

2012-03-15 BG a 3.108-110

In Kṛṣṇa consciousness, one comes directly into communion with Kṛṣṇa, and thus all directions from Kṛṣṇa may be understood in that transcendental state. One is sure to achieve results by such activities and attain conclusive knowledge. One only has to carry out the orders of Kṛṣṇa or his representative, the spiritual master.

That was the whole point previously, was the aspect is that Kṛṣṇa can be known only through instructions coming from itself or from the representative. So still we see it's coming back to that same point. It means as we go through, we see that hearing means practicing Kṛṣṇa consciousness and the association of devotees.

So that means hearing from them, discussing with them, practicing with them. That's actually the essential point of Kṛṣṇa consciousness. Because Kṛṣṇa, His whole idea is to interact with the devotees.

So that's already going on. So if we want to take part, then we have to associate with those devotees. So association of devotees, therefore, is the most important element.

Because if we're not associating devotees, how will we associate with Kṛṣṇa? Because Kṛṣṇa is not just going to hang out with us and leave everybody else. I mean, He does as Paramātmā, but at the same time as, you know, does that make sense? So it still comes back to that point, that association, that's the most important. Śrīla Prabhupāda writes in his purport, Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam, 4.4.20, Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam, 62, Lord Śiva is in the transcendental position because, as stated before, he is always absorbed in thought of Lord Vāsudeva within himself.

Therefore, neither the activities of the gr̥hastha nor those of the sannyāsī in the renounced order can be applicable to him. He is in the Paramahansa stage, the highest perfectional stage of life. The transcendental position of Lord Śiva is also explained in Bhagavad-gītā, 2.5.253. So that's these verses here.

It is stated there that when one fully engages in the transcendental service to the Lord by performing activities without fruitive results, one is elevated to the transcendental position. At that time he has no obligation to follow the Vedic injunctions or the different rules and regulations of the Vedas. He has no obligation.

It means you want something from it, you're obligated. You don't want something from it, you're not obligated. So the reason the devotee follows anything is because it pleases Kṛṣṇa.

Does that make sense? So we shouldn't take the understanding here, oh, therefore you don't have to follow any rules and therefore we're devotees so we don't have to follow any rules. It is mentioning here Lord Śiva. So the point is that there's no obligation to do something because you have no benefit to get from it.

Does that make sense? You want a house, so you're obligated to pay taxes on the house. You want land, you're obligated to pay taxes on the land. You know, you want a car, you're obligated to put petrol and oil and change the tires.

You know, you want children, you have to feed them. Does that make sense? There's obligations because you have something you want to gain. But if you have nothing you want to gain, there are no obligations.

So therefore if you engage in anything, it's not for your own benefit. So the Paramahansa means he's beyond, doesn't mean he does nothing. We all think nothing because we're in the mode of ignorance.

Then the mode of ignorance means the ideal is to do nothing. Does that make sense? That means confer. Yeah, you could say.

You have no obligation but at the same time you're doing things because you're working for. So we're working for Krishna but we have no material obligations. Because here when it mentions that the Vedic, no obligation to follow the Vedic injunctions, the different rules and regulations of the Vedas because we're looking, this means the aspect of the Aparavidya.

We don't have to follow those rules because we have something to gain from that. We want the Brahminical social status means we're obligated to follow the rules of the Brahmin. So just like we see the Sukadeva Goswami is not following those rules.

He has no obligation. So he's not following them. But at the same time because of that, no one relates to him in that way either.

It's not that, oh, I'm above, I don't follow any rules but everyone has to respect me and do this and that. No, they don't respect and they come and laugh and joke and he has nothing to say because he's not doing anything to get respect. So therefore if they don't respect him, it doesn't matter.

So that's also been the next step where then, where we see that our, how you say, our mode of ignorance perspective on this particular point comes to a screeching halt is that yes, we're Paramahansa so we don't have to follow anything but that means no one has to follow anything in relationship to you. They can deal with you however they like. Then it's like, hey, wait a minute, no, no, because I'm advanced they have to respect me, they have to do this, they have to do that.

No, no, no obligation. No obligation because there is nothing to gain from it so there's no need to follow it. So if you're not working within the system, no one has to deal with you like that.

You know what I'm saying? They're playing their game in the stadium there and somebody jumps over the side and goes running through the field. No one's under any obligation to deal with him as a member of the field. You understand? Because he's not taking any responsibility

on that field.

You understand? So it goes both ways. Of course, you know, the one way street is always our perfection in, you know, social, you know, very, you know, liberal and broad-minded in consideration of ourselves or a strict and, you know, conservative towards others, you know, like that. When one is above the direction of the Vedic ritualistic injunctions for attaining different allurements and is fully absorbed in transcendental thought, which means thought of the Supreme Personality of Godhead in devotional service, one is in the position called buddhi-yoga or samadhi, ecstasy.

Interesting. Buddhi-yoga or samadhi, ecstasy. So that means basically one's liberated.

So then here also then we're applying buddhi-yoga to the platform of bhava, you know, until one comes to that full absorption where one becomes prema. For a person who has attained this stage, neither the Vedic activities for realizing material enjoyment nor those for enunciation are applicable because they don't have to enjoy. If you want to enjoy, you have to follow the rules of enjoyment.

If you want liberation, you have to follow the rules of that. But they're already liberated because of Kṛṣṇa consciousness, so they don't have to follow any of those rules for that purpose. Now to set example, they may follow for preaching and that, and they may act as a madhyama and do like that, but for themselves they don't have to.

So if they don't follow anything, then it doesn't matter, but then that means they're not taking part in anything of the social situation. So basically speaking, you'll think they're crazy. So if you don't mind everybody thinks you're crazy, you know, then hey.

But if that bothers you, then you're obliged to follow the rules. Vṛtti. After hearing about the glories of the sthita-prabhya, one who has realized ātmā, Arjuna wants to know what the symptoms of such person are.

Lesson 2. The symptoms of such a spiritually situated devotee are significantly manifested by the following signs. Because you want to be clear about it, what it is in theory, and then how to actually appreciate it. Because that's Arjuna's point.

It's okay, now this is spiritual. What is someone situated like that? What do they look like? What do they do? So now 56.272. Big blocks on this section, right? 256. One who is not disturbed in mind even amidst the threefold miseries, or elated when there is happiness, and who is freed from attachment, fear, and anger is called a sage of steady mind.

Right? So we say, we're not saying, not disturbed amidst the threefold miseries. We're not saying elated, yeah, and elated where there's happiness. Because generally we'll say, yeah, we're not bothered by the material miseries.

So we might get to where we become quite stoic about that. But then when it's happy, then he

becomes elated. So it still means it's not balanced yet.

