#28
Formal talk-31102006 Afternoon day11
Lila recording day 11, afternoon
31/10/2006
061031001
1 Hr 29 min
Recording 28

B: Just one statement more about this formula.

Y: Yes.

B: Now?

Y: Now would be a good time.

B: So professor (Ackovich?) he was working on this model of consciousness for years. It is very sophisticated and I'll send you his articles. And he has books actually as well. And the whole proceedings of the conference...but just one more statement. So he proposes that Delta T subjective is Delta T objective over square root of one minus V Squared over C Square which is connected with Alpha as well with coupling constant. And it is also Delta T objective over square of one minus Epsilon air over Epsilon where Epsilon Air is, for instance square root of… I should say, something like V over C zero and Epsilon square root of E over…of V zero over C zero, or something like that where C zero is the speed of light in vacuum. But the point is he also has drawings stressing the difference of awaken state where you have… when you have one content of consciousness which is amplified which is your main thought or state of consciousness. And then in, since in ultimate state of consciousness when comes to this broadening of this whole structure of this, which are the meridians, which are building the channels in nadis, in a way.

Y: (Acknowledges)

B: Then because the subjective time is being broadened then all these hidden contents of consciousness come to the picture. And they are all even and they could be easily integrated. He gives this picture and he supports it with a lot of evidence, measurements, also philosophy also quotations from Holy books. He is really amazing, a really good friend of mine. I invited him together with another professor from philosophical facility and he gave a lecture at electro-technical faculty in Skopje. It was very well-accepted and visited and so on. I wanted to stress out just this. In this Delta T subjective, we have Delta T objective over square of this one. One… The consciousness so to say, I am using the words consciousness in the sense he is using. When it broadens so much and he is viewing. You know, there are some similarities. He is viewing the whole universe as a big optical net, in his words. And in this optical net, there are like centers where these all meet. And, for instance, when you… for instance, he explains telepathy and all these different phenomena in parapsychology by his model. By using his model, for instance, when I concentrate on someone, on another individual, then it comes to broadening of this wave lifts my body. It is broadening a wave. And in a way, I come to this point somehow with my consciousness and then telepathy occurs. It is so explained, but it is a thick book.

And finally when this happens and when this V the speed of mind probabilistic wave which is in a sense it is Schrödinger's probabilistic wave of possibilities, when it reaches C then I have Delta T subjective is Delta T objective over square of one minus one because this become one. I have C square over C square. And this Delta T objective over zero and this tends to be infinite. And so I got infinite now. He comes to infinite now.

Y: In the subjective?

B: Hum?

Y: In the subjective.

B: In the subjective.

Y: Yes.

B: And it might be whatever that or nirvana or whatever. He doesn't say, but he doesn't write it but he mentions. So this is interesting. He comes to infinite now, subjective. Ok.

Y: When you say infinite so you mean temporal now or temporally infinite or spatially infinite?

B: In this case temporally because he's defining Delta T subjective.

Y: Ah, yes.

B: Yes, but also spatially because this wave then is moving with the speed of light. In the case V becomes C so it's so to say embracing, I don't know to say infinite space but something like this.

Y: Ok. Is he still alive?

B: Yes, yes, fifty two, fifty three years old.

Y: Well, he is just a boy.

B: His father is a scientist also.

Y: Ok, I would like to take up the subject of time, but not so much as time but as direct knowledge. Now when we first went over this, I said that, A is in a state of knowledge of B which includes B's direct knowledge of C. But I am trying to clarify what is meant by includes. I said that, B ● is embedded in C dot's present time for A as a memory, one unit of time in the past. I want to clarify what is meant by embedded, included, memory, past; these are kind of throw away words that I have used without dealing with it rigorously in terms of knowledge. Now when we draw the domain for A, this is A itself. And we put a state that A is in, which is based on B, that B is this B. So this is a state of knowledge based on the ultimate reality B individual. So this state does not include B itself. It is only a state of knowledge based on B. It's

based on B, but it isn't B. And this circle is not a state of knowledge. You might say it is the ability of A to originate itself into a state of knowledge, direct knowledge or no direct knowledge. For example, there is no A arrow A because there is no A arrow A where going to put this time. This is a state of no knowledge of A. It's also a state of no knowledge of this is a B. Is that right, no?

B: Maybe first we should observe just this because you are including something new into the picture. This is the state of no knowledge.

Y: Yes, I am.

B: Yes, Ok. I thought maybe…

Y: So, it is not B because this is the state of knowledge of B that A is in but C. A is in state of no knowledge of C. Now, state of knowledge that A is in based on B, now that's got to include B's, all of B's states, so B is in a state of knowledge…

B: Based on C.

Y: Well, is it state of knowledge, yes, well, it should be based on C.

B: Based on C.

Y: But also B is in a state of knowledge of C's state of no knowledge of himself.

B: Of himself, yes.

Y: Now where does that go? Does it go in here?

Don: (Acknowledges)

Y: Or out here.

