2012-02-23 BG a 2.84 masculine-feminine nature

Sadhu Even a man of knowledge acts according to his own nature. For everyone follows the nature he's acquired from the three modes. What can repression accomplish? One can be freed from the modes only through devotional service.

Unless one is situated on the transcendental platform of Kṛṣṇa consciousness, he cannot get free from the influence of the modes of nature, material nature, as it is confirmed by the Lord in the seventh chapter, verse forty-six. This divine energy of mine, consisting of the three modes of material nature, is difficult to overcome, but those who have surrendered unto Me can easily cross beyond it. Therefore, even for the most highly educated person on the mundane plane, it is impossible to get out of the entanglement of māyā simply by theoretical knowledge, or by separating the soul from the body.

There are many so-called spiritualists who outwardly pose as advanced in the science, but inwardly or privately are completely under particular modes of nature, which they are unable to surpass. Academically one may be very learned, but because of his long association with material nature, he is in bondage. Kṛṣṇa consciousness helps one to get out of the material entanglement, even though one may be engaged in his prescribed duty in terms of material existence.

Therefore, without being fully in Kṛṣṇa consciousness, one should not give up his occupational duties. So here is the situation one is in. So that will mean the material body, the mind, the intelligence, all that.

That is established from one's previous activities. So there is no question, and also pointed out here, there is no actual ability to act outside of this. So when we say here, that means we are still saying he should perform his occupational duties.

Therefore, without being fully in Kṛṣṇa consciousness, one should not give up his occupational duties. Therefore, that means this is giving conclusion. So starting, unless one is situated on the transcendental platform of Kṛṣṇa consciousness, he cannot get free from the influence of the modes of material nature, as it is confirmed by the Lord.

So that's the conclusion. So we don't mean here that, oh, what can repression accomplish, means I just do whatever I whimsically want. That's not what we're talking about.

What we're talking about is, what is your duties? According to your nature, that there is no need to give up, because you're following the process. Because unless one is basically on the transcendental platform of Kṛṣṇa consciousness, then one can act outside of that. Because someone would say, no, we're devotees, we don't care for all this, we're transcendental.

What is your body made out of? How transcendental is your body? How transcendental is your mind, intelligence, false ego? Is it transcendental? If it is, you don't have to worry about it. If it's not, it's going to act according to its nature. Or along the same lines, we can make similar, just as logically relevant statements.

We're going to say they're absurd, but we always do that. In one situation, we will say, no, this is science. The next situation, exact situation, but just adjusting the thing.

Then we'll say, no, that's absurd. We're going to say, because I chant Hare Kṛṣṇa, because we're above the modes of nature, fire won't burn me. I won't get wet in water.

If I fall off a building, I won't get hurt. Because we're saying, I'm transcendental to the modes. No, transcendental means we're not controlled by the modes, but it doesn't mean the modes don't act.

That's how the material world functions. It's not because now we're chanting Hare Kṛṣṇa, when I get in my car, it's not that the pistons are going up and down, and the wheels are going around, and the people in the bus are going up and down. No, that doesn't work anymore.

We're transcendental. Mechanics stay exactly the same. Nothing changes as far as mechanics go.

But we're so confident, it just came out of my mouth, therefore it changed. Like we were discussing before, Buddhist philosophy, if you're conscious of it, it exists. If you're not conscious of it, it doesn't exist, because it's all about me.

But it's not like that. So what Kṛṣṇa is saying is that the modes of nature are still going to control it anyway. It's just a matter of whether you're controlled by it or not.

If you're controlled by it, you follow the rules that concern it. If you're not controlled by it, it doesn't matter, because you'll be absorbed in Kṛṣṇa. If I give an example.

Now, a small child, a little one and a half, two year old child, are they interested in getting dressed? No. Do they end up being dressed? Right? Did they, you know, was there any consciousness focused on their getting dressed? No. But they got dressed.

How? The mother dressed them. But their consciousness wasn't there, but it happened. Right? Do you understand? So in the same way for the devotee, the modes of nature take care of everything, but their consciousness is fully absorbed in Kṛṣṇa.

Right? So therefore, performing prescribed duties because you'll be purified by them and uplifted, that's no longer necessary. Right? But, you know, day to day, you're eating, you're sleeping, all this, that will go on. Modes of nature will take care.

You won't worry about it. That's what it means. It's not that, Oh, we chant Hare Kṛṣṇa, I don't care for the rules, but I'm going to do exactly what I want to do.

You know? And that's also being really, really practical for rules. Right? No. The point is, is that even a man of knowledge acts according to his own nature, means whatever it is, what kind of intelligence, what kind of body, what kind of situation, one acts according to that.

It doesn't change. Right? The person was an intellectual before, now he's a devotee, he's still an intellectual. Right? The guy was a good cook before, now he's joined, he's still a good cook.

The guy before was a manager, now he joins you, now he manages for Kṛṣṇa. That doesn't change. Yes? Yes.

Body and subtle body. Original means? That's only by bad association or lack of knowledge. What would that mean? It means, give an example? I would say that even if it is your duty, as a Vaiṣṇava, you sometimes qualify that you have another service, that even if they were a female, they could do other services, which probably would be a man's duty, a male devotee's duty.

Okay. So, okay, so that's an example that would work in line with the modern concept of, you know, how you say, feminine liberation. What about, you know, what about that the dishes are dirty? Who's going to clean that? What did Prabhupāda say? Who should do it? You know what I'm saying? You know what I'm saying? They're only, what are they doing? When they do this, they only pick certain things.

Who gives the class? Who worships the Deity? You know, or, you know, who spoke at a program? Do they give any other examples? You understand? So, in other words, according to the modes of nature, then those who are professing, in this case, the examples of the, how you say, the feminist perspective, which is not arising from Kṛṣṇa consciousness, they were feminists before they joined. You know what I'm saying? Remember, feminism came out of the sixties, right? And if you kind of go back in time, then the people in the sixties, now, in their sixties, are talking about all this feminism. You know what I'm saying? It's the same people.

The people from the fifties aren't talking about it. You know what I'm saying? The ones that are, the ones that are 70 years old now, they weren't talking about it before, they're not talking about it now. The ones that are in their fifties, sixties, they were, you know, at that time, that was the modern issue.

They're talking about that, right? And the people from another, they're not worried about it. Does that make sense? But they're only giving those examples. Are they saying that, you know, why can't the women take out the garbage? Why can't the women be the ones that have to, you know, get in the van, go down to the, you know, shopping market and do all the heavy marketing and moving and loading all those boxes? You know what I'm saying? Why can't the women go into the basement and clean it out and, you know, scrape down the walls and, you know, sand it down and getting themselves really dirty and mucky, you know, like the men do, you know, right in there and, you know, have to re-plaster and paint the basement.

But you go to every temple, all these things are going on. What's the fight over? Something that

puts you in the center of attention, which is, you know, just off the record, quite feminine. Females make themselves the center of attention.

That's what makes them interesting. Right? Does that make sense? You know, so the men do it, but they just kind of do it and it's kind of fun and it's a laugh. The women do it, but include everybody else in it.

In other words, if the woman is the center of attention, everybody else has to agree with it and come in line with it and accept it. You know what I'm saying? It's very feminine. So it doesn't matter if someone's a feminist.

That's the whole point. They're just a female Ishwar. That's all.