Because we generally look at the one side. Why is the material world so miserable? We don't look at it, hey, this hotel is great. Does that make sense? Okay, and then fear, anger, and attachment.

So attachment is your element, I'm the enjoyer. Fear is that I'm the controller. And then anger is when neither of them work.

Right? You're saying, I'm the enjoyer, that's your karma. I'm the controller, that's your jnan. And when neither of them work, then you take up anger, which is your Buddhism.

Right? So that's why the Mayavad fits so well everywhere. Because actually it's just Buddhism, it's anger. They present themselves as this fear, but actually it's anger.

You know, I mean, they take from, they lean more on the fear, but it's actually due to anger. They present it as they get rid of fear. Yeah.

But they neglect that. Yeah, but as you get rid of fear, yeah, by being angry. Yeah, exactly.

Yeah. Okay, nisthita-dir muni is always in Krishna consciousness. The word muni means one who can agitate his mind in various ways for mental speculation without coming to a factual conclusion.

Such a nice explanation. Not only that he has his own philosophy, you know, something glorious, something noble. Yes, the word muni means one who can agitate his mind in various ways for mental speculation without coming to a factual conclusion.

Yeah. It is said that every muni has a different angle of vision. Otherwise, you know, how does everybody, you know, so it's like every chef has his own uniqueness or every architect has his uniqueness or every musician or painter, you know, like that.

So he has his own uniqueness. And unless a muni differs from other munis, he cannot be called a muni in the strict sense of the term. So in other words, if your music sounds like someone else, then you're not really even a musician, right? You're just a copy artist, right? nisabhrishir yasyamatam nabhinna mahabharata vanaparva Three, three.

I shouldn't say the numbers. Oh, okay. So then they say the numbers out.

Okay. No, they follow authority, but they have to have their own kind of spin on it. Because you're speculating.

That's the whole point. So you have to be able to look at it from some different angle, come up with something new. Otherwise, you're not a muni.

You may be a scholar, but you're not a muni. No, but his different perspective is that it's based

on Krishna. So that means the muni aspect is supposed to be engaged in Krishna's service.

Ah, okay. So maybe that's why he used the word sthita-dhira muni instead of just muni or sthita-dhira. So in other words, just like the jnani is using intelligence, so he's using mental speculation, but he's not using it for Krishna.

Or the karmi is performing activities to get a result, but he's not doing it for Krishna. So therefore, you get the negative element. Is that what he's saying? Because I always remember in these is that he's the unique example, someone who's using it.

You know, like this morning we had our, how do you say, Beijing friend, that says, No, but Krishna doesn't follow the rules. He doesn't give an example. The rasa dance, and? You know what I'm saying? So he said that means all these, Sukadeva Goswami, this and that, but the idea is that he has a particular perspective that he uses, because others aren't generally called muni, because his is the pancharatra, like that, means devotional service in the pancharatric system.

So naish karma and pancharatra, that's specifically his angle, how he preaches. There's always that, that you're following the rules of the pancharatric system, and you're engaging your senses without attachment to the results. So he focuses on these two points.

So that's what he especially adds to the system, because the pancharatric system is attributed to Narguna. It was originally given by Krishna to Lord Brahma, but in time they're lost, so it's Narada Muni who again reintroduces them into the human society, like that. It means, you know, Brahma hasn't forgotten, but, you know, we have.

So when we say Narada pancharatra, it both means the singular, you know, pancharatric text called Narada pancharatra, and also means all the whole pancharatric text, because it has been received again from Narada Muni. So that puts him into the thing where he has the different angle of vision, but that angle is within Krishna consciousness. He just emphasizes that aspect.

So that's why yesterday was called Muni? Yes, like that. So Muni means someone who is, you know, his mind is always absorbed in contemplation, right? And it's not just contemplating something that someone else has given specifically, but it has some new presentation. So for the devotees, it's bona fide presentation, and for those who are not devotees, then it's just something unique within the realm of mental speculation.

So Gautama would be a Muni, because it's different, right? Vaisheshika, Kapila, Patanjali, your Jaimini, like that, Shankara, these would be, because they're different perspectives. You know, in your Western, you also have your people, when they talk philosophy or talk any of these things, they always bring up a few names. So these would be Munis, you know, like that.

I would probably refer to Plato and Socrates as Munis. Yeah, yeah, because it is different from the others, right? You know, one was true in his Muniism and got killed, and the other one was, you know, basically Muni, but, you know, a little more politically correct, like that. That's the only reason he survived.

But does he call Aristotle a Muni? No, because Aristotle is the one that got completely accepted by the, you know, the ordinary thought. You know, even so ordinary that I think it was, what was his name? Also with an A, I think. He combined the Catholic doctrine.

Aquinas. Aquinas, yeah. Aquinas.

That was Aquinas? He combined them to try to bring everything together, but it was too little, too late. It still didn't work. You know, Luther still won.

Is that, is that okay? Okay, so continue. Okay, so 3-1, 3-13, 1-1-7. So that would mean vanaparva, be the big parva, means as in the eighteen.

The 3-1-3 will be within the smaller parvas, and then the 1-17 would be the, excuse me, that would be the chapter and this would be the verse. But a sthita-dhira Muni, as mentioned herein by the Lord, is different from an ordinary Muni. The sthita-dhira Muni is always in Krishna consciousness, for he has exhausted all his business for creative speculation.

Because creative, you're just looking at it different ways, just for that's the fun, right? Rather than you're trying to, you're starting with authority and then trying to see how that authority applies. You know, in other words, it's the taste of coming up with these different, does that make sense? That's why you see when you're dealing with academics, that if you come up with something very intelligent, especially if it's a new angle, they appreciate it like anything. But as soon as you come to a conclusion, oh, that's it, they get offended.

Because then thinking stops. The point is, if you conclude, then you can't speculate. Then you can only contemplate what is actually the fact and try to apply it into your situation.

So you lose the taste altogether. So that's why within, both within the Vedic and the modern academy, that the speculative method can't have conclusion. So the more uniquely way you can come up with those speculations, the greater your held in esteem.

Because then it gives others, then they can, you know, they're not the Muni, but they can follow the same patterns and get their intellectual enjoyment out of it. Does that make sense? So he's exhausted all his business of creative speculation. He is called prasanta-nisesa-manorantara-stotra-ratna-43, or one who has surpassed the stage of mental speculations and has come to the conclusion that Lord Sri Krsna, or Vasudeva, is everything.

Vasudeva sarvam iti samahatma sudurlabha. He is called a Muni fixed in mind. So that's dita-dir Muni.

