

Lila recording day 1, afternoon
21/10/2006
Tran. By Vijaya
App. 1 Hr 37 min

B: This is connected with... when you have an arrangement, as if... Yes we have in Lila Paradigm then we have a law of transition from one position to another. Then specific patterns could occur and this is John Gomez's *The Game of Life*. I have something here in my book about similar automata.

Y: Automata yes.

B: It is connected to similar automata. And this is connected to fractal geometry and theory of chaos. This is what I am teaching here theory of chaos.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: I am looking for this John Gomez. Here it is.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: There is a certain position given, and this is also very similar to what this doctoral candidate of mine which I mentioned to you, has in his master's thesis for metabolic processes with molecules. These are molecules and this is like transition law given. Then by using a certain initial position and then the transitions, then you get different... Like process or specific images.

Y: Now what? He is the same man?

B: I am looking for him. I am looking for the name, he...

Y: Same man that did what?

B: How did... Here it is. John Norton Covey.

Bret: The game of life.

B: Yes, *The Game of Life*.

Y: Yes, but what's that got to do with free will?

B: John Covey is here. It has to do with free will in a way because we ask ourselves if these forms which we could find in the universe and in the processes in life, if they are based on such a simple, so to say, law, such a simple initial position in the transition and the rules for transition. For example, in his *Game of Life* there are just three rules for transition. Then maybe everything in the universe, no matter how complex it might seem to us, is based on some very simple rules.

Y: Well, if that were true, then there would be no free will.

B: Yes, and this is the connection with the question of free will.

Y: So there is a big argument.

Bret: Recording.

Y: OK. What I thought we would do is carry on here. However, the part that we are going to deal with now saying roughly is the same thing, but just giving it as the attributes of the individuals. So I'll just read it very quickly. Because there is very little that is new. Now and then there will be something that is new. So the first attribute is the one of existence.

Existence

The non-physical individuals are not created. They are assumed to 'just exist.' They are completely non-physical unlike souls, spirits, and minds of Bishop Berkeley or the monads of Gottfried Leibniz, which were created. Individuals that were created imply that at some time, in the back ground of time, the individuals did not exist, were then created, and existed from the time of creation. Thus created individuals are located in time. Being located in time is a physical property. Since the non-physical individuals in this paradigm are not created, they are not located in time, which includes the 'present.' The 'existence' of a non-physical individual is treated here as an attribute of that non-physical individual.

Now the reason I have stressed this point is because I find that when I explain the Lila Paradigm to people, they automatically assume that anything that exists is at present time and those are different.

Being completely non-physical, these individuals also are not located in space, nor at a specific distance from anything - there is no background of time (space). In addition, a non-physical individual is not energy charge or mass, has no quantum spin, is not physical matter.

So when I write A on a piece of paper and say that's a non-physical individual, they say. "Well, that's located, now and here."

Bret: You said, "No background of time. It reads no back ground of space.

Y: You're editing.

Bret: No, you said it.

Y: Well, you're right, that it's an error. Well, there are lots of them.

Bret: No, just in your speech, just now you used the word time.

Y: Oh, I see.

There is no back ground of space. In addition, the non-physical individual is not energy charge or mass.

OK.

Consciousness will be defined a little later. Let us suffice it for now to say that it is only each of these non-physical individuals that *can* be in a conscious state.

There is some strong 'first person' evidence for the actual existence of these non-physical individuals. David Chalmers in (1993) argues, I think correctly, for non-physicality of consciousness. We suggest that that which can be in a non-physical state of consciousness would also be non-physical.

It is hard for me to conceive of something that is in a non-physical state of consciousness and yet it's... The thing that is in that state is physical--like you would imagine a complicated computer or something. People imagine that suddenly consciousness is going to arrive at a certain level of complexity. And yet if consciousness is non-physical, that which is in that state must also be non-physical. It can't be physical.

Since most people claim that they have first person conscious experience, they would be the non-physical individuals assumed above rather than homosexual (Homo sapiens) bodies, brains, resident fields, quantum fields, microphysical fermions or any other physical thing.

So if they have that first person experience (well, scientists say we don't deal with first person experience), they have stopped themselves by that very act of saying, "No, we don't deal with first person experience. We deal only with third person experience." That stops them from being able to solve the very problems they want to solve.

Bret: You just said out loud homosexual bodies instead of Homo sapiens bodies. Sorry I'll stop if you want.

Y: I beg your pardon. Homo sapiens is what it says here. That's what I typed.

Bret: Someday someone may listen to this so. Sorry.

Y: So anyway the point is regardless that science and scientist exclude themselves from the very thing that they need to know in order to solve the problem of science by saying that we don't deal with first person experience, it is unreliable. I agree with you, it can be very unreliable.

People can say, "Well, I am seeing a kidney floating across the middle of the room." I have had people tell me those very things, just like that. And there wasn't; so their first person experience was unreliable. But you shouldn't throw out the baby with the bath water. People do have first person experiences; especially able people have ones that are usually reliable. Now:

Another first person experience that most people claim that they have is that of originating acts, at least sometimes.

They think, "Well, I am picking up the pen and I originated that act."

Since according to modern science, the physical only reacts and does not originate acts a person cannot be physical. Assuming that this is valid, we must be non-physical individuals.

And we are the non-physical individuals described in the Lila Paradigm. So that first person experience should be given room.

Unity

This section actually needs to be expanded.

Each non-physical individual has the attribute of unity. Each is indivisible and is therefore labeled 'a non-physical individual.'

What is unity and unity of the mind, unity of consciousness? There is a beautiful paper written by David Chalmers on that. If you wanted to, you could read that some day.

B: May I say something regarding this first person experience? I have also read this article by Chalmers.

Y: Excuse me, Biljana, I have got to run.

Don: I am recording it.

B: We shall all have copies.

Don: Sure.

Bret: Yes. I am recording too, so we have a back up. Did you catch that spurious comment at the end of non-physical individual, in the document?

B: Where.

Bret: Unity at the end of a non-physical individual. There is a comma that doesn't need to be there. Minor.

