

2011-12-15 BG 1.54-57

Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare, Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare, Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare, Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare, Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare." Okay, continuing with page fifty-four. Such liberation of the living entity from material bondage is not at all easy. The impersonalists, the yogis, attain liberation only after much trouble and many, many births.

Even then, the liberation they achieve, merging into the impersonal brahmajyoti of the Lord, is only partial, and there is the risk of returning to the material world. But the devotee, simply by understanding the transcendental nature of the body and activities of the Lord, attains the abode of the Lord after ending this body and does not run the risk of returning to this material world. Because if you're on the same platform, then you can be involved on the same platform.

Right? So the living entity appreciates the Lord and His activities, the personal feature. Therefore, he can be in the Lord's pastimes. Right? So that position, then, is eternal.

But for the mayavadis, the impersonalists and the yogis, you know what he mentioned, right? Yeah, impersonalists and yogis. Then they may get to the Brahman after a lot of trouble, because they don't know about the spiritual world. Right? And they only think about merging, because they're a spiritual spark.

So if you remove the material body, and if you don't know about Bhagavan, then what's there? So it's not that there's a specific attachment to that they can't have one. They just don't know about. Right? Because all they're dealing with is from here.

Right? If you remove the material coverings, all that's left is the soul. Right? One ten thousandth of the tip of the hair. You don't know about the Lord's pastimes.

So there's just the Lord. So therefore, He's spiritual, you're spiritual. But you don't have a body.

He has a body. You either merge into His body, or you don't know He has the body, like the impersonals, the yogis know. But then you just merge into the Brahman.

Right? Because you're Brahman, and He's Brahman. So you merge into the Brahman. Does that make sense? But the devotee understands the Lord and His pastimes, and how there's nothing mundane about it.

So he understands the transcendental nature of form and activities. Therefore, then he will be on that same level, and will merge into that existence, which means within a form, you know, within the Lord's pastimes. Then you become absorbed in that.

Understand? So it's quite logical. You see? By principle, then there's no difference. Right? The

difference being is that they don't know about transcendental form and activities.

All the devotees do. So both come to the transcendental platform. Both are liberated.

The one is eternal, because you're in the pastimes. And the second, it won't be eternal, because the living entity can't function exclusively without a body. So he will be bad.

They're attached to not knowing. No, it's not that they don't... They're not attached to not knowing. They just don't know.

Because if you're attached to not knowing, that's like the Mayavadis. You know, that's your problem. Here he uses impersonalists and yogis.

Yeah, okay. So impersonalists doesn't... Right? It means Mayavadis are a class of impersonalists, but technically they're not actually impersonalists. They're Buddhists.

Right? But they base their Buddhist philosophy on the Vedas. You know what I'm saying? But they're not followers of Buddha. I mean, they could follow anyone.

They're not overly attached in that way. They're more focused on people being following them. That's there.

That's the personal thing. But what we're saying here is just that they're attached to the idea that we're God and everything is all one, from that platform, that there's no qualities. So what would that mean, being one? Because being one is a quality.

Right? If you're saying that they're undifferentiated, that's a quality. Right? Wouldn't we say that? I mean, it means in language, in English it would be an adjective. It's defining something.

Does that make sense? It's not the noun. It's defining a noun. Right? So it's the same in Sanskrit.

So all languages have that. So it's just the quality itself is there, though they'll say there's no quality. If there's no quality, that means it's also not all-pervasive.

Because all-pervasive is a quality. Does that make sense? So that's where things start to fall apart. You know, like that.

So they only know that much. That's why they don't have the problem that there's forms, but they only see Brahman. So it's not that the form for them, the element, it's not that Brahman is doing anything.

It's more it's existing. You know, people in their illusion are taking part in, they have a value of this Brahman that's mundane, and therefore they interact with it because they want a mundane response. Does that make sense? So for the impersonalist, you give that up, and then you just exist.

Does that make sense? So there's nothing technically... How do you say? There's nothing

technically... What do you call it? Like, say, bad. You know what I'm saying? Bogus. It's just incomplete.

You know what I'm saying? Like I have, you know, some lemons, and I have, you know, it means you want to make, you need lemons, you need sugar, you need some water. You know, so I have water. I don't have lemons or something, like the old Bogdil thing.

If we had some bananas, we could make a milkshake if only we had some milk. Yeah, like that. So that's kind of, you just don't have all the stuff.

Does that make sense? Yeah, exactly. It's a positive way to look at it. Yeah.

So they only know up to that much, up to Brahman, or up to Paramatma. But it's not that everything else is illusion. It's an illusion to think we're the body, we're not Brahman.

Does that make sense? That's why we say for the impersonalists and for us, the path is the same. Technically, it's our path. They also follow it.

It's just that they get off at the brahmajyoti instead of continuing all the way up to the spiritual world. Does that make sense? Because otherwise, it's, oh, that's their path we don't take. No, it's our path.

Does that make sense? Yeah. So they don't know. So the point is, they don't know, so they only understand Brahman.

So therefore, they're qualified to be situated in Brahman. But the devotees know the Lord's qualities and pastimes. Therefore, they're qualified to be situated in the Lord's pastimes.

Because all the qualities and the forms and interactions and everything is there. Does that make sense? So that's why I said the devotee, all it is is what you're accepting. So for the impersonalists and the yogis, it's very difficult because it's not the natural position.

Right? But for the devotee, it's very natural. It's just that, you know, just like you know there's a person and he has a family and he has activities and qualities and all. That's not a difficult thing.

You know, and so it wouldn't be difficult to be friends with them. Right? Does that make sense? But you want to make sure, but so the same principle is very natural, therefore, to be associated with the Lord, to have that relationship, to have that friendship with the Lord. Does that make sense? Yeah? Now, nobody should go take now, take this into a tangent of sakhya rasa.

Friendship here meaning, friendship meaning that there's a relationship. Then what makes them so stubborn? Who makes them so stubborn? The impersonalists, real impersonalists are, I don't think, are so stubborn. Just we're not used to real impersonalists.

