

20130305 Apasampradayas p11-15

Sadhguru chants Sadhguru chants Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare, Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare, A popular superstition in Bengal alluded to the purport of Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Madhya 10.23, is that persons born in caste Gosvāmīs are automatically Uttamādhikārīs. Thus the title Prabhupāda is theirs by birthright. The Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Sampradāya rejects this, quote, It is said, phalena pariciyate, one is recognized by the results of his actions.

In Vaiṣṇava society there are many types of Vaiṣṇavas. Some of them are called Gosvāmīs, some are called Swāmīs, some are Prabhūs, and some are Prabhupāda. One is not recognized, however, simply by such a name.

A spiritual master is recognized as an actual guru when he has seen he has changed the character of his disciples. Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Antya-līlā 3.143 purport. It is also difficult to hear us when you are working on these principles, is that you are not trying to change the character of the disciple.

Because if you are pushing too much, then they become dissatisfied, so then they are not going to be very supportive, and you don't get your dakṣi. Right? So that's, that's the difficulty there. So they are not trying to change, they are trying to just inspire them to, you know, keep that connection.

So then that's another weakness of this kind of approach, because then the difficulty is you don't actually get the position of guru, of actually trying to change. Right? So, so it, you know, you end up with this very sentimental sampradāya, that they think that they are performing pure devotional service when actually it's not being done. In Vṛndāvana many of the important temples are managed by caste Gosvāmīs.

The history of two such prominent families illustrate how the jāda Gosvāmī contamination can divert even highly qualified persons from the path of the great ācāryas. To avoid the unpleasantries of controversy, some names are omitted. One clan has temples in Mathura, Jātipura, Gokula and Kāmān.

They descend from a brāhmaṇa who is a famous contemporary of Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu, who, as described in Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta, became formally linked with, with Gaurīva Vaiṣṇava's sampradāya when he received initiation from Śrī Gaurādhara Paṇḍita. Śrīla Prabhupāda remarked that Lord Caitanya accepted him as a great scholar, but not necessarily as a great devotee. At Govardhana he took over the management of a temple that had been established by a great Gaurīva Vaiṣṇava ācārya.

During this time, the learned brāhmaṇa associated with the six Gosvāmīs, especially Rūpa and Sanātana." Okay, footnote. Quote, Therefore, Vallabha Bhatta invited Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu for lunch, and the Lord introduced the brothers Rūpa and Vallabha to Him. From a distance, the

brothers Rūpa, Gosvāmī and Śrī Vallabha fell on the ground and offered obeisances to Vallabha Bhatta with great humility.

When Vallabha Bhatta walked towards them, they ran away to a more distant place. Rūpa Gosvāmī said, I am untouchable and most sinful. Please do not touch me.

Vallabha Bhattācārya was very much surprised at this. Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu, however, was very pleased, and He therefore spoke to him this description of Rūpa Gosvāmī. Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu said, Don't touch him, for he belongs to a very low caste.

You are a follower of Vedic principles and are a well-experienced performer of many sacrifices. You also belong to the aristocracy. Caitanya tried to leave him, but he'll leave in 1965.

Generally, brāhmaṇas are puffed up, you understand, here, so He's dealing with them as if He's a scholar. Because the point is, within devotees, you don't worry about this, that someone is low-born or this or that, so that Lord Caitanya would also support, No, don't touch him, because he's low-class. Do you understand? So, in other words, He's dealing with the element of scholarship, not with devotion.

Isn't also Mahāprabhu wasn't really pleased with his commentary? It's not so much the commentary, but the attitude that his commentary is better than Śrīdhārāṣṭrā's. Because Śrīdhārāṣṭrā, he's previous in the line, and Śrīdhārāṣṭrā is accepted by all the Sampradāyas as a scholar. So you don't say you're making a better commentary than the previous Ācāryas.

You can add things, try to bring out, just because the Ācārya doesn't bring out a particular point in a particular detail, doesn't mean that when you add that, that you've made something superior. The principles are there, and you give example on a, by something that would be relevant to explain it. Now, if you have to explain it in a different scenario, it doesn't mean that you've improved it.

Does that make sense? Let's say, like, someone makes a comment in one language, but somebody doesn't understand it. So by you translating it into another language doesn't mean you've improved upon the quality of the original statement. You've simply made it accessible.

So that's the whole point, if Śrīdhārāṣṭrā has given a commentary. Now, if there's something that you feel in a particular environment would need more explanation, because the persons don't understand what Śrīdhārāṣṭrā is saying, then you do that. That's your ānubhāṣya, your sub-commentary.

And that's fine, that's great. That's what preaching means, is how to make the teachings of the Ācāryas accessible to the target person. So that's natural.

But to say, because you're doing that, therefore it's better, then that's not understanding the attitude. Does that make sense? You know, it's just like, let's say the mother has cooked, you know, but it's sitting up on the counter, the child can't get at it, you know. So, you know, the

sister, you know, comes along and takes it off the counter and puts it down on the table where the kid can eat it, and now the sister claims that, you know, her dealing with the food is actually a superior position than the mother's, because the mother's was inaccessible to the child, but now she's made it accessible.

