

2010-11-05 BVPS BG 4.16-4.24 ND

Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa So verses 16 to 24, naiṣṭhānyā, how to transform work into sacrifice. In verses 14 and 15, Kṛṣṇa urged Arjuna to follow the example of the great souls from the past. In order to do this, Arjuna should understand the distinction between action, karma, unauthorized action, vikarma, and inaction, akarma.

Because the point, the difficulty comes is that we see things according to the external, the form. Now the form, of course, has a meaning. It's not that the form is not valid, right? The form has meaning.

Prabhupāda. You're here for some time? 21st of February. 21st of? February.

February, great. And I'll be teaching a lot, so you can sleep away, maybe once a week. Oh, okay.

Okay, we're on third chapter of, no, fourth chapter of Gītā. Okay, great. Okay, so there's karma, akarma, okarma.

Now, the element that's important here is that we're trying to distinguish work, right? Because the work doesn't change, right? If it's your duty, right, that's karma. If it's not your duty, then it's vikarma. And if it's being done in Kṛṣṇa consciousness, the same activity becomes akarma.

So the activity doesn't necessarily change, right? We have this idea, okay, you know, doing good work, that's pious and that's nice, you know? And so it stands on its own, right? That's this, you know, this week's ongoing thing about compassion, is that it stands on its own. And that's why it's good. But it's not spiritual, it's just mundane, right? Maybe nice mundane, but it's still mundane.

Then, if it's, you know, how you say, unauthorized ask, it has to be something really sinful and disgusting and terrible, right? Then only, then, does that make sense? So then we can relate to that. And then akarma means no karma, that means like the impersonalist doing nothing, right? Does this make sense? So we see what's the point, what's the common element here between these three? Activities. Activities.

But now, in the first example, all the activities were exactly the same. Well, they're all devoid of bhakti. All devoid of bhakti, but here also, and this is, Kṛṣṇa will point out that akarma, that's, that by the impersonalist is not actually akarma.

Because he'll say there's action and inaction, inaction and action, right? That'll come up. So what I'm saying is here, is we see one is the three, means what Kṛṣṇa's pointing out are the three activities exactly the same, but the consciousness is different in all three. And, but how we see these three tends towards that the activities are completely different, right? And the emphasis is not put on the consciousness, right? Because the activity itself, we will feel that is,

that is the consciousness.

Is that because the activities are in relation to ourselves instead of in relation to Kṛṣṇa? Yeah, it's in relation to ourselves instead of Kṛṣṇa, but we take ourselves to be the body, the mind, the intelligence. So that's who's performing the activities, right? So because of that, then, does this make sense? So in other words, we have this more stereotyped concept of, you know, spiritual material activity. And then, you know, karma, you know, good, nice, you know, beneficial, and it's glorious.

You know, and then, then that bad activity is, you know, completely disgusting, that's not useful for anything. You know, like this. And then, because we're not involved in material activities, we do no activity, right? This is a mistake.

So Kṛṣṇa's pointing out here that it's the consciousness that changes, right? The consciousness changes because the consciousness changes. That's what will make the difference, right? Like that. That's what will make the difference.

So that's what has to be brought out, because we're seeing in the last chapter, it's talking about karma. But it's bringing out the element, you change the consciousness, you change the karma. Right? Because the point is, is consciousness is the natural element of the soul.

Right? And in being conscious, then you can understand who you are and what results you can get from your endeavors. Right? Does it make sense? Like that. So consciousness is the actual key point.

Not something else. We'll take it, oh, it's what I'm doing, or this or that, or I didn't quite do it right, that's why I didn't get the result. That, of course, there is in the skill.

And to get the material observable result. But the real result's not what you gain through action. In other words, what is from the operational cause, then how the material energy transforms as the material cause, that result is not actually the main thing we're looking for.

What we're looking for is the consciousness that we have in doing that work for Krishna, and that result is for Krishna. Yes? It seems like one reason we don't get the essence of karma, this being consciousness, is because we ordinarily talk about karma as action and reaction. Yes.

We don't go deep into the essence of it. Yes. Because the action-reaction, because yesterday the discussion is that, that's being brought out by Baladeva and Viswanath, is that one is interacting with Krishna anyway.

Because the point is, is Krishna makes the laws of karma. And so it's his laws and his potencies that are working. The dead matter is not doing anything.

So his potencies are working. So we interact with Krishna in the right way, what he says is correct according to the rules. And so he responds, but you're not seeing him involved in it.

So because you've done the right work, he responds by giving you a good material result. But the real point is, is you're interacting with Krishna. So if you see that, naturally the good material result comes, but that's not the focus.

But what comes is that self-realization or liberation or even more important, devotion. We miss it because, say, in Vedic culture, when people talk about action, consciousness is implied in that. It's implied, but the point is, is... But it's not implied in the West.

It's not implied in the West. People talk about the lives, your karma, but it's like it's external. Because in the Western, basically all the Western philosophies, and even the religions, what's the soul? The body.

The body. The soul is the body. Or at best, some will say it's the mind.

Your idealists will say it's the mind. Or some of the feelings are the real you. So you're going to have all these different concepts that actually are just dealing with the element of the actual form of karma.

And also you have the element that now, since... I mean, it started, it's very historical, but basically you could say the Enlightenment was the victory of the bourgeois to establish their value system as the prominent value system. So in other words, the result of activity. In other words, wealth, and that is actually the foremost important element of the common culture.

You have individuals within the culture who have their own personal interests. But the main point is, ultimately, as long as the society's prosperous, it's fine. But before that time, then religion was more important.

Philosophy is doing the right thing, and all that, in the better circles. And the misuse of that was what would have generated the inspiration for the Enlightenment. But it should have been called something else other than Enlightenment.

It should have been called prosperity or something else. The Enlightenment gets the idea that actually it's a philosophical victory, but it's not. It's just a victory that you can do whatever you want to get done whatever you want.

That's all. That's not exactly Enlightenment. If you present it like that, most would say that's kind of a bit self-centered.

But whatever. That's the point of euphemisms. They make something not so nice sound really good.

What do you call it? On the front of, I think it was Auschwitz, they had, work is freedom or something like that. Which means? Work will set you free. Yeah, work will set you free.

Work you so hard, you'll be dead. You're free. You're no longer in Auschwitz.

Of course, we understand that is because you see, as they will call it the Dark Ages or Middle Ages or like that. So when Lord Chaitanya appeared, suddenly the whole world became a little bit more conscious. And so then everything just perked up and all that.

That'll be the effect of that. But the problem is, is they're still misusing it. See, consciousness is there.

Harani Kashyapu is, of all the materialists in the universe, is the most conscious. Therefore, he's successful. He's more conscious than Indra, more conscious than any of them.

Therefore, he can defeat them all. So that's why that Rupa Goswami points out, first you have to have consciousness. If there's no consciousness, nothing can be accomplished.

So you can't establish relationship. You can't affect the relationship. You can't get the taste of the results of the relationship.

So you have to be conscious to do that. But being conscious, you have to be conscious of God. And that's not enough.

Then that consciousness has to be favorable to God. Otherwise, you may be conscious of God, but it's favorable to you. Like we were saying, a jnanaist is conscious of God, but it's only for his own benefit that God will, by following logic and doing everything in a logic pattern, therefore God will arrange within the material energy that one will be free from it.

So it's God conscious, but it's not actually devotional. And we understand that until you understand the devotional element, that God that you're conscious of isn't actually a complete form of God. So still, it's atheistic.

That's why sometimes we'll say, oh, they're God conscious or they have this higher consciousness or they're based on the Vedas and that. We'll bring out what is the actual good element within it. But their actual conclusion, when we deal with that, we'll say they're atheists.

That's why you see this element within the Vedic literatures and within Prabhupada's books and his purports. The element that it appears that two opposing sides are being spoken on the same thing. In one purport, Prabhupada's glorified.

In another purport, he's saying it's bad. There's a purport where Prabhupada's showing the superiority of the Vedic culture and those who follow it. And in that, he is giving as an example people like Vivekananda and Gandhi and Shankaracharya.

The whole freedom movement in America by Martin Luther King was based on Gandhi's movement. And it worked. It was successful.

They were both successful, politically at least. They were both successful. So he's quoting, and why are they doing that? They're basing it on Vedic principles.

In other words, it means you have to defeat someone else with superior strength. So in the West, generally strength is taken as martial strength or monetary strength. Generally, you don't look at it as cultural strength or strength of qualities.

And because that's there in the culture and they had that conviction, therefore, by using that, how long can you fight with an enemy who doesn't fight back? The taste is, and your strength comes from you fight, they get stronger, so you can get more strong. Because if you're not, it really makes it very hard for someone to continue. And even if you continue, others around will say, this is not proper.

So by using superior qualities, he defeated him. But where does it say that qualities are the superior wealth? The wealth of the Brahmins is the renunciation of these things. Of course, he could have renounced political involvement, but as the Prophet said, he's a saintly politician.

