

2011-02-03 BVPS BG 13.2-13.5 Using culture-assisting in Parabrahman realization

Sadhguru chants Sanatana Gosvami's name Sadhguru chants Hare Krsna, Hare Krsna, Krsna Krsna, Hare Hare, Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare So, page four. Krsna's answers to questions three, four and five. Knowledge means to understand the field and the knower of the field.

Because here we say, well, that's two, right? With sambandha we're dealing with three. But the knower of the field is two, right? The living entity and God. So, therefore, they both come there.

Krsna answers as follows. The body is the field of activity. The soul is the knower of the field.

Krsna, the Supersoul, is the knower of all fields of activity. Knowledge means to understand the body and its knower. Because when we say, well, that's simple, that's just the body, but everything is connected with the body.

It means everything, one's identity, one's self, what activities you do, where you place yourself, it's all based on your body. You're a family person because of the body, not because of the soul. Whatever your engagement in, you have an occupation.

Why? Because you have a body. Does the soul need lunch? No. So, therefore, you're working for the body, right, to maintain the senses of the body.

So, therefore, you understand the body. If you actually understand it, then you understand everything's connected with the body. So then you can separate that this is all going on because of the body.

Then after that, then you have who knows the body, which is soul. Then you have the Supersoul who knows all bodies. So that we know something, so we're beyond.

But then Krishna is beyond the beyond. So that's the discussion on the field and the knower of the field includes three topics, cit, acit and isvara. Srila Prabhupada summarizes the connection between them in his purport, the verse three.

OK. So cit means, how do you say, consciousness. So that's the jiva.

Acit will mean no consciousness or dead matter, the material world. And isvara means the controller of both. This material world, which is the field of activities, is nature.

And the enjoyer of nature is the living entity. And above them both is the supreme controller, the Personality of Godhead. It is stated in the Vedic language, Svetasvatara Upanisad 112, bhokta bhogyam praritam ca matva sarva-proktam tri-vidham brahma etat There are three Brahman conceptions.

Prakrti is Brahman as the field of activities. And the jiva, individual soul, is also Brahman. It is trying to control material nature.

And the controller of both of them is also Brahman, but he is the factual controller. In other words, although everything is Brahman, there's a differentiation between the inferior and superior Brahman and the controller of both. So everything's Brahman because it's all made out of the Lord.

It's all coming from the Lord. The difficulty is, but it's divided into three. So there's inferior, which is acit, it's unconscious Brahman.

Then there's the conscious Brahman that is very small. It's trying to control and enjoy. This is inferior Brahman.

Then you have the superior Brahman, which is Krishna. So he's controlling everything. So it means these perspectives, right? Because now we're starting to give these perspectives within it.

These are details. We've already established the process of connecting one's nature to the Lord. We've established that connecting the nature of the soul to the Lord directly with the consideration of the conditioned nature as secondary, not primary.

Then that will become, that's the basis of pure devotional service. So now we're getting into techniques of how we work with the yoga system. So if you understand how the material energy is Brahman, then we understand its position.

So it's actually something that is superior to what we actually think it is because we just think it's this matter here for us to enjoy. But it's actually, you know, a eternal substance. The difficulty is that we want to control that and enjoy it how we want.

And because of that, we become illusioned because the difficulty is this. As we are Brahman, the material energy is Brahman, but being dead matter, it's only reflecting what is superior. So it's reflecting the internal potency.

So Krishna and his internal potency, they're interacting without any touch with the material. But the material is a reflection of that. So therefore, it appears to be animated and have value and be attractive when it's not.

Like, does that make sense? You see something very nice in the mirror, then you think it's the mirror that's attractive. No, it's the actual item itself. Right? Does that make sense? But it reflects in the mirror, so it appears that the mirror itself is the attractive feature.

But it's not. You understand? But if it's not Brahman, how does it reflect? You understand? There must be something to have... There must be a common point for there to be a relationship between anything. Yes? Could you say then that the material energy is eternal, but

the form it takes is temporary? Yes, material energy is eternal, but it's temporarily manifest.

It manifests, unmanifests, the forms are constantly changing. Right? So in the spiritual world, there's the element of... How do you say? Means everything's eternal, but it's also ever fresh. That means there's something, because it's always expanding, there's always something new about it.

At the same time as whatever's there is eternal, that remains. Okay? So now, the point is, if you can't see... What's the problem with the living entity in seeing the material world? Right? Is it the variety that's the problem? Is it the freshness that one may find in it? Is that the problem? What's the problem? Temporariness. The temporariness.

Okay. But why... Okay, but even when we say it's temporary, you have to deal with something. You know what I'm saying? No.

Let's say you're very hungry. Now, you would like a full meal, right? What if somebody offers you a snack? You'll take it. I'll take it.

Yeah, okay. So, it's better than nothing, right? So, since you have to do something, so the living entity's dealing with material energy, so that he's dealing with material energy, that's not actually the problem. What's the problem? That it doesn't satisfy us.

Doesn't satisfy, but let us say if it did, what's still the problem? He sees it separately. He sees it separately than the Lord. Oh, yeah.

You understand? That's what's always so fun about this. We just read the point, and then we discuss it in detail, and then it's always interesting to watch that we get like ten different answers that go all around it, but never actually mentioned like that. I don't know if you've noticed over the last, you know, like, you know, so many weeks that we always tend to do this.

Because that's the point. Krishna consciousness is that simple. The living entity is seeing it separate from the Lord, right? So, that means, what does that mean? He's actually missed the mood, right? Because internal potency has this variety for Krishna's pleasure, but the living entity simply sees the variety and wants to enjoy that variety.

Right? So, what does that mean? If the living entity is making that mistake with the internal potency, won't he naturally make the same mistake with the external? Right? If you can't understand something that's superior and so much more obvious, why will you understand with something that's less obvious? You know what I'm saying? So, therefore, the living entity comes here and doesn't see the mood that is actually the reflection from the spiritual world. Right? For the internal potency. So, therefore, then they think that what they're dealing with, that's generating the variety.

You know what I'm saying? But the Lord is already performing His interactions that create all the variety. That being reflected, because He's attracted to that reflection, He interacts with it.

That will create the transformations.

So, it appears that, therefore, He's creating things when He's not. You understand? The Lord and His internal potency are making all these varieties of changes. And then it's just reflected.

Does that make sense? But, yeah. Right? So, that's the point. One shouldn't make the mistake that, oh, they're doing what's ever going on here.

No, they're doing the original and we're taking bits and pieces from that. Right? You know what I'm saying? You know, it's like you have a, like a buffet. Right? You have so many varieties of things that are complete and there's already menus, how you put it together, and everything like that.

The person who's put it together has this variety. Now, people will come along and take what they want. Right? So, they're based on what's already there.

But they'll put it together in their own way that they feel is unique. But they're only using the elements that are already there. Does that make sense? You know, it's just like I come along and say, okay, well, everybody keeps the book like this, but I have to be different.

So, I'm going to keep the book like this. Okay? Or, okay, that's obvious. Okay, I'll put it like this.

That's less obvious. So, I can say, see, I'm so unique, I'm doing different than everybody else. Right? But the point is, what are the options given? Am I creating the options? No, I'm simply seeing the options that are there.

So, I can still only put it on, can I stick it on edge and have it stay like that? No, it's not an option. Why? Because that's not given in the original. So, I can only, my options are only what's in the reflection.

Does that make sense? So, I can only deal with that. So, if this kind of thing is understood, then you start to see the difference between things. Right? We all say, we've heard Chitta Chittishwar, the living entity, the Supreme Lord, and the material energy, you know, a million times.

But this is what it's meaning. This is, you know, the beginning of that stage of understanding the Brahman aspect. Right? So, therefore, we see that it's so much deeper.

You see this, what happens? What happens to your material interests and desires? They simply become broken up and separated into their mechanics. And then you see, actually, what I'm looking at and attracted to isn't actually the item I think it is. Because it's only reflecting the original.

So, the original is what's attractive. Right? So, if the original is attractive, why am I bothering with becoming attracted to what's in the reflection? I should turn my attention to the original. So, therefore, I should worship, therefore, you know, Lakshmi, Narayan, or Radha and Krishna.

Right? Does that make sense? But, since I'm dealing with the material energy, and I'm going to, I want to show that attraction and affection, I will still use the material energy. Right? Because how are you going to express affection? You still have to use the body, which means the field of activity still remains. Right? Does that make sense? So, it's not going to change, necessarily, the activity.