B: Here

Y: This is the state of knowledge based on B. So it has got to go out here. It's included in this which is the state of knowledge. Yes state of no knowledge.

B: State of knowledge of B based on C being in a state of no knowledge of itself. As I understand. It is state of knowledge of B because we are in the circle of B still, in the circle of B.

Y: Yes.

B: Based on B, state of knowledge of B bases of C being in state of no knowledge of itself.

Bret: I don't think so. This is the C stuff, this is B stuff and so this is just the B doesn't have an arrow to itself.

3

Don: I agree.

Y: State of no knowledge…

Bret: Of B.

Y: Of B.

Bret: I think what you said…

Y: Yes, it does go.

B: We haven't come to this.

Y: Based on C. But C is in a state of no knowledge of itself. It is also in a state of no knowledge of B; and it's in a state of no knowledge of A. Do we have three A, B, and C with doted circles meaning no knowledge. Now, if this was all the individuals that exist, this would be a correct representation. I left something out.

Don: Yes, this should be B's state of no knowledge of A.

Y: B is in a state of no knowledge of A. B is in a state of no knowledge of itself.

Don: And no knowledge of A.

Y: Another one. That's B's state of no knowledge of A. It is getting more complicated already.

B: This is actually the complimentary graph. In order to know how many of these do, we have, we must draw the complimentary graph. So in the complimentary graph, maybe we draw it, we have no knowledge of A of itself. No knowledge of B of itself. No knowledge of C of itself. No knowledge of C. C is in state of no knowledge of B. A is in state of no direct/direct knowledge of C. B to C we have, A to B we have. And C is in a state of no knowledge of A.

Y: That's correct.

B: So this is the…so all this should be visible here; and we have one, two, three, four, five, six. We have one, two, three, four, five, six.

Bret: I recommend a different notation.

B: Also there is another on the seventh one. B is in a state of no knowledge of A. B is in a state of ….

Y: Yes, we decided that one. Yes. So…

B: A to B and B to C.

Y: So if there is all in existence only A, B, and C, this would be all the states that we are dealing with. But if there are more, then there would be all… This would be D over here and E over here, and F. And no one is accepting anyone but these two arrows here.

B: And also for B and also for C.

Y: Yes. So there could be a lot of states of no knowledge; or there could be a lot of states of knowledge. If everyone is all in a state of knowledge of each other or is could be in between which is roughly random. In that last paper you gave on graph theory, there is a chart that gives the very ones like that for random distribution and for scale less.

Don: Scale free network.

Y: Scale free, it's like this. It is the same two curves. And they get that a different way.

Don: Preferential attachment.

Y: But that's a separate thing, but it tells a story of how many connections have what affect on the state of affairs. We're just trying to understand this one right now. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven no knowledge states is that what you got? Seven, yes, you have seven. These there are seven of those.

B: Just this, this, and this. This and this are existing…are states of…

Y: Knowledge.

B: knowledge.

Y: Yes.

B: And all these are not.

Y: Yes. So there's one, two, three, four, five, six, seven states of no knowledge.

B: It's three squared minus existing. Nine minus two is seven. There are three for each. A in state of A, A to B, A to C, B to B, B to A, B to C to C, C to A, C to B.

Y: Yes.

B: So there are nine all together, three squared. Nine altogether minus the existing is seven.

Y: Yes.

B: And there are seven. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven.

Y: Yes, and I have seven. But that doesn't answer the questions I was asking. The question's about what do we mean by temporally embedded or memory or a state of knowledge that includes B's knowledge of C. What do we mean by includes? Or we can say A is in a state of knowledge of C by way of B, or it is contingent on B. I am not quite sure what the word contingent means if we are not talking about time.

Don: Dependent on.

B: Yes, dependent.

Y: Ah, but is it dependent when B is in a state of knowledge of C?

Don: Yes.

Y: Not unless B exercises its ability and then it's a different time or is it a different time? Or is it contingent then? You don't get my point?

Don: No, I'm missing it, I'm sorry.

Y: All right.

B: You remember when I mentioned at least we have one logical operation, and this is transitivity. Maybe it should be named transitive somehow.

Y: Yes. That is a term that is used in symbolic logic about a transitive relationship. But that is just another word for time.

B: Ok, no, because we were discussing whether we should include indirect direct. We might say transitive direct.

Y: Well, that's a question but I am trying to deal with this in terms of just knowledge states or no knowledge states. I haven't put any indirect connections down here because they are derived from the direct connections or which include direct knowledge of or direct no knowledge of so that we're dealing only in terms of direct knowledge or the lack of it or the positive state of no knowledge. And these relationships or this is in side of this, or this is inside of this. So all of this is really a state of A because this we define as A itself, its ability to put itself into a state of either knowledge or no knowledge (or a state of no knowledge). And so this state of knowledge that A is in based on B is really a state of A itself. This is based on C, this one, this state of knowledge. Well, how is it? I don't know what other words to use other than the words I have already used like based on, is embedded in, is in the past of, in the memory. But that presumes that there is a memory that somehow exists. And this is what creates memory.

