

2010-12-13 BVPS BG 7.8-7.15 NF

Thus Kṛṣṇa is not only the origin of everything, He is also the essence of everything. He is the active principle in the water, which quenches our thirst. He is the light of the sun and the moon, and the essential element in evil itself.

All stages of being, goodness, passion or ignorance, are manifested by Kṛṣṇa's energy. Although everything is coming from Him, He is fully independent. He is not under the modes of material nature.

Śrīla Prabhupāda gives an example. All material activities in the world are being conducted under the three modes of material nature. Although these material modes of nature are emanations from the Supreme Lord, Kṛṣṇa, He is not subject to them.

For instance, under the state laws one may be punished, but the king, the lawmaker, is not subject to that law. Similarly, all the modes of material nature, goodness, passion, ignorance, are emanations from the Supreme Lord, Kṛṣṇa, but Kṛṣṇa is not subject to material nature. Therefore He is nirguna, which means that these gunas or modes, although issuing from Him, do not affect Him.

So, others, when something is coming from you, you are affected by it, because of our attachment, our connection with, our dependency upon it. Just like a parent is a parent, why? Because they have a child. So your parent-ness is dependent upon having the child, and we become attached.

Anything we deal with, we become attached to. So, but Kṛṣṇa is not like that. Kṛṣṇa is beyond, He is independent, like that.

So, His dealings then are purely on the platform of just the experience of the relationship, the taste of that relationship. So your attachment is based on the relationship, not on the need for something. Does that make sense? We have a need to experience the parental rasa, therefore there's family life and everything that goes with it.

But He doesn't have such a need, all right? It means, in other words, He's fine as He is, but to expand that pleasure, then it goes. So, you see, there's a subtle difference. Why? Why does it work in one way, and why does it work in another way? That's because He is independent, He's God, and we're energy, so we're dependent.

So we'll always be dependent on everything. So we'll always view it that way. So, this is the point, is we're trying to learn that God is different.

So He's not like this. That puts Him in His unique position. So being in that unique position, then there's so many elements that He'll be able to take care of and do, that we won't, right? Our need for variety and all this make changes, and therefore makes us, in one sense, unreliable,

because of that need for change.

But Krishna doesn't have a need for change, right? So He doesn't change. He is existence, right? So all variety that's there, He is that anyway, so He doesn't need to change, because He's already all change, right? So He's tasting the interaction with the devotees. The devotees require this, that's why they create it.

Does that make sense? So He is change, so there's no need to experience it. But the devotees being dependent, then that requires different varieties and different ways of seeing that connection. So it's stemming from the need to connect with existence, then the nature of the energy to have that variety, that means all these different ways of connecting.

So then we're the living entities being assured that all this connection, all these different needs are fulfilled by us. And Krishna doesn't need. So that also is the thing.

It's just like if people are selfless, you feel comfortable becoming involved, right? So God's selfless, so therefore we shouldn't feel bad about getting involved with Him. It should be natural, right? We have problems, someone has some motive, some selfishness, then we're careful about being involved, right? If there's no, none, then that's okay. Does that make sense? Yes.

So Krishna is not attached to the Jivas, but at the same time He does care. Means He's not dependent upon the Jivas. It doesn't mean He's not.

But His attachment is based on what? On the relationship. But it's not that He specifically needs. Are we able to... You understand? In other words, you have to take these subtle elements that are the positive and take it, and then where it goes into the other, just like, okay, let us say there's also the element, because we were saying there, about being not attached.

If someone is not attached to results, you don't mind getting involved, because then that means you could get results, right? Because they don't need them, you could get them. If they need them, then it's competition, okay? Now, that's one side. Now, that's based on facilities, on the environment, you know? And, you know, motives and all.

But then there's the other thing, it's where someone is dependent upon you. Then there's the element of getting involved, because that puts you in the point of control, right? If someone else doesn't need it, it gives you the option, but here it puts you in that system of control, right? In other words, so here the active element takes it to a higher level, right? If they don't need anything, then that means there's no fear, right? But they need something that puts you in control, so that means you've gone beyond fear to actually now being in control, because so now you could be happy, you know what I'm saying? You know, the child's dependent, so because of that you don't say, oh, he's motivated, this, that. No, because he's dependent on you, that puts you in control.

You know, saying someone is dependent, but they exercise the control, that then you say will

be exploitation, you understand? So in other words, does that make sense? So the point is, is here Krishna has nothing to gain like this, so he puts himself under the control of the devotees. So it's just the rasa. At the same time, he is in control of everything, but he has nothing that he needs to gain for himself.

So therefore, you know, on the tattva level, then we could be comfortable, and on the rasa level you can be comfortable, right? So all these are being given so that the jiva is willing to surrender, because otherwise, you know, there'll be all kinds of doubts and misgivings about if I surrender, there'll be some loss, because now I'm in control, you know, so things aren't going so well, but at least I'm in the position where I could make it go well. But once you're convinced that you can't make it go well, you're not the controller, Krishna's the controller, but everything will go nice if we surrender to him, then we slowly, slowly start to accept these points. You know, major points we get quite quick, you know, he's God, we're not.

That kind is fairly easy to work out, right, you know? So it's, you know, it would be nice if we were God, but it doesn't quite work, you know, it's like we can't ever, you know, say a situation where it always went well. So these things are easy, but then these finer points of gain and safety and other things like that, because that's why we want to be in control, you know what I'm saying? In other words, being in the position of God, okay, that's artificial, but why do we want to be in the position of God, right? Control and enjoy, right? So control, that establishes our identity, that gives us our security, right? Establishes the relationships, facilities for relationships, you know, and the enjoyment will be what we'll gain from that interaction. Does that make sense? So now that's, because that's the real point, but we focus on, you know, what gets done, but it's just like, you want to go for a drive, but you just want to go to relax and get out and just, you know, just some different thing and just, you know, nothing to do, but you focus on the car, you know what I'm saying? Because the car is what will give you that experience.

But it's not the car, it's the experience that you're trying to get. So we focus on, you know, being the controller and enjoyer, but the real reason that we're doing that is not just to be a controller and enjoyer, there's a purpose. You want to be the controller and enjoyer, there's something, reason behind that, that you're making that endeavor.

Is that, is that okay? Yeah, yeah. So that takes more convincing, right? You know, we're not God, that's basically obvious, you know? Important, but more obvious. But these other things, then these are the subtle, that where we don't notice, we just get caught up in.

Does that, does that make sense? Yes. So that would be a great way to identify each moment when we're trying to be in control or enjoy, you see, even though... Yes, yes. Means, it means, so we should be contemplative, means not contemplate where we don't act, but contemplate it to be aware of why I'm doing something, you know? In other words, if it's doing, it's going nicely, and just in Krishna consciousness flowing very nicely, then it's great.

If it's not, then there's something to analyze, right? So either it's not, you know, it's a matter of

the mood, everything's right, but just the situation, you are in a material situation. So one has to see, okay, what's the best way to overcome the difficulties here to serve Krishna, right? Or it may be that the difficulties aren't coming from the environment, they're coming from our own consciousness, right? So in any case, whatever's the obstacle, that has to be overcome. But you can't, unless you overcome doubts, you can't work.

So that's why Arjuna can't do anything, because he has doubts. So when the doubts are clear, then he'll be able to do something, right? So in analyzing, analyzing the clear doubts, but you don't want to get caught in the trap that the taste of analyzing doubts is the goal. You know, some people get like that, they're so like this, because it makes it all about themselves, right? But the point is, this analyzation of doubts is there to remove them, so you can do an activity.

The activity can't be the analyzation of the doubts, and everything's about that, you know? So one has to be very careful with that, because otherwise, sometimes they say, you have a problem, you go to somebody, and so they interact, you get a lot of attention. You know, so then some people think, so they'll come up with newer and newer problems, so that you have the relationship, but the relationship can't be based on that. Because otherwise, you solve the problem, and then you come up with another one.

So if the other person is trying to help you solve your problem, but your problem is, is you're trying to get attention through solving problems. So how are they going to solve that? You know, it's like, so... You need a psychologist, you pay him, and then... Yeah, yeah, you pay him, and so that payments your austerity, right? Then you get purified, right? Yeah. Yeah, then you go to him.

