

20130304 Apasampradayas p10-11

I belong Sahana bhavatu Sahana bhunatu Sahabhir yam karababahi Tejasvihavaditamasthamavidvishavahai Om Shanti Shanti Shanti Om Jaya Sri Krishna Chaitanya Prabhu Nityananda Sri Advaita Gadadhara Sri Vasudeva Bhakta Vrinda Hare Krishna Hare Krishna Krishna Krishna Hare Hare Hare Rama Hare Rama Rama Rama Hare Hare The Jada Gosai are a hereditary caste of so-called spiritual masters. Their qualification to give initiation is too often limited to the boast of family connections to associates of Sri Caitanya Mahaprabhu, or to disciples of these associates. A famous example of such a family is the so-called Nityananda Vamsa.

They claim seminal descent from Lord Nityananda through persons who are actually disciples, not sons, of Lord Nityananda's only and childless son, Virabhadra Goswami. So the whole idea is why they're called the Goswami caste, the caste Goswamis, is that it's the seminal line of family coming down. But for the Goswamis, then they weren't married, so then they, who's coming down is from their pajaris, right? And if it's the associates of Lord Caitanya, then it may come from them if they did have families, or many times it's just from their disciples.

In some way, they're trying to establish themselves as unique in the brahminical field, and so therefore, automatically, just by being born there, they're special. What's their basis? I was just about to say. It's that the blood of these personalities runs in their veins.

Other than that, then, not a whole lot else is happening. Is this just to make money at all? Not really. I don't... See, that's the nice thing about the Upasampradayas.

It doesn't actually have to be based on Shastra. Just do whatever you want. That's the glory of it.

You start your own, you do whatever you want. But then the weakness is, is because you've just started your own, it doesn't actually have the spiritual potency. But that's mainly that.

Yes? It would seem that it has to be not based on Shastra. Basically. No, but sometimes then they'll take something and misinterpret it.

That's also good fun. You know? Like that. So, because... See, there's a lot of times, if something sounds good, that's good enough for people.

It's not that it actually has to be correct. Just that it sounds good. You know? Does that make sense? Okay, footnote one.

There cannot be a Vaishnava vamsa. There's no guarantee that every descendant of a particular dynasty will become a Vaishnava. Because, see, as you can say that the bodily vamsa is there, just like, you know, you say, Mr. Smith is there, and he has his son, he's also Smith, and then his son is Smith.

So you can say that goes on. But to say, because Vaishnava means that the soul has spiritual

realization of his relationship with Krishna. So that you can't say is going to happen by birth.

Does that make sense? It's going to happen because someone takes it up themselves. Right? Otherwise, if they kind of basically accept the teachings, then they're counted within the Vaishnava circle, but as ordinary Vaishnavas. Just like, let's say, you have a family of practicing Vaishnavas.

Right? Now when they have children, their children are considered ordinary Vaishnavas. Right? Just by birth, because they're in that association, and in that association they generally do the practices of what the parents do. But it's not necessarily their own commitment.

That's why it's considered ordinary. Now once, by that association, they come to the point of doing it because it's their own commitment, then they become Sampradaya. Right? Does that make sense? So, here to guarantee that because they're born in these families, that therefore automatically they're Goswamis, then that's a bit of a stretch.

It doesn't work in anybody else's family. Why should it work in theirs? They know. They know what's special about them.

That's the thing. Yes? So Maharaj, without initiation for bona fide Sampradaya, it is ordinary Vaishnava? No, it's more about the commitment. You know what I'm saying? Ordinary means you're just doing it because you come in that line.

You're in that line. It means your family goes to the temple, so you're going to the temple. Right? You know, if they were going to McDonald's, you'd be going to McDonald's.

You know, so it's just that you're just doing what the family's doing. You know what I'm saying? Because that's just what kids do. So, because of that, they're considered ordinary Vaishnavas.

Now, anybody who by commitment takes up the process, then that's called Sampradaya. Right? Now, once they take initiation, then now they're properly situated in the Sampradaya. But they're still Sampradaya as soon as they are committed to it.

Does that make sense? So... Yeah? So, in other words, you'll have... because they weren't born into the situation, so they had to make that decision to actually practice Krishna Consciousness. Well, the others, they're born in that situation, so they don't have to make the decision to be practicing. Right? But when they do make the decision to practice, then you say, now they're Sampradaya.

Right? Does that make sense? Yeah? Master, in the sutra you're talking about grants, Vishnu, Dasa, Hari, Gautama, Vaishnava, and it seems to say the same thing, that a servant of Krishna who is in the form of a rat is a Vaishnava. Yes. Now, that's the whole idea, is that... grant all the... in other words, all the different elements of... the creation, because this all comes from Krishna, they all work on the same principles, just so they have the uniqueness how they manifest.

