

20130225 Apasampradayas p2

GURU PARAM PARAGHATU SADHUPADESHASYA The prefix sam indicates connection, while the stem is a cognate of pradhana, source. In the fourth chapter, connection, so in other words, connection to the source, that's the whole idea is that sampradaya means that you're connected to the source, right? So apasampradaya means it's not connected to the source, right? So that's the whole point, is that something has gone wrong, so there's no connection. Do they consider themselves apasampradaya? Do they consider themselves apasampradaya? Probably good chance no, just like criminals never consider themselves criminals.

Mayavadis call themselves mayavadis. Yeah, they call themselves mayavadis. Yes, sahajiyas call themselves sahajiyas.

Yeah, it means most of these, these are their names. Jadgosais means here, these are the kind. Jadgosai, smartas, they do, that's what they call themselves.

That's their names, you know, just like, just like, how you say, America, in America they call themselves Americans, you know, but in other places that does not necessarily have a good connotation. So, you know, ah, those Americans, really they call themselves Americans? I mean, that wasn't just, you know, a bad name for them and all that. So, in other words, these are their names.

But so apasampradaya just means not connected to sampradaya. They don't consider themselves actually in a sampradaya, right? Because they're coming in this line, you know. Prakriti sahajiyas, so they have their line of, ah, what do you call it? Of, of, ah.

Non-connection. Yes, of non-connection. They have their non-connected, connected.

In other words, there's a, there's a definite sampradaya connection to their founder. Problem is, is between their founder and the actual sampradaya, that's where the problem comes in. Right? And then within that, then they're properly practicing all the bogus teachings of the, of their, head of their line.

Right. Is that, does that make sense? Yes? Okay, so, yes. So they all have, ah, specific, ah, heads of the line, or? Yeah, yeah.

No, there's someone who started it. And nobody say they, that they go back to, like, Chaitanya Mahaprabhu, or? No, no, they'll all say they go back to Chaitanya Mahaprabhu. So, so they'll have their bogus? Yeah.

Okay. Yeah, yeah. Okay.

They'll, they'll all have their, their line like that. And they'll all consider that they're all nicely connected. Right? But the problem is, is they're not exactly what you'd call nicely connected.

Oh. Like that. You know, that's the thing.

See, if you cast Goswamis, just because you're born in the family, and then you consider yourself, ah, Goswamis, right? It means here, between Jada Gosai and Smarthas, they're, they're both considered, they're both Brahmins. But here, the, the Smarthas just means they're Brahmins, coming in that line of Brahmins, following the brahminical practices. So it's a Vedic line, right? Problem is, is they've missed the meaning of the Vedas, right? Means, in other words, their practices are generally exact.

But they don't know why they're doing it. That's the thing. But, you know, they're situated in goodness, they have a sense of duty, so they're doing it, but they really don't know.

So there's no, you don't have the spiritual potency, right? Does that make sense? There'll be, brahminical potency will be there, but it's not on the level of the Vaishnava brahminical potency. Because they don't know why they're doing it. Right? Well, the cast Goswamis means, you had at the time of the six Goswamis, they each established temples.

And so the temple worship was going on by Grihastha brahmins. So the children of those Grihastha brahmins, they consider that we're the Goswamis there. So let's say Gopal Bhatt Goswami at Radha Ramana.

So those brahmins who were taking care, their children would consider we're the Goswamis, we're the Pajaris, and as it goes down. So that's still an unbroken line, you know, from that time. And so they'll consider that they directly represent Gopal Bhatt Goswami because they're born in that family of the Pajaris.

They don't actually have a, it means in other words, the lineage is from birth, but they don't have a birth connection to Gopal Bhatt Goswami. But you know, so that's why there's the bogus thing, because why it's so special. They're Pajaris of the deity.

Right? So that's special. But why do they think that they represent Gopal Bhatta? Right? They're taking care of the worship. But then the point is just because you're born in the family doesn't mean that you're qualified.

You have to become qualified. Like, let's say, both parents are lawyers. So the child is born.

It doesn't make him automatically a lawyer. Right? He has to become qualified. Though, because the parents are lawyers, they'll be talking about it, living that lifestyle, he'll very easily become one.

But unless he becomes one, you can't call him a lawyer. So the point is just because you're born in a Smarta family or a Kash Goswami family doesn't mean that automatically you're a Brahmin or a Goswami. You have to qualify.

But they take it that simply by birth. So in the same way, because that's their qualification, that's

everybody else's qualification too. You're not born in a Brahmin family, so you never can be a Brahmin.

Do you understand? Because it's all just by birth. Because if they take it by qualification, then they would have to look at, okay, these persons not born in a Brahmin family, they actually have brahminical ability. And those born here in these Goswami or Kash Goswami families, they're not actually qualified, so they should be reidentified as someone else.

But because it's a social prestige, then they don't actually look at it in that way. Does that make sense? Then you have prakriti sahajiya. So prakriti is material, and sahajiya means they make it easy.

They bring the spiritual down to the mundane platform, and therefore it becomes very easy. Sahaj means easy, like that. So they're cheap pseudo devotees.

Gauranga nagaris, rasa-bhaktas, they make Lord Caitanya, who's come as a devotee of Krishna, they make Him into Krishna. It means we understand, no, He's Krishna, but He's in the mood of the devotee serving Krishna. They make Him into the nagara.