B: Included.

Y: It's not that you have a mind that has memory and you are using that mind. It means that this is memory itself. So it's not memory. We call this arrangement, this situation memory. But Darshana's not happy with that.

B: May I look in the dictionary for include, for instance? What do they have all the synonyms.

Y: Which dictionary?

B: I have one in my computer.

Y: Well, you can use that or we can use the Biguns.

B: Or for embedded. Maybe they have something. Other wise, it is clear enough for now. Maybe later we shall go deeper into the real metaphysical meaning.

Y: So why is C…B's knowledge of C included in A knowledge of B? That's really the key question. Why is it so? We can say because of this situation.

B: Comprise, contain, embrace.

Y: Yes, all those apply. We could…

B: Comprise, contain, embrace. We might try comprises, for instance.

Y: Comprises.

B: Comprise include be composed of…include, be composed of. Compose. Ah! embedded.

Y: Embedded has two B's, I think, does it?

Bret: No, two d's but one b.

Y: Two d's. Yes.

B: E m b…

Y: Embedded.

B: Embedded, implement. Ah ha! this is Albanian. I have Albanian here because I learn Albanian. Implant, plant. Embed the root is implant, plant.

Y: Hey, look here embedded.

Don: Embed – fix firmly in surrounding mass. Of mass, surrounds us. Or place as in a bed. So fix firmly in surrounding mass.

Y: That's a pretty narrow definition.

Don: Yes, it is.

B: Individuals are put whatever it said.

Y: I just can't buy contingent. That's like saying if B were in a state of knowledge of C or if B were not. But it's not 'an if' situation. Either this is the case or it's not the case. If it's not the case, but you are comparing one arrangement with another arrangement, and if you just had this arrangement, there would still…A would still be in a state of knowledge of C regardless of the contingency because…just because he has the ability not to be in a state of knowledge of C doesn't mean he is. And we have said he is in a state of knowledge of C.

B: He didn't exercise it, ability to be in state of no knowledge of C, by choice.

Y: Say that again.

B: I'm just repeating…in other words, A has not exercised its ability to be in state of no knowledge of C by choice. He (deviacta? Sanskrit word) by choice.

Y: Yes, A is in a state of no knowledge of C by its own choice. It is in a state of no knowledge of C by its own choice. There is no arrow there; and it's chosen not to have one there.

B: So whenever it makes a choice, it makes two choices now because it makes the choice.

Y: No, it is making whatever choice it's making, period.

B: This is like another choice made to be in state of no knowledge.

Y: It's in a state of no knowledge. A determines its relationship with C in part so far as this state of no knowledge is concerned.

B: Ok. Yes, it is also in state of no knowledge of all the other (N) minus two individuals and minus three.

Y: Yes, if they exist. But we're saying only these three exist for now.

B: Yes.

Y: But what you say is true if there were (N) individuals. Yes, it's doing it for everyone except for B; and it is in a state of knowledge of B by its own choice. So all states that ones are in are originated by itself. But it's not both of them; it's not originating both. A is not in a state of originating…having originated itself in a state of knowledge of B and a state of…and a state of no knowledge of B. That's not correct.

B: Because at every origination, actually (N) square minus one choices have been made. (N) squared is the total number of choices.

Y: Why is it minus one?

B: Because this one was made out of possible (N) squared choices which is the total number of choices of A being in state of knowledge of every other individual including itself.

Y: Of the total number of possible.

B: Of possible, yes, and out of this possible, he exercised just one. He originates just one.

Y: So it's one.

B: So it's (N) squared minus one, always. I don't…

Y: No, he could do two, three, four, five whatever it is.

B: Yes. Ok.

Y: Up to (N).

B: Yes.

Y: So it could be (N) squared minus (N).

B: (N) squared minus the one being made. Minus…

Y: Minus whatever they are.

B: Minus whatever they are. N…

Y: So you think it's good enough to say embedded, or includes. It got it across to you. You understood it right away. But I have been talking to Darshana about it for fifteen years, and she doesn't agree. She should be here.

B: Yes, about contingent we have dependent upon, possible, accidental, happening by change.

Y: Yes. See those are conditional, possible but not actual. So if it is actual, that's the case that we're considering. What state is A in when these actually are, not when they are possible? So we are trying to account for A's state. Are we missing anything by using the word includes?

B: No.

Y: Embedded seems a little bit off, stuck in mass.

B: Includes is good, I believe. Includes.

Y: It's an includer. I need some objectors. Are you going to object to includes?

Bret: Yeah.

Y: What's your objection?

B: Comprise, embrace.

Bret: My objection is the one that you dismissed this morning. States is the wrong word. A originates direct knowledge of B. B originates direct knowledge of C. A has a conflict because A originates no direct knowledge of C. And yet C is because A originates direct knowledge of B that conflict that tension creates time just as tension in another arena creates energy. Time is the uncertainty about existence.

Y: I don't see how it does. You're using an energy example, and there is no energy.