Does that make sense? You know, it's just like you have prasada, so it's all Krishna, but the manifestation is so unique, each different preparation, each different kind of menu, different times of the day, different seasons, so you have unlimited varieties of the one thing. So, in the same way is that there's just Krishna, and so if everything is Him, that means it's all going to work on the same patterns. So even language works on the same patterns as the philosophy, because your tattva explains what are these patterns, and then those patterns are applied in the social systems, etiquette and culture, they're applied in the communication through language, or through drama, or through music, all these different areas.

So, they'll always have the same thing, so that's what's very interesting. That's what's so nice about the Vedic, is everything is all connected, it's all common. It's just a matter, even if you don't know it still works, just like the kid, he doesn't know how a hammer works, but it works anyway.

So that's the whole idea, then if you know how it works, it just makes you more fixed, it makes you better to properly understand how it works. Is that something? Okay. We are seeing many rogues take birth in various Vaishnava families, and they're acting like demons, whereas many great people have taken birth in the family of dog-eaters and Yavanas, and become Vaishnavas on the strength of pure devotional service.

Many non-Vaishnavas are found in the families of Vaishnava acaryas. On the other hand, many Vaishnavas have taken birth in families of gross non-devotees. So this is the point, why you can't say that automatically by birth they're going to be something.

Because it goes both ways. Just because they're born in the family of devotees doesn't necessarily mean they'll be a devotee. Generally they will be, but it doesn't necessarily.

Just like those born in the family of materialists generally will be materialists, but sometimes they're not, because sometimes they're devotees. Does that make sense? So that's why you have general rules, but yet they're not fixed. So because you're born in a Vaishnava family, you have the best opportunity to become a devotee, because you're already in a purified atmosphere, you're doing all the things that devotees do.

So easily you could become a devotee. Just like, let's say, families where the parents are academics, generally the children become academics. Families where they're musicians or actors, their children become like that, because of the association.

So by association they should become. But it's not 100% fixed, because if you fix it, then that means people who aren't behaving, you'll say they're devotees and take proper, try to take association when they don't have proper association. Does that make sense? And in the inverse, is that someone born in non-devotee families, we say, well, they're automatically non-devotees.

If they're practicing Vaishnavism, then we won't take advantage of the association. Does that make sense? So that's why you have your general rules, but there's always exceptions. Like you

say, well, why should there be exceptions? Because Krishna is a cinta-veda-veda-tattva, it means He's everything.

So He is everything, at the same time He's not. Right? That's the exception. It's interesting, Krishna took all of His family members, and He left, and they left right now.

Yeah, yeah. Because otherwise then people will say, oh, we're coming in these lines. You can imagine, like that, He's got 16,108 wives, each one has 10 sons.

Right? You know. And so they're going to have, so you can imagine how many caste goswams there'd be. It'd be insane.

You could start a whole country. You know, the caste goswam. So therefore, you know, just when Krishna goes, He winds up His pastimes, they go with Him.

You know, you can see these, you know, many times these prominent personalities, they don't have family. Yeah. You know, like that Lord Caitanya, He didn't have children, the goswamis, you know, like that.

Because sometimes they don't just create problems. But others, because of the pastimes, they do have family. So, you know, it's just, it gives an opportunity for those who are interested in bodhis, that they get their chance.

See, see, it's like here, see, the thing about this is, just look at the ease here. Now, let us say you're not born in a special family like this. Okay? So now, if you want to start an Upasampradaya, you actually have to use your brains, come up with your own philosophy, come up with your presentation, actually do your presentation, convince people, and put out a lot of energy for a long time before you actually get established.

That's hard work. How many people can do that? Right? Not so many. But, if you're born into one of these families, automatically you're bogus.

You know? You don't have to create your own philosophy or anything. It's already there. You know, your parents, grandparents, great-grandparents, you know, your generations.

Like, I think, Nityananda Bhamsa, one of the lead persons in Vrindavan, is seventeen generations. Seventeen generations. It doesn't mean that because they're born in a Goswami family, they won't be bona fide devotees.

They may be. But the point is, just because they're born there, that doesn't qualify them. That's where the Jada Goswami comes in.

Because they say, just we're born there, we're qualified. No, it's because you're actually practicing and hearing and following the proper parampara, of hearing the instructions. That makes it bona fide.

Because even diksha lines, you have bona fide diksha lines, like many of these lines, the mantra is actually, it's come from person to person. So you can say, the mantras are bona fide, but it's not necessarily the practices are. Because it's the sikshas not.

Like Bhaktivinoda Thakura's, that Vipin Bihari Goswami. So the mantra was still in connection. But the siksha wasn't.

That's why you don't hear of Vipin Bihari Goswami ever really giving instructions. He heard from Jagannath Goswami. So that's the thing.