Means there's Munis, and then there's a Muni who's fixed in mind. Does that make sense? So Narada Muni would be a Muni who's fixed in mind, or Vyasadeva Muni who's fixed. So they're actually transcendental.

These other ones are either presenting themselves as such or couldn't care less about being

transcendental, just having a good time. How could we deal with someone who has a jnani tendency that is strong? Well, it depends upon if his jnana is simply the taste of the jnana, or it's just the path of yoga that he will best fit into. You know, there'll be a difference.

So it's just like here, the difference here is that, is this dita-dir or not? Means it is a jnana, so they like to contemplate the intellectual aspects. So therefore, all these technical points like given in Gita, these last chapters of how the modes are working and divine, they can contemplate that. So they would situate themselves within jnana yoga.

So it's the contemplation of the mechanics, metaphysical mechanics that will separate for them the material and spiritual. So it's a very, you know, approved path. But if it's just they like to think about this and that and so many things and just come up with different ways, that won't be very useful.

But the problem is because they're good at it and others aren't, they'll consider themselves superior and more intelligent, but they're just basically a disturbance. That's why I say, śruti-smṛti-pūrāṇādi. You don't follow that, you're just a disturbance.

So in such a case, it's just a matter of their intellectual and that means something to them. Then through that path, you show them how by contemplation they can realize the Lord. Does that make sense? But if it's not, then you just be pleasant and there's always something else to do.

That's why, I mean, of course, now it's just, oh, you know, like that, but otherwise before you'd have to pull it out and push the thing and boom, you know, so you can get a little bit more. The best with that is you have a monocle, so when you fall, you drop the monocle. Then they really know, oh, okay, something's going on, you know, so like that.

But otherwise in wristwatches, do that good. Or if you don't have one, you can always ask them what time it is on their watch and then you can, you know, like that. 257, yes.

It's always something to do with the numbers, right? You know, I mean, you could, you could. I mean, he's everything, so if you're looking at him as Brahman, as Paramatma, or as Bhagavan, you know, so the point is his conclusion means it actually connects to Krishna. If it doesn't connect to Krishna, it's not a conclusion.

Does that make sense? Yeah. So the thing is, is the reason if you conclude something, then you can't discuss it anymore, because then after a conclusion, what's the next step? What is the mind? What's the next step of the mind after a conclusion? Application. Application, right? After prayojana comes abhidhaya, right? Once it's touched on that, then it has to act.

That's what they don't want to do. They're mental speculators. Your armchair speculators, you know what I mean? Our chair, yeah, armchair speculators.

So you don't want to do something, you know, unless somebody has to push a button on the armchair that makes it, you know, gives you a massage or something like that. Then that might

be okay. Like that.

Or the remote for the television or something. Oh, now they have these universal remotes, right? You can turn on anything and off anything. You can increase the armchair speculator.

Is that okay? See, there's not a problem in someone's intellectual, and he looks at it from different angles. But the difference is he's not agitating his mind to try to get something. Like the senses, you agitate the senses.

The sense is just peaceful. You agitate it, right? And then, you know what I'm saying? You weren't thinking about eating and someone comes along, hey, you know, like this. And so then, you know, it's always like, you know, someone asks you, are you hungry? No, no, I'm not like that.

And then when they get out whatever it is they have, then it's kind of like, hmm. The senses get agitated, right? You know? So that's the thing. They agitate the mind to just get the taste of intellectualizing, right? But if the mind's intellectualizing for the purpose of understanding Kṛṣṇa, then that's not called mental speculation.

That's just called contemplation, right? Because you're starting with authority, then you're contemplating how does it apply in my life, meaning how I'm going to practically use it. But even if you're starting with authority, like the Vedic Munis, they'll start with authority, but they'll just contemplate it, but they don't want a conclusion, otherwise there's something to do. Yes? Sometimes it's bewildering for me because the teachings of Śrīla Prabhupāda are very straightforward.

And then the senior devotees, they kind of expand this. And then I've heard from two senior devotees, Śrīla Prabhupāda's disciples, their opinion on the same subject. And one said, it's a... It's a... I think he lost the leash.

Like another step away from Śrīla Prabhupāda. And another person said on the same thing, this is going to bring us closer to Śrīla Prabhupāda. And it's... Yes.

It means, that's why it means you're thoughtful. So you think about it and look at it. Will it actually, you know, what is the point there? So it's not a matter of bringing closer to Prabhupāda or farther away from Prabhupāda.

It's a matter of, like it says, associating with Prabhupāda through his instructions and then trying to apply them in our life. So in other words, that instruction, by those who are applying it and trying to advance in Kṛṣṇa consciousness... Oh, I see, it was that they're supposed to go this way instead of this way. So it wasn't, he got out of his cage.

Does that make sense? So in other words, that means you contemplate the element is, you know, what's the point? Why would it bring one closer? Why would it bring your father away? It's a matter of, you're close because you take the instruction and follow it. You apply it in your

life. So are they, you know, is there a correctness in that? You know, I mean, what's the point being made? Why would it bring you closer? Why would it take you farther away? We can say this is correct only because one says it's true... No, no, no, but that's a general thing.

Oh, you mean about what Prabhupāda says? No, it's... Because that's very clear. If someone says, well, Prabhupāda says here it won't work or it's a speculation or it doesn't apply now, then you can just take that and throw it out. But if it's a matter of, okay, Prabhupāda's saying this to apply it, we would apply it like this, and someone says, no, we would apply it like that.

Then it's a matter of seeing what's the active principle. Why, what's the context that they would be saying it? Because there may be some truth in, in this situation you'd use it like this and someone else is using a different situation. So you have to see what's the principle that's there, because the principle would be common, though the detail of application, because much of the time that's, that's physically the case.

Someone's applying it, you know, something happened in their family and someone else is applying it in something that they saw on the street. And so it's, it's the same principle but two different forms that they may not be seeing the difference there. Or it may be they understand it, but they're only giving you the example in that line.

So you just have to see what of that is working and so how to, how to deal with that. Does that make sense? So it's not that you have to take it as it is, but you take, or you do have to take it as it is, but what is the actual as it is is what you have to discern. So it comes back to drawing the principle to life.

Drawing the principle, yes, yes. So that's the whole idea of analyzing, is that the analyzation is, is so that we know how to apply it. Because you have the basic point, you just apply it.

But then in analyzing it, then you can see what, what is of substance and what's not. Right? Because you do have the element that the mind, the senses, you know, the fruit of the, sometimes they're tricky. So you just have to see within that there may be something, it's true on one level, but there's something else that we're missing.

So that's the idea of the analyzation, is that we can start to break down what it is that we're working with, so we can see that all aspects are consistent. You know, like the example I gave, that the authority is saying, just surrender to Krishna. Krishna is sarva-dharma, just give up everything and do, so you don't worry about your conditioned nature, this and that.

