

## 2010-11-01 BVPS BG summary Ch 3. Ch 4 ND

Hari Om Sahana Bhavatu Sahana Om Punarthu Sahaviyankara Bhavahai tejasvi nāvadhītām asthamā vidviśāvahaiḥ auṁ śāntiḥ śāntiḥ śāntinī auṁ jaya śrī kṛṣṇa-caitanya prabhu nityānanda śrī-advaita gadādhara śrīvāsādi-gaura-bhakta-vṛnda Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare So, the third chapter is teaching us how we can, you know, properly, we can elevate ourselves through proper knowledge, proper understanding. So, in here it's the important thing to note because it may seem that, you know, we have so many things and you have to remember this and connect this to that and so many different things, but it's a very simple element, right? We're talking about the mature world, then Prabhupāda will talk about its temporariness and its element of misery, and he'll also talk about its illusion, right? So, now if we take these three, how will these three work or match with sambandha, abhidheya and prayojana? Where do we put temporariness? Prayojana. Sambandha.

Okay, why prayojana? Because whatever you get, you can't really enjoy it. It's gone, but whatever you get always moves back to sambandha anyway. So it's position, being there.

So then illusion would be sambandha, prayojana. Illusion would be sambandha. I mean prayojana.

Because it's like the water in the desert. The water in the desert, okay. That means as a goal, okay.

Why do you say sambandha? For temperance. Yes. Because the field that we're dealing with is temperate.

So because you're dealing with now sambandha, abhidheya and prayojana, if you're applying on it the internal potency, right, then you're going to get samvit, sandhini and ladhi, right? So samvit, sandhini means sat, which is eternal. You understand that connection? Yes. Because you can always move them, but I'm saying that's the most obvious, right? So the spiritual world's eternal, material world is temporary, right? Now in the spiritual world, then hladini is, what is that quality of the soul? Pleasure, ananda.

Ananda, okay. And the material world is? Misery. Misery, okay.

Now this is, so that we can generally catch. Now this is the important element, is then we have one left, illusion. So where does that fall? Abhidheya.

Abhidheya. What's in abhidheya? Activity. Activity and? Knowledge.

Knowledge, right? In other words, it's knowledge and activity are there. So that means if the knowledge is based on illusion, the activities will be illusory. If the knowledge is based on actual reality, then the activities will be real.

You understand? So in that case, we would be shifting to our original identity as a source of not. Yes, that's the point. Do you understand? In other words, how is it that we who have a conditioned intelligence and conditioned mind can function actually and progress spiritually? Why wouldn't we just continue materially? Because you can't understand devotional service with material intelligence, right? So how would we actually be able to take up spiritual life and progress? The association with someone who has it.

Okay, association with someone who has, yes, that's good. But what does it actually do? Reawaken the intrinsic nature of the soul. Yeah, reawakens the actual nature of the soul, which is? What's the essential point in this regard? What is it that you can deal with that is overarching of anything else? Consciousness.

Consciousness, right? So the consciousness is the nature of the soul. The soul is conscious, okay? But in that position... So where does consciousness fall in this element of the sambandha, abhidheya and prayojana? Marginal. Marginal, okay.

But prayojana? Sambandha. Do we have a third? Abhidheya. Abhidheya, okay.

Everything. Everything, okay. But when you're doing sac-cit-ananda, what is cit? Consciousness.

Consciousness, right? So cit is in the position of abhidheya, it's in the position of knowledge. So that means with consciousness one can invoke the spiritual knowledge, which then means that you can then override a material mind and intelligence. You understand? That's how one's able to do it.

So it's not a matter of I can't do it. Of course, the conditioned state, we can't do it. But the soul can because the soul is actually not the conditioned nature.

We only identify with the conditioned nature. Does that make sense? Yeah? Okay. So then that's the whole point.

So having overridden, or at least making the attempt to override the conditioned nature by one's consciousness, spiritual consciousness, and then using spiritual intelligence, that cit potency, then one can engage one's conditioned nature. Because we're so used to working in that way, that's our practice. So we guide and control the senses in our occupational duties, which are based on our conditioned nature, but from the platform of consciousness and spiritual intelligence.

This becomes karma yoga. We've seen the mechanics here? So it's not just the sentiment. You can describe so many ways, this, that, and what does it really mean? This is what it means.

That's all. Does that make sense? So jnana yoga means we're not the attachment for the results that come from those activities. It's not so important to us anymore.

But the conditioned nature is still there, so it's more comfortable to work within one's

conditioned nature than to not. Isn't it? If you're strong, it's easier to do activities that deal with strength than sitting behind a desk, pushing keys on a typewriter or something. Maybe you could push them very hard.

Yes? In jnana yoga, is there also a focus or an interest to better operate the field? Is there an interest to better operate the field? It means that element is there. It means karma yoga, you're practically applying it. Jnana yoga means the absorption in the technical aspects of it.

In other words, operating more of the intellect on understanding how the field is working and seeing it in all the little things. That would be jnana yoga, though you're still performing activity. But the emphasis is less on the activity and more on the knowledge by which you're performing the activity.

Not the material knowledge to do that skill, but the actual metaphysics of it. In other words, the sankhya aspect of it becomes more prominent. Does that make sense? But still, that combination is there.

It's just what you're emphasizing. Because the point is you're performing your activities, your duty, but with that spiritual consciousness and intelligence. So that is jnana.

That is true jnana. That is sambandha jnana. So it's still there.

That's why it becomes karma yoga. But the emphasis is still on performing your prescribed duties and giving the results to Krishna. Well, the other one, it will be the results are automatically Krishna's.

But you're analyzing the field that you're working within to keep one from getting entangled in it. Finding out those little things that distract one. Does that make sense? So one is the practical application of it more.

The other, you're practically applying, but that's habit now. Now you're analyzing more. In other words, it's like if you're just learning to ride a bicycle, what do you focus on? Riding the bicycle.

Right. Okay. Now let's say you're quite expert at riding the bicycle.

What do you focus on? Whatever you like. Whatever you like. Yeah.

Talking on the phone, you know, whatever you want to do. Does that make sense? But now let us say the person who is riding the bicycle and he's expert at it. Let's say he's focusing on riding the bicycle.

So what will he be doing? Perfecting. He'll be analyzing all the little things, you know, how it works, exactly how much he would do, everything that's connected with it. That's jnana yoga.

You understand? So jnana yogi means he's better at the karma than the karma yogi because he's analyzing. But that's not his focus. His focus is not the perfection of the performance of the

activity, the result is on mechanics of it so that he can get a better result for Krishna.

Do you understand? The karma yogi is focusing on the activity and then getting the result, then giving that result to Krishna. But for the jnana yogi, the result's already Krishna's. Now he's just seeing how it operates that you get a finer.

Does that make sense? So there's technically no difference between them when it comes to devotional service. The karmas will make a difference. How our focus is will make this difference.

But it's actually all buddha yoga. It's just a matter of where our emphasis is. Does it make sense? So it's important this element of illusion, you know, to note that, that that element is illusion means we're using the material consciousness, right? So we're actually not seeing things as they are because what's actually happening is the spiritual.

Yes. Can karma yoga and jnana yoga be parallel with the two phases of the growth? Can the two be applied in anartha nivrtti? It means anishta bhakti and nishta bhakti. Yes.

What is that? But more important than that, what are those two aligned with? Anartha nivrtti is in what stage of development and nishta is in what stage? It's another way to analyze this. But anartha nivrtti is throughout in one sense until... Bhava means yes, that's there. It's always developing.