The four Kumaras, they're real impersonalists. And Sukadeva Goswami, they're real

impersonalists. Like that.

So, they only know that much. So they're fixed in the concept of Brahman. So if you can show them how it goes beyond that, then they'll accept it.

Right? But the idea that you become God, that is then the big problem for them. Right? So there's an attachment to it. They're attached to not being disturbed by the disturbances of the material world.

Right? But if you can show that you can go beyond that, then... The four Kumaras and Sukadeva Goswami, they're free from envy? Hmm. Because they're able to get... Yeah, yeah. I mean, Hegelian impersonalists would be free from envy, on one level.

But the thing is, they haven't given up the Purusha Bhava. So there still is the underlying, the fundamental. But as far as the manifestation of envy, that you wouldn't see.

Because there hasn't been the surrender acceptance that I'm servant of the Lord. You've come to the neutral point where I'm not the material world. Right? I'm spiritual.

So you're situated spiritually. But it's not transcendently in that you are connected with the Lord. Because spiritual is a situation.

Material is a situation. But transcendental means it's above. Right? Spiritual technically means it's not material, or you could say it's also.

But transcendental means it's beyond the material. But you're only beyond the material if you're never going to go back to it. So the impersonalists would go back to it.

So that's why we, in this case, then point out it's spiritual. Does that make sense? But real spiritual is transcendental. So therefore, the spiritual world, you know, it will be more commonly used than transcendental world.

We say transcendental pastimes. You know what I'm saying? But we're talking Bhagavan. Yes.

Transcendental means Bhagavan. Exclusively. Yeah.

Because otherwise this, you know. Is there a tendency, there's a tendency for the neophyte devotee due to lack of full knowledge and culture to treat the family, you know, once they join Krishna consciousness, to treat the family in a personalistic way? And we've also begun with the devotees as well. Yeah, can be.

Because the idea is that activity then is maya. Right? So therefore, you know, we were being pleasant and nice for our own purpose. So if we're not going to do that, then that means we're not pleasant and nice.

No, but now you'd be pleasant and nice for Krishna. The difference is whatever was being done

before, that should be done if it's appropriate, you know, in connection with Krishna. Don't throw the baby out next to the hot water.

Yeah. That would be the basic. Or, if you want to be more specific, it's depending upon which side you're on, you don't, you know, either blow up Protestants or Catholics.

Well, that takes all the fun out of it. What are we going to do now? Okay, so there's no risk of coming back because one's come to the point of actually dealing with Bhagavan. Does that make sense? Because you could, means, now, the Lord is saying, the Lord is there as a person, right? As Paramatma.

But it doesn't mean that they're dealing with Him as Bhagavan. Does that make sense? So the point, that's what we were saying before, is that one is with the Lord, but one is not dealing with Him as Bhagavan. You know what I'm saying? And so, therefore, or even if there is that element, it's not very well established.

But now, we know that that doesn't work. We have plenty of experience. Because once you get to the liberated platform, one isn't as foolish.

And so, getting to that platform, one will understand that that doesn't work. So this time we'll be very careful to do everything properly. Does that make sense? Like before, we weren't.

Does that make sense? Because otherwise, one may say, no, but if going there you don't return, why is it we were there when we came here in the first place? Because technically we were there, but not really there. You know what I'm saying? You know, it's kind of like, let's say in a family environment, the teenagers, they're there, but not really there. You know? They're not actually part of the house scene.

They're supposed to be. They have the potential to be, but they're actually somewhere else. Like, you know, some other part of the planet, you know, with some big sword lopping off someone's head.

You know? Yeah. Okay. Man, Lesson 24.

So this is continuing in the reasons, right, why, you know, this has to be, you know, you have to hear from God. God Himself will arrange everything, and you have to hear from Him or His servants. So He, you know, means this, the Lord or His servants, then they will come, and what will they do? They will give information about the Lord.

Because, so, His birth is different, so this is how He will save, is by understanding this, and then the misidentification, so that's, man's misidentification of material nature is a malady from which fearfulness is born. Right? Part 10. Being free from attachment, fear, and anger, being fully absorbed in Me, and taking refuge in Me, many, many persons in the past became purified by knowledge of Me, and thus they all attained transcendental love for Me.

Right? So if God says many, many, you know it's quite a few, right? How does bodily identification become the cause of fear? As described above, it's very difficult for a person who is too materially affected to understand the personal nature of the Supreme Absolute Truth. Generally, people who are attached to the bodily conception of life are so absorbed in materialism that it is almost impossible for them to understand how the Supreme can be a person. Because then a person means maturely involved, and so God's kind of above that, at the same time, you know, so they can't really work it out.

Does that make sense? In other words, like we said, the impersonalist understands spirit, so he gets situated in spirit. The devotee understands the transcendence, he's situated in the Lord's paradise. The materialist understands material endeavor, material enjoyment, so he's situated there.

Right? So one is situated wherever is the... So materialists, they, at best, they concoct some kind of deism or something? Deism is also, there's other, I mean, it means you have that, yeah, there's another term for it. I was just looking at it. Deism? I forget what the other one is.

The one is that he becomes involved here, but they don't see the transcendental nature. You know, so there's a name for that. And then the other's deism, he's not involved here.

You know, so he's separate. So in other words, one is he's transcendental, but he has nothing to do with here, so he's not even controlling it. Right? Because otherwise he'd have to be here to do it.

The other is he's here involved, but then that affects his transcendental position. So there's always a problem with these, you know. And materialistic devotees, what we can say about them? What about materialistic devotees? It means that they'll appreciate that, but it's just there's not realization.

So in other words, there's an understanding. So the materials can't understand. The devotee can understand.

But it's when you realize, then it's kind of like, what am I doing here? You know what I'm saying? Just like you're saying, like the person who's smoking, then, generally speaking, for most of them, they can understand it's not good for you. It's a bad habit. But they don't realize, so they can't stop.