But what changes is the consciousness, that you can see what's actually going on. Right? And since it is part of the Lord's plan, what's the problem in dealing with it? You know what I'm saying? The householder, he has his family, you know, he has his facilities, but if it's reflecting the original, there's no problem in dealing with it. Right? Because it's not yours anyway, it's Krishna's.

Right? And what's the appropriate interaction, that's what you take part in, as an instrument. So, what's changed? Consciousness has changed. So, now, instead of me being the enjoyer, trying to control the material energy for my own purpose, I become an instrument for the Lord's pleasure.

So, the situation doesn't have to change. Right? This is the secret. So, when we say, it doesn't, Bhaktivinoda Thakura says, it doesn't matter whether you're in the house or in the forest, it's because if you have this consciousness, it doesn't matter.

Because the forest is Krishna's and the house is Krishna's. Right? So, it doesn't matter. You can use both.

But you have to see with this vision. Otherwise, the ones you're seeing externally, then you'd say, yes, the forest is better than the house, if you're trying to become renounced. Because in the forest, there are no facilities, so you're not going to become distracted.

You understand? Yes? Often times in life, people see crazy things that happen in the material world. Say, those who are, you know, see the religions like Christianity or Judaism, and then they'll look at stuff and then they'll see, how can such a crazy thing happen? There can't be a God. You know, then the idea of safety comes and all these things.

So, how does one actually look at a situation, become bewildered by the craziness of that situation? No, but the point is, is the essence. See, what we're talking about here is, what is it? The persons are attracted to the religion. Right? So, why are they attracted? What are they looking for? What does it offer? Idea of God? So, is that a bad thing? Okay.

What about a sense of security? You know, some knowledge of who I am, where I'm going. Some purpose in life. Some emotional support in the way of, you know, the sentiments that come along with it, or other people to share that with.

Right? Because the point is, is you can be, practice a religion in your own home, and just as you're going, what is it? As you walk us by the way, as you would sit us down, as you would stand us up. You know that one? Don't know that one. Okay.

It's probably one of the essential verses in the Old Testament. It's basically saying that you should remember God, no matter what you're doing. Now you catch it? Yeah.

So, that, whatever you're doing, right? And then, you know, you do this, then they say you should, you know, how you say, you know, difference of opinion, right? So then it should be carried on the hand and on the forehead. Right? So we do it with tilak and bead bag, and others do it with little boxes. Right? So, whatever.

So, the idea is that one should always be aware. So that's fine. The problem is, is then they apply their mundane concepts, because they don't understand the eternal philosophy.

So, those parts are good. So then you start from there, and then from that, you want that. So that's not a problem.

But then you should look, you should look, I mean, to have come to that point, and are finding something that's better than someone who hasn't. Right? But still, better is someone who sees it in the proper light, you know, in the proper way it's situated. Then you can see is that the eternal position by which you can gain those qualities that you're aspiring for.

Right? And then, and not just gaining them on their own, but they're connected to a person, you have a relationship with that person. So it doesn't matter where you start, because everything in the material world technically is pseudo. Because it's dead matter that's reflecting the internal potency, so you think it's alive.

But it's not. So everything technically is pseudo. Right? There's nothing actually that's, you know what I'm saying? You know, it's like you said, we're sitting on these blankets.

So, we're sitting on the blankets because they're supposed to create a softness and a warmth. Right? Because it's cold, so that would be valued. In the summertime, we don't want the blankets.

Right? So, but we think it's the blanket that's generating the warmth. No, it's the medium, it's the particular combination of material energy that will reflect that particular aspect. Right? Of softness and warmth that is there in the original state.

Does that make sense? So, if one can see like this, then it doesn't matter where you're starting, what you're starting with. Right? Because the natural thing is here. Okay, if it's all the reflection, because, you know, we generally tend to be deists.

Right? Is that, you know, God's good and the material world's bad, so God can't be connected with the material world. Right? We have this particular kind of logic. So, material world is all bad things happening, manifestations, but the point is, is what is the principle on which the person is doing a bad thing anyway? Right? In other words, it's a low-grade manifestation of something that they're looking for.

The person's stealing. Why is he stealing? He wants possession. So, why does he want possession? Prestige? Okay, but the prestige is the thing.

But prestige can be gotten anywhere. So many varieties of prestige. This just happens to be a lower-end element of it.

But if you follow it nicely, you know, the prestige is only prestigious in the general way if you're not caught. You know what I'm saying? You know, and if you are caught, it better have been something big, otherwise it's not going to be prestigious either. You know what I'm saying? So, the... But that means you have to not get caught.

So that's the detail that comes along with trying to obtain prestige through stealing. You know what I'm saying? And what you steal should be something worthwhile. The more valuable it is, the more rare, the more difficult to obtain, the greater the prestige.

You know what I'm saying? So, that's the... Does that make sense? Yes. What he said. You're trying to... The consciousness is what you're trying to adjust, to bring to the proper understanding.

Then you're going to engage your activities in that consciousness. Yes. Which religion? Oh, okay.

Yeah, I didn't hear that. I just heard Romic. And I'm thinking, well, okay.

Well, let's see what the Iroquoians have to say. For example, personal liberation, is it possible for that? Personal liberation. I don't think that that's their worry.

You know what I'm saying? I mean, basically, the Judea... It means all of them are trying to get to the heavenly position, generally. And most of the time, God doesn't actually have to be party to that heavenly experience. Yeah, well, for example, there are also saints whose main concept was that we should always serve to God.

Yes, but then who is that God? Ask Him. Right. There was one person who said, you know, God's a person, we have a conjugal relationship with Him.

But I think that ended up in the standard, you know, burning at the stake, you know, kind of thing. You know what I'm saying? But they don't know how to explain, or don't have... So, it's a difficulty. See, because you're dealing... The difficulty is that, as a first step, it's good.

But the problem is, if one becomes attached to the material consciousness, that's the problem. So, one could be in any situation. If one's attached to that situation, you know, overly, then it's going to be a problem.

But if one's not, then one can progress. You know what I'm saying? So, anything that will generate a progressive attitude, or an openness to progressiveness, then that's of use. You understand? Because, see, otherwise what we're doing is we're taking this part of the material

energy is useful, this part's not.

Technically, the material energy is just material energy. It doesn't have a specific application other than to help one go back to Godhead. So, if one uses it other than that, that's a misapplication of its purpose.

If one uses it in that way, that means anything can be used. But the point is, it's like... Because we were discussing before is you're going to see the Lord and His internal potency in whatever's going on. Right? As the reflection.

It's their potency that makes it work. No? So now, if that's the consciousness, and one is then seeing it, then I should be an instrument to favorably render service to that Supreme Lord and His consort. Right? So then, what is their taste in things? You understand? Is it a known... What is their taste? Right? Is information available, like, where God likes to live, or who He likes to interact with, what He eats, what He dresses, how He talks, what activities He does.

Is that there? Right? So therefore, if you're seeing it in relationship with God, then you'd naturally want to bring your situations that you're assisting in as close to that as possible. Right? Does that make sense? You know, it's just like, okay, you have a friend, they're into music. Okay? And specifically, they like classical music.

Right? They're not really interested in much else. Right? Does that make sense? And so, then you want to do something nice for your friend. They're into music.

So you buy tickets to the, you know, best, you know, grunge concert that you know. Okay? It's music. So, okay, maybe they can find something in it that has some element, you know, now and again between the, you know, screaming and the other, you know, power chords and that.

They'll find some little bit of melody, might, you know, find it by mistake or something like that. You know what I'm saying? Probably better to take them to an emo concert. You know, there'd be a little bit of melody there, you know.

You know what I'm saying? So, in other words, what is it that they like about it? That's the point to find. So, in other words, they're interacting, but on what level? Right? How does Krishna interact with other kids? How does he interact with his parents? How do the parents interact with him? So, since it's him that you're looking at, it's him who you would want to, you would want to be an instrument in that level. Because you can take anything.

But the point is, is then the distance between the culture that Krishna follows and the culture that you're finding it in is very different. Then the question comes up as if one's saying, if it all can be used, why can't we use this? It's like, if it can all be used, why would you use this? Then the question comes, what's your motive for using it? You know, I mean, it's nice to talk to philosophy and all that, but what's your motive? Does that make sense? Is that okay? Because otherwise, we didn't go into anything, you know. You take the particular, how you say, very expensive white powder, right? And you have it in its container, right? And it's got a nice tight

lid on that.

Okay, now if you smell that, are you going to get any benefit? No, why? Because there is no connection. You know what I'm saying? Your nose works on air. It has to be in contact with the air, the same air that your nose is.

