

2011-12-12 BG 1.38-40

Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare, Hare Kai, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare, Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Hare Hare And okay, so then, continuing with the Hare Kāriṇa, to a material nature subordinate to Godhead, then now we're in the conclusion of that. As omnipotent Godhead is manifested as all-pervading, impersonal supreme truth, in one manner described. So these are all the different details that are coming from that, so bottom of 38.

The living entities are eternally in the service of the Supreme Lord. This is also conferred by Lord Caitanya in His teachings. Therefore the description of Brahman mentioned in this verse is in relation to the individual soul, and the word Brahman is applied to the living entity is to be understood that he is Vijnana Brahma as opposed to Ananda Brahma.

Ananda Brahma is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. So here the living entity are eternally in the service of the Lord, so we'll take it that when they're in the spiritual world, they're in the service of the Lord, but when they're in the material world, then they're not. No, they still are, it's just they don't know it.

And so in this case, since they don't know it, because you're talking about relationship, you don't get the credit, you know what I'm saying? But devotees, they are doing devotional service, right? So that's known, so it's called devotional service. And they're doing devotional service if they engage others, even though they don't know, then it's agyata-sukṛti, right? But if others engage in proper activities without involvement of the devotees, and they don't know, it's just called pious activity. If they engage in things that are opposed to devotional service, then it's called impious activity.

Does that make sense? So, they're always rendering service. That's the point, because the Lord's energy is serving the Lord. Now whether they're serving, whether they're dealing favorably or unfavorably, you have two levels.

You have the consciousness, and you have the mechanics, right? Does that make sense? It means you perform an activity, that's the mechanics. But the mentality with which you perform it, your consciousness, that's a separate thing, right? Because the mechanics of an activity, the devotee can be doing it in Kṛṣṇa consciousness, and a non-devotee can be following same activity, same mechanics, and not connecting it to the Lord, right? So it's not in devotion, it's in illusion, in sense gratification. Does that make sense? So, the whole idea is that it means you're trying to get a result, right? Nobody engages in the activity unless it's going to give a result, right? And to perform the activity, a certain amount of knowledge is generally necessary, is necessary.

So whether you're conscious of that knowledge, or whether somehow or another by practice or habit from previously performing it, you're doing it even though you're not aware of it. Right?

But that will give less efficacy than if you are. Does that make sense, right? So in any case, the mechanics are being performed, right? So now the proper, so now if you follow the mechanics properly, then that means that you are assisting in that activity, because that activity is being controlled by the Lord's energy, right? It's not actually controlled by us.

We desire so we are therefore involved in it, right? So we want to be involved in this activity, therefore the material modes of nature are arranging the transformation of the situation, right? But because we are focused on it, we are involved, so we're the operational cause. Does that make sense? But we're still only doing what we're doing in the form that's established by the Lord's internal potency. Does that make sense? Cooking is established by the internal potency.

You can cook within the material nature, in maya, but how cooking works is established by the internal potency for the pleasure of Krishna. Does that make sense? So we're looking at it, oh, things there are like here, no, things here are like there. This is the reflection, that's the original, right? So the living entities are always serving because they're having to work under the Lord's energy.

Now they do that willingly, right? In devotion, then that is called devotional service. They're doing it willingly, but not in devotion. It's called pious activity.

You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? Like that. And even if they're unwilling, it's still only by the Lord's grace and by the grace of the Lord's potency that you can perform something that's not appropriate, right? It's still by their grace because we're not able to perform any activity. Does that make sense? We can only desire.

Does that make sense? Because the point is, is to do anything still requires a skill, an ability, and Krishna's the ability, right? But as we see as it goes, it gets smaller and smaller, the amount of potency required, you know? And it becomes more and more localized into a very narrow area, right? Does that make sense? Like that. So, yeah. Yes.

It means that everything is established by the internal potency of Krishna, every activity. Yes. It's just where you apply it. Just like one man is making a fire to do a yajna for pleasing the Lord, right? Another man's making a fire to do a karmakandya yajna, right? Another man is starting a fire so he can light his cigarettes, right? But the principle, the mechanics of the fire is the same.

It doesn't matter whether it's on the end of a cigarette or it's, you know, being used for another purpose, cooking for Krishna or... Does that make sense? It's the same thing. But the one is that it's, you're including, you know, the ritual, you're including, you're seeing yourself as a servant of the Lord, so it's a bigger area that you're dealing with. But the cigarette, then it's just dealing with you and the cigarette.

So it becomes very narrow. But the principle that it works on is still the same, but you're misusing it, right? But that ability to be able to figure out which end of the cigarette to light, be

able how to make the cigarette lighter work and stuff like that, that still is the Lord's grace. You know what I'm saying? Because, you know, quite often people are distracted and into something and light the wrong end of the cigarette, right, and then, ah, like this, you know what I'm saying? So that's because they're not actually performing the activity properly.

So even something like that, still, the mechanics are still based on fundamental principles and you have to follow them. So that's why the living entity is still a servant of the Lord, but he doesn't know he's a servant and he's not performing the activity to please the Lord, therefore he gets no credit for being a servant. His just position is that of a servant, you know what I'm saying? Just like the common person, you know, in the state, in one sense, is serving the state, right? They're following the laws, they're giving their taxes, so they're serving the state, right? And they appreciate they're a part of the state and they're doing like that.

The criminal is also a servant of the state, right? But his service is not, he doesn't see it as service to the state, right? Like that, you understand? Just as punishment or the, no, but he's still following the orders of the state and his time is his tax, right? The other one is his money, this guy's his time, you understand? So serving is still there, but one is in the negative, one is in the positive, but everybody is still serving the state. So in the same way, all living entities are serving the Supreme Lord, it's whether they know it or not, right? So the impious person doesn't know that his activity is not worthwhile, but the mechanics of his activity are still based on eternal principles, right? The person who uses those principles for an uplifting activity, that's pious, right? But it's still not God-conscious, right? Then you have the point where you're engaging that pious activity in the Lord's service, so it's called devotional service, right? Then you're conscious, right? And then, of course, like we said, yagyata-sukrti, someone's doing devotional service because the devotees are arranging it, right? So devotional service is manifest, but others are taking part, but they don't know it. Ratha-yatra is going by, and there's, oh, who's the guy with the big round eyes, or they appreciate the dancing, or everybody's happy, or nice decorations, or something like that, so it's a yagyata-sukrti.

They hear the holy name, they might take the shod, but they don't know it's devotional service. So it's devotional unknown pious activity, right? So that'll add up to become devotional service. Yes? I don't understand how lighting a cigarette is serving the Lord.

Because you're taking the mood, you're taking the mood of service, that exclusively, that's the service, right? Let us say you have the prisoner, and he's making license plates, right? Who benefits by that? The state. The state, right? So is he serving the state? Yeah. He is.

Now does he feel, I'm serving the state, I'm being a good boy, or it's something he has to do, but he'd rather be playing basketball? Well, it is something he has to do. Yeah, so the point is, if you want the cigarette to work, you have to light it according to God's laws. So you're following the laws.

But he doesn't have the mentality of servant, he has the mentality of enjoyer. Just like the person who's doing the very nice, he's helping the old lady across the street, right? So you'll say

this is something very nice. But his mentality is just, I'm a good person, I do these things.

It's not that the old lady really matters, it could be any old lady, it's not this old lady is special. So it's just his identity, but he's still doing it for material purposes, just therefore we'll call that pious. It's a nicer application of it.

So it's following a greater environment of laws, right? Social laws, rather than just mechanical laws. So then, like, instead of using the example of lighting a cigarette, say, you use the example of cooking, but you're not cooking for a Christian, you're cooking for yourself. That's what I do, but then the problem comes as like this, and you won't understand that every living entity is serving God, and therefore make a distinction.

I don't understand about lighting a cigarette, but I couldn't understand about cooking because then... Because you're looking at pious and impious activity, and you take it pious as devotional and impious as not. But I'm taking it that pious or impious, they function on the same mechanics. And so the real thing is, the real differentiation is, are you conscious of God or not? Because then the problem comes is then, you have the nice people down at the yoga studio, and they're so nice, and they're better people than the, you know, the, how do you say, the street wallahs, you know, down at the mechanic shop, who, you know, talk dirty and about all, you know, lewd pictures on the wall.

But there's absolutely no difference between the two as far as, they're both not God conscious, so they're both, they're both demoniac. Just one is more cultured demoniac, one is uncultured demoniac. You understand? Because we're taking the principle, pious means it's connected to the Lord, impious means it's not.

