

**2011-11-28 BG 1.1-17**

[illegible]

Right? Does that understand? Means an adhikāraṇa is the main point that's being made, the thesis. Right? So when you have the logic, you have a thesis that you're establishing. Then from the thesis, then you are going through giving your reasons, giving your explanations.

Right? Giving any synthesis between the doubts and then bringing it to the point of the conclusion again, so that the thesis has been established. So that whole thing together is the, basically you can say, the adhikāraṇa. Right? How it functions.

But now the adhikāraṇa itself, excuse me, the adhikāraṇa is presented through that logic, but the adhikāraṇa is that main point. Does this make sense? So what it is, is in all these lessons that are there, in other words, Prabhupāda gave it as these different points, then there'll be a main point and then so many points will give support and other elements of it. Then he'll go to the next point, the next point, the next point.

Now as we see, like when Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura was going through on the Tattva-sūtras, right, for the Īśopaniṣad study, then there's a point to be established. Right? So he establishes that. And then once all doubts are removed on that point, but then that point being established, the point itself brings up a new point.

Does that make sense? So then you say, so therefore we have this. So understanding this, then one might think this, or one might say, right? He would always be saying that. Then he would go into, therefore the author has made this point.

And then there's the next ādhikāraṇa. Does that make sense? So that's just the typical way that

the Vedantic philosophy or the Vedic presentation works. Right? It's logical.

So you establish a point. So then once that's established, if that brings up any other points, then that's addressed. And that's until you've completed, let me say, you know, all the different points that connect to each other.

So now it closes. It concludes. Right? So then that will be these different parts here.

So part one, part two, part three, they will conclude in themselves. Yes. It's chronological.

It means how you say the, I'm not sure what would be the correct breakdown of the word, but the chrono is logical. Right? You understand? In other words, it's the logic of presenting the points like that. So, but each point is presented with logic.

Right? Then having established that point, then the doubt will come up, but the doubt is coming from the mind. Right? Does that make sense? So it's not necessarily how you would make the presentation, because there's two ways you can do it. You can make a presentation and you can just take it logically through the steps, one becomes the other.

But the difficulty is this. The mind itself isn't logical. Right? It has its own, you could say logic and that by observing a field, right? You have a field of activities.

You observe it with the senses. Right? Because that's how does the mind get in contact. Right? That's how we know anything is through the senses.

So through the senses, then the mind observes the field. From observing that, you can see that there is, you know, a particular mood of that field. There's particular results you can get.

There's certain purposes within the different elements that are there and activity you can do to get that result. So the mind seeing all that becomes inspired. Right? Then being inspired, then contemplating it, what you can get, it gets attached.

Right? And when it's attached, then we're going to work very hard to get what we want. Does that make sense? So it's a logic. But it's, but the generally things we have, we have this facility, you can do this with this facility, you can get this result with that facility.

Right? That would be standard logic. Right? But the point is, is the mind will go from, here's the field, this is what we can get from the field, therefore we're going to do this activity to get it. Does that make sense? So in here, then you're going to have a combination where you had the logical presentation, but that logical presentation is being made to convince the mind.

Does that make sense? So you're going to have that combination that from here, you might move on to another point, but because the mind will have a doubt, therefore we deal with that doubt. So the chronology, so all the points will be made, but we move through it in a pattern that the mind itself would be comfortable with. Does that make sense? Yes.

Is it the same principle that when we are studying the different sutras? Yes, the different sutras. It's a standard thing is that, means this whole point of now we're being introduced to this adhikarana. Right? So this principle we're going to see right through now.

From now on, it'll be a major element, because especially in the Vedanta Caksus course. So there we'll be studying Vedanta Sutra and the Satsang Dharmas. So at that point, all they're dealing with is adhikaranas, means that's how it will be defined, right? Because you're dealing with sutras.

So they give the main point and then that logic, that panchanganya, that five-limbed process of logic. So Prabhupada's using that here, right? So it's based on the Vedanta Sutra and how the Upanishadic, in other words the Vedantic presentation. It will always go from the point, the thesis, logically present that and having established that point, so that's accepted.

Then what doubt comes up from having established that point, that's what you deal with next. Right? Does that make sense? So you're logically going through, but that logic is going through is how the mind will accept it. Yes.

Is it available? It means it itself is, only I got, this? Oh this is, this is grouping with all the, yeah, okay. Yeah, it's, if you look at the folio, then in, I don't, it's not in the main section, I think it's the second section is in the folio, at least the newer folio. And in that section back there with so many things, I think, is it called Analysis of Bhagavad Gita? It's just called Analysis of Bhagavad Gita.

It's just because one point is that means these here, these 46 lessons, 53 and 3, they're just one right after another. It just says part one, man's eternal relation with Godhead, then it gives 46 points right after another. Then it has the part two, man's duty towards Godhead, the 53 points in two sections, and then the part three, man's ultimate necessity in perfection of life, and has three points.

But that's all. It doesn't, there's no explanation or anything. What he does is he's given the point and given the, the, the Gita verses that deal with it.

Right? So it's for, this is why we're saying is that this is the second aspect of the study. The first being chronological study. The second is that thematic.

Right? So, so now he's taking, you know, anything to do with Sambandha and putting it all in one place. Right? So he takes the first point and then anywhere it is in Gita, then he'll pull it all together. Right? If it's only in one place, then it's there, but then there'll be that, that logical order.

Does that make sense? But that's, that's what's there. So, yes, the devotees were, I mean, I showed it to various devotees and I only had one devotee that understood its significance because from his background, he had, you know, studied Vedanta and all the, you know, Vedic and Upanishads and all that. So he could understand that, that way of thinking.

So when he read it, he could see the significance that was there. Most devotees I showed it to, he said, well, this doesn't make any sense. They, they didn't catch anyone's attention.

I think to today, it hasn't caught anyone's attention. So the previous study guide was based simply on this. So previously, this, this study, that was the, the main course.

The chronological is a very light course beforehand that you went through. And so the main study was on this. But we found that the way it was put together, the presentation, it was hard to tell.

Devotees couldn't identify what was the original analysis and what was the points put in to understand that analysis by the, by the devotee who was organized, who was compiling it. So then that's been readjusted. And then there was also a difficulty as to, there was so much prominence on these points that were being made.

That, I don't know if anybody has done, has anyone ever taken a purport and read it more than once, right after another, right? So the first time you see is that, okay, you catch one or two points in the whole purport. Okay, if I was giving a class, I could speak on this point or, you know, sometimes we have to look like that. You read it the second time, then you start getting so many points.

You read it the third time, you know, then whole sentences start. You read it again, then words start, you know, it just keeps getting more and more. So his, his method was he read every purport six times.

Then after reading it six times, then he made the questions. This Atma Tattva, like that, he's one of the original, you know, founders of the academy. So himself, Sahukta Maharaj, Narasimha Prabhu and Krishnakasetra started the academy in 84.

So then, but the difficulty came is that anybody who was doing the course was only reading the purport once. So for much of the questions he was asking, it was obvious. But for a lot of them, they couldn't understand, you know, and I'm not talking just general devotees here, because when, when the course first came out, the first ones that took it were all the sannyasis and GBCs and like this.

But no one could get past halfway through, because they couldn't, it got so technical, they couldn't figure it out. So then, so now, then, then Pandava Pandava, who has taken that and represented it, you know, and put in his own, he's added, what he's added this time is that, and now understanding how the Panca Ganyaya works with the Adhikaranas, he's taken it and looked at what Prabhupada has given and put it into the Adhikaranas. And the amazing things, it just naturally falls into that.

Because Prabhupada mentions that, he, I think he's quoting Bhaktisiddhanta Saraswati Thakur, that the, you know, in philosophical circles, then philosophy is presented through the Panca Ganyaya. It's just, that's the way it's done. So I've seen Prabhupada's purports were like that,

and even like this.

So then, then he applied this onto this study and found that it was exactly the same. Right? So that will, so that he's added to. And then we've taken the, those points that were being made and put them as part of the study.

Instead of being part of the questions, they're part of the study. Does that make sense? And then we're continuing with our, how we've established that the question part is the essay. You know what I mean? What you'll be tested on is the essay.

Because before it was, the thing was, is writing all those different points out and going to and finding them and all that. So the point was, is that most you could find, but if you hadn't read the purport six times, some of them you couldn't find. So, okay.

So the thematic study opens with a list of the adhikaranas connected with the Dasamhula Tattva. These adhikaranas are then presented together with their evidence and the doubts they raise and answer. Next, the relevant questions and answers from Srila Prabhupada's purports are added for further clarification.

The section is concluded with a summary of the main points. Okay. So the thematic study opens with a list of the adhikaranas.

So that is combining what Prabhupada's given with the Dasamhula, Dasamhula Tattva. Right? Just putting it into that order so we can see it. And that is being presented, we're giving the headings of the Panchanganyaya so that we get used to it like that.

