

2011-03-10 BVPS BG 18.28-18.40 Spontaneous not whimsical. Dharma creates artha. Divorce

Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare, Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare, Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare. Okay. It's the middle of forty-four.

Then I'm going to purport to twenty-six. A person in the Kṛṣṇa consciousness is always transcendental to the material modes of nature. He has no expectations for the result of work entrusted to him because he is above false ego and pride.

So here one is performing the work, *naiṣṭhikārmya*, and it says work entrusted to him. That means it's coming from authority. It's not whimsical work.

Otherwise then it would put it in the mode of ignorance. But it's actually work according to authority. See, we have to understand the difference always in between whimsical and spontaneous.

There's a big difference. Western mindset, they're basically the same because when you become spontaneous, you become whimsical. Because there is no foundation.

There's no idea that it should be done this way. And because of that, then to manifest enthusiasm or excitement, then it's whimsical. So people appreciate the enthusiasm, but they always think the whimsical element is a bit weird.

So it's a mixed element because they like the enthusiasm, the energy, but they'll have a problem with you'll be unsteady, unstable, because it's whimsical. But spontaneity means within a structured framework, one is able to, in unique ways, organize or construct that framework. That's spontaneous.

So spontaneous means it's based on a framework, an actual science. Then within the science, the mind is able to, the mind having accepted that science as the foundation, is able to take it and transform it in so many special ways. That's spontaneous.

What we see is that the residents of Vrindavan, they're in spontaneous devotional service, but they never do something that's outside the nature of their *rasa*, or their relationship, what's expected of them. They don't do anything outside of that. So that means that there is unlimited ways of organizing a structured formula.

Does that make sense? So as we give example, music, there's seven notes, but there's unlimited music. You can have music that's thousands of years old, someone hums a few notes and you know what it is, and it's unique to that thing, it's not an overlap. If there's an overlap, they'll say, oh, this song is copying that song.

So it's just seven notes. You get 3,000 diseases out of the combination of mucus, bile and air. So

like this, whatever's there is based on formulas.

We understand that, then we can work within this element. Radharani, she's cooking. There's not an unlimited number of spices.

There's not an unlimited number of techniques. So she takes those and puts them together in unique ways and unlimitedly comes up with something different to cook. Does that make sense? So that means also we have to be able to appreciate subtlety.

Does it mean spontaneity is in the details? Spontaneity is in the detail, yes, but the principle is always maintained. Whimsical means it's just what you feel like. It doesn't have anything to do with the principle.

It's just your feeling. It's only purely mind. So that means the whimsicalness means to do something, you have to apply intelligence.

So what whimsical means, the intelligence has to function in the realm of the mind, right? Spontaneous means the mind functions in the realm of the intelligence. So how does one check oneself to see if one is being whimsical or spontaneous? If it's according to authority, it's according to the scripture. That's the bottom line.

Logically what you're inspired to do could be backed up by spirituality. Could be. It means if what you are inspired to do is within the framework of defined duties, then that's inspired.

Am I saying? Does that make sense? If that's the prominent element, it means it's not that within the structured form there's not inspiration, but it's just what flavors prominence. Does that make sense? So in Vrndavana, prominence is that spontaneity. But let's say in Ayodhya, then it's going to be the element of religiousness.

So there's inspiration to do religious work, but that's the feeling that comes through. So there's still a prominence. So in any activity there's going to be inspiration.

Does that make sense? So if someone is doing business, he's inspired of different ways to go about it to create a profit. And if it's according to the formulas, it works. And if it's not, it doesn't work.

Does that make sense? So in relation to this, what is the position of the avidins? We see some great devotees, they become avidins sometimes. It seems to be... But what's the purpose of the rule? To please Krishna. Yes, so then they're always doing that.

So they're just functioning on a higher principle. Yes. The higher principle everybody should be functioning on.

Right? It's just a matter of whether it's coming naturally or whether it's practice. See, the point is, one will be following direction. But the element is, is that direction followed here? Or is that direction followed there? So an avidut means he follows it there.

And then he's not necessarily obliged to follow it here. Right? You know what I'm saying? The acharya follows it here, just to set the example. Because we can't be avidins.

Right? Because that's because they're beyond everything here, so they don't really care. They're just like little kids. They're avidins.

You know, on the material sense. They're not worried about their eating, their sleeping, their dressing, you know, anything. They just, whatever they feel like, they do.

Right? But that's just, you know, immature. Right? But an avidut is following everything on the transcendental platform. And he's not worried about what happens here.

So he's not worried about his immaterial arrangements. Does that make sense? Okay. So, he has no expectations for the result of work entrusted him because he's above the false ego and pride.

So, one is able to work under authority if one's free of false ego and pride. If one has false ego and pride, then that means to that degree one will not act under authority. Right? Or, one can act under authority, but one expects results.

Right? So to be able to act under authority and not expect results, one has to be free from false ego and pride. Right? Because one understands I'm servant of Krishna, so that means I have to follow his directions. And I'm not the doer.

Right? So it gets rid of the false ego and pride. Right? Means identity is proper, and one understands one's position within that identity. Still he is always enthusiastic till the completion of such work.

We discussed that yesterday. So that means the ability to carry a work out from the beginning to the end, enthusiastic all the way through, that's the mode of goodness. Enthusiasm in the beginning, not at the end, that's the mode of passion.

Not enthusiastic the beginning, not enthusiastic the end, that's mode of ignorance. He does not worry about this distress undertaken. He is always enthusiastic.

Because we're thinking the distress is something that's going to impede our enjoyment. But why will there be distress? You know what I'm saying? If you don't do anything, there's no distress. There's no happiness either, but there's no distress.

So why would one do something? For results. So that means there's you and something else. So there's a relationship.

Does that make sense? So if you're dealing with the relationship, you don't worry about the distress undertaken, because it's the relationship that's being cultivated. Right? So the point is, is to be able to understand you're working under authority, you're working to please Krishna, that's the higher relationship, as opposed to just dead matter. Right? It means things or money

or facility.

He does not care for success or failure. So he is, it means the success or failure for himself, like that, but he's trying to get success as a result, because the result's for Krishna. Right? So if he gets the success, then great, Krishna will have a nice result.

If there's failure, he'll keep trying until he gets the success. But he doesn't blame himself, oh, I'm so useless, because if I'm so useless, it means I'm the doer. It didn't work out, so I couldn't do it, so... You understand? So the lack of self-confidence and all that is actually another form of false ego.

Right? Does that make sense? You'll notice in societies, societies where the ego is the prominent element, right? In other words, where they're more spontaneous, move more away from following some religious authority especially, that then their idea of punishment is that you should feel real bad about yourself. You understand? But it's still false ego. It's not actually a correction.

You're still staying within the function, because they only can think in false ego. So it's either you feel confident about yourself with your ego, or completely, you know, you're falling apart, because, you know, like this. But that means you're not going to do anything to feel worse.