So it's not that someone couldn't be a devotee, but it's not automatic, just because they're born there. It's all this thing, we're coming in this line, and we have all this. That has nothing to do with it.

Because sense one is the body, the spiritual element. Right? It's the soul. So it's connection from one soul to the next, and hearing transcendental subject matter, so the soul becomes, you know, how you say, absorbed in this chit potency.

That's the actual bona fide line. Is that good? Yeah? All right, the same principle, it seems to be what happened to the castes, right? The castes, yes, same thing, same thing. It's because they're born in a Brahma family, they don't actually act as Brahmins, and then the problem comes up is from not acting as Brahmins, but they want the prestige of facilities, so then they just push that it's, that's the thing.

And so that falls apart. Because the point is, is the castes are bona fide, and we don't technically have any problem with the term, that's just the English term for it. So then, but the point is, is if they're misused, just like anything, do we have a problem with a baseball bat? No, but if you take the baseball bat and hit someone up the side of the head, it may be a problem.

You know what I'm saying? So it's not automatic, they take it that it's, oh, because caste, therefore, is bogus. No, if you use it properly, all that says is this is a group. Like if we say, white-collar worker, does anybody have a problem? No, but that's a caste.

But the point is, is you can say, well, it's not a caste, because it's not by birth. But much of the time, you'll see the white-collar worker, his father was a white-collar worker. Or if a blue-collar worker, his father was a white-blue-collar worker.

Right? But it doesn't have to be. So generally, if you're from that group, you're from that group. You're born into a middle-class family, you're middle-class.

You're born in high-class, you just remain that. You're born in a poorer class, you remain that. Right? It's common.

If you say the guy's poor, and his parents were poor, is anybody going to think that's weird? No. But the point is, is you do have people born in poor families who become rich, and people who

are born in rich families who become poor. So then you don't classify it, that, oh, that's caste.

So that's the Vedic system. Just because you're born in a Brahmin family doesn't make you a Brahmin. It gives you the best opportunity, but it doesn't mean you'll be.

So as long as it's good in karma, then no one has a problem with it. So it just has to be explained, is that the system is fine. If people misuse it, you can't blame the system.

You had something? Oh, okay. Yes. I had a discussion last week within our Vishkanth Sankar Gaya in tandem with God Brothers, who are in some deviation, or we need to make corrections together.

And I was stressing to follow, normally we follow Sadhu Shastra. We're doing it. But then I was answering that it depends on the time, place, and circumstance.

But that's for application. But it always has to go back to the time, Guru Sadhu Shastra. It always has to go back to that.

But the time, place, and circumstance is how the detail is applied. But the root has to be there in authority. Otherwise then, if it's not based on authority, what are your options? It'll be based on the senses.

Right? So it may be just directly sense perception, or it may be sense perception that's been applied with a little bit of intellectual element to try to find the missing part. I can see A, I can see B, but I can't see C. So A is connected to B, B is connected to C, therefore A is connected to C. Does that make sense? So that's inference. But still, I'm using the senses to see A and B. Does that make sense? And B and C have been seen on occasion, but not necessarily this occasion.

Does that make sense? Yeah. So therefore then, it's still based on the senses. So that's your point.

It's either based on the senses or it's based on authority. It's not that there's some other glorious element. Right? Because one's a devotee, so I do whatever I want because it's time, place, and circumstance, but what's the basis of doing whatever you want? If it's not guru, sadhu, and shastra, it will be the senses.

Right? Now, guru, sadhu, and shastra is applied through the senses, but it's already started, since the senses are imperfect, you've already started with something perfect. Then you try to apply it to the situation you're in. But this idea that immediately we just remove that, because what's the point? Now, if you say, no, it has to be on guru, sadhu, and shastra, and the retort is, no, but it has to be time, place, and circumstance, what's the actual purpose of saying that? Because you have to see the intent.

The intent is, get rid of authority. And so if you get rid of authority, I can do whatever I want. That's the intent.

It's not a philosophical point. The point is simply they don't want authority. Otherwise, why say that at that junction? You would say, yes, that's correct.

Now, we can't just take what the authority says and just blindly apply it. We should know what we're doing. Because if we don't know what we're doing, how do we apply it to the situation, time, place, and circumstance? That would be the natural thing, because then you're connecting how authority then comes down to the point of perception.

That's correct. But if you say authority, and they immediately say perception, where's the connection? Does that make sense? What do you think of lunch today? Tuesday. What's the connection? You know what I'm saying? So that's the whole point is, is that it's a matter of they're not following the whole thing.

And so that's why that's the problem. That make sense? So we cannot force them to follow. If they don't want to follow... No, we can't force them to follow, but they can't force us to follow.

So if they don't want us telling them what to do, then they should keep their mouth shut and not be telling us what we should do. It's natural culture, natural etiquette. Like that.

