**2011-04-01 BVPS BG 18.78 Connections gross and subtle**

BVPM: In his purports to Bhagavad-gita 18.1 and 18.78, Srila Prabhupada summarizes the entire gita.

**In every chapter of Bhagavad-gita, Lord Krishna stresses that devotional service unto the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the ultimate goal of life.** One always has to get to the person, and devotional service to that person. Otherwise, there’ll be processes of getting some aspect of the absolute. You’ll also have them recognizing the person and even as the Supreme Person, but not acting within devotion, so that combination of getting to understand the Absolute Truth as a person and to interact based on devotion is the ultimate point that is being made.

**This same point is summarized in the Eighteenth Chapter as the most confidential path of knowledge.**

There’s confidential, there’s more confidential but the most confidential is devotional service to the Supreme Person.

**In the first six chapters, stress was given to devotional service: yoginäm api sarveñäà... . "Of all yogés or transcendentalists, one who always thinks of Me within himself is best."**

Devotional service is the stress. Devotional service is to the person, but the emphasis is on the service itself. In the beginning, that may be more along the line of for one’s own purpose. It may be *sakama*, as one advances, as one matures, it becomes *niskama,* but the emphasis is on the service itself. One who therefore then remembers the Lord within himself, he’s the best of *yogi’s*. The one who’s connected himself, who’s remembering the Lord is the best. It’s on the emphasis of service. But, remembering the Lord as the Person that you’re serving, then the service is an assistant to that service to the Lord. You want to please the Lord, this is an opportunity for a particular service. That service itself is in support of pleasing the Lord. While for the others, the service is the prominent, and the result of that you’ll use to please the Lord. Its slightly different. Same thing, it’s all devotional service, its just where the emphasis is.

The first six chapters are describing how you everything can be connected to the Lord. We’re trying to get ourselves through these stages, and we see that its not a problem. By the eighteenth chapter we have to know that this is the conclusion so we know where we are.

**In the next six chapters, pure devotional service and its nature and activity were discussed.**

Now we’ve discussed devotional service. Devotional service can mean its service but its not necessarily pure. You have devotional service, pure devotional service and pure unalloyed devotional service. For us, pure devotional service and pure unalloyed are the same, because that’s our standard, but at the same time one can make a distinction. Pure devotional service is there, but there may be something on the spiritual platform for oneself. There’s no material platform.

In other words, pure devotional service means that the material platform is not the consideration. In devotional service then you’re considering the material platform. What are our needs, abilites, nature? You’re dealing with that. Pure devotional service means that that’s not the important thing. The important thing is serving Krishna, and then, one is engaging one’s conditioned nature. Its not that one doesn’t consider it. Its considered second, not first. Its not primary.

One is you’re doing the service. The result will be pleasing to the Lord. The other is that you’re pleasing the Lord, so you’re going to use devotional service.

**In the third six chapters, knowledge, renunciation, the activities of material nature and transcendental nature, and devotional service were described.**

Then one knows what real knowledge is. What is the difference between matter and spirit. Renunciation means that you’re doing it for yourself and giving that to the other person, or you’re doing it for the other person. One may say, “No. I’m just doing this for the poor people.” “No. But you’re doing it for your satisfaction of doing something for the poor people.” You’re doing the work and you’re giving the result to them. But still, there’s the element of your satisfaction. Pure devotional service means that your satisfaction isn’t the consideration. Its only theirs. That can only actually be done in connection with the Lord because that’s transcendental.

If one is working in the material platform, it will always be tinged.

Q: Is there a risk that someone might lose some motivation when not dealing with the material

BVPM: If he loses motivation, what does that mean? Which mode? Ignorance because in passion you’re very motivated.

Ignorance means that then you’re thinking that “This is the right thing to do.” That’s knowledge, but you don’t think “You’re not that.” I am that activity. I’m not doing it, so I’m not inspired, because I’m not involved. Because you think you are that activity, therefore, one’s not dealing on the platform, so since that is the consideration, then act within that. Engage it. The point is to connect it to the Lord.

The confidential point is connection with the Lord. Then more confidential is connected to the Lord, “He’s Paramatma.” More confidential is “Hes the Supreme Person”. But the most is that you’re doing it to please Him, and the other considerations aren’t prominent. The connection to the Lord is the common ground between all levels of spiritual development.

Q: Should devotees bring this aspect of service first, and then the personality, or should we just go for the person?

BVPM: You describe them both. If you talk about the person and service to the person, how are you going to understand it unless you know what service is? Krishan started with the field because God is part in that respect of the field. Technically He is the field. He’s there, you’re there and material energy is there. How can that be engaged in such a way that you are engaged in the Lords service. You have to know what is service and what is the field. Once that is understood, immediately the next point is not fine technical detail about the service, but rather the devotion to the Lord. You learn service, then you learn about the Lord. That devotional service is for Him. When you start there, then these other things become useful in that they will be fine tuning pure devotional service. Of course, they can be used to fine tune devotional service or the yoga processes, but the difficulty will come in the fine tuning because its dealing with material energy, and we may get absorbed in it and identify with it. “Yes I’m more intelligent.” or “I deal on a more refined platform, or subtle platform.”

