

2011-11-11 NOI 10

Hare Kṛṣṇa Hare Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Hare Hare Hare Rāma Hare Rāma Rāma Rāma Hare Hare Is this first part of the lecture on... On ten. Yes. Ten, ten.

But in the practice of devotional service, there are many favorable topics that are faultless, even though they are about others. Only the devotee renounces. He gives up talks about others completely.

But because a householder is engaged in earning, saving, protecting and maintaining the family, he cannot completely give up talking about others. Right? Because, in other words, the sannyāsī has no one else to talk about, technically. Right? You know, so if there's something in service... But here, the householder, then, he has other members of the family and things connected with the family to talk about.

So the idea is that... Means, of course, is there's the... You know, the two levels of talking about, meaning... One meaning that, you know, that they're talking at all. Right? Sannyāsī doesn't have family members to talk about. So you could say he's not talking at all.

Right? The other is that one is talking about aspects connected, but it's connected to Kṛṣṇa. So in that way, then, it's not talking about. But here, as we discussed before, is that there's interactions that are just necessary because of the relationship.

Right? And people are in these relationships because of their attachments or bodily identification. Right? So there will be some connection there of discussions. But the idea is one should be seeing how much is possible to connect that to the Lord.

Yes. Sometimes it seems difficult to see where it kind of shifts. You're talking about devotional service.

Maybe you have some seva or something, but actually you're just talking about the activity. So that would be favorable discussions. Right? It's about the activity, but it's not necessarily, in one sense, direct.

Now, if you're remembering that the activity is for the service and that, but otherwise you're getting into the service, then you're going to use that to perform service. So the idea is that when we are completely, at all times, completely absorbed in Kṛṣṇa, that's the ideal. If there's any moments that are not, those should be removed.

Right? Because we see, until one comes to the platform of prema, that element is always part of the process. In other words, we're taking these principles of the devotional process that go through the whole process, but we're applying it to this case where we are. Right? So one can say, oh, it doesn't matter, it's only a little bit, but it does matter because on the platform of bhava, just a little bit of not thinking of Kṛṣṇa is already too much.

Right? Especially when you see the gopīs, the moment that the eye blinks and they can't see Kṛṣṇa, they're already complaining that that's too much. Right? So that means the absorption is complete. That's what we're trying to get to.

So at our stage now, we'll have our way of applying that, but we should never deal with the process as if where we are now is fine and great, and, oh, that's as good as it gets, or anything. No, it's always, this is just before the next step. But the principle is always the same.

Right? Does that make sense? So in other words, it's service connected to Kṛṣṇa. You're discussing it, even though if you may not be thinking about it or its connection to Kṛṣṇa, you're just absorbed in the particular activity because of our own natural conditioning and interest in that subject. But the point is that knowledge has been and will be used in Kṛṣṇa's service, so it will still have that beneficial effect, but it won't have as much effect as if we're talking about it not because of our conditioning, but because of the service to Kṛṣṇa.

Does that make sense? It's subtle, but it has a difference. So that's the idea is we know all these levels, so we can tell them where something is at. Right? It's no use saying, oh, you're just fine, and then that's it, because the point is, how do you define fine? You know what I'm saying? That's the thing.

Then it becomes subjective, and everybody has their opinion and everything like that, and you can have a lot of heated arguments over what fine is. You know, like that. So it's... Okay.

So in other words, you know, we're saying is that there should be no topics. Yeah. You know, in other words, if we have no connection with anything material, then we have no discussions about anything on the material platform.

All right? But if we're connected to things on the material platform, then we are to connect those to Kṛṣṇa. Then it becomes fine. That's the idea is that that's there.

So the idea is that if we don't have to talk about anything mundane, that's better. But if we do, then see that it's connected to Kṛṣṇa. So it's not that you can't talk about other things, but they should be connected.

Right? So therefore, the household engaged in earning, saving, protecting, maintaining the family. So he may be talking about these things. You may hear two gr̥hasthas talking about these things.

But the point is, is the quality of the conversation depends on its connection to Kṛṣṇa, not that they're talking in those subjects. Right? So it's not that it's fine to talk to those subjects, or it's complete nonsense to talk to those subjects. The point is, is if you need, you talk about it.

If you don't, why would you? Right? And if you need, then see that it connects to Kṛṣṇa. Right? So there's always that. Right? Does that make sense? Because we always have, you know, what's, you know, perfection, what's absolutely, you know, disgusting, and then, you know, as

far as we're concerned, that's it.

No, but then there's a very big space in between. So the point is, is the more you talk about mundane things not connected to Kṛṣṇa, the worse it is. The more you talk about the connection to Kṛṣṇa, the better it is.

Right? If there's no need to talk about a volume of them, well, you know, then you talk about less. That's better. If there's no need to talk about it, you still talk about it.

That's not as good. Does that make sense? So it's just, it's just that simple. The closer it is towards perfection, the better it is.

The farther away it is, the, the, it's not. And then you also have to see what direction it's going. Right? It's closer to perfection, but going away from perfection, that's not so good.

You know? It should be going towards Kṛṣṇa. But this thing is that when all one's material activities are related to Kṛṣṇa, with Kṛṣṇa, then even this unavoidable talk about others becomes sinless and part of devotional service in relation to Kṛṣṇa. So it is material activities that have been related to Kṛṣṇa.

Right? That's the idea. It, it's not that it's spiritual. No, it's material that's related to Kṛṣṇa.

Therefore, it becomes part of devotional service. Right? It doesn't become devotional service. It becomes part of devotional service.

The devotion is the connection to Kṛṣṇa. Does it count as indirect devotional service? Not necessarily. But it's making me subtly hear is that it's still the element that we are distinguishing between what is the actual devotion and what's the medium.

Right? Because the, the, the medium becomes a part of the devotional service. But we have to remember it's still just the medium. Because you could say if it's devotional service, then that's what you have to do.

Right? But this is, you don't have to do it. It's something that if you're doing it, connected to Kṛṣṇa. So the connection is what's the devotion.

You know what I'm saying? I collect all my money to Kṛṣṇa. Great. But someone else is serving Kṛṣṇa without using money as the medium.

So it's not that it's therefore the process. It's part of the process. You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? Cooking for Kṛṣṇa, that's devotion.

Cooking a potato for Kṛṣṇa, the potato is part of the process. It's not that the potato is the devotional service. You know? Does that make sense? Yes.

As it's worthy, use it for Kṛṣṇa. As it's worthy, use it for Kṛṣṇa. So here the emphasis is on the

using it.

