Lila Paradigm for you.

> A labeled directed graph, a diagraph is used in modeling structures which provide the mechanism for reduction, thus illustrating the way that observed phenomena emerge from the quantum unitary state. The mechanism makes non-physical or perhaps mathematical objects which are represented by the labeled nodes or the letters of the diagraph appear to be generic physical quanta of matter. Direct relationships, that is, directed connections represented by the arch or arrows of the diagraph are made to appear as space that is one dimensional space or length and to appear as energy. The diagraph model explains what electric charge is, what length is, what the electromagnetic coupling constant is, that is alpha, and what an electron and its mass are. This diagraph paradigm also provides the basis of formulating and directly computing the values of elementary electric charge and the Planck length from the Compton wave length of the electron and the electromagnetic coupling constant.

That's just the abstract. I'll read the introduction in a minute. But I can see now what was wrong with my approach. I was using a directed graph and connecting it to physical measurements immediately. Whereas, we have been talking this morning about having a mathematical system to stand alone, so that, that system is not being expressed in terms of the physical.

B: Yes.

Y: Introduction.

> The nodes of a directed graph or diagraph, the uniqueness of which are indicated by letter labels, are used to represent non-physical "mathematical objects" which originate or terminate non-physical or mathematical directed relations or directed connections represented by the arches or arrows of the diagraph. Neither the nodes nor the arches are located in space or time. There is no background of space or of time. All the labeled nodes each of which represent a different non-physical object are catholically

B: Are what?

Y: Catholically, universally.

B: Ah, yes, catholically means general. Yes, yes.

Y: Or existentially related.

So all of these labeled nodes which each represent a different non-physical object, all of them are members of the same existential set.

> There is, however, and additional type of relations, a directed relation which consists of the nonphysical existence for the non-physical object from which a directed relation originates of a non-physical object at which that directed relation terminates. For example, in the diagraph structure, A arrow W, both node A and node W exist in a common non-physical existential realm. However in addition, node W exists non-physically for node A. That is to say, there is a directed relation from node A to node W represented by the arch or the arrow from node A to node W also, however, that node A does not exist for node W since no arch extends from node W to node A. It is the directed type of relation that enable the paradigm presented here to successfully model that which underlies phenomena.

Now there is one more paragraph in the introduction.

> Call big (N) the number of nodes in the diagraph, and call

In this case, I have used little 'a'

> The number of arches that actually exist in the diagraph, the maximum number of arches that could possibly exist in the diagraph. (N) squared minus (N) is only one possible value for A. Only one arch that is non-physical directed relation can exist from a particular node to another particular node. A second arch would be an identity.

A second such arch would be an identity.

> There can not be an arch from a node to itself.

This is wrong.

B: Yes.

Y:

> In the diagraph representing the network of non-physical objects and non-physical directed relations that subsist the phenomena of our actual physical universe, the number of nodes must be finite. If the number of nodes were infinite all computed physical values would be infinite. See Finkelstein 1993. This problem has plagued most theories bases on thermodynamic paradigm resulting in a need for renormalization. All the nodes are equivalent, that is, non-identical to each other. Each node is no more or less than any other node in that it is a non-physical object which can be the origin or termination of non-physical directed relations, but each node is different from every other node in that each non-physical object has its own unique non-physical qualities.

Well, you see that I am talking my way around words like 'who' and God and Divine individuals. I call it a unique non-physical quality that the non-physical object has.

> All the arches are equivalent to each other. Each arch is no more or less than any other arch in that it directly relates one particular node to another particular node. However

each arch is unique in that any particular arch exists only from one particular node to another particular node.

And that ends the introduction. Then I give the model the usual spiel. Then I talk about physicality by introducing a rule, and unitarity, and the relative magnitudes of spaces and electric charge. And then I ask, "Is this model correct?"
 Then I give the references. It almost sounds like a paper that you would put in a journal-- almost. It could go perhaps in a diagraph journal. There are two of them right now. There are graph journals that have both directed and non-directed. But none of them are fundamental like this. Not one of their papers in years of publishing has anything that is fundamental. So I thought I would let you see the contrast of my different approaches.

Bret: I had the thought.

Y: Just one moment before you go on. I have another paper which I won't read now. Tomorrow I might read the introduction. And it's called, "How in principle to make a consciousness chip." This actually got accepted at a conference in Tokyo. I didn't go. I probably wrote it as a joke because I said in order to build this chip it would take about two billion dollars. But in principle, I show how it could be done. So you were going to say…

Bret: That someone would be interested in a paper that allowed them to solve a problem that they want to solve. These are difficult to grasp at first and it isn't so obvious what the applicability is to what they want to do from their point of view. But one, for instance…

Y: For this one, they want to find out what consciousness is.

Bret: And that one worked.

B: How much does it cost?

Y: They posted this on the poster board.

Don: How could you make money off it?

B: This is language they speak, cheap-expensive.

Bret: For someone to go out on a limb for an idea that isn't theirs is another generation removed. Someone gets their own idea, they will champion it. But to champion someone else's idea… It has to be…

Y: Well, I don't know if you get… I've got journals that there's all kind of stuff in them like how did the patriarchs of ancient Judaism live to be 900 years old. That's published and a lot of other stuff like that. I don't know if it… I said I was going to think about this problem during the break; and I have thought about it. But do you just write to get published? Do you just write to make money, to get a grant? Is that what it's about? It's not what I'm about.

Bret: Some people it might be. There are alternatives though.

Y: Well, there are those that say, "Well, yes, I want the truth but I also need to… I got kids and a family, I've got a mortgage, I got to pay money for it."
Ok, maybe we should wait until they become professor of Emeritus and they're retired and then talk to them.

Bret: Instead my thought is what problems do the top people in the field want to solve like gravity, for instance.

Y: Like what is consciousness. Everybody wants to know what consciousness is. I stuck this under their nose; and they say, "Why is that consciousness?"
Well, either they get it or they don't.

Bret: Maybe that's the barrier.

Y: But… so I haven't solved my… I have been thinking about it, but I haven't settled the question yet. But you said that you personally anyway are interested in the Lila Paradigm for itself.

B: Yes.

