

2011-04-01 BVPS BG 18.78 Connections gross and subtle

Hare Krsna, Hare Krsna, Krsna Krsna, Hare Hare, Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare, Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare. In his purports to Bhagavad-gita, 18.1 and 18.78, Srila Prabhupada summarizes the entire Gita. In every chapter of Bhagavad-gita, Lord Krsna stresses that devotional service under the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the ultimate goal of life.

So it always has to get to the person, right, and devotional service to that person, because otherwise there'll be processes of getting to some aspect of the Absolute. You'll also have them recognizing the person, and even Supreme Person, but not acting within devotion, right? So that combination of getting to understanding the Absolute Truth as a person and to interact based on devotion, that one's actions are... So that's the ultimate point that is being made. The same point is summarized in the 18th chapter as the most confidential path of knowledge, right? So there's confidential, there's those more confidential, but the most is devotional service to the Supreme Person.

In the first six chapters, stress was given to devotional service. Yoginam apisarvesam. Of all yogis, a transcendentalist, one who always thinks of Me within himself is best, right? So devotional service is the stress.

So it's devotional service to the person, but the emphasis is on the service itself. So in the beginning, that may be more along the line of for one's own purpose. It may be sakam.

As one advances, as one matures, then it becomes nisakam, right? But the emphasis is on the service itself, right? And one who therefore then remembers the Lord within himself, then that... he's the best of yogis, right? So the one who's connected himself, one who's remembering the Lord, that's the best. Does that make sense? But it's on the emphasis of service. But now remembering the Lord as the person that you're doing, you're trying, you are serving, then the service takes... is an assistant to that service to the Lord.

You understand? You have an activity... you want to please the Lord. There's an opportunity for a particular service. That service itself is in support of pleasing the Lord.

You understand? While the other is the service is the prominent and the result of that you'll please the Lord. You understand? It's slightly different. Same thing.

So it's all devotional service. It's just where the emphasis is. Does that make sense? So the first six chapters are describing how you can connect everything to the Lord, right? How everything can be connected.

Smokes too much? So we're trying to get... we're trying to get ourselves through these stages. And we see that it's not a problem. Eighteenth chapter, we have to know this is the conclusion.

But we're trying to get there so we know where we are. Right? And... does that make sense? In the first... next six chapters, pure devotional service and its nature and activity are... were discussed. Right? Okay.

So pure devotional service. Now we've discussed devotional service. Now devotional service can mean it's service but it's not necessarily pure.

Right? So you have devotional service, you have pure devotional service, and you have pure unalloyed devotional service. Right? So for us, pure devotional service, pure unalloyed are the same. Right? Because that's our standard.

But at the same time one can make a distinction. There's pure devotional service is there, but there may be something on the spiritual platform for oneself. There's no material platform.

In other words, pure devotional service means the material platform is not the consideration. Devotional service, then you're considering the material platform. Right? What is our... what is our needs, our abilities, our nature, and so you're dealing with that.

Pure devotional service means that's not the important thing. The important thing is serving Kṛṣṇa. And then one is engaging one's conditioned nature.

Right? So it's not that one doesn't consider. It's considered second, not first. It's not the primary.

Right? The one is you're doing the service, the result will be pleasing the Lord. The other is you're pleasing the Lord and so you're going to use devotional service. Right? In the third six chapters, knowledge, renunciation, the activities of material nature, and transcendental nature, and devotional service are described.

So then one knows what all these actually are, what is real knowledge. Right? In other words, the difference between matter and spirit. Renunciation means you're doing it for the... for the... yourself and giving that to the other person, or you're doing it for the other person.

One may say, no, but I'm just doing this just for the... for the... you know, the poor people. Like that. No, but it's... you're doing it for your satisfaction of doing something for the poor people.

So you're doing the work and you're getting the result. You're giving it to them. But still, there's the element of your satisfaction in it.

So pure devotional service means your satisfaction isn't the consideration. It's only there. You understand? So that can only actually be done in connection with the Lord, because that's transcendental.

If one's working in the material platform, it will always be tinged. Yes. Is there a risk that someone might lose some motivation when... If he doesn't deal with... but now if he loses motivation, what does that mean? What mode? Passion.

Ignorance. Because passion, you're very motivated. Oh, yeah.

You understand? Yeah, that was what I meant. Yeah. Okay.

So ignorance means is that then you're thinking, oh, this is the right thing to do. So that's a knowledge. But you don't think you're not that.

I am that activity, so I'm not doing it, so I'm not inspired, because I'm not involved. So because you think you are that activity, therefore one's not dealing on that platform. So since that is the consideration, then act within that and engage that.

The point is, is to connect it to the Lord. That's the essential point. The ultimate means... the confidential point is its connection with the Lord.

Right? Then more confidential is connected to the Lord, He's Paramatma. More confidential is He's the Supreme Person. But the most is that you're doing it to please Him.

And the other considerations aren't prominent. Understand? But the connection to the Lord is the common ground between all levels of spiritual development. Right? Yes.

In our preaching to the people, should we... As in we the people? Or do you mean like Socrates' people? Or do you mean like Marx's people? Or what do you mean by the people? People means devotees. Devotees. Okay.

Should we bring this aspect of service first, and then a personality? Or should we just go straight to the personality? Means you describe them both. Means you have to know... In other words, how are you going... If you talk about the person and then service to the person, how are you going to understand it unless you know what service is? Right? So in other words, Krishna started with the field, because God's part, in that respect, part of the field. Technically, He is the field, but He's there, you're there, material energy's there.

So how can that be engaged in such a way that you are engaged in the Lord's service? So you have to know what is service and what's this field. Like that. Once that's understood, then immediately the next point, how Krishna goes, rather than find technical detail on the service, is then the point of the devotion to the Lord.

So you learn service, and then you learn about the Lord. So that devotional service is for Him. So when you understand it's Him, then you start there.

Then these other things then become useful in that they will be fine-tuning pure devotional service. Of course, they can be used to fine-tune devotional service, but the difficulty will come, or these different yoga systems, difficulty will come as the fine-tuning, because it's dealing with the material energy, we may get absorbed in that and identify with it. Yes, I'm more intelligent, or I deal on more refined platform, or more subtle platform.

Does that make sense? So that's the danger of introducing that before pure devotional service.

If you just talk pure devotional service, everything else is secondary, they won't take the devotional services seriously, because then it's secondary. So why would you deal with something secondary when you have the primary? The sahaja element is just, there's the Lord, why do we care about rules and all that? It's the mood, it's goes down.