Not the worthiness so much. Because what it's pointing out is that prajālpa means discussing worldly matters. Just discussions.

You know, you're in the material world, so anything discussed about what's going on around you, that you can perceive with the senses, right? Then that is prajālpa. But there are, so one avoids prajālpa. That's all.

But within that, there are topics that aren't, how do you say, that aren't a problem. If they're connected. Right? So that's the emphasis.

In other places, the conversation would be about the worthiness of something. So therefore, the more it's in line with the ideal and the traditional, that's more worthiness. The farther away it is, then the less worthy it is.

But the point is, the real test is the principle. Will it work? You know what I'm saying? You have this nice tungsten steel hammer with the rubber grip and all the different things, and that may be the most worthy. But you could also pick up a rock, and it would do a pretty good job.

You may not get it flush with the top of the wood. You may make a few digs in the woods, so you're, how do you say, someone doing furniture and all that probably wouldn't use a rock, unless they wanted to get that old Neanderthal furniture look, like that. So the idea is that, but it still works.

It's definitely not worthy, but it'll work. You know what I'm saying? But then to argue, you know, the rock's just as good as the hammer, that's a waste of time. That's what the modern, oh, it's all equal, everything's good, nice, see the bright side, all that.

That's all those things, though well-meant, are complete childishness, yes. Does that make sense? You know, of course, we figure that once we grow up, the childishness goes away, but it doesn't. You have to train it to go away, you know what I'm saying? Just because you don't see it as often, because before you're always in the kitchen crying about the cookie jar.

So now you're not in the kitchen crying about the cookie jar, you're crying about something else. So you think it's not the same, but it's the same. And also he's saying here, even his unavoidable talk means if you avoid it, it would be improper.

You know what I'm saying? You know, the grhastha's so Kṛṣṇa conscious, renounced, and, you know, his kid is having an emotional breakdown, but it's over something of stupid attachment, so therefore he's not going to get involved in such mundanity. You know, the kid should just make a bridge, get over it, grow up, you know, all these different kinds of things. Yeah, Caitanya Mahāprabhu, like that.

And so he'll figure he's being the great Kṛṣṇa conscious grhastha. No, he's not. He may be

being a nice Kṛṣṇa conscious renunciate, but why is he a grhastha then? He wants to behave like that and not get involved.

Don't get involved. Great. Don't get married.

Don't have kids. Right? But he is married, he has kids, therefore it's unavoidable he sits down and talks about these things. You know what I'm saying? But he's doing it because he wants to make them understand so that they'd be more Kṛṣṇa conscious, but the kid's just looking for some emotional support.

Right? So that's unavoidable. So that's been the problem with the past. Not the renunciation, not the Kṛṣṇa consciousness.

It's that they don't know what's unavoidable and what's avoidable. Right? Does that make sense? He should not talk about others in a way that is detrimental to anyone. Right? It means, let us say, you're discussing with an equal and you're talking about another equal.

Right? That you're working together and, you know, the person didn't cooperate in this way. You know, it should be, you know, work more with the team, not so independently. And the other guy says, okay, like that, how can we work it out? Okay, that's not detrimental.

Right? Now let's say there's a junior there. Now to them this person is an authority. Right? So for them to hear the conversation, that's detrimental.

You may think it's not. So like parents all the time talk about authorities in front of the children. And because, you know, we're talking about this and the child is non-different from me, therefore the child hearing about this is also fine.

And then they wonder why in the future the child doesn't accept their authority. You know? So then that's detrimental. So it shouldn't be bad for somebody.

It may be good for you, but not for someone else. You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? You should talk about others only whatever little is necessary in his Kṛṣṇa conscious family. So whatever little is necessary.

In other words, don't, not more. Whatever is necessary, you talk. Whatever is not necessary, you don't talk.

Right? But at the same time is don't look at this in a, how do you say, a linear regulated fashion. You know, that okay, every day we can talk three minutes, you know, about, like that. There'll be days when all you'll talk about is others.

And, you know, that's only a little. Right? And there'll be other times when you won't talk about anybody else at all. You know? You know what I'm saying? That's the point.

But this means how less you can, that much you do. You don't, you don't, you don't encourage

it. Right? Does that make sense? You're encouraging relationships and development, but you're not encouraging useless talk.

Right? But the useless talk may be necessary in cultivating the relationship. You understand? If it's necessary, it's used. If it's not necessary, it's not used.

Does that make sense? You know, the husband's there, he's chanting, and his wife is chanting, and she's really absorbed. And then he remembers some gossip that was there. He doesn't say it at that time.

It's unnecessary. Right? The wife is absorbed in her chanting. Right? Another time when she's talking gossip, that's when he uses it.

Does that make sense? Yes? There seems to be one more, there's a rule and there are... Exceptions. Exceptions. So, renunciates, managers, they will also talk about others.

But it's only in connection with the service. You know what I'm saying? And the service there would be direct. They may be engaging their direct, indirect aspect of their occupational nature of management.

You know what I'm saying? But the service itself is direct. But taking care of a family is not direct devotional service. You know what I'm saying? Because it's not inherently.

Managing the temple is directly devotional service. You may manage it and not think of Krishna at all. You know, just like the name and Krishna are non-different, you can chant the holy name and be completely inattentive.

But it's still the name. You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? But taking care of a family on its own is not devotional service. But you can connect it to devotional service.

Then it becomes a part of devotional service. Does that make sense? So that's the distinction. Chanting the holy name is devotional service.

You know, taking care of the family, if done in connection to Krishna, becomes part of devotional service. But it's only part as long as it's connected. That's where we're making the distinction here.

So, therefore, things that would normally not be considered useful in devotional service, because they're not direct devotional service. So indirect devotional service is only called devotional service because it's connected. Otherwise, indirect would be dropped also.

It was not that taking care of the family is indirect, you know, no, it's just, it's material. Connecting it to Krishna, then it becomes indirect devotional service. So that becomes a part of the devotional process.

So he's taking care of his family, he has his sadhana, he has his business, you know, he has his

other social things. So these all become part because he's connected them all. But his sadhana, that's direct.

Does that make sense? You know, if he and his family are sitting there and doing kirtan, that's direct. But that he's engaging his family members, that's indirect. You know what I'm saying? But that they are all chanting, that's direct.

You know what I'm saying? Because they consider, why them? Why not the neighbor? Why aren't the neighbors here at the kirtan? Because they're not part of the family, that's why. So it wasn't that he's just catching people. If there are no family, he's just finding some people, getting them there and chanting Hare Krishna.