Don: Yah, I think this started mid-sentence. The expansion contracted at that moment.

Bret: OK.

Don: No, I didn't see that.

B: Maybe it is not strictly connected to existence as an attribute, but still it should be noted. It has, I believe, also a mathematical meaning to it and meaning regarding artificial intelligence and not just philosophic. I have mentioned to you in my letters and also in our conversations yesterday about Gödel's law.

First of all, in artificial intelligence there are thick books written about this. For instance, there are two currents, like two types of scientists: one belonging to the stream of hard artificial intelligence, and the other belonging to the stream of soft artificial intelligence. And they are arguing if it is correct. It is strictly connected with first person experience.

For instance, Douglas Hofstadter who is one of the greatest scientists belonging to hard stream has written *Gödel, Escher, Bach*, a very famous book in artificial intelligence. He has written also a book titled *The Minds I*, meaning the 'I', the 'me.--the 'I' of the Mind. This book is maybe at least seven hundred pages thick. In it there are articles written by different scientists belonging to different areas of research who are discussing this I.

He also gives this Gödel theory which I have been mentioning to you. I am teaching this for seventeen hours every year. So it is strictly connected in science. Now we are talking science, in strict mathematics. If it is possible for a formula logical system (in other words, a robot)--if it is possible for a robot to say I. Mathematically, this means that I should be able to build such a formula or such a mathematical sentence in which, by mathematical means, it will be possible to reference to this same object.

First of all, this is connected with the attributes of consistence and completeness. Namely, it is of interest in artificial intelligence and in mathematics to build such a formula logical system. And that means actually an artificial man. That means a robot that will be at the same time consistent and complete.

Consistent means everything that he says is correct. This is consistence. For instance, if A is correct, then there is no way that the compliment is not correct. This is consistence. If I say something and it is correct, then the opposite is not correct. This is consistence. So consistence means that everything that this formula logical system creates is accurate, is correct, and is true.

Complete means that there is no truth outside the system. This means that everything which is truth should be manifestable in this system. It should be possible to present it into the system. So consistent means everything that is true. Everything that is in the system is true. This is consistent. And everything that is true, every truth no matter how complex it could be, is presentable in the system. It is in the system. So there is no truth outside the system. This is completeness.

So once I have such system which both consistent and complete, that problem in science could be solvable. And this in broader discussions this is also said about humans, not just robots. So once I build such a system, no matter how many years it could take to build it, then I will be sure of this system by the power of consistence and the power of completeness, that this system or this robot or this human for that matter, will be capable of solving every possible truth or every possible puzzle.

So if in the input of this system, I define in the language of the system some mathematical puzzle or philosophical puzzle or every kind of tack of paradox, then because this system is consistent on the output what I have will be true. And because this system is complete, what I have on output will be presentable in the system. The system will not say, "This is something outside me because it is complete".

So by the power of consistence and completeness of this system, every task and every assignment in science should be solved by building this system and Gödel has done it. Many mathematicians throughout the history of science have had this dream to build such a system.

For instance, Gauss, who was a genius, or De Morgan or the others, or Russell, David Russell, Whitehead and so on--they did not succeed; but Gödel did it. He has defined some features which are very famous in artificial intelligence. I think this is what is meant by these comments here regarding first person experience.

If we are building more complex, a more and more and more and more complex system having as an objective to build a consistent and complete system, finally we shall reach a point in which this system will be capable of talking about itself. We shall have a self-reference system. A system that is able to say 'I' by mathematical means. When we reach such a point, I'll need seventeen hours of mathematics (for instance) in my lectures to the students.

When we finally reach this point for a system to say 'I,' then we introduce a genuine paradox into the system, a genuine paradox meaning this is not a paradox which could not be solved because of my mathematical skills now or because the skills of the whole of mankind at this present moment are not ripe, are not mature enough to solve the problem.

And maybe after a hundred years and after two hundred years somebody will come who will solve the problem. It is not the case, but paradox is inherent. This is an unsolvable paradox and by mathematical means it could be proved that it is insolvable. So this is what they mean when they say the first person experience is not possible in science because science works with formulas and with formula logical systems.

And when we reach a formula logical system which has an ambition to be perfect, this means to be correct consistence; this means there is no truth outside that system. Then we bump into these boundaries, into this limitation. We come to the point that Gödel's laws of incompleteness which is proved, shows us that such a system introduces an inherent paradox into the system.

This is like an individual asking. "Who am I? Who am I? Who am I? and trying to figure out who he is by contemplation, by a process, and not by direct experience. So this is what was meant, I believe, at least one aspect of it.

Y: I think you are right. But what do we do about it?

B: Non-physicality is the answer. Yes, you are right.

Y: OK. All right. Good. I didn't know that connection between Gödel and first person. OK.

Acts

An attribute of a non-physical individual is that it originates acts. All acts reduce to only one kind of act. A non-physical individual originates and act by either:

Originates itself into a state of direct knowledge of a non-physical individual or originates itself into a state of no direct knowledge of that non-physical individual.

Each non-physical individual so acts with regard to each non-physical individual including itself. This attribute of non-physical individual is not a thought or a (any) mental process. It is an absolute non-physical primary ability to so act.

That is an important sentence, I think, because what it is saying is don't think that this is a mental process or that this is a matter of thinking. But it is an absolute non-physical primary ability to so do.

The act of placing itself in a state of direct knowledge of a non-physical individual and being in that state are two ways of saying the same thing.

So it's being in a state of direct knowledge and placing yourself in it, in that state of knowledge. Being timeless and non-physical is the same thing.

The state of direct knowledge or no direct knowledge, of a non-physical individual is a completely non-physical state that is not located in time or space and does not take time or space or energy.

The phrase 'state of direct knowledge' refers here to the state of a non-physical individual in which it has placed itself wherein it knows a non-physical individual. It is a state from which

consciousness of things appears. This state of direct knowledge is not perception and is not consciousness; and is not a result of perception.

A state of direct knowledge can only be based on a non-physical individual as it really is, not on something other than what it is.

