#54S
Lila Recordings
Set 3: 13-11-06 to 15-11-06
13-11-06; AM
061113000
1 Hr 23 min
 Recording 54

Y: Yes. I was… 'Why 2?' is answered.

B: Why 2? For a moment I thought that maybe even it is not two but it is just one; just N. And the result fit it for the tau particle when compared with the table. When I divided my result with two – which means it is as if I was working just with N, not with 2N. For a moment I thought maybe it is still N because the result fit it. The digits were the same as in the table, but in the table, multiplied by two, as you did. (Y acknowledges.) So... but then I reconsidered. I went over the whole procedure. First of all, I have implied (applied), for tau particle, a procedure which is simplified in comparison to one used for muon yesterday because I thought, now, since I have tried two different procedures and they prove to go to the same result that maybe the thinking is verified and I could simplify it. But now when I went once again through Baker's pi **[Recording time 1:44]** paper, I'm afraid maybe I am wrong, that he has made a mistake here. (Y acknowledges.) The procedure is very elegant; it is really tremendous. And we have implied… Actually, his thinking was in the *Basis* of finding the value for muon; but actually here, maybe I am doing a big mistake. This morning I was trying to check the result. Here, if we compare, he's using the Compton wave for electron, isn't it so? Or some other, (Y acknowledges.) because the digits are…

Y: The *e* stands for electron.

B: Yes, *e* for electron.

Y: Compton for the *c; e* electron.

B: Yes. And also the digits are the same as in the table. In the table, for Compton wavelength, we have 2.426310.

Y: Yes, that's where he got it from.

B: Ah hah. But then here we have the dimension is 10 to minus 12 meters.

Y: Yes. And he has centimeters.

B: He has centimeters because he's using Planck length in centimeters which is dimension of 10 to the minus 33 which is OK. But, now… yes… But you know, when we go from meters to centimeters, actually we multiply by 100. (Y acknowledges.) 10 to the…

Y: So it's two orders of magnitude.

B: Yes. We multiply by 10 which is 10 squared (Y acknowledges.) minus 12 plus 2 is minus 10, isn't it so? We have more meters, the larger number, more centimeters than meters. It should be 10 to the minus 10th, and not 10 to the minus 14th. He was mistaken as if he's transmitting centimeters into meters; the other way around, isn't it so?

P: I think you are right.

B: We have one meter is hundred centimeters. (P acknowledges.) In order to go from meters to centimeters, we multiply by 10 squared, 10 to the degree of 2. The number should, when going from meters to centimeters, the number should be larger. And since we have here 10 to the minus 12th, it should be plus 2, not minus 2 as he is doing.

Y: Let me think it through.

B: And now, I have done the whole procedure. And it will affect, somehow maybe, the procedure itself although the procedure might be still OK, just the mistake. But then we don't have N as we want it to be. Maybe I try to do it now with Mathematica.

Y: Yes. Take your time.

B: Yes. And I have… I was working several hours during the night. All this was done from yesterday to now. I was checking, checking, checking, and finally I have get result for N if it is correct. I have done it now; this is why I was late several minutes. This one: 8.75855 times 10 to the 27. **[Recording time 5:56]** I will check it once again. I will check once again. Maybe I am making mistake. And I was thinking we might adjust *tq* for instance, the elementary time unit, and still fit. But somehow it will affect the others. When I was looking for tau particle, I had some doubts whether it is so although the results fit it. And this is why… I mean when I divided by two…taking into consideration it might be N instead of 2N. But then I came to this. I checked once again for *lp*, *lp*, for instance, *lp* (Planck length)…

Y: It should be a smaller number if you're changing from centimeters to meters.

B: He's going the other way around, from meters to centimeters because *lp*, Planck length, is in centimeters which is correct. He has here for *lp*, 1.61605 times 10 to the minus 33. And I'll show you… Ah hah. In meters, it is 1.61624 10 to the minus 35. When you go…

Y: In meters, yes.

B: In meters.

Y: That's right. So, this has to be smaller…

B: He's using centimeters (Y acknowledges.) rightly. And it is 10 to the minus 33. When we go from meters to centimeters, we multiply by 10 to the degree of two. Minus 35 becomes minus 33 (P acknowledges.) which is correct for the…

Y: That's correct.

B: That's correct. But then, we should go the same here for Compton's wavelength. We have 10 to the minus 12 meters in centimeters which should be plus 2 (P acknowledges.) in the degree. And it will be 10 to the minus 10th. And then we got quite different results for N. So, either somehow the elementary time unit should be changed, but this will be too much adjusting. (There is silence for a minute.)
Y: I did it with a muon. **[Recording time 9:16]** And here it's 10 to the minus 15th meters.

B: It is strange how it fit all. And I should check once again, maybe here when doing all these operations because there are too many of them in Mathematica. Maybe I also should go once again through the whole procedure. But it won't be this one for sure. It won't be **[Recording time 10:00]** 141.388 times 10 to the 22. I got the result of the degree of 10 to the 27.