But the point itself, the main points, those are Prabhupada's points. The Panchanganyaya is, we're applying that on what Prabhupada gave and the purports he gave. So that's all what Prabhupada gave.

Just that he only originally gave the original thing. We've gone and pulled from the purports. Right? Like that.

Next, the relevant questions and answers, that is what we were discussing before. The Atma Tattva pulled from reading the purports six times. Like that.

So that will go through like that. Then there's a summary that is also then put together by the author of this present study guide. All lessons are taken from, so the lesson is the original.

Right? All lessons are taken from Srila Prabhupada's analysis of Bhagavad Gita. All notes on the lessons are a humble attempt to elucidate their meaning. Okay.

So we can just to get an idea, you can see if we go back to page two. Right? So then on the table of contents, that then, so you see here it says lesson one, two, three, four, five, six, seven. They just go straight through.

Right? Those are the original, what Prabhupada gave. Right? You know, so in this point of that, you know, that the nature of Godhead. Right? That's the first section, right? The first part is man's eternal relationship with Godhead and is the constitution of all living entities.

So then we see it's second chapter, eleven to thirty. Then lesson two, parts and parcels of Godhead, fifteen, seven. Lesson three, living entities compared with the sun and the sun rays, thirteen, thirty-four.

Qualitating one and the same, fourteen, two. Krsna begets all living entities in the womb of Mother Nature, fourteen, three and four. Right? So that's, this is the original.

So if you read that through, then you get, so it just works in a very nice chronological system. Now what's happening here is the first adhikarana then deals with one through five. So it's all living entities are eternal and subordinate to Godhead.

Right? Then you have these parts here. Then the second adhikarana, material nature is subordinate to Godhead. Right? And then it has, you know, from six to fifteen established that.

Right? According to the Panchaganya. Right? Then adhikarana three, four, five, five, six. So there's six adhikaranas.

Right? That, but there's forty-six lessons. Does it make sense? So there's six adhikaranas and then it's sub-lessons. So there's the main lesson and then the supportive lessons.

So does that make sense? So total you get forty-six. So that's, that's now the method. So first is an over, overview of it.

Then we'll get into more detail. Then into, you know, all the different things. And then we move on to the next section.

Right? The idea is that by going through it in these various levels, we'll get a clear picture of it. Right? Because otherwise if we go into just all the big thing and go through, then we don't see the forest for the trees. Right? So the first is we go back and go, that's a forest.

Right? Then we get a little closer and see the forest is made of trees. Then we go in and look at the trees. Right? Basically that works everywhere but unless you're in Sweden.

Right? Because in Sweden you go along and something like this would go, oh, forest. You know? And then they go, the Swedish person would go, no, that's bush. That's not, that's not forest.

You know? Then you get to a bigger tract of land. You know? And then you say, you know, that's forest. And they say, no, no.

That's just a, you know, that's a little, you know, like this. Until you get to where it's like, you know, hundreds of kilometers of, this is forest. Right? You know, like that.

Okay. Okay. So the adhikaranas means for this whole section.

In other words, you see all adhikaranas together for the whole section. Then we'll go, the next thing is looking at the individual adhikarana. Right? Then we'll get into the detail.

Okay? So this is for the overview of the whole, this whole first part. Adhikarana 1, Lessons 1 to 5. All living entities are eternal and subordinate to Godhead. Yes? Lessons.

What does it mean? Lesson 1. What does Lesson 1 mean? It means the study of the first point the Prabhupada made in his analysis. Does that make sense? So there's 46 points he made. So we're taking each point as a lesson.

Did Prabhupada use the term lesson? Atma-tattva. Atma-tattva he used as lesson. Because he broke it down like that.

But Prabhupada, it was just, these are the points. Right? Oh, one thing to also note. Just, just to make it so it's a little more clear.

Is that on this analysis of Bhagavad Gita that's written that you'll find in the folio. Basically speaking, I'm not sure how much. Somewhere between 80, 90 percent.

A little more like 70. 60, 70 percent. Means that the lessons that we're using here, everything's exactly the same.

There's a difference in what purports, which verses are quoted. So that was found, this is why there's a difference. Because this, this was originally written back in the 50s on the original Gita that was stolen or lost.

Right? Prabhupada had it. The manuscript was ready. He found someone to publish it.

Then when he went back, the manuscript was gone. So he had to write again. So what he's written again is what we have.

So then Atma-tattva spent, I don't know, a long time, you know, years going through every purport until he found where it had come. Because the verse doesn't change. But where he gave the, you know, the whole nyaya on explaining it, that sometimes changed from one purport to another.

So he went for years to figure out where the purports were. So you'll find is that the point Prabhupada makes, all living entities are eternal and subordinate to Godhead, that won't be any difference between this and what's in the folio. But what verse is there, you might find a difference.

Sixty percent or so will be the same, and another, you know, forty percent has been adjusted. Because it's the two different copies of Gita. That make it a reason why devotees haven't taken it so seriously, is they can't find what Prabhupada is speaking about.

All living entities are eternal and subordinated to Godhead. Adhikarana 2, Lessons 6 through 15. Material nature is subordinated to Godhead.

The first two Adhikaranas are confirmed in the Dasamala-tattvas following. One, the Vedas are the principal scriptural evidence, which in turn expound the following nine principles. Two, Krsna is the Supreme Absolute Truth.

Three, Krsna is omnipotent. Four, He is the fountainhead of all relationships and love. Five, the living entities are His separated parts and parcels.

Right? He is omnipotent means He will include the material energy and liberate the living entities as parts and parcels. They're included in there, but then they're given extra attention, right? Because it's us who have to get, become self-realized, not material energy. She doesn't really have any problem with this.

Right? Adhikarana 3, Lessons 16 to 20. The living entity is born of spiritual nature, but it has the tendency to enjoy material nature. Forgetfulness of His real nature is the cause of His multifarious trouble.

Right? The third Adhikarana is confirmed in the Dasa Mula Tattva as follows. Six, the living entity, due to his constitutional situation as the marginal energy, may come under the sway of material nature. Right? Adhikarana 4, Lessons 21 to 31.

Godhead Himself, Godhead comes Himself or sends His confidential servants to reclaim these forgetful living entities. The forgetful living entities can know Godhead only if He explains Himself or if He is explained by His confidential servants. Right? Because between the spirit, it means by material knowledge and material senses, you cannot know God who is transcendental.

So it's only when He comes or His servants come by their association, then we can know. Adhikarana 5, Lessons 32 to 37. The confidential servants of Godhead explain that any man can attain to transcendental loving service of Godhead by his own occupation.

Adhikaranas 4 and 5 are confirmed in the Dasa Mula Tattva as follows. Seven, again due to His marginal nature, the living entity in a liberated condition is free from the influence of material nature. Adhikarana 6, Lessons 38 to 46.

This is possible because Godhead is both imminent and transcendental, impersonal and personal. Adhikarana 6 is confirmed in Dasa Mula Tattva as follows. The living entity in everything in this material cosmos is simultaneously one and different from the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

So the lessons end here, and that ends in the Dasa Mula, the section on Sambandha. So we see it just naturally. Yeah, I would say it's that, because you have the thing is that the material, because technically speaking, the material world, what you can, what you experience here, or



what you can experience, I mean, yeah, what you experience here and what you can perceive here is just the Brahman and Paramatma.

You cannot experience or perceive Bhagavan, right? It's only when the, means even, even understanding Brahman and Paramatma, it's only through authority, right? But it's only when that authority is presented in the parampara, coming with devotion, then you can understand Bhagavan, right? So the material phenomena, you know, means Brahman and Paramatma. Does that make sense? So it is that, because impersonal here, we don't mean impersonal means it's not a person. We mean impersonal means it's generic.

If I say good, you know, like that, then it's a general quality. You know, if I say define goodness, you know, you say, okay, the person's nice, or he's kind, or he's honest, or, you know, we'll go through all kinds of qualities. But, but the point is, is it's generic.

It can be applied anywhere. So that's what makes the impersonal. But that, that quality is still coming from the person, from Bhagavan.

So Krsna is the support of Brahman. He's the support of Paramatma. Means they don't, they don't, they don't have, they're not separate.

He's not, you know, the point is Krsna is one. He's not non-dual. Excuse me.

He's not, yeah, he's not non-dual. Means he's, you can't, yes, you can't separate, but at the same time it sees a person is different. So that's the acintya-veda-veda-tattva.

Right? So the living entities, the material energy, you know, the Brahman is all Krsna, but at the same time is different. So that then concludes how all these different elements of, of sambandha are all held together. What's their, what is, you know, when we say the relationship with Godhead, then that establishes it.