Liberate for the gurus or not? Liberate for the gurus or not? Okay, it means if you're taking anartha nivrtti to mean freedom from the conditioned nature. But even within working the conditioned nature in line of what we're doing, where in the devotional process would we make a clear distinction between jnana yoga and karma yoga? Madhyam and uttama. Madhyam and uttama.

Kanishita and madhyama. Sorry, kaisita and madhyama. Kanishita and madhyama.

I was going to say, wow, then what's kanishita? Yeah, that's madhyama and uttama. So what's kanishita? You understand? So kanishita means he's more attached to his field, his conditioning. So for him, karma yoga is the process.

But he's learning knowledge and everything. That's what he's doing. When that knowledge becomes more prominent and his need for the results and all that for himself are working in that because he wants to be in that field rather than it's easier in that field.

In other words, the attachment is more for the field than the results of the field. Then it goes to jnana yoga. So that's the madhyama because the madhyama is fixed in devotional service.

The anarthas aren't the pressing issue. It means they're still there, but they become much less. They're much less prominent.

So the prominence will be nishta, won't be fixed in devotional service. So before that, one is not

as fixed. One day things go well, one day not.

One day you determine, one day not. All these kind of elements come up. Does that make sense? So we see here is that as we'll go through here, we'll see is that they will elevate Arjuna from this platform just being a karmi, to a karma yogi, to being a jnana yogi.

And then they'll take him to the sarva-dhama-pratyajya, which will be working as an uttama-adhikari. So basically in the time it takes, I've always heard it takes half an hour, but I think it takes longer to speak all the yiddish shlokas. I know.

Okay, 40 minutes. Okay, that sounds better than half an hour. But I say in 40 minutes that's going from karmi to uttama-adhikari.

So that's why it's Arjuna, right? It takes us a lifetime to read the book, so we don't notice that element. But that's actually how quickly things went, right? Does that make sense? Yes. When you say consciousness and abhidheya and identity, I was still trying to... because when I analyze, changing my identity from I am a joy and controller to I am a servant of Krishna, is that changing my consciousness and then that's the abhidheya? Yes, you're changing the consciousness.

No, we're just... because, see, the samana-abhidheya-pratyajya, these elements, it depends upon what perspective you're using. Then you'll place things accordingly, right? It means, in other words, if you're saying, I am servant of Krishna, I'm not the body, I'm the soul, I'm servant of Krishna, that's sambandha. That's one's identity, right? It means that's actual knowing the field.

Because, I mean, you may study all the field you like, but you can't use the field until you know where you are in the field, because you're the one doing the activity. If you're not doing the activity, yes, you can study the field, as long as you can see the elements that are there and who's doing. But for yourself, until you understand yourself, you can't actually understand how you connect to the field.

So that's why someone who is more efficient in getting things done has more of a clear identity, right? Though it may be materialistic. So those who are very materially successful, they have a very strong material identity. So if you ask them where you fit in, they know exactly what they are, what they're supposed to do.

That's why they don't get much done. They have more. But the problem is that's still temporary and going to be suffering.

Because with that consciousness, then he performs the activity and he gets his result. So he's able to operate the field, get his result, but it'll still be temporary and bring him misery. Does that make sense? So in here, identity will be that.

Performing the activity will be abhidheya, and getting the result will be payoja. So it's just a

matter of... That's what we're discussing, so we see what are our options to look at things. In other words, all the different philosophies are only dealing with these things.

I think I mentioned here that when Lord Caitanya is talking to Sarvabhauma Bhattacharya, he says there's only these three things. The position of the living entity, God, the material energy, the relationship, how that relationship is engaged and what is the result. He says everything else is just superfluous.

It's not actually that important. It only has a meaning in relationship to these three. Does that make sense? So if you can see with these three, but the trick is to be able to understand which manifestation of these three you would use.

Because one would say, well, why isn't it always fixed? Why isn't it always exactly the same, never changing and everything like that? Because God's never changing and everything. Wouldn't that be a correct assumption? So now here comes the point. Is God and His energies non-different? Yes.

Yes. And no. No.

Yes and no. Yes and no. But ultimately, is Krishna many-branched? Yes.

Yes. Depends on the perspective. Okay, the philosophical perspective.

Is Krishna non-dual or He's dual? Non-dual. Non-dual, right? If you want dual, then you've got to go for one of these Zoroastrian-based religions. Like that.

Does that make sense? You have to go back to our man from Ur if you want to really appreciate the dualistic aspect. You understand? So that means God and His energies are non-different, though at the same time they're different. Right? Does that make sense? So because of the non-difference, it is Him, right? The man and his money, are they different? No, but they are different.

So what's the importance of the difference? What do you want to bring out by emphasizing the difference? Relationship. Field. Individual personality.

Individual personality, right? It means, in other words, Krishna is a person. He has all His energies and everything's working, but He's still a person. Separate from all that.

At the same time, all that's Him. Right? Because when they describe the Upanishads, or describing the Lord, the Bhagavatam describes the Lord in three features. Right? Brahman, Paramahansa and Bhagavan.

But, it defines Him as non-dual. So there's no difference between these. But there's a difference.

Right? So this is God. So, therefore, things change position. Right? Depending on how you're

looking at it.

So, Krishna is everything. Right? There's nothing that's not Krishna. Because Krishna is the sum total of everything.

At the same time, He's that person who is the sum total of everything. Okay? So this pillar, then, is Krishna. But how is that pillar Krishna? Through His energy.

So it's Him, but at the same time, it's Him through His energy. You understand? So the manifestation of this pillar is His energy. But what makes the pillar work? Krishna.

Krishna. In what form? Brahman. It's Brahman.

Right? But at the same time, it's on that level, you have the quality, which is Him, but then there's the manifestation of that quality. Right? Both on the Brahman platform. And then you have the manifest form of that.

Right? Because you have the original cause and the formal cause. So that's the masculine and feminine of the subtle elements. The subtle, meaning the metaphysical, what's beyond, the Brahman platform.

Then that's manifest as the operational and the material. So the operational would be the masculine and the material would be the feminine. Right? But where's the manifestation? It's in the masculine or in the feminine? It's in the feminine.

Right? So Krishna has the quality, and then there's a form that matches that quality. Right? Then there's the operational material world, and then there's the transformation done by the material world to take on the new manifestation. Make sense? No? At least if you remember all the different, what we were talking about before, the four kinds of causes.

Right? That made some sense, right? Yeah? Some sense. It wasn't like Greek or something. No, no.

I didn't suppose it to be. Okay. Tibetan maybe or something.

Okay? Does this make sense? So depending upon how you're looking. So therefore, how you look at it, then it adjusts. Because from one perspective, you're looking at, that's Krishna, but then what Krishna is, Him and His energies.

So you can always split Him and His energies within that. You know what I'm saying? Krishna is everything, so it's all masculine. It's all Him.

But you can say, but at the same time, what you see is His manifestation, which is His energy. Right? Then you take any one of those, then you can say, this part is Krishna, this is His energy. Then you can say, take Him or His energy, and then split it again.

Because Him and His energy are non-dual. Does it make sense? Okay. So this makes, so in here, then, this karma yoga is working because of transcendental knowledge.

And that transcendental knowledge is there because the soul is conscious. Right? The soul being sat, cit ananda, cit means consciousness and knowledge. So that element of the soul, cit, that's what you use.

Right? So from there, then you identify that I am not the body, I'm the soul. And ananda actually happens when it's the element that sacrifices there, and it's for someone else's benefit. So it's connected to Krishna.