Y: You have already got a job doing that so you don't need it or you don't not need it. So I can share the Lila Paradigm with you do with it whatever you do. I think that is a working solution. I've put it out and either they use it or they don't. I don't think John Nash developed his thing just to get a Noble Prize. Ok. You wrote a note about Finkelstein.

B: No, just to remember him because you were…

Y: Yes, I cited a paper of his. Is that what I cited there? Oh, private conversation.

B: What I was also intending to do and which I could do independently of any other so it depends just on me, is to include Lila Paradigm by its name and your name to be easily found through internet in the official syllabus of the university. This I could do. And I could make sure that when you look with this usual browser Mozilla and so on, to put it in megatops. You know megatop? It is like a…

Y: Online publishing internally?

B: It makes sure that the key words that you put into your presentation will be easily found. For instance, if somebody enters through Google, for instance, "consciousness" then this will appear. There is a way to do it. For instance, in front page editor, under edit preferences you enter 'go to those megatops;' and in those megatops you put your key words under which you want to be found easily. For instance, Charles Berner, Lila, consciousness, individuals. So whoever searches them puts 'individuals' as a key word he could found you easily. And he would found at university of southeast European under the subject named' self-reference systems', this paradigm is being taught. So this is which…

Y: You could do that.

B: Very easily it depends just on me. For instance, as a first step…

Y: Ok, got it. Now, what about…you were looking at that chart from Monte Carlo random selection.

B: Ah, yes, we could look at it; I haven't got time this afternoon but…

Y: We could look at it now.

B: Yes, yes. It is great. We could go step by step and check the probabilities and check the ranges set for the procedure. And this could be done. This is a very nice subject for a thesis. Someone could do this and it is nice because the number is finite which it is anyway. But it is reachable by this matrices also. You have that many individuals. The number of individuals is the numbers of letters in the alphabet so.

Y: I would be interested to know if a matrix 26 by 26 would be able to show up easier patterns that this doesn't pick up. This picks up circuits pretty easily.

B: I could found circuits…

Y: But…

B: This (message?) I send you. They are recognizing circuits.

Y: Yes. But this it is hard to tell when you have got a physical phenomena happening here. When you have a pattern, it just looks like a jumble.

B: Yes. There are certain patterns which are easier to find on matrix than on graph. And I tried to show that when I was searching line by line.

Y: Yes.

B: For patterns like this one which is one dimensional space or two dimensional. So this is very easy to see here. For instance, out of (N) there are two arrows out going. These are F, O. And then I search for the column of (N) and then the first one in the column of (N) shows me, this is (N) these is F of ( ) and the first one in this column of (N) shows me the preceding. If I check, I'll check this is true. Sometimes this is hidden and couldn't be seen easily. For instance, we have structures like this arising from the (Elt?) row. From the (Elt?) row have E, P, R, from the (Elt?) we have E, P, R… E,P,R. Now I jump to the (Elt?) column and the first one in the column shows me in whose consciousness does this consciousness of one dimensional space appears. It is E.

Y: Ok, now I have a question at this point. Say this paper…This work is done and there is a report written. Does it just stand like that and a recommendation be that this could be used for what? What could it be used for? Would we point out what it

could be used for? Or would it be… Just leave it up to the reader to find a purpose. In other words, is it just a mathematical approach?

B: Yes. Both approaches are possible. We could decide which is most in favor.

Y: Because unless this is related either to individuals or to something physical, what good is it? It is just a mathematical procedure.

B: You know when I was presenting Lila Paradigm at least what I knew about Lila Paradigm at that point, before I came, to my doctoral candidates, they found that they were able to find applications themselves. For example, one of them said, "This metabolic process is in molecules."

Y: Yes, I can see that they could do that.

B: So we either could find an application or present it like a mathematical paper, a paper in Monte Carlo method. This is also possible. This is one usage of Monte Carlo method which is of interest.

Y: So what's that got to do with the Lila Paradigm?

B: But actually… Maybe… At least one of the things you should do with Lila Paradigm. You should write a book and so on and so on. But one thing is yes, yes you could write a paper in which this is emphasized. The mathematics, matrices, the simulation. And then explain. And then give your paradigm as well. Maybe not the other way around, you know, because we have deductive process and inductive. In deductive we have the global and then the particular which you do usually. But there is also another way possible from particular to the general. And maybe this is easier for people to grasp. And is easy because it is very difficult to say, "I have a new explanation for the whole universe."
People are suspicious and they are unable to grasp it.

Y: Too good to be true.

B: Too good to be true if you say, "I have answer to all of your questions."

Don: Yogeshwar, I just have a thought on this. Can I share it?

Y: Yes.

Don: You know just like in Mary Gelman found that Lie groups gave a picture of relationships among quarks…

Y: Yes.

Don: That… Would it be possible just to develop the mathematics of directed graphs based on probabilities of expectancies values, and show that there is a mathematical relation between certain patterns and so on that relate that happen to be the same as the rest mass of certain particles? Now that says nothing about the underlying. It says purely that we have a mathematical correspondence between a physical

phenomena and that. And you wouldn't have to say, "This is a theory of everything."
You would just say, 'Well, we have this mathematical correspondence."

Y: That's what I am doing here. I just talk about a couple of applications. But unless
you make some connection, it may just lie in the draw for a hundred years. And
somebody says, "Hey, this is just the thing!"
Like tensor analysis wasn't that used until Einstein needed a way to deal with his
general theory. Then his friend said, 'Oh, you should use tensor analysis." And he
said. "Oh, yeah? What is that?"
He had never even heard of it. And he pulled it out and used it. It had been
developed fifty years before. Well, we could do that approach. Leave it in the drawer
until somebody needs it.

Don: Hard to say at the end. Then you speculate on what the underlying would be.

B: You may just put shyly, you know, a notion of the underlying.

Y: It might possibly be something a Nobel Prize in this for you.

Bret: In this configuration gives next week's lottery number.