You have a very strict thing that deals with the, you have a religious code that deals with a lifestyle that's in line with the philosophy, right? Then you kick out the lifestyle, right? Then you create your own rules and regulations. Then you kick out those rules and regulations again, and just keep the bhava. You understand? So that's just naturally what happens if one is not careful, if one doesn't understand that the, how do you say? If one doesn't understand that the natural inspiration, that rag is based on vaidehi, right? And it should be that the vaidehi is consistent with one's philosophy, right? So the rules and regulations are not just separated ritual that is part of your life, that's how you live your life.

Does that make sense? You know, so the idea of the Vedic system is, see in these other religious systems, generally speaking, you see is that where you see the consistency, at least closer consistency of the lifestyle and the philosophy is only with your priests, right? So there there's more of the concept that they're connected, but the Vedic concept is everybody would have that connected. Now it's a matter of whether they're aware of it like the priest is or not, but the lifestyle is basically the same. You know what I'm saying? So that's the point is that then everybody has a consistent lifestyle, and then those who are leaders within that, then they discuss this and make people aware of it, not that it's two different things, because if you do that, then what is the lifestyle of the common person? What is it based on? Right? Because if it's not based on God consciousness and understanding of God's laws, what would it be based on? Because that's all there is.

That's reality. So it means it would have to be based on some illusion. You know what I'm saying? So it means the whole thing is you explain the whole thing, but then you get into details of the devotional process.

Once that's understood, then you can get into more detail about the Supreme Lord, right? Then the two connect. Then the fine things of understanding the fine differences in all these things. Because when you're doing something at first, you teach what's the main aspect.

Then you teach what's finer details within that or exceptions to that. You want to know the main rule first. You know what I'm saying? So that's... Is that OK? Yes? Question being asked.

Cleaning the Gundica. Yes, that's a good example. When Lord Caitanya cleaned Gundica, then he went through the first time, you know, and all that, because they haven't used it for a year.

So cleaning out all the branches and sticks and leaves and all the main dirt and everything like that. So you sweep it, it looks clean. Then he'd go back again, and now the cracks in between the stones and, you know, all the fine little things, then and then washing all that.

That was the second cleaning. So the example he's giving, the first one is like, you know, the major cleaning of, you know, situating oneself in the devotional process, you know, accepting those things that are favorable, rejecting that which is unfavorable. Then the second cleansing is like the subtlety of all the fine points within the mind and the consciousness that aren't proper, correcting that.

Right? Does that make sense? So it's always, it's natural. You give the overall so they understand, because the more you understand the bigger picture, then the more you understand where to put all the fine points. Otherwise, it's just so many details that it doesn't make sense.

That's why we always start with sambandha, abhidheya and prayojana, because then it's just three places to put everything. Right? So then you can start to see the connection. Then you see the varieties within sambandha, within abhidheya, within prayojana.

Right? Then it makes it very easy. So it's becoming more and more developed, more and more sophisticated. Is that going to burn the tree over there? But at the same time, it is, same time is that it's on a very simple frame, framework.

So that's what makes it work very nicely. Does that make sense? So that combination between is very simple and clear, but at the same time, it's very developed. Yes, sophisticated, but simple.

So these two do go together. The Western concept, they don't go together because simplistic means, it's simplistic. So, but that's not, point is, there is simplistic because you've cut out details down to what's the most, the beginning details to learn, but you're talking on a more developed situation, that would be simplistic.

Right? Simple means you've cut it down to what's the fundamental that always apply. Then you start from what details are the first ones to learn, and then you build on that. Yes? I think Einstein said, keep things as simple as possible, but not any simpler.

Simple as possible, but not any simpler. Means they're smart. Just, they just fall short.

They just don't quite get to where they're supposed to. It's not that they're not smart, but it's just, but so what they say, you have to see in context of the bigger picture. But if you try to adjust the bigger picture to their perspective, then it won't work.

You try to, you know. It was concluded that all acts should be performed in conjunction with the Supreme Lord. Right? So, so, represented by the words om tat sat, which indicate Visnu, the Supreme Person.

So it's concluded all acts, no matter what it is, what the situation, it should be done according to, I mean, should be done in connection with the Lord. Now, whether, what level one's doing that, what level of advancement, then that's something else. But one's trying to do that in

connection with the Supreme Lord, om tat sat, because then everything is then connected to Him.

Right? So one's trying to bring that together. So there you also get the sambandha-abhidaya and prayoja. So you're seeing it in that, in light of this.

The third part of Bhagavad-gita has shown us that devotional service and nothing else is the ultimate purpose of life. Right? There isn't anything else. To think anything else, then that's an illusion.

Whatever is your illusion, that can be connected to the Lord. But it's not that, that there is something separate than the Supreme Lord. So that means if we're devotees, we're engaged in devotional service, that means everything's connected to the Lord.

So to think that there is something separate, there's the Lord and something separate, is actually atheistic. Yes? What's the essence of it? You know what I'm saying? Selfishness is a perspective of the result. Gross means that you're dealing with a detail of the manifestation of what you're trying to obtain.

You understand? So therefore, you say something's very selfish and very gross, but the point is there's an ultimate element that one is trying to obtain. Right? Because that's what you're working with. Remember there's always the element of where you're applying your energy.

That will give you a result. The result's for yourself. But the point is, what is your energy actually being directed at? You know what I'm saying? And you're going to use a specific form in directing that energy.

That make sense? You perform an activity, you have to have a particular facility or machinery that you're using. So that may be more sophisticated or less sophisticated or more subtle or more gross. You know what I'm saying? But an activity is being performed directed at a particular quality of the Lord.

Right? That's what you're doing to get your result that's for yourself. You understand? Does that make sense? So what you have to identify is, what is that aspect that you're actually directing your energies towards? Does that make sense? That's where you connect it. Then once you do that, then it's very obvious that it's for yourself and the quality of the field that you're using.

You understand? Then you can work on that. But unless it's connected, how you'll be able to do it? Because if it's not connected, you're working in the modes. And if you're in the modes, you can't get yourself out of the modes.

You know what I'm saying? You can get yourself to goodness by great endeavor if you have that nature. Right? But that means you're still going to have to go through the same mechanics of seeing that there are subtler forms of this grossity, and there are higher forms of my selfishness, and there are higher aspects of application of the result than my selfishness. So

you're going to have to basically get to the same fundamental mechanics as devotional service, just that you're doing it without the benefit of working with the Lord.