Because that someone else always ends up as Krishna anyway. So therefore, if we understand as we connect to Krishna, then we'll be happy. So the soul starts from there.

Why would the soul start from there? Why that one? Why not sat or ananda? Okay. Ananda would give the inspiration or would give you the inspiration. Because consciousness is the only remnant we have of the spiritual reality.

Consciousness is the only. Another, maybe, because we may have, it's maybe been a while since this was discussed. You know, maybe in the Jaya Dharma we got this.

Free will within the realm of consciousness. Yeah. Free will is in the realm of consciousness.

Okay. Yeah. That would be, because who we are is who we are.

And what you're going to get from performing the activities is what you're going to get. That's the rule. So you can have your free will as your consciousness.

That's a very good one. That's a very good one. But the soul means, sat-chit-ananda is an expansion of the cit potency.

Right? So that would be specifically here, cit, but it can also mean, cit meaning the surupta-sakra. But in here would more specifically mean, cit meaning the potency of cit. Right? Because there is no, there's material inclination of the soul.

Right? Because being, the point is, is the internal, not the internal, the surupta-sakti then will include the external. Right? But that's, you know, just like an inferior manifestation. Right? So the soul, being an expansion of this internal potency, will also have that element of, of the, not having it, but having the proclivity towards.

Right? Just like it said, you know, because Krsna is independent, therefore the soul is independent. Krsna wants to be happy, therefore the soul wants to be happy. Right? But specifically then we're an expansion of His potency.

Right? So those qualities are going to be there. Does that make sense? But we're, we can be overwhelmed by them because we're dependent. But we have that, that, that, we can go, we



can, we can choose to serve Krsna or not.

Or the internal potency is not going to be so foolish. You know what I'm saying? Because that's, that's, you know, her shadow. Right? So she's not going to identify with the shadow.

But we're so small that we can either become absorbed in the internal or become distracted by the shadow. That's what I'm saying. Okay? Yes.

Is Radharani the svarupa-sakti or, or, or you do that in the aspect of... No, Radharani is svarupa-sakti. But it's just this manifestation is manifestation of specific svarupa-sakti, the Hladini. She's the whole thing.

So that means she can... Like Krsna is everything. So He can manifest as whatever He likes. So He's, He's Vraja-Krsna, you know, but He can also be Visnu.

He can also be, you know, the potency that's, you know, holding up the building. You know what I'm saying? So, so like that, She also. But so, therefore, the nicest manifestation is Vraja-Krsna.

Right? Who is? Gopinath. In which position is Gopinath in? Of Sambandhade prayojana. Prayojana.

So naturally, what would be the, the, the, the, the... What do you call it? I always forget the word. The natural... Position. No.

Yeah. Natural position or... Counterpart. That's the word.

Never remember that word. That's always the one I'm looking for. The natural counterpart to Krsna is Gopinath.

Radharani. Radharani, because it's Ladini. Ladini is in the position of, of prayojana.

Sandini is, is, is Sambandha. How do you say? The, the... Sambit will be Abhidheya and Ladini will be prayojana. Right? Now, one can look at it that way.

That's what we'll look at is philosophy. Okay? It's because Krsna is there as Gopinath. Right? Then the natural counterpart will be Radharani.

Is that the Sri Bhuvanila? Yeah, you get Sri Bhuvanila from that. So, so... Then... But if you look at it from rasa, then how does it work? Krsna is Sambandha, she's prayojana. Oh, that's another.

If you're taking that, means that would be... No, but in this specific, what would be... How would it work? How would you see Braja Krsna? Since Krsna is everything. Why would you see Braja Krsna? Pastimes. Pastimes? Okay.

But why would those pastimes be there? Someone has love for Bhagavan. Okay, okay. That

would be... Okay, so you're taking that how would you see, meaning how would the individual come to the platform being able to see.

No, we're saying is why would Krsna manifest as Braja Krsna? Why would He manifest as that? What would be the impetus? Radharani. Yeah, but rasa, but what aspect of rasa? Radharani. And technically? Madhuri.

Madhuri. Okay, but that's adi-rasa because it includes all the others. We discussed before.

Okay. Because she's the asri. Right? She is the full asri.

And He's the full visayi. So in that position that that Krsna she sees, that's Braja Krsna. Right? And so therefore that's Braja Radharani.

And then as He expands into anything else, that's what she does. You understand? So in other words, because she's in that mood, that's why that manifestation is there. Madhuri is the rasa.

Does that make sense? So that's why then we would identify her as Ladini. But she's a surupta-sakti, just like He's the full personality of Godhead. Right? But that's the sweetest form.

Does that make sense? Okay. So we'll get into the fine details of this in the third year. We're studying the last chapters of Jaiva Dharma.

Okay? So transcendental knowledge, chapter four. Transcendental knowledge, the spiritual knowledge of the soul. Right? So this is the definition.

The spiritual knowledge of the soul, that's transcendental knowledge. I mean, you have knowledge about transcendence, but that's the natural inherent knowledge of the soul. But we forget that.

We become covered by illusion. The spiritual knowledge of the soul, of God and their relationships is both purifying and liberating. Such knowledge is the fruit of selfless devotion, action, karma yoga.

The Lord explains the remote history of Gita, the purpose and significance of His periodic descent in the material world, and the necessity of approaching a guru, a realized teacher. So this will be your pratigya, I think you could say. Okay? Does that make sense? So this knowledge of the soul, God, and their relationships, right, that is sambandha-jnana, that is knowledge.

Then how to apply that in selfless devotion. So what does that cover now? Abhidheya? Selfless? That's karmic, so that means the result. You understand? So just in this little explanation, you're getting sambandha, abhidheya, and prayojana.

Right? Does that make sense? So one has to understand these key things, then one can see what Prabhupada is talking about. Otherwise, because Prabhupada doesn't use the fancy terms all the time, then people will think, oh, he's speaking very simply. Because somebody else will

use the fancy terms, then they think, oh, see, he knows more, or he's on a more elevated platform.

Prabhupada gave the beginning. No, Prabhupada is so far ahead of everybody that it's so subtle that people can't see it. You know, it's like Sudama.

Was it Sudama? Or Subal. I think Krishna and Subal sit and talk. Sometimes what they're talking about, others can't even understand what they're talking about.

It's so subtle and so intimate. Right? Like that. So, you know, Prabhupada is the same, because it's written in such a way that everybody, it's using language that anybody could appreciate.

But in that simple language, he's defining the most elevated concepts of transcendence. And so, because of not being used to that, right? Because people speak very simple and straightforward and generally practical people, which are? Karmis. And then those who speak the philosophy and all that, they don't do work.

It doesn't have to be practical. So it's very... Its taste is its technicalness and its words and its vocabulary. Right? That's the jnanis.

So that's all we're used to. So we're not used to that high-level knowledge presented on a practical level that you could apply in Karma Yoga. Does that make sense? All right.

Okay. Verses 1 to 15. Transcendental knowledge about Krsna.

So 1 to 3, the disciplic succession. 4 to 6, Krsna's body is transcendental. 7 to 8, the reason of His appearance.

9 to 10, the benefit of understanding Krsna's birth and activities. 11 to 15, Krsna as the object of everyone's realization and creator of varna-asrama. Okay? So that's transcendental knowledge about Krsna.

Then 16 to 24, naiskarmya, how to transform work into sacrifice. Then verses 25 to 30, sacrifices resulting in transcendental knowledge. And 34 to 42, a summary of transcendental knowledge.