So it's a matter of, this is what the authorities have recommended, you follow it, you get this result. You don't follow it, then, you know, hey, look around, that's the results you can get. If you want a spiritual result, you have to follow the authorities.

And if you're happy with mundane, hey, then hopefully you have a good material authority, because not all of them are successful. So the point is, you're going to have to discriminate, and you're going to have to go by what they say. So you're still going to have to accept authority.

It's just a matter of whether I have to accept these authorities for that thing, or I whimsically want to choose who I want. But who they whimsically choose is what particular result they want. So if they're whimsically not taking the authority of Guru Sādhū or Śāstra, means they don't actually want to go back to Gāte.

Because by following them, that's what you get. And if they don't want to follow, they actually want something material. Or they want that, but eventually, not right now.

These are the implications of what's being said. They may say, no, no, but there's so many things, it's complicated, it's this, that, you don't understand. There's so many things they can say, but the point is, facts are facts, and then there's the feelings and emotions that surround it.

Does that make sense? Yeah. Yes. You made a comment one time that if you end up choosing what to do by the ego, so if you identify the ego itself with Kṛṣṇa, then you'll make decisions complementary to it.

So where does that fit into what you just said? Here is then, if you're identifying as an independent person, then you're going to want to make your own independent decisions. If

you identify as servant of the servant of the servant, then you'll choose the authority. Okay, so you can't say, because I identify as the servant of the servant, then I am able to make the right decision? No, it just means at least you're willing to do what is recommended.

One still may, by conditioning, still make the wrong decision, but at least, you know what I'm saying, but at least there's the willingness to follow authority, while the other is the authority is always yourself, because that's it. Either the authority is someone else, or the authority is yourself. It's not a third choice.

You know what I'm saying? So when you say guru-sādhū and śāstra, and then you don't accept that, then basically you're saying it's yourself. You can say, no, no, but I accept so many people as authority. No, that's the point.

You accept them as authority. If you didn't accept them, they're not authority. You know what I'm saying? That's the thing, is that who in your life you feel inspires you, that's because you chose them.

They didn't choose you. It's not that you were told that these are the people you have to follow. You just decided, you know, when you're reading about them, that they did something that you can relate to.

Are you saying that's a good thing or a bad thing? We're saying on a preliminary level, on the mundane level, it's good because you at least accept that there's someone else other than yourself as authority. But what we're saying is that it's still mundane, because it's still centered around yourself. But it always comes up.

But the point is, is the spiritual authority, it means you're accepting to come in line with that. But the point is, is these are authorities. It's by God's arrangement you made the right choice.

It's just like that. You say in history. Okay.

Who are the people that they tell you about in school? Yes. Yes. But the point is, is they've decided who is going to be, you know, you're going to hear about in history.

You know what I'm saying? Like that. So, and anybody can be good or bad, right? It means if you look at the locals, somehow another Captain Cook wasn't necessarily a special guy. Right? You know, especially down in Tasmania, they're probably really not going to appreciate, you know, that lineage.

But from others, then he's, you know, the founder of the, you know, this and that. You know what I'm saying? So it's all just a matter of what whimsical you do. But these are, it's not whimsical.

This is, it's coming down, it's authorized by the Lord. So this is proper. So the principle of authority is Krishna.

But then there is who Krishna says is good. Because the point is, is there is the principle of qualities. But then God is beyond that.

Because He is the one who has those qualities. Does that make sense? So therefore, His opinion, that's actually something special. Otherwise, it's God's opinion or our opinion.

He is everything. And we're, you know, we're only part of everything. And we're the smallest part.

Doesn't mean as any, we're not important. It just means that our particular take on, material take on things may not be as grand as we make them out to be. Does that make sense? So it's by the Lord's grace.

Because everything else is why you're choosing someone even we'll think I'm choosing, but actually we're not. It's that I am under a certain mode, so I have certain desires. Now how am I going to be inspired in those desires? I'm going to be inspired because I will take people who are doing those things as my inspiration.

Does that make sense? Yeah. I mean on the spiritual. Well it's not actually out of conditioning.

Because the desire for spiritual life is not based on conditioning. Conditioning can't create it. So it's only because there is that sincere idea that you're interested in transcendental than because Krishna is in the heart.

He knows that. He puts you in contact with bona fide devotees. So you can actually interact.

Then having interacted, you still have your independence. You can choose whether I want to do this or not. Well this is nice, so I'll add this to my life.

Or you know, okay, now I know what pure devotional service is and it doesn't look like what I want. What I meant is when you decide to become a devotee then you choose your authority according to your conditioning. It means you're choosing authority according to your conditioning but that only means the authority is bona fide.

It's not that you're making them bona fide. They're bona fide. It's just which one you work with.