Among politicians, he was a saint. Among the saints, he was a politician. Yes.

Is that okay? Yes. Is it the same activity, depending on the consciousness? Can it be either karma or the karma? Yes, means it's your work. Arjuna is going to go off into the forest and beg, a noble occupation.

But is it his occupation? No, so it becomes vikarma. That's what we're pointing out here is this duality in all this. Performance of karma, it entangles you in the material world, this, that, so we'll look at it bad.

You can also look at it, it's nice, you're being nice, giving in charity, doing all kinds of nice work, like that. So therefore, it's considered good. People will say it's noble.

Vikarma, then generally we'll take it as something really bad, like where it was a chainsaw massacre or something like that. So that will be vikarma. But vikarma can be a very ideal service that is not supposed to be done at that time.

You know what I'm saying? Yes. Krishna gives an extreme example in chapter 18, text 17. *yasya na hankirto bhavo buddhir yasya na vipriti hathvati saiva loka na hanti na nivartate* He says, one who is not motivated by false ego, whose intelligence is not entangled, though he who kills men in this world does not kill, nor is he bound by his actions.

Because that was Arjuna's situation. He was telling me, you've got to massacre your guru, your teacher, your relatives, and if you're motivated to serve me, that's akarma. For the most abominable externals, but the right internals, that's the ultimate.

So this is the point that Krishna is trying to bring out, is that, in other words, it's in touch with him, it has meaning. If it's not in touch with him, there's no meaning, there's no value. So this has to be there, because otherwise we'll place value on things without its connection to Krishna.

But that's what Krishna's pointing out. No matter how good and nice it is, it still has no meaning

if it's not connected to him. Like Indra, how did he become Indra? He's done a hundred ashramedha yajnas in one lifetime.

That's serious accomplishment, right? How many Brahmins do you have to support during that time? An ashramedha yajna, to build the kund generally will take like nine months or a year. Because you can only do certain things at certain times. And the priest has to build all the bricks themselves.

He builds all the square ones, his wife builds all the triangular ones. So one kund is ten thousand bricks. That's a lot of bricks.

And then, you know, so he does so many bricks, they'll be ready. Then at a certain time, then they lay them. Then they build the next one like this.

So it takes a year just to make the kunda. Nine months, and then you do the yajna. So in one year you can do one ashramedha yajna.

So it'll take you a hundred years to do. And in that, these Brahmins are being supported. You have to feed so many Brahmins.

You have to give so much in charity. I mean, you're talking about serious wealth, right? Yudhisthira had to do one, right? And his brothers are all over searching to get this wealth. He also did an ashramedha.

So it's a big thing. So to do a hundred of those, you had to be so pious to get that much money. To get that much money means you had to have done the work to get that much money.

So that much given in charity or good works, you're going to be feeding tens or hundreds of thousands of Brahmins over all that. Very pious. But what do we say about the value of Indra's life? He's doing work for God, right? He's managing God's universe.

But what do we say about his position? Yeah, he's a kinista, but in relationship to karma and Krishna. We'll say basically it's useless. Being in the position of Indra is useless if you don't become God-conscious.

You know what I'm saying? So here's the implication. He's doing work for God and still we'll say it's useless because his consciousness is not connected to God. So he's only taking the pious aspect and doing that nicely.

And maybe he's offering the result, maybe he's not. If he offers it, great. If he doesn't, it's still useless.

Even that great of piety. At the same time, if something's as insignificant as giving a few grains of chira to Krishna, then that itself got him more wealth than Indra has. In other words, it still isn't in comparison, but if you filled up the universe with all the wealth that it would actually deal with, there'd be no space for anyone to move around.

So to leave the proper space, as far as wealth goes, that's considered a good amount. You have as much wealth as Indra, no one's complaining. Because above Indra anyway, no one worries about wealth.

So the Prajapatis, they live under trees anyway. Yes, he had the wealth of Brihaspati, he had a grass hut and a yajna court, that's it. Your duty for Krishna.

That's why Krishna goes through these steps. You do your service, perform your duty in knowledge, because without knowledge you won't perform the duty right, it'll just be sentiment. And actual knowledge means understanding sambandha-jnana.

So you understand you, God, and the activity you're performing. Then you're doing that for Krishna. And also, he says, remembering.

There are situations when devotees have to do things, which is not actually their duty, it's just the situation requiring that. But the situation requires it means it's an emergency, so it becomes your duty. Duty means what you do day-to-day when everything's just, you know, blasé, normal for the material world.

In the material world, being what it is, there's always situations that are out of hand. Okay. Karma means pious deeds described in the Karmakanda portion of the Vedas, and vikarma means sinful activities.

A karma refers to activities without karmic reactions. Although engaged in all sorts of work for Krishna, a devotee does not enjoy or suffer the effects of work because he is devoid of any desire for sense gratification. Srila Prabhupada explains in his Purport to verse 20.

This freedom from bondage of actions is possible only in Krishna consciousness. When one is doing everything for Krishna, a Krishna conscious person acts out of pure love for the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and therefore he has no attraction for the results of the action. He is not even attached to his personal maintenance, for everything is left to Krishna.

Nor is he anxious to secure things, nor to protect things already in his possession. He does his duty to the best of his ability and leaves everything to Krishna. Such an unattached person is always free from the resultant reactions of good and bad.

It is as though he were not doing anything. This is the sign of akarma, or actions without fruit of reactions. Any other action, therefore, devoid of Krishna consciousness, is binding upon the worker, and that is the real aspect of vikarma, as explained herein before.

Because Bhagavatam will define, you know, pious meaning, it's Krishna conscious, and impious meaning, it's not Krishna conscious, like that. So within impious, then we have those activities we consider pious, and those we would consider impious. You know, it's just like, let's say you have a basket of potatoes that are, you know, not of good quality, right? So the ones that are in less bad shape you'll consider better, and the ones that are, you know, really rotten and that,

those will be the bad ones.

Right? But they're all technically bad. So that's the thing. So the good in this world is simply the reflection of the activities and relationships and mentalities of those in the spiritual world who are using all that for Krishna.

So that opportunity is given here, right? That's why the pious person surrenders, because piety is what is engaged in Krishna's service. But when it's engaged in Krishna's service, it's not called piety anymore. Then it's devotional service.

Right? So the opportunity is given to live that lifestyle and offer those activities to Krishna as they do in the spiritual world. So that's what the Vedic culture is. Right? The recommendations of the scripture are simply the reflections of those activities that one, if one was Krishna conscious, one would be doing.

Because in the spiritual world, that's what they do. Yes? I'm thinking about Manaji's question and like the result of non-Varnashram culture is that everybody is always in emergency mode, because it's always this crisis management and you've got round pegs and square holes. So I'm wondering if the question behind her question was, when are we going to get stable? Although, as you point out, there's three kinds of duties.

There's routine, there's emergency and there's stuff we like to do, there's desiring activities. So, when you say that activities in goodness are more a reflection of what's going on in the spiritual world, but I'm wondering in the context of what Krishna just said about one who's not motivated by false ego, not necessarily, right? Because it could look pretty bad externally, but be Krishna conscious. Could be, but the point is, if it is Krishna conscious, what will happen to it? Will it remain like that? Are the devotees still going into graveyards and stealing the flowers and offering to the deities? No, it will be purified, it will be uplifted.

Yes, it will naturally, because as you become purified, then even your conditioned nature is in a better state. Because your conditioned nature won't change, but you can purify it. This concept, you've got to change your nature, Prabhu.

No, you can't change your nature, you can purify it, right? In other words, let's say you have a little kid, you have an eight-year-old kid or a ten-year-old kid, he's very bold, you've never seen him before, he just walks up to you and goes, Hi, my name is this, what's yours? Now, that's bold. Now, if it's impure, you'll consider boldness very bad. But here you'll say it's very good.

Okay, we need a volunteer to do this, okay, I'll do it. Boldness, you'll say, that's good. So, it's a matter of the state of purity of it.

So, that will then bring it up and down in its state, where it applies. So, the same way is that the principle of the conditioned nature's working doesn't change whether it's in a pure state or an impure state. Rasa doesn't change whether it's transcendental or essential.

The principle is the same of the ashram vishad, the mechanics are the same. You know, you take a car and you drive it to the temple, or you take a car and drive it and go rob a bank, the principles of mechanics of driving stay the same. So, this is the point, is that the principle of work doesn't change.

And so then what one's doing is bringing out a change in the consciousness, so you see that. So, what happens is this, in here, it's not a problem that devotees didn't know what they were doing or this or that, and they use, engage whatever is their normal material activities in Krishna service. That's fine, because the consciousness is right.

From that they'll get purified, they'll start using the higher natures of that. But when someone makes up a philosophy that we don't need to change and Vedic doesn't work in this age and all that, that's just 100% bogus. Not even 99%, it's 100% bogus.

Because Vedic means what? God's laws. You're saying God's laws don't work today? It's 2010, it's Kali Yuga, the laws of nature don't work anymore. But that is Kali Yuga, that's one of the laws of nature, that's God's arrangement.