That's direct. Does that make sense? So for indirect devotional service, you get direct benefit, because it's connected to devotional service. But its definition, it's only devotional service because you've taken your attachment and connected it to the Lord.

But if you didn't connect it, it's just your attachment. You understand? Do we catch this? It's a subtle point. It overlaps.

But it makes a distinction on how to work with it. So here he uses the term necessary, unavoidable. Not necessary, but unavoidable.

Necessary means you need it. Unavoidable. So unavoidable discussion.

So that way then the renunciates don't get disturbed. Or the grhastha doesn't become too renounced, artificially renounced. But at the same time, it's put into this category because it actually technically, for the soul, is not necessary.

But because of his conditioning, he's involved there, so therefore he connects that to the Lord. Does that make sense? So then it becomes devotional. Right? So that way then no one gets too renounced.

At the same time as they're involved with it, they don't become too comfortable with it and too relaxed. You know? It's not because it's unavoidable where you talk all kinds of stuff. No, you talk just how much needs to be.

Does that make sense? You know, it's just like we were saying. Let's say you're sitting with a kid. Now, you know, most of the time they only are able to sit for 20 minutes and chant.

Then they've got to go out and do something else. And, you know, it bothered you in the beginning, but, you know, you've kind of worked out things that you can go and do, and you wanted to do those anyway, so let's do them at that time. You know what I'm saying? So now you're sitting there again and chanting.

And 20 minutes is up, but the kid's still absorbed in chanting. So now if you say, come on, let's go, then that will be unnecessary. Because the reason for it was simply because of the child's

lack of attachment, and your attachment to be there with them, and then your attachment to be efficient about, you know, engaging your time.

Because that time is actually just for japa. So it's not important that you're doing something else, but if that's all the more they can chant, and by going and doing something else they can continue chanting, then it becomes, you know, unavoidable. You know what I'm saying? So you have to be able to distinguish between, you know what I'm saying? Let's say you go and sit down, you know, you chant, then at 6 o'clock you go and do your e-mail, right? This is very, how do you say it? Sorry if it's too theoretical, this example.

So, but now, you know, sometimes you can spend hours doing e-mail, right? And then there's a time you're doing a lot of e-mail, right? Things are happening and all that. So you spend, you know, two hours doing that. And then, you know, you get into class, you know, they've already finished the verse and everything, and he's just started talking, but it's just the beginning of the talk, right? So you haven't really missed anything, right? You know, because all that other stuff is just ritual.

So like that. So that two hours, and that happens over weeks, okay? Now let us say those two weeks are up, okay? And you're not complaining that you're spending the two hours. You know, you're comfortable with it.

You know, it's not, you know. But now let's say you go the next day, and you go on e-mail, and there's one letter that all you have to do is say, yeah, okay, at 5 o'clock. Now, will you get back up, go into the temple and chant and do the rest of the program, or is there a good chance you'll find something else to do on the Internet or with your computer for two hours? Facebook.

Huh? Facebook. Got a point there. You've got a point, YouTube.

Does that make sense? That's the meaning of where it means, that's where it's not necessary, right? The other is you need to do it for the service unavoidable. It's not important to do it at that time. You could do it at another time, but that time no one's going to bother you.

Why? Because everybody's doing spiritual stuff. That's why they're not going to bother you. Well, if you try to do it from 10 to 12, then every 10 minutes you get a phone call, you get a this and that.

So it annoys you that I'm doing this work, I just want to do this work, get it done with. Right? And no one follows the Vedic thing. The Vedic thing is from 4 to 6 in the afternoon.

That's when you do this stuff. You ever heard of that? Because it's also a time. Nobody's around at that time.

It's everything's like that. You go out and do something you can do. You don't go out, no one bothers you.

So that's the time to take care. And the Vedic thing, that's when the Brahmins would take care of all these ordinary dealings. It would all be done at that.

The king would go look at the armies, check the arsenals, the stables. All those things that are just ordinary day-to-day stuff, not something out of the ordinary. It's not like court.

That's his service, is the court. But to do that, he needs to have his armies and that. So he checks.

So the Brahmin's doing his puja and his training and teaching. That afternoon time, that's when he does. You understand? So that's not known.

So nobody uses that time. Like that. Does that make sense? So to be able to tell the difference that I'm doing this because... But if you bring this up, means we're here, you know, and we've been hearing this and that, and we're laughing about it.

But I guarantee if I brought this up cold in a room full of managers and senior men, it would not be received well. Huh? Theoretically? Means theoretically it wouldn't be perceived well. Or theoretically I'd survive.

There is a chance I could survive by the mercy of the Vaisnavas. So the idea is that because then it would immediately be, no, no, it's service, I'm doing that. It may be.

Like we said, if the person's renunciate, they're not doing it. It is temple service. It is actually direct service.

But the reason that they're doing it at that time is not because of something direct. It's because of connecting their conditioner. Does that make sense? Yes.

I heard that they come from four to six. Four to six. That's money.

That's when you deal with ordinary stuff. That's when you call the plumber and do all that kind of jazz. All the stuff.

Recharge your phone. You know, all those things that you got to do as regular stuff. You know, pay the bills.

You know, go through the tax things. That's the time of the day for it. Because the morning's for sadhana.

Then you have your occupation. You know, then there's the lunch and all. Then there's that.

Because then in the evening, that's the time of the family, social things and all that. So you shouldn't do that in the evening. And it won't fit into the morning.

Right? You don't want to fit it into your sadhana. So you don't want to take it out of sadhana, occupation or family life. So that's the time it could be anything.

You know what I'm saying? Because you've already, before that, spent some time with the family. At the lunch, there's a little time, taking a little rest. But now it's time to be active again.

You know what I'm saying? You know, in other words, between the, you know, afternoon artik and evening artik, that gap, that's the time for that stuff. Because evening artik, again, that starts the spiritual or, you know, interaction with family and like that. Yes.

And what about the aspect of sinlessness and reactions? Sinlessness and reactions. Means, okay, sinlessness means there won't be any bad reaction. But it doesn't mean that the reaction to the, from the transformation of the medium you're dealing with won't happen.

Does that make sense? I take the potato. I put it in the boiling water. I come back after 20 minutes.

What happens? Right? The potato gets cooked. Right? So, whether you're doing that, but if I do that for Krsna, is it sinful or sinless? Sinless. And if I do it not for Krsna, then? Full.

Full. Okay. So, that's the point.

It's sinless or sinful, but the potato still gets cooked. How does it apply to? How does it apply to? To talking about others. Talking about others.