So once again, I'm putting my value in the past. Right, right. But the thing is, is that's why the example is given, is because the other one, I use the cooking, that works nicely, and we're comfortable with it, you know.

But the problem is, is that when we're differentiating, then we, how, what will we decide? Okay. The brahmachari was talking to the lady, oh, this is very bad, right? You know, why was he talking to the lady here and this and that? Then, but the grihasta man is talking to a lady that's not his wife, and they're sitting in his house, it's private, nobody's there, and nobody will say boo, why? Because of our own Western values. But according to Shastra, when it defines adultery, the whole definition is given in connection with grihasta men with women.

There's no example given of brahmacharis and sannyasis with women, because if you understand the one with grihasta, which is the fuller, then the sannyasi and brahmachari is automatic. You know what I'm saying? Just like if I, if you understand the process of cooking rice, I don't have to explain boiling water. You understand? So, so, but we'll look at it that, you know, all the bad things, you know, all the bad sexual things within the society have always been, you know, the gurus, the sannyasis, the big, you know, the brahmachari temple president.

Nobody talks about the huge volume of grihastas getting involved in illicit activities, running off with each other's wife, and that doesn't even feature. That's just, hey, well, that happens, you understand? So why? Because of our values, that's not a big deal. So what we're doing here is separating that it's not our values that define what is standard.

We start from our values to connect ourself to Krishna, that we do. But as far as what's right and wrong, that's already set by God, it has nothing to do with our perception. You know what I'm saying? In other words, does the man who smokes a cigarette, does he make up the laws that define, you know, that the fire is hot, and if you apply the tip of the fire to the proper end of the cigarette, that the cigarette will light? You know, does he define that if the cigarette is packed too tightly or too loosely, it will burn better or not burn properly? You know, does he define that when you get to the end of the cigarette, then that's when you have to stop smoking it, because either you'll burn your lips or there's nothing left? These are all laws established by God, but they're using laws of fire and burning in a sinful way.

And even that's not the worst part. The worst part is that it's not connected to the Lord. Because even if we use it in a pious way, the person uses the fire very nicely, he cooks.

And he not only does he cook, he cooks at a home, you know, for the, you know, the, those who don't have much facilities like that. You know, he cooks at a home where kids that were in foster homes that didn't work out well, they come to this shelter, and he cooks there, and he tries to cook nicely because he knows they don't have much else, and they've had a bad life. And we'll go, wow, this is a really nice guy.

But the point is, is he's only nice because we think he's nice. You understand? Nice means it's done for God, you understand? But the point is, is why would we consider it nice? Because he's cooking for others, right, at the sacrifice to himself. So sacrifice is the principle.

But sacrifice only becomes real when it's connected to the Lord. Any other sacrifice actually isn't real. It's an illusion, right? And even there, now let's say he goes in there, and he cooks.

Now he knows what he's doing, he's following God's laws of cooking. He doesn't know what he's doing, he's not following them, so he doesn't get a good result. So it doesn't matter, the reason someone's very expert in this world is they're following God's laws.

Now whether they attribute it to Shastra or not, that's another thing, right? But it's just like the bird, the bird flies, right? Does it know all the mechanics of aerodynamics and all that? No. But it's following the laws of God, so it flies, right? Does that make sense? And then you have the Wright brothers there trying to figure out about these dynamics, and then they sit there and they put together their little gliders and this and that, and then they kind of start being able to do stuff that birds on their first day work out, right? Does that make sense? So that's the element is that the mechanics are already there established by God. So there's the mechanics that you're working with, then there's the consciousness of which you're doing it.

So we ignore the mechanics, right, and look at simply the conscious, which is appropriate because the consciousness is the primary element. But as long as the consciousness we would consider is improved, we'll say that's good. So therefore, the nice guys doing all this welfare work, we'll consider good.

But actually, you know, in Krishna's estimation, they're the last in the line, basically. The only thing worse is the Mayavad, you know what I'm saying? Because they're nice now, but there's a purpose behind it, and next life then they may not be so nice, or even this life they may not be so nice, you know? You know, you have Vlad, he was a, what do you call him? A, well I guess at that time it would have been Hungary. He was a Hungarian, you know, prince.

He was extremely religious, extremely religious, until one time he went off to war and when he came back after a few years his wife was dead. Then he became an atheist, right? And then his reputation also grew at that time, and he was known as Count Dracula. But he was extremely religious at one time, and then he became an atheist.

So the point is, is you can move around within pious, unbiased, this, that. That's just changing, like the seasons and all that change. Point is, is devotional service is the actual measure of what's there.

So now we're breaking it into knowledge, you know, and then the technique based on that knowledge, and then the actual proper consciousness, right? So the difficulty is, is if we do, we'll emphasize in connection with religion simply the mood, which is not bad because it's the highest, but then the problem comes is then you end up just with sentiment, because there's no philosophy. Therefore, many of the religions of the world, then they just deal with, if you have that faith in God, then that's all you need. On one level, yes, it's all you need, but somehow they don't apply, it's the faith in God when they go out and run their business.

You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? So the weakness comes is then the mechanics, and then for mechanics, we don't see that God's given the mechanics. So we go to the karmis for the mechanics, when God's already given the principle mechanics. You go for the detail of mechanics, that you get, because that's an art, and you learn that from artists.

But the science of it, it's not seen, because what I'm talking about here in the cigarette is the science of the cigarette, how it's functioning. How does fire apply itself into a cigarette? We're not talking the art of it, how he'll hold it and do all the different things. We're not talking about that.

We're talking about the science. But even that, even the art, the art is still defined by God, because there's a certain hand that would be considered refined, certain mudras that are already there. So if you use these finer mudras, you know, grab your cigarette like this, someone's going to say, wow, that guy's really refined.

Stick it at the end here. You may make it tough, you know, you'd expect him out there with a

motorcycle and a shotgun. Okay, great.

But it's probably not going to work at the Academy Awards or something like that. So the thing is, is even those are defined. Everybody is following God's laws.

If they're successful, it's because they're following it properly. They're not successful because they're not following it properly. But devotees don't attribute that, okay, I'm going to take this self-help book, and I'm going to study this, and I'm going to be successful.

But they're not, in no moment are they thinking that this reason that these principles that are being, or these points that are being given in this book are based on observation of God's laws. That never once crosses a devotee's mind. Otherwise, why is it when you go to one of those seminars, you know, it could be the guy there with the bald head himself, not me, it means not us because we don't have a bald head if we're giving a seminar.

And, but it'll sound the same, smell the same, everything the same, except for not his expert. Right, because he's looking at principles, we'll look at details. But in none of them is it being connected to God.

You understand? We don't have any problem with science. We say this whole thing, this dichotomy, there's science and there's religion. All science is is the observation of God's laws.

That's all. So therefore, if someone's religious or irreligious, if they look nicely, they'll see something. So it's not a problem.

The point is, what are you going to do with that observation? That's the point. Does that make sense? So we're trying to distinguish what factors we're actually working with, the field of activities. Because when it says the senses, you have the field, you have the senses.

So the field is, you have the guy there, you have a cigarette, you have a lighter, you have his hand, you have his mouth, you have his lungs. So those are all the field of activity. Generally, his eyes will be involved also, unless he's just so good he could roll the cigarette himself while he's driving his motorcycle and all that.

Well, then you have to include the tongue, right? So that would be right there. You know what I'm saying? But it's still, it's a matter of, this is the field. Now, if they don't match them up, it won't work.

You know what I'm saying? So you have the field, the knowledge, the senses. But then there's the point of the soul. Now, is he only involved in assisting in this process, you know, for his purpose of sense gratification? Or is he involved in the process because he sees it's God's laws, right? Or does he do it because it's favorable to the Lord, right? So now, the principle of the cigarette is smoking, is fire, right? People do it because it's sense gratification.

Right? But the principle is fire. So he's dealing with the fire in a sinful way. According to the

rules, but he's applying it sinfully.

And his consciousness is sinful. But now, dealing with fire doesn't change. Right? If he's good at that, he'll be good at using fire also in a pious way or in a devotional way.

That's why we're saying the person who is expert at something, then if they take up Krishna consciousness, they'll apply that same expertise into Krishna consciousness. You know what I'm saying? But we'll say, oh, he's such a gross materialist. He's just absorbed and he'll never be able to become a devotee.

But if you can convince him, he'll be very expert at practicing devotional service. The point is, is being good at mechanics, you're good, whether it's devotional or not. It's not that I'm not good at mechanics and then I become a devotee.