So, that aspect is what basically we're talking, talking, you know, is most pointed on. Just this contemporary kind of fascination with, you know, intellectual anti-Vedic-ism and saying that it's very practical in one's own life, though not one intellectual can show a result of that as an improved, either Krishna conscious, social, or even economic situation. The motivation is wrong.

Yes, because the consciousness is wrong. Like that. So, because of that, the consciousness, instead of being anandamaya, it's basically, when they're talking this, they're talking pranamaya.

You know, for everyone's benefit and good and nice and all, that's pranamaya. But underlying it, there may be that what's its purpose. It may be even anandamaya.

That's the thing, is that you use a medium of consciousness, just like someone comes up to you and they want to get something done for themselves and it's not necessarily Krishna conscious, they start quoting, you know, Krishna conscious points to get it done. So, they're using the technique of that one thing, but the consciousness may be another. That's why Varna Shankara is so worried about in the first chapter, because Varna Shankara will have a mix of action and work, right? So, you have a brahman has a child with a shudra, you get a nishada.

So, nishada will have, he will have the one sense of thinking kind of like a brahman, but at the same time doing the activities of shudra. That's going to be a problem. You know, or actually I think because the mother and father reverses.

So, the motivations are going to be mixed. Yes, so therefore it'll be mixed. Yes, well, in your traditional things, if you read stories in the Vedas about businessmen, they're just like through and through businessmen.

I mean, you know, we see kshatriyas, they're just completely kshatriyas, or brahmans, they're just completely brahman. So, it makes everything very clear and everything works nice. But when you have mixed, you don't necessarily know what they are.

You have Romaharsha Vasudha, right? Father is a kshatriya, mother is a brahman, right? Or at least his lineage is that, so that's his bloodline. So, he's sitting on the Vyasa-san like a brahman, but he's thinking prestige like a kshatriya. You know, when God comes along, you know, prestige is the issue, right? So, therefore, Balaram killed him, right? Up to that point, he's sitting on the Vyasa-san, doing all the activities nicely, speaking the shastra, he's respected as a brahman.

But as soon as that happened, then they all started talking, well, he's a suta anyway, what do you expect? You know? And then they tell Balaram, because he's a kshatriya, so you're supposed to protect the brahmans, and, you know, we had given him benediction, he'll live a long life to speak the Puranas to us. So, then Balaram, as a kshatriya, solves the problem. And then he also, using shastra, then says, you know, the son is non-different from the father, so we'll install Ugrasrava-suta on the Vyasa-san.

And at the same time, as a kshatriya, and he's done something in their eyes wrong, then he puts them before themselves for punishment. And then they say, OK, go on all the places of pilgrimage. So then that keeps them busy for that year, so he doesn't have to be involved in the Kurukshetra battle.

So, you know, he's happy. So, it all works. So, these elements of the consciousness and the activity should match.

It's very important, because the activity has a cultural obligation in its performance. And then, that's still not enough. That will make it pious.

When the activity and the consciousness of that match, then that will be pious. Now, if you add Krishna consciousness, then it makes it devotional. So, that mechanics is that we're trying to, you know, take this fine.

The difficulty is, is because of the overlaps. You know, it's like day and night, we understand that sandhya we don't talk about. Why? Because is it day or is it night? It's got both.

You know, so depending upon what you're looking at, you'll bring that out. You know, it's still light, so you can do things like in the day, but it's still having the effect of night. You know, or if you're taking, it's night, so you don't do the activities of the day, you can't see.

So then you take up the spiritual activities. You know, so, like this. So then, this is generally where the confusion comes.

You know, so, Krishna's spending three chapters basically explaining this. You know, it's such an important element, being able to find karma, the knowledge of that karma, and the Krishna

consciousness, and being able to blend all three of them. Because otherwise, then the tendency is that, as he says here, he's saying that the devotee leaves it for Krishna.

So he's not worried about his personal maintenance or his things, but then devotees will be neglectful. But if you're seeing it that this is what Krishna gave me, so it's Krishna's things he gave me to use, then I will take care of them for Krishna. But whether I can take care of them, the facility is there, that's up to Krishna.

So he has the facility, I take care of it. Then Krishna takes them away, I'm not worried. But we'll take it, oh, Krishna will take care.

So, you know, we never fix the temple car. Right? Because it's Krishna's car. Right? You know? Like that.

But the point is, that's why duty is pointed out. So duties are performed. Like that.

But the point is, they're being done for Krishna. So that's the fine point that's here. So that's what we're trying to bring out, because otherwise we speak a lot on the form of it, which is very important.

But what a lot of times gets left is the consciousness of that. We'll say Krishna consciousness. So we have this form, we have Krishna consciousness.

So where do they meet? In other words, the devotee is driving on the highway in North Australia, and he's a book distributor. He's the best in Australia. And he's out on that highway, and he's doing who knows how fast he's going, 90, 100 miles an hour, to save time for Krishna, distribute more books for Krishna, until he hits one of those, you know, trucks that have about five cars behind him.

Right? And then that's the end of his book distribution. So he's driving for Krishna. He's driving in Krishna, but where did they actually mechanically meet? That's what's never discussed.

The actual metaphysics of, you know, Krishna meeting, how do you say? The material energy or material, you know, like that. So in Mahabharata, it says, He's reminding us that because we're all born of unpurified and unpurified situations, we have trouble distinguishing these things. That's why Gita is there.

That's why this is in the Mahabharata. Because there's more chance that from our background, if any Vedic literature would be interesting, this would be the one. Right? You know, all the stories and the politics and, you know, all the emotions and everything like that.

So it's going to be more attractive. And then within this, then you have the Gita. So the Gita is actually, well, it's meant for everybody.

It was especially meant for us. So it's a literature that's giving the highest understanding. Therefore, someone like Shankaracharya is appreciating saying you only need this one book.

You know? Like that. Too bad they didn't understand that when they burnt the library at Alexandria. They were holding the wrong book and saying, This is the what book? You know, like that.

So, whatever. So the thing of technically understanding how form actually, and consciousness, knowledge, results is connected. Because that's generally where it breaks down.

Because of that, the sentiment is the driving force. So we'll say, Oh, it's for Krishna. And then, you know, say, do like this.

But how did what you're saying to be done actually connect to Krishna? It may. Like that. What we're saying is that if one doesn't understand, one may not be able to continue that.

Otherwise, we do see plenty of communities that are full of people who were the dynamic leadership in earlier days. You know, GBCs, sannyasis, temple presidents. You know, like the gurus.

They're full of them. So why? And what are they doing now? You know, it may not be. We don't mind that, OK, they're not doing this and that.

But the dynacism of their devotional service, that's the loss. Not necessarily that, OK, they want to, you know, take care of the family. They haven't done that for 30 years.

That's fine. You know, that's their personal choice how they want to engage. But my point is the main loss is that dynacism of Krishna consciousness.

That's the loss. So what happened is that they understood we should serve Krishna, and they're trying, but they're not studying the philosophy. And because of that, they can't maintain that, OK, you know, you went to buy the groceries for your house.

And so it's just an ordinary thing, just being practical, Prabhu. But the whole point is Krishna's giving here right here, how that could be done here and here. Naishkaranya, how to transform work into sacrifice.

How his buying of groceries, even choosing what groceries, how it could have been done as sacrifice for Krishna. So he could be coming liberated, going back to Godhead, by going on buying groceries. You know, nicer if he had been, you know, managing his own, but hey, but he's buying groceries.

But he could still connect it. But he's not, because he's just, oh, we're being practical. You know, this Vedic stuff doesn't work.

It's like, you know, hey, why are you eating food? You know, is that, you know, in the American Constitution, it says that, you know, from now on, people are going to eat food, and that's why it works, right? And so the American government has established this and is very, you know, careful on implementing it. You know, they've got food police out everywhere to make sure

everybody's eating like that, you know. But they're getting a lot of, how do you say, backlash by the, you know, the zero-breast-size people that they're not conforming.

But, you know, they will be successful. So it's not, no, God made food, and God made all this. So that's what's being missed, is it's still God's, so therefore, how it's working.

So it's vegetarian, and there's a good chance it'll be offered. So that's there, but they're not using their intelligence to use the mechanics of it. I don't mind is okay.

The guy left like this and goes back to, you know, a conditionally simple guy, and so therefore he just, you know, how you say, you know, sweeps, you know, is a janitor somewhere. And so he doesn't, you know, he's not life simple. That's all right.

But life's not simple. They're coming up with these very complex philosophies, and their life is very sophisticated. So that means that sophistication is not being engaged in Krishna service.

That's a loss. That's lost opportunity. So that's what Krishna's talking about here.

Right? Is that okay? Like that. It means what we're doing here is coming in from the specific angle of the metaphysics, like that, and trying to distinguish what is karma and what makes it, because the activity's the same. You know, like Prabhupada says, illicit or illicit sex, it's the same thing.