Okay? Now, you know, can you use anything? Okay, you want to get it in your nose. So take a newspaper, roll it up. You know, I recommend Sunday edition because, you know, you get more for your money, right? You know, it's quite fat and everything.

So roll that up. Okay, will it work? No. You understand? So there are laws.

But the point is, so you can find what's the point, what's the philosophical point that makes it work. But why use that medium when you can use something much higher? Right? You know what I'm saying? If you're trying to find energy so that you can do things, the point is, as you get energy, it comes from the Lord. So that means it'll come through the devotees, come through the devotional process.

That's where you look for your energy. You know, you're inspired. So this is, you're not inspired, so you're mechanically making some inspiration.

But that goes away. This other inspiration doesn't go away. You understand? So the same principle you're looking for, look for it in its higher state.

It's much broader, much more applicable, more universal. Smaller, you get this more smaller. It works only in that connection.

Does that make sense? You know, so it's like, let's say, you have your energy drink. So then you'd roll up a paper and snort it up your nose? No. So, you know, it's very limited in its application.

You know what I'm saying? That's the point. That's why we can discuss it on this level, but what's the point? If you understand what I'm talking about, you'll be able to understand it in these nicer examples. Because that'll be more... But the point is, is if you really understand it, you can see how it runs there, how it works there.

So that means you can start there if you need to. You can explain to the crackhead what it is he's looking for that's actually the Lord. It's not the crack.

No? You understand? So that's the point. But we don't... Because we can unlimitedly go on discussing that because it's something... Well, you said like this, but what about in this? That means we can go into any of the grossest, disgustingest stuff. But, you know, that's... Right? Pigs eat garbage and stool.

But what are they looking for in that? Right? The same thing you're looking for when you look for something to eat. No? But just the medium is much lower. So why use the lower when you

can use the higher? It is available.

You're human. You don't need to use the lower. But if someone is caught in that, you can start there and bring them up.

So that's why we don't have any problem dealing with anybody on any level. That's the universal aspect. But it's not that, oh, therefore that's okay.

It's not okay. But that's where you're starting from. Right? Right? You're going down the road and then you got distracted and went into some gully and ended up, you know, two miles off course.

Right? So now if you want to put that person back on course, where do you start from? From where they are. They're off course two miles. So that's where they start from.

You can go on all day. Oh, you're not on the course. The course starts over there.

Okay, but how do you get them there? You start there. But is it all right for that he's there? No. But that's where he's going to start from.

This is the point. You have to be able to work. It's not good, but this is what you got to work with.

You can understand that. Then you can understand this. The field of activities, the body.

It's not great. You know, like that. But that's what you have to work with.

So that's where you start from to get yourself to go back to God. Does that make sense? Right? So it would be good if we don't. Unless it's, you know, something you really don't understand.

Don't be clever and come up with a. No, but then if you can apply it to anything. Where, but you know, what about the, you know, you know. You know what I'm saying? You know, that's not necessary.

It shows you have a brain. You can tell the difference between things. But it means that we're wasting time and we are missing the point.

Is this okay? Yes. What stops us because of our attachment? Because we actually think the thing itself is giving that. We may intellectually know, but we don't realize it.

But the point is by intellectually knowing and connecting it in this way to Krishna. Then with time it starts to wear away. Like that.

So that's why it's seen in that light. Does that make sense? But it doesn't mean that it's right. Because right means to be an assistant in the Lord's pastimes.

And this is not what he does for fun. You know what I'm saying? You know, it means we're

talking about how you say, you know. In this last example of something that, you know.

Supposedly gives you some emotional experiences. That is supposed to be, you know, great for. I forgot how many seconds or something.

It's a very short amount of time. But the point is, is then. We're talking about Krishna is the source of inspiration.

He is Prajna. He is the one that creates that. So you're dealing with unlimited.

You know, so we're talking here is okay. Maybe they finding a touch, but that touch is Krishna. That potency is Krishna.

But we're talking about, you know. Whatever the greatest pleasure, even like Brahma's position. Is like a drop compared to the ocean of just being off the bodily platform.

And that ocean is only like a drop compared to the unlimited ocean of devotional service. You know, it'd be like we're discussing here. Let's say, let's say we're having a seminar on economics.

Okay. And, you know, people, you know, you know, have money, want to make money. Or, you know, stuff like this are coming to this.

You know, this like that. And so you're discussing some economic scheme. That, you know.

You can take a very small amount of money. And come up with this, you know, you know, billions and trillions of dollars. You know, by just a simple adjustment of how you perceive the whole economic process.

Right? And the rewards are great. But then you have somebody who says, No, but I have this one cent, you know. What's wrong with my one cent? Why can't I keep my one cent? My one cent is making me so happy.

Great. You have your one cent. We're offering you, you know, billions and trillions.

But you want your one cent. So that's the whole point. No, but, you know, by that, then, you know, then it's okay.

You know, we have our families. We have our facilities. And we do whatever we want.

Yes, it is. But now, do you want Krishna? Or is that you just want, you know, this family? And after a while, they're going to, you know, grow up and walk out on you anyway. And then you're going to die.

So, now, then what? Yeah, then you can try it again. Yeah. Yeah.

Don't like Tapasya? No, some people really like Tapasya. I mean, just think of this. You've been

out, you know, around the world in wintertime, right? It's cold outside, right? What are the kind of like young, up-to-date, kind of like fashionable girls wearing? They're freezing.

That's austere. And that they are those girls, they don't eat. That's austere.

They would love to walk into some, you know, junk food place and just pig out and roll around in it and everything. But they won't. That's austere.

So, people are austere in the world. So, that's not really the problem. The problem is, is they don't want to give up their independence.

That's the real problem. Well, I'm only talking about that. Like that.

You know, we don't need to talk about the Karmis, right? Does that make sense? The point is this. We think we're the controller of the field. That's what we don't want to give up.

Because if you control it, you enjoy it. You can only enjoy something you control. Right? Let us say there's you.

And then there's a piece of glass. And then there's a samosa. Can you enjoy the samosa? Hmm? No, but it's on the other side of the glass.

Can you enjoy the samosa? Virtually. Okay. Okay.

So, how's that working for the, you know, the feelings of hunger? You understand? So, what's the problem? Why can't you enjoy it? Because you don't have control of it. Now, if the samosa is in your hand, now can you enjoy it? This is not a trick question. See, this is the problem.

When something's so simple, we're looking for complicated. And when we're talking complicated, we're thinking simple. You understand? At least as everybody else understands.

It means if you control it, then you can enjoy it. So that's the disease. So, what it is, is that we want to, we think if I control it and I enjoy it myself, then I'll be happy.

When it's no, I don't control it. I'm an instrument in being involved in it. And the enjoyment's for someone else.

That's when I'll enjoy. You know what I'm saying? That's the point. So, we don't quite have the faith in that.

So that's what you're trying to develop, the faith that this is actually the way it is. You know, but we have this tendency to think, well, it's actually this other way. But we understand it doesn't quite work for us.

Right? You know, our system of controlling and enjoying still hasn't quite given the perfect results that we're looking for. Right? So we know that it, we see that there's some weakness there. And so then we're starting to doubt.

And then Krishna Consciousness is there and then that makes sense. But still, you know, we're attached to that concept of controlling and enjoying. That's the problem.

It's not what situation one's in, anything else. It's that. One wants to be the controller and enjoy it.

You know. Because that's our identity. So we say give that up, then for the Mayavadis, that means then you have no identity.

You have nothing. Because they can't imagine how you would have an identity, serve, and be happy. Doesn't make sense to them.

Does that make sense? Yes. Yeah. One is always trying to control the other.

Yeah. Because there, I mean... Okay, yeah. So the spouses are trying to control each other.

So is this an example? You would have on... Yes, you would say that's an example. But there's an element that even if you change the consciousness, it doesn't change the environment. You know what I'm saying? It doesn't change the field.

Because the problem is that there's the reflection and there's the perverted reflection. You understand? So... The point is that the husband and the wife are always trying to get control. You know, get what they want done over the other person's, what they want done.

It's because they feel that's how they'll be happy. You understand? But... But that origin of it, what I'm saying is that won't change even if it's perfect. If one is Krishna conscious.

Because there's the natural masculine-feminine relation on a conjugal platform. Even if it's not, it's still there. There's always going to be that element of chivalry.

Right? Because the point is you have the element of the masculine means OK, if you control the feminine, you enjoy. But the point is it's because the enjoyed is dependent. That if there's the sense of control, there's connection.

So that means there's security. You understand? So that's why the wife wants to control the husband. If the wife can control the husband, that means he cares.

And if he cares, there's a connection. If there's a connection, there's security. You understand? So that's why anything that the husband does that appears to be he doesn't care.

