

2012-02-20 BG a 2.82-83

Hare Krsna, Hare Krsna, Krsna Krsna, Hare Hare, Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare, Hare Krsna, Krsna Krsna, Hare Hare, Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare, The knower of the Absolute Truth is convinced of his awkward position in material association. He knows that he is part and parcel of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Krsna, and that his position should not be in the material creation. He knows his real identity as part and parcel of the Supreme, whose eternal bliss and knowledge, and he realizes that somehow or another he is entrapped in the material conception of life.

In his pure state of existence he is meant to dovetail his activities in devotional service to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Krsna. He therefore engages himself in the activities of Krsna consciousness and becomes naturally unattached to the activities of the material senses, which are all circumstantial and temporary. He knows that his material condition of life is under the supreme control of the Lord.

Consequently, he is not disturbed by all kinds of material reactions, which he considers to be the mercy of the Lord." So it's understood that it's awkward because otherwise we will think that it's normal or, you know, there's something not so bad about it or there's some aspect of it that's okay. And we were talking about this okayness is not the part connected to Krsna, right? It's just, it's okay. You know, it's fine.

So he's very convinced that he's not the body, he's the soul, he's serving the Krsna, his duty is to serve Krsna, and that's the only way, you know, and his natural position is to be situated on the spiritual platform. So being like that, then it becomes very easy, right? Because then it's very clear what you should be doing and what's not so important. So moving within the material world means just moving in how to serve Krsna, right? Because in the beginning it's, we're doing what we're doing, then we're connecting that to Krsna.

Then with time it's, no, it's just we're supposed to be serving Krsna. So whatever's the situation is set here, circumstantial and temporary, right? It's just the circumstances. Previous activities have generated it, you know, what those activities are, why we're here, that's not so important, but it's what you're in now, right? Because if something's going on now, you don't get into all the things why it did like that.

You deal with it, right? When you have some moments you can contemplate it, but at the time of action you can't contemplate why it's like that, right? You deal with what it is at the moment, right? Because if you're contemplating why it's like that, unless that's necessary to understand what to do, then one's going to get distracted, right? One's going to be so worried about how it got there that the moment to do something about it is lost, right? So therefore that's not a big deal important element for him, right? So how he got here, how this circumstance came up. So simply it is just the reaction of all kinds of material activities, and it's by the Lord's grace that we're in this situation, we have the opportunity to serve Him. So that way one doesn't get too

distracted, or what we, you know, colloquially call, get too mental.

Right? No, it's just this is what situation one's in, how to best serve Krishna in that situation and then do it. Then things work very nicely. See the point is, what do you have to deal with? No, but at what stage? Like right now means your body is there in a particular condition.

So in dealing with this condition right now, what is the judgment? That you were hungry three years ago and so hungry you could have eaten, you know, three kangaroos or, you know what I'm saying? Yes, but what do you have to deal with? You want the body to be in good health, but what do you have to deal with? What the body was before, or what the body will be, or what the body is right this moment. Yes, so it means we're talking practically you have to deal with what situation the body is in this moment. That means the body itself and the circumstances that are there.

You know what I'm saying? Let's say someone has been told by the doctor that eat very often, so don't get too hungry, right? Because otherwise you might get acid, okay? So now you're standing right in the middle of the kirtan, right? They're doing the, you know, for the thing and you suddenly get really hungry and you're right in the middle of the tamper room. So what should you do, right? Reach in your bag, pull out that, you know, how you say that, you know, cheese on rye that you've been putting there since the morning and then start eating it, right? Because then you're following doctor's orders, no? Does that make sense? But now let's say you're sitting at home and you suddenly get really hungry. What do you do? You eat something.

The other one, at least you wait until you get out of the tamper room to some side and then start eating your food. Yes, it means you have to deal with what is there. That's why he says, which are all circumstantial and temporary.

Why you got hungry and you're right in the middle of the tamper room or you're sitting there and you're surrounded by food and you're not getting hungry. This is just circumstantial. It's just the way it is.

So Krishna's mercy is that no matter what the situation, you have an opportunity to serve Krishna. Does that make sense? It doesn't mean that you can't work out, okay, what, what means you diet wasn't right. But we're saying is that in dealing with it, you want to eat something, right? You can't sit there and be contemplating, well, three years ago I did this and then I did that and then we went traveling and then I threw it off.

No, you're not eating. Just eat. You know, at moments in between, then you can contemplate these things if it'll help.

See, because there's also a difference between contemplating because it will actually give you a better idea of what to do in the situation or it's just the mind wants to contemplate these things because it basically has, making you miserable is what it feels is the best thing to do. Does that make sense? Yes. Yes, yes.

So the point is, is, means mode of goodness then is, deals with knowledge. Knowledge is what is applied for action. So if you want to be able to apply knowledge and action together, then you have to be dealing in the present, right? Because otherwise you can't apply that knowledge to the future.

And you can contemplate the past, but you can't do anything about it. So it means you have to apply it to the present. Otherwise it won't, won't function, right? So the point is, is what situation you're in, you have to be able to see that.

It's circumstantial. It is there now, but it won't be there after some moments. It's always changing.

But the point is, if you want to do something with it now, you have to deal now. You know what I'm saying? So the Vedic is this very nice balance, is that you're dealing in the present, but it's very practical, right? You understand it's Kṛṣṇa's mercy, but you're acting. Because generally what we have is always Kṛṣṇa's mercy, so you do nothing.

Or if we're, you know, very active in doing things like that, then I'm in control of it. No, but it's just circumstantial. You're not in control of the present environment, because you didn't, you're not, you're not the one creating it, the material energy created.

It may be created on your previous desire. And like we give the example, when you're at the restaurant and you give an order, you didn't cook the food, right? You didn't go to the market and buy it. You didn't plan the menu.

You didn't buy the pots. You didn't arrange the cook. You know, the waiter is, you didn't, you had nothing to do with.

So that means the material energy is arranging everything, but based on your desire. So that's the way it is with everything. Just that's very obvious.

But even in the situation you're in, it's still the way it works. The material energy is doing it. You know what I'm saying? You push the button on your vacuum cleaner, but that the button turns the vacuum cleaner on, you didn't do.

That the electricity going through and all that, and the motor and someone else made it and made the arrangements and plugs it. You're just taking part in it. That it, that it, you know, you're moving it on the rug, but then, you know, the point is, is that it sucks things up.

It's doing it, not you. You'll say, I vacuum the rug. No, the vacuum cleaner vacuumed the rug.

Does that make sense? So, so the whole idea is that you're dealing with the science, but the point is, is that science is working because it's coming from a person and we're a person. So therefore the mind, the mood, the sentiments, all those things are part of it. But the problem is, is one looks at the science, no sentiment, one looks at the sentiment, no science.

So the Vedic is that the more you can understand this and balance it, then the better it works. Is that, does that make sense? Yeah. So, so therefore the mode of goodness means that you're dealing in the present, but you also want to see that you're dealing, you know, from that platform also, from the transcendental platform, using goodness.