But the reason he's saying it is due to his own conditioned nature, that he's a manager, and you're not doing what he said, so that he has to adjust. So it's not that it's necessarily, no, the point is for Krishna. It's that he's a manager, and you're not falling into being able to be managed, so that doesn't work well with his conditioning.

So there and that, he's correct on the one, but he's incorrect that he hasn't considered his own conditioning. So because of that, it's just one conditioning against another, is that he's getting

his conditioning so he's comfortable, but the person whose conditioning wasn't addressed is not comfortable, and so they're not satisfied. Now he says, oh, they're just, you know, what do you call it, not satisfied, or what are these terms they use? I can't remember.

But, you know, that he's not sincere, and he's not, you know, he's not, like that, it's, no, he wants to engage his conditioning just as much as the authority wants to engage theirs. Right? But one has the facility, but the other doesn't, so it's not actually a balance. You know what I'm saying? But the principle that's being given there is true.

Right? So the one, by speaking it makes spiritual development, the other one, by trying to apply it, makes spiritual development. So spiritually a development, socially it falls apart. Right? You know, it means, there generally is not a concern that we're lacking in philosophy.

Right? Even generally the materialists will say, you know, if you've got philosophical questions, you come to the Hare Krishnas. We've got answers. But generally not very many people, either inside or outside, will say we have culture.

You know what I'm saying? So that's the weakness, is that we're not addressing that aspect. You know what I'm saying? So what I'm saying is there's a truth there, and of the true, it's spiritually correct. That's better than, let's say, someone who's a, you know, just, you know, is a Hindu, so it may be culturally correct, but not spiritually.

You know, the person wants to join Nobel, what about the family, you have duties to the family, you're the oldest son, this, that, blah. Materially it's correct. Socially it's correct.

And it's according to Shastra. But they've missed the spiritual conclusion of service to Krishna. Does that make sense? Not to the previous point, but you have an example, like, one senior devotee said about vegans, complete... Vegans.

Yeah, complete nonsense and all that stuff, you know, milk, and it's important, Shri Mataji said we should drink it, and milk products. Now the devotee would say, and it happened, that they say that we don't want to deal, to do anything with the unprotected cows. What about the unprotected women? What about the unprotected earth? You know what I'm saying? As much as you can do.

No, but it means all these others, so why only the cow, because human means all of the aspects. Because it's for, their point was that we don't take it for sense gratification. It's kind of... No, no, but I'm saying, but I'm saying on, it's a sense gratification, why would it be sense gratification if we offered it to Krishna? Why is engaging the senses in the Lord's service sense gratification? See, that's a misunderstanding of philosophy, it's actually impersonal.

You know what I'm saying? It's a nice sentiment, right? It's a nice sentiment, but the point what's being missed is that we don't have the influence to change it. It's not by me not drinking milk that the whole system changes. Because it's like this, you drink the milk, they milk the cows.

You know, you don't drink the milk, they eat the cows. You know what I'm saying? It's not that you're dynamically going to change the system. You understand? Now, if you want to change the system, start a go-shop.

Raise cows that are properly dog-raised. How many vegans do that? Right? Knock me out. That's the whole point.

It's simply a social perspective that gives them some meaning. Because if someone's a vegan, as a devotee, it means that's what we're talking about, right? If they're a vegan as a devotee, it's an issue that gives them something special to do in their life. So chanting their japa or worshipping the deity or book distribution or preaching is not very prominent for them.

So to give them something that they feel is connected to Krishna consciousness, you take up the vegan issue. You know, like you could take up the kids issue or the women's issue or, you know, some issue. Or, you know, not new issues, you know, the death issue.

You understand? It's just some issue that now you connect that to Krishna and then you feel you're doing some devotional service. But the point is, the devotional service is you've taken the milk of the cow, offered it to Krishna. So it's not just about us.

The cow gets spiritual benefit. So the point is, is that cow is going to be killed and eaten anyway. But now if you take its milk, offer it to Krishna, you get spiritual benefit.

That means next life it's a human being. Otherwise it's just going to be a human being. I mean, it'll be the human being who is eating the cow.

Right? And then the life after that it'll be the cow that's eaten by the human. It'll just go back and forth. But you do this, you do that, you break the cycle.

So that's spiritual. Now if you want to do further about it, open a go shop. Otherwise you just sit there and not take part in one, but not do something.

You know, so it's not necessarily you're doing something for the cows. You know what I'm saying? Because the point is, is it would be another thing if cows are just wandering around wild and because people are drinking milk, so they go out and catch those cows and that, and if nobody drinks the milk, they just put them back out in the forest. Right? You know what I'm saying? It's just like, let's say you have some kind of oar in the ground.

Because people are using it, therefore they dig it out of the ground. No one wants it, they don't dig it out of the ground, they let it sit there. No, they're going to eat the cows anyway.

You know what I'm saying? It's their culture to eat the cows. It's not that it's something, just a resource that just sits there and wanders around. And then because people want milk, you go out and catch them and milk them.

It's not like the, how you say, the buffaloes, I forget in which place, you know, where they make

the mozzarella. The original mozzarella was made from these kind of semi-wild buffaloes that they'd hang out in this area, and so they'd go out there and milk those buffaloes and make, but no, they're not their buffaloes, they just are out there. You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? So, it doesn't sound very good and it doesn't address the bile issue.

You know what I'm saying? But the point is, it's just funny how, going back on all the different things, the origin of that particular point goes back to Naan. Yeah, it means we were there and they were taking us on the tour. They came to the goshala and they had the milking machines.

And then they, you know, going on about that, because they have their own cows, their own milk and everything like that. And they say, you know, and so the thing goes through here and it has to happen, and I forget what it was. They had to be able to milk the cow in a certain amount of time, like one minute, thirty seconds or something like that.

Somebody asked, well, what happens if it takes longer? And then the guy who was doing the tour says, well, everybody likes their steak, don't they? Right? So that's the point. Is that, you know, you drink the milk, they milk the cow. You don't drink the milk, they eat the cow.

Right? So it's just a matter of they eat it today or they eat it tomorrow. That's all. So the point is, is as a devotee, it means if you're not a devotee, then it's a nice thing in that you're considering other living entities.

You're trying to elevate yourself. You're restricting your lifestyle, you know, based on some, how do you say, some element of pranamoy that's more elevated than Sanskrit, because their point of view is, no, you're just on the level of Sanskrit education. No, we're taking prasad.