Y: But how did we get it correct for the muon?

B: I'll recheck it once again also although I hope the procedure…because the procedure was so elegant and it was done in two different ways. Even for tau particle, I got the digits. So I still hope that the procedure is maybe OK. Something in the dimensionalities should be maybe reconsidered because even for tau, I got the fitting of the result I got with the table. And I was so happy; it was during the night. But then I reconsidered; and I found this inconsistency.

Punita: But the fact that you got the digits correct in both cases…

B: Although, I divided by two because… Even so…

Punita: Yes. Even so there's…

B: It is still such small possibility that the procedure is…

Y: Something doesn't…

B: Something with dimensionalities.

Punita: Yes. I mean, fundamentally it is still, (B acknowledges.) I mean, there may be some detail that needs to be corrected; but it just sounds like the…fundamentally…

B: …the procedure and that the thinking is all right. **[Recording time 11:46]**

Punita: Yes. I mean it's hard to see how it couldn't be just based on that.

B: Yes. Yes.

Punita: That's very strong evidence.

B: It is done three different ways including Baker's. (P acknowledges.) I mean basically based on the same thinking, but still three different approaches.

Punita: So it just sounds like it needs, (B acknowledges.) you know, just some work on the details. (B acknowledges.) But there's nothing fundamentally incorrect there.

Y: I'll let you do that.   When I ratio the electron mass (B acknowledges.) as computed by the F formula to that of the muon mass, (B acknowledges.) I get twice the value that they get. And it's exactly twice the value. So something is amiss here because what you've got is to the 27th? **[Recording time 12:47]**

B: To the 27th; yes.

Y: Which is four orders of magnitude off. And if you moved the wrong way (P acknowledges.) twice on centimeters to meters, that would account for the four orders of magnitude. (P acknowledges.) But just to see where that happened in your work, I think you're better suited to do it. So, if you're willing to check it again…

B: Yes, I'll do it for sure. Otherwise, I have done all this procedure for the tau particle although simplified because instead of going now through all three circles…

Y: You just go one?

B: I go once because when I was doing the muon… actually, this took me several days to figure out how to avoid having, on the sphere, having two actual equal pathways. For the biggest one is 2N; **[Recording time 14:28]** the smallest 2N one two N minus F of three; And the other one, two N minus…

Y: F of four.

B: …F of four. And then when I did the procedure by equalizing the circlings around the smallest circuit and the medium and the biggest, then finally I find out, actually, that this K, which was difference in a circling made around the smallest circuit, is approximately one which is as if really these two are the same. But going through two different procedures showed that at least the procedure is OK because they too gave the same result. And so, here I simplified. Maybe it is not justified. I simplified the procedure by supposing that I should just go through a circuit with the circumference of 2N minus F of five.

Y: Which is this.

B: Which is this. And why five? Because when we have three crossovers… and we have here referential nonphysical Individual A, we have one arrow, two arrows, three arrows, four arrows, three for the crossovers and one for the circuit and one for A. It is five which was the same thinking as for muon.

Y: Yes, the wavelength gets shorter; the mass increases. (B acknowledges.) Does that make sense with your formulation?

B: It makes sense, yes, because now the lambda is 2 over square of 2, 5th root of 120. The previous for muon was 4th root for…

Y: So this is larger…

B: This is larger. It's five factorial.

Y: …which makes this smaller.

B: Which makes it smaller. Yes.

Y: Which is what should happen. (B acknowledges.) It looks correct.

B: It looks correct. And so for lambda, we have 2N squared over 5th square of five factorial N to the 4th multiplied by square of 2N lp. And this is for N. N is to the degree of 2. We have here minus **[Recording time 17:14]** half for this square root and minus four over five.

Y: I'm not sure of that.

B: Yes, this. Yes. Maybe this should be corrected.

Y: Maybe that's F. Maybe it should be F3.

B: No, this comes from *tp*. This…

4

Y: But you've got *lp*.

B: I've got *lp*. But here, here it is. (Y acknowledges.) Here I have…the frequency…the frequency. I start with the frequency. In one beat, I have 2N minus F of five over F of five multiplied by N. Aha; pardon. I started with this one. I have told this procedure before. I have tau particle. Then I have F of five on a sphere. Then I draw here an illustration why it is F of five. And then I do the same procedure as for the muon. I equalize the… for instance, while we shall do for one beat X circlings around the largest circuit, for this one beat, we shall have 2X plus one. Now I simplified, putting one because the previous procedure showed that if I put K, for instance, it still is something very close to one. Maybe I shall go through the whole procedure once again and this multiplied by the circumference of the smaller circuit which is N minus F of five. **[Recording time 18:52]** Then I have XN is XN plus N minus X plus one F of five. This and this is eliminated. X plus one from this side of the equation, multiplied by F of five is N. X plus one is N over F of five. So X is N over F of five times one **[Recording time 19:12]** which is N minus F of five over five which is the same as for the previous one. The previous for the muon was N minus F of four over F of four. (Y acknowledges.) So time per one beat is 2N minus F of five over F of five multiplied by N *tq*.