A lot of people say, "Well, I accept you; I know you." But they know you not as you ultimately are, as a non-physical individual, but as a human being or as a personality or as--you name it.

Rule one:

Now I call this a rule because I haven't been able to prove it. But I give a reason for the rule anyway.

In the above meaning of state of direct knowledge is also included any states of direct knowledge and states of no direct knowledge that the *known* non-physical individual is placing itself in.

Is that clear what I mean by that? A-B-C. A accepts B, B accepts C. A is in a state of knowledge, direct knowledge, through B of C because when you accept someone you accept their power of choice. When you accept their power of choice, you accept the states they are in. Is that clear?

This rule is because what a non-physical individual is includes the origination of states. The ramifications of this important rule are applied in the Section on Consciousness of a Proto-Physical-Particle Located in Time.

I don't know where in sequence a lot of this stuff belongs.

Who

'Who' an individual is, is an important attribute of a non-physical individual. That which originates acts so that it is placed in states of direct knowledge or states of no direct knowledge of non-physical individuals is 'who' the individual is.

So the one that does it, is who the individual is.

From a second or third person point of view or from God's eye view or from an Archimedes point, who the individual is, is 'which one the individual is'; but for the non-physical individual itself (as a first person), 'who' it is, is self-evident and is a non-physical attribute of 'me,' or 'the one I am.' All the non-physical individuals are the same in their attributes except in the attribute of 'who' each is.

You can go into a long discussion at this point that this is responsible, the difference in the 'who' each is, is responsible for all differences in the universe because it is the only source of difference. So I'm here and you are in a different spot over there, is caused by the difference between us.

It is not as bodies, not as things; it is non-physical individuals who are responsible for all differences in location of space of everything. From other things. We'll talk about that when we get to space. This is one of the hardest things for people to grasp, I have found. So I'm just making a point out of it, the difference between individuals is the only difference there is. And it shows up in the apparent physical world primarily as difference in locations of Micro-Physical-Particles.

B: May I say something? This is a very, very great point and really explains many things. But I was thinking about these algorithms in matrix theory. In these algorithms, we are... when defining... I know we are still to go through it and find maybe some other pitfalls and so on. But at this point what I realize is when we are defining space and time, we are taking into account only the specific arrangements between the non-physical individuals. That means only the non-physical individuals as such and their ability to act and their choices. These are the only attributes taken into account.

When the matrix theory is involved, is introduced, it has still to be developed, but not the attributes. And here...

Y: But what?

B: But not the attributes. As, for instance, 'who' the individual is. It is not taken into account when we are introducing these matrixes, you know. In these matrixes, what we only take into account... It is too early to talk, of course. This is only a suggestion. Maybe it will be erased.

Y: I think it is too simple.

B: Yes, yes, because here we take into account just the non-physical individuals. These rows and these columns are actually... Yes A is 'who' this individual is. So implicitly the 'who' attribute is taken into account, but not in an explicit mathematical way.

Y: (acknowledges)

B: Explicitly when developing these algorithms, at least how I imagine it; this is how I introduce this whole picture. Maybe it is not good all together. Maybe the rows should be the columns or something else. So but the way I developed these was by taking into account just the non-physical individuals as agents, as nodes in this graph and there relations. This means their choices, their ability to act presented into mathematical form of zeros and ones. But what is inside every one of these non-physical individuals is not taken into account.

Y: Yes.

B: There is implicitly purposed, implicitly made and an assumption that they exist because they exist. They are here so they exist. So this is just implicitly taken into account, but not in an explicit mathematical way. And the other attribute, and this is 'who' that individual is, is also just implicitly taken into account. By the fact that O is O and B is B.

Y: Yes.

B: And B could not be O, but not mathematically, not explicitly. Maybe this is a point. And when you define space, and this is great, when you define space, you say, "Yes, space is the consequence of our difference. Space is a kind of consequence of me being me and you being you, the other non-physical individual.

Y: Yes.

B: So this creates space, not as a basic attribute, but as a consequence. But these consequences should find some mathematical picture. It should be pictured in a mathematical way somehow. It could be taken into account explicitly and not just implicitly.

Y: I agree.

B: OK, then this matrix should be maybe three dimensional. I think three maybe four.

B: Maybe four.

Y: To properly include time.

B: Yes.

Y: OK. Very good, we agree. Easy.

So there are four attributes of a non-physical individual in the Lila Paradigm: Existence, Unity, Acts and Who it is.

Now here we get to the meat of the Lila Paradigm.

Consciousness

Before I go into it here, I discovered during the break that two of the illustrations, the one on time and the one on space, the diagrams....

Don: (acknowledges)

Y: Are not as clear as they could be. And it is not your fault. It's because I instructed you improperly. I drew it up myself in error. The first two, as far as I can tell, are right on: Self-consciousness and consciousness of a unit of matter. So we'll do those, and then change the last two for tomorrow or the next day.

Don: OK.

Y: So first we take up:

Consciousness of Self

The next applies to consciousness of self and consciousness of physical things; however, since a description of consciousness of the self is simpler it is given first.

Consciousness is a state a non-physical individual is in wherein: an attribute in the state of direct knowledge a non-physical individual is in, is the same as (is like) an attribute of the non-physical individual who is in that state of direct knowledge.

Now most people with an IQ under 130 can't understand that sentence. They lose it. Consciousness is a state a non-physical individual is in, so that is clear enough. And in that state an, attribute in that state of direct knowledge that the non-physical individual is in, is like an attribute of a non-physical individual who is in that state of knowledge. Well so we try to explain it.

If the non-physical, call it individual A, places itself in a state of direct knowledge of itself, Individual A will be conscious of itself as it is, a non-physical individual, a unitary existence *who* acts.

In other words, the attributes of an individual make 'what' or consists of what the individual is, a unitary existence who acts.

The reason, according to the above definition of consciousness, is that all four attributes of Individual A in the state of direct knowledge Individual A is in of itself are the same as all four of the attributes of Individual A. Individual A is conscious of Individual A's four attributes which is what Individual A is.

So let me get out my diagram here.