Right? And so unless you tend by conditioned nature to be in goodness, then that will be very difficult to do. But if it's done in connection with the Lord, then it becomes very easy to do. You understand? Does that make sense? So therefore, that's how it always starts, because what it is is always the form of it.

You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? That's good. And our selfishness is just what we do with the result. You know, it's ours for ourselves.

It's ours, we're willing to share it. It's ours, it's for someone else, but we'll get benefit from giving it to them. Or it's theirs, you know, for their benefit.

You know, so these are just qualities of dealing with that. Right? And the other, but it's not synonymous. The actual point where the illusion comes in is we think something's not connected to the Lord.

It's always connected to the Lord. It's just because of our conditioning. Therefore, we will use a grosser aspects of dealing with the result and grosser aspects of detail.

Does that make sense? So we take it if the detail is fine or the result is not personally selfish, extended selfishness, then it's glorious. We might even call it spiritual. You know what I'm saying? You know, most people's concept of a spiritual experience doesn't get past pranamoy, like that, in actuality, like that.

Sometimes it's touching on manamoy, but it doesn't, generally it doesn't get very far situated there. Is that OK? So that means one can apply, one just has to be able to separate it. You know, so we know that devotional service is the thing and the Supreme Lord, but then because we don't know how to separate it, means the knowledge in the last six chapters, then we'll consider, oh, it can't be connected.

But there's nothing that's not connected. That's what the last chapters make, make very clear. And therefore, everything is, you can, is, there's only devotional service.

So then one can identify, right? Because if you have the subject, the object, the instrument, then the result, right? So then you can start to see what, what actually, you know, who are we? So that's a problem. Because if I'm selfish, then I'm the enjoyer. Right? Does that make sense? You know, we're putting ourselves in a position of the doer.

OK, even if we're the doer, still it's for the benefit of the other person. Or even if we want it for ourselves, we still have to consider the person that we're performing it with. Otherwise, you won't get the result.

So you're already refining it. Because if you want what you want, but you're only going to get

what you want if you do it according to what the other person wants. You know what I'm saying? So, hang on a second.

You want lunch. You want to eat something. So you cook whatever you like.

And you sit down. You're happy. Right? You want someone else to appreciate your cooking.

So what do you have to cook? What they'll like, not what you want. You understand? Then you'll get your result of them appreciating your cooking. You know what I'm saying? So, but you notice, it's the same thing.

The mechanics are the same. Whether it's devotional service that you're cooking to please, you know, the Lord and the devotees. Or you want them to praise you.

It's all about yourself. You're still going to have to please them by doing something in connection with them. This is the point that's being made.

Is that there's no difference between material success and spiritual success as far as mechanics go. Because there is only devotional service. What's here is the reflection of devotional service.

It's perverted because the devotional aspect is removed. But mechanics are the same. You understand? So you're going to have to go through all that anyway.

So you might as well get some devotional benefit. You've gone to so much trouble. You might as well get eternal benefit rather than just temporary benefit.

Right? That would be smart. Because to do it for our own benefit means that you think I'm something other than who I am. That's the illusion.

And my position is something other than I am. I'm actually, I think I'm doing the activity. So I'm the subject.

And God's the object. And so therefore I perform this service using the implements of the material energy for His pleasure. And I get therefore the result of what I wanted.

Right? That means the dative comes in. That's what I got. And then I get that for myself.

But the point is we're not actually the subject. Because the instrument is connected to both the subject and the object. The verb's right in between.

The instrument's connected to the verb. So that means it goes together. So that means that you're dealing with the activity.

You want that result. So you're dealing with the activity that gets that result. And that activity has to be performed according to the object, according to their pleasure.

Right? And then it's done. So that would mean then we're not the ones actually operating. We

consider that we're the operative cause.

But it's simply our desire. Right? But it's carried out by the modes of nature. And the modes of nature, what they're carrying out is the material mechanistic forms that are generated by the internal potency that are being reflected.

Does that make sense? Yeah. So actually we're still serving either the internal potency as an instrument, serving Kṛṣṇa as the internal potency, serving that, or not understanding this and serving the external potency. So we still come back to the same place.

But even if we think we're the subject, still you have to please the object to get your result. It's just the way it is. So the sooner we accept that, the sooner life becomes so much easier.

Right? And even it becomes so much easier, still it won't be satisfactory until we connect it to the Lord, because it's still temporary and we're eternal. So it's, you know what I'm saying? It works nice, it's great, we're getting the experiences, but still there's something missing. Why? Because it's still temporary, but we're eternal.

Does that make sense? So it's not actually a problem. The problem comes is when we try to rationalize that, oh no, but devotional service means you can start from wherever you're at and engage that, and so my engaging all my, whatever it is, material desires, that's perfectly fine. No, that's not fine.

What's fine is that it's connected to the Lord. What's not fine is you can still consider those aspects that are yours so they're separate from the Lord. So when you say, yes, it's connected to the Lord, but how much connected? So what's connected is good, what's not connected, that's still a problem.

Because if it was fully connected, you wouldn't be rationalized. Because you only rationalize what's for yourself. You don't rationalize what's for Kṛṣṇa.

You understand? So it's, the system's foolproof. The third part of Bhagavad-gītā is shown that devotional service and nothing else is the ultimate purpose of life. You may have purposes in life, but it's not the ultimate purpose.

So we're rationalizing purposes, not ultimate purpose. This has been established by citing past ācāryas and the Brahma-sūtra. So the ācāryas, the śāstra says this, and we take the nīmaṁsa, I mean the nīmaṁsayā, of the ācāryas.

Their hermeneutics is how we view it, so we end up with the ultimate goal is pleasing the Lord. And Brahma-sūtra is the foundation of establishing this, because it's the end of the Vedic knowledge. So it's the essence of the Upaniṣads.

So it's very clearly establishing what is what, actually. So that we get that perspective from the ācāryas. But it says, certain impersonalists consider themselves to have a monopoly on the

knowledge of Vedānta-sūtra, but actually the Vedānta-sūtra is meant for understanding devotional service, or for the Lord Himself is the composer of the Vedānta-sūtra and He is the knower.

So He's written it, so it's actually for Him. That's what He says. They have their ways of misinterpreting it for their own purpose.

So because that's all they do, that is their occupation, they consider they have the monopoly. But actually, those who know devotional service, they actually have the monopoly. Because it's for the Lord.

They're the actual ones. So one should not become distracted by their, basically, logical presentation up to a point, but actually it's rhetoric, because logic ends in conclusion, vāda, because that's Kṛṣṇa. The process has to end in Kṛṣṇa.