Does that make sense? So, it's just not the etiquette. The point is, is to make it accessible. But the Ācāryas are giving principles that are always being able to be applied.

Now, someone who's intelligent can catch that, but otherwise the commentaries are made to make it more accessible. Does that make sense? You know, so that's what Lord Caitanya didn't appreciate. There was no discussion of the commentary itself, you know, like that, yes.

Do you think Balabhata recognized his mistake? That I'm not sure. You'd have to look in Caitanya Charter. You know, this section seems to be something that's dealing with it.

You know, we'll see what's said. The problem is, is that's another thing, because the point is, is Lord Caitanya has met all these personalities and then told them what to preach, but whether He met Balabhata Ācārya or whether He met him as Nimbārka, that's another thing, you know. Then, no, He met him.

Then that's a dervish's song. I'm not sure which line that is. But whatever is the line, means, I think He met him in this original form.

Okay, next quote. Generally, Brahmins are puffed up with false prestige because they belong to the aristocracy and perform many Vedic sacrifices. The aristocracy means Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas.

That's the aristocracy. So, you know, that's another thing. In South India especially, this fastidious position is most prominent.

Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu actually started a revolution against this brahminical system by inaugurating the chanting of the Hare Kṛṣṇa mantra. Right? It doesn't mean that you bring down that. He says this acts against this brahminical system.

Means, in other words, you've taken the Veda and you've misapplied it. So, it's a revolution against that misapplication. It's not against the brahminical system because the point is, it's everybody who chants then by their position is that of a brahmin.

So, you're not revolting against the brahminical position. You're against that brahminical position as by birth. Does that make sense? Yeah.

Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu is here hinting to Vallabha Bhāṭṭa that an exalted brāhmaṇa who makes sacrifices in following Vedic principles should not neglect the person who is engaged in devotional service by chanting the holy name of the Lord. Oh, I see. This is the verses, then this is the purport.

Okay. Okay. Actually, the Arupa Goswami did not belong to a lower caste.

He was from a highly aristocratic brāhmaṇa family. Basically, the level of brāhmaṇa family he's from, you don't get really any higher than that. You know, the Gaur Saraswat brāhmaṇas, that's already higher.

Because even within the Saraswat brāhmaṇas, the Gaur Saraswat are considered a touch higher. And then within them, he's from the Bhāradvāja-śākha, so that's considered very, very elevated. You know, it's an impressive position.

But due to his association with the Muslim Nawab, he was considered fallen and was excommunicated from brāhmaṇa society. However, due to his advanced devotional service, Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu accepted him as a Goswami. Vallabha Bhattacarya knew all this.

One who is a devotee is above caste and creed. Yet Vallabha Bhattacarya felt himself prestigious. So that's the position.

He knew all this, but still he considered his position very special. So these things happened. Okay, during this time, the learned brāhmaṇa associated with the six Goswamis, especially Rūpa and Sanātana.

Because his own men lacked training, Gauriya Vaiṣṇavas were appointed to do the puja under his supervision. The brāhmaṇa had two sons. He left the world in the year 1530.

Śrīla Raghunātha dāsa Goswami requested one son to take over the temple management. The temple duties continued to be shared between Gauriya Vaiṣṇavas and the learned brāhmaṇa's disciples until around the year 1550, when an intrigue was begun against the Gauriya devotees. Once, while they were worshipping the Deity, an envious disciple of the brāhmaṇa set fire to the homes of the Gauriya pujārīs and drove them out.

Thereafter, the Deity was claimed as the sole property of the brāhmaṇa's clan. In 1699, due to threat of Muslim attack, the Deity vacated Vṛndāvana and eventually came to Rajasthan. So now is that, I think there's even a, just a custom in the temple, is they don't even, they don't let Gauriya sannyāsīs come into the temple, because they're worried they'll claim the Deity.

Though the brāhmaṇa's son was not part of the intrigue, he took no steps to heal the rupture with the Gauriya sampradāya, to block a challenge to his authority from among his father's disciples. He appointed his seven sons as ācāryas and willed that only they and their descendants could use the title Gosvāmī Mahārāja and give initiation. Later on, the family propagated a myth that the great brāhmaṇa's son was an incarnation of Kṛṣṇa.

The same pseudo-divinity was appropriated by succeeding generations and used as means of explaining away the amorous pastimes of some of the clans. The second, okay, so that's one main line that you see in Vṛndāvana came out of the Gaudiyas. The second line of Vṛndāvana-caste Gosvāmīs under discussion was started by someone who took sannyāsa in Gopāla Bhatta

Gosvāmī.