 That’s the danger of introducing that before pure devotional service. If you taught “pure devotional service and everything else as secondary” they won’t take the pure devotional service as seriously because then its secondary, so why would you deal with something secondary when you have the primary? The *sahajiya* element is just “There’s the Lord, why do we care about rules? It’s the mood, the *bhava*.” That’s the nature you see. It goes down. You have a religious code that deals with a lifestyle that’s in line with the philosophy. Then, you kick out the lifestyle. Then you create your own rules and regulations. Then you kick out those rules and regulations again and just keep the *bhava*.

That’s just naturally what happens if one is not careful. One doesn’t understand that the natural inspiration, that *raga*, is based on *vaidhi*. It should be that the *vaidhi* is consistent with one’s philosophy. the rules and regulations are not just separated ritual. It is part of your life. Its how you live your life. In other religious systems, you see closer consistency of the lifestyle and the philosophy is only with the priests. There, there’s more the concept that their connected, but the Vedic concept is that everybody would have that connected.

Now, it’s a matter of whether they’re aware of it like the priest is, or not, but the lifestyle is basically the same. The point is that then everybody has a consistent lifestyle and those who are leaders within that make people aware. Not that its two different things. If you do that, what is the lifestyle of the common person based on? If it’s not based on God consciousness and understanding of God’s laws, what would it be based on? That’s all there is. That’s reality. It means it would have to be based on some illusion.

You explain the whole thing, but you get into details of the devotional process. Once that’s understood, you can get into more detail of the Supreme Lord. Then the two connect. They you can get into the fine tuning of the differences between these things. First you teach what is the main aspect, then the finer details within that, or the exceptions to that. You want to know the main rule first.

Q: Did Caitanya Mahaprabhu want to show this when He was cleaning the gundica mandira?

BVPM: Yes, that’s a good example. When Lord Caitanya cleaned gundica, He went through the first time because, you haven’t used it for a year, cleaning out all the branches, sticks, leaves and all the main dirt. You sweep it and it looks clean. Then He’d go back again and get the cracks in between the stones, all the fine little things and washing. That was the second cleaning. The example is given that the first one is like situating onself in the devotional process. Accepting that which is favorable, and rejecting that which is unfavorable. The second cleansing is like correcting the subtlety of all the fine points within the mind and consciousness that aren’t right. It’s always natural to give the overall, so they understand.

The more you understand the bigger picture, the more you understand where to put all the fine points. Otherwise, its just so many details that it doesn’t make sense. That’s why we always start with *sambandha, abhideya and prayojana.* Then its just three places to put everything. Then you can start to see the connection. Then you see the varieties within *sambandha,* within *abhideya*, within *prayojana*. Then it makes it very easy, so it becomes more and more sophisticated, but at the same time it is on a very simple framework. That’s what makes it work very nicely.

That combination is between very simple and clear, and being very developed. Sophisticated and simple: these two do go together. The western concept is that they don’t go together because there simplistic means you’ve cut out details down to whats the beginning details to learn, but you’re talking on a more developed situation. That would be simplistic. Simple means you’ve cut it down to the fundamentals which always apply, then you start from what details are the first ones to learn, then you build on that.

Keep things as simple as possible, but not any simpler. They’re smart, they just fall short and don’t quite get to where they’re supposed to. its not that they’re not smart, but what they say you have to see in the context of the bigger picture, if you try to adjust the bigger picture to their perspective, it won’t work.

**It was concluded that all acts should be performed in conjunction with the Supreme Lord, represented by the words oà tat sat, which indicate Viñëu, the Supreme Person.**

It’s concluded that all acts, no matter what the act, or situation, should be done in connection with the Lord. Now what level of advancement one is doing that on is something else, but one is trying to do that in connection with the Lord, *Om tat sat* because then everything is then connected to Him One is trying to bring that together. Then you’re also getting the *sambandha, abhideya* and *prayojana*. You get to see it in light of this.

**The third part of Bhagavad-gétä has shown that devotional service, and nothing else, is the ultimate purpose of life.**

There isn’t anything else. To think there is something else is an illusion. Whatever is your illusion, that can be connected to the Lord, but its not that there is something that is separate from the Supreme Lord. This means that if we’re devotees serving the Supreme Lord, then everything is connected to the Lord. To think that there’s the Lord and something separate from Him, is actually atheistic.

Q: But we see things that we can’t connect like gross selfishness.

BVPM: But what’s the essence of it? You could say that selfishness is a perspective of the result. Gross means that you’re dealing with a detail of the manifestation of what you’re trying to obtain. Therefore, if you say that something is very selfish and very gross, but the point is that there’s an ultimate element that one is trying to obtain. That’s what you’re working with. There’s always the element of where you’re applying your energy. That will give you the result. the result is for yourself, but the point is to know what your energy is being directed at. and you’re going to use a specific form in directing that energy. You perform a particular activity, you need a particular facility or machinery that you’re using . That may be more sophisticated, or less sophisticated, more subtle or more gross, but an activity is being performed directed at a particular quality of the Lord. That’s what you’re doing to get the result for yourself. What you have to identify is what is that aspect that you’re actually directing your energies toward. That’s where you connect it. Then once you do that, its very obvious that its for yourself and the quality of the field that you’re using. Then you can work on that, but unless its connected how will you do it? If its not connected, you’re working in the modes, and if you’re in the mode’s you can’t get yourself out of the modes.