Mark? I just want to check that I heard you correctly. Did you say that what is dependent at the same time tries to control brings about exploitation? If one's taking the masculine position, you know what I'm saying? That, in other words, you know, let's take something that's... I think shouldn't be too much of a problem, but... The element of, how do you say? Let's say there's manliness, okay? So the manliness is, you know, he gets his time, you know, he goes out into the, you know, more wilderness kind of environment and does whatever he likes to do, you know. Some camping, some this and that, and, you know, not worrying about whatever one might worry about if one was in the domestic environment.

And, you know, it's just an expression of that. But it's not, it's just expressing it. It's not specifically dependent upon something.

You're just getting into an environment where you can do that. So going out into camping can do that. Going to the garage, you know, and getting into the car can do that.

You know, whatever it is that does that, you know. So the environment is always there. It creates the conducive, you know, atmosphere.

But it's always a difficulty when the word you want to use, you've already used. So, but let's

take, that's an expression of, let's say, manliness, okay? But let's take another one, because that's basically devoid of emotion, right? So it's basically just an atmarama state. But then you have the element, let's say, machismo, okay? So the macho-ness there that is dependent upon, it's being appreciated as macho by others, and specifically women.

Because it can't be macho if women aren't involved. It's men to men, it's not really macho. I mean, they can do it, but it's in connection with what will be impressive to women.

You know what I'm saying? So there, then you have the element where you're dependent, but at the same time, you're having to control. You know what I'm saying? So that, then, doesn't come off quite as good. You know what I'm saying? At the same time, it can be used because of those cultures where, you know, this word actually comes from, you know? It has more of a problem when it crosses cultures.

But then there is, do women understand the men's dependency? So that puts them actually in control. So then they can deal how they like, but because of the nature of it, it's more fiery. So it works in their culture then.

But when you take it out of that, when the women don't understand that as a dependency. You know what I'm saying? So, because if you, yeah. Because in other cultures, that's not dependent.

You know what I'm saying? So the ones that it is, it works, but the ones it's not, it doesn't. You know what I'm saying? Is that okay? I probably represent. Furthermore, verse 12 establishes the principle that the supreme absolute person is inconceivably and simultaneously one with and different from his energies.

This philosophical conclusion is called acintya-bheda-bheda-tattva. It's been explained by Lord Krishna himself. I am in one sense everything, but I am independent.

I'm not under the modes of material nature, for they, on the contrary, are within me. So this is a very essential point, actually, to catch. Is that how he is everything, right? He's everything.

That means everything's within him, but same time he's different as a person. Right? So that for the devotee, that's that last link, mechanical link, before we deal with Krishna as a person, you know, appreciate his qualities connected to him rather than just as God. Right? In other words, brahman, you're appreciating the qualities of the Lord, right? How it's entered everything, but it's non-interactive, right? And so then there's the element of paramatma, where there's interaction based on that appreciation, because the Lord is the ultimate cause and the formal cause, so that's the brahman that's pervading everything, but at the same time, if you want to interact with that aspect of brahman, then you have to do it based on the Lord and his internal potencies direction.

Then you deal with the external, you know, the external nature, so the operative cause and the material cause come into effect, right? So that element, then you're appreciating paramatma,

right? But at the same time is, why is that going on, right? Why would there be a need to see in that way, right? Because one is either absorbed in the element of jnana, but more likely there's the element that is being used because of our particular attachment to those areas, right? So that's why we're inspired to analyze it in that way, okay? So that works, so it's because of our attachment to the material energy, then we're seeing in these ways. Because otherwise, then the next thing is, is that, well, everything's in Krsna, so whatever you're attached to, that's within Krsna. So it's not just this particular one, it's all, right? Everything's within Him.

So therefore, He includes all the... So it's not just this attraction, this one thing or that one thing, He is all of that category, and so all the element of attraction is Him, you know, so you can see it on a bigger scale, you see, on the bigger... But then now you're directly connected with Him as a person who has his likes and dislikes and that, not just as Paramatma who's controlling things according to, you know, the proper way that the material world's been set up. You know, you deal this way, you get a good result, you deal that way, you get a bad result, right? So then there's Him as a person, then Him as a person, how would you want to please Him as a person? So then if you're pleasing Him as a person, then you don't have to see these other lower levels. So the aspect of Brahman and Paramatma are already contained within Bhagavan.

He is the source of all that, right? So He's not under the modes, but He's controlling the modes. You know, so Paramatma is controlling that. The modes are dealing with the operational and the material cause.

They're not dealing with the formal and the ultimate cause. That's beyond. That's transcendental.

That's Vastu, et cetera. So it's beyond. You know, so His involvement, He's not controlled.

But at the same time as He is beyond, He is a person. Does that make sense? So by that, then one can take it all the way through and doesn't get stuck, right? Brings it closer to the person, then how to please Him as a person. You know, so what pleases Him? So that's going to be the devotion.

Devotion is expressed through what? Through some medium, through an activity. So those activities, then, is karma yoga, right? But to do the activity, you have to have proper knowledge. So that's jnana yoga, right? And since you're doing it for Him, you'll be meditating over on Him.

That'll be jnana yoga. Whether you're doing all this, that's bhakti yoga, right? So then, does that make sense? So in other words, if it comes naturally, that's always preferred. If not, then one uses this mechanical method, right? Does that make sense? You know, you want to do some activity.

If it comes easily, you just do it. If it doesn't, you have to go through some process, you know? Does that make sense? You know, someone wants to act, they just act naturally. Then it works.

They just, you know, go and stay. Someone who doesn't, goes to acting school. Then they teach

them mechanically how to go through it and become an actor.

Does that make sense? You know, you see, it's like that in everything. So you see those who it comes naturally, but then those who learn it. You know, at the end, they're both on the same level of expertise or mastery.

But one goes, one comes naturally, one has to go through the mechanics. Does that make sense? You know, so once someone has natural good qualities, then someone acquires those good qualities. But in any case, you have them.

So some people, it's like they just can't learn music. Or they just can't learn some sports. Or is, are there any teachers that are like that in terms of devotional service? Well, it's like whether, whether they can't learn devotional service.

Well, the material conditioning is simply so thick. Yes, they're basically called the lower, that means non-humans. You know, those who are not in the human species, then they are like that.

Because even though there is, that they are by nature the same souls, but the covering is so deep that you can't. You know, that's the example of, you know, the mode of ignorance. It's like the child covered by the womb.

There's nothing that can be done, right, you know. So you're trying to get to goodness, because within the human, it means the animals are in the mode of ignorance. So that's just the way it is.

But a human can be in any of these three. So if he situates himself in ignorance, he also, like the animals, he can't betray. But the point is, is still you have the element of prasada, the ultimate devotional weapon.

So, so that's there. But the mode of goodness is compared to the cleaning the dust on a mirror. So that's why the goodness is preferred, not that goodness itself is important.

You know what I'm saying? Because ultimately is, you know, goodness is reflected from the hladini-sakti. But the point is, is the hladini-sakti, then there has to be an environment, the sandhini, in which you can perform an activity, the samvit. So Krishna doesn't make a distinction between the three, because they all work together.

But he won't make a distinction here, so we analyze and this way break down our attachment material. A phenomenon, you know, because it's all together. And so as soon as you break it apart, it loses its, you know what I'm saying? You have something you're very attracted to.

Let's say you take, you have, you know, one of these machines. You like this very much. Now if we take it down, down to the last bolt, there's nothing that you can't take apart and spread it out.

It's not very attractive, right? You know, it's interesting. Okay, it has so many things. But that

attractiveness, that is gone.

So that's why one analyzes the material energy. Because you break it down and it becomes no longer attractive. Q. So is attraction somehow linked to mystery or... A. Of course.

That's why, yeah. That's why attractiveness, you know, just like say in the social system, is that when you're dressed, that's attractive. You know what I'm saying? The West, they're not dressed, so it's not attractive.

Because, you know, what you see is all you get. So here, you know, in the Asian environment, you don't know what's there. There's always a mystery.