So for a person with ego, the worst thing that can happen is that you feel bad about yourself. Right? You understand? So this is very interesting. So you notice in cultures where that element is there.

Other ones, they want you to feel, it means you've done this work wrong. That's the problem. Right? They don't mess with your ego.

Right? But when ego is the prominent thing, then that's what must be dealt with. Right? So this idea of, that you should, you know, stand up in front of everyone and say, this and that, like this. It's just another form of false ego.

They really like it. They really like it. That's, but that's, you're supposed to be contemplating what you've done wrong.

See, there's a difference in your contemplating what you've done wrong, and that I am, I am, I, you understand? Because there's the, there's the work, and then there's the field. You understand? So if work is what's important, then good and bad work is what will be looked at. Right? But if the field is what's important, then all that will be looked at is your position in the field, because you can't change the field.

You know what I'm saying? You know, I'm in this environment. It's not I can change everything here, so the only thing I can work with is myself. So if the focus of the society is simply on the field, you know, getting money, getting facility, getting position, but it doesn't mean you're doing anything with it as far as the relationship goes.

Does that make sense? Right? So then and there, then the, means having that facility so that all they can do is take away your facility that you've gained and take away your identity so that you can't function in that field. Right? You're in that field, and you're not dealing well with the field, so therefore take away your identity so you can't work within the field. But it's not actually the work, because the work is whimsical.

So what's defined what's good and what's bad? You understand? Does that make sense? Kind of horrible. Hmm? Kind of horrible actually. Yeah, but if you look at it, that's, you know, as we go into the more and more modern, it becomes more and more prominent.

But you can see it because of the element of false ego and pride. So therefore they don't work under authority. Therefore they're not working without a desire for fruit or result.

Like that. Does that make sense? So it's more important to bring one back into, under authority, instead of, you know, put a bad name and hang it. Like that, but authority is whimsical also.

So it's just a matter of, yeah, like this. Yes. So if, if, if you're in a, in a situation where you feel like devotees are not really acting appropriately and so then if you get sort of upset about this, it bothers you, I don't know if you can connect that to what we're talking about here.

That's true. Maybe like false ego too. Like, you know, you should just say this is the field Krishna gave me.

So I have to just worry about myself kind of That's there, but the point is, is that the distinction here is between the devotees you mentioned that they're doing an activity that's not appropriate for the situation. So that's always going to be a problem. So the correction is how to understand what should be done in that situation.

Does that make sense? So that's the actual point. Not that the individual that they, their ability to function is removed. You know what I'm saying? Because the point is, is correction is a dynamic element.

So that can only happen if there's movement. If nothing happens, you can't correct something. That's why then if you're not changing the understanding in that, then as soon, with time, what's unconfident will become confident again.

And then the work that will be done will be wrong. As I probably said, the material prize chitra doesn't do anything. Because it may temporarily make people feel good, but the person will do the same activity again because you haven't changed the viewpoint of working under authority without desire for result, free from false ego and pride.

Does that make sense? So that's the point. If you change that, so if you're in a position that you can have influence on that, you do. And if you can't, then don't worry about it.

You worry about yourself and what you can do. And then don't worry about distress and don't

worry about success or failure. You know what I'm saying? You're doing what you're supposed to do.

If others are not doing what they're supposed to do, you'll figure out ways to work around it. You know what I'm saying? It's a big place. Move over to the next block.

So then you do that. He is equal in both distress and happiness. Because they're both two sides of the same thing.

Like that. They're not different, actually. If it's seen in relationship to the relationship.

Such a worker is situated in the mode of goodness. Verses 29 to 35. Understanding the determination, understanding and determination according to the modes.

So, understanding according to the modes. That understanding by which one knows what ought to be done and what ought not to be done. That which is feared and that which is not feared.

And that which is binding and that what is liberating is in the mode of goodness. So understanding this, that'll be that in the mode of goodness. Can you explain a little bit of fear in the mode of goodness? Fear.

What is to be feared and what is not to be feared. Like the demigods, when the Srini Dev, after he, you know, performed his pastime, he was sitting on on Hiranyakasipu's throne, the demigods were afraid of Nrsingadev. Prahlad wasn't.

And so Nrsingadev said, you're not afraid, everybody else is afraid. He says, no, I'm not afraid of you, I'm afraid of Maya. He says, material energy, that's what I'm afraid of, because that makes me forget you.

You understand? So, he's situated, why are they afraid of Nrsingadev? Because he's, they're afraid to lose their position. Yeah, lose their positions. Who knows what he's going to say? So, there are times where they're worried about that.

So, they want to serve Krishna, but they want to serve Krishna from that specific position that they're in. Does that make sense? So, that's the importance. So, what is to be feared, what's not to be feared.

So, to take up that service, to make that endeavor, even if there is a failure, you're not afraid of that. You're not afraid of the distress. Right? Does that make sense? So, these are things, but these are things that most people are afraid of.

So, they're actually, it's the wrong, wrong, wrong element. Right? You know what I'm saying? The person you've got in stage fright, what does that mean? Bodily conscious. Bodily conscious.

You don't want to lose your prestige. You don't, what could cause you to make you lose your

prestige? You're the doer? What's the actual problem? Yeah, you're not going to do it properly. You forget your line.

You know, you do something, you know, wrong on the stage. So, that's, that's the wrong thing to fear. The fear is that you're working together with others to create a production that is for the enjoyment of others.

You know, for whatever purpose that you've decided on doing that production in that place. And so, by missing, doing that wrong, then you, you know, you wouldn't go properly. Others would be, you know, upset or in distress.

The audience will not be comfortable with it. That's the actual reason to worry about you'll do something wrong. But that's not what they're worried about.

They're only worried about themselves. You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? The production, of course, is next, but, you know. Yeah.

Does that make sense? So, in other words, the focus is in the wrong place. What ought to be done and what ought not to be done. But that means still in connection with Shastra.

Then, within the particular situation, then what's to be done and what's not to be done. Okay? So now, let us say, just take an example. Okay, you know the Shastra.

It's okay. We should follow Varnashram. So that's what ought to be done and, you know, not following that is what not to be done.

Some other form like that. Okay. So now, within that, we go to apply it.

The detail. But if we don't know in detail what should be done and not done, then if it goes wrong, then we have a problem. Because then what happens? Then we'll blame, oh, Varnashram is the cause.

Oh, it doesn't work now. Why? Because I couldn't make it work. Why? Because I'm the doer.

Right? And that it failed, then it's got to be someone else's fault because of my pride. Right? Does that make sense? And then, you know, then you have to come up with some whimsical idea. Oh, it's Kali Yuga doesn't apply.

Right? Who made Kali Yuga? Right? Right? It's the 29th Amendment, right? You know, just to create variety, we have, you know, all men will have Kali Yuga. Right? And then, you know, it's like this. So then, does that make sense? So, the point is that that's where then the mode of passion comes in because you want the result.