You can get yourself to goodness by great endeavor, if you have that nature, but that means you’re still going to have to go through that same mechanics of seeing that there are subtler forms of this grossity, and there are higher aspects of application of the result than my selfishness. So, you’re going to have to basically get to the same fundamental mechanics of devotional service, just you’re doing it without the benefit of working with the Lord. Unless you tend, by conditioned nature, to be in goodness, then that will be very difficult to do, but if it’s done in connection with the Lord, then it becomes very easy to do. Therefore, that’s how it always starts, because what it is is always the form of it.

Our selfishness is just what we do with the result. Its ours for ourselves, its ours, but we’re willing to share it, it’s for someone else, but we’ll get benefit from giving it to them, or its theirs for their benefit. These are just qualities of dealing with that. Its not synonymous. The actual point where the illusion comes in is when we think that something’s not connected to the Lord. Its always connected to the Lord, its just because our conditioning that we will use grosser aspects of dealing with the result, and grosser aspects of detail. We take it that if the result is not personally selfish, but extended selfishness, then it’s glorious. We might even call it spiritual.

Most people’s concept of a spiritual experience doesn’t get past *prana-maya* in actuality. Sometimes, it’s touching on *mana-maya* but it generally doesn’t get very far. They’re situated there. That means that one can apply it, one just needs to separate it. We know that devotional service is the thing, and to the Supreme Lord, but because we don’t know how to separate the knowledge in last six chapters, then we’ll consider that “Oh, it can’t be connected.” But there’s nothing that’s not connected. That’s what the last chapters make very clear. Therefore, there’s only devotional service. Then, one can identify things. If one has the subject, the object, the instrument and the result, then you can start to see who we are. That’s the problem; If I’m selfish, then I’m the enjoyer.

We’re putting ourselves in the position of the doer. Ok, then even if we’re the doer, still its for the benefit of the other person. Or, even if we want it for ourselves we still have to consider the person whom we’re performing it with, otherwise you wont get the result, so you’re already refining it. You want what you want, but you’re only going to get it if you do it according to what the other person wants.

You want to eat something, so you cook whatever you like, you sit down and you’re happy. You want someone else to appreciate your cooking, so what do you have to cook? What they’ll like, not what you want. Then you get your result of them appreciating your cooking. You notice that the mechanics are the same, whether its devotional service where you’re cooking to please the Lord and the devotees, or you want them to praise you. Even if its all about yourself, you’re still going to have to please them, by doing something in connection with them. This is the point that is being made; there’s no difference between material success and spiritual success as far as mechanics go because there is only devotional service. What’s here is only a reflection of devotional service. It’s perverted because the devotional aspect is removed, but the mechanics are the same.

You’re going to have to go through all the anyway, so you might as well get some devotional benefit. You’ve gone to so much trouble. You might as well get eternal benefit, rather than just temporary benefit. That would be smart because to do it for our own benefit means to think that I am something other than I am. And my position is something other than it is. That’s the illusion. I think I’m doing the activity, so I’m the subject, God’s the object , therefore I perform the service using the impliments of the material energy, for His pleasure, and I get therefore the result of what I wanted, which is where the dative comes in. That’s what I want, and I get that for myself. But the point is that I’m not actually the subject.

The instrument is connected to both the subject and the object. The verb is right in between. The instrument’s connected to the verb, so that means that it goes together. You want that result, so you’re dealing with the activity that gets that result, and that activity has to be performed according to the pleasure of the object. Then it’s done. That would mean that we’re not actually the one’s operating. We consider that we’re the cause, but its simply our desire. Its carried out by the modes of nature. The modes of nature are carrying out the material mechanistic forms that are generated by the internal potency, that are being reflected.

Acutally we’re still serving the internal potency as an instrument, serving Krishna as the internal potency, or, not understanding this and serving the external potency, so we still come back to the same place. Even if we think we’re the subject, still you have to please the object to get the result. That’s just the way it is, so the sooner we accept that, the sooner life becomes so much easier. Even if it becomes so much easier, still, it won’t be satisfactory until we connect it to the Lord, because it’s still temporary and we’re eternal. It works nice, its great, we’re getting the experiences, but still there’s something missing. Why? Because its still temporary, while we’re eternal.

It’s not actually a problem. The problem comes when we try to rationalize it by saying “Devotional service means you can start from wherever you’re at and engage that, and so my engaging whatever material desires is perfectly fine.” No. That’s not fine. What’s fine is that it’s connected to the Lord, what’s not fine is that you still consider those aspects yours, so they’re separate from the Lord. When you say “Yes, its connected to the Lord”, how much is it connected? What’s connected is good. What’s not connected that’s still a problem, because if it was fully connected, you wouldn’t be rationalizing. You only rationalize what’s for yourself. You don’t rationalize what’s for Krishna. The system’s foolproof. “**The third part of Bhagavad-gétä has shown that devotional service, and nothing else, is the ultimate purpose of life.”** You may have purposes in life, but they’re not the ultimate purpose. We’re rationalizing purposes, not the ultimate purpose.