Maybe when you take, you're engaged in Sanskrit education because you don't see the connection to Krishna, because you don't see the offering the milk to Krishna is a spiritual activity. But he'll say, no, but Krishna won't accept such thing. Why would he accept anything else? You know, in Holland, the vegetables, they put them out there, and when they're almost ready, they spray a gas, and the plants get scared.

So then they grow quicker to come to seed, because actually a cauliflower, if it grows more, it turns into seeds. You know, all the vegetables turn into seeds. So it gets ripe quicker.

So why would Krishna eat that? You know, why would Krishna accept, you know, the service of, you know, the husband, he doesn't deal with his wife very nicely, or his kids don't, you know, the kids, they're in kirtan, but Krishna won't accept it because he doesn't respect his parents, or, you know what I'm saying? We're in the material world. We're talking as if there's such a thing as a utopia. There isn't.

Is that, is that what you're saying? Yeah. And the funny thing, there's no cows in Shangri-La, are there? Would the same logic apply to wearing leather shoes? Yeah. But the point is, it's not that you need to wear leather shoes.

You could wear something else, but if it was useful, you'd use them. So you have no need, no need. Of course you do.

It develops the finer brain tissues, and because you're not drinking it, that's why you don't understand it. Cows are important. See, they're taking it that cow's important just on its own.

The cow's important because it gives milk. So the milk is what's very important, because that is what's used in Brahminical culture. You know what I'm saying? There isn't an alternative to the milk, but there is an alternative to the shoes.

You know what I'm saying? But if you were in a situation where you had to wear, let's say you're working on a construction site, you know, like that, and you have to have the steel toes and all these things, and there's all kinds of, you know, sharp and nasty, then leather would be the thing you would be required to wear. So you would be required, so you can't use something else, you know. But, you know, for just walking around on the street, they can use anything, you know.

Does that make sense? But milk is required for, this means it's offered to Krishna. The point is, it's offered to Krishna. They've come across the thing that, well, no, Krishna won't accept it.

But that's the same line as, oh, you know, you've done this, Krishna won't accept it. Krishna says, you know, in the previous verses, still sadhus. Does that make sense? So this is not a moralistic point of view, because otherwise, what is, if we're talking dharma, what's the rule on that? They're not, they're talking prana-moha, pure.

You know what I'm saying? It's a nice idea, just like any of the New Age stuff is nice. Prabhupada said, if you're not a devotee that is New Age, you're a step above someone who doesn't think at all. But for a devotee to step back to New Age, that's a step down.

You know what I'm saying? Because all these ones, you know, jumping up and down about the vegan and all that, they're all in cities. They're so concerned. Why don't they move out to the farm? They need help on the farm to take care of the cow.

They're not moving out there. If all the vegans were on the farms, then they might have a stand. But they're all city slickers.

And probably if you check, half their bodies have got tattoos all over it also. What about that? God doesn't like tattoos. So then, now what? You know what I'm saying? The earlobe, that's the place to pierce.

Like that. Women will do the nose. They make a point in the scriptures, you just hear about the yogis in the forest eating fruits and roots.

They don't need milk. So, go out to the forest and live on fruits and roots. Quit being such a hypocrite.

Often it doesn't mention milk, though. But they all have cows out there. They all have milk.

Otherwise, how are they doing yogis? They also go and beg. They also go and beg. They also just glean from the field.

Or they what people think. So the point is then, live that lifestyle. Don't just take part of it.

You know, that's the point. They only take the part they want. So, therefore, every vegan, according to this rule, should move out to the forest.

So since you're out in the forest, take care of the cows. Yeah, yeah. That's also there.

I mean, there's so many rules of vanaprastha. So if you want to get into a discussion of that, that's another thing. But don't just take what you want.

Which? Is Vedic Bhagavata or Vedic? Is vegan Bhagavata or vegan? Bhagavata or Vedic? Is that your question? No, I mean prasada. Prasada. It's Bhagavata.

So it's above the rules. Munis, they eat leaves. Some of them.

Munis ate leaves. Yes, like Narada. Narada Muni eats leaves.

They just go living in the forest and live on leafy leaves and things like that with a little water. But do you know what leaf means? Spinach is a leaf. Yes, or a leaf of a tree.

Could be, but the point is... What is the point? What are you trying to get to? What are you actually trying to say? Because do you actually understand? Or you've just heard from one place that they ate leaves? No, it's that... I've only heard when they're doing an austerity that... Dhruva Maharaj ate the leaves... No, not the leaves. He ate the berries off of a banyan tree. And that was only, I think, in the second month.

And after that then he stopped eating. And then he also then stopped breathing. So are we going along that line? No, no, no.

You know what I'm saying? No, but I'm saying, do you know something about the livestock? Because Manu doesn't mention anything about leaves. Not one time does he say leaves. So it's not part of the vrata.

It's not part of vanaprastha. So what I'm saying is devotees catch one thing from one place and then take it and extrapolate it into another place that it doesn't have any connection. So all it is, is we're picking and choosing from wherever we like.

Because like what I said, is that if we're so concerned about why only the cows, why not the whole environment? Why are we living in the city? And they say, well, you know, Bhaktisiddhanta wants to preach, so therefore he's in the city. Bhaktisiddhanta says that he couldn't care less about a vegan. It's the last thing on his list.

When the devotees told him, oh, but if we go and preach in that place they only drink alcohol and eat meat. And then he looked at them and said, I thought like that 10,000 lifetimes ago. He says, if that is all there is to eat and that's nothing else and you want to preach, then you eat that and preach.

But nowadays we don't have to think, oh, so we can eat meat. No, because there's plenty else to eat. Everywhere you go there's something.

Like now those places have potatoes and cabbages. You know, might have a lot of gas, but hey. The occasional carrot.

You understand? So the point is, these things are issues, they're social issues. They're not Krishna consciousness. That's the point we're making.

Because this is an analytical study, so that's what we're dealing with. This is not a social study. Social study is in the afternoon.

This is an analytical study that the inspiration for it may be based on an aspect of Krishna consciousness, but their drive to do it is purely social. It's a social element of ethics. So it doesn't even come to the platform of dharma.

Dharma, cows give milk, that's their dharma. They're giving milk anyway. So now if you take that milk and offer it to Krishna, they get benefit.

Because they're not going to offer it themselves. That's your business. Now, in taking that milk, you're supposed to deal nicely with them.

You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? So we have to be able to see a little bit wider. If we're only dealing on the material platform, then they have a strong point. But because we're dealing with the spiritual, then... Because otherwise, how do you develop the finer brain tissues? Prabhupada used the milk, and the cows weren't in any better or worse condition in the 60s than they are now.

In fact, they probably kill them a little nicer now than they did back then. Because there's so many movements about that. There was a whole thing in Australia where they showed a movie of how the Australian cows were killed in Malaysia.