It's simultaneously one, but at the same time it's different. The Adhikarana is supported by evidences. Okay, so now we'll go through the Adhikaranas, what was mentioned there, within each, each Adhikarana.

Vrtti. Okay. Samsaya, doubt.

The beginning of Bhagavad-gita replies to two prominent doubts. One, is there an eternal spirit soul different from the material body? Two, if such a soul exists, is it fully identical with Godhead? Right? So these cover the karmi and the jnana, right? The karmi is that, is the soul different from the body, right? You ask most religionists, what's the soul? They'll say the body, or they'll say the mind. Right? There's, there, it's not separate.

Right? And the impersonalist, soul exists, then they'll say he's fully identical with the Supreme Lord. So you get two extremes. Either you're dead matter or you're God.

There's nothing in between. Right? You know, so this is, like that. Purvapaksa, right? Samsaya is

doubt, Purvapaksa is the objection.

The first doubt is connected to the atheistic philosophy of Carvaka. The followers of Carvaka maintain that consciousness, normally regarded as proof for the existence of the soul, is just another product of matter. It should not be thought, they say, that because the elements of matter are unconscious, there can be no consciousness in objects made of them.

There are many examples in which qualities originally absent in the component parts are developed when the parts are combined together in a particular way. For instance, Betel leaf, nut, and lime chewed together acquire a red tinge, originally absent in any of the constituents. Like, what they're trying to say is that, if you say, no, but, you know, it's dead matter, how will there be consciousness in life? And their point is, no, but many times we see when we take dead matter and combine it together, it comes out different.

You know, it means the Betel leaf is green, right? You know, and then the lime is white. So why is it when you put them all together, and then it comes out red? So their point is that, see, it can change, so therefore we can take dead matter, we combine it in a particular way, then life will come, consciousness will come. But what they've failed to notice is that the change is still in dead matter, it's still not conscious.

It's not that the red, how do you say, color that comes from it is now conscious, right? So, like that. But it works good. The point is, is if one wants to be cheated, it sounds good, and the mind accepts it, hey, great.

So now, this is the modern science? Charvaka means it could be, Charvaka basically means he doesn't really worry about the Vedic conclusion. Yeah, so it's basically any non-Vedic will use this, that works on the platform of karma. Like that.

Similarly, the elements of matter combined together in a particular way give rise to the living body having consciousness. Since consciousness ceases to exist with the end of the body, when man dies, nothing of him is left to enjoy or suffer the consequences of his actions thereafter. Therefore, Charvaka urges his followers, if you have no money, then beg, borrow, or steal, but in some way secure ghee and enjoy life.

It combines together in a particular way, then there's consciousness. So therefore, when you die, that consciousness goes away, so that shows it was a combination. That's from their idea.

And since it goes away, there's nothing left, right? Because we'll say we're not the body, but it's the consciousness produced from it, is us. But then that consciousness goes. We're only left the body.

So therefore, life begins with that particular combination of the matter, and it ends at death. So therefore, in between, just have a good time, like that. Enjoy yourself.

That's his point, because otherwise, when you're dead, you can't do that anymore. And then,

because of that, then since you die there, there's no reactions afterwards, right? There is no next life, so there is no karma afterwards. You only have to worry about what will get you now.

Don't do something now, it'll get you now. But you don't have to worry about next life, because you won't be around. So therefore, then you can really go for it and enjoy, right? So they have to cut out certain things in the philosophy to create this enjoying mentality.

Because for most of them, if there's no karma, then it doesn't matter what you do. That's a very essential point, because if there's no karma in the next life, then it doesn't matter. You can do anything you like in this life.

So that's one of the first things to go for. And then since we're coming from matter, the point is this. If chemicals are just interacting, and some chemicals are conscious, and some chemicals are not, what's the big deal about how interaction goes? Because it is just chemicals, right? So then right is wrong, it's just based on what you like, what's good, what's nice.

You know what I'm saying? So it's very dangerous, but very popular, right? You know, various elements of it, you know how you say. The second doubt refers to the Mayavad doctrine of Kevaladvaita, exclusive monism, right? Because we accept the monist, but not exclusive. Monism is one aspect.

You have the impersonal, you have the personal. They both go together. But they'll take it, no, it's only impersonal.

The Mayavadis claim that the soul and the Supersoul are identical in all respects, as it is explained by Srila Baladeva Vidyabhusana in his commentary on Vedanta-sutra, Adhikarana 11, Pada 3. The Mayavadis argue that the soul and the Supersoul are like the sky within the pot and the great sky beyond it. When the soul is liberated, he becomes the Supersoul. Just as when the pot is broken, the sky in the pot becomes the same as the great sky beyond, right? So it means you have a pot, right? And there's sky, there's ether in the pot, right? And there's ether outside.

So now if we break the pot, so the pot is limiting the connection, right? So if you break the pot, now there's no obstacle with the ether in the pot merging with the ether outside the pot, right? Sounds logical, just like Charvaka, right? But we have to understand, it sounds logical, the mind likes it. Why? Because the mind wants to be the enjoyer or wants to be the controller. That's why these philosophies work, is the mind accepts it because we have this predilection for controlling and enjoying, right? As soon as that's given up, then we understand these are just downright stupid, right? They're foolish.

Because the point is, if they're the same, then you should be able to take the whole completeness of the sky and place it in the pot, right? Otherwise, why you can only catch part of it in the pot? That means you've caught part of it, you haven't caught the whole thing. And you can bring another pot, and then you still have ether in the pot. Does that make sense? So all these examples they give, this is one of their better ones, right? More difficult to do.

Like the green bird in the green tree, pretty common. They say it's all green, but the point is there is a green bird in the green tree, right? So that one's the more simple one they'll deal with, because it's very direct. If that one works, then no need to go.

If that doesn't work, then they'll use this one. So this is their more difficult one, right? But the point is, it can do. Madhavacharya then defeated one of the biggest Mayavadis in South with the same principle, because this same thing is that you have all the water, and then you have some in the cup, but then you remove the cup, and then it emerges back.

The same principle. So he came to Madhavacharya and said, I've read your commentary on Vedanta Sutra, and it makes very logical, very well presented and everything. But this one point I still don't understand.

So then Madhavacharya, he called for his Akshaman cup and his Gindi, and then it always comes on the stand, right? The stand has edges. Gindi. It's those little water pots with the spouts on them, you know, like that.

So then he brings the two, right? That means they come on the stand, because generally you have the Gindi, you have your Akshaman, your Tilak, or anything that you deal with water for doing your Akshaman and other sadhanas like that, doing your puja and all that. So he brings that, he takes them out. You know, the person's watching.

He takes both of them, pours both of the water into that thing like that. And the guy, yeah, there's no talking. He just says, you know, that's the point.

Then Madhavacharya, like this, then he picks it up, pours the water back into this pot, pours it back into that pot, puts it down, and then puts them back. And then the guy, like, wow. And he just surrenders on the spot.

So it's like a ten-minute, you know, how do you say, you know, debate, and I mean a ten-second debate that no words were spoken, right? It was a very, very prominent Madhavacharya. He surrendered, became a disciple. But that's the point, is that you can again put it back in the pot.

So that means you didn't catch the sky, so there's a difference. There's a difference and a non-difference. So in the same way as the soul is non-different, but different.

You understand fully. It means that in the example of Madhavacharya, to put together means there is oneness. Yeah, yeah.

And able to put together. Because the point is, is the water is one, but the forms, or in other words, the bodies make the difference. So this is a Gindi and this is an Atman cup.

Yes. So that's what makes the difference. But actually they're not different, because if you pour them together, all the water is one.

So the only thing getting in the way is the container. Yes. In other words, the soul is non-

different from God, but the container, this body, separates the two.

So if you remove the body, then the two can merge. Yes. That's their point.

Madhavacharya then showed, yes, you can merge them, but at the same time you can pour them back out and separate them again. Yes. So that means you can't say they're one.

Yes. Like that. Does that make sense? Because the point is, is one's in the body, one leaves the body, so then one should merge.

But the point is then one goes back into another body. So it doesn't work. You don't know that if you make the final liberation where you no longer take birth.

But the point is, is the principle is not going to change. The point is, is you didn't have a body in between. So why didn't it stay like that, if that's the natural position? Does that make sense? So there's a difference.

So the Supreme Brahman doesn't have that consciousness of being attracted to material energy, but the soul does. You know what I'm saying? Yes. Yes.

No, no. Madhvacharya is two, because he didn't want to get to anything that had the word oneness in it, he would avoid, like the plague. So this is two.

There's no... But he's showing there that that's the Mayavadi's concept, that you go together as one, but then you can pour them out and it's two. So his point is it's two, like that. So it was there because Ramanujacharya, then he spoke this vishistha-dvaita, where it means special oneness.