**This has been established by citing past äcäryas and the Brahma-sütra, the Vedänta-sütra.**

The *sastra* says this. We take the *mimamsa* of the *acaryas.* Their hermeneutics is how we view it, so we end up with “The ultimate goal is pleasing the Lord.”. Brahma-sutra is the foundation of establishing this because it’s the end of the vedic knowledge, it’s the essence of theupanisads. Its very clearly establishing what is what. We get that perspective from the *acaryas*.

**Certain impersonalists consider themselves to have a monopoly on the knowledge of Vedänta-sütra, but actually the Vedänta-sütra is meant for understanding devotional service, for the Lord Himself is the composer of the Vedänta-sütra and He is its knower.**

He’s written it, so it’s actually for Him. That’s what He says. They have their ways of misinterpreting it for their own purpose, so that’s what they do. That’s their occupation and they consider that they have the monopoly, but actually, those who know devotional service, they actually have the monopoly. Because its for the Lord, they are actually the ones, and they should not become distracted by their basically logical presentation up to a point, but which is actually rhetoric.

Logic ends in conclusion, *vada* which is Krishna. The process has to end at Krishna. They don’t end at Krishna, so technically, it’s not logic. They’re using logic as a means of rhetoric, that’s all. Its just better rhetoric. Rhetoric is just how to win an argument. How to present so that you get what you want. Logic means that it actually logically comes to the proper conclusion with no fallacies. If one doesn’t fully understand the philosophy, there’ll be a fallacy.

Anything short of Vedanta will have fallacious aspects of logic, so it will always fail. Vedanta will always triumph, but if you don’t have the personal understanding of Vedanta, you’re logic therefore won’t go complete enough. In theory, they get to the Brahman platform, they’re touching the Lord, so it should be correct, but the impersonalists aren’t claiming the monopoly, it’s the *mayavadis* who never actually get there. They only claim that they’re real impersonalists, but they’re not. They’re *mayavadis*. One may think, ‘Oh, that’s our term.’ No. They call themselves that.

Just like *sahajiyas.* They call themselves *sahajiyas.* Because we’ve learned the word in that derogatory sense, for example take the word American, others may take the word one way, but those from that particular federation of states, they use it with great pride. They say “Yes, I’m American.” Everyone else says (deridingly) “He’s American” It’s the same way. *Mayavada* is their term. That’s why we call them that. *Sahajiya* is what they call themselves. That’s why we use the term. We also may use other appellations, nomenclatures to add to the flavor, but its still there. So, here, *mayavadis* are *mayavadis*. They’re in the class of impersonalists, which is a very broad category.

Q: Would you say that it’s also like a business title?

BVPM: A business title. You could use that as an example to make your point, but I wouldn’t use that as the definition. If you’re in an environment where comparing it to business and that becomes a business appellation, then its useful, but to make that the definition, that I wouldn’t because then it takes on a particular flavor. In other words, that’s a detail.

In your explanation of your thesis, of that postion of mayavadis, impersonalists, or some who don’t know the supreme Lord, claim a monopoly on Vedanta Sutra, when Vedanta sutra is actually defining the Supreme Lord and devotional service to Him, then depending on the environment, that could be used as an example, but I wouldn’t use it as a definition. Sometimes, devotees will pick something that made sense to them, and take that as the definition. So, it works in that environment, but if you change the environment it doesn’t work and one can become confused because one would have to use a different example. The thesis is one thing. Your explanation is according to the audience. You’re wording of your thesis will also be according to your audience, but the thesis stays the same. Your examples will be very specifically according to the audience. Whatever are the particular doubts or misgivings of the audience, that’s what you’re going to have to work on in removing the doubt.

If they accept that Krishna is God, you don’t have to remove that. If Krishna’s God, but we’re all God, then that’s what you have to remove, but not that Krishna’s God. You’re dealing with whatever is their doubts and misgivings. With the mayavadis, there’s no argument that we’re brahman, we’re the soul, that’s why I didn’t mention it. But, with the materialists, you have to mention it. But, with them, their problem is “Who is the Supreme? What is the supreme platform?”. That’s where the problem comes in.

Using knowledge to separate yourself from the material identification; there’s no disagreements here. The disagreement comes in on actual identity and the Lord, but the process there’s not a difference of opinion, really. They see “Yes, I am a soul”, but actually that’s an illusion that I’m a separate soul from the Supreme, so they can’t see that there’s a soul and then there’s a Supreme Soul.

They use word jugglery, that’s why its saying its actually rhetoric. Though, they’ll be the closest to applying *nyaya* or logic appropriately, because they’re basing it on Vedanta, and Vedanta is logic. It’s called *nyaya-prasthana*, the authority of logic. That’s why it will become confusing. That’s why Prabhupada spent a lot of time on it. But, if you can separate these fine points, you can see that its confusing because where it appears to support us, it actually supports them.