Automatically, I'll become good at that. No, if you're sincere, Krishna will give you intelligence. But it still all comes back to God.

Does that make sense? So the point is, the living entity are eternally in the service of the Supreme Lord. But here, they're indirectly dealing in this way. Right? So they're serving Krishna in the form of fire.

But they don't know that it's God. They don't know this. It's not being done in a favorable way.

So they get no credit for serving God. Right? But they're serving God. The illusion is that the living entity in any situation is separate from God.

Does that make sense? Yes. This knowledge makes one pundit. Yes, that's the idea, is that you can see God in everything.

So the point is, is it's the superior quality that's God. It's not the smoking the cigarette is God. It's the principle of fire, and that's working as God.

You know what I'm saying? Enjoyment, happiness is also God. But they're applying all these things in a wrong way. So the superior quality is Krishna.

But its use of that superior quality is not. Does that make sense? Yes. Yeah.

Because then he sees equal. Because then anybody can be a devotee, everybody else. So you just see the potential that's there.

Otherwise, we'll simply look at it from the modern moralistic point of view. Oh, this person could become a devotee because he's more moral. But this person who's not moral couldn't become a devotee.

But actually, that's not the point. It's who's receptive to God consciousness. Because the very moral religious person, you tell them about, you know, God consciousness.

They try to convince you, you try to convince them. But your arguments are better than theirs. And so, therefore, the only way that you could be better than them at it is that you are a representative of the devil.

And he can turn on you like that. So instead of being another religious person, you know, you're the devil. Simply because their false ego is hurt that, you know, they thought they were really good at all this, and then you're better.

Because all they have is faith. They don't have knowledge. So that creates sentiment.

And if you take it further, it creates fanaticism. So not knowing philosophy, you get sentiment and fanaticism. But if there's philosophy, then the point is, no, it's whoever's favorable.

Because that person's very proud of their position, I'm religious, I'm fine, even though they're suffering materially. You know, it doesn't matter to them. But the other person, the materialist, now he has a difficult situation.

He thinks he's the controller and enjoyer. It's obvious it's not happening. He may be open.

Or he may be very demoniac. No, I have another plan. You know, like that.

So does that mean the 1950s and 60s avant-garde endings were demoniac? Because it always ended with, you know, it's almost going wrong. I've got a plan. And then it closes, like that.

Yeah, in a sense, you could say. There's always that hope. Yeah.

We can make it. It's always, there's no... So like 1980s avant-garde movies, they were actually quite pious. Because it was always ending with everything going wrong.

Yeah. Then you had like this, but then... Because that's the pessimistic. The other one is the karma.

You know, it's like, no, we can do it. The other one is, no, see, you can't do it. You thought you could be happy.

Well, you can't be happy. Why? Because I can't be happy. Just like that.

Yes. Can we say then, if we analyze that pious and impious is actually a combination of activities rather than activities? Yeah. It's what it means.

It means there will be standard activities you would consider pious and standard activities you would consider impious. But the mechanics of them may be non-different. You know, just like we were saying here.

The mechanics of illicit sex and the mechanics of sex according to religious principles, the mechanics are the same. You know what I'm saying? The difference is in whether you see it in relationship to higher authority or not. You see it in relationship to higher authority, then you're

including a bigger range.

The field is greater. Right? So, it's greater means it's getting closer to the Lord. So, therefore, it's pious.

As it's getting smaller, it's considered impious. It's moving away from the Lord. Right? Right? Because the guy's smoking cigarettes, so God's not included.

God's laws aren't included. Right? He doesn't even, you know, may not even accept that, you know, he may get cancer from this. He's not considering anybody else in the room.

Like that. So, it's just down to him and the cigarette and the lighter and all that. It's that small.

Like that. Does that make sense? While the other person, they're giving all these things and fighting. No, you can't fight and smoke in public places and this and that.

So, they're including health. They're including others' health, the broader, instead of anamoy, pranamoy. So, therefore, we consider it pious.

You know, because it's moving forward. It's progressive. But it's still, all it is is, you know, the other side of the same thing.

Attraction and repulsion. You know what I'm saying? So, it's only when it becomes connected to the Lord that it becomes real. Right? Because we're used to the concept that pranamoy is actually religion and is actually spiritual.

But it's neither religion nor spiritual. Right? It's simply a finer form of sense gratification. Religion means it's your duty based on your inherent nature.

Right? The other one is simply based on, it's productive for myself, so it's anamoy. It's productive for others, it's pranamoy. That's all.

But the productivity is your principle. Does that make sense? Like that, yeah. You know, when we're saying the facilities for the senses are being encouraged, they're being developed, we call that artha.

When the senses are engaged themselves for their own productivity of sensuality, then we'll call that anamoy, or self-centeredness. You understand? So, but the point is, you know, so one is considered glorious, one's not. But if your range is only that, you'll consider that really good.

You know, like you have a bunch of kids out in the backyard, and they're jumping. Who can jump farther? And one jumps, you know, 90 centimeters, and the other can jump 100 centimeters. Right? Then they're considering, wow, yeah, you know, he's the champion, he's not.

You know? And then, you know, along comes the Jamaican from next door and jumps, you

know, like five meters. You know? That is kind of like, boom. You know, so both of them are, you know, not so well-situated.

So it's just, if you compare between those who don't know what they're doing, you take who's the less bad of it, and he's the great one. Yeah. That's all.

Ja. Welcome. Does that make sense? You were two minutes late for our comparison of 60s and 80s avant-garde endings, where they were in the demoniac or non-demoniac scape.

Which was the final conclusion? That the earlier ones were more demoniac, because even though the situation was impossible, somebody said they had an idea, and then, you know, it gives you that hope. You know, like that. But at the same time, you could also look at it that someone, the materialist, whether he's a karmi or a jnani, is considered bad.

Bad association. But of the two, better the karmi than the jnani. So then, in that way, you can consider the 80s endings, where it's bad, and they accept it as bad, and it just completely falls apart, and there is no hope, is actually worse.

Because the point is, is the relationship with the Lord, and those kind of things, there is always that hope. But here they make the idea that life is not worthwhile in relationships, so we could take it as even more. That's true.

Like that. So that one. Extended version.

Yeah. Okay, is this clear, what we're trying to do? In other words, in analyzation, we're breaking it up into parts. What we have to be able to do is not be attached and apply our own values onto these parts.

Because it's when we put it together, and it's favorable to Krsna, right? That's when it becomes devotional. Because even if you're a conscious of God, that doesn't necessarily make it devotional. Right? Because someone may follow God's laws.

I want to become rich, and there's the standard laws that you have to behave. Okay, now if you deal with money properly, you'll get money, you give money in charity, and you'll get back. And if I give to qualified people, I'll get more back.

But these laws are established by God, therefore I'll follow them, I'll become rich. Right? So he's following the proper mechanics properly. He's God conscious, but it's not favorable to God.

Right? Because it's totally based on karma. Right? But he has some knowledge, right? But only enough knowledge for the karma. Does this make sense? Right? So, therefore, when we look at it, the living entity is always the servant of the Lord.

Because he's always taking part in the Lord's pastime. But he's not necessarily taking part in a way that's favorable to the Lord. Or even with an understanding.

But he can't get out of the point that God is everything, and he's the mechanics of how everything works. He's the purpose of those mechanics. He's the knowledge behind those mechanics.

Right? That's what's meant when Krishna says, but the example is given in a very nice way. He is the sacrifice. He is the person performing the sacrifice.

He's the person who is having the sacrifice perform, or the sponsor. He is the mantra. He is the gi.

He is the ritual. Right? He is the paraphernalia. He is the results.

Right? So, in other words, that same applies to anything. You just have to know what's the superior quality that's functioning. Right? Because when we say smoking, we think of the smoke and the guy and lung cancer and that.

No, it's fire. So the principle of fire working, that's God. Or we could take the principle of health, right, from the eye of it.

And then from there, then it's bad because of, you know, like that. So, you can apply these different things, but you have to know how to see God in them. The difficulty comes is our values, then we have a consideration.

Right? The value, we apply it in a certain way, but even what's the root of the value we're not looking at. You know what I'm saying? Because we get caught up in the form of the values. And so we even, therefore, again, miss Krishna, we see the energy and we have our opinions about it.

But the point is that energy is to serve Krishna. So we still miss. So until you get to the root, the root's always Krishna.

Then what's perceivable and what's interactive, that's the Lord's energy. Right? You see that connection to the Lord, you're dealing with the internal potency. You deal with His energy not in connection with the Lord, you're dealing with her in the form of Maya.

