

2011-09-15 NOD

Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare, Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare. So we'll begin with the Nectar of Devotion, the thematic study. So this year, then, the classes are taking last year's books, the Bhagavad-gītā, Nectar of Devotion, Īśopaniṣad and Upadeśaṁ, read it, and then studying them by themes.

All right? It's the two methods of studying. Prabhupāda says, first you read the book, then you study the book. All right? So reading means it's read chronologically from beginning to end, so you know what the work is and you've respected the complete work.

Then thematic means you're taking what are the main points and connecting them together with the other points in the work, because the points, though they will develop chronologically, they won't be necessarily, I'd say, consecutive right next to each other, because in a conversation, basically you're developing in a cycle. Means the basic fundamental points are made so that you can understand, you know, how to deal with the topic. Then once that's understood, then more detailed information will be given, like this.

And then once that's understood, then again. But you're dealing with, you know, let's say there's five different aspects of the subject. You'll give all the fundamentals of all five.

Then you'll give what's the next step in all five, then the next step in all five, then like this. It'll progress until you get to the end, the conclusion. Then it'll make sense, right? So what in the beginning had to be done as a step-by-step thing, now once you've come to the conclusion, you'll understand the subject matter.

So that's not necessary anymore. Now from, you know, the, how do you say, from the subject, that first part from all different levels, now you can put them all together, right? And you can see them as one thing as opposed to just different parts of the other. Does that make sense? It's not that it's steps and then you've left it.

No, those are just how you'll understand it. But in working, you'll use them all together. Does that make sense? So the thematic study means that you are seeing how to practically apply the subject matter.

Because now you have all the parts now, because the first you're getting, by reading you get an understanding. By the thematic study, then you get a practical ability to apply it, right? So then now with these two, now one can perform manana, right? One can contemplate and practice. Because you understand the whole thing and now you understand how it works.

Does this make sense? Because the Vedic concept of education is that it is, it is always practical. Even though we may say, well, it's an academic element or it's a theological element, there's no such thing as the theology is not practiced, right? We practice that we're not the body, right?

We practice that we're servant of Krishna or we're not supposed to be attached to the results, right? This is all part of the theology. Does it make sense? But it's a practice.

It's not just a knowledge. So in the Western Academy, they have to, some do, some don't. They distinguish between practical and academic, how do you say? Yes, studies.

Like let's say you can have, you can be a doctor of law, but you're not actually authorized or qualified to be qualified to practice it in court. It just means you've academically gone into it, know everything about it and the history of it and who made what law where and why and what his grandmother said and you know, all these different things. But you don't know how to apply it, right? But then someone who studies law to become a lawyer, it's a different course.

Does that make sense? So you have these two separate things. So does that make sense? Those are academic so that they're seen in a good light. Then they'll have the practical things.

Okay, you're learning, you know, mechanics or something. And so then you'll, that'll be seen as a non-academic degree, right? Though it's a course of study, right? So that's generally where they see, okay, there's that. But anything academic is seen as not necessarily practical.

But the Vedic, academic and practical, they have to go together. There's no question that they don't. Otherwise, why would you waste your time? Does that make sense? So the Vedic concept is, is you study it and then you can teach it.

It's, yeah. So in the Vedic, in the Western, you'll have the element that someone knows the subject, but they may not be able to teach, right? Like that. So then they get the qualification that they're able to teach, right? And the interesting thing is previously that used to be given by the church.

The church used to authorize who was a teacher and who's not. Though the, the academy may have been secular, but still the church had to authorize who teachers were, right? Because there was the concept that they had to have an understanding of the theology and be committed to the practice of it, right? Then you could be a teacher. But with time and that, that it was separated.

So then, then the state authorizes. So it's just who knows the subject matter. You don't have to have an effect on the people's lives.

Does that make sense? So in the Vedic, though someone knows the subject matter they can teach, but the distinction is made in levels of teachers based on how much they affect the life of the student, right? Someone who just teaches you the subject matter. And so you know it, so you can practice it. So it's practical, as we said before, so it'll always be practical.

But it may not adjust your life. But someone who can show you how that comes in contact with Kṛṣṇa, how to apply it in your life, as opposed to occupation, is as part of your āśrama, as part of your sādhana, right? Then that's considered a higher teacher. Does this make sense? Like

that.

So the Vedic means you have these concepts in the modern academy, but they're getting more and more distant, like that. Previously it was much more, there was more of a similarity, you know, knowledge is knowledge, and a teacher's a teacher, a student's a student. But now with time it's more and more getting where it's less and less able to identify, right? So here, this is then the thematic study of the main points from the Nectar of Devotion, right? Means to get all the details you have to read chronologically.

But in the thematic you go through what are major, major points. Then those are brought out. So here we've taken from the works of the ācāryas on when they've written books on Nectar of Devotion, they've taken a specific theme.

And then their whole book is about that one point, right? So then we'll go through that. So here then six different main topics have been selected. The definition of pure devotional service is one.

Then guru-parāśraya, accepting the lotus feet of the bona fide spiritual master, is the second. The third, development from śraddha to prema. Fourth is the nine limbs of bhakti.

Fifth is the ten offenses against the holy name. And sixth is the six principles of surrender. So from that then different ācāryas in that have written works that are taking from a verse from the Nectar of Devotion.

And then they expand on that. Yes? The later studies Prabhupāda didn't give within this mandala as such. As it is now, we have it worked into the Bhakti-sarvabhauma, because there it's talking about bhava and all these different levels.

So at that point, because Caitanya-caritamṛta, that's the one thing it's bringing out, is that aspect of rasa. And so they'll be studied there. So many of these same books will be studied, but then in context of the last chapters.

Means the first chapter is defining basically devotional service in the first five chapters, and then the practice of it in the next chapters. So that would take one from the Vaidya-sādhana to spontaneous devotional service, to bhava, and then to prema. Does that make sense? So then, OK.

Definition of pure devotional service. In Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu, 1.1.11, Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī defines pure devotional service as follows. anyābhiyālāsita-śūnyam jñāna-karmadya-nāvṛttam anakulyena kṛṣṇānu-śīlaṇaṁ bhaktir uttamaḥ When first-class devotional service develops, one must be devoid of all material desires, knowledge obtained by monistic philosophy and fruitive action.

The devotee must constantly serve Kṛṣṇa favorably, as Kṛṣṇa desires. So this is the root verse. And then from that, then so many other works have been given by the ācāryas that are defining

or expanding on this verse.

We also see here... I have to learn all this. I see. Yeah, yeah.

It's just like when you have the auctions. The one guy clicks his teeth, the other guy does his hat, and the other guy, you know. I like that.

So you have to catch, you know, how they... Okay, he's got a question. So here is... Now, this is then nectar of devotion. It's the science of devotional service, right? Now, Bhāgavad-gītā has also given the science, but it's specifically from the tattva aspect of understanding who you are, you know, who God is, what's your relationship, material world, you know, why you're here, you know, why you shouldn't be here, you know, how you'll get out of here, what will be the result of getting out, right? So in there, then we see is that Kṛṣṇa has defined devotional service in the first chapters, and then after defining devotional service, then he talks about pure devotional service, right? Does that make sense? So then in the pure devotional service, then he... It is taking on a different flavor that karma and jñāna, it must be free from karma and jñāna.

He spent the first six chapters of Gītā explaining how to use karma connected to Kṛṣṇa and how to use jñāna connected to Kṛṣṇa, like that. Then... Are we making more books, or is that some... PRABHUPĀDA Okay, okay. And so then, yes, how karma can be connected to Kṛṣṇa, how jñāna can be connected to Kṛṣṇa, you know, and how you can progress that way.

But then he gets into pure devotional service. It's free from karma and jñāna. So it means it's not starting with karma and jñāna, it's starting with devotional service, and therefore you may engage your activities, karma, or your intelligence and senses, jñāna.

You understand? Like that, yes. Yes, because here he is mentioning first-class devotional service, so he's meaning pure. So that'll be kevalam.

So it means, in other words, it's devoid of any material considerations, no material desire, because desire means then there'll be a need. Because the result, if it's for Kṛṣṇa, that means you can't want the result. So if you are not going to want the result, means you can't have a desire for it, right? Because desire turns into need.

Like, I can desire something and not need it, right? But if I need it, desire automatically is there. So desire is the first stage, right? So if there's no desire, means from sambandha, then that means there'll be no karma and jñāna because that's your identity, right? Because in sambandha you'll identify as a karmī or a jñāna. I'm an intelligent person or I'm a, you know, fruit of work or all like this.

Okay, does that make sense? And so then you can tell what are the conditionings. But here he's saying first-class doesn't have this, right? And then the devotee must serve Kṛṣṇa favorably as Kṛṣṇa desires, right? So then you're going through these stages that we were saying is that you're conscious of Kṛṣṇa, then you're, it's favorable to Kṛṣṇa as He likes it, right? And then it is free from karma and jñāna. So it has to have all these elements.

So we see in the Gītā, you know, it is defined by the nectar of devotion. The nectar of devotion and all the technical points are given in the Bhagavad-gītā. Like how to find them and find them.

Nectar of devotion is telling that they're there. Gītā is going into the analyzation of how to find them. Yes.

So jñāna has to get rid of the need. You have to, no, no. The need, the point is, is need remains, but the need's not for yourself.

The need is to do it for Kṛṣṇa. Means, that means, this was what we were discussing in the Vedic psychology. There's this idea, it's a monistic idea, that spiritual, it means I advance spiritually, I get rid of desire and need.

Right? Sound, like if I said that, now you, we've taken up Kṛṣṇa conscious, so we must get rid of all, all desire and all attachments, right? And then, then we'll be able to advance in devotional service. Then we can come to the highest platform. Right? Would anybody blink an eye? Good chance no.