Don: There at the end of the document, I printed out separate copies which are clearer than the one embedded in the document.

Y: They look like this.

Don: All four of them are at the end of the...

Y: So let's get the first two. Yes, that'll do it. Now we show Individual A itself on this diagram. Individual A itself is this whole. Now, actually an individual doesn't cover an area. You all are smart enough from what we have said previously. And it's not located on a piece of paper, in present time. This is just to illustrate as if this were Individual A itself. It has room for being in states, so to speak. And one of the states that it is in, is the state of itself. It says A's state of direct knowledge is based on A's ontological attributes. Now these are not A's ontological attributes.

This list, 'who' A is, existence, unity and acts, are inside the dotted state of direct knowledge, are the ontological attributes and are what make Individual A itself: who A is, existence, unity, and acts. That is not inside the dotted circle.

So we know the difference between the list of ontological or A's own attributes and the ones, the list of attributes in A's state of direct knowledge which are based on A ontological attributes. So when A acts to place himself or be in a state of knowledge of himself, then we have this arrangement that we have diagrammed here. Now these lines that go between the attributes, the four lines: between existence and existence, between unity and unity, acts and acts and who A is and who A is. Each of these lines represents A's state of the likeness or the sameness if you like (I like likeness better) of an attribute in A's state of knowledge based on A with an ontological attribute of itself.

So 'who' A is for A is like 'who' A is. That state by philosophers and experts in the field of first person consciousness, say that that is what consciousness is. The first one that stated that was a chap by the name of Nagel. And then his follower including David Chalmers says what it is like to be a bat.

It's the name of an article he wrote. Consciousness if you... You're in a state of what it is like to be a bat, then you are conscious of being a bat. That is if you were a bat. So what it's like for Individual A of the attribute of 'who' A is, is his own attribute, his own ontological attribute of who he is. So these two are in the same individual because they are in the same unitary individual the two are compared. That state of comparison between who A is and it's state of knowledge of itself and who A actually is, that comparison is a state. And that is a state of consciousness of who A is. And that's my definition of consciousness.

Now if you have any questions. The time to ask them would be now.

B: Maybe I'll ask something. Is this all that is in this diagram?

Y: Say it a little louder.

B: Is this all that is when we want to grasp the meaning of consciousness? Is this diagram in which we have just the sameness of the ontological attributes and the direct knowledge of these attributes...

Y: That's all that is?

B: Is this all that is? Because you mentioned yourself that there are some arguments by the scientists who are stressing this first person experience as something of importance. When attribute A chooses by his own... When the non-physical Individual A chooses by its own ability to act to know... to be in the state of direct knowledge of itself, then by this act it also chooses to be in the state of direct knowledge of all the attributes of itself.

One of these attributes, one of these states, pardon, is for A to choose to be in state of direct knowledge of A. And so A is in state of direct knowledge of A which in the state of direct knowledge of A, which is in state of direct knowledge of A, which is in state of direct knowledge of A, which is state of direct knowledge of A and so on and so on. So this is the same argument of this first person experience.

And I know that this could be cut off. And you have done it geniusly. This is why I am here, actually, because the only way to solve this is as they do in Zen. When the master hits you or, makes you understand, makes you... or throws you away into the state of direct ... into the state of, which is not just direct knowledge but consciousness or whatever we shall come to.

Y: If consciousness were a thought then that would be true.

B: Yes.

Y: But consciousness... this... We're not talking about thoughts. We are talking about non-physical states of knowledge.

B: I mean all these circles.

Y: This is not data about oneself. This is direct knowledge. That's why I went to the trouble to say that it is not vidya. It's not data or a result of perception.

B: Yes, I know, but when you say consciousness, this consciousness, when you say consciousness and when you draw this picture, then this picture should be this. And this should be the same as... OK. The same as is here stressed by the lines...

Y: This is the same line. The knowledge is the same. You have knowledge of the attribute of yourself.

B: So consciousness is just the sameness. Consciousness is just the sameness. So when I am conscious, I cut off all this thought processes. While I am doing this thought processes, I know these thought process are a great limitations and this is what I am here for.

Y: Well, if you have a lot of thought processes. ..

B: Is this not conscious? Am I not conscious when I am doing this all these circles? Am I not conscious then? Am I conscious just when I jump into sameness? Am I not conscious while I am asking for instance in myself what is the maiden name of your mother, which I don't know? I try to know the maiden name of your mother and I am not able to because there is no sameness. But while this is in process, am I not conscious? Is the consciousness just the sameness? Am I conscious only when I say aha! your maiden name is Hawkins? or...

Y: Are you talking about who people are on earth today? You and I are sitting here talking to each other. Are you talking about that kind of a person? Or are we talking about an isolated individual? We're talking about Individual A only and nobody else. And Individual A puts himself in a state of knowledge of himself. He doesn't have any other thoughts because he doesn't have any connection to anybody else. He is not connected to the net. It is just him. This is the state of abstracted enlightenment.

We've simplified this to the simplest thing that there could be. In order to answer your question about thoughts going on and trying to discover yourself, all that is through this very complex network of 138 billion trillion individuals that your are connected to and the subsections of that which represent your thoughts. And you are connected with all those. And all those and you are conscious of all that stuff. But I am showing you in the simplest possible form what consciousness is, so you don't try to figure it out in the other one. You will never succeed.

B: OK..

Y: Now, that's one answer. I could give others if you need them.

B: Yes, I am sure of it. I am just trying to know.

Y: Will you turn that heater on right there?

Bret: No, because the computer is plugged into the power supply of the heater instead. What can I do?

Y: Well, that's not acceptable.

Bret: OK..

Y: We are going to have to (change). You can plug it in over. Here there is a multi.

Bret: How much?

Y: Turn both of them on. You can plug in; there is a multi outlet over here.

Bret: OK.

Y: So, do we go on or do you...?

B: OK.

Y: Ok? Now we are talking about the self. Now, keeping the diagram there and going into the text:

If a non-physical individual is called Individual A

I read some of that didn't I? Is that all four? Yes, I read that. This is shown on the following table.