That's what feminist means. It's just that they can't control their own personal life. The men in their life don't do what they say, so since they can't control the men that are theirs, they'll try to control all the other men.

And in this way get the female satisfaction. You know what I'm saying? So what's the fight over? Who can give the class? Who can be a GBC or temple president? Right? And who can do things that they're not supposed to do? And what position does that afford you? Control and the center of attention. There's not one fight over a thing that doesn't do that.

There's not one. Right? There's no fight. Well, why can't they be the temple cashier? Right? You go to every temple and there's some bhakta or something like that.

Always a man who takes out the garbage. Is there a fight? Why they get to take out the garbage? Why can't we take out the garbage? You know, is there a fight over doing the, you know, how you say, the four-in-the-afternoon artik? No, what's the fight over? The mangala artik, the darshan artik, or whatever artik everyone's going to be there and see? You know, is there a fight over coming into the deity room and doing the backup? You know, cleaning the floors, taking out the, you know, stuff like that, bringing it? No. So who's going to dress the deity? In other words, anything where you'll be recognized and seen.

Think about it. There's not a fight over one other thing. Nothing.

So, that's the point. It's not about that we're female, we can do anything. No, it's not about that.

It's about we want to be in control. That's all. Does that make sense? So the point is, there isn't one feminist on the planet that doesn't exactly act as a woman.

If you understand feminine nature. Unfortunately, they don't even understand feminine nature. You know, just like men are men that don't know how to behave as a man because they don't understand their own nature and their duties.

So, woman has their nature, they don't understand it, so they don't act like it. You know what I'm saying? It's not that... The kid is born into the human species, does he know what to do? No,

you have to train him. So just because you're born as a woman or a man doesn't mean you know what you're supposed to do.

You just go by your feelings. You know? So, it's... It doesn't change. There is no change.

The intellectual still acts as an intellectual. The manager still acts as an intellectual. He acts as a manager.

You don't act outside of your mode. So, Krishna is saying that's not a problem. This is the nice part.

You don't have to act separately from the modes. The point is, know what your nature is and act according to that. But the problem is, what is the fight over? Simply the externals.

There's no understanding of why that is. You know? Prabhupada gives the example. We've heard the story that in... I think it was in the Bosch... You know, the Bosch company.

You had all the top managers sitting. You know, they had couches on each side of the room and there was a door at each end of the room. So, it's a small room but that's where they used to sit and meet.

You know, because they're just there and they can talk to each other and that. The cleaning lady came in. Nice cleaning lady.

Not big, fancy, you know, rich, you know, you know, knock the guys out, you know, on the front of Vogue magazine lady. I said, cleaning lady. Right? Starts with a C. She walks in.

Right? And you, as technically, you don't walk through a group of people that are interacting with each other. So, she came through and the only way to get to the other side to do her duties was through that room. She walks in, doesn't know what to do and therefore, she feels shot.

So, she manifests shyness. What happens then? All the men who are the heads of the company stand up so that she can walk through. That's power.

But you have to know what power is. There they willingly, voluntarily, respectfully did that. Where is the respect where, no, the women have to give the class and because they're giving the class, the men can't not come.

Where's the respect? So, that means these ladies aren't even getting the respect of that cleaning lady that Prabhupada talked about. Why? Because she used her feminine powers to do things. Not trying to act like a man.

That's called stupid. What do the women think of men who act like women? So, why would one think any different about a woman who acts like a man? Why would there be any difference? It's the same thing. You know what I'm saying? So, the point that we're trying to get through here,

this is Bhagavad Gita.

And it started out the last chapter pointing out we're dealing with the soul here. But in this feminist issue we're not dealing with the soul because it's because they're a woman why can't they give a class? That's not transcendental. That's not dealing with the soul.

Because there is because they're women they should do this. Be able to do it. You know? Because, you know, why are you discriminating? Why can't I use this rock to cut the subjis? Why your demand that only the knife can cut? Why you're saying I can't use this rock? I want to use this rock.

What's wrong with this rock? This rock wants to cut the subjis. Why you're getting in its way? They say, no, but the rock doesn't do such a good job. You know? It's a gross example.

But the point is this is, you know, did it work? Was it nice? We're not saying it can't be done. You know what I'm saying? Like the kirtan mela. There's one mataji.

She's leading kirtan. But is that because she's a woman? No, it's because she's good at kirtan. That's all.

She's good at kirtan. People like her kirtan. It's not because she's a woman.

Right? Does that make sense? The other guy, the ones that are there. Are they there because they're men? They had sat down and thought, well, who are we going to, you know, who are we going to get to do, you know, like that? Who are men, you know, like that, to do like that? Well, this guy's a man. You know, so like that.

Yeah, well, he's also a man. Hey, check this guy. He's a, look at this guy.

Little man. No man. This is because they can sing and they can inspire devotees in that.

So that's the point. Who can do that? They do that. So the point was is this person could do that.

So let them do that. But everybody appreciated it. But to say that we're doing it because we're a man or a woman, that's not the point.

So just as much as it's not the point that, oh, the men can only do this, you know, why only the men? It's like, why would then, therefore, it would be okay that it's a woman who does it? You know what I'm saying? You know what I'm saying? So that's the whole point is that we're talking that we're off the bodily platform and then giving an exact application that's totally the bodily platform. That doesn't make any sense. Doesn't make any sense.

The point is, one acts according to his nature. He has the nature fine. You know what I'm saying? He has the nature great.

Then let's discuss and let's see how is it really okay? Because ultimately we are dealing with

Krishna. Right? And we have to be able to make a distinction. Now, talking about Krishna, is there any restriction? Right? So then if you say, you know, maybe you give the class or this or that, then there's no restriction because that's on the Bhagavata platform.

Where do restrictions come in? They don't come in the Bhagavata platform. We apply it like that because we can't tell the difference between anything. It's in the Pancaratrika and the Vedic because those take into condition, the consideration condition nature.

Does that make sense? So it's the condition nature has a nature. It's the way it is. Right? It's just like this.

You go in, let's say we're doing a program in the deity room. Like some special service. You know, cleaning or something like that.

Okay? And let's say a bunch of men are involved in it. Okay. There's someone who's in charge and all that.

But it's just you're cleaning the deity room or cleaning the deities. Right? Like that. So, yeah.

So now, you know, there may be some disagreement over, you know, who does what or how it should be done. Right? But, and so it's, you know, there may be control issues. But it's only about control.

That's where it ends. So it's not an emotional state. Does that make sense? Okay.

Now, let's say it's a group of women who are doing the same service. So, of course, there has to be who's in control. You know what I'm saying? With the men, if there's someone in control it works better.

There may be a man who likes to be in control. But with the women, if there's not a pecking order exactly who's the top woman in the thing, it won't work. They'll simply be fight.

Why? Because every woman is trying to control it. You know, amongst the men, those who, you know, have the nature to control, they'll try to control. But the other ones will just follow.

Well, women, every last one will want to control. And not only that, that is, now you're throwing into it the element of possession. The men don't have a sense of possession.

It's not their ditty room and their ditties. But with the women who are doing that, it's theirs. Therefore, the emotional element is there.

It makes it even more difficult. Now, any little friction that's there, it's like, you know, the world fell apart. Now, you're going to tell me that's exactly the same and that's equal? That's totally two different worlds.

And then we're going to say it's all equal? You have to really not know what you're talking

about, either on the spiritual or material platform, to try to pull that one off. You know what I'm saying? People who say everything's equal, they're cheaters. They have no idea of the philosophy.