He's bringing out the oneness of that, the transcendental mood, oneness of relationship, of the pastimes, and all that. So that converted a lot of people from Buddhism, which is all... Yeah, Buddhism and Mayavada, to this vishistha-dvaita, because their thing is it's all one, or it's all nothing. So then bringing to there, it worked very well, but it didn't work completely.

So Madhavacharya's point is that you have to be more direct. No, it's two. There is none of this oneness stuff.

So he's very, very strong on that point, just to try to completely clear any vestiges of this Mayavada, Buddhist philosophy. Does that make sense? When the soul is liberated, it becomes the Supersoul, just as when the pot is broken, the sky in the pot becomes the same as the great sky beyond, right? But it's not as big. Because the soul is thus the Supreme Personality of Godhead, He is the creator of the universe.

This is where they take the steps to. And everything else that the Supreme is, right? So now, after you merge, then you become the creator. But the point is they give credit to each other before they've gone there, right? So when they meet each other, then Narayana, Narayana, the more Narayana, you know, like that, they'll always, you know, like that.

In this way, there's no difference between the soul and the Supreme Brahman. To support their view of the Mayavadis, quote the following verse from Brihadaranyaka Upanisad. Who is the self? He is a person full of knowledge who stays in the life breath.

He is the splendor in the heart, remaining always the same. He wanders in the two worlds. The self is the omniscient Brahman.

He becomes freed from all desires. Being Brahman, he attains Brahman. He who knows this becomes the fearless Brahman.

But here we're talking about the Brahman, meaning one comes to that Brahman platform, because one is Brahman. But fearless Brahman means opposed to fearful. Fearful means we don't understand that relationship with Godhead.

So even though the Mayavadis will talk about, yes, we'll become this fearless Brahman, they never actually do, because they still have the idea that I am the controller, right? So they will actually never become fearless, because what they're fearful of is their relationship with the God. Because if you have a relationship with God, that means God calls the shots, right? But if we don't have a relationship with God, or we are God, then we call the shots. Does that make sense? So therefore.

Okay, so Śrīla Prabhupāda stood out the conclusion. Śrīla Prabhupāda refutes these doubts in Adhikāraṇa 1, okay? So this is the doubts that have come up, right? And this is then their objection then is explained. In other words, the purva-pākṣa, the objection here, is that they give their examples, right? So we give our examples, right? So when we're presenting the Pañca-niññāya, you have, you know, Uddhahāraṇa is the example, right? Purva-pākṣa, these, saṁśaya and purva-pākṣa, these are Vedānta-sūtra terms, right? Yeah.

So in dealing with these others, means there's two ways you are presenting it. One is that your logical presentation, you have your thesis, your reason, your example, right? Then your further explanation and then your conclusion, right? So, and so you have the pratigya, hetu, uddhahāraṇa, upanaya and siddhānta, right? Upanaya means to bring near. You bring the other, any other ideas that could happen, bring it and synthesize it.

So that Pañca-niññāya is then presented like that, that's the logical presentation, right? But the problem is, is why is there a need for logical presentation? Because people have doubts, right? So that means there may be a discussion or a debate, right? So then when you consider the elements of the discussion, right, rather than a presentation, then Vyāsadeva uses these other terminologies. Does that make sense? So these other terminologies means is that you presented your pratigya, your thesis, right? And then you have your hetu, your reason. Now with the hetu reason comes their saṁśaya, their doubt.

So saṁśaya and hetu are the same. So if you say it's the doubt, it's only a doubt because you've given a reason. Does that make sense? So, and then you give your uddhahāraṇa, your

examples, but then they have, from their doubt, they have their objection, and then they have their examples.

So you understand they go together. Does that make sense? It's the same process, it just means one is just showing the logical natural presentation and the other is showing that presentation being given along with someone else's involvement in it where they don't understand something, right? Yes? What's the difference between *saṁśaya* and *hetu*? Because it's doubt and objection. Because the doubt is just, you know, their question, and then the objection is why.

Explanation. Yes, their explanation. Does that make sense? Yes? Just like we give our reason and then our explanation.

*Vṛtti* means notes. So whenever you say *vṛtti*, that means the author is saying something. Right? But he doesn't say, the author now states.

Not he's trying to avoid being that bold. So we just put *vṛtti*. Okay? So you'll see it in any of the studies.

Also when we go into the, when we do the *dharmaśāstra* after the festival, then you'll see *vṛtti* is used. It works the notes. Like that.

Like that. Because it means if they're more serious than you have, like commentary is *bhāṣya*. Like that.

But this is not commentary, that's just bringing out notes so it makes the study more clear. Information that we might not have noticed or added information to make it more clear. Does that make sense? Yes.

No, it means until you say something, how can anyone doubt? You know what I'm saying? It means as soon as you go, no, it doesn't work like that. Because then you could say, was the thesis in there? No, it was their *śaṁśaya*. Yeah, well, this was just, this is to open it.

This is just the opening. Because to start this means, in other words, you're making a point, but you only make a point because there's already a doubt existing. Right? It means like if you're going to give a presentation, you give a presentation already based on that there'll be, you know that there's already some doubt.

So you've already included that. Like that. But when it's dynamic, when the interaction's going on, then these other, like in *Vedānta-sūtra*, then he'll make the point in the *Ādi-kāraṇa*, and then I'll say, but Jaimini says this, and then says the things he says, but then, you know, it says, you know, *Vyāsa* says this, and then, you know, the whole, the whole.

Does that make sense? That process is *pañcaṅga-jñāya*. In other words, there's five stations that are there. You've made your main point.



You've given your reason for it. Then you give your examples, your explanations. Then, because the doubt seems that it's something different than what you're saying, you bring them together and show that they're not different.

He's just taking either a specific point, misunderstanding it. Something is there that he actually, it's not, it doesn't exist. It's no need, or it's already existing in what you're saying.

So it's not a separate entity like they're presenting it to be. And then the conclusion is you establish your thesis again. Does that make sense? So, what you're saying is just like, basically is, would be, we say there's fire on the mountain.

Okay? That's our thesis. So, in logic, then we've said, you know, because A is fire. That means A is the mountain, and C is fire.

So we say, you know, there's fire on the mountain. Okay? Now our reason for that is B. Right? Is that there's smoke. Right? And so we can see the mountain, we can see the smoke.

So A and B are connected. And B and C are connected because, you know, where there's, you have smoke, comes from fire. So therefore we can conclude that it's come from fire.

Right? So B is your reason. Right? Because if I say, there's fire on the mountain. Right? And then someone, you know, you could say, no there's not.

But I don't know what you're talking about. How do I know it? So I'll ask you, why? What's your reason? And then I'll say, because there's smoke. Right? Then I can have a doubt.

You know, well actually there's not fire in the mountain. There's a guy there, you know, there's 50 Cubans there that are smoking cigars. Right? You know, so there's actually no fire on the mountain.

There's 50 guys smoking cigars. So then I can have a doubt. And then I have my, and then we say no.

Because wherever there's fire, then, I mean, wherever there's smoke, there's fire. That's our reason. And then they're saying no, but that's actually a bunch of Cubans.

Like that, you know. Does that make sense? You know, so that's their points. You know, but then you point, then you'll bring out is that, the point is, are the Cubans on the mountain? Yes.

And so are they connected to the cigars? Of course. Otherwise how do they smoke them? So that means, then that means that fire in their cigars is on the mountain, if it's cigars. So either way, whether it's a bush fire or it's a bunch of, you know, Havana cigars, there's still fire on the mountain.

So it's not a different point. Right? The point is, we see the mountain, we see smoke, so we know there's fire. What is the nature of that fire? That's a different point.



You know, because that would be this adhikara is completed. So therefore, I can say that there is fire on the mountain. Right.

And then now the doubt will be is whether it's a bush fire or whether it's a bunch of, you know, Cubans. Does that make sense? And so then we could go into the next phase. Right.

Right. And then we find out when we get there that they're not Cubans, but it's actually Texans. Right.

You know, so like that, you know, so that you work, you work it out. OK. Does that make sense? You see the logic there? Because then you're trying to show is that, you know, you say there's not fire because you say it's another source of fire.

But the point is, is the fire itself is on the mountain. What form it's in. That's another thing.

That's a detail. But you've synthesized their argument into yours. Does that make sense? It works, but they have basically they only categorize it as three.

You have your point. You have your point against it. And then you have the synthesis.

They don't use words like conclusion because that would be against the academic. How you say? More than mood. It's just like the life soul.

You know, they're there. Yes. Their whole motives of their existence, you know, their whole everything, you know.

Yeah. So does that make sense? So they don't use those. He means you've made a statement.

But we're not saying that this is your thesis. Then you have the antithesis. Then you have the synthesis.

So that's how they use it. So they'll use all five. But they won't necessarily.

They'll count that the thesis includes all the reasons and explanations. So it's not as scientific. But it's the same.