Right? But actually what I've just said is actually Māyāvāda philosophy. Right? Because you, there's no question you can separate the living entity from desire. That's the symptom of life, is desire.

Right? The table doesn't have a desire. Right? Does that make sense? But the bug on the table has a desire. That's why it's on the table.

Does that make sense? But the point is, is that material desire, you know, karma, connected by karma and jñāna, and therefore material need or attachments that are based on karma and jñāna, that's what has to be given up. Right? So that's why it says one must be devoid of all material desires. He doesn't say desire.

Māyāvādīs will say all desire. No, all material desire. Right? And must be free from karma and jñāna.

That means it's free from the fruit of desire and desire for liberation. It doesn't mean it gets rid of the action or engagement of the senses. This is where, again, we make mistake.

Does that make sense? So it's very specific what's devotional service. Is that a, does that make sense? Yeah. So this is something very, very important.

If we catch that, it makes devotional service and the philosophy so much easier. Because then we don't get distracted by what we think is material and what we think is spiritual. Spiritual is not, not material.

Right? Spiritual is the natural state. When we're not acting spiritually, then it's material. So spiritual has senses and activities and desires and needs, but they're all connected to the Lord.

They're all, right? Material means they're not connected to the Lord. That's the only difference. Right? One eats, you know, connected to Kṛṣṇa.

Or one eats and it's not connected to Kṛṣṇa. The eating process is the same. But we, we may make the mistake that spiritual means eating process changes.

Right? Before I used to pick it up, put it in my mouth, and now, you know, we must become innocent and go back to our roots, free from all, you know, this material absorption. So like a baby, we just kind of smear it all over ourselves. And that's the real way of eating.

But then, because we come up and we get all these, how do you say, concepts of status, you know, and all, and social norms that are made by materialistic persons, then we have this understanding we have to put food in our mouth and not spill it all over ourselves. But the children, being innocent, are free from all these misconceptions. Right? Isn't it? You could go into a seminar and talk all this stuff to the karmic, and they might go, wow, yeah.

Huh? Yeah, they'd think, wow, this is, you know. So we have to get back to our roots, back to that innocence. Does that make sense? So here, so this is the foundational point.

But now we're studying from the angle of the mind and how we're going to apply that in our life in devotion, practically. Right? Well, the Gītā is showing from the intellect that we're able to discern the difference. And so, therefore, not get entangled in the material.

And while Vector of Devotion is showing how not being entangled, now we're going to engage in the spiritual. Right? Does that make sense? But it's not you have to do the one and then the other. They go simultaneously.

Right? Because action remains. Identity remains. Need remains.

It's just all you're doing is redefining. Yes? So the platform of the mind means two? Mind means that you're actually engaged in something. Does that make sense? Already accepted.

Basically, yeah. You could say. Gītā will explain that, but it's more on the intelligence side.

That's why Kṛṣṇa says someone who studies Gītā is worshipping Me with his intelligence. Right? Does that make sense? So that that's been accepted by the mind. Now we're dealing with the mind that's controlled by intelligence rather than a intelligence that's controlled by the mind.

So that's been accepted. Then you can take this up. Right? Does that make sense? Because one could be not a devotee and study Gītā as long as he has the spirit that, OK, I'll at least theoretically accept that I'm the soul, God supreme, and I am subservient to God and his laws.

Then you can start studying Gītā. But Nectar of Devotion, it right in the introduction points out, if you're not a devotee, don't even bother. It's like close the book now before you get yourself in trouble.

Right? You know? Step away from the book. Like that. Does that make sense? Put the book where we can see it.

Step away from the book. Like that. OK.

Summary of the first chapter of Bhakti-tattva-viveka by Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura, entitled The Intrinsic Nature of Devotion. The foremost duty of all Vaiṣṇavas is to understand the true nature of śrūdha-bhakti. This understanding will benefit us in two ways.

First it will make our human life successful by allowing us to relish the nectar derived from śrūdha-bhakti. Secondly, it will save us from the polluted and mixed ideas about śrūdha-bhakti, which are prominent in society. Right? So understanding pure devotional service is actually the point of human life.

Right? So we're saying, ātāto brahma jijñāsā, inquire into what is supreme. Who are we? What is Brahman? And what's the relationship? And now it's the actual pure devotion is the full, you could say, definition of Brahman. Right? Because you have Brahman, Paramātmā, Bhagavān.

So the highest understanding of transcendence is Bhagavān. So that means there is exchange. So that's the devotion.

Right? Does that make sense? And so from that, you'll get the taste from that, because that's the natural stage. Because why do people engage in śrūdha-bhakti? They want taste. They're not doing it because they love the miseries that come with it.

You know, so you know, why is it you work, say, you know, 16 hours a day, you know, job, you're always working there. Oh, I just love to be miserable and away from the family and, you know, all the time and all that, you know, co-workers harassing, boss harassing like that. And that's, you know, no.

You know, it's because they get a taste from it that they get money, they get facility, they get all that. That's why they do it. So it's a taste.

That's why they're fruitive. Why is the Māyāvādī so determined in his pursuance of, you know, monism? He doesn't want the misery, but then if we look at it in the same concept, there's a taste for not having material misery. Right? In other words, one is supposedly material happiness, trying to avoid the misery, you know, just ignoring it.

The other one is trying to avoid the misery by not engaging in the activities and that not having that misery is happiness, because that's actually material happiness. The fruitive worker has a pain that he doesn't have something, and he works very hard and gets it. When he gets that moment's called happiness.

Right? So then the Māyāvādīs have taken another step further, or the personalists have taken it a step further, is that if I get rid of all the endeavor, I get rid of the pain. So therefore, having

removed the pain of material endeavor, you know, of material existence, that removal, that will be called happiness. Though by definition, it will also be a temporary element.

Right? So the real happiness is positive that's in connection with devotional service. So he's pointing out here is, therefore, that will be the first benefit. The second will be you won't be bothered by the material world.

Right? Because you're only bothered by the material world because you're engaging in these two lower tastes for karma and jñāna. But if you have the taste for the higher, for devotional service, then you will, you know, not be bothered by the miseries that come from the lower taste. Does this make sense? Yeah? These, and it says, which are prominent in society.

These polluted and mixed ideas that are prominent in society. In other words, we can see the ācāryas aren't really worried what's prominent in society. What's prominent doesn't mean that it's right.

According to, is it the sophists that their thing is, is Vox Populi? Or it's just the general thing. Whatever it is, it was a Greek idea. Vox Populi is whatever, whatever is the public says is good or true, that, that becomes fact.

But the ācāryas actually couldn't care less about that. Means dealing socially, of course, you worry about those things that you deal properly according to social custom that people will be pleased. But you yourself personally couldn't care less.

Does that make sense? You know, it's just like for the adult, there's not a important need for him to talk, you know, simple language, you know, of a child. But when you're talking to a child, you have to use simple language. So it's what you do, but it's not your need.

Does that make sense? So there's a difference. But in the modern society, they make because of Vox Populi, that's what everyone does. That's true.

So I should be truthful, you know, and I should be good. So that's what I should be doing. So they actually take it, take it on board, right? As, as their actual lifestyle.

Does that make sense? But we see the ācāryas don't care for that. So if you're interested in spiritual life, you can't worry about those things. Because that's means giving up karma and karma means all the social and fruitive elements.

Yā means all the philosophical speculation. These polluted and mixed concepts are our greatest enemy. When people speak directly against the principles of bhakti, they can be easily recognized and avoided.

But those who seemingly accept bhagavad-bhakti as the highest dharma, and at the same time behave and teach against its principles can easily harm us, right? If somebody's just saying, oh, you hikers, you're all nonsense, and this, or, you know, religion, oh, that's, that's for, you know,

people who are, you know, less intelligent. All these, it's obvious. But when people are talking about devotional service, and then, how you say, it's mixed with karma and yāna, that's, that's dangerous, right? So then the idea of studying the sciences is to be able to discern between what's real bhakti and real philosophy and what's not.

Therefore with great care, the previous ācāryas have defined the intrinsic nature of bhakti and have repeatedly warned us against polluted and mixed concepts that exist in the name of śruta-bhakti. So intrinsic means it can't be changed. So it's not an opinion, right? Some people might try to say, well, that's your opinion.

It doesn't matter, you know, or, oh, yes, we'll agree to disagree. No, that doesn't fly. You know, it means, you know, we disagree because there's a problem.

What you're discussing has nothing to do with devotional service, or it's a low level of devotional service, when in this situation we have an opportunity for higher devotional service. So therefore we don't agree to disagree, right? You know, we understand we disagree, and that's your opinion, fine, right? But it's not going to, we can't put them on equal level. Your material concept and the concept of the ācāryas, this is, are the definite, we're not going to accept that as equal.

Does that make sense? Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī defines śruta-bhakti as follows. anyābhilāṣita-śūnyam jñāna-karmādy-anāvṛtam anukulyena kṛṣṇānu-śīlaṇaṁ bhaktir uttamaḥ When first-class devotional service develops, one may be devoid of all material desires. Knowledge obtained by monistic philosophy and fruitive action.

The devotee must constantly serve Kṛṣṇa favorably, as Kṛṣṇa desires. Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Madhya-līlā, 19, 167. In the above definition, each and every word should be analyzed.

Otherwise, we cannot understand the attributes of bhakti. The words uttama-bhakti refer to bhakti which is free of any contamination, adulteration, or attachment to material possessions, and which is performed in an exclusive manner. By the usage of the qualifying adjective uttama, Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī indicates that usually people practice misra-bhakti.

So bhakti means is that, you know, okay, there's the element that the result is for Kṛṣṇa, but whether that result being for Kṛṣṇa, we have a part of it there also, then that's the meaning of mixed. It means devotion because it's for Kṛṣṇa, but mixed means is that we have some, let's say, investment in the result for ourselves that's either coming from karma-jñāna or both, right? That's the meaning. So uttama means it's free from that.