B: Then they will be tested. Lie algebra actually were presented in 30's, in 1930, and
no one knows about non holonomic motion planning in robots, for instance, at that
point. And then, when they encounters problems like this, they remembered how we
have Lie algebras. So this is also… for instance, to go back to this diagram. When
introducing Monte Carlo method, sometimes this picture is being given. You have
circle rolling like a roulette. And then you have a painted area here; and you have a
pencil which puts dots. You roll this and then you stop at a random time. You have
one dot, and here dot etc. And you have also dots here. And when you divide these
dots, which are obtained in random moments of time, by the dots in this coloured
area… Sometime this is… This is rotating, it is rotating, sometimes the coloured area
is here; sometimes the coloured area is here; so on and so on. And sometimes it is
in… the dots is in the coloured area. If you divide the… for instance, you have M
numbers, M into the coloured area. And you have M numbers all together. This is
the angle alpha over P actually over 360 degrees, 2 P. And since you know this, you
know that, you are counting the numbers you might find the angle alpha.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: So this is the same actually.

Y: Another way to get a random.

B: So this is opposite way of thinking than we usually do because usually out of…
Now based to the probability, we got definite numbers. Usually we do the other way
around here based on probabilities and random numbers, we got definite numbers.
For instance, alpha is 36 degrees. So this is the same actually.

Y: Ok. Well, I can see all this part would be quite easily done.

B: Yes, yes. It could be done.

Y: If fact, Bret has already done it. He's already written a program on it and randomly selected. And we found out a number of results. I got them in the files here.

B: And maybe this could be used for what I was talking this morning to find the probability for certain structure denoting 4D to appear, and find out that due to the simulation with Monte Carlo for, for instance, 90 thousand individuals or iterations, we will found that this probability is lesser than the probability to have a pattern for energy. And then associate these two to physical reality.

Y: To What?

B: To physical reality.

Y: Ah. (acknowledges)

B: This could be done. This is very good.

Bret: We got off on other topics this morning when I was mentioning things I thought of. But a second thing that I didn't mention this morning was the thought that perhaps the reason that there is 3D space is because it is more preferable than 4 dimensional space and higher is too static. It doesn't move. And one and two dimensional space doesn't have enough detail; but three is very rich relatively. If you interpret the sub-states as 3D space, maybe you get more richness or the most richness. And that would be a statistical thing to look for. And maybe that is why individuals like to hang out there.

B: Yes, the probability is great.

Y: Well, perhaps. However, we do get one dimensional space and two dimensional space.

Bret: But they are boring was my thought.

Y: Yeah, I understand that, and we get three dimensional space. But we…the three dimensional particles that we notice, don't decay into two dimensional particles that we can measure. They may exist, but we can't measure them. They are inside the hadron bags isolated in two dimensional space. So a three dimensional device can not observe them. It's not as romantic as your definition.

Bret: But maybe if it is interpreted as 3D space, you stay closer to the edge of chaos. And that is why it is preferred.

Y: All right, if that is what you mean by interesting as…

Bret: for a fully enlighten…

Y: Get some action.

Bret: For a fully enlightened individual, there aren't a lot of choices left. The choices are all made.

Y: Well, the fully enlightened individual just gives it all up.

Bret: Right.

Y: "*C'est la vie,*" what will be will be. He doesn't even bother to do that.

B: So this is… in order this A to B to be smaller, you take just 3 digits, zero then 384. You know how do they do this in Monte Carlo method? They associate, for instance, 4 digital number to this and find ranges. For instance, I have for A; I have range from 384 in order to be the smallest, to 768, one number smaller than yours.

Y: Yes.

B: Then for B, I have 769 to 1153, then 1154 to 1537, then 1538 to 1922, one smaller. Then one more, then I stop, 1923 to 2307. This is C, D, E. And then it is easy to find the range in which the number you got belongs.

Y: Yes. That's how I did it.

B: Yes, I know that's how I did it. And this is how the program should do it. To make it easier to make a table like this.

Y: They call this a look-up table.

B: Yes because it is easier. And so on shall I proceed or not? So maybe we could look at it. Or at random take one and go to this.

Y: Well, I think we have talked over what might be done with it.

B: Ok.

Y: We could analyze each case, each extant. This is extant and that is extant. And what seems interesting to me is that this does not change to that one. There is this one; there is this one. Depending solely on what the choices are of the individuals, it is not a background in which one is changed from one to the other.

B: Yes, of course.

Y: An individual are… in total all the individuals are making whatever choices they are making. And to say that it changes from one to the other is to deny someone having the power to make a choice, whatever choice he is making. If he changed then this is not saying that they have the power of choice to have it be the way it is. In other words, one does not stop making this choice and start making another choice. That is not what takes place. This one is making this choice and that is that. I make that point because people are so use to thinking in their minds. In fact, their minds can not do otherwise than have a background of time. You have to over ride it and ignore your mind; and just say. "This is how it is."

B: Ok, these are discrete states which when… sometimes it is pointed out that discrete stage does not mean you go from one stage to another stage. So they are all the same…

Y: So your best student at university might be able to understand that.

B: Yes.

Y: And if he can, then it won't just be a mathematical exercise, he'll say, "Ohhhh!"

B: Actually, these students who was working metabolic processes, he has a very similar picture, and he gave me the program. But I have to find it and guess the parameters in order to have…

Y: Do you want to look at this more or should I file it? I think we are going to have to go back over some things that we have sort of skimmed over and go into them more rigorously and in more detail so that it becomes not just something you heard once. It becomes something that you understand in depth. You do a lot by applying what I say to different examples that's of that process. But I am not sure which parts you would like to address.

B: I should like to know more about configurations of particles.

Y: Ah ha!

B: What is tau anti-tau? We have seen many of these so far but still. For instance, this is electron. But to be able to know why it is electron and so on. This is positron and this is minus, minus, minus.

Y: Yes.

B: There are… it is three dimensional.

Y: But why… But they are in three dimensions. Now there is a sub-state here of this and this. Just forget those right now. And that is an electron, this positron, same thing with this one. Same thing with this one. But to be in three dimensional space, you have to consider all of that sub-space. That sub-state, so there is several sub-states. Let me get my board out.

B: For instance… Later on I'll ask you.

Y: What I am indicating is a sub-state. I indicate like this. This individual here, call it R and this is W... R is conscious of himself as a positron and of W as W ●, the electron. He is conscious of it, and he is in this three dimensional space that is formed by these three arrows. He's located in that space, and he is conscious of this particle W ● that is an electron. He is also conscious of himself not only in this location but that he has a positive charge with respect to W ● which is an electron. How does he know that is because these are attracted. That attraction is caused by this arrow. This is called a photon, the boson where the positron and the electron are

fermions. Now we have got the same story with R, with this one Q and Y. So this is a positron. Again it's a positron with respect to Q ● and again in regard to Y ●.