Nagara means the enjoyer. So in other words, it's like Krishna's the enjoyer in Vrndavana. They make Gauranga into the enjoyer in Navadvipa.

So it's rasa-bhaktas. That's not why He came, but that's there. Sakhi-bhakti and chudahari.

Rasa-lila imitators. So sakhi-bhakti means you have all these men, and they're dressed up, because they're sadhus. So they have the little beards and all that.

They don't dress very well. But they haven't dressed up in saris. They sometimes have little pearls in their nose and stuff like that.

They're a little weird when you see it, because they've got a little bit of a beard and wearing a sari. It's a little strange. But it's kind of like, oh, we're in the rasa-lila, and so they meditate like that, so they dress up.

So it's kind of cheap. Similar to sahaja? Yeah, yeah, but it's just a different line. Because the sahajiyas, they take it as the body's not but through meditation, but at the same time, there's not really a great difference.

It means they're all bogus, like that. It's just different varieties of bogus, like that. Atavadi, too great, means everybody's, the guru's great, everyone's great, like this, but too great in that they become so great that it becomes like deification, so then they don't actually follow nicely, like that.

Sufi, Tantric, Vaishnava syncretists. Ooh, that was a good one. Okay.

Oh, Sufi, Tantric, that's Vaishnava syncretists. So they've somehow or another taken Sufism and

the Vaishnavism and mixed. From what I understand, the sahajiya is a mix between Buddhism and Vaishnavism, and this one is between the Sufi Muslims and Vaishnavism.

There's also Nidanidhi, Vaishnava Buddhists, syncretists. Okay, so another, yeah. And then Kartabhaja, worshippers, the guru is God.

They decided guru is God, like that. Basically, you could say half the planet follows this sampradaya, like that. Maybe unknowingly, but that's the problem.

Okay. And so, yes, so there's a great heritage here of so many lines there. So it's just all the different ways that Vaishnavism can become distracted from what it's actually supposed to be.

Introduction. Okay, we want to, okay. In the fourth chapter of Bhagavad-gita, Lord Krishna declares himself to be the original source of the transcendental science of bhakti-yoga.

And he confirms that one is connected to this knowledge only through guru-parampara. In the vocabulary of Western religious traditions, sampradaya really has no exact equivalent. One might be attempted to employ orthodoxy, but as a noted German Sanskritist has pointed out, this word really applies to matters of doctrine, not practice.

So the thing is this here, it's the practice. It means you're trying to point out now, oh, not who, who, who's which one. No, this is it, that's you.

No, no, no, that wasn't you. Oh, the paper, not the question. Okay.

Okay, so here orthodoxy, it generally means it's the doctrine. So it's not necessary the practice, right? Because it means, depending on where it is, it may mean a practice, but basically in the Western. Because Western means, technically means the Judaic or the Islam, you wouldn't count it as Western.

Basically Christianity comes into Western. You know, the others are considered more of an Eastern, like that. So then there it's a doctrine, not a practice, because there is not necessarily a specific practice, like that.

Admission into a sampradaya does not only depend upon a theoretically correct grasp of Krishna's teachings. The candidate must practically demonstrate his learning through strict adherence to the purified lifestyle, ācāra, set down by great saintly teachers, ācāryas. Because, and technically also here, even saying, because this is also giving some space here, to even say that it does not depend only upon a theoretically correct grasp of Krishna's teachings.

Because technically, unless there is that element of devotion, there won't be technically correct grasp. Right? You might have some areas here and there, but it's not enough to put it together. You know what I'm saying? Going from knowledge to realization.

Yeah, just like, let's say, you know how to cut, okay, cut things into cubes, and you know how to measure things in a cup. So that may be correct, but it doesn't mean that you know how to

cook the recipe. Like that? Does that make sense? So it's not that just because there's one thing in common, that doesn't mean they have the whole thing.

That's why Bhaktivinoda Thakur, if you're looking at it from that broad kind of, how do you say, perspective, then there's elements in everything that's going on that's correct, because you're dealing with jivas. Jivas have an inherent nature, right, of service to God, you know, of knowledge. But because that's covered by the modes of nature, depending upon the modes of nature, it comes out differently, right? Just like you have colored glass.

You shine light through it, it comes out in these different colors. So the only reason you're able to perceive the color is because of the light, right? So because there is a philosophy or lifestyle, because the soul's there. But that's being reflected through the material conditioning, the modes of nature.

So therefore, in every person, there's something that's right. That's because it's the nature of the soul. But which things come out more in their natural form and which things don't, that's going to be very much up to the individual.

So those have general categorizations. So in Vaishnavism, then these are the categorizations. When you're not dealing with Vaishnavism, like in Tattva-Viveka, basically it's which is karma or jnana.

Then whether there's the understanding of the nature of the soul being of reincarnation or not. So all these things you add to it, then you end up with all these variety of mixes. But otherwise, that's why you can talk to somebody in basically any line somewhere in anything, and there'll be some elements that are correct.

But just because they're correct doesn't mean, oh, that's correct, so they're just like us. No, they've gotten little bits, but they can't put it together. That's what makes it not like us.

So that's the part where it fails in actually being devotion to God. Does that make sense? So in other words, there may be that faith, but then there's no practice. Or there's practice, but there's no faith.

Or there may be knowledge and no practice, or practice and no knowledge. So that's the difficulty, is you come up with that. So one should not be surprised that you can find something of use in anything that anybody's doing.