Because otherwise you, you have the practical person who's dealing in the present, but their whole purpose of doing that is the mode of passion or the mode of ignorance. You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? It means you can use something for another purpose. You know what I'm saying? You're nice to the person, right? So that's, you know, considered proper social etiquette.

But you could be doing it because you're simply trying to get them into a position where then someone else can then, you know, cause them some problems. You know what I'm saying? So in other words, everything, there is, there is the activity itself, but then there's also the mentality of the activity. So when you combine it all, then you'll say that action was done in the mode of passion, even though it was done at the present, you know, with consciousness and intelligence.

But because your purpose of using it wasn't that. Does that make sense? Because you wanted to gain some result. Yes.

For the picture of consciousness. Yeah. But so, therefore, it's, it's not being done because that's your duty, it's being done because you want a particular fruit of result from it.

But you have to use the mode of goodness to do that. Does that make sense? Like that. So that's the point.

You have, so on the very point of how you took care of it, yes, you did everything perfect. You said hello properly, you shook their hand, you did all that. So that was all proper.

But that's only part of the bigger picture, that you're doing that for some other motive. Right? So the whole, that whole activity you have to see according to its overall. But within it, that specifics, you may have been doing it exactly correctly.

Does that make sense? So that's how, when you're dealing with, it means the Vedic literature will be describing all this on all the different levels. So the point is that Krishna consciousness takes care of all the levels. It's the biggest picture.

Right? Then you come down to the platform of, of Brahman, that I'm not this body, I'm this soul, you know, we don't belong in the material world, you know, that kind of thing. That's very big, less than that. Right? Then you have Dharma, the particular circumstances you're in, like that, and how those circumstances relate to each other, you know, on a greater social and long-term function.

Right? Then more narrower than that is you get into Artha, what I can do with this situation,

you know, in a shorter-term way to get the results I want. And then the smallest is the senses and the sense objects. You understand? But to deal with any one of those, you have to deal in the present.

So even you're dealing on the smallest, the sense gratification, unless you're dealing in the present, it's not going to work. Right? Let us say, you know, you're arranging something, you got your prasada, you put it down, and then you forgot something in your bag, you turned around, you know, got all that, you look back, your plate's not there. Right? It's been moved over.

Okay? So now are you going to sit down and go, no, my plate was here, I put it here. So then you start picking up imaginary food and putting it in your mouth, and everybody's looking at you, what's wrong? What are you looking at? You know, I'm eating my food. Is that going to work? You understand, you have to deal.

No, the plate's over there, so you move over there, move the plate back. Does that make sense? So the whole idea is that you have to deal in the present. People who don't deal in the present aren't getting the results.

But the problem is, is when devotees or anybody talks about results, what level are you talking about it on? Right? There's five levels you can deal with it on. Which level is it being dealt with on? Right? So there's the consciousness, you know, which is the fifth level, but there's the mechanics of it, which will be within the first four. Right? So you're dealing with the dharma, artha, kama, and moksha.

Then you're dealing in that, but then that's the mechanics, because that goes with the situation. But what's your motive of that? If it's devotion, then that's the best. If it's not devotion, it'll be also dharma, artha, kama, moksha.

But do they match? Are you dealing with moksha with moksha? The dharma with dharma? Are you using dharma for kama, or dharma for artha? Does that make sense? Otherwise, why would Bhagavatam say, don't use it like this unless you could do that? Right? So the idea is to become aware of all these things. So that's what he's saying, the knower of the absolute truth is convinced of his awkward position. He knows he's part and parcel.

His position should not be in the material creation. He knows his real identity is eternality, knowledge, and bliss. So you're talking about a lot of things at once, right? But we wouldn't be talking about it if we couldn't do it.

Right? In this pure state of existence, mental dovetail is activity, so everything's connected to the Lord. So he understands all these things. Then the material world is temporary, so we don't get overly disturbed by it.

What situation is there now, that's what we deal with. We have facilities, we use them for Krishna. We don't have facilities, we don't use them.

You know, whatever is there, that's what we use. Then we're not worried about it, because whatever it is, it will be temporary. It's nice, it will get not nice.

It's not nice, it'll become nice. Right? That's, you could say in a nutshell, that is, what do you call it? Yiqing, right? The yiqing. That's all he's telling you.

If it's good, don't get too excited, because it will become bad. And if it's bad, don't worry, it will become good. That's all he talks about.

So it's just how bad it is, means how not much, you know, don't worry, anything like that. That's all. That's just the way the material world works.

Right? Yes. We've heard since, you know, from the number of devotees joined, they usually hear that we should contemplate how we got in, in order to get out. Contemplate how we got in, in order to get out.

It's a common... But, means, but how you got into the material world means that we have material consciousness. So that puts us here. So we'll get out by reversing that, and not having material consciousness.

Because the detail, how will the new devotee understand? You know, you're talking about being able to accommodate the transcendental and the mundane position exactly in the same place at the same time, functioning perfectly together. Welcome to Iskcon. Huh? Welcome to Iskcon.

Yeah. So that's the whole idea is that, it means, in other words, we perform material activity, that gets us to our situation. Prabhupada says, by contemplating your present situation, then you can tell the past, you can tell one's previous lives.

You don't have to go to somebody, you know, to look in a... check the Ouija board or something, right? It means you can contemplate. You're in that situation because you did that before, right? Does that make sense? If you suddenly notice that you're sitting in a restaurant, how did you get there? Because you walked in the door, right? And if you don't live next door, then you, good chance you took some kind of transportation to get there. You know what I'm saying? So it's not, it's not actually difficult.

It's just that, you know, generally we like the idea that, you know, last life we were some king or some big this or some big that, you know, the other things aren't necessarily so great, you know. But wouldn't that be a disturbance? You were the great king last life and now you're just some schnook, you know. Wouldn't it be better that you were a schnook last life and now it's better, you know? So, in a footnote, footnote 45, Śrīla Prabhupāda writes in his purport to Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 6.16.5, it is our practical experience in this material world that the same person who is one's friend today becomes one's enemy tomorrow.

Our relationships as friends or enemies, family men or outsiders, are actually the results of our different demons. Cittakītu Mahārāja was lamenting for his son, who is now dead, but he could

have considered the situation otherwise. This living entity, he could have thought, was my enemy in my last life, and now, having appeared as my son, he is prematurely leaving just to give me pain and agony.

Why should he not consider his dead son his former enemy and instead of lamenting, be jubilant because of his, because of an enemy's death? Okay. As stated in the Bhagavad-Gītā, 327, *prakṛteḥ kriyamāṇāni guṇaiḥ karmāṇi sarvaśaḥ*. Factually, everything is happening because of our association with the modes of material nature.

Therefore, one who is my friend today, in association with the mode of goodness, may be my enemy tomorrow in association with the modes of passion and ignorance. As the modes of material nature work in illusion, we accept others as friends and enemies, sons or fathers, in terms of the reactions of different dealings under different conditions. So the modes are acting, and that's what we're accepting, because we say, oh, this one's my friend.