Right? He was late, he didn't call. Right? He, you know, happened to be with his friends, he comes in the house, and, you know, the conversation starts up, he continues in the same kind of language and tone of voice that he was talking with his friends. So he didn't adjust it for her.

Right? You know? In other words, all these little considerations, that's how, then, the woman understands he cares. And so if he cares, that means the relationship is solid. And if he doesn't

care, or at least if he's inconsiderate or insensitive, that means, then, he's not attached.

Because attachment degenerates that. You understand? In other words, if the attachment is on the relationship between them, can't be attached because you want something. Right? You know, the guy goes, you know, boys and girls, they go to the pub.

Right? You know, they go to the nightclub. Why are they there? You know, are they looking for their soulmate or something like that? No, they're just looking for something for the night. Right? You know, and, yeah, whatever.

And so, the point is, is then, then, you know, in the morning, then it's a matter of, you know, he sneaks off because maybe she started to get a little bit, you know, showing some symptoms or things like this of, you know, affection. Or she wakes up in the morning, God, what am I doing with this guy? Right? You know, she's ready to, he's laying on her arm so she'd rather chew her arm off and walk away than, you know, wake him up and have an interaction. Right? You know what I'm saying? So, therefore, it's a motive.

There's something they want to gain from it. It's not actually the person, the personal dealing. You know what I'm saying? So, therefore, it doesn't carry the natural reflection.

So that, the argument, therefore, is working on a lower level. But you see is that, you know, Lakshmi Narayan, Radha Krishna, they still argue because it's the masculine-feminine nature to do that. Because feminine creates variety.

But the variety is only manifest through the activity of the masculine principle. Right? So they're each dependent upon the other. So, therefore, there's the natural element of the control.

But it's being done for Krishna's pleasure. Right? Because if everything's so easy, then it's not nice. We'll think, oh no, but if it's easy, it's great.

I'll tell you a slight story. Who's on the, what was it called? Yeah, Twilight Zone. Right.

Yeah. Right? I think I've told it before. Many of you have heard it.

Maybe not. So this guy, he was a thief. He was running away from the police or something like that.

And they're telling him to stop. And he comes to this dead end in the alley and he goes to climb over the fence and he hears a shot. And he falls down to the other side of the fence and gets up.

And then he's met by these extremely beautiful girls. And they say, come with us. And they make arrangements for him.

Anything he desires, they arrange. Right? Because he's a bad guy, then, you know, he goes to the casinos. Whatever he bets, he always wins.

You know, whatever he wants, he gets. Whatever girls, whatever, you know, anything. And he's thinking, this is great.

He's going on and on like that. And so it's only, after a while, he kind of figures out that sound, he was shot. He was dead.

At first, he didn't know he was dead. But then he understood he was dead. And so then, all this is going, and he thinks, this is so great.

But then, after a few weeks, anything he wants, he gets. So there's nothing, you know, what's new, what's special. You know, because it's, as soon as you want it, it's there.

And so then, he starts to get depressed. And then he turns to one of those girls, you know, kind of like the girls like his host. Whatever he wants, he arranges and everything and does this and that.

So he turns to her and says, I never thought heaven would be so distressing or boring. And she got up and got this little smile on her face, turned to him and said, whoever said this was heaven. Right? So, so this is, right? So the point is, is that something becomes interesting because of that difficulty to get.

Right? It should be progressive that you're able to do, but there's obstacles you have to move around. So, that's the thing, to make it eternally interesting, you have to move. Then Radharani eternally creates these varieties that means that Krishna has to change always constantly how he's approaching and how he's dealing. That creates variety.

That's how it's generated. Right? But we're thinking, no, I want to be the controller, so it should just work the way I want it. But if it does, we'll get bored.

Right? We say that's what we want, but it's not actually what we want. Because, because simply control means security. But it shouldn't be, control means there is no variety, there's no unknown.

Right? So the unknown creates the variety, it creates this obstacle. Understand? So, that's going to be there anyway. But the difference is, is that because they're trying to serve Krishna, they have good communication, they're serving together.

And so, anything that does come up by the difference, because men and women are different species, they'll never actually understand each other. Right? It's compatible, but not the same. Do you understand? Yes? They're different.

So, therefore, then, it works. You see, connection to Krishna, everything's like that, then it still works. It doesn't mean that there's not going to be disagreements.

Right? But it's how you deal with it, the consciousness. Now, then you have those that's perverted, so then, therefore, they're trying to get control because they sincerely think that I'm

my controlling it, that's how I'll be happy. Well, the other is, no, I perform my duties and serve Krishna, that's how I'll be happy.

That's the nice karma. But that's the point we discussed before. That doesn't mean one has to leave grhastha life.

If it's favorable for the devotional service, what's the problem? If it's not favorable, then why one would be there? Right? But the problem is, the other, even if it's favorable, they're not taking advantage because they're simply trying to get whatever material facility they can from. Does that make sense? The Mayavadi school claims that the word cha in verse 3 implies the absolute identity between the soul and the super-soul because cha means and, or also. So he's trying to take that the knower of the field, so they're trying to say that it's just two.

The knower of the field, the two knowers of the field are one. Right? And then the field, they're going to say, is illusion. It doesn't exist, so it still ends up as one.

Right? So this is their trick. So this is what we mean by the word jugglery. They simply take the word also and then that means, you know what I'm saying? Like that.

According to this theory, when the Lord says, I am the knower of all fields, it means I am the jiva. For them, even the Supreme Lord is influenced by ignorance and thinks himself as a conditioned soul. Just like a person takes a rope to be a snake.

In order to remove this illusion of duality, the Lord, in verse 3, makes a statement of oneness. I, the Supreme Brahman, am the jiva. By this statement, the illusion of thinking himself an individual jiva, different from all other jivas and from the Lord, is destroyed just as the illusion of a snake is destroyed by the statement.

This is a rope, not a snake. However, this theory of one soul, ekatmavada, right? In other words, he's saying that you have the soul and you have the Supreme Lord, so you're the manifestation of the Lord and the manifestation of the soul. But he's saying actually it's one.

But notice that he's the jiva. You know, the one who is the jiva is not the Lord. So, I mean, it's, you know, why would it go that way? But, you know.

However, the theory of one soul, ekatmavada, has several irresolvable contradictions. If the soul and the super-soul are factually one, as the Mayavadis claim, it is illogical to assume that the part of that one imparts knowledge to its other part. Means otherwise, if they're the same, why does one have to enlighten the other? And if the Supreme is an illusion by thinking that he's separate, that he's the teacher in giving, what would be the value of his instructions? Right? Illusion is illusion no matter whether it's nice or not nice.

So, that's the problem is that it's... Because here is what they're also, they're saying, cha makes them one. Okay? So, but if you look at it, actually, factually, grammatically, you know, which is what they're trying to do, but if you factually look at it, that means you're taking the Lord and

the living entity and through the word cha, then you're putting them together. Right? But what's the togetherness? But based on what? It means in this grammatical point.

That one is the other? One is subordinate, but what's the connection between the two? Individual, but what, how, what's the symptom? What is connecting them? We're talking here in this sentence. Okay. Okay.

So that means is that cha is referring to their, how you say? Existence, right? Because also will be establishing existence. Right? So that means they exist together. But the point is that existence is being held together with cha.

With also. Right? But so that means that there is, there is a, a passive dynamic going on here. Right? Does that make sense? So if you remove the word cha, then there's not together.

So the relationship is based through there. Right? Because technically that would become your, you know, be doing the work of like a verb. Right? But an intransitive verb so nothing's happening.

So it's just stating existence. Right? Does that make sense? Right? So they're taking it that this shows that they're all one. But still it's three words.

So you're still gonna have subject, object, and, and the verb connecting. Right? So the point is is that cha, then that's the platform of devotional service. That's where the oneness is.

That's where the eternal existence is. Right? And so the living entity is not the one or the other. Because they're not the original.

God's not interacting with us directly. He's interacting with his internal potency. We can take part in that.

So that cha means that we're the servant. So we're instrument. Then that relationship between the Lord and jiva.

Because jiva means servant. So that means the internal potency. Right? Then that is where your oneness is.

So we can assist in that and get the same experience. Right? So in other words, when God and the internal potency experience in their exchange, we can experience by assisting in that. Right? Does that make sense? It is irrational to even suggest the existence of two parts of the absolute one.

Right? If it's all one, then how can there be two anyway? It's an illusion. You say, well, this is this one and this is that one. But the point is that there's two of them means it's an illusion anyway by the philosophy.