Mechanics is the same. The man, a grihastha or a grihamedhi, the activities are the same. It's just a matter, is Krishna the center, or is the house the center, and Krishna's one of the circles around the center.

Like that. That's all the difference. It's not, we don't, grihamedhi's this disgusting, terrible guy, sinful.

No, grihamedhi that's being given in the Bhagavatam is a guy who's waiting for Garbhodan Samskara to have an intimate relation with his wife, and he's quoted as the grihamedhi, because he's not thinking about the Krishna consciousness of it. So we're talking about very pious people. But we'll take grihamedhi, you know, it's disgusting, you know, the muda, you know, like that.

So we're just bringing out that element, because generally these things aren't, they're just trying to create that thought, that consciousness, because Krishna just before this was pointing out that by consciousness, consciousness will bring out intelligence, because the soul is by nature intelligence. So that's spiritual intelligence. So cit is a combination of intelligence and consciousness.

So that means the soul at any moment can click into that consciousness and use the spiritual intelligence, or the inherent intelligence of the soul, and override material intelligence, material mind, everything. That choice is always there, but whether we use it, that's another thing. So

Krishna's trying to give that knowledge and understanding by which one can take advantage of that.

But then that means one has to be convinced, otherwise why would one have the determination? So that means the mind has to accept. So you still have to work within that personal element of relationship and determination, but still there is that overriding effect that you can use it. It means you can, the mind can accept, I want to be Krishna conscious, and so my conditioned mind and intelligence isn't actually trained in that way, but I can override that through using my original.

So that's possible. So these kind of subtleties are... This discussion has given me a deeper understanding of a remark I heard Prabhupada make in Miami in 1975. Prabhupada actually applied Bhogai Svarupa's Saptana, that verse, in the minds of those who are too attached to sense enjoyment and material opulence, and who are bewildered by such things.

The resolute determination of devotional service to the Supreme Lord, samadho namadhi, does not take place. So Prabhupada took that verse and he applied it to demigods, who are very, very powerful and pious servants of Krishna. He said, you don't find devotees like the six Goswamis on the heavenly planets.

He said, this is the Deva. He's very... he might be pious, he might be doing good deeds, he's not on the level of... he was trying to encourage us, but look at the paradise we have. You're in a more fortunate position than these big Devas, because samadho namadhi, they get overfeeling like Indra or any of these guys, they're so... They're overwhelmed by their position.

Yeah, the externals. Like that. So that is the point, is that devotee has a position to get overwhelmed by it, you know.

So... In simple things, like we were discussing before, I was just thinking this morning, why is a ship, you know, in the Navy, those who work in the sea, you know, and ride around on ships, why are ships called she, you know, because you think, you know, because sailors, when you think of sailors, they're very masculine or anything like that. So then why is she, you know, because the thing is, you could say, is that, you know, the masculine position, they're the man, the wolf, the sheep, but then the point is, is how do they deal with the ship? Do they deal however they like or how they have to? You deal with the ship how you have to deal. You don't, you sink.

Yeah, that's another thing. But in other words, you're completely, your intelligence and your expertise, your masculinity is how nicely you understand the need of the ship for the situation and deal with that, and that will get you through anything, right? So that's the principle. It's understood by the roughest quality of man.

You know, you can't say that there's, that people are much rougher in quality than a sailor, right? You know, especially when they've been out there a long time, you know, they get pretty,

pretty, yeah. Yeah, they get pretty, yeah. Salty.

Yeah, it's salty. Yeah, it's a whole, once in Poland, there was this, kind of like the city was having their little festival. It was a seaport city and, you know, a little, you know, village thing.

And so they had set up a stage and different people were coming and doing things on the stage. So they, we had worked in, because we were there doing Hari Nam, that we could also come on the stage and do a kirtan and that, you know, because it's kind of like anything went. It was, you know, like that kind of thing.

So then, you know, they brought us up. There's a place to sit for the next people to go on the stage. So who was on the stage before us were actual sailors who were singing the sailors' songs they sing when they're out at the sea, like that.

And, you know, unfortunately, a lot of the people for doing kirtan were ladies, right? And they're Polish and they understand what they're saying. They were all sitting there with their ears covered. They were like bright red.

And what they were saying was really, really rough. You know, so the point is, here's the roughest class of man in actual practice and theory knows perfectly how to deal with a woman. Right? I mean, and their life is dependent upon it.

But when they go home, they don't deal with their wife like that. And therefore, their marriage has trouble. So this is what's meant is one becomes overwhelmed.

You know, it's my wife. I do whatever I like with my ship. I do what I like.

Yeah, go ahead and sink it. You know, so like that. So they don't understand.

They don't. They don't make these connections. So because of that, we're trying to point out that generally, if anybody's good at anything, they know the technique for dealing with anything else in the material world.

But they're not applying it from one thing to another. You know? It's just like someone's an expert chef. He could become expert at driving a car.

Because what actually makes them work is the focus on the moment and dealing with the moment according to what's appropriate for that situation. That's a common element in anything that's successful. Anything other than that will not be successful.

That's a common element to anybody. So devotees don't see it. No one sees it.

And so therefore they don't apply it here and there. But Krishna's giving the point is that in doing... And so you're going to do that, and that's going to take great intelligence and consciousness to do. Great focus.

Great, you know, patience and detachment and this element of naiskarna. You have to have all those to be successful materially. But now you're going to do that and in the end you're getting just some kind of mediocre result.

You're getting a very good result. That same amount of endeavor, you could have just added Krishna and then it would be fabulous devotional service. So devotees are even nowadays, it's popular to become... You're worried about how to deal with the material energy more expertly and they're becoming very focused on it.

They have seminars. They talk a lot about it. Conferences.

But they're not adding Krishna. So for all that endeavor, that's Sravaya Vihikevaram. You know, so it's like you're talking about there.

Because what it is, the heavenly planets are full of neophyte devotees and they're overwhelmed by the positions. And that's the thing. When devotees think culturally about problems they've had in the society, it's because of this.

They're overwhelmed by their position. And so that's the weakness, is that one can become distracted by the karma. So the karma has to be elevated to the point of being the karma yoga, which means you have to add the consciousness and the intelligence.

When you add that, then it becomes valuable. So it may be Sakam, but to get the result, you have to be Nishkam. Once you get it, you can be attached to it.

But the work itself has to be done in Sakam. So by that practice and by that understanding, without time, then you won't work in Sakam. It'll be actually, the consciousness will be nice karmic.

Because when we say nice karmic, we mean the work and the consciousness, everything. But you can, the big businessman is nice karmic when he's doing the work. Because he can't be attached to the result because it's changing at every moment.

So what stock he's buying, he can't be attached. Oh no, I like that stock. It has a good ring to it, the name.

No, he has to sell and buy immediately. And he's doing. But then when he's finished, then he's got the result.

Because of the nice karmic work, now he's attached to it. Now it's my work. So that's for the devotee.

No, it's for Krishna. So it's mine, I give it to Krishna. Or Samyast.

It's already Krishna's. So when Rupa Goswami gives that famous analogy of the devotee serving, he serves Krishna better than a materialist serves. Because the analogy is to the

paramour.

A lady is a paramour. And so she's more attentive to her duties so the husband won't suspect the paramour. Because she really loves the paramour.

She does everything better for the paramour, actually. So that's why we miss it. Because if it's for Krishna, we should do it better.

Because we're doing it for Krishna. Yeah, that's the point. But they're turning to the karmis to learn how to do it better.

And it doesn't work. The only one that was successful following the rules of that self-help book is the author. And that's why he's a millionaire and the people who bought it are not.

And never will be. That's the point. I always make the point.

It's, you know, how you say, it's pointing out the good habits of successful people. The successful people aren't having to read the book. It's the losers that are reading the book.

So they also hear us being overwhelmed by something. Yeah, no, we won't get into that. Okay.

So real vikarma is... I mean, excuse me. Okay. Okay.

This is the sign. Such an unattached person is free from the resultant actions of good and bad. Because it's for Krishna.

So it's not his. So it's not going to affect his consciousness. Just like Krishna has nothing to gain in the world, so therefore he arranges to fulfill all the needs of the living entities, and it doesn't affect him.

Because it's not his work. So Krishna's only asking us to work in the same spirit that he's working in. He's working for someone else's benefit, means the living entities, and we work for someone else's benefit, Krishna.

And so such an unattached person is always free from the resultant reactions of good and bad. It is as though he were not doing anything, because the result will not come upon him. Because you have to remember, in a relationship, the result or the dative is another case.

You have the subject and object, they interact through the verb. Right? But the dative is another thing. So the experience is when the verb is active, the subject and object are connected.

The experience is gained. So the result of that is something else. You understand? So that's how results... You can be engaged in the activity in the proper consciousness, getting that consciousness, that experience, and you're still not connected with the result.

Does that make sense? It's very good. That's why the grammatical explanations are always given by the Acharyas. Though, unfortunately, because we're using English, and of English,

American English, these things have basically no meaning, you know, unless you went to a really good school.