As if in initiation, invitation of Lord Nityānanda, he later married two sisters and claimed that he had been ordered to do so by Śrī Kṛṣṇa personally. The Gauriya Vaiṣṇava community disapproved both his deed and defense. In the year 1585, he established a mandir near Kaliya Ghat.

The caste Gosvāmīs who manage this mandir today are descendants of his first son. Descendants of his second son manage another famous Vṛndāvana temple. This, so this is the second line.

This clan takes a dim view of what they think are the unnecessary austerities of the Gosvāmīs of the Gauriya Vaiṣṇava sampradāya, because who established their line was the sannyāsī who then got married, right? So therefore they don't like the idea of this renunciation and everything like that. Because if it's good, then there'd be an idea, well then, why did their leader get married, right? Kṛṣṇa loves His devotees, they argue, and He becomes pleased when He sees them living a life of material comfort and sense gratification. They uphold their founder's example as superior to that of the six Gosvāmīs.

So this is the difficulty, is when you have a position and to try to maintain social prestige, then one adjusts the philosophy, right? The point is, is if they want to be married and live a comfortable life, do it. You can still be devotees. But don't then claim that you're the Gosvāmīs and this is the superior position to the renounced Gosvāmīs.

In other words, the married Gosvāmīs are better than the renounced ones. You don't do that. Because socially it doesn't work like that.

The point is, is that whatever your position, whether you're engaging the senses or engaging renunciation, it doesn't matter. What works for you and the position you're in at the time, that's what you do, right? So it's not what's superior, it's what's better for you. Does that make sense? Let's say you have some nice, well-cooked, you know, food, but you're sick and you can't eat that.

You have to eat something else, like let's say Corella juice or something. Now if you claim that Corella juice is superior food and this other, what we call normal food is not, you know what I'm saying, why do that? You know? So for social prestige you don't do those things. Right? It's just that, you know, you're sick, you're taking this.

That person's not sick, he can eat that. That's, that's, then, then the dance goes nicer, then everybody can cooperate together. It all works very well.

One Priyadasa of this clan composed a work called Shushloka Manimala, in which he asserts that the founder was the spiritual master of Sanatana Gosvami and Jiva Gosvami. With this and other fabrications, they defend their apasampradaya as the genuine sampradaya. This, this sannyasi, Duke Sannyasa from Gopal Bhatta Gosvami, now he's claiming that he was the

spiritual master of Sanatana Jiva Gosvamis.

Right? Because, you know, all these things they're just trying to do to establish their position. Rather than just saying we're a bunch of grihastha pujaris who are worshipping the deity and, you know, we're comfortable as grihasthas and we're just pujaris, know that they want to be the acharyas. You know, so then it doesn't work very nice.

Several historical accounts, including the biography of Srinivasa Acharya entitled Prema-vilasa, relate that the founder met his death by having his head chopped off, either by robbers or by a disgruntled pujari. In 1932, the Kaskoswamis of Vrindavan proposed the Vrachamandala Parikrama. Sri Bhaktisiddhanta says what he talked about.

And his Gaudiya Matha disciples on the grounds that he had deviated from the Vedic system by offering the sacred bed to persons not of rabbinical parentage. Right? So now that's a big offense. You can't deviate from that.

But all these other deviations, those are just normal. You understand? Because then they're born in the Brahmin family and if you push that point, that's the one point you can't say that they're not doing. Does that make sense? You're born in a Brahmin family, you can't claim he's not born in a Brahmin family.

So by that qualification alone, then, you know, he makes his stand. Right? Now all the bogus things are just by being born there, you automatically, utta-madhukari, you're Goswami, you know, the grhastha position is better, this, that, all these different things you say. That's all bogus against the Vedic principles.

Because those ones, then it's a matter of you have to have the character and behavior to be identified as such, as a Goswami. But the other one, you don't have to have any character at all. You can be a complete rat bag and, you know, because you're born in the family, then you can claim that we're Brahmins.

Does that make sense? It has nothing to do with your own character. You may have character, but the point is, is it's not based on having character. The other one is you have the character, that's your position.

You don't have the character, you're not in that position. Does that make sense? Therefore, you'll see, they pick and choose those things that they will adjust, they're very lenient and broad-minded about. And then those things that they can take as facts, then they'll be very, very hard-lined, because then that puts everybody else down and them up.

Right? Does that make sense? Because if you can be born in any family and come to the position of a Goswami, what's the uniqueness of their position? Because we see even in their line, you had so many personalities there, but then they claim that, no, only this person or only his sons can be used the title of Goswami, no one else can. Right? Does that make sense? So it's just simply that it's based on birth. It has nothing to do with actual qualification.

Right? In theory, born in that family, they should get exposed and trained nicely. But still, the idea that only they can do that, that's not proper. You know what I'm saying? So that's what Lord Caitanya was revolting against.

