

2010-09-28 BVPS BG Intro Sastra are basis, Consciousness key factor

You know, does that make sense? You know, the guy knows something about the Far East or he's an Egyptologist or, you know, some other kind of interesting thing, but this is, it's just a body of knowledge. It's not dynamic, right? So when that knowledge is dynamic, you actually want to be involved. That's vajuna.

Just the field itself, what's there, what's all the different things, all the different elements, who's who, what's what, what's the relationship, what's right, what's wrong. That's sankarsana. Vajuna means that interest to be involved.

So that would be the spirit. So that's where the relationship starts, right? The purpose of the Gita, that will be your prayojana within the sambandha. You know, it means, what does it do? Well, you know, what can you do? It means interacting with the elements.

Then what result will that get you? Right? The subject matter of the Gita, that will be sankarsana. Right? So the purpose will be the prayojana or amiruddha. Subject matter of the Gita, that will be sankarsana.

And the process of understanding the Gita, that will be vastasena. Right? So now with that knowledge, then you can then be able to understand the full result. Result of understanding the Gita of the knowledge presented is going back to Godhead.

Right? Means the purpose is to bring you to the transcendental platform. And the result of that will be to go back to Godhead. You understand? Because you can say, well, no, but that's what you want to get.

But that's the result. But how do you, how will what you are studying give you that result? That's the purpose. You understand? Does that make sense? Like that.

And then how to practically apply this knowledge to attain the desired results. Right? Because then you have to be able to practically use it. If you can't practically use it, what's the use? Right? So that's why Gita is very, very practical.

Much of the time we don't necessarily see the full practicalness of the Gita. Right? To many, it's a philosophical work, which of course it is. But it's a simply, it's just philosophy.

And then we have our life. But if you, they're discussing the, I think so, they're discussing, they're discussing asking them to go to the next floor. That's on the third floor.

They're on the third floor? I saw them just sitting here. Oh, that's another, oh, wait, wait, wait. That's another class.

So this is the Ganesha's class. They're doing Sanskrit. Ganesha is saying a lot.

Might find something to eat also. Because the thing is, is the style of chanting, then it's very penetrating. Because that's what it's for.

It's to cut through and go, you know, be heard long distance and all that. So it works really good. And also, here, this area, it's not, it's all pukka.

So everything echoes. If this was a grass hut, they could be sitting over on that side during the class. It wouldn't bother us.

Because some kind of grass, grass is, it's what you would, you know, call acoustically dead. Which is like for someone who's doing recording is like, you know, heaven. You know, there's no echoes or anything.

So it doesn't bother you. But here, it's not actually the sound. It's the echoes that comes off of it.

Because the high pitch will come and it'll bounce off that wall and then come down here. It's amazing. You can be up there.

You can hear what's going on here. And if you're here, you can hear what's going on there. Because this wall goes out and goes straight up.

Okay, so now to practically apply this, that would mean that we look at it. Now, the three modes of nature, are they involved in our life? During the day? Yes. Okay.

There's a chapter in Gita on the three modes of life, nature. Right? Are we dealing with choosing between doing something right and wrong? Is that there in our day? So that's the divine and demonic equality. You understand? You know.

Are we ever doing anything, is there a question of doing it for our own benefit or doing it for someone else's benefit? Right? So that's explaining all the sacrifice and all the different things that are there. Right? Is there the element that, I'm doing this, I'm ready to get a result, it's going to be connected to Krishna, but do I consider it my result or do I consider it's Krishna's work and his result? Am I working for Krishna or am I working for myself and offering it to Krishna? Does that come up? Right? So that's the determination between sannyasa and renunciation. This is 18th chapter.

So these aspects, these elements, we don't necessarily see that the whole Gita, especially, but there's practical, technical things that deal with everybody's life no matter who you are. It doesn't matter. You're in the temple or you're not in the temple.

All these things are there. The technical way in which the material energy functions, it goes wherever you are. Right? It doesn't stop when you, you know, leave the temple.

Right? Does that make sense? The material energy carries on. Right? In fact, it's more obvious. That's why when you're in the temple, then you can look at more the chapters on devotional

and all these kind of elements.

Like this. When one leaves the temple, then the elements of karma and beyond start to come in because you're dealing more with the modes of nature. Does it make sense? So, we have to understand this, that this, that what is given in the Gita practically applies in our life.

You know, so when we say the ABCs of spiritual life, we're talking spiritual and not ABCs of some nursery thing. You know, we're talking about understanding Brahman, Paramahamsa, Bhagavan realizations, how they work, how you can become a Paramahamsa. You know, in this lifetime, in whatever situation you're in.

Does that make sense? Right? So, this is, that means in the Bhagavatam, we're talking about Maharaja Malayadvaj and the Queen Vidarbhi. In the purport, then, he's discussing about the spiritual master-disciple, husband and wife, and about Paramahamsas. And what he's pointing out is it doesn't matter what position you're in, you can come to that Paramahamsa platform by understanding the philosophy.

Does it make sense? Because the point is, we have an idea, Krishna's here, he's not here. Right? But the point is, is Krishna's in everything. Everything is Krishna.

So, that means you can find Krishna anywhere. That means you can become a Hamsa in any situation. This is important.

So, we have to be able to see that. Then, naturally, since you're doing it for Krishna, then you will choose what is better and what is not. But the element of is it connectable to Krishna, there's no question of that.

Everything already is. It's a matter of do we see it or not. So, when we say connected to Krishna, it's not that we're connecting it.

Right? This is also an illusion, the sense of control. I am making it Krishna conscious. I am doing... No, it's not a matter of that.

It already is Krishna conscious. Is Lakshmi Devi Krishna conscious? What would you think? Right? Yeah. So, everything that there is, such as all Krishna, Krishna doesn't deal with his illusory energy.

So, that would mean that Krishna is... It means Lakshmi is the energy doing everything. Krishna deals with Yogamaya. We're the ones who deal with Mahamaya.

You understand? Because we see Lakshmi is I'm controlling this, this is mine. Right? So, that's the illusion. So, there's no situation where it's not.

So, this is the point. How to practically apply this knowledge to attain the desired result? Gita is giving this. So, this is not a light study.

It's not like, okay, yeah, Gita, you know, like this and that, and then we'll get on to something.
No. Gita is serious.

It's the essence of the Upanishads. Upanishads are serious. So, that's the thing.

Yes. Can you explain a little more how Krishna doesn't make the difference between energies and we make the difference? No. That point I was making there, what you're asking is that's what we discussed yesterday is Krishna when he is interacting with his energy he only interacts with his internal potency.

But because we think the internal potency is there for us to enjoy she manifests to us as external potency. Does that make sense? That's the point. That's where illusion comes in.

Does that make sense? So, that's what's happening. That other point we're saying is Krishna doesn't make distinction between the sandhini, sambhitta, and vladhini potencies. Because they're all part of one person.

It's just like you don't make a distinction. You know, your hand's not part of you. It has a function, but it's still just, here's your hand, here's your elbow, here's your head.

So, yes, sandhini does certain elements of sambhitta and vladhini, but they're just different aspects of one bigger thing. Because ultimately there is the svarupa shakti. Right? The svarupa shakti means the complete energy.

So, there's no need to make distinction. These are there so we can understand the mechanics of how it's functioning. Then we say this is this, this is that because we're trying to make the distinction so that we understand what's material and what's spiritual and how material can be connected to Krishna.

You understand? That's why it says that once one gets to the hamsa level it's not the philosophy that's driving anymore. It's the relationship of Krishna that's the drive. The residents of Vrindavan, they can explain how Krishna's God, but that doesn't, that's no big deal to them.

You know what I'm saying? Just like the mother, the son may be a very prominent personality in the society, but does that really matter to their relationship? The son is the prime minister of the country. Does the mother actually care? Does that mean that now he's the prime minister? She's not going to tell him to dress properly and don't work too hard and make sure he eats regularly? Is it going to stop her from doing that? No. So that's the point.