Bret: In whose consciousness?

Y: R

Bret: But does R in its consciousness experience itself as three positrons?

Y: Yes.

Bret: As three, Ok. It's not, but that's so much for consciousness. Consciousness doesn't report the truth. R is not accepting himself. If he were, he'd recognize that there were three positrons that had his point of view and know that it wasn't him. An enlightened person is like that. They are associated, they see the room, they feel the head, and all that just like anybody else; but they know that's not them. This is a photon also and so is this.

Bret: And all of those are from R's consciousness. That's a photon to R and that's a photon to R. That's what you mean.

Y: Yeah, photon to R. I am not sure what the word to means.

Bret: Well, in R's consciousness.

Y: Yes. Now if we took the sub-states, you would think that R would be conscious of two electrons. But that's not so because an electron that we all know and love is in three dimensional space. This one is in two dimensional space. So it is not an electron. It appears to R as a different particle in two dimensional space. Some where one of these days, I'll have my charts finished about the recursions because each one of these is associated with a recursion. Each crossover arrow in addition to another one recurses the original pattern so that we have the recursed pattern and it's recursed once more once for each dimension. Well, in that curve, the full curve, there is a section of the curve that deals with the first recursion. This is the original pattern (OP original pattern) and this is the first recursion and then, this face here, second recursion. This is the so called real universe. This is the 2D universe and this original pattern is the 1D universe. This is a transition from 1D to the so called real. People call this 3 dimensional world the real. It is really just a 3D. This is a transition; and there is some strange kinds of particles that take place. That this Q and this Y are no longer electrons in the consciousness of R over here but is these strange things like plus and minus W's. X bosons are the double two dimensional bosons. So these are no longer photons; they combine. These bosons combine with each other because they are in one sub-state although these are all still in the circuits. And they are called heavy bosons or massive bosons, like W and Z. There is more complication than this; but I won't go into all of it.

B: I read here, for instance, that this picture has something to do with the fact that fermions have half spin. For instance, electrons which are… The pair electron positron have spin of one half. And then this is why they are in pair and the boson has spin… This massless boson has spin of one.

Y: Has spin of one, yes.

B: Is it connected somehow?

Y: Yes. But the photon has spin of one also.

B: Which you associate with boson because it is…

Y: It is a boson.

B: It is with out mass.

Y: But the mass comes by looking at it together in one sub-state rather than in the single particle sub-state.

B: Yes, yes. This is how I understood that, for instance, movement is perception of space and mass is resistance to this movement.

Y: Yes, that is correct. Now we have got three of them.

B: We have three, yes. We have three factorial. We have six because we differentiate between… There is a uniqueness for each one. We have six actually, six sub-states.

Y: Yes.

B: Six sub-states. We have U Q; we have U W; we have Q W; we have U alone; W alone; Q alone. I mean not the arrows.

Y: There's four; now when it's three like this…

B: And the three of them together.

Y: The charge now is minus this and this… I've got it in that paper. This goes to; and we can draw another one, and that's to these; and then this one and this one can be combined.

B: This is what I was trying to…

Y: This is how we keep getting more and more particles out of the same number of individuals. You wondered how come? Well, you didn't. I brought it up that there is many more particles than there are individuals because there is many combinations.

B: Ok, this is clear, yes.

y. It's like (N) factorial.

B: Yes, yes, the number of relations is greater.

Y: This is a fractional charge. I had it figured out once so that this is two-thirds charge; and this becomes the down quark. No, these are the down quarks and this is the up quark. These are all downs. It is close to that. I would have to look up my notes on it. And now there's photons, not photons but bosons that gather all three of what were these arrows taking them as a unit. And we get an X bosons out of it. For the three bagger and when you have a two bagger here it's… The next one up is W plus and minus. There's a plus and minus boson. You take these two, you get a plus. You take these two you get a minus. You take these two; you get another plus or sometimes a minus that goes back and forth. Sometimes it's one and then it changes to the other and it changes to the other. If we had a particle physicist here from CERN, he could say, "Oh I see how it is," just like you do on some things that you know well.

I'm just trying to give the principle of combinations and how the sub-states work to give different particles with different charges on them. The charges on the electron are always one. Minus one, and this one the positron is plus one. These are the hadron bags. When this process of transition is complete everything is completely bagged and everything is just like protons, neutrons, electrons, positrons and neutrinos and that's all there is. Now where dark energy is and dark matter is and all that stuff I haven't a vaguest idea of what they are talking about. Turns out they don't either. They say, "Well, we have this much mass unaccounted for. And so they come up with ideas that might account for it. But they have not found any evidence for the dark matter or dark mass. They only found places, the missing it's missing. Now there maybe some dark matter and some dark mass. If it is, I suspect that it is coming from the state of no knowledge. And dark matter and dark space, a dark energy, make up 96 percent of the mass in the universe. And that fits the distortion of our graph from a random distribution among individuals way over to one side or at the edge of chaos.

Bret: Biljana, this is a book of Yogeshwar's that I am reading. And Don asked me to start bringing it down a couple of days ago; and I hadn't mentioned it since. But I don't remember if it was a book you decided not to read or would…whether it would be of interest to you. It's a fairly non-rigorous non-mathematical, but quite readable overview of particle physics and the local evolution. It had been mentioned earlier, but perhaps I didn't remember. If you'd decide to pass it by or if you would like to look at it.

B: Ok, thank you.

Don: It's got a beautiful presentation of Lie groups and the whole mapping. Again it doesn't go deeply into it, but all the principles are there.

B: It's great. First of all, I'll write it down. When I am back, I'll go the library and tell them to order it. Or maybe copy it here down in the city.

Bret: Yeah, Don's free. I'm joking about it. (Throw) something else on him.

B: No, I have seen there is a copy shop, so we could.

Don: It is probably the best non-technical presentation of all the ideas, but it's very conceptually rigorous, but not technically.

B: Ah (Shum?)Or (Sham Kahoi?) there is a series of books by (Shamati?) and somebody else.