You know what I'm saying? But they understand. Right? But somebody who's really materialistic, they don't even understand. I once, you know, a clip of a lady, she had the, what do you call it? Where they remove your larynx.

Oh, trachea. Yeah, like that. And so she has to, but so they have a hole in the throat, you know, that they breathe through and stuff like that.

But she would smoke too then. And people, and she was ranting about how, how, you know,

that her getting that throat cancer had nothing to do with the smoking. And this is all propaganda, and it's all nonsense, and all that.

And, you know, they're just trying to, you know, envious people. Like that. So, yeah.

You can't be materialistic, so you must be envious. Yeah. That's called the mode of ignorance, right? It comes in reverse.

You know, to be materialistic means you're envious. It's not like this. It's not.

It says in Gita, though, that the prophets have explained that one can never be completely miserable or completely happy in the material world. No, no. So you can't get... Listen, if you were completely miserable, then you would, you know, it would have that taste, that pure fullness of misery.

But, you know, it's, you don't even get that. Because you can still make nice smoke rings on the throat hole. Oh, OK.

It's not all bad, you know. But also it increases the misery because you just get that little bit of joy and then it's gone again. So you get reminded of how miserable you are.

Yeah, yeah. Yes. That's through knowledge and practice.

That's why you have to have the association of devotees. Through devotees, you understand it. Then, you know, learning from them how to practice it, then you apply it.

So that, that continuous contemplation and practice, that's what then generates realization. Right? So if you don't practice, there won't be realization. Right? Or if you don't contemplate, there won't be realization.

So you may practice but not contemplate, or you may contemplate but not practice. So as you do both, then you can realization. But contemplate doesn't have to be as very complicated.

It can be very simple. You know, the principle point. That's all it requires.

Like smoking and cancer? Yeah. Like that. Simple point.

Okay. I so absorbed material that that it's almost impossible for them to understand how the Supreme can be a person. It's almost impossible.

So basically, they just don't. Because on one level, they'll talk, yes, he's a person. But because they know with people, you have interaction, you have relationship.

But then when you ask, okay, well, what does he look like? Then that's where it all falls apart. You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? So up to a point, then, you know, most things all have a good foundation. But the point is, is because it's not connected to the Lord, it'll fall apart before it gets to the Lord.

Right? You know, like that. Such materialists cannot even imagine that there is a transcendental body which is imperishable, full of knowledge and eternally blissful. So the closest they get, I think, when they talk about that Moses saw the Lord.

He only saw, they say he saw the Lord. And once it kind of says face to face, what that means is fire. But technically, he saw his lower back.

Like that. And then it says that he was terrible to behold. Like that.

It's so awe-inspiring and overwhelming that it's not... In other words, he didn't seem to see the three-fold bendy form of Shamsud. That doesn't seem to come out. It sounds more like an all-devouring universe.

Yeah, it's more like that kind of element. Because that's this... They only see material nature, so that's as close as you can get. That's what the universal form's for, is those who are spiritualists or personalists can get a glimpse of our concept of the Lord.

But unless you take that on to Bhagavan, like we discussed the other day, Krishna's the taste in water. That's just the taste, but it's Krishna so kind as a person that he gives us water and the taste and all those kinds of things. Does that make sense? So universal form means you don't get to that point.

You can start there. That's not a problem, but it has to... Having taken that step, then the next step is Bhagavan. But if you don't, you just remain there, then it's... you know, it can get a little wild.

Hmm? It's a taste. It's a taste. Okay.

In the materialistic... such materials cannot even imagine that there's a transcendental body which is imperishable, full of knowledge and eternally blissful. In the materialistic concept, the body is perishable, full of ignorance and completely miserable. So here it doesn't even say a little bit.

Therefore, people in general keep this same bodily idea in mind when they're informed of the personal form of the Lord. So it's just they project their own... For such materialist men, the form of the gigantic material manifestation is supreme. Either in the way they just see material nature and it's great, but they don't connect it to God, or they may connect it to God, but they don't connect it to God as a person.

That's the thing. They don't get to the personal because there's just... materialism is too great. So materialism here doesn't matter whether it's karma or beyond.

Consequently, they consider the supreme to be impersonal. And because they too... because they are too materially absorbed, the conception of retaining the personality after liberation from matter frightens them. When they are informed that spiritual life is also individual and

personal, they become afraid of becoming persons again.

And so they naturally prefer a kind of merging into the impersonal void because they are worried that the body is going to be a problem. Generally, they compare the living entities to the bubbles of the ocean, which merge into the ocean. That is the highest perfection of spiritual existence, attainable without individual personality.

So you can get up to that point on the spiritual platform. You can't get higher because then you have to understand individuality. This is a kind of fearful stage of life devoid of perfect knowledge of spiritual existence.

So we see that the impersonals will get to that level of fear. Like that. But the karmis don't because for them perfection is heaven.

So basically, you're going in this body or it'll be a little bit better or something like that. So I'm not sure how they work it out. I think it's a great point.

Like we get into these little things of how to work it out. Like this morning you have some point and then how to work out that fine detail. So you can imagine not having much philosophy.

Because the thing is what form do you go to the heaven in? You know what I'm saying? Your 88-year-old body? Yeah, it's like that because they bury you and then in the great getting up morning then everyone's going to rise up. And then yes, so are you going to be 88? Like that. So that's a problem.

So they have different things worked out. I forget what it is but you can tell it was older guys working it out because I think they say you'll be around 30 or something. We don't know those details.

Like that. If you're a kid I think you remain a kid because then the family whole relationship like that. Could be fun to hear.

Yeah, yeah. But also there seems to be consideration whether, but that's only if you came to practice of the religion early and then became old. But if you took it up when you're old then you'll go there you'll still be old.