Why would this one be my friend and that one not? Right? We're dealing with the particular situation, the modes, because we're taking this body and this subtle body, this acting in this particular way under these modes that's present, is favorable to me. I call them friend. But the soul is exactly the same, no matter what the situation, what the modes.

Right? And we're the soul, we're not the body. So are they doing something that's favorable, as a soul, that's favorable for me as a soul? Right? Or is it something that they've done with their body that's favorable for me with my body, or with their emotions that's favorable for mine? So we're so conditioned to think that the material situation is the reality of our existence. Right? It means it's there, but it's not us.

Right? Just like these rocks are here, but we're not the rocks. Right? So the same way is that all these things are just adjusted. Right? So this is why, without Shastra even contemplating, it's hard to figure out the past, because otherwise one wouldn't consider like that.

Right? In other words, my son dies. Right? So if you look at it in the normal way we look at the cycle of karma means, means, yes, means he's getting me back his last life as his son, I died. And he was upset with that, so he came this life as his son and now died.

So like that's because the previous life to that, then he died on me. But that doesn't, where's the cause and effect really? Right? But here, he was the enemy. And he couldn't harass you enough last life, so he took birth as your son this life, so he could die on you to really make you feel bad.

So it means these are how the material nature functions. Because it doesn't necessarily function the way we think it does. Does that make sense? Because here you're dealing with a material situation.

He's a materialistic, pious, but materialistic person. Right? Like that. He's very committed to having a son.

He's married 10 million wives just to have a son. Right? So that's committed. You'd have to admit that.

That is committed. So the situation, it means basically you have the principle, but as a devotee, then devotees are there. So if the son dies here, it just means they go back to Godhead earlier.

They only had that much time that they needed to spend to come to the platform that they're qualified to go back to Godhead. So then they did that. Just they happened to be more qualified than us, so that's the annoying factor.

Right? Does that make sense? So they left earlier. And because we're materially attached, that's a disturbance. But if we're not materially attached, then it's not a disturbance.

Right? Then it's more of a loss of association. If they were that advanced, then we've lost that good association. You understand? So the emotions stay the same, but the whole circumstances change.

So in other words, how the materialist looks at the material nature and is causally affected isn't necessarily a very solid platform, because materially it can change so drastically, and spiritually it changes so drastically. Does that make sense? How does it change drastically spiritually? Means that instead of, means the other, means here in either case you're saying is that the son has died, but the one is that he's the enemy, so the enemy, so then that's good. But at the same time, it still doesn't make you feel much better.

Right? Because, but on the spiritual platform, the person's, you know, means they're born into the family of devotees, so that means they're a devotee, but they only had a little bit left. Otherwise, why are they born in the family of devotees? If they had a lot of materialism left, they wouldn't be born in your family. Right? They'd be born in some nicely situated materialistic family.

So they spent that amount of time, now they've gone back to Godhead. So that's great. That's something, that's quite drastic from the normal way of looking at it.

You know, because then it's something that it's, their attainment of going back to Godhead is something special, but at the same time, that loss of that association, that's, that's what's lamentable. But the point is, is they're not actually dead. You know, as Krishna's pointing out, it says, Bhishma and Drona, they may be killed on the battlefield, but they're old.

So, so as devotees, they'll either go back to Godhead, if not, they'll be born in young bodies, and young bodies are always a bit better than older bodies. Right? At least that's how they, the advertisements go, right? So in a sense, just struck me, you know, how he had the saying, the youth is wasted on the young, right? So now the four Kumaras, it's not, because they turn, they're, you know, they're, they're so old and mature, but at the same time, they're still youthful, right? So then, yes. So now we cannot understand all these topics without a guru such as Shastra.

No, we can't understand without guru such as Shastra. Like that, because if one might get some idea, a little inkling of it, but that'll just be something left from previous understandings. But to get a complete picture without guru such as Shastra won't work.

So that's why, just basing on what we feel and that it's not enough. If it's confirmed by guru such as Shastra, that's okay. But otherwise, you know, the mind could come up with so much or something comes through, but our situation is different than it was before.

And so we'll apply that in another way. Does that make sense? You know, so the person is a very expert, you know, Indian classical musician, right? They're born into families that do that. The whole family does.

They're very expert. So they know exactly what notes go with what, what you can mix and everything like that. And, but, you know, they're using an enharmonic system and they use no harmony, right? But he was pious enough to maintain human life, but not enough to maintain it in India.

So now he's born in the West. Next slide, right? So, but because of his karma of dealing with the music, you know, and it's according to Shastra and everything, had guru and all that. So he's actually very expert in it, just inherently.

He goes into the garage and plays and it's quite good, right? And all that. But the thing is, is then he knows how to, these notes go together, but he doesn't put them together according to Shastra anymore. Now he puts them together in chords and other things like that.

Does that make sense? So, so, so the circumstances have changed, but because now it's not Guru, Sadhu and Shastra, he won't put it together in the same way, but he has that inherent, you know, understanding of it. Does that make sense? So, so that's, that's the difficulty. Without Guru, Sadhu and Shastra, it still won't come out the same because we think, no, because I'm feeling it or I'm thinking it, it must be perfect.

But that's then saying that the, our gross body or subtle body is perfect. No, the soul is perfect, but not the gross and subtle body. The gross and subtle body will never be.

It's only perfect when it's connected to the Lord. In other words, our whole existence, what we think it is, it actually isn't. That's why it's called maya, that which is not.

But that, the point is, is whatever it is, it doesn't matter. That's why the past isn't so important. It's, it's what will you do with it now according to the, you know, the, the consciousness, you know, the knowledge and skills given by Guru, Sadhu and Shastra.

Then we will come up with something proper, something good, you know, something beneficial. So that's why we don't have to become disturbed that the whole situation isn't actually how I think it is. It doesn't matter.

You deal with it according to Guru, Sadhu and Shastra in the present and it'll work. You'll get your results. Does that make sense? You know, it's just like the person's there going along and then he finds out something about, you know, completely different than he thought for the last 20 years.

So there's, but now they can't function, right? But factually, you know, you want to get your toast in the toaster and, you know, it doesn't change how it mechanically works. But emotionally we're so disturbed because we're thinking of the past, how it would have been and then what will be in the future and this and that, that we can't function. So the point is, is even if how we view, how we were viewing the world we find out by the proper understanding of Krishna consciousness that is completely different than that, it still functions in the same way.

Does that make sense? So even though these perspectives may completely change how we view things, how everything works stays the same. All that we're changing is the consciousness. I thought it was like this.

I was the body, you know, and I'm, you know, the parent of this, you know, this child and I'm living here in this house and we're in this economic bracket and I'm a member, you know, of this particular country and we have this particular social status, but it's none of that. But still our day-to-day functioning doesn't change. What changes now is our consciousness, that I'm not those things, but those things have put me in this circumstance that I'm in now.