The śrutlakṣaṇa, or primary characteristics of uttama-bhakti are anukulyena kṛṣṇaṁ śīlaṇaṁ, right? So śrutlakṣaṇa means that's the form of it. That's not going to change. So it will be manifest.

You can see that. Other aspects, other lakṣaṇas may come and go according to the situation, right? You know, just like humility is a lakṣaṇa of a devotee, right? But the śrutlakṣaṇa is that

dependence on Kṛṣṇa, the surrender to Kṛṣṇa, right? So someone like Bhima is saying, you may not see humility, but his dependence on Kṛṣṇa, you'll always see. Does that make sense? So the śrutlakṣaṇa means it's always the observable one.

It's always the inherent one, yes. Other terms? Yes, that I know of. Uttama-bhakti, sudha-bhakti.

Same time, you can say, I would even say here is that it's taking it a little bit further, is that you have the element that there's a slight overlap, that uttama-bhakti will also infer that one is not on the... There is no material contamination. So what it could be, you know, more clearly meaning one has come to the uttama platform, you know, that of bhava-bhakti and on, right? So that's the uttama-adhikārī. So there's no as such material conditioning.

So technically there's no karma and jñāna mixed there. But there may be... And so that's also the time when he says anartha-nivṛtti, it's complete. Then that's actually when it's complete, when one comes to the stage of bhava, because one is performing devotional service not with the material body, but with one's natural sarupa.

Does that make sense? The same time as you have an overlap is that the madhyamādhikārī, because they have crossed also over the major aspect of anartha. So the anarthas are on the wane, you know, that means that the bulk is that it's workable, right? You can deal with it. It's not overwhelming.

So they become fixed in devotional service. So the bhajana-kriya is niṣṭa instead of like the neophyte aniṣṭa, right? So there also one can call it śuddha-bhakti, pure devotional service. But at the same time as one's engaging, one's comfortable to engage one's particular conditioned nature in Kṛṣṇa's service.

So it's not specifically starting with the element of the service to Kṛṣṇa and then coming back to your position. You're just engaging your position, but the result is for Kṛṣṇa. You don't have a desire for karma-jñāna from it.

You're just comfortable with the methods of karma-jñāna that you are conditioned to. Does that make sense? So the neophyte, generally speaking, the result is mixed. The madhyamā, the result's not mixed, but it has that element of that, you know, the situation one may prefer.

So it's not on the uttama, the best platform, the topmost platform, but it's still considered śuddha-bhakti, right? So someone fixed in devotional service, steady, like that, a preacher, is actually a pure devotee. Does that make sense? Like that. Then you have the uttama, then it takes it into there.

Just like Kṛṣṇa has defined the devotional process, brings it up, and then He, the kevala-bhakti and all this, at the same time as then He takes it to the sarva-dharma-parityaja, is that even within pure devotion there are also these levels. Just like in bhava, though it's not conditioned, there's still, one's not conditioned to a specific nature, but one may still have the shortcoming that one hasn't, is not manifesting one's relationship with Kṛṣṇa through the expression of

prema. Right? So there may still be the elements of being comfortable with the situation of bhava.

Does that make sense? The situation is the liberated platform, right? But because you're performing devotional service, then ecstasy is starting to grow. Does that make sense? Like here you're situated in the material world, material existence, right? Like the temporariness, I'm the body, everything connected with the body is myself. Does that make sense? Then bhava means you're situated on the transcendental platform, on the Brahman platform.

So you're not on the material, but the actual, technically the spiritual, what the definition between the two is, it's all for Kṛṣṇa or it's for yourself. Right? The activity is the same. So even on the liberated platform, the activity is actually still the same.

Does it make sense? But you're developing that taste, right? It's very dynamic. That's why it's called ecstasy, right? There's no material things to get in the way of its manifestation. But one has not necessarily fully committed in such a dynamic, as dynamics it should be, to the platform of that pure unalloyed devotion.

Right? Does that make sense? So, so that bhava is where that becomes, that's the middle ground for that change. Does that make sense? So it's just like you have the kīṣṭa and the uttama and the madhyama is like in between. They're situated in between, right? So they're not actually really, they're not acting according to the material, but at the same time as they're not situated like on the fully, on the spiritual.

It's fully spiritualized, but it's not. Does that make sense? So in the same way bhava is in between material conditioning and prema. Does that make sense? So that's why when the ācāryas are defining it, they'll be defining something that it works in the conditioned state, it also works in the liberated state.

The same definition is for both. And in the conditioned state, it's also for vaiṭṭi or rāga. Right? Does that make sense? So that's why Rūpa Gosvāmī will explain one thing and then somebody will be talking about it in connection with bhava, someone else is talking about it in connection with vaiṭṭi, someone else in rāga, like this.

Because it actually means all three. Because the method's the same. Does that make sense? The method's still the same.

Yes, if it's there. But here it's just saying that the best is that. But so that means that the best is going to be there is no karma and jñāna.

But if you're conditioned by karma and jñāna and that's not, that's not, how do you say, practical, then you're going to take your karma and jñāna and connect it to Kṛṣṇa. So that's what, that's what's being explained. So the vaiṭṭi sādhanā allows that.

But the purpose of it's not to be comfortable that that's good enough. The purpose is to get to

the platform of uttama-bhakti. Does that make sense? That's why we don't rationalize.

Even if one is rightly situated, you don't rationalize it's good enough. Because pure unalloyed devotional service, now we're talking. You know, and then from, and that's, that's prema.

Right? And then, you know, once you're on that platform, then there's, you know, a few more stages you can go through, you know, like that. Prema is number two. Mahābhāva is number ten.

Like that. So there's always room for development, right? Yeah, because half, if you see it, but I would even have a tendency to take it even a step further than half empty or half full. Because the half empty, the person who it's half empty, they're not going to fill it because it's half empty.

There's a fault. You know, oh, it's half empty. So, I mean, oh, we've got this much.

Oh, what does it matter? It's half empty. So it's not full. It's not this, that.

So they're not attempting to fill it. Right? And the person says, no, but you have to look at it. It's half full.

So look at the positive and be inspired. But they're not trying to fill it either. But the real point is, you know, you're inspired because it's half full.

So you're halfway there to making it full. But you understand, in fact, it is still half empty. That's why it's not full.

If it was, if it was full, it wouldn't be half empty. So therefore, you make the endeavor. You're inspired by knowing it's half full.

But you make the endeavor because it's half empty. You understand? So it's just like the teaching methods of the monkey or the cat. They're both the methods, but we use the combination of the man and the well, and he's throwing a rope.

So like the cat, you're pulling. But like the monkey, he has to hold on. Does that make sense? So there's always that element.

So because we like to always turn them in by our conditioning, we always like to turn it into a duality or you can say dichotomy. Is it this or is it that means that they can't work together? You know, is it hot or is it cold? You know, what happens if it's in a place that's not hot or cold? Tends to dichotomize coming from passion. Yeah, I would say.

Because passion is especially the opposites. You know, you want something and so you suffer the most. A person in ignorance doesn't actually suffer that much.

A person in passion suffers more. The person in ignorance, he can kind of go and stay at the, you know, cheapo hotel and all that. It doesn't bother him too much.

Okay, if there's too many cockroaches, okay, it's a little bit of annoyance. But that there might be some cockroaches there is not a, you know, ideal killer there, you know. The person who's in passion, he has to enjoy himself.

He needs a fancy hotel. Then if there's even one cockroach, it's a total freak out. You understand? Because it gets so much in the way of their enjoy.

So the extremes are much more. The person in ignorance is nothing. The person in goodness, then there's also less extreme.

You know, it's ideal, that's clean. But if it's not, and this is all we got, this is what we put up with. Does that make sense? So the person in goodness, the person in ignorance, they're the ones that aren't suffering so much.

That's why it says the fool in the Paramahansa, they're not suffering in the material world. It's the person in the middle who is, right? Yes. Dualism.

True. Yeah. True.

Is that you could say there's the inherently that we don't see things connected to Krishna. So we see it as dual. That's an interesting thing, because we're always so strong against the Mayavadi who say it's all one.

But we'll make the point very strongly that God and his energies, he's non-dual. So there's no difference between Krishna, Paramatma, and Brahman. Right? So even though the Mayavadi say it's all one, they're very specific to say the absolute truth and this manifestation are two different things.

But if everything's all one, the illusion is also part of the oneness. So if all there is is Brahman, then this illusion is also Brahman. You understand? But they don't say that.

So you could also say that it comes from the duality of seeing the material world as separate from Krishna. Yes. For preaching, then you're using that.

But for your own personal development, unless you understand the cup's half empty, you won't progress. Yeah. I'm forward.

It's already halfway there, so let's continue and do that. Or it's half empty, so since the goal is that, I should... Because, yeah, because Baladeva's pointing out anything. He emphasizes this word.

I'm sure it'll come up here. It's the iti. And here comes out anyabhilashita, the iti there, means anything connected to the unalloyed bhakti.

Is that, so even you're attempting to take up the process, the newest person taking up the process, it's connected to pure devotional service because that's the goal. So therefore it's

connected. So even though it may be very mixed, it's still connected.

So therefore it's progressive. It's good. It'll be counted as bhakti.

Right? But Viswanath points out that because this is our definition, therefore prema is actually the beginning of bhakti. So that we don't progress a little bit. We've been around three months and now we're the big devotee in advance and then the new guy has just walked in the door.

And so, you know, we don't know. So you've still got a little ways to go like that. Does that make sense? So between the two, then you do.