We have the list of Individual A's attributes in column one. In column two Individual A's state of direct knowledge of the attributes of Individual A. In column three attribute in two, is the same as in one. Yes, yes, yes and yes. And so the result is given in column four. Individual A is conscious of Individual A as additive down the column because the two columns are the same under existence and he is conscious of existence. In unity, he would be conscious of unity and in acts he is conscious of acts and who A is the same as who A is so he is conscious of who he is.

But because there is a unity in the individual (there is only one individual), he is conscious of these attributes of himself. So they, all four consciousnesses (you notice you have never heard that word consciousnesses) all four of them, are united into a single state. This is the collapse of the wave function, in its simplest form.

So they are all in one state embedded in the individual itself in the conscious state. So instead of just one attribute separately in each of the four states of consciousness, in the unity or unitarian state of consciousness you get A conscious of a unity existence who acts. And that is what he is. And that one would be fully self-enlightened.

So that sameness between column one and column two is what consciousness is. The sameness or the likeness, that is a state. They are like each other. That's a state and both of them are an aspect of Individual A. And because they are both an aspect of Individual A and they are like each other, they are a state of Individual A. That likeness is a state, and that likeness is what consciousness is.

One might ask, "Why is this consciousness?"

When I was talking to David Chalmers about it, he said those very words. "Well, why is this consciousness?"

Applying Thomas Nagel's famous phrase, "that a being is conscious if there is *something it is like* to be that being;" And applying the statement that Chalmers gave in 1996 in his book, similarly, he says, "A mental state is conscious if there is something it is like to be in that mental state." To the above example of self-consciousness we have the following:

- The mental state is Individual A's state of direct knowledge of itself.

There's a part in the dotted circle.

- Individual A itself is something that it is like to be in that mental state since Individual A is something like Individual A in the state of direct knowledge of Individual A in which Individual A is.

B: This is what I tried actually to.

Y: Well, you can go on a thousand times if you want to. And you can have infinity in the non-physical realm.

B: Yes. Only you have. Yes...

Y: But it is also summed.

B: Only in the non-physical realm, you could have this infinite circuit only in the non-physical not in the physical.

Y: Yes, that's right, only in the non-physical.

B: But my question was, yes, this is a fully enlightened person. And this, of course, it is, but what about a person who is not fully enlightened but is still conscious? I know lately that you give a definition for enlightenment as well which should make a difference between consciousness and a fully enlightened person. Because there are some persons, I don't want to say individual because a non-physical individual is something basic. But persons who are not fully enlightened, but still they are conscious. This could only mean that they are implicitly enlightened. But then enlightenment is a conscious state.

Y: I can point out later on as we develop more complicated versions of consciousness how that takes place. How can somebody like George Bush walk around? He is obviously conscious, but is he conscious of being conscious?

B: Yes. I know.

Y: This is conscious of being conscious.

B: Yes. I know you have answers to this. I know. What I am trying to say...

Y: You want to answer the scientist is that it?

B: No, no. Yes, yes. Partly, yes. This is to answer the scientist because the scientist will ask this question. And secondly, when we come to this more complex definition of consciousness, this more complex definition of consciousness will be based on the essential definition of consciousness. So this essential definition of consciousness should be able to answer this question.

Y: OK. Can you write it so that it is like that?

B: What do you mean?

Y: The definition of consciousness as I have given it to you. Can you modify my definition or explain it in such a way. Not at the moment, but would you be willing to take a crack at it? I am willing to take a crack at it too. And see what we can come up with.

B: OK..

Don: It is not an easy task to bridge.

B: Not at all. It takes century. Centuries and centuries of contemplating, contemplating.

Don: Well, because the scientists don't know who they are and without that fact, it is very hard to understand this.

B: Yes, yes. Exactly.

Don: If you could get them to one of your enlightenment intensives first...

B: Yes, they should take one, but they also are entitled to the answer you know.

Bret: That's a cop out. That's just saying, well, we can't do it unless you know this. That's a cop out. That's just saying, well, I can't explain this to you until you know this on your own. Whereas what we are trying to do is come up with a way to get it across to people anyway.

B: Yes, yes.

Bret: I have a thought listening to what you are saying. You say a person is conscious. When you were speaking to Yogeshwar, several times you said, a person is conscious. Conscious of what? Consciousness is always consciousness of something. Are you talking about an individual being conscious of himself or of something in particular? And I think that modifies the thinking about it and helps with the statement. To keep that clear, what are you talking about being conscious of at the time? And don't mix up. And think one thought about one thing and another about another.

B: Maybe awareness is what.

Bret: No, consciousness is the right word. Just notice it is always conscious of something.

B: Yes, consciousness is what is described in his definition. And maybe my question is regarding awareness. And maybe the answer to my question should be... What you are talking about is awareness and not consciousness. But then we might have... We should have definition of consciousness is this and awareness is this.

Y: That should be clear.

B: And then the answer is given.

Y: Yes.

B: But we should do this.

Y: Yes.

B: We have to do this, I am sure you have done it. But...

Y: I have done it for myself, but I haven't written it properly.

B: Yes. Maybe it should be added. When somebody asks you something like this, you answer to him. What I am talking about is consciousness and what you are talking about awareness. And awareness is this and this and this. According to Lila Paradigm...

Y: Yes.

B: Yes. Something like that. We will do that. Then we have the third step.

- Therefore Individual A is in a state of consciousness of itself.

I have found that a lot of people, lots of my own students, have trouble with that. So I reworded this. I reworded it in terms of:

- A mental state is a conscious state if to be in that state is like something.
- Individual A's state of direct knowledge of itself is a conscious state if to be in that state of direct knowledge of itself is like Individual A itself.
- Because Individual A's state of direct knowledge of itself is *like* Individual A itself. Individual A's state of direct knowledge of itself is a state of consciousness of Individual A.

I like that one better actually. But what I have left out here is what is Individual A conscious of? Is it conscious of itself or is it conscious of a state of knowledge of itself? The second. It is conscious of the attributes unified in the state knowledge of itself. It is not conscious of itself of the actual you. You are in a state of consciousness of the state of knowledge of itself which is accurate. It is correct but it is still not you. Consciousness cannot be wholly trusted.