So that's the thing, is that mystery means something new. So newness is always attractive. So that's the element in the Vedic, you know.

It's, oh, why do I have to dress like this, or this and that? But it's, hey, if you just want to be common, go ahead, go to weekend. You know, it's like, that's your choice, you know. So that's the point, is that element of mystique is there.

That's the point, because then there's something, there's something... You know, of course, ultimately there's nothing new in the material world, but at least you can stretch out the illusion for a while. Right, so that's why marriage is only given, you know, 25, 30 years, because after that time, basically, there's not a whole lot left to be mystified about. You know, and by then, then, once devotional activities, then, you know, Krishna becomes the mysterious element.

So one already has something to keep you busy. You understand? So you're breaking it down, because if you break it down, then it becomes not so attractive. That's the idea.

Q. I have a question from last class. I didn't want to ask. It was about... It said that Krishna is even the taste of wine.

So Prabhupada says that I'm the taste of any liquid that attracts you. But somebody who is addicted to, say, drinking alcohol and smoking, it might not be the taste that they're attracted to, but... A. No, but there is a taste in it, because otherwise, let's say they haven't had for a while, and they really want, and then when they get, then what do they do? Q. They enjoy it. A. Yeah.

So there's some elements of that point. So there's that taste that may be the specific taste itself, you know, how you say the grapes have been rotted in just the perfect way, you know, like that. You know, in this monastery, they actually do according to tradition, so they get in there with their feet, so that adds that little bit extra, you know, flavor that you don't get in other monasteries that use these more, you know, modern machineries and stuff like that.

You know what I'm saying? So someone may be able to appreciate that, but the point is, is there's an overall experience that's a taste. So when we say taste, it can mean the taste buds, or

it can also mean what it is you gain from that. You know, like someone goes out and likes to go very fast in a vehicle, so it gives them a taste.

It's not that they're tasting, essentially, like that. Nice, you know, high-octane, you know, a little bit of the rubbery, you know, that would be nice, but, you know, it's not that. You understand? There's a taste in it, so it could mean directly taste, or it could mean also what they're gaining from it, because there's a reason for it, you know, the material where it bothers them so much, so then the alcohol then dulls them to that, so then that taste of not being bothered by the outside, or someone is so they can't do things, so like that, they relax and become an idiot, you know.

So these kind of things, it gives them a taste. So basically, we have to, in order to help such a person, we have to make them understand what is that taste. Yeah, what is that taste? And that, whatever it is, that motive for it, that's actually God, because it's dead matter.

Why, what's, why, why that would be attractive to the soul? You know, we're not the body, we're the soul. That's why that's the first knowledge, because to understand these things, you have to understand you're not the body, right? So it's when we platform the soul, then we understand these things aren't, these, it's not, it's not me that's getting taste. So I identify with the body, so that interacts with dead matter, so I think it's dead matter, dead matter.

I take this rock, you know, this rock, you know, and then, you know, interact, you know. So, you know, what's going on? Nothing, you know, so why would the body and the material energy then have any, why would there be anything? Thoughts, because we identify with it. So in the case of the thoughtless, it would be that they would be attracted to the motive of ignorance, right? Yeah, the ignorance, but there's some purpose why ignorance is attracted, you know, because there's pain, they're trying to get rid of pain, you know what I'm saying? And so that pain means, so there's something more behind, it's just the motive of ignorance, but why ignorance, you know? You know, it's just like, he's attracted to alcohol, someone else is, you know, it's a coke freak, right? You know, because they're, they just, energy, you know, happening and things, so they have to get things done, the motive of passion, right, you know what I'm saying? Is that correct, yeah? All right, in that story of Purandja, is that the intelligence is compared to pain.

There's a text of Jyotikam, where it mentions that we get identified because the soul imitates what the intelligence does, and by doing that repeatedly, then the soul thinks that it is that intelligence that's coming into the body. Is that how we're imitating? It means, well, because of that, you could say it starts from there, because we were just seeing just before, is that the mahat is the intelligence, the element of intelligence, because the mahat then discerns everything, because without discerning, how do you endeavor? How do you find who you are in the environment? You can't tell the difference between you and the car, then there's going to be a problem, you know, like that, you know what I'm saying? So you have to be able to tell, otherwise then, you know, where do you sit? You know, because the driver goes there, if you

don't know you're the driver, then if you're in a car, then, you know, then, you know what I'm saying? So there is that discerning. There is a difference, at the same time the mood is connected, you know what I'm saying? So you're always going to get that element of a chinkamay to make a cut to that, because you know you're the driver, and then there's a car, but then there's also a oneness in that purpose, in how the car works, and how you deal with the car when it does work, you understand? So you're always going to get that, so mood there's a oneness, but in intelligence, there's a distinction.

So the intelligence then identifies where you are, then from that, the false ego comes up, you think this is me, and then that makes you special, and then the mind, you know, what is, what one gains from that, then that's, you know, where the mind comes. So it's, that's why then the consciousness is the inherent nature of the soul, so that being conscious on that higher level, that's the easiest thing for the soul to do, because it has nothing to do with the material energy. That you've identified with material energy, so that the mind, the intelligence, is the false ego that are covered with that, but the consciousness is beyond.

So that's why in consciousness, you can actually understand things as they are, whether you act according to that, that's another thing, because then with that, then there's a spiritual intelligence, because consciousness and intelligence go together like something. So from there, that's where it starts, then from there, if the intelligence then comes to under the control of the mind, then you go back to the conditioned state. But if the mind is attached to Krishna, then it engages in such an all-stay spirit.

But it starts with intelligence because of mahat, not because of quantum. You just have to make sure where it's. Yeah.

That means also we weren't conscious because you should be able to see that pothole before it comes. And the nicer the car we have, the more test we are to the car, and the more we think we are to the car. Yeah.

Okay. Furthermore, verse 12, establish the principle the supreme absolute person is inconceivably and simultaneously one with and different from his energies. This philosophical conclusion is called acintya veda veda tattva.

It has been explained by the Lord Himself. I am in one sense everything, but I am independent. I'm not under the modes of material nature, for they on the contrary are within me.

If Krishna is the controller of the modes and the origin and essence of everything, why don't people recognize this as the Supreme Personality of Godhead? The Lord answers this question in verse 13 to 14. Krishna is above the modes of nature, but the conditioned souls are under their influence. Deluded by the modes, they do not know Him.

The fools think that Krishna is under the modes of material nature, just as they are. They cannot overcome the divine energy of Krishna, but those who have surrendered under Him can easily

cross beyond it. In his purport to verse 14, Srila Prabhupada stresses that it is only Lord Krishna who can award liberation.

So that's why there's so much put on Krishna's position, because we don't know Krishna's position. Being energy, we can't know actually the energetic. So it's only by the grace of the energetic then we can know the energetic.

So if we accept the principle, then we can know Krishna. But by studying, then we slowly slowly get rid of the element that we're God, because we can't be. So we'll think He's under the modes, so He'll act in this way.

Thinking about the element is that why do you get a bad reaction? You do something in karma and you get a bad reaction. Well, what's God's perspective on that? So the world religion, generally you see is that God's angry. So He smoked him down, all these different things like that.

But the thing is, is God's not angry. It's just that this is the reaction to that activity. You know what I'm saying? You know, you put an orange in the juicer and you got orange juice.

Right? So is that because God was angry, so you got orange juice? You know? No, it's because that's just what happens. You got juice. Yeah.

Well, that's where it all started. That's the whole point. Could you say that everything we do is like asking Krishna a question and then He gives us the answer? Asking Him a question gives us an answer.

I mean, it's a poetic approach. Yeah. But I wouldn't get too stuck on that.

In other words, only get stuck on approaches that the Acharyas give. Otherwise, then they'll carry these other fragrances, right? And then you're going to need... You know, you're going to need some dandelions and some other things like that, and a rainbow, and a meadow. You know, especially when it's a little bit of a hill.

Because if it's just flat, you can see the whole thing. So there's nothing mystical about it. It's a little bit of a race, but not too much, because you don't want too much.

Has to be enough just where you can't see, but it's still enough. But it's still less that you can still skip. You know, like that.