But for preaching, the preaching then you'll see is that Baladeva's is very proper, you know, mentioned his commentary because that will give that element of not pointing out the downside too strongly. You make awareness, but you don't overemphasize. Viswanath also doesn't overemphasize, but he'll just take that angle.

It's not that. Therefore, this is what you do to get to the thing. And Baladeva's taking is that, you know, OK, it's all missing, but we've done this much, so let's continue.

You understand? It's saying the same thing, but there's slightly different flavor. Right? Does that make sense? So there's no contradiction between the two like that. So we may, if we're looking at the form, we may find that it's a difference, but it actually isn't like that, because we always remember form is serving the principle.

So the principle is always one. It may take different forms. So that doesn't matter.

Does that make sense? You know, it's just like Bhaktisiddhanta Saraswati Thakur established Mats, right? His, of course, is only brahmacharis and sannyasis, the communities outside. But then the Mats were preached to the community. But the emphasis is on the Mats.

Bhaktivinoda Thakur is just emphasizing community. He doesn't bother with temples and all temple life and everything like that. You know, so they used to joke with each other, you know, calling them Vishayi or, you know, stuff like this, you know, you just attach grihasta, you know, like that.

So then, but then Srila Prabhupada didn't establish Mats, he established temples, right? He started to establish a Mats, but then I think when Jatarani came along, it became obvious that that's not going to work, you know. So then he established temples, right? And then we're thinking that's so fanatic, so we try to go back to communities. But at the expense of destroying the temple, and especially the element of Mats, and just the community on its own is going to go on, but where is the leading preacher like Bhaktivinoda Thakur? Because in getting rid of the Mats, then you also get rid of, and the temple, you get rid of authority.

You know, so the funny part is Prabhupada's the one who made it accessible so easily to grihastas, that they could live the life that the Mats is. So he's actually the liberal one, and we'll

take it that he's the fanatic one. So this is the fun part of the mixed devotional service, because we come up with all kinds of misunderstandings.

So we're trying to, but where's the center? So Bhaktivedanta says that the Mats was the center if you want it on an organized level. But if it's just on the individual taking it up in himself, you just have to have, you have to start with some prominent preacher, and then others will come, and then everybody will preach, and then it expands. But that means everybody's convinced and committed to it.

But the modern thing is how to not be so committed, but get the nomenclature that I'm the pure devotee, the recognition, the social status, which is all karma. And Bhaktivedanta is like, we're a temple, you want this, move into the temple. You don't want this, live in the community.

So it's very clear. You have material desire, no problem. But now we're trying to say, yes, having material desire is no problem, but that you are saying that it's mixed, that's a problem.

We want you to call it pure devotional service, because everything's equal, everything's one, because we're all Mayavadis here. Do you understand? No, there's a difference. But the point is, because there's a difference doesn't mean there's exploitation, because in the non-Vedic environment, unless it really impresses renunciation and higher subtle values than that, like Buddhism, then non-Vedic means exploitation.

You will exploit, if given the opportunity. So therefore, you're exploited by someone in the position of power authority, with money or knowledge. So therefore, you cut that out and make everybody equal, then supposedly now everything will be wonderful.

You get rid of the exploitation. No, but the only point is, the common person will exploit more than the trained person, even though he may be in a position and he's exploiting. But the common person will exploit more, because he doesn't have the elements of certain culture to regulate it to some degree.

Does that make sense? The Srubh Laksana or primary characteristics of uttama-bhakti are anakulyena krsna-anusilena, the cultivation of activities which are meant exclusively for the pleasure of Sri Krsna. So here is the word exclusively is for Krsna. It means, it may be for the pleasure of Krsna, but it's also for ours.

So he's saying exclusively. In his commentary on Bhakti-rasamrta-sindhu, Srila Jiva Gosvami has explained that the word anusilena has two meanings. First, it means cultivation through the endeavors to engage and disengage one's body, mind, and words.

Second, it means cultivation towards the object of our affection through manasi-bhava, the sentiments of the heart and mind. So anusilena here, cultivation through endeavors to engage and disengage one's body, mind, and words. So engage in devotional process to disengage in the material process.

And then the sentiment will be then connected like that, because that's what makes it dynamic. Because we may be doing it as this is the rules, this is the right thing. So the body's engaged, the mind's engaged, the words and activities are engaged.

But still, that full commitment, because the mind can accept, OK, it's good to do this activity. But you may be arguing with yourself about doing it, or the opportunity comes up, and you kind of, well, try now, or maybe later. You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? You're standing there, and the Haryana party's going by in the distance, and you can see the deities there, but you were just doing something.

So should I offer my obeisances now? Because Rupa Goswami says, when you see the deity go out, you should offer obeisances. But I'm doing this for Krishna, so should I finish that and then offer? Or I'll wait till they get closer? All this means that we're not talking about the manasi-bhava, meaning the heart and the mind. It hasn't come naturally, spontaneously.

So it means one can disengage from the material, engage in the spiritual, and then there's the other element of the heart and the feelings following that. But the point is you have to start with the activity. Then the feelings follow.

The sahajiyas means they're going to say, you just do the feelings and all that. But he says here, Jiva Goswami says there's two points. The sahajiyas only accept the one.

That's what makes them sahajiyas. They're very important, because as we go here through this Nectar of Devotion, Upadesa Amrita, in this year, then we'll start to see things that are getting on the edge of, we're not sure, we've always thought that this is sahajiya stuff. No, but this is just normal philosophy.

And then also in the third year you'll see even more fine points like this. So in other words, we have to be able to discern between what's real and what's not like that. When the two are combined in a proper balance, then that's the Anushila.

But if they're not, then that becomes the mixed with karma jnan, and so it becomes the Mayavada or the sahajiya. No, no, it means, because what we were saying before about what Balade is pointing out, that these elements that we will attribute to the advanced levels of devotional service, they're inherent, intrinsic in devotional service. So when we say it's mixed, it doesn't mean the intrinsic element is not there.

But what we have to do is see what is mixed. The problem is what's mixed in it. Like you have some milk, right? And you have some poison.

The problem's not the milk, the problem is the poison. So the milk is inherently still milk, but it's got this mix. So you have to be able to identify poison.

Therefore you have to be able to avoid that. Does that make sense? So therefore, that the person has taken up the devotional process, saw the devotees in Haryana, was interested and

wants to know more. But the devotees are connected to Krishna, so he wants to know more about Krishna.

So it actually is progressive. But there may be the element is that he's interested in anything. If some Buddhist walked by, he'd want to know about them, too.

Or some African tribals walked by, and you'd go, wow, where are these guys going? You know what I'm saying? But it's connected to Krishna, therefore it's progressive, even though it may be still mixed. So that aspect is there. So that point is you have a spark, fan it.

You can say, well, no, we're talking here about a raging fire. That's just a spark. No, but if you fan the spark, it'll become the fire.

Does that make sense? Yeah, the cultivation. That's why Krishna is giving this, you could say, fluid formula of bhuta yoga, which is the combination of karma, dhyana and dhyana yogas. So depending upon how much of one or the other is prominent, then that is what is practiced.

So if you're more, if the body is more prominent, like that, then the karma is there. The words and the dhyana is more, or the mind and the dhyana is more. Does that make sense? So whichever is there, but it may have its, there may be purposes other than pure devotional service that are there in using those mixes.

But the central point is this devotional service. Right? So it's progressive. As long as you understand what's pure devotional service, if you know what the goal is, then you'll keep moving towards the goal.

If you think just to, okay, go to Mangalati, chant my rounds and, you know, and have a service at the temple and then that's the ultimate goal, then one will stop. And then one, because he thinks that's the end, then you've already done. How do you keep yourself busy? Therefore, you have to fight over that apartment that just became free because that senior devotee was there for years, who used to be the temple president a long time ago, but the new kids that came along didn't want to kick him out because of, you know, the sentiment and all this and that, and he made a lot of trouble, especially his wife.

But, you know, now he's gone, so now it opens it up free. So now who should get it? Now, technically, the temple president before, he got that. So that's why he had it.

Now we have a temple president, but he's not a senior. Some other devotees, and it was a senior devotee who had it. So should the senior devotee, who's the most senior here, get it, or should the actual manager get it? But then, should he really be the manager? And since, you know, my wife says we should get it because we were here longer, so maybe I should become the temple president.

So in other words, this is what starts going on. Because one isn't seeing pure, unalloyed devotion as the goal. It's pure, unalloyed, but not devotion.

We have some experts at that. If you, not the first shed, but the second, and there's piles of grass, and then at the last down there, there's another shed like that. They are experts in this particular phenomenon.

You understand? So it's, yes. Yes, but also cultivating selflessness, you can also make it about yourself. See, that's why Krishna's pointing out in the first six chapters of Gita that this cultivation process, where you're focusing on certain qualities and all those things, you know, being humble or being dutiful or being active instead of lazy or using your intelligence or, you know, focusing the mind or, does that make sense? They're cultivations.

You understand? Then there's doing that for Krishna because there are pious people who, they would be the nicest person you ever met because they're just so well they've cultivated those. But it's still about them that I'm a pious person. That's why I do this.

Yeah, yeah, OK, OK, OK, OK. Yeah, but then you would say is then, then it would be an element of, you know, a righteousness or a feeling of piety or... Yes, humility, tolerance, respect for others. That's where, where you see is it becomes because being humble, that takes, you have to have, you know, knowledge and understanding.

But you could also be humble just because you're insecure. You're tolerant because there's nothing else, but that you respect others. The person who's insecure doesn't respect himself.

How will he respect anyone else? He may be afraid of them, but he's not respecting. So the person who can actually respect others, then their humility and tolerance will be dynamic. And then the next day you don't expect anything for yourself.

So that then you can engage in that pure devotional service. So you can always chant. Problem is, is that these other, these other elements then are symptomatic that there's elements of karma, jnana or other things mixed.