So, in other words, last chapter we've learned about the soul. All right? So now we're learning about Krsna, and we're learning about taking that work and offering it to Krsna. All right? So what is that work? What's the work made out of? If we're discussing sambandha-jnana, what is the work made out of? Hmm? Say, but if we're discussing transcendental knowledge, the key here is knowledge.

Chit? No, don't get upset. Don't worry. You're catching the focus.

What pulls these three together? Right? We've said it right in the beginning. The Pratigya says this, the first sentence. Right? Knowledge, but of, we've said the soul.

We've said Krsna. And then? The relationship. And what's that relationship? It means you have the transcendental, but here in the, how to work into sacrifice.

What's that work based on? What are you working with? Knowledge. Material energy. Material energy.

Right? You're applying the knowledge on material energy. So in other words, you have knowledge of the soul, the material energy, and God. That's sambandha-jnana.

Right? Now you're applying that knowledge through selfless work. So that's naiskarmya. Right? So that means the result is for Krsna's pleasure.

It also makes the point that this knowledge is the result of this naiskarmya. Yes, and also it means the knowledge will be the result, but that it's not the ultimate result. What's the ultimate result? Krsna.

Krsna's pleasure. Krsna's pleasure. And that will be expressed through? Devotional service.

Devotional service. And what are the forms, and these forms of devotional service? Means, when devotional service is in its perfect stage, what do we call it? Bhakti. Bhakti.

What's the perfection of bhakti? Prema. Prema. In other words, the ultimate goal is prema.

So there may be so many other goals before that. That's the thing is, sambandha, abhidheya, and prayojana is that they'll always keep moving. Because something's not in the field, you want to get it.

Once you get it, it becomes part of the field. So prayojana always goes back to abhidheya. To sambandha, it will be applied.

In abhidheya, it will get you some new prayojanas. But the ultimate one that, where it ends, where all others are leading up to, is prema. Love for Krsna.

Right? So then all these other things are simply an expression of that love for Krsna. Yes, they'll always be. Because you want to get something, then it comes back into the field.

Because the thing is, is it being eternal? In sambandha, then what is its quality in sac-cid-ananda? It's eternity. Eternity. So you've gained something.

So what you've gained in the spiritual platform is eternal. Material platform is temporary. Right? That's the problem.

The soul's eternal. It wants that pleasure eternally. But it won't happen.

Because as soon as it gets something, it moves back to the field, which in the material world is temporary. But in the spiritual world, it's eternal. Right? So it's manifestation.

You've gained that. It's eternality. Now it's eternally part of those pastimes.

If we're never distanced, yeah? Where does separation come from? Means, is there a difference between Krsna and His energy? No, but yes. So therefore, one's always with Krsna. So is there a difference between sambhog and vipralambha? No, but yes.

In other words, means you can scientifically define acintya-bheda-bheda-tattva. Right? You can define what's going on here. So it's not just we say it.

So the idea of this, because this is the ABCs of spiritual life. This stuff is the ABCs. So you can appreciate what's in Bhagavatam.

What's in Caitanya-caritamrta. So. Okay? Right? So we're trying to get this.

In other words, this course, this whole mandala is called Shastra Caksus. Seeing through the eyes of scripture. So in here, we're learning how the scriptures work.

What is all, what is all presented in all that. Okay? Does that make sense? You know, then the next will be, the next one is darshan. I mean, how does, darshan means the commentaries of the acaryas.

Means how to see through their vision. How to take, okay, within that transcendence, how to see through their vision. Right? And then, then you have Vedanta Caksus, so that we can see.

What is the absolute conclusion? Right? And so that conclusion will be, you know, for us, within our, our, our vision of it. Right? And then Caitanya-caritamrta's Prema Caksus is where appreciating how that rasa works. Right? The taste of it.

So that's your standard Vedic 12-year course. So this. Okay, so this is year one, so.

You can imagine what year 12 is. Okay. So verses 1 to 15.

Transcendental knowledge about Krishna. Verses 1 to 3, the disciplic succession. Now, in this, now let us say, why did we start, now here, Krishna is the most important.

Why didn't we start about knowledge of Krishna? Of these Sambandhagyan. You have to catch the mind. You have to catch the mind.

Okay. Everything expands from Krishna. Everything expands from Krishna.

But this is fourth chapter. Soul with second chapter. It will come from the, from the activities of Karma Yoga.

It will come, the not, means, yeah, the realization of it. Right? In other words, what we're saying is that that, there's that spark of the consciousness and the spiritual knowledge. That gives the, that impetus to be involved.

Then you'll get transcendental knowledge as a result of that. But still, why do we start with the soul? Yeah. Unless we know who we are, then how will we understand who Krishna is? Right? Because if I'm, you know, if I, okay, Krishna's great and all that, and I'm God, so hey, you know, it's like, it's nice.

So, so we start with ourself. That's why self-realization. And then from yourself, then you can work.

And then from your work, then you can understand the Lord. So the Lord is the ultimate goal. He's the cause of all causes.

Right? So we've discussed second chapter, the soul. Third chapter, you know, more, how the material energy, how we're, then this fourth chapter, now we're getting to Krishna. And that, you know, knowledge now, and once Krishna's there, then we can understand how to put those three together.

And that will be the fifth chapter. Yeah, well, yes. I mean, we'll see that, and then the fifth chapter will show how it's nicely put together.

Does this make sense? So Krishna gets a little bit of knowledge, and it shows how it's applied in action, and from that we get more knowledge. Yes. Yeah, that's why now we go through in this, because we ourselves are learning in that.

Once you finish the book, then there's points of this transcendental knowledge that are all throughout. There's points of other things that are all throughout. Then there's the analytical study.

You understand? So that's what the second year is, is the analyzation of it. Does it make sense? Yes. So, yeah.

Yeah, because if you don't know who you are, you can't act. Yes, yes, I think that would be. Because we see here, there's a procession, Krishna's body is transcendental, you know, like that.

So you have to establish his position and all that. And if it's something that's been going on for millions of years, so it's not something new. Otherwise, Arjuna can think, oh, hey, you just said this to get me to fight.

You know, it could be just something like that. Because they are friends, right? Generally, he will always talk in the third person. Only now and again, he'll speak in first person.

Because, therefore, you can understand when he speaks in first person, that's the conclusion of all the third person discussions. Because he'll say, all these things are there. As God, he's established them.

Right? And so, therefore, the Brahman, the Paramahansa aspects, it's all there. And he, as God,

as Vishnu, the maintainer, has done all that. Then he's going to say him as a person, as Krishna, what his opinion is.

So you can always take it, that's the essential point. All others should gather around that one and support that one. So people get confused, because there's so many points.

Which is main? You know, saying, you know, you're in the kitchen, what's main? You know, is the fire the main thing? Is the pot, is the spoon, is the vegetables, is the spices? You know, so you don't know what it is. You know, and they can all just say, well, there's no salt. It doesn't matter what you do.

So, therefore, salt's the most important. You know? You know what I'm saying? So you can always go on and on and on, but then they'll point it out. It's not only cooking, what's the important thing? What is the thing you appreciate from eating? The food.

The food, okay. This guy is French. What is it about the food? You put your face in it.

The taste, okay. So that's the essential thing, right? So, therefore, what pot you use to get what effect, what spoon you use to do that, what spicing, what techniques you use, those are all, even though those are all important, how you cut it, it'll make a difference in the taste. You know, it's just like, you know, one of the more, how you say, I find amazing elements of facts of, I mean, I take it as a fact.