You don't get it, so then there's a distress. You give up the work because it's too troublesome. Right? Or mode of ignorance.

Then you say, oh, this doesn't work and all that. Then you move into that. So you can see just naturally how it flows.

One can say, oh, it's this or it's that or it's, you know, so many things. You know, it's El Nino. It's, you know, it's anything like this, it could be.

But it's not, it's not to do with any of that. It's how the modes work. Krishna says everything works by the modes.

You work in goodness, it'll stay there. You don't work in goodness, passion and ignorance will naturally follow. Okay, so that means you have to know because mode of goodness means you're dealing with the present.

And if you're dealing with the present, it means you're seeing how your plan connects with actually what's going on and the result. So if that's not seen, you may not do it properly. So this idea that mode of passion is practical.

No, mode of passion is only seen as practical because that's the only way a person with false ego is willing to work. This concept, I'm going to work without the desire for the result. No matter what comes.

That does not in any way, shape or form come into the mind of the materialist. So they will say this mode of goodness stuff is not practical. Right? Because I'm driven by my whimsical needs and desires.

Or I'm driven by just the fruit of result. That's practical. Yes.

On the Kshatriya we would say it's working in the mode of passion. No, that's the position he, that's what he's working from because the idea of getting results is very important. But it doesn't mean that he's not doing it out of duty.

He may be situated in, but the mode he works with, or the Brahman, the mode he works with will be, you know what I'm saying? So they're dealing with principles, knowledge. One is, one would be more on the, you know, the platform of understanding. And the other one, it would have to be applied.

That one must always be very careful of this to distinguish a Kshatriya's doubting your philosophical point or your theoretical point and someone else. What they're not doubting is the principle of authority. What they're doubting is that your presentation is practically applicable.

Others are doubting the results. But they don't. They can be very aggressive in expecting you to, you know, be very professional in your presentation.

You don't come across it often, but when you do, they're very strong-headed, strong-willed. What is binding and what is liberating? Liberating means it's being performed with knowledge,

without attachment. That's liberating.

And doing something without knowledge or doing something with attachment, this will be binding. Because, okay, if you're doing it for Krishna, you don't know what you're doing or how it's working and all that, but if you can keep focus that it's always for Krishna, you'll be fine. But that moment you forget, then that's where the problem starts.

So since we tend to forget, that's the advantage of having this knowledge, is then we can deal with the intelligence and the mind and the situation that we're in and how to see that in connection with the Lord. So indirectly we bring it back and connect it to the Lord. So we can just remember Krishna and absorb the doing for Krishna, that's direct, that's the best.

But at moments where that's not happening, then intellectually we can bring it back to Krishna and it becomes connected. That understanding that we cannot distinguish between religion and irreligion, between action that should be done and action that should not be done, is in the mode of passion. So the mode of passion, the result, we see its result is what we want and there's attachment to that result.

So if we're looking at result, then we don't really worry what's religion or irreligion or what should be done or what should not be done. What we're looking at is what gets our result. Because in doing any particular activity or let's say goal that one wants, there'll be many, many ways to get it, many forms to obtain it, many methods.

That's the variety element of the Lord's potency, is that it can create variety. We will generally want to take whatever is the quickest or the easiest, right? Because quickest from the mode of passion, easiest from the mode of ignorance. So in that way, then we don't distinguish what's religion or irreligion, what should be done, what should not be done.

Because sometimes by considering religion, it slows things down. So the pragmatist religion and proper activity get in the way. So it's like you could do it something in a particular way and yes, okay, so after 20 years, we'll get to the level, economic level we want.

But if I do some little things with the books and some this and that, then in five years we can get it, right? But the problem is that's not their duty, that's not the method, because then there's an element of cheating. So they're not distinguishing what's religion or irreligion or what is to be done or not done. So they could actually understand what is to be done and not done.

Yes. They just don't bother. It's 15 years difference.

Yeah, yeah. You know what I'm saying? That's 15 summers out in Bali or something. Cost-benefit analysis.

Yeah, so the whole point is, it's just because of greed. Things are going well, so they become greedy. And because of greed, then there'll be an illusion.

So an illusion, then they'll do something they shouldn't. And they keep trading consciousness for results. And eventually the consciousness gets lower and lower and lower.

Yes, yes. It's just the consciousness is absorbed in results but for themselves. So that element of passion, then, is going to mean is that whatever gets the work done.

So if religion will get their work done, great. But if irreligion will do it, they're not so worried because of the practical element. So this is the common point between the kshatriya and the vaisya.

Just one would prefer that it's important to religion. The other one prefers that it's just as economic. So for one, it's the control.

For one, it's the results of the facility. Yes. Question from the audience.

Means if you're... By karma, if you're... You have the karma to get that object. So if it's there, then if you do it properly, you'll get it at the time allotted by proper work. By doing improper work, you'll still get it at an earlier date.

But because you've done improper work, then you lose that facility of having that option in the future. You know what I'm saying? You work hard and after 20 years you're at the goal that you want to be, but you've done it in the proper way. So that means in the future, when you want to do like that again, you'll be able to get it.

But if you cheat now, then later, then you'll be working to get that and someone will cheat you and take all your facility. Right? You understand? Because you're working on... Religion generates economics. If you're only working in the economic field, then it's already limited.

You understand? If you're only functioning within economics, there's a limited amount of resources. So then, if you want more, what does that mean? I want to get more. How do I do that? There's a limited resource.

Yes, somebody else you have to get. But if you're working on Dharma, it's not limited resource. Because Dharma creates Artha.

So you just perform your Dharma, you'll get. If everyone performs their Dharma, everyone will get. That's the difference between the Vedic system and your just economic-based systems.

The Vedic, someone doesn't have to lose for you to gain. Because it generates its own facility. But the Kshatriya reading scriptures, he should be able to understand this, right? Yes, because that's why it's said that Kshatriyas are goodness and passion.

Right? So that's why they always need Brahmins around, because it keeps them towards goodness. Yes. Sometimes I think... So, acting under Dharma would mean to accept authority properly.

So then the question is, what if authority is questionable, at least under certain circumstances? But the point is, is the ultimate authority is there. Preaching and these activities are kind of coming under the pure authority. So you do that, you're fine.

What about if we talk about religious principles, not devotional service? You know, you're supposed to... Who talks about religious principles? You know, it's bar not showing Dharma, certain rules... But is it according to authority? Yes. So the principle is there. You follow the principle.

If the detail isn't exactly right, then if you can work with it and still get what it actually is for... You know what I'm saying? They don't understand, but you do, and you can make it work, then you go ahead. If what they're suggesting is not going to work, then there's a question of discussion. For example, Srila Prabhupada discouraged divorce.

And this is a religious principle, not a matter of devotional service, but... So what's the problem with divorce? What's the real problem? We're wasting... Because so many trees must be cut down to make that divorce thing, and so it's not environmentally... Friendly. Friendly, yes. Because of all the paperwork.