That's why humility is not there. Tolerance is not there. Respect Yeah, you could, you need it all.

But what I'm saying is just the cultivation of giving up the result. That's a practice because means you could do that. It means it doesn't have to be Krishna's that, okay, you know, it's like you're there all alone.

You know, you do what you like, you play in your video games, you got your friends that you want, you go to the movies when you want, you do whatever you want. And now you kind of want to expand. You kind of gotten older and notice that there's, there's, there's another like class of people that dress very differently.

You know, either all of your group has pretty much long hair and this group has shorter hair or you've got shorter, they got longer hair or, you know, there's a difference there. So you want to be involved with them, but you basically want to just take them and add them to your already present world. So when I want to play my video games, I do when I want to do this, I do that.

And when I want to talk to this other person, I do that. But you have to actually give up something that has to be the result of the endeavor has to actually include them in a sense. So there, and then, then, then they get there.

So then they're working out, they've worked it out, they do that, and then they have a child, but now they have to give up all that interact there for the child. So there's always that constant process of giving up, you know, and then the family for, you know, the bigger family than that family for the community, the community for the nation. Does that make sense? It's always going on.

So therefore, you could just be a good person for doing this. You know what I'm saying? So that cultivation in connection with that, it's that, that giving it up has to be connected to Krishna. Does that make sense? Because otherwise, sometimes you hear devotees talking about not being attached or being selfless or working for the, you know, the greater good.

But these are nice things. But a gross materialist who's intelligent talks the same thing. Any pious person will talk that any religious person would talk that.

Does that make sense? So that the difficulty comes is that that's not enough. It's better than being gross, but it's not enough. See, this is where we're saying about the distinction is that we have.

OK, so we have to be selfless here. No, it's not just selfless. The point of being selfless is that it's for Krishna.

Right. You know, that was that was what was being for is that you're engaging, disengaging the body, mind and words, but then the sentiments and all that are coming. You know, so so there's these two things going on at once.

Point is, is as long as the see the result being for Krishna, if this would if it would get the best result for Krishna, then you stick to that, even though that's what Bhaktisiddhanta says, what he gave that address, you know, who, you know, look at that fool sitting on the asana there. Who does he think he is? You know, he's better than the others. He's so puffed up and this and that.

It goes on and on and on because people could observe like that. But he says, no, he says the point is, is the the word and order of the Acharyas. That's the supreme point.

So you're simply representing that so that the glory is not ours. The glory is theirs. So.

So, yes, we will sit here and we will speak all this stuff because this is what, you know, is this is the message of the Lord. So the common person may not even the common person they probably respect, but the so-called intellectual will see that there are, how you say, problems because, you know, he thinks he's special or outstanding or he's better than others. But it's not that it's that the order of Krishna is better.

So there's that at the same time, because you're working in a social environment that the specifics that you're dealing should be according to the audience. So it's not just you can say whatever you want. You know, if you're talking to if you're giving a class to the community, then you might talk about, you know, relationships in the community and dealings and all that, you know, and then you're talking to a group of brahmacharis and they may be talking more about, you know, controlling the senses and, you know, these things like that.

So you're speaking according to the audience. So even though you're saying what needs to be said boldly, you also have to consider how is it being absorbed or accepted by the person you're speaking to. Does that make sense like that? So, in other words, this is always going to be what we're looking for.

What's the clear? It's this or it's that. But it'll never be means you can. Yes, it's this or that.

You get those things. But then as you go deeper, then you see that the two are connected and then one becomes confused again. So the idea is that to be able to discriminate these finer points.

So we discriminate this point into two and then each one of those has two points. But it's the same principle as those two major points. Right.

Then they on their own have two and those minor points have the same formula of the division. Does that make sense? So always being able to discriminate. So you get down to what's pure devotional service and how it's applied.

And it's not because of a form. Right. The Sroop Lakshana is the activity purely for Krishna's pleasure.

That's the form. Now, you're including others. You're working on your own development.

That's those are secondary aspects. That's why you'll get so many, you know, Acharyas and their preaching methods are different or their communities are preaching to are different. Right.

Or, you know, you know, present day preachers, they're very different. But that the principal point of surrendering to Krishna is the same. You know, saying it's like, you know, it's there's a broader range joining now.

But let's say in the 60s, 70s, basically you had one group joining, basically hippies. And they were all the same, talk the same language, dress the same. You know, it was all the same.

And as they become devotees in advance, they become more and more different. So you see, as the same as they advance, they're so different from each other because it's a personal process. Does that make sense? But the commitment you see is more and more the same.

Does that make sense? So one has to be able to discriminate those fine points so that one can

see that the Suroop Lakshana is always there. And then other details, then that will be according to their particular nature or taste. So they'll emphasize one thing or another thing.

And this comes from training. Is it because a man? Yes. I mean, it'll not.

Yeah, it'll come. If not, it's also just... Yeah, it means you can tell if it's not, if it's that they're taking on a specifically defined identity, that they've looked at things and said, OK, I'm going to, everyone else is doing this, I'm going to do this, or, you know, something. Or then it has a flavor to it.

You know, they're being the senior man or like that. It has a particular flavor to it than if they're just naturally the senior man. Does that make sense? You know, it's like you have a room full of devotees and then some there have to, like, establish themselves to prove they're senior.

Others walk into the room and even if you don't know who they are, it's very quick and then they find out. You know, either it's obvious or someone else mentions it to them. Does that make sense? They don't have to endeavor for that because they're absorbed with something else.

So it's... Does that make sense? Although anusilana is of two types, the cultivation through manasi-bhava is included in the cultivation through one's activities. Hence, one's activities, ceshta, and one's internal sentiments, bhava, are interdependent and in the end it is ceshta which are concluded to be the sole characteristics of devotion. Right? So here was the fun part.

So we went on that and then we go... You know, you have the engagement of the body, mind, and words. So there's a positive in Krishna's service and the disengagement by taking out of that. So then we'll take, OK, that's there and of course the engagement is higher than the disengagement unless you're disengaged, how do you engage? So they're interdependent, right? Then you take then the mind, the sentiments of the heart and mind.

And then, you know, we'll naturally say, OK, that's the higher point. Then it's pointed out that the heart and mind are automatically engaged, connected to the endeavor, right? Because the endeavor means there's no endeavor unless the mind's involved, right? Unless you have a desire and the need, there won't be an endeavor. So if that endeavor is there, they're automatically included.

OK. So then we think, OK, so automatically included, so we'll just do this, you can drop off that. And then he says, so ultimately it's the endeavor which is the actual soul characteristic.

So that one is endeavoring. In other words, the Srubh Lakshana are the cultivation of activities which are meant exclusively for the pleasure of Krishna. So cultivation means the mind and seeing that it's not connected to the material and that.

But it's the activity. So activity is actually the central point. Yes.

So sometimes we're engaged in activities and we feel like we don't really have the sentiment there. But this is then actually incorrect. No, it may it may not be incorrect.

It just means we have to keep means. See that we have the right mentality and if we keep at it, we keep at it, then it'll come. This is the part we're Manasi Bhava get very disturbed with this word automatic because they'll say, no, it's an endeavor to for the Manasi Bhava.

But our point is, is no, because the endeavor is the Srubh Lakshana. If you endeavor with the proper understanding what Uttama Bhakti is, it will come. Does that make sense? If if I, you know, because otherwise we say, no, you have to make the ultimately the endeavor, then that means we are the cause.

But if we're not the material cause, we're not the spiritual cause either. Right. We can make the endeavor.

That's what we can do. Right. So the the instrumental cause is what we can do, though we like to call it the supreme controller cause.

You know, that's generally the element. The other other elements are either non-existent or are, you know, we've made the material energy do is no material energy by the Lord's laws converted. We simply made the endeavor.

Right. So we can only assist material nature and material nature is assisting the spiritual nature. Right.

And so therefore, if we want to assist the spiritual nature, you know, be involved in spirit. It's still the matter of assisting. So we'll use the medium of the material, but we're focused on the spiritual.

So the result is spiritual because ultimately Maya is not in Maya. Right. Maya Devi herself is not in Maya.

She's a pure devotee. Right. So therefore, the connection is there.

So it's so it's. Yes. OK.

Yeah. You could say that. Yeah.

The Jesus is. Yeah. Because he is technically expanded from the Chit Shakti and Chit Shakti represents, you know, within the dividing the spiritual potency into three, then the Chit Shakti is the intelligent endeavor.

Right. But it's dependent upon already the Sambandha and the Prayojana being in place. So we're not the Sambandha and the Prayojana.

We're not even technically the endeavor. We're expanded from the endeavor. Right.

So when the Sambandha or Krishna, you know, is then engaged, you know, or has the mood of engagement with the the Prayojana, which is Radharani, then an endeavor can be made between the two of them and we can assist in that endeavor. So that's that's our position. Yeah.

So therefore, we say endeavor because you're going to make the endeavor, but we're endeavoring to assist the endeavor. You know, in other words, Lord Caitanya's preaching mission is going on, headed by Srila Rupa Goswami. We can't.

And then the previous Acharya is down to Srila Prabhupada. And then we have, you know, so many Vaishnavas that are here engaging us so we can endeavor to assist them in their endeavor to assist in the, you know, Prabhupada in serving the previous Acharyas headed by Rupa Goswami, who is serving, you know, assisting Lord Caitanya. So like that.

So the endeavor is the same, but we have to be careful. What is the fine point of endeavor is we're still not the cause of the result. We're the instrumental.

So we're an assistant in in the process of causation. Yeah. True nature.

But also the point is our true nature. But at the same time, is that's even the nature of in the spiritual world. It means it means even the those who are not jivas will think like that because their servant of the servant.