But if you ask her, oh, what does your son do? Oh, he's the prime minister, this and that. So she can explain it, but that's not important. So in Vraj, Krishna's God is not important.

Because we see when those from Vraj come here, they can explain how Krishna's God is the prime minister. But that's not the reason that they worship Him. In Vaikuntha, they worship Him because He's God.

In Vrindavan, they worship Him because they like Him. They like Him as a person. He's God or not, that doesn't matter.

Does that make sense? So then practical application. So this is very important. It has to come to this point.

That's why it's made as the last point because generally the last point is what's the most important in this case. When you're giving a run of things like this and generally the last. So we see here how Prabhupada is presented and in the Bhagavatam, the Chakrasloki, it's presented in the same order.

So that point ends on the Abhidheya because that's what you're going to do. When you're convinced, you know what the environment is, you're convinced about your result, who you are, then you're going to perform the activity because the activity is ongoing. The activity, you'll apply the knowledge.

Then the subject of Gita. Material world B. Material world is eternal and real and C. The manifestation of the material world is also real but is temporary. So material energy is a real energy.

It's there and it's eternal. Then it manifests and unmanifests. That's the essence.

So it has its temporariness. But what is manifest is actually real. It's there.

It's not that it's illusion. No, what's illusion is we think it's separate from God. That's what is illusion.

But it itself is real. We understand these two points? Material energy always exists and it's real always exists and occasionally it manifests and occasionally it manifests all varieties and occasionally it's not manifesting varieties. So when it manifests varieties it's still real.

The floor you're sitting on now actually is there. Not that it's not there. That's what the Mayavadis will say.

That's what the Buddhists will say. D. There are intrinsic differences between the Supreme Lord, the living entities and material nature. The Lord is supremely conscious.

Conscious of all bodies. The living entity is conscious only of his particular body. That's why training is necessary.

God doesn't have to be trained. He's already conscious of everything. He is everything.

He's conscious of everything. But the jiva is only conscious of his own body. So he has to be trained that other living entities and other bodies are also conscious.

So you have to be aware of that. And there's a bigger picture than that. Not just us and the

other living entities.

There's also God and material energy. It's all persons. So we have to become aware of that.

Even when the Lord descends in the material universe his consciousness is not material affected. If it were, he would be unfit to speak Bhagavad Gita. In other words, why would you hear Bhagavad Gita from someone who's not on the liberated platform? So God's consciousness isn't affected.

Why? Because it's just part of his energy. Because we think according to location. There's here and there's there.

Which is true. There is that locative difference. But there's also the element that it's all Krishna.

Krishna is the whole thing. At the same time he can be a person separate from that whole thing. That's what makes him God.

We can't do that. This is what God does. Therefore, him coming into the material world is just part of the man going to different parts of his house.

It's not that it changes him. He walks into one room and he's changed. He's completely different.

He walks back out of the room and he's not an illusion. No, it doesn't work like that. But the Jiva's consciousness and conditioned life is materially contaminated.

So that's why without scripture we won't actually know what's right and wrong what to do. The mind is going to choose what's right, what's wrong. But we have to base it on scripture.

If we don't then that choice of right and wrong could be illusion. That's important. Because otherwise, many times devotees may be discussing some particular point and coming to a conclusion but on something they feel is right or wrong.

But what is the basis of their feeling of right or wrong? Does it come from scripture? If it does, good. If it doesn't, what's the basis? It's conditioned. So that means it will be wrong.

Only scripture can properly give what is the balanced correct thing in all situations. Because it may be right in this situation, but it's wrong in that situation. Does that make sense? So one has to be able to see this.

Both the living entities and material nature are property, energies of the Lord. But the living entity is conscious, whereas material energy is not. So this is the difference.

It means there's God and his energies. So there's a difference there. And then within his energies, then we see they're more conscious, not conscious.

So God is fully conscious. Then the internal potency is also to that degree of what position they

are in expansion, then they will be conscious of more aspects or not. But what they're conscious of, they're fully conscious.

They see Krishna fully of whatever they're doing. The Jiva is only conscious of themselves. So they have to be trained to be conscious of others.

Material energy is unconscious. So we can see the superior and inferior aspect of the energies of the Lord is based on consciousness. So the internal potency is greatly conscious.

The Jiva is minutely conscious. Material energy is not conscious. So that's what makes it.

It's not something else. So consciousness is actually the value. In other words, how conscious you are is of how much value that one is at it.

The more conscious we are, the more we have spiritual significance. Because the Jiva, being marginal, it either has to be more conscious or less conscious. So the living entity contaminated by material energy is less conscious.

The living entity in touch with the internal potency is more conscious. So that's the point. Material energy is always going to be like it is.

Internal potency is always going to be like it is. The Jiva has the choice. Does it want to be more conscious or less conscious? So that's the whole point.

How much you're conscious and even in consciousness, OK, you have an ant or you have a dog. So which would you say is superior? The dog. Why? It's more conscious.

The ant can't even see what's in front of it, you know, two inches. The dog can see so many things and see people and they can interact and go, you're happy, it becomes happy, you're not, and it becomes a little like this. So they're more conscious.

So the Jiva, then as he's more conscious, so being conscious is not enough. So more conscious or less conscious, that already establishes something superior. But the actual final understanding is if it's conscious of God or not.

And then with consciousness of God, how you're conscious of God, that also establishes superior and inferior. Or not superior or more superior. So that makes the level in Vaikuntha because the consciousness is more.

The consciousness of greater aspects. More aspects. In other words, the personal.

So we see is that ultimately is consciousness of the person, Godhead, that is the supreme consciousness. When you're conscious of how God is a person and interact with him, being conscious for his pleasure, that is the thought mode. So that consciousness is called devotional service.

Or pure devotional service. E. Liberation means freedom from material consciousness. Situation in pure consciousness means acting in accordance with the instructions of Krishna.

What is liberation? We say go out of the material world, but that's not the point. The point is that the consciousness is beyond the material world. Right? Like that.

So the Mayavadi technically is not beyond the material world. They'll say they're liberated. But their consciousness is being not material consciousness.

Does that make sense? But it's about the material world. Like what does an atheist complain about all day? God. You understand? It's not separate.

So the impersonalist is complaining about the material world and getting out of the material world. Oh, it's so nice not being in the material world. So they're not actually free from material consciousness.

So only the devotee, when you know Krishna, right, then you're actually liberated. So we can see here, now so far as what we're coming up with in here, these last points, we can see is consciousness is the important point. It is the element that one has to deal with.

Other things are there, you do this, you do that, that's nice. But the point is, is consciousness. If the consciousness is right, then all these things that one does, that becomes very proper.

But if one's not conscious, it's nice. You understand? You do pious activities, that's nice. You know, you're conscious, that's better.

But if you're God conscious, that's what we're looking for. So consciousness is the point. That's why somebody does something wrong.

What's the problem? Is it actually a problem that material energy has been, you know, manipulated and you ended up with some different result. It's just more material energy. Is that actually the problem? The real problem is the consciousness, why did you end up with something wrong? You know what you're trying to get.

You know the activity to get it. How did you not get it? Right? You're frying some potatoes and that, if you're conscious, you know what you're doing, they'll come out right, but if you get distracted, the phone call, you're talking on the phone and then the potatoes burn or, you know, you're too worried not paying attention, you take them out early. So, what's wrong there? It's still material energy, it's a potato, it's not supposed to be something else.

It's just lack of consciousness. You understand? So the problem is lack of consciousness. We say it's no, this activity.

But why are they doing that activity? The problem is the consciousness. So, what do you actually have to change? The consciousness. Now, if somebody is so externally absorbed, then their consciousness is based around the externals of their body and the environment they're in.