What's the reason divorce is not good? Well, at least generally, it encourages people to whimsically just disregard proper relationships and under authority. Generally speaking, I would think there are exceptions to the rule. Okay, but is that how most people look at it? Most people just look at, see if it's condoned, then they'll just... No, but why do they want a divorce? So they can enjoy their senses with someone else.

Yeah, so... But is it that someone else is so important? Themselves. No, it's themselves. In other words, I have a particular idea and I want to be happy in a particular way.

This other person somehow or another, at least at the present, seems to perfectly embody that situation of my being happy. You know what I'm saying? And so it's not that that's not part of the overall relationship because the element of attachment and need is part of the process. But notice in here, it's not really about the other person, it's about yourself.

Because if this person does it, you'll go with them. If that person does it, you'll go with them. It's not... You're the constant principle, not the other person.

You know what I'm saying? And one could naturally say, well, I mean, what other perspective are we going to have? We can only see it from our viewpoint. Okay. That's okay.

Then... But the point is, it's the relationship between the two individuals that's important. So what are the duties? What are the things to be done? What should be done? What's not to be done? What's the religious elements? What's the irreligious elements? That's not the point. That's really... It's about I'm not happy here.

The point is, is... Well, happiness comes from action. So if you're not happy, it means the action

you're performing is not right. But due to false ego, I'll always say it's the other person.

Because I'm perfect. You know what I'm saying? So they're not actually addressing the real element that's wrong. You know? And then, the thing that generally never is considered, it means I've... It means I'm sure there are individuals who do.

But in the long run, it's never considered our children. It's always between the adults, and the kids have to understand. No, the adults have to understand.

You know what I'm saying? It's like, if you look at it, which is the stronger position? A husband and wife is a legally binding contract, and if you break the legal binding, they have no relationship with each other, technically. Right? But if someone's your mother or father, you know, where's the breaking of that? It's just a fact. You know what I'm saying? So that's a stronger relationship than your feelings with your partner.

So for the parents, it's all about themselves, and the kids have to adjust, and who gets custody, and who gets this and that, and all these different rights. It's all about themselves. Because I want them on the weekends, but, you know, I want them on, you know, how you say, Easter and Christmas, you know.

No, but, you know, we have to have them. But it's not about the kid. It's not about how they see the parents in a relationship.

You understand? So, you know, husband or wife generally means kids, means family, means other people, and it's a big thing. You know what I'm saying? When people get married, you're marrying two families, technically. So, this is not all considered in that.

So the problem is, is you're breaking down so many relationships by divorce. This is what's the actual element, essential element. Right? But as you said, if you think, I can get divorced, I don't try.

You know, it's like, well, you think it'll last, well, I'm not sure, but we'll give it a try. If it doesn't work, hey, you know. You know, but the point is, if you have the principle of no divorce, then someone's going to really work hard to try to make it work.

Of course, if they're religious. So, that will give them the impetus because the element is, if you think there's any other option, you know, on a bad day, you might take it. So, if the principle is theirs, divorce is not allowed, then it's not an option.

So, you're actually going to try. Now, here's something else that's going in a different direction. That's looking this direction, looking the other direction, which, basically, you know, from what I've, I've seen a few people that, sincerely, this is just the way they think.

Others may do it because they think they should. Most don't even bother. Or, if after the fact, they can make it work, great.

Is, if there's no divorce, that means you should marry the right person. So, then there's a process for finding the right person. That people don't bother with.

[illegible]

If there's no focus, there's no effort. So if one thinks, well, if this doesn't go my way, then I can do something else. So you have to work according to authority because passion is you don't want to take the trouble.

So if I say no divorce, I have to work under authority so that means I have to be brought into line. So I should bring it up to I want to make the effort. Does that make sense? But there's always the element of looking at the individual case.

That's there, but that doesn't authorize that divorce is okay. Exceptions don't authorize the general rule. This is the problem of the mode of passion and ignorance is they think it does.

If there's any exception, that writes off all rules. If you notice, it means if anyone's observed, if we go through this, as soon as we make a very strong point of a rule, what's the first question? The exception. Today, okay, that's okay.

What about the avid hoot? And then somehow the avid hoot then makes everything else doesn't matter. You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? That's always going to be, we want to find the exception because then we think I don't have to follow that authority because there's an exception. No, but the exception means it's an exception.

There's the rule and then there's an exception. Does that make sense? So difficulty comes is that people are not looking at the real reasons behind why there's divorce and not divorce. They just look at, there's a rule.

Okay, Vedic means no divorce. Okay, but why does Vedic say no divorce? There's a reason. It's not just something there to give you trouble, to make your life miserable, right? It's there because if it's understood the complete picture, it works very nicely.

And if you go back in time when it was, that principle was accepted, you find that basically speaking, most of the time things went well. Does that make sense? Yes? It means, though it's a very nice question, I don't think it applies to this particular point. This is understanding according to the modes of nature.

You know what I'm saying? So what we've been discussing here is what ought to be done and what not ought to be done. You know what I'm saying? So that's getting into a detail. But the point is Manu concludes all rules and regulations on household life to say if there's mutual

fidelity between husband and wife, then that is the final rule.

If that's there, everything else will work because you have to make it work. You understand? So all the rules are just in connection with that. And anything other than that is a detail.

So we don't want to get into exceptions. Okay. Is that okay? You understand? In other words, they're looking at only a particular portion of it, not at the complete package.

Yeah, well, the only, I mean, in principle, everything you said makes total sense to me. But it seems that the kind of foundation upon which you made your point is that you look at this big picture, and when this big picture, when all the elements of the big picture are there and applied according to rules, regulations, culture, then it all works. Yeah, but my point is this 1966 is when this was applied.

How many years is that? Till now? 44 years. Yeah, so in 44 years, then people who claim, a culture that claims itself as intelligent and dynamic can't get it together, that's 44 years. That's a long time.

You understand? So that's why it's hard for me to buy. Yes, the situation is not proper, but whose choice is that? The individuals who have put them in that place. The knowledge of how to adjust things to make it favorable has been there for 44 years.

But if it's not taken, it won't work. But it's not the problem of the system, it's the problem of the individuals who don't apply it. So yes, now then, in consideration, you'll have to apply it on them, but are they just going to keep going on making this mistake because they're whimsically dealing in the mode of ignorance? That's my point, is that, yes, okay, someone's dealing in the mode of ignorance, they're whimsical, they do all these things, their marriage is not working, and it's really anybody with a brain who understands what a real marriage relationship is, knows this is not going to work.

So now, do we dogmatically stick to the point of no divorce, or do we let them divorce? But you still haven't solved the problem, because what's going to be their method for finding a new partner that they won't divorce? That means, in other words, all they'll do is get married and divorced until they're just too tired to fight anymore, and then they'll actually be submissive and deal nicely in their relationship. So that's what the Vedas are suggesting from day one. Be submissive, be nice.