They don't know their own nature. They don't know what's man, what's feminine. They have no idea.

And it's simply out of their own whimsicalness that's based on the mode of ignorance, according to Bhagavad Gita, that they profess these things. Now, if they're trying to say, no, but we're not dealt with properly, that's another topic altogether. That I'll totally agree.

The cultural dealings between the men and the women, it's not right. That I'll agree. But that's because there's eternal laws of masculine, feminine nature.

And that's not being followed. So that's true. But to say that there's no difference in nature, we're all transcendental, Prabhu, I don't buy it.

Because as it says here, until you're on the transcendental platform of Krishna consciousness. Why would this be put here? This is third chapter. And this is also at the conclusion of Krishna giving all these things, that someone acts according to their nature.

And that by connecting that nature to Krishna, that's how you get purified. So, why give that example? Why not give an example of someone who, you know, doesn't move in high society, isn't trained in all that, but somehow or another by Krishna consciousness, they're able to do that. Why not give the example of, you know, the devotees going to London and living in the Beatles' house? There's not one hippie on the planet that had that opportunity.

But they did it. Why? Because they're connected to Krishna. Why not give that? Why it's something that always pushes the feminist issue? Why that? It's always the same thing.

You know, without knowing the cause. Yes, the ladies did give class on these big pandals. But they don't understand how these pandals work in the Indian tradition.

You start off with the smaller speakers and get to the bigger speaker. But they make it sound like everything's equal. If you go to a rock concert, who plays first? The big band or some small band you never heard of before? Think about it.

You know, when you go to the, you know, dance program, who's on first? You understand? It's just the standard thing when you're arranging programs that the smaller or the newer or the unknown is first. And then you get to the biggies at the end. So the ladies did speak.

Then who spoke? The sannyasis. Then who spoke? Then Prabhupada. And then they'll present it that everybody's equal.

No, it's not. We have no problem that the, Prabhupada's point is if our ladies can talk this philosophy, then, you know, how deep is this philosophy, how powerful is this Krishna

consciousness movement? Because generally speaking, ladies aren't into philosophy. You know, if you think about it, in our movement, how many ladies are, consider themselves philosophers? You know, really, that they identify, and there's a couple of them, that's all.

Because in general, it's the activities of Krishna consciousness that attract the ladies. Not the philosopher. Even amongst men, not that many are philosophers.

Right? Your Mayayaprityajanas are philosophers. Your Jigyasu is a philosopher. That's one out of four.

You know? Does that make sense? And that philosopher has a wife. You know? And maybe, when he comes home and says, wow, we had a great program, we had all this, and we're talking this philosophy and that, she'll say, oh, nice honey, did you bring the cauliflower? Go ahead and try to say that that's not the reality. We're just talking, the point is here, is Krishna saying this to give security, not to take it away.

You know, the idea is if there's something I can't do, I feel insecure because I'm not in control. Because they've never been in a position where someone controlled you and took care of everything for you. That's their personal issue.

Does everybody else have to live with that? You know what I'm saying? Is that fair? So the point is, that shelter's not being given okay, that's a problem. It is, it's a real social problem. But to go about it by an external bodily concept is not going to solve the problem.

The problem is based on lack of culture. So what things will work nicely, this, that, that's the question. Does that make some sense? We're not saying it's not there, but like I gave the example, someone who actually could do it, but it's not because they're a woman.

She's not the CEO because she's a woman. You know, it's not like the board of directors sat down and okay, we need a new CEO. Are there any women around? Hey, there's one.

Hey, she looks pretty good. Yeah, let's make her the CEO. You know what I'm saying? You're qualified, and that's the point, but not because we're women.

You know, so the point is, why is something traditionally a man's activity? Because generally only men want to do it. And even if it's there, how many continue? You know what I'm saying? So, it's there. Like, what is it? We have, you know, one, you know, yeah, two Matajis, but one Mataji, you know, from Germany.

She's been, you know, managing temples and that since what, like the 90s or something, and she's still doing that. Where are all the other ladies who are doing all the big management? So many were temple presidents here. Where are they? So she's, she can do it.

You know what I'm saying? But if you look at it, men who have been there forever, you know, in the temple, there's much more of them. And occasionally there may be a woman. So the point

is, is if, the point is, is if there is someone who is qualified, therefore judged by qualification, not by whether they're a man or a woman.

The argument is not that. No, women should be, there should be a day for ladies to give a class. Great.

Where are they? This whole argument, fight over the ladies who give class here in Mayapur, I think happened, what, about eight or ten years ago. Who's giving class? When they came up and said, okay, this is a ladies' day. Who wants to give? No one wanted to give class.

Women want something that's rare, hard to obtain. Once it's not rare and not hard to obtain, who cares? It's just options. I could wear it.

It means, in the wardrobe, how many saris are there? How many of them have been only worn once? They may be never used again. But if you say, hey, you never used this, let's get rid of it. No.

Why? Because it's options. You could wear it if you wanted to. You know? You know what I'm saying? If it was, you know, afternoon on Thursday and the aliens landed, I wouldn't want to wear that.

You know? But, you know, if that happened on Tuesday, I might not wear it. And if it was in the morning, definitely wouldn't wear it. You understand? So, it's options.

It's just that we could do. There is no restriction. Whatever I feel like should be available.

That's what we're dealing with. That's a conditioned nature. And every man acts according to their own nature.

That means those women are acting exactly according to their feminine nature. It's not transcendental in the least. So, you understand? But we're saying if they have the qualifications, is anybody complaining? Noah's complaining to that lady's manager because she's been managing.

She's a manager. But it's not just because she's a woman she has to be there. She's a manager.

Great. Like I said, she's leading kirtan. Everyone likes her kirtan.

Why? Because she's doing it because she likes kirtan, not because she's a woman and she's there in your face and we can also do it. I've been to those kirtans. You know, the whole thing, the men are insensitive and this and that.

Once in Belgium, I was trying to get in the temporal. Why? Because they switched the thing on which side the ladies are on the men's side. There's a tradition like that but they switched it.

Like that, the ladies like that side better. Okay, great. And then the kirtan's going on, rip-

roaring, it's all the ladies there.

They're marching back and forth and really going for it and everything. It was definitely a Brittany or something was going on there. And so, the only thing missing was the headphone or the mic.

That was it. Like that. So, I couldn't get in the temporal.

I'd go there to try, the ladies, you know, it's just like you don't exist. So, what's the difference? You know, this is animal farm all over again. You know what I'm saying? The point is, is those ones that will complain about it, you put them in the same position, they'll exactly do the same thing.

So, they were told, I had to sit outside with the ladies who were making flower gardens. At least they'd give me a spot. You know, they were more sensitive.

So, I sat out there with the ladies making garlands and all that until the rip-roaring, snorting, kirtan finished. And then you could go in the temple. You know? But, you know, if the men were doing it, the ladies would get in the temple but they couldn't walk straight through.

They'd have to walk in, go down the side, go around the back and over there because that wasn't set. So, they switched the sides. So, now the ladies won't let anybody through.

So, who's the insensitive one? So, the point is, it's not just because we're women or we're men or we're kids or we're this or that. That doesn't work. This whole approach is totally mundane.

The Vedic system is the women, the brahmacharis, the old men, the cows and the brahmins have to be protected. You know? And we'll make a thing for women for a time. You know, now there's posters all over of, you know, dead old people.