Then, so, generally our translators always cut them out, but sometimes half of the comments of the Acharyas are grammatical explanations. I use it here because most everybody here is not from... that kind of a background, so... it means something in your language, you know. Okay.

So this is the sign of akarma, or actions without fruitive reactions. Any other action, therefore, devoid of Krishna consciousness, is binding upon the worker and is the real aspect of vikarma, as explained herein. So, in other words, when you come down to it, there's only akarma and vikarma.

Right? Karma is just a... how you say, an aspect of vikarma. Right? So you can say there's karma vikarma and vikarma vikarma. You know.

There's bad bad work and, you know, pleasant bad work. You know. Does that make sense? So, even though he's given the three, it's there, but we have to see when we're looking at it from the spiritual point of view, there's only two.

Spiritual and material. So, akarma and vikarma. If you look at it from the material, there's only two.

Right? Vikarma and karma. You understand? So, the karma is the overlap. That's the point I'm talking about.

That's what's used. That's the ideal usage. Because that's... Mother Yashoda would use that.

You know, the gopis, the cowherd boys, they'd use that. But, you know, we're not them, so when we're here, if we were like them, we'd be there, but we're not. We're here.

So, we're using it for our own purpose. So, that's where the overlap is. So, that one, if it touches the material, it becomes this.

If it touches the spiritual, it becomes that. So, you have three things. But, if it touches spiritual, they go together.

If it doesn't touch spiritual, they go together. So, practically, you only end up with two. So, Prabhupada's brought that out in this purport.

That there's akarma and there's vikarma. So, karma is just the quality of the activity used that if you're Krishna conscious, it's devotional service. If you're not Krishna conscious, then it's vikarma.

Does this make sense? Because of knowing his constitutional position and relationship to Krishna, the devotee is free from the three modes of material nature. His activities become sacrifices to Krishna, and the resultant reactions merge into transcendence. Now, this is

something standard we'll always hear.

This group, it'll always be this group. So, yesterday, we just were doing a look on, research on the sambandha-abhidaya and prayojana. So, Prabhupada always will talk in these threes, even when it gets more and more subtle.

This is more obvious. Because of his knowing his constitutional position and relation to Krishna, that's sambandha. His activities become sacrifice to Krishna.

That's abhidaya. And the resultant reactions merge into transcendence. That's prayojana.

But in this, it's giving the actual working principle. By knowing his constitutional position, he's free from the modes of nature. In that way, his activities transform from being just karma, or vikarma, into a karma.

And the resultant reaction means the reaction is there, then it's merged into transcendence because it's given to Krishna. In other words, you perform the activity, there is a relationship there, it nourishes the relationship. There's benefit.

Then you get the result. Then you can take the result and use it for yourself, or use it to nourish the relationship. So, you get the result, then you use it for Krishna.

Right? So, you get two things out of it. Materialists sometimes get nothing out of it, or get one thing out of it. They're just looking at the result, so the experience of getting the result and the relationship, they don't even experience.

Or the relationship is important, then they can't take advantage of the result. So, this is the point Prabhu is making, is that the devotee is actually better at it. He gets more out of the endeavor than the materialist will, because he's conscious of everything, he knows all the aspects, so he's able to apply all that.

Does that make sense? In 12.10 Gita, when Krishna says, if it can't even work for me, I'm just paraphrasing, if it can't even work for me, then just try to act in a philanthropic way. And then in the Purport, Prabhupada connects that do-gooding. He says, if you do that, then it may be a stepping stone to Krishna consciousness, but the bottom line is, it's not an external activity.

Prabhupada uses the phrase, sacrificial spirit. If you work in the sacrificial spirit, then it will dawn on you that the ultimate sacrifice is the sacrifice for the Supreme. So it can be a controversial point among devotees, because sometimes in another context, Prabhupada will run philanthropy in the ground, because it's selfish, extended selfishness.

But if it's done in the sacrificial spirit, it's really good. It means, in other words, it's just like what we're saying, in a basket of bad potatoes, that you can pick out what's good. Well, this one, this half is good.

So in other words, because that element of vision is very useful in Krishna consciousness.

Someone who can't see that also, will always criticize devotees. Because the point is, devotees will make mistakes.

But for them, the majority is correct, and there's some small amount of mistakes. For this philanthropist, majority is wrong, and then there's this aspect is nice. So then the thing is, how do you get over, how do you forgive devotees? How do you do that? It's by seeing the good quality, even when they... Let us say, you go into a meeting, and you say, speak something.

That's very nice, but then someone stands up and completely smashes that, and comes in some other things like this and that. And if you analyze it, it could be that the other person was actually very un-Krishna conscious, and the method they used was very uncultured, and the results that they will get have nothing to do with anything beneficial. They may give some seemingly short-term things, but very shortly that will disappear.

So it will be very hard from looking at that aspect, because that's what you would apply to yourself, because you can't actually control what the other person does. So to go through all those things that they did there, the only benefit is from yourself, okay, if I do that, that's what kind of results I'll get, so I should avoid that. So it's only benefit is for improving yourself.

But we'll use that to criticize them and improve ourselves by, I'm better because I can figure out his faults. But in reality, if you want to move beyond that, and really benefit the person, then you have to be able to forgive them. But that can only happen if you understand, okay, now why did they do that? Because as we've analyzed, basically everything is wrong, but they sincerely were thinking that they were doing something nice for Krishna and protecting his interest.

Though it may have been completely coming from some kind of misunderstanding of Western mundane mentality, some political, all these other things. But the point is that they, in their own mind, sincerely think they don't even understand their own impurity. So they sincerely think that they were serving Krishna.

And they were successful, right? Everybody bought their point, they didn't buy yours. So that means he was convinced, he was determined, he was eloquent, he had already spoke to everybody before the meeting that he didn't know about. So he actually did all, in one sense, all the right things and got the results.

So you have to appreciate that. That's why you see in the more nobler of times, then one enemy would appreciate the other, because they were appreciating what they were doing right. What you're doing wrong is what makes you enemies.

So if you can't appreciate what's good in the philanthropist, you can't appreciate what's good in devotees, on the technical point. But at the same time, it doesn't mean that the philanthropist is situated nicely. The devotee is nicely situated, but in this situation, maybe his consciousness or this, or he's become overwhelmed by his conditioned nature, so he acts badly.

But other than the good quality of that charity or that selfless work, that person who's doing it has no good quality, because even their selfless work is for their own purpose. Otherwise, why is he sitting there? Why is there a million pictures taken when he gives the charity? So he'll be recognized for that. He wants to get for both sides.

I lost the money, but I'm getting the... So I'm getting the pious activity, plus I'm getting the social benefits. Of course, they don't know, according to Gita, they lose the benefit by that, but hey, you know. So that element is very important.

Why that will be brought out is that what is the good of it? Not that, oh, see the good in everything. No, it's a matter of what is good, because if you can see the good, you can see the bad. The other one is, oh, see the good, so what's the bad? They can't see it.

So that's sentiment, because then you'll have a problem, you know, like that. So you have to know. The tiger is there, has never seen people.

This one person who lives out there is very nice to the tiger, so the tiger is not afraid of humans. Then another person comes along and sees the tiger, and so the tiger is very friendly and is not afraid, and so then that other person shoots the tiger. So that's sentiment, because the tiger had the sentiment, but didn't have the knowledge, so they're not able to protect themselves.

There's that famous exchange between Prabhupada and his wife, who lives in London, because it's a science of self-realization, and she was complaining to Prabhupada in a letter that, I encountered two of your disciples and they were very rude, the way they were trying to get their message across to me, and Prabhupada answered her, apologizing for their rudeness, but then he said, he gave the punchline at the end, he said, they may have made mistakes, but they've given their lives to Krishna, and that is never a mistake. So he was, at the end, he was trying to get her to see the good, the real essence, because she was just seeing the externals, the rudeness, and she didn't see that they were trying to give their lives to Krishna, so Prabhupada was just what he was saying. So that's the thing, if you can see like that, that's what the Shastra gives, that's Shastra chakshas, is seeing through the eyes of Shastra, otherwise we're going to see through our intellect, through our emotions, through our senses, even through our false identity, you know, these are our options, you know, basically that's all you have, you have the body, you know, you have the mind, you have the intelligence, you have the false ego, so that's basically what we have, the senses are made out of that, it's connected with the intelligence, so you throw that into the mix.