Does that make sense? So the living entity is always situated in that position. Right? So therefore, Krishna is Ananda Brahma and the living entity is Vijnana Brahma. Right? So now in the footnote, Baladeva.

Srila Baladeva Vidyabhusana writes in his commentary to Vedanta-sutra, The word Ananda-maya used in the Vedic literature must refer to the Supreme Brahman, for it is repeatedly used to describe Him. The four verses of Taittiriya Upanisad, beginning with the verse Anad, Vai, Prajah, describe the Anamaya, Pranamaya, Manamaya and Vijnanamaya levels of existence. Each of these levels is progressively higher than the preceding one.

And after them, the Ananda-maya level, which is different in quality, is the highest of all. Right?

Because it's different in quality. Because the first four are Dharma, Artha, Kama and Moksha.

Right? Not in that order. The order will be Anamaya will be Kama. Then Pranamaya will be Artha.

Then Manamaya will be, how do you say, Dharma. Then Vijñanamaya will be Moksha. Right? So those all have the similar quality.

Right? They're all material. So that's the common thing. Then, within that, three are dealing with karma, one is dealing with jñana.

Right? In the way of fruit of activity and liberation. So they seem that they're different, but there are two sides of the same thing. Because even if you're trying to enjoy yourself, there's always the other point.

Right? You're there, you go to the restaurant, you order whatever's the best on the menu, and that, you enjoy yourself and all that, but can you just sit there and keep enjoying yourself? No. You have to get up and leave. Right? Then you can go back again to enjoy yourself.

But if you just stayed there, and this is so great, I'm staying here, you know, like that, there's a good chance that, you know, they'll tell you to go. And if you don't go, then they'll, if they have security, they'll usher you out. If not, they'll call the police.

Right? You understand? So there's always the two go together. But the point is, is the one nourishes the other. Because there's renunciation, therefore, the fruit of activities goes nicely.

Right? And because there's fruit of activities and the pain for that, therefore, the path of jñana goes nicely. If there was nobody trying to enjoy themselves and therefore suffering, would the Mayavadis have a great audience? Would their people be flocking to their doors? No. Does that make sense? So the one always nourishes the other.

It's just which one you are focused on. Right? That's all. So therefore, they're the same thing.

Anandamaya is completely different, because it's transcendental. At this point, someone may raise the following objection. These levels of existence describe the condition souls have fallen into the raging river of material suffering.

A raging river. Why has this stage of blissfulness, Anandamaya, been made the chief of these stages of suffering? Does this continue? Ah, okay. I was going to say you can leave it there and tune in next week.

To this objection, I reply. There is no fault in this. The all-blissful personality of Godhead is present in the hearts of all the suffering-conditioned souls.

And therefore, it is perfectly appropriate to mention them together. The Vedic literature speaks in this way to make a difficult subject matter intelligible for the unlettered common man. Just as

one may point out the small, difficult-to-see star, Arundhati, by first pointing to a nearby easy-to-see star, and then lead the viewer from that reference point to the tiny Arundhati.

In the same way, the Vedic literature is first described as suffering-filled life of the conditioned souls. And then, from that reference point, teach about the all-blissful personality of Godhead. So here we see that the point has been made, the objection comes up, but immediately he just starts with synthesis.

What you're saying, there's no real fault in it. But it's just that you're not seeing that bigger picture. You're adding to that what makes it complete, right? Rather than fighting with the two points.

It's not a matter of, you know, there's this and that, like we were discussing the other day. Oh yeah, with Indriyaj. He made the point that when you ask most kids, they learn in the school, you know, what's Hinduism, they'll say, well it's a religion where they worship all the demigods, right? Like that.

And then they may say, you know, this one's supreme, that one's supreme, depending on who the teacher was. And then the normal thing we'd do is say, no, no, there's, you know, the one supreme God and all that, and all this is all nonsense and that. So what happens here? How many opinions are there now? Two.

Right. But this method he's using here as synthesis is that, yes, that's there, and then there's the head of all of them who gives them their power and authority. That's the single supreme personality of Godhead.

Right? Then there's no two opinions. You've simply taken what they know and taken it a step further. And by doing that, you remove all the problems that would be with the demigod worship and Shiva and Parvati and anything else that may come up.

Does that make sense? Yes. You've just used your trump card. You've used your trump card.

You haven't written any other... Yes, but it's more than a trump, because the trump would generally be taken as evidence. It's a technique. Because then when you're giving your examples, that's generally where you give all your evidence.

You know, so you give a progression of your evidence. If there's a need, if it's something very simple, one evidence should do. If you need a series, then you would take them through.

But here is what you're doing is you're presenting that what they're saying is already included in what you're saying. They're just not able to see it. So you're pointing out what it is that causes them not to be able to appreciate what you're saying, because you already appreciate what they're saying.

Right? They see it as two opinions. You only see it as one opinion, just two different parts of it.

Does that make sense? Yeah, that would be the... You know, it's just like... It's just like... Okay, does that make sense? So, the point is that you're doing it by starting at one place, because they're not going to understand this other point.

Right? Because it means here, when you're talking about Arundhati, it means what we call the seven sages, or the great different. Right? So there's seven sages there. So one of them is Vashishta.

So next to Vashishta is Arundhati, because Arundhati is his wife. Right? But you can't see that star immediately. It means you look in the sky, you're not going to see it, but you can see the seven sages.

Then from seeing the seven sages, next to that one is Arundhati. So that's the whole point, is that there's all kinds of things that can be talked about, so you start with something that they can relate to, and then slowly bring them to the point. That's what you're doing, because they'll think, oh, how did he work out that he talked about his car, and that, you know, to that... Well, I can never remember his name, because there's so many of them.

Graham Hill, or something, Moss, or... I can't remember. But one of the British, you know, Formula One racers. So he started talking about some, you know, 1940s, I think, British car.

You know, it was available in India and all that, and it was a bit of a classic. And so immediately they both start talking about it, you know, he gets involved. And then he moves it from there, so that's the common ground, is the car.

So then he moves it to driving the car, right, because there's the car itself. Then there's operating the car. Now, in operating the car, in his situation, it's very dangerous.

So operating it in a dangerous situation, then does he become afraid, right? And then become afraid, what does he do about the afraidness? You know, does he turn to God? What does he do? So in this way he brings it to a discussion about God. Because a person could talk about cars, and they'll talk all day about cars, but he doesn't connect that even in his own life that there is some element of God consciousness that he's unaware of. He'll just think it's part of the fear.

So you just bring it there. So that's what they're doing. You're just bringing it across.

You're starting at the common, right? Now, in this case, it's just automatically synthesized. So it's what you're saying is fine. But you have to know it's this part of it, right? And so therefore don't use it against that part of it.

Does that make sense? Like in yesterday's discussion in the class, in the questions. It was taking two parts of the same discussion and pitting them against each other. You know what I'm saying? But they're both part of the same thing.

It's just like, you know, A plus B, right? You know, times, you know, A over C. Right? Then we can go, we'll go, no, but this is addition, and that's division, so they have no connection. No, but it's algebra. It's all part of the same thing.

They're not opposed. No, no, but they're different. No, they're the same thing.

So that's what happens is that we see, we're trying, what we do is we take something and then we take elements within it and fight the elements within it against each other. But the point is, is those elements are part of a field. The field is created by God.

How the field runs is established by God. Therefore, if on that level you can't see it, the next level up will give the answer, or the level above that. Right? That's the whole point.

Because as you go above, then you start to see how God's involved in it. Right? So here, that they're complaining, why it is that there's these two things, and why would you say it's higher? Because dharma, artha, kama, moksha, the shastras have been talking about that forever. Now suddenly you're introducing this anandamaya.

So why is it it's not in with these other five? Because anandamaya is more subtle. So dharma, artha, kama, moksha, everybody in the material world is going to relate to at least one, if not more. Right? So once you've established that, then you can move on to the anandamaya.

So he's saying it's not wrong that you have this objection. But the reason for that that is coming up is that we're presenting what's knowable to you, and then through that getting to the unknowable. Right? Because in logic, you start with what's known to get to what's unknown.

Right? You don't know there's a fire on the mountain, but you can see the fire and you can see smoke. They're known. But from combining those two, then you can understand that there's fire that is unseen.

Right? So in the same way as you take things that you can see, and then from that we can understand there's the soul there, or there's God there. Right? It means we see nature. Right? It's obvious.

But then there's the element of that it's working so perfectly that we will call it laws. In fact, we will base our science and every last aspect of science on those laws and we'll say, that's scientific. But the point is, why would such science just happen by chance? Right? The odds of it would be so great that no scientist would ever take that odds as actually anything real.