You're still going to get the material result of, you know, family members being happy or not happy or this or that or, you know, whatever. All the different interactions and transformations are on the material platform. That will happen.

Does that make sense? It's not because you're raising your child to be in Krsna consciousness that he still doesn't yell and scream and get sick at night and, you know, have nightmares. You understand? But for the materialist, then, it's a complete waste of time. He wants to be happy, and this is what he's dealing with.

So, how is that an improvement? That's just Maya's trick. Right? But for the devotee, he's involved in that environment, but there's no sin to it. You understand? It's just that he's saying points.

He's saying here, earning, saving, protecting and maintaining the family. Right? And then you have the, you know, the famous verse of, you know, you know, how you say, griha-suta-suta-suta-pare. You know, that one about, you know, the materialist is attached to the place of his birth and his family and his house and all these different things.

So, it's sinful. Right? But here, it's connected to Krsna, so it's not sinful. But it doesn't mean he doesn't have to pay the mortgage and that, you know, the drain on the, what do you call it? What are those columns? It's been a long time.

You know, when the roof comes down, you have that little metal thing that catches the water. The gutter. Yeah, the gutters don't rust or need painting or they're not leaking or, you know,

that the neighbor's dog just, you know, dug a hole in your lawn.

Those things still go on, but there's no sin. You know what I'm saying? That's the problem. We think because it's sinless, there'll be no disturbance.

No, the same disturbances are there, but they become part of the devotional process. So, now they become opportunity, become humble and tolerant and all these other things. Well, before, they're just reasons to make you upset and angry and all that.

And even if you become humble and tolerant, it doesn't matter because as soon as things go good anyway, you'll drop the humble intolerance. So, it's a temporary manifestation. Does that make sense? Does that make sense? Just like this.

I mean, is that vivid enough? You need something very vivid. This part is clear. Okay.

And applying it to managing and talking about others and sinful reactions. Because you're managing for Krishna, so, therefore, Krishna will protect you. But because of one's attachment that one is dealing in a particular area and, therefore, you know, this guy's got to move out and this guy's here.

It's not that it's not going to give reactions, that, therefore, now these guys are going to make a party here and these guys are going to be supportive. It's not that the political field won't remain. You know what I'm saying? Yudhishthira is sinless, but still, there's Duryodhana.

That's because that goes with the field. You deal in administration. Then you've got to put up with politics.

Right? Does that make sense? So, whatever the field, then you have to deal with everything that goes along with that. Right? It means, you know, the dog slobbers. The dog has fleas.

The dog drops hair all over the place. Right? The dog barks. So, whether you have it out on the lawn and it's protecting Krsna's house or not, it does the same thing.

Does that make sense? So, that's the point, is the same situations and difficulties will be there. Nothing changes. You know, it's not like devotee babies, you don't have to change diapers.

They cry enough that you can feel, you know, the interactiveness, but when you want to go to sleep, then they stop crying. Does that make sense? No. It's just the way it is.

But there's no sin. That's all. But the environment's the same.

So, what he's pointing out here, we're taking this particular angle because this aspect is being brought out here in the Prajalpa, that Prajalpa's technically not necessary, but there are unavoidable aspects that if they're connected to Krsna, then there's no sin. Yes, sin is detrimental to Krsna consciousness. In other words, sinful keeps you here.

So, even the person is very pious, it's still, we can say, it's a sinful life. So, when we're talking, generally when the Bhagavatam is talking about the gross materialist who, you know, totally absorbed in his family and his money and his emotions, they're talking about a pious follower of the Vedas. Generally, why are they going to talk about some tribal out in the forest, you know? What's that going to, what is that going to do for, as an example for the follower of, the person who's reading the book, right? They are reading Shastra.

So, who's going to be reading Shastra? That sinful person? Or the pious person? It's the pious person who's reading it. But the point is, is that piety, if it's not connected to the Lord, it's sinful. But the pious person, automatically when you say sinful, will think of somebody else.

So, at least, if nothing else, it keeps him from doing that. It keeps him in his pious position. Like a lock keeps honest people honest.

You know what I'm saying? That's what it does. So, these comments keep people who would tend towards piety, but also may have a tendency towards sin, keeps them pious. But the sinful people, what do they care that says that, you know, all this stuff is there? So what? So, there's a chance of running into sinful reactions where the science of connection is not properly followed.

Yeah, where the science of connection is not followed. But you have the element that one is a devotee, and one may have one's weaknesses in the practice, so Krishna still protects you. He carries what you lack, preserves what you have.

Right? So then looking at the bigger picture. But it's not that in that area where you've done wrong that you're not going to get a reaction in that medium. You know what I'm saying? You don't, let's say, you're an authority, you don't deal with somebody properly.

But it's not that in the future some authority won't deal badly with you. Right? That's the reaction. But at the same time, the protection is that you can see it in Krishna consciousness.

You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? If you completely adjust it, there may be no need for the reaction. That's a whole different discussion. Here the point is that being in the material world is unnecessary.

Therefore, anything to do with the material world is unnecessary. But there is much within the world that is unavoidable. So the devotee, by engaging in the Lord's service, then there's no sin.

It becomes part of the sinful, I mean part of the devotional process. Yes? If you're not Japanese, then just say fine. Then you say whichever one you think, whatever.

I mean it depends upon how serious you want to take the people or not. Otherwise you would have some fun to say a country that no one can pronounce. You know, like Lichtenstein or something like that.

Who's ever heard of a country that's like that? The answer is how to deal or not. It's not like somebody may want to deal with you on that level. Then you can say yes.

It means in other words, if there's an opening in that to interact and get into Krishna consciousness, then if it's pleasant and all that, it starts off, then you can bring it to that. These are just ways from, you know, how you say, one entity to start an interaction with another. Because otherwise, what does he ask about? Hi.

You know? Yeah. Have you ever, you know, what size shoes you wear? You know, what's your opinion on mothers-in-law on Tuesday? I mean, how do you open the conversation? So you're asking, you know, how they're doing, talk about the weather, but not in Japan. Japan, you only talk about the weather.

You don't ask a Japanese how they are because it's so analytical to go, how am I? Well, I hate my job. I hate my boss. I hate all the people I work with.

I'm having a problem at home with my wife. My kids hate me. And so it's really things like that.

I'd love to run off. I have to go to work every day. It's two hours on the train down and two hours back.

And it's packed. And it's sometimes really hard to get. And it's stuffy.

And I'm not fine. And this is crazy. And why am I doing this anyway? And so you have a meltdown.