So seeing with that vision is what changes it, because otherwise Krishna is not going to change what Arjuna does in the second chapter, so the first thing he introduces is that spiritual vision, but the spiritual vision doesn't mean now he doesn't do the duties, this is the difficulty, because we're so used to there's material and there's spiritual, material means I do the activity, but I don't have any knowledge, and spiritual means I have the knowledge, I do no activity, like that, so this Buddha yoga is something very new to the soul, you know, at least in the conditioned state. Yes? I heard once that Shri Ravakrishananda Saraswati in an assembly of his disciples,

and knowing him rather well, he would have one stand up and say something good to someone he knew that he didn't get along with, as an exercise in humility, but also for that person to search for something good, and that person that he can't tolerate, and Guru Goswami has recommended that persons seek out life-binding persons, and then they associate, speak the philosophy, and in this way they grow strong and develop, and I've also heard in my years connected with Krishna consciousness, that there's such a thing as offering respects from a distance, so naturally there's going to be people of different natures, and on top of that, a combination of modes, different modes working on different individuals, and so there's going to be people that we're drawn to, and there's going to be people that we, and sometimes they may be reminding us of something within ourselves that we don't like, or something like that, so sometimes it's healthy to just associate with persons, life-binding persons. I've heard the fifth regular principle according to one teacher that I've come across is do not criticize.

Well, that's kutinati is the first, first, you know, of all anarthas, that's the most strong, means there's four main categories of anarthas, so the kutinati is the main, you know, so there's four, has four within it, so that's sixteen, so it's the prominent. Kutinati means criticizing devotees, specifically, fault finding, it's a thing. See, there's a difference between fault finding and analyzing what is there so you will know what to do.

The point is, fault finding means you're just finding the fault and it's just a topic of discussion because of one's own feelings, it becomes an element of gossip, but the point is being able to see what's right and wrong, that's not a problem, otherwise why is Krishna pointing out Arjuna's foolishness? So in other words, one has to be able to take these things and be able to balance between the social and the intellectual aspects of it because otherwise, then we'll go either too much one way or the other because Bhaktisiddhanta Sarasvati Thakur would do that, but it would be in connection to somebody and something, like he was up in his room and you have all the senior devotees downstairs, they were all somebody I think had just died, I'm not sure, I think it was from the gosala or something, you know, he was somebody who wasn't that prominent, his character wasn't very strong, he didn't get along, I think, with many people and there's stuff like this, so they're all making some points and they're all each basically agreeing with it, you know, and so then Bhaktisiddhanta Sarasvati Thakur came down, you know, into the assembly and they're all, you know, shocked and then he said he kept his clothes very clean and then walked back upstairs, so that was basically the end of their pursuit of the discussion, you know, so it's not just intellectual aspect, it has to be balanced but at the same time it doesn't become a phenomenon where we get a group and all sit in a circle and have each one stand up and say, like that, because the impetus of that is not practically applied, it becomes itself a ritual, it becomes a method and to get a taste of that, no, it has its place, otherwise too much of that taste, then what? You know, so in other words we're trying to get that there's a balance here, is that you know that this is what's there so therefore in your own life if you are endeavoring to try to see the good point then it works, you know, in other words we want that the community of Vaishnavas is a very pleasant and protective, you know, environment, right,

that's what in surrender, you know, Krishna's my maintainer, Krishna's my protector, that element is there, that's the social element, right, before that accepting and rejecting what's favorable, that's your, in the realm of your forms, you know, the rituals and those things like that and then the attitude or the consciousness of, you know, being humble and, how you say, being dependent upon Krishna, so these three areas are there, but it doesn't, you can't bring one more prominent because as soon as you actually go into one you'll see it's not just social, the whole point, Krishna's my maintainer, is that when you get to the spiritual world you will have a place there, there will be a place that's yours, where you stay, where you do your service from and whatever you need will be taken care of, you know, it will go to that, we may use it here, Krishna my maintainer, okay, but there also, right, he's my protector, so in performance of my duties, because there's different mentalities in the spiritual realm of how to best please Krishna, somebody's not going to be happy with what I do, right, means you leave after the Mangalartik and Radha and Krishna then run off to their places, that, and then you're going back to your home, but you happen to just go through the Kunj of, you know, the opposite party and then you explain a few things of just what happens before you're leaving, that does your work for your party, but at the same time as the other party's not necessarily pleased, but Krishna will protect you, because that's part of the rasa, because if you don't do that it doesn't create the jealousy where now that party will try even harder to please Krishna, and because they're making more elaborate plans, your party has to do more work to get the upper hand, so Krishna's pleasure increases, Krishna will protect you, does that make sense? therefore, it has its place, it doesn't become its own culture or ritual, so we have to be very careful there, it has its place and application in our life, so they're very important, by like-minded means that they will, in other words, like-minded, the most important is the realm of Krishna consciousness, what is the approach to Krishna consciousness that you can speak freely in Krishna consciousness, then other than that you also, the social is that how you live and how you do, the others are also comfortable with that, so they don't bother you for that, otherwise, if you're more advanced you couldn't care less, but if you're not, that gets in the way of the relationship, so in other words, the same kind of social environment and the same level of Krishna consciousness makes it just comfortable for you to body, mind and words to always be engaged, you don't have to always pick each word that you worry, you know, like that, does that make sense, you don't have to, so that is important, you know, so then it works naturally, but that other element, that element, that's something that we ourselves must try to apply personally in our life, you know, it's like, why they're doing it is very personal, it's not an external thing, he'll come and use it in that example, but it's application is within the individual, like we were discussing, we find the fault, but the fault is, I wouldn't do it like that, why not, it wouldn't get the result, so therefore, I could learn from, so I should be, I can learn from their mistake what not to do, so even in that way we get that effect, so we learn from what they did wrong, I won't do that, so I won't get the same, you know, you're in the trench, you know, and the, you know, the corporal stands up to see what's happening, gets shot in the head, so you learn from that, you don't stand up, you don't get shot in the head, so, you know, so you learn from it, but at the same time as there's also the exercise in trying to see what is the good element, so that you can use that in your life also, otherwise, why does it have such a strong

effect on you, unless there is some emotional content in that, because you will only work within your own values, you won't notice something that's not in your value, right? So even in, this is your dad's mod, how do you say his name? We've been associating on Skype. Oh, okay, okay, cool. Even in this like-minded realm, it works both ways, you can, you can be like-minded to reinforce each other's illusions, you can be like-minded to... Well, it's why you chose that like-mindedness, you know what I'm saying? So, you have to see, it's just like, yeah, it's just like, you know, 30 persons that come regularly to the temple, and they associate with each other, and they support that particular lifestyle, you know, the other 1,470, they associate with each other and don't come to the temple, right? So, they support each other's... The point is, you want to go back to Godhead, you choose that kind, you don't, then, you know, so that's the thing, you want to become a rascal, then you have to choose good rascals, you know, otherwise how are you going to become a good rascal, you know? So, that's why, I remember once as someone who knew a lot about music and all that, and I mentioned that I was, that, you know, we were considering some studying of some things in the Indian music scene, you know, the traditional music, and one of the, first question, he didn't say, you know, what teacher, what this, what that, and so many things like that, he says, what music are you listening to? Because his point is by associating with those who make that kind of music, that's how you're going to become like them, Then the teacher can guide you in that, but if you're not listening, you won't, you won't learn that, you know? So, it was a very interesting.

Subtle. Yeah, subtle, yeah. I think like mind it can also mean similar aspirations.

Yeah, similar aspirations. You have to choose what it is that you're, you know, it's like somebody, it's fashion, so they all wear fashion stuff, you know, or they all go skiing, or they all, you know, do something, or they all watch, you know, cooking programs. You know, you have to find what it is, or they all want to, you know, go to Harvard, or something.

It has to be, it's going to be connected because your aspirations is going to be, you know, based on what your identity is, and therefore what endeavor you do to get them. So it's still going to come back to someone, you're going to have to look at all three. Though, you may emphasize one or the other, you know, one is more on, there's a whole group of people who are insecure, so they're going to emphasize the element of identity, and, you know, that support, and security, and all those things that create sambandha, right? Another group is going to be, you know, action-minded, getting things done, and that was great, and, you know, stuff like that.

They're going to be, and, you know, what's the purpose, why we're doing this, you know, because it gets us this result. So the element of abhidheya is going to be more prominent. Another is the goal-oriented, what you get, and, oh, that would be so nice, and, you know, things like that, won't that be great? So you'll see is that though you require all three for any, to appreciate any one of them, they're going to emphasize one of them, So here, as we see is, ours is balanced, because it always goes together.

We don't just talk about prema, that the sahajiyas will, but probably, in it will be what activity you do, and what is the identity, what is the, what is the position you establish yourself in, the situations, the knowledge, the consciousness, that the others don't talk about, you know, and like, let's say, the, yeah, does that make sense? So, according to your mentality and what you want, you have to choose your association. Is that okay? Yeah. Verse 24 declares that when the material objects are engaged in the Lord's service, they become spiritualized.

Srila Prabhupada explains in his purport. The absolute truth covered by maya is called matter. Matter dovetailed for the cause of the absolute truth who gains its spiritual quality.

Krishna consciousness is the process of converting the illusory consciousness into Brahman, or the Supreme. This is a very, very important element we generally don't work with. This means, in other words, it's Brahman that's covered by illusion.

Right? And that illusion is us. Right? This wall is not an illusion. This wall is just a wall.