The point is to see what supports us, and what doesn’t. What doesn’t, that part’s the illusion, so that’s what you attack. You don’t have to deal with the portion that’s the same. Describing the Supreme as brahman is not the problem, so we don’t have a problem with that. The difficulty is that they say that’s the end. No, that’s the beginning. One has to always be very careful that one doesn’t choose something, and then it gets stuck like that.

Take something, it works in a situation, but if you take that as the main definition, that’s a problem. Take “Win win”. If you say this is a win win situation, its good up to a point, but what does it actually mean? It means you get what you want, and I get what I want. There’s no relationship, just that we cooperated to get what each of us wanted. Actually, its just as selfish, just we’re willing to cooperate in our selfishness. That’s called *pranamaya.* I want something, you want something, there’s common ground, so we can work together to get what each of us wants. That’s *pranamaya.* *Manomaya* is I do it because it’s my duty. Then, you can talk about actual emotional content. People think that emotions are happening on the lower levels, but no, they’re not. Feelings are there, but no actual bonding.

Being able to break this down, this is what’s being offered. You have to be very careful, otherwise with time it will work out that you will think, “Okay, there’s something wrong here.” They’re cooperating together, but they’ve missed the point that they’re supposed to develop a relationship with each other, having something more, as a person. Then they’ll have to redefine the term win win as something else, as the mutual personal cooperation. So, what we call win win today may turn into that later, once they figure out what the weakness is. That’s the difficulty in using a definition that’s not eternal, but you use it according to your audience.

Yesterday I used the example of a broccoli, when the audience could only relate to a potato. Think about it, kids playing Mr. and Mrs. Broccoli-Head. I don’t think it would work. Their noses would fall off. Maybe the potatoes, with the lighter color are more toward goodness. But the broccoli is more like a combination between goodness and ignorance. It is the king a vegetables.

Comment: But no one likes broccoli mashed.

BVPM: No, I’m sure there are some people who would consider it, but I’m not sure if you would want to become to intimate with such personalities. You don’t hear of countries where people are dying because of a broccoli famine.

That the Lord is the compiler of the Veda, He is what’s to be known and He is the knower, **That is described in the Fifteenth Chapter. In every scripture, every Veda, devotional service is the objective. That is explained in Bhagavad-gétä.**

He says in every scripture. The point is that your body of knowledge should be connected to others. That’s *sangati.* You have *sangati* from verse to verse, *sangati* of those verses to the *adhikarana*, or the point being made in that particular chapter, the *sangati* between the different points being made within the *adhikarana* of a chapter, each chapter with eachother, the chapters with the book and then the book with other books. Here is the point that in every scripture, every Veda is devotional service is the objective. There isn’t something else. If one comes to that conclusion, one’s missed the point, and if that is the understanding and the objective, then one’s approach to those literatures is very different.

It’s personal. Its about how to please Krishna, then the field is all of the people involved. All the paraphernalia required, all the knowledge required, but ultimately it’s for the Lord. So, then if the Lord’s first, then only that particular aspect which is usful to please the Lord in that situation is used. Therefore the person doesn’t have that particular fragrance.

But, if you’re starting from “This is my nature, this is what I like, and the result is given to Krishna.” Then, yes that’s good as long as it gets to Krishna, but it will tend to have that fragrance. Why? Because there’s so many aspects of a particular element, take say Ayurveda. You are impressed by the mechanics of how it works. You like this kind of medicine, or those, so you’ll emphasize those, then that’s all done to take care of Krishna’s devotees so they can serve Krishna, so it’s connected. It’s good. If you start with pleasing Krishna, then, in this situation what would you use? And then, you’d use that.

Whether you would prefer that style of medicine, or not its an *aristan*, so that would work better, but you like *rasayanas,* so you’d want to work that in. No. Its just, “This works.” So, that’s what’s used. Or, adjustment in the lifestyle, *dinacara*, your daily activity is wrong, or your seasonal activity is wrong. You’re doing the right activity, but for the wrong season. Its hot now, but because its acting like spring, its still cold in the morning. That’s why in the winter, there’s probably less people with sniffley noses and stuff like that than right now. Because we’re acting as if its summer when its spring. That means morning is cold, you cover up and as soon as the morning’s over then you don’t have to, because then it gets hot. But at night, when you sleep, its starts out warm but it gets cold. In Summer it starts out blazing hot, then it cools down to not going to kill you hot. Therefore it doesn’t matter that the fan’s on, because in the beginning of the night, the fan’s not going to do anything anyway. Its not until the end of the night that its nice. That’s why you don’t want to get up.

Q: Is that true also of scriptures when the compiler or author is not a Vaisnava, like Canakya?

BVPM: The thing is if it’s an accepted scripture, then yes, it applies that way. In any case, if the mechanics are correct according to the other scriptures that its derived from, then that means its application has the same purpose. Why would we accept Canakya? What’s the reason? He’s got a cool name? It works. Why would it work? It follows God’s laws. Therefore, God’s laws are meant for serving him. Therefore, even if he doesn’t understand that that’s what its for, that’s why it works. If it doesn’t work, then you don’t have to worry if it’s object is Krishna because you wouldn’t want to connect Krishna into it, anyway because it doesn’t work and Krishna will get no result.