Otherwise, that's what will come to you on this path. Of course, yeah, fluffy cows. Butterflies, you know, like that.

Shouldn't be too hot or too cold. You know, warm enough that, you know, you're comfortable. You know, not too cold.

You can't, you know, take off your clothes and jump around and be natural. Does that make

sense? That's why one has to be careful. Is that why one analyzes according to how the Acharyas give.

One can start from wherever one is and connect that. So that's important. But one has to see that then one has to go beyond, because otherwise that particular perspective has an attachment to it.

That's why it's there. Everything nice, everything good, everything wonderful. But the thing is, is it's just not like that.

And then when you come across it, it's not like that. Then why isn't it like that? Because God's made the world. So he's made it so it's bad.

Why would he make it bad? God's all good. Why would he make it bad? You know, that's the difficulty in taking these particular positions too strongly. But you can start from anywhere.

So it doesn't matter. You can start from, you know, anything. The most, you know, crazier, you know, emotional or sentimental.

It doesn't matter where you start, you know, even the most nasty. Still, you start there, but then it has to move. You know, because there's a question, but the point is, is that are you asking questions of God? Because if you are, then that's one thing.

If you're not, then that's illusion. Alternative communities, they always get stuck there. Because at one point is, see, when you take up something, it's new and it's fresh.

You know what I'm saying? Let's say you're vegan. Okay, it's new. You know, you weren't vegan.

Now you are. And so it has all that passion, the dynamic, using intelligence, this and that. But how long can you do that for? And what about other things? What about your pants? You know, where do you live? So all these other things have to be addressed.

And after a while, you either have to find this balance or that's all you do. You know, so there will be a distraction. That's why it's recommended.

You only take up those things that are recommended in the scriptures. You know, otherwise they're just seeing the elements of Krishna consciousness, of the Krishna conscious lifestyle. They're only seeing it from the platform of basically ethics.

It's not the nature of a human being. It's just ethics. You know, and that nature is not purpose of getting out of the material world.

It's just for being good and righteous. And so you're always going to get stuck with that. You know, and then they're always going to be, and who are they fighting with? Who are the enemies of the vegans? Vegetarians.

Not exactly. They're not the ones bothering the cows. Who's bothering the cows? Corporations.

The corporations. So corporation is economics. So economics, justice, and ethics.

They don't go out of that circle. You understand? So you could say, no, no, but this is higher. No, it's just a, you know, seemingly higher aspect of the exact same thing.

So they're focusing on the ethics while these others aren't focusing on the ethics. They're focusing on economics. You know what I'm saying? But with time, as they get established, then you're going to have to have a whole supermarket of vegan stuff and the whole vegan thing.

So then they're going to have to get into economics. You know what I'm saying? And then, you know, how are they ethically dealing with the soybean? Are they dealing properly? Or are they exploiting the soybean? You know what I'm saying? At some point, then that may come up because to actually make the profit, to make it viable, that you can have the supermarket that everybody could be vegan, then the problem comes as maybe you're not able to make enough profit off of the soybeans using the particular methods you're using. So you might have to use slightly less ethical methods.

But then, of course, what is it called? The goal. But that's that famous aberration. The goal justifies the means.

The end justifies the means. You know, then they'll bring in that. So then what's the difference between them and the corporations that they had a problem with in the first place? You know what I'm saying? So that's the thing, is that it goes the same method.

You know what I'm saying? The person's father's on Wall Street. They see the problem. Then they just, you know, got onto the Salvation Army, pick up some old clothes, and they move out to some farm somewhere.

They don't need any paraphernalia. There is no paraphernalia. You know what I'm saying? It's just you don't worry about it.

You just live in that. But how long does it take before then you have a shop for them and have a whole community market and this and that, and it turns into this whole thing where there's all the paraphernalia, and then, you know, to take care of all that, then what happens? That person is back on Wall Street. You know what I'm saying? So this is the difficulties.

They don't see what they're dealing with. They don't understand they're dealing with prana more. So devotees, generally, they don't get too distracted by sense gratification.

So the karma is not generally the problem. But how do you say? The prana more, the artha, that's generally the big distraction. Because that's the culture.

Bourgeois culture is artha. It's not dharma. You know, the nobility is dharma.

You know, Brahminical, it's intellectual. It's motion. But the business community is artha.

So then that's just a sphere. So unfortunately, then they don't understand they're just, you know, fighting over a different side of the coin. No, the head side is good.

No, no, the tail side is bad, you know. You know, that's all. This has just happened to the organic dream.

It's going to economics now. Yeah, yeah, of course. I mean, I remember visiting my mother in her town.

There were three fully organic supermarkets. I mean, not small, not big, I mean big. You know, there was, you know, low end and high end and then something in between, you know.

In fact, so that means they even have, you know, you know, gourmet level kind of, you know, stuff like that. You know, so like that, you know, regular old. Yes, so that's the.

But it's not wrong that it develops that way. But the problem is in developing that way, if one's not God conscious, there's always the point where we'll get distracted. You know, because then one's goal becomes to make money rather than just, you know, trying to establish an ethical platform.

So that's where we're saying is that these things can distract very easily. In his purport to verse 14, Śrīla Prabhupāda stresses that it is only Lord Kṛṣṇa who can award liberation. The words mām eva are also significant.

Mām means unto Kṛṣṇa, Viṣṇu only, and not Brahmā or Śiva. Although Brahmā and Śiva are greatly elevated and are almost on the level of Viṣṇu, it is not possible for such incarnations of rājaguna, passion and tamoguna, ignorance, to release the conditioned souls from the clutches of mind. In other words, both Brahmā and Śiva are also under the influence of māyā.

Only Viṣṇu is the master of māyā. Therefore, he alone can give release to the conditioned souls. Right, because liberation means no connection.

So even though their connection is very minimal, but still it's some connection. So then there won't be the ability to award liberation, because there is that touch. Right, that flavor.

So not possible. Conditioned soul is faced with only two choices. He can fight endlessly with the divine energy of the Lord without any hope of ultimate success, or he can surrender to the Lord and gain release from all material sufferance.

Depending on their choice, the living beings are divided into two categories, the pious and the impious, right? So pious means they're surrendering to some degree. Impious means they're not. Right, and then that gives rise to the Bhagavatam's definition of piety and impiety, means you've surrendered, means in devotional service, then you're pious.

You haven't surrendered in devotional service, you're impious. Right, and so therefore of the impious, then you can divide it into two, those who follow the direction of scripture, so therefore be pious of the impious, and those who don't follow, who are the impious of the impious. Right, you know, just like in a gang, you have those who go along, follow all the rules of the gang, and do that, and then there's a guy who always tries to do everything on his own and all that.

But they're a gang, you understand? So it's impious, but at the same time as within impious, there's more pious than impious, right? And of those who are, you know, impious of impious, then there's worse. So that guy is, you know, a trouble, but still he can kind of work with the gang, but there's guys that are so independent, they can't, right? And for those who can't, they're just on their own, then there's ones that are more successful, get around, don't get themselves killed and stuff. Then there's those ones that are so crazy, they always get themselves killed.

Does that make sense? This is a side point, you know, not that it's of any importance, but it said, you know, of occupations, every occupation has its risk level, like that, whatever you're doing, you know, like that. So, you know, like insurance, like, you know, you might anger the person that hit you over the head with a chair. So, you know, so everything has its risk.

So the highest risk occupation in the world is being a member of a gang. The life expectancy is one to two years once you've joined the gang and are part of it. So it's considered the most risky occupation.

Go ahead. I'm just. So we had before the affirmative, the devotional service, that's the frame of this, right? Yes.

So that means under that, everyone is being pious. No, no, means you've, you've accepted, you've taken up devotional service. In other words, once you surrender to Krishna's practicing devotional service, they're pious.

And those who are not practicing devotional service, they're impious. Right? So in this connection, then he's saying about the pious and impious means on whether they're, they're means you're surrendering the Lord directly in devotional service or indirectly by following the Shastras. Right? So the direct, that's, that's called actual piety.