Y: *tq*

B: Where for *tq*, elementary time unit, we take Planck time over square of 2N. (Y acknowledges.) And now I go from here. Time per one beat is 2 X which is N minus F of five over F of five N *tq*. Frequency is reciprocal value F of five over 2N minus F of five N which is this one (Y acknowledges.) multiplied by *tq* – uh, the reciprocal value of *tq* which is square of 2N over *tp*. And now, the wavelength multiplied by the frequency is *c*, for speed of light, (Y acknowledges.) which is one Planck length over one *tp*. Lambda is *c* over the frequency. It is one over the frequency *lp*. So lambda is now the reciprocal value of the frequency; frequency is this one. So the denominator is now numerator 2N minus F of five N over F of five F of five multiplied by square of 2N. And now here… *tp* is down; and it eliminates with the *tp* from the *tq;* and we have just *lp*.

Y: OK.

B: And we have now lambda; lambda is 2N squared over F of five which is fifth root of five factorial. It is 120N to the fourth multiplied by square of 2N. And now the second member is neglected. Maybe it shouldn't be neglected. It will be N over… because this will eliminate. We shall have 2N over… all this over… we shall have 2N F of five over F of five square of 2N. Maybe it shouldn't be neglected.
And finally I got this: 2 over square of 2 fifth root of 120N to the degree of – I have 2 from here, minus ½ from here, minus four over five from here. And it is square of 2 over **[Recording time 23:06]** 102 to 1/5th N to the 7th over 10. Here we have three halves minus four over five, 10…we have, 2 in 10 is five by three fifteen minus 8 is seven over 10 *lp*.

So lambda is square of 21.41421. **[Recording time 23.38]** And this one, it is done in Mathematica, 5th square of 120 is N – in Mathematica – N of 120 to the degree of one over fifth. And it is 0.542849. And this whole thing, multiplied by N to the seven tenth. For N, this number is taken – with over 30 digits – 1.3825 and so on. And then, finally…finally I got this… Here, I should check – which is for proton, actually, 1.32.

Y: That's what you got?

B: I shall check this one, you know. I should check once again.

Y: Let me copy that. That's 1.32986 times 10 to the minus 14ᵗʰ. (B acknowledges.)

B: The digits are for the wavelength of proton. But… then I proceeded, you know. Then I proceeded; and then I found something else. So, it should be checked. And finally, I even got the digits for the tau particle. Tau from the table multiplied by 2; and mine, divided by 2 because maybe it is just N, not 2N.

Y: You've got .69 and I've got point .66.

B: It should be checked because I proceeded later on, I proceeded, (Y acknowledges.) and then I found…

Y: I think there is a problem somewhere.

B: …then I found this one. I found this one which is for tau particle. (Y acknowledges.) But mine, the value I have got is divided by 2 which might mean that, after all, we don't need 2N, but just N, you know. And the value from the table is multiplied by 2 as you did for muon. And then even I got fitting of the results. But this should be rechecked once again because I was working over 3-4 hours. (Y acknowledges.) Then I came back to the Baker's paper. And then I decided the whole procedure should be checked once again. But still, we are onto something, I believe.

Y: I think we're on the right track. But there's…something's that happened somewhere…
[Recording time 27:28]

B: I don't believe it is just coincidence that the digits are…the result is the same.

Y: No, I don't…too unlikely…

B: The degree's the same; (Y acknowledges.) and the digits are the same. And so, after all, we might not need 2N but just 1N.

Y: We might not.

B: But this was strange about Baker's…
Y: Yes. And that it would come out exactly the value for N.

B: Yes. It is strange.

Y: Unless he was…hand waving. You've heard of hand waving? (B acknowledges.) This is my explanation. (Does something with his hands) (All laugh.) OK.

B: These are mine?

Y: Those are yours. So you'll have to check that. (B acknowledges.) The digits might be off a little bit for the tau particle. This is because, as I've said, they were two different experiments were made. The earlier one made by Dr. Pearl at Stanford University agrees with my calculations. The one made by a man by named Ballas, Dr. Ballas, has a…was off by about 2 and ½ percent from mine, where the one by Pearl was in a hundredth of one percent. They're using the one by Ballas because it was done more recently. But they… the people who make those tables, they don't know which one to pick. They have no basis; so they took the most recent. Nobody has duplicated either the Pearl experiment or the Ballas experiment. So, if it's off by a few digits… because they're using the Ballas experiment, don't be

6

concerned; (B acknowledges.) but it should be the right degree and probably the first number should be right, the same.

B: Yes. Yes. I have three digits for tau particle, three digits when I divided my result by 2, fitting in three digits; and the degree is right. (Laughs)

Punita: Not bad. (Both laugh.)

B: You see?

Y: Yes.