Maybe it's not, but let us take, you take pasta, right? It's made out of exactly the same thing, but it's in different shapes. If you take the different shape and put it in the same sauce, it will taste different. Because there's, you know, the way, the volume of it, how the bite is, it gives a different taste.

So all these things have an effect on the taste. I said something wrong. Okay.

You start thinking about breakfast. Lunch. Lunch.

Okay. I guess that's what the brahmacharis get about, you know, pasta at six in the morning. Doesn't matter.

Okay. So, does this make sense? So you have to know what's the important thing. So, everything else in the whole science is to bring about the element of taste.

If you know that, then you'll be a good cook. You'll be able to balance it all. It's the same way as you have all this knowledge, but you have to know that it's going to, it's for developing that love for Krishna.

Otherwise, you can come up with all kinds of strange conclusions and all that. Right? But, you know. Yeah.

Yeah. Because it's also, yeah, that has to, it has to. In other words, why is the presentation

important if we're looking at a Sambandhavidya prajna? Because it increases prajumna.

It increases prajumna. The inspiration. Right? Because if prajumna is there, then you get attached.

Then you'll act. You'll eat. Yeah.

That's there. You'll eat more consciously. Yeah.

Because if it doesn't, you know, you just eat because you have to. Without eating because you want to. Right? So, you have the, yeah.

All these things are there. So, by this point that he just made, that if it looks nice and, you know, the presentation is nice, the consciousness would also be increased. Then what would be better for spiritual development? Something properly cooked, looks proper, tastes proper, smells proper, proper presentation and serving.

Or, you know, just in a bucket with, you know, a soup ladle. And, you know, every man for himself. Yeah.

The former. Okay. Yeah.

So, it attracts the attention. Then you can see. It's not because otherwise you say, okay, that's philosophy, that's theory.

Now we have to get down to practical application. When we say practical application, what does that include? Action is performed with? Knowledge. So, therefore, they're saying we'll be practical with no knowledge.

And they're saying that the theory doesn't connect to the practice. What's the meaning of theory? Theory means is what the practice is based on. Right? Does that make sense? At least it should make sense.

Okay. So, but because of the modern academy, you can have the modern academy and its separation from the theology and the lack of theology. Therefore, you can have theories that actually don't apply.

Right? Because think about it. The, you know, how you say, the renowned, you know, Ph.D. in economics, you know, that has tenure. And he has, you know, he's respected all over the country for being the top guy.

Why is he only making, you know, 5,000 a month? With that knowledge, if he could really apply it, wouldn't he be the richest man in the country? So that's the thing is he can't apply it. The Vedic is those who could do it, they were teaching it. Right? In other words, let's say if you wanted to teach, you know, how you say, the process of economics, you know, justice, administration and all that.



Who do you want as your teacher, a Ph.D. or Chanakya? Right. So in the Vedic, that's who would teach. Those who know it and can do it.

They would be the ones that would teach on that, you know. Does that make sense? If it was something, means the brahmana knows the philosophy, knows the yajna, puja, all these things, so he's teaching because he does know that. And he'll teach you the knowledge about the court, king's duties.

But the king is a brahmacari, will learn all that, then he'll graduate, go back to the palace. Then he'll see, he'll be shown how to apply it practically. And by who? By the court brahmanas.

By the court brahmanas, yeah. By the Rajguru and by the other ministers. Right? So they're getting the practical.

But he's learned all the theory and how it all connects together, the philosophy and everything else in his life. From a brahmana who not necessarily will do that. Understand? But so at some point it has to be that the two are combined.

Just like in the gurukula you learn so many things. But the business person then learns all these things, the culture, philosophy and all this. But then where will he actually learn business? From a boy.

Yeah. Will he learn in a school? No, you can't teach business in a school. You have to learn it in the business.

Yes. They are acting as those brahmanas. This is the theory.

Someone has to teach it. But why is he teaching it? No, but why is he teaching it? Why is that? He's doing it because it's his living. But those people probably on top usually they are critics of learning.

How do you say critics? I would say it's probably Greenspan was on top. And he did run the whole economics of America. Not a PhD.

So he knew it better than them because he could apply it. The point is, is you may have a few people like what you're talking about. Now, let us say there's an opportunity in that university for the chair of economics.

Is that PhD that you're talking about interested? Yes. May or may not be. But if we go into university politics, how much fighting is going on over the chair, over tenure? Over whose theories are on top? There's a lot.

So that means there may be that rare person that you're talking about who is a true academic who's only interested in knowledge. Like that. But much of what we see has nothing to do with that.

Because otherwise if it was true knowledge, if you thought it was true knowledge, would you worry about your position in the academy or not? No. But they're in that seat. Why? Because they worry.

You know what I'm saying? They have to worry. Yeah. So in other words, those who don't mind living with nothing.

So he may be that kind of academic and he's working down flipping burgers or something. Because they don't want him in the university because he's too stuck on his truth. You know what I'm saying? So you will have the element.

We're not saying that the modern is not having the elements of what natural laws of God. But what we're saying is that there's a good chance. And we're not saying that they're not brahminical by nature.

But we're saying because it's not connected to Krishna, it actually doesn't become useful. And because it doesn't need to be connected to Krishna. Therefore, then with time is the practice of economics in the field and the practice in the university.

What is the university studying? The study that the teacher is teaching you, what is he quoting? From the previous guys, but more importantly? What are they studying? Statistics. The statistics. Where did the statistics come from? Result from the other guys.

You result from the people who are actually in business, in economics. So they're studying. Okay, this company did this and that and that was successful and this one did this.

So there are the practical people are already doing it, making the money or losing the money. All right. They're studying that.

You know what I'm saying? So it's not like when the Vedic Academy where they're studying the authority of the scriptures, which is already stating what it actually is. Then your contemplation is how to apply that in your life. Here they're actually taking what's going in a life and trying to develop a theory from it.

In hopes of better understanding and better application. You know what I'm saying? So it's backwards. That's what we're saying.

It's not coming from the people who... There it's like they have knowledge, but don't know the practice. Others know practice, they don't have the knowledge. The Vedic, the concept is the two have to be combined.

Because that's what's being given here is transcendental knowledge. Means you have the knowledge, you're applying it. Otherwise, why after the fourth chapter we don't stop? Why do we, fifth chapter we have the karma yoga meaning that combination.

Does that make sense? We're not talking about that pure. And even if he is the pure intellectual

and completely that and not worried about all these different things. What's the use of being on that platform if you're not God conscious? You know what I'm saying? So all that good qualities and all that development and all that intellectual capability, but it's not connected to God.

So next lifetime you don't know what it'll be. Especially if he... How you say? Is proficient in some strange branch of knowledge. Frogs, he's got a chance that's where he's going to end up.

Does this make sense? Is that okay? Verse 1 to 15, transcendental knowledge about Krishna. Verses 1 to 3, the succession. In the third chapter, Krishna recommended nice karma as a means to obtain transcendental knowledge.

Now the Lord describes how transcendent knowledge is received. The karma yoga, this nice karma, that will give you transcendental knowledge. But now how to receive that? Because otherwise knowledge comes, but now what do you do with it? How do you interpret the information? Right? This is what defines philosophical schools.

All the schools basically have the same information. What do they do with it? How do they interpret it? So that's your hermeneutics. So that's then what must be seen, is how that's gained.

So nice karma makes you eligible, but you still have to receive it when it comes. Yes. It means you can get it, but you still have to be able to take it properly.