So you don't ask how they're doing. That's just the etiquette. You just talk about the weather.

You just say, oh, nice day today. Very rainy today. You know, and that's crushed the conversation.

For a psychiatrist, it would pay off. For a psychiatrist. Oh, to watch the meltdown would be good.

You could probably sell tickets and make money, right? Like that. Well, it's going on. Then you call a vacation.

There could be a poll on how long it would take. Hm? There could be a poll on how long it would take. How it would take, yeah, yeah.

Then you'd need an Aussie. Yeah. Like that, to do the bets.

Yes? I just wanted to ask you, when you're presenting books to an audience, they sometimes bring in a particular subject matter, which you are not expert about. And I guess what I'm trying to ask you is that, is it okay for us to engage ourselves into certain news, for example, about all aspects of what's happening? If you're going to use it. The point is, if it's something

that you can see using, then what's the problem? If you know that you go there and there's all these kind of topics they ask about, you don't know which ones, so if you're up to date on them, then you can make your comment, you know, like that.

So it's not that that's what makes the devotional service go nicely, like that, because you can also deflect, you know what I'm saying? We have a tendency, we're asked a question about a certain thing, we feel obliged to answer on that. But the reason that they're asking on that is generally another purpose anyway. So they're trying to get their own purposes done by asking this question, but it's not that you can't be getting your purpose done by answering yours.

If you look at sometimes the conversations with Prabhupada, they're asking one question, he's giving a totally different answer. Prabhupada will come up and they'll ask him, you know, so Swamiji, why did you come to our country? You know, yes, because Krishna Consciousness, this and that, the need of the hour and all that, and then he'll stop and then say, so Swamiji, how many followers do you have? And then he'll keep going, yes, so the human life is meant for like this, so just keep going, if there's more point, he'll just keep going, because there are things that are irrelevant, you know, or you just deflect it off. Swamiji, why do you wear this color, this, you know, like that, you know, it's like that, he says, no, it's just the color that's used, like that, so then it could be any color, he said yes, because then he'll drop the conversation, you know, and he said, oh, it could be any color then, yes, you know, and Prabhupada said, yes, saffron.

So he, you know, he's got him off the topic, otherwise why saffron, why not this, why not, you know, shark-proofs, my grandmother really liked shark-proofs, he liked that, and so on and so forth. Okay, he should talk about others only whatever little is necessary in his Krsna conscious family, because as we saw, the renunciates don't need to talk about others, but the family members have a tendency to talk about others, but the others are who are connected to them, it's the relationships that they're talking about, not management, right, it's that they've affected them in some way, it's like, you know, so many times it says, oh, you know, they said this, and they made me feel really bad, and the husband, you know, what do we care about them anyway, and this and that, why do you let them affect you, and all this and that, the point is, it's not a matter of, because why you let them affect you, that makes you feel that you've done something wrong, because you let them, no, it's a matter of, you are affected, so then let's talk about it, does that make sense? But if it's outside the family thing, there's no need, right, there's no need. Of course, if you applied this, you should not talk about others without reason, if you applied this, then that would mean, basically in the world, all pubs would shut down, right, you know, there would be no pubs, clubs, any of these things, they'd all shut down, they'd have nothing to talk about, right, you know, right, so without reason, but this reason should be connected to Krishna, right, of course, it's going to have some connection to your conditioning, but it shouldn't be that it's just the conditioning, does that make sense? Yes.

Mark, sometimes when we preach, we meet people, they come and they just want to talk. They just want to talk, but at least they're willing to talk to you. But sometimes they just talk for too long, and then other people, they pass by, and then we can't approach those.

But you can't tell what those people look like? Isn't that normal? How many categories do you have, nine, or how many do you use? You have so many categories of people, so with this person you use these lines, that person use that line. Like some old ladies, they look interested, but after like half an hour, they don't take the group. Okay, well, half an hour, depends upon, yeah.

Where are you from? Well, I was born in Slovakia, but I preach in Belgium. Oh, okay. You get that in the years with the Christians, you know, somebody comes up to you and like, so what about this and this, and you think what this person is interested in, and 20 minutes later, it's the only thing about Jesus.

You get trained up to kind of listen to the questions. Yeah, then you know the line of God. But then you should preempt them on that.

Before they get to the Jesus voice, you should pull it on them. Exactly, instead of doing that, it's like, after some time, you're like, yeah. Can you tell? No, I mean really sound, you know.

When you look under the rocks. There was one who went to go to Brazil. He was, everybody thought he was a little nutcase, you know, but he was very smart.

And the Christians came to him, and everybody got caught up for at least 10 minutes. And then finally they would preach. And then he said, the person said, yeah, what about this, wonderful, where's the temple, give me the address tomorrow, I'll go there immediately.

So they gave him the address, finished, and gone. Yeah, that's a good one. That's Aikido.

You just go with it. One of the devotees, they come up, have you found Jesus? And you go, I didn't know he was lost. I can help you look for him if you want.

I said to a bunch of, they're like really rude Christians, actually. They really think, they saw we have to disturb these guys, whatever you're doing here. So this lady came, don't you want to go to heaven? I need to talk to people, why is this question? So finally I said, no.

She said, why are there too many Christians there? She just feels sorry. Boring. Okay, I guess boring.

How many talking lions can you deal with? So without a reason, if there's some reason or something, someone's done something in the community you want to protect your family members from, you might be talking about it, but not about how they're bad or this, that. About how, what is going on is not good and how one shouldn't get involved and how one can avoid it. So it's not about the people.

It's about the activity. Because that's the main thing. The people aren't the problem, it's the activity.

What was that? She's going to use the phrase, dear sober. Dear sober, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah,

yeah, very good. Yeah, you'd have to be sober to do it.

But same time as the soberness isn't dry. So that's the thing is the devotee is sober, but he's poetic. You know, he's enthusiastic.

So he has all these other, you know, so it all balances nicely. Moreover, when a guru enlightens his disciple on some topic, then unless he occasionally talks about others, his instruction may not be clear. Because you have to put it in a context that it means something to them.

When previous Mahajans have talked about others in this way, there is merit in such talk, not fault. As Sukadeva Gosvami said, like you see in the conversations, they say, you know, you know, ask a question. Oh, this one was talking about that and so they'll discuss.

Srimad Bhagavatam 2.1.3.4 The lifetime of such an envious householder is passed at night, either in sleeping or in sex indulgence, and in the daytime, either in making money or maintaining family members. Persons devoid of atma-tattva do not inquire into the problems of life, being too attached to the fallible soldiers like the body, children and wife. Although sufficiently experienced, they still do not see their inevitable destruction.