You know, does that make sense? So so they'll see like that. They're cooking something, you know, for Krishna, but it's it's Mother Dashoda is actually the one who's feeding Krishna. So then Radharani can assist Rohini in cooking, you know, in assisting her cooking, in assisting Mother Dashoda cooking for Krishna.

Right. And then Lalita and Vishaka and the others, they're assisting Radharani, the maidservants are assisting them so that that principle is always there. Does that make sense? So they see everything goes back to Krishna.

So even, you know, the cowherd boys are so because they're able to connect themselves to Krishna. So if they can prepare something, you know, and then that's sent out for lunch for them, even as cowherd boys. But they're, you know, doing this and assisting in pastimes with Krishna.

So there's still a system. So there's no. So the exclusivity is that it's for Krishna, not exclusivity, that it's, you know, exclusive means it's just me and Krishna.

Exclusive means it's just for Krishna. Because if it's me and Krishna, that means then there's something else there. It's mixed.

It's just for Krishna. It's unmixed. But it doesn't mean it doesn't have a particular direction or point or a particular taste.

That's where we'll then. OK, well, if it's that, then it doesn't matter what it is. You know, you

should do it.

No. But the point is, everyone has a nature. You know, Mother Dashoda is not not thinking, why wouldn't it be great to go out and play in the dirt with Krishna? You know, she comes out and says, you know, what do you think? You're a street boy out here playing in the dirt and they get inside.

Take your bath. It's time for lunch. You know, so it's it's they each have their taste and it's all part of the bigger.

You know, so all these things together then expand on the whole system of Rasa. So ultimately, the exclusivity is Radha and Krishna. You know, Krishna as the supreme manifestation of Godhead and hers, the supreme manifestation of his energy.

That's actually what everything is. It's all the system that create the variety, you know, the unlimited ways in which they can taste that oneness and difference. You know what I'm saying? Because endeavor comes because of difference.

Right. Why would there be endeavor unless there's a difference? There's a difference between my being hungry and my being full. Right.

So there's an endeavor to create something to eat. You understand. So because of the difference, there's endeavor.

Right. Because of the the mood being one, then therefore you have the common ground in which that endeavor can be made. Otherwise, you know, what is it? What's the connection between the two? You do one thing and, you know, who cares? You know, and the other person does another.

It's like, does that make sense? Yeah. Yes. This understanding of being an assistant.

Isn't this one? Maybe like this whole characteristic. So when would be the endeavor? I mean, to ask this like in 15th chapter we have proof that we are understanding our situation and then just as a. But that's a situation. So endeavor is different than situation.

Only when you actually understand your situation and you understand what that situation can produce. And and then that's the mechanic. And then that that that that situation and what it can produce.

We see that in relation to Krishna. Then there's an endeavor. I'm saying that's why it says cultivation of activities.

So cultivation means you see the situation and the goal. Right. And then you make the endeavor because the quality of the endeavors dependent upon the quality of your understanding, the sambandhan, the priority.

You know, I'm saying this endeavor with this perspective seems to be more like just a sentiment that, OK, I just want to assist in this endeavor. No, but you're doing something. No, but it's but the point is, is it's already been pointed out, is that what what what moves something in this material world? What is the mechanical thing that actually moves something in the material world? The three modes.

OK, so that means you are not. It's sentiment just thinking that you are the supreme controller and enjoyer anyway. And so the alternative is I'm the servant.

So the three modes will control it here. And they some that's on the in your body and you control it there. We can only assist that.

The sense one is reflected the other. Therefore, we can perform spiritual activities through seemingly the modes of nature, because we don't see it. We know that their modes and how they're working, but we're seeing them in connection to Krishna.

So they don't act like modes anymore. They only act as the mechanics of the material inferior energy. But because we see it in relation to Krishna, it actually gives us the result of the mechanics of the spiritual energy.

Does that make sense? So we're always assistant. So that is, yes, that's the monastery Baba. But that is assistant to making the endeavor.

The point being made here is it's the endeavor that we call devotional service. We make that endeavor. So even if you're sitting and just thinking about Krishna, you have to endeavor to think about Krishna.

Does that make sense? OK, the sentiment has to be manifested. The point is, is Rasa is manifested in the environment of Tatva, but Tatva is only defining the actual engagement or manifestation of our exchange of Rasa. Right.

So when Rasa doesn't make sense, therefore, we discuss Tatva. But having discussed Tatva, that's not that that's the top most. It's the element of the Rasa.

But the point is, is Rasa can only be expressed through Tatva. And Tatva's only purpose is to express Rasa. Right.

Means you have a rule. It is only for the purpose of expressing something. But that expression can't be done except through that rule like that.

So they're non-different. But so what's being pointed out here is the endeavor is the primary thing, because the endeavor is actually manifest. It's the real thing, while the moods are unmanifest.

You know what I'm saying? Sambandha and prayojana are actually unmanifest. It's the endeavor that is manifest. Right.

And then it keeps transforming and moving through time until it gets to the point where what result we're looking for is in the present. Because prayojana we're looking for is the goal to get to. So we've gotten.

But the goal becomes the present. So but the problem in the material world is gone from the future. The present will go to the past.

But in the spiritual world, because the goal is Krishna, he's always present. And when you get to that goal that seemingly is time bound, that you obtained it, it's still in the present. And even though it appears it's in the past, Krishna is always in the present.

So you're always in the present. There is only eternal presence in the spiritual world. But there's the flavor of future and past.

You understand? Because endeavor is the actual reality. And so even those who are successful in the material world understand this point. It's the endeavor that makes everything work.

You don't endeavor. You won't get anything. But they, of course, don't see it in relation to Krishna.

So they remain here for all their good intentions. Is that OK? But the quality of the endeavor is measured by the quality of the sentiment. Yes.

Because the sentiment includes your goal, which is based on your desire, your sambandha. So if the sentiment's wrong, then you're endeavoring for the wrong purpose. You understand? Your endeavor won't give the right, the proper result.

So that's the point is the endeavor is based on the emotion. But the point is, where does the past time take place? The gopis are sitting in their little kutirs and meditating on Krishna and he's in his place meditating on them and on that platform. And it's all going.

They're all just feeling the bhava and all that. Right? No, they come out and do things. So that's the point that's being made is endeavor is the thing, because your other so-called intellectuals won't agree.

It's the endeavor. It's the intellectual understanding of that taste, the intellectual taste. That's what's the difference between the Vedic Academy and the modern is that Vedic.

There has to be an endeavor that does something on the modern. The ultimate goal is just the experience of intellectualism. You know, it means there's an endeavor, of course, for that taste.

But ultimately, it's not that that knowledge has to do anything or get anywhere. It doesn't it doesn't really matter because it's the taste. Otherwise, it's just like, yeah, so it's just it's a taste.

And if the taste is gained somewhere else, in other words, if some some intellectual can can bring out the taste in another perspective, everyone will drop the present perspective unless

somebody doesn't have the intellectual qualification, then they'll continue in the old. You know what I'm saying? So it's just the taste that they're looking for. They'll drop it on the spot.

You know, it's not like engineering or something that they have. This is how you build a bridge. And so then someone else comes out with some other far out idea.

They don't accept it unless it actually works. You know, it actually you have to make a bridge and stand up so it'll be based on the same principles. But it may be you've understood finer elements of the principles so you can get away with less stuff or do it in another another approach.

But the principle remains the same. You know, so the mechanics work while the other is just the taste. There is a sense.

Yes. Yes. I would say I would say because like here it says engage and disengage with body, mind and words.

So the mind is where Manasi Bhava is. But there's the there's that L and endeavor to engage. And then there's the mood.

So you're endeavoring to engage the mind, though it has its own mood. But you're cultivating. You're trying to cultivate that mood.

But that mood is for the purpose of the endeavor. So that's that's the thing is ultimately why our philosophy. We can get into these things so easily.

You know, I'm saying, in other words, this kind of discussion that we're having here, if we were in the trees or mud with somebody, it wouldn't be general devotees sitting here. You understand, it would just be the top scholars and sannyasis. That's all that would be sitting there, you know, or maybe some of the mutt brahmacharis.

But that's it. Because because it's it's it doesn't have the element that you can work with two things that are opposed or seemingly opposed at once. Well, we can't because that's the point is that these two things we're always trying to go.

Well, it's this. Well, it's that. No, they both happen at once.

If you can see that they both happen at once. Yes, it is this and it is that. But they're happening at the same time because that's also in the material.

Oh, we mostly say it's this or it's that. And there is a philosophy. It's this and it's that.

But we're not looking at it that it's this and that at the same time. That's what we're trying to get here. That's why it's always these subtleties become confusing, because it's hard to reconcile that they both can happen at once, because we can understand both of them, you know, or we may be inclined towards one and not the other.

But that they both work at once. That's that's what we're trying to appreciate. Right.

So that's the thing is, you can't just like it says, Krishna's energies, you can't separate. But at the same time, you can't. Right.

Krishna's energy means Radha and Krishna. You can't separate. But at the same time, you can't.

You know, Krishna's devotees, the Krishna's creation. You can't separate. But you can't.

You know. So the problem is, is we're so used to dealing with the dead matter. And of that, we're just looking at the Adhyatmik.

No, is it? I think the Adhyatmik, isn't that the demigods and all that? Well, that's no, that's the Adhyatmik. So the Adhyatmik, that's the. OK, yes.

OK, so the Adhyatmik, meaning the body and the forms that we see around us. So they're unaware of the Adhyatmik and the Adhyatmik. So they're just the Adhyatmik.

We're so used to that, that these others seem to us to be impractical. But the Adhyatmik only functions because the Adhyatmik is in, how do you say, interacting with the Adhyatmik. But the medium is the Adhyatmik.