Like that. So all these weirdo things that they have to try to worry about because they don't understand how even the material world works let alone the spiritual. So then the point is that losing of this position that I'm in so there's two aspects of fear.

One is that I have this material situation and I'm attached to it. I identify with it I'm attached to it. So losing that means by death or any kind of accident or anything I'll lose that identity.

So one's fearful of that loss. Right? And then for the impersonalist they're fearful of being people because being a person here was such a bad time. They're worried about being a person there.

Does that make sense? Okay, so attachment is the karmic. Fear is the impersonalist. And anger is the Buddhist.

Because when attachment and fear don't work then you become angry. Right? Anger after frustration. So you think I'll be attached.

That doesn't work. Okay, no problem. I'll be fearful.

That doesn't work. Then you become upset. Then you become angry.

Maybe they should have a game you know, like that you know, those little games they call it Angry Buddhists. That's a real thing? Angry Buddhists? No, no, I was saying they should make it. They should make it.

I thought you said I used to have this game. No, no, no. I'd like to play that game.

Angry Buddhists. I understand. Yeah, Angry Buddhists.

Why mess around with birds? You can shoot Buddhists through the air. Yeah. Definitely.

Fear. So in other words, fear becomes because of our not knowing our relationship with the Lord or technically being fearful of a relationship with the Lord. Right? Does that make sense? So the karmis are afraid because then I'm not the enjoyer.

And the jnanis are afraid because I'm not God. So it's identity. Yes.

So they're afraid of their actual identity. So people don't necessarily like to hear about it. It's like we hear I'm servant of Krishna.

Okay, that's okay. But it's not that we necessarily like to hear a lengthy lecture on how we're the servant. You understand? So it's like that.

Yeah. As you go it starts to you add up all the different definitions it starts to get. 4.11 As all surrender unto Me, I reward them accordingly.

Everyone follows My path in all respects, O son of Pritha. How does the Lord help the impersonalists? What do they lose in their liberation? The pure devotees both here and in the transcendental abode associate with Him in person and are able to render personal service to the Lord and thus derive transcendental bliss in His loving service. As for those who are impersonalists and who want to commit spiritual suicide by annihilating the individual existence of the living entity, Krishna helps also by absorbing them into His effulgence.

Such impersonalists do not agree to accept the eternal blissful personality of Godhead. Consequently, they cannot relish the bliss of transcendental personal service to the Lord, having extinguished their individual identity. So all as they surrender, He rewards them.

So everyone's following Krishna's path. There's no one who's not. It's just how much you

surrender what you see, that connection to Krishna.

So how much you see in relation to Krishna, that much He reciprocates with. Does that make sense? So, as Krishna explains and the devotees explain Krishna, then how much we appreciate that, that's how much Krishna will reciprocate. So we hear from bona fide devotees, then one gets to that personal platform, because you appreciate it.

Right? But if not, then you don't appreciate it. So therefore, one will be more interested in the heavenly planets, or in liberation. So He reciprocates according to what you desire.

But it's the same path, right? It's just different stoppages on the way. Lesson 25. Actually, I have a question related to these two points.

When we say that the identification because of fear, and you speak about impersonality, so how... Oh, because the other one we're more familiar with, it's like we're afraid of losing the body or position or, you know, all these kinds of things that are based on the bodily platform. But this is then taking that fear. We're afraid of losing material relationships.

But the impersonalist is afraid of gaining spiritual relationships. Yes. And how we can work on that with the association of devotees? Yes.

And how can we integrate or assimilate this... If we don't have any relation with Krishna, if we develop a relation with Krishna, then there is some active principle. Yes. Communication, interaction.

So, how can we be sure that this relationship is developing? Means the general way to tell if one's advancing is knowledge and detachment because they're a byproduct. Yes. So if there's lots of knowledge and detachment piling up on the side, then generally that means that one is advancing.

You know, it means one's attachment to things of the world is starting to go down. One's understanding of Krishna Consciousness is increasing. That's generally how you can... That's one of the... Yes.

What I... When I just connected that I... Personally, I connect with some personal view from my side. So I understand that because in the same purport, yesterday I was reading this purport actually. Srila Prabhupada explains the fear of the spiritual personal identity.

And he explained about negligence of spiritual life and compensation of void, the three points that you mentioned. And that I was connected with the fact that personally I have some fear of the spiritual personal identity. In what way? I mean, you're worried about the concept or you're worried about who you're going to be and who you're going to be? It means together.

How far down the line are you going to be? How many people are going to be above you telling you what to do? Is that what you're worried about? Some confusion is there. The point is that

the spiritual position is the natural position of the living entity. So that means they're fully satisfied.

Yes. Yes, I understand. Yes.

So, therefore, that's the understanding. And the practical application is that whatever we do, we do it trying to please Krishna. And so you combine those two and then slowly, slowly, everything will happen.

That's why Krishna says many, many persons of the past became purified by knowledge of Me. That's why He says, otherwise He'd just say, you know, many persons or somebody says many, many. So that means He's emphasizing to bring that point to make it very clear.

So it's possible. Yes, because the point is the conditioning, these are all set patterns of material energy anyway. So it's not that there's something that's so far removed one can't become God conscious.

No. Because the soul by nature is God conscious and its position is to be, natural position is to be God conscious. So one is just in the unnatural position.

You know what I'm saying? It's due to false conception. Yeah, false conception. Like if one is, you know, how you say, in some place where they you know, tie you upside down and hang you from the ceiling.

So, you know, the only way to move around the room is to use your hands. And it's very difficult. You know.

And so then, you know, you're told that you know, in the spiritual world then, you know, how you say, you walk around on your feet, but we're kind of worried about that because the hands are so much so how much more will the feet be? You know, so. Does that make sense? But no, it's quite it's very natural. Here is not natural.

We've just gotten used to the not natural. Does that make sense? You know, so it can work. Mars, is it like somebody who's been in a like a dump prison cell for so long that they don't want to go out into the some day outside? Can be.