B: I am pointing to tension as the… between two that are contradictory. In energy the tension was between two paths that were different lengths. Here the tension is about existence itself. A (I'm using the wrong words.) but to A there is no knowledge of C.

Y: So this is in contradiction to this.

Bret: Right and that creates a tension and it resolves in an uncertainty.

Y: Which I said in the original text, the conflict.

Bret: (acknowledges)

Y: Well, I think that is the right thing; but you have to compare the two.

Bret: Yes.

Y: Without the comparison step, we don't get a conflict. And you don't get time.

Bret: Direct knowledge of B is direct knowledge of B's direct knowledge of C.

Y: A's state of no knowledge of C which is this one is compared to A's knowledge of C which is this one.

Bret: A's knowledge of B's knowledge of C, that part doesn't fall...

Y: A's knowledge that what?

Bret: That part doesn't fall away, that it's B's knowledge of C.

Y: Well, I'm not so sure because if he is in a state of knowledge based on C, no matter how he got it, he is in the state because this circle is inside of this circle. It's true that it's by way of this one. But I think this and this are compared. And the comparison is of the states of knowledge. Now, there is also consciousness that A is conscious of this and conscious of this and conscious of this; but he is also conscious of both these.

Bret: I agree that the comparison occurs. But the reason I say that A does not lose B is that, that fact that A gets as direct knowledge of B, direct knowledge of C, is why A arranges B and C such that B is in the past. It's not just comparing the two, it's the fact that it's comparing them in this context.

Y: Well, yes, he compares them when he has to compare them.

Bret: So A originates direct knowledge of B; B originates direct knowledge of C. A originates direct knowledge of B direct knowledge of C. A originates no direct knowledge of C.

Y: Yes, you have just described what we have written down. Well, we have to do the comparison situation.

Bret: It's inherent in the direct knowledge.

Y: Inherent.

B: When we introduce comparison, we introduce measurement, and we introduce physicality in this case. This physicality is referring to time.

Y: Not necessarily. I think comparison takes place on the states of knowledge level, and state of knowledge and no knowledge.

B: Ah, yes, we have comparison even without time. Even…

Y: Without consciousness.

B: Without consciousness and without seeing the picture.

Y: Yes.

B: Because when we say, for instance, this is why I mentioned, maybe first. Now we are doing something new, at least in terms of what has been illustrated so far in the paper.

Y: That is correct. It is new.

B: It is new. If it is new, we start from A is in direct knowledge of B ●. This is more essential. And then we shall come to conclusions. We shall start with this one because this… A, B… A originates a state of direct knowledge of B; but also it has… it is in a state of B being in no knowledge of itself, and B being in no knowledge of A.

Y: Yes, all that's true.

B: All that is true. But it is more essential than this one. So we should start from this one and then complicate it with time. Now this includes time. This does not include time.

Y: Yes.

B: And it is more essential.

Y: Yes it is.

11

B: And since we are including something new into picture. This is the…these states of no knowledge; it should be essential. We should start with something more simpler, I believe, and see what happens.

Y: Well, to be exact, we should; but let me see if I can take a step here.

B: Ok. Yes, because we have here two things, we have time which is one new ingredient. We have states of no knowledge which is second new ingredient. It makes…

Y: Too much all at once.

B: Yes, it makes it complicated.

Y: I understand that.

B: We couldn't differentiate.

Y: I understand that.

B: Ok, ok, go on.

Y: We have a state of knowledge for A based on C; and we have a state of no knowledge for A of C. These two are both states in the unitaryness of A. And so therefore, those two states of knowledge are…amount to a dual state of knowledge for A of C. So he is two states that makes a new state. (Something breaks.) This is yours.

Don: Not anymore.

Y: Can it go over these? So these two are a state; and that state together is the state he was calling tension. So A is in a future state of…with regard to C that…that C…C is in a state of…he is in a state of knowledge based on C; and he is state of no knowledge based on C. And that state is a state of knowledge of what?

B: You can't leave out B as you say that. It's not a state of knowledge of C and a state of knowledge of not C. It's a state of knowledge of C through B.

Y: I understand that that is also true. That's another state that we have to draw.

B: There are many of them. There are…

Y: I will be back before I go on the floor in here.

B: Three factorial which are six.

Don. Yeah. But if A was in a state of direct knowledge of C, would A still be conscious of C? Could A still be conscious of C in the current time and be in the past?

B: Yes.

Don: I am not sure Bret has the same…

Bret: Yes.

B: It is so out (   )

Don: If that is the case, then the time would appear not to be contingent on this tension, but on the containment if you will.

Bret: That's exactly why I am saying you can't leave B out. It is the containment that brings about the tension.

Don: Ok. I thought that we were talking about the state of no knowledge and the state of knowledge being about the tension.

Bret: No, at the last, that's what I was contradicting Yogeshwar saying, "It's not just tension, it's the containment."

Don: Ok, good. No, it's a good point in both ways, I think. It's good to explore.