Just like when you go to lunch, if there's a variety of preparations, you choose what you're interested in according to conditioning. Does that make sense? But they're all prescribed. So it doesn't really matter.

That's the nice thing in Krishna consciousness. It doesn't really matter as long as someone is properly situated in Krishna consciousness. Hearing from them is always useful.

You know, but just you may prefer this one, that one prefers that one. This vision would really allow diversity in unity. We'd be able to see the different applications.

Yes, yes, yes. That's the new hat. Yes.

No? Yes. Okay. Yes, yes.

Yes, true, true. Because the thing is, the point is, the principle is always Krishna and the manifestations are always His internal potency. So Krishna is one, but the manifestations are many.

That's why there's one Krishna, but there's 16,108 gopis. Those are prominent. Right? Because that's the prominent variety.

But if that's a problem, then you have 108. And if that's a problem, you have eight. Does that make sense? And that eight, then you have two.

And then, of course, you have one. Does that make sense? So that way then you can see the categories. Because the eight, it's easy to see what are the categories.

You know, because you have all the directions. The four cardinal and then in between. Right? But you have east, and then you have southeast.

Right? So those are very clear. But you also have east, southeast. And south, southeast.

You know, and then you have east, east, south. You know, like this. It means it just gets finer and finer.

So that's everything. So the eight are these eight directions. And then when you expand that 108, they're all the little ones in between.

And then 16,108, then there's even finer in between that. Does that make sense? So variety is inherent. If there's a creation, there's variety.

Right? If it's only Krishna, then you don't see the variety. She's in the center. That's what's called the yogapeet.

That's the Brahma star. That's why there's not supposed to be other things there, because that place is already taken. The prestige that is given to the caste Vaishnavas and descendants of Vaishnava acaryas does not increase the glories of the Vaishnava religion.

Rather, the audacity of non-Vaishnava dharma is increasing. Okay. Fun part.

This is a quote from Bhaktivinoda Thakura, Sajjantoshani 9.9. So that opening. There cannot be a Vaishnava bamsa. We are seeing many rogues take birth in various Vaishnava families.

That's Bhaktivinoda Thakura. Okay. The Jada Goswami, the use of Goswami as a family name is a deviation particular to this Appasampradaya.

Because Goswami means one who controls the senses. So it's like a title. Let's say the father

was, you know, very knowledgeable and a great scholar, so they give him the title Vidyabhushan.

But that applies to him. It doesn't apply to his son. Now his son's born, so now he's Vidyabhushan.

And then it starts the Vidyabhushan line. No, that's a title for him. So the six Goswamis, that's their title.

But the Prajaris, it's not their title, and it doesn't mean that it goes down. You might have an individual in the family who is, but then that applies to them. They're just like, you have a family for generations, they've been lawyers.

But it doesn't mean that automatically you're born in the family, you're a lawyer. No, you have to qualify yourself. Those sunken in mundane family affairs, they think themselves as important as the renounced Goswamis of the Gaudiya Sampradaya.

Because they're Gopal Bhatt Goswami's line, or Sanatana Goswami's line. So because they're in that caste Goswami line, they'll consider, yes, I am part of this. We are representing.

But the point is, how are they specifically representing? You know what I'm saying? If they're representing the teachings, yes. But if they're not, then no. Special shoulder wear.

No, that's mundane piety. Spiritual, it's just on your own, or specific uniqueness means the qualities of it will last, but the others won't. So that means you've done something very pious in the family.

It can be going for, basically means two and a half generations. So when you say three, it means the third generation is not full. Like that.

It always runs out there. So that's why it's important that if that tradition is good, that the son learns it, right? Then you push it ahead. So instead of just his son having partly that, it'll be now his grandson.

So each generation is doing that, so it goes on. That way then, even if somebody's not following, it's possible the next generation, you know, skipping a generation, could take it up, because they would have some element of piety, but they have to take it up. They don't take it up, then it's confirmed, it's finished.

Does that make sense? Okay, this is from Chaitanya Charitamrita. One who is still in family life should not misuse the title Goswami. Srila Bhaktisiddhanta Saraswati Thakur did not recognize the caste Goswamis because they were not in the line of the six Goswamis in the renounced order, who were direct disciples of Lord Chaitanya.

Namely, Sri Rupa Goswami, Srila Sanatana Goswami, Srila Bhatta Raghunatha Goswami, Srila Gopal Bhatta Goswami, Sri Jiva Goswami, and Srila Raghunatha Das Goswami. Srila

Bhaktisiddhanta Saraswati Thakur said that the grhastha ashram, or the status of family life, is a sort of concession for sense gratification. Therefore, a grhastha should not falsely adopt the title Goswami.