B: Then I discovered this mistake in Baker's; and this has shaken me. And I said, "Oh, maybe the procedure is somehow not right." But actually the result is…the result is minus 1.38535 multiplied by 10 to the minus 15 meters. And theirs, from the table – the Compton wave for tau particle…

Y: 1.389

B: 1.39544 multiplied by 10 to the minus 15 meters.

Y: So that makes theirs a little bit bigger, the wavelength a little bit longer. Is that right? Yes?

B: Yes.

Y: …Which would make the mass a little less which is exactly what they reported in the Ballas experiment, that it was a little bit less.

B: And I shall see, once again, maybe the second member shouldn't be neglected…of the equation.

Y: But you got this by dividing by 2.
B: Dividing by 2, yes.

Y: Hmm. (B laughs.) Mysterious!

B: Yes. It should be …. **[Recording time 32:26]** once again.

Y: We can't print that. (P and B laugh.) OK. I'll be right back. And then I have something.

P: Biljana, I was just speculating on square root of minus one.

B: Ahhh.

P: What relationship. And one direction I was thinking what…fundamentally we have self-reference and negation of an Individual's indirect knowledge of itself through the circuit, and it's lack of (B acknowledges.) direct knowledge of itself. You've got a conflict there. (B acknowledges.) You know, that's a negation; and that's a state of knowledge because I'm sure you've seen people on intensives say, "I don't exist!"

Right? They come to that conclusion (B acknowledges.) because if you take this away… when they get rid of that dependency, if they don't have this, they say, "Ah, I don't exist." (B acknowledges.)

You know. But anyway, you know I was just thinking how would that then manifest in consciousness? You know because you've got an uncertainty, a doubt, between the two states.

B: Uh huh.

P: I don't know. I'm just looking, you know?

B: Yes, yes.

P: I'm just searching for things. (B acknowledges.) But it would have to be something very fundamental.

B: Yes, yes. It is negation and self-reference.

P: Yes. That manifests and involve one. And see, this is one. (B acknowledges.) See, that's how…our one is the Individual. And so I'm looking at it in terms of the Individual. Well, we have the self-reference; and we have a negation. (B acknowledges.) And that's our normal state of consciousness. (B acknowledges.) So it permeates. (Y returns.) Anyway, who knows? (B acknowledges.) You know, just thinking out loud.

B: Yes, yes. Great.

Y: I'm a square root of minus one? (B and P laugh.)

Punita: Not you!

Y: Oh, OK.
B: There are square roots of minus one, but not you.

Y: About 15 years ago, Stephen Hawking wrote a book called, *A Quest for a Theory of the Universe*. And in it he said… He set down the six things that have to be taken care of in order to have a theory of everything. I don't think his list is quite long enough. But this is what he said.

The first thing is you have to unify the forces and the particles. He wants to unify the bosons and the fermions. Secondly, he wants to answer what is the boundary conditions. I agree with that one. Third, be restrictive to this universe. So he says that the theory of everything has to be restricted to this universe and it can't apply… What it means – he doesn't mean there can't be some nonphysical something. What he means is it can't be talking about multiple universes because you can't do any measurements. If there were another universe, it's "So what." Four, have few arbitrary elements. And number five, it should be simple. And number six, it should resolve the general theory of relativity and quantum theory.

I think the Lila Paradigm has every opportunity to meet all those conditions. I would add for number seven that it would have to include an understanding of consciousness and its role in connection with the physical. **[Recording time 37:01]** Have you mentioned Kafatos?

B: Who?

Y: Kafatos, Michael, Dr. Michael Kafatos. He wrote a book called *The Conscious Universe*. Maybe you haven't mentioned it (B acknowledges.) with a K, '*mit ein K-ya*'. And he said,

"The indivisible whole of the universe is outside the domain of scientific knowledge." So he said, "The indivisible whole of the universe is outside the domain of scientific knowledge." (B acknowledges.)

He concluded that because any scientific knowledge is always gathered by measuring one part of the universe by another part. Then he says, "It is as if the price we pay for dispelling the notion that we are not skin encapsulated egos was the terrifying realization that there is no empirically valid connection between our formalism for describing physical reality and reality itself." I think he stated the question properly.

I called him up one day. He's at the University of Virginia which was started by Thomas Jefferson. And somehow somebody got a phone to him when he was in a middle of a talk to a conference. (All laugh.) And he even tried to answer my question. He was quite nice. **[Recording time 39:35]**

All right. Here's some more formulas. And I think you ought to write this one down. e to the plus or minus – that is, the magnitude of the electric charge expressed as length. If you take the Planck length, it's equal to one Planck length divided by K minus one. So, the Planck length is that length in the Lila Paradigm which is developed by one crossover of a circuit. And all, the sum of all the *lqs* (*lq* plural) is one Planck length. Well, if you divide that by the number of crossovers, the average number of crossovers from an Individual, you get the electric charge. The values check out exactly. So therefore, the electric charge, explanation of electric charge, is due to the crossover of the circuit must be correct that that is the right model for it. Otherwise, you couldn't arrive at this formulation which I did. And it comes out to be the exact value which you might want to write down. This is even more exact than the one in Wheeler's book. (B acknowledges.) It's 1.381141062 times 10 to the minus 36 meters. And I think Wheeler has it that far. (Bilana acknowledges.) I'd like to show you the different places where the Lila Paradigm is working.