The other one, it's, it's, it's a nice, it's, it's, you know, it's the pleasant workable form of impiety. You know, I believe they've accepted the Shashtra. So they've accepted the lifestyles.

Now all you have to do is add Krishna and then everything's in place. So culturally it's, it's working, but philosophically it's wrong. Well, well, what we call impious is philosophically it's wrong and culturally it's wrong.

Right? Well, for the devotee, philosophically and culturally, it's right. You understand? So, so, so, so, so there's an overlap there, which means the proper culture, that creates the piety. So you

use that term, but at the same time, there's lack of the wrong philosophy that creates both the impiety.

And that sounds like a practicing Krishna would be impious. A practicing Krishna, Christian, basically. But you would say that they're more pious of the impious.

Okay. You know what I'm saying? Because they don't actually know what's going on. So what defines what they do? You know what I'm saying? You know, you know, is it, is it important? Like now the Christians burn libraries.

But if a Christian went out, but a Christian priest went down to the local library and burned it. Right? Because, you know, I mean, first, of course, he first go in and take out the Bible, you know, because there is one copy there. And then he burned the library.

So would that be considered good? Would he be recognized by the community as a pious man? Would the church award him with, you know, I say, sainthood? No, but the, but the Christian priest who burnt the library in Alexandria, you know, which is at the time, the biggest library in the world. He was, he was awarded, he's a saint. So where does that come from? Why is it one's a saint and this other guy would be put in jail? Yeah, it's just a matter.

So it's all mundane considerations. Because the point is, is if knowledge is coming from God, this other knowledge is. So the point is, is the problem is not the knowledge.

The problem is the perspective of learning that knowledge. Right? So that's the problem. You know, so the people are studying in that.

That's not a problem. So, because they don't know that, so therefore they don't study. Right? You know what I'm saying? You know, the pagans, they take their baths, but so therefore, you know, we're not pagans, so we don't take baths.

You know what I'm saying? Where does this come from? You know what I'm saying? This is the point, is that, how do you define what's okay and not? You know what I'm saying? You know, before science, there was no tolerance. You know, anything subtle, anything until that age was not tolerated. But now it is.

So what defines that? Because, because there was probably a lot more people made saints at the time when all that was intolerant than there are now. You know what I'm saying? Because now you have to work within the particular confines and everything. There was just pure emotion, whatever you felt like.

So if it was seemingly in line with the Lord, it was considered glorious. You know what I'm saying? But now all the elements of the value of the secular state, you know, and that comes up. And what are those laws? It means who said don't burn the library? Right? Did God say don't burn the library? No.

So where does it come from? So why does the Christian care about it? If God didn't care, why do they care? But because they value the state, therefore the state said, therefore they care. So this is a big change in consciousness. You know what I'm saying? So technically, are they actually Christians? You know what I'm saying? So that's what the point is, is that how do you define what's priceless? That's why it's said you follow the Vedic literature, then you're following the scriptures.

You know, so at least if someone's following the scriptures, within whatever they have, because religion has to come from God, then there's some point. Right? You know, so if you have an orthodox, you know, Jew or an orthodox Muslim like that, so then there's something there. They're basing their life on scripture.

So that's going to be better than someone who doesn't. But the point is, is that in the parampara, who's interpreting what the scripture is saying, then that becomes the difficulty. Their witness is there, but it has been broken.

Like that. Yeah. So then how do you interpret? You know what I'm saying? So it's like, you know, why Sunday or why Friday is a Saturday? How did they come up with that? The Old Testament very clearly says it's Saturday.

So if they're following Jesus who followed them on Saturday, why would they follow on Sunday? What's special about Sunday? You know, Sunday is controlled by the sun. Sun is, you know, the greater planet. So that was very prominent in the pagan religion.

So therefore, Sunday becomes prominent for them. You know, that's all. It was a pagan consideration.

You know, so it's not based on scripture. So why that? So then that means then following the altar would be more pious in their consideration. You know what I'm saying? So this is the difficulty is that, that why it has to be in parampara, like that, because then there's a proper understanding.

Otherwise, then you end up with all kinds of strange and wonderful. It's nice. It gets the emotions going and stuff like that.

But that's sentimental. It's not enough. You know, it has to be pleasing to God.

You know, you say it's for God, but you know, how is that? You know what I'm saying? Yeah, so that's the difficulty, because they're seeing things in the mother patron, in the mother ignorance. They think the body is the soul, and then all bodies are different. So therefore, there's different souls.

You know, so therefore, a Christian soul is different from a Jewish soul is different from a Muslim soul, right? And therefore, they've historically been killing each other. But you know, it's a problem. The next section deals with these two kinds of persons, the impious who lacks

knowledge and never surrender unto Krishna, and the pious who develop knowledge and surrender unto Him.

So here we're saying is that they actually surrender to God, right? So that then defines them as they gain knowledge and they surrender, right? So that would be proper. Verses 15 and 19, two classes of this. Pious and impious.

If one can be freed from birth and death simply by surrendering to Krishna, why aren't big leaders of society surrendering unto Him? The Gita answers this question very frankly. It's from the 715 purport. Those really learned leaders of society like Brahma, Shiva, Kapila, the Kumaras, Manu, Vyasa, Devala, Asita, Janaka, Bali, Pralaya, and later on, Madhvacharya, Ramanujacharya, Sri Caitanya, and many others.

Who are faithful philosophers, politicians, educators, scientists, etc. Surrender unto the lotus feet of the Supreme Person, the all-powerful authority. Those who are not actually philosophers, scientists, educators, administrators, etc., but who pose themselves as such for material gain, do not accept the plan or path of the Supreme Lord.

So it seems that they're not real philosophers. So we say administrator, or he's a good businessman. He's not actually.

If he's not connected to Krishna, he's not actually a good businessman. He's posing as a businessman, you know, and doing that activity, because the point is this, what's money for? What are you supposed to use money for? Student 2 To elevate yourself. Prabhupada Yeah, to elevate yourself.

So elevate yourself in Krishna consciousness. So is he doing that? No. So he's a so-called businessman.

Right? Because he's only doing part of it. You know what I'm saying? Student 3 He's wasting it. Prabhupada Yeah.

Let us say you want to make a, you know, a cheese substitute, right? You're frying the paneer, frying the cauliflowers, frying the potatoes like this, you know, and then making, you know, the spices, the sauce, you put all that in there and make a nice thing like that. And so that's what it is. Okay, now let's say the person just fries the potatoes.

And then doesn't bother with the rest of it. So do you have a cauliflower, a cheese substitute? No, you have fried potatoes. But you know, it works.

You can eat them. Right? So that's the point. So but can you really call him someone who knows how to cook this? No.

You know, he's a potato fryer. A potatoizer. So then that's the problem.

They're doing business, but business includes the charity. Right? Paying of taxes and the

charity. So the charity has to be the qualified person.

So that means promise. So is that going on? Right? So if that's not, and then you're supposed to, when you have a certain amount, you're supposed to start doing yagas. You know, you're supposed to be regularly feeding the Brahmins, doing yagas, giving in charity, all these different things.

So is that going on? No, because they're all the duties of a vaisya. You know, so business is a detail. Right? When you say vaisya, what does that mean? Yeah, but through the medium of? But what do those generate? What's the principle? Economics, right? So in other words, someone who's going to elevate himself through the medium of economics, that's a vaisya.

Now, as a detail, he can either be into cows, farming, business, or banking. Right? So businessman is a detail. A vaisya.

But is he actually a vaisya? If he's not elevating himself through that, he's not actually a vaisya. So therefore, so-called. Those who are not actually philosophers, scientists, educators, administrators.

Because they're not, you know, philosophers, they're not understanding the Supreme Godhead. So how do you actually know any philosophy? If you don't know who God is, you are in the material energy. You know, what's the process to elevate yourself and become God conscious? Then you're not a philosopher.

You may be very intellectual, but you're not a real philosopher. You're only dealing part of it. Right? You know, if I have a steering wheel, it's from a car, but I can't say I have a car.

No, but it's from a car. Still, it's not a car. Come on, vroom, vroom.

Like that. No. You can imagine a little bit.

You know, so does that make sense? It's just, it doesn't work. Right? And the rest of it. Scientists, they don't know actually where it's coming from.