So using this circumstance in Krishna's service, because I would have used the circumstance for my own material purpose. Now I'm using the circumstance for Krishna. Does that make sense? So it doesn't change.

What changes is our consciousness, our perspective, right? So the identity changes, but what you're dealing with doesn't. See, it's like this, is that I want to perform an activity, right? What am I going to use to do that activity? Right? It's not 1960, so telepathy's not going to work, right? We're actually going to have to use the senses, right, which means the body. No? Okay, now I think I am the body, right? So therefore I'm doing the activity, right, that has to be done with the body.

Okay, now I read Bhagavad Gita and then I understand I'm not the body. What's going to do the activity? The body. So the activity doesn't change.

The situation doesn't change. What changes is the consciousness from I'm the field of action to I'm actually the soul. I'm not the field of action, but actions performed with the field, so therefore the action doesn't change.

The method of action doesn't change. Does that make sense? So that's why the devotee doesn't become disturbed as he figures out that his whole life that he thought was reality is not. Because when a karmī figures that out, he's devastated.

Like I'm the body, I do this activity, if I'm not the body, how will the activity be done? No, you

never were the body anyway, you just thought you were. But it doesn't change. So someone is a friend, is an enemy, is the son, we've accepted that as the material thing, because no, the body is what you call the son.

What makes the body work is the soul. So actually it's the soul who thinks I'm the parent, or the soul who thinks I'm the child. The body doesn't think any of that.

The body's not sitting around and thinking, yes, I am American. It doesn't do that. It doesn't even think I am a pile of chemicals.

It doesn't think, it just sits there. So we apply all this on there, and then we become disturbed by it. So Prabhupāda's example here is, according to śāstra, it completely turns around exactly where it says, instead of lamenting, we should be having a party.

But the point is, just as we would say, this is absurd, the other one is just as absurd, but it's just socially acceptable. So the idea is that you deal with the situation according to one's duties, because the point is, okay, he's my enemy, how should I deal? Or he's my son, how should I deal? But actually the situation is that there's the parent and there's the son, but neither living entities are either of those. So therefore, what's the duty of someone who's the parent, what's the duty of someone who's the son? What are their activities? That you follow, because we're not that.

That's why Kṛṣṇa constantly says, perform your duties, but without an attachment to the results. Because otherwise then, that, oh, for not that, and he's the enemy, and says, what am I? No, you just do the duties. He's the son, so therefore you go through the proper rituals that the parent does for his son.

The son dies. Does that make sense? Like that. And then according to one's Kṛṣṇa consciousness, then you see it in the proper light.

But on the material platform, you can take anything and turn it around any way you like, and it can be, you know, each one is more absurd than the other. Like that. Is that, you understand? So that's the point, is that only Kṛṣṇa consciousness gives a proper perspective.

It brings things into the proper way of seeing, so you can get a balance on things. You know, it actually accommodates the soul, the consciousness, the relationship with God. Because all these other things, it could be this way or that way, and each one just means we can say, no, no, but it's more natural, but the point is, you're not the body, they're not the body, so nothing, nobody's died.

Right? Just these chemicals aren't functioning in a way that, you know, you want to, you know, hold on your lap anymore. You know what I'm saying? So, so that's absurd also. But because there's relationships between the living entities and they go through these forms of the five rasas, therefore that has some validity only because of it being a reflection of what is actually real.

But to say that it is real, that's illusion. Does that make sense? You know, it's kind of funny because it's like intellectually you can kind of see it, but it's kind of like looking through a haze, right? Yes. Means when we're completely convinced, he is convinced.

Means that we're sitting here, we're convinced. Otherwise we wouldn't be sitting here. But as one goes, it's just the maturity of that conviction.

Right? So prema is complete conviction. Right? So sraddha is the beginning of conviction. So as we go, then we can say we're adjusting from thinking that we're the material, you know, the body, to understanding we're, you know, fully servant of Vishnu.

So as we go, the first stages are generally going to be more cloudy. Right? And as it goes, it becomes less and less cloudy. You know, so as the sun comes up, then, you know, the more it comes up, the less and less the fog gets.

Does that make sense? Yes. Is it due to you always connected to the nature? Is it due to that we're connected to the nature? Yeah, like there's a nature of the person. No, there's the condition nature of the person.

The nature of the person is satchitananda. The conditioning is under the modes of nature. So that's always going to be adjusting and changing according to the situations we're in.

Right? From our previous activities and our present activities. So it's constantly adjusting. Right? In other words, let's say you have a kaleidoscope.

You know kaleidoscope? So you have the kaleidoscope. If you just let it sit there, then it just stays the same. But why is it like that? Because it's been moved.

Now if you turn it, it adjusts again. So that's what's going on. So we know we're doing activities, so it's constantly being adjusted.

But it's being adjusted from what it was before. You know, so you can say, well, why is it exactly in that particular pattern? Then you'd have to go back, you know, so many steps to get it to that pattern. But the point is, is what you're seeing and dealing with is what the pattern is right now.

You know what I'm saying? But we're not that. But dealing with it is the same. You know what I'm saying? If we're Krishna conscious or not, and we want to cook some potatoes and the potatoes are sitting in the basket, we have to get the potatoes out of the basket and into the pot to cook.

You know what I'm saying? It doesn't matter if you're, you know, Hiranyakashipu or Prahlāda Mahārāja, right? It means it's going to be the same process. Does that make sense? Okay, 3.29. Bewildered by the modes of material nature, the ignorant fully engage themselves in material activities and become attached. But the wise should not unsettle them, although these duties are inferior due to the performer's lack of knowledge.

Right? So not unsettling means that you can still function in that position, right? And how much one can appreciate of the philosophy being applied to that situation, that's how much you deal with. Right? Does that make sense? So, yeah. So the elements of using that, you're trying to wake somebody up, but you can also wake them up pleasantly.

Right? You can come up and, you know, shake their leg, call their name, or you can come in with, you know, one of those big Chinese gongs, you know, and you know, like that, you know, bucket of water, you know, I mean, there's a lot of alternatives, you know. Electricity. I never thought of that one.

I never tried that. But water we've tried, you know. One boy, he was so, he would sleep so heavy that it was middle of summer, you know, so really hot out and everything like that.

And no matter what, they were trying to wake him up, this even, you know, took him, had his bed, dragged it outside onto the veranda, nothing woke him up. So somebody came by and threw a bucket of water on him. And he just suddenly sat up, looked around, and laid back down.

Like that. So, you know, he woke up, no one was there, no one wanted to say anything, so okay. Okay, does that make sense? So in other words, what situation one's in, that's the situation you apply it to, right? So this knowledge we're giving here may be considered unsettling, right? But the point is you have to bring it to the point of wherever the person is situated and apply it at that circumstance.