Then by changing the environment or by interacting with their body, then that will make them conscious of, you know, the situation. Does it make sense? But, if the identification of the body is not so strong with the environment, therefore it's a matter of adjusting the consciousness only. Because what your consciousness is, that's then what you do.

Does that make sense? That's why for, in Manu, for many of the punishments they're less for a brahman and more for a sudra. One may say this is unfair, but it's not based on bodily considerations. We are getting upset about it because, oh, this is not fair because on the bodily platform it's not equal.

Vedic culture is not defining the material platform. It's defining consciousness. So, the consciousness of the shudra is more physically involved.

Therefore, unless something physically happens, they don't think anything, they won't take it seriously. But for a brahman, then the consciousness, they can see the change in consciousness so they can bring it back proper. But the shudra is only conscious of the body.

Oh, I did this, and so that was wrong, not this. They're not thinking of the conscious, why you're doing this or that. That's why then they may get a physical punishment, the brahman won't.

Does it make sense? That's why all these modern elements of what's right and wrong are all wrong. Because right and wrong is based on consciousness. The consciousness then determines the activity.

So, if the activity is wrong, the real cure is change the consciousness. Prabhupada's giving that address. He's talking about chanting and all that.

What's his point? You can chant Hare Krsna. You don't have to change your position in life. Whatever you're doing, stay exactly like that, but introduce chanting.

That will change the consciousness. Consciousness changes, everything else will come with it. Does this make sense? So, this is the point.

You change the consciousness. So you're going beyond all material considerations. This is what Gita is offering.

How to go beyond the mundane by elevating the consciousness and then seeing what one's doing and others are doing in relationship to that. Does it make sense? Yes. That's why many Buddhists say that you have to develop awareness.

What? The Buddhists, yeah. Yeah, because the point is in Buddhism they're saying you have to be aware, but the difficulty is they don't really make the distinction because they're being aware of illusion. So why would being aware of illusion improve your situation? You know? Because they're aware of illusion using illusion.

They don't mind meditating with the mind, but the mind is illusion. The meditation is illusion.

They're meditating on the wall.

The wall is an illusion. You know what I'm saying? Their philosophy is an illusion. Everything is illusion.

You know what I'm saying? But because the conditioned nature can easily make the mistake that what the mind likes and doesn't like, then you take that as truth. Therefore, the philosophy finds appreciation. But in actuality, according to their own philosophy, their whole process is bogus.

Completely bogus. Why would you need... Why would you make a... Did Buddha make temples? Did he have a house? Did he have a place to stay where there are ashrams? No. They were always out on the road traveling.

They didn't have any place. You understand? So what you see nowadays, technically, is not even Buddhist. But even... But in any case, you know, it does have that philosophy of the illusion and all that.

So that's the same. It's just that they're absorbed more in the illusion and manipulating the illusion. And supposedly that would get them out.

But the problem is, then, how do you define what they're doing? You know what I'm saying? Did Buddha say, sit around with a wheel and go like this? Were there wheels? You know what I'm saying? That's the problem. They created their own religion. Because you either follow God's religion or you'll make your own.

That's all it is. Basically, you're just trying to understand the Vermont platform. But, because it's not being presented in relationship to God or the Vedic literatures, then there's no... Yeah, there's no reference point.

So, therefore, it will simply be in the mind and it can go anywhere they want. So, that's the difficulty. But it's not that he's not, you know, underlying preaching the correct path of liberation.

But he's having to take people away from the Vedas for them to even just basically become human. So it's a trick. It's a trick.

Same with Mayavada, Shankaracharya. Because everyone was Buddhist, so he preached a philosophy that was Buddhism, but with a reference point of the Vedas. So now people follow the culture and lifestyle, as Prabhupada said.

So it's following the Vedic lifestyle, even if it's on a lower level, like Kali worship, it's better than someone who's not following the Vedic culture because they're in the system. The system of Guru and all these different things. It's just like a Buddhist sees a temple, will they bow down? They come here to this temple, will they bow down? Not necessarily.

OK. Will a Christian bow down? Definitely not. We won't even ask about the Jews.

So, sit down. But will a Hindu bow down? Even if they're Mayavadi, not a hardcore Swami, but one of the regular, they'll bow down. So, it's within the system.

So now all you have to do is replace their goal, replace their deity. Will a Hindu then become a worshipper and is in a better condition? Yes. Because he's in the system.

So all you have to do is change the consciousness. Then the form is already there. While the other, you change the consciousness, where's the form? As we brought up many times, what is Christian food? What is Christian dress? What is a Christian lifestyle? There isn't any.

You know what I'm saying? It's just whatever is the local basically European lifestyle, that's become adjusted with the modern environment. That becomes a lifestyle. So basically just be good.

Good means wear a suit and all that. Then that's what you do. That becomes a Christian clothes.

How do you define good or nice? You understand? That's the problem. There is no system. There's no lifestyle.

That's why devotees have a trouble taking up the Vedic lifestyle. Because they've never had one. You understand? They've never had one.

So therefore it looks like restriction to them. No, all it is is human lifestyle. But they've never lived it.

So it is strange to them. Philosophy, yes, they can relate. But the system, that doesn't make sense.

So that's why, otherwise, why is it something as basically simple as Varanashram can't be established. It's just because we're not used to an actual lifestyle. Does that make sense? That's the situation.

Regulation, yes. You go to school at this time, you go to bed at this time. So they can get up and do that nicely.

So that's why devotees can be very regulated. They can do the work because you do work, you get results. Society means if you work, you get results.

So they can do that. But now they're doing that for Krishna. So what they do connect is perfect.

But it will be lacking because there's a lack of the lifestyle. So that's why it mentions being able to practically apply it in your life. It means throughout the life because devotees will only apply it in these areas of endeavor that gives results and regulation.

What is the definition of a lifestyle? Definition of a lifestyle would be that you have correct and incorrect activities to be performed based on authority of the scriptures that will elevate you to your goal. Because Upanishads means you have God, the living and immaterial energy. Then you have to have a process to elevate yourself to your ultimate goal.

Does that make sense? So otherwise the limit is be good, be nice. But then what's good, what's nice? How do you define that? So there's general terms being considerate of others and all about Pranamaya things. So that works.

People can relate to that. But beyond that, then it becomes difficult. So the Vedas deal with this.

They deal with how to apply all these things. Others, they have the lifestyle, then they learn to apply the more subtle aspects onto it. But if you don't have a lifestyle, you start with those subtler points of whatever you're doing.

And then you'll connect that and then as you become purified, then you'll look for better quality of activities that will be consistent with your philosophy and other things. So naturally they would come into the lifestyle. So if you start with a lifestyle and see the higher points, or start with the higher points, it will generate the lifestyle.

That's why said, the Upanishad, it's perfect and complete, whatever comes from Krishna. So it works, no matter how you approach it, it will work. Because it's from him.

He's perfect, therefore everything's perfect. Just we have to bring it in line with Krishna. Be conscious that it works.

Is it easier to start with the right lifestyle or to start with the subtle points? Is it easier to start with the lifestyle or the subtle points? Depends. You start with the subtle points to get people convinced. Then that will naturally make a difference in the lifestyle.

But most present the form of Krishna consciousness, which technically is their devotional lifestyle, but it's not necessarily their lifestyle out of devotional activities. You know what I'm saying? In other words, devotees are in the temple, they chant, you don't bring it back to the deity, they generally do all the things that are mentioned in the scriptures properly. But when they leave the temple and go home, what are the standards? How do they keep things? How do you do things? What is the standard? Because they're not chanting their japa or hearing Srimad Bhagavatam, worshipping Tulasi.

So the direct activities the devotees do, but the indirect activities, that's where it lacks. That's what Nrgidha can show you. Does that make sense? The Jiva's consciousness under the covering of material circumstances is pervertedly reflected, because the different kinds of consciousness are there, but in the spiritual world it's consciousness of Krishna.