So what do they know what they're dealing with? Educators are not teaching God conscious, only teaching part of knowledge. Like that. Administrators are not detecting.

They're not connecting the whole thing, representing the Lord. So, you know, it's just, they're just doing like very complex management. Verse 15 describes four kinds of such unfortunate persons who don't surrender to Krishna.

The grossly foolish, the lowest among mankind, those whose knowledge is stolen by illusion. And those who partake of the atheistic nature of demons. Anybody who does not surrender to Krishna must belong to one of these four categories.

Srila Prabhupada confirms this in a lecture from Vrindavan, November 8th, 1972. This is the

conclusion that if one is not Krishna conscious, we do not accept him as highly qualified. That is the statement of Krishna himself in the Bhagavad Gita.

Right? Nectar of devotion, highly qualified, then has two aspects. One is that, is knowledge in that, you know, the character comes from the devotional standing. Those two aren't there, then they're not highly qualified.

They may, they have a lot, lots of knowledge. We say they're intelligent. They have, you know, good character.

Then we'll say that they're, you know, morally stout, you know, like this. But only when they're combined, then you call that highly educated. Devotional character and knowledge, like that.

So we take this formula. We test whether he has surrendered to Krishna. If not, then he comes into the four groups.

Duskrutino, mudha, naranama, mayaya pratyajana. We take it immediately. He must be one of them, either duskrutina or mudha, or all.

Naradhamma, mayaya pratyajana. They cannot do anything good to the human society. That is not possible.

So they're one of these. It's just, that's what it is. But the point is, is because everybody's in Krishna, everybody can take up devotional service.

The point is, is everybody is, as we were reading before, the spiritual nature is covered. It's not that, oh, they have a material nature, they have a spiritual nature. No, the spiritual nature is just covered by the material.

So the spiritual never goes away. It's just covered. So in the material world, people are covered by the material.

So they think they're not spiritual. But the point is, is everyone being part and parcel of Krishna, right, everybody being within Krishna, then that means that everybody is a devotee, just they don't know it. So according to their conditioning, then you deal with that in some way to try to convince them of the fact, right? So that's why then one doesn't see, you know, it's not that demons and this, that means we call them, you know, duskrutina, you know, asura, that means, these are, these are, you know, quite strong points, but that's because that's his conditioning.

But it's not the soul. So therefore, we never think badly, oh, he's this, he's that. No, he's not.

That's his conditioning. No, because, you know, innocent would be, that's, that's taking a different mentality. A different, that means how they're situated in there, not surrendered to God.

But then of those, those are those, there are those who are committed to that platform and

those who just by association are doing that. So they would be more innocent. So the innocent, then you could convince them, though they may be from one of these backgrounds.

But then they won't be acting as that. So generally this is given when they're determined to act in this way, you know, and then the innocent will be those who are, you know, are open that they could surrender. Q. They have the soundness characteristics, but actually... A. Yeah, but you take what's prominent.

Q. Okay. A. You know. You know, if you have a box of orange juice, what's the prominent element? Q. The juice.

A. The juice, yeah, not the orange. So there's juice. Then it happens to be orange or apple or this or that.

Do you understand? But if it's whole, it's not that, then what's prominent? Q. It's not. A. If it's, if the orange is whole, it's nothing but juice, then it's a fruit. Then it's an orange.

Q. Yeah. A. That's an orange, that's an apple. So it's fruit, right? So it's either fruit or juice.

Do you understand? But there's, you know, so you're just seeing what's prominent. So if it's a matter of they're committed to their, you know, impious nature, then one wouldn't call them innocent, right? But if they're just doing it because that's all they know and everybody else is doing it, but if you speak about God-consciousness and there's a chance of them, oh, okay, then that's innocent, right? So therefore, if you're preaching, those who are innocent are going to respond. So for the effort you put in, you're going to get the maximum return, right? But those innocent may be in any of these four categories, right? But those who are, who are, who are against, you know, you speak and they're against it, why waste your time, right? Because there's so many living entities, there's always someone who is willing to listen.

So when you're preaching, sometimes you get someone from so-called philosophical path which acts so against the peace. They'll always act against because the point is, the philosopher, what is his position? Why is he a philosopher? Because he's always trying to ask questions. He's, yes, he's always philosophizing, right? Is being a philosopher an occupation? But in reality, is it an occupation? So the point is, is they make it into an occupation.

Why? Because you can always philosophize, right? But what, what makes it that they can always philosophize? There's a conclusion. So as soon as their conclusion, then their mental speculation is over, right? So real philosopher is able to philosophize within the structure of the Vedic paradigm. So he can analyze within that and come up and engage his intelligence.

While these others can't do that, they'll feel restricted. So they have their own academy and they have their own rules, but somehow they've accepted those, so that's fine. They'll speculate within their paradigm, but within the Vedic paradigm, they won't.

You know what I'm saying? So, so it's very important is that they're not actual philosophers

because it's two different complete schools, you know? But if, if you were discussing within their school, even though it's a different point of view, then they can discuss it quite nicely. You know, at least, at least the good ones can. But because it's a completely different school, and our school is very much against theirs, you know, means in other words, we can start off with not having a conclusion, we don't mind, and then get to a conclusion.

But their point is they start off with no conclusion. If they start, they'll start with a conclusion and develop it so it has no conclusion, then they'll figure that's good. But, you know, you bring it to the point where everybody's right, and everybody can speculate on it.

You know, in other words, you're finding that synthesis means you find that common ground that you both can speculate, like that. Oh yeah, I never thought of it like that. So I have two possibilities of speculating instead of one.

Well, I opened up my opportunities, right? You know, so we're doing it the other way. You speculate this way, you speculate that way. We give a conclusion that both of them have their conclusion.

Their conclusion is important. So they don't like it simply because there's a conclusion. Not that they actually know anything about anything.

You know what I'm saying? You know, because they don't know what they're doing, because they're arguing this and that. They can't even define intelligence, or mind, or ego, or the soul. Or, you know, these are the basis of philosophy.

Right? The first book they teach to the kids is called the Tarka Sangha. All it is, is it's got seven chapters, then it defines different categories of things. You know, very clearly, exactly, what is this? So it has all these definitions, and only when you have the definitions, then can you properly discuss.

Otherwise, you may have had the experience that, you know, I mean, it would probably happen with everybody. I've noticed especially, you know, Brahmacharis, because they have the time, right? Karasas, you know, you have to go or something. But Brahmacharis, they can, you know, argue for hours over something.

And then after three hours of arguing, you find out that you're actually saying exactly the same thing, but just you use different words. So to you, this meant this, and to them, that meant that. You know, by their conditioning.

And then after three hours, you find out, oh, we're saying the same thing. Hey, okay, let's go, you know, see if we can steal some malapishas. Everything's all right, you know.

You know what I'm saying? So that's why the idea in the Vedic system is everybody should have the same vocabulary, so you don't waste time arguing about, you know what I'm saying? But in the West, you don't mind because you argue over the terms and this and that, because all

you're trying to do is waste time. You know, so, you know, so they, they, they, they, they waste time, intellectually, and others waste time emotionally. The sinful people, did you add something? The sinful people described in verse 15 have only one interest, to satisfy their egoistic passions.

They often make a show of being religious men, but behind this, I would say facade, facade, facade, facade. Beside this, behind this facade, that's how you spell facade. You take, you know, your Scottish accent or something.

I forgot what the word it was. I could say tin, the time, but it's the same I as in is. Is, you know, you know, what, what is the tin, you know? So what it is, is they don't, they, they, they, they, they fix sounds for, for the vowels.

And so you get these, you know, sounds strange, you know, but actually they're just fixing the sound. Same sound. Yeah.

They're just using similar sounds. So that's, that's, you know, I kind of figured out some slight differences in the English and the American accents. English control the mouth more than the Americans don't.

So you end up, you know, oh, you got it. Ah, you know, mouth is more open. Yeah.

So it's just. Yes. There is some theories.

They stuck a lot of people on a boat and then they ended up on an island somewhere. Criminals and sailors. Yeah.

They're practical people. So they work something out. Yes.