They don't end in Kṛṣṇa. So therefore, technically, it's not logic. They're using logic as a means of rhetoric.

That's all. It's just better rhetoric. Does that make sense? Rhetoric is just argument to, you know, how to win an argument, how to present so that you get what you want.

Logic means it actually logically comes to the proper conclusion. There's no fallacies. So if one doesn't fully understand the philosophy, there'll be a fallacy, right? Anything short of Vedānta will always have fallacious aspects of logic, and so they'll always fail.

Vedānta will always triumph. But if you don't have the personal understanding of Vedānta, also your logic, therefore, won't go complete enough. Because in theory, they get to the Brahman platform, so they're touching the Lord, so it should be correct.

But the problem is, is the impersonalists aren't claiming the monopoly. It's the Māyāvādīs who, therefore, never actually get there, right? They only claim that they're real impersonalists, but they're not. They're Māyāvādīs.

That's why they're called that. They also call themselves that. One may think, oh, that's our term.

No, they call themselves that, just like sahajiyas. They call themselves sahajiyas. You know what I'm saying? But because we've learned the word in that derogatory sense, you know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? Just like, let's say, take an example, the term American.

You know what I'm saying? So others in the world may use it in one way, but those from that particular federation of states, they use it with great pride. Yes, I'm American. And everyone goes, he's American.

So it's the same way. Does that make sense? So Māyāvād is their term. That's why we call them that.

Does that make sense? And sahajiyas, that's what they call themselves. That's why we use the term. You know, we also may, say, use other, what do we say, appellations.

Yeah, nomenclature, all these different things to add to the flavor like that. But it's still there. So here, Māyāvādīs are Māyāvādīs.

They're in the class of impersonalists, which is a very broad category. Business title. Yeah.

Yeah, you could. I mean, that would be, you could use that as an example to make your point. But I wouldn't use that as the definition.

You know what I'm saying? If you're in an environment where comparing it to business and that becomes a business appellation, then it's useful. But to take that as the definition, that I wouldn't, because then it takes on a particular flavor. In other words, that's a detail that were in your explanation of your thesis that.

I say the position of, you know, Māyāvādīs and impersonalists or on this aspect of some. Those who don't know the Supreme Lord claim a monopoly on Vedānta-sūtra and Vedānta-sūtra is actually defining the Supreme Lord and devotional service to him. Then, depending on your environment, that could be used as an example.

But I wouldn't use it as a definition. You know what I'm saying? Sometimes devotees will pick something. Oh, that made sense to them.

And so then they'll take that as the definition. And so it works in that environment. But you change the environment.

It doesn't work. Then one could become confused because one would have to use a different example. Because the thesis is one thing.

Your explanation is according to the audience. Your wording in your thesis also will be according to your audience. But the thesis stays the same.

Your examples will be very specifically according to the audience. And whatever are the particular doubts or misgivings of the audience, that's what you're going to have to work on in removing the doubt. If they accept Kṛṣṇa is God, you don't have to remove that.

Kṛṣṇa is God, but we're all Kṛṣṇa. Then that's what you have to remove, but not that Kṛṣṇa is God. You know what I'm saying? So you're dealing with whatever is their doubts and misgivings.

You don't have to deal with something else. Like with the Māyāvādīs, there's no argument over that we're Brahman, we're the soul. That does no argument.

That's why I didn't mention it. But with the materialists, you have to mention it. But with them, their problem is that who is the Supreme? What is the Supreme platform? That's where the

problem comes from.

You know, using knowledge to separate yourself from the material identification, there's no disagreements here. The disagreement comes in actual the identity and the Lord. But the process, actually, there's not a difference of opinion, really.

But they see, yes, I'm the soul, but ultimately that's an illusion that I'm a separate soul than the Supreme. So they can't see that there's the soul and then there's the Supreme soul. That they can't see.

They use word jugglery. That's why I'm saying it's actually rhetoric. Though they'll be the closest to applying nyaya or logic properly because they're basing it on Vedānta.

And Vedānta is logic. That is, it's called nyaya-prastha. It's the authority of logic.

Like that. So that's why it will be confusing. That's why I probably spend a lot of time on it.

But if you can separate off these fine points, then you can see is that what they're saying, that means it's confusing because it seems like it supports us, but it supports them. So the point is to see what supports us and what doesn't. And what doesn't, that's where the illusion is.

So that's the part you attack. You don't have to deal with a portion that's the same. It's describing the Supreme as Brahman.

That's not the problem. So we don't have a problem with that. The difficulty is that they say that's the end.

No, that's the beginning. Does that make sense? So one has to always be very careful that one doesn't choose something and then it gets stuck like that. Because, you know, so it's just like, let's say you take something.

It works in a situation. But if you take that as the main definition, there's a problem. Like you take win-win.

Okay. You use that. Yeah, this is a win-win situation.

So it's good up to a point. But if you actually analyze it, what does win-win mean? You get what you want. I get what I want.

There's no relationship. Just that we cooperate together to get what each of us wanted. So actually, it's just as selfish, just we're willing to cooperate in our selfishness.

That's called pranamoy. That's what pranamoy is. I want something.

You want something. We have something in common. There's common ground.

So we can work together to get what each of us wants. That's pranamoy. Manamoy is this is my

duty.

I do that. Then you can talk about actual emotional content. People think, no, the emotions are happening on the lower levels.

No, they're not. The feelings are there, but not real bonding. You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? So being able to break this down, then this is what's being offered.

Then we can deal with it. Does that make sense? So you have to be very careful. Because otherwise, then, with time, it'll work out that there's something wrong here.

You'll go, OK, they're cooperating together, but they missed the point that they're supposed to develop a relationship with each other, and having that something more as a person. So then they'll have to redefine the term win-win as something else. You know, as the, you know, how you say, mutual personal cooperation.

So what we call win-win today may turn into that later once they figure out what the weakness is. You know what I'm saying? So that's the difficulty in using a definition that's not eternal. You know what I'm saying? But you use according to your audience, right? You don't want to use an example they wouldn't relate to, right? You know, like the other.

It was yesterday, you know, I used the example of a broccoli when the audience could only relate to a potato. Right, you know? I'm still shaken up by that. Yeah.

Yeah, I mean, think of it. Kids playing Mr. and Mrs. Broccolihead, you know? I don't know if that'd work, you know? I don't know. Their noses would fall off.

I think there's a reason they don't. Yeah. Yeah, yeah, like that.