You know, like that. You know? And then, you know, and a few years back there was a whole push on cows. You know, and then, of course, and the kids.

Is there ever one for brahmins? Have you ever seen it? Is it going to come up? No. It's politically incorrect. So it's not human that we're doing this.

It's not because of the Vedic culture. It's not because of our philosophy. It's only because that's what's going on out in the material world.

In the material world now hospices are a big new thing. It's a new thing. You know? And some devotees see the need for it because it's just one more thing to make a completeness in our society and others it's just a new issue, something to keep the bile moving, right? Otherwise lunch doesn't touch that.

You understand? There's a difference. We just were reading about that, right? Otherwise, it's just morality. You remember where that was? The Prabhupada was just saying about is that if

it's not, you know, seen in connection to Krishna, it's just morality.

Just, you know, you're connected, it is. You know, but why do we have to take care of our old people? What's the reason? You know what I'm saying? You know, it's like the Eskimos, when you get too old, you just, you know, on your own voluntary walk off out into the, you know, snow and disappear, you know, because otherwise you make so much trouble, you know, and I think there's one other tribe that, you know, they eat them, you know, it's like, you know, they have a big festival, you know, in his honor, you know, he's the main, you know, main feature, yeah. You know what I'm saying? So it's like, you know, so the point is, is that it's coming up simply because the, you know, first world western tribe has decided that it's important.

Not because the Vedas say it's important, not because Prabhupada mentions that it's important, no, just that that's the mood they're into today. You know what I'm saying? Of course, we're not saying everybody's like that, but I was just saying is the presentation, you know, here's like a shock up there, you know, you have to go up there and see a burning body and all that, so you got to take care of your own people, you know, why don't we put up a nice sign there that says, how many cows did you eat, you know, and now, how many cows have you protected? What would happen if I put a sign like that up? I guarantee from the top to the bottom it would freak devotees out, but that's the reality. You've eaten more cows than you've protected, you know, so, you know, let's get real here.

No, it's all going, oh, this, that, you know, it's like, who's creating this culture? The idea is, Krishna says that the culture should be created, you know, he's the one that's giving the direction. So, you understand? So, we're doing this because Krishna says. We're taking care of women because Krishna says.

We're taking care of cows because Krishna says. We're taking care of old people because Krishna says. That's why we're doing it.

It's not that there's not truth in what's being spoken, that there may be, you know, unequal dealings in situations that could be equal, you know, that we're inconsiderate when we should be considerate. Those may be truths, but what is the basis of that truth? Is it coming because this is what the Shastra says? Is this the culture, the tradition given by the Acharyas? Or is it simply because it's something that resonates with my modern need for, you know, whimsicality? Because I feel like it. You understand? That's the point.

You know, it's a general rule. There's a general rule. There are exceptions.

But exceptions are exceptions. You don't make it a general rule. You know? Somebody said.

Yeah, but in China, like, you know, because after liberation, you know, the men and women are, you know, performing the same level. They perform the same level, but what's the aura of the women? So now women becomes like men, you know. They can do everything men do, you know, like cleaning, or, you know, managing.

Everything you can do like a man, you know, in China, it's like that. Okay, but if you look at it, it's just like, I remember visiting there, it's like, whoever came home first cooked dinner. If the man was busy something, then the woman cooked.

And if the woman was busy, the man cooked. But who cooks when it's a bigger festival? You know, you have 20 devotees, or 50 devotees come. Unless the woman's a really good cook, the men cook.

No? Yeah, the men cook. Yeah. But if it's a daily thing, the women may cook, or the men may cook.

You understand? So it still follows the same pattern. You understand? Because the point is, if the women want to cook, it's a personal thing, and when they're doing that, if the woman's a cook, then she likes cooking because it's cooking which is the thing. But the other, for the woman, it's not cooking that's important.

It's the interaction with, you know, whoever it is you're cooking for. And so cooking's the medium. So as soon as it turns into official stuff, women aren't interested, unless they're cooks.

You know? Does that make sense? All women can cook because it's an art. But how many, you know, cooking is, you know... You understand? See, feminine nature is ashram. And that's the occupation.

Now if they want to venture into varna, then fine. But to do it, they have to adjust. The varna is the men's world.

The ashram thing is the women's world. So, but for the women to venture into it, they have to change the varna world into a woman's world. So it's not equal.

If it's equal, then, you know, the guys are out there cursing and yelling and screaming, why can't you do that with a woman? You know what I'm saying? So what I'm saying here is it doesn't change the nature. That's the point. Detail, there's unlimited detail.

The point is, is the feminine nature remains feminine nature, the masculine nature remains that. Problem is, without training, the men don't act as men, therefore the women aren't comfortable, you know, in their performance of duties, they don't act as men. This is a woman.

You know what I'm saying? And if a woman's outstanding in a particular skill, you know, like that, then fine, nobody complains. You know what I'm saying? The Vedic culture, no one complained. No one had a problem with Gargi, you know, you know, being part of the assembly in Janaka Rishi and being one of the speakers.

No one had a problem. But it wasn't because she was a woman, it was because she was a great scholar. You know what I'm saying? And she wasn't trying to pull any, you know, I'm a woman so I have rights thing.

You know what I'm saying? So therefore there's no problem. Does that make sense? So the point is, is that correct the situation by correcting the social, actual social problem, not by adding a new problem. Because otherwise, if that's there, you know, resolutions are there, now everything should be perfect.

But is it? No, because the social environment hasn't changed. In the state of Kali, men are open with, more open with feminine nature and women are more open with masculine nature. Isn't that? It's like, have you ever seen girls do dramas? All the actors are just girls and they're doing it amongst themselves.

Okay? Girls are having a sleepover or something and they decide to do some little role-playing stuff. Right? You see? Okay. So now, when the girls play boys, how do they play it? You know what I'm saying? So, not liking to cook is a male thing? Think about it.

Who are all the top chefs in the world? Knock me out. They're all men. There might be one, I think I've heard of one.

They're all men. So what do you mean? It's like, all my friends that I know of, they all are cooks. And most of them, I can say, are damn better cooks than most any women I know.

So just to say because they don't like to cook, that's because they're lazy. They just want to be served. How else does food happen? You know what I'm saying? And if men don't like to cook because they're the man, that's also stupid.

You know what I'm saying? Men who don't want to cook because they're men and think that's women's job, that's also not very nice. The women are complaining about that. But if a woman takes that attitude, oh, everybody's got to stand back, and that's her right.

You know what I'm saying? There are countries where the men will never cook. They think it is weird. It is stupid.

In fact, they will harass any man who does. I'm talking countries or even regions here. And we're talking millions and millions of people, hundreds of millions, maybe even billions of people.

So that's not appreciated. That's not modern. That's archaic and this and that.

But if the woman says, no, I'm not cooking because I'm too busy. I'm doing all this man job, then that's okay. That's not logical.

So that means it's just the mind. And if it's just the mind, that means it's feminine. So this attitude that, you know, we're women, we're professionals, and we don't cook, that's purely 100% feminine.

That's not masculine. You know what I'm saying? Who are the top when you take the schools of dance in India? You know? The top person in the Sampradaya, except for in, yeah, no, not even

that, except for one or two schools, they're all men. Odissi, it's a man.