You know, I think for this to be like it is by the odds, it's something that trillions or something, that it can happen once. You know? Does that make sense? You know, there's a guy sitting here and he's got, you know, saffron clothes on and cheddar in a pan and all that. You know, it means each one of those could happen once in trillions.

Right? And then, amazingly, he's not the only one. There's more. Right? So does that mean

they're clones or it's a virus? You know, I mean, but the point is, it's way beyond anything they wouldn't be able to mathematically calculate.

Right? So that's why, you know, in other words, if you can't calculate it by math, you know, for them it's not real. And since they can't calculate it, so it's so much bigger than their ability, therefore it does not real. Right? So, but it's based on the science.

So then we can see is that, therefore, anything that has such regularity and such science means there's intelligence behind it. So that means to run this whole nature, there must be a superior intelligence. So through seeing nature and seeing the regularity, taking those two, then we can understand the third principle.

Right? Does that make sense? Because there's nature, right, that's running regularly. Right? So you have A and you have C. What makes them run, what makes them connect? That's B, God. Does that make sense? That's how it works.

So that's the process we're using here. So it's not, means it's very, means in other words, if you're aware of it, anyone can use it. It's just being able to identify.

Is that okay? Yes? Yes. In order to, in order to apply this concept, you need to understand the atym-tabula-veda-tattva. Right, yes, yes.

It's connected. Yes, connected. It's intubated.

That makes it the easiest. But anyway, as long as you understand that God is, you know, he's the creator, he's maintaining everything like this. So you're talking to the kid playing on the street.

It's not what he's playing that's important. We'll get into, oh, why this game, not that game, and, you know, you're doing this, but you'll be happy if you play. No, that's not the point.

Why are they playing? It makes them happy. Why do you want to be happy? Right? I don't know. I just want to be, because that's the nature of the soul.

Why is it the nature of the soul? Because God is anandamaya. You know what I'm saying? In other words, it's knowing, it's knowing how to see the essential point in whatever's going on. Right? So, you know, we'll look, okay, spiritual.

We'll say, okay, it's all Krishna, but then how to see Krishna in it? So that one, see, even if one can't see it, but he has faith that it's God, then, you know, that's there. Devotionally it's beneficial, but mechanically it'll be harder to apply that situation in your life or someone else's life. Really? So that's the idea.

If you can see that mechanics, then it just makes it so much easier, because you know what you're looking for. And even the mechanics will go better, because the point is the mechanics work, because they're dealing with items that get that goal. They manifest what you want.

Right? You know what I'm saying? Let's say the principle is beauty. You're looking for beauty. Right? So now you're standing in an empty living room and looking at all the floor space and the wall space and all the windows.

Right? And so now you're going to have to apply beauty into that situation. Right? So that means then there must be forms of beauty that in that situation will manifest beauty. Right? Of course, the architect is already standing there and saying it's beautiful, but, you know, that's great.

But then, you know, the person is going to move into it. That's another thing. That's why architects' houses, you look at it, there's nothing there.

There's no curtains. There's nothing. It's just the forms and, you know, the different things and, you know, the elements and that itself.

So then, you know, yeah, somehow they just have the glass house just sitting there. No way. So then, where were we? Ah, interior decorators.

Okay. So then the interior decorator will look at it, but he has to work with that field and he has to know the goal is beauty. Then he can say it's okay.

Then we can apply curtains, we can apply pictures, we can apply furniture, rugs, you know, how do you say, various, I don't know what you call, household accessories, you know, those kind of things. Does that make sense? Then you can draw out the beauty. But unless you know beauty is what you're looking for, then you don't know.

And unless you know what are the elements of beauty and the mechanics of beauty, you won't bring it out. Otherwise, so many people stand there and think we'll put this here and that there and when they get done, it's okay, but it's not something special. You know, why is it that, you know, you know, her stuff always looks so good and ours doesn't? You know, it's because of understanding these mechanics.

Does that make sense? So the idea is that by understanding how to get to the essence, it makes everything work better because God is the ability anyway. He is what you're dealing with anyway. So you're recognizing his laws in what you're functioning with.

Does that make sense? So that's what's not understood. We think, no, we have to go outside the Vedic literature to find, you know, profit and prosperity. No, the Vedic literature is the only thing that can define it because they start dharma.

Dharma defines, you know, generates artha. Like that. So that's why you can perform the activity, it doesn't get artha.

Right? Seemingly gets artha. Does that make sense? You know, the one person performs an activity, he gets profit. Another performs the activity, he doesn't get profit.

Why? Because the one is applying according to the rules, the other is not applying according to the rules. You know what I'm saying? The one man takes a bundle of notes, walks into a room, and there's a desk there, puts the money on the desk. Right? And then a month later, he gets two bundles of money.

Huh? Well, wait. Then another person, then the second person thinking, hearing about this, then he thinks, oh, so it's just a matter of putting a bundle of money on a table. So he takes his bundle of money and looks around in his house, what would be appropriate, he values his money, so he looks for his nicest table, and puts the money there.

Comes back after a month, there's, if he's lucky, there's still one bundle of money there. Right? Now, what he missed was that the first example, the person put the bundle of money on the table of his investor. Right? And there was something coming up, and it was invested, and he got a good return.

The other one just saw that he put money on a table. He didn't take into consideration that there's a guy sitting behind a table that he's going to do something with it. And also didn't take into consideration that he put the money on the table, and there's a person behind the table, his teenage daughter, and she took it out and went down to Rodeo Drive.

Right? You know, so then... Does that make sense? This is, again, the bigger and smaller... Yeah, the bigger and smaller means they're not seeing the essence. So you think it's putting the money on the table is what works. No, it's investing money.

Money grows by investment, not by being put on a table. You know what I'm saying? Now let's say you have a vase, right, and you have nice flowers in it. That you put on a table.

Then that's where you generate your profit. Because if it sat in your cabinet, you know, the cabinet somewhere... Well, it's not a cabinet. Yeah, a cabinet.

It could sit in the cabinet somewhere. The flowers are out in the back garden. There's no profit.

But now that's gotten out. You've got the others. Put them on the table.

Then your friends come over for tea. And then you get profit. Oh, such a nice arrangement.

You always make such... You know, like that, you're in profit. So you have to know what the essence is. The one, it's investment.

The other is being seen. Right? So even the cabinet, if you look at it, it's got glass windows so that people can appreciate all the facilities you have. Does that make sense? So the point is to get to the essence.

But the point is, is even one can get to the essence, that essence only has a value if you get to the real essence, which is Krishna. Right? And that should be favorable to Krishna. Right? Free from karma.

Yeah, that's called pure devotional service. But the mechanics of activity don't change. Success in an activity doesn't change.

That's what we're saying. The same qualities required to become a pure devotee are the same qualities you require to be successful materially. Right? Why does Indra is in a lower position and gets into more trouble than let's say, you know, the Prajapatis by applying this principle? Because he's following the mechanics but he doesn't see the connection with the Lord.

He gets up to a particular point. Prajapatis will take it higher. Brahma will take it higher than that.

You understand? But the mechanics of how you deal are the same. Brahma's dealing with, every day we were just discussing this morning, that when Brahma sleeps at night then everything up to Satya Loka is destroyed. Right? So that means every morning when he wakes up, he has to recreate the whole universe again.

Right? And then, 14 times a day, there's a change in all the major demigods. Right? Every 72 Mahayugas. So that means Indra and everybody changes.

So there's a destruction up to the heavenly planets. So that means 14 times a day he has to do a two-thirds or three-quarters reconstruction of the universe. Pulling them, you know, just after getting up.

You know, like that. Then, at the end of every Kali Yuga, then there's a destruction up to the middle planets. That's a thousand times a day.

Right? And that's one day. That's times 360, times a hundred. So therefore, you can understand, Krsna's made perfect arrangements that His desire for creativity is fully expressed to the point where He will think, I'm not doing this again.

Right? You know, that's the one side of, you know, Brahma that we generally don't think about. Does that make sense? Yeah. So it's like that with everything.

Like that. Yeah? OK. OK.

He's the Vijnana Brahma as opposed to Ananda Brahma. Like that. Is there some other names they give to the internal Brahma and the external Brahma? Or he just talks about these two? It means the Vijnana Brahma.

OK. OK. Oh, so he's talking about this Vijnana in connection with those levels of consciousness.

OK. Yeah. They don't understand that there's, that Jiva can come to the platform, Ananda Brahma, but then there's still the Supreme Ananda Brahma.