You just have to know how to look, right? Means if you want to find gold in a dirty place, you have to know what gold is, not what dirt is. You should also know what dirt is, but you should know what gold is, yes. No.

Yes. But you have to see, how are they advanced? Because there's the idea that they're steady in their practices, because that's generally the first symptom of advancement, is that their practices are stable. You know, they've been for some time.

But then the problem comes is, they may be stable, but do they know what they're doing, why they're doing it? Do they have the proper attitude? Because many times you see people are stable, like you're conservative, generally are very socially stable. But now why they're doing it, it's simply for, you know, the social prestige and the economic position, you know, or the concept of just morally being good. But why that's good? You know, why having money is good, that they can't explain.

Or why behaving yourself socially is good, that they can't, just it's proper. You know, that means they can point out that there is an element of goodness to it. But why, what is the science behind that that is good, that they can't say? Right? So they never actually get that developed.

But they may be very well situated in that, and have very good faith. But you'd have to see is that, so that element is there, but that aspect of broad-mindedness won't be there, because it means Vaishnavism means it's on the line. Anything else means it's off to the right or the left.

You know? So it won't quite have the thing. But you will find that you can meet people who are, can accommodate more. Right? They can appreciate more, because they're so well-situated.

They don't mind what other people are doing. Right? They can appreciate that there's some good there, like that. So that would be your symptom of the more advanced.

It means definitely someone who is new, doesn't know the philosophy, doesn't know the practices, someone who knows the philosophy and practices and are fixed in that is better. But someone who can accommodate others, that's actually the more advanced, again. Right? So generally those persons are considered more, you know, stately or like that.

Yes? Everything we're discussing about, unless the knowledge comes from the lips, because the whole discussion is related, right? So here... Lips, as if the lips are something divine. Different from the... What about the teeth or the tongue or the throat or the... Sinuses, right? You can't say, if you have all those sounds, that's all sinuses. So, you know, from the divine sinus, sounds good.

So, the question here is, would this be what is... He's pointing out here what is lacking in the element, because it's unless the person has this whole perception, he's an acharya, because he has parts of it. They're missing out, because see, it means... There's two ways, two perspectives one can look at it. It means there's the world that's going on, then there's Vaishnavism, right? And so then, you know, there's the reality of the world, then there's what you should be doing as Vaishnavs, and then there's that... You know, so the Vaishnavs is this little group who, you know, kind of sees things in, you know, an appropriate way.

The other is that there's only Vaishnavism, and then there is distractions from it. So if it's distractions from it, it gets different categories depending on how it's distracted. You know what I'm saying? So they overemphasize or underemphasize or keep certain things and drop other things, like that.

But you're starting with the Vaishnav tenants. Right? Does that make sense? So, I mean, it means the soul exists. So even the persons who are discussing whether I exist or not, or whether the floor exists or not, because it's the natural thing of the soul, of I exist.

But when you cover in the mode of ignorance covers, then the question of existence comes up. Do I exist or not? You know? Does that make sense? But it's coming from the nature of the soul, or they have faith in God because the soul, by nature, understands God is the source. Right? And so, therefore, there's a connection there.

There's a relationship there. So that aspect is there, but then how they express that connection, now that will be then under the modes of nature. Does that make sense? Right? You know, so these things come up.

You know, it's like, it means you're supposed to offer pure water to God, but where you are, there's no pure water. So, therefore, the only water you can drink is that if you turn it into wine, because the alcohol kills all the bugs. So, therefore, now this is pure water.

So now we're offering wine to God. You understand? But according to the Shastra, you know, wine's not involved in all this. You know, in the Tamasic rituals, all these, like, left side, you know, the more demoniacs, they may use it, because the ghosts and all that, they don't mind.

Right? So then that's there. So the mode of ignorance is taken, so now they're doing something like that, but at the same time, everything's very formal, and this and that, and, you know, the washing of the goblets, and all these different kinds of things are there. But the point is, it's still in the mode of ignorance.

You know? So that's the problem. Does that make sense? But the concept of offering to God and giving something that you consider of good quality, that's correct. But just the problem is, because of the mode of ignorance, what they consider good is not exactly offerable.

You know what I'm saying? You know, so the intent is nice, but the medium that it's given through is not, so therefore, you can't say it's on the same platform as the proper intent with the proper items. But, technically, according to Manu, it's better than the person who's given proper items but has no intent. Right? Because of the two, the intent and the offering, the intent is more important.

I've seen the weakness in this book, the example you're giving, the weakness for the priest is that if he's offering wine to God, I mean, after that, wine is okay. So I've seen many priests which are sitting around with this congregation, drinking. Yeah.

It becomes... Yeah, yeah. It becomes part of it. Yeah.

Of course. Of course. So, yeah.

So therefore, because that's the neophyte element, that's why the word prakriti is used. So we

use prakriti bhakti because they tend to take... The materialistic element is more important, you know. So, but it's not actually... Does that make sense? So, there is a... It means you have the... It means that, of course, it's all material.

But then there's whether... What's the mode that it's under? You know, it's like, oh, well, I like to wear karmic clothes because that's me. I feel comfortable, you know. But what's the basis of that? So that's the mode of ignorance because, one, we're already not the body and, two, is that definition of those kind of clothes are simply based on the body.

There is no other basis for it. But let's say the smarta, he likes wearing his dhoti and chudder and everything like that and he identifies that this is me because we're Brahmins, we wear that. So it's a mode of goodness but at least it has a shastric basis.