Bret: There is a Shumway something. I don't know if you are thinking of something else. Publishing or something…

B: Ah, yes, it is something else.

Don: Yeah, it is a publishing house.

B: Ah yes. Great, excellent.

Y: It is a well-written book on a very difficult subject. But it's an overview. It doesn't go into the papers that give all the details about the various particles.

B: Great! Ok, shall I look at it or...?

Bret: Yes. If it is useful for you because I will be here longer than you will.

B: Ah. Ok, thank you, yes, I'll read it.

Bret: It was mentioned that's why I picked out of the library. And so I had the impression you had heard about but were approaching it in some other way. But it occurred to me, maybe that's not true.

Y: No I hadn't mentioned it to her.

Bret: Well, Ok, someone did that why I… Don did and that's why I picked it up out of the library. So I thought you had already had a crack at it and passed it by. Sounds like it would be good for you.

B: Ok, thank you, yes, yes. Ah! all this.

Y: They look like you.

B: Yes, yes. In the diagram, I was showing to you about electron becoming positron which comes from the future instead of electron going from present to future, it might be positron coming from future to present based on… Ah the same.

Bret: Exactly. He goes over that.

B: This is the same.

Y: That was right from Feynman paper on the subject. And I think he is wrong.

B: Ah yes. Ok, he has background of space and time.

Bret: But the math works.

B: And Wheeler says… Ah ha, regarding this because this was also in the book about time by Paul Davis.

Y: Paul Davis.

B: This is where I met this first time. And they say the same diagram, the very same diagram. He says that Wheeler who was mentor of Feynman. Unfortunately Feynman died at forth five and Wheeler lived ninety and older. But Wheeler said, "Regarding this, we might consider this to be just one electron."
Ok, this is true. Just one instead here, viewing a positron going from present to future, we have an electron coming from future to present because this is time. It goes backwards. But even further, we might consider that the whole universe is made out of one electron going from present to future to future, from future to present and back to future, back to the future like in the movie.

Y: This is called an advanced wave, comes from the future back to the present.

B: So Wheeler says, "It might be that the whole universe is derived on the movement of just one electron based on this picture." This was one point; and second point was written by Paul Davis that the distant galaxies for which we suppose that are anti-matter (made of positrons and so on) this could be that this is a mirror of our universe coming back from the future.

Y: Yes. He did write that.

B: You read that.

Y: Yes, I read that a long time ago.

B: And he had one wonderful chapter where he says the first time he had a real insight that was new that he hadn't read from somebody else is that he imagined himself to be down inside of an electron flying through space. Feynman also did this same thing himself. But when Paul Davis did it, he could see how it looked from a particular point of view. And he then saw… and it changed his whole life. And he has become something entirely different kind of person now. And he has a different job, now he is an astrophysicist now… astrobiology now working out about life in the universe. And he is no longer a physicist because he had that particular viewpoint of how it would be like to be a particle moving through the universe and understanding the laws from that perspective. Just like Einstein was riding on a wave front and that's how he has his insights. Now this tells you something. It tells you that the global view is not true. And this is a global view that the universe is not made up of one God, God's eye view of it. You have to get down in there and look at it from your point of view as you are part of this great network of relationships. And if you do that, you can understand the truth of the matter. And that is a very valuable principle.

B: I have Einstein writing on a beam, I'll show you on my book.

Y: Ah! I want to see that. Their math is wrong. That is why it agrees with their math. Their math is symmetrical. Now, it is all right for math to be whatever way it is as

long as it is consistent. But it doesn't have to have a one to one relationship with the apparent physical reality if I may use such a phrase.

B: It was not Einstein, it was Superman.

Y: Who is this?

B: Superman. I believe that I have another picture moving with the speed of light.

Y: I see. I see why you like this because you dress like Superwoman (lots of laughing).

B: Albert wanted to create a simple…paint…a simple picture for the functioning of the light. He was asking himself whether ether is needed. Do we need ether? I have another picture. Here is the stealer of time, a thief stealing time.

Y: It's a what of time?

Don: Stealer.

B: A thief stealing actually the notion of same timeness.

Y: He takes it. Did you say stealer?

B: Stealer.

Y: He steals the time.

B: Who's the notion of…? When you have two things happen at the same time?

Don: Synchronicity.

B: In a way, but not synchronicity.

Bret: Simultaneity?

B: Simultaneity, maybe.

Y: It is like Kali. Kali is the destroyer.

B: Ah, Kali. Yes, Kali, I know, mother Kali. There are three manifestation of mother goddess, Durga, Lakshmi and Saraswati. And Kali is the mother who should kill for her children… She's self-reference. I had Einstein somewhere, but maybe I am wrong maybe. I had a picture of Einstein looking in the mirror, this example of Einstein having a mirror and moving with the speed of light.

Y: Your book should be in English.

B: Yes.

17

Y: And it could sell all over the world. The other one is more… That's why I am checking my mail because they told one student to translate something from my book.   And I am waiting for this to be able to read it. Maybe later.

Y: Ok. There's another.

B: Ah! (Spencer and Fermi). I was puzzled by your remark, Yogeshwar, when you said that this one half doesn't mean… It is just a name. But whenever I read hear, for instance, they associate meaning to this. They say that because fermions have one half here and one half here. This make a boson which is with spin one. They associate meaning to spin being one half. They associate meaning.

Y: On a ratio basis that is true, but it does… This could be one and one and this could be two…

B: Yes, yes.

Y: And be the ratio.

B: This is correct.

Y: This is a historic accident.

B: But that yes, ok. Ah, yes, this is correct.

Y: Would you check the book shelf for it's called Quantum Physics A to Z? It's a paper back.

B: I have Paul Davis on one of the CD's I believe I gave you.

Don. This one?

Y: Doesn't say A to Z. It says (Q for bondsman?)

Don: Here, particle physics from A to Z.

Y: Yeah, there it is. So here's a book on quantum physics. It's a reference book really. If you just want to know the meaning of some term, you just look it up and it tells you immediately. He is the author of *Schrödinger's Kittens.*

B: *Schrödinger's Kittens.* I have a book what was the name like. It was Schrödinger's Cat involved but I don't know. I have a picture also in my other book of Schrödinger's cat. Maybe you know this picture. This is the dialogue between (Cheri Putra?) and (Quantoff?) I invented. I have created… I have written this… What quantum physics thinks and (Cheri Putra?) thinks, about reality. Schrödinger's cat.