There is no two. So why are you even talking about it? You know what I'm saying? You know,

the madman saying he's Napoleon Bonaparte. So why would you even discuss it? You know, it's an illusion.

So it doesn't exist. You know? Srila Baladeva Vibhushan writes in his commentary in Bhagavad Gita 2.13, Even the existence of an instructor of oneness is impossibility. Does he know the truth or not? If he knows the truth, there is only one Atma.

Right? So why would he be talking? Talking to yourself, right? That means you're crazy. Right? Okay. Then the existence of someone to teach will not manifest.

Right? If it's all one, if he's really realized there are no other people to... That means it's all one so you don't have to preach. So that he's preaching means he's in illusion. So what he has to say doesn't have any meaning according to their philosophy.

Right? If he does not know the truth, then he is not in the position to teach knowledge of Atma because he is in ignorance. Right? So if he doesn't know, then he's also useless as a teacher. Why would you want to hear from him? Right? So the main point is never hear from my Atma.

Because they're either an illusion or in an illusion. The argument that Brahman can be the subject of baddhita anuvad, residual appearance of duality after it has been destroyed by knowledge has already been rejected. See footnotes on 5.7. What does that mean? 5.7. Oh, over there.

Generally in these kind of things better to lift it and put it because then... Yeah, yeah. Just leave it in the footnote on the bottom because see what's happened is this has been studied before in the fifth chapter. But at the same time is then we haven't seen it in as broad an understanding and now we're getting the technical.

So it'll actually be seen in a fresher light. Like that it'll reconfirm. So anything you have like that you can always include it as a footnote because then it'll just reconfirm.

You know, you're just connecting it. You know, though that'll be, you know, next year a serious problem. But I would say don't worry because then we'll you know, go through and who knows, we'll find it.

Okay. So what they're saying is that now you've destroyed the illusion by your knowledge, right? You know, you're the big, bad Mahayavati, right? And so, but the problem is there's a residual appearance of the duality. That's why it appears that there's difference.

Now where does this residual come from? You know? So if it's a residue it's still from that source. So that means it still has that flavor. Right? As Manu says, if you're cleaning something as long as the spot remains or the fragrance remains or both you still have to, you have to wash it.

Right? Until that goes away. So that means, you know, what's the point? What do you mean

residual? Right? Because all it is is then that's how that's their clever trick on how to get over the point that they don't know what they're talking about. Right? Moreover, the difference between the soul and the super-soul is obvious.

Five, seven. Verse five, seven. Verse five, seven.

One, two, three, four, five, six, seven. Is that then the notes from what Prabhupada's written? Message to Godhead? Because there isn't anything. Okay.

Nice karma. Proportional down on the bottom Is there a six up here? Yeah, okay. Ramanujas.

Okay, message to Visvanatha, Chakravarti, Bhutatma. Okay, yeah. Śrīla Prabhupāda states, *sarva bhūtātma bhūtātmā*, as compassion for all living entities.

It does not refer to a person who has become one with all other persons, ātmas, because this has already been rejected by Kṛṣṇa in verse 212. Moreover, if there was only one ātma, the conversation between Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa would have been meaningless. Okay.

And then in this footnote. In an attempt to defend themselves against the last argument. Right? Because it means what we're saying about this, having something to say, or, you know, like that.

In other words, the person in ignorance with something to say and the person in ignorance who, you know, wants to hear some ignorance to remove their ignorance. Right? The impersonalists bring in the theory of *bādhita-anuvṛtti*. According to this theory, a *jīva-mukta*, one beyond duality, can still teach others, although teaching implies duality.

The *jīva-mukta* somehow maintains a type of conditioned vision because of, caused by remaining ignorance. This ignorance, however, does not interfere with his realization of Brahman. Very clever, these guys, right? This ignorance... Okay.

The Vaiṣṇava commentators answer that even if such a theory was true, the teaching could still not take place. Śrīmad-Rāmānujacārya writes in his commentary to verse 212. The perception of water in a mirage and such other perceptions are undoubtedly a persistent continuous of what has been sub... sublit... sublit... sublit? Oh, okay.

Okay. Sublated. But they can... cannot be the cause of activities like fetching water from the mirage.

So also here the knowledge of distinctions which has been sublated by the knowledge of non-dualism cannot be the cause of instruction and such other activities, though it may continue to persist. For there is the conviction that it is the subject of unreal nature. So, just as the mirage, you can point out if you see water in a mirage, there is no water, right? Because that's why it's a mirage.

So, that can be used to... to... point out that it's an illusion. You make the distinction. But it can't

be useful in getting water.

You know what I'm saying? You can't say, now that we've figured this out, now we'll get some benefit from this by, you know, taking this water from the mirage. Right? So, if it's an illusion that there's a duality, that you could have teacher and student and knowledge, right? Then you can't get benefit from that by saying, no, but you can still be, you know, liberated and have this... No. That's like saying the mirage, it doesn't exist, but we'll still get water from it.

Does that make sense? This is why they have the word acharya after their name. Therefore, one who has achieved the vision of non-dualism cannot engage in the activity of teaching which requires a wholehearted belief in dualism. Because you have to have teacher and student.

Then there's a connection, it's a whole relationship. Like that. Okay.

Moreover, the difference between the soul and the super-soul has already been confirmed by the Lord in Bhagavad-gita 2.12. And will be stated again in Bhagavad-gita 15.17. Thus, the eternal distinction between the soul and the super-soul and the subordinate position of the soul has been established by reason and scriptural evidence. In verse 4, Krishna says that he will briefly describe the field of activity and its constitution. Verse 6. Its changes.

Verse 7 and 20. Its production. Verses 6, 21 and 22.

The knower of the field of activities. Verses 14, 18 and 23. His influences.

Verses 14 to 18. Having heard that the Lord will only briefly outline these topics, Arjuna asked a question. Quote, who then has described them in detail? In verse 5, Krishna answers that they were described by various sages in various Vedic books and were especially presented in the Vedanta Sutra.

Srila Prabhupada writes in his purport, The Supreme Personality of Godhead, Krishna, is the highest authority in explaining this knowledge. Still, as a matter of course, learned scholars and standard authorities always give evidence from previous authorities. So, you have guru, sadhu and sastra.

So, all these are going to be there. Because otherwise, they'll say, oh, we'll only take knowledge directly from Krishna. Right? And then if that goes there, okay, Gita is directly from Krishna, but you didn't hear it, so you're getting it from Arjuna.

Hearing it, so then you want to get it direct, so then it'll be a problem. Right? And so then, where will be the relationship? Everybody has a direct relationship with Krishna. And that's all there is.

Where's, where, how will that relationship expand? How will you do something wonderful? Because everybody, it's only one on one. Right? But the point is, is, amazing things happen because people work together and do something. So, that means they have to have that

commonality of relationship amongst themselves.

In his commentary to this verse, Srila Baladeva Vidyabhusana gives examples from all three sources of knowledge mentioned by Krishna. The tradition, the Vedas and the Vedanta-sutra. Regarding the Vedas, the acarya quotes Taittiriya Upanishad, where the five levels of consciousness, the five koshas are described.

In the section ending brahma-puccham pratishtha, Brahman is the foundation. The five purusas consisting of food, prana, mind, knowledge and bliss are described. The first three, food, prana and mind are material, comprising the ksetra.

The purusa composed of knowledge, vijñana-maya purusa, is the jivatma, the knower of the ksetra of the body. He is the ksetra-jña. Different from that, at the end of the sequence is the ananda-maya purusa.

The Supreme Lord, who is also ksetra-jña. Thus, this truth is to be found in the Vedas. It means the Supreme Lord, that's obvious.

The jiva is also obvious, that he's trying to be purusa over the material energy. Material energy itself is purusa, because you're dealing with it. You are drawing from it what it is you want.

So that puts yourself in the feminine position, so the material energy becomes purusa, in this way. You understand? See, it's an interesting thing, because rasa is there, but then we see that it reverses in the material platform. It's not actually out of order, it's not that it's strange, it's very natural, but it's in opposition to how we perceive it.

Spiritual platform means you have the enjoyer and enjoyed, so the enjoyer then is that which is basically you can draw from. Like Krishna, all rasa is there. Mother Yashoda sees him in a particular light, so she draws that.

He's the visaya, the enjoyer, she's the asaraya of that particular relationship. In other words, it's based on her mood that the relationship is going on. That's why in the first canto of the Prabhupada, it says, it means that the masculine and feminine, the feminine defines the relationship, the nature of the love.