Broccoli also. Yeah. True.

I guess maybe the potatoes and how you say, that lighter color is more towards like goodness and everything like that. You can do anything. But a broccoli is more like a combination between goodness and ignorance, so.

You can do anything with a potato. That's true. It is the king of potatoes.

It is the king of vegetables. Don't hear about broccoli mash or something. No, I'm sure there are some people who would consider, but I'm not sure if you would want to become too intimate with such personalities.

I stick with potatoes. I see, yes. Yeah.

You don't hear of countries where people are dying because of a broccoli thing. That's the importance of potatoes. Yeah.

That's true. That's true. He is what's to be known.

He is the knower. That is described in the 15th chapter. In every scripture, every Veda, devotional service is the objective.

That is explained in Bhagavad-gita. He says in every scripture. So this is the point.

It means your body of knowledge should be connected to others. Right. That's sangati.

So you have sangati from verse to verse. Sangati of those verses to the adhikarana or the point being made in that particular chapter. The sangati between the different points of those different adhikaranas in a chapter.

Each chapter with each other. The chapters with the book. Right.

And then the book with other books. Right. So here is that every scripture.

Right. Every Veda devotional service is the objective. There isn't something else.

If one comes to that conclusion, one's missed the point. Right. One's missed the point.

And if that is the understanding and the objective, one's approach to those literatures is very different. Because it's personal. It's about how to please Krishna.

Right. And then the field is all the people involved. All the paraphernalia required.

All the knowledge required. But ultimately it's for the Lord. So then if the Lord's first, then only that aspect which is important to actually please the Lord in that situation is used.

You understand? So therefore the person doesn't have that particular, how do you say, fragrance. Right. But if you're starting with this is my nature, this is what I like, and the result is given to Krishna, then yes, that's good as long as it gets to Krishna.

But it will tend to have that fragrance. So why? Because there's so many aspects of a particular element, let's say like Ayurveda, that you are impressed by the mechanics of how it works. You like these kind of medicines or that.

So you'll emphasize those or different things like this. Then that's all done for, you know, take care of Krishna's devotees so they can all serve Krishna and all. So it's connected.

It's good. If you start pleasing Krishna, then in this situation what would you use? And then you'd use that. Right.

Whether you would prefer that style of medicine or not, you know, it's an arishtam. So that would work better, but you like rasayanas, so you would want to work that in. No.

It's just this works, so that's what's used. You know what I'm saying? Or adjustment in the lifestyle. Being a chari, your daily activity's wrong, your seasonal activity's wrong.

You're doing the right activity before the wrong season. You know what I'm saying? It's hot now, but because it's acting like spring, so therefore it's still cold in the morning. That's why in the winter there's probably less people with sniveling noses than right now.

Because we're acting as if it's summer when it's spring. So that means morning is cold, you cover up. And as soon as morning's over, then you don't have to because then it gets hot.

But at night when you sleep, it's cold. It starts off warm, it gets cold. In summer it starts off blazing hot, then it comes down to not going to kill you hot.

So therefore it doesn't matter that the fan's on because at the beginning of the night the fan doesn't do anything anyway. It's not until the end of the night, then it's nice. That's why you don't want to get up.

Does that make sense? Yes. The point, the thing is, is if it's an accepted scripture, then yes, that applies that way. Because in any case, if the mechanics are correct, according to the other scriptures that it's derived from.

Then that means that its application, it's the same purpose. Why, why, why would we accept Chanakya? What's the reason? He's got a cool name. It works.

Why would it work? It follows God's laws. So therefore God's laws are meant for serving him. So even if he doesn't understand that, that's what it's for.

If it works. If it doesn't work, then you don't have to worry about its object description because you wouldn't want to connect Krishna into it anyway, because it doesn't work. So Krishna will get no results.

Does that make sense? Like the modern social system or something. So, you know, there's no need to connect it because it doesn't work. So better to use something that works and connect that.

What you're looking for in trying to use a system that doesn't work, that's Krishna. But the forms that you're using have no connection. Right.

I'm thinking of carrot juice, you know, because of the vitamin A and all that. And I'm eyeing, you know, some oranges. You know, which ones do I want to use? Do I want to use like the mandarin oranges or do I want to use like the navel oranges? You know, which one would be better? Am I going to get carrot juice? No.

So that's the problem. But it's so nice looking. Look, it's such a big orange.

Hey, it's from Israel. You know, so the thing is, it's still not going to get you carrot juice. Right.

Does that make sense? You know, or the guy's out there with a big basket of carrots. He's got, you know, a, how do you say, you know, he's borrowed from his father. He's got his self a gavel.

And so now he's going to make some juice. Is it going to work? Not much, unless he wants to hit the carrot and lick off the gavel. Maybe he'll get something.

But, you know, so they said, no, no, here's a drop. That's not juice. That's a drop.

When there's one drop, you don't call it juice. When there's a drop on the counter, you don't say, wow, there's juice on the counter. No, you say there's a drop on the counter.

You can say a drop of juice, but you're not going to say juice. This is juice, you know, like that. Otherwise, then you go into a juice bar and they would hand you an eyedropper.

Right. You get your one drop, you know, like that. No, it's not going to make sense.

So the point is, is it's there. Most of these personalities, the presentation, because they're writing for a particular audience to see that they're connected to the Lord, because if you're connected, there's more chance that you may understand the real purpose of what's going on. So many times they're seen as not devotees, but sometimes it's revealed in the scriptures that they actually are.

Just they're presenting it for the materialist. Because people will think like that. So they they develop the system, how they can completely think in that way, but still be connected indirectly to the Lord.

But but, you know, and so the ultimate of that is Vyasadeva in the Mahabharata, because any other any other aspect of any branch of knowledge is in the Mahabharata. But it's using that same technique. So you may miss that it's about the Lord and the devotees, because a hundred thousand versus twenty five thousand are on the Pandavas.

So seventy five thousand are not. So just by, you know, the the inclination towards Vox Populi, then because there's more verses that are not, we will tend to not see the relation to the Lord. So Narada Muni makes the point, no, they should all be in connection with the Lord.

That's why we see first canto. I mean, the Bhagavatam itself, everything's connected to the Lord and the Mahabharata as retold in the first canto is all connected. So all the main stories, all the major, it's all in that first canto.

Then if you see any other stories in the Mahabharata in connection with that, then you'll see properly. But if you don't, you miss the point. So like Prabhupada, do you think of him as a great musician? He's a musician, you know.