OK. OK. Then, OK, then 13, 14.

Everywhere are His hands and legs, His eyes, heads and faces, and He has ears everywhere. In this way the Supersoul exists, pervading everything. So now how the Lord is omnipotent.

The Supreme Lord can extend His hand without limit. The individual soul cannot. In Bhagavad-gita the Lord says if anyone offers of a flower or a fruit or a little water, He accepts it.

If the Lord is far distant away, how can He accept things? This is the omnipotence of the Lord. Even though He is situated in His own abode, far, far away from the earth, He can extend His hand to accept what anyone offers. Therefore this verse describes the Supreme Soul, the Personality of Godhead, not the individual soul.

So here on the platform, He is there because the Paramatma is everywhere, so His eyes, legs, hands is everywhere. And He is in every atom, between every atom. So basically there isn't a place where the Lord's hands, legs, eyes, face is.

Then you have the manifestation of this through the laws that govern what would be in connection with a leg, a hand, an eye. So the different varieties of legs and hands and eyes that will be manifest for the living entity to be involved with. Does that make sense? So in this way is the universal form, which will be taken on the platform of Brahman.

Then He is everywhere. Then as Supersoul, who is also universal form, because He is what makes all of that work, He is everywhere. Yes? Mark, when you speak about a Supersoul being in between the atoms, does it mean that He is present in the atoms of the space, the ether, and between the atoms of earth and water? Yeah, why not? Because it is Him, so why won't it be Him? Hmm.

You know what I'm saying? You know, it's your hand, but you're also within the hand. You know what I'm saying? So that's the point, is that it is Him anyway. But at the same time, as Supersoul, He also expands it.

You know, because He sanctions everything how it works. Because if He sanctions it, that means He's sanctioning what the living entity wants and what maya does. So maya is the external potency, so she is the atoms of material, you know, the external potency.

So all those 24 elements, that's her. So how will that work? How will something dead act as if alive? So the potency of that, the earth atoms could come together and form something like a brick or a table. That's still by the Lord's potency because He's in those atoms and they can do that.

Is that what you're saying? That's the problem, because this man is saying that everybody is in me but I'm not in them. Yes. So how is he to understand this? Means everybody is in Him because He's everything.

Is that understood? You understand that part? Mm-hmm. Yeah. And everyone is not in Him because He as a person is separate.

As a person? Yeah, as a person. Because everyone is in Him, that's as Brahman and Paramatma and like this, those aspects. But He is still separate from that as a person.

So they are not in Him. That's why we're making the point. You can be involved in God's creation but not be God-conscious or devotion.

Right? But the point is the mechanics of God's creation is Him. It follows His laws. It's not a matter of why one believes that or not.

It's just the way it is. Is that what you're saying? How do the residents of Pithiloka, forefathers, how do they take the offerings? How do they take the offerings? So you want to know how long is their arm? God is having this potency, so like... So that means God... So how God arranges that they get it is still by God's arrangement. Because if He's everywhere then He's the one that's affecting that.

How do you get the food from the plate to your mouth? You're one ten thousandth the tip of a hair. Right? Can you imagine how big a piece of, you know, cauliflower or potato would be compared to you? You know, billions of times bigger, right? So how is that working? Because the Lord arranges it. Right? Because He's there, so then... Does that make sense? If you want to know details, it's called a crow.

Crows eat it, it goes to the forefathers. Yeah. But still how it gets from the crow to the forefather, it's still the same principle.

God arranges it. Yeah. There's a Quranic description about one ray of the sun nourishes the lotus, which is full and small, and the nectar that fills it with the diet is in the feet and you drink it at certain times of the month.

Yeah? In other words, God arranges it. But you don't have to worry about it. Like, you have to worry about, you know, what happens between after you swallow, after you swallow something.

You know, you don't have to sit there and go, digest, okay, we need a little bit more juice from the liver here and a little of that. You know, you don't have to do any of that. You just have to not get in the way of the process.

Okay. Then 1315. The Supersoul is the original source of all senses, yet he is without senses.

He is unattached, although he is the maintainer of all living entities. He transcends the modes of nature, and at the same time he is the master of all the modes of material nature. Right? So, all these contradictory things.

So now, what is the meaning of nirguna and why can't the impersonalists see the Lord's form? The Supreme Lord, although the source of all the senses of the living entities, doesn't have material senses like they have. Right? In other words, it doesn't mean he doesn't have senses,

just his aren't material. Actually, the individual souls have spiritual senses.

But in conditioned life, they are covered with the material elements, and therefore the sense activities are exhibited through matter. So that's the point. The mind is spiritual, the intelligence is spiritual, consciousness is spiritual, but it becomes covered by the material elements.

Therefore, it's false ego, material intelligence, material mind, material senses, material body. So it's just a matter of uncovering. We'll take it that it's always these two.

Because in the material world, everything is always duality. So we'll always try to make it into two. But if there's something one, then we won't be satisfied.

We have to turn it into two. Then they can oppose each other, and then we can have some fun. Right? Because if everything's all one, and everything's all nice and all that, it gets boring.

So you have to make two. Right? Does that make sense? Yes. Does Krishna keep the senses and mind covered until the living entity starts to decide properly? I mean, of course.

But it's just a matter of how nice the covering is or not nice the covering is. You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? Yes. So that's all.

So are you praised in some academic journal or science magazine or GQ thinks you're great or, you know, like that. You know what I'm saying? So it's just a matter of there's better, lesser and nicer what you're covered. What are the combinations of what you're covered with? But the covering is.

So as you... That's why we say, purify the senses. It means the covering is less. So that doesn't mean that what you see there goes away and, you know, you start sitting there and start flickering and fading in and out.

People start going, you know, like that. You know, it's like it's a matter of your identifying with the material energy that's the covering starts to go away. Therefore, the material covering is not covering the senses.

Right? So then it's spiritual senses. But the spiritual senses manifest through material atoms instead of spiritual atoms. This is where it gets confusing.

That's the main difficulty that we were having yesterday's topic in the temple is that these two are simultaneously and to be able to look at both of them without applying our external values on it. Because as soon as we apply the values then we start to take it one way or the other. We take, you know, one and then the other becomes the opposition.

No, it's just a matter of they're not a problem. Right? Day and night aren't in opposition to each other. They're just different aspects of time.

Does that make sense? Yeah. Okay. Yeah, the sense activities and therefore the sense activities

are exhibited through matter.

The Supreme Lord's senses are not so covered. Meaning not so covered means that they're covered only a little bit not as much. They're not covered like that.

His senses are transcendental and are therefore called nirguna. Right? So this is the meaning of nirguna. It means there's no material guna.

Because when we say the word nirguna and saguna they both apply. He's nirguna on the material but he's saguna and he's full of qualities. Guna means the material modes but his senses are without material covering.

Should be understood that his senses are not exactly like ours. Although he is the source of all our sensory activities he has his transcendental senses which are uncontaminated. This is very nicely explained in the svetas of Karu Upanishad 3.19 in this verse apani pado javano grahita The Supreme Personality of Godhead has no hands which are materially contaminated but he has his hands and accepts whatever sacrifice is offered to them.

That is the distinction between the conditioned soul and the super soul. He has no material eyes but he has eyes otherwise how could he see? He sees everything past, present and future. He lives within the heart of the living being and he knows what we have done in the past what we are doing now and what is awaiting us in the future.

This is also confirmed in the Bhagavad Gita. He knows everything but no one knows him. It is said that the Supreme Lord has no legs like us but he can travel throughout space because he has spiritual legs.

In other words the Lord is not impersonal. He has eyes, legs, hands and everything else. Because we are part and parcel of the Supreme Lord we also have these things.

But his hands, legs, eyes and senses are not contaminated by material nature. So that is the thing. So his are different because they are transcendental.

Ours are covered. They manifest through material energy. So even when they are purified that ability to be a perceived Lord is still by his grace.

That is why he has to empower then it can be seen. And he is the source means he desires therefore the principle of seeing is there. So seeing there then the principle of how sight works through the various ways of seeing the different kinds of eyes are there are then manifest with it.

That then the internal potency arranges. Then according to the desire and qualification of the living entity then he gets eyes. So he can see.

But it is because the Lord is seeing. Does that make sense? Although we do not see his head, face, hands or legs he has them. And when we are elevated to the transcendental situation we

can see the Lord's form.

Due to materially contaminated senses we cannot see his form. Therefore the impersonalists who are still material affected cannot understand the personality. Got it.