You know, what do you call it? Katak, it's a man. A lot of these, you know, these like Kerala and these other, they're all men. You know, so what do you mean it's like, you know, oh, we do this or don't do this.

You name it. It's just whatever it is. The men are good at it.

You know those models that walk down the runway, those supermodels and all the ones in Vogue magazine. You know who puts on their makeup? Take a guess. Men.

Who made their clothes? Generally men. There's one or two ladies who are really good at it and everybody appreciates, but all the rest of them are men. You know what I'm saying? So therefore, don't give these particular kind of external things and say that's man and that's woman.

That's the whole point of this conversation. What I'm complaining about is we're saying, oh, we're off the bodily platform. We're not men or women.

And then the examples and the things we fight over are exactly on the bodily platform. That's my point. The point is, is that she'd rather be out doing a career because she's not getting any taste at home.

So therefore, hey, if that's what she wants to do, great. But don't claim that because she's a woman that's her right. It's just what she'd prefer to do.

No one minds that the woman down at the office, if she moves up and she deals nicely with everybody, no one minds. But if she's a nasty person, no one likes a nasty man at the job. Why would they want a nasty woman? You know what I'm saying? If she's nice, she's good at it, who's going to complain? Nobody.

Who do they complain about? The ones that are there simply because they're women. That's what the complaint is about. We have to be able to distinguish here.

This is philosophy. So we're not talking cultural issues here. We're talking the weakness in the philosophy.

And therefore, it turns into a cultural issue because it's whimsical. It's just from the mind. It's not based on anything solid.

So its point is this. You know the feminine nature. That's why they're doing that.

But the same point is that woman who won't cook, she still wants to eat good. You know what I'm saying? So what's flourishing? Nice restaurants. But when the men are just going to work and just eating, what do they eat? You know, they go down to the coffee shop, they have a coffee, they have a donut.

You know? You understand? They pick up a sandwich. Did I miss one? You know what I'm saying? So what's flourishing? Sandwich shops, donut shops. You don't even hear about them anymore.

You know what I'm saying? You have these, you know, high-end, you know, coffee shop and this and that. Well, it's all meant for women. So all it is, is they've taken their home out onto the street.

They didn't move into a man's world. They just made the man's world more feminine so that they could function in it. You know how much the men harass each other? But if the man harasses the woman, oh, it's, you know, it's abuse.

You know what I'm saying? So it's not that they moved into a man's world and they're functioning in a man's world. No, they just brought with them the woman's world and the men have to deal. So before it was, they had to deal with the woman's world at home.

There was a stark difference. Man's world, woman's world. So when you walked into your house, you know you were in the woman's world and you dealt like that.

Now it's woman's world everywhere. When do you actually, when are you, where is the relief that you can therefore come back refreshed and deal with the women and then the women are complaining and the men are getting worse and worse at dealing with the women. Of course, because there's no change.

There's no difference. You know, the woman won't be there with the men all the time either. She's got to have her room.

She's got to have her place. Right? You know, when the two people walk into the room like that and then, you know, it's not specifically an intimate relationship. Right? Who gets the couch and who gets the bedroom? Even if it's the guy's house, the woman gets the bedroom and he's on the couch.

And that's considered normal. But if it was he's in the bedroom, she's on the couch, oh, this is inconsiderate. Oh, this is this.

Oh, this is that. What happened to equality? The equality is just who can be a CEO. Right? Is it that, you know, oh, the lady can be the guy down at the end taking care of the coffee machine.

The lady can be the peon. The lady can be the one that, you know, how you say, you know, delivers the boxes, you know, to a place where you just dump them off and there's nobody there. Think about it.

The women only want those areas in the man's woman, the world, that they can relate to as women. They're not acting as men at all. So they're using an art, not a science.

The reason the men, the women, all the women are cooks because women are artists and so all

of them have to know the art to some degree. But the reason the men are the chefs is because they know the science. And those women who are also chefs because they know the science.

But most women, that's not what they're interested in. They're interested in the art because that's where the interaction is. That's where the experience is.

That's where the taste is. So, Krishna says here, God here is making a statement. That everybody acts according to their nature.

That's all. So we're saying that, yes, if the women, by the environment, aren't being taken care of by the men, they have to go out and get their jobs and all that and do all that, then you're going to have to make that environment friendly to women. It's going to have to be female compliant.

It's just the way it is. Does that make sense? Not at all. Not at all.

That's not a feature. Yeah, but the problem is, is God makes reality and you simply make things up. That's the only difficulty.

See, the thing is, it's just like you go down to the insane asylum. What's the reality there? Who's real? The guy sitting there, he says he's Mowgli and Bonaparte. And his mind is real.

So just because you feel doesn't make it real. It means that the feeling is real, but it's reality is what happens in the world. It's what's happening in my world is different from what you are saying.

For example, in my world, there is a guy, he's the boss. He's not prepared to be, but he's the boss because he's a man. But he has no knowledge.

He's just a good person to deal. He has more feminine nature, like you said. No, it's just untrained masculine, that's all.

And we see many things changing in our lives. But it's all external what you're talking about. I'm talking about the fundamental principles of what you work by.

That's what you're not catching. So you're going on the externals of what I see. My reality are these rocks, and this is brick, and this is cow dung, and this is wood.

I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about what is the masculine feminine principle. You ever heard of Parvati and Shiva? So there's a whole philosophy about the masculine principle.

No one has a problem that the demigods can't defeat one of these big demons. And no one has a problem that Shiva's wife goes out and she kills the demon. They're not complaining because she's a woman and this and that.

She has the ability. But she still does it as a woman. How does Kali go out? She goes out naked.

What's going to be more freaky than having, you know, completely off her head lady going to cut your head off and she's naked. That's going to be freaky. So she does it as a woman.

That's why it's more freaky. If your father's upset, that's bad. But if your mother's upset, watch out.

You don't know where it's going to end. Your father, you know, he's going to say this, he's going to do this, and it'll end. But with your mother, you don't know what will happen or how long it'll go on for.

You understand? It doesn't, the nature doesn't change. So that's why it's so freaky when she goes on the battlefield. Right? Because of the feminine nature.

So we're talking about what's behind, what's subtler than the subtle. We're talking about the foundation upon which it's based. That's the philosophy.

External, I have no problem when women do all these different things. I have a problem that they're doing it because they say they're women. You understand? Yes, I agree, but I still think that nowadays many men have feminine nature.

But why is that feminine nature there? Why would it be there? Why would it be there? No idea. So this is my point, is that we have to know what's going on. Did that guy with the feminine nature, did he ever get trained by men, or he always grew up in the association of women? So therefore he's just going to do things like his mother and his mother's friends did.

And if he's got sisters, then throw that in also. You know what I'm saying? Because before it was the man, he went to work, there was only men there, and they would train him what to do. But now everything's women everywhere, so where is that training? So the men don't get trained culturally how to behave as a man.

They still think like a man, because, you know, intellectual is intellectual, emotional is emotional, sensual is sensual. They still think like that. The three separate things.

Women, this one thing. All three are one thing. It's just, you know, you're looking at the intellectual side of it, you're looking at the emotional side of it, you're looking at the, what do you call it, the sensual side of it.

You know what I'm saying? The girl's wearing something a little bit bold. In her mind it's sensual. It's not sexual.

But every man who's looking at it is sexual. Now you're going to tell me that therefore, you know, they're feminine, they're this and that. No, just that they're not very strong, because they've always been the association of women.