Right? But it takes until they're 50 and on their third marriage that they start to do that. So, do we want to stick to this malicious system just because we're malicious, or do we want to actually learn human civilization, and at least make an endeavor? Because there's no fault in the proper performance of one's duty if one fails. But if one didn't try and one fails, what's the glory? So the person who tried and it didn't work, at least they tried.

These others aren't even trying, and they're so proud that they say, there's no need to try, why should I try? As if they're not in God's creation. You know what I'm saying? As if they're in their

own world created by themselves. So my point is, okay, it didn't work, this is not going to work, it's obvious it's not going to work, okay, move on.

But what are you going to do to educate yourself, to bring yourself now to the mode of goodness, since you acted in the mode of passion or ignorance, to make it work? Does that make sense? So that means, one, one doesn't know the general thing of nature, and two, one doesn't know specifics. Because we see kṣatriyas meeting with other kṣatriyas, and getting married, right? And you never hear of any problems. So the basic foundation is there, that they have the same nature.

Maybe the detail in nature is different, but if you understand the science, you'll bridge the gap. But here, it's not even getting the right varna right, and then at the same time, the details aren't there. So then, it's really a mess.

So what about the, well, you said, well, it's 44, 45 years, you know, since Hare Kṛṣṇa movement has been developing, so the movement ought to have a, have established. We've at least been making the endeavor to establish. So then the point might, couldn't you argue, though, that, well, yeah, the society should know by now how to do things properly.

And yet, it's generally the individuals within that society who are generally young, by definitely, by inherently, on average, are going to be the young, inexperienced ones within the society. So to say, well, the society should know better, well, what does that have to do with the fact that it's the individual who's bearing the burden of the society's lack of knowledge or knowledge, you know? But then, so, but the point is, is the individual, but then that means there's leadership, right? You're not going to just have the proletariat and that's it. It sounded good, but then you had the Kremlin, right? So there's only śūdras, there's only the common man, but then they have the Kremlin, which is kṣatriyas, right? Kill all the brāhmaṇas, kill all the vaiśyas, and then it's just kṣatriyas and śūdras.

Because if you say, everyone according to their need, everyone according to their ability, great. But who decides what's their need and what's their ability? There has to be an authority. So there's always going to be an authority.

So the point is, is when we say the society, we mean the authority. When we say America, do we mean, you know, over in, how do you say, one country has a problem with America? Do they have a problem with, you know, Mr. Smith out with his pitchfork out in his backyard, you know, pitching hay and, you know, feeding his pigs? Is that their real problem? No, they have a problem with the administrative structure of America, right? So the point is, when we say in this context, the leadership, why not? Because, but the point is, is the leader did start off, like you said, as one of the new people. And then as they come up, they should be educating themselves.

So if they haven't, and then a young person under their authority makes what practically one might consider a mistake. Yeah, but the point is, is you have the authority to enact something if

you also are taking the responsibility. With authority comes responsibility.

There's no such thing as the responsibility, I mean, authority with no responsibility. It means you get away with it if you have a committee and you have bureaucracy. Because the bureaucrats, they have authority, but no responsibility because they're just part of the machinery.

And if you have a committee, you can just say, well, I didn't vote for it. That's all. So that's authority, no responsibility.

But the point is, is if you're going to say that, yes, someone who divorces will be punished, means you have to be responsible that they only married someone that they should have. And if all indications are there, everyone's convinced that this is proper, they've been trained in the proper way, they don't use it, then they divorce. Yes, then they're culpable.

Then you can say, this person's a nonsense. But if you haven't trained them in all that, then how are they to take full blame? Does that make sense? So there has to be a proper balance. Protection means you see that the situation that the common person is in is favorable for their duties.

And if you're not doing that, you can't complain that they don't do their duties right. You know what I'm saying? If the parent gives all facility and all education as to why they should be doing what they're doing, and then the child goes out on their own, what can you say? Right? Does that make sense? But if you haven't given that facility, and then they make a wrong choice, you can't really blame them. Does that make sense? So that's the point.

Leadership has to understand these things. It's not rocket science. That's the fun part.

It's not rocket science. It's simply, are the natures the same? If they are, it works. You have a basis.

If you know how to behave, you know what is to be done and what's not to be done, you know what's knowledge, what's not knowledge, you actually know what a man is or what a woman is, what a husband, a wife, what a parent and a child, you know these things, then you can make it work. But people don't know. It seems like the modern world almost celebrates the opposite.

Because it's the mode of ignorance. If you're celebrating the opposite, that means it's the mode of ignorance. But you see that it goes back.

It means people can do whatever they want, but it's kind of more conservative. Don't make a scene about it. But back in the 1980s, that was the time to really... You know what I'm saying? Before, it was like you push it to the limit.

How far you can push it and still get a decent rating. You don't want an X, but you want something before. But nowadays, people would rather just have something that's general

viewing.

So now they depend more on acting and scripts and stuff like that. Before, it was like pushing the limit. What can we do that's not allowed? And that was the glory.

You understand? Like you said, it was celebrated. But now it's not celebrated because they've tried it and it still didn't make them happy. So now it's just a matter of survival.

Does that make sense? So the point is if one knows what should be done and not be done, then things work nicely. But if one can't tell the difference between religion and irreligion, it's just a matter of practical. We should do like, oh, that's not practical, Prabhu.

Okay, it has to be practical, but you can't say that the theory is impractical. Theory has to be applied. It's called theory because that's the knowledge by which it's done.

But it's not theory because it's not connected. You know what I'm saying? The theory is you get on your bicycle and basically if you apply the principle of balance and that you shouldn't fall off. So that's a theory.

So does that theory ever not apply? You know, you can be unbalanced and all that because it's just theory and that. We can do whatever we want on the bicycle. No, the theory always applies.

If the point is it's not practical, it means you haven't figured out how to get that theory and make it practical. That's the point. But this is what's missed.

So this is mode of ignorance. That's mode of ignorance or mode of passion. You don't want to go through.

So in that case, what you gave before, for example, would be mode of ignorance because you're throwing out the principle. But no, the principle remains. It means, OK, maybe the person is too theoretical in that they're just sticking to that point but they can't see how to properly apply it.

That's fair enough. But that's where the criticism should be. It's never on the principle of authority, Guru, Sadhu and Shastra.

That's not where the complaint is. You know what I'm saying? The complaint is we haven't made it practical. But practical means present, means mode of goodness.

That means your knowledge is not enough. We're getting closer there. That understanding we consider irreligion to be religion and religion to be irreligion under the spell of illusion and darkness and strives always in the wrong direction is in the mode of ignorance.

So that's your, what do you call it? Celebrating. Celebrating, yeah. Ignorance, yeah.

Irreligion. Determination according to the modes. It seems great because of illusion.

You think, I will be happy. But they're not happy. It doesn't matter.

That's the problem. But because the illusion is so great, you'll think, well, I should have tried this way or that way. That's mental speculation.