So the point that they're using this name as family people, that's the problem. So that's already starting off bogus. Because how are they in control of the senses? Because then why are they married? They may, within family life, engage everything, that's there.

But you don't consider that specifically, you don't give that the title Goswami. Right? That's the attitude. You understand? Because the form may be able to use spiritually, but if you're talking about renunciation, that's not the natural form.

The natural form is to not have those things. Right? So then that goes together, the form and the title go together. But if you're taking them and engaging them, then you'll say, that's like Ambarishmara, she's engaging everything in the Lord's service.

So you'd use something more like that, Atmanivedanam, or, you know, does that make sense? So it's just, you want to use the proper terminology. So Goswami wouldn't be the right terminology. Yes? Can you just now please clarify the word renunciation, because I think in the Bhagavad Gita it says that someone who is able to utilize their spiritual service and not attach, that is renunciation, as much as... Yes, but Gita gives it in, I think it's 18.1, gives it the definition between it.

Renunciation means you have something, it's yours, then you give it up for a higher purpose. Does that make sense? That's renunciation. Means the householder has a job, he makes money, then he uses that money in Krishna's service.

That's called renunciation. Because it's his money he's using in Krishna's service. Sannyasa is defined as before you start the work, it's already Krishna's.

So it's never yours. And that's renunciation also? It is, but it's a higher form. Oh.

You know what I'm saying? You still use the same word. Yes, so you can use the same word for both. But sannyasa means that you've given up the result before starting and renunciation means you're giving up the result after getting it.

You know what I'm saying? In other words, it's my money, I give it to Krishna. The other is I'm going out doing some service for Krishna that generates money, but it's not my money. So why does... Is there that verse that says... Sorry, I really can't remember where it is.

It says that... I think it's talking about one of those personalities in the Bhagavatam and it says that they are as good as a sannyasa. Because they can have that mentality, that they can be on that platform. But you just said one's not enough.

No, but it says you can be on the platform of sannyasi, that the indication there is the word

sannyasa. So sannyasa would indicate that in that case the work that they're doing is already offered to Krishna before they start the work. So he goes to his job and he thinks the money that comes from that job is already Krishna's.

It's not his to give to Krishna. It's already Krishna's. So therefore the grihastha can be the same as sannyasa.

All the four are supposed to be. That's the natural Vaishnava position. But if you don't gain that in the other, then the final stage of sannyasa is meant to... At least by this stage you do it.

But otherwise the idea is it's done before. There's just some very fine points and differences in those and they all seem to be around, like they've all got the same word universe. That's why context is important.

You have to see the context. Otherwise then it gets so many words it becomes hard to... You know what I'm saying? Most people know a word, maybe they know one or two synonyms, but sometimes that word has ten synonyms. But we don't use them or know them, but they're very specific.

You know what I'm saying? So if you're taking the finer, then renunciation and sannyasa are two aspects of the same thing. But if you're taking more generic, then it's all called renunciation. Does that make sense? Before Srila Bhaktisiddhanta, it seems that not so many people were sannyasis.

Not many were. It's just you don't hear about it so much because they were mostly just Paramahamsa sannyasis. They weren't taking pre-indrajakta sannyasis.

And can we say that the title of Babaji is like... We can apply Goswami to Babaji with bona fide Babaji. Babaji meaning... The term Babaji. The term Babaji is for someone who's acting in that way, yes.

It means it's just the fourth stage of sannyasa. Yes. Like that.

But it should be by realization. Someone could just sit down and be like that. But the point is it's natural that one goes through and then comes to that platform.

So Babaji means like... Means it is the position of Paramahamsa. Now whether the person is a Paramahamsa or not, that's another thing. Yes.

So the point is here, just to see and go out and to take advantage of the facilities offered by the sannyasa ashram that people are going to take it more seriously. The reach that they have. The influence that they have.

Then that can be used nicely in Krishna's service. Because the Babajis and all that weren't impressing the people. Right? But then if you have the dandi sannyasi, then generally most people will take them seriously.

So then for preaching it's a better position than that of the Paramahansa. But it's not that the sannyasi can't be a Paramahansa, just like the grihasta might be a Paramahansa. Does that make sense? But it's not that... They can't be a Goswami.

They can be, if they're acting on that sannyasa platform. But then that's them as an individual. It's not that it's automatic.

That's the point. Like a dwaita is known as a dwaita gosai. But he is married.

The ISKCON movement has never confirmed the title Goswami upon a householder. Although all the sannyasis we have initiated in ISKCON are young, we have awarded them the titles of the renounced order of life, Swami and Goswami, because they have completely dedicated their lives to preach the cult of Sri Caitanya Mahaprabhu. Caitanya-caritamṛta, Adi-lila, 12.27, purport.