So just like in the world, the woman defines that, what it's going to be. If the man tries to define it, then what's the meaning? Because it can be so many things, but it means he can deal in so many areas, but the point is, you only have a relationship in those areas that the woman is interested in. If her attraction is in one area, that's where you have the relationship.

You may be attracted to some other things, but that's not common, so where's the relationship? You know, saying, well, I want to be able to do what I want. OK, do what you want, but what's that got to do with your wife? Right? Relationship is based on what she sees as the points of the interaction. You understand? It's just philosophy.

So the Jiva wants, no, I want to be able to be independent. You can do that, but that's not philosophy. That's just, you know, being illusioned.

You understand? So, then that reflects down here, then you have the emotional platform. The partiva, no, the svargiya rasa. That first is Vaikuntha rasa.

That's its natural state. Then it comes here, is that, it reflects that, but the point is, is that you have the emotional content. Somebody there, and you draw that emotions and things like that.

But it's on the material platform, but it's according to proper religious principles. So, therefore, you get the proper emotional feeling, though it may not be in connection with Krishna. That's why it's defined as svargiya, means it's heavenly rasa.

Right? Then partiva rasa means it's the senses and sense objects. Right? No? Okay. So, now, following the pattern is, you're drawing from something.

So, let's say something you want to eat. Let's say you have a rasgulla. Now, we'll take it, I'm the enjoyer, the rasgulla is the enjoyed.

But what is it that you want to enjoy in the rasgulla? Sweetness. Sweetness. The taste.

Right? But does rasgulla only have taste? No. It has a shape? Right? It has a fragrance? It has texture? Right? What are we missing? Weight. Weight.

It should have a sound. Huh? It should have a sound. Yes, it has a sound.

It flows freely inside the mouth. Yeah. Okay.

But the point is, is these are what we want to draw from. We want that experience. So, it's offering that.

Not us. So, that puts it in the position of the visaya. So, the rasgulla is the enjoyer, we're the enjoyed.

Now, this really messes with your head, right? But that's the fact. Because the real point is, is now, we're looking at the material platform, that's where you screw up. Because that's why you can't enjoy.

Because you're trying to take a position that you're not actually. Right? Because if you put it in your mouth and there's no sweet taste, you'll think, what's going on here? Right? You know, so it's that you expect a certain thing from it. You know, Mother Dashota expects Krishna to act as her child.

Right? Because she sees those qualities in him. So, therefore, she deals to bring those out. Does that make sense? So, that's her control.

The situation is creating an environment in which she can draw those qualities from Krishna.

But it's actually for Krishna's pleasure. But she's controlling the situation.

And that's her pleasure, is that Krishna's being happy in that situation. So, we're controlling the situation. We have the rasgulla, we pick it up, we put it in the mouth.

But the point is, is that sweetness is actually Krishna. And his internal potency has taken the form of this rasgulla. You know, it means the concept of it.

Then material energy has manifested in the reflection, the gross matter, rasgulla. But the principle that makes it work of the sweetness is still Krishna's internal potency. That it could be, sweetness could come in the form of a rasgulla.

Right? Like Lakshmi, when it comes to sweetness, doesn't come as a brick. You know what I'm saying? She comes as a rasgulla, not as a brick. Right? So, that means then we're taking part in their interaction by eating the rasgulla.

So, we're serving them as sweetness and that form of sweetness. And the process of combining them through the eating process. Right? Connecting the sweetness to the tongue.

Right? We're taking part as an instrument. Right? So, that's why we use the term sayanamrita pao. We honor.

Because some will say, well, in Bengali, you wouldn't say pao, you say cow, eat. You know, like that. But that just means eat.

No, but we're honoring. Because we're assisting through the process of eating, we're honoring the prasadam. You understand? So, we're assisting here.

So, that's the problem. Everything we do that we think is sensual, we're simply taking part in assisting. The spiritual master takes pleasure to see disciples honoring prasadam.

So, we give pleasure to the spiritual master when we take prasadam. Listen to Krishna because you're appreciating the qualities. That's why it's there, it's nice, it's prasadam, you know, it's like that.

The endeavor of the devotees to make it, you know, the arrangements, the serving. So, all these different things are things one can appreciate in this. And so, you're appreciating Krishna.

That's why it's expanded. So, devotees lose so much of this and that the reasons for eating aren't very good, the arrangements of serving is not good. They're not so worried about the cooking itself.

Right? Because it's not necessarily inexpensive means bad taste. It's expertise of cooking makes. You know, I had once some, I just took some potatoes, cut them, and I think cooked them with just some salt and black pepper.

Right? In some, I think it was butter or something like that. But how they were done and all that, you know, it was like amazing, what the flavor. But it was so simple.

And when you ask for the recipe, because you couldn't quite figure it out, it was just so simple, but so, it was so balanced and blended. And then, you know, the response was, ah, this was, you know, hundreds of lifetimes of austerity to get this recipe, you know, like that. And in one sense, it may be true that someone could take something so simple and cook it and come out with such.

Does that make sense? Like that. So, I'd come across preparations like this by expert cook. Like, I think, a pineapple chutney.

That's just, cut the pineapples and then just sugar and some salt. Right? And then cook down until it gets the sauce. Right? Because the salt will draw the water out of the pineapple and the sugar also becomes wet.

And you cook it until it starts to, you know, get a little bit sticky. It's so simple and you wonder, how is this? Like that. I think they put in, I think they put it maybe in a chili or something.

You know, give it a little, otherwise it won't be so chutney-ish. You know, but I've seen it. So, that simplicity is just so perfect.

Does that make sense? How did we get on to this? Is it because it's, you know, just a few minutes before breakfast and so we got into this? Maybe that's why examples of food are so good in the morning. Like in the afternoon you mention food and I don't want to hear it. How did we get? Oh, OK.

Because we were discussing how ana, prana and mana, the food, the life air and the mind are our purusha. Like that. So, that's the point of this is that you understand these things and it puts on a different level.

So, we've heard these levels of consciousness. You know, sense gratification, extended sense gratification, the level of, you know, emotions and all this and the level of the intelligence and liberation, you know, and the level of transcendental consciousness and, you know, in the Lord. But that that anandamoy is only actually real if it's connected to the Lord.

Does that make sense? But these are the finer points that are being brought out in this that we might not catch. That's the problem is that we've heard these things that, OK, we've heard that, let's get into something more advanced. But the point is is actually, you know, being the scriptures and scriptures are non-different from Krishna, the understanding is unlimited.

So, there is no end to understanding these things. Right? Only the beginning. That's all there is.

OK. Right? So, that means the Lord is, you know, He is Brahman, the Jiva is Brahman, the material energy is Brahman. But He is the controller of all.

He is Brahman. So, Srila Prabhupada summarizes the discussion as follows. The Vedanta-sutra also describes the Supreme by saying, anandamayo bhyasat.

The Supreme Personality of Godhead is by nature full of joy. This is also Taittiriya Upanishad. To enjoy His transcendental bliss, He expands into vijñanamaya, prāṇamaya, jñanamaya, and ānāmaya.

In the field of activities, the living entity is considered to be the enjoyer and different from Him is the ānandamaya. That means if the living entity decides to enjoy in dovetailing Himself with the ānandamaya, then He becomes perfect. This is the real picture of the Supreme Lord as the supreme knower of the field.

The living entity as the subordinate knower and the nature of the field of activities. One has to search for this truth in the Vedanta-sutra or Brahma-sutra. So, that's what's to be.

Right? Because it opens in the Tattva-brahma-jijñāsa. You have to know what is Brahman. That's the opening.

Right? And then here, it's being quoted from the scriptures. Why is there? Śāstra-yoni-tattva. Right? That's it.

This knowledge is the source. Knowledge is not. Śāstra is the source of this knowledge of Brahman.

So, therefore, Kṛṣṇa is quoting these other personalities. Because He's spoken it, then in the discussions it's come down and that becomes the Smṛiti. I mean the Smṛiti.

Smṛiti is what's the Veda. Discussions on the Veda, that becomes Smṛiti. That's what's tradition.

So, when we say tradition, tradition is what it is the sages do. Just a side thing on tradition. Let us say you are doing some activity.

Right? And you try different ways and you find one way that works really good. Okay? So, now, let us say every time you're going to do the activity, what are you going to do? Yeah, you'll do it in that particular way. Why? It works.

It was efficient. It got the results done. Okay.

So, if that's what you do and then you come back after ten years, you're doing that same activity in the same way, So, what do we call this? Tradition. So, nowadays the term tradition is used to mean, you know, in a pejorative way that it means something, this old archaic that doesn't work. But the reason it's tradition is because it does work.

It's practical. They'll say, oh, that's theory. No.