So, therefore, that's pious while the other one's not pious. No, they're both material. You understand? But one's the superior material, one's an inferior material.

Does that make sense? Student, the doubt that you said. I didn't doubt it. There is a thing which you have to know.

A little bit more loudly. In that discussion, the argument is that only the vibration from a human body, from himself, can... Yeah, but then that means it's the body that's important. So these are what we would call vapu-bodies.

They're not vani-bodies because the vani only has importance if the vapu is there. You understand? So, therefore, from that also gives rise to your caste Goswamis and that because then it's the diksha line, the bodily diksha line. And that's what you find.

All these Jada Goswamis and that, these are all diksha pranalis, what it's called. Diksha means the line, the pranali is in diksha because you can take each one and go back and take their diksha line back to some associate or that of Lord Caitanya. So that's how are their caste Goswamis.

But it's a diksha line. But the diksha, it's not that they know any diksha at all. I mean, they have the idea, of course, okay, Lord Caitanya is Krishna.

There's two basic fundamentals. But other than that, generally the philosophy isn't what's important. It's that they're born in the line, that's what makes them qualified, not that they know the philosophy.

Well, ours, we're a diksha pranali. That's why you find between Lord Caitanya and Srila Prabhupada, basically Lord Caitanya and the Goswamis, there's actually a direct diksha connection there, but on the Bhagavata platform. And then between Bhaktisiddhanta, Saraswati Thakur and Prabhupada, there's a diksha and siksha connection there that's direct.

Everybody in between, who's a siksha guru and who's a diksha guru, are completely different.

None of them are the same lines. They all are bona fide.

They all connect back. The diksha line connects back. But it's the siksha line that we're taking.

So what's there, the sampradaya, that's the siksha line. So we're a siksha pranali. But you'll generally find that those who get into that, then they'll also be talking diksha pranalis.

And so then that gives rise to this caste Goswamis, and then it also gets the, even sometimes the sahajiyas, if they're from Brahmin backgrounds and that, they'll pull the same trick. You know, it's like that. Like if you go to Radhakund, like that, then where the Brahmin sahajiyas are sitting, that's, you know, the mlecchas can't go and sit there, though everybody's Paramahamsa.

But somehow or another, it means these Paramahamsas have to sit over here, while these Paramahamsas can sit here. Right, you know, it's like that kind of thing. So it becomes all these things.

That's why it's important we analyze it, because you're never going to have exactly what's here in the book. You're going to have all the elements. You know, just like when we say the six systems of Vedic philosophy.

You're going to have, you have those pure elements of that line, but it's very rare you'll ever find someone who's practicing like that. Exactly, that is their only tenets. It's very rare.

It means closer back to when they started, you know, thousands of years ago, yes, but now, no. So generally what you find is mixes of these. You know, just like in bhakti yoga, the buddhi yoga, you have karma, jnana, and jnana, elements of bhakti yoga as a combination.

So each devotee is going to be a little bit more karma, a little more jnana, a little more jnana, a little more karma and jnana, or jnana and jnana, or, you know, I'm saying any of these kind of combinations, but if you understand the main elements, you can understand what you're dealing with, right? Because you can't work out all the different things, so that's why it's not important. It's important to know how they function, right? That's how the sampradayas, that's how these upasampradayas, how their functioning is on, what's the correct, what's the elements. So in other words, now we're getting into the elements, because you'll find that even these, you'll get mixes, right? So these are your specific kind of like points that are there, but they'll be this point in the one thing, but they'll take from another line in the other thing, and then combine it, and then it's a new thing, but all it is is these two elements.

Does that make sense? Yes? The chit potency travels through the consciousness of the devotee? It's through the consciousness, but it also empowers whatever is being used. Just like here, the lotus lips become, it's the chit potency that becomes, that is making it there, you know? Because then the body becomes more important, and I think that's the kartabhaja, the worshipper versus God. The guru is God.

That would be the element of that. So you have to be very, very careful. So you have to also know the source and know the point.

The point is if someone says, oh, I can just listen to Prabhupada's tapes on my own and get benefit. No, you have to hear from someone who's present. Right? They have to accept you in that.

So, because that's the point, because we're identifying with the body, therefore you need that body, that's for us. Does that make sense? So, because otherwise, is that between Narottam and Vishwanath, there's four generations, so he didn't directly hear from, but he's heard the siksha in his line and accepted that siksha. He has a proper bona fide connected diksha line, but it's the siksha that is like that.

So siksha-wise you can do that, but the conditioned soul needs to have the diksha also. But in establishing that, then the neophyte, what do they do? They overemphasize the diksha and the personal presence and everything like that, so they misunderstand what the authority has said. And so then this starts this whole thing.

And they'll say, no, no, but he said this. No, he never said that. Like Madhava, he never said what these Tathagatis are saying.

There's gradations of souls. Yes, it means there's liberated, and there's, you know, demoniacs. So what do you have in between? Gradations.

And what are the gradations based on? The modes of nature. Of course. So therefore some in the mode of ignorance, you can try, but if there's no response, leave it.

The person in the mode of passion, you try, but if there's no response, leave it. The person in the mode of goodness, they'll take it. So then they take it.

We don't have to preach the mode of goodness, so it will naturally come to us. That's not what the Acharya said. Otherwise, why did he go out and travel and preach? He would have just sat in Udupi and done his bhajan.