Like the modern social system. There’s no need to connect it, because it doesn’t work. Better to use something that works, and connect that. What you’re looking for in trying to use a system that doesn’t work, that’s Krishna, but the forms that you’re using have no connection. I’m thinking of carrot juice because of the vitamin A, and I’m eying some oranges “Which ones do I want to use? Do I want to use the mandarin oranges, or the navel oranges? Which one would be better? Am I going to get carrot juice?”. No. That’s the problem. One may go “No, but it’s so nice looking. It’s such a big orange. Hey, its from Israel.” The thing is it’s still not going to get you carrot juice.

Or the guy’s out there with a big basket of carrots. He’s borrowed from his father a gavel, and now he’s going to make some juice. Is it going to work? Not much, unless he wants to hit the carrot and lick off the gavel. Maybe he’ll get something. But, they say “No no! Here’s a drop!” That’s not juice. That’s a drop. When there’s one drop, you don’t call it juice. When there’s one drop of juice on the counter, you don’t say “Wow, there’s juice on the counter!” No there’s a drop on the counter. You can say a drop of juice, but you’re not going to say there’s juice, otherwise, you go into a juice bar and they hand you an eyedropper. Get you’re one drop. It’s not going to happen.

The point is that most of these personalities are writing to a particular audience to see that they’re connected to the Lord. If you’re connected to the Lord, there’s more chance that you may understand the real purpose of what’s going on. Many times they’re seen as not devotees, but sometimes its revealed in the scriptures that they actually are. Just they’re presenting it for the materialist because people will think like that, so they develop a system so they can completely think in that way, but still be connected indirectly to the Lord.

The ultimate of that is Vyasadeva in the Mahabharata. Any other aspect of any branch of knowledge is in the Mahabharata, but its using that same technique, so you may miss that its about the Lord, and the devotees. Out of 100,000 verses, 25,000 are about the pandavas. 75,000 are not. Just by the inclination towards *vox populi*, because there are more verses that are not, we will tend to not see the relation to the Lord. So, Narada Muni makes the point that “No. They should all be in connection to the Lord.” That’s why we see that in the Bhagavatam itself, everything is connected to the Lord, and the Mahabharata as retold in the first canto is all connected to the Lord. All the main stories its all in the first canto. If you see any other stories in the Mahabharata in connection with that, then you’ll see properly. But, if you don’t you’ll miss the point.

Like Prabhupada: Do you think of him as a great musician? He’s a musician. Sits in his room, he’s got on his beret, a little goatee and a double bass in the background? Do you think of him as a chef? Do you think of him as an Ayurvedic doctor? Do you think of him as a logician? A grammarian? A translator? No, but he was master in all these things. Because the goal is Krishna, he’s starting there, then, as needed he goes back and uses all these things. When Ayurveda is necessary he can talk Ayurveda. When cooking, he can talk that. But that’s not what he does all the time. An Ayurvedic doctor, that’s all he does. There’s no topic you can breach that they’re not going to come up with some change in your diet or lifestyle to annoy you. You just wanted to go and have some fun, but “Oh, but the weather’s like this.”

The point is that you’re doing this, that’s what’s prominent. Doing that, that’s what’s prominent. That’s the meaning. Devotees, they know the essence of all the scriptures, and at the same time they may actually be expert in a particular text also. Like this top Ayurvedic doctor said for Prabhupada to know that in his particular condition that that’s what the disease was, and what particular medicine could cure it, he said that only a master Ayurvedic doctor, with years of experience and very deep study could know that. But, you never heard him talking about this and that. He didn’t get into sugar trips or white flour trips, where you use this thing, you use it. Where you don’t use it, you don’t use it. You talk about sugar, but he also travelled with dry *karalla*. How many food freaks eat *karalla* every day? How many brush their teeth with a neem twig? We’re in India. We’re in Mayapura. These things can be done, if that’s what you’re into. Prabhupada did it. That’s just where you use it. The rest of the day, you don’t worry about it. Cook *halavah*, put some sugar. He knew how to balance it because Krishna was the goal, not something else.

That’s why you have to be very careful about something that’s an example, taking that as the definition. No, definitions came before that, then examples. You have thesis, definition, example. Then, you’re going to clear the doubts of others by your examples that are in line with what they would understand. Then you’re going to show that what they’re talking about is not excluded from what you’re talking about. It’s not a matter of “He’s got this opinion, you’ve got your opinion. You defeated his.” Because then, that means that his opinion is completely outside of what you’re talking about, so that means there’s no common ground, so how did you actually discuss?