And it caused a riot in the country. They weren't worried that they got killed. They just didn't want them killed like that.

They should be killed on our own soil. Then we can go there and let the local villagers deal with the unsophisticated deal. One of our labourers, when we were shifting campuses, then there was a bunch of trees.

And they said, so what about the trees? We can move the trees. I said, they're too big, they may die. He looked at me and said, let them die on our land.

A loyal labourer? Huh? Loyal labourer. Yes, loyal labourer. He says, why should another department get them? We grew, planted and grew the trees.

Does that make sense? So in other words, the issues have some validity on a social level. But ultimately they don't. Because it's God's creation.

So the point is, the creation is supposed to be used for the Lord. So milk is used in service to the Lord. Now, that they're not dealing with the cows properly, that's an issue to deal with.

But the point is, milk is supposed to be offered. You know what I'm saying? Otherwise, if we made a rule, no one can come to the temple and render service to the deity who doesn't have an idea. If there's not two parents in the family, we won't accept any service from any kids.

Or from the single parent. Or if they were married, we won't accept. Because then socially they're not going to be on that balanced level.

So they're not going to have that wonderful, you know, floating through the fields of marigolds, or the butterflies and the rainbows and all that. And so Krishna won't accept their service because there'll be some distraction and distress. If we want to take the pure principle and apply it, then we'd have to go through... There'd be a few families here in Mayapur who can render service, and a couple of brahmacharis and like that.

But that's because we have so many thousands of devotees. But if you go to some place, then you might have nobody who can render any service. Cows give milk on a daily thing.

It's what they do. Yeah, that's what I'm saying. That's the point.

The principle is the same. If it's a matter of if there's some distress in the person's life, and therefore we won't accept anything from them, who would be there to... So if the cow is distressed in giving milk, and we won't accept their milk, we accept the milk because the cow gets better. We're not accepting the milk because we really like the dairy farmer.

You know, Joe's a really great guy, you know. I don't know. You understand? The point is cows.

The point is milk. You know what I'm saying? What we're trying to do is get it where we can differentiate these different elements, because what happens is there's an intellectual, but the mind catches one area and then mixes it up in there. So the emotion and the intelligence... No.

Be able to analyze it first. If you can't analyze it, how do you know if the mind is choosing the right thing? But as soon as we mention it, the mind just jumps in. No, but... Then how do you know it's right? You know, because the point is, if it was so important, then you don't think Prabhupada would have said, don't drink the cow's milk because they don't deal with it nicely, only drink if it's on our farms.

He couldn't have said that. You know what I'm saying? Yes. Yes, so that's the whole point, is that how is it now they've got the spiritual angle and they're doing the right thing and everybody

else isn't.

No, it's just a matter of, you know, they were a goth or something before, and, you know, society and this and that, you stand on your box and yell and scream, and so now it's just what they can do inside the moment, it's just engaging their mundane-ness, their alt-ness, you could say. You know what I'm saying? I've heard the argument from Hindus is that these non-Vedic, you know, Jersey cows, their milk is actually fourth class, it's worse than buffalo or goat's milk, it can actually have a detrimental effect. That is bad.

Who's proven that? Who has proven that? They say that, because what it means is, but if you're going to go by that, then they're not even, who's saying that? Are they, you know, born in a, you know, like a Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya family, practicing in India? Are they? The person who's saying that. That's what I'm saying. They'll say that, but no devotees will use that one.

Because if they do, then according to the same philosophy, they can't do devotional service, because you can't cross the ocean, you can't do all these different things. You know what I'm saying? So the point is, that's what Prabhupada said, you know, if you're monosamhita on its own, not connected to the Lord, according to Manu, we're mlecchas and yavanas, so we have nothing to do with Manu, so don't quote Manu. Does that make sense? Yeah, so that's the point, is that we'll pick and choose what we want from where, and put it together, and it seems very nice, but this is what he's saying, agitating the mind for mental speculation.

But the conclusion doesn't have a solid basis. They'll say that, but those right-wing guys aren't scientists anyway, so how do they know it has a detrimental effect? You know, according to them, they're pigs. You know, they're not cows.

You know, like that. But then, according to that, we're probably half-pig also, by all the different medicines and drugs that are going on now anyway. So therefore, if we're half-pig and we're drinking pig's milk, it can't be all that bad.

Should we use pigs as internal organs to transplant the genes? Yeah, yeah. That's the closest thing. Yeah, yeah.

That's the whole point. I'm not sure if that would work if you had an actual human, right? So what does that mean? Right? Because remember, an animal farm, who became the bureaucrats? The pigs, right? So then, you know, the bourgeois society is a bunch of pigs, so therefore it matches. You know what I'm saying? So don't worry about all that.

But at least there, they're basing it on some Shastra point, so at least it has a little more piety. Because they are drinking milk from, if the cow is, you know, one of the Indian breeds, then they'll drink that. And they're not worried how it's taken care of.

You know, that's not the reason. They'll also support goshalas, but it's not necessarily the cow that they're drinking the milk from comes from one of those goshalas. You know what I'm saying? So this other is just a blanket.

You know, you don't take any milk. Because I guarantee you, if you have one of those hardcore vegans, right, and I come up with a glass of milk from one of our cows and put it in front of him and say, drink it, there's a good chance he won't. Because their principle is we don't take dairy products.

Not that we don't take dairy products that are like that. Because there is available that are. You know, the guys around here, their cows are up here, you know? So are they drinking this milk when they come to Mayapur, they drink milk? You know? It's right there.

They're staying there in Bombay and there's a cow around the corner. The guy keeps it outside his house. He drinks it.

So what's wrong with that? Well, there's empty garbage on his head. So are you. You're breathing garbage.

You know? What does it do to your brain at, you know, 30,000 feet, you know? Think of all the, you know, you're up there, but what about, you know, you're close to all the radiation that it does to your brain, like that. So therefore, that's why you can't understand why it's useful. But why is it garbage? He's taking care of it.

You can't say that his cow that he's taking care of and milking is the one that's wandering around on the street. You don't make a business out of one's wandering around on the street. That's somebody's cow and they get a liter and a half out of it a day.

But they drink it themselves. So you don't have to worry. But this guy that's going to give it to you, it means he's feeding the cow.

You know what I'm saying? So will they take that? So that means that all the vegans, you know, when they visit India, should be drinking milk. Will they? No. Because it's an issue.

It's a lifestyle. It's an identity. It's not devotional.

That's the bottom line. Like that. Because they'll say not to take it, but you don't see any movement by the vegans to support cow protection.

That they're putting their money and their effort and their intelligence how to make our Goswamis work. Like that. One or two maybe.