Right? And those who wanted would have come there and heard his lectures. Right? But he didn't. He traveled and preached.

You understand? So the neophyte tends to misrepresent what the Acharya has given. There's a class of Prabhupada, which is showing the temple of Prabhupada, saying, only reading, as you said, won't realize. You have to do it.

Self-realize soon. So the point you're making is that that self-realization is a siksha line. Yes.

And you think it's a diksha line. Yes, that's the point. Because, generally speaking, if you ask a general devotee, he won't know the difference between siksha and diksha.

Right? And if there is some understanding, it's taken from the diksha perspective. But we take it from the siksha's perspective. The diksha means, now you're serious about siksha.

Right? While the others is, no, the diksha line, now you're connected. Right? The point is, it's the siksha that connects you. But without that personal presence and initiation, the pancharatha initiation, we don't take it seriously.

You know what I'm saying? It's just like, you have the temple, right? Let's say you have a major temple where people come through all the time. Right? You have these, you know, cities or places where everybody comes through. Right? You know, my, of course, one of them.

So, if there's someone that you appreciate, then they're special. But if it's somebody you don't appreciate, you don't care. Right? But at the same time, there's someone else who, this is their guru.

You know what I'm saying? So it's not like, here are senior Vaishnavas, and of that, then there's my guru. It's no, there's my guru, and that's kind of it. Then there's the other Vaishnavas.

Right? You know? It's the new bhakta, you know, the other guy's guru. Okay. Means if you ask, of course, the guy's guru is more senior than the new bhakta.

But if I don't ask, I'm not really going to make much of a distinction. You know, it's just a matter of when I'm going through the crowd, whether I say, excuse me, Prabhu, or excuse me, Maharaj. That's all.

You understand? It's not based on a realization. It's the instruction. And then that instruction, it's not their instruction, it's relevant instruction.

The acharya is Prabhupada. So Prabhupada's giving the instruction, while the others are simply helping you understand that from relevant instruction. That's why it's important.

Because relevant means you can read the passage, it may not mean anything to you. So, therefore, someone who's there explains it to you in context of your position, then you understand its relevance. Right? Because Prabhupada also talks about his relevant instruction.

Right? But that relevant means it's based on the acharya. It can't be. Does that make sense? So like that.

Then you take that, and then you bring that down to other senior Vaishnavas, and then you end up with something that, you know, it's something to do with the lips. He's got special lips. You know, like that.

So then when you become guru, you know, then they give you some new lips or something. Like that. Lots of lip balm.

Yeah, special lip balm. Yeah, so it has the chit potency lip balm. Like that.

Right? Does that make sense? So, yeah. So it's interesting. The nonsense.

Does that nonsense make sense? Yeah. Is that okay? Right? Yes. Can we say that those self-assumptuous, they actually manifest some kind of anarthas? Like present in everyone more or less? Yeah, yeah, yeah.

Yes, yes. So that's their identities. They have their own special, unique blend of anarthas.

Like that. But at the same time, as they have their philosophy to explain that those anarthas are okay. You know? Does that make sense? Trying to take their anarthas back to Godhead.

Yeah, but suddenly they don't make it. Like that. Sad, but true.

Yes. Okay. Okay, so the purified life child, achar, set down by the saintly teachers, the great saintly teachers, acharya.

Right? So it's all coming from that, that achar. Like vichar means to discuss from different angles the achar. Upachar means the purified lifestyle offering the ingredients.

Does that make sense? So prachar means to preach the lifestyle. Right? So what we're preaching is the lifestyle. That's based on the philosophy.

Because the point is, that's what he said, you just know the philosophy but don't practice the lifestyle. Like we mentioned, that there in Boston you have these academics who they can get into hair splitting on syllables in Jiva Goswami's tattvas, I mean in his sandarbhas. They probably leave tattva.

But they're all sitting around drinking beer while they're discussing that. So it's not that they practice anything. So therefore they don't actually know.

So that's why he's saying, is you may theoretically have a correct grasp but the actual correct grasp means you actually follow. What's the upachar? Upachar. Upachar is paraphernalia.

But it's paraphernalia used in that purified lifestyle. Like when you offer lamps to the deities, that's upachar. Like you have the 16 upachars, the 16 varieties of offerings.

So like, that is statement. Lifestyle does not mean... Yes, that's why it's a lifestyle. That's why the training, means your temple training or the gurukul training is important.

You know, so that's a weakness in creating this temple community kind of like, what do you call it? Where they're kind of separate. Dichotomy, you'd say? Yeah, dichotomy. No, which is the important and all this and that.

No, you have to have both. The point is the temple is there so the community is involved in Krishna consciousness. So therefore, where will the lifestyle be seen? It's at the temple.

Right? Those who have picked it up, then even going to their house, you'll see it. But where did

they get it? They get it from the temple. And the temple, how many people can it hold? You have the, let's say, the New York temple.

Okay, how many people in New York? You know, you have 15, 20 million. So all of them are going to fit into the temple? No. So therefore, it's the center for those 20 million to learn how to live that lifestyle.

Because you learn the philosophy, but you have to learn how to live and apply the philosophy. So we get, oh, don't be fanatic, but the point is it's achar, it's lifestyle. So even if you're not fanatic, but what's the philosophy behind it? The philosophy is not applied, so even you're wearing karmic clothes, what's the philosophy? Not that, well, that's Indian and we're American and they're both material countries, so therefore, what does it matter? It's that, no, the point, Krishna is a gentleman.