Then they're not going to be disturbed. So they are attached to the material energy, so how to apply this knowledge to that position of attachment? Then that's not unsettling, so the wise do that. But if it's just a matter of its maya, and you're advanced more than them so you can see it, and so you just tell them that and leave it at that, that's not wise, right? Means you have knowledge, but wise means realization.

So you have knowledge, yes, but you don't have realization. Otherwise one wouldn't do that, right? But one can point it out so that they wake up and aware, and then bring it to how to apply it in their situation, so they're still comfortable. Their situation hasn't changed, but now their understanding and consciousness has started to change.

Does that make sense? So that's the difference. So we tend to not bring it to the situation, so we either leave them as they were by not saying anything, right? Or we say something and not make it practical for them, right? So if we're trying to be less fanatic, so therefore we don't tell them anything. No, the point is that you tell them the same thing, but you bring it to the point where they can use it in their situation.

That's the more developed. The devotees are more merciful than the Lord. Men who are ignorant cannot appreciate activities in Kṛṣṇa consciousness, and therefore Lord Kṛṣṇa advises us not to disturb them and simply waste valuable time.

But the devotees of the Lord are more kind than the Lord because they understand the purpose of the Lord. Consequently they undertake all kinds of risks, even to the point of approaching ignorant men to try to engage them in the acts of Kṛṣṇa consciousness, which are absolutely necessary for the human being. So now here we're getting two aspects on not disturbing them, right? So Kṛṣṇa's point is that they're not interested.

So if you bring it up, they may give you trouble. So therefore Kṛṣṇa doesn't want the devotees to get into trouble. So He's very kind to the devotees, right? But those who are not acting in the position of devotees, He's leaving in their position because that's what they want, right? But the devotee, understanding that Kṛṣṇa is not actually happy that the living entity is so ignorant that He shouldn't be disturbed, that the devotee who is protected by the Lord, then he goes and disturbs those ignorant persons.

Does that make sense? You know, a prophet says, at risk, all kinds of risks, because it will please Kṛṣṇa if you're able to make them. But Kṛṣṇa Himself is not going to do it. So the point is, Kṛṣṇa's leaving them in that position, right? But the devotee, in service to Kṛṣṇa, doesn't leave them in that position.

But if he's wise, he brings it to the position they're in. In other words, you take the philosophy to the situation that they're in, right? Rather than just saying it and expecting that they get to it, and if they are, they're sincere, and if they don't, then they weren't sincere. Does this make difference? So that means if you just leave them where they are, then the problem is, we're doing the activity like Kṛṣṇa would do it, but unfortunately we're not the controllers.

Yes, but the point is, if we're dealing in the present, we try to help. So we view the situation, we think we can help. So you start to help, but you see the reaction as it's coming, right? And as it's coming, we make adjustments, because we know what the result we want, right? For them to be able to favorably apply Kṛṣṇa consciousness to their situation.

So if we find that it's going away from that, then you adjust. You know, adjust the approach, or adjust the application, because when we say we have vichara, vichara means different perspectives you can apply on one thing. So they're all correct, it's just which one's correct for that particular situation.

So let's say for us, one would be correct. So in that situation we'd use it like this, but the other person disturbs us. Does that make sense? You know, so then you will use other approaches to that particular situation, or that particular application of the philosophy.

But it's all according to Guru Sātra and śāstra. In other words, we never water down the philosophy. It's a matter of which application would be the way to apply it.

You know what I'm saying? Just like, let us say, someone's doing something. So, by pointing out some weakness in it, they may be inspired to correct that weakness and make it better. Or it may be the situation is such that by pointing out the weakness, they won't be inspired.

So by pointing out what was good about it, they'll be inspired. Right? Because the point is, without inspiration, you don't work. Right? So what will create the inspiration? Because you've pointed out the fault, and if they didn't become inspired, we'll be thinking, well, I was just trying to help.

But it didn't help. So the point is, is either, you know, don't do that anymore because you don't know what to do. Right? Or, you understand, okay, that didn't work and adjust it until it does.

Right? But it's not enough that we can just say, well, I was trying to help. Yeah, you tried to help, but it didn't work. So acknowledge that it didn't work, and, you know, don't try to push the issue anymore, because the situation changed.

You applied it, it didn't work, the situation changed. Now you can't try to say that it was right, okay to try, because you didn't understand the situation. So it's just a matter of false ego, rather than, okay, that didn't work, so I'll have to rethink how I deal with this situation.

Right? But there's no need to become insecure. It's just a matter of, the mechanics didn't work. Does that make sense? Many times I've felt that when I was trying to do that, the person counter-argued such something, which checked my conviction and my perception.

More specifically, let's say, you're talking about Maya is only not perceiving Krishna in everything. You present a different perspective. Maya is a specific set of activities within Maya.

And then you end up a little bit in a philosophical debate, rather than the initial pursuit was help, which is help, you have to move from Maya. That's just something different. Oh, okay.

Because then you just, means, in other words, you have to, means you've given a, you've given a perspective, and they're looking at it from another perspective. But it's not necessarily that they're equal, the perspectives. You know what I'm saying? Their situation is different.

Let us say, you'll say, anything not connected to Krishna is mine. Right? Just as an arbitrary starting position. Right? So, so, the, the, the advantages is that means it can be used to accommodate anything in Krishna consciousness.

So whatever situation you're in. Right? But that's very useful when you're applying it to yourself, or applying it to someone who's having a difficulty applying it. Right? But now, if it's a situation where the person's, they're not worrying about their own application, necessarily.

They're worried about someone else's application. Because the general tendency, I'm very, you know, everybody else, I'm very broad-minded with myself. You know, that's generally how we apply, you know, this, this thunderbolt and rose balance.

Right? You know, everybody else, thunderbolt, myself, rose. You know, it works out. Hey.

Yeah. And because I think about myself more than others, then the rose is the prominence, I'm a really pleasant person. Right? You know.

So, now if you said, let us say, you know, the person's done something that we would consider morally wrong. Okay? Because that's always a good point of contention. Right? Because all religions of the world, except that based on, you know, the Vaisnava, you know, that is based on moral activities.

Good moral or bad moral. They're not actually talking about the soul or, you know, anything else. So, so it'll always be a strong point of consideration of good and bad.

So, you'll say anything not connected to Krishna. So, then they'll think is, in their minds, oh, so if they've done that, that immoral act connected to Krishna, it would be okay. Right? So, then, then they'll, then they'll, because they're looking at morality is the position of good and bad, and Krishna consciousness is good, therefore it's moral.

So, then they're going to say, no, it's that these activities are, are, are wrong. It means you do these activities, they can never be Krishna conscious, and these activities only can be Krishna conscious. All right? So, because what they've done is they've dropped it from the transcendental platform of anandamoy down to pranamoy.

Right? So, on the platform of pranamoy, yes, there is what is correct and not correct. Right? So, yet good and bad on, on, on anandamoya is connected to Krishna's good, not connected to Krishna's bad. You know, when you drop it down to, to vigyanamoy, then what is in consideration of, of Brahman is good, what's not in consideration of Brahman is bad.