Same basic principle. Because the logic comes from God. So it has to follow the same rules.

How much they understand of it, that's another thing. Yes, everything must be clear. That's why you have to have your... It means you have your knowledge.

And, you know, other people, they have to define it. Like, I don't know. Like yesterday in the class with some of the ghosts.

You know, here is saying that the kshatriyas can be involved in illicit activities. You know. But, you know, Rupa Goswami says pure devotional service means free from karma and beyond.

So, therefore, then they can't... The Pandavas, in gambling, they can't be on the platform of pure devotional service. Right? So that's the doubt that comes out from it. But the point is, is their explanations aren't clear.

So how do they define pure devotional service? Is it the activity or it's the mood of the activity? Right? So then they have to admit it's the mood. Right? And then also in the activity they say that the kshatriyas can just, you know, as they like, be engaged in these things. Or it's said only for political reasons.

Right? So, therefore, on the political level, then there may be things. But then it's not the form. It's not an ideal form.

But it's the form being used for Krishna that makes it devotional. Right? So then you can show that it's not a separate thing. So they're not defining clearly.

Right? They're taking it that sin means non-devotional. But then according to that would mean piety means devotional. Because then they're taking it that the activity itself is the devotion.

But no. It's engaging piety in the Lord's service. That's devotion.

Right? So engaging sin in the Lord's service is not ideal, but it will work. You know what I'm saying? Just like the devotees, you know, I think, I'm not sure up to what point it was there, but sometimes they'd hop over the wall of the cemetery in the early morning and go in and steal all the flowers on all the graves and stuff like that, bring them back for the deities. Like that, you know? Stuff like that.

So you wouldn't necessarily call that piety. You know what I'm saying? But in their mind, because they don't understand pure and impure, so for them it's just flowers. And their point is, what's the dead guy going to do with it? I mean, isn't the dead guy supposed to be underneath pushing up the daisies? Isn't he supposed to be making the flowers? So what does he need flowers for? Right? So they come and they take the, you know, you have that term? Maybe it's an American.

Okay. American, you say someone's dead, you say he's pushing up daisies. You know, he's underground.

But that's what they do, you know, sell the daisies. You know, you don't have to worry about that. So whatever, it's an American.

So, you know, so therefore they don't need flowers, so we'll go and get the flowers, and we need flowers, so we'll get them and offer them to Krishna. So I'm not sure how long that was going on. It was going on for some time, until it was explained that things in the cemetery aren't pure, right? So, you know, leave those alone.

Now it's just the neighbor's gardens you have to worry about. Like that, you know. So you

would say it's not, but it's engaged in Krishna's service, so in that way it becomes glorious.

But because you're working in a human environment, sinful activities are not recommended, because sinful means it goes against the grain of the natural unfolding of human interactions. That's why it's sinful, right? That steel is sinful because you've taken someone else's quota. Does that make sense? That's the problem, right? Because we say we go into the forest, and we're walking along, and there's a flower there on the side, and you pick it.

Then, you know, no one will say, you know, you can't do that, you know? But if you're walking along on the sidewalk, and in somebody's yard there's a flower, and you pick it, then we would say that, because we see ownership. But the point is, in the forest, that all belongs to God. You know what I'm saying? It's the same thing.

There are elements that we will consider that's okay, and that's called pious, and elements we'll consider not okay, that's impious. Does that make sense? Because otherwise we put too much... We consider that the piety and impiety, that's spiritual. No, piety and impiety, that's religious, right? And religion is to be engaged in the Lord's service.

Right? Varnashram is to be engaged in the Lord's service. But it's not that the Varnashram itself is the devotional service. So that way, then, the piety is not automatically devotional service.

But that's what's being inferred. That the sinful activity being performed, you know, then it can't be pure devotional service. Right? But they're not distinguishing it, that it's the connection between the activity and the Lord that makes it devotional service.

The emphasis is on the activity itself. So they're inferring that pious activity, recommended pious activity in the Shastra, that is recommended for the devotees. That's automatically devotional service.

Does that make sense? You know, being a householder, is there having an occupation, you know, cooking, all these different things, all pious activities. So that's how the devotee maintains himself, how his life is. Right? But it's because he connects it to Krishna that it becomes devotional.

Right? Because the same activity is being performed by the follower of the Vedic culture. But he's not connecting it to Krishna, so it's not devotional. Does that make sense? So, therefore, there's the weakness in the logic.

You understand? Does this make sense? It means we've been, like for this year, then looking at the analyzation of things. We might think it's, you know, what's the need of getting down to that degree of analyzation? But the point is, that's so you can separate these points because where problem comes is you merge something together. Does that make sense? You know, that's why I was saying before, prejudice has come up because we connect things that actually aren't necessarily connected.

Does that make sense? Yes. Yes. Yes.

Yes. In other words, every varna or every ashram has something that's nice and something that's not nice. You know what I'm saying? So, that's the thing.

So, that's where they get their strength or weakness of that ashram is. You know what I'm saying? Brahmacharya, it's unencumbered. Right? Nothing's yours.

You don't have to worry about anything. You just have to be fully absorbed in rendering service. Right? Life's simple.

Very straightforward. So, that way it's strong. But now if someone has material desires, then it's weak because there's no facility for engaging the senses in a broad range.

So, that's where the grihastha ashram is strong because it has that facility. But to have that facility, then it's very encumbering. Does that make sense? So, each thing has its something there that's some element.

You know what I'm saying? Just like we do business, you can't 100% tell the truth. You know what I'm saying? You know, enough that the person's comfortable, but not that much. You know? Okay, so now, page 9, right? 9. So, Adhikarana 1. The living entities are eternal and subordinate to Godhead.

Pratigya, Thesis, Lesson 1. The constitution of all living entities is to be eternal servants of Godhead. 2.11-30 Hetu, Reason. 2. The living entities are parts and parcels of Godhead.

So, they're eternal servants of Godhead because they're parts and parcels. Right? Because there has to be a reason. We say, the constitution of all living entities is eternal servants of Godhead.

Right? So, what would be the reason? So, the reason is, therefore, because they're parts and parcels. Right? Right? So, now having said they're parts and parcels, now a doubt can come up. Right? Because the first thing, it doesn't mean that you can't get from there, but it's when you give the reason.

Because then we can say, but no, they're not parts and parcels of Godhead. It means they're just produced from matter. Right? If the living entity is produced from matter, why do they have to be subordinate to God? Right? That's the Charvaka.

Or the other says, they're not parts and parcels of God. They are God. So, why do we have to be submissive to God? You understand? Those are the doubts that come before.

So, the hatred. So, then now in our example, then we'll have to clear that. Uddhaharana.

Example. Lesson three. Living entities compared with the sun and the sun rays.

Right? So, that'll be the example. Vritti. Srila Prabhupada gives example in his purport to 1334.

There are various theories regarding consciousness. Here in Bhagavad-gita, the example of the sun and the sunshine is given. As the sun is situated in one place, but is illuminating the whole universe, so a small particle of spirit soul, although situated in the heart of this body, is illuminating the whole body by consciousness.

Thus, consciousness is the proof of the presence of the soul, as sunshine or light is the proof of the presence of the sun. Then, purport to 15.7. It is, however, understood here that the living entity, being the fragmental part and parcel of the Supreme Lord, is qualitatively one with the Lord, just as the parts and parcels of gold are also gold. Then in 222.

The Vedas, like the Mundaka Upanishad, as well as the Svetasvatara Upanishad, compare the soul and the Supersoul to two friendly birds sitting on the same tree. One of the birds, the individual atomic soul, is eating the fruit of the tree, and the other bird, Krishna, is simply watching his friend. Of these two birds, although they are the same in quality, one is captivated by the fruits of the material tree, while the other is simply witnessing the activities of his friend.

Krishna is the witnessing bird, and Arjuna is the eating bird. Although they are friends, one is still the master, the other is the servant. So, Krishna is not... How do you say? If we're saying they're the same, then the difficulty comes is, then why is one bird eating and the other bird's not? Because he's not hungry, or he's got a bad stomach, or he's getting too old.

The Supersoul has been around a long time. It's like that. But it's because he's the master, the other is the servant.

Upanaya, further explanation. The Lord and the living entities are qualitatively one and the same. So that's been explained here, also with C and D, as they call it.

Prabhupada's explained that before. Siddhanta, conclusion. Krishna begets all living entities in the womb of material nature.

Yes? For example, in this example, it's Srila Prabhupada who is speaking. So if somebody says that... Do you have another example directly from the Shastra, and not from Srila Prabhupada's report? No, but that'll be from... He's here, he's got Svetasvatara Upanishad. No, this thing of the sun and the sunlight, that'll be from Summa Upanishad also.

Any example Prabhupada gives is Shastra. He's not making it up. He's not talking about potatoes and Ferraris, and other stuff like that.