He dresses like a gentleman. Therefore, then, if you're going to use the non-Vedic dress, then dress as a gentleman. Talk as a gentleman.

You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? In other words, does a gentleman have all kinds of, you know, funny tattoos or things sticking out of his face? Right? No. But do ladies have things sticking out? Yes. You know? In other words, the ladies have it, it's cultured.

Men have it, it's uncultured. It's a matter of culture. Does that make sense? So, therefore, you would follow like that.

Then there's some meaning to it. Otherwise, it's simply your attachment. That's all.

There's no other basis. You know what I'm saying? So that's the idea, is that, what is the principle behind it? And then you have the element, it's cultured, it's gentle, but it's also very simple and practical. It's clean.

A dhoti, you take it, rinse it out, hang it up, it's dry. I mean, like, in the daytime, you can go down, let's say to the Ganga, go rinse your dhoti, put it on the bank, go take your bath, dry off, by that time it's ready. You can put it on, walk off.

Can you do that with a pair of jeans? No. You can wash it, hang it up, two days later you'll have it. So that means, how many pairs of jeans do you have to have to maintain that you're putting on a clean pair every day? That's a lot of jeans.

So is that simple? No. It's complicated. You know what I'm saying? You can just get a bolt of cloth, rip a piece off, you have a dhoti.

But can you do that with a pair of jeans? No. So it's complicated. So therefore, it doesn't have the same thing.

And you may say, no, this is more simple. It's not more simple. You have to actually know what simple means.

Also, it can do so many things with it. You can wear a dhoti long, you can pick it up and wear it as shorts. You can't do that with your pants.

I mean, some of them have zippers on it. And then what do you do with the pack that you unzip? You stick it in your pockets? Put them on your sleeves. Yeah, okay, yeah.

Like that, yeah. You have a big enough nose. What do you do with it? You know what I'm saying? Then it's a problem.

You know what I'm saying? That's the difficulty. It seems, but it's not. But at the same time, there's the sophistication.

So that element is there. So unless you're wearing it, the clothes itself, the cut, the color, how you're wearing it is sophisticated, then it still is not up to the Vedic principle. So even in karmic clothes, there's very few devotees that actually dress according to what would a Vedic standard be.

You know, very few. You know what I'm saying? Like that. Someone's simple, they dress, you know, like that.

That's fine. I'm talking about the ones that are talking all kinds of their sophistication, but they're not. Because that's the thing with the devotee, even you don't, you don't have to wear, at least then you fit into that category.

And you say, oh, but he looks, you know, looks like a pair of diapers. He says like that. But the problem is the same guy wearing karmic clothes would look like a slob.

I know. You know. You know.

Yeah. I think you mentioned once or twice how a person who's preaching the wrong philosophy gets so much more... A hundred times more of the reaction than just following. In other words, if you're doing something bogus, you get the direct reaction for doing something bogus.

But if you preach that bogusness as proper, then you get a hundred times the reaction. That's Manasamitra. That's Manasamitra.

Yes. No, no, no. That just means he doesn't know what he's talking about.

And it won't work. People won't respond. Right? So then he'll have to learn it properly.

Yeah. Right? But if his false ego's there, then they establish it. I can't see.

Well, one guy's riding a bicycle and the other one's taking a chair and walking the chair around the house. This is what you call holidays. It must be insane.

Otherwise, it's not a holiday. How do you know? Yeah, it's insane. How do you know it's not a holiday? It seems to be normal.

Okay. Okay. So, one is, quote here from Bhagavad-Gita, One is understood to be in full knowledge whose every endeavor is devoid of desire for sense gratification.

Right? So here, this is Krishna speaking, so it's it's the his action. That's where you see it. Someone speaks, that's good.

They know the philosophy, but then watch the action. Then you can see what's the principle at work here. Is there a principle at work here? Right? So every endeavor is devoid of desire for sense gratification.

So that's the point is because this world is Krishna's world. Right? That's the thing. We're thinking, okay, here's the material world, spiritual world is somewhere else.

No, it's all Krishna's. This is the inferior energy. Right? In other words, if you have the prison, is it on the land of the state? So is it technically part of the state? Yes.

So all it is is it's part the part of the state that the state doesn't mind the criminals using. Right? The other part the criminals can't use. So the material world is that part of God's creation that those who don't have the proper consciousness are allowed to use.

But it's still God's place. Right? Who makes the rules? It's still God. Right? Does that make sense? Yeah.

So, he is said by the sages to be a worker for whom the reactions of karma have been burned up by the fire of perfect knowledge. Right? Because now he's not seeing it in connection with sense gratification. Right? Whatever is there he sees it and looks for opportunities for Krishna.

Just like let's say you're hungry. Okay? We look at these rocks. Is there anything to eat? No.

So do you contemplate it? Try to figure it out? No. You look somewhere else. Right? Okay, you got those plants over there.

Okay, is that something to eat? Huh? It's closer. Yes, but you know the cows will come in and eat that. You know? And there are bugs who will eat the rocks.

You know? Like that. So you keep looking until you see something that's useful. Therefore, whatever the situation, you look at it.

If there's no service to Krishna, you keep looking. So that means then someone's in full knowledge because then he knows why you're looking because the other thing is I use knowledge to find activity but if my activity is sense gratification that's not full knowledge but when I look and I look only for opportunities for activities that are Krishna conscious that's full knowledge. So now that person is said to have burned up the reactions of karma by the fire of perfect knowledge.