So the materialists they have their senses are covered so they cannot see his which are not covered. Right. It is just like if you are covered by a blanket you cannot see what is outside the blanket.

You know. And then if you say nobody exists because I cannot see them. You know.

Like that. So then you say well unless you know unless God appears here but the point is it is not his appearing it is a matter of removing the covering. So why would he remove the covering when you like the covering? You know.

You know it is a cold winter day you have covered yourself with a nice blanket and say nobody exists because you do not see them. So unless they manifest so you come and start pulling on the blanket and he goes Hey! I will leave my blanket alone it is cold out there. You know.

So therefore you know it does not happen. So. So the person pulling on the blanket does not really exist.

They just do not talk about that. Yeah. But you do not talk about that.

Except for to tell them that you you know give them your order of the you know your hot chocolate. Oh yeah. Because they can put another log on the fire.

You know. So. Like that.

So then it is by your own mystic potency that you are able to control everything. Good. Yes.

Not you have to know all God's laws. You have to know that the laws that they function on are coming from God. You only have to know those laws in connection with your values.

You know what I am saying? Means you have a value. Let us say you value eating and therefore then you have to know the laws of either cooking yourself or knowing how to put yourself in a situation where there is good food. You know what I am saying? But you know but let us say you are interested in riding a bicycle so you do not have to know the laws that govern riding a bicycle.

Does that make sense? So therefore it is not that you have to know everything. You just have to understand that what you are dealing with then God is the essential principle of it. He is the actual value.

Though we only see the mechanics most of the time. Most people that is the difficulty is people only see the mechanics of their values. They do not actually understand what it is they value.

Does that make sense? You know just like let us say you know popular one. The person is a how you say natural food freak. Okay? But the thing is what is actually valued is health.

But what but there is a the the particular value has a manifestation that a certain kind of food stuff is accepted as healthful. And even though there might be other things that are healthful those will not be acknowledged within that. You know just like when we are cooking rice dal subji chapati the western health food freak will consider no that is so rich or that is so hot or so spicy that cannot be good for health.

So therefore my nice bland you know like this and you know stuff is that is healthy. But what does that make sense? But if health is the real point then you know this thing hates the digestion this does this this does that. The reason that the westerners will take the Indian food to be so rich and undigestible is because the westerners do not use chili.

And if they do use chili they put too much. So they are not expert enough to put exactly the amount if you put the exact amount you can take let us say we take you know let us say you know take a cauliflower ok and a half kilo of potatoes ok cut it up put it in a pot. If we pour in half a kilo of ghee right that will seem very rich.

But now if I put the right amount of chili it will neither taste hot nor will it taste rich. It will taste as if you know I have used very little chili in that and put in you know one tablespoon of ghee. And it will digest.

Because the point is you have to know the science. You understand? So the point is because of that then we will get the thing that no this is what is healthy. But they do not even actually understand that health is the essential point.

They will take it that the form is the real healthful point. You know? Does that make sense? You know? I understand what you are saying but I still feel that we have to get to know all the laws that we Yes but it is not that without knowing all of them that you cannot be God conscious. You start with whatever is prominent.

In other words you have so many values something is more prominent. Start there. And then by exercising that because it is the prominent one it will connect to so many others.

And they will connect to so many others. So from that then as you become good at that then you will look at you know it is just like once you get you know the living room looking really good then you start to work on other parts of the house. Once the house is looking good then you start to work on the outside the grounds.

You know what I am saying? So it just automatically expands. So you start with what is the primary asset. You see Krishna in there and what is working there and how to connect that then automatically seeing that connects to so many other you know important things you will start to see it there.

And then slowly slowly on you know you figure it out what to do with that little funny thing of where and what you know what particular you know earbuds you know why in that configuration where you kept them and why you used them. It will eventually get down to there. Unless personal hygiene is you know your primary thing then you will start there.

You know then eventually you get to something else like interacting with people or something like that. Does that make sense? Yes. Maharaj, just kind of back to Krishna path and I understood what you were saying about we have to stop where we are where we are at highest but in regards to like what Krishna wants when we go Oh that that is another step.

The point is that is why it said he is a person beyond that is that we are going to start from whatever it is that we are perceiving see the mechanics and then bring that to the point where we are God conscious and following the mechanics properly. So that is a step forward you acknowledge God's laws and you are doing everything according to that but the point is is you know which laws in which way are used in which situation to please God that is another thing. You know so that is why it continues because otherwise we would just okay I have connected this to God and then the job is done.

No that is the start but he is a person so how would he want you to like you know I am the cook you know so you know like this and so you specialized in Mexican cooking or something like that so you cook that for Krishna right and then you know you bring it up and the standards you know like there okay so it is cleaner and this and that but then at some point is oh how would Krishna like me to cook you know so the principle of cooking so Mexican food that is a manifestation of cooking so the principle of cooking how would he what is he like so the main thing of course is the devotion so whatever you have cooked has always been appreciated but the thing is is if you want to please him as a person then you would start to look at that and then you know Krishna's Kaviraj Goswami is explaining all kinds of far out things that is being offered to Lord Chaitanya and all that so then you think well he likes those so then try then you start to move in that direction Chaitanya Charita Muta so we have to wait so we have to wait I mean also the Bogartik song explains a lot full lunch right there now you just have to look at the song yes so to connect with Krishna without pleasing him means to connect with Brahman it means yes you are connecting with Brahman and Paramatma but if you are doing it for the purpose of pleasing him that you have these desires and you are engaging them and connecting with him for the purpose of pleasing him then it how you say it has that element it will be progressive I mean one is progressive of course if it is situated in the Brahman and Paramatma platform but that you are doing with the idea that that will therefore be purified to the point where you will be able to properly you know engage in what is pleasing to him what will be direct service right so then that will naturally come because it is by desire right devotional activity is based on desire so now when the desire is to please the Lord it is called devotional service when the desire is to please yourself it is called material activity right so it goes through the stage as we see here the two ends are basically obvious the problem is the middle because the middle can be used either way like the discussion before fire can be used devotionally piously and impiously so impious that is very direct because the form is impious

right the devotional will look at it that it is devotional but you can also follow that same activity acknowledge you know God's authority but not do it devotionally and it is called piety you know like that means somebody is performing these big yajnas and Lord Vishnu is coming to the sacrifice so they know he is the supreme but it is not being done to worship him as the supreme it is being done so that they can elevate themselves to the heavens and the planets does that make sense so that is the difficulty is that overlap that is where the confusion comes because what is recommended is using pious endeavor in devotional service as opposed to impious endeavor you know or pious forms instead of impious forms right but it is the mood that makes it correct so we get confused so those those pious or impious elements that I am comfortable with I consider those ok to engage right and if it is pious then I just do it if it is impious I will go well it is the mood that counts it is not the form and all these kind of things like that and so then I will always you know try to justify what I am doing now if it is a aspect that is not what I would approve of in my own personal values if it is impious it is automatically well that is impious but even if it is pious I will consider oh but that is karmakanda you know the devotee is sitting down reading Bhagavad Gita and then the temple commander comes along and says enough of this you know jnana we are supposed to do something practical use that it is kind of like hey is that devotional reading is also devotional service you know what I am saying but it will be taken in all these you know what I am saying because it is that stage that could go be defined either way but ultimately there is the Lord's energy and you use it for Krishna it is transcendental you don't use it for Krishna it is material and then within that you have pious and impious does that make sense so when we discuss the impious then there is always a problem right and as long as it is obviously impious then there is generally there is you know a strong reaction you know that this is not good but as we start to move that impious activity into what would be called standard malecha life then everybody starts defending it and saying no it can be engaged in the right service so it is just a matter of how how how much of piety or impiety is accepted by you in your own conditioning that defines that line you know what I am saying you know like it would be considered you know an impiety on the part of the father the girl herself has to go out and look for you know her partner you know but we will just say oh that is just practical for both you know what I am saying so it is just we just so easily do that so it is it is based on so the idea is that whenever that comes up we try to separate the things so we can see what is the God consciousness element you know what is the appropriate activity and what is you know what is not appropriate you know what I am saying as I was saying it means the father doesn't look after the daughter so she has to go out and get her own you know person like that so yeah that would be proper way to say person so that leaves it open yeah like that so then then then one would say well that is just practical but practical means what finding someone who actually practically is a life partner so is it does it end up that way like that so it doesn't work out all the time and even those that are you know that are staying together for the sake of the children you know like that it is still not following the proper thing so it wasn't the right partner so it doesn't doesn't really work but that can't be discussed because you know they don't see any alternative because the alternative appears to be restricting and that therefore you won't find you know what I'm saying instead of rushing out and just anything that smiles at you you know you know taking them home then like this