Should the Prabhupāda explain the fallacy of the Jād Goswami in this regard to a letter, in a letter to Acyutananda Swami, regarding the validity of the brahminical status as we accept it, because in the present age there's no observance of the Garbhodana ceremony. Even a person born in a brāhmaṇa family is not considered a brāhmaṇa. He is called dvija-bandhu, or unqualified son of a brāhmaṇa.

Under the circumstances, the conclusion is that the whole population is now śūdra. It is stated, kalau śūdra-śambhava. So for śūdras there's no initiation according to the Vedic system.

But according to the Pañcarātrapa system, initiation is offered to a person who's inclined to take Kṛṣṇa consciousness. Right? So in the Vedic, the Upanayana, then it's not offered because the qualification is not there. Right? But, in the Pañcarātrapa, then one can gain that.

Because through the Pañcarātrapa the body is changed, or purified, then one can qualify. Is that what you said? Yes. Yes, Mahārāja.

Like, now comes the younger generation, sons of the devotees, and they, if they are inclined, and they come to Kurukula, and even before they're born they'll be making saṁskāras, like Karmadāna, it's all proper way, so then they kind of can take the Upanayana to study like that. Yes, if they have the qualification, yes. But otherwise it's by Pañcarātrapa that someone becomes qualified.

Yes, but basically it starts from the Karpasvara. Yes, but it's not by birth that they have it. They have to qualify.

So some people just consider that as they're born in the family of devotees, then automatically they qualify. But it's the same mistake. It's the same mistake.

Right. It's interesting, right after Śrīla Prabhupāda left, his son actually claimed, you know, and he fought again, he gained, he scored. Yes.

He claimed that. It's his. Yes, it's his.

Yes, yes, yes. So that's, that's, that's, the whole thing is always you have to avoid these things, you know. You always have to be very careful.

Because you see is all these lines, these Goswamis lines, they're not actually starting from the Goswamis. They're starting from someone who's a disciple of a Goswami. And then they're claiming that they're the Goswamis.

And then in worse is that later generation is saying they're superior to the original. You know, so it's, it's, it's all, it's, because if you establish the original, then you have, they'll be saying that

what their position is not right. So you have to say they're actually the gurus of, so just their disciples didn't really understand.

The six Goswamis didn't really understand because they weren't on the level of the guru, right, you know. Does that make sense? No. No, okay.

Yes, so that's the problem. It doesn't make sense. But it's, all it is is to establish their social position.

Śrīla Prabhupāda, okay. Śrīla Prabhupāda explained the fallacy of the Jada Goswami in this regard in a letter to Acyutananda Swami. Regarding the validity of the brahminical status, oh, okay, we just read that.

Yeah, in other words, it's not that they couldn't come up to the standard like anybody else, but it's not that they're in a more special position than anybody else. Because they may be born in brahmin families, but they're not practicing, they're governed on saṁskāra. So then, how is it that their birth is special? So by their birth is not more unique than anybody else's.

Now, if the parents are practicing some variety of Kṛṣṇa consciousness, that's an advantage. You have an advantage over another person who parents don't practice any kind of Kṛṣṇa consciousness. But the claim is not because the parents are practicing Kṛṣṇa consciousness by that association, now they've taken that up and become serious.

That's not the claim at all. The claim is that they're born in this family, that's their qualification. But Prabhupāda's point is that brahmin means born according to Garbhodan.

If you're not born according to Garbhodan, that's not brahmin. So you don't have the birth advantage. Because that's the point why it's said aristocracy.

Because in the past, all the aristocracy, brahmins, kṣatriyas and vaiśyas, they all had children according to Garbhodan. Śūdras didn't worry about it. Not that they couldn't do it, but they didn't chant the Vedic mantras.

And generally, because passions are there, then... Does that make sense? So many families you can talk to that they were only planning on having this many children, but they have a few more. So what does that mean? It means that the concept of Garbhodan is not exactly rating high on their list. Does this make sense? So, that point is, how can you claim to have that special brahminical birth when it wasn't? You're born into a family of people who come in a lineage of brahmins, and maybe may or may not be practicing, but your birth is not unique.

It's no different than a śūdra's birth. Is that yes? Mahārāja, can you explain this when you said that through panchalātrika system one changes his body? Yeah, through initiation. Can you explain what it means? Means you want to know the actual metaphysics of how it changes, what happens with the DNA, and if it doesn't go this way it changes and goes that way.

Not just this concept. But what aspect of the concept? Means you're initiated into the Sampradāya, so that changes the body, just like the example is given that you can make, how you say, mercury into gold, to go through the alchemy process. So you're just changing it because it has that ability.

The human life is meant for spiritual realization, so you commit yourself to that practice, then it changes. It's not that you look any different. So don't get your hopes up.

You know, person comes to initiation, sits down in front of the guru and he calls for the name, hands the guru a picture. The guru looks at the picture, what's this? Says, after initiation my body changes, I want to look like that. So, that won't happen.

You'll still look the same. Yeah, because the point is, you're changing the subtle body, because you're changing the consciousness. So the gross comes from subtle, therefore it changes.