So we don't understand. We think that that medium is actually the factual endeavor, but the actual endeavor is the other. Right.

But the point is, is on the spiritual platform, they're not. It's all non-different because it's not that you have the soul is spiritual and God is spiritual and the material energy is dead matter. It's that the endeavor there also is performed in the spiritual platform with spiritual elements.

Does that make sense? So then there's not a difficulty there. So the endeavor is actually the important element. So that's why for a gross materialist who's successful or at least committed, he's in a better position than the person who's lazy to endeavor.

That's different from the person who's willing to endeavor, but they've lost interest because they don't see any benefit from it, because they've dealt with the material energy and see actually what you get back is not worth it. So they take up a position of inaction. Right.

So they may in this way become a take up the Buddhist or the Mayavad philosophy. But but if they endeavor, they're very committed to it. So if they take up Krishna conscious means once you intellectually convince them of the spiritual and spiritual endeavor, they'll be active.

Or the person who's the karmic, who's very active. Does that make sense? Who will have a problem is the person who's lazy. They have a desire, but they're not willing to work for it.

They'll have the most problem because spiritually you have to work for also. Because you're trying to endeavor to please Krishna. So if you don't make the endeavor, how do you express

your devotion? You know, that's always just the feeling.

It's not the endeavor. No, no. The feeling is expressed through the endeavor.

Otherwise, how do you know? Right. The guys at work and, you know, the reason he's at work is because it is a protection for his family members. Right.

But when he comes home in the evening and he's forgotten that it's their anniversary, even though the mood he has the picture in the wallet, a picture on the desk, he's got his ring on, you know, the whole thing. He's in trouble. Right.

Because his affection wasn't expressed. You know, oh, I'm so busy working and his thing is I'm working for the family. But the point is, is the family are people.

What's the interaction directly with the people? So therefore, the mood has to be manifest. Yeah. Generally, you more get in trouble at the end of the day or the beginning and the middle is generally everybody's distracted.

Once everybody else's endeavor started, then there's less trouble. Right. That's sort of saying is that if you understand this, you can apply it anywhere.

Right. Because the point is, is material is only successful because the Adi Atma is engaged in interacting with the Adi Daiva in the way prescribed by Adi Daiva. So the Adi Bhotik is in the way prescribed by Adi Daiva.

Right. Is this God's laws on what are the forms of this world and how those forms interact? So if the Adi Atma engages in those in the proper way and connects it properly with the Adi Daiva, whether they're conscious of Adi Daiva and Adi Atma or not, they will get the result. But if you're not conscious, you get a material result.

So we'll say that's piety. If you're conscious, you get a spiritual result. Right.

Does that make sense like that? So. So that's that's the the. And then if the Manasi Bhava is correct, then you get the devotion.

Yeah. So. So.

So, yes, it's that that is that's the thing. But that's why we don't actually have so much problem with means we shouldn't have much the time to think, oh, they're gross materialists. You know why we should preach to them.

But the point is, is if they're convinced they'll be very dynamic in Krishna consciousness. But only if they're interested are they going to listen. So you have to look for those opportunities.

So wherever one is and there and therefore wherever one's nature condition nature is, you'll be comfortable to endeavor in that environment of preaching, you know, to that particular group

of persons or in that situations. And so you will look for the opportunity there. You know, I'm saying.

And so you'll find it. And then someone else won't find it there. Yeah.

So that's why that's why the sankirtan mission means all varieties of devotees are engaged for the same purpose of preaching. But they do it in their own own areas. So therefore, it's the complete kirtan.

Everybody's connected to Krishna. So. So that's the thing.

So it's it's the philosophy means success either way. Spiritual material. Our point is, is that we're only pointing because we're so used to the material.

We're pointing out where it works there. But unless it's understood, it only works. It's it's it's actually working because it's connected to the spiritual.

Then we won't get the results. Because unless you're extremely pious, you can't work with material energy without the spiritual understanding and be successful. It's according to your karma.

Does that make sense? But the devotee working beyond karma, therefore, they can work in the pious way with the material energy because of the spiritual endeavor and therefore get nice material results. Does that make sense? But materially, they may not be successful, you know, saying this. Yeah, nothing.

But in the society, there's something very special and look very developed, sophisticated and all that. And when they go back outside, then they just go back to wherever they left off. You know, therefore, there's so much discussion about, you know, including the modern academy in the devotional society, because that way, you know, if you do go back out, then you can go back out to something that you would feel is more glorious for your position.

But the point is, this material is never glorious. And if you want it, you got to work. Unfavorable activities cannot be called bhakti.

Only when the activities of one's body, mind and words are favorably executed for the pleasure of Kṛṣṇa are they called bhakti. For example, Kamsa and Śiśupāla were always endeavoring towards Kṛṣṇa with their body, mind and words, but their endeavors are not accepted as bhakti because they were unfavorable to Kṛṣṇa's pleasure. In the footnote, of course, such endeavors also please the Lord by affording him opportunity to fight and protect his devotees.

Still, it would be absurd to say that demons perform devotional service. Therefore, Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī qualifies this definition with the adjective anukulyena, favorable intention. Thus, śruta-bhakti is not just an activity that incidentally pleases Kṛṣṇa.

It must be intended to please Him. So that's why it's, if we get into the thing, I'm doing the

devotional. I took up this activity because I wanted to please Kṛṣṇa.

And with time, I've just gotten into kind of a, you know, a habit where I just do it, but I'm not actually thinking about Kṛṣṇa or thinking about pleasing Kṛṣṇa. So that my original idea of doing this is to connect it to Kṛṣṇa and please Kṛṣṇa. As long as that result goes to Kṛṣṇa, then it'll still be devotional, but it won't be as dynamic as if one is conscious.

Right. So now that's a devotional activity, like managing the temple or something like that. But the point is, is the element of management that's fallen out of where the result is for Kṛṣṇa.

And it's in the environment that is open for Kṛṣṇa. But our intent in doing it in the immediate is not to please Kṛṣṇa. We're just absorbed in whatever.

Does that make sense? So we're losing some benefit there, like that. But when you're taking the indirect, like you're taking your family and your facilities and seeing that it connected to Kṛṣṇa, as long as you're conscious of it, then the intent is there, then you're getting the benefit. But as soon as the intent is not there, you're not getting the benefit.

That's the advantage of direct devotional activities over the indirect. Is the direct, even if you're not conscious, they still have an effect. Not as much as if the intent is right.

Does that make sense? But the indirect, basically they either connect to the spiritual and you get liberated or you get bound. Right? Does that make sense? In his definition, Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī uses the word *kṛṣṇa* and *viṣṇu*. So that's where we can say is, so when we say, well, the mixed devotional service is not devotional service.

No, but it's called mixed devotional service. It's called devotional service, but it's mixed. Because the intent is to please Kṛṣṇa, but it's not pure because there may be intent to please yourself also.

Right? Does that make sense? So that's why it's not pure, because it has two intents. That's why Kṛṣṇa says, one who thinks of Me alone. Because otherwise you think of Kṛṣṇa and something else, so there's two intents.

So how do you work it out? So you can only, Kṛṣṇa is only Him, because that's what goes on in the spiritual world. So the only place where you can have two intentions and Kṛṣṇa would be involved is in the material world. Right? Does that make sense? So then one can come back born as a devotee, because there you can have Kṛṣṇa as an intent and the material.

Right? Does that make sense? If it's just, you get distracted and aren't really thinking of Kṛṣṇa at all and just thinking of material, then that's the program, heavenly planets, come back born in pious or religious family, some higher level family, because in that there's a tendency, because pious people take up Kṛṣṇa consciousness, then because you perform Kṛṣṇa consciousness, at some point you'll come in contact with it again, then you'll take it up. But then, because you haven't been committed in your intent, that is for Kṛṣṇa. So if it's just Kṛṣṇa, then you go to

Gokula.

Right? If the intention is mixed, then you're born in the family of devotees. Right? So that means that they were advanced, they were fixed, otherwise why would the intent be there? Why would Kṛṣṇa be there? But it also has the other things, you know, you know, Kṛṣṇa and this and that, oh, but who's going to take care of the family? Bang! Okay, then, what does that mean? Then the two have to be there. So that's why one could say, well, how is it, you know, they're born in devotee families, but have all these material desires, because that's why they're born in the family of devotees and not in Gokula, because they had material desires, but they're born in the family of devotees because the intent was to serve Kṛṣṇa.

Does that make sense? Yes. So we see is the intent is very important. So therefore, why we were bringing this up is someone shouldn't say is because there's some other intention, it's not devotional service.

No, it is, but it's not of the, it's not uttama-bhakti. Right? Does that make sense? You know, the person's painting the temple, but they're really into interior decorating the field, expressing themselves, and they thought this should be here and that, and some of the things annoy everybody, you know, because like this, but it's devotional service because he's doing it for the temple, you know, like that. Does that make sense? But it's mixed, it has this other thing.

How much it's mixed is how much it's going to annoy everybody else. You know what I'm saying? Yes. Can we say that on the Kaniṣṭha platform, sometimes it is pure devotional, sometimes it is not? You would generally see on the Kaniṣṭha platform, it'll tend to be more non-devotional and a little bit, and, you know, and a good amount of time devotional.

Madhyam will tend to be more devotional, less non-devotional. You understand? And uttama will mean it's devotional, but it's a matter of getting it from pure devotion to pure unalloyed devotion. Does that make sense? So you can have a Kaniṣṭha pure devoting.

That's the standard Prabhupāda set. The modern Vox Populi is the seriously mixed devotee platform. But we shouldn't say that they're mixed or any less than the Kaniṣṭha pure devoting.

