

2011-12-16 BG 1.61-63

Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare, Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare, Hare Rāma, Hare Hare, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare. So, lesson twenty-eight, only those who are addicted to sinful or unlawful acts, page sixty-one, only such foolish men of demoniac principles do not want to serve Godhead. Okay, so this is, yeah, further explanation.

No? Twenty-eight. Ah, here we go. Yeah, Upanāyana.

Okay. Fine mūḍha, Nārādhāma, Māyāya Pratijāna and Asuraṁ bhavaṁ asritā. Nārādhāma.

Let's see. Seven-fifteen. Those miscreants who are grossly foolish, who are lowest among mankind, whose knowledge is stolen by illusion and who partake of the atheistic nature of demons, do not surrender unto Me.

The mūḍhas are those who are grossly foolish, like hard-working beasts of burden. They want to enjoy the fruits of their labor by themselves and so do not want to part with them for the Supreme. The typical example of the beast of burden is the ass.

So, here hard-working, so generally, as we were saying this morning, we would typically take this to mean, you know, you're just very common hard-working laboring class. So, on one level it can mean that, but on another level it can also mean that, you know, anyone who's working hard for material existence, right, without seeing any connection to the Lord, then, you know, they're working hard to enjoy themselves. That's what the donkey is doing, but, you know, he's not... We get probably more out of him than he gets out of his hard labor, you know.

But, because he's grossly foolish, he doesn't appreciate that, you know, or wouldn't want to appreciate that, you know. Another class of duskṛti, or miscreant, is called the nārādhama. It's always nice how Prabhupāda uses that to say, the mudas are that, like that, another class of nonsense.

You know, so that way then you get, you know, so it's... It's called the nārādhama, or lowest of mankind. The civilized human beings are those who have regulative principles of social, political, and religious life. Those who are socially and politically developed, but who have no religious principles, must be considered nārādhama, right.

So here is that, they're developed, regulative principles of social, political, religious life, very nicely developed, very sophisticated, but it's not religious principles, meaning that it's based on actual religion, right. Because here it mentions religious life, social, political, and religious life. So that can even mean that they're following the Vedic literatures, and they're very sophisticated, very aspects of the literatures.

But the actual religion, like sanātana-dharma, that they're not catching. So that makes them

nārādhama. Not necessarily.

It means all of these, you have your typical example, but the principle is actually generic. So you can have one of them, who is working very, very hard. It depends where the focus is.

The focus is on working hard, getting out, then it's nārādhama. I mean, then it's mudha. If it's their sophistication and all that, and refinements in life, but then it's nārādhama.

So in either case, they may be working hard or not, you know what I'm saying. It means that mudha is, but he may be more sophisticated in that he may not be. So in either you could get the jñānī, who's working very hard for his position, you know what I'm saying.

In other words, the focus is on working hard, because that's what a donkey does. Well, here then the focus is on that sophistication, that development and all that. So as you said, this morning you could actually have one who has all of these things.

Yeah, but you see is that there's, you know, different cultures. Some of them it's on working hard and all that. I mean, I don't know if it is now, but I know back in the, like in the 90s, like in Germany, if you had one job, that was considered, you know, you were lazy.

You know, you had to have two jobs. You're out there really working and really developing, working, you know, like that. So the emphasis is on the work, though what they do is very technical, very sophisticated, you know, the social, but the emphasis is on the work.

So that emphasis, that's the mudha aspect, you know, like that. Or where they see that very, you know, sophisticated and all that, that's the Narottama. Hmm.

Okay. Nor is religion without God religion, right? So this is, this is the point, is they have their religious principles of what you're supposed to do. You know, you have to be moral and nice and good and all these different things, and they, but God is not really the point of it.

Does that make sense? Because the purpose of following regular religious principles is to know the Supreme Truth and man's relationship with Him, right? So you have to know God and what is your relationship. It's not just enough even to know God or to have a relationship, you know, or define it that I, you know, serve it, but not know who you're serving. Does that make sense? You know, so that'll encompass both the persons who are the intellectuals and all that, but they don't do any service, and others who do service but don't know who God is.

So then you can get your, you know, your theologians and then you're just, you know, a particular person who, you know, is working nicely but doesn't know much. You know what I'm saying? So it captures all these different aspects that are not useful for, how do you say, Krishna consciousness. Because when these are there, the tendency is they don't surrender, right? The Buddha is already absorbed.

He has no time to surrender, right? The Naradama is too sophisticated to surrender. You know

what I'm saying? He's too busy with, you know, it's like that. Or this person is either religious, but they're already busy.

They're already, you know, speculating or, you know, rendering their activities. But they won't actually surrender to the person and become his devotee. Does that make sense? You know, so that means someone could be, as in, you know, modern definition, a religious person.

You know, they're given charity, they're nice, you know, they try not to, you know, at least obviously cheat people and stuff like this. And they go to their, you know, their place of worship regularly. But they're not interested in developing a relation with God.

They're doing that as just part of their material progression, right? And they appreciate that unless you're religious, you're not actually going to be materially prosperous, right? So they're more intelligent than others, you know, more developed than others. But it doesn't mean that it's not, we won't get in the way of their surrender. Yes.

In that definition, that it's God religion means religion, relationship with Bhagavan, with the person. Yes. It means everybody who is not that, to know the supreme truth and man's relation with him, means if he's not... It means as long as there's some aspect you can say that it's religion.

But then we have the element, is it true religion? You know, because Prabhupada mentioned that. It means, let's say, if Vermont is their Paramatma and it's, you know, it's authorized, then you could say that it's religion. But it's not, it hasn't come to the fullest understanding.

Yes. You know, so here then we'll have mixes, you know, where they accept God as a person. So technically the concept of Bhagavan isn't foreign.

They won't think that's strange. But they can't discern how the Lord is transcendental and how he can come and deal, but still under Yogamaya. You know, his internal potencies are ranging.

So then they'll have the problem of thinking that it's mundane, you know what I'm saying, or something about it. So their only solution is to say he has no form. But they can't accept he has no material form.

That they'll accept, but he has a spiritual form. So they can't tell the difference between matter and spirit, because for such a religionist, what is the soul? The body. The body.