In Bengal, besides caste Goswamis, who at least have a valid genealogical link to some Vaishnava of the past, there are even pretenders who claim to the name Goswami, lacks any foundation whatsoever. So he's even saying, amongst these caste Goswamis, some of them do say, you can say, there is a family link back to some personality that was prominent. But he says, but there's other lines that they don't even have that, they just use the title.

Many of the important temples and holy places connected with Lord Caitanya's pastimes remain under Jada Goswami control. Up until the early part of this century, they held the lower caste Vaishnavas in an iron grip of ignorance and exploitation. It's only with the preaching, basically, of Bhaktisiddhanta Saraswati Thakur that this gets broken.

Srila Bhaktivinoda Thakur challenged the Jada Goswami in such works as Jaya Vidharma and Harinam Chintamani by proclaiming that it is not enough to accept the spiritual master merely on the basis of his caste. Before initiation, the candidate must be completely satisfied that the initiator is fully conversant with the scriptures and can lift his disciples out of ignorance. The guru must be of spotless character.

If he is addicted to sinful acts, even those he may have already initiated must reject him. Bhaktivinoda Thakur's, now here this rejection is depending, if it's a proper line, then the connection is valid, just the siksha is not valid. So the rejection means you're rejecting the siksha and then taking siksha from someone else.

But the siksha remains in place. If they were, you know, a bogus line, so there is no connection to the shit potency, then one actually takes initiation in the line. Does that make sense? So you have to distinguish between these two.

There is no question of re-initiation. Re-initiation, no. It means you call it re-initiation if they were bogus sampradaya because you may go through the same rituals and call it by the same name.

But it's actually a real initiation. But it's actually only the first time you're getting initiated. But if it was actually a proper initiation, but then later the person who gave the initiation proves to be unfit, then the initiation is valid, just the nourishment of it is not.

Does that make sense? You know, it's just like, let's say, you're born and then you're fed. Right? What nourishes your birth? Right? The food. Right? So therefore, your mother gives birth and she feeds you.

That's the normal thing. But now if she becomes unqualified to feed you, she's sick or something, can't take care, it's not that now your birth becomes invalid. You understand? No, the problem is you still need to be fed.

Therefore, someone else will feed you. Does that make sense? Of course, that example doesn't work so well trying to apply it to the other part of it. It means that, well, what if you weren't born? It doesn't work.

Yes, in other words, examples have to be eliminated. Bhaktivinoda's books unleashed a wave of reform in Bengal that pushed the Jada Goswami into a defensive stance. But the conversation came to open war when his son, Srila Bhaktisiddhanta Sarasvati, took over the Gaudiya mission.

So in other words, when Bhaktisiddhanta Sarasvati Thakur became the president of the Vishwa Vaishnav Rajya Sabha, that's when it really started to get... that's when it was direct war. With Bhaktivinoda Thakur, he made it available to everybody so the individual could read and understand so they themselves might not practice. But he wasn't directly confronting them.

With Bhaktisiddhanta Sarasvati Thakur, he directly confronted. In 1912, he was invited to attend... Saminlani... Assembly of Vaishnav sponsored by the Maharaj of Koshin Bazar. But some Jada Goswami and the Sahajiya supporters prevented him from giving a public lecture.

In protest, he fasted for four days straight. Because he was invited to go, and then they arranged it so he wasn't speaking. So he was invited by this... the Maharaj of Koshin Bazar.

So he was at his place, but he didn't eat. So you're at Maharaj's place, and he can't even feed you. He gets out.

So he became very worried. According to the account of his disciple, Sambhinanda Radhas, the Charyasiddhanta Sarasvati refuted all the arguments placed before him by the caste proponents in a discussion separate from the main program. The Jada Goswami thus learned to fear Śrīla Bhaktisiddhanta Sarasvati as the single most threat to their privileged existence.

It's very interesting. He established the position of the brāhmaṇas. So they were very much appreciated.

Because the point is that the position of a brāhmaṇa is special. But then, after having done that, then he showed that the Vaiṣṇava position is superior because it's not based on any mundane

consideration. It's simply based on the level of consciousness.

Therefore, anybody by qualifications, by association and practice, can qualify themselves as a brāhmaṇa. After taking sannyāsa in 1918, Śrīla Bhaktisiddhanta Sarasvati mounted a concerted effort to smash the influence of the Jāda Gosvāmī, even in their strongholds. He fearlessly toured Jessore and Kulma, now in Bangladesh, the home turf of Priyanātha Nandī, who was the leading spokesman of the caste Gosvāmīs.

Priyanātha met defeat in a public debate held at the village of Tutpara. Things came to a head in February to March 1925. Just as the Gauḍīyamāt began nine days of anabhadrī pāraṅkā, leading up to that year's Gauḍīyamā festivals, the party of devotees, numbering several thousand, and personally led by Śrīla Bhaktisiddhanta, was viciously attacked by guṇḍa hirelings of the Jāda Gosvāmī when it entered the city of Navadvīpa without paying a tax for maintenance of caste Gosvāmī temples.