That's all. And the women, who we take the other way, they didn't have much masculine association, so they have to make up the difference. The point is, it's going to be a balance

between masculine and feminine.

You have to have 100%. So if you have 100% feminine, you know, you have 100% masculine. But the point is, if you can only manifest 80% of the feminine, that means it's going to be 20% masculine that they have to manifest.

But the underlying principle, it's still going to be feminine, and it's still going to be masculine. The man's still going to be insensitive in the ways that he is, and the woman's still going to be, you know, overly sensitive in the way she is. Does that make some sense? See, the problem is, is what I'm talking about doesn't make anything good for issues and, you know, movements and fighting and all that stuff.

This is just, this is the philosophy. And now it's a matter of understanding, since I'm not the body, okay, I can't repress my nature, but I have to therefore engage it according to how God wants it to be engaged in His service. That's the bottom line.

So the point is, is, you know, does God want a man, a woman doing a man's activity with a man's mentality? Is that what He wants? Right? Baby Krishna, who's He controlled by? Who tells Him what to do? Who dresses Him? Who feeds Him? Who says when He's going to do all these things? A man or a woman? Huh? Mother just showed her. A woman. Does He have any problem with it? He has no problem being controlled by women.

But, they do it as women. Does that make sense? If I go to buy a ticket, I'll stand in a line, there'll be a hundred people there. But a woman can walk straight up to the front of the line and just go in, because she's a woman.

Where's the equality? Why don't you stand in the back of the line behind the other hundred people? Try that one first. You know, being equal in the man's world. You know what I'm saying? Women don't want to work in the man's world as the men do.

They want those facilities as a woman. Why does a guy have to wear a black tux suit and a woman can wear all kinds of flashy colors and this and that and jewelry? She's got to just be very subdued. Why? Because it's all about the woman.

You know, but the guy that comes out with all the, you know, fancy this and that, all the women are, who's this guy? Women don't want equality. You know what I'm saying? They just want to feel comfortable. They want to feel comfortable in whatever environment they choose to be in.

That's all. Does that make sense? So the point is, is what Krishna's saying here is that everyone has a nature. We're going to act according to the nature.

So, therefore, one should not give up one's occupational duties because Arjuna's wanted to give up his occupational duties. You know, the point is a woman doesn't want to cook. Who's supposed to cook? Right? So the man has to cook because she doesn't want to cook? Fine, great.

You know, but it's something like that. You say sometimes, but I'm talking about the principle. She got someone to cook.

Some rich ladies have people to cook. But in a high-class Indian family, even they have tons of servants who actually does the cooking in a high-class house. The servants? Not at all.

If the lady of the house doesn't cook and the servants cook, in Indian tradition, that's called low-class. Rich, but low-class. You understand? We're dealing with, there is the human element.

It's not just about getting things done and occupation and getting money. And who's done that? Who has pushed it in that direction? Who runs the economics where that happens? Is it women? No, it's men. Sometimes.

Alan Greenspan was a man. The one running the reserve bank, that was a man. All those top guys, the little three-foot tall guys that wear pinstripe suits in Zurich, they're men.

Do you know what I'm saying? Like that. They define the environment because they know the science. Who put women in the factories in World War II in America because the men are all out in the field? And they needed munitions? Men.

Do you know what I'm saying? So here's the problem. No, we're not controlled. We're free.

We're independent. We're doing our own thing. That's an illusion.

Think about it. Who wears more clothes on a tennis court? A man or a woman? Do you know what I'm saying? And do the men mind? Not at all. Great.

Do you need to have a skirt that short to play tennis? The men wear something that long. But the women have to wear something this long. The men wear these big baggy T-shirts.

The women have to wear these super tight tank tops. Why? To play tennis, you have to do that. No, we're just being practical.

We're just getting out there. No, it's because the women want to be seen and the men want to see. The modes of nature act according to the way they work.

It doesn't matter who you are. They still act in that way. That's why I say it's an illusion.

Does that make sense? I still think it's not a rule. It's not a rule. Water is wet.

Is there any exception to water being wet? Fire is hot. So why would there be an exception in these other things? See, the point is you can't tell what's the difference between feminine and masculine. You think it's because they do a certain work that in a particular environment may be traditionally masculine.

But just because you do the work doesn't necessarily make it feminine or masculine. Like we said, it says the woman doesn't want to cook. Men have never wanted to cook.

Most men don't want to cook. Most men don't know how to cook. But if they decide to cook, they're better at cooking than a woman.

So it's not because of the external that makes it man or woman. That's where we're making the mistake. You're trying to take it that this activity is masculine, this activity is feminine.

No. There's a masculine nature, feminine nature. Therefore, they like certain things.

You know what I'm saying? You generally don't have a genre called a man's flick. Occasionally you get a movie that will say this is a man's. But there's a whole genre called a chick flick.

Because all ladies like it. It deals with the interactions, the romance, the different things, having difficulty coming together, then having it work out, and then having a different thing that they get, how do you call it? The misunderstanding that it all works out. Men don't want to watch them, but all women like to watch them.

Why? You know what I'm saying? It's called a chick flick. So it doesn't matter. She's the CEO of a company, or she's a maid in somebody's house.

They all like to watch it. You know what I'm saying? There's underlying natures. So it's not that, okay, she's the CEO of a company, or she drives a taxi.

Great. The point is, so people harass her because she's driving a taxi. That they shouldn't do.

But it's not that she's driving a taxi because she's a woman. It's her right. No, you know how to drive a taxi.

You want to drive a taxi. Hey, what do we care? You know what I'm saying? So for people who, men who also look at it externally, that's a problem. But women who look at it externally, it's just as bad.

So therefore, the women who look at it externally, and the men who look at it externally, then they fight over it. And you know, there's magazines written, there's different things, there's marches made. But it's all just the same thing.

That get anywhere? See, that means, there's a nature here. Krishna is the masculine nature. His internal potency is the feminine.

Everything else comes down from there. In the material creation, there's Shiva and there's Parvati. Therefore, because there's Shiva and Parvati, all species of life are divided into the masculine and feminine.

And their natures come from there. That's the way it is. You can say there's exceptions.

No, there's not. There are 10. Does that make some sense? Not really.

Okay, so then we're just going to have to leave it at this point. Yes? You said, like, you

understand correctly that, like, let's say, like, only in the beginning, like, this activity itself is not feminine or masculine. But why do you say it's better, like, women to do it? It just depends where.

Let's say you're cleaning the back of a garbage truck. So who should clean that, a man or a woman? Who's cleaning, you know, you know, how you say, you know, the cupboard where all the ladies' shoes are? No, I mean what a man is like, when I think, I mean, like, why is it better for a woman to do it? You know what I'm saying? What would you like? You put on your sari, or your husband puts it on for you? You know what I'm saying? Because there is the nature, the feminine nature, it's just like, you go to a single woman's house, generally speaking, it's always tidy and clean. You know, there's little elements that make it a home.

You know, she's out in the morning, she goes to the market, she'll find something to buy. Ever walk into a bachelor's place? Right? So, where does the term come from? Domesticating. It applies to what women do to men.

They make them fit to live in an environment where women are. Does that make sense? So, that's why the women traditionally work in those areas. Right? Because it's something that means something to them.

It's what... It's like even you go down to the business. If you go down to the business that's run by a woman, it looks like a house. You know, it's not stark and dry, like if it's just men.