So therefore spirit is the body. So then God doesn't have, is not comprised of matter, so therefore he doesn't have a body. You know what I'm saying? These are the weaknesses.

Does that make sense? Yeah, but the point is to know the Supreme Truth and man's relationship with him. So that's what they should have. So these others, there's no real relationship.

It means they define a relationship, but it's not actually the relationship. You say is that God is

Brahman. That's correct.

And we're Brahman. That's correct. But to say our relationship with him is that we merge into him, that's not a real relationship.

So therefore also the Paramatma realization can have that same weakness. Because in Paramatma realization you take up service, you're dealing with Bhagavan. But if you go to merge, then you go back to Brahman.

That's why then Paramatma's in between. So localized specifically, therefore taking that step further. But depending on how you deal, you either move forward or you move back.

You know what I'm saying? But actually God himself, he gives them the intelligence. You don't miss it, miss the point. Because that's what they want.

But they're in ignorance. Like the child. They want to be in ignorance.

He wants to play all day, but there's a parent who makes sure that he doesn't. Wouldn't it be more logical that God will kind of not allow whatever they want? So what? Once you cross about 16 or 18, then what happens to that relationship where you want to do whatever you want and then the person who is bigger than you when you are below 18 tells you what to do and you are supposed to do it? Huh? Yeah, just take it that this is between 16 and 30. It's taking a long time.

So what happens at 30? Right. And so what does that mean? Authority. Yeah, authority, responsibility.

Youth is over. You know what I'm saying? So it's kind of like you don't have the same romantic concept of complete abandon. You know, like that.

So the idea that the material world you can just enjoy it and do whatever you like and it's going to go the way you want. Then when you come to that realization, it's not going to go that way. Then you could say one has come to some maturity.

You know what I'm saying? Those impersonalists, they seem to be after 60 then. So, following the same logic. Yeah, because the whole grahastha scene didn't work at all, even though they did start listening to their mother.

And so then they get frustrated and want to try something else. Is that what I'm saying? No, see, because what's the weakness in taking that line? If you take that line that, you know, like a parent, shouldn't God do something about it? So what does that mean? No free will. It means no free will.

Yes, I mean, that would be the most pertinent one. But it also means that we're not at fault. Do you understand? It's God's fault for not being a good parent.

You know, like that, you know. Does that make sense? So, but the point is, no, he's willing, he's,

look at it this way. Because you're looking, how would he, okay, let's try to think, okay, let's say, even we say, okay.

You know, God is the parent, you know, he should be, you know, applying his parenting skills here. You know, or if not, you know, get a few books, I'm sure. You can read, right, you know.

Like that says he's the origin of language. And so then he should, you know, do something. So is that parenting skill manifest? Or is it just a concept? You know what I'm saying? If your parent is guiding you, are they doing something? Or it's just, they're just kind of hoping you will? They do it, okay.

So now, would, and, okay, and where does this happen? Where does this parenting happen? Yeah, I mean, where's the location? Yeah, home, okay. So now the Lord has created the whole material world and all the facilities that go with it, right? So that there's, you know, air to breathe and water to drink and, you know, all those kind of things like that. So you could say is that he's providing even more facilities than one's own parents are getting, right? You know, he's providing the facilities that your parents are working with, okay? Then they're going to do also what? So what's another way they'll manifest this good parenting? Care.

And that will take the form of? But we've done with that, we've given the facility. So what about instruction? Okay, so would we consider the Vedic literature to be, you know, by volume enough instruction? Okay, and not only that, is that you should get educated so teachers are provided. So he says he, you know, the spiritual master.

You know what I'm saying? Yeah. So at what point does one say, well, the kid himself has to also want to be part of this? You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? So that the difficulty comes up is that we're kind of reluctant, you know? That's why we're here. Does that make sense? Yeah.

Yes. Buddhism and impersonalism. So it's kind of those medication going through the steps.

Why the steps? Yeah. Why the steps we're taking. Didn't you just explain? What did you just explain? Superficial.

Oh, okay. I seem to agree. That's right.

So the point is they're misusing the instructions. So if you're misusing something, what's the standard way? What does the parent do? They give you money and you misuse it. Then what? They don't give you money.

So if you give them the Vedas, you don't use them, then you take back the Vedas. Right? Because the point is they're using the Vedas to be violent. So you take away the Vedas, which is their basis to say that they can be violent, and then make them peaceful.

Right? And then when they're peaceful, then you can bring back the Veda again. But because

now they're voidus, then you have to bring the Vedas back in such a way that they'll accept it. Because the problem was not technically, philosophically.

It was culturally. Right? So you have to throw out the Vedic literature because then you remove the culture. You know, on one level.

And then their whole philosophy behind that, though it's not a real philosophy. Then, now they've to work in that way to keep them busy, then there has to be a little bit of, you know, philosophy. You know, the detachment instead of the enjoyment.

Because they're misusing it for karma. So you have to basically lean it to jnana, because that means you won't do activities. Because to have karma go from bad karma to good, you know, that's the problem.

And to go from bad karma to no karma, that's easier. Right? If you're doing something and somebody says you're not doing it right, one of the first reactions is, OK, I won't do it. That's easy.

Right? But, you know, oh, OK, and then how do I do it right? Now that's a little more difficult. Right? Like that. So then that means that you'll remove the, you know, that whole element of karma and all that.

It doesn't mean that the fundamentals of social life and that are gone. Right? Because the Buddhistic, you know, lifestyle and the Vedic is very similar. Right? But you're removing the interest in karma, so you brought it to jnana.

Right? And then because it's in jnana, then there's the element of pessimistic. Because it's not based on the Vedas, then it has to have some other things. You know, so then there's no authority.

So what's Brahman? This and that. So there's just nothingness. Right? So now you have to bring it back to the Veda.

And so bringing it back to the Veda then means you have to be able to establish that all that is being done. Means that philosophy and that element of jnana is established. But it still has that same philosophy.

Right? So the Vedas are being used as authority now. Right? Instead of just the word of Buddha. You know what I'm saying? So then you can substitute Brahman.

The Brahman actually is the Lord and there is substance here. But because you said there's nothing and it's all illusion. Right? Because if it is substance, why wouldn't I want to try to enjoy it? But there's no substance, so therefore why should I get involved? You understand? And so you're actually just taking Buddhist philosophy and covering it and just calling it Brahman.