Sits in his room, he's got on his beret, his little goatee, you know. You know, there's some double bass in the background. Do you think of him as a chef? Do you think of him as an Ayurvedic doctor? Do you think of him as a logician? A grammarian? A translator? No, but he had all those qualities.

He was master in all these things. This is what I mean. He has all that, not because he starts, the

goal is Krishna, he's starting there.

Then as needed, he goes back and uses those. So when Ayurveda is necessary, he can talk Ayurveda. But that's not what he does all the time.

Ayurvedic doctor, that's all he does. There's no topic you can breach that they're not going to come up with some change in your diet or lifestyle to annoy you. You know what I'm saying? You just wanted to go have some fun.

Oh no, but then the weather's this and that, so you have to, you know. You know what I'm saying? But the point is, you're doing this, that's what's prominent. You're doing that, that's what's prominent.

That's the meaning. So that's how the devotees, they know the essence of all the scriptures. And at the same time, they may actually be expert in a particular text itself also.

You know, like this top Ayurvedic doctor, he said for Prabhupada to know that in his particular condition, what the disease was, and know that this particular medicine could actually cure it. He said only a master Ayurvedic doctor with years of experience and study, very deep study, could know that. But you never heard him talking about this and that.

He didn't get into sugar trips or white flower trips. Where you'd use this, you'd use it. Where you don't use it, you don't use it.

You know what I'm saying? He talked about sugar, but he also traveled with dried karela. You know what I'm saying? So how many, you know, food freaks eat karela every day? How many brush your teeth with a neem twig? We're in India, we're in Mayapur. You know what I'm saying? These things can be done if that's what you're into.

The Prabhupada did it. Right? Because that's just where you use it. The rest of the day, you don't worry about it.

Cook all of it and put some sugar. You know what I'm saying? So he knew how to balance it. Because Krishna was the goal, not something else.

Right? Does that make sense? Make sense? So that's why you have to be very careful about something that's an example, taking that as the definition. No, definitions came before that. Then example.

You know what I'm saying? You have thesis, definitions, example. Right? Then you're going to clear the doubts of the others. But their doubts is by your examples that are in line with what they would understand.

Then you're going to show that what they're talking about is not excluded from what you're talking about. It's not a matter. He's got this opinion.

You've got your opinion. You defeated his. Because then that means his opinion is completely outside what you're talking about.

So that means there's no common ground. That means how did you actually discuss, you know? Does that make sense? You know, we're saying here is that. Yes.

You know, this dog is, you know, purebred dog and all that. How can you prove it? What kind of camshaft does he use? You know, like that. He doesn't use a camshaft.

What do you mean? Then what's the meaning of this? How do you have a discussion? You can talk thoroughbred by talking about horses and dogs. And the common point is that or about within that, within dogs. So that would mean if you have a basis for discussion.

That means that if you defeat them, their argument must be within yours. It's not just that they're wrong. You understand this completely changes the approach of what the argument is.

Rhetoric is that I have one of yours or something else. Logic is no. What they're saying is already included in what you're saying.

And you just have to strip away what's all their fallacies and what's actually real. That's already here. So what you're trying to gain is already in our presentation.

And why yours seems like a different one is you have all these. Improper understandings or perspectives or. Does that make sense? Then you get the conclusion of how now you'll practically use this with all this.

Now, you know, knowledge has been given. You understand. So, yes.

So, yes. So every scripture, that's all. All they're talking about is Krishna, but different aspects of Krishna.

So all these are aspects of using in the process. If you're following 18th chapter, what would we call you? Are you a karma yogi? Are you a gyana yogi? Are you a gyana yogi? What are we going to call you? Pure devotee. Because it includes the others.

When it's time to engage the body, you're engaging it. So that's the karma aspect. Intelligence.

Thinking of Krishna. But someone who's fixed in their activities are only done in this and that. And they do all the different things connected with their religious duties and all that.

And that's the main focus. But it's connected to Krishna. Then you'll call him a karma yogi.

Because it's karma misra. What's the misra? Yes. Something is there.

That's their own taste. Even if the result is that they like working with that field. So there's getting a result for Krishna and doing it through what I like in this field.

As opposed to just pleasing Krishna. And this is, I can only work according to my ability. So this is what I can do for Krishna.

It's different. Does that make sense? Subtle. So that's the aspect that one's trying to get.

So in other words, one is supportive of Vedic system without taking on that flavor. Does that make sense? One's supportive of Varanashram without taking on that flavor. In other words, you could practice Varanashram and not be covered from head to foot with cow dung.

It's actually possible. Like that. Because, yes, the serfs always will be covered like that.

But the king is still part of Varanashram. And he's not covered with cow dung. Wasn't that the definition? Yes.

Yes. So, therefore, then your Varanashram would fall apart because the king is not covered with cow dung. Yeah.

So that's the point is that Varanashram means the whole social system. You know, how to engage everyone according to their need of Dharma, Arthakama and Moksha in the ultimate need of serving the Lord. That's Varanashram.

Because most people only talk about economics and farming. That's it. They don't even talk about trade or banking.

But that's very much part. So why only two parts of the vaisyas and the Brahman, Satya and Sudra is not even discussed. So you take half of the vaisya, which is, of course, the most important.

But you take that and that's Varanashram. That's why it won't work. And ashram is never discussed.

Does that make sense? So you're taking half of one-eighth. So you're taking one-sixteenth of the whole thing and then saying we'll establish Varanashram. Yes.

Yeah. Devis definitely get it. They take up space, you know, space, all those people to serve them and everything.

Yeah. Yeah. I mean, see, that's where it comes in.

Remember we're saying is motive ignorance. And you think one work is the all in all. Was that ignorance or passion? Ignorance.

It was ignorance because you think that's all. No, it has its place. If the preaching is not going so well there and it would go better in the city and the cows need more space.

And so by doing that, then it would work. But it's just a matter of the principle is no, the land is for the cows. Therefore, you know, I say, I say, you know, yeah, quit the farm, you know,

Gandhi.

And so was he using nonviolent principles to for his political movement? You know, so then then. Yeah. They missed the point.

It's all part of the whole thing. You know, it's just like a baby. Why do we call a baby? What are some symptoms? The small.

Okay. Yeah, that would do it. Okay.

The dependent garbled language. So they're not. Okay.

But in connection with this point. Selfish. Very immature.

Yeah. Immature, selfish. It all about themselves.

What's their main focus in life? Eating. Right. So that is the one and only important work.

Right. So that's why it's an ignorance, because that's all there is. So when there's only one thing, then there's ignorance.