Yes. But if it is directly the Shastra, it is Siddhanta Upanishad, Mukundana Upanishad, is it... If somebody... Because it's supposed to be quite logical, you know? Yes. Well, this is just giving an overview.

It means we'll go through this in detail after. You know what I'm saying? This is the second level. The first was the whole chapter, and now we're taking the Adhikarnas in more detail.

So we see the flow that's going on. Does that make sense? Like that. So more detail will come after.

Vritti, samsaya, doubt. At this point, a doubt may arise, right? Because this has now finished your first Adhikarana. So that's what it says, is that when the Adhikarana ends, it's established one thing, but it'll create the next doubt.

Yes. Because Krishna is the one... The full will come out in the purports and stuff like that. That's the difficulty.

It means if this is going to be too confusing, we can go straight to the other one and then look at this afterwards. I don't know. You know what I'm saying? But here, just look at this.

So now that you've established, it means Krishna begets the living entities because He's the one. So He's the source of them. So because He's the source, they're part and parcels of Him.

Therefore, they're subservient to Him. Right? That's what you're establishing. So now from that, then your doubt can come up.

At this point, doubt may arise, is material nature dependent or independent? Right? Because we've established, okay, the living entities are, but what about material energy? Purvapaksha. In the Gita, 16.8, it's said, they say that this world is unreal with no foundation, no God in control. They say it's produced of sex desire and has no cause other than lust.

Right? Because that's what your Charvaka would be establishing because it means that He says by a particular combination of the material elements. So that means that would be sex. Right? And that is then coming from lust.

So therefore, lust is actually the cause of creation. Right? So therefore, what you desire, you should endeavor for. Because if we say life is glorious, right, it's only glorious because its foundation is lust.

Right? Does that make sense? That's how the Charvaks would come up with their philosophy. Therefore, just spend your time trying to enjoy yourself. Right? But the point is, is if lust is how it's seen, means that's how you entangle yourself, that's how you're in your various situations you're in because of lust.

But it's not the cause of life. Right? The living entities are separate. And the material energy is controlled by the Supreme Lord.

Therefore, you have your lust, and according to the rules of material energy, then you'll get your rewards or not. Does this make sense? Okay. Supposedly, at the end of the day, at Karna, no more lust will arise.

Yeah, it means once we get to the act where we finish the sixth Adi-Karna, which means the 46 points, then doubts on Sambandha would be cleared, on relationship. That's the idea. Because

it's like, you've cleared this one, but then something else will come up and clears one, until you get to the final, and then everything is cleared.

And it starts with it. Because if everybody accepts that we're all parts and parcels of Krishna, servants of Krishna, then there's no need to discuss. Right? So we're starting with that fast.

The Karmis will say this, the Jnanis will say that. Right? Okay. So is this okay, or should we just go to the... Yeah, page 20.

Because then you have the same thing, but then you get all the points from the purports and everything like that, so it'll seem more logical. Okay? These little ones with the little four... the diamond with the four small diamonds, what is that? Those are Admikratras. Okay.

Oh, I see. So these are then the lessons with all the points being made and with all the questions and then all that. Oh, I see.

Okay. Okay. No, I think we'll just continue through this and then we'll go with that, because that'll get into so many other questions.

Okay. So, Adhikarana 2. Material nature is subordinate to Godhead. Pratigya thesis.

Nature and the living entities are all subordinate to Godhead. Reason. Godhead and his impersonal features all pervading, including the material nature and the living entities.

Right? So he means... he's all pervading, pervading means everything is him. Right? But at the same time, he's different. Lesson 8. Nature means potency.

Everything that exists is emanation of Godhead. Right? Because nature... the living entity is potency, but nature is potency. Right? So that means he's the energetic.

Godhead, lesson 9. Godhead is omnipotent and therefore he's the master of all potencies. Namely, the material, spiritual and marginal potencies. Udarana, examples.

Lesson 10. Earth, water, fire, air, sky, mind, intelligence, and ego are all products of material potency. The living entities are products of spiritual potency.

Vrti. Srila Prabhupada gives the following example in a lecture on Bhagavad-gita, 7.4, from New Vrindavana, 1974. Vrindavana means separate.

An example is when I speak into the tape recorder. When you play the tape recorder, you hear my voice, but it is not me. It is my separated energy.

With my energy, I have spoken. I have vibrated some sound and it is recorded on the tape. When it is played back, it produces exactly the same sound, but it is separated from me.

Try to understand. This material world is just like that, bhinna, separate. Real life is in the spiritual world and these energies, the external energy, Krsna says, are separated.

Separate means you cannot perceive Krsna directly from this energy. So in other words, real life is in the spiritual world because that is where Krsna and the living entities interact on an actual, real level. But here it is separated, that potency of, how you say, walking and breathing and talking and interacting and driving your vehicle and all these things.

That goes on in the spiritual world. But here that seeming potency is there, but it has been separated. So it is, but it is not.

I will probably give you an example. He speaks, it is recorded, but what you are hearing on the tape is his separated energy, but it is not him. You understand? So it is same, but different.

So what we are seeing here is Krsna, but it is different. It is a separated energy. So it is Krsna, but it is separated.

Yes, right? That is why it is so important that we deal with Krsna as a person. Because, you know, if now I only interact with the tape and not with Prabhupada, now that would be a bit of a problem, right? Yes? Does Srila Prabhupada sometimes use the example of the cow and then the milk? The cow and the milk? Yes. Yes, the milk is also cow, but it is different.

Like that. So that would be the Vedic example. Does that make sense? But then we might have a doubt that the milk is not actually... The milk is different, right? In other words, the concept of there can be that oneness, but difference is more common in the Vedic understanding, right? So people... Your more general populace can think in that way.

Does that make sense? But you will have a difficult... The Western, they are not used to that kind of thing because you are the body, so they can't even tell the difference between the gross and the subtle, let alone the soul, right? So then by the tape recorder, then you will say, no, but it sounds like Prabhupada. It sounds exactly the same. So it is... So therefore... You understand? So then from there is... Yes, it is, but it is separated energy.

So Krsna's... How everything works here is working on His potency. So it looks like the spiritual world. It is the reflection.

But at the same time, it is not real. You understand? It means the person is there, the other person is there, and they are talking. That is actually a fact.

But that is real talking. And that is one soul talking to another soul. That is not happening.

Right? Because the soul thinks of the body and the other soul thinks they are the body, so the two bodies are talking. But because you identify with the body, you think I am talking to that person. Right? But you are not.

But in the spiritual world, Krsna as a person, who is non-different, His form and Him are non-different. The living entity is non-different from His form. They are talking.

They are actually talking to each other. You understand? So it looks like it here because of



Krsna's separated energy. So it looks real, but it is not actual.

So that is why you can't actually perceive Krsna directly from this material energy. You see here, and then you understand the shastra, then you can get back, but you have to have heard that from authority. Otherwise you won't be able to figure it out.

Because those who aren't working according to Vedic authority, they look at this world. They come up with all kinds of ideas. You know, how it was created, and who is in charge of what, and this and that, and so many things.

Srila Prabhupada writes in his purport to 14.3, The scorpion lays his eggs in piles of rice, and sometimes it is said that the scorpion is born out of rice. But the rice is not the cause of the scorpion. Actually the eggs were laid by the mother.

Similarly, material nature is not the cause of the birth of living entities. The seed is given by the Supreme Personality of Godhead. They only seem to come out as products of material nature.

Thus every living entity, according to his past activities, has a different body, created by this material nature, so that the living entity can enjoy or suffer according to his past deeds. The Lord is the cause of all the manifestations of living entities in this material world. Upanaya, further explanation.

Above these two potencies is situated the almighty Godhead. Conclusion. As omnipotent Godhead is manifested as all-pervading impersonal Supreme Truth, in one manner described, material nature is non-permanent, the spiritual nature is permanent.

Vrtti. Samsa, a doubt. Here a doubt may arise.

It is possible for the superior energy, the living entity, to come under the control of the inferior energy, material nature. Oh, is it possible, OK, for the living entity to come under the control? Purvapaksha. In Bhagavad-gita 3.42 the Lord says, The working senses are superior to dull matter.

The mind is higher than the senses. The intelligence is still higher than the mind. And he, the soul, is even higher than the intelligence.

Right? Purport to 8.20. Krishna's superior spiritual energy is transcendental and eternal. It is beyond all the changes of material energy, which is manifest and annihilated during the days and nights of Brahma. Krishna's superior energy is completely opposite in quality to material energy.

So the doubt is there. But the Gita is describing that the soul is superior to material energy, so how would the soul come under the control of material energy? Because we're saying that the living entity is subordinate to God, material energy is subordinate to God, and the living entity in the conditioned state is subordinate to material energy. Right? So how would that be if

they're superior? Adhikarana 3. The living entity is born of spiritual nature, but it has the tendency to enjoy material nature.