And then using Vedic authority to establish it. You understand? So once that's there, then you

come in. And then the Vaisnava acaryas then establish again the actual conclusion.

In the Gita the Personality of Godhead clearly states that there is no authority above Him. That He is the Supreme Truth. The civilized form of human life is meant for man's reviving the lost consciousness of his eternal relationship with the Supreme Truth, the Personality of Godhead, Sri Krsna, who is all-powerful.

Whoever loses this chance is classified as a naradhama. Right? So it's a very, very subtle thing here. Is that human life, civilized form of human life.

So civilized technically means following Veda, following Varnasrama. Right? Because if you're not following the Veda, technically it's uncivilized. Right? So then that means that they're moving in that direction.

So it's meant for reviving the lost consciousness. But it says whoever loses the chance. It doesn't say whoever doesn't do this.

It says whoever loses the chance. Does that make sense? So that means that opportunity is there, but they're not interested. Right? Does that make sense? So they come in contact with the devotional process.

They come in contact with the actual purpose. But there's no interest. So because there's no interest, then you lose the opportunity.

That's all about desire. Yeah. Yes.

There's another part of this paper which says that they appear sophisticated, but they don't want to hear. Oh, okay. Yeah.

So that's the point, is that they don't want to take part in the process. And so, you know, they're satisfied with their sophistication. You know what I'm saying? So that's what we have to be very careful about.

So in other words, Naradama has the point that they're not interested. But they can be following, or they have a very sophisticated... You know what I'm saying? So this can mean the follower of the Vedic culture, you know, but who's not interested in hearing about God consciousness. Right? Okay.

Or it can mean, you know, the non-Vedic, who they're very sophisticated and very developed in their idea, and very proud of that, and so they're not interested in hearing. Right? So it can work on all those levels. So it's not just, you know, we always, these, you know, we like the, you know, the karmis, you know, stinky, smelly, dirty, you know, like that.

You know, pull them out of the dustbin, you know, like that. That's the mudas? Hmm? These are the mudas? No, no, no. No, stinky.

Oh, no, no. We just say karmis, you know, just they're all stinky, smelly, dirty. Then within that, then the mudas are more stinky, smelly, dirty, because they work hard at the dock some days, so, you know, like that.

And they stink a lot. They burp a lot, you know, stuff like that. The civilized and the uncivilized.

The mudas, it doesn't say that they're specifically uncivilized. Their focus is on working very hard. And by that working hard, they'll be happy.

While the naradhama is that by being sophisticated and cultured and developed, they'll be very happy. You know what I'm saying? So it's kind of like, like you, it means, it means history is being, it means where you have that sophistication, like the renaissance, you could say, is that, that kind of like sophistication where the social, political, or religious development, but still it's not necessarily that aspect of surrender to God as a person and be a servant. Individuals maybe, but in general it's just, you know, that kind of element.

You know what I'm saying? So they were considered, so those who are now will consider that before that, that was called the dark ages. That was just the middle ages, right? The dark ages. Why? Because they were interested in the social, political, and religious development.

They were just, they were more like mudas. They just went along with day-to-day life. You know what I'm saying? Yes.

That, well, let's see. Let's, let's go through here. This, it means, here it's talking about the sophistication.

So they have the intelligence, they have the, the culture, that they could easily take up Krishna consciousness. They wouldn't have a problem in, you know, being able to contemplate philosophy or follow the, the, you know, the regulations of culture because they're regulated, they do all these different things. You know what I'm saying? Like that.

Like you see is that the, you know, your common man, he's working hard, he's worrying about working, you know, getting a job and that and stuff like that. Then you have a class that's higher than that, that they're, they're more about their social status and their position. They're working even generally harder than a muda, but the focus is not on the hard work.

The focus is on the social status and the power of the influence. In a sense, so the folk, the consciousness is in a different place. It's not necessary that they're not all doing the same thing.

It's just what they're focusing on. Does that make sense? The kitchen helper is also there stirring the pot. He's only just seeing that it doesn't burn.

You know, that it comes out nice and it tastes good. That doesn't concern him. But would you say he's cooking? Not really.

So therefore, externally, all of them may be doing similar things or overlap, but it's where the

focus is, what the mentality is. Is that okay? Okay, when you lose it, then you become the lowest of men. Right? Because otherwise we're going to consider the muda as the lowest.

So the social position of Narottama is higher than the muda, typically. But because he's lost the chance, it actually puts him in a worse position. Because the muda, he just thinks that that's there, but then if you can catch his attention, if there's some calamity, then he might be open to listen.

Because he's working, I work hard, I'll be happy. He's working hard, he's not becoming happy. He might be able to say something, in some instance.

But the Narottama has lost the chance because opportunity is there, and he's consciously made the decision not interested. When social development is so important, it's difficult to listen to others. Yeah, generally because then they consider themselves very special.

Europe was going through social development. It means they had been not developing for over a thousand years. Things were just sitting there, falling apart.

And then they suddenly started developing again. Not even long from when this development happens, then they consider themselves now superior and go to conquer the world, to spread the good word. Though the other cultures had been having a social, political, and religious life in a very developed way, sometimes for hundreds of thousands of years.

So they already had that as a standard. Does that make sense? So this is the difficulty. So like you said, they become proud and aren't able to listen to something else.

Because they also came to India. And even though there are more sophisticated elements, then they're not interested. So that aspect, that makes Narottama.

It means the glass is already full. If you put water into it, it will spill. They can't hear anything.

Yeah, yeah. It means that they're already, because they're so developed. Because it says those who have regulative principles of social, political, and religious life.

The next class of Duskrti is called Mayayaprityajana. Oh, it's on the other side. Mayayaprityajana.

Are those persons whose erudite knowledge has been nullified by the influence of illusory material energy. They are mostly very learned fellows. Great philosophers, poets, literati, scientists, etc.

But the illusory energy misguides them. And therefore, they disobey the Supreme Lord. So they have a lot of intelligence.

Right? And they apply that into so many literary fields. But they're unable to understand the Supreme Lord. So all that intelligence, therefore, is misguided.

Philanthropist. Can, can. That might be philanthropist.