Tradition is what works. Right? Does that make sense? That's why they do it in that way. That's

why the acharyas do it in that particular way.

That's why there's traditions on how you do things. Because it works. Not because it doesn't work.

Right? Sages aren't not practical people. They're practical. So, because it works, that's why they do it.

That's called tradition. So, when you have, let's say, like Narada Pancharatra, you have Lord Shiva, right, talking to his brother, Narada Muni, and they're discussing about, you know, Lakshmi Narayan, and their, you know, the philosophy, their worship, and all this. So, their discussion is their realizations of this and how they practically apply it in their life.

So, that's tradition. That's Smriti. Yes? So, in the West, people would say accelerating culture, iPhones, Internet, what do we mean? No, no.

But, that, is it accelerating culture? It's accelerating a field in which you could express culture. But, do people actually express more culture because they have an iPhone? That's the point, is that they can't, because it's just like, the soul thinks it's the body, right? So, it can't distinguish. So, they think, if I have facilities for relationship, I have relationship.

Right? Does that make sense? I have a house, therefore I have relationship. Right? I mean, what is the guy, the guy comes back from work, right? It's been a long day. Right? Every day is a long day.

But, you know, today's been more of a long day. You know, and then the kids want to play, or the wife wants to do this or that, and what does he say? I'm tired. And say, you know, no, but, you know, you know, what about us? And what's he going to say? Yeah, they're working for the whole day.

That is the relationship. I worked hard. That's why you have the house and everything like that.

So, what's the difference? So, that means he thinks that that is the relationship. They can't distinguish. Right? And he'll claim he's the intelligent one.

Right? And they can tell the difference. We have a house, now let's do something. Right? So, that means there's two.

But, by this concept, no, I've already done my job. I don't have to do more. No.

The facility is just so you can do that. That's the point. Yes? Forgetting why? Yes, yes, it would come from that.

Like that, because then you don't have answers. So, then, if you don't have answers, that means you're not a proper authority. Right? Do we see which direction we're going? So, the basis of lack of appreciating tradition is authority issues.

So, that's why, if one's educated, one can give answers and then there's no problem with authority. But, because authority can't, is telling you, you have to do this, but can't tell you why, then they have lack of faith in authority. Right? So, that's the point, is authority should know why they're doing it.

Tradition is there, but people followed it because they understood what was going on. If you don't understand what's going on, how you'll be able to take full advantage of tradition. Does that make sense? But, you have to know what the tradition is doing, because otherwise, just to blindly follow it, then it's just you're taking the form, then it's the other side of Niyamagraha.

Right? So, one is you're following the form, but you don't know what it's for. And the other is you don't know what it's for, so you reject it. So, of the two, it means the form is there, one accepts it, and blindly, and one rejects it blindly.

So, both are wrong. Right? But, at least the one accepts the principle of authority. So, that's why you'll consider them more pious.

Yes? Styles. Right. You point out one English word there.

Knock me out. Even one French word. Or Italian word.

Chinese word. Mexican word. Or Lebanese.

I think that's it. I think we've covered all the cuisines of the world. Worth mentioning.

We'll kind of leave out of it the roast pig on the spit in Hawaii. So, what were those words? Bengali words. Right? So, then... You know what I'm saying? It's just an attachment to the thing.

But the point is, is if they knew how to cook, then it's not a problem. Because there's a particular quality. I knew someone, he was French.

I mean, he was really... He was French. You know? Like that. So, when he'd cook, the preparation would look French, but it tasted Bengali.

Very amazing. The looks of it, you looked at it, you'd think it's continental food. But you tasted it, it was Bengali.

I've never seen anyone else do that. You know what I'm saying? So, you know cooking. You're trying to get a quality of cooking.

That's the most important thing. You know, what you know. Otherwise, I think it was one person who made the point.

Because they said, can you offer pizza to the Lord? And then he said, what you feel is the best, you cook with the most devotion. So, in other words, you're giving the best to Krishna. So, if that's your... Just say, I don't know Bengali cooking.

Or say, I don't like Bengali cooking. But don't make stupid comments like, where does it say that that's what it is? You know what I'm saying? What are they reading? You know? You know, it's like that. Maybe that's the problem.

You know, in the important section of the newspaper they read, Calvin doesn't talk about these things. You know? Like that. You know? Right? Yeah.

Maybe they should try Schroeder. Maybe he'd have more to say. Like Siggy.

Hmm? Siggy. Siggy, yeah. Dennis.

Sorry. Okay. We'll move on here.

Okay? So, the point is, you have to see what's the point being made. You know? You know, the point... And they'll say, well, you know, we don't like those. It's a matter of quality of cooking.

I had one kid, he didn't like french fries. Right? Generally, it's very rare you ever find someone who doesn't like that. And then, one day, for some reason, I ended up cooking them.

And then he ate them, he liked them. So, it means they were never cooked right before. So, that's why he didn't like.

You know? So, the cooking that everybody in the whole society did in every continent of the world was the cooking the Prophet taught. It was actually based on the Bengali principles. Right? And everywhere you went, it was consistent.

And then somewhere in the late 70s, early 80s, that disappeared. So, it's not that it can't be cooked. Cooking works anywhere.

Same principles are used by everyone. You know? It's just a matter of what's your proportions. That's what makes it or what spices you emphasize.

No. Krishna consciousness matters. Because you're Krishna conscious, you're going to choose what's the best quality you can offer.

Right? In other words, don't... In other words, this is the weakness in understanding tradition. Is that you think it's a specific form. No, it's a specific result.

And the traditional forms are the most efficient way to get it if you know how to do it. You know what I'm saying? You have a chutter. You can do anything with this.

How much can you do with your jacket? What other use can you use your jacket for? You have it zipped up. If it gets hot, then what do you do? Unzip it. Okay.

Does it look as good if it's unzipped as if it's zipped? If it's formal? Informal? Okay, of course it's cool. Now, what happens if it gets hotter than that? Then what do you do? Take it off. What do you do with it? You're walking around.

Tie it around your waist. Now, how high class is that? You know what I'm saying? So, that's kind of the limit of what it is. So that, you're just dragging around.

But the chatter, you fold it up, put it on your shoulder. It's a fashion statement. Tying that around your backside is not.

You understand? So, that's the thing. But, at the same time, as if you're not a little skilled, it's hard to wear. But if you know how to do it, it's very easy to wear.

And one can complain, well, that's very difficult. But in the West, they wear all kinds of stuff that are very difficult to wear. You ever tried to wear stilettos? I mean, I haven't personally, but they're very difficult to wear.

Ladies have told me. You know? But, at the same time, you say, not only that, but you see, like, professional dancers, they dance in them. You know? Like that.

They dance in them. So, it's just a matter of practice. So, when devotees say it's not practical, all they're saying is I don't have the knowledge, I don't have the skills or the practice.

That's all it is. That's the translation. Saying it's not practical.

What do you mean it's not practical? Arjuna went to war in a dhoti. Right? Look at the pictures. What are they wearing? Are there chudders? Are there all kinds of nice things like that there? They're on the battlefield.

You know? We can't go to Calcutta without putting on, you know, Western clothes. Somehow, if the car's driving around here, you could wear a dhoti, but if it's driving to Calcutta, you have to put on pants. Otherwise, it won't work.

Right? You walk into the, you know, the boundary wall, one of the shops here, and you're dhoti. You can buy things, but in Calcutta, you can't do that. You have to wear pants.

Why would you want to? Why wouldn't you want to? Krishna's wearing a dhoti. Why wouldn't you wear that? You know what I'm saying? Let's say you're that person. If they were going to go to a footy match, what would they wear? A tuxedo? No, they'd go out and spray their face green and red and do all those crazy things and stand out there and yell and scream.

Right? Right? Let's say they're going to go to a formal party. They're going to paint their face green? No, they're going to wear a tuxedo. So, you're going to go on the altar.

Everybody else there is wearing a dhoti. So, why wouldn't you be wearing one? You know what I'm saying? All these stem from their unrivaled attachment to the land of their birth. That's all.

It's already said that, you know, Grihasupta, Sutapta, you know, like that, means the place of your birth is holy because you were born there. But they can say that it's the consciousness that matters. Yes, and if you had the consciousness, how is it that the pants improve the

consciousness? Why wear pants? Why not wear, you know, a Chinese outfit? You know, big, long, baggy arms.

You know, cool, you know, like that. Accept more the books. We're talking about on the altar.