Here, its that “Yes. This this dog is a pure bred dog.”
“How can you prove it? What kind of cam shaft does he use?”
“He doesn’t use a cam shaft.”
“What do you mean?” Then, what’s the meaning of this? How do you have a discussion? You can talk thoroughbred by talking about horses and dogs, and the common point’s within dogs. That would mean that if you have a basis for discussion, that means that if you defeat them, their argument must be within yours. Its not just that they’re wrong. That completely changes the approach of what *nyaya* argument is. Rhetoric is that I have won it. Yours is something else. Logic is that what they’re saying is already included in what you’re saying, and you just have to strip away all of their fallacies, and what’s real is already here. So, what you’re trying to gain, is already in our presentation. Why yours seems like a different one is that you have all these improper understandings, or perspectives. Then, you give the conclusion of how you’ll practically use this now with all this knowledge they’re getting.

Every scripture, all they’re talking about is Krishna, but different aspects of Krishna. All these are aspects of using in the process. If you’re following the eighteenth chapter, what will we call you? Are you a *karma-yogi*? Are you a *jnana-yogi*? Are you a *dhyana-yogi*? What are we going to call you? A pure devotee, because it includes the others. When its time to engage the body, you engage it, so that’s the *karma* aspect. Intelligence: *jnana*. Thinking of Krishna: *dhyana*. But someone who’s fixed in all their activities, this and that and they do all their things connected to religious duties, and all that, and that’s the main focus, but its all offered to Krishna, then you’ll call them a *karma-yogi* because it’s *karma-misra.* What’s the *misra*?

Something is there that’s for their own taste. the result is there, they like working in that field . There’s getting a result for Krishna, then “I like doing it in this field.” As opposed to just pleasing Krishna, and “I can only work according to my abilities, so this is what I can do for Krishna.” Its different, subtle. That’s the aspect that one’s trying to get. In other words, it’s supportive of Vedic system, without taking on that flavor. One’s supportive of Varnasrama without taking on that flavor. You could practice varnasrama, and not be covered head to foot with cow dung. It’s actually possible because the serfs always will be covered like that, but the king is still part of varnasrama, but he’s not covered with cow dung. Therefore, your varnasrama would fall apart because the king is not covered with cow dung.

The point is that varnasrama is the whole social system. How to engage everyone according to their need of *dharma, artha, kama* and *moksa* in the ultimate need of serving the Lord. That’s *varnasrama,* but most people only talk about economics and farming. That’s it, they don’t even talk about trade and banking. That’s very much a part. So, why not two other parts of the *vaisyas*, and the *brahmana, ksatriya* and *sudra’s* not even discussed. You take half of the *vaisya,* of course that’s the most important, as *varnasrama.* That’s why it won’t work, and *asrama* is never discussed. You’re taking half of 1/8th. You’re taking 1/16th of the whole thing, and then saying “We’ll establish *varnasrama.*”

Comment: I knew a devotee who wanted to move the deities off the farm and have all the devotees offer the cows *prasadam*.

BVPM: Yeah, deities definitely take up space. All those people to serve them and everything. The mode of ignorance is that you think one work is the all in all. No, it has it’s place. If the preaching is not going so well there, and it will go better in the city, and the cows need more space, then it would work, but if its just that the principle is the land is for the cows, therefore, quit the farm. Like Gandhi. He was using nonviolent principles for his political movement. Then, they miss the point. Its all part of the whole thing. Just like a baby. Why do we call him a baby? What are some symptoms?

A: He’s small.

BVPM: He’s small. Yeah that would do it.

A: Dependent
A: Garbled language

BVPM: Garbled language, ok. But in connection with this point? Selfish, immature, its all about themselves, but what’s their main focus in life?

A: Eating.

BVPM: Eating! So that is the one and only important work.

That’s why its in ignorance, because that’s all there is. When there’s only one thing, that’s when its in ignorance. When one sees how it all goes together, *dharma, artha, kama* and *moksa*, then *bhakti*, that’s one thing with *bhakti* as the principle and these others are supporting, then you have a complete system. Then its not ignorance. That’s an adult, otherwise you have a very large kid. A very opinionated kid.

So now to the last paragraph of 78. The first was summarizing the whole work, and this is the chapter.

**The living entity in his original position is pure spirit. He is just like an atomic particle of the Supreme Spirit. Thus Lord Kåñëa may be compared to the sun, and the living entities to sunshine. Because the living entities are the marginal energy of Kåñëa, they have a tendency to be in contact either with the material energy or with the spiritual energy.**

I could see where the days come in here. Is this the right audience? How did the *jiva* fall?

**In other words, the living entity is situated between the two energies of the Lord, and because he belongs to the superior energy of the Lord, he has a particle of independence.**

Material energy is not independent. The *jiva* has that minute independence because he’s a particle of the internal energy. He has those qualities in minute form. Therefore, he can try to be the Lord of the external energy. Its because of his situation is actually spiritual that he can try to be something here.

**By proper use of that independence he comes under the direct order of Kåñëa. Thus he attains his normal condition in the pleasure-giving potency.**

We see the material world as the spiritual world’s reflection. We’re right on the edge, but we’re actually on the margin, but we’re on the internal potency’s side of the margin. If one can use one’s independence to serve the Lord, then he comes under the internal potency. If he doesn’t, he comes under her reflection as the external. There’s nothing in a refelction. You can’t get anything from a reflection. That’s the difficulty.

Q: Then what kept him here?