Okay, footnote two. Quote, A person who has the pure characteristics of a brahmana due to devotional service, which is like a blazing fire burning to ashes all the sinful reaction of past lives, is certainly saved from the consequences of sinful acts, such as taking birth in a lower family. The consequences of sinful acts, such as taking birth in a lower family.

So that in itself is a sinful act. Because it's your consciousness and your desire, therefore you're taking birth. That's just the result of your desire.

Yes. How do you define western families? I mean, you're using that generic term or you would apply that to certain ethnicity? No, just generic. Okay, generic.

Not necessarily. But it's possible, right? It means, are you applying this for yourself or you're applying this for others? No, it's just... The idea is that the soul is pure. So if someone gets into... distracted, then how much one gets distracted, it's not a big deal.

Does that make sense? You don't make that much distinction. You know, he drank one bottle of beer or he drank five bottles of beer. Does it really matter? No.

Or he drank this brand of beer or that brand of beer. Does that make sense? That kind of thing, then, it's not... So therefore, for the devotees, it's not... The living entity comes into the material world. So where they happen to be at the particular time, when Lord Caitanya's mission comes, it doesn't really matter.

So they may be from a very good, pious background, and they may be from an impious background. It doesn't really matter, because the soul is pure by nature, so they just take up Krishna consciousness. Does that make sense on that? Yeah.

Okay. And you also have the element that... one of the reactions to improper thinking or thoughts, impure thoughts, is birth in a low family, like that. So you might have a very advanced person that somehow or another there's some distracting thoughts, so they'll take birth in a low family.

That's something why many times you see is that how someone from that background might very quickly progress. But it's not necessarily that it was coming from the devotional platform. It can be just from very pious.

They may have been very well-situated in the Vedic culture, but been thinking about things they shouldn't have. Do you know, actually, my question's really stupid, because I just applied, like, sinful to Western, whereas you can be sinful even in, like, some... So anyway, sorry. Yeah, sinful's, you know... How do you say? In Kali Yuga, then it's a very broad-minded, all-encompassing kind of thing.

Anybody can be sinful. Yeah, exactly. Yeah, like that.

So it's not an exclusive club. Yeah. Like that.

Yes. Maharaj, I apologize if this question has already been covered, but what is the difference between Goswami, Gosani, Gosai, Mahasai, these terms? They're the same thing. Same thing? Yeah, yeah.

Like that. You know, it's between devotee, Vaishnava. They're just all different ways of saying it.

Goswami is Sanskrit. You know, Gosai, that's Bengali. Okay, even though he may be born in a family of dog-eaters, he is recognized by learned scholars.

But a popular sutra... Oh, got it. Although a person may be a learned scholar in Vedic knowledge, he is not recognized if he is an atheist. Haribhakti Sudhodaya, 311.

Right, so the point is, is you're recognizing the actual qualities and activities. If it's devotional, then it's recognized that way. If it's not devotional, then it's recognized as non-devotional.

Okay, they may be in a very... As a non-devotee, they may be nicely situated or not nicely situated. Right? Very good birth, education, and everything like that. Or it may be the opposite.

They're devotee, but it's not good. So the point is, is the material situation isn't the deciding factor. It's what you do with it.

That's what decides. Is that something? Sometimes we hear preachers pointing out that choosing people from better situations is desirable. Is that only concerning the mechanics? It would be easier to understand... The mechanics means choosing someone with a better background.

Now let's say someone is from a Brahmin background. Right? Then if you're looking at the aspect of the other person is from a Brahmin background. Okay? Now, what would be an advantage? Right? Because spiritually it doesn't matter.

So therefore it only matters on the material platform. Right? Now conditioning means material. And mixed devotional service or neophyte means there's material mixed with spiritual.

So the point is, is when they're having a bad day and they're looking at the world through mundane eyes, you know, then are they gonna still have respect for their Guru? Yes, because they're born in a Brahmin family, the Guru's from a Brahmin family, so therefore they won't have any problem. Does that make sense? But if he's not, then they might have problem. So just to avoid that, that there should never be any mundane view of the spiritual master, that rule is there.

But it's only there because of the conditioning. So if someone's from a high-grade Brahmin family, it might be something to consider. But it's not actually important.

Because for the Vaishnavas you don't really care. Does that make sense? But, at the same time, it doesn't apply outside of that. You know what I'm saying? It's not that someone from a Brahmin family now can start something that everybody should take initiation with him because he's according to, you know, what's Hari-Bhakti-Velasthi's recommending.

And the others are born in Mleccha-Yavana family, so that's not ideal. Those are only given because of the mundane consideration. Like we saw all the different personalities who came to see the Babajis, right? And so they had heard that, you know, I can't even remember the names now.

But he was from Shantipur, from a nice Vaishnava family, but now he's hanging out with those Navadvipa Vaishnavas, or the Swoopna's Vaishnavas. And from that, then, you know, he's not acting in a way that, you know, a proper caste Goswami would act. You know, so then they were indignant about that.