B: In the manual for masters of enlightenment, you give the definition of enlightenment.

Y: In the manual?

B: Yes, to consciousness. Maybe this... It should be added here or maybe we should read it. You know to... It was very beautiful and maybe a kind of it answers this question.

Y: Sati who was here reading at satsang, she did the editing of that manual.

B: Because there is a definition of consciousness and then a definition of enlightenment where the definition of consciousness is included. But there is no sign of equivalence. They differ from each other. And it should be done here.

Y: Well, I am.

B: Maybe we should reread it. Unfortunately, I didn't bring it with me. But I have it in my computer. Maybe you have it.

Y: That manual?

B: The latest.

Y: I have it printed out right there.

B: The manual. Because they are...

Y: It's on the bottom far left, that's it.

B: Because it answers the question in a way because not every conscious person is enlightened.

Y: Chapter three. I think it is in Chapter three.

B: Enlightenment in the beginning, what is direct knowledge, the experience of direct knowledge, one of just knowing. What is consciousness and what is enlightenment? And it was a difference. It was a very subtle difference, but it was a difference. Consciousness is the result of the comparison that takes place in the state direct knowledge. It doesn't exist on its own.

Y: She actually did it.

B: And enlightenment can only be consciousness of direct knowledge of oneself.

Y: She actually did it.

B: Conscious direct knowledge. Actually you differ. Conscious direct knowledge happens when oneself is directly known by oneself because the knower is the same one as the known. The sameness produces an accurate reflection of the self, to the self in the same way that a mirror gives a true reflection of the face upon looking into it.

But how do you go through this constant looking in the mirror of the person who is looking in the mirror, of the person who is looking in the mirror, of the person who is looking in the mirror? The sameness is consciousness. And enlightenment should be something. It should have some additional scientific attributes, something to be more accurate.

I believe when I was reading first, that I was able to differentiate between these two based on your definitions. That I found a definition what consciousness is. It is the sameness of the attribute in the direct knowledge of attribute. Enlightenment is consciousness of the sameness of something like this. It was like self-reference included, but it was an addition, a very subtle addition, of something that makes us differentiate between enlightenment and consciousness because you explain this non-physical Individual A being in the state of self consciousness, being in the state of direct knowledge of the attribute of itself.

If you mentioned yourself, you stress that he's a fully enlightened non-physical individual and that's OK. But what makes it not just conscious, but also fully enlightened? What is this subtle something added to the consciousness?

Y: What I'm ..

B: Makes it not just self-conscious but also fully enlightened.

Y: I have got your question. The answer partly is that consciousness itself is not the truth. You're conscious of the state of knowledge of yourself and that's not you. So you have to go one more step which is to be in you. And that is an undivided state. It does not depend on the state of knowledge, let alone consciousness and that is unspeakable.

B: Ah, that is unspeakable. But you speak here. So this is... I know this is why I mentioned Zen. This is why I mentioned at this point the master kicks you and the master strikes you with a stick. This is it. I know, but somehow it should be mirrored in this definition. I know it is unspeakable. It is about all our ideas concepts we are in process, which should be broken. This I am aware of. But it should be visible here in your definition because your definitions are...

Y: I thought it was implied in this manual. I haven't even discussed enlightenment in this one.

B: OK.

Y: I thought it was implied that one in a discontinuity would grasp it.

B: Yes.

Y: Because it is unspeakable. Even in Zazen you go in for an interview with the master and somebody goes (u bop). He says either you got it or you haven't because the one who knows, could do anything, because nothing can say it. It never will.

But I thought it got close to it there. But as I said, I didn't write that. What I did was to explain it to Sati and she wrote it. And I checked it. And I accepted her way of putting it. Because I thought she writes pretty well. But could it be... I think we could fix this up. But I don't think we can do anything about that unless Sati and/or I progress further. So we can end this for now.

I see what you are asking for. And even this does not say what consciousness is, let alone enlightenment. But it brings a reader up to the point where he might have a brief experience and say, "Oh, it's a state of myself!" This is consciousness; and what a particular state it is, is the state of likeness with some aspect of me.

Strictly speaking, as I say in the last paragraph.

Consciousness is only the above state of a non-physical individual and is not a thing in itself.

There is no such thing as consciousness. There is this state of affairs. That is:

Consciousness is not an independently existing non-physical thing that was created by the above described situation; it is only that situation which Individual A is in.

(Comprende? Verstehst du?)

B: Yes. The 'state of affairs' which is a good expression.

Y: I think that comes close to pointing out something that there really isn't any consciousness. There is just this state of affairs, of yourself in this... The next page after that....

Don: Bottom.

Y: Yes. If, on the one hand, an individual consciously experiences itself as it is, that person experiences itself as 'a unitary existence *who* acts,' in so doing this person does not 'see' anything, anywhere, not any when, and not even a 'clear light.'

As the Tibetan Buddhist, I bet that you have never read a book that I wrote called, *A Guide to the After-Death Experience*.

B: I read it.

Y: You did. How did you get that? I wrote that in 1958.

B: It was even translated into several Servo/Croatian.

Y: What! Amazing!

B: As I remember, maybe I read it in the original. But, yes, it was translated.

Y: This is what consciousness of the non-physical is like. On the other hand, most people who set out to be conscious of themselves usually experience themselves as a physical something rather than as one really is, a non-physical individual. (See the section on how a common universe occurs).

So I didn't talk about enlightenment there. I was just talking about what happens when they set out.

As will be seen in the balance of this paper, this definition of consciousness not only has intuitive appeal and has great explanatory power with regard to what fundamental physical particles are, what their location in time and space are, what time, space, energy continuums are, what the four fundamental forces are, what mass is, and why quantum theory is the way it is. Using this definition of consciousness, direct calculations of the magnitudes of these physical items can be made.

Now :

Consciousness of a physical thing

This is the thing that I am satisfied with. That it's offering something new that has not been understood for the last five hundred years.