Yes? So if all the activities are Krishna conscious but there's some activities that are more

Krishna conscious than others? Means it's always means here is that everything is Krishna conscious. Right? So everything is not done for sense gratification. So you could say that is imperfect knowledge but then that can also just get you liberation.

So therefore we'll consider such a person a transcendentalist. But then there's doing that with devotion. Then there's doing that with prelude.

Right? Does that make sense? So there's gradations within. In other words, within perfect knowledge there's gradations. But we're distinguishing perfect knowledge from imperfect knowledge.

So the first thing is the difference between spiritual and material. Once we have that then we can make gradations within spiritual. Because gradations within material we're basically kind of used to.

If we say, OK, the guy's selfish you know, about his sense gratification. We'll say, yes, that's the lowest. Then they will say someone who's selfless about their sense gratification.

We'll say that's higher. Right? Because we're conditioned to that. We're used to that.

But if we say someone who actually understands the inherent nature of everything and therefore what is the social obligations in dealing with each one of that that will be higher. And then at that point it's already stepped out of the concept of our conditioning. It's like, well, what does that mean? You know, it's kind of like, no, it's the Vox Populi.

Yes, it means it's I'm selfless but I'm selfless according to what the overall group has agreed is the mark of selflessness. So I'm asking more within the virtual service Yes, of course. That's what we were discussing before.

You have Shraddha to Prema. That's a very standard way of doing or, you know, neophyte, Madhyam and Uttama. Like that.

But the point is is devotional service is always special. So even the, you know, first, you know, moment neophyte devotee is still, he's special compared to the ocean of materialists. Even if they have so many great qualities, they're a celebrity, this and that.

How long are they a celebrity? You know, they're big and then they're gone. And even if they were great their whole life, they're still, they're dead. You know what I'm saying? Where are they? Okay? Yes.

All right. this connection, is the Acharya again his identity that is used as part of me and not... Yes. But at the same time it's that that duty's being done to please Krishna.

That's the real identity. Otherwise, then yes, I'm a grihasta because these are my duties. Oh yes, I'm a brahmachari.

But if that's the main identity, then it's also been missed. Because then it's, no, I am engaging grihasta facility in Krishna's service. I'm engaging brahmachari facility in Krishna's service.

So the point is I'm Krishna's servant. Now, according to conditioning, according to the particular taste, then I situate myself. Right? Is that what's up? Yeah.

It's like how it's like raising your baby is not the service. Yes, raising your baby is not the service. Being... pleasing Krishna is your service.

Now, therefore, then you're raising your baby to please Krishna. Then it starts to become service. But just taking care of the baby, that's not service.

That's your duty. But it's not... But where's the spiritual? Service means it's spiritual. unless you're thinking about this baby belongs to Krishna, so how to raise Krishna's baby to be Krishna conscious and serve Krishna, then it starts to become service.

But how are you going to do that unless you're chanting and you're also rendering some service? Otherwise, they're going to learn from you. You're not doing the acharya, how they'll learn the acharya. Does that make sense? So, it's the consciousness that makes the difference.

You know? But that's the problem. It's okay. There, so then we raise a child to Krishna conscious, so raising my child, that is, Krishna conscious.

That's my service. But the point is this. Are you remembering that it's for Krishna? If you are, then it becomes service.

If you're not, then it's just pious. Right? It means every... Yes, every parent is supposed to raise their kids. That's the proper thing to do.

That's God's law. But the point is, is following God's law just to follow the law, then what's the benefit? Why are you doing it? Why would you do it? Right? Why would you raise the kids? Right? Because you want kids. You want that interaction.

You want that feeling of the parent, the reciprocation with the child. You know, all the, whatever goes along with it, all the nice emotional things, all the, you know, the proper piety, whatever it is. But it's, it's you want that.

But, but it's, you know, it's good. You know, are you doing it simply because what you get out of it? Or, you know, then it's anam, are you doing it because of what they get out of it? Are you doing it because this is actually the duty that I'm supposed to do? Right? Or I'm doing this because I do this in a way, you know, that without attachment I get liberation. But it's actually, you understand, so that's four levels of conscience just to raise the baby.

But now, am I thinking that I'm doing this for Krishna? This is Krishna's baby. Right? Yes. I'm just thinking, Krishna's baby, Rosemary's baby.

Yes. Your choice. Yeah, every last single second.

You understand, it's not that you have to think that, but you're acting in such a way that it's that. Okay, right. You know, just like you said, you know, you think, I'm going to cook now.

And then you go in and cook. You're not thinking, I'm cooking now. But you're cooking.

You're focusing on the cooking. You understand? So in other words, it means, what means, in other words, okay, you're going to feed the baby, but babies need to be fed. How you're feeding, why you're feeding, you know, what you're feeding.

You know what I'm saying? That's, yeah, because that's the whole point. You're dressing the baby. How are you dressing? Why are you dressing? You know what I'm saying? You know, they're living a lifestyle.

What can they do? What can they not do? Who are their friends who are not friends? What are their activities? What are not their activities? That's where you're going to see, is the basis on Krishna or not. Means there's something connected to Krishna, but it just means Krishna is everything, so there's always something connected. But you're dealing with the indirect, so there's going to be a lot of indirect there.