Yes. Yeah. Yes.

And we're not running out of time. But behind this facade, they commit many sinful activities. Srila Prabhupada describes them in the renunciation through wisdom as follows.

They vilify the sanctity of the religion of their birth and go against their own country's interest. Their self-centered lives preclude their following even the common etiquette of human behavior. What to speak of dedicating their lives to Lord Krsna's devotional service.

Sastramani persons are more dangerous than poisonous snakes. But the point is, is because religion is going to restrict. And so if you want economic growth and all that, then many times, the religion will restrict what you could do.

But you'd have to work on some longer term plan and get a bigger result later. But they want immediate results. Right.

And they somehow never see that immediate will be very big. And they're not very experienced.

So they end up with something quite small.

Right. You know, it's like Calcutta in its day. We've had one once.

But it was considered the second best city in the British Empire. The British Empire was very big. Right.

So London, of course, had to be first. So Calcutta was second. Now, whether Calcutta was actually second, you know, but, you know, of course, this British Empire has to be second.

But in any case, it was that beautiful. Right. So but the point is, is now it's not.

Because of they vilify the sanctity of religion of their birth and go against their own country's interest. Right. So like this, they used to wash the streets of Calcutta twice a day.

So it was so clean like that until the communist government took over. So they're not what you call very religious. You know, so then now now it's known as the, you know, I'd say, you know, I say.

So this is Ellen Ginsberg called the armpit of the universe. The four types of impious persons are one, the grossly foolish mudas. So this is all too much.

Generally, the gross fools and the ignorant fruit of workers do not surrender to the Supreme Lord. Such people never inquire into the absolute truth. They never ask this question as who is God? What is the world? Who am I? Why am I working like an ass my whole life? That's why they're mudas.

Why am I working like an ass? You know, the next one. Why am I a Narada? Why am I the lowest of mankind? Or what is the result of my endeavor? The ass slaves his whole life carrying the washerman's burden just for a handful of grass. Similarly, the karmis, fruit of workers, toil tirelessly simply to secure a supply of food and other necessities.

The ass is a symbol of foolishness, for he works hard only to fulfill his belly and to copulate with the she-ass. So also do the asinine karmis toil tirelessly out of affection and attachment, struggling to maintain their homes and beyond that the land of their birth, which they consider worshipable. In the home, the karmi's sole source of enjoyment is his wife, who cooks for him and provides pleasure for his misery-ridden senses.

The short-sighted karmis do not want to know of any broader issues concerning themselves or their world. They are simply tethered to their home and bodily cares. And those leaders who foster the people's sensual lives are bigger fools and rascals than the ordinary karmis.

Therefore, they never come in contact with the Bhagavad-Gita or Lord Krishna. The word surrender means nothing to them. So here we see is that it's not just limited to a particular group, because generally you think, you know, okay, you know, mudaj, the grossly foolish, you know, the dock workers, and you know, the guys, you know, the jackhammers, and the steed,

or drive a truck or something like that.

But here we see it goes beyond. It's the fruitive worker, like that. So he could be very pious, you know, on, you know, following different things, doing all kinds of sacra, giving in charity, and all that.

But he's doing all that simply for economic development, sense gratification, all right? So, and then you have the person who is, of course, going to be more, you know, more gross than that, which will be more common. That they're going to be just absorbed in just doing their work, getting their money, trying to pay the rent, pay the bills, you know, interact with the family, and that's all. That's their life.

There's nothing more than that. But it also probably brings us, then the people who are above this, who their whole point is also that fruitiveness, you know, on big, and they're managing, you know, controlling bigger areas. They're the same, right? So they're all within the same thing.

You know, the common, you know, gross uncultured person who's doing, the cultured person who's doing the same thing economic development, or the very big, you know, on big economic levels and all that, they're doing the same thing. So it's all, these are all the grossly foolish, the muda, because they see nothing more than generating some economics to take care of the family and the house, and that's it. They don't have anything beyond that.

Does that make sense? Two, the lowest of mankind, not in harmony. Naradhama. People who do not surrender to the Supreme Lord are called Naradhama, the lowest of men.

Such men fritter away their human lives, behaving like animals. In other words, when a person does not use this rare human birth to achieve its actual purpose, but wasted in degrading activities, he is called Naradhama. When a beggar suddenly finds a treasure, yet continues to live like a beggar, he is surely a miser and a Naradhama.

Similarly, when someone receives the priceless gift of a human birth, yet squanders it by living like an animal, simply eating, sleeping, mating, and defending, then such a person is a Naradhama. These fools do not realize that after many millions of births in lower species, the soul finally receives the rare human birth, and it is in this birth that the soul must sincerely endeavor to elevate himself to the transcendental platform, attain the Absolute Truth, and return to his original home in the spiritual world. If in this human life the soul makes no attempt to alleviate his situation, even after learning how horribly he has suffered in millions of previous lifetimes, then such a person is certainly a miserable miser and Naradhama.

But if one tries to utilize his rare human birth for self-realization by becoming elevated to the brahminical class, then his life is successful. Brahmana does not mean brahmana by birth. A brahmana is one who surrenders to Lord Kṛṣṇa, the Lord of the brahmanas, and Naradhama cannot do so.

Therefore, another meaning of Naradhama is one who rejects devotional service. Okay, so we see there's a difference. One is just absorbed.

He doesn't inquire beyond. The other one, he may, you know, get into this and that and so many different things, but he still doesn't surrender, right? So this can bring in all your more subtle kind of aspects of life, all the different, you know, I say, new agey things or this or that, so they can be involved in all this, but still be a Naradhama because they don't surrender. So this, the one is that all he sees is house and home, and that's it, right? And the work that it takes to maintain it.

So that's a mudhā. Someone who, his focus may be on whatever he's into, but he's not interested in using his human life for this higher purpose that it's actually meant for. That's a Naradhama, right? So we also see here is just like the mudhā goes on all these different levels of, you know, very uncultured to those who are cultured, to those who are very powerful, right? We see here that this also works on different levels because one who rejects devotional service.

Now, one of the keys that is in here that's very important is when you say one who rejects devotional service, what would that imply? He has connected with it. You understand? That's what makes him a Naradhama. You understand? That's why it's very, very careful in how you preach.

Don't preach to the faithless because he's faithless. Let him be that way. You preach and you see it's not, leave it.

Because if you give him more, then what is he doing? He's rejecting Kṛṣṇa consciousness. Right? So that's the point. And so here you get the ideas, he rejects, he's made that decision.

So that means your mudhā could also, he comes in contact, doesn't like it, rejects, then that makes him a Naradhama. So as Prabhupāda says, he can be all of that. Yeah, we must take it immediately.

He must be one of them, either discreteen or mudhā, or all. Naradhama, mayāyikita. Right? He may be one or he may be all of them.

Right? But his situation is there. Now he's come in contact, now he rejects, now he becomes, you know, a mudhā-Narādhaka, Narādhaka. Right? You know, someone else is a Surabhāva-Narādhaka, and someone else is, you know.

Does that, does that make sense? So that's, that one has to be very, very careful. So you get the idea is that, you know, they may be with brains, may be without brains. Right? So one has to be very, very careful.

One has to find some way to present it to them that they'll all accept it. You know, so what is the platform that goes? Like, let's say we go to, what is the, if you're dealing with, you know, the New Age environment, what is the attractive feature? What's interesting? The mystery. Mystery.

Okay. So that, that's the emotional platform. There's some other elements.

Impersonal. Impersonal. Okay.

But that would indicate? Mood of goodness. Mood of goodness. Yes.

Health. Health. Yeah.

Well-being. Okay. Well-being.

Yeah. Well-being. I would say that would be more, and that would include the mental and all that.

Social. Yes, social. So we see there's more refinedness here.

The basis of goodness. Well-being. Everybody's there.

Same time it's impersonal. Same time it's mysterious. Same time it's, one thing I've mentioned is that the intellectual aspect, because you're always discussing something.

It's not just getting together and just feel. It means there's something that you're dealing with. So there's the intellectual platform.

You know what I'm saying? So that's what you're looking for. Not, it's not the yoga. It's not the astrology.