I would put them in the Narottama. Oh, right. Because the point is, it's not that, because if they have regulative principles of social, political, and religious life, means that there's education.

But here is erudite knowledge. You know what I'm saying? It's like any, generally in most cultures, if you have somebody who you consider your upper class of people, they've gone to school, they know so many things, and they'll use words and quote things from school that, you know, you never cared about. They somehow or another remember it.

You know? And so, you know, you would call them, you know, educated. But you wouldn't say they're erudite. It doesn't mean that amongst them you might not have someone who's erudite.

But then, when the erudition becomes the main identity, then they take on this mayaya paridhyanam. You know what I'm saying? These are the jnanis, then? These jnanis would go in here. Yes.

Like that. But it's broad enough that it counts everybody. Because we want to be able to identify those who are following Vedic culture, those who are not.

Because the principle is still the same. Though one is better situated than the other. But still, it's not ideal.

Does that make sense? I would like to know what is the meaning of erudite. I don't know. Erudite means scholarly.

Scholarly. Yes. Can you say that those mayaya paridhyanam, they are more sophisticated than the others? No, no.

I wouldn't say. Like the erudite and scholars? Just because they're scholars doesn't necessarily make them erudite. If you've ever hung out with academics, sometimes they're pretty gross.

But erudite usually refers to their knowledge, not to their sophistication. Yes, yes. That's what I'm saying.

It's generally they're very knowledgeable. What we're saying is you might have somebody who would be typically in the Naradhamma social scene, but their erudition is what's more prominent in their mind. So how would you classify them? I would say that what's prominent is their erudition, so they would be mayaya paridhyanam.

But those mayaya paridhyanam, they can also be followers of the Vedas? The same as you said about Naradhamma? Yes, yes. It means like these mayavadi scholars, they're very intelligent. So their main qualification is their scholarship and developed intelligence? That means their qualification is to be a mayaya paridhyanam.

Naradhamma is the sophistication? It's the sophistication. The muda is the hard work. You know what I'm saying? It's whichever is prominent.

It's not that any of them are not doing what the other is doing. Like that. Like I've seen where you go to, now I can't say, but back in the 70s, you go to somebody's house, and they're very wealthy, and they have a big business and everything like that, but they just sit and talk philosophy.

Their only interest is reading philosophy and talking about that and everything. But they're very hardcore business people. But their focus is on that.

So you would say, their distraction would be the mayaya paridhyanam. You know what I'm saying? At that point. But then, most likely, when they go out to a wedding and other social things, then they would act as a naradhamma.

Like that. Probably if you catch them at work, they would be a muda. Does that make sense? So these are the four mentalities.

Like that. So here is that one's working so hard, he's not going to be absorbed in the Lord. His absorption is so much in the social development that he can't see the Lord.

Does that make sense? Or this one is that he's so absorbed in his knowledge that he can't see the Lord. Right? So we get this. We have, like we said before, is that the devotees means these are someone who the anarta is the identity.

So they can't take up devotional service. But for the devotees, then these are just anartas. Right? They've taken up because the prominence is devotional service.

But until it comes to that pure platform, there's going to be a distraction. Right? So the distraction will still be these. Right? You know, we say, oh, I'm just being practical, Prabhu.

That's your muda. You know? That's what's there. You know, the Mr. Politically Correct can't do anything wrong.

You know, don't want to do harinam, don't want to do this and that because you're going to disturb the people. That's the naradama. You know, anarta.

Like that. The one that's so scholarly and it doesn't make sense and this and that and, you know, have conferences and they just discuss all this jazz. That's called the mayaya pratigya.

Does that make sense? So all it is, is it's the anarchist to the extreme. It doesn't allow them to be absorbed in Krishna consciousness. Right? Because what is reduced, then they're able to take it up.

Does that make sense? Can we also classify the varnas into it? Yeah. Well, let's finish this and then ask that. Because otherwise, let's finish the last one and then you can do it.

Because you can also classify it. It means it's typical, but it's not that it's just stuck to the particular one. You know what I'm saying? Just like we said, you can have this mix, it can be anywhere.

Oh, that's another thing. Yes. Everything.

It's not really clear yet. If they were Vedic, then they would be this, but it's just... Yeah. Yes.

Lazy monks, they would still be... They're not hard-working, they don't do anything. Well, they're grossly foolish, that you could say. Because a donkey, if it's up to him, he'll stand there and not move.

You have to make him move. Like that. The devotees were talking, it was... Dhananjaya, I think, was saying, or someone else, maybe it was Guru Goswami, was talking about how when they were building the Vrindavan temple, because they're doing the foundation, so you have to dig down.

So, you know, here the guys just carry it on their head, but over there, they use donkeys, these little dinky donkeys, you know, like that. And, yeah. So, in the morning, like in the winter, like this time, it's really cold, so the donkeys are just sitting there.

And they want them to move, so they get them and they start pushing them and pulling on the rope. They won't move. I mean, you could beat them with a stick, they won't move.

So they would start a fire underneath them. They would start a fire. Literally start... And only when the fire's there, then they would move.

And once they're moving, then you can keep them moving, but to get them initially to start, it's kind of like, no, I'm not moving. They won't move. Once they're moving, then I guess, you know, they're foolish enough.

So, so, so you do have within the mood of the grossly foolish, that element. Because why is a guy working hard? Why is that guy working like an ass? Yeah, it means that the family needs, the kids need, you know, like that, the government, you know, there's a time. There's something there, and so he's pushed.

If it was up to him, he'd sit back and enjoy all day. Because he's also the guy that buys the lottery ticket, right? Because he thinks, I'll be rich, and then I can sit back. Does that make sense? Like that.

So, you know, when they say these four, they're all inclusive. It's just, they're just contemplating enough to figure out where everybody fits. But it's not that, oh no, there's people outside this.

No, they fit into this. It's also very hard work to be a bum. Yeah, but it's very few are bums, actually.

You know what I'm saying? Because the bohemian concept is you present yourself as a bum, though you're actually not necessarily a bum. You know, it's just, it's cool to be a bum. Mars is in the story of the king, and he was fed up of his citizens being lazy.

So he said, all the lazy people, they can come. We have some luxurious accommodation. You can come, get some nice eatables like that.