We're an illusion about the wall. It's good, it's bad, it's whatever it is. So, when we see it in relation to Krishna, it takes on its position as Brahman, as Srila Prabhupada says, converting the illusory consciousness into Brahman, or the Supreme, because the Brahman has come from Krishna.

So, we won't just see Brahman, the impersonalist will. We'll see it's part of Brahman, it's Krishna's quality, it's his energy. So, this element is that it always was Brahman.

Right? So, this would be the element that will say that our process is the same as the impersonalist, to get liberated. Because by seeing it as Brahman, you're on the liberated platform. But they're only interested in liberation.

So, they don't see Parabrahman. But because we know that Brahman is coming from the person, therefore, then, that frees us from there. Means, understanding as Brahman liberates us from the material condition.

Because then we actually see the world for what it actually is. And at the same time, because we're connecting with the person for his pleasure, therefore, the devotional element is developed. We go back to Godhead.

Yes? Is it because that we don't know, we know, and we don't accept? Ah, you may have both. You may have both. Because the thing is, generally, it's nobody knows.

Because they think is that whatever it is that's important, that's what's there. You know, it's my house that makes me happy. It's actually, you know, the materials that the house is made up and the arrangement of those materials that makes me happy.

But it's not. It's Krishna's potency that makes you happy. Because Krishna says, if you put together an environment in this way for your nature, that will create security.

Don't know. I think it's, what is it? tasya prajna-pratishtita. Right? Isn't that one? It becomes fixed.

Stita prajna. The one that's fixed in consciousness. It's interesting.

He probably uses that exact words four times. Then in the second tasya prajna-pratishtita. Context is saying do we make a difference between someone who's in this consciousness or not? Not.

So the stita prajna, the one that's fixed in spiritual consciousness will be defined. So it means within ourselves, someone on the platform Brahma-bhuta is always, that level of consciousness is there. But because it's Brahma-bhuta, the interesting element is Krishna, not the Brahman.

So you'll only see the devotional aspect. But that's how they see. They see everything connected to Krishna.

Like that. While if they're the impersonalists then they would see just the Brahman element. They don't see the personal element.

Yes. Means the point is Krishna's recommending that you go directly to the personal aspect. If you can do that, that's always the nicest because it's the person who all this is coming from.

So, it's just like the man, he has his properties and all that and it's all nicely done and laid out. That's all his personality that you see there. The nice lawns and the walkways and the gardens and all that.

That's his personality. But still, he is a person, a separate. So if you appreciate the gardens but don't appreciate the person, it's better than not appreciating anything.

There's a possibility. But if you just directly go to the person, you know, this is so nice. Where is it? Who made this? You know, that's better.

It's more direct. So that's what Prabhupada says. The gopis, they're not great intellectuals.

So they just directly go to the personality of Godhead. Of course, you bring them here and, you know, when it comes to, you know, refined philosophy, no one's better than them. But, you know, that's not what they're thinking about.

You know, there, they don't have to worry about that. So if you, Arun, if you appreciate, take your example, if you appreciate the gardens, that's like Brahman. But if you appreciate, but if you deny the garden, the person who made the gardens, is that like, is that what we call mayavadi? That would be mayavadi.

It's just, it's all illusion. Ah, what's this? Ah, stupid gardens, you know, like that. Just sense gratification.

In one sense, it's nice, but the point is, you're missing the, the point of its connection. The person and its connection to Krishna. So that's the difficulty.

It's what, it's just like, you know, brahmacharis, grihasthas are all in Maya. But, grihastha's one of the ways to have sacrifice. Arjuna's a grihastha.

Most everybody we read about in the Vedic literature is a grihastha. Only Narada, Muni, and a few others aren't. So, that itself is, for your own personal application, that's okay.

You know, I don't see any benefit in grihastha life, so therefore I'm not one. So personally, that's okay. But then when, in dealings, you deal in that way, then that's lack of etiquette.

That becomes offensive. So that's not devotional. So this, the difficulty is that the inability to understand that work takes on its quality based on its consciousness.

That's all. Brahnavadi just doesn't know the connection to the person. Brahnavadi doesn't know.

Mayavadi says, they know and they deny, but basically they'll say there isn't any. That's why we say there's no real difference between the Mayavadis and the Buddhists, other than Buddhists don't accept the Vedic literature as Mayavadis too. But they'll say it's all illusion.

So this is all here because you think it's there. You know. But then, who is controlling it? Everybody thinks it's there that they don't get into.

They'll say if you understand it's not there, everything is Brahman, it will cease to exist. But that's what the Buddhists say also. One is that you merge into the light, Brahman's light, and the others say there isn't any light, it's just void.

So that's all. But impersonalists, actual Brahnavadis, know it's there, it's Brahman. But they don't make, they don't distinguish, their non-distinction means everything is Brahman, but they can tell the difference between a column and the space between the column.

That's why Sukadeva Goswami didn't bump into any trees. Otherwise, if he was a, you know, a Brahnavadi according to the more mundane sense, then he would be bumping into trees, falling into the water and this and that, you know, because he can't distinguish between Brahman. But he can tell the difference between tree Brahman and, you know, road Brahman, so that's why he was able to run away.

Yes? Sometimes, I would quote Gandhi, how the blade of grass moves without the sanction of the Lord. When we all deal with events in time, and a beautiful expression I heard from Vaishnavas, that even in difficulties, even when things apparently are going against us, we can think that Krishna is behind the screen. Yes, yes, of course.

Even smiling. It's all good, somehow. But then you have to connect and make that connection that what Krishna is doing is good, and that what your results you're getting is from your,

you've acted badly, that's why the bad results.

Krishna would like the bad results, but that's what you want, that's what you're getting. Otherwise, if you're not careful, then that same point, then is, well, it's Krishna's fault then. Why did Krishna allow this to happen? And that's what many religious, religious in the world do, and to avoid that coming up for the, they, they therefore create, it happened because of Satan.

So it gives rise to, you know, instead of monism, and not monism, monotheism is actually, I don't know, you call it dual theistic or whatever it is. Because that's the whole point is that God's all good, therefore, what's going on here is bad, so God can't be involved, so therefore, someone else is the controller. And God has no control because you could say, well, he could control, then why isn't he? So then you say, he can't control here, you know, like that.

And so then you put God off the hook that you can still have faith in him, at the same time, the material world's run by someone else, and you could deal with it without God. So these, one has to be careful of that point, that when you're defining what you're saying, you have to fill in those gaps, that's what we're talking about, these, these metaphysical gaps, then put everything in place, otherwise, that the sentiment has its strength when the knowledge is complete, because the point is that you can only apply with knowledge. Right? Activity, potency means consciousness and knowledge, then there's activity.

But if you have activity without proper consciousness, without proper knowledge, then, then that activity may not continue, or you don't know what the activity is actually for. Because with knowledge, you know, if I do this, I'll get that. But if you don't know what it's for, it's kind of like, why am I doing this? Everyone will stop.

That's, that's the problem. When knowledge isn't handed down with tradition, then people are doing the activities, but they don't know why, and when they question, no one can answer, so they stop. But, as Krishna said, that following the example of the great souls from the past, because they're great, they're knowledgeable, they have performed these activities, so by performing them, we're situated nicely, but we have to have the knowledge that they had.

We may not have the realization, but we at least have the knowledge. And then by practicing the tradition as they taught, that combination of knowledge and practice, that will give the realization. Does that make sense? Yeah.

Yes. Yes. Yes, yes.

Yes, yes. She's praying for that. But at the same time, when there's difficulty, she also prayed for the difficulties, because then she'll remember Krishna, and Krishna will remember them.

In other words, basically the Pandavas' main medium of interaction with Krishna has been their difficulties. So therefore, if the difficulties are there, Krishna remembers them, and they remember Krishna. So that's their medium.

So then it's natural. That's the point. Anything can be a medium for Krishna consciousness.

You just have to see it in that light. I'm sorry if I keep taking whatever you say from that pleasant, uplifting, supportive, emotional content into just stark Vedanta, but that's actually what the class is for. You know what I'm saying? Because otherwise, then what happens is like you may catch what it is, but others who are hearing it may not.

And then they'll apply it in their life simply in a sentimental way, and if it works, great, they'll be inspired. But if it doesn't work, then they're going to think back and blame you. And then that's bad, but then more bad is going to be they're going to think badly about the sources before you got it, and that won't be good for them.

Does that make sense? So in other words, the points are nice to start from as long as you don't mind it being brought into that analytical point to see where it goes. Because here we're analyzing this. If this was a seminar on family life or husband and wife relationships or the male field, then we'd be talking the opposite way.

The examples would all be practical stuff, then we'd go back and show the technical point. But here we're dealing with the technical point so that people can take it and put it in their life. We're not taking a specific topic.

It's a generic, your life. Otherwise, if we take a specific thing, then it would be the opposite. You know what I'm saying? Like you have Vedanta, it also includes seeing the proper balance of everything that you're dealing with.