Armed with brick bats and other weapons, the guṇḍas charged the elephant procession, injuring many pilgrims. The shocked public sided with the Gauḍīyamāt devotees, and the pilgrims continued under police protection. The incident permanently tarnished the reputation and influence of the Jāda Gosvāmī.

Overnight, their stubborn opposition to Śrīla Bhaktisiddhanta's preaching lost all force. We'll just smile again for next time. The Caste Gosvāmī Mentality at ISKCON By Śrīla Prabhupāda's mercy, the grossest Jāda Gosvāmī deviation, hereditary guru-ship, seems unlikely to take root in the ISKCON he constituted.

Because it's understood, it just doesn't work. And also, see, it's really easy, I mean, in general, it's easy to say, it's easy amongst mlecchas and yāvanas, that, you know, there's nothing special in birth. Right? Because there is nothing special in birth.

So, therefore, it's a very easy concept to accept. Yet, the author recalls a period in the 1970s when the devotees of the New York temple were addressing their GBC man as Gosvāmī Mahārāja, even though he'd abandoned his sannyāsa āśrama and taken a wife. After various indelicacies about his marriage came to light, such nice words, right? Certain indelicacies, this person was forced to relinquish his position.

So here is at least one example of how an aberration of the Jāda Gosvāmī type found its way, albeit briefly, into ISKCON. So one has to distinguish between just respecting for what their position is as a preacher and that of what was previously held. Right? Just like, well, he's giving the example here, if you had the sannyāsī, who therefore may have been a Gosvāmī and then got married but continued with the title, and then all his hereditary, they carried that line.

So he's saying in that kind of example it was similar. Does that make sense? It's another thing if by their activities it's still the same, then they may be respected as a preacher and a prominent person. Does that make sense? But that's different, you want to be careful it doesn't, it's not

simply because you used to have it, but that you actually qualify.

In this connection there are other characteristics of the caste Gosvāmī apasampradāya that are worth noting. The jat Gosvāmī are the priestly caste of a mundane religion that superficially resembles Vaiṣṇava dharma. As Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī used to say, they use the śaligram śrīla and the arch of igrāha as stones for cracking nuts, i.e. as means of income for sense enjoyment.

He gives the story of the bhajāī got some nuts but they were too hard to crack so he picked up the śaligram and broke the nuts with the śaligram. So the idea is that they're showing the deity to make money. This is what Prabhupāda many times talks about, we don't do that because that's what the jat Gosvāmī does.

They give siddha pranāli initiation in which they quote-unquote reveal the disciples' rasa with Kṛṣṇa as a ritual means of garnering a follower's lifetime financial support. Because there's nothing higher than this, otherwise they get initiated and they may come to more realization and give up the position. So if you've already given them the so-called highest position then you'll naturally stick with them your whole life.

And because it's okay, now who makes money in the society? Gṛhasthas. Who needs money? Gṛhasthas. Therefore the Gosvāmīs of Gṛhastha is saying it's a superior position than renunciation so he doesn't have to give up Gṛhastha and the others don't have to give up Gṛhastha.

So therefore the income becomes permanent. So you have to give them credit for really thinking this through to create a very nice social and economic position. They neglect their disciples' factual spiritual advancement by not teaching them the regular principles of sadhana bhakti.

Indeed such quote-unquote Gosvāmīs are worshipped by BD Seva, ceremonial presentation of cigarettes. Offerings of fish. That will be more, I think, in Bengal the ones outside those lines mentioned before.

Because he mentioned these Gosvāmīs coming down from Gadādhara and from Gopal Bhatta. So those will be ones that will be practicing to some degree the Gaudiya tradition. But the problem is that they say simply by birth they're qualified.

Then you have, as he says, other ones who just take the titles and how they connect themselves I'm not sure. But they may be to other associates and this and that. But many of the lines have become degraded where they smoke cigarettes and eat fish.

But they ritualize it so it seems like a part of the sadhana. How they do it, that's another thing. Okay, how does such deviations begin? Here are a few indications.

Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Thakur explains that even though one may become free from

the desire for fruitive activity, sometimes the subtle desire for fruitive activity comes into being within the heart. One's trying to get rid of it but it may come up on its own because we've been in the material world a long time and that's what we've been doing the whole time. So simply out of habit sometimes these things just come up on their own.

One often thinks of conducting business to improve devotional activity. However, the contamination is so strong that it may later develop into misunderstanding described as *kūtināta*, fault-finding, and *pratiṣṭhāśa*, the desire for name and fame, for high position, *jīva-himṣa*, envy of other living entities, *nisiddhācāra*, accepting things forbidden in the *śāstra*, *kāma*, desire for material gain, and *pūjā*, hankering for popularity, *cittaṇi-caritāmṛta-madhyalīlā* 12.133 purport. So in other words, the idea may be good that one is trying to create facility and from this facility then improve devotional service or expand devotional service, but one has to be careful that these things don't come up along with it.