He invited all the lazy people to come, and they came across and went to the house, and then he said, now set it on fire, and he set it on fire, and then, like, you know, everybody came running out to him, except these two guys, and then they were like, you know, they felt the flames, you know, and then they would turn over to the other side, you know, and he didn't come out, and he says, yes, they can stay, you know, they are truly lazy. I think it was just something he was worried about, those who couldn't work and this and that, and something like that. He didn't pay enough tax.

Hm? That's what his minister told him to do, that people didn't pay enough tax because not all of them were working. Oh. The majority were not working.

Oh. And that's the minister told him. Oh, okay.

You'll find out he's lazy. Okay. So there's only two.

Okay. Chinese. Hm? Chinese.

Yes. So they're only, yes. Okay.

And so those two didn't have to work and everybody else had to work, you know. Okay. Right.

But the illusory energy misguides them and therefore they disobey the Supreme Lord. There are a great number of mayayapratijana at the present moment. Even amongst the scholars of the Bhagavad-gita.

In the Gita, in plain and simple language, it is stated that Sri Krsna is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. There is none equal to or greater than Him. His mention is the father of Brahma, the original father of all human beings.

In fact, Sri Krsna is said to be not only the father of Brahma but also the father of all species of life. He is the root of the impersonal Brahman and Paramatma. The Supersoul in every entity is His plenary portion.

He is the fountainhead of everything and everyone is advised to surrender under His lotus feet. Despite all these clear statements, the mayayapratijana deride the personality of the Supreme Lord and consider Him merely another human being. They do not know that the blessed form of human life is designed after the eternal and transcendental feature of the Supreme Lord.

So it's the other way around. They'll say it's anthropomorphic or something as you make God in

your image and like that, that's what they'll claim, but it's actually the other way around. Yes, so here, this is your typical jnani, you know, intellectual who then, like that.

The last class of duskrtih is called asurabhavam asritah, or those of demoniac principles. This class is openly atheistic. Some of them argue that the Supreme Lord can never descend upon this material world, but they are able to, unable to give any tangible reasons as to why not.

There are others who make Him subordinate to the impersonal feature, although the opposite is declared in the Gita. Envious of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the atheist will present a number of illicit incarnations manufactured in the factory of his brain. Such persons whose every principle of life is to decry the Personality of Godhead cannot surrender unto the lotus feet of Sri Krsna.

So here the emphasis is on being dedicated to demoniac principles. Just the demoniac lifestyle is what's important to them. Now they may have a philosophy, they'll have some philosophy about it and all that, you know, so then, I mean, I think some of your, what's it, French existentialists might fit into this category.

You know, complete hedonistic, you know, and so, they make a philosophy just to define their hedonist. Not that they came up with a philosophy and thought, oh, I should be a hedonist if I'm going to be true to my philosophy. No, it's just that they were dedicated to the demoniac principles and when people would complain about it they would make up, they made up a philosophy to, you know, I should defend it.

Like that. Does that make sense? So then, then they go against the, the, the, the principles. Like that.

That's their, they're committed to that. Yes. There are others who make him subordinate to the impersonal feature.

Although the opposite is declared in the Gita. You know, Brahnavadi and Mayavadi. Brahnavadi, they... No, but they would be Mayavadis.

But, but, they're not just intellectuals. They're committed to, you know, sinful life. That's their, their focus.

Oh. You know, because... Demonic... Yes. Because it means, in other words, they may be from one class or the other, or may be from any of these classes.

But it's just, you know, what their lifestyle is, is, is not the, the consideration. It's the, where their focus is. So, the demoniac life.

So, means if, means like that. They make up incarnations. In other words, you have someone, someone who's, let's say a Mayavadi, but he's just focused on, on, on philosophy and living that renounced lifestyle.

And for him, that, you know, engaging in karma and other things is, is, you know, useless. But he still doesn't come to the, the conclusion of surrendering to the Supreme Lord. So, therefore, then he becomes a Mayavadi.

Right? But you'll have some is that they say there's incarnation and then they get facilities and they try to enjoy those facilities and everything like that. So, they would be within this, this asura, asurabhava. Is that, so, they may have a philosophy also with that they attract people.

So, they use this as a justification to their, their demand. Yes. So, they may have, you know, so they'll always, it appears here that they'll always have some kind of philosophy, you know, but they're openly atheistic.

While, while the, the Mayavadis may not be. You know, they may be, but it's, it's, that's not their focus is being atheistic. Their focus is on knowledge.

But here, the focus is on being atheistic. You know, so you have them. Now, again, you don't see them so often, but you see them.

They're just so openly about that. Anything you say, they just immediately, you know, others would just, you know, they don't, that wouldn't be what they're into, so they don't make any comment on that, you know, you know what I'm saying, let it ride, and then, you know, the situation carries on with whatever it was. It was a, you know, a party or this or that.

They don't, but the asura, no, he has to, no, it's that, you know, he has to fight it and everything like that. Like that. Does that make sense? Yeah.

Like that. So it's, it's, so your question? Yes. I mean, you have, you have to understand it's very general, so it's like that class can more easily have that, you know, or would have it in its extreme, you know what I'm saying, but it's not that one couldn't be in another varna and be of that definition.

Does that make sense? Yeah. So, so your, your muda would typically be a shudra, right? It means your asura would be the kshatriya, your, your naradhama would be your vaisya, and your mayayapahirti jnana would be a brahmana. You know, just like your, your artha, how you say, would be shudra.

You know, your artharti would be the vaisya. Your jijnasa would generally be the, you know, the kshatriya. Your jnani would be the brahmana.

But, you know what I'm saying, but it just doesn't typically follow, fall in that way. But it's that, they would have the most, means, in other words, someone can be committed to demoniac principles. He could be brahminical.

You know, like we see those, those demoniac philosophers, like that. But you see it in its most extreme form if a kshatriya takes this up. Because then he makes a whole, you know, he has, he

has facilities, you know, like that.

You know what I'm saying? How you say? Does that make sense? You know, like our, our, our, what do you call it? Our said gentlemen on acid. Oh yeah. You know, like that.

Because they'll take this and then they, they push it to the extreme. Does that make sense? You know. But your mayai pratyajana, that you're, generally you'll see is the, the brahminical class will push that to the extreme.