How is he taking instruction from someone who's not from a caste Goswami family? So they came over to, you know, establish their position. So depending upon who they were, then much of the time then they would ask Vaishnava Das Babaji to speak. Because he is from, you know, Brahmin family, he speaks Sanskrit, he was a sannyasi, a varanasi, he can speak and can debate, do all those things.

So anything that they would regard as desirable in a guru, he had. Then when he explains Vaishnavism, how it's not important, they have more of a chance to accept it. Otherwise, the others, they could easily, right? They could easily explain it.

But from the mundane platform, they maybe say, well, you're just saying that because you're not from such a family. You know, but now when someone from that family says it, then it's kind of like, okay, then you have to accept it. So that's why then it's considered.

So the time Bhaktivinoda Thakura, you know, even now there are, but it's getting smaller and smaller. Like that, it's getting smaller and smaller. But it'd be more prominent in society.

So therefore, just go with that. In other words, a Vaishnav from a Brahmin family, accept him. But if he's only from a Brahmin family, that's not the person you accept for Vaishnav dictionary.

Then it's a matter of whoever knows about Krishna, he's guru. Now if amongst that, then there's opportunity to someone from the Brahmin family, and you're from the social system, right? It means you're a grihastha and that whole. Then that might be there because even if you accept, others might not.

And then every time you meet relatives and other members of the community, all you're talking about is how is it that your guru is not a Brahmin. A real waste of time. So therefore, you accept someone from a Brahmin family, and no one says anything.

They simply ask about the wife and kids. But otherwise it's like, oh, hey, he's the guy who's guru. So it's just to avoid trouble, that's why these rules are there.

But it's not that they're the prominent rule. They're simply details that apply if your situation is like that. And if it's not like that, then don't worry.

Because the point is, the devotee is what you're looking for. That's the essential. What's that? A popular superstition in Bengal alluded to in the purport of Chaitanya Charanamita, Madhya Lila 10.23, is that a person who's born in caste Goswami families are automatically uttamadakaras, right? Because it's saying that those who have committed the sinful act of being born in a low-class family.

So therefore they're taking the opposite. So therefore if they're born in Goswami families, they're automatically pious and this and that. They're automatically born uttamadakaras.

How would you say that? It's like if you're really rich, you're born with a silver spoon or a gold spoon in your mouth. You're born with a pair of japa beads. I don't know.

Born with a Tulsi leaf in his mouth. I don't know. It's like that.

Yes. I would say most midwives wouldn't recommend this. Yeah.

So therefore, you know, he must be a great personality. He's born like that. Others are not exactly born like that.

So. Thus the title Prabhupada is theirs by birthright. The Gaudiya Vaishnava Sampradaya rejects this.

So they think because you're born in a sinful family, that's a symptom of sin. If you're born in a Goswami family, it's a symptom of piety. So because it's devotee, so therefore it's devotional piety, therefore you're automatically an uttamadakara.

You get the steps there they're taking? Yes. That's the... It is said, falena pariciyate. One is recognized by the results of his actions.

In Vaishnava society, there are many types of Vaishnavas. Some of them are called Goswamis. Some are called Swamis.

Some are called Prabhus. And some are Prabhupada. One is not recognized, however, simply by such a name.

A spiritual master is recognized as an actual guru who, when in a scene, he has changed the character of his disciples. Because that's the point. How do you know if his character is... Can he change the character of others? Does that make sense? So one may doubt the person, but you look at the disciple.

Their change, then you can say, OK, otherwise how does that affect? Does that make sense? Because otherwise you can find fault in anybody. Ramachandra Puri found fault in Lord Caitanya. You know, that he's a grossly materialistic sannyasi because there were ants crawling around in his room.

And so if ants are there, ants like sugar, therefore he must be eating sweets. You know, so it's possible to find fault. You know, say, Jarasandha didn't appreciate Krishna because he killed his uncle.

Right? You know, why would he kill a family man? You know, because Kamsa was, you know, his uncle. He was a demon. Right? So he found fault in God for this, you know, seeming transgression.

So one can always find fault. So here is that you have the person, of course, but then see what's the effect on who they are associating with. Does that make sense? Good.

Okay. Okay. So we'll end here.

Next we'll get into more detail. He says here, To avoid the unpleasantness of controversy, some names are omitted. But you notice he said, Some.

Not all. Some. Okay.

Hare Krishna. Hare Krishna. Krishna Krishna.

Hare Hare. Hare Rama. Hare Rama.

Rama Rama. Hare Hare. Jaya Srila Prabhupada ki.

Jaya. Jaya. Jaya.

Jaya. Jaya. Jaya.

Jaya.