Right? Manamoy, then, what is dharmic, you know, according to shastra and all that, is good, what's not according to shastra, you know, as far as good work, is bad. Right? And when you drop it down to artha, then it's what actually creates economic development and the rules that make it that I've got my development, you can't take it. You know what I'm saying? So, that's where, because that's where it's going.

Let us say the person's gone off with the other person's wife. Okay? The real bottom line, because what they're, unless they're quoting dharma shastra, you know that they always are interested in dharma and they're a religious person. Then when they say this is wrong, he's taken the other person's wife, then you're dealing with dharma.

Right? But still, okay. But more, more general will be that, you know, no, that's bad. You know? Like that.

But it's not based, because shastra says it's bad. It's just that it's socially not acceptable. Right? Does that make sense? So, then they'll take it, well, you're saying, well, if they took someone else's wife but you were Krishna conscious, then it's okay.

So, they'll say no. It's just that activity is bad no matter what. Okay? So, but underlying what they're missing is, why is it bad? Because if he can take his wife, he can take my wife.

Not that it's, so it's just artha. You know what I'm saying? Your modern religious platforms, it's

just artha. He took his money, he can take my money.

So, I don't want a thief, because they can take my, well, if I say, we don't want a thief in our neighborhood, am I worried for everybody else's money? Or my money? No, they can take my money. So, the same way as I'm worried that this guy took someone else's wife and gets away with it, someone else could take mine and get away with it. But if he's punished severely, then people will think twice about stealing mine.

You understand how it's working? So, that's why it's said that it's, that's why Bhagavatam opens in the second verse to kick out cheating religion, because that's cheating religion. The reason that it's bad is because God said it's not good, because it throws off the, it disturbs relationship. Right? That's why it's bad.

Not because you lost something or you gained something. Because just as you lost, the person who stole the other person's wife gained. So, that's prosperous.

You know, you know what I'm saying? You know, look at the bright side. You know, the glass is not half, it's half full. You know what I'm saying? That's what Prabhupada's making the point in this thing about, you know, your son has died, he was an enemy his last life.

He's dead now, you should be happy. You know, it's like, it's that the material energy is that absurd. You just a little, little switch like that and suddenly, hey, you know, it's great.

You know what I'm saying? Because that's what everybody does on everything on the material platform. You know, like we were saying before, is that, you know, there was some, how you say, a serious, I'm not sure what would be, I can't give the full, what do you call it, euphemistic terminology, you know, but we'll give you a general idea, that there was some unfortunate situation of mixed ethnicity. So, then the government, you know, took, you know, how you say, dynamic steps to correct this ethnic imbalance and bring it to a pure platform of ethnicity, right? So, therefore, that purification, then, you know, for, instead of having to say all these words, they just take it down to ethnic cleansing, you know, and then it's, does that make sense? So, in their minds, they're doing a great job.

So, that's the material world, you simply change. So, the same principle you can apply in Krishna Kunt, you change the definition. So, now it's a matter of, you say that and then you say, yes, you're correct, means they're correct in their point, they're not correct that their point is, you know, is broader than your point, you understand? In other words, you accept the correctness of their point, yes, to take some of that, that's incorrect, right? So, now, they're going to be happy, yes, and they might, you know, you might be able to continue speaking or they might say a few more things because they're, you know, like that, but then you point out, but why is it wrong to steal someone else's life? That's where you're going to run into the problem, you know, because generally they're not going to be quoting Shastra there.

They're just going to say, well, it's wrong or everybody knows or it's just socially unacceptable

or it's bad or, you know, they're just, they're going to use this kind of thing. Then, it says, it's wrong because Krishna has said it's wrong. So, the point is, is this person is not connecting this to Krishna because if he connected to Krishna, Krishna says, don't steal someone else's life.

Right? So, that's, that's, you've taken the problem, you've removed that, that debate element, that aggression of it, validated it, but shown how it's already part of yours. So, that's the synthesis, right? And then, again, you go, therefore, the lack of Krishna consciousness is what makes something good or bad. Is that, is that okay? Does this make sense? Okay, here.

Consequently, we undertake all kinds of risks, even the point of approaching ignorant men to try to engage in the acts of Krishna consciousness, which are absolutely necessary for the human being. So, it's not like it's an option. Absolutely necessary.

Prabhupāda doesn't say necessary or important or a good thing to do or real nice or, you know, something like that. He says, absolutely necessary. Because if a human being doesn't perform those activities, they won't be human next life.

It's, it's that simple. Three thirty. Therefore, Arjuna, surrendering all your works unto Me, with full knowledge of Me, without desires for profit, with no claims to proprietorship, and free from lethargy, fight.

So, now he's concluded these, all these elements before, that everything is, means, that you're considering everything according to the Lord's direction. You see that the activity to be done, it's duty, but not the desire, the result's not yours. So, now, where does that result go? It goes to Him.

All works to Me, full knowledge of Me. You had knowledge, so it should be knowledge of Him, not just for the situation. Right? Without desires for profit.

Because if the work is for Him, right, then that means the profit would be for Him. Right? I do the activity because I'm going to get the result. I don't get the result, I don't do the activity.

Right? So, now, if you want to get a result for Kṛṣṇa, I have to still do the activity, even though the activity's not for Me. Therefore, surrendering all your works unto Me, without desire for profit, you have to give both. Right? Because I may, may surrender the work, but I still want some of the profit.

Right? Or, the, the result's for Kṛṣṇa, but I don't see how that will be done, so I perform no work. Yes? Any living entity that receives prasādam? Yes, gets a human body. So that's why prasāda distribution is good.

Right? That, you see, in, in these festivals like Govardhan Puja, that it's inherent, I mean, it's just implicit, that in, you know, feeding, starting from, you know, the Vaiṣṇavas, the brāhmaṇas and Vaiṣṇavas, like that, then everybody, you know, down, and then at the end, then you have to feed the animals and the cāndalas, and like that. So everybody's getting fed. So that's, that's the

idea, is that everybody should be included.

So with prasāda, everybody can take part. Other activities, you're having a class on Vedānta-sūtra, some of these others may not be interested, but prasāda, everybody is. Right? So it's the one thing you know that you can do that will be benefit, everybody will appreciate.

Overpopulation in some countries is due to... So you're saying in China... Okay, there's more people in China, so does that mean that they had so much prasāda before, right there? Interesting way to look at it. But the question is, is that where did they take the prasāda? Because then it could have been they took prasāda in one country but ended up being born in another country. You know what I'm saying? Let us say you go out and you feed, you go out to the park and there's some dogs, right? Okay, you're in San Francisco, Golden Gate Park, and you see a German shepherd, right? And you give it some prasāda.