Does that make sense? Because if you have no money, don't need any money, you're living under a tree, then is there need for money and prestige? Not really, unless you want to say, we're in this line of tree sitters so we sit under these trees and only those in my family can sit under these trees, you've got to sit under those trees. But otherwise, generally speaking, we don't hear too much of that kind of a thing. Definitely the people that sit under the trees, even in material society, all trees, anybody can sit under the trees, everything's natural.

Does that make sense? Because you're dealing with these areas, these are the faults that come up. Means where does all fault-finding, desire for name, fame, high position, envy about the living entities, accepting things forbidden, desire for material gain and hankering for popularity come from? They come from dealing with these areas. Those that deal with the areas of economics and position, these are the difficulties they have to watch that don't come up.

Does that make sense? So therefore, the devotee always has to be aware that they don't come up. Does it happen merely by association? It means if you associate with them by habit, you might think of that mentality that one has had before in the material world when dealing with these things. Does that make sense? So therefore, one always has to be aware.

So the point is that sometimes it settles up. Often one thinks of conducting business to improve devotional activity. It says, however, the contamination is so strong it may later develop into misunderstanding.

It may. It's not that it has to, but the point is if you're not warned, you may not be careful. If you go into the kitchen, if you're not warned about the knives are sharp or the machines are dangerous or the pots are hot, then... Does that make sense? You might... But even you know this, you might forget.

So the point is there's always a danger. So one must always watch out for these things. So he's just saying, how do they come up? This is how.

That you're dealing with the material energy, but you have to be careful to deal with material energy that, you know, the yukta is there, it's connected to Krishna, the vairagya, the result is for Krishna. Because otherwise then we may sometimes forget to connect it to Krishna, therefore the result's not for Krishna. And so then these things can come up.

Yes? So... I'm going to use an example, because I have this one in my head, but this is about the spiritual world, so I know it doesn't apply, but someone like the residents of Vrindavan, their wives, and they're engaged in, you know, like exchange of money and stuff. So just say you've got a family like that, you're in the material world, would they get... you know, if somebody's dealing with money and all this sort of stuff, does that mean by what you just said from the paper that they're going to get... No, he's saying, he says, it might. It may later develop.

The spiritual world is, there is no contamination, therefore they never misuse these things. See, the difference, the material world's a reflection of the spiritual world, so what does that mean? It means all the same kinds of social positions and activities are there. The difference is in the spiritual world, they never use it not connected to Krishna.

In the material world they might use it not connected to Krishna. That's what's the mundane. What's to stop one family from becoming corrupted? The main thing is proper association.

Because in that association they learn the philosophy and they see examples of practices, so then they just stick to that. Yeah, and by association, if you do see it coming up, then you discuss with others and how to deal with it, so it doesn't remain. As well as dealing with those bad associations.

It means, no, it means, the point is this, kutinati is fault-finding, you're associating with devotees, so you can see the good qualities, or you can fall into fault-finding. You know what I'm saying? So if you're looking at the good qualities, then less difficult to fall into fault-finding. Desire for name and fame and high position, you see yourself as the humble servant of the Lord.

Right? Envy of others, you're compassionate towards others. Accepting for things forbidden in Shastra, you accept what the Shastra recommends. Right? Desire for material gain, you don't desire material gain, you're trying to create the facility for Krishna consciousness.

You know what I'm saying? And hankering for popularity, if you're not, you know, you just interact with devotees, then you're just... You said that engagement in these things in the past creates desire for the now. Do you mean the past life? It just means before taking up Krishna consciousness. Like that.

So whenever that started. So then if you maintain good association within Krishna consciousness, there should be no problem. Yes, yes.

That's the idea. You maintain good association, proper practices, then these things shouldn't come up, but you should be aware that they can. That's why one is always keeping good

association and proper practices.

It's not a matter of being popular, it's the need, hankering for popularity. Does that make sense? There's a difference. Like somebody has something, it doesn't mean that he needs it.

He has it, that's his position. He uses it. Okay.

I'm just trying to understand why he has it in the first place. Like why he... Because he... He didn't want it? It's not a matter of not wanting it, you perform the proper activities, you get it anyway. From dharma comes art.

But it means the desire... Yeah, it means that's there. So from the past they have desired, so then they've gotten that. But also now they may be doing the police Krishna, but it's the same activity, so it gets the same result.

Right? Does that make sense? Like... Maybe a wasted example, like that certain personages are not present, but let us say you cook a pot of halava. I do it by spirit. Yes, by spirit.

But you're not a devotee. You go to Macedonia, they cook halava. Right? So then the point is, after having cooked the halava, you have a bucket of halava.