B: Uh huh. I was thinking about this tau particle maybe because I'm taking one circuit now. I had to divide my results by 2. And it could still be correct. I don't believe it could be a coincidence to have the same digits and the same degree.

Y: I agree as simple as that. (P acknowledges.)

B: I couldn't stop thinking about it yet. I couldn't. It's so great, actually.

Y: Well, this is another one that fits.

B: This is another one; yes, I'm amazed. This is beautiful. It is pure beauty. It is the strength of Lila showing.

Y: Yes.

B: It is great.

Y: OK. I'm trying to go today without painkillers; and I'm having a hard time. (B acknowledges.) My mind is just as clear; but the body hurts so badly that it makes me want to just cramp like *this*. Nevertheless, I'd like to go on with the *Radical Theory* that we were doing yesterday (B acknowledges.) as long as I can go. We were on page 24. And we're right at the paragraph. (B acknowledges.) All right, I'll read.

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 this illusionary "self" be affected or possibly, it thinks, destroyed. Through its memories, the agent is conscious that certain of its acts appear to produce results that contribute to its welfare. **[Recording time 45:16]**

So he's being misled by himself. He's being misled by temporal memories that actually didn't take place, that makes him think that the right thing to do is something in order to solve his problem of being badly affected or being destroyed. And it's… this is what is meant by a *Pashu*. In Sanskrit the word is *Pashu*. *Pashu* means someone who is ensnared, trapped, prisoner, caught, deluded, tricked. What is the name of the angel that fell from Heaven? And he fell in a streak of light; and his name is Lucifer. (B acknowledges.)

It is the consciousness that is involved with reflective light that is responsible for this delusion that the *Pashu* is trapped in, that the Individual is trapped in because as Lucifer fell he said to the other angels, "Hey, this is fun; come on."

And some of them followed him. We could say that a large percentage of people on earth are included. (Yogeshwar makes a banging noise with his hand.) We fell to earth. This same story is told in Hindu legends, also, that there was this Divine Individual that was deceived by Maya. And he fell all the way from the *loka* down to the *loka* of earth (Makes banging noise again) face down with his senses stuck in the mud, his nose sticking in the mud. And then eventually he turned over to see the stars. But they were just wonderful things to him of wonderment because he himself was still laying in the mud. But then one day he sat up. And when he sat up, the flow could take place in the *sushumna nadi.* And he was on his way to return. (B acknowledges.) This is the same story here, that he's deceived. Most of these acts produce results by giving the other agents reasons to make certain determinations which, if made, are perceived by the original agent as physical events in the physical universe that contribute to the agent's selfless welfare.

That is, he does things with or about other people in order to manipulate them into doing things that support him. And the whole idea is to be the best one in the whole world at doing that while standing on everybody else. And that's how you get all this misbehavior and adharmic behavior.

Using the paradigm of a background of time rather than one of embedded sub-states, embedded memories, we could say that the agent originates more and more such acts, in the process, becoming conscious that certain denials or non-denials produce bigger affects than do others because they trigger more acts by others.

Now I'm going to tell you another story that fits with this sentence, that you get bigger and bigger affects. When I was studying with L Ron Hubbard and Scientology for 10 years, I was one of his bright young men that he had great hopes for. But the trouble with me is that I read his actual stuff and his axioms. And I said, "I think this axiom is wrong, Ron." (Y laughs.)

And he got very upset. He says, "The biggest purpose in this universe is the creation of an affect."

And I said, "Well, that's not true."

He said, "Well, it is in this universe." (B laughs.) He tried to defend it by saying *in the physical world*. And yet, he taught that the *thetans* **[Recording time 50:50]** were in this world and were responsible for this world.   That's his name for souls, *thetans*. (B

acknowledges.) And so they're in and a part of this universe. And so the highest purpose for those *thetans* is a creation of an affect? And it caused us… that started a split between him and I. But I stayed with him another 6 months. And when I finished this advanced training that he gave, and I was number one boy, he wanted to give me, appoint me, the head of his entire world wide organization. And I'd be number one guy; and I'd run it even after he died. I told him, "No."

And he says, "Why?"