That would be, how do you say, by modern social liberal standards would be wrong. You know what I'm saying? So therefore, that's what Bhaktivinoda Thakura was talking about back here, is that those who discuss devotional service that's mixed and they preach mixed devotional service, they're more dangerous than the ones who preach atheism, because they're pretty obvious. Does that make sense? So you can have the pure devotee neophyte.

Just means they're not so situated in the philosophy and don't know it so well and would be able to argue it, but they're committed to serving Kṛṣṇa and do everything that they can, that they are aware of for Kṛṣṇa. So you'd say they're a neophyte pure devotee. The more the personal concerns come out, then the more that it's mixed.

Like, let's say, just for an example, you have someone who, a couple who is newly come in

contact with Kṛṣṇa consciousness. So for them, that's the most absorbing thing. So when they're at home, they talk about it.

You know, they're going to work. They're just waiting until work's over, then go to the temple. They're waiting for the week to be over, so they go spend the weekend at the temple.

So you could say that they're neophyte pure devotees, because they're doing their job right. They're taking care that they're interacting the way they always do. But their focus is not on their home and their job and all that.

Their focus is on Kṛṣṇa consciousness. No, they're doing everything nicely. So therefore, that's the third-class pure devotee.

They don't know much. You ask them things about it, and they wouldn't know how to answer. You understand? But as soon as then the home is very important, you know, got put in the time like that, and then we're working, when can we go to the temple, and this kind of thing like that, that's where it starts to become mixed.

You understand? Because the home stands on its own, and then there's Kṛṣṇa. But what we're also talking about is that seeing the home things in connection with Kṛṣṇa, but by the mechanics of what's given in the Gītā, then again you're coming back to that. But generally, that would be more symptomatic of the muddle.

But it's not that the kaniṣṭha wouldn't be doing that, and that way they try to reduce the influence of the mix in devotional service. So there will be those moments that it's more pure, and those moments that it's less, but it's not stable. That's why it's called anishta bhakti.

It's not steady. Once it becomes steady, then it will always do that certain endeavor, and then it has those problems. You know what I'm saying? But it's not that one day everything's great, and one day it's not, and this and that.

It's not like that. Does that make sense? So we're trying to point out here is that all of this, if it's in line with the paramparā, and that endeavor is being made with the proper attitude, it's devotional service. So one shouldn't say that the guy who only comes once a year to the temple, it's not devotional service, because he came to the temple to please Kṛṣṇa, unless he just came because he's hungry and that's it.

Then it's ajñāta-sukṛti. But maybe only one day in a year he has that intent. So it is devotional service.

You couldn't say, oh, they're not a devotee. No, they are devotees. But it's not ideal, because you have 364 days that aren't exactly what you would call the best, you know what I'm saying? So, like that.

So we're trying to see that we don't say, well, they're not devotees, because as we get more and

more technical, we don't want it to, it should be, it broadens the scope of being able to appreciate devotional service rather than narrows it. It becomes scholastic, it narrows it. But if it becomes actually a proper understanding, then it broadens it, so then one can see everybody.

That's how the *uttama* sees even the *karmī* is engaged, in his mind, in devotional service, because it's everything's *Kṛṣṇa*'s, it's his creation, his law, so he's actually interacting with God. The forms aren't actually a thing, so he's actually, but the soul is in ignorance, but you see it as that he's the pure soul, he's, you know, like that, so does that make sense? So they'll always see like that, so then that puts them in that, so does that make sense? Yeah, so they don't even see the material phenomena, they see the manifestation, but they don't see what we define as the material, they see the inferior manifestation. So they're situated on the Brahman platform, so everything's Brahman, because it is, it's only material concept that we say this is material, it's just inferior Brahman.

It's called material because we see it not connected to the Lord. So *uttama* being on the transcendental platform, it's all Brahman, but they can make distinction, they can see the difference. The *Māyāvādīs*, they'll never get to the Brahman platform, because they don't know what Brahman is, you know, they're sitting there in Brahman, you know, like that, their bodies are Brahman, but they say it's all illusion, so they don't even know what Brahman is.

They're actually, they're hardcore dualists, like that, though they may not agree with that, but... And if we take a devotee, for example, who is practicing for some time, and he knows the philosophy, he has to give his goal as a pure devotional service, but at the same time he's staying outside, he has some family affection... Yes, so it'll be some mix, but you have to see what mix is here. And when he comes to the temple, for example, and he's applying to a spiritual worship or some service, and when he's doing this service, he's trying to do it totally for Krishna, if you have that, it's great. This particular point, is this devotional service pure or not? Yeah, can be, but the point is, is generally speaking, that I would say is that that presentation would be fairly theoretical, because the tendency is that your consciousness is going to be affected by what is prominent in your life, so if he has this whole parallel lifestyle, that is going to have some effect.

Now, if he comes to the temple occasionally, or it's a festival, and then they get together, become completely absorbed, then you may just see the pure devotional aspect. That's why when you see devotees who don't come around much at a festival, generally they're at their best, but on a regular day, day in, day out, you may not see it. Because they're at Mangala Arthik and that, but they're thinking about, well, they had this meeting today at work, and then they got this presentation, and maybe just after Mangala Arthik, and in 20 minutes they can get this thing that they just thought of, and put it into the presentation to make it better.

So the idea won't be there, but generally at a festival, one forgets all about things, and then is able to, so you would get that there, so you would have to see. If they're doing it, yes, but at the same time, it's not automatic. It's not automatic just because they came to the temple, that

automatically they're going to be in that mood of pure devotion.

If they can pull it off, great. Yeah, but the point is that if it is, then it will make what they're doing seem less, outside of that, less important. So by that process of being absorbed in the material, and then seeing what that taste and result is, and then being absorbed very nicely in the pure devotional activities and good association, one starts to see that the difference between the two is quite great.

So it starts to lose one's taste. So as long as that's there, but if it's a philosophy that when I'm at temple, when I'm here, when I'm there, I do that, I'm just a practical guy, I'm down there, whatever I do, I do fully. That's what Bhaktivinoda's talking about, is misdirected.

You know what I'm saying? So that's the point, is that it is possible. Someone could say, no, but he hasn't come to the temple for 20 years, and all this and that, but he just led a fabulous kirtan, and was so nice, and spoke about Prabhupada so nicely. It doesn't matter.

He is on the pure devotional platform. Now, what happens when he walks out of the door, that's another thing, but you can't say, what has 20 years got to do with eternal? So that's the point, is one has to be able to see that, at the same time as one has to be able to see the opposite, where someone's presenting themselves in one way, but it's actually another. So that's the thing we have to be able to see.

Is that, is that, because that's, that's, that's the fine. Yes. No.

That was just you were scratching the eye. In his definition, Srila Rupa Gosvami uses the word krsna-nusilanam. The purport is that svayam bhagavan, Sri Krsna, is the ultimate objective, indicated by the term kevala-bhakti.

The word bhakti is also used for Narayana and other expansions of Krsna, but it's only Krsna who can reciprocate the complete sentiments of bhakti. Right. So this, this kevala means unalloyed, that only Krsna, because has all those aspects, because the point is, is when the, the, because with Narayana, then it's the greatness, the majesty and all that, that one accepts that he's God.

But it's not that God as a person is what's important. It's the person filling the post of God that's important. Does that make sense? So there's a difference.

So this, this element of bhakti, it's, it won't be as fully manifest. You know, the complete sentiments, it's bhakti. So that means someone who's worshipping Narayana, it is bhakti.

But the sentiments of bhakti won't be as great as someone who's worshipping Krsna. Does that make sense? Because then it's Krsna as the person that becomes more important. Does that make sense? So, of course, one could argue is that someone who appreciates more the personal element of Narayana as opposed to the post of Narayana will get more than like that.

And you'll see that. We even see it in Gopal Kumar. When he went to Vaikuntha, there were those who, you know, and he was very relaxed in his interaction with Narayana.

Then some of the senior persons didn't mind it because, OK, it's there. Narayana has all this variety. But some of the junior ones, they thought, well, this is not according to the rules.

So they couldn't accommodate it. You know, so you'll also get within the Vaikuntha platform this wider range of even the more sentiment or more rules. But still, ultimately, because Krsna is the visaya, you'll get something more from Him than an expansion who is visaya and asvara.

Does that make sense? So here he means that this means specifically Krsna. Right? So therefore, Krsna, not Visnu. How the expansion is visaya and asvara.

It means the expansion is visaya because it's Visnu-tattva. So he's enjoyer. He is the controller.

But he's asvara because he has devotion towards Krsna, who is just visaya. So that means Balarama, though he is visaya, he's also asvara. So he has devotional sentiment or devotional intent towards Krsna.

So he's trying to please Krsna. At the same time, his devotees interact with him. He interacts on that platform, but Krsna is not part of it.

He has his rasa dance. It's just him and his gopis. He's not in that specific state trying to please Krsna.

But it'll have a different flavor than Krsna's rasa dance. You understand? So Balarama is associated with serving Krsna. So he's both at once.

That's why Prabhupada in Nectar of Devotion refers to him as the Supreme Personality of Servant or Godhead. He's Balarama's first. Then he expands into maha-nirayana.

That then into sankhya-samprajuna, aniruddha, and vasudeva-dorkha, which expand into sankhya-samprajuna, vasudeva, and aniruddha, and all the other 23 expansions in Vaikuntha, and then as the pusa avatars in the material world, like that. So these are all of these. They all feel themselves as servant of the servant of.

That's another way of how even God feels himself as servant. So other than Krsna, all the others feel as servant. And then maha-nirayana, servant of the servant, because he serves Balarama, serving.

And dorkha, then serving maha-nirayana, serving Balarama, serving. Is that OK? So that's it. Om Hare Krsna, Hare Krsna, Krsna Krsna, Hare Hare, Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare.

Jaya, Srila Prabhupada ji. Hare Meetha, Bhaktivinoda ji. Jaya.