I tried it. It didn't quite work. I should try it this way.

Determination according to the modes. Unbreakable, sustained, and steadfastness by yoga, which thus controls the activities of the mind, life, and senses is determination in the mode of goodness. So unbreakable, sustained, and steadfast.

So it's unbreakable because one has faith. One knows that this is how it's going to work. Sustained is that it's always there because one is able to see the whole process.

One's positioned with a goal. You're convinced that this is what's there. It's just a matter it hasn't worked.

So you're not worried about, I say, success or failure. So failure's there. You just keep trying until it works.

Steadfast by yoga is that the steadfastness is that it's connected to the Lord. Yoga means it's the connection to the Lord. So you see that, so it becomes devotional service.

So then one is steady. So that controls the activities of the mind, life, and senses. So it has to go all throughout.

Otherwise, if it just, so it's mind, life, and senses because we'll apply that if we're doing direct sadhana. But we don't necessarily apply this when we go outside of sadhana because therefore life, your lifestyle, is that controlled by this proper understanding. It's the engagement of the senses according to this.

Determination by which one holds fast to fruitive results in religion, economic development, and sense gratification is in passion. Liberation wasn't really a point made there because liberation means you have to be able to perform that activity with knowledge, without attachment. That's the only way to get liberation.

So liberation can only be attained from the mode of goodness. Like that. Okay.

Determination, okay. But the fruitive results of religion, economic development, and sense gratification. It's still not been fully given to others.

Determination which cannot go beyond dreaming, fearfulness, lamentation, moroseness, and illusion is unintelligent determination. It is the mode of ignorance. Śrīla Prabhupāda describes determination in the mode of goodness as follows.

Yoga is a means to understand the Supreme Soul. One who is steadily fixed in the Supreme

Soul with determination, concentrating one's mind, life, and sensory activities on the Supreme, engages in Kṛṣṇa consciousness. That sort of determination is in the mode of goodness.

The word avyabhicāriṇa is very significant for it indicates that persons who are engaged in Kṛṣṇa consciousness are never deviated by any other activity. So when one's Kṛṣṇa conscious, one's not deviated. If one's deviated, it means at that moment one wasn't so Kṛṣṇa conscious.

So the solution is make one Kṛṣṇa conscious. Then one won't deviate. Yes.

For the way Prabhupāda describes it, it sounds more like he's describing pure goodness than goodness. But that is goodness. Because when we say goodness, we mean pure goodness, because otherwise goodness is mixed with passion or ignorance.

So for us, material goodness is not so useful. So that's why the whole thing to get to the platform of material goodness and then you can take up devotional service for us isn't so important. We approach pure goodness.

So that means goodness element of goodness is not the problem, right? It's the passion-ignorance mix. So if we're striving for pure goodness, what's the problem? Passion and ignorance. So simply we're going to have to look at that, that we're not acting whimsically, we're acting according to authority, we're not acting for a fruitive result.

That's what Kṛṣṇa says. Perform your duty, which means according to authority, right? Without attachment, in knowledge, right? So that's the mode of goodness. And then for me, that brings it to that pure platform.

So that's the direction all throughout. These are just details to explain so we can see the different angles, so we can catch where the mode of passion or ignorance, or where that lack of Kṛṣṇa consciousness is coming in. Yes? Going a little bit back, it says the determination by which one holds fast to fruitive results in religion and so forth.

It seems like that's almost a description of the demigods. Yes. But they're in the mode of goodness, right? In one sense they're in the mode of goodness, but at the same time they're there because of their material desire.

So that's mixed mode. Yes, it's mixed. But their lifestyle is situated in goodness, so working on that, because they're working for the Lord, they're working in knowledge, they work according to all those things.

That's why it's working for them. Yes. Only occasionally they do something that's outside of that.

Either it cuts off Vishnu's head or like that stuff, then he runs into trouble. You know, tuberculosis personified as chasing and stuff. You don't want that.

You don't want that. Yes, okay. Then verses 36 to 40, happiness according to the modes.

Happiness which is in the beginning like a poison, but at the end is like nectar, and that awakens one to self-realization, is in goodness. Srila Baladeva Yavusra describes the happiness in the mode of goodness as follows. That happiness in which there is satisfaction arising from repeated practice, not a sudden appearance of satisfaction as in contact with sense objects, is in the mode of goodness.

Enjoying such happiness one crosses samsara. In the beginning it appears to be poison, filled with lots of suffering. That's why I said before, mode of goodness was not worried about distress that comes from the activity, because practice means you're not good at it.

Whatever you're not good at gives you trouble. But if you practice it, you become good at it, then it doesn't give you trouble. But unless you can get through the difficulty, it won't work.

You get the satisfaction from knowing it's progressing. From progressing and also just the results that come from the satisfaction of that work properly done is done for Krsna, it does give good results because dharma generates artha. It does create the facility and that enjoyment that one's looking for anyway.

You understand? One wants to have facility, one wants to be able to enjoy that facility, that still only comes with dharma. Because if you use any other method, then it'll be temporary. You may get something, but it'll go away.

And since the soul is eternal, generally they don't like the temporary aspect. So it's only because one's performing dharma, then that lasts. But that satisfaction is there that one can see then the difference between the material facility enjoyment generated and the spiritual.

And so then with time, it's very distinct, the difference in that happiness. So then they choose the spiritual. In the beginning it appears to be poison, filled with lots of suffering.

This is because it is difficult to control the mind, since the atma has not yet manifested itself as an entity distinct from the body. But it later becomes sweet like the falling of streams of nectar, with the attainment of samadhi, from the manifestation of the atma separate from the body. So the difficulty is because we identify with the body, so the body being the field, if something goes wrong in the field, then we suffer.

But if we don't identify with the body, then it has its methods, and we have ours, and so then we're not affected. This happiness in the mode of goodness arises from the intelligence, which has been purified by concentrating on atma. Purity here means complete extinction of the contamination arising from contact from material objects.

So now we shouldn't take here contamination arising from contact with material objects, meaning we don't contact material objects, because that's not possible. What it means is contamination arising from that. So how would it arise? How would contamination arise from the senses engaging the sense objects? By identification.

Yes, attachment. Seeing oneself separate. It's not engaged, it's not connected to the Lord.

Yoga is not there. So if yoga is there with intelligence, that detachment is there, then one is not affected. So the point is, because we say, oh, the point is that, no, you shouldn't engage, then Arjuna would have been, we would have finished in the first part of the second chapter.

Arjuna would have said, you know, this is it, I'm going to the forest, and Krishna would have said, hallelujah, we've been waiting for this all your life, you've been there, you know, that detached grhasthas, and kshatriya kind of all that falsity, but now you've finally understood, and Haribol, and everybody else would go, where's he going? He's going to the forest, not like you idiots. That's where it would have ended, right? So Gita would have been a very easy book, right? It would have been about 50 shlokas, and everybody could handle that. Probably you could memorize it all, right? Memorize the whole Gita.