But it's pervertedly reflected because here we're conscious just of ourselves. So even though everything may look the same as in the spiritual world on one level, but the difference is the

pervertedness of consciousness. The mother, mother Yasoda is conscious of Krishna.

She has that consciousness manifest a parental relationship with Krishna, her particular kind of consciousness. But that comes into the material world and still parents relate to children in a parental rasa. But now is it about Krishna? One, the child is not Krishna.

I don't know. But then the idea of, okay, that's what we're saying about direct. Directed is Krishna.

But indirect means it's not. But the point is this, mother Yasoda is conscious of Krishna. She's applying that in parental rasa.

Do you understand here? This is your tattva. Mother Yasoda is applying her consciousness of Krishna into the parental rasa. Right? So that means the parent in the material world can do exactly the same thing.

They can be conscious of Krishna and they can apply that consciousness of Krishna into their dealings with their child. But, difference, mother Yasoda, because she's the supreme of that, then Krishna is her child. Well, here, you know, at least according to Bhagavatam, we have another how you say, for 427,000 years before Krishna will be born in somebody's family.

So, right now I think I can safely say that no one's kid here is Krishna. Does this make sense? But the principle, the principle is that mother Yasoda is conscious of God and is applying that consciousness into the parental relationship. So we can do exactly the same thing here.

That's the point. That's why we've said there's no difference in opportunity. It's just here we're dealing with an inferior environment.

But the consciousness doesn't have to be any different. It's material energy is not, we become absorbed in material consciousness within the material energy. It's not the material energy forces us to be conscious of it.

We want to be. Practical application. Okay, so the point is that mother Yasoda is conscious of Krishna and she's applying it in parental Rasa.

So, that would mean that according to that Rasa what things she would do that would please Krishna. Like cook for Krishna. Like, you know, dress Krishna, bathe Krishna, keep the atmosphere really nicely for Krishna.

Right? Does that make sense? So, now, looking at it just from consciousness, that means the parent can do the same things. Right? Because it's still Krishna's Krishna. So, that means the parent is cooking for Krishna.

And then the remnants of what's offered to Krishna, that's given to the child. Right? Krishna likes things clean. So therefore you keep your child clean.

Krishna likes, you know, a nice environment. Therefore you dress the kid nicely. It's because it pleases Krishna, that's why you do it.

But we do it because that's what pleases us. Because we're looking at the parental Rasa that we're actually having this Rasa. But this Rasa is between two lumps of dead matter.

So, where's the Rasa? You know what I'm saying? You know what I'm saying? This column here, you know, really is concerned about that column there, you know, and it's always worried, you know, that everything's nice and there's not too much, you know, on its head and everything like that. You know, you laugh, right? But that's actually what you're dealing with. Because the Jiva is never a parent of another Jiva.

The Jivas come from Krishna. You understand? It's the bodies that have the parental relationship. So that means then the bodies are dealt with in the parental relationship according to how Krishna would want to be dealt with.

Because it's Krishna's potency that actually makes the child act as a child, or the parent act as a parent. You understand? It's not something else. There's not something else making your child act like a child.

It's Krishna's potency. But it's not directly Krishna. So, we can directly serve Krishna by doing our service, you know, offering things to Krishna and doing that.

But the application of it will be indirect. We're following the same principle, but we're applying it in a different situation. And the reason that it works in that situation is because it's still Krishna's potency that's working there.

So whether he's Bhagavan or whether he's Parabrahman, still it's Krishna. But we're trying to be conscious of Bhagavan. So that's like, what would Krishna like? So we view him that way.

Yeah, I mean, that means, in other words, how Krishna wants you to look after the child, because the childness is Krishna anyway. So, Krishna as childness, how does Krishna as childness want you to deal with him? Right? Because Krishna as the child, as mother showed his child, then there's a way he likes to be dealt with. Right? So that same form will be here.

But there, her conscious is directly Krishna. Here it's not. It's indirectly Krishna.

Because the child is not Krishna. The child is actually dead matter that Krishna's potency has empowered to act like a child. And then there's a jiva in the body that identifies with it and therefore wants to be involved in that relationship.

That's actually what's technically going on. So indirectly will be how Krishna would like to be dealt with as a child. I deal with my child.

But directly would be that while that's going on, that can remind you of how mother just showed us doing these things. In other words, that mother is taking care of her child according

to how Krishna as a child would want to be taken care of. So that purifies, it liberates you.

Does that make sense? We're giving you a system how changing your baby's diapers, you can liberate yourself from material existence. Now if that's not practical, I don't know what is. But the point is it's consciousness.

If the consciousness is not right, you're not liberated because that's what Krishna points out here. Liberation means freedom from material consciousness. So if the consciousness is not material, you're not conditioned.

So it's not the activity. It's the consciousness. But consciousness is not enough.

That's the first stage. Then you have to be conscious of Krishna. Then it has to be favorable towards Krishna.

And then it should be free from karma beyond. So as it becomes there, then you become more elevated. So that means it's a reflection.

How Krishna is reflected here, you deal with him how he would want to be dealt in the original. And at the same time, if that's absorbed you because there is an attachment to the reflection, that will be more absorbing. But at least one is being elevated in the process.

Do you understand? But when one thinks that this is how Mother Yashoda deals with Krishna and this and that, then you're dealing directly. Does that make sense? So that's the whole point is anything can become *ujjipan* for remembering Krishna. But we use whatever is our conditioned nature as the medium for remembering that.

Because the whole everything is reflected, but we're only interested in certain parts of the reflection. You go to a mall, you're only interested in a few shops. There's a hundred shops there, but you only go to three or five.

So that's where you focus. Someone else is going to a different shop, but they follow the same process in their shop. Does that make sense? *Ujjipan*.

Ujjipan means that which is stimulus for remembering Krishna. Like that. It's part of in how you say the definition of the Babas then that is within the Baba.

Due to this means that the conscious being pervertedly reflected. Due to this he is entangled in the actions and reactions of his own karma. Because he's seeing the reflection.

He's seeing the reflection and he's identifying with it, so therefore interacting with it, he's dealing with the material energy, with illusion. So there's going to be reaction. But he sees it in relationship to Krishna then it's not karma.

There's no reaction. Like that body of a child is a manifestation of energy of Krishna. But for Krishna this energy is Lakshmi.

Krishna's dealing with it will be his Lakshmi. Because he is childness and then Lakshmi takes the form of a child to manifest childness. So what you're seeing is the particular material cause.

Right? But what it's based on is on the formal cause which is Lakshmi, which is based on the ultimate cause which is Krishna. This is why we studied the primary creation and the secondary. The primary is that's Krishna and his internal potency interacting that makes all the different forms.

In other words all the kinds of consciousness, all the kinds of interests and desires, all the different situations that there can be, all the different interactions that can be done in those situations to generate that particular quality, those are all defined in the primary creation. Right? Then the secondary creation is where according to the living entity's karma, in other words the operative cause, him doing an activity that adjusts the material energy to get that particular form that you're looking at. But that form is there, you know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? In other words, if the mommy came in with a poo bear and introduced you to her child, what would you think? It's a problem.

Why? Because that's not how it works. It's not there in the formal cause. But now if a three-year-old girl walks in with her poo bear and says that this is her baby, then is there a problem? No.

Because that goes together. Where does it change? Krishna and Lakshmi? Lakshmi is Supreme Conscious and then matter or mental energies? Because it manifests through there. You know, it's just like when you look in a mirror, what's in the mirror? Your reflection.

But is it made out of the same things that your face is made out of? No. But it's based exactly on what your face is. So that's why you want to scratch your head.

You can do it here and in the mirror we'll do the same thing. That's why it says perverted reflection. Reflection is the same.