Y: Ah, the cat.

B: Schrödinger's cat is inside here associate.

Y: Yes, I know that story well.

B: And the reduction of the wave function.

Y: And I say the reduction takes place always instantaneously outside of time with every particle. Whatever the extant pattern is, it's reduced. That's what I say. This is but people…

B: This people from Neocom, this is a computer company in Macedonia and they gave me some money in order this book to be published. And so I put them there (Everyone laughing).

Y: Advertising.

B: Yes.

Y: See they wanted something and she gave it to them.

B: Ah, yes.

Y: So we're sharing books.

B: This should be copied.

Y: I am thinking…

B: I am bringing to the city to be copied.

Y: I'm thinking two things.

Don: Can I see that? What's the name of it.

Y: Ah! But he writes a lot of popular science books.

B: This is encyclopedia. This is valuable. CERN I was there only not downstairs. I was hundred meters above this.

Y: The accelerator? In CERN?

B: In CERN last year and trough video conference Paul Davis has participated. They connect with him and he was answering questions.

Y: He is in Sydney now; he's working there, the University of Macquarie. I'm thinking that I want to go back starting tomorrow morning, and go back to basic ideas. We are going to start with what is a non-physical individual. I want to clear up any confusions or questions between us that is not clear. And then we'll talk about direct knowledge states. And we'll clarify that from different angles. And we can keep track on the side of any rules we think of.

B: Ah, yes, great.

Y: As we go over those in clarifications. And then we'll deal with how states of knowledge… How the act takes place of being into a state of knowledge or state of no knowledge. And we'll look also at the ramifications of what no knowledge does to consciousness. Then we'll deal with how unity takes place, how it affects these states of knowledge. Now this is fundamental stuff; but it is the core of the Lila Paradigm. And if there is any error in it, it will show up all the way through and cause trouble and confusion. But if this part is crystal clear, then you won't make serious mistakes for long.

But I need to have either tomorrow afternoon session or the Monday afternoon session off. I have to deal with a Chinese doctor. Is that possible that we could cancel the 2 to 4 either tomorrow or Monday? If Monday was off, it might be easier for you to do things downtown or arrangements or whatever.

B: What is best for you is fine.

Y: I think Monday would best for me.

B: Ok.

Y: On the other hand… Yes, I think Monday would be best.

B: Ok, thank you.

Y: That's all right with you?

Bret: I'll have to check my busy social calendar (laughs). Yes, that is fine.

Y: No, I just mean is it all right with you?

Bret: Monday off that's fine.

Y: Not the whole day.

Bret: The afternoon session.

Y: The afternoon session only.

B: Since we shall be talking about states of consciousness and so on maybe this is not strictly Lila. Maybe this is the second book of Lila you have been mentioning; there is another book of Lila. Maybe you could repeat the stages of samadhi you were talking on the lecture about Kripalu's commentaries. It will be good to have this on recording or not, maybe or maybe not.

Y: I won't say it like I would say it in class. I don't let them record. I let them take notes. And their notes are always partly wrong. So there's no problem. So I'll do that. But I'll fix it up for the Lila Paradigm.

B: Yes, great.

Y: All you have to do is ask and I'll do my best sometimes complete and sometimes incomplete. So don't hesitate to say, "I don't see how this is so."
Because there is two levels of understanding something. One level is to understand it from the point of view of an idea and another is to grasp it for yourself, maybe just momentarily. But that's different than what people write down on examinations. They just say what they think the teacher wants to hear.

B: Yes, yes. And they try to be kind. Yes. Like this student who sends me messages, "How are you professor?" Because there is no chance that he could learn. He's is very… but he asks… He is polite, he is kind.

Y: That's one thing. Another thing is to really understand it. That doesn't necessarily mean agreeing that it true. But to really understand something, there's several things that have to be done. Number one, you have to grasp the words and the concept. Second, you have to reword it in your own way of putting it. In that process of rewording it will go on until it's correct and not sloppy, precise. And then you have to work out examples. They usually save that for graduate work, working on examples.   But you don't really understand something until you have worked out two or three examples. And then you have to teach it to somebody else. And when you have succeeded at teaching it to one or two others, then you understand it fully. Five things. I learned that from L. Ron Hubbard. You've heard of him.

B: Yes.

Y: I knew him very well. I knew him and his son and his wife and children. They played with my children and all that. But I asked him a question one time. And he didn't know the answer. I went, "What! You're my teacher and you don't know the answer to what is size. S I Z E what is size." He said, "That's a dumb question."
So I went off to find another master. I found Kripalu. God was very good to me. But I learned things from Hubbard. He did know some things. Practical people call practical principles where the Lila Paradigm in the short term passes on practical applications till you ask questions like this, the levels of samadhi.

B: Ah yes.

Y: Well, anything else you guys want to take up this afternoon? If I could find radical theory in here some place.

Bret: I have a copy.

Y: Let me see about this a little bit more. You saw these were…

B: Yes.

Y: This is the same connection.

B: Isomorphic Hamiltonian.

Y: And each one is a different Hamiltonian, spanning Hamiltonian. So this is a quark, this is a quark and this is… This is an up quark. I don't know if that's entirely correct. I have said we have not worked out the rest mass numbers for the other fermions. However, the electric charges of the quarks may be as shown in these bifurcations made up of crossover arrows in sub-arrangements.

B: You have…

Y: I am not satisfied with those.

B: Ah, no, because you have quarks here.

Y: Yes. I contributed to that and I did this myself. But even this, since 1998, I'm not satisfied with. And like this pair, "Why is space 3D?" And it says, "This argument is incomplete." This is good, the relative strength of the forces. This is amazingly good. See, this doesn't include the circuit and it has to include the circuit. And that's why I tried to do that in what I drew out.

> Most people, especially scientists, claim that what it is that they are is a human body. Some mainly neural biologists think that what they are is some functioning of the brain. Others, including some philosophers, think that what they are is consciousness itself. Some others think that what they are is a soul of spirit that leaves the body at death and moves around in space and progresses through time. Some think that the quotes "self" does not exist.