And I told him, "You don't pay enough money." (P laughs.) And he accepted that as the reason. But the reason is the one that I just told you, is that I disagreed with his basic assumption that the highest purpose in this universe is the creation of an affect. But this is what one who is deluded thinks. That if we use the paradigm that there is a background of time rather than the one of embedded sub-states or memories, we could say that the agent originates more and more such acts that would appear to be done. And in the process becomes conscious of certain denials or non-denials produce bigger affects than others because they trigger more acts by other agents. You tell a lie that Saddam Hussein has nuclear weapons, and there's no doubt about it. Then you get this following. Millions of people vote for you and soldiers die for you and the whole world is made a mess as a result. You get a big affect. This is what the ego believes; this is what *Der Teufel* believes, the devil. The agent then tries various denials and non-denials looking for even bigger favorable affects. At first, all these actions would be on the atomic level. Then, significantly, the agent begins to act in conjunction with one or more other agents, each of whom is also trying to aid its own physical existence by constructing triggerable systems that are used to aid the survival level of those agents as a group. So he gets a staff and people work under him and they do things. But this is on the atomic level we're talking about to begin with. I don't mean atom bombs, I mean with atoms. (D laughs.) Such systems would be the most elementary biological forms, like a very simple protein and that it is reproducible by an RNA protein. Then you got the simplest biological forms going.

It turns out that in order to successfully construct such systems, most of the agents involved need to selectively deny most of their information states since biological forms work best if the sub-arrangement on which they – arrangements it should say – on which they are based has only a few directed connection arrows per agent. So that this group of agents are working together to make certain choices to build this thing that we now call a biological form, but at the time, was just some way to create bigger affects by just putting one arrow in. And then if some other group has their biological simple form that's going to attack that, they can't hurt the guy that just puts in the one arrow. It just hurts that biological form that he's associated with. So he, as a nonphysical Individual – but he thinks he's physical – is protected, he thinks, because he needs to be protected, he thinks. Usually, the average number of directed connections per agents that operate in a graph **[Recording time 56:32]** modeling of biological form is between 2 and 10. (See Kaufman.)

I've got his book over there on *The Origins of Order* (B acknowledges.) and his friend that wrote the book on artificial life who found the value for lambda, the edge of chaos – which is…what is it, 2.7 or something like that? (B acknowledges.)

In the information… I must have lost it. (Lost his place reading) There. In the information model of the Lila Paradigm where there are about 10 to the 23rd agents, the operational K is from 2 to 13 of a possible about 10 to the 23rd non-denials per agents. And the optimum K is 12.7 on average. That tunes the value of the electromagnetic coupling constant and of the strong force coupling constant and of the weak force coupling constant to exactly what they need to be in order to have all this thing that we have now--the universe, body, sitting here at

11

a table, electricity running through the stove to cook our food (B laughs.) and the whole thing. This extreme skewing from a random selection of denials and non-denials is shown graphically in graph A. Now, the random would be about 10 to the 22nd denials and about 10 to the 22nd non-denials.

The slide from a maximum number of agents about 10 to the 15th **[Recording time 59:23]** that have 2 denial/non-denials down to about 11 agents that each have 13 states of knowledge, direct knowledge, of other nonphysical Individuals is the operating edge of chaos. (See Langdon and his book.) Each of the agents that is using a simple amplifying system, perhaps some primitive version of a protein, would want to use it primarily for that agents own welfare. So the agents involved with him would make up a system, a protein that would create more systems by replicating itself, perhaps a simple form of RNA.

Any time you have any questions about what I'm talking about, let me know. (B acknowledges.)

An agent is able to use this RNA protein to act locally, that is, within reach of the RNA protein, to affect the environment within say a few microns. The protein would also be connected to its local environment by light, by vibrations of perhaps water and air and by adjacent or touching molecules and atoms. So that in the same way that the agent uses the protein to cause bigger affects than it could by just its own unaugmented denials and non-denials.   The agent can focus its consciousness on local situation to those connections to the local environment.

Now I've given you a couple of things that show what I think what those patterns would be (B acknowledges.) for the different senses. And show how the nerve patterns in the senses of our body are related. This means he can focus on certain parts and pick up information about what's going on around him locally. And we get the senses and we have the organs of actions for creating bigger affects than just one arrow to one other Individual. The rest is just more selecting of denials and non-denials in conjunctions with many agents, directly changing the RNA to form DNA and changing the DNA to construct more and more complex motor sensory and reproductive systems arriving finally at the biological bodies that now exist on earth.

Now this would be done at the edge of chaos. So that one is making more acceptance and less acceptances, more states of knowledge and states of no-knowledge so that the total number of them remain about the same; but the pattern of the connections are highly specialized. And we've had a real party doing this and going through this whole process and getting to be ones who are able to affect that very focused place in the brain where…the command center that is also the report center. And we run it and steer it and sense it just like it's a robot – which the body, in affect, is. But it's been at the cost of all these other Individuals who actually make up these bodies. And so, therefore, our karma for being alive is to die.

I know I'm mixing Lila Paradigm with other things in this discussion. But that's because it seems appropriate to me. (B acknowledges.) I've lost my place.

B: …the agents of…

Y: Where were we? This paragraph?

B: Yes. The agents…

Y: The agents. The agents also make selections that determine which particular biological

forms they are associated with according to which living body survived well and which ones did not survive well influencing the process of natural selection. It is the agent's determinations that produce the (quote) "environmentally caused variations." However, the direct genetic manipulation is primarily responsible for evolution.