It's a reflection. But it's perverted because you think you're the mirror. You think you're what's in the mirror.

So material energy is the mirror. You know what I'm saying? Material energy is that manifestation of the mirror. Your desire is the mirror.

So you desire Krishna, then you see Krishna. You're not desiring Krishna, then what you see in the mirror you think that's the real thing. If you know what's going on, then you know it's you in the mirror.

So you don't think the mirror is you. But let's say an animal and you show them a mirror of themselves, they think it's another animal. Does that make sense? But we are serving this quality, connecting this quality as Krishna, not directly Krishna, it's his quality.

He's non-different from his qualities, but still if not Krishna as a person. You know what I'm saying? It's a whole other discussion. We'll get to these.

Especially the last six chapters of Gita, this will be predominantly what we'll discuss. But Krishna has qualities. Because of that, he's effulgent.

That effulgence is the Brahman. So the Brahman is actually the fullness of his qualities. So the qualities are non-different.

So that Brahman we see here in this material world. So what we're seeing is Krishna's qualities. But we're thinking it's our qualities or something else.

That's the illusion. Everything that's here is Krishna's qualities. You're sitting on the rug instead of the cold floor.

The warmth of that, that's Krishna. Or the softness of that is Krishna. Or if it's not such good length, or the itchiness of it, that's Krishna.

You know what I'm saying? That you're actually held up. You don't fall through the earth. That's Krishna.

But it's manifest as earth. It's manifest as a blanket. Manifest as a floor.

You know what I'm saying? So all these things are there. So for Krishna's pastimes, then his internal potency has made all these forms. So the calm is there, the paraphernalia and everything that's there.

Yes? So that's reflected here. So in the reflection here, then the primary creation means it's based on the principles of the origin. But what's manifest, that's the reflection.

Because then it manifests as material. Now, just because it's material energy, it just means it's inferior. Because the point is if one day you're Krishna conscious, great.

But one day you're not, it's not great. So the energy itself in the spiritual world is conscious. So it would not like to be dealt with when you're not conscious.

So therefore, the manifestation is the external energy. Because there, if you deal properly or not, it's not going to bother the material energy. So it doesn't disturb maya that you deal with because it's unconscious.

What disturbs her is your consciousness is wrong. So you're punished for wrong consciousness. The wrong consciousness, therefore you do wrong activity.

It's not the activity because it doesn't matter to her. You know, it's dirt or you put it together and push it like this and make it into something else, into a brick. It doesn't really matter to her.

Because her natural state is pradhana. So it's all, you know, there's no, it's homogenous.

There's no distinction between them.

So Krishna's potency, then it all manifests. Does this make sense? So that's the thing is the reflection is between that original cause and formal cause. That is the original form.

Both in the spiritual world and the blueprints of the material world in the primary creation. Then you have the operational cause and the material cause, which is the manifestation of how do you say the material creation based on our activities, operation. You know, then the material energy adjusts that you get the material cause.

It's only because the material energy will adjust you get your result. So it's not that you're getting a result. No, the modes of nature change its form.

So we're not the doer. Still, it's Krishna's potency that's doing it all. But we have the desire, therefore it changes.

And because we have that desire, therefore it's implicated in karma. It's our desire that it changes, so therefore the result and the reaction is yours. If your desire is to please Krishna, then it's changing, there is no karma.

Because this changing is for Krishna. And since you're doing it for Krishna, then naturally it's better to use forms that are in line with the original forms. The original understandings, the original activities.

Because that's the way Krishna likes it. So that's why we recommend and do things based on that. Do you know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? Glance, no, that's where everything's put in.

Garbhodakṣayi Viṣṇu does the primary creation. And then Kīradakṣayi Viṣṇu then is, you know, how you say, is the one who authorizes its working. So we're dealing with this Brahman understanding, technically we're dealing with Garbhodakṣayi Viṣṇu as the universal form.

In other words, the universal form is that primary creation. Because that's the potency. In other words, the child has that child-ness, that child-ness, that's the universal form.

And so, there are unlimited manifestations of child-ness. Every child on the planet has that. Therefore it's said the puruṣa has thousands of hands, thousands of arms, thousands of eyes.

There's unlimited manifestations. So all that variety of manifestations, that's what Lakṣmī ranges. So that's it.

But when you're dealing with it, you have desire, you're interacting with it. So, interacting with what you see, that's Paramatma. That's Kīradakṣayi Viṣṇu.

Because Kīradakṣayi Viṣṇu is Aniruddha. So that's the goal. So that you get your result, that's because of him, of Paramatma.

That the situation is there, that's Hiraṇyagarbha. That's Kīradakṣayi Viṣṇu. And then what you do with it, that is Kīradakṣayi Viṣṇu.

Does that make sense? So, Socrates means there's many elements that he has that are correct. So, what's missing is that connection with the actual philosophy. In other words, it all goes back to there.

If you analyze it, you'll see these things are there. But the problem is that without understanding God and all that, there's still a problem to define this. Because where would this illusion come from? You know, why would there be an illusion? Because Mayavadis will say, well, the reason that the soul is separated from Brahman and thinks it's a separate entity is because of illusion.

But where did the illusion come from? Because Brahman is non-dual. So where did illusion come from? So even though they say they're monists, they're not. You know what I'm saying? And so, the same thing as the religionists.

They say God is the controller, supreme controller, but then they say he's not in control of the material world. Because if he was, why isn't good things happening? Why are bad things happening? So, because they don't understand karma and all these elements and the free will of the living entity, therefore, to keep God from looking bad, they have to say there's a second person managing it. It's the same thing.

So, whether it's karma or jnana, it's the same thing. It's just two sides. You know, you have a coin.

There's one side and the other side. So one side's karma and one side's jnana. It's the same thing.

It's just what you emphasize. If you're emphasizing the fruit of results, it's called karma. And if you're emphasizing the cessation of the pre-existence, that's called jnana.

But otherwise, they have the same flaws. One must become free from this bodily concept of life. The living entity, being part and parcel of the Supreme Lord, is neither the creator nor the enjoyer, but a cooperator.

So if he doesn't create it, it's already created. But he's not the enjoyer because actually it's Kṛṣṇa interacting. So, Kṛṣṇa's interacting with his internal potency.

So now, if we want to try to enjoy his internal potency, claiming that we're Kṛṣṇa, then it's a problem. That's illusion. So we can cooperate in that.

In other words, we want to do a particular activity and that activity, if we're conscious, then we would be doing that how Kṛṣṇa would like it to be done. So still, it's Kṛṣṇa's quality, Kṛṣṇa's potencies, that are at work and interacting. But we become involved in it to serve that

interaction.

Serving that interaction, then we are a cooperator. So just like in the spiritual world, you have Krsna as a person and his devotees there as persons, and they're interacting, we can assist those devotees in their service to Krsna. So in the material world, it's the same thing.

One, when we do that directly, that's what we're trying to do. We want to do that. But in other areas where we're just a distraction or just ordinary dealings, then it's still Krsna and His internal potency interacting.

We can be an assistant in that interaction to get that result that we're looking for. Because that results for Krsna. It's Krsna's pleasure.

That's why we want to get a result Krsna would like. Does that make sense? Alright. Is that why devotees don't cooperate with others? Cooperate with? Other devotees.

Do devotees not cooperate with other devotees? You could say it means it would be here, but it would be at this point that they're not cooperating because they don't actually see how it's all Krsna and all connected. But it would probably more go back a step if they're not conscious. And because they identify with the body and they actually think, they're seeing in the mode of passion, so therefore the soul is the body.

And so there's different kinds of souls. And because there's different kinds of souls, I don't like being with these kinds of souls, but those kinds of souls I like being with. So it's because of the mode of passion there, or mode of ignorance.