And you see a, one of those little puffy, you know, fluffy little Pekingese dogs, and you give it some prasāda. So now when the Pekingese takes birth as a human, would it take birth in China? You know, having come from, you know, the Chinese stock, you know, and the German shepherd would naturally take birth in Germany. Are you expecting that they'll take birth there in San Francisco? You know what I'm saying? So I wouldn't take it that far because technically there is no overpopulation.

It's just how you manage what you have. You know, like that. Yes? I would think the purpose of giving prasāda isn't that they get a human form, but that they start their spiritual life.

Yes. Otherwise they're just kind of pushing in the queue and pushing someone else out to get a human form. No, you don't have to push anybody else.

There's plenty of room. Like that. I mean, America's worried about overpopulation, right? It's nine times the size of India, you know, with, you know, one third, you know, no, excuse me, one third the size with, and India's got three times the population, so that means it's nine to one.

So it means America, for the land mass that it has, could have nine times the amount of people and only be up to the level that India is. You know what I'm saying? So the problem is says overpopulation is just, we just say that there is, that there isn't. It means you drive, it means if there's no traffic, you drive 20 minutes out of the heart of Manhattan Island, you're in forest.

There's no one out there. I mean, absolutely no one there. You know, so it's most of America is like that.

So overpopulation is just something that, you know, there's a fight over facility, that's all. But it's not that you can't put more people there. Is that okay? So you won't lose that.

The point is, yes, it's part of devotional service, but as a byproduct, then they get human life. So there. But because they've gotten human life by taking, taking prasād, then that element will be there.

They perform the jnata-sukrti, so they'll get opportunity to do a jnata-sukrti again, like that. So, you know, you feed those ducks down at the park, then they take birth as humans, then they come down to the park looking for prasad, you know, and if you're only feeding ducks, then they got a problem. So that's why, now you have to feed the humans, because, you know, they were ducks last life.

Yes. Maharaj, I used to work with this western nutritionist, and I invited her to give in this, she took prasad, gave her the high taste book, and that was all good. I thought everything was like nicely, and then a few days later, at work, she absolutely turned.

The debate started off as if like, you know, the advantages of not taking vegetarian, but I found out later on in the discussion that it was really because of the fact that she was anti-religion, and she kind of like read the introduction to Christian consciousness in a higher taste. But I feel like that I didn't actually leave that person on a, not so much in a good note, but on a healthy state, because as we were debating, there was a lot of emotion, so to say, going out, and usually I've responded in a nice way, but I ended up basically just saying, well, we don't, you know, we don't slaughter cows, because it's a heavier karma, and she just didn't read it as well, too well. You know, these things, so that's why it's made the point is that you speak according to what's important to them, so their point is religion, not actually the vegetarianism and that, so the point is, is it's God's creation, so all these things are there, because a vegetarian was not good, why is it a, you know, huge amount of the animal population is vegetarian, right, and they do fine, you know, it's just like, you know, we'll say, well, if you don't eat meat, you won't be strong, but, you know, the bull eats grass, not even grains, just eats grass, you know, it means, in other words, the bull is eating salad, right, you know, and is being able to do the work, why, because his body is made like that, so the human body is made, it can function in that way, like that, if you eat what they eat, so humans eat grains also, so vegetables, grains, milk products, that combination, then the human, so the point is, is it's just there is God's creation, you know, and if they don't like God, then it's just the laws of nature, you know, like that, so it's just there is a way of doing that, so it's not a matter of all these things, because by nutrition, you can so easily prove that you don't have to be non-vegetarian, I mean, to try to say through the science of nutrition, they're going to prove you have to be non-vegetarian, they would be fighting a serious losing battle, serious, because many of your major nutritionists in the world who have done books, they're vegetarians, so it's not going to work, so the issue is just authority, you know, the laws of God and all that, so don't, means you try to avoid introducing information that's going to distract from the actual point, in other words, you're trying to win the battle, not the war, does that make sense? So you may, you know, a few points, you just leave, so it appears that they've won that, but you're going to get the main thing.

Yeah, yeah, no, no, but that's why practice is there, you know, and so, because the point is, is if it's someone that you always see and always have to work with, then you can always approach it again, you know, and just say, I thought about what you said, and this point, a good point here, there, and then do like what you said with that, and then take that and catch just what

you want from it and get them to agree on that and adjust, you know what I'm saying? Because it's like, yeah. Everything belongs to the Supreme Lord. The cashier may count millions of dollars for his employer, but he does not claim a cent for himself.

Similarly, one has to realize that nothing in the world belongs to any individual person, but that everything belongs to the Supreme Lord. That is the real purport of *mayi*, or unto me. It all belongs to him, right? So the point is, is ultimately, we have a quota, right? And so we have a right to use that quota, but we also have obligations to use that quota for who the quota is given by, right? And when one acts in such Krishna consciousness, certainly he does not claim proprietorship over anything, right? So you have the rights, just like the child is in the house, right? He's sitting on the, you know, he's coming to the kitchen, you know, he's sitting on the furniture, he's doing the different things, he's, you know, riding around in the car, but he's not claiming proprietorship, right? You know, if he says, you know, this couch is mine, his mother's going to inform him of the actual realities of life.

No, it's her couch, right, you know? You know what I'm saying? The father, it's his car, you know, it's his mom's kitchen, and you know, so like this, but he doesn't, but he gets to use it all, but he has a quota. He can only use it the way that is being given by those who it belongs to, right? So ultimately everything belongs to Krishna, so we have a quota, so we have a right to use that quota, but we have an obligation to use it according to who it belongs to. This consciousness is called *nirmama*, or nothing is mine, and if there is any reluctance to execute such a stern order, which is without consideration of so-called kinsmen in the bodily relationship, that reluctance should be thrown off.

In this way, one has become, everyone may become *vigata-dvara*, or without feverish mentality or lethargy. Everyone, according to his quality and position, has a particular type of work to discharge, and all such duties may be discharged in Krishna consciousness. As described above, that will lead one to the path of liberation, right? So here Prabhupada's also confirming that thing.

You perform your duty, means you have a type of work to discharge. You're in a particular situation, you have a particular type of work you're supposed to discharge. Now, you may do that in Krishna consciousness, right? Now, the discharge of the duty in Krishna consciousness, that discharge of the duty done in Krishna consciousness, will bring you to the path of liberation, right? That you've done it to please Krishna, that will give you *bhakti*, which is the real path of liberation.

Does that make sense? So it means, both of those activities means the proper consciousness in which you perform the activity, then that will give you devotional service and liberation, right? In other words, you've taken the situation and connected to the Lord, so then you're going to be in a transcendental situation. Devotional service is how you use the situation. Does that make sense? So it's two different things, but it's one thing.

So I had a question? No, that was... Oh, okay. 3.31. Those persons who execute their duties

according to my injunctions and who follow this teaching faithfully, without envy, become free from the bondage of fruit of actions. Because you're doing the duty as Krishna directed.

You'll become freed from material bondage. You'll be situated on the transcendental platform. Because you've done it devotionally, therefore you'll be situated on the Bhagavan platform of transcendence.