Forgetfulness of his real nature is the cause of his multifarious trouble. Pratigya, thesis. Lesson 16.

The living entity is born of spiritual nature, but it has the tendency to enjoy material nature. Hetu. The living entity and Godhead, being qualitatively one, are both called purusa, the enjoyer, and the nature is enjoyed by them, therefore nature is called prakriti.

Udharana. Godhead is real enjoyer, but the living entity is the conditional enjoyer under the modes of nature. Right? Vrti.

Srila Prabhupada gives the following examples in the Purport to Thirteenth. Three. One has to understand the position of prakriti, nature, purusa, the enjoyer of nature, and isvara, the knower who dominates or controls nature and the individual soul.

One should not confuse the three in their different capacities. One should not confuse the painter, the painting, and the easel. This material world, which is the field of activities, is nature, and the enjoyer of nature is the living entity, and above them both is the supreme controller, the personality of Godhead.

Two. Twenty-three. Because they are atomic individual souls eternally, sanatana, they are prone to be covered by the illusory energy, and thus they become separated from the association of the Supreme Lord, just as the sparks of a fire, although one in quality at the fire, are prone to be extinguished when out of the fire.

So again we're seeing, because that subservience that was there in the beginning, the living entity, though enjoyer, like the Lord, because he's part and parcel, he's the small enjoyer, right? While God is the great. Upanaya. The real position of living entity is therefore that of an enjoyed by Godhead, or servitor of Godhead.

Forgetfulness of his... So we can see here is that the nature of the living entity to enjoy the material energy, because he's nature of Godhead, but that means that if he has that nature, God has that in full. So God is the enjoyer of the living entity, right? But, now, here's a very important key, is if God is the enjoyer of the living entity, then the living entity is the enjoyer of material energy, right? So now the point is, how is enjoyment attained? What's the medium of enjoyment? Do you understand? It means you're using the senses, right? So living entity is using his senses, God is using his senses. So the difficulty comes is that the living entity is trying to enjoy the material nature, not use it in the Lord's service, right? So the point is that the engagement of the senses isn't the difficulty, right? This is where it becomes difficult, because the karma is this engagement of the senses for enjoyment.

The jnani, since you don't want to enjoy, you're not engaging the senses, right? So the senses remain. If you enjoy by engaging your senses, that means the Supreme Lord enjoys by

engaging his senses. So if we're the subservient enjoyer, then our enjoyment has to be in line with his enjoyment, right? So when he enjoys, we enjoy.

Because we've tried this enjoying separately, that didn't work out so good. It's still not working out so good. But we're still determined.

No, no, there's this one little... Okay, conclusion. Forgetfulness of this real nature of living entity is the cause of his multifarious troubles. So all his troubles are coming up because he's forgotten his subservience to the Lord, right? So he's established, he's enjoyer.

But he is the small enjoyer, right? So now this will bring up a doubt again. Here a doubt may arise, is it possible for the forgetful soul to re-establish this relationship with Godhead? Objection. In Bhagavad-gita 16.9.22, the Lord states, Those who are envious and mischievous, who are the lowest among men, are perpetually cast into the ocean of material existence, into various demonic species of life, attaining repeated birth amongst the species of demoniac life, O son of Kunti, such persons can never approach me.

Gradually they sink down to the most abominable type of existence. Here's that abominable word again. So then, according to this one, they sink down and down and down, and then that's it, and they just stay like that, right? But, yeah.

Yes, nitya-bhāda and anādi. So then we say he'll stay there. But the point is, why is the living entity in that position? Not because of God's arrangement.

It's because of our forgetfulness of the Lord and our endeavors in interacting with material energy. So if it's up to us, we probably would stay here forever. Right? Does that make sense? But, fortunately, it's not up to us.

It doesn't mean our free will is not intact. Don't get worried about that. It just means that God steps in.

Ādhikāraṇa 4. Godhead comes himself or sends his confidential servants to reclaim these forgetful living entities. The forgetful living entities can know Godhead only if he explains himself or if he is explained by his confidential servants. Pratigya.

Godhead comes himself or sends his confidential servants to reclaim these forgetful living entities. No one can know Godhead unless he explains himself or he is explained by his confidential servants. Because what we already said before is that you can only perceive the material energy and being separated from the Lord, you won't be able to understand God from it.

By hearing a tape of Prabhupāda, you don't know anything about this tape. So you hear that. Will you be able to understand, here is the founder, Ācārya, of ISKCON, which is coming in the line of Rūpa Gosvāmī under Caitanya Mahāprabhu and the Brahma-Madhva-Gaudiya Sampradāya? No.

That's the point. So you can't know God by studying material energy. Because it's the separated energy.

So that's why, unless it's explained by Godhead himself or his confidential servant, you won't know. Reason. His descending or so-called birth is different from that of any ordinary being.

Examples. Man's misidentification with material nature is a malady from which fearfulness is born. Man's attempt to get rid of that fearfulness of survival by work, knowledge or mystic power, is always baffled.

Because always remember, the potency of work is a separated energy. The potency of knowledge is a separated energy. The potency of the mystic powers is a separated energy.

So therefore, through any of these, you can't know the Lord. Living entity seeks happiness by serving other living entity, driven by a false desire of enjoyment. So the living entity is serving anyway other living entities, for the idea to enjoy.

That's how it works. You're serving in that way. But because we're enjoying from that, we don't call it service.

If it's called service, then we get all bent out of shape, and you have to start a union, and all kinds of things like that. But if it's not defined as service, then we'll consider it. You know what I'm saying? Let's say the mother is cooking for the child.

In her mind, is she the servant or she's in control? She's in control. Now, as long as the child understands that, everything works really nice. As soon as the child thinks, No, but you're supposed to cook for me.

Whatever I want, you're supposed to cook. Now, do things go nicely? No. So as soon as it's defined that it's actually, because you're controlling by service.

So that's the secret, is that we are controlled, but you can control by service. Right? Does that make sense? That's how it works. So when the living entity is fully surrendered to serving the Lord, then that devotion controls the Lord.

Right? So that's how the feminine nature works. Controls through service. Right? As long as it's not pointed out.

Does that make sense? As soon as it's pointed out, then you're dealing with tattva, not rasa. And the feminine nature only works with rasa, not tattva. So therefore, you want to be in tattva? Fine, go ahead.

And then according to tattva, yes, there's the kitchen, there are the ingredients, and, you know, go for it. Does that make sense? Man's attempt to get rid of that fearfulness of survival by work, knowledge, or mystic power is always baffled. Right? Because the fearfulness is coming from his misidentification with the material energy.

So then he becomes fearful. If you're not the body, are you going to be fearful? Right? Like, you know, if I say here, okay, we put this rock here. I'm not this rock.

And then you come and say, well, you know, I'm going to kick this rock. I'm going to step on it. I'm going to throw it outside there.

It's kind of like, yeah, go ahead. What do I care? Knock yourself out. Does that make sense? Right? But the problem is, is that, but if I identify with this rock, then there's a problem.

Oh, he stepped on me. Oh, he threw me out in the garden. You understand? So it's misidentification that causes fear.

There's a real identification of servant of Krishna. That's why the shastras again and again say, become fearless. Right? So that's one of the symptoms of *nishta*, is when it's fearless.

Does that make sense? At least predominantly. When Godhead descends, the fools consider him as ordinary man. Only those who are addicted to sinful or unlawful acts.

Only such foolish men of demoniac principles do not want to serve Godhead. So once it's addicted to what's unlawful, then you won't want to serve Godhead. Because serving Godhead means then you naturally won't.

Because if you serve him, he's not impressed by sinful activities. To him, they're not a medium for interaction. You know what I'm saying? Like that.

So he, the medium of interaction is pious things. Right? So that's why only this pious person could surrender. Right? Lesson 29.

Only those who are law-abiding, faithful men revive their God-consciousness when they are in difficulty, in need of money, inquisitive or aspiring after gathering knowledge. Right? Vrti. In his purport to 7.15, Srila Prabhupada compares the grossly foolish hard workers to asses and swine.

So it doesn't matter that it's 8.45. You said 7.15. It's 8.45. 7.15 is just the time. Okay. So it's not referring to the time.

No. Okay. The ass does not really know for whom he works so hard day and night.

He remains satisfied by filling his stomach with a bundle of grass, sleeping for a while under fear of being beaten by his master, and satisfying a sex appetite at the risk of being repeatedly kicked by the opposite party. The ass sings poetry and philosophy sometimes, but his braying sound only disturbs others. This is the position of the foolish, fruitive worker who does not know for whom he should work.

He does not know that karma action is meant for *yajna* sacrifice. All these things that I explained, it means we'll think they're kind of funny, but this is actually how the donkey thinks.