Consciousness *of* physical things is ubiquitous. Consciousness and physicality are inextricable paired. The only exception is consciousness of oneself. (As seen in Consciousness of Self).

Which we just went over.

Any 'perception' is in the Lila Paradigm considered to be *of* a physical thing. This includes all organ sensory perception and all mental perceptions such, as mental images, etc. in dreams, memories, and thoughts.

So anything that shows up even on a subtle first person level is considered to be a result of perception and is therefore a physical thing. Although it a subtle, refined physical thing.

The same definition of consciousness is given in the consciousness of self section applies to consciousness of physical things.

Consciousness is a state a non-physical individual is in, wherein: an attribute in the state of direct knowledge a non-physical individual is in, is like (or the same as) an attribute of a non-physical individual who is in that state of direct knowledge.

The word 'same' as used in the definition does not mean 'one and the same.' It means, for example, even though twins are the same or are (alike), in the same way that they look, their looks are associated with *different* people. So, though two non-physical individuals are the same as each other (they're alike) in that they each include, for example, the attribute 'existence,' their 'existence' attributes are based on different things:

- (1) The attribute of 'existence' of the real non-physical individual and
- (2) The attribute of 'existence' in *a state of direct knowledge* (based on a real non-physical individual), that the real non-physical individual (1) is in.

Here is the simplest example of consciousness of a physical thing:

You could call this a proto-physical thing: A proto-fermion.

A non-physical individual, call it Individual A, is placing itself in a state of direct knowledge of another non-physical individual, call it Individual B. This state of direct knowledge of that Individual A is in of Individual B includes the four attributes of Individual B:

‘Existence’
‘Unity,’
‘Acts’ and
‘Who Individual B is’

And for the sake of completeness, this includes Individual B’s state of no direct knowledge of Individual A including no direct knowledge of Individual A’s four attributes: Individual B’s state of no direct knowledge of Individual B itself; and Individual A’s state of no direct knowledge of Individual A itself. Using the above definition of consciousness, the following table is formed.

Before we go to the table though, let’s look at the diagram: the one labeled matter. So we have here Individual A itself as the whole circle. Then we have the list of the four ontological attributes that A is. Then we have the list in A’s state of direct knowledge based on the four ontological attributes that B is. Then we have the lines of (there’s an error here. No, it’s not; it’s correct) A’s state of consciousness. The content of A’s state of consciousness is a physical matter particle: A proto-fermion.

Now look at the table; it explains the details of that. The difference between this table and the previous one is in the fourth row: who Individual A is, in column one (1) and in column two (2) is Individual A’s state of direct knowledge of the attributes of Individual B. So who Individual B is, is that attribute in that column. In column three (3) is the attribute in two (2) like (or the same as) in column one (1)?

No. So we get a different result in column four (4). In Individual A’s consciousness of Individual B as ‘exists’, ‘a unitary existence’, and ‘a unitary existence that acts.’ And then since there is none in the fourth row (4), there is no state of consciousness, we get in the unitary state of A’s conscious state, consciousness of a unitary existence that acts, not one who acts.

And I claim *that* is what a physical thing is. It is a ‘unitary existence that acts.’ All quarks, all electrons and the other leptons are unitary things. They have no extension in space. You can say they are point like, but they are a thing. But it is a thing that acts, in the sense of interacting. It looks like... Oh, look what that electron is doing, it is going over and bumping into another electron. Or trying to, getting near to and they repel each other. That’s an act that they look like they are chasing. They are separating from each other.

B: In the third rows, should they also acts or who?

Y: It should be acts.

B: In the fourth, yes, it is that because four couldn’t be the same.

Y: The fourth one should be, they are the same. They act because there is no who.

B: Because it is physical.

Y: There is no ‘who’ in the consciousness because there is no sameness between ‘who’ Individual A is and ‘who’ Individual B is in A’s state of direct knowledge of the attributes of Individual B.

B: May I say something else? OK. These I accept, but acts, you say here acts, but when the Individual A chooses to be in state of direct knowledge of Individual B, it accepts its choices. So what is the same? Is it the ability to act? The ability to act, yes. We have the sameness of the attribute of ability to act and the direct knowledge of the attribute of the ability to act.

Y: They’re alike.

B: Yes, this is yes. But it is something which is known. And these known are the choices themselves. When you say acts this includes implicitly the choices you make when you are acting. The Individual B which I have...I am being Individual A, for instance, and I decide, I do a conscious choice to be in

direct knowledge of Individual B. And thus I accept all its choices, all its acts, because all its acts include the acts themselves, the choices of B. I accept the choices of B.

Y: Yes.

B: And this is...

Y: But the choices are different.

B: The choices are different.

Y: So, therefore, you have no consciousness of them.

B: According to me because the choices are different, there is no... If it is acts here, but if here it is written ability to act, then this is yes. And then we have sameness. The sameness is referring to the ability to act and not to the acts themselves.

Y: We agree. The ability to act is what is the same.

B: And not the acts themselves.

Y: That's right. So you say that's not clear there. It should be made clear.

B: It should be clarified in sense that here it is better to be the ability to act, and this ability to act, and then...

Y: Good, I buy it.

B: OK.

Y: That clarifies it. I am so close to it, that I couldn't see that.

B: Actually...

Y: I know it, but I couldn't... When I read acts, that's the way I read it. Just to close. You have got a sharp capacity to differentiate or as we say in Sanskrit, a *buddhi*.

B: This is due to your definition and to the strictness of your definitions.

Y: We can say some more things back and forth. How wonderful we are! OK. Then we'll go on.

Since the attribute of 'existence' of Individual A's state of direct knowledge of Individual B (in column 2) is like (same as) Individual A's attribute of 'existence' (in column one 1) as shown in column 3, row 1, according to the definition of consciousness, Individual A is in a state of consciousness of Individual B's attribute of 'existence,' as shown in column 4, row 1.

Well for Bret's sake, I won't read. I won't reread all this. He just can't bare it just saying the same thing and we are not trying to proof read it this time.

In a similar way....

Go down half way through the paragraph.