If you just do it because it's your duty, right? And you're doing it as Naishkarmya, so therefore you're recognizing the element of Brahman. You'll be situated on the platform of Brahman. Does that make sense? You're doing it because Paramatma is there.

You'll be situated on that platform of transcendence. So devotion means Bhagavan. But automatically Bhagavan is eternity.

He is everything. And he does enter into everything and make it all work. So Brahman and Paramatma are already included in Bhagavan.

So if you perform your activity without attachment for the Lord, your situation in transcendence already includes Brahman and Paramatma. So you will be situated on the liberated platform, but in association with the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Krishna. As opposed to just being freed from material entanglement.

Does that make sense? One should have faith in the Vedic injunctions. The injunction of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Krishna, is the essence of all Vedic wisdom, and therefore is eternally true without exception. So this is important.

Without exception means it's always true, because we'll say, oh, but it's a different situation, it doesn't apply. No, it's always true. It's just a matter of how expert you are at applying it to the circumstance.

If you took the injunction, applied it, it didn't work, it doesn't mean there's a fault in the injunction. It doesn't mean that the situation has now become more powerful. Because by saying that, then you're saying that material energy is more powerful than God.

No, it means that we didn't understand how to apply that injunction in the situation. So either our detail was correct, but the principle was wrong. If the principle was correct, the detail was wrong.

Or we could have had both wrong. Yes? Injunction. Rule.

You know, the rule for action, because injunction generally is connected with something that you do. Right? So injunction is, you offer your food, what you eat, you offer to the Lord. Okay? So then, that's the injunction.

Now, let us say we are in our house. Okay? And we have some food. So what do we do? Where do we take it? Right? We generally take it in some way, put it on the altar, do some way, there's

some, you know, more pancharatric aspect of the ritual there.

Right? And then we may bow down, offer prayers, ring a bell, you know, do all kinds of things. Right? Okay? Let us say we're traveling and we're on a bus. The bus stopped at some place, you know, for petrol, you got off, you bought something in the little store there, and now everybody's getting back on the bus.

Now, the injunction is, you have to offer what you're going to eat to Krishna. So now what are you going to do? Get out your picture, go up to the front of the bus, you know, and put the picture there, you know, next to the driver, put the stuff up there, bow down, ring the bell. Right? No.

So, but if you did that, and you got yourself thrown off the bus or something, then you can't say that, no, the injunction to offer, you know, everything we eat to Krishna is wrong. It doesn't apply in this modern situation. You know, it just means that how you apply it, we didn't apply it properly.

Does that make sense? Yes. So, that means that when we apply the different things of Krishna consciousness, of surrender, of Varna Ashram, you know, the elements of Deity Wish, all these different things, we have to understand the circumstance that we're in. Right? Because circumstances are always changed, so that means we have to understand the principle.

If that's understood, then we'll be able to understand what's there. So, let's say, or you take something in between. We were in the, it was a devotee, you know, van or, you know, vehicle, right? So, they had the picture on the front of the dashboard, right? So, any offerings done by the devotee in the car goes on the dashboard, right? And so, but they were stopped at a place, there were lots of people walking around, and people would be looking in.

So then, if you took what you wanted to offer and made it so that the picture could see, then also everybody else could see. Right? Does that make sense? So, what was, the bhoga was in a bag, so they took the picture and put it in the bag. And then made the offering.

You understand? So, that way then you make adjustments with the situation. Does that make sense? Like that. It works.

Okay. The injunction of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Krishna, is the essence of all Vedic wisdom, and therefore is eternally true without exception. So, the injunction of the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the essence of all Vedic wisdom.

Right? So, the Vedic wisdom, one has faith in that, but that has come from Krishna. Right? So, Krishna, what he gives, that's the essence of what the Vedas are trying to say. They'll give so much broad range of detail so that anyone in any circumstance can connect themselves to the Lord, but sometimes it gets so, how do you say, not necessarily distant, but so indirect, indirect on indirect on indirect, that it may be hard to see.

So, therefore, the injunction that Krishna's giving, you know, here in Gita where he's speaking, that should be how all injunctions of the Vedas are understood. Right? One should have firm faith in this injunction without envying the Lord. Right? Not that, why, why is he always right, you know? You know, why can't I get a few, you know? There are many philosophers who write comments on the Bhagavad Gita but have no faith in Krishna.

They will never be liberated from the bondage of fruitive action. Right? And those philosophers, generally speaking, because he's not worried about Vaishnava philosophers. He's generally worried about Mayavada philosophers.

So, here's also another indirect way that it mentions that, where we always ask, well, will the Mayavadis go to Burma? No. It says they'll never be free from the bondage of fruitive action. Right? Does that make sense? Because we say that the killers of the soul, they go to hell.

Going to hell is only for those who are bound by fruitive action. Right? Because if you attain Brahman platform, there is no heaven or hell. Does that make sense? So they never actually get out of that because they're envious of Krishna.

You know, you can't be envious of the guy who manages the whole thing and expect you'll get liberated. Right? But an ordinary man with firm faith in the eternal injunctions of the Lord, even though unable to execute such orders, becomes liberated from the bondage of the law of karma. Right? So even if you have faith in it and you're making the attempt, though you're not doing a very great job of it, you will be liberated.

Right? So when we're pointing out weaknesses in the performance of their activity because it's not very expertly done, we're speaking on the element that since the result's for Krishna, we want to get a better result for because then Krishna will get a better result. But as far as the application of the philosophy to their situation, like that, they'll be liberated by that, even though they didn't do a good job. Right? Does that make sense? So that's why the transcendental vision, the transcendental position, is so different from everything else.

But that's because he had faith. Now if he or if someone has good faith and is a very expert, it's still very good. Right? You get a nice result, but the result's still not for Krishna, so what's the benefit? In the beginning of Kṛṣṇa consciousness, one may not fully discharge the injunction of the Lord, but because one is not resentful of this principle and works sincerely without consideration of defeat and hopelessness, he will surely be promoted to the stage of pure Kṛṣṇa consciousness.

Right? So he's not resentful of this principle, that is correct. So if we're resentful that, no, this is the modern age, we can't use these injunctions that are given here and that, that will not be progressive in Kṛṣṇa consciousness. We have to be very expert to apply them to the situation.

Right? Right? To be gentle, to be sophisticated, to be cultured, doesn't mean one has to act as a karmī does. Right? Sophistication, gentleness, all these different things come from Kṛṣṇa

consciousness. Kṛṣṇa is the most gentle, most intelligent, most cultured.

So that means His devotees are. So that's where it comes from. The materialist has this thought, it's only a reflection.

So we don't have to be like them, we can be like ourselves. And here, without consideration defeat and hopelessness. It's not working nicely, but it doesn't mean we get, without consideration defeat and hopelessness.

He will surely be promoted to the stage of pure Kṛṣṇa consciousness. So it's just a matter, if one has that faith and acts, then one will come to the stage of pure Kṛṣṇa consciousness.