But they have the tendency, they take care of cows and stuff like that anyway, whether they were a vegan or not. But most of the ones that jump up and down, they're not about to. You know what I'm saying? And if they're young, take them a little more seriously than if they're old.

Because the old ones can't digest it anyway. So, therefore. But if they're young, then they could.

On the previous point, we were saying how we have philosophy but no culture. The Hindus have culture but no philosophy. So, is it fair to say that we have a tendency to not apply the

philosophy whereas the Hindus have a tendency to misapply the philosophy? No, because if you're not worrying about the philosophy, you're not misapplying.

We will tend to speculate. They will tend to be sentimental or fanatic. That's the weakness.

So, that is tradition. Yeah, tradition they do it so they don't know why. So, when their children ask them why, they can't explain.

So, if they have a good relationship, their children to some degree follow. But if they don't have a relationship, then they won't follow at all. Like that.

Well, we tend to speculate as his previous question. It's like you have completely different answers. The problem is that it's not two different answers on the philosophy.

It's two applications in the culture. Philosophically, there's very rare there's any difference between the two. But in culture, where you apply it, that's where... So, that's the speculation.

Because if you have philosophy without religion... Because the religion defines how you apply philosophy. Like that. Yes.

Oh, OK. Yeah, yeah. It means the same point can have so many different angles in it.

Yeah. Does that make sense? Yeah. So, it's not that there's not some valuable element in any of these various points.

The point is whether that's actually the best position to take for serving in Prabhupada's mission. Exactly. You know, in other words, we do something because it pleases Krishna, not because of any other consideration.

I saw, even in the Bhagavad Gita, Krishna is explaining the opinion of different sages. Yes. And he said, that is my opinion.

Yeah, and that is his opinion. So, what the sages are saying are all correct. Yes.

But then there is what will please him as a person. Yes. Because the others are elevating.

So, that's the point is that when we say here, we give up all those different things of penance and austerity and these different things. Those are... that they are for a material benefit or for some kind of elevation. You know, either materially or spiritually.

So, all that's given up by to follow just what's nice for Krishna. Does that make sense? That we need to we need to accept this conclusion for ourselves. Yes.

We accept the conclusion, then we can contemplate it and try to apply it. It's when we don't accept the conclusion and we contemplate it, then we're going to come up with all kinds of... Either we just have fun or we come up with something weird. Or both.

Yeah. Double drop it, right? In the... 257. In the material world, one who is unaffected by whatever good or evil he may obtain, neither praising it nor despising it, is firmly fixed in perfect knowledge.

So, the other is that he means that not disturbed in mind. So, here is he's unaffected by... You know, the one is the concept of it or just the people... But here is that it actually has, you know, some force upon one's existence, but it doesn't doesn't bother you. So... And you're not praising it or despising it.

The other one is just you're ignoring it. Okay. But you might, you know, talk about... It doesn't bother you in the situation when you talk about it to your friends, you know.

So, you didn't get involved but you still talk about it like that. Okay. Those who are fixed in Kṛṣṇa consciousness are not affected by dualities.

There is always some upheaval in the material world which may be good or evil. One who is not agitated by such material upheavals, who is unaffected by good and evil, is to be understood to be fixed in Kṛṣṇa consciousness. Yes.

If this is because of the practice of Kṛṣṇa consciousness or because of the knowledge of being in Kṛṣṇa consciousness? Means of being unaffected. Yeah. It would be both because your practice is based on the knowledge.

And by... When you have knowledge, contemplate it and then apply it, then that contemplation will make your practice better. And by the practice it will make your understanding better. So, both.

Yeah, both go together. Yeah, that... Because that's the potency. It's knowledge and activity.

As long as one is in the material world, there is always a possibility of good and evil because this world is full of duality. So, it's always possible. So, if we want that perfect world and then only, then we can engage in devotional service.

Because as I said, why just the cows? Of course, cows are very important. But what about Brahmins? Are they worried about that the Brahmins aren't being supported and all that? Somebody just did somebody's marriage the other day. How much did he get? You know? They give him a thousand rupees or they give him lunch and figure that's good enough.

Like that. The outside pundits, like you go to Bombay and you do some of these things, they'll get like 50,000 rupees. So, are devotees giving that? That would be supporting the Brahmins.

So that here's this poor Brahmin just going through eking out an existence here. So is that you're taking you're letting him do ritual for him and he's being exploited by everybody else. No one else is taking care and recognizing position.

Wouldn't that be improper that you have him do something for you? He's not a happy Brahmin.

Does that make some sense? So it's it's we're only worried about the one but what about continuing that? You know what I'm saying? So we continue those things like that. It's like you have to protect Brahmacharis so that means education.

So are they being educated? Are we fighting for that? Old people are we fighting that they're taken care of and comfortable? You know what I'm saying? So someone only fights and they don't really care about the others. So to take such an extreme stand on the one and it not be balanced with everything else then it is over-exaggerated. So the world is always going to have a problem so you make the best you can.

Means if you know okay, this cow's nicely taken care of this one's not I'll get the milk from the one that's nicely taken care of. It's because it's based on economics that not every movement have a lot of old people so let's protect the old people. No, no, no.

It's because the old people are old and they're in positions of authority so they're saying let's protect the old people. Young people aren't worried about the old people anymore than they were when those same old people were young. Because there were old people then and they didn't care.

I'm telling you. Is it that they don't get involved? It doesn't it doesn't it doesn't in other words unaffected means you continue your Krishna consciousness. Yeah.

Because in other words like let's say everything's going nice everybody likes you so it's wonderful being in Mayapur and the spiritual world and everything like this and then something goes wrong or somebody doesn't notice you in this and then you're all grumpy and then you don't you know that's what it means. If you're still grumpy and continue with Krishna consciousness No. You said it says what if you're grumpy but still continue with your Krishna consciousness then that means your mother trained you well.

That's that's that's because everything's going well. But one who is fixed in Krishna consciousness is not affected by good and evil because he is simply concerned with Krishna who is all good absolute. Right? So he's all good absolute.

The problem is the material world is a difficulty. So the reason we do something it says if we don't have any obligation that means we don't have any obligation to any of these so we don't have a material obligation to the cows it's a matter of we're doing service to Krishna. So then that automatically means the benefit is there.

So if we can't render material benefit then at least we can get spiritual. So it should be they go out and buy as much milk as possible and offer as much milk and distribute it and since you can't how much milk can you do so they should cook it all into burfi, right? And then distribute it because that way then they can buy thousands of litres a day and just do it. That would be a better thing.

In Australia we used to do a collection amongst the dairy farmers. Initially we thought okay

these are pious people then we realised they're just businessmen. So we found the best pick was when the baby calves had just been born and were being stacked up the front gate to be taken away to be slaughtered because then the people had extra money.