 I read this to you the other day, did I?

B: Yes.

Y: Yes, I think we have covered it all on a light level. I mean not very deep. And I think we ought to go deeper. So I am going to read this to you instead. It says

> The Lila Paradigm light version means not heavy.
>
> Amongst the people of our world there are two principles, fundamental paradigms of what ultimate reality is.
>
> Paradigm One:
> Only the physical world exists and it naturally produces biological things some of which are conscious. This is the paradigm of modern science.
>
> Paradigm Two:
> Only a theistic power exists which originates acts that produces consciousness of a physical world that includes biological things. This is the paradigm of modern theologists.
>
> Most modern scientists now believe that there only exists several physical "fields," physical fields out of which time, space, and matter particles, mass motion and several types of energy, charges such as electric charges have been produced from these fields by random occurring quantum fluctuations. They believe that some of these have

naturally evolved into biological forms and that at least the human body forms are some times conscious. And that these humans are able to be conscious and are what it is that each of us is.

Most modern theologians believe that all that exists is God or Gods or a non-physical principle or a power that without being caused to, originates acts that are states of consciousness of what appears to be physical. For example, human beings conscious of a physical world. However, the theologians vary as to whether the individuals who are conscious of that physical world are Homo sapiens, bodies, or maybe that they are the brains of such bodies or minds or personalities, souls, spirits, or angels, etc. that are associated with bodies.

These two paradigms have with good reason have been the standards that mankind have used to understand what is happening and have been the two basic guides by which we have steered our actions. We owe them an incalculable debt; yet they both have grave defects.

The modern science model is not adequate to explain what consciousness is or how consciousness can even exists. Also it can not account for how the physical universe got to be the way it is. That is why it is not some other way than the way it is. And modern science can not settle the question as to why at least human individuals seem to have at least the power of choice.

The modern theological model can not account for what the acts of the non-physical originator of those acts are or for the presents of evil or what we individuals are. If it were possible to combine the features of both modern science and theology would a fully adequate paradigm emerge? I think not. And besides, they can not be combined without internal contradictions. Well then, is there some model of ultimate reality that does account for what consciousness is, how it can exist, how the physical universe appears to exist the way it is? How an individual can have the power of choice, how evil can exist, what the acts a non-physical entity makes to create a physical world? Yes, I think so.

I quit at that point. I said, "I think this is working; it is a beginning that is shallow enough and wordy enough to take even an ordinary intelligent half-educated person and lead them gradually to a realization, not only of what the problems are but of what some of the solutions are to it. But you are right about one thing. People don't really want answers. They don't want solutions; they want tools to do it themselves. The Enlightenment Intensive is a tool for them to do it themselves. And that is very popular. I put that out and now 700,000 people, I estimate, have taken Enlightenment Intensives because it is a tool that they can use. You have to beat them into it, but they submit to it because they can see that if they do it, it is going to do something. They don't know what, but they are going to do it. And they do it and they pay for it. They don't pay for this kind of stuff. They don't need to pay for it. We'll put it on the internet and they can all have it for nothing.

Bret: We are a self-selected group. We are the Lila individuals that want to live on the edge of chaos. We want the universe to be a mysterious place.

Y: Speak for yourself, Bret.

Bret: You're here.

Y: I don't want to be here. I am doing everything I know how to do to get out of it.

Don: Not be on the ( )

Y: That's why some people like natural meditation because it is a tool they can use to find their own way with just a little help. So how to get the Lila Paradigm to be a tool. It may be agreeable both to you and me how it can be used to buy people to work on and accomplish the ends that they want. I had Karuna post on the website of Natural Meditation, website. It's a summary of a series of four talks that I gave called "The Road to Liberation." And in there I say step by step what you have to go through to get liberated. And the first part is you have to be dharmic. And then get rich and then successful and have a family and be dharmic and kind. And then you do the next thing, and the next thing, and the next thing, and the next thing. I don't know if that'll do any good. I gave the talks at Silvano and Silvana Bunelli's place.

B: Ah, yes, yes.

Y: He had about two fifty people there.

B: Udine in Italy.

Y: Yes, just outside of Udine in the foothills of the Alps. He has a beautiful place, an old mansion that he re-did completely. He made a lot of money giving Enlightenment Intensives. So he put me up on the third floor, very nicely done. And then he bought another place with seven or eight buildings. It used to be a convent for nuns. And they can't get any nuns anymore so the Catholic Church sold it to Silvano. And he fixed it all up with auditoriums and houses and places for renunciates. It is called the place of gold. As my guru said," This yoga is not a business."
I used to treat it partly as a business. But when he said that one day when he was at my ashram. He had just arrived. He was there. But I and Amrit and Om Shanti were off in the corner with him, and he says, "Yoga is not a business."
I took it seriously, but my guru brother and my guru sister they heard it but they didn't change their procedure. I said, "Let's share mailing lists."
"No, no, no, we don't want to share mailing lists."
"But yoga is not a business; and they changed the subject."
So I gradually got rid of all the business aspects and finally dissolved the organization. He worked very hard there, night and day, month after month.

B: Like he is doing now.

Y: Yes.

B: Magnificent.

Y: Whatever you people want to do, there's only a few minutes left now.

Don: Yogeshwar, I was just speculating on… since the expectation value is dependent on averages the (K) is an average.

Y: Yes.

Don: And… which is very different than the reality…

Y: Yes.

Don: Yet is work obviously, mathematically, it works very, very extremely well. In predicting and calculating…

Y: Up to a point. Yes, ah ten, twelve, maybe fifteen places.

Don: Not bad. But so … it seems there must be a correlation between that and the process of direct knowledge of sub-sumption or comparison, that somewhere in there, that it is a reflection of that process somehow or the process of consciousness.