Right? Because otherwise, let's say you did your work, you got your money, but you don't actually understand the value of money, how to use it, so you immediately take your paycheck and walk out the front gate of the factory you're in, and there's all the liquor shops, who happen to be only open on that day, when everyone gets their paycheck, and then you buy all your booze and sit with your buddies and all that, and then you go home with nothing, and then your wife yells at you. And you say, don't worry, next week. You know what I'm saying? So he doesn't know what to do with what he's gotten.

So now this is the point, is what to do with it. It comes down to the chain of paramparā can be properly understood only inside the paramparā system. Śrīla Prabhupāda writes in his purport, the verse 3, there are two classes of men, namely the devotee and the demon.

Right? He didn't give a third. He didn't say two classes of men, namely the devotee, the demon, and the, you know, how you say, the cultured, educated, you know, intellectual liberal. He didn't say they have to be one side or the other.

The Lord selected Arjuna as the recipient of this great science, owing to his being a devotee of the Lord. But for the demon it is not possible to understand this great mysterious science. Right? Demon simply means that one is unwilling to connect it to the Lord.

That's all. One hasn't connected to the Lord, that's innocent. So innocent is, how you say, potential for being a devotee.

But someone who's not interested, doesn't want to be, that's, you know, good potential for being a demon. So the innocent would be like on the devotee's definition, or maybe on the devotee's side, which is not awakened. Yeah.

He hasn't awoken. He's there in the middle. But it's like, in other words, how do you know when there's a demon or a devotee? What's, what has, what, how do you tell? When you talk about Krishna.

When you talk about Krishna, then it will split. So the modern concept is, you talk in such a way it never splits, and that way then everybody is all included. But because it never splits, you also don't have dynamic devotional service.

Right? So therefore, it's actually because it doesn't, then the demoniac element is there in everything. So it's not really connected to Krishna. Because that's all it is.

Demoniac means it's connected. Devotee means it's, how do you say, yes, it is connected. Demoniac means it's not.

That's all. It's a very simple point. There are a number of editions of this great book of knowledge.

Some of them have commentaries by the devotees, and some of them have commentaries by the demons. Commentation by the devotee is real, whereas that of the demons is useless. Bhagavad-gita is not meant for the recreation of armchair speculators, and is not simply an abstract spiritual treatise designed for mendicants living in the forest.

The philosophy of the Gita is practical, and when properly applied, it can solve all problems of life. So, just looking at why he gave this, it's not for armchair speculators, right? So it's for those who are not practically doing anything, and just contemplating, or for those who are renounced in the forest. So if you wanted to give an example that is for everyone, right, that is practical, down to earth, what would be your best example? Hmm? Arjuna.

Arjuna. Why? Because he's a great astronomer, because he has a job to do over here. Right.

He's a ksatriya. Ksatriyas, they're practical. They like sastra, they like authority, but it has to be practical.

You can't make it practical, they're not interested. Right? A brahmana will accept it whether you know how to make it practical or not. They'll make it practical themselves.

But a ksatriya is being practical. You come along with some nice theory, great, as long as you can apply it. If you can't apply it, he'll keep on with his practical.

Right? So there is the element of the sastra and the higher understanding. With a vaisya, if it just works, if it's connected to sastra, great, then he can get some pious credit for it. Right? You can tell others how religious he is.

Right? But if it doesn't, it doesn't matter to him, he'll make his money. Shudra, as long as that feelings are there, and this and that, and those are being experienced, that's enough. You make profit or not, you know, that would be nice.

But if you don't, then that's the most important. Right? Yes? Okay. Therefore, Krishna gives this knowledge to the saintly kings.

The kings of all planets are especially meant for the protection of the inhabitants. And therefore, the royal order should understand the science of Bhagavad-gita in order to be able to rule the citizens and protect them from material bondage to lust. Human life is meant for cultivation of spiritual knowledge.

In eternal relationship with the Supreme Personality of Godhead and the executive heads of all states and all planets are obliged to impart this lesson to the citizens by education, culture and devotion. In other words, the executive heads of all states are intended to spread the science of Krishna consciousness to that... so that the people may take advantage of this great science and pursue a successful path utilizing the opportunity of the human form of life. Oh, you don't have this.

It's just that you have so as the last word, and above that you have the as the last word. Right? They're exactly above each other. So if you take the T off the one and the O off the other, then you get two.

That's that full word dyslexia. Okay, now notice here when he says executive heads, he doesn't say what kind of administration it is. He doesn't say it has to be monarchy, it should be democracy, or it can't be dictators or oligarchy.

He's not saying that. It means whoever is the head, that's their business. These other things are just various forms that one can use.

They all have their advantages and disadvantages. For the Vedas, it's all of them together. The proper balance.

But if you want to separate them off, they're parts of something, you'll get something out of them. They'll have their strengths and weaknesses. But the point is it's God consciousness because they're the ones that are seeing how people live.

Right? To the actual quality of life. They're seeing to the discipline that people are following their life in a certain way. So they should be seeing that that's God conscious.

So through education. So the educational system, people should be taught that way. How the culture means how people interact and what's going on in the day-to-day culture.

And devotion. So all that's there, that's nice. You've learned so much knowledge, you've learned the culture, but it must be devotional.

Because that knowledge and that culture, that is your karma and yama. So if that's done with devotion, then you have buddhi-yoga. So you can see here, again, education, culture, and devotion.

What is that? We'll say, okay, there's three different words. No, but that's also buddhi-yoga. Knowledge, culture, which is application, and devotion.

Otherwise, this knowledge and culture, that could be nice karma, it could get you to the heavenly planets or get you to the Brahman. But devotion will get you back to Godhead. You can see the kings, they were building schools, maintaining the rules of society, and making shambles.

Yes, so you see all that. So that's why the kings are always the focal point in Puranas. Kings and Brahmins.

And that interaction. So because that's where your knowledge and your application of that knowledge, to see that the people learn that and practice it, is happening. It's between these two.

You need money for that, but that's the secondary point. You have the relationship, whether you have money or no money, things will work. But it will work better if you have money.

But if you follow dharma, artha comes. So therefore, the great kings are dedicated to dharma, under the direction of the Brahmins. So therefore, their kingdoms are always prosperous.

You generally never hear of a religious king, whose kingdom is not prosperous. Does that make sense? Question from the audience. Yes, community or even here it would be society, because you might even have many communities within a society.

Or you might even have many societies within a nation. But it's a matter of, in other words, the human social interaction. You must be there.

Because that means that culture is going to be there in your private life, within the ashram, but it's going to be there in the public life, through the element of varna. And then that combination. Because devotion basically brings them all together.

They'll all manifest. You have a festival or something, then it brings all these elements together. That's Bhagavad Gita 4.1 purport.

In the purport, Srila Prabhupada estimates that Krishna spoke Bhagavad Gita to the sun god at least 120,400,000 years ago. So that establishes that it's always been around. And that would put it back, because it means 4,300,000 will be a full cycle of the years.

So that means that at least this once, if not, he doesn't have to mention the one before. This is already mind-boggling enough. There's other ways to go.

Yeah, I spoke this much to him, but then before that I spoke it. And then before that, and then three days later. And yeah, and then before that.

Verses 4 to 6, Krishna's body is transcendental. So that was the discussion. So one must hear it in the disciplic succession.

What is there? It has to come from within, because the disciplic succession means... What is the disciplic succession? It's the form of it? It's the siddhanta. So that's the potency. That's what's alive.

Just like electricity goes through a wire, but it's the electricity that's important. So you have this form of teacher-disciple and all that in that relationship, but it's that knowledge that is passing through that line that's important. So to be able to appreciate that perspective that is being given in the paramparās, because the paramparās actually are only Vaiṣṇava.