You know, your naradhama, naradhama, generally the sophisticated, generally it's the vaisya cultures that, that develops all this social, political, and religious life. It doesn't mention about liberation or anything else like that. Social, political, and religious life.

Because this religious means, so it's generally the lower end of varanashram and, and the artha. So the focus is on artha. That's the middle class, the bhuja.

Yeah, the bhuja, generally. But it means, that middle means that the vaisya. So they may be a little bit more, you know, they have facility and all that.

So typically in most cultures that they would be, you know, your higher middle class or, you know, like that. you know, it can be more than that but it's just where they, they focus. So it's like you have some people that are immensely rich, millionaires, billionaires, but they work so hard.

That's all their focus is just on their work. So even though the guy is a millionaire, he's still a mudha. You know what I'm saying? So he could be a businessman or he could be, you know, into the military just working, working, working to develop like that.

You know what I'm saying? It's not balanced. In other words, when the work element is out of balance, then that's the mudha. When the sophistication element is out of balance, then that's nirnara dhamma.

When the intellectual, intellectualizing is out of balance then you get the mayaya prarabdha jnana. And when the, you know, the dedication to the demoniac principles and establishing those is there. You know, just like the ksatriya established his religious principles.

You know, they go out of their way to practice them and to see that others do it. So here the asura means he goes out of his way to practice and establish demoniac principles. Does that make sense? It means that those who are out of balance means those who are That's over-emphasized.

Those who don't over-emphasize it so it means when they hear about Krishna they can surrender? That's the point? Yeah, you could. But yeah, that's basically you could say like that. But generally is that they will see some problem in it.

You know, they're not they're not convinced that having facility by working I'll be happy. You

know. Or means there's there's a need they're unable to fulfill it.

Well, these ones they're perfectly confident that they can fulfill their need through their their endeavor. Or as Prabhu said their commitment to lack of endeavor. Yes.

So in this Asuram Babamashita the atheist represents a number of illicit incarnations. So it means that a person who is following so-called incarnation is atheist. Well, that means that they'll be an atheist.

Means all of these are in some way some kind of atheism. But this is a worse one. Depends how you put it.

But Naradhamma is considered the lowest because see the first and the last two that it's not necessarily they've come in contact with with the proper with the chance. You know what I'm saying? Yes. Like that.

The Naradhamma has and he's neglected it. It doesn't mean he went out bought a book and then sticks it on the shelf and neglects it because it doesn't cross his mind. Naradhamma would be the guy who goes out buys the books you know puts it on his table you know and then sometime he has some freedom and sits down and reads it and goes nah, this is not not interesting and then then puts it on the shelf.

That would be the Naradhamma. Just he has the book never read it just put it on there you know or looks at it and goes nice you know puts it on the shelf and forgets about it. That wouldn't be a Naradhamma.

Naradhamma means he's decided I'm not interested in Krishna consciousness. It doesn't mean one who fell from Krishna consciousness it means one who's not interested. Consciously.

Yeah, consciously. But the other ones are unconscious of it. But just because it's they're asuras so they have to fight religious principles.

You know so they'll fight Krishna consciousness they'll fight the Christians they'll fight the Jews they'll fight anybody anybody who has a philosophy you know that has a religious they'll fight it. It doesn't matter. You know they're how do you say you know equal points you see all followers of faith equally You know they're all nonsense.

I think that's so so is a When we consider maya pratyajana more because it's here said that they can be even scholars of Bhagavad-gita Yeah No, no, no, no because because what's the commitment? The commitment's not to the knowledge the commitment's to the dhammanayat principles. Okay. They may have knowledge or they may not but the commitment is to dhammanayat principles.

The maya pratyajana his commitment is to his erudition. Right. The naradhama his commitment is to his social political and religious life but not in connection with God

Consciousness.

Right. And then mudha his commitment is to his hard work. So so each may have elements of the other but but it's where the focus is is what you call it.

You know you mentioned that naradhamas are the worst. Yes because they're naradhamas means that adhamas nara adhama so that means of men they're the lowest because the point is is the guy's a demon but he doesn't actually know about Krishna Consciousness so he hasn't really rejected it but the naradhama means he knows about it he's rejected it so that makes him the worst. And maya pratyajana he doesn't know either.

He doesn't know either because his his intelligence is misguided by maya. You know what I'm saying? What are you confused about? No, no, that I know but what's the what's the confusion? But here is they know about Gita but it doesn't mean they understand it about devotional service. It's not that they have an opportunity for devotional service.

If they're given that opportunity and they reject it that's another thing. Then they would be you know reclassified. But that doesn't mean someone who's a jnani and is fighting philosophies you come along with your philosophy they just deal and they don't accept the Krishna Consciousness therefore they're naradhama you know necessarily.

This is that they understand something about it you know that it's something that could be practiced or that but they're not interested. It's slightly different though it's right on the border. Yeah, but see it's just like do you only perform karma yoga or only jnana or only jnana yoga? No, it's whichever is prominent at the time because if you're performing the activity it's not that you're not thinking of something and you're not using intelligence.

Does that make sense? But the prominence is the activity or when you're contemplating something it's not that you're not doing something you might be doing something else and thinking about so then the jnana is the prominent or the absorption in Krishna is the prominent so therefore that becomes the prominent element. Does that make sense? So buddhi-yoga means all these combined so the demoniac nature is all of this. Now these are the four elements there's only maybe one you know just what do you call it the quintessential you know just mudha you know like that you know he's even got two tattoos mudha you know like that you know it's just he made the poster child yes the poster the poster donkey you know I'm not sure if you could fit the hogs dogs camels and asses into here but you know the asses definitely go with the first one that we know I would technically think that I would think that the well it's hard to say these are also other mentalities because the dogs would be us right? Could be yeah they're not necessarily so intellectual and they do kind of have a bit of a but but then you're going to have a problem with the you know the hogs and the camels because the camels I would tend to think the camels would be the maya and the hogs would be the neurononymous sophistication yeah because the hogs own certain sophistication unseen unseen by others yeah yeah because they have this this regular they work very means like the hog if the pigs are there where they're eating and all that they won't pass stool over in the corner you know so they're