They're experienced, they've been out there, they see, you know, everybody around them, what's happening to them. You know, especially as you get older. You know, before it was, you know, you read about, you know, something happening in another country or the other side of the country or this or that, you know.

And then as you grow up, then things start happening around. But they're on the other side of town, people you've never heard of and that. But as you go, then it starts to get closer and closer.

You know what I'm saying? The older you get, then it starts to get really close, you know, like that. Until it gets supremely close. And then it's you.

Although Sukadeva Gosvami talks about the materialist in order to instruct his disciple, he is not considered a prajalti. Therefore, such activity should be considered beneficial. He's talking about them, but he's talking about the principle.

The problem is, is they're envious. They waste their time on non-Krsna conscious activities. That's the problem.

He's not talking about, you know, Sam over here, you know, like that. Does that make sense? Unless one speaks in this way while instructing and while concluding a subject, there is no benefit for one self or others because no one will understand it. That's why Purana, it has to be put into a context, right, a useful context.

Therefore, when the previous acaryas have personally set example and taught others, how will we be benefited by acting contrary to their instruction? And if one discusses in this way the

improper behavior current in a religious sect or amongst the general public, then such talk is not adverse to devotional service because you're talking it for the purpose of devotional service. You know, but if it's just a matter of talking, ah, those guys are so attached, you know, and that's where it ends, then what's the point? But what is pointed out, that this is a problem. Because they're attached, they can't even see their own destruction, right? And then they'll be born again, have to go through all that.

Oh, maybe that's it. That's who they should talk to, right? That's sometimes a problem because although it is like, the attraction in the beginning may be mistaken with aversion and then it will just, aversion will manifest itself as describing the fall down. Yeah, well, that's why it is, that's why we were discussing before.

We gave the difference between when the Bhagavatam describes, you know, it's like the Bhagavatam is discussing Pururavas with Urvasa, right? And so that's, it's a very major event. It's from that then came the start of the Treta Yuga. He was the one who started Yajna because of that incident.

But it deals in a few verses. It's surprisingly small, right? So all these different elements is that when the sage has a problem, then half a verse or one verse talks about it. You don't have to discuss the rest.

But if Mahabharata talks about this half a page, you know, how the tongue came out, how it rolled out, how far did it roll, how much saliva was on the tongue, you know, how it glistened in the sun, you know, just like that, you know. All that, that's there because you're dealing with the need for more Prajalta. Does that make sense? So the point is, is how much is necessary to make the point, that's fine.

Now, if you have to discuss more to get the point across, that's all right. But if you don't have to, then why use more? You know what I'm saying? Yeah, it has to be connected, and it's only how much is necessary to connect, right? To hang a picture, I need one nail. I don't need to put ten in the wall.

You could say, well, just one of them. Sure. It falls off one end of the other.

That could also work. Okay. But then use the ones with the double head.

It means the nail comes, and then there's one here, and then the nail goes again, and then there's another one. Oh, like that. Yeah, that way it won't go in so far, and you can still pull it out if you want to move the picture.

Yeah, sure. The practicing devotee normally discusses ancient history in the association of devotees. Occasionally they talk about non-devotees.

Such talk is always auspicious and favorable to devotional service. But those who talk about others while influenced by devotional impediments, like envy, hatred, pride, or distinction, are

offenders at the feet of bhakti-devi. So, in other words, the prajalpa, if it's in connection with devotion, it's not a problem.

But if it's in connection with envy, hatred, pride, or distinction, then it's going to be a problem. Only devotees can speak? Technically, only devotees should speak, yes. Only devotees? Yeah, only devotees should speak.

Everyone else should not speak, because that's the whole point. You're not supposed to speak about others, right, because that's prajalpa, so all prajalpas should stop. But there are ones that are either unavoidable, and then you connect to Krishna, or are beneficial.

Right? So that means only the devotees are connecting things to the Lord, you know, or like that. So technically, only the devotees talk. If only the devotees spoke, then the world would probably be a lot better, right? Think of all the trees we'd save.

No? You might have a problem down in your place, because then, you know, the jungle will overtake every place, chopping them all down to make magazines and stuff. You got something? Someone had something? Oh, okay. I knew there was a hand somewhere in that direction.

Did we miss one paragraph? Yeah, the great sage. The great sage Maitreya. Oh, where did we get speak about others, and then there's something about speak about? There was some word that connected it.

Yeah, no, we missed the whole section. Even if someone talks about a particular person, there is no fault. In Srimad-Bhagavatam 4.14.29, Maitreya Muni, the foremost devotee, spoke about Vena Maharaja in this way.

The great sage Maitreya continued. Thus the king who became unintelligent due to his sinful life and deviation from the right path became actually bereft of all good fortune. He could not accept the requests of the great sages, which the sages put before him with great respect, and therefore he was condemned.

Sri Maitreya Rsi needed to speak about others in this way. He spoke to his audience to instruct them. This is not prajapa.

The practicing devotee normally discusses ancient history in the association of devotees. Because ancient history means from the scriptures. Because anything else that's not ancient is modern.

It doesn't matter how old. Like, we'll take Greeks to be ancient history, right? But for the Veda, that's not ancient. Ancient means, you know, what's in the Shastra.

You know, what's five thousand years. So it's modern if it's not connected to the scriptures. So it may be generic, like householders is a class, or it may be specific, Veda.

But it should be in connection to the point being made in devotional service, right? How to practice. In other words, we understand here is that if you're a leader and don't properly respect authority, then there's always going to be problem. So not only was it that he's non-devotional, but even that could be left.

Because at least, okay, he's not a devotee, but he's doing the job of a king. But the king has to listen to superiors, listen to the Brahmins. When he stopped doing that, then his position as a king was no longer of any value.

Because the first thing that Manu describes when talking about the varna-dharma of ksatriyas is his being under the protection of Brahmins, listening to Brahmins, being trained by Brahmins. That's the first thing. When that's clear, then it gets into everything else.

But if that's not in place, then don't even bother with the rest. Yes. And it says, occasionally they talk about non-devotees.

Such talks are always suspicious. There's no way to talk about non-devotees that is not beneficial? I mean, just to talk about them, this and that. If it's just discussions, then it's not beneficial.

How is one benefitting? Yes, that's what I'm saying. One is not benefitting, right? It says, such talk is always suspicious and favorable. It means, here, it's in the context of what they're saying.