Bret: The principle that I am working on is that no relationship can be ignored. No aspect of ordering the relationships, none of them are (levitable?). They all have some effect.

Y: Now, we can further ask what effect on consciousness does this contradictory. He knows this and he knows that, probably be conscious of a state of tension, you mentioned, or confusion, or doubt.

Bret: My phrase is uncertainty about existence is time.

Y: Uncertainty about existence and you are calling that time.

Bret: That contradiction raises uncertainty about existence and therefore something that is, it isn't. It's like a memory.

Y: Can't see it…what that has to do with the consciousness of time; and this does have something to do with it, that this state is embedded in another state which includes the state of knowledge of B that A is in.

B: Yes, there are six of them.

Y: I am going to draw this and then you can say something like that which includes B. Yes, you were going to say something?

B: No, this sub-states are of A factorial, E factorial when we have three into picture. There are three factorial and it is six.

13

Y: Which is six.

B: Sub-states which are all in the state of B, all in the biggest circle.

Y: So we have three states of…

B: Six subsets.

Y: Which is factorial of this.

B: Which is…for instance, B is with this. These with this, these with this. These with this. These with this. These with this. These with this one. These with this one. The biggest with this one. So actually it is three factorial plus two factorial plus one. Six, two, nine, there are nine actually.

Y: Yes.

Bret: Why do you think that B is experienced as being in the past as opposed to C being experienced in the past? Maybe it is the other way around.

Y: Were you talking to me?

Bret: Yes, pardon me.

Y: You have to talk louder.

Bret: Shall I repeat it.

Y: Well, I don't know; I didn't hear it.

Bret: What bases do you decide that A has an experience of B in the past as opposed to A having an experience of C in the past in this arrangement?

Y: I don't know; but I think the answer is there.

B: Maybe we should go back to this arrangement.

Y: We will in a few minutes. I just didn't want this to get away from me. So I have to wipe it off. What is this? This compares this and this to each other. So it is knowledge of the comparison of this and this is a comparison of A and this.

Don: Got it.

Y: Now, so that we can follow this step by step instead of taking advantage of my seventeen years of thinking about it. We'll take it step my step. Would this be easier with a matrix?

B: Yes, because the complimentary graph will be easy to determine.

Y: Automatically there.

B: Automatically there. We might write the matrix for this one. We have A to B. I have A B here, Li and La. A is in state of knowledge of B; so this is one. A is not in state of knowledge of A. B is not in state of knowledge of B if B is not in state of knowledge of A. So this is the matrix.

Y: That's the matrix of this.

B: This is the one.

Y: It's been 'Lila-ed.'

B: So this is…let me see how Lila was. These…these are La's…

Y: You are going to have a circle.

B: And it has a…I just want to see how…a circle here.

Y: For the knower?

B: For the knower and in terms of graphs, the direct graph is this one. A is in state of direct knowledge of B and the complimentary graph is A in state of knowledge of A, B in state of knowledge of B, and B in state of knowledge of A. So all this is missing. And all these connections will be drawn by dashed circle so we have them all at once.

Y: And they are all right there.

B: And they are all right there. We just change…

Y: But how do we have…

B: I change zero's…

Y: How do we understand what it means? What it means in terms of knowledge.

B: Yes. It is easy to make the drawing and then think.

Bret: Forty life times of sadhana ought to do it.

Y: I think that is about right. Well, this maybe that time not much time left.

B: So let us draw it, for instance. This is A.

Y: We draw the…

B: This is B. This is A not being in state of knowledge of A. This is B not being in state of knowledge of B and B not being in state of knowledge of A.

Y: Now, we're what's up. We have four. One, two, three, four.

15

B: Four.

Y: Ok, and that's what you have here.

B: Yes. And then we could find the subsets.

Y: Well, that results in A being in a state of knowledge of B, that situation. But A is also in a state of no knowledge of itself.

B: This is B in state of no knowledge of B. This is B in state of no knowledge of A. This is… A is…

Y: In state of no knowledge of itself.

B: Of itself.

Y: So what we need to know from that according to our previous analysis…is that is…A is in a state of knowledge of B and is conscious of a particle labeled B ●.

B: Yes.

Y: That's the consciousness, the next step. And B ● is physical.

B: Why? A is… Why is A conscious of B as a particle? A particle is that which can't act, but A has direct knowledge of B. So A knowledge of is (   ) of an individual.

Y: It has direct knowledge; but direct knowledge is not consciousness. Consciousness has been defined as a likeness of a content of a state of knowledge with the one who is in question. And the likeness of existence and unity and ability to act are the same, where the 'who's' are different. And so that's why in consciousness it appears that it is physical. Something that exists that is a unit and has the ability to act, called interaction, but is not a 'who' originating anything is a physical particle. So that's why according to the Lila Paradigm. So I think you have laid it out three different ways.

B: Yes, of the same (   )

Y: Of the same (   ).

B: Matrices and complimentary graph and your way of presenting.