They're worried about what, just what it'll mean and all that. So that's why then also all the elements of the you know, the Lord, the pastimes and all this and that are there. That's the advantage of reading the Krishna book.

One knows where one's going. You read the Gita, you know why you go there. Maharaj, you rightly put saying that same path, different stoppages on the way.

Suddenly I got this thought that I heard somewhere or read somewhere in some books and stuff like that. The impersonalists, they say as many paths, so many ways and screws up the whole. That's there, but what they don't understand is just it's the same path.

Yeah. Because to them there's no direction. It's just all one.

So it can go in all directions. But you know, but the point is that it's going somewhere. What does Brahman have to do with going somewhere? What does that mean? Why would there be a path? Because if it's all one, then whatever you're doing now and supreme it's, so it's all an illusion.

So it just sounds good. It's just poetry. That's what the meaning of Krishna's pointing about about these they become distracted by the poetry like that.

So they miss the point. Yeah. So it just sounds great.

All paths are leading. So if all paths are leading, then why are they following that path they're following? Like that. And so if you take that, then you can do anything and it's leading back to the supreme.

So why do you need a sadhana? Why do you need philosophy? That means the living entities anyway on their own are going, so you don't have to bother at all. So just everybody should have a good time. Does that make sense? Okay, lesson 25.

Man's attempt to get rid of fearfulness of survival by work. Knowledge or mystic power is always baffled. Right? So there's rid of fearfulness by of survival by work, so the karmic, by knowledge, the jnani, the mystic power is the yogi.

So it's always baffled. Fearfulness of survival? Being fearful whether one will survive or not. Yeah.

Don't work, you don't eat. Don't think, therefore you're not. Right? Something to worry about.

Didn't think of that. Yes. That's right.

Not thinking. Be careful of your naughtness. You want to survive.

She doesn't seem convinced. It's not fearful of survival. Yeah, yeah.

Yeah, I would say it's that. A concern of survival. You know, they want to always go on.

Verse 16. Even the intelligent are bewildered in determining what is action and what is inaction. Now I shall explain to you what action is, knowing which you shall be liberated from all misfortune.

Okay. How should action in Kṛṣṇa consciousness be executed? Action in Kṛṣṇa consciousness has to be executed in accord with the examples of previous bona fide devotees. To act in Kṛṣṇa consciousness one has to follow the leadership of authorized persons who are in a line of disciplic succession as explained in the beginning of this chapter.

Therefore, one has to follow in the footsteps of previous authorities in the line of disciplic

succession. Otherwise, even the most intelligent men will be bewildered regarding the standard actions of Kṛṣṇa consciousness. So, the one becomes bewildered what to do and what not to do, right? Because one's trying to do it oneself, right? Like that.

So he's misidentified with the material energy, so therefore he has this problem. He's trying to solve that problem by karma, jñāna, and yoga, but it doesn't solve the problem. So unless he follows, tries to solve the problem by approaching, you know, those in the line of disciplic succession coming from the Lord, therefore getting that instruction, then it's not going to work.

It is said that one cannot ascertain the ways of religion simply by imperfect experimental knowledge. Actually, the principles of religion can only be laid down by the Lord Himself. No one can manufacture a religious principle by imperfect speculation.

One must follow in the footsteps of great authorities like Brahmā, Śiva, Nārada, Manu, the Kumāras, Kapila, Prahlāda, Bhīṣma, Śukadeva, Gosvāmī, Yamarāja, Jānaka, and Bālī Mahārāja, so the Mahājānas. So here is what it means. To ascertain the ways of religion simply by imperfect experimental knowledge.

It means the inferior knowledge that is used, that they're trying to find what is the nature of something. Why is the universe the way it is? What's the nature of the atom? What's the nature of life? What is all these things? So they're trying to identify religion, because religion means the inherent nature of something you can't change. You can't change it.

That means it's science. If you can change it, then that's a detail. So that's connected with the art.

So the science means it doesn't change. So they're actually looking for that. So the scientists, what they're doing is creating their own religion.

So whether their religion is quantum or whether it's chemistry or biology or sociology or psychiatry, they're trying to by observation, with their experimental knowledge, they're trying to establish what is the nature of it. So in other words, it's a religion. Though they're claiming that they're not.

They're secular. They're just pure knowledge. But actually just they don't like the established religion.

They're making their own, that's all. They're not doing something different. Does that make sense? So the principle is religion.

God says what's the nature of something. He defines. That's why there's laws.

That's why there's Shashtra. Because that's how he's defining for our benefit how to fall. Because in other words, it goes back to again, God descends or his devotees, and they give knowledge about God.

So again, it goes back to that. We try to do it on our own, through karma, jnana, yoga, we will get baffled. But if you do it according to authority and disciplic succession, then there'll be no problem.

So that means great authorities. What they say, what they did, that's what we try to do. It's not that Brahma has four heads, so we try to grow four heads, and then we can follow the Mahajanas like that, or Shiva hangs out in the cemetery, so we'll hang out there, then we'll be able to.

Not like that. That's imitating. Following means what's their instruction, that we follow.

Roll out. Throw them into fires and stuff like that. Yeah, you can do that, or just try to keep yourself small, you know.

Like that. Always stay in the cabinet or something. And you just started emulating Sukadeva? Yeah, Sukadeva, the Kumaras also.

The difference is Kumaras are only five, so they stayed that age on purpose. But Sukadeva wasn't worried about it. If you're in the womb, there's no one to look at you anyways.

He wasn't worried about it. The intricacies of action are very hard to understand. Therefore, one should know properly what action is, what forbidden action is, and what inaction is.

Action, forbidden action, and inaction. Otherwise, we get confusions here. And one looks one way, but it's the other way.

What is the conclusion to which the entire Bhagavad-gita is directed? One is serious about liberation from material bondage. One has to understand the distinctions between action, inaction, and unauthorized action. To understand Krsna consciousness and action according to its modes, one has to learn one's relationship with the Supreme.