So the lack of consciousness is there. But otherwise there's the natural thing of that once Rupa Goswami says, associate with like-minded devotees, because the point is, it should be comfortable and natural. So those devotees that have a similar perspective, similar value as you, then by associating with them, then your realizations in Krsna consciousness, that will apply in their lives.

There's the same values. And their realizations apply in yours. Just like, let's say, you like management, so you associate with other like-minded devotees.

You spend your time with other managers managing Krsna consciousness. So now in their management, they'll come up with ways that they're more Krsna conscious. You can benefit from that.

And as you benefit, they can benefit. So let's say a devotee who isn't interested in management, then on that level, where's the point to interact? You know what I'm saying? You can interact on kirtan, in Bhagavatam. That's common to all devotees.

So that's why those five main activities, there's no restriction. But on your day-to-day activities, that's where you choose like-minded devotees. And even within the directly spiritual activities,

those that have that same kind of interest or enthusiasm as you have, you associate with them.

You'll be inspired. Does that make sense? You have a devotee who's totally inspired, taking prasad. You know, he takes prasad nicely, he's very considerate of prasad, he does everything like that.

But you have stomach problems, so you can't digest it nicely. So, even though what he's doing is perfect, it won't be the right association for you, because you'll always feel bad that you can't do the service he can do. You understand? So that's the thing, is that this element is there, but devotees may see it on the external platform of the body, the conditioned nature, and make the mistake that that's the spiritual consideration or non-spiritual.

No, it's where the consciousness is, so you're matching common consciousness. You understand? And in general, everyone's Krishna conscious, so that's why devotees can bhagavatam, everybody from anything can do a kirtan. It doesn't matter.

You know, people that you might not associate with on a daily basis, or a regular basis, in kirtan it may be fine. And when you see them on the road, oh, hi, how are you? Other than that, you might not interact. You understand? So, there's all these levels of consciousness, so this is what Gita is talking about.

Isn't it? But devotees are missing these things, so that all these other so-called they're thinking that they're spiritual but they're just social issues. The problems devotees have generally are always social issues. You know, Jai Gurudev was pointing out rittvik, okay, that's a philosophical issue.

But other than that, all other things that devotees jump up and down are social issues. They're not simply spiritual. But now if they can take the social issue, connect that to Krishna, nice.

But most of the time they don't, just because they feel like it. Because what you value is Krishna, but they don't see that. So therefore they have the determination to follow their values.

But because they don't see it in connection to Krishna, it's actually illusion. Though they're doing it in connection with Krishna, so there is benefit. But at the same time, they could get so much more benefit if they could understand how the consciousness is working.

So in other words, you get rid of all the social problems by going beyond them. Because if you're going to deal with them directly, it's too broad. And modern social considerations aren't broad enough.

Because when we talk modern social considerations, what are we talking about in reality? My point that I'm making is totally politically incorrect. But you're talking about those cultures that are based on Western European culture. That's political correctness.

What an Asian thinks, what a South American thinks, what an Inuit thinks, that doesn't come

into, it's not even considered in the picture. It's what a Western European thinks. That's political correctness.

That's the value system that they're projecting. It's very narrow. How many million people are in that? Not that many.

I think it's less than a billion. So most of the planet socially won't be able to relate to that unless they take up that culture. Which is being quite successfully expanding, but still there is a difference.

So on that platform you won't be able to solve any social issues. The devotees are trying to solve it on that, but they're using tools that aren't right. Like trying to use a toothpick to take out a screw or something.

It can't do it. So the only thing means you have, if you want to do it socially, then you have to go to the Vedic social system, which does include humanity. Not even just humans here, also the humans on other planets.

You can relate, right? Kings here and the demigods, they can relate. The great sages from the other planets, they can relate. Why? Because it's one culture.

So it's broad enough to include all that, and it also includes the animals. Or, if that's going to be too much of an issue because of mental difficulty, then you go beyond that and deal with consciousness. Just directly philosophy.

But you have to direct philosophy at this technical level. Because then it makes all the connections that you can see. Otherwise devotees deal with philosophy, but it means they have the faith, but much of it is based not on the understanding of it, but the faith in it.

Which is not wrong, but it makes it a difficulty in trying to explain it and establish it. Point is, if you have faith in the Holy Name, whether you understand much or not, you can go back to God. So that's perfect, but if you want to deal with social issues of this and that on a level that people will be satisfied with, because they are socially attached.

It's one thing to just chant, what's the problem? And then they go, yeah, right, and just start chanting. Then, of course, that's the easiest solution. But if not, then they want a technical solution.

The only thing that's technical enough is the philosophy. Does that make sense? Otherwise, if you want to deal with that, then you have to come down and use the Vedic, the culture. Because the Vedic culture is the companion to the philosophy.

The philosophy is defining the culture. The culture is applying the philosophy. They are not different.

Like that. So devotees are trying to use tools that can't do it, never have. Is there ever a time in

Western history where things were going nicely? You know what I'm saying? Never.

But you read the history of the kings in India until more recently. Very nice. But you read that you know, once there was, whether he was even there or not, it was like King Arthur or something, he wasn't bad.

You had one or two here and there. You guys have vlog, right? You know, vlog. So, that's the problem.

So, there is nothing in recent Western history, you know, because basically it starts with Socrates, that they can say that this is a standard of how the culture works. So how will they be able to solve it? There is no example, there is no resources. You can't do something without resources.

It's all talk when they talk all this modern politically correct stuff. Because political correctness comes from the Vedas. That's what Niti is.

Niti is political correctness. So you understand Niti, you know how to deal. Niti teaches you that.

How to make friends, how to break friends. You know, how to make a line. This is what it teaches.

That's political. That's already there. And you know what the best part is? You can produce like that.

This is what you teach to kids. The philosophy is what you have to teach to an adult. The political thing you teach to a kid.

They were designed to teach to kids. There was a king who had some sons and he couldn't teach them. So he put out a bigger award for any brahman who could come and teach them how to become proper shaktas.

So many came and went and for years nothing happened. And one day this one brahman came and in six months he turned them into shaktas. By teaching them to keep their production.

So that's what it's for. And then they are talking about this high level stuff as if it's something really special. No.

Philosophy. That's adult stuff. But this is just normal stuff.

You know what I'm saying? So everything is out of proportion. So what's being given here we will think oh this is philosophy but we can see as we're going through we're trying to give practical examples that this is all what makes it work in our life. The tools are here.

Do you understand it? It will work. You don't understand it? It won't work. Is that okay? The relationship is like that of the master and the servant.

If the master is satisfied then the servant is satisfied. Because Krishna is everything. You please him.

Then we're satisfied. If he's not satisfied how will we be satisfied? We're part and parcel of Krishna. Right? So how can we be satisfied if Krishna is not satisfied? Because we're part of him.

Right? If the body is unhappy how will the finger be happy? Does that make sense? The whole body is cold but the finger is thinking no I'll be fine. The finger will also be cold. The body is in a comfortable environment the finger will also be comfortable.

So that's the point of master and servant. Krishna is pleased. We're pleased because Krishna is the whole thing.

Krishna is always satisfied. As Bhagavan he's satisfied in his dealing with the devotees. But the point is the individual living entity can make a choice whether he is endeavoring to satisfy Krishna or not.

So he's working to satisfy Krishna then he'll be satisfied. Why? What's the connection? As we're saying A B and C. So you have Krishna. So Lakshmi is connected to Krishna.

She knows how to satisfy Krishna. So our business is to satisfy Krishna. That means if we satisfy Lakshmi then Krishna is satisfied.

So that's why what we're doing and dealing is important. We're thinking no I'll do whatever I want because it's between me and Krishna. There's only one problem.

It's not between you and Krishna. It's between you and Lakshmi and Lakshmi and Krishna. So you don't make her happy.

He's not happy. And if he's not happy you're not happy. The point is she's happy, you're happy.