Y: But then when I did it for A B C, then we have comparison states. And that comparison happens in terms of states of knowledge before we…as a different kind of comparison that makes consciousness. Consciousness has to do with ontological attributes and the states of knowledge attributes of an individual or the lack of it.

B: Yes. Here we also have sub-states, but this sub-states are not substantial because they are sub-states of states of no knowledge.

Bret: This is something like empty knowledge. Sorry empty consciousness. I am trying to…like…there is no comparison.

B: The basic knowledge.

Y: It is just consciousness of a proto fermions. It has no location in space or time. It has no spin; it has no charge. It has no mass. I mean it is somebody. It is a stripped down Chevy.

Bret: But for A to have direct knowledge of B means has direct knowledge that B is an individual that has choice.

Y: That's right, but he has knowledge. And you have to differentiate knowledge from consciousness so that is going to need a little work, I can see. I'll do that. I have been working on knowledge and all fourteen definitions of knowledge and then reading up on epistemology and what they have to say about knowledge. And I was explaining yesterday the difference between tacit knowledge and explicit knowledge. Explicit in our terms means conscious of and tacit means (which means silent); but it mean not conscious. So tacit knowledge is knowledge that you have, but you are not conscious of it as different from not being in the state of knowledge. So if we had A like this, a would have no knowledge whatsoever, tacit or explicit. Explicit knowledge means consciousness of.

B: Yes.

Y: And tacit like this. He's in a state of tacit knowledge of B but he is in a state of consciousness of that dot, that particle. So we really need to start with this state.

B: Yes.

Bret: Knowledge is blind. Consciousness sees things; knowledge is blind.

B: But consciousness sees them wrong; but it's partly right. So it's a salvation. I think that answers it Ok. You got it?

Don: Which?

Y: This last one about tacit.

Don: Oh yeah. Yes, explicit.

Y: Tacit silence. Literally means silent.

B: Tesena comes from here. Tesena is Slavic language.

Y: Yes. And it is a Latin term, Tacitus.

B: I have found it. It says, implicit in my dictionary. Implicit, hidden.

Y: I'm?

17

B: Hidden, implicit.

Y: But Explicit means not only conscious but it means definite and obvious and clear. But I am using it in the limited form called consciousness or no consciousness. Yes.

Don: I was just looking up the derivation. It is literally silent. Tacit is. (Contasary – Latin) to be silent.

Y: Silent. Yes. That is what we understand; we don't say anything. Tacit agreement. And we don't speak of it. Ok. I think that's a little head way. And there's a how to state the A, B, C and then how to state the A, B, C, B, D and space. I don't know. I am trying to see if I am up to it. Yes, let's take it bit by bit, literally a bit. Here we got it from bit. That was John Wheeler's statement. He said, "You get it from bits." Bits of information produces consciousness of it. And that's an it. But we want it to be in time. I just can't see it in this kind of a diagram.

Bret: I am still playing with the idea that C is the one that A has consciousness of as being in the past. And the now, the brightness was the closer one.

Y: B and this is in the past, huh.

Bret: I would have to draw a lot of diagrams to see if there is a contradiction. But that allows the tension argument and so I am pursuing the thought for awhile. See if I can find the contradiction.

Y: But it doesn't work for the whole rest of the theory.

Bret: Doesn't it?

Y: No, explanation of circuits and everything right out of the window.

Bret: Circuit is a common present anyway, the same mechanism roughly.

Y: But the histories are not related.

Bret: Well, that is true of observers. They have different histories up to and including (   )

Y: We have different futures. I can't.

Bret: We still don't have a future. We just have a past that is different than the past in the other way.

Y: So time's arrow would be running backward, the way everything is going like this. I'll find enough objections.

B: Maybe we should draw the complimentary graph in the matrix.

Y: Do it. I know God would come up with something.

B: So we have…um, yes, maybe why not?

Y: You are a good one.

B: We have A is in state of knowledge of B, and B is in state of knowledge of C. And the complimentary graph is a stronger color. We have the matrix first A, B, C. A, B, C. B La. So A is in state of knowledge of B and B is in state of knowledge C. All the others are zero.

Y: Or states of no knowledge.

B: No knowledge. And now that this is graph G and this is graph complimentary to G, G not G. Just the graph...the matrices is.. The matrices will be because we have a matrix with G is it zero…One zero one, one, one, zero, one, one, one. Li, La and now the graph A, B, C. We have A to A. We have B to B. We have C to C. We have A to C. We have B to A. We have C to C, C to B which we don't have here and C to A. So all of them except the existence; and the existence is B to C and A to B.

Y: What are all those represent? The yellow ones.

B: This is states of no knowledge. These are…this ones which do exist which are states of direct knowledge.

Y: Now where do we show the…that A is in two states with regard to C because A is in a state of knowledge of C? Here A state of knowledge of C. How does he get in? It doesn't show that so you need something at right angles.

B: Because it is not direct; it doesn't show.

Y: Yeah, but it does exist, nevertheless.

B: I have…this should be…

Y: Shown at right angles.