In other words, one has to learn perfectly... One who has learned perfectly knows that every living entity is an eternal servitor of the Lord, and that consequently, one has to act in Krsna consciousness. The entire Bhagavad-gita is directed towards this conclusion. All other conclusions against this consciousness and its attendant actions are vikarmas, or prohibited.

Right? So, one could say is that action then means what's... How do you say? Depending upon how you're looking. Inaction is Krsna consciousness. Action means material activity that gets fruit of results.

Inaction would mean activities in Krsna consciousness, because they're not getting any kind of material response. And, how do you say? And prohibited action, that means not being a devotee. So technically, you're prohibited from being immaterial.

That's from a material point of view. No. I was thinking, you know... No, it's just like this.

Someone's in the prison. Are they allowed to be a criminal? No. No, you have to give up being a criminal.

Yeah. Yeah. Okay.

So, in other words, it's prohibited to be a materialist within the material world. Because the nature of the soul is not to be a materialist. So it's prohibited action.

So anything not Krsna conscious is prohibited. Right? Put up a big poster. No materialism allowed.

Yeah. X is denied anyway. X is denied anyway.

418. One who sees inaction in action and action in inaction is intelligent among men. He is in the transcendental position, although engaged in all sorts of activities.

Describe how a Krsna conscious person is free from the bonds of karma. A person acting in Krsna consciousness is naturally free from the bonds of karma. His activities are all performed for Krsna.

Therefore, he does not enjoy or suffer any of the effects of work. Consequently, he is intelligent. He is intelligent in human society, even though he is engaged in all sorts of activities for Krsna.

Right? So this is inaction in action. He's getting no material result. He's not being bound by the material energy.

He's acting, but it's inaction. That's why it says, who sees inaction in action and action in inaction. A karma means without reaction to work.

The personalist ceases fruitive activities out of fear, so that the resultant action may not be a stumbling block on the path of realization. So he thinks that spiritual means no activity. So therefore, he won't get involved because he's afraid if there's form and activity, there'll be pain.

So his idea is, I will do nothing. So now we're explaining action in inaction. He's doing nothing, so it seems to be inaction.

But the impersonalist knows rightly, but the personalist knows rightly his position as the eternal servant of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Therefore, he engages himself in the activities of Kṛṣṇa consciousness. Because everything is done for Kṛṣṇa, he enjoys only transcendental happiness in the discharge of his service.

Those who are engaged in this process are known to be without desire for personal sense gratification. The sense of eternal service-ship to Kṛṣṇa makes one immune to all sorts of reactionary elements of work. So the impersonalist, though he's not doing any activity, but he's still getting a reaction because he's not Kṛṣṇa conscious.

He's still doing prohibited work. So that's why you have to know what action, inaction, and prohibited action. So you're doing action that doesn't give any result by being Kṛṣṇa conscious.

And if you're not Kṛṣṇa conscious, then any kind of action, any kind of inaction gets you a bad result. So there's always this thing that means Kṛṣṇa consciousness is always one side, the whole material is on the other. It's not that there's different aspects of this, like the many paths and all that.

It's not like that. It's that there's Kṛṣṇa consciousness. Then there's nonsense, basically.

But we're very used to that if it's good nonsense, then that's okay. It's like you have most cultures, they'll have some time, at least traditionally they have a time of the year, like a night where you can go out and do anything you want and no one will bother you. Like that.

Does that make sense? I think it's become merged now with Halloween. It's kind of like that night and the All Saints' Day become merged somehow or another. St. Patrick's means you can go out and pick anyone's clovers or something like that.

But here it's more as it means, yeah, you can do that or you can go out and do tricks on people or stuff like that and nobody minds because that night's meant for that. Does that make sense? So, how did we get into that? Yeah, of course. Yes, nice nonsense.

So the thing is it's just a matter of what's accepted is okay. You know what I'm saying? You're sitting in a very high-class restaurant you're drinking some kind of how you say aged fruit beverage for the last 50 years and then you're eating some piece of some animal and that would be considered nice nonsense. Do you understand? So the point is the nice and not nice are just arbitrarily defined according to the particular culture.

Does that make sense? You can get fried cake in China. Yeah? Yeah? I'm sure they have a variety. Probably even get a cockroach one.

You know. Prabhupada gives the analogy of wet stool and dry stool. Yes, it's all stool.

Yeah. Because you have the cow dung paddy which is dry and you have the wet one stuck on the wall. But it's the same thing.

Those who engage in this process are known to be without desire for personal sense gratification. The sense of eternal servitorship to Krishna makes one immune to all sorts of reactionary elements of work. Because if you're a servant of Krishna, that eternal servant, then there's no reaction because it's work for Krishna.

So we're only getting a reaction because we're doing something wrong. You know, if the kid sits there and does his homework, there's no reaction. But if he doesn't do his homework, there's a reaction.

So you may think, no, but there'll be a reaction for doing my homework. No, there won't. So

serving Krishna, there's no reaction.

But for not serving Krishna, there's always reaction. Lesson 26. That wasn't a comment.

Lesson 26. Living entities seek happiness by serving another living entity driven by a false desire for enjoyment. 720.

Those whose intelligence has been stolen by material desires surrender unto demigods and follow the particular rules and regulations of worship according to their own natures. So they'll surrender depending upon their nature, different demigods, there are certain things they want, so therefore that's why they'll perform that particular ritual. Why do people surrender to the demigods instead of the Lord? Less intelligent people who have lost their spiritual sense take shelter of demigods for immediate fulfillment of material desires.

Generally such people do not go to the Supreme Personality of Godhead because they're in the lower modes of nature, ignorance and passion, and therefore worship various demigods. Following the rules and regulations of worship they are satisfied. The worshippers of demigods are motivated by small desires and do not know how to reach the supreme goal.