very careful like that when they sleep they all sleep exactly like that they don't just here and there like the dogs and stuff they're all exact so it's more developed social and political they're also more intelligent than dogs when it comes to combining stuff yeah but they don't get in a fight they don't get the dogs get all emotional and freaky and all that the dog the hog just sits there you know when the dog comes like this honking yeah it's ok yeah does that make sense so the thing is is this all these things are just to get an idea because we know what a qualifications so therefore we we could understand ok the mood how that he may be prone to lamentation and getting very easily distracted and things like that and so does that make sense you know so you could see is there the Narad Hamad gets distracted by you know their own concept of ethics and you know political justice and other things like this you know they're going to get distracted because that's what Vaishya's get distracted by like that then yeah does that make sense you know so you can understand from the one the other what's the connection it shouldn't be used to anybody who manifests anything like that and then you go oh he's a shooter he's a that's not it shouldn't be used that way all these connections are so you can broaden the understanding because certain things means these things you you discuss in this this this situation you know what's their occupational nature you discuss in another situation does that make sense so between them all then you can you know even in Ayurveda you have the mucospinal air so that will establish also like that so you know what one does what the other does you know what I'm saying yeah and so through all these different things then you can better understand one one particular you know situation that's being described because you know what all the background is but what's very important is to be able to understand what's the prominent aspect because that's the one that's being described now so the other ones are ok for giving support but you don't take it and transfer oh so we can define it like this and then take it completely into something else because then it becomes artificial because then you're making something prominent that wouldn't be as prominent in that situation it would be you know an aspect of it does that make sense let's say you have some eggplant right you cut it up into little squares you fry it very nicely right and you put and at the end you put you know some tomatoes for flavor ok now in there you know you're going to put salt the regular amount you're going to put some chili but you're going to put only a little bit of sugar right just something to cut the edge of anything that might be you know gotten bitter from you know but now you take the same elements all the same thing the chili the salt the sugar you know the eggplant and the tomato but now you make the tomato prominent and then you just have some eggplant that's you know cut up small deep fried put at the end now the proportion of sugar is going to be way greater because the one's the subject the other's the chutney so if one can't tell where the definition is then one will artificially try to oh so that means then we could you know take the you know how you say take the cauliflowers and then the cheese and just you know adjust the proportion and put a lot of sugar in it and just call it chutney you know what I'm saying so we miss the principle what was there is that the tomatoes and eggplant go together you know what I'm saying so it's just a matter of which is more so if the tomatoes then you know that you could put some of the one or if this is there the other one could be there does that make sense we all catch this because otherwise sometimes we're looking at one thing then we see a connection with the other then we want to define it

according to that no no it's just a matter that definition and this one have a connection because you're dealing with Sambandavidaya and Praoan so there's always a connection between things right does that make sense so then it's a matter of seeing ok what adds what to where so then from the one you can see that this will be there that will be there you can see so many things does that make sense this is the point of where we analyze things but they still have to be analyzed according to a root root you know how you say fundamental points that's the difference between this kind of analyzation where you're looking for the essence and just analyzing because analyzing means you can go off in any direction as long as there's something to intellectualize on right so the intelligence is going to see the difference or the sameness so if I can find the sameness in anything or the difference then I can you know there's kind of reddish lines here there's reddish lines in the blankets over there so blankets and rocks are similar you know but that's not what we're looking for you know what's the point of it the rocks are in the garden that's over there for warmth so they don't actually or you could look at it ok they're here for aesthetics and aesthetics is for creating that you know niceness or that attractiveness so that means that warmth so in that way there's a commonality between the blanket and the rocks you know but it's not warmth as temperature you know it's warmth as the feelings from aesthetics does that make sense so you can see commonality but you have to be able to tell how where it's being applied that has to be the principle you're using because otherwise if you take this other one and then try to apply it it won't work because that's why it's defined in that different way it's for that situation but now that you know more more information then when you go to apply it in the one area you'll be able to get a better effect because you have all this other secondary information or supportive information it's secondary in this situation in another situation it might be primary right so it comes back to what we discussed before knowing what's primary and what's secondary right because we want to be able to think and contemplate and connect things together but it shouldn't be when we connect it because we were able to connect it now what we connected to that becomes the principle and now we're learning this oh that's this and so that's the principle now this is the secondary no this is the primary that's the secondary and then when you go to study that subject you'll see this is primary and this has a connection here this is the secondary then it makes it work so these miscreants and they're all not how do you say able to appreciate the lord's position though he comes like that so now this being in the Upanaya section this means this has to the other right so all the others those people he comes and man can't see right because of his material absorption or you know his intellectualizing or demoniac you know demoniacizing whatever it is you know so it's like so that establishes so here is how you bring that all in right to bring near right so lesson twenty nine only those who are law-abiding faithful men revive their god consciousness when they're in difficulty in need of money inquisitive or aspiring for knowledge right so these so they're able to because otherwise here's law-abiding faithful men because you had law-abiding who were not faithful right how about faithful who are not law-abiding you mean like early Christians or something it wasn't legal to be Christian they were faithful but not law-abiding yeah devotees stealing flowers from the cemetery yeah seven sixteen oh best among the Barthas four kinds of pious men begin to render devotional service unto me says begin the distressed the desire of wealth the inquisitive and he was searching for