You do have non-Vaiṣṇava, we'll call them paramparās, just because it follows the form of the Vaiṣṇava paramparā, but it doesn't have the actual life of it. Does that make sense? Just like if in the house there's all wires and everything around to connect it, you'll call it electric wiring, but if there's no electricity in it, it's not actually doing anything. But you still call it electric wiring.

So they'll still call it paramparā. Even the music lines that say paramparā, they always talk paramparā, at least the old guys, the young guys not so much, but the old guys always talk about paramparā, you know, oh, you're so good at this, yes, that's our line, you know, I've learned this from my teacher, you know, like this kind of thing. So even they talk, the musicians in India, talk paramparā.

But, you know, it doesn't have the transcendental knowledge. Verses 4 to 6, Kṛṣṇa's body is transcendental. Verse 4. Arjuna inquires, The sun-god is senior to Kṛṣṇa by birth.

How could Kṛṣṇa have instructed him? With this important question opens the discussion on transcendental knowledge. To remove the ignorance of the conditioned souls, Arjuna raises a classical doubt regarding the omniscience and eternal nature of the Lord. This doubt arises because Kṛṣṇa appeared in a human form and was born from Devakī.

If He is human, He cannot be omniscient. If He was born, He cannot be eternal. These classical doubts because anytime we come up with something that doesn't seem to make sense to our intelligence, and that's because our mind has a particular way of interpretation.

This is why it's important. Because the mind has to accept a particular way of interpreting things. Does that make sense? We're interpreting according to sambandha, abhidheya and prayojana.

With sambandha meaning the position of Kṛṣṇa as the Supreme Lord, the soul as His part and parcel, material energy as His external potency. Then the process is devotional service, which is the combination of that knowledge and skill being done for the goal to please Kṛṣṇa, to develop

love for Kṛṣṇa. So that will be our hermeneutics.

That's Vedānta. So we're always going to interpret through this. But others have a different idea from their mind of what it is that they want to get from something.

Sense gratification. Any opportunity, they'll look for how you can get sense gratification out of this. The devotee may be in an opportunity of sense gratification, but that's not what he pulls from it.

He sees an opportunity to serve Kṛṣṇa. Does that make sense? To engage others in Kṛṣṇa consciousness. Does that make sense? So here is this classical doubt.

Is that, okay, well here he spoke before, but Kṛṣṇa is here now and He was just born, so how would He have been there before and all that? And so then what will we do with that? What's the first point? The doubt will... What's the first... What's its object? Experience. Okay. No, Kṛṣṇa, that's what we're going to establish through this question.

But the mundane intelligence that comes up with this doubt, what's its point? Yeah. In other words, Kṛṣṇa is not God, so if He's not God, we don't have to worry about this. Therefore, my material life goes on as it is.

So much of the time, doubts we have, we have to see is the doubt there to actually clear the doubt so we have a clear understanding or the doubt is there used for our own purposes to not change anything. Does that make sense? So many times if you're having a discussion and there's an argument, generally what will happen is you'll say something. Instead of trying to understand what you're saying and then asking a question on that, they will take your example or whatever the point you've made and find an exception to the rule.

Right? Now, why will there be an exception? They're thinking it's because there's something wrong with it. Why is there such a thing as exceptions? Why would it be there? Yeah, there's a principle and its application. So there's always going to be, you know, differences.

And now the principle is one, the application is many. Why? Why is the principle one, the application many? Time, place, circumstance? No, but why is it the principle of many details, one principle? Yes. Yes, yes.

And his energies are many. You understand? So there's always going to be that. And between those different feminine manifestations, is there going to be differences? Is there going to be contradiction? Right? That's what gives the variety.

You understand? So there's always going to be that there. So it means it's inherent in Krishna's nature that there's contradiction. Because if you take everything that there is and bring it all together in one place, are there going to be different elements that are contradictory? Yes.

Now, same time you take it the other way. How is it that in manifesting something that's



coming from one place, why is it there's so much variety that are contradictory? Where did that contradiction originate? Yeah, to increase pleasure. Where did that contradiction come from? If after so many stages of manifestation, then there's completely contradictory elements.

Where did those contradictory elements originate? Yeah, from Krishna. You understand? Otherwise, how did they get there? Right? So either way, Krishna reconciles all those because he's the origin of all of them. So that one found a doubt, you know, I mean, a contradiction.

That means you're intelligent, that you put things together. But it doesn't mean that you're actually smart. And that you actually want to know.

Right? So what's the motive behind finding that? Arjuna's was so he knows. So we have to see, is our one because we're just trying to find a fault to dismiss the theory? You understand? So we have to be very careful that, you know, how a doubt actually is supposed to be used. So he's asking one because this is what'll come up.

Oh, but you know, you were just born now. How could you have been there, you know, 120 million years ago? Right? So like that, then you throw the whole thing out rather than, you know, so you have to ask. That's why submissive inquiry means you inquire in such a way to elicit the actual proper answer and proper understanding.

Otherwise, if it's challenging, that means you're saying that what's being presented is not real. The submissive inquiry means you can ask anything. Right? But it has to be for the purpose of trying to understand.

Right? So this is very important because now we're dealing with transcendental knowledge. So that means that this element becomes very important. Okay.

Śrīla Prabhupāda writes in the purport, Therefore, to clarify this point, Arjuna put this question before Kṛṣṇa so that he himself could speak authoritatively. That Kṛṣṇa is the supreme authority, is accepted by the whole world, not only at present but from time immemorial. The demons alone reject Him.

Anyway, since Kṛṣṇa is the authority accepted by all, Arjuna put this question before him in order that Kṛṣṇa would describe Himself without being depicted. Depicted? Oh, depicted by the demons who always try to distort Him in a way understandable to the demons and their followers. In other words, the demons, they can't understand God, so they'll try to make an adjustment in God that fits their mundane intelligence.

Then they'll end up with all these strange definitions of God. That's why you have these things as omniscient, omnipotent, He's the creator of everything, He's the maintainer, all this and that. But at the same time, He has nothing to do with what's going on here.

You understand? This is coming from a non-devotional intelligence. But the point is, it's only through devotion can you understand this. So that means someone could be religious, but not

devotional.

I remember that one man's house, and he was a devotee of Kṛṣṇa. But his wife would have nothing to do with Kṛṣṇa. Zero.

She was a very serious devotee of Rāmacandra. And when asked why not Kṛṣṇa, her point is that Kṛṣṇa is not religious. He's off dancing with other people's wives, doing all kinds of crazy stuff.

But Rāmacandra, now he does everything according to religion, he's proper. So here is someone so situated in religion that they can't actually understand the origin of the religion. So that means that same problem could come up by people who, in one sense, have faith, but at the same time, they have all these other material considerations.

So piety and being good. Because the whole point is, God is good. So living a long life and parents dying before their children, that's good.

So having a short life, children dying before the parents, that's bad. So that means if God's good, He can't have anything to do with this. But it's going on.

So that means God's not in control. You understand? So their attachment to the religious, or the moral, then is greater than other things. So it's good, it's pious, but it's not necessarily devotional.

It's only through devotion you can understand God. And so we see that there's a difference between those who have knowledge or are religious and those who are devotional. Generally speaking, most of the time, those who are devotional have a rough time with those who are only religious.

So most of your more devotional saints in history always had a big problem with those who presented themselves as being religious. They all ran into a problem. So it's there.

Nowadays we are getting elements that those who are devotional may not have been very religious. Yeah, but that's the other side. Because you have two sides.