B: Yes. It could be shown that they are connected in the moving through the matrices. We have A is followed by B. I go to B. B is followed by C. This is the animation that I have sent to you. We have A is followed by B. I now go to B. B is followed by C. There is no disconnection and this is the way how could it…it could be shown that A is connected to C through B. This is the way to see it because I haven't.

Y: Yes. That's fine only I don't understand what those lines are. What?

B: This is moving.

Y: What process? What do they stand for? This line?

B: Yes.

19

Y: What are you representing?

B: This, I say here A is followed by B. This means out of A, I have one out-going arrow and this is pointing to B. I say, "This is what one stands for." I say, "A is followed by B."

Y: I can follow that.

B: Now.

Y: But why do you do this?

B: To jump to the B…to the row which is shown to me by this one in the column.

Y: So instead of B being known, it becomes a knower.

B: Yes, yes. Now I question. I have come to B. Is B followed by something else because I'm to find a circuit?

Y: So now B is a knower.

B: Yes.

Y: Of C?

B: And being the knower, I go to Li. I go to Li. And this goes to Li is (there) one off. Or I could just jump from the B column to B.

Y: But he is a knower and to find out what he knows…

B: I search for the one. And I find it knows C.

Y: And this is in the knower column.

B: Yes.

Y: Known.

Bret: Can I suggest a slightly different interpretation? That instead of this being considered the individual, it be considered the individual's knowledge so A's knowledge is of B. B's knowledge is of C and so it's not a jump from an individual to and individual.

Y: But we have no one knowing and no one known.

B: Then we'll…you know, I have mentioned at certain point that the other attributes. Here this are the states…the acts of the nonphysical individuals. But the…besides the ability to act, they have 'who' and existence. Existence is shown implicitly.

20

Y: Resistance are you saying?

B: Existence. They exist; they do exist. I have A here, I have B here, so it is implicitly stated that they exist and…

Y: They do exist. That's part of the axiom.

B: Yes, I know. And then they have identity; they have 'who.' This who A is, this is who B is.

Y: Yes.

B: At one point, I have mentioned maybe three dimensional or four dimensional matrix will be included. But this could also be done by this transcription or way to illustration.

Y: Why don't we go on with this process now? We'll get to here. Why don't we go on to more?

B: Yes, we go. I go to C from I go to C and I search and I see that they are all zeros. So this is the end.

Y: So we are stopped here. These are all states of no knowledge.

B: Yes, these are states of no knowledge.

Y: Ok, you see for matrices, you have to go carefully step by step with me.

B: Yes, yes. We shall do this because we need further on when we will make…

Y: Now, you were saying here.

B: This is another way to represent all the exist attributes once we reach the point to introduce consciousness and this sameness.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: In order to do so we might instead of just illustrating the non-physical individual. (Diveaviakta?) In Sanskrit.

Y: (Viakta?).

B: (Deveaviakta?). Instead of introducing.

Y: Sanskrit for individual.

B: Divine individual.

Y: Yes.

B: Instead of just having a point, we have four informations. This is existence, who, unity, ability to act, just way to illustrate them, to have four information for one non-physical individual.

Y: All right, I am starting to feel more secure that we're getting a common understanding between the two of us.

B: Ok, is out of question that we shall reach that point.

Bret: As long as it is the right one.

B: You know, even if it is not the right one because this is this fantasy rule I mentioned. You enter into fantasy, and you have an axiom. And then you go from one legitimate transition to another legitimate transition. From statement to statement to statement, all legal statements and finally you reach why. And when you leave the fantasy, you know for sure if X then Y. And this is true. No one could ruin this process of moving through the statements, it could just ruin the assumption. The reason why this eight hundred Buddhist have been killed. You mentioned.

Y: Oh, yes.

B: So this is just a notion. There are many buts.

Y: Something.

Don: Oh, I'm just thinking how time and why C is in current time and B isn't. And this doesn't work. I'm not quite sure if you looked at first the comparison or A's ontological attributes with B's at that point gives B a consciousness of B.

Y: Yes, B ●.

Don: Yes. And if somehow the comparison to C were dependent on that, then it would come quote unquote "after" or there would be a dependency and the dependency would be time so one became conscious of B and then conscious of C.

Y: I understand the principle. I am not sure of the language yet.

Don: I am not either but it…there seems to be…

Y: Yes. There's a resolution that takes place of the conflict.

Bret: Hang on though.   It's opposite of what you have been saying. He is suggesting C is in the past.

Don: No.

Y: No, no, he didn't do that.

Don: No, because I am first conscious of B. Ah ha, I have made that comparison now knowing B or conscious of B, I make a comparison to C. Ah C comes after B so C is in the present, B is in the past.

Y: It's all right with me. It could be stated that way instead of saying that C is in the present and has a memory of B in the past. It is just the mirror image statement. But you're using consciousness of B as the reference.

Don: Yes.

Y: And going on to C, and then reflecting back on that.

Don: Well, but it puts C in the present and B in the past.

Y: Yeah, it does.

Don: It just resolves that.