You know, they're discussing about... So Maitreya Rsi, the practicing devotee, normally discusses ancient history. Occasionally he talks about non-devotees. So what he's trying to point out is that they're discussing about non-devotees in connection with that ancient history as an example of application.

So then that's always suspicious. Otherwise we could say, oh no, he's making these points, why they're criticizing, don't say this. Because you do have sometimes that people will say.

Talking about Ravana, for example. Yes, talking about Ravana. So the idea is that if it's connected to Krsna, it's fine.

If it's not connected, it's pretty useless. Debate arises only from a desire... Okay, so then that was the next. So that was debate.

Where was that list? Okay. Useless talks, arguments, gossip. So that was gossip.

Debates, fault-finding. So that was gossip. In other words, it's gossip saying, Vena, he was, you know, a nonsense and he didn't listen to the brahmanas and all that.

But it's in relationship to devotional service and trying to understand the principle. Therefore it becomes useful. So now the next, the next prajaltas is debate.

Right? Debate arises only from a desire for conquest. It is extremely abominable. Okay.

Fault-finding arises only from imposing one's own bad habits on others. Okay, debates and fault-findings. Okay, so a debate is because you want to win.

You want to establish your... It's not so much that the truth is what's important. It's that you want to win. They'll make it sound like it's the truth.

Because if I say, Yeah, I'm going to start... It means you've said that. I'm going to start an argument, you know, a debate here because I want to win, you know. I just feel that you're too confident in saying this.

I just have to win. I can't let anybody... You know, everyone would go, Well, what's that? That's stupid. The discussion would be about their need to win.

But if I say, No, that's not wrong. That's not the truth. That's against the truth.

So then people, Oh, okay. This is a value. Yes.

Sometimes philosophical discussions are tinged with this debate. Yeah, you just have to win. So that's... I think it's called... I think it's called didanda, where it doesn't matter what you say as long as you win.

So the person can even be speaking against his own philosophy. As long as he wins the argument, then that's okay. I've observed rather more often that I think that this is right, so this must be established.

But then that's the need for conquest. You know, conquest, self-righteousness, we're superior. Why are the conquistadors going around the world? To help.

To help. Because they just feel they have the right life and they have to teach all the... benefit all the savages of the world. And because the savages are so happy with the new lifestyle, then therefore we can plunder all the wealth of their country as, you know, a token of their appreciation.

Symbolic. Symbolic, yeah. Token would actually mean it has some substance.

Is that... It's funny how often it works to agree with something else than what people say. But if you're in a heated argument and people are putting forth an argument, if you agree and then agree to something else than they actually said, it's scary how often they accept that. How scary that is.

I mean, you know what I mean? Not exactly. You're in a heated argument. Someone is out to win.

It's like you're in a Turkish bath or something. Yeah, something like that. Some Bikram yoga.

It could be. No, that's irrelevant. It could be.

Let's say for argument's sake it is. Or two guys with their heads in an oven or something. Yeah, yeah.

So just let the other win the argument but with your conclusion, actually. That's what it's all about. Oh, OK.

How would you let them win but give your conclusion? Just, oh, so what you mean is... And then you bring your conclusion. Oh, but you make it sound like it's there. Yeah, if they came to that conclusion, then actually very often they're, exactly, that's what it's all about.

I'm going to try that. That was a good one. You use that? I use it regularly.

OK. Wow. I'm going to try that.

Sometimes people who are not so much operating on logic but just on emotions, they lack definitions. So they will often try to use it unconsciously against some other arguments. We are presenting something logical and they will twist it according to their emotions and hope for you to come to agree because you cannot understand, actually, their modus operandi because they are functioning otherwise.

OK. But if you present it in the tone of voice like they've won, that you say your conclusion... Oh, so... Ah, OK. Like... Like you just... It just dawned on you.

Always profound. OK. So do you wait to laugh until you've turned around and completely gone to the guy around the corner? Yeah.

I usually... It works better that way. OK. Otherwise they might come back.

Yeah, exactly. Wait a minute. OK.

So you maintain this subtlety. OK. Debate arises only from a desire for conquest.

It doesn't say anything else. It is extremely abominable. Fault-finding arises only from imposing one's own bad habits on others.

Hmm. So Maharaj... That was a good one. Desire for conquest with passion and bad habits and ignorance? Can be.

Can be ignorance because one's bad habits are one's identity. You know, I find fault in that because that's... You want to impose what's... what you're doing on the other. Because if it's... If it's actually the quality is good, why... You don't need to impose it.

You're trying to help the other person. So even if what you're talking about may be good, but you need to impose it, then there's something underlying that's not. You know.

The habit may be that the attitude's wrong. But here it's generally... You're... It's like... If you have somebody who's doing something wrong but they're attached to it and someone who's

not doing something wrong, the tendency of the person who's doing something wrong will be to criticize the one who's not doing something wrong. Right? So then it makes them look that they're okay.

You know. You know, say some other... Yeah. He just wants to win.

That's the thing. You know, but he's willing to work for it. Yes.

And some of the other Chinese... It would be... There it's not so much as a debate as it is that he just feels he's not trained. Right? There it was more of... Yeah. It means you could probably say it was more of a fault-finding.

Though well-meant, a fault-finding, in that he's a sannyasi of the Bharati line, which is a lower line, but he's of the Bhattacharya line. So, therefore, he could elevate himself to this higher... It would be socially better. You know.

And only because, you see, just that anybody probably wouldn't care. But here's someone who looks, you know, all pious symptoms, very attractive. So you're dealing with something of substance.

So he's most likely very intelligent. And so he wants to teach him that higher understanding of Vedanta and all that. And then, you know, the Lord, through humility, tricks him and shows him that he doesn't actually know what he's talking about.

So that's... Q. But in a situation where, for example, somebody puts out a conclusion, which was against the Vedas, some philosophy in the private, in a private talk with you, so kind of, you know, you don't want to enter into debate, in one sense or another. A. Yeah, but then you move to the principle. The point is that much of the time when somebody's... You're talking about devotees.

Q. Devotees always dealing with, you know, some devotees, non-devotees... A. Yeah, but that you're going to them. They're not coming to you. So you have some specific purpose.

But the devotees, then there'll be something that generates in them an issue coming from something based on authority, guru-sadhu and shastra. But it'll be a specific detail that's bothering them. But the point is to go to the principle of that point.

Discussing the principle, then they'll see what they're looking for is already there. You know what I'm saying? Because they're giving a detail of one thing and talking in their mind some nice quality. But what's happening is they're not catching the principle that connects that Vedic point to that quality they're looking for.