Y: Yes, it is. We can say it; one way is that the sub-sumption whether it is of knowledge states or of consciousness states, gets it at the extant network, at the way it is, averages. But if you look at it from a temporal point of view, you get all this changes and motions. And they're being subsumed. I think you would then get, if you take that approach that is ingrained of the time factors, history that is built in to the extant arrangement. You will get a different value than the one you use in your measurement because all the measurements they get are based upon the assumption that one you are measuring at this time. And then you measure at this time. And then those vary. Even the speed of light they found varies in the fifteenth place. Now in their reports, they say this value for the speed of light is fixed. This is the definition of the speed of light; that's how fast it goes. And so you adjust your seconds and your lengths accordingly. That's the same thing as taking two measurements and noting that's there's a variation. But there's not a variation. And without some kind of a finite algebra, you will never know exactly what it is. But the number (N) never changes. The only thing that changes is the number of states of knowledge and no knowledge and the particular distribution of those between the individuals. I am answering your question from a point of view of background, theory of background. But you could answer it yourself if you think about it. To answer your question, the answer is, "Yes, there is a correlation".

Don: Involved in states of knowledge and in states of consciousness. We can look for averaging in the mathematics of both those realms.

Y: Yes.

Don: K

Y: There are averages take place due to the reduction or the sub-sumption. But there are the variations. You see the variation is asymmetric. You can… to get into the past just take an arrow out; and you are one unit into the past. But…that's valid but you can't add an arrow. There is no future; the past exists in the extant pattern.

But adding an arrow is changing the extant pattern. So it is asymmetric and time is asymmetric even the truth about time is asymmetric. That is why I say, "Time does not go backwards. Time has an arrow and there is no doubt about it."

Once you've accepted the explanation for time that I have given, it automatically gives a direction to it. So it is asymmetric. So you can take the average of going into the past, but you can't take what it would be if you went ahead. Well, you can calculate it, but it doesn't say that those are the choices that the individuals are making to do that. There is no way to say that in any language that is not incorrect.

Don: I understand that.

Y: Because an extant pattern is an extant pattern. You can't say somebody chooses and then chooses to do this. I don't know. (Kazitki?) didn't handle that problem.

B: (Korsitki?)

Y: (Korzitki?).

Don: Thank you.

Y: (acknowledges)

Bret: Were you going to speak to us, not today probably, about something to do with not choosing? Is that still coming up?

Y: That's coming up.

Don: In the tension.

Y: Tomorrow morning we'll launch into this fundamental stuff and go over it again with a fine tooth comb. You'll be leaving on which date for Sydney?

B: Seventeenth.

Y: Seventeenth. Fine. I think we'll be far enough along that there will be no problem with that.

B: When you say to take out an arrow and then go backwards in time. You mean sub-state.

Y: Sub-state. But there are no sub-states in the future.

B: Yes, yes. It is adding something which...

Y: That doesn't exist. But the sub-state does exist.

B: It does exist, great.

Y: Then there is the whole question which we can take up when we are doing fundamentals. I didn't go into it, this kind of thing. What do we mean by existence?

We say one of the attributes of an individual is existence. What do we mean? And there is a famous comment on that by Clinton. It depends on what your definition of what is, is. You know that got him off. That beat the whole Congress of the United States. Senate was defeated by that one phrase because they had no idea what the hell he was talking about. So in that case, he is probably not guilty because even if he is such a good guy, we are not going to vote him out of office. What's your definition of what is, is? You look up in the dictionary it says… You look up 'be,' and then you look up 'is.' And then look up existence. You just go in circles, goes absolutely nowhere. But it is worth discussing what it doesn't mean.

B: Ah, yes. To be…

Y: I finished it.

Darshana: Yeah.

B: Fromm, there is also Erich Fromm. There is a book to be or to have a choice.

Y: Yes. I read it. I read a lot of books. I read one by Frieda Fromm-Reichmann too. She is a psychiatrist Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, German psychiatrist in the 1890's, 1910 period. And she is the one who said to get into communication with these psychotic people, you duplicate what they do.

B: Ah ha!

Y: If they're… What they do, they do things that nobody will duplicate. So she says even if they defecate on their hand and throw it on the wall, you do the same thing. And they say like, this I don't believe this. So about two years later, I was called by an older woman. Her daughter was insane and she felt bad about it. Would I go to the insane asylum and see what…if I could do anything for her daughter? So when we got there, there were all these people like a snake pit. And she was sitting in a chair about this far from a wall, just sitting there staring at the wall. And her mother said things to her. And she just sat there she didn't do any… she just stared at the wall. So I got a chair and I set it down next to her, right next to the wall, and I stared at the wall. Pretty soon she looked over like this. I started a conversation with her. In three days, she was out of the asylum. Two years later she had a family. She was pregnant and had a family for the ( ). And her realization about six months later when we were doing some therapy work was she says, "You know, if I keep on doing this, you know, they are going to want me to do house work again." And then she laughed and she said, "I've got another choice. I can be insane or I can do house work. So I'll do the house work."

B: Great! So this is actually neural linguistic programming, isn't it.

Y: Hum?

B: There is like a branch in psychiatry, neural linguistic programming.

Y: Yes. Yes.

B: This is it. In which they…

Y: It was established by Frieda Fromm-Reichmann.

B: And they breathed like this. They breathed like the person.

Y: Yes, that's how they mimic. And the person goes like this, you go like this. They go like that, you do that. It works. Even with people who are not insane, it works with. They say, "Why are you doing that?"
Finally they said something real. Before they were just being formal and polite.

B: They open up, they open up. You establish communication.

Y: Yes, they open right up; you just mimic them. They say, "Stop that! You're just mimicking me. Why are you doing that?"
And then you tell them why and they say, "Oh, in that case, you really want me to be open."
There's another kind of approach also for people who are epileptics. And that means they lose control of their body. That place I said in the brain. They lose control at that place at the base of the hypothalamus or the thalamus.
So I did some research with several cases. I did some research and said, "What is it like when you feel an epileptic attack coming on?"
And they all described it in similar way. Like there is a light coming and they can't stop it and it is coming closer; and then that happens. So I realized, of course, it was just an effect happening in the brain, a wave in the brain of light giving effect. And so I'd just have them put their attention on it and go right to the center of it. Like the technique of divine sound, I have been about. And one case who is a very famous person, and she had been an epidictic since childhood, and she was in her seventies. She was cured in 10 minutes. She just put her attention on it. We did it two or three times. She never has another attack. Famous dancer and singer on Broadway in New York City.

B: So, isn't this the same as you were describing in post mortal guide you have written?

Bret: Book of the Dead.

Don: Guide to the After Death Experience.

B: In post mortal experience, you should go to the essence of the light.