The devotional is the middle. And then you have those who follow the rules but don't know the purpose. And those who are all sentiment with no rules.

And what's really unfortunate is when those who are sentimental and know rules become the establishment. Then you really have a problem. Yeah, good, yeah.

Like that, what's used, what's engaged, what makes things nice, which protects. But religion technically means what is the inherent nature. People don't necessarily see.

In other words, the inherent nature is going to do certain activities. So they only see the activities of the inherent nature. They don't actually understand the inherent nature.

You know, they say, okay, a businessman, he's going to do this, this, this. So, you know, these activities are okay. These are not.

He's going to make money. So, you know, if he gives, you know, in charity, he takes care of his people, you know, and protects his money. Okay, then that's good, that's fine.

You know, but if he doesn't give in charity, doesn't pay his taxes, won't take care of his workers, or he's so foolish he loses all his money, we'll say that's bad. Right? But we don't understand what's the inherent nature of the businessman. That's to generate profit, you know, through the system of economics.

That's the inherent nature. So if he's following that, then you're going to, so why is it good he takes care of his workers? They don't leave, yes. Yeah, they'll increase his profit.

They don't go, they're more inspired. Inspired man does more work, right? You know, steals less or, you know, cheats less or like this. So these things are there, they'll seem as just techniques, but it's actually because of the inherent nature of the field he's working with.

Right? So that's when Prabhupada says dharma, he means that, the inherent nature. And then based on that, you have the forms and the rules that govern those forms. But most when they say, we hear dharma, religion, then we'll take the forms and those rituals and that that govern it.

Since they don't know the nature, therefore it seems like dry ritual. You understand the nature, it's not dry ritual, because nature doesn't change. So that means nature doesn't get old.

So tradition never becomes old, it just becomes the practiced way that works. Why do you do something again? Because it worked, you liked it. You know, you went to this restaurant, it was good.

You go back? Yes. And then, you know, you went on a certain time and that worked very nice, so then you go again at that time. So then it'll become in the family known as? A tradition.

Because it worked. But because with time no one remembers why they went there, why that worked, then the tradition gets lost, because why do we have to go there? Why can't we go somewhere else? You know? Does that make sense? So tradition is what worked. And so in the beginning, the people who it worked for understood why it worked, that's why they did it again.

But afterwards, if that knowledge isn't passed down, then it gets lost. So that's why Krishna's speaking it again, it got lost. You know, so the form was there, but the knowledge wasn't.

You understand? So this whole thing of tradition automatically means bad. It's kind of like, well, why do they always say tradition is bad? That itself is the tradition for the liberals. If I say tradition's great, then the liberals will go, what? This guy's not a liberal.

So that means liberals have their tradition. You understand? Otherwise, how do you identify?

Use the wrong word. So you have to use the right words, the right kind of frame of mind, the right perspective.

Does that make sense? Why do we only speak on the liberals, not the conservatives? Because generally conservatives already have an idea that they have their rules and they follow it and all that. So it's already understood. At least we think it's understood, maybe it's not.

It is necessary that everyone, for his own interest, know the science of Krishna. Therefore, when Krishna himself speaks about himself, he is auspicious for all the worlds. So Arjuna is getting Krishna.

Everyone has to know Krishna. And so Arjuna is getting Krishna to speak about himself. So that is going to be something very valuable for everybody.

So this is those kind of questions that we see in the Bhagavatam are glorified because they're for everyone's benefit. Verse 5. God is transcendental to both Karshna, Kshara, Kshara and Akshara, fallible and infallible living beings. So Kshara is fallible.

So Akshara is infallible. But then the letters are called Akshara. You have all the different sounds.

Those are Akshara. So that means they, because they're coming from Narayana, so they must be infallible, no? Although Arjuna is addressed herein as the mighty hero who could subdue the enemies, he is unable to recall what had happened in his various past births. Therefore, a living entity, however great he may be in the material estimation, can never equal the Supreme Lord.

Therefore, anyone who is a constant companion of the Lord is certainly a liberated person, but he cannot be equal to the Lord. 4.5 purport. You know, so Krishna's, you know, his position, so the living entity, though he may be transcendental, he still is not in the position of the Lord.

The Lord's always superior. As Krishna's saying, he remembers everything, but we don't. You know, if we do, we get confused.

We're dependent. He's independent. So he remembers everything.

How you deal with him, that's how he reciprocates. But we have to remember, God has nothing to do. Right? Not as a bad thing.

He doesn't have to do something to maintain himself. Right? So therefore, when someone interacts with him, he responds, and that's his pleasure. Right? But the living entity needs to work in a particular way because they're dependent.

Right? But the point, yes. He's transcendental to fallible and infallible because they're two aspects of duality. So Krishna's beyond that.

Right? In other words, Krishna's the cause of both. Just give another example. You have the

material world.

And then you have the spiritual world. But material and spiritual world are both emanations from Krishna. So Krishna is beyond spiritual.

Does that make sense? Because spiritual we define as not material. So we have the non-material and we have the material. But Krishna's beyond both.

He's something else. That would refer to Atmarama. Atmarama, yes, that's there.

But at the same time, he's something else. We're coming from him. The material manifestation, the spiritual manifestation is coming from him.

But he's of another nature. Right? He is the source of everything. So he's something that we can't actually understand.

So it's only by devotion, then he'll allow you to understand, you know, whatever we can. So is he also beyond eternal? Is he beyond eternal? No, that's a definition of his position. Because there is no beyond eternal.

He is eternality. He is knowledge. He is bliss.

You know, so that's the basis of everything. Right? You know, eternality is your existence. And so whatever there is, the field, whatever you're going to act in, knowledge means activity.

Right? And bliss means your results of your actions. Right? So that's complete. Those three include everything.

Is this okay? Is that okay? Yes, he's infallible. But at the same time, he's the source of infallibleness. You know, so that puts him beyond that.

Okay. Verse six. Here the Lord explains his transcendental nature.

Although he is not subject to birth and death, he still appears in every millennium in his original transcendental form. His appearances are not governed by karma, but by his own sweet will. Krishna does not change his body and is thus free from ignorance.

The fact that the Lord remembers all of his appearances is not surprising, because he is the very source of remembrance, knowledge, and forgetfulness. Bhagavad-gita 15.15. Okay. So instead of changing bodies, that's what creates ignorance.

Right? One would say, well, why would that create ignorance? Because the point is this. In that position of where ignorance is, then in the element of sambandha, what's the definition of the material existence? Palsika. Palsika.

What did you say? Forgetfulness. Forgetfulness. Okay.

So forgetfulness of the previous. So the temporariness, the temporariness then is a, you could say, a quality of ignorance. Right? Because otherwise it would be eternal.

Goodness means it's eternal. Right? Does that make sense? Right? It means the future has not arrived. Right? The past is already over.

But the present is always present. Do you understand? So that position is eternal. That make sense? So ignorance then means it's temporary.

Right? So that's a quality of it. So when you change body, that means temporary. And that means ignorance.

Right? So when one changes the body, one doesn't remember. Right? It's also a benefit. Because otherwise, if you remembered your previous birth, you may not be so pleased now.

You know? Like that. You know, people are thinking about this and that, but they only talk about the ones that are nice. You know, they don't talk about other stuff.

Like that. Does this make sense? Okay. Okay.

Then the next group of verses, the Lord explains why He appears in the world. So then we'll... Today's Monday, right? Yeah, so Tuesday. So we'll deal with all that.

This is one of the biggest ones, right? Yeah.