But a devotee of the Supreme is not misguided because in Vedic literature there are recommendations for worshipping different gods for different purposes. Example, a diseased man is recommended to worship the sun. Those who are not devotees of the Lord think that for certain purposes demigods are better than the Supreme Lord.

But a pure devotee knows that the Supreme Lord Krishna is the master of all. In Caitanya-caritamṛta Ādi 5.142 it is said, Only the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Krishna, is master and all others are servants. Therefore a pure devotee never goes to demigods for satisfaction of material needs.

It depends on the Supreme Lord and the pure devotee is satisfied with whatever he gets, whatever he gives. So one goes to the demigods because you think that will be quick. Well if you worship the Lord then that will take some time.

So then the idea is they'll go to the demigods because being in the modes of passion, ignorance, then they want quick, immediate results. But what they don't understand is the results of the demigods give are coming from the Lord anyway. So that means you go to the demigod, have to please the demigod.

The demigod then has to request the Lord. His giving sanction then you get what you're looking for. So that means you could have just directly gone to the Lord and got it from him.

Right? But the difference is if you work with the demigods though you're doing service you think you're master. Well if you're dealing with the Lord, then unfortunately devotional service somehow or another seems to always have that element that you have to be in the subservient position. You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? So one may say no, but the other

subservient, no you have a man, he's doing business and he wants to get something done so he may invite someone out for lunch or this or that.

He's maybe taking the junior position but why is he doing it? He's going to get something done. So he still feels, yeah, no, I took the guy out to lunch today and this and that and then he approved this and that and so many things. So you still feel you're in control.

For the Supreme Lord, it won't work if you feel in control because in reality we're not. Does that make sense? So therefore those in the most impassioned ignorance will tend more towards the demigods. It keeps up the status quo.

It is like a progression in comparison to personality. It's a progression. All these things in the Vedic path is a progression but it's a very slow progression because you're dealing here with thousands and thousands of lifetimes.

It's not just one like this and then one like that and one like this and then you're done. Then it wouldn't explain unlimited lifetimes. So it means one gets into the path of karma and does that for thousands and millions of lifetimes.

The path of God does that also like that and then there's a yogi. Brahma Samhita is saying that the yogi drills a repetition of the breath for millions of lifetimes. He's still not going to see just even the effulgence off the toenails of the Lord, let alone the toenail.

Just the effulgence you won't see. So you're talking about being involved for a long time. I think I've heard it a few times that Prabhupada mentioned it.

I think it was Ravi Shankar. He had been playing sitar for a thousand lifetimes. And for those who know the field he only knows one quarter of what his guru taught.

Right? There are other disciples that knew more. So that must mean that they were playing for two thousand lifetimes. Does that make sense? So in other words they've been doing that a long time.

So that's why it comes so naturally so good. Stuff like that. So that means to be a good karmi you have to have been at it for a long time.

Then you become good. In other words, those kids were sitting in garages for thousands of lifetimes. Therefore they were able to work out Google or Mac or this or that.

Something about garages. Is that why Americans make so many inventions? Because they all have garages? Like in Europe there's no garages. So therefore there's less opportunity.

Okay, that makes sense. So if they're ministers, so they're responsible for a particular area. It seems logical to go to them because they are responsible.

And wouldn't it be that the Lord is sometimes be bothered by those who are materialistic

coming to him for material purposes? And then the demigod has to go to him? That's like a normal thing you have your once a week or something. The point is they think the demigod is giving the result. It's not that I want to get this from the Lord so I'm going to the appropriate secretary.

They think the secretary is the supreme and they are the sanctioning authority. So it's a little different. Like when you go to the office like that, you know that it represents the government.

And the part of the government. But that's different. Here they think that that person is the government.

Does that make sense? So it's different. And those who go to the demigods seeing them as the representatives? Of the Lord? But the point is you're going to do the same worship. So why not do that for Krishna? Like this astrological things, you know worship this planet worship that planet.

But the point is who gives the planet its potency? Yes. So I'm saying Krishna is the Lord of the moon. So why not just worship him? Vishnu is the Lord of Mars.

Right? Does that make sense? So then the difficulty is that if you just worship the Supreme Lord all those other things are already taken care of. Because there's another technicality that's not so much mentioned here. But it's that since the demigods are considered the arms of the Lord then they're actually one body.

So if you only worship one of them and not the others the others will not be very pleased. Right? And there's 33 million of them. If you look at it that way then it's a lot harder.

You know. You have to go to you know. Does that make sense? It's not just you go to one office and they call that coming up alaya or whatever.

Huh? No, no, no. It means you rise up to getting the citizenship. Oh.

Something with an A. Yes. Yeah. It's not just you go in there and just hand the paper and that's done.

You have to go through this, that. You keep going forever. So it would be easier to go back to God.

Yes. Everybody is progressing. Everybody is progressing.

Who said? No, but who said? You said that. No, but who said everybody is? You know what I'm saying? You have heard. I see.

So are you still hearing? So what does that mean? Everybody's progressing. Who is this everybody? So that means Obama is progressing. Okay.

Everybody has to come to Krishna. Everybody has to ultimately come there, but until they do then they're just going around in circles. So you think that demigod worship is better than gross materialists? What do you mean by gross materialists? We generally define those who worship the demigods as the gross materialists.

They don't worship anybody. They just want to No, the ones who worship demigods, they're the sense gratifiers. The other ones are animals.

Does that make sense? Are they not these people are at least accepting some authority in demigod worship? Yeah. They're accepting authority, so they're going one direction on Krishna's path, and then when they get up to a certain point, then they turn around and go back down the other way. So they just keep going around in circles.

So you can either go around a little circle here, or you can go a little bit bigger and go up to the heavenly planets and go even bigger up to the Vermont, but everybody comes back. That's why it's called samsara. It just goes around and around and around in a circle.

So when you become a devotee, then that's the inaction. Then you're out of that cycle of action and reaction. So it's inaction.