It's not that. These are mediums for this. You understand? Catch that point? This is the trick in the preaching there, is because therefore, then you present Vedanta, pure Vedanta philosophy, but bringing out the elements of, you know, using the mediums of goodness and nice language that you're using and, you know, stuff that you see, the welfare of everybody and the goodness and all these different things like that, you know, the mysteriousness of it, you know, the words you use.

Does that make sense? Then you can preach directly in that environment because you know what they're looking for. But if you think they're there because of yoga, then you're going to try through yoga and then try to find some place where at some point you can just slip it in. But what happens with people who won't or won't? Then, you know, you're stuck.

You wasted your time. Right? Because you're actually trying, dealing with the wrong medium. You know what I'm saying? That's the point.

Let's say you have somebody who's a connoisseur, you know, in eating. So it's not necessarily what cuisine it is. It's the quality of it.

So therefore, maybe they're used to always eating one particular thing. But if you can cook something else to the same standard, if not better, they're going to be interested. So you have to know what it is that they're looking for.

Why are they there? You know? Yes? That's the Narada. So that's why you have to be, that's why you have to, means you're dealing more with the mind, but you're very intelligently dealing, right? Intelligence means, let's say you're having, you want to make a point. If you intellectually want to make a point, you simply make the point, then explain it.

Right? But if you're dealing on the, on the emotional platform, you create the environment, then you make your point. Right? Because it's emotion. The other one's intellect.

So you can just go, it's okay, these are all the different things and this and that. There's no choice. It's just a matter of, you can look at it this way, you can look at it that way.

Oh, okay. Right? But when you're dealing with the mind, it's accept and reject. So if you present the wrong field, then they reject.

You know what I'm saying? So in other words, in here is that, two things. One, keep it more intellectual, then there's not an opportunity for the mind to reject it. Right? So you can get more explained.

And so what you're doing is creating a bigger, broader field that the mind has already accepted. And so when you add something more to it, the natural thing is to accept. You know what I'm saying? So you're intellectually using the mental platform, because that's why they're there.

It's the experience of all of it. You know, they like things presented, you know, very clearly and intellectually, you know, analytically. But it must generate an experience.

So you have to do that, generate that experience, and give enough logic that it covers so much, you know, background that then when you do present, you know, Krishna and like that, that it's already, the foundation has been laid. So if they reject, it means you have to do more cultivation beforehand. That cultivation means you're speaking our philosophy.

Cultivation doesn't mean you're not speaking the philosophy. This is a mistake in the, that would be the way we say it, this, you know, so-called soft preaching. It's not actually preaching.

You know what I'm saying? If you're talking our philosophy, but using their language, you know, because that language comes from us anyway. You know, the Upanishads and that, they speak in that language, the divine, the supreme, the ultimate, like that. So, you know, we can do that.

So, but the point is, is that if you're using that and talking our philosophy, then that's actually directly speaking, but within their medium. But if you're not, you're just talking all these things about being nice and good, then that, you call that indirect preaching, but it's not preaching at all. That's why it doesn't get anywhere.

So those who are successful there, you know, because they are preaching, just using their vocabulary and their moods and all these things. They just know how to preach in that

environment. Does that make sense? No, because teaching is somebody, somebody's actually, someone's good with kids, someone's good with adults, someone's good with this kind of adult, someone's good with that kind of adult, or this training in this area or that area.

But teaching is one thing, but it's just where they apply it. So then some will be very expert in using those languages and stuff like that. Does this make sense? So in preaching in the New Age community, they might have some misconceptions about different definitions, like the reincarnation.

They're thinking that actually you choose when you are dying, when you die, then you choose, you know, yourself, you know, who will be your parents in the next life. And they're not accepting authorities. But just avoid those points.

Why bother with those? In other words, areas that they have these things about it, because the point is, what's the problem with reincarnation? Well, for them, it's... No, no, not for them. Just what's the problem with reincarnation? No problem. So you don't mind taking birth again and again and again and again.

It's like on the sticker, born again. Yeah, that's the suffering. Yeah, I mean, the point is, is being born is a problem.

So whether you choose or don't choose, that's not that. So we'll argue, no, you don't choose. I know, but the problem is, is that you're taking birth again.

That's the problem. So the soul is eternal. Why should we be taking birth again? So we want to solve that problem.

So whether you choose, you know, someone else chooses, or, you know, it's a lottery or, you know, the universal game of roulette or whatever it is, it doesn't matter. Is that you're taking birth again. And even if you choose, still, there's all these problems.

You're going to die again. No one likes you just because you can choose where you're going to go next life. Do you still like to die? No.

No. You know what I'm saying? No, it came up to you. You know, I've got my friend.

He's got, you know, you know, this big gun there. And I give you a form, you know, please, please fill this up, you know, before we blow your head off. That, you know, where we'd like to take birth, what kind of, you know, social status, you know, money, good looks, you know, you can get into details, you know, kind of nose, ears, you know, all these different things, you know, you know, a whole big, you know, thing like that, you know.

Would you be more comfortable? No. So that's the point is that the difficulty is not whether you choose or not. It's a matter of you're going to be, you die and you're born again, and then you die and then your body just goes on and on.

So they want to solve that problem. So that you have to solve by connecting to the Supreme. The Supreme is eternal.

Soul's eternal. But we're working within this environment that people don't see its connection to the Supreme. So if you don't see the connection to the Supreme, why would you get a supreme result? You see its connection to the Supreme, so you get a supreme result, which means eternal.

You know what I'm saying? So that's straight our philosophy, but you've presented it in an environment, then so you sidestep. That's what's being brought even out of course, teaching in the Krishna Sandarbha, of Krishna Samhita. The devotees mistake it and they think, oh, he's giving all these things and you know, all he said, no, all he's showing is techniques, how to sidestep all the mundane considerations that people will come up with and how to keep it on track of just pure philosophy.

That's the technique. It's not that he's saying what he says. Oh, they're just a bunch of kings.

It's not that. It's just you say there, but they are a bunch of kings. The Navyogendras, they're a bunch of kings.

But that's not the point. You know, they're greatly elevated, great devotees of the Lord. They don't want to hear that.

Because of this, they get all sidestepped. You know, how big was Ghatotkach, was so big, you know, who cares how big he was? You know, it was that big or whether it was this big. What does it matter? The point is, is that, you know, his commitment to, you know, serving, you know, the forces of his qualities is what we should be looking at.

You know, don't worry about how big he was or how small he was, how many teeth he had. I mean, that's what happens. They get distracted by that.

And because of that, you can't discuss. You know what I'm saying? You know, it's just like, oh, but, you know, Varanasi was a caste system, and it's so bad, so much exploitation. So yeah, there is so much exploitation, because people don't understand.

No, someone's supposed to be engaged according to what's his nature. He's an intellectual. He should be given the facility to do his intellectual work very nicely.

He shouldn't be distracted by other things. You know, the businessman should fully be able to do his business. He shouldn't have to worry about other things.

The artist should be able to do his artwork. Whoever someone is, they should be able to do their activity without restraint. So you want to have, the social system should be defined to do that.

You know, does that make sense? So you just sidestep their argument, because you try to get to

what is essential, right? That's why we're always discussing what's behind what is going on, because that's the constant. That's the thing you can catch in your own mind, because our own mind will do the same thing, get us off on a tangent. But when you're preaching, it's the other person.

It's that what's actually the point is that what you discuss with, because the principle is universal. The detail is specific for the situation. So if you're discussing the universal aspect, there's no argument, right? But if you're discussing the detail, then that will go on until the cows come home.

Does that make sense? Okay, so we'll continue tomorrow with the Maya Epitaphs. Do you think that's the 11th or 12th? 11th, 12th. I don't think it's going to work like that.

So I think what we'll do is we'll just, when the official time the classes end, which I think is around the 10th of February, something like that, 8th of February, whenever it's not punching, then we'll just continue after that. The kids won't have classes, so then we can do this class earlier. So it doesn't get, because the problem is it comes later and gets in the way of the temple program.

So we can do like from 6 to 7 30. And that way we can still get to the temple for this event. That I think will work better.