But they're connecting it all to Krishna. No, but I'm saying you're dealing with indirect, so you're taking indirect and connecting it to Krishna. The problem is, is the neophyte takes the indirect and doesn't connect it to Krishna, so it doesn't become indirect.

It just remains as mundane. I guess what I'm trying to ask is, does a person in Samadhi still look after his future? If they're grihasthas, yes. Yeah.

And that's the duties. That's why duty is important. We'll say, oh no, but that's this and that.

But the problem is, is when you don't feel like it, you still do it. No, but I want it to be natural and all that. The guy would actually prefer to just sit on the couch with his little remote and his newspaper and not talk to anybody.

That's actually what he'd really, really sincerely want to do. Is the wife happy with that? But it's the same lady. No, but I want real.

I want sincere. But that's sincerely what he wants to do. And he sincerely wants to tell that joke that he heard down with the boys amongst the ladies.

Do the ladies want to hear it? No. So it's not about what's sincere. It's about what you're supposed to do.

That's the start. That's workable. Then sincerely doing what you're supposed to do.

Now that's better. You understand? So one has to be able to make the distinction. It's not just

the feeling because otherwise the feeling, if everybody just works on feeling, then it's just a bunch of animals.

You know what I'm saying? You know? You're sitting down with your salad. The cow sees the salad. It wants the salad also.

Now who wins? You got a plate of salad and you got a cow there. There's a good chance you'll lose there also. But the monkeys, you're guaranteed to lose.

With the cow, then there's a bit of a fight. You might get some of it, right? Because they can't bite the whole thing at once. So you'll get half.

They'll get half. But you'll have to eat your half the way the cow ate their half. Okay? Does that make sense? So in other words, all this thing comes back again to the philosophy.

At the same time, one must know culture. You know? Because then the problem comes up is, how do you know what to do? But the thing is, why is it that stories are the most important? Because it shows you the lifestyle. But we don't look at that.

It's just like Kardama Muni. How many people will look at it that Kardama Muni is, according to his position, creating the best environment, most comfortable environment for his wife? He means, he's son of Brahma. So he can create a flying palace that can go anywhere by will.

But, you know, that's something nice, you know, like that, you know. You don't have to leave your house to go down to the mall, right? You just, your house just goes to the mall. Right? Then you just walk out your front door straight into, you know, wherever it is, you know.

Does that make sense? Not bad, right? You know, and then when you want to get out of there, you just walk out, get into there, and you know. Whistle? Yeah, and then think of all the people there, you know. You don't get into a car, it's wow, that's cool, you know.

So even that's better than what you bought, right? So, so, so like that, you know, he arranges that, you know, she's decorated by 2,000 maid servants, right? And not just, you know, on land like everybody else, underwater. You know what I'm saying? I mean, think about it. It means that in the movies, and you have to do it, they have to have the fans blowing and everything, you get the hair to move and do all the things, you have to put it into slow motion.

If you're underwater, that's automatic, you know, you know. Yeah, think about it, you know, it's really, it's happening, you know. When things dry out, they're not as shiny when they're wet, they're shiny.

I mean, think about it, you can't get any better than that. You understand? They're dressing nicely, they're taking care, they're submissive to her, she's the main girl. You understand? How many husbands make a distinction? It means when something push comes to shove, yes, then the wife is number one, but same time you're talking to the wife, wow, she's dressed in a nice

sari.

Who's number one then? The wife or that other lady? You don't do that. That's what you get from reading these stories. Does anybody get that? No.

And then we say, no, but where's the, how do we know? We're just doing what we can do. It's all right there. How many times have you read the stories? You understand? So that's the point, we don't connect the philosophy to the culture.

We don't have culture, so we don't catch that. Right? So unless, you know, unless somebody's into yogurt, you know, there's no culture. Or maybe they're a baker, okay, or a cheese maker.

So these three have some culture, right? So yes. Yes, that's the point. Acharya, he shows by example.

So this whole idea, no, but Prabhupada can do whatever he wants, so he can, he can do something that even Shashtra doesn't recommend, but he's Acharya, he wouldn't do that. Avadhutas do that. This whole thing, no, but he can do.

That's, that's these Kartabhaja and Atavadis. They do that. Oh no, but he's so great, he's beyond, he's Acharya.

He just, he does what he wants, what he's preaching, and he wants you to do, he's doing it. Same time, you have to make the distinction that he's the senior, so therefore, but he's shown, right? So in other words, you follow his teachings, but at the same time as you can follow the example, but as long as the example fits. Yes.

We should still also be able to distinguish between the principle of what he's doing and the detail. Yeah, and the detail, because the principle is the main thing. That's what the teaching is about.

The detail, that's, you know, according to the time, place, and circumstance. That's where Prabhupada says the books are more important than the letters, because the letters are the time, place, and circumstance, and we only have what Prabhupada said. We don't know what the original letter was, what the actual question or the attitude was, because it's not just the simple question, it's also the attitude.

He knows why that particular example, why the different things like that. So that's a weakness. So it gives some idea.

So if it's seen in light of the books, then it is strong, but if it's not, then it would be weak. Okay? Sure thing. Well, thank you.

Thanks. Om Hare Krishna Hare Krishna Krishna Krishna Hare Hare Hare Rama Hare Rama Rama Rama Hare Hare Hare Jaya. Srila Prabhupada, Jaya.

Jaya. Jaya. Jaya.

Jaya. Jaya. Jaya.

Jaya. Jaya. Jaya.

Jaya. Jaya. Jaya.