Y: Yeah, I see that.

Don: And for any…

Y: Because it follows B rather than B being before in C.

Don: In consciousness.

Y: Yes, this is all in consciousness.

Don: And that works, of course, for any number of embeddings. There is always that dependency if you will. And so it, Ah ha! Now I am conscious of that.

B: Then first consciousness should be introduced in your scriptures, first consciousness, then notion of time.

Don. Well, it is.

B: Ah, well, it is then.

Don: It is.

Y: It is, yes.

Don: Yes, the time…

Y: There is consciousness of self, consciousness of a proto fermion, and then time, and then rudimentary one dimensional space. Now can you find that book or paper on scale free? And find that drawing of…I want her to see that with not having to read the whole paper. Out of all these non directed graphs, it's the only thing that I found of any use.

B: Ah ha!

Don: Ok, there was the Wikipedia presentation.

Y: Either it was the Wikipedia or the Scientific American presentation, I don't remember which.

Don: Ok, Scientific American, Scale free networks. Ok, and that had the…Yes, OK. See, that's the bell curve distribution and this is what we end up with, the power law distribution which results from preferential attachment.

Y: And that is from non-directed graphs?

Don: I will have to look. But many of these are directed graphs because a lot of process, biological processes are directed.

Y: (acknowledges)

Don: So they do…

B: Ah, this is great.

Don: You have this.

B: Where.

Don: It's under the Barabási folder.

B: Ah Barabási yes.

Don: I would have to look further to see…

Y: To find out.

Don: Whether it's specifically…

Y: But I think it's true on both graphs.

Don: It would be…

Y: I think the parameters would be a little different.

Don: (acknowledges)

Y: That the absolute values would be a little different. Ok. Well, I think we are going to end now. You remember your home work assignment.

B: Shall I write it on hand? Because it will take great…it will take me time to draw it, this a log.

Y: On the computer, you can do that hand… Hand work is just fine with me.

B: Ok.

Y: But in the text, I want you to have the primary sutra…the sloka, the two lines and some of the statements that go with it.

B: My idea was to have sutra, the primary sloka as you say, and then this Li and La and matrices symbol. And the explanations…

Y: For what is this about?

B: For what this is about. But this should be both.

Y: Ok, we agree.

B: So I should write down the whole thing, all these explanations.

Y: Owe?

B: Or just the…

Y: Just the start.

B: Just the start.

Y: We can do…you can do like some explanations of the sutra itself and then of the attributes just one liners about the attributes or something. That's about all. Or you could… you could state what an example of direct knowledge…like we were talking about today. However you think it would be…would communicate to your best students something like that.

B: (acknowledges) Ok, I will start.

Y: Not much, just enough to so I can see a sample of the type of thing that you have in mind because it is not completely clear to me what you were suggesting. You said brief statements. So you can make those brief statements either of explanation or enlargement of expanding on the sutra, but I'll leave that up to you.

B: Ok.

Y: Just the beginning. I don't know if you have any ideas about an introduction but that would be for another time. Then we could talk over. I don't have any quotes on this one. Do we want quotes? Or quoting Penrose or Wheeler or Heisenberg or Descartes.

Somehow I lost my graph on time. The latest version. Is it on here, or is it on your machine?

Don: I think it…down here.

Y: It is under Lila graphs, at least it was. Not under graphs.

Don: Not under graphs. Process diagram time. Number 2.

Y: But is it the latest one? So if you could bring that tomorrow. You could bring either as a print out or a file.

B: Now, Bret, if you have anything you want to share with me or ask about or tell me. Any suggestions this would be a good time to do it.

Bret: Just a caveat that I haven't come to a conclusion about, but which is why I want to read the physics book. As above so below. Just as on the most degenerate level in a Platonic universe with infinitesimals which doesn't exist. We find *pi*. So I think we will find the principles that we are looking at many levels though the exploration. So my worry is if I come up with simple explanation for motion that it may not in fact be. It will be a degenerate case. And if I try to come to conclusions based…built on it, I won't…I will run into a tangle. So I have the thought first to get it straight in my head what measurements am I trying to explain. I am not trying to explain Platonic motion. I am trying to explain measured by physicist's motion.

Y: Yes.

Bret: And so for me one of the first questions which I don't…haven't resolved yet is are the any measurements of stillness that have to be explained? And I am still not certain that true.

Y: Stillness.

Bret: You haven't…you've suggested that you could. There was stillness, but haven't said anything about it since then. But if there isn't stillness, then all motion is the same thing but in different magnitude and arrangement. But if there is stillness, then there has to be something that is stillness as opposed to motion. So first I want to get it clear what it is I am trying to explain before I start exploring so much.

Y: Well, I think that's correct in any case.

Bret: That was the only thing that I thought of that was worth mentioning.

Y: Because I have spent years trying to do the other, it is a waste of time.

Bret: And I filed my taxes this morning so that out of my attention.

Y: Oh good.

Bret: I have more attention.

Don: Done.

Y: Yes.