Men, it'll just be, you know, paka, this and that and all that. But if a woman runs it, it'll have that feminine touch to it. You know what I'm saying? It's just... Women need to be in an environment of pleasantness, niceness, aesthetics, opulence.

That's just where they thrive. So, therefore, that's why traditionally, in the home, because the sense of possession, they do that. You know what I'm saying? But, if they're more rich, they get servants to do that.

So, we're not saying it's not, but just they do that. But who controls the servants? The lady. Draupadi had 2,000 maidservants.

Does it ever say Yudhisthira had 2,000 maidservants? No. So, that means the palace was controlled by Draupadi. She controlled that.

She controlled their personal finances. She even said, said to... I forget who she was talking to. Maybe to Satyabhama and that.

The Pandavas don't even know how much money they have. Only she knows. You know what I'm saying? So, it's just a matter of knowing what's the masculine and feminine, where the line is.

It's just been a long time. The culture's been broken or lost. So, now, we're fighting over these

grossly external things.

And we can't even tell the difference in subtle things. You know what I'm saying? The woman is very concerned about the house finances. But even if she's, you know, the big, you know, woman, she's not going to be that much about the detail of the company finances.

Right? But the man generally will be. But you do have ladies that are. They're accountants.

They're good at it. Does that make sense? You can always tell the difference. You know, it's just like you have a male dog and a female dog.

They're dogs. They bark. They'll both rip your leg off.

But watch them walk. You can tell what's the female dog, what's the masculine dog. You know, they both bark at cars.

You know, like that. They both, you know, go out and eat garbage. They both do exactly the same thing.

So, they're cocky, but they're still male and female. You know, you have the lioness, you have the lioness, still male and female. She's tough.

She'll rip your head off. She'll eat you for breakfast. Like that.

But she still is female. We once saw this clip, this film clip. There were two male lions sitting down next to the water hole.

Big, really big, mangy male lions. They're sitting there, you know, waiting for some deer to come by. And a female lion walks by them.

You know, first behind them, you know, make it subtle. Then a little bit more out where they can see. And they just sit there, you know, because there's two of them.

So, they're just doing their man thing, right? And she walks past them and gets to a distance. And then, getting to the point where they should have noticed by now, and they didn't. She turned around, walked back over to the biggest of the two.

And then, when he's right there, then he turned his head and noticed she was there. She took her paw and whacked him across the face. And walked off.

And he just, what was that, you know? And stopped. Why? Because she's feminine. You know, the men are supposed to notice her.

She walked by. You know, why they didn't notice? You know, they're not doing their duty. You know? One of the most annoyed faces I've ever seen is when you're walking down the street and you can spot them like at least a hundred feet or a hundred fifty feet away.

There's a woman, she's dressed to let everybody on the street know she's got it. And she's walking down and both sides of the street are noticing her. Right? And so, I'm walking down the street, you know, and, you know, being a sannyasi, we're not supposed to get too much into that kind of stuff.

And she looks around because she's scanning the whole street. And, you know, she doesn't do it obviously, but, you know, just the walking and looking and, you know, like that. So she's making eye contact everywhere.

And as soon as she makes eye contact with me, then I'll just break it. As soon as it comes, I'll just break it. And then from that hundred fifty feet away, she won't look at me again.

And she'll walk by so annoyed. I've seen it again and again. I've never seen an exception.

So I didn't acknowledge that she looked good. Everybody else did. I didn't acknowledge it.

Does that make sense? So what we're trying to say is that there's this underlying, inherent, masculine, feminine nature. And therefore, the externals are secondary. And like you're saying in China, you know, is that now it's adjusted a bit, but before, there was a size thirty-six and there was a size forty-two suit.

Right? You had those pants and that, you know, thing. That's what you wore. Men and women.

It might have been a different size for women. It might have been a smaller one for women. They wore exactly the same thing.

They wore the same shoes, did the same work, same everything, but you could still tell who's a man and who's a woman. Just their nature and everything like that. You know what I'm saying? Because you're working on a principle.

You know what I'm saying? Like you take Western, you know, how you say, you take like say boxing or something like that, you know, you generally take a masculine sport. Women do it. They're generally a masculine kind of a thing.

But like the oriental martial arts, it's not masculine or feminine. It's the principle. So you work on the principle, it works.

It doesn't matter who you are. Right? They don't complain if you're a man or a woman. If you're a top martial artist, they don't complain.

They don't. Because they're working on a principle. So they're working, because there he's talking about, we were talking there before, you got this chi and li.

So the gross external is not anything to do with their philosophy. So they don't, that's not a discussion. You know what I'm saying? But the Westerners, because everything's external, there is no subtlety.

They can't even tell the difference between the gross and subtle body, what's the soul, what's life, what's death, nothing. So everything about the Western culture is external. Everything.

But we see it in the Asian and in the orientals that it's all about what's the subtlety. That's what makes the masculine feminine. So therefore, this kind of discussion, you know, it just depends upon the background.

Because India has followed the West, therefore, you know, you have to deal with that. But in Asia, they're following now. But otherwise, it's, you know, in tradition, it's not a problem.

You know? It means Queen Elizabeth is one of the best, the first. Second also. Some of the Elizabeths are good.

Some of the best, you know, monarchs England has had. But there's only been two. You know what I'm saying? When they're good, they're good.

Nobody's complaining that it's a queen. You know what I'm saying? But when they're, you know, when they're not nice, then, you know, it means Elizabeth. We call her Elizabeth.

You know. Is that right? You know, this one's called Elizabeth. What is the name that they call Mary? Mary the First.

What's the title they give her? Bloody Mary. She was nasty. You know? So it goes by, what's the nature? You know? You know, your Russian wallah who pulled all the states together, Ivan, what is he called? Yeah.

Because of the nature. You know what I'm saying? So the point is, is that if someone has the skill, that's not the problem. So it's not a fight over who cooks or who cleans or who changes the diapers.

The point is, what's the masculine, the point is, is that the wife is going to tell the husband to change the diapers as a woman. You know? I changed it last time. So, you know, and then he's just supposed to do it, right? When she comes to the point, and says, no, you changed it.

No, I got it. No, I changed it last time. What's he supposed to do at that time? Argue? Or just change the diaper? Okay? Now, what if the man says, I changed it last time? What's going to happen? Wife's not going to talk to him.

Why not? Because he's insensitive, he's being this and that. She can be insensitive and all that she likes. Why? Because she's a woman.

Does that make sense? So the inherent underlying, so it's not who changes the diaper. He's still going to say what he says as a man, and she's still going to say it as a woman. That doesn't change.

That's what we're talking about. So the discussion started that we foolishly take this point of

nature from the external. You know what I'm saying? The man wears a black suit, or whatever his suit is, to work every day.

Right? And generally it's always the same. Maybe he has a gray one and a dark blue one. Right? So would the woman survive with two colors? I mean plain.

You got a plain blue sari. I mean plain. No booties, no borders, no nothing.

You know? And then you got, you know, a gray one. Did it work? You know how much money we'd save? You know how much money would be available to the world population? Right? Think about it. Even the guy has a silk dhoti.

Right? It's four meters. Right? Three hundred, twelve hundred rupees. Right? And he'll have what? I mean he goes all out.

He's got five of them. Right? That's 750 rupees. And he's considered like a gross sense gratifier.