Right? Now let's say you're cooking the halava for Krishna. Having cooked the halava, you still have a bucket of halava. You understand? So the activity is the same, but you still may end up with facility.

But the point is, you're using the facility in Krishna's service. But you may have it from the past because of your pious works. You understand? Or you may have it at present from your present.

You understand? Or it means it'll always be past works, but it may be only pious, or it may have been devotional. Just the way I understood it was that you have the desire for something, therefore you get it, and then you are sort of entangled because you have that desire in the past. Yes, but that's how the cycle works.

But the point is, as you break that by, means the whole thing is, you have a desire based on identity. Right? Then you have a need. Right? So if there's I, and then mind.

Right? So now, once there's mind, you make the endeavor to do the work. Right? So now if you change I to I am servant, mind means it's all for Krishna. The activity may be the same, but the mentalities change, therefore the results have changed.

Right? They're not material anymore. Right. All right.

Quote. If a person overly addicted to family life takes to Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam, or Kṛṣṇa consciousness, to earn a livelihood, his activity is certainly offensive. That means, in other words, reading Bhāgavatam and these things just to make money.

One should not become a cash guru and sell mantras for the benefit of mundane customers, nor should one make disciples for a livelihood. All these activities are offensive. One should not make a livelihood by forming a professional band to carry out congregational chanting, nor should one perform devotional service when one is attached to mundane society, friendship and love, nor should one be dependent on so-called social etiquette.

All this is mental speculation. None of these things can be compared to unalloyed devotional service. Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Madhya-līlā, 83th Purport.

So here is that, that you're performing devotional service to make money out of it. Right? That shouldn't be done. Right? You can consider, Oh, but this Kṛṣṇa consciousness may have that element, but it's mixing, it becomes offensive, because that's not what devotional service is for.

Like this. Then to make disciples for a livelihood, that's also mentioned, in the Ten Offences. Professional band, that you do kīrtan and to get paid for that, that's what you're doing as a livelihood.

It's one thing you do kīrtan and people give a donation, that's what, but you don't do it as an occupation. What about if someone is distributing Śrīla Prabhupāda's books to sort of maintain the family, like that? That's been authorized, you're distributing that, but then, you know, something of that should be going to the temple. Yeah, and then performing devotional service attached to mundane society, friendship and love, because you're performing the activity attached to the mundane, it's not going to get a good result.

It should be that you're trying to do it for Kṛṣṇa. You may be attached to those things, but you're trying in the service to not be. But if it's like, fine to be, like we see the Cascoso armies, it's fine to be attached.

In fact, their idea is that, you know, God wants to see everybody happy. Therefore, if you're attached to everything, then everything's good. Right? But it's not exactly.

It's that your attachment is connected to Kṛṣṇa, then you're connected to the whole, the complete whole. Therefore, then you'll actually be happy. The soul can't be happy on the mundane platform.

Right? So it just doesn't work that way. So, the end of the dialogue is really, really valuable. If you're not at that stage, simply the endeavor is.

The endeavor is valuable, but the point is the consciousness with the endeavor is important. You're performing devotional activities with the consciousness to please Kṛṣṇa. That's what you're trying to do.

Yeah, that's what I mean. The endeavor to please Kṛṣṇa. Oh, okay, okay.

Yes, yes, yes. You're trying to, even if you're not very good at it. Yeah.

So you just, that's, all you have to do is just keep trying for the rest of your whole entire life. Yeah. Yeah.

But just doing that for your whole entire life will most likely get you there. Okay. Okay.

And, nor should one be dependent on so-called social etiquette. You're dependent for devotional service on social etiquette. Is your position how you deal with that? No.

Devotional service is independent. Even if you're not even expert at social etiquette, if you're following devotional etiquette, it will work. Right? People will appreciate humility and tolerance and respect, even if you don't use the proper words, the proper behavior.

Yeah. Right? Does that make sense? Like, people like kids when they're innocent, even though they don't do things right. Right? Does that make sense? Because the attitude's good.

So the same thing. So it's not dependent upon these material things. All this is mental speculation.

In other words, mental speculation means where the mind is speculating on various ways to become materially happy. That's a mental speculation. It doesn't mean it's purely intellectual.

If you're sitting down and the materialist is going, hmm, do I want this flavor or that flavor? That's mental speculation. Why? Because they're speculating, well, if I take this one, I'll get this benefit, but that one, I'll get that benefit. So now, which benefit is better? That's speculation.

Does that make sense? So that's always going on. So, material means mental speculation. Then we, we will bring out the mental speculators means in the area of Gyan.

So that's all they do. You know, they don't actually do an activity. They just speculate.

Right? None of these things can be compared to unalloyed devotional service. Caitanya-caritamrta, Madhya-lila, 8, 83, purport. Okay.

We'll stop here. Om Hare Krishna, Hare Krishna, Krishna Krishna, Hare Hare, Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare. Jaya.

Jaya. Jaya. Jaya.