He thinks when he's braying, it's very nice music, or very eloquent poetry or philosophy.

He actually thinks that. But unfortunately, no one else seems to appreciate it. It's such a loss.

The swine who eat the night soil do not care to accept sweetmeats made of sugar and ghee. Similarly, the foolish worker will untirely continue to hear of the sense enjoyable tidings of the flickering mundane world, but will have very little time to hear about the eternal living force that moves the material world. Because they're so absorbed, there's no taste.

So these are the examples. Not that it's not inherent that you can't, but they just don't. Upanaya, Further Explanation, Lesson 30.

God-consciousness, which is transcendental, is never revived by dint of works, knowledge, or mystic power, but only by devotional service. Because otherwise you can't know the Lord. Conclusion.

No one is barred from approaching Godhead, because simply by willing to approach Him, one becomes at once purified. So that's the point, because then we can say, OK, because it started out that these persons, by their karma, are so absorbed, but Godhead Himself comes, He descends. He doesn't become like the others, therefore He can establish.

And so then, hearing that, then even these mudas, they can take it up, or in this case we're doing twos, so you could probably say hogs, dogs, camels, and asses. Then they can take it up. Such a poetry of that, so nice.

Prabhupada works it out. The order and all that, you could have used pig, use hogs, right? I don't know if it's a common, you use hogs? Yeah, OK. Simply by willing to approach Him, one becomes at once purified.

So the willingness is very, very important. That's where the main purification is, one is willing. Then further purification is by that commitment to be determined to not be involved in something that's not devotional, or to be involved in something that is.

Does that make sense? That's the main point. Because otherwise, if the soul is actually pure, how will the activity purify it? Does that make sense? The soul is pure, he's only covered. So how will good work purify the soul? No, it's because you do good work, you are given that position that you're looking for.

Does that make sense? So that purification comes because the Lord is pleased. He's the one that purifies, not the work. Otherwise we think it's the work.

I'll do this activity, I will purify myself. It's not, the activity doesn't purify. You understand? So that's why the Vaishnavas aren't so worried about prayas citta, because it doesn't purify.

It's that attempt to please the Lord, that he's pleased, you become purified. By purifying, do you mean determination becomes clearer? Those are symptoms. Purify, yeah, those would be

symptoms.

One's less inclined because the knowledge is increased, the detachment is increased. So one's less inclined to be involved in, you know, how do you say, more hoggish or doggish activities. So when Shukadeva Goswami says that the Lord in the heart cleanses the desire for material... Yes, he cleanses the desire by giving that knowledge of detachment.

Like that. So he purifies, so therefore... Yeah. The point is, but because it's free will, we had to be willing.

Point is, let's say you're in the water and you can't get out of the water. But now someone can help you out of the water if you're willing, but if you're flailing your arms and this and that, they can't help you out of the water. Do you understand? Does that make sense? So it's just like what he called it.

If you're trying to save someone in the water, and you're in the water, if you go close to them when they're like that, they'll simply grab you and you're both safe. Right? So you're supposed to stay away. Or if they're not so good at it, then you go up and you punch them in the head.

And then they stop doing that, so they became indirectly willing. Or they were willing, but didn't know how to express their willingness. So you help them in that expression.

Can means if it'll work. Point is, you'll use these techniques, these direct techniques, if they'll get the result. If they won't, you don't say anything.

So the point is, one might not learn something because he's not willing to learn it. Right? Someone willing to learn it. Then, in other words, the student is there, and when there's some symptom that you can see that they could learn this, then you start to teach them.

But if that's not there, you don't bother. Here someone may raise a doubt. Is it possible for an ordinary person to approach Godhead? Because now we've already said the mudhas.

So now we said, you know, they don't. But now, OK, they can, but can an ordinary person? Purvapaksha. In Srimad Bhagavatam 1.8.20, Queen Kunti says, You yourself descend to propagate the transcendental science of devotional service unto the hearts of the advanced transcendentalists and mental speculators who are purified by being able to discriminate between matter and spirit.

How then can we women know you perfectly? In the Bhagavad-gita, the Lord says, Out of many thousands among men, one may endeavor for perfection. And of those who have achieved perfection, hardly one knows me in truth. Right? So this could come up.

So we say, OK, well, the second one, that first of the ones, the women, well, that's so ancient and all that. It's not so ancient. You know, the Christians only accepted women who had souls very recently.

You know, like that. So it's not that far away. You know, so the person may have the doubt.

Conclusion. OK. OK.

Adhikarana 5. The confidential service of Godhead explained that any man can attain the transcendental loving service of Godhead by his own application. Now, by the term here probably used, man, does that mean women can't? So would that be the next natural doubt? You know, so here man means generically as a species. Because we always have to remember the Shastra.

There was a time when they were being overly, you know, like pins and needles sensitive. The feminists were very worried that, you know, the Prabhupada and the Purports and the Shastra always says he. You know, why not? Just like, you know, it's like the archaic, you know, like older English and that.

Let's say you say one. One should do this or one should do that. And that works for everybody.

But then if you want to be more specific, you know, and bring it into the more contemporary, then you have to say, you know, he, she, he or she. But then now, but then that would work good. But then what is it? The L? I can never get it right.

LGBT? Yeah. Means they might complain because, you know, but, you know, are they a man or woman? You know, like that. So then you'd have to say it.

You know. And so therefore, he, she or it, you know, like that. So we see Prabhupada uses this third person, just one or a person or like that.

But if it says him or he or man, it's because the living entity thinks they're Purusha. Right? That's what we established before. And Purusha means male.

Right? So that's the one. Visaya, thesis. The four castes are scattered all over the universe according to acquired qualities of the modes of nature.

The Brahman is the Kshatriyas, the Vaishyas, the Shudras. Any man can attain to transcendent loving service of Godhead by his own occupation. Right? So that's the point.

By your taking your occupation, connecting to the Lord, anybody can come to the transcendental position. Reason. Only under such transcendental modes can the ordinary fruit of workers, the salvationists or the mystics also attain to Godhead.

Okay. So now the example and further explanation. The result of work is to satisfy material needs.

The result of knowledge is to attain salvation. The result of mysticism is to see all-pervading Godhead in its localized aspect. All these can be attained indirectly by transcendental loving service only.



Vritti. In his purport to 9.18 Srila Prabhupada writes, To approach the different energies of Krsna is to approach Krsna indirectly. One should directly approach Krsna, for that will save time and energy.

For example, there's a possibility of going to the top of a building by the help of an elevator. Why should one go by the staircase, step by step? Right? In other words, the processes of seeing God through His energies and all that, like we were discussing before, then that is valuable if the understanding of seeing God as a person isn't able to be appreciated. Right? So then by analyzing according to the mechanical aspects of what energies are working, and therefore what's the form, what's the activity, and what is the quality that you're trying to obtain, then you can see the Brahman aspect of anything that you look at within the material phenomena.

But, Krsna is still beyond this, so then why would you be doing that except to please Him as a person? So you bring it back to the person, but at some point then this activity is not so important. It's Krsna that's important. It's important to you because we're attached to it.

Right? So if we're attached to it, we're attached to what's sinful, then that will be given up. Right? As we become purified, we can give it up. If it's pious, then it can be engaged.

Right? But still it's the engagement that's of value. If you don't engage in it, no value. Srila Prabhupada writes, and so therefore if you can go directly, why go by it? So therefore devotional service, rather than it's not that we don't use these methods, but for us they're very quick, transient positions.

You might use it for a few moments to figure it out, then it reminds you, OK, it's Krsna, then you remember Krsna. But if we're talking about these salvationists and mystics and they're spending thousands, if not millions of lifetimes moving through that. Well, the devotee does it in a few moments.

Does that make sense? So, the point is getting to Krsna. Srila Prabhupada writes in the Purport to 1848, this example of fire and smoke is very appropriate in this connection. When in wintertime one takes a stone from the fire, sometimes smoke disturbs the eyes and other parts of the body.

But still one must make use of the fire despite disturbing conditions. Similarly, one should not give up his natural occupation because there are some disturbing elements. Rather, one should be determined to serve the Supreme Lord by his occupational duty in Krsna consciousness.

That is the perfectional point. When a particular type of occupation is performed for the satisfaction of the Supreme Lord, all the defects in that particular occupation are purified. When the results of work are purified, then connection with devotional service, when connected with devotional service, one becomes perfect in seeing the Self within, and that is Self-realization.

That could be, you know, taking it out so you can put some water on it to make the sauna work.

But, you know, in some way, you know. Conclusion.

In all scriptures, therefore, the only aim is how to attain Godhead who is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. So all scriptures. Any scripture, that's all it's trying to explain.

Nothing else. Okay? So then we'll continue tomorrow with this last doubt and last Adhikarana. Then we'll go on to the main part.