If one sees that it all goes together, Dharma, Artha, Kama, Moksha and Bhakti. All that's one thing with Bhakti is the principle and these others are supporting. Then you have a complete system that is balanced.

That's an adult. Otherwise, you have a very large kid. Very opinionated kid.

Okay. Now to the last paragraph. It's smaller, but you never know if it's actually.

Okay. The living entity in his original position is pure spirit. So this is from 78.

Oh, that was 8181. Okay. And now.

So the first. First of the. I mean, the 18th is summarizing the whole work.

And the first one is giving that. And now this is summarizing the chapter. The living entity in his original position is pure spirit.

He is just like an atomic particle of the Supreme Spirit. Thus, Lord Krishna may be compared to the sun and the living entities to sunshine. Because the living entities are the marginal potency of Krishna.

They have a tendency to be in contact either with the material energy or with spiritual energy. I can see where the days come in here. It's the right audience.

How did the Jiva fall? In other words, the living entity is situated between the two energies of the Lord. And because he belongs to the superior energy of the Lord, he has a particle of independence. Right.

Material energy is not independent. Right. The Jiva has that minute independence because he's a particle of the internal potency.

So it actually has his qualities in my new form. So therefore, he can try to be the lord of the external energy. So it's because of a situation actually spiritual that it appears he can do something.

By proper use of that independence, he comes under the direct order of Krishna. Thus, he attains his normal condition in the pleasure giving potency. So we see, you know, the material, the spiritual world, the material world's reflection.

So we're right on that edge, but we're actually on the, how do you say? Yeah, on the margin, depending. Yeah, that makes sense. So, but we're on the internal potency side of the margin.

So if one can see, use one's independence to serve the Lord, right, then he comes under the internal potency. If he doesn't, he comes under her reflection as the external. And there's nothing there.

There's nothing in a reflection. You can't get anything from a reflection. That's the difficulty, so.

So how did the fever fall? Oh, I see, trying to keep it going. Because he looked in the mirror and thought, that looks good. That looks nice.

Yeah. Could you explain what that stuff looks like? You get some land, you plant some carrots, make sure you get a lot of dirt under your nails. And start a journal or a blog complaining that no one else is doing what you're doing.

I think those would be quite essential. At least in the past, many have done that. I think there are others who are more successful at it, and they have a broader range.

But those who made the most noise and did the least basically followed that potency. Thank you. Thank you very much.

All right. Wow. OK.

Now, discussion is there on, what do you call this? What we do next. What we do next. I mean, we know what we do from September.

Because that's in the main course. So next September, that would be an analysis of the Gita, based on Prabhupada's analysis. So that you're going to go through in basically the Vedantic form of logic, of what are the main points, your, what do you call it, adhikaranas.

Your adhikaranas of what are the main philosophical points and what are the details. And in a logical order, it's establishing just, you know, one after another. So then, that will be by Gita.

Nectar of devotion will be studied according to the works of the acaryas, because they've done

analysis of the nectar of devotion from various, taking various points like that. Isopanised by the Tattva Sutras, you know, with the support of the other literatures. In other words, it reverses.

Does that make sense? You're taking, in the chronological study, then, or like here, you're getting these points from other literatures that support it. Then, so you're studying the chronology of the book with support of other literatures. The other one you're taking, studying from the viewpoint of the other literatures about the book.

Like that. So it becomes an analysis, rather than a chronological. Like that.

So that's what will be the next year. So this time, it is two months that, I mean, of course, it worked if we didn't finish. Then it goes over.

So that worked nicely for at least those who are here. For those who are not here, then it worked less nicely. But so this year runs nicely.

Everything fits in. Next year also runs nicely because everything fits. The third year, then it can fit or not.

Hopefully, because of the experience and understanding, one can deal with much more technical things, greater volume of things in a shorter time. So if that happens, then everything should also fit in. But because there will be introducing, I mean, you're dealing with the Jiva Dharma, which is the like conclusions of all the Vaishnava Siddhanta in story form.

But it deals with everything, all the aspects of Dasamu. So basically, what we're establishing is the Vaishnava theology. You know, in its, you know, the broadest, you know, easier.

I say. Yeah, comprehensive, detailed, comprehensive kind of understanding. So all this we've studied, we know how it fits all together.

Then. Sorry. Yes.

And then there'll be how others view that same philosophy. So the six systems will be there. The your modern philosophies.

Because six systems are Vedic. They follow the Veda. So they're correct up to a point.

And then at some point they get distracted. So they miss. That's why they're considered bogus.

But they're based on the Veda. So. No, no.

That's that's just the six systems means. Yeah. Means the ultimate study of six systems will come in the the seventh, eighth and ninth years because we'll actually study Vedanta Sutra as a support of the Bhagavatam.

So that's what it deals with. This dealing with that Bhakti is the supreme and that there's six

other methods of not thinking that that's the goal. So he deals with all that.

Yes. Yes, they have. They have.

But we'll deal with it. Not this next year, but the year after. It's like that because it means we've dealt with them, but not in context of this course.

They've just been individual studies that they've they've they've been going through. Yeah. And now it'll be in context of here.

So it'll be more developed. Be more clear. Yeah.

We did six times on the website. So then. So that's there.

So another. So you deal with the Vaisnava sadanta directly with the. And then you're dealing with how others see it.

The Vedic, the six systems and the non-Vedic, the the with the touch of a bake, that will deal with all the different varieties of philosophies and religions that are non-Vedic. It also defines the Vedic distractions because the Vedic distractions are the original. Just these others are less informed and more convoluted.

That's all. So instead of six main forms, you end up with about 26 because, you know, like that. Appa Sampradaya's will be in there also.

So that's there. So those two basically just kind of fit the Jiva Dharma. It's a little close.

Then you have the idea was just to go through all the Vedic literatures. Right. In an overview to be able to see their connection, see what their elements are and see their connection, the practical elements, how they're actually used, what's their use and its connection with the Lord.

That makes sense. So you want to see how how these things connect to the Lord and how they were connected to your life and devotional service. Otherwise it becomes a confusion.

That's the idea, because Bhagavatam is already considered. One has already studied all these. One's already studied all these Vedic literatures, the Mahabharata and then done this.

So that's that's the idea. So then we're going. Yes.

Anything that would be good to read from now until September? No. Like that means if you if you have you've already finished this and have nothing to read and when it can sit, then then take the the study and all the Bhagavatam purports on the Gita. Yeah.