[The attribute of 'unity'-----In a similar way,]

The attributes of 'acts' in Individual A's state of direct knowledge of Individual B is like (the same as) Individual A's attributes of 'acts.'

(Or I should say ability to acts)

And therefore Individual A is in a state of consciousness of Individual B's attribute of 'act' which is subsumed into a single state of consciousness so that Individual A is conscious of 'a unitary existence that 'acts' as in column 4 row 3.

The word subsumed is used there. Made because of the unitaryness the different states of consciousness here are subsumed into a single state. That is a term that David Chalmers uses also.

However, the attribute of who Individual B is in Individual

A's state of direct knowledge of Individual B (in column 2, row 4) is *not* like (the same as) (column 3, row 4) Individual A's attribute of who Individual A is: therefore, according to the definition of consciousness, Individual A is *not* in a state of consciousness of Individual B's attribute of 'who' Individual B is. As a result of Individual A's subsumed state, Individual A is *not* conscious of 'a unitary existence, *who* acts,' which Individual B really is, but instead is consciousness only of 'a unitary existence *that* acts.'

So, consciousness is useful because it gives us part of the truth, but only part of it. It leaves out the 'who.' I had this realization one day, myself. I was driving home and there were all these beautiful trees lining the road on both sides. And I just felt a companionship with them, that at least trees were not my enemies. They were my friends.

Suddenly their liveliness came to me; and I realized they are a 'who' like I am. This was part of the history that led me gradually to the Lila Paradigm. So, I accepted them and was in a state of knowledge of what they really were, not the tree as a whole, but each one. The whole tree was just like ornaments of Christmas, ornaments of vibrant 'who'nesses.

There is a little song I wrote one time. It is called, *All Is God*. And somebody sent me a book that he had published on yoga and inserted my poem. He sent it to me because he used my poem. I said, "*All Is God*. This is God; that is God; this is God; that is God. But he had changed it to, *All Is Spirit*. I haven't had the courage to write him back and tell him that he missed the point. He is the head of the largest yoga ashram in the world.

Let's look at this last paragraph:

Consciousness of 'a unitary existence *that* acts' does not appear to have a 'who' attribute that originates acts. The unitary existence *that* acts appears to only react; that is, it appears to be a physical thing! In this simplest example described above is a fundamental 'proto-physical-particle' since it has no location in space or time, no mass, charge or spin.

It doesn't have any other quantum numbers either.

Yet it appears as unitary existence that acts, acts that 'just happen' as in quantum interactions and fluctuations.

I asked David Finkelstein, "What causes the quantum fluctuations?"

He said, "Well, they just happen."

I said, "What kind of a physicist are you to say things just happen? Everything has a cause and effect relationship."

He said. "Ah, I don't know what to think of it. I am sixty five years old now and I am going to do to lunch. Let's go to lunch."

B: This is very much in the manor of the Zen master. I go... Just eat. Eat you soup. There are Zen stories like this.

Y: Yah.

B: What is the meaning of existence? What is the meaning? And the master says, "Have you eaten your soup and washed the dish?" So he is very... Actually, he gave you a good answer.

Y: Yes, he did. That's how it appears; they just happen.

B: Feynman, the very famous quantum physicist....

Y: Feynman.

B: Feynman. He also explained at one point. This is so and why this is. So don't ask me.

Y: It's so.

B: This is so and so. This is so. This is as I told you.

Y: Yes.

B: My English is maybe not perfect. This is as I told you.
This is...

Y: So.

B: This is as I told you. "This is so. And why it is so, don't ask me," he exclaimed. Just like...

Y: "Don't ask me," he says, "Nobody understand quantum theory."

B: Yes, it is just like theologian would say, "God creates or God says so. It is how God creates the world. Why? Don't ask me."

Y: But at least we can experience causation for ourselves. That you can move your own hand, through a whole series of via's, but you can set it off. You can act.

B: Yes.

Y: You have some free will, not much. And those articles are about this argument, about free will.

B: Ok, free will...

Y: Read the one from the science magazines first. The *New Scientist* it that this one?

Don: Yes, no, it's there.

Y: I would like to have you read some of... at least ... this is...

Don: This is... I just ran out of... this is our paper. It's scrape because I ran out of paper. I am getting some tonight. Sorry about that. I should have crossed it out, I was in a hurry.

Y: Anyway, there's a magazine article that gives a nice summary. I would like to have you read it before tomorrow.

Don: It's on the front of the one I gave you. Right there.

Y: This one. That's this week.

B: We must be losing free will. We have no choice.

Y: The *New Scientist* article.

Don: That is.

Y: It's the same one?

Don: Yes.

Y: Oh, it's this week in *New Scientist*.

Don: Yah.

B: The uncertainty of quantum physics means we must give up the cherished notion that we have free will.

Y: It's a very interesting box, that scientist have got themselves in. So cornered that one says you are wrong; the other says no, you're wrong.

Don: And they can prove it.

B: Always

Y: Well, if you can put up with a little bit more, we have a few minutes left. I am going to read this second rewording.

- A mental state is a conscious state to be in that state is like something.
- Individual A's state of direct knowledge of Individual B that includes the three attributes of existence, unity, and acts, is a conscious state if to B *any attribute* in a state of direct knowledge of Individual B is like *any attribute* of Individual A. The attributes of a non-physical individual include existence, unity, and acts.
- Because Individuals A's state of direct knowledge that includes those three attributes of Individual B are *like* or the same as those three attributes of Individual A, Individual A's state of direct knowledge of Individual B is a state of consciousness of those three attributes for Individual A.

And then I repeat the statement that it is just that situation and that's all it is. There is no such thing as consciousness. It is just a convenient term to describe that whole situation in one word. Now we won't go into the next section which is time, until tomorrow.

So anything you would like to bring up. Show us your Gödel program or something.

B: Now or tomorrow.

Y: Well, you could do it now. We have twenty minutes left.

B: I might show you or just tell you. I have a presentation in power point on my computer.

Y: In PowerPoint? Yes, you can show that.

B: Yes, yes. This is beautiful and I think the boys would like to see it.