knowledge of the absolute like the inquisitive just looks interesting but but the God is searching for knowledge of the absolute that's his prominent focus yes four kinds of pious men pious yes necessarily pious means that that they're able to do this that makes them pious because actually connection to Krishna consciousness that's real piety not being connected to Krishna consciousness that's real impiety so that's why we see in the previous definition somebody could be pious and still demoniac you know like that so the definition of piety and demoniacness is not based on you know ethics and morality and other and religious principles as defined in Varnashram but it's based on whether you accept God or not so it's a surrender yeah yeah yeah and accepting if you're willing to surrender so this is the sukritina instead of the duskritina unlike the miscreants these are adherents of the regulated principles of the scriptures and they're called sukritina or those who obey the rules and regulations of scriptures so here it's defining that unlike the miscreants they don't follow the scriptures or they may practice but they're not following for the purpose that the scriptures give which means God consciousness they are called sukritina or those who obey the rules and regulations of scriptures the moral and social laws and are more or less devoted to the Supreme Lord right more or less so then they're able to take it up right on the whole when the distressed the inquisitive the seekers of knowledge and those who are in need of money are free from all material desires but when they fully understand that material re-enumeration has nothing to do with spiritual improvement they become pure devotees as long as such purified state is not attained devotees in transcendental service to the Lord are tainted with fruitive activities the search for mundane knowledge etc that's what we were describing before so we shouldn't take those qualities that they're demoniac no it's when those qualities are in you know how you say prominent and there's no and they're you know avoiding or not interested or you know staying away from Krishna consciousness or not involved then you can call that demoniac right but it's because it's the same in artists you know what I'm saying the one is the muda means he has a great faith in the fruitive endeavor so if there's any fruitive endeavor it has that if they have you know social development then that's the that's does that make sense or knowledge or in power and influence like that so you have all these are just standard in artists just when they become overemphasized in one way then you call it that if the same thing becomes overemphasized and affects the health then you'll call it the medicine muda means you know the whole medical science you know there's too much of this too much of that here mentioned the moral and social laws separate from rules of regulations of scriptures and this symptom of piety and supremacy what is extra mentioned what is mentioned separately social and moral laws just to make sure that you know what they're talking about yeah it's actually impossible but the moral and social laws are more or less devoted to the Lord means in other words they follow they do what they're supposed to do as far as they understand from the scriptures they're following right so then they they surrender right so now the obvious question is you know except for one or two that doesn't include any of us here in the room because we weren't following the regulative principles of the scriptures and all that and more or less devoted to the Lord so that is the power of the Lord's devotees coming and preaching so that's what Prophet said you know because they'll say what's our qualification Prophet said we have no qualification right so Prophet said he's made our fortune so by hearing the Holy Name by us taking Prasad or Prasad

or whatever then that is the that is the Sukṛiti that is bringing one to that platform where one can take up does that make sense so in that way you become pious because otherwise there may not be a whole lot to identify one as pious right yes can you say that in previous lives devotees they were still not pious or we cannot ascertain for sure because because the Lord won't interfere with your independence.

So, therefore, the point that Krishna's making here is, this is how He's doing. These, they surrender, these don't. But the point is this, how you get them to come to that point of surrender, that's then the devotees, because they don't care about your independence.

It's quite obvious, right? Like that. So, they just come in and just let you know about what you're supposed to be doing, not what you think you should be doing. Does that make sense? Like that.

So, that means it doesn't matter the background. So, one could be from a very, very, not a very good background. One devotee was telling me, he was sitting with Prabhupāda and some guest came, and then the talking, you know, he's a gentleman, that Indian gentleman.

And then, I don't know how the conversation got around him, but at one point Prabhupāda made a comment about that devotee who was sitting there, that his life before Kṛṣṇa consciousness was absolutely abominable. Like that. And he had never talked to Prabhupāda about what he used to do or anything like that.

So, he was always, it was kind of like, you know, afterwards, like, how did Prabhupāda know? You know, like that. So, it's, it's, yes. But without, so say Prabhupāda, he distributed so liberally, but yet we see that despite so many people coming into contact, many didn't take to the process.

So, surely it would be that element of sukṛti. No, that remains. Bhakti-sukṛti remains.

So, you, you are, you take up, you, you, you, you know, see the devotees go by in Harinām, you know, that's, you know, interesting, you know, unique, you know, people out in bed sheets and, you know, doing public, a moving public musical demonstration, you know. So, it's something, something new, yeah, like that. You know, so, that happens enough and then after some time, then these other elements come up.

Then, then, then one gets that sukṛti to, you know, find, try to find out, to inquire, to, like that. Then it builds up. So, it says many, many.

So, that maybe just from preaching that, maybe from so much from lifetimes before. And now, you know, because it's when it's, when it comes to a certain maturity, so now by that one Harinām, that was enough to bring it to maturity, or that one Ratha-yatra, or that one time of getting prasāda. Because you have these sorts of devotees come.

It's just, I think it was Madhudviṣa, he was just, you know, he was just, I think he was just

wandering. You know, he had whatever he owned in a, in a little, you know, backpack and he was walking along, and he happened to come across the San Francisco Ratha-yatra. You know, he's not from there, he's just passing through.

And he saw that and it was nice and he liked the thing, threw his, his bag up onto the Ratha, took part in the festival, and when he went back to the temple, he went with them and that's it. So, that's all it took. You know, so that means it was really close.

You know, it's just, does that make sense? Because so many others are coming there and taking part in that and when they finish, they go home and, you know, and, you know, talk about how it was a great festival, you know, over a, you know, how do you say, American flag, you know, reefer and stuff like that. You know, so it's, you know, so they just move on. You see, so that is just adding.

And then these kinds of things, you know, that's, that's, that was just what it took. That was what was left. So, how long that takes, how many lifetimes, that we don't know.

You know, we don't worry about it. We just know the process is there because the detail isn't important. You know what I'm saying? You know, you're sitting in the water, you know, out in the middle of the ocean and a boat happens to come, you know, and the boat comes by and then before you'll get out, you really want to know is that, you know, you know, you know, what did you trip over on the, on the deck there that you fell in the water, you know, and, and did you, you know, let me see, you know, exactly which toe got caught on it, you know, and, and was it, you know, was it more the toe or was it the, the shoe itself is what actually got caught in that, you know what I'm saying? And they're saying, you know, you know, throwing you the line, that, and they're just telling you, grab the line, we'll pull you out, and you say, no, no, no, one minute, I got to work this out, you know.

Does that make sense? So that's why, other than what will help you get out, all these other contemplations, these digressions aren't so important. You know what I'm saying? Like yesterday, I think we ran into a few of them, right? Does that, does that make sense? That, that, if that's the topic, then you're seeing that topic in connection to Krishna, then the details are, are, are important. They fill out the thing, right? Like if we're discussing how not to trip on deck, then, you know, we could get into all these different things.

Does that make sense? But when we're talking about getting out of the water onto the deck, you know, then talking about tripping on the deck, it really, even though it's maybe have its place, it has nothing to do with that. Does that, does that make sense? But it was simply for the point of why does it fructify in some and not fructify in other, even though... No, it's not your question. I'm talking about yesterday's question.

Oh. Okay. Oh, okay.

So then we'll continue on Monday, Lesson 30. Thank you.