then you know after 30 or 40 of those then you know finally maybe you find you know the right person but you could have also used your intelligence figured out who it was and just went for the one that you know you waited 20 years to find anyway because all that time you really didn't know what you were looking for so instead of taking 20 years you might have worked it out in a much shorter time you know what I'm saying so the Vedas say it because it is practical right but there's some value the no I want to do whatever I want to do so yes then it would be impractical but if you're trying to get a good result then what you're doing is impractical so in other words the modern culture as far as individual freedoms and just doing whatever you like great but as far as actually successfully working as a social system that doesn't prove itself you know what I'm saying just like the kids they're free they do what they like whatever comes into their mind they say they do you know they're superman they're the king you know they're the this they're the that they're the you know tyrannosaurus rex they're you know anything whatever it happens to be then it's fine but are they accomplishing anything no you know and the parent has to do what they are according to their identity you know I'm the householder and I'm sitting here and I'm writing out my tax forms like that and therefore he gets something done so if you want to play and get nothing done then hey you know but if you want to get something done then that's something else does that make sense so the difficulty comes as being able to look at something without having a bias right bias inclination towards a particular yeah inclination a bias you prefer this over that so if I you know the two are there you'll take this one and not that one like that but it's before it actually comes up you have it not that I bring two things well let's see you know though you already have before right you know it's like that does that make sense you see the conditional mentality yes the conditional mentality so because of of the bias then we have a tendency is that even when we're dealing with a philosophy we'll apply that bias onto the elements of the discussion and so then one can't clearly see what is the devotional element right what are the mechanics being applied here you know what is the result you want to get from the mechanics what are the elements that you're working with you know and who are you in all this right so that's why it says do your duty do you have a place in this you walk into something you know it's just like you're looking around for a friend and that and he disappeared walked off somewhere and so you think he went that direction so then you walk in and you walk into this huge you know room with all kinds of desks and computers and this and that so it's a situation but do you have a duty there no because you're just looking for your friend so in this situation there's no friend so in the in the activity of looking for the friend he's not there you have nothing else to do there right but someone else walks into that room and they have a desk there and they have a job there and so therefore it is their field of activity does that make sense so then then it's a matter of performing one's duties but unless one knows who one is how do you know what are your duties so how do you know what situations you have a right to speak anything you know what I'm saying because that's the thing because we always think we have a right but unfortunately there's also an obligation you know like that so that's the thing yes where is religious and irreligious means when we're dealing with mechanics and religious means according to the to the law of God and irreligious means against the law of God so that's that's where the cigarette example wasn't understood right then then if you bring it down farther then religious means according to the inherent

nature means what that's what you're doing before as you're working according to but here is working according to the inherent nature of what is your nature therefore what is your duties you know what I'm saying in other words lighting the cigarette you are following the inherent nature of the cigarette and the you know the how do you say the lighter but the point is your inherent nature it's not your duty you understand you know because somehow or another you have lungs and smoke doesn't work so good in lungs so therefore you're not supposed to smoke you understand so if you take your duty in your situation then you would say it's therefore irreligious to smoke you know what I'm saying but you light the end of the cigarette that has no filter that's that would be religious because it's according to the nature of the cigarette if you light the other end it's irreligious now as far as fire goes it doesn't matter that's why you can take the guy when you find him smoking again go up take the cigarette out of his mouth you know wrestle with him get his pack of cigarettes and throw him into the fireplace the fire doesn't matter which end is lit first you know what I'm saying so they'll burn up you know the whole thing because that's the nature of fire right and it's the nature of cigarettes to burn you understand so you have to see at what level you're looking at what is the appropriate application in the particular situation in other words what's your goal therefore you look at your mechanics there just like we said you come into a room you're looking for something for someone if they're not there then your job in that room is done but if something in that room you've come to do like you walk into the kitchen and you know your mother's not there then you walk out and look in the living room or somewhere else but if you were trying wanting to cook walking into the kitchen that's where you do your activity so you have to know what is your goal that's what Krishna talks about the goal look at the goal first if you don't understand the whole thing well of course you look at the soul who you are and what the field is so you can tell the difference otherwise you can't tell if you're the body that means you can't tell the difference between you and the field because the body is part of the field right the field expands from the body right what what what situation the body is in contact with that's what you call the field if you can see it smell it taste it touch it because you don't have another way to deal with anything so whatever the body is in contact with that's called the field right but we're not the body so therefore the body the body is also part of the field then you can judge well what body is it so what what activities it can do in this field does that make sense so that's why sometimes when we're dealing with rights we're not seeing that they're we're not the body you know it's my right no it may be you're you're defining that as your body's right you know you're not saying it's the soul's right you'll say it's the soul's right but if it's the soul's right but then the point is is yes but the soul's right is according to the condition because you have to apply it does that make sense yeah oh okay if he concocts it and he still doesn't follow it he still does it that way oh okay so not following your own concocted ideas yeah yeah but the the principle is is you should stay you have to be fixed in what you do there has to be regulation so whether you make it up or don't you still have to follow something yeah there has to be integrity you know it's just like you have a gang but they'll say he's a good gang member because he follows authority he follows the etiquette he deals properly with the others he's loyal like that but he's in a gang no but he's he's a good gang member no no but he's in a gang he doesn't no it's just he's a good gang member like that means in other words if he's still alive

he's a good gang member if he's dead then you know then it depends who if someone else shot him then he may have been a good gang member if his own people shot him he wasn't a good gang member like that so it's he's following the thing you know so that's that's what because it's you'll either follow you either follow religion or you'll make up your own that's Bhaktivinoda Thakura gives that rule so here they make up they made their own up then they have to follow it so therefore one shouldn't become too complicated in making up one's own so in other words the concocted rule that we have a higher standard of deity worship because we take a bath after eating before going on the altar which is concocted right you're not supposed to it means after eating you wash your hands mouth and feet and you don't wear clothes that you've eaten in or slept in so so as long as you eat wash cleanse yourself according to hands mouth and feet and change into clothes that are you know not contaminated that's the rule of Shastra this other one is concocted so now if that is the concocted rule at your temple if you don't follow it then there'll be a reaction for not following a concocted rule so maybe this is why people are worried about changing away from their own concocted ideas to actual Shastra authorized principles no but we've always done it like this like that because maybe they have more recently visited that hell does that make sense it's interesting how do you tell what the concocted ideas are in these temples how do you tell means you know what the Shastra standard is I mean if you go into different temples there are different concocted ideas most of them no the thing is is see the spiritual ideas that you go to different temples and they'll emphasize different aspects because you know that's according to an individual's inspiration and you know dedication and then by association others take on that quality and so you'll see that but the mundane ones that are made up generally they're pretty all-pervading you start at one temple and you know within months the whole movement does it but you know something that's actual real spiritual standard you know 30 years and nobody can still understand it because it's not perceivable by the mundane senses so like every temple you go to the new bhakta takes the flower after the arctic and touches your forehead and shoves it into your nose and I mean some of who are not so expert do it when you're not chanting but the real expert ones do it exactly when you're chanting especially if you're leading the kirtan it has to be done when you're singing because it's your turn right? the other when you're not singing that's everybody else's turn but now you're singing so you're the lead singer so now you said now it's your turn to smell the flower right? like that but you go any temple you go to they do that who started that? Bhakta Jose yeah Bhakta Jose right and why? because it's a mundane concept right? there's something about it it means the principle of honoring the lord's maha prasadam that's correct but the detail is not according to tradition you know what I'm saying so like that all these ones that devotees make up those are the ones that are really the only rituals you'll find you know if it's actually traditional generally you know individuals here and there but most of the time you won't find them because of this principle we can't separate what's what we can't tell what's what you know what I'm saying it doesn't mean that there won't be uniqueness you know it's just like they dress the devotees nicely so one temple they like it more formal so they you know stretch the chudders and other things out flat so you can perfectly see them while another chudder another place will have it rounded and curved so some you can see and some you can't like that but you know so that will be according to their particular concept of

aesthetics right does that make sense how does somebody with the correct understanding of the shastic injunctions and these things how do they exist in a place where there's concocted ideas or stay in their room a lot or be out at some some program that's generally what you do or stay for a very short time there might be other methods you can ask around and see oh Hare Krishna Hare Krishna Krishna Krishna Hare Hare Hare Rama Hare Rama Rama Rama Hare Hare Shila Prabhupada ki Samaveda Bhaktivinoda ki Jaya Nityai Gaura