And so then you take Ayurved, and it just deals with how to balance the gross and subtle elements in the consciousness like that. So it'll take that as the major point, but it'll connect it back to the philosophy. But that'll be the minor.

Does that make sense? We're here for the big picture. Yes. I have a question.

We have a tradition in the West of thinking that the feedback culture is a big problem. Feedback. To have feedback of what we're doing.

Yeah, yeah. In our institution, in my experience, I haven't seen that greatly. Is that because it's not part of your process? The feedback.

Yeah, feedback culture. We were always wanting to know if what you're doing is proper. How are you applying this? Because when you mention it, I think of the media, you know.

I think of the media, but that may be more of a, kind of like, I'd say, more gringo-y, you know, like that, kind of like that. More north of the border, you know, kind of stuff. Does that make sense? You mean personal feedback kind of thing? Or... As an institution.

As an institution. So, as an institution, you're going to find good feedback is this. You're going, it's going to split the public.

Some are going to support, some are not. So, when you see a good article, nice, great things, you know, The Village Others says really nice things about, you know, the devotees and all that, know that there will be an article that's exactly the opposite. And so, when you see the one that's opposite, know that that's going to be fine.

otherwise, why would, why, the media has millions of things to write on. Millions. So, why did they write on us? Because at that moment, we had some importance.

Yeah, we had some importance. There's some element. So, that's why they're writing, even if it's bad.

Otherwise, it's like, you know, it's like, there you go, oh, you know, something happened, you know, even the Hare Krishnas were, you know, upset somebody on the street. But why do they do that? There's a million people being upset. You know, there were some guys who just got, you know, snuffed in Harlem.

You know, so why isn't that in the news? Because this is there. So, you have to understand how to interpret even these things. Prabhupada said, when you preach, it will separate the demons from the devotees.

But we're thinking, we're going to do this nice, soft preaching, and nobody will be upset. Yes, nobody will be upset because nobody cares. There's nothing happening.

You know, so their thing is, nothing's good, no one's upset, that's good, that's the, no. Our thing is, people are becoming Krishna conscious, that's what we're looking for. Because there's always a demonic, demoniac nature.

You can't get away from it. They think, no, no, but we have a better idea than what Krishna has. We'll create a third.

But it's not. We don't create, we're not the creators. So, in other words, Prabhupada said, it's, you know, no publicity is bad publicity because you're in the news.

Say what you like, there's this and that. One of those twin towers went down. The maximum amount of literature that was ever sold concerning Islam was sold in the next week.

And so you could say, as far as, you know, seeing this, but people wanted to know, who are these guys? You know what I'm saying? So, negative brings it to mind. Who are they? Who are these Hare Krishnas? You know? And if they want to know, then they may come in contact. Because that's what Krishnas Kaviraj Goswami mentions.

You know, when a living entity wants to know Krishna, then only, then Krishna arranges that you meet the devotees. You know? So, whatever it is, you know, it's like, you know, you have a crowd of, you know, punks on the other side of the street and they're saying, eh, this, that, so many things, and somebody's talking about your bald head, or whatever it is like that, and

somebody says, eh, Hare Krishna, he's the best one in that whole crowd. Right? And then when he tells others, eh, Hare Krishna, like this, like that, they're getting the benefit of Nama Vasa.

That's the thing, is that the real element of seeing the good, it goes through everything. So, it's not that we only see the good in this area. We see the good in anything.

You know? But we're, we're generally, you know, what I'm saying? But the good in everything doesn't mean we can't see the negative. We see both. That's the balance.

If you're in the, the middle path means you see both. The middle path doesn't mean you only see one side. So, they say, oh, they're, they're, what do you call it, you know, too, what do you call it? Traditional, you know, like that.

So, that's not good. That's not the middle. You know? And then you have the real liberal like that.

But we, we're the middle. We support the liberal, but we're not as liberal as them. But they don't support the conservatives.

So, they're not actually in the middle. You know what I'm saying? So, the point is, is being able to see what is the, the good point in both of them. That's the middle.

And taking only that and leaving what's not good. Like conservatives, what's the problem? Right? They're stiff. They're stiff.

They won't, they stick to the rules. They won't apply the rule to the individual. I mean, to make any exception to the rule to the individual.

So, they don't see individuals. They see rules and community and all these different things and structure and all that. And so, because of that, individuals suffer.

Right? The liberals see the individual. Right? They care about the individual. That everything's applied nicely to the individual.

But they don't see the rules. They don't see the actual form of the community. What makes it work.

You know? It works because there's an office there with a guy that sits there and makes sure your water comes into your house. That's why it works. It's not just because, oh, we all live together.

That's why it works. No. So, the point is this.

Therefore, you can see is that the, the, if you had the, the understanding of authority and tradition and rules and regulations and structure of the conservatives, but you could apply that to the individual case. Right? That's the middle. So, that only someone in Krishna consciousness

can have.

It's just because of Krishna consciousness that it's there. Not because of some mundane, you know, more intellectual and more enlightened viewpoint. Well, that's what I was talking about.

I was, okay, the last point that I was making, I'm talking about ISKCON intellectuals who have these funny little degrees with little letters after their names. You know, but what I'm trying to do over the last few years is reform myself and not be so bold and blunt on these things. Cynical.

A bit generic. For your classes, I've taken a nice feedback, I mean, about, when we take to, to Niti instead of Dharma and then to community and all this, it's a nice feedback and it's inspiring to change. But as an institution, many times, something doesn't work and you can't interact very easily when you're saying that.

So you leave it. Point is, ultimately, the movement is for what? Becoming Christian. Self-realization.

Yes. The individual becoming God-conscious. So if you can have an effect, do it.

But if you can't, you just work on your own self-realization. Because if you can have an effect, it should be your making that effect is part of the process of your self-realization. Now, let's say you're a manager, a leader.

If you can affect Krishna Conscious management and leadership, that's the medium through which you purify yourself and you connect yourself to Krishna. Right? That is the action in Krishna Consciousness. But if you can't, then you just pull back to where you can comfortably function and just continue with the same process within that smaller environment, you make yourself Krishna Conscious.

Like that. So it doesn't matter if the opportunity is there, why wouldn't you take it? But if it's not there, why would you try? So that's eleventh canto, is that the time element. The time element sometimes is favorable and sometimes not.

You know, Krishna, Prabhupada gives, it means the example is given in the, I think, second chapter in the Krishna book, where Devaki, examines, she looks like a fire covered by ash. And so Prabhupada says that sometimes the sadhus, you know, they can speak openly Krishna Conscious, sometimes they can't. So when they can't, they don't.

They're respecting Krishna because otherwise you speak, it won't be appreciated. So why speak? So better to not speak pure philosophy and have people think it's bad. It's not that one doesn't try, but in trying, if it doesn't work, then you adjust.

But we're not afraid to try. That's why we'll go out into assembly and talk about Krishna. And then if people come forward, then we talk to them.

People don't come forward, then we don't talk to them. Is that OK? So, feedback is nice in that you know, OK, what's working, what's not working. So then you work on adjusting that.

You don't defend the position, you know, unless you know, OK, they don't, in other words, it can be this, let us say, your position is good, but you're getting some negative feedback. What's the negative feedback coming from? So it could be that what you're doing is right, but your presentation is not good. So you adjust the presentation.

But it may be is that what they're talking about actually is there. You need to adjust what you're doing, you know, in the way of the body of the, you know, the subject matter itself. So, like that, then you see, you see what's good, what's not.

You have to judge, and then you have to judge it in the context and that, and who's going to be more for that? Does that, does that make sense? Like, I just had a comment the other day. It's kind of a joke, but at the same time it's like that, is that the Gurukul is not, how do you say, handicapped, how do you call it? There's a name for it. No, they have a new name.

It's for the physically challenged, not for the physically challenged. Yeah, it's not, but what? Yeah, but what is it? Accessible. Yeah, it's not handicapped accessible.

Somebody couldn't come here in their wheelchair, have a problem walking, and get around this place. You know, they'd probably, you know, there's a million places they could kill themselves. You know, it's designed for, you know, it's basically designed to create a pleasant atmosphere, you know, aesthetic atmosphere and something that'll slow the kids down, right? So they don't kill themselves, right? So, now it's a matter of what's the major amount, it's for the kids, so is that something they really consider or not? You know, since it's their environment, it'd be nice if others could appreciate, but at this point, we don't have that, you know? So you have to actually see is what would, yeah, that would be the point, how many would be coming over, you know? So, when there's a lot of them, you know, then we'll make some, you know, ramp here, and then they can look from the veranda and then go back down the ramp.

Kids might like it also, right? Get in a wheelchair and, you know, zip off in the temple, right? Fun ride, you know. Coming back might be tough, but, hey, you gotta pay, you know. Okay, so then we'll, we'll end here and continue on Monday.

Yeah, okay. Om Hare Krishna, Hare Krishna, Krishna Krishna, Hare Hare, Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare, Shila Prabhupada ki, Sama Vekha Bhakti Vrindiki, Jai Nithaya Govinda Pramananda.