I don't think that Krishna, you know, kicks your offering off the altar because he didn't like your dowry. You understand? See, in other words, the point here is that do you want to use your intelligence to find a seeming contradiction or do you want to understand the principle? You understand the principle, you answer all your questions. You go like this, you're going to have to do neeti, neeti, neeti, neeti, or neti, neti for a long time.

Because what's the point? The point is you want to wear karmic clothes. Right? That's the real point. Because the point is this.

Okay, Sam Ketan, if you wore pants, they'd take your book. What happens if a woman wears sari? Would they still take her book? They'd probably take a book from her more than they would from wearing that, you know, that funky, how do you say, gopy skirt, you know, and, you know, that funny top that didn't quite make it. You know what I'm saying? So, but they're wearing their, you know, 2,000 rupee sari.

They'll look as good as somebody who's walking down the street with, you know, high fashion wear. They know how to wear it. So it's all how you present yourself.

The point is, is most people can't dress to save themselves. That's the bottom line. Because even if we say Western clothes, even we want to follow that argument, but are what they're wearing, is it nice? I mean, I remember what kind of clothes we'd wear out on Samketan.

We had two different colors of socks. You know, you had a pants that you were holding tied up with a kopan. Not only that, your kopans were hanging out the back.

You know? Nothing matched, and somehow or another the people are really going to be inspired to buy a book from that person. I remember doing just as good as Samketan wearing a dhoti. You know what I'm saying? The point is, is if they're going to dress, then dress nice.

But what do they dress? No, they dress how they would dress if they were carmies. That's the thing. So, what actually is the success? The person buys the book from you because you wear pants, right? That's why everybody buys, you know, goes down and gets ripped off at the second-hand car salesman place, because he wears pants.

Right? You know, they're walking down the street and say, you know, I want to buy something. Well, check out a shop where they're wearing pants. Oh, hey, that guy's wearing pants.

Let's go buy that. No. The point is, is because you're wearing the crappy clothes that you would be wearing anyway, therefore you feel confident.

God only knows why, but you do. You know? Anybody else would drop dead if they were

wearing that on the street, right? But because you feel confident, the air of confidence is what attracts a person. That's why you sold the book.

It had nothing to do with your stupid pants. Nothing. Zero.

A priest walks down the street in an outfit that's a thousand years old. Not joking. The Pope is wearing a thousand-year-old outfit.

If he came, you know, in with jeans and, you know, and a shirt, you know, with something on it, you know, you know, Jesus ruled. You know, something like that. You know, when people go, wow, hey, I like this Pope up to date.

You know, you know, you wear one earring, you know, put on a little cudgel, you know, you know, you have some fun, you know. You understand? So it's not the clothes. The clothes don't... The point is, is this is said by people who the clothes make the man.

That's the problem. It's that you're comfortable. That's why.

If you're comfortable in a dhoti, you'd still... you'd sell books. They just want to see comfortable energy. They just want to see someone satisfied because they're not.

Someone who's happy because they're not. Someone who knows what they're doing because they don't. That's what they're looking for.

So if by putting on a dhoti and your pants, that's how you're going to sell the books. Do it, but don't claim it's the pants. Then you're saying material energy is the cause of devotional service.

And you have to be downright stupid to say that. And I'm not saying this to you. I'm saying this to anybody who comes out with these philosophies.

Because then they're saying that material energy is the cause and that karma is the actual thing. I did this, I put on pants, that's why I sold books. But if you ask anyone who's good at it, some days they have, they go out, they don't sell one book.

They sit there and freak out. And then they have their techniques. Go, and what do they do? Go, sit down, chant, read something, get spiritually inspired again.

Then they go out, and the books start happening. So it's because of your spiritual consciousness, that's why the books go out. So that's it.

So many times professionals join the movement and they fail because they think it's by their material skill they're going to be expert and do things in Krishna consciousness. And they fail miserably. And if they accept that it's only devotional service, then they stay and they do fine.

If they don't, they leave because they have to feel good about themselves so they have to go back to being a professional. It's happening all the time. So that's why we're discussing the

philosophy on this level because this is stuff that goes on today.

That's why I said before, I'm not talking karmis, I'm talking devotees. Does that make sense? This is the point. Because generally speaking, you can always tell a devotee on the street in karmic clothes because they look so different than anyone else.

There's only a few people you go out and they look good. You don't want to go up and talk to them, they look good. But it's rare I've ever seen a devotee dress like that.

I only know of a few that can do that. Yeah, it's like that. Or if they buy stuff, they buy what they would want to wear.

You know, like that. So they're not thinking of that level of attraction. The point is and bottom line is this, Krishna's interested in he's Madana Mahana, he's attractiveness personified, right? So now to be attractive, now he goes out on, let's say he goes out for a night and he has thousands or tens of thousands, millions, hundreds of thousands, they generally don't use millions in our connections.

Women are out there and they're really eager to be there with him. So now if, so he does that which will enhance because he's saying here he has expanded the field of activities. It's him.

So now if the field of activities would be the most attractive to women would be a pair of pants, don't you think he'd be wearing them? Right? Do the women have any problem that Krishna wears a dhoti and chudder? You ever heard anyone complain? Oh, wouldn't Krishna look so much more cool in a Versace suit or something? They're perfectly fine, the turbans and this and that and all stuff that men might say, well, that's pretty feminine. But he pulls it off quite well. Right? Krishna's pretty good with all that.

So that means maybe he knows something that we don't. Does that make sense? So we have to be able to see what actually makes the material work. It's not your pants that make the books go out.

If we present so-called Krishna consciousness in a non-sectarian way... So-called... What do you mean so-called Krishna consciousness in a non-sectarian... What does non-sectarian mean? So you're saying the first world Western Protestant culture is non-sectarian. Is that what you're saying? No, I mean Krishna consciousness in university to teach... Yeah, but the point is you used words and you're responsible for the words you used. What do you mean non-sectarian? Why is first world first world Protestant non-sectarian? The point is you're not explaining the word sectarian.

Okay? Okay, so then you want to go into the university and preach and you want it to be accepted. What's the clothes you should wear? Who do you want to... You're saying you're going to university so university means the intellectual class. Right? So those who run the intelligentsia what do they wear? No, not dhoti but are they wearing what you wear? No, they wear suits and other things like that.

Is that where you're going on campus and preaching? Are you wearing a suit on campus? If you're not don't give me this crap. Because a college student they're only there because they have to be there. So to them it's not I'm on the campus of some big intellectual thing and I'm only going to be able to accept things in that kind of environment.

You can meet them on campus you can meet them off campus and this and that it doesn't matter. But we're using the idea that we're going to preach to the intelligentsia. College kids are not intelligentsia.

Those who are doing postgraduate degrees that's intelligentsia. Or if they're undergraduates and they happen to be at Harvard, Yale, Oxford Cambridge, Brown, Columbia then you could say maybe they're intellectuals. But all these others they're just doofuses that are there because they've heard they get a degree I don't know what job they're going to get with their BA that they have.

You know what I'm saying? So this attachment this idea that this is going to work Vishnu Jaan made more devotees than in his alone than all the temples in the western world make today. More. And they were all wearing dhotis.

Because if you actually sit down and actually observe what people are wearing especially the youth they don't have one standard way of wearing stuff. It's all so different from one person to the next. And then we're going to say no I've got to wear my particular kind of outfit.

And that's what bridges the gap. I sold that book to that goth because of the particular slacks I was wearing. A tattoo might get you more book distribution.

You know what I'm saying? So all this is just a failure in understanding the principles of Krishna consciousness. I don't have any problem that someone wears some variety of western clothes. That's not my problem.

My problem is that people actually have faith that it's because of that. That's why Krishna consciousness is successful. That means they're gross materialists.

That means they don't understand their philosophy at all. They'll say it's yukta-vairagya. I'll say no it's not.

Because there is no vairagya. Yukta, yes. But vairagya, no.

They're attached to that. That's why they're wearing it. Look at the karmic clothes that Prabhupada had the devotees in.

Look at Leela Amrita. Devotees were wearing one of two kinds of clothes. Devotional clothes or suits.

Bedsheets or suits. New York, how everyone sits on the they sit on the steps, right? So this devotee was walking in and the guy, you know, the guy is sitting on the stoop there going into

the building. You know, there was a program at some devotee's place and as he's sitting there he's walking by the guy says, hey, what's with the bedsheets? And then he turns to him and says, says, well, that's all there was.

The blankets were dirty. So the guy laughed and then Haripala. That's what it takes.

Cleverness. Now the guy's cool. Hey, devotees are cool.

That's all. Devotees have lost their coolness. Uniqueness.

That's why then they try to take shelter in all kinds of other things and even that then not so good. Okay. So end here.