Sarasvara, he memorized the whole Gita. Sarasvara. Yeah, yeah, there's a few, I think Pushkar knows the whole thing.

I think there's one other, I can't remember, who? Yeah, he probably knows the purports. He is a Krishna book. Huh? Yeah, yeah, no, I've heard it, it just sits down and just says, it's just like, you know, you could get out of the book, and it's just like an audio, you know.

Yeah. Forget who that other devotee, I met him like that, he also knows. But I think Poonapragya knows also.

Like that, but there's a few, there's four or five devotees. Okay. Okay, so that means the extinction of contamination, it doesn't mean the extinction of the senses engaged, that's the Mayavadi's thought.

Now, our point is that the senses are engaged, but it's not engaged for our purpose, it's engaged for Krishna's. Therefore, it's under authority, since the senses are going to be engaged, engage them according to the direction of authority. Happiness derived from contact of the senses with their objects, which appears like nectar at first, but poison at the end, is in passion.

Śrīla Prabhupāda explains in his purport to verse 38, A young man and a young woman meet, and the senses drive the young man to see her, to touch her, and to have sexual intercourse. In the beginning, this may be very pleasing to the senses, but at the end, or after some time, it becomes just like poison. I think this is in line with your question.

They are separated, or there is divorce, there is lamentation, there is sorrow, etc. Such happiness is always in the mode of passion. Happiness derived from a combination of the senses and the sense objects is always a cause of distress and should be avoided by all means.

Does that make it a little bit more clear, more direct? In other words, the concept has come because of the mode of passion. So what I was meaning before was saying, okay, deal with the

situation appropriate to that particular thing. It doesn't authorize divorce, but if by the mode of passion this has been come to, there's no other way to deal with it.

What do you call it? Irreconcilable. Irreconcilable differences. Irreconcilable differences, right? That's the euphemistic thing by, they hate each other.

And they have no idea how to make it work. Because hate comes from ignorance, right? So they don't know what they're doing and they allow themselves like this. So the point is, what my point is, is why isn't the approach to marriage being performed in the mode of goodness? Why isn't that knowledge being given, right? Why isn't that a valuable point? The thing is, is you take a few weeks, you know, or a few months, and, you know, whoever is interested or not sure or who already is married can sit down and go through a course and then they'll know what they're dealing with.

Then it's up to them to apply it. But at least they can know what they're supposed to be doing. Happiness that is blind to self-realization, which is delusion from beginning to end, and which arises from sleep, laziness, and illusion, is in ignorance.

At least it's consistent, right? Beginning to end. Goodness is consistent. Ignorance and passion, that's the one that's not consistent.

In the last verse of this section, the Lord summarizes the total influence of the three modes of material nature over all the universe. No one, human being, demigods, or those on the higher planets, is free from the modes. In verse 1 to 12, the Lord summarized the first six chapters of Bhagavad-gita, explaining the meaning of karma and how work combined with knowledge frees us from material bondage.

Yes, so work with knowledge, that frees one. Work without knowledge, that's binding, right? And knowledge without work doesn't get you anywhere. So the combination, this is buddhi-yoga, that's what's unique.

With knowledge, you're working. In verses 13 to 18, He summarizes the last six chapters of Gita, in which freedom from reactions is explained from the viewpoint of jnana. When one understands that he is not the main doer and surrenders to the witness and sanctioner of all activities, the Supersoul, his work does not produce reactions.

In verses 19 to 40, the Lord concluded by explaining the actual doer in the material world, the three modes of material nature. So the first six is by acting in knowledge, that then is what's going to free one from material contamination. And then the jnana, one understands, okay, I'm acting in knowledge, but I'm not actually the doer, right? I'm the soul.

The field is acting, right, according to my desire. So if I bring my desires in line with the Supersoul, then the field that I am having some connection with, therefore, will be favorable to Krishna consciousness. So that's, yes.

Is it fair to say that chapter two is the Gita summarized from a Sambandha perspective, and chapter 18 from an Abhidheya perspective? Yeah, you could. Because the second chapter establishes what is the field, the difference between the soul and the body, like this. But you could also say it means it's the conclusion, because then it's how you can apply it.

It's practical application, you see. The second it was there, and then from that one could contemplate it and come up with what one should do. So that's the standard Upanishadic method.

They give you the knowledge, you contemplate it, you work it out. So for very intelligent people, that will happen. So, but the Gita being Gita Upanishad, it's Upanishad, but it's considered the essence, because it's bringing you to the point of showing you how to apply that.

So what's given here, this, the other Upanishads, they've explained it in seed form, but they haven't brought it to such detail. You won't find this in the others. So that's why technically it's superior in that way, because the ability to apply it is greater.

Although conditioned by the three modes, if the four varnas perform their prescribed duties, as a form of worship of the Lord, they will become steady in their knowledge and will attain liberation. This is explained in verses 41 to 48. OK, so that's an opening to the next.

So these have, OK, so we're seeing that the relationship between the first six chapters and last six. Middle is explaining pure devotional service, the Lord and all the different ways to approach Him. And the best is as a person in that pure devotion.

So the first six explaining that knowledge, that by having the proper knowledge with work, one will be freed from attachment. So in other words, by working in that way, knowledge will increase. But if you have some knowledge and you're doing your proper work, that knowledge will increase.

These last six chapters then will be the fine points of how to be able to see separating yourself actually even from the work. That knowledge is even greater that you see I'm different from the work. I'm not the body.

I'm the soul. So if I'm working under the direction of the Lord, that's what makes it karma yoga, jnana yoga, jnana yoga, because it's connected to the Lord. So Buddha yoga means that's been connected.

But at the same time, I could think I'm the doer. And so then the problem comes if I'm the doer, naturally, I'm attached to the result. So if I'm not attached to the result, it means I have to not be the doer.

Does that make sense? So therefore, then one has to see one's relationship with the Lord, the position of the Lord. Then it's the modes are actually doing the work. I desire it.

Then according to our karma, then the modes of nature carry it out. Yes. When we hear about the knower of the field, I think it was at one point also described as being the doer.

Yes, but the point is, is that it ultimately comes down because you're bringing it closer and closer. Yeah. Because you're the doer in that because you desired it and are connected with that field.

There is an influence. If you go down to the real nitty gritty of it, then it's separated. Yeah.

But ultimately, you come down. Your element of your doing this is simply as an instrument. So someone else is actually doing the work.

You're just an instrument. Just like the spoon is stirring the preparation, but it's not actually doing the cooking. Right.

The verb is cooking, not stirring the pot. You understand? Stirring the pot is an assistant to the cooking. So someone else is doing the cooking.

Right. But the cooking is being applied according to the nature of what is being cooked. Therefore, the stirring is necessary.

You know what I'm saying? It's not that the cooking itself means how you say that you need. It's not that you have a need in your life to scrape the bottom of a pot with a spoon. Right.