So they become situated in Krishna consciousness. Then you can say, now they're progressing. But otherwise, who's progressing today, tomorrow is regressing.

Because there's only one path. This is where you ask the question, there's only one path, and it's like a razor's edge. What about traffic jams? You say, I want to move quicker.

I want to advance. So does that mean it's as thin as a razor, but then it also has that depth that the razor has, so so many can go at once, but it's only that wide. Could you knock three? That's true.

So quite a few of them can go on a razor's edge. No, but she's saying just a single razor blade is so wide compared to one ten thousandth of the tip of the hair, therefore thousands of souls can fit on there. So it's actually a very wide road.

Yeah. We should get a microscope and check it out. I'm sure that if you can look it up and see what's the thickness of the hair.

Because that's the thickness of the hair. Then there's the tip that's thin. So actually how thin is the tip? So you're thinking that someone who's let's say from the Orient and their soul's actually a little bigger because their hair is a little thicker.

That's probably why it says the tip of the hair. Probably the tip of the hair is all the same. That's why we are like some kind of a mission all together can go the same way.

That's what I'm saying. Everybody can fit on. I was just saying these are opportunities to get sidetracked by a tangent of the example.

So he depends on the Supreme Lord and this pure devotee is satisfied with whatever he gets. Whatever the Lord awards, then he's satisfied because there's some reason that he'll get that much or not. Because the Lord can give unlimited.

Why he's giving a certain amount, there's a reason. So if we're happy with that, then we'll be satisfied. 721.

I'm in everyone's heart as the super soul. As soon as one desires to worship some demigod, I make his face steady so that he can devote himself to that particular deity. The point is, God does that because you can't have faith in basically speaking dead matter.

So Krishna has to arrange it. One may ask why the all-powerful God gives facilities to the living entities for enjoying this material world and so lets them fall into the trap of illusory energy. The answer is that if the Supreme Lord as super soul does not give such facilities, then there's no meaning to independence.

Therefore, he gives everyone full independence. Whatever one likes, but his ultimate instruction we find in the Bhagavad-gita, one should give up all other engagements and fully surrender to him. That will make man happy.

So Krishna arranged it because otherwise where's the meaning of independence? If you can't do what you like, then there. So Krishna gives that arrangement. But the point is we can't do it ourselves.

So we're still subservient to the Lord. And because he's arranging it, therefore material energy is subservient to the Lord. So that waste of time then is corrected by hearing from the Lord as the voice.

Full surrender, do we see that in extreme circumstances or can we discern full surrender also in what we would call everyday life? Full surrender means the it's just connected to the Lord, because as we described, it's not the activity. It's the mood. So that's why it says performing your prescribed duties because that includes the little day-to-day activities.

It's like the duties are prescribed. So by following the duties, we're just doing what we're asked to do. Is there another element of surrender where you go above and beyond the call of duty? It means that you're doing it to please Kṛṣṇa.

Because duty means on the material platform you perform your duties, then it's pious, so therefore you get a good situation. But you're not worried about getting a good situation, you're worried about pleasing Kṛṣṇa. So you're doing it because it pleases the Lord.

Does that make sense? So the smarter will follow the Varanāśrama because it creates the proper material environment. Then in that environment you can be happy. But the devotee is following it because it pleases Kṛṣṇa.

That is the social environment that Kṛṣṇa likes to be involved in. That's where it comes from. So you're following Kṛṣṇa's instruction, whatever it is.

Does that make sense? So that's what's important. But even the Varanāśrama has come from Kṛṣṇa. So you see that, then it works very nicely.

So it's not a problem that is separate from devotional service. One doesn't see that, then it's called piety. Like we're discussing many times these elements of ethics and morality and being good and all these different things.

But not seeing it in connection with Kṛṣṇa, it's actually just piety. Because the basis for it isn't Kṛṣṇa consciousness, as we're saying. It stands on its own as something good.

Its inherent goodness is self-illuminating. But it's that nature that it has come from the Lord, because the Lord defines that. But we're attached to that activity as opposed to being attached to pleasing the Lord.

And because we have that nature, we're using that activity, because it could be anything. Does that make sense? Mahārāja, the Buddhists, they have Buddha deity, so in some way they worship Lord Buddha. Yeah, in some way they do.

They've been tricked by that. It's pious, because they don't really understand his position as a person. So they're just seeing him as some kind of supreme goodness or something.

So they're not getting Sukṛti? They're not getting bhakti-sukṛti. Does this mean that only people that are in this kind of movement are actually devotees? No, no. It means those who are within, as it mentions, the lines of the paramparā.

This line? No, there's four lines. Four? Yeah. So if they're in any of the four lines, it works.

But the point is, the four lines have different places they want to go in the spiritual world. But that also will make a difference. So two of the lines are specifically bhakta lines.

And then one of the lines then either worships Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa or or, I'm sorry, yeah, Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa or they worship Kṛṣṇa and parental gods. Is that what you're saying? So they'll worship, you know, Vṛndāvana. But it's not Vṛndāvana.

But it's still Vṛndāvana. Here in Vāikuṇṭha, many worship Kṛṣṇa and Vṛndāvana, but it's as Narayana. You know, it's just, you know, sweet pastimes instead of so much awe and reverence.

But it's still the same God's so great, He does these sweet pastimes. So there's so many bona fide lines, but it's just if you want this, this is what you, where you go. You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? You get on the bona fide airline, you get to your destination, but it's just where do you want to go? That's the point.

Om Hare Kṛṣṇa Hare Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Hare Hare Hare Rāma Hare Rāma Rāma Rāma Hare

DISCLAIMER: This is an automatic transcription which contains some misspellings and other irregularities. When in doubt, compare with the audio.
All lecture audios are available on bhaktividyapurnaswami.com. If you would like to help us edit these transcriptions, please write to bvps.transcriptions@gmail.com

Hare Hare Kṛṣṇa Hare Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Hare Hare Hare Rāma Hare Rāma Rāma Rāma Hare
Hare