Right? Five sets of clothes, and, you know, and there's silk. That's one nice sari. And there's at least another 50 of them.

You understand? So the whole point is this. Nature won't change. Occupation is what you do to make your money.

So now if they want to fight over who does what occupation, fine. Let them fight. Who cares? The point is that the actual bottom line of their inherent nature and how they get things done, they're still going to do it according to their nature.

That's what Krishna says. That won't change. It can't change.

You know? So gain and safety won't change. Woman is into gain and safety. Why does she want gain? Makes her feel safe.

The man wants to control it just because, you know, then he thinks he's the controller and enjoy it. It's not about safety so much. But the woman, she wants to control it so she gets the result.

That adds to the environment. She feels safe. Does that make some sense? Sometimes it appears this conversation is not going... Like in China, it's very popular, you know, men dress like women and women dress like men, you know, and behave like a man.

That's nothing. Go to Thailand. Check it out, okay? You brought up a point about if the high class woman has servants cooking, then it's not called... No, it's not high class.

That's rich lady has servants cooking. It's called rich. The high class lady... Because the point is, it's whose food you want to eat.

You want to eat your servant's food? Their consciousness, their health, like that, their standard. So they may cut the vegetables, they may, you know, do so many things, but they don't actually

cook it. They'll go to the market, they'll wash the vegetables, they'll clean the kitchen, they'll wash all the pots, they'll cut all the vegetables, grind all the spices, do everything, but they won't actually cook on the fire.

You know? The Western thing is, is no, we're rich, and so because we're rich, that makes us high class, so we have servants, so we have a cook. But in India, which is actually high class, they don't cook. Means you have Akbar, the emperor of the world, his wife cooks.

You know this sabji in India, so she had the, you know, kind of like something that's like rich, deep fried, and then it's in like a tomato sauce with all the spices and all that. You know where that recipe comes from? Akbar's wife. Because tomatoes came from the West, so when they first came into India, who gets them first? The emperor.

So that means, what's he going to do with a basket of tomatoes? It goes to his wife. She created that recipe. And it's so good, it's still being used hundreds and hundreds of years later.

You know, you make variations on it, and so is she, but it's the principle of the tomato sauce and this, she created that. Yes? You're saying that when girls to apply and apply to all men, you didn't finish the example? Sorry? You're talking about when girls to apply and apply to all men? Yeah, because they do, they bring out the, you know, the strong elements, and all the things that, if the men do it without consideration of them, then they'll complain about it. You know, men, they do all these things.

It's just, you know, they'll always do like that. You know, and then when they play the women, they're always shy, and they'll do all these kinds of things like that. So they just naturally do that.

You know, they make very big separation, what's the masculine, what's the feminine, they do do all that very much. They like it, it's very melodramatic, it's very extreme. Does that make sense? So that's just the natural thing.

They'll do, they'll take those elements. But that's, that's man and woman interacting amongst themselves. So the problem is, is then when the woman goes into the public environment, and she takes on these masculine roles, she does those roles, because she's this masculine, she takes on, and she starts profiling like she would as doing the drama of what a man acts like.

But it's girls acting as a man. Yes. Marge, I was reading in a university sociological textbook, there was a study done of American teenage girls, and they concluded that the girls, they dress not to impress men, but they dress to impress other women.

Yeah, because the men don't notice. The girl, if the girl walked out in a burlap bag, you know, you go, oh, nice, honey, yeah, great, you know. They wouldn't notice.

So the only one that notices the subtleties of what they dress, so it means, the point is, is the girl looks good in one sari, and if she wore it every day, the man wouldn't complain, because he

wears, you know, one dhoti every day, he wouldn't notice that she's wearing that variety, because the point is that she got a fancy sari, right? She wears, let's say, a Fagora Pornima. When's the next time she can wear that again? That was a big festival. She can't wear it for a couple of years, and even if she does, she'll never wear it again at Gora Pornima.

And even if, you know, it was something there, she would wear it in an environment where different people than the ones that saw it at Gora Pornima would see it. Daily stuff, okay, then that you can, you know, depending on what it is in the circuit, you'll move in at least every few days it should change. But for some, it has to be months.

Otherwise, what? You don't have any clothes? So it's the women. They dress, even when they're dressing so they're very revealing, they're doing that for the women. They're not doing it for the men.

Like I said, they could go out in a burlap bag and the men would still go, ooh, check her out, you know, like that. It doesn't matter. So it means all the accessories, all the different things, all the boldness, all that, that's all for the young women.

That's why when the men go, wow, she was looking for it, and they go, what are you talking about? Because it had nothing to do, that's what I'm saying. They can work in the realm of these emotions and senses and it has nothing to do with the men. They want to include the men, then the men will know it.

So that's why there has to be a clear women's world. But if it's up to these modern women, they won't let the men have their world. You know what I'm saying? Because it's like, before it was the women had their world, and they could interact, and then the men have their club, and they go down to their club, and they go out hunting or go camping, and for the women it's cool, they get their man time.

But now in the present day, you can't have a man's club. The women want to crash here, why can't we be there? You know, equal rights. So that means the men never get their own world.

The women have to be part of it. But the women will make their own time. That means when the woman doesn't want to talk to the men, there's no question the men will be around.

They can't go, hey, we want equal rights here, we want to be here. It doesn't work. So as I'm saying, the men and women, they'll act according to their nature.

Occupations and stuff like that, that's external. What you do with the body to make money, and so if that, you do something that's traditionally manned or traditionally woman's, what's the big deal? That's not what we're discussing. That's not what I'm discussing.

I'm discussing the actual, what is the masculine kind of nature. You said that everybody is acting according to the conventional nature, but for example, when a man is giving himself to the center of attention, so he's... Yeah, he's asking in a feminine way. But he'll still do it the way

the men do.

He'll still be very insensitive when he does it. But the woman will make herself the center of attention. She's very sensitive to you.

You know what I'm saying? The man can just go on being the center of attention and never give anything back. The woman, according to how you've given her attention, she'll reciprocate. So she's always very just on it because it's always shared.

Women share everything. Men don't. They can be trained to.

But it's without training, the man doesn't actually perform the duties of a man. But he doesn't, it's not that he still doesn't want to be the, you know, the controller. You know what I'm saying? The boy grows up with his mom.

So who does everything? The boy or the mom? Okay, now when he gets bigger, he gets married. What does he expect his wife to do? Everything, because that's what his mom did. That's the problem.

So therefore, if the wife has to do everything, because then that's not her duty, therefore then, to make up that balance, she'll apply that same thing outside or within the house or something to try to create the balance. Because she's a wife, not a mother. But for her own children, she'll do everything.

You understand? The point is, is the mother can be, make the child the center of attention because with the husband, she's the center of attention. You understand? But if she's not the center of attention, then the women will think, oh, I'm being like that and not making their children the center of attention. So that means, now the women are doing their duties.

So what's the difference between the man didn't do their duties that makes people neurotic, now the women don't do their duties that make people neurotic. So it's like somehow or another, now this is fine, this is great, now we're equal. Yeah, yeah.

No, but it's just, it's simply acting according to one's nature, but just becoming more and more an illusion that you don't know that that's what's going on. The best thing about the mode of ignorance is that what's right seems wrong and what's wrong seems right. Only in the mode of goodness you can distinguish.

I feel Prabhupāda ki sama-vetā bhakti rende ki jaya, jaya, jaya.