No. You want a particular preparation, a particular result. And you want that experience of interacting with what it is you're cooking to get that result.

OK. But the point is, is what you're working with, the preparation itself, it requires the stirring. Right.

So the process of cooking has to be able to include what you're looking for and what, you know, what's being cooked is looking for, and the instruments and how they fit in and the ultimate result that you'll get from there. Right. So the verb holds it all together.

Why are you in the kitchen in the first place? Huh? To cook. To cook. But why would you need to cook? To eat.

To eat. OK. So hunger is driving or the need to do an offering or, you know, somewhere, someone else is hungry.

Right. So in other words, hunger is driving it. So that's the thing.

And then the place of cooking is the kitchen. So the verb holds all of them together. So that's why the verb is the central.

So abhidheya is the central. Right? Does that make sense? So that's it. Yes.

I have some misunderstanding in two verses of Bhagavad-gita. Two verses of Bhagavad-gita? In the 18th chapter of Bhagavad-gita there is a statement that we have five actions. Uh-huh.

But who does the action? What from? OK, it's like this. Let us say I want to make some carrot juice. Right? OK.

So I need a blender. Right? And that has to have the pot on top. I need a carrot.

OK? I'll need some water. I'll need some electricity. Right? No? So all those things are needed.

Those are the factors required in action. Right? Who turns the carrot into juice? You do. The blender.

They think the blender. You think you did it. So who actually did it? You? If you did it, why do you need the blender? So the blender actually turns it into juice.

So the point is you get all those things in place because of your consciousness, but the modes of nature actually do the work. Does that make sense? So the reason this is difficult because we're attached to the idea that I am the controller and I'm the enjoyer. Right? So that gets in the way.

But if we follow this process, that even if we are attached, we pull it back. OK, I am the one doing everything, but I should be doing according to authority. And I should be doing without attachment.

Right? Because I understand attachment. I understand doing work. OK.

I understand knowledge. I understand authority. I put that all together.

So I do that. That will give us intelligence. Then we start to be able to get that knowledge that we are able to start to separate the soul and the field.

So the blender is the juice, which is the instrument. We're only the instrument. Now the question comes is, who's the juice for? Why is it being blended? If it's for Krishna, then we're the instrument in the spiritual process.

But if it's not, you know, it's just for ourselves and Krishna doesn't have anything to do with it, then we're the instrument for binding ourselves. Now that's stupid. Right? So we can be the instrument for freeing ourselves.

It's amazing because by mundane logic we would always think that the blender is the instrument and I'm the doer. Yes, but that's what we were saying before. That everything is opposite.

Happiness that is blind is self-realization, which is delusion from beginning to end, and which arises from sleep-laziness and illusion is ignorance. So that's it. We're just in ignorance.

That's what we think is... Because always we place ourselves as the enjoyer. You know what I'm saying? That's always who put us. So we always put ourselves in the masculine position.

But it's an illusion that we're in the masculine position. Krishna's always in the masculine position. His energies are always in the feminine position.

And we're always in the feminine position of assisting the feminine position. So we're in the subservient feminine position. Always.

There's no question. Even the biggest, nastiest, stinkiest demon is still in the same place. He's just more an illusion about it.

Does that make sense? That's all. It's interesting that the blender is more masculine than we are. You have a problem with that? My wife is always in the kitchen with the blender.

Do I have to get worried that she's with another man? No, but isn't it true, Maharaj? Actually, the blender is only the doer for the sake of parlance, actually. But the blender is just the modes of material nature which are also inanimate. And it's actually Krishna.

And Krishna is providing the electricity and empowering the blender to work. So Krishna's the doer, but... No, he's not the doer. His energies are doing, but the point is... Because the thing is you have to be able to obtain the element that the deists are trying to obtain without being an atheist.

You understand? It's that Krishna, the internal potency, means the element of grinding something and getting juice. It's an eternal potency that Krishna's internal energy are engaged in. So there's an original form.

That original form of that reflects into the material world. So then you're dealing with the dead matter. But it's only functioning because it's functioning according to the potency that's there in the eternal platform.

So now you have the choice to therefore engage in that activity of blending in connection with the original reality. And then it becomes devotional service. Or you can deal with the reflection, an illusion that I'm doing this and this is mine.

And then you'll be bound. So even though it's Krishna's potency, it's still, you're using it. You know what I'm saying? Your dad had bought the car.

It's in good shape. There's, you know, there's... how do you say? I wanted to say petrol, but gas would be more appropriate here. And so that's all in the car.

And then the kid, you know, snicks the keys and goes out for a joyride. You know what I'm saying? The reason that that car is working and everything, it's got a license, it can be on the road, all that is because of the father's potency. But misusing that car, that responsibility goes to the kid.

But that you push on the gas and it actually goes faster, the car goes faster. You don't actually make it go faster. You know what I'm saying? Because the point is, if you don't push, if it's you making the car go faster, you can do whatever you want.

You don't have to push anything. It'll just go because you desire it. But if you push on the cigarette lighter, does the car go any faster? No.

So it means you have to act according to what it says. So if this is understood, then you can apply this. Because yes, you're in the masculine position there, the car's in the feminine position, the things work like that.

But ultimately, if you look at it, you're only the instrument in there, in a much bigger picture that's going on. But he's not detached from interacting with his internal potency. Therefore, there's action.

Because in his state of pure unattachment, then that's atmarama. So there is no cosmic manifestation. So there's no distinction between him and his energy.

But here, there's a distinction, but there is no distinction, but it's manifest. So because of its manifestation, there's a distinction. But ultimately, there's no distinction.

So is my statement correct? It means what you just said now is correct, yes. What you said before, that's a problem. Yeah, that was just elaborate.

So what you said now is correct. Previous statement then, it runs into the problem, how can good things happen to bad people? I mean, how can good things, well, they're actually more worried about how do bad things happen to good people. Heck of the book wasn't, why do good things happen to bad people? No, it's like, why'd it happen to me? That was me.

Does that sound okay? Okay. Okay. So now down to ten pages.

We're getting there. Slowly. A lot of the time it looked like we weren't going to get anywhere today.

No. Because we spoke so much about the other one before. It's just a matter of we spoke about it.

Okay. That's it. Om Hare Krsna, Hare Krsna, Krsna Krsna, Hare Hare, Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare.

Śrīla Prabhupāda ki, samaveda bhakti-bhṛndiki, chānyatāya gaura-prananam jīvera. No, you're taking that who carries out the work and the factors of action, and that factors are just what's there. there.

The factors aren't the work. You understand? That's the way you're getting confused. The factors are what is there.

Work is another thing. The work is what happens. The factors are what's the field.

So you have to have the body, you have to have the senses, you have to have the living entity. You have to have the activity itself and you have to have the super soul. That's what must be there.

But then there's the action. The action is carried out by the Lord's energies. So it's either carried out by the modes of nature of its material or by the spiritual nature of the spiritual.

Okay?