So I'm saying that, yes, there is genetic manipulation going on, but the manipulation is being done by the only source of origination there is which is us. And so, yes, there is evolution but it's caused by us. So Darwin was only half right. That it's not… It would appear to be random selections because it's on the edge of chaos. But yet it creates the order of these bodies, highly ordered. They are incredibly complicated. By God, are they complicated! Right down to the most microscopic level to the organization, layer on layer of organization so that we get these things that we use and think are us. I mean what a scene! (P laughs.) So the people who say that there is – what is the name that they call it? The ones who are against evolution?
Darshana: Creationists.

Y: The Creationists are partly right because God, *as us,* is making these choices that make these bodies and make evolution take place.

Punita: Intelligent design.

Y: Intelligent design.

Punita: Yes.

Darshana: The modern version. (P acknowledges.)

Y: But so are the evolutionists because it's being done on a genetic level, very definitely. And Sahaja Yoga, Natural Meditation, works on that level also, that the DNA in the sex cells are caused to crossover instead of just a little crossing over and then you have children, crossing-over goes on and on and on. So the evolution is speeded up in someone who is in the second and third stages of Natural Meditation, speeded up and then it starts to affect, gradually, from the nervous system out the body of the practitioner. OK. Next paragraph is it? The local focusing (P and B acknowledge.) of consciousness caused by the sensory system amplifying local inputs tends to washout the unamplified direct universal consciousness of an agent that has been described in the previous sections of this paper. **[Recording time 67:48]**

So the sense organs gather information from a point of view and focus it at a certain part of the brain, that one, as a nonphysical Individual, is connected to that part of the brain…to one part of that pattern and the rest of his pattern that is on the subjective realm, so-to-speak, of his own private network. That from his place in the network is so weak compared to this amplified, gathered focus thing that is done by the sense faculties and sense organs. You notice that they all focus down and that washes out. It's like being in a movie theater and you're watching the screen. And then somebody turns the lights on and you can hardly see anything on the screen. It washes out that. So we're like living with bodies in a theater. But what's going on in our minds is on the screen and it's normally washed out until you lay down and close all this down, disconnect from that part of the brain. And then you have dreams in the mind. And then there's dreams behind the mind that are yogic dreams or true dreams. And then you're on another *loka.* And then you get, by sensory deprivation – that is, pulling away from the senses long enough,--you can go to these different *lokas*. And that's how I found out about the Lila Paradigm. (B acknowledges.) (P laughs.)

Although the principles described apply equally well to the amplified local consciousness,

since it is simply an amplified part of the agent's universal consciousness. That's a long story. I'm going to have to illustrate with illustrations. Sensory deprivation carried on long enough uncovers a universal consciousness. And many people are conscious of a shadow of it when, for example, they notice that they have a sense of existence of a present time throughout the entire universe. Especially when somebody is teaching the theory of relativity and they say, "Well, something that's across the intervening space to another galaxy, that's not in present time. What you see is as it was millions of years ago."

Yes, that's true but does it exist now even though I have no evidence through the senses or through observation that it is existing? That sense is a sense that you get through the timeless connections of directly accepting that part of the net that is responsible for Andromeda. So you have a remote viewpoint in Andromeda. And say, "Well, of course, Andromeda is still existing although it will take several million years for the light waves of that to arrive here where this view point is going on." The sensory system of the human body makes an organized pattern of activated fundamental particles in the brain available to the agent associated with that brain. If that agent is in a not denied information state based on one of the agents upon which that pattern… (Turns page) (All that needs to be rewritten.) …of activated particles is based, the agent is conscious of the pattern. The connection between the agent's determinations and the sensory and motor amplifiers may occur in the microtubules **[Recording time 72:44]** (See Hameroff and Penrose.) (B acknowledges.)

They were both at that conference in Tucson on consciousness. (B acknowledges.)

Which agent is primarily associated with a particular party *may* be determined by many factors. One likely factor could be a similarity between the local sub-arrangements of not denied information states of that an agent is in with a pattern of neurons in the brain of the body. (I think we read this a few weeks back.) It may be that the sub-arrangement that the agent is in acts as a guide informing the neuro pattern of that brain.

I've come to the conclusion that that's definitely true. And that each person after they get the body, their own connections in their mind affect the connections in the brain that are still forming and continue to be formed so that they match the patterns in his subtle nonphysical universe. And so his brain becomes a coarse copy of the pattern with him seemingly at a place in the network so that it seems like his. "This is *my* brain because it thinks like I think."

It is likely that once an agent has a made a tentative association with a brain, the agent's denial and non-denials will influence some of the neurons to make or break connections modifying the structure over a period of time to fit the agent's own local pattern of non-denials. It may be that one of the fundamental particles based on an agent – say, a positron – might actually exist in a key position in the brain of the body such as the location suggested by James Newman – the intralaminar complex of the midbrain of the human body. **[Recorded time 1:14:53]** OK. That's as far as I can go this morning.

B: Thank you.