Because to them, that particular detail, the connotation in their eyes is that it's another, it has a different result. Does that make sense? Let us say... Yes, go ahead. He was discussing something and he was talking about fundraising.

And he said, actually, every food can be decorated or you know, sweet or whatever. But the real, you know, the one who does devotional service is the one who raises the money. He brought it up.

The one who, for example, he's the one who's everybody else is kind of, on the side, but he's the one who gets the credit. The one who raises the money is the one who does devotional service. Everybody else is on the other side.

And they use that example of Ambarish. It was an actual conversation. Okay, no, no.

Okay. So then you do, you know, like what he was saying. And you just take it through.

Because you agree with it, then you're on the same situation. You're opposed and it may not work out. But you go through it.

You know, because then, see, as if you work beyond the general level of conversation, then there's nothing for the mind to catch on to, to be upset with. You know what I'm saying? It means only when you drop down into the secondary creation, then people have opinions. There's no opinion on the platform of primary creation.

You understand? Because it's just, you're just dealing with this is this. You know, trees have leaves on them. It's not a problem.

Now, if you like leaves, you like that particular leaf, that's where it starts to get a problem. So the thing is, is you can say, yes, it's true that the person who does the activity is, you know, the one who gets the benefit. But as Prithu Maharaj says, the devotional process is so great that the person who does the activity, the person who instructed in the activity, and the person who supports the activity, they all get the same benefit.

So therefore, the person who raises the money, the person who gives the facility for that, and the people who help, you know, in applying the money into the devotional activities, then all of them get benefit. So then you just leave it at that. Huh? He didn't.

He just said, this only is the one thing. You know, but then if that's the case, then you're dealing with the ego there. Then he says, great, you have tons of money, and if it doesn't get spent in Krishna consciousness, you get no spiritual benefit.

In fact, you've collected the money, but the only when you get the benefit for having collected it is when somebody spends it. When that pajari that you say is useless goes out and buys flowers for the deity, then you get the credit. But until then, you get no credit.

Because all you've done was dealt with economics. Right? That is the second lowest class of consciousness in human beings. Right? Third, you know, means second lowest.

Higher than that is dharma. Higher than that is moksha. Higher than that is bhakti.

So you're dealing in economics. So he says, you know, that's vaisya. That's on the bottom.

That's ignorance and passion. So if you want to say that your ignorance and passion is superior, that's really being self-centered. But that's why the management thinks, you know, all the guys that make all the money, they're pretty useless because they don't know how to control it and spend it properly.

Right? And then the brahmana will say, well, unless you guys have knowledge in that, you're all useless in that. So like this, you can go on arguing eternally. So if you want to stay in the material world eternally, you keep this mentality.

But the point is, is until your money is spent and used for Krishna, you get zero benefit. It's just like the person, the grhasas, had the child. He can't say, now I produce the devotee.

No. When the child is trained, turns sixteen, and is now on their own consciousness, being Krishna conscious, then you can say you've gotten the benefit. But that means sixteen years, they get no benefit for having raised a devotee.

It's the same way with your collecting money. So if that's the thing, then we should just have a temple. We should just have, not even a temple, because then you need all these useless people to take care.

What would, you'd have to ask them, what would be the perfect scenario where you just have collectors? How would they position themselves? Because they couldn't use a house because then someone would have to clean it because cleaning would be below a collector's thing. And as devotees, you wouldn't want to have slaves or something like that. It would really be politically bad for your collecting.

So therefore, you couldn't have a building or a house or anything. You'd have to situate yourself kind of like just in space. So does that mean that you would, could you walk on the roads and stuff like that, but then the problem is is those roads are maintained by all those useless people.

So actually, you'd have to kind of function in space, you know. So that would mean then to really be a perfect collector, you'd have to do austerities, get the mystic power that you could fly so you could just hover in space when you weren't actually sitting in front of somebody and asking him for money. So then that would be perfect.

Yeah, then we'd just get rid of all these other people. But now, would the demigods be considered, the guy who would give you the mystic power, would he be considered of any value? I guess he would because he's not just decorating or that. He's kind of controlling something.

So I guess he would be. Yeah. I mean, that's what I'd do to them.

You just take it beyond the absurdity to where you just kind of like, you know, you just lose them. I gotta go. It's called resurrection.

Yeah, great. But stay away from all those useless people like that. But the point is, it's a particular mentality of pride.

You know, you have book distributors. They have the same mentality. You know, like that.

So it's very common. The collectors, they may need more facility. They'll get something like that that's very valuable.

And because of the nature of it, they need more facility, you know, to do the collection. But also they consider that they require more because they're superior. So something more is there.

Bhaktisiddhanta, Sir, is what he talked about, would create something more. But if they actually think that it's superior to other services, that's when it's just complete, it's just mundane. Because they happen to have a collecting ability.

That's what it is. So all it is is due to their karma, due to their past material activities. So they're saying the material activity is the actual cause of the devotion.

And their one is real devotion and no one else's is. That's just pure, unalloyed mundaneness, which you would expect from somebody who's a collector. Because vaisyas aren't known for their brains, you know, when it comes to academics and all that kind of stuff.

It's not that you don't have, but the point is, is such a collector is not a moneyed person who would have money for long. Because you see, all those who, even though they're vaisyas, and they deal with money, that those who have actually character, those are the ones that have had, are having now, and will have money. So even that kind of mentality is from a small time.

You know, if he wasn't a devotee, he'd be doing second-hand car salesmen or some other stuff like that. Disconnection. What I'm trying to practice now is how not to get involved with such.

How not to get involved. Sometimes, I mean, you enter and you regret you entered. That's there.

Generally, that's three hours later. Yes. Well, actually, it's two hours later, but you only get out after three.

Otherwise, you can try other kinds of deflects. When they study that, and you go, Oh, no! You know, like that. It's like that.

Like that, and just leave. It's just this very value. Of course, it's valuable service.

It is prominent. It is special. It is necessary.

Without the money, you can't go on and all that. In other words, you go as far as you need.

Speak the correct philosophy, but you only speak that much of it.

You don't put it in the context. You know what I'm saying? Because that's what Shastra does. If they're talking to a specific mentality, they only talk about the topic in context of just the topic, not bigger than that.

Like Shiva. He is the supreme, but supreme in the material world. Like that.

So that's the thing. You know, like the example is that the guesthouse manager is the supreme authority in the guesthouse, but then he's got his boss, who's not in the guesthouse. You know, so that's all.

So like that, is to use that method.