Because when she's happy Krishna's happy. So automatically you're happy. So that means whatever you're dealing with it's Krishna's energy.

So if you don't deal with Krishna's energy correctly she's not satisfied. So this idea we do whatever we want or it's modern I can do whatever I want or I should do it in this way we don't want to do the Vedic. But the point is a skyscraper in New York is still made out of Krishna's energy.

It's not like New York has it's own potency. That's atheism. That's this dualistic concept.

That's why we always say God is non-dual. We don't mean it personal. God is non-dual.

He's non-different from his energy. Otherwise the G will separate off from his energy and then claim now I'm the controller of the energies. But that building there is there because Krishna's potency allows it to be there.

According to the workings of the potency according to your karma to be involved in that. But it's still Krishna's building. But for the sake of rasa therefore you can consider it yours.

Because then if it's yours you'll use it in his service. There's a relationship. If it's all his then how do you interact? That's why Krishna in rasa is not taking the mood of sarvajna.

Of all-knowing. Because he's waiting to see what do you do. Not that Krishna doesn't know everything.

But he chooses through his yoga maya to not pay attention to that. So he can see what you do. When it says when Krishna is satisfied then we are satisfied.

It means when Krishna is satisfied with what we are doing. If Krishna is satisfied with what we're doing. Yes.

What we're doing is based on the consciousness. So that's why sometimes you do something correct but you're not happy. And another times you do it correct you're happy or even sometimes not even correct and you're happy.

That's because the consciousness was right. And the other thing you did it perfectly but consciousness wasn't there. So Krishna wasn't satisfied.

Because point is it's devotion that pleases Krishna. Right? So lakṣya is devotion. So when we act in a devotion mood in ways that are favorable for his pleasure then he's satisfied because lakṣya is satisfied.

In pure consciousness the activity will be dovetailed with Kṛṣṇa. And that will make one really happy. These purified activities called bhakti are transcendental to the three modes of nature.

Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam defines Liberation means obtaining one's constitutional position of service to the lotus feet of Hari. Okay. So in pure consciousness you'll dovetail the activity on whatever platform.

Either you just see the ritual but the ritual is connected to Kṛṣṇa or you see how Kṛṣṇa's qualities are working in that and so you see that in connection to Kṛṣṇa. You're seeing that I'm choosing to do activities properly according to Kṛṣṇa's will or it's him as a person likes it done in this way so therefore I'm doing it in this way. Whatever is the connection that you make the dovetailing then Kṛṣṇa's pleased.

Then you'll be pleased. If it's not dovetailed that way then Kṛṣṇa won't be pleased. In order to ensure the correct appreciation of this knowledge, Śrīla Prabhupāda next clarifies so this is the subject matter.

This is the subject matter that's being defined in the Gītā. This is what the Gītā is giving us. That's why we don't have to worry.

This is the introduction. So Gītā is defining this so more practical detail will be brought up. Because you have why are we not worried that it will be practical.

Arjuna is a warrior. He's on the battlefield. So he has to be able to apply this in his life right then.

It's not that he can take years of practice and then. No, it has to be applicable right then. So that's the point.

This philosophy is applicable immediately. Like that. Now we will go to the order of some other Prayojana, Abhidhaya.

What is the difference between Sambandha Prayojana Abhidhaya and Sambandha Abhidhaya Prayojana? What's the difference between Sambandha Abhidhaya Prayojana and Sambandha Prayojana Abhidhaya? There's no difference. But one is taking the viewpoint of the mind and one is taking the viewpoint of the intelligence. Means if you're just saying the order that things work, you're going to have relationship.

Then there's a process within that relationship. There's a result that comes from that process. So that's Sambandha Abhidhaya Prayojana.

But for you to actually be involved in that process, then the mind has to be interested. So that's why you go Sambandha Prayojana Abhidhaya. Because Sambandha, you have the relationship what goal you can get when that's there.

Then you make the endeavor. And then for making the endeavor, then you'll get the goal. That's why we see here is the goal can be defined analytically.

In other words, intellectually you can define the goal. But you don't have it. But you know what the goal is.

So keeping that in mind when you apply the process, then you can get the result. So it's knowledge and activity will get you a result. So that knowledge is Sambandha Jnana.

So the knowledge is in the Sambandha. So then that's going to define what your goal is. So the mind accepts that.

Then you make your endeavor. And then you get the result. So as far as mechanics go in operation, you have the field, you operate the field, you get the result from the field.

But as an individual, as a person, you're only going to do that if you're interested in it. So that's why then that element of the spirit is there, then the purpose, and then you get more inspired. So in order to ensure the correct appreciation of this knowledge, Srila Prabhupada next clarifies for the process of understanding the Gita.

So it means you have that subject matter, but you have to be able to see the subject matter

properly. So then you're going to give the process of understanding. So to make sure that we are approaching this knowledge appropriately.

Right? Because there's going to be the process, how you say, the process of the knowledge. But then there's going to be the actual, how you say, application. That's going to be later.

Vedic knowledge is infallible above all doubts and mistakes. Bhagavad Gita is the essence of all Vedic knowledge. So if we don't have this, we have all that knowledge, then we might get distracted.

Because we, let's say I go to apply the knowledge, I don't see it working. So then what's the first thing that's going to come into my mind? I'm not wrong. So that means it's someone else's fault.

Right? Something goes wrong, it's got to be someone else's fault. Right? So the first thing we're going to do is go for the knowledge. Right? Just like why are many devotees, this is just a practical example, not so enthusiastic about the concept of Vedic culture.

They haven't made it work and in the past those who were enthusiastic to make it work didn't necessarily apply it in its best possible way, you know, social applicable way. And so many people became disturbed by its application. Right? And so then instead of thinking that, no, the Vedic culture is coming from the Shastra, the Shastra is infallible, so there's nothing wrong with it, so we haven't applied it right, we'll say, oh the Vedic doesn't apply, oh it's Kali Yuga, oh that's so old, you know, we have to be up to date and be modern and everything like that.

But even the basis of that, where is it coming from? Even you say, because the Vedas say it has to be applied now, because applying in the moment, that is the mode of goodness. But at the same time is that element in the moment, in the present, that's based on the mind. Does that make sense? It's based on the mind.

And so people are on the mental platform, therefore they talk about the moment, but they actually can't understand that the present moment's connection with the past, or the present moment's connection with the future, that's because they don't have knowledge. Does that make sense? Because the knowledge spans the past from the future, and then how to apply it in the present. So because of that, then they make temporary solutions based on the present.

Oh this is happening now, this is what we have to do. Perception is the most important. It's not a fact, it's a perception.

You may be doing everything right, but people perceive you as doing wrong, so you're wrong. This is the politically correct statement. Yes, but perception is everything.

Yes, perception is everything, but who defines what perception is? Is mundane perception everything? Or is God conscious perception everything? So they're taking an element of the philosophy, without even knowing it's the philosophy, because they'll say perception is

everything, taking it for modern political correctness. In their mind, there's absolutely no connection to the Vedas, but actually that point comes from the Vedas, because action has to happen in the present. Right? And to do that, you have to know what we're dealing with.

What's the spirit? What's the mood? So the perception of it, how you see it, is important. You don't have the right perception, you can't do the activity. But they don't understand, God defines perception.

So this is where it becomes useless. Even though it sounds great, and they'll say it with great confidence, but it still doesn't do anything. What is appropriate in the West? I was just walking down the street, not even walking, even driving, in Helsinki.

And Helsinki's very West. It's one of the only places I've seen where the whole city looks good. Helsinki.

It's just before you fall off the edge of the earth. Everything's not new. There's old buildings there, but it's not like New York where half of it looks like a slum.

It's actually everything is meticulously taken care of. They're like Germans. And for days they were having some kind of metal concert.

Everybody was wearing black outfits. So everyone was some variety of, I don't know what that would be. Golf.