Y: If you have any feedback, now and then, on some of these things… do you think it's a good idea to discuss these biological forms in relationship to the nonphysical Individuals and how they are now alive?

B: Yes. Yes, by all means. Maybe something about this teleological point of view the scientists are mentioning.

Y: Could be… **[Recording time 75:54]**

B: The teleological – the evolution is due to a certain objective, teleological, from Greek word.

Y: Teleology

B: *Teleo* which means…

Y: a goal.

B: …an objective; a goal. (Y acknowledges.)

Y: Yes, there was that marvelous man, a French man, priest (B acknowledges.) who wrote a book about it. About the *omega point,* he called it.

B: Yes, yes. It is wonderful. I couldn't remember – Chardonay [Pierre Teilhard de Chardin] or something. (Y acknowledges.) He's a genius. He is very…

Y: He was a genius and he took huge leaps. (B acknowledges.) And he would have picked up on the Lila Paradigm just like that. (Snaps his fingers)

B: Yes, yes. It's very much in favor of his thinking. So…

Y: The teleology of it. (B acknowledges.) Yes. Yes, I think that should be mentioned. And that makes both the scientists and the… I've forgotten again. What did you say they…? The intelligent design **[Recording time 77:12]** people. They're both right; and they're both partly wrong. (P &B acknowledge.) But they're both partly right. In fact, I sent this paper to one of them, lives up in Brisbane. (B acknowledges.) And he didn't answer. I pointed out, "Look, look. You're partly right."

He thought I was the devil, I think, saying that the scientists are partly right. And they are. There is evolution; but we're doing it and we're God. And we're doing it for a purpose. It's not *just* to manipulate others. There's another purpose. And that is, someone who's accepting nearly all or all has made a pattern for the others to follow on. And I've called it Jacob's ladder. Or it's called the human form. The change that has happened from chimpanzees to human beings is so drastic. And it was done by a different way. Instead of crossing-over more and more sides of the unrolled DNA – those parts crossover and mix and gradually evolve over a slow procedure--what has been done is a methyl…

P: Methyl group.

Y: Methyl…?

P: Group.

Y: …group have been attached at different places along the DNA that makes the humans like they are. And so it turns the humans are much different than the chimpanzees. Whereas just on… if you only looked at the DNA, chimpanzees and humans are 98 point something the same. (B acknowledges.) But when you look at the methyl groups that are attached that cause the inner connections – and this one turns this one off and this one turns another one on and it makes human beings. That was done by that Individual and his selective choices that he made to make human beings be human beings. Because they're written… their name, as he says, is written in the book of life. (B and P acknowledge.) And this is what those people knew way

back when they wrote the Bible. They knew. Jesus was like a *Siddha* who had the divine body. And he knew all these things; and some of the others that preceded him; not many. But there were some. And some of them were in Persia. And some of them were in India. (B acknowledges.) And they were called *Siddhas* there or *Avatars*. They're even up one level higher, the *Avatars*. Enough said.

B: Thank you.

Y: I wanted to say a few of things before you got away, though. I've got you trapped. (P laughs.)

B: I'm so grateful.

Punita: You know the methyl groups **[Recording time 81:08]** the epigenome…

B: Aha, yes. Epigenome

Y: Is what?

Punita: Epigenome, the around the genome. (Y acknowledges.) The epigenome.

Y: Yes. That's what they call it now. (P and B acknowledge.) And they're all excited about it. (P and B acknowledge.)

B: They say the next Nobel Prize will be in epigenomica.

Y: I would think so.

B: In the field of epigenomica. (P acknowledges.) It's wonderful!

Punita: You know you thought the DNA was complex. (B laughs.)

B: Yes. Yes.

Y: You know the guy who mapped the DNA, who was behind that…who invented the machinery… (P acknowledges.) When he found out about the epigenome, (Y laughs.) he threw his hands up and said, "Oh my! Not more! More order, on top of order, on top of order, on top of order." (B acknowledges.)

B: Yes, yes. Now they are coming to the point that you could influence your own…

Y: Yes!

B: …you could even change your genes in accordance to your ideals.

Y: And that's exactly what natural meditation does. (B acknowledges.)

Punita: Yogeshwar…

Y: And other meditation techniques does too. Yes…

Punita: I was just thinking about the edge of chaos and number of selections needed to maintain. Could you look at it that you have to maintain a few enough number of connections so that the Individuals can be tricked because if they had too much knowledge, you couldn't

16

manipulate them?

Y: Yes. That factor is going on in the anti-Christ and Satan and his crowd do that sort of thing. But there is those who have a lot of acceptances. And what they're doing is pulling them along and trying to move the edge of chaos more to include more and more states of direct knowledge. (P acknowledges.) And we are those. We are part of those. But we're not in the highest rank. We have levels to go. But it's coming to an interesting time. (B acknowledges.) As the Chinese say, "We live in interesting times."

B: Ah, yes. Great!

Y: OK. We take a break now.

Punita: Thank you.

B: Thank you.