That was when we did the best collection. We would go there at that time. They were taking advantage of the... Now that's awesome.

Always practical. Not mental. I don't know if there's any Australian vegans in Australia.

There are some. We got a phone call from a vegan. He said, can you tell me where I can get a supply of your vegan quality milk? Oh, okay.

So as long as there are some like that. But generally the authorities are always behind on that. He will only take dairy products from protected places.

Oh, okay. Yeah, yeah. The point is somebody who is looking for it and is taking then that's fine.

So they're being selected. That's nice. Somebody eats organic or not.

That's the whole point. But to say that it's not organic so we won't offer it but that's all that's available. Then the point is how do you serve Krishna? Oh, okay.

Yeah. Having here heaven and earth or whatever when Krishna conscious is. Notice there was no mention of goodwill to man.

So where it comes from because devotees generally have this tendency that if we become Krishna conscious then there should be no problems. Yes, yes. Where is it coming from and does Hindus or whatever they're also affected by this? Oh, everybody is.

No, it means that the reason we turn to religion is because it will give it will give economic development. So if you're very religious then there'll be always constant continual economic development. Relief from distress.

Yeah, relief from distress because you do good work you get a good result. So that's any religion will have that problem. That's why the point is always being made about ritual because this applies to any religion.

Does that make sense? That's why we say Krishna consciousness is the actual point. You know, so what was that? You know, so if if you define Hindu by one who follows the practices you know follows the practices of the Veda then we're Hindu by culture but we're not Hindu by philosophy we're Vaishnava. Does that make sense? So the thing is is that anybody looks like that even the common person thinks if I'm good I'll be more prosperous than if I'm bad.

Does that make sense? So that's that's just the natural fruitive fruitive element. Does that make sense? Yeah, that's interesting whoever comes to Krishna consciousness they all have this utopian idea. Yeah, yeah.

So that's why these things are given is that means things will be better on one level but it doesn't mean that the material world is going to get better because it's still the material world. It still can only be so good because it doesn't have anything for the soul. Because even if you get all the facilities to be perfect it's still there's going to be anxiety it's still going to be a problem.

We only think that no, if it's perfect then I'll be happy but nobody's ever come across it. That's Prahlad Maharaj's point, Shukhi Sukhat that we've we've heard about the happiness no one's ever had it. That's why it says you know what was it? That's the one you'll become what was that one? Oh yeah.

When your intelligence is passed out of the dense forest of delusion you shall become indifferent to all that has been heard and all that is to be heard because people will still tell you no, you'll be happy here. Like that. But that's it people have only heard about it.

Who's gotten it? You know what I'm saying? You know people will say oh this is this person this was great that was great but if you look at the person's life it wasn't necessarily you know you know they had some money or they had some position or they had some influence they had some so we think that's great but if you look at it then it's not actually very great. So what we're actually being attracted to are Krishna's qualities. Does that make sense? The qualities that His that are manifest through the you know the cultivating Brahman that there's a form and an activity that is able to shine you know allow that to shine we're attracted to that but otherwise it's not the form it's not that it's Krishna's potency so there's nothing actually attractive here it's just Krishna's attractive.

So even if literally everything's perfect it's still be dissatisfied because it's Krishna who's the attractive element So we'll only be satisfied when we appreciate it's Krishna who's important. It's not that, oh yes, no, we have the perfect situation, the perfect things for the cows and they're the perfect milk and everything perfect, then it will be wonderful. No, it's still, it's still about Krishna.

Why would that natural, why would, let's say, an organic, you know, thing be better than something that's not? We'll say, oh, do the health like that, or someone more subtle, no, but, you know, the consciousness and this and that, but is that the real point? The point is, is that, you know, God made the creation, it works in its natural form, so therefore organic is just the way God's, you know, has made the universe to run, so organic is better simply because that's the way God likes it to run, but that's not why we're saying it's better, you know, because it's following God's laws, because then that means the authority is someone other than us. No, it's because it's good for health, you know, like if you say, you know, why is it Sikha? If you say just Krishna likes them, it's, no, no, I mean, why do we really have Sikha? You know what I'm saying? So it's always like that, when you get down, yes, in the Arctic, you know, this is the fire and this is the earth and this is the water, so all the five elements and people, okay, now I understand what Arctic's for. No, it's there to please Krishna.

Krishna just likes Arctic. Now if there's other explanations, nice. You know what I'm saying? But it's always got to be down to the little, you know, so therefore in that, then what kind of water, you know, we use? Yeah.

Maharaj, can that feeling of perfect in Tokyo come from the soul, which is such a tremendous thing? Yeah, it means, what they're talking about here, this Stita, dear Muni, for him the world's perfect, because it's just all about Krishna, everybody is all devotees of Krishna, just whether they realize it or not, so he's living in the perfect world. We're the ones that have the problem. Because if you want the world itself to be perfect, it'll never be perfect.

You know what I'm saying? You know, it'd be like, let us say, should a house have a bathroom in it? That means as a standard facility. Is it good to have, you're living in a place, is it good that there's some toilet facilities? It should be outside. Okay, but whatever, like that.

But should there be a toilet included in your sphere of living facilities? Okay, now, what if we take just the toilet, and then we try to make that the total sphere of our activities, and we want it to be perfect? Then we've got a Chinese kitchen. Yeah. Maybe they are ahead, right? They're thousands of years ahead of everybody else.

Yeah, so, you understand here? That's what we're trying to do. We're trying to take a toilet, you know, and make it into perfection. You know? So it's a gold-leaf toilet.

Yes. Yes. Because it can be perfect.

Its perfection is being able to become Krishna conscious. That's the perfection of the material world. So if we're looking for perfection, that's it.

But it's not to be found within the system. The system is designed to be imperfect as far as making one happy. It's designed that way.

Maya only will give you a little bit of happiness so that you will continue to work. Because if everything was absolutely nothing, then everybody would be sitting around, be like one of those, you know, really melancholy, you know, how you say, film noir kind of things. You know, like that, and everything's dark, and blah, blah, blah.

Like this, you know, like that kind of a thing, no? But that means she gives you some inspiration. Just a little bit. And then you're working really hard, you know.

Does that make sense? Yeah, that's how it works. You know how you say? A guy's just about ready to give up, completely finished like that, hasn't been able to make things work for months and all that. Just as he's about to give up, she'll give him one smile.

That'll keep him busy for another few months. So that's how it works. Because otherwise, can you imagine having a prison that's full of discontented prisoners? What a problem that is.

But if everybody's satisfied being there, hey, it works really easy. So you want to keep

everybody busy. Right? No? Yeah.