So they're wearing that. They're wearing cudgel. They've got funny haircuts.

They've got tattoos all over. What do they mean it doesn't work in the West? You can wear anything in the West. You know what I'm saying? So those people who are saying this are extremely narrow-minded.

They're extremely conservative. And they might feel insulted because they'll claim they're the liberals. But they're very conservative because you can wear anything.

So what do you mean people won't accept if you wear this outfit? You can wear anything. And that's the boss. Then you have the punks.

And then you have the emo. All these guys. And then you have people that wouldn't be caught dead on the street wearing what those devotees say you can't wear in the West.

You would never go out in the combination of pants and shirts and stuff. They would rather die than wear that. It's so fashionably suicidal.

You know what I'm saying? So those people who define Western dress would never wear what those devotees say you can't wear this in the West. You understand? And people who are up to that level of fashion would appreciate what we wear if we wear it correctly. So what they're actually saying is I don't know how to wear these clothes.

That's all. That's the bottom line. That's all.

Because you can wear anything. All the ladies are wearing these Punjabi bold pants that the ladies wear here. So what's the problem? Shawls.

You go into every airport and every shop has them. Businessmen are stupid? They keep things in their shop that no one buys. No, they keep it in the shop because everyone is buying them.

So that means there's hundreds of thousands or millions of ladies and men wearing shawls. But we can't wear them because we can't wear them in the West. It's like, you know, it's just it's just their own feelings and misgivings and they're trying to they don't want to wear it? Don't wear it.

They keep your mouth shut. In other words, it's just like this. I'll give you an example.

Let us say you have just some okay, let us say in New York with New York friends you go out to you know, a restaurant and then everyone gets a menu and they start to order. Right? Now, one guy just says, oh hey, I'll take this. What do the other three say? Why are you taking that? You know, one, they want to figure out one, are you stupid and less than them? Or, are you better than them and you figure out something that they don't know? It's all based on insecurity.

So you can't actually do what you want to do, though they claim all of us are individuals. You have to do what your group does. It has to be accepted by the group.

Otherwise, they'll harass you the whole meal. And these are the so-called high-end liberal guys. But if you go out, let's say some other place, you know, Chicago, this or that, it's not so high-profile.

People a little more down-home or something like that. Then you order what you want, they order what they want and you have a good time. You know what I'm saying? So this concept you can't wear is because of their own personal insecurities.

And they can't handle as if someone else is wearing it. That means I could be wearing it, but I don't want to wear it. So therefore, I have to say it can't be worn.

That's all. The society now technically is more liberal or more conservative than it was in the 60s. More conservative? Then.

Yeah, I mean, except for the hippies, everybody just wore... I mean, if you look at the pictures of Prague Pog, like in Tompkins Square Park and that, even the hippies are wearing slacks and shirts and regular dress shoes. You know, the hair's a little messier, a little longer, they don't have the button done. This is their hippiness.

Dirty hippies came along later. Long hair. So, much more conservative and it flew.

So why not today when anything goes? And now we're standing on it. Wouldn't you call this like

a 40-year-old philosophy? And then they're claiming they're up to date. You understand? The point is, is it's all the mind.

They don't analyze what they're saying. Analyze what they're saying, then it wouldn't be right. But the point is, is they don't want to analyze because they don't want to dress this way.

Generally because they don't know how to dress. That's the main point. Because the point is, the traditional dress is gentleman dress.

But they're not gentlemen. You were saying before that they use the argument that there's too much of a restriction. Yes.

Previously they didn't have any restriction. But the way the mind... Oh, yeah. According to their own philosophy, there is no defined western dress.

So then now that you say this is the dress, then that becomes a problem for them. But at the same time is, then you have to wear certain things. You know what I'm saying? If you don't wear that, then you're fashionably not in line.

But the point is, is if you know fashion, you can wear anything. You know what I'm saying? What walks down the runway, you know, no devotee would wear. I would take it in the first step.

I would even go to the point of saying no devotee could wear. They don't have the fashion ability. There's a few handful who could.

But those few handful, they're not the ones complaining about the Vaishnava dress, because they know how to wear it. You know what I'm saying? So in other words, they're saying these things, they're coming from backgrounds where they would be very in a conservative kind of thing, and they can't see outside of their box. Because the point is, is you can wear anything as long as you can wear it properly and get away with it.

You know? Does that make sense? So that's the whole point. It's just how you wear it. That's the thing.

The Western culture, it's like if you can pull it off, that's all that, you know, who dares wins. That's it. But then they'll start to define and ritualize the Western thing.

But there isn't really any. And the ones that are, they wear suits. They wouldn't wear what these other people are wearing.

Really, it's like that. They wear suits. So we'd agree with that, too.

You know? At least you look like a gentleman. Probably instead, if you're going to wear Western clothes, you wear what a fine, up-to-date gentleman, American gentleman, would wear. So that means it's up-to-date, it's worn well, you know, and it would be, you know, what would be the cultured standard.

So if it's a more formal situation, you wear the one thing. If it's less formal, you wear what's appropriate. But they don't just wear anything.

The devotees wear anything. So even if you analyze the statement according to the Western terms, it still doesn't apply. That's all.

It's just a matter of what you're used to wearing, what you can wear. That's all. And wearing anything takes practice.

Right? You've seen sometimes the local Indian punks wearing Western clothes. Do they look Western? No. It takes practice to be able to wear the pants, to put your hands in the pockets just right, you know, to stand around and look cool, sunglasses on your head.

It takes practice. So the same way, it takes practice to wear a dhoti and a sari. So that's all.

They're not willing to do it. They're not fashion conscious enough to do it. It's just by association.

They grew up wearing the Western and they're comfortable with it. So 20, 30 years of wearing that, they can wear it okay. But to learn something new, let's not.

So that's why I say they're actually narrow-minded. It's not broad-minded. They can't think outside of their little box.

And if you're doing something outside your box, you're weird. But according to the Westerners, yeah, you will be weird in one group, but in another group, you'll be fine. You know, the avant-garde, they won't be caught dead with the Wall Street guys.

The Wall Street guys wouldn't even go into that part of town where those avant-garde guys are. It's like, you know, who would get on the, how do you say, take the subway? It's got like middle-class professionals. Like, who would be caught dead? You know what I'm saying? For those guys.

Yeah, it's middle-class. It's middle-class suburban like this. Because if you go up, they can appreciate it.

Maybe they wouldn't do it. That's the thing is that I said, they're very regulated. You know, the upper-class Western society is actually very regulated.

They're, you know, very committed to, you know, intoxication, illicit sex, you know, things like this, but their lives are very regulated, very standard. They have standards, what they'll do, who they'll marry, what they'd eat, where they'd go, what they'd wear. It's very regulated.

You know? And then I think if you hit the bottom also, it's also regulated. If you're in a gang, you have to wear what the gang wears, you know, so there is an outfit. It's the guys in the middle that have the problem.

You know, so, you know, only the fools and the paramahamsas are happy in this world. Okay, so then we'll continue tomorrow with this process of understanding. Thursday, yes.

Okay, so are you reading this introduction? Because then more of this will make sense, because this is just taking the central point. But in there you see how Prabhupada naturally moves from one to the next. It's being reflected here, this point, in order to ensure the correct appreciation, so it's going.

But you want to see how that works, how it's presented. Because Prabhupada will present it in such a way, it's so smooth. Notice one thing is that, you know, people will say Prabhupada is not a rasi.

But I think it's on the second page of the introduction, after the mantra, Prabhupada has already introduced the five rasas. In Krishna. Already right there.

So it's right there in the beginning. It's not a big problem. The problem is if you don't see it properly in connection with Krishna as the acarya is giving.

Hare Krsna, Hare Krsna, Krsna Krsna, Hare Hare, Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare, Jaya Sri Prabhupada. Jaya. Jaya.