Study that and then that will give you basically an honors in this course. But so if you want to keep yourself busy, do that, because the other ones know there's nothing by reading Ayurveda. It's not going to prepare you for it.

I wouldn't bother because it will. It'll make more sense because that's the third year. What I'm saying is the second year is we're going to analyze this now, according to the Vedanta formulas.

So by doing that, then that will make sense. That's why we're doing it again, because otherwise we went through it. But we don't know so much about this technical philosophy.

So we can't go that deeply into it and see the fine points where it exactly goes off. So that's why that's in the third year. So I wouldn't.

You know, is it free to study? I'm just saying it's not essential that one will prepare oneself. Yes. Yes.

That's confusing. Yeah, that's why I'm saying it's I wouldn't I wouldn't bother with it personally. I would just say if you have nothing to do, do that, do this Bhagavatam purports like that.

And do the essays for that? I have two chapters. OK. Yeah.

So I would just do that and contact Ms. Shanti and get the rest of it. If you have something you want something to do, I would I would recommend that. Because now it'll just be this.

But in the future, when it's done around and you make it complete, it'll also include the Chaitanya Chaturvedi purports. So it'll only get bigger. Take advantage now.

It's smaller. What about the sloka books? Have they been given out? No, they've been put back into that form of the Bhagavatam. Oh, OK.

So when it comes there, it's just so that they're familiar with it. It just so you know that these are there where they fit, you know, where they fit in the philosophical. So how to use it.

So it's more of a familiarization. Yes. So what's next is then there are subjects that I would consider would be useful.

In the in the similar perspective, but aren't specifically course material. So one of them is the Vedanta psychology, because that's showing how to get the mind to accept and think in this way that we discussed. Yeah.

Yeah. But it's not a long book. But I think because we've gone through a lot, it would go much quicker.

It would be it would be much quicker to study it. So that I think could go through very nicely and it would work nicely in the time. Another would be to go through and study Nyaya.

But I think that that will be better after we've gotten more used to the logical presentation like that. So I'm kind of thinking that might be better next year. This year.

I mean, that's just the inclination is the. We call it the Vedantic psychology. How many weeks are we looking at now? We're talking, I think, until end of.

We're talking two months. Sometime in. Oh, no, it's machine.

It's a courtesy machine. It's a 2016. Yes.

So then we're talking six weeks. Oh, no. Yeah.

No, that's right. Last year we stopped as soon as. Yeah.

I'd have to see if that'll work. I forgot about. Six.

So that means basically five weeks. Yeah. I mean, the other consideration was to do do these Vedic courses on the Vedic literature.

So during this time and not have them at that time. So they would be required course material. But, you know, someone's here, they can take advantage of someone's not here.

Then they would have to. But it would be stretching it over three years. So we did that.

Then we start with Dharma Shastra because that was the only one that's actually prepared. Yes, a condensed version. Doesn't mean that we're not going to get seriously off track.

See, the problem is, is you get down to the essential points that someone should answer. Ask. I mean, no.

But the questions are always on the points that you cut out to get to the essential. That's the difficulty with it. That's what I found.

So it's always hard to run. So it means you'd have to have some basis in the knowledge to get to the essence. So.

So would there be. Yeah. The psychology is a book that we have to buy.

It was a publication. It's it's a it's a it's an academy publication. So to merge, put it together.

So he got interested in the West and psychology. And so he would go into it and then studied all of the whoever was, you know, you're doing, you know, human. All all those madmen.

And they can't give answers. They can't put it all together. So then he started seeing that what they're missing is in Vedanta.

So then he just went into our philosophy, but understanding what were the elements that they were dealing with and just showed how those are already there. So it becomes a very practical psychological study. Most.

Yeah. If we go into that one, one advantage will be because that will bring out the element of the Sankhya, Shankha, Jumna, Arjuna and Vasudeva. We'll go back to that and then we'll try to bring out greater expansion of that because there's a lot more expansion.

Just it hasn't been developed. Yes, I'm thinking to go with that because we should acquire that. Yeah.

Can I'm I'm thinking just to probably read through it, read and go as we go. Or or we may depend since it's only five weeks. There may be sections that need to be read and then we'll speak on certain points.

It's a small book, but it's still there's a lot of things that it's written taking into consideration the Western psychologists. And so showing different things from them. I'm not as worried about.

In other words, this is not showing how all the things in the modern is there in the Vedic. I'm basically doing it the other way around. So it'd be the same thing, but we'll emphasize on those aspects that are dealing directly with the philosophy and its application on how to deal with the mind, how to control the mind.

So that will be there. It should. It should be.

I think probably should think of copies. So they don't just psychology. Could we change the timing? I can see.

In fact, I'm also thinking of even for. Yeah. We'll check.

Yeah. Yeah. We possibly could.

I can see if that can work. And we could do it in the evening. Problem is, is it's very hot at that time.

Chandan Yatra means it's the hottest time of the year. Generally, that was the reason we stopped evening classes because of it being so hot that, you know, I say the I guess due to the heat, a combination of heat and humidity. It's somehow another creates a vertical challenge.

That's generally what I've seen. So most people always seem to be at some degree of anger. Other than straight up, you know, that matters.

She does good because she's got the pillars. But everybody else kind of like slowly melts. So that was the reason that we had given up.

But we can see if everyone's enthusiastic enough and acclimatized. So then one other point just in consideration and considering also that it might be an advantage for next year. Means the morning class at this time.

But then the next class is redoing 10 to 12. I was thinking possibly to move them from four to six. Oh, that's right.

That's true. I have a place. You're sponsoring.

But it was said that advice is given if one is going to take going to get it done. Otherwise, if we

tuned into every every living room, every garage and every bar in the world, all the world's political, social and economic problems are being solved at every moment by everybody. But at least, you know.

Yeah. Enthusiastic. We're trying to be helpful.

Yes. And that's as opposed to an Xbox. I don't know.

It might be. We may have to go to the next. You have to do further.

Yeah. I'll get back to you. OK.

Yeah. Yeah. No.

Because the thing is, is that the idea was this late enough in the day because lunch, the seconds we used to run this class in the evening before. So it's a good time. It doesn't work.

That's the problem. OK. So it worked during 10 to 12 to Sunday.

OK. Next class will be the Vedanta psychology Monday. It's 20.

Yes. Oh, my. Krishna, Krishna, Krishna, Krishna, Hare Hare.

Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama, Rama, Hare Hare. Shila Prabhupada ki. Samaveda Bhakta Vrinda ki.

Sanitary gold.