BVPM: He looked in the mirror and thought, “That looks good.”

Q: Could you explain Varnasrama further please?

BVPM: You get some land get some carrots, make sure you get a lot of dirt under your nails and start a journal or blog complaining that no one else is doing what you’re doing. I think those would be quite essential. At least, in the past that’s how many have done it. I think there are others who have been more successful who have a broader range, but those who made the most noise and did the least followed that *patha*.

(applause)

Wow. What do we do next? Now in September there will be an analysis of the Gita, Prabhupada’s analysis. That you’re going to go through in the Vedantic form of logic:

What are the main points: adhikaranas, adhikaranas of what are the main philosophical points, and what are the details in a logical order establishing one after another.

That will be the Gita. Nectar of Devotion will be studied according to the *acaryas,*  because they’ve done analyses of Nectar of Devotion, taking various points.

Isopanisad, by the *tattva-sutras*, with the support of the other literatures. In other words, it reverses. In the chronological study like here, you’re getting these points from the other literatures that support it. So, you’re studying the chronology of the book which is supportive of the literatures. In the other, you’re taking the viewpoint of the other literatures, about the book. It becomes an analysis, rather than a chronological. that’s what will be next.

This time in this two months, of course it worked. If it didn’t we’d go over, so it would work nicely for those who were here. For those who are not here, it works less nicely. This year it runs nicely and everything fits in. Next year also runs nicely because everything fits. The third year, it can or not. Hopefully because of the experience and understanding, you can deal with much more technical things, and a greater volume of things. If that happens, then everything should also fit in. But there, because we’ll be doing Jaiva dharmawhich deals with all the conclusions of the *vaisnava-siddhanta* in a story form, all the aspects of *dasa-mula*, basically we’re establishing the *vaisnava* theology in the broadest, detailed and comprehensive understanding. All this that we’ve studied, we know how it fits together.

Then, there’ll be how others view that same philosophy, so the six systems will be there. There will be modern philosophies. The six systems are vedic, they’re based on the Veda, so they’re correct up to a point, and at some point they get distracted and miss. That’s why they’re considered bogus. But they’re based on the Veda.

Q: Is that the Vedanta?

No. The ultimate study of six systems will come in the seventh eighth and ninth years because we’ll actually study the Vedanta sutra as a support of the Bhagavatam. That’s what it deals with. Bhakti is the supreme, and that there are six other methods of not thinking that that’s the goal. So he deals with all of them.

Q: Have we covered this in the past, do you have it on mp3?

BVPM: Yeah, they have it there. We’ll deal with it not this next year, but the year after. We’ve dealt with it but not in the context of this course, they’ve just been individual studies. They’ve gone through it. But now it will be in context here, so it will be more developed, and even more clear.

Q: Was that like the 2008 evening classes?

BVPM: Yes, we did the six *darsans.* You deal with the *vaisnava-siddhanta* directly and then you’re dealing with how others see it. The Vedic six systems and the non-Vedic, with the Tattva Vivek. That will deal with all varieties of philosophies that are non-Vedic. It also defines the Vedic distractions because the Vedic distractions are the original, just these others are less informed and more convoluted. So, instead of six main forms, you end up with about twenty six. Those two just basically fit. The Jaiva Dharma is close.

Then the idea was to go through all the Vedic literatures in an overview to be able to see what the practical elements are, see how its used, and see its connection with the Lord. You want to see how these things are connected to the Lord, and how they connect with your life. Otherwise, it becomes a confusion. If one has studied Bhagavatam, it is considered that one has already studied these. One has already studied the Vedic literatures, the Mahabharata and then the Bhagavatam.

Q: Anything that would be good to read from now until September?

BVPM: No. If you’ve already finished this and you have nothing else to read, then take the study in all the Bhagavatam purports on the Gita. Study that and that will give you basically an honors in this course. If you want to keep yourself busy, do that. The others, no. Reading Ayurveda will not prepare you.

Q: I just got the *sad-darsana*

BVPM: I wouldn’t bother because that’s the third year, now we’re going to analyze this according to the Vedantic formulas and by doing that, that will make sense. That’s why we’re doing it again. Otherwise, we’re moving through it, but we don’t know so much about this technical philosophy, so we can’t go that deeply into it and see where it exactly goes off. That’s why that’s in the third year. You’re free to study, but its not essential that you prepare yourself like that.

Q: The study material arranged for the thematic study of Isopanisad, that’s confusing.

BVPM: Yes. That’s why I’m saying, I wouldn’t bother with it, personally. If you have nothing to do, do the Bhagavatam purports. Do the essays for that. If you want something recommended to do, I would do that. Now, it will just be that, but in the future when you make it all around, it will include the Caitanya-Caritamrta purports. It will only get bigger. Take advantage now while its smaller.

Q: What about the sloka books?

BVPM: Have they been given out?

Q: Have they been put back into that format?

BVPM: Its just so they can become familiar. You can know where they fit philosophically. Its more of a familiarization. What’s next is there are subjects that I would consider would be useful in the corresponding method, but aren’t specifically course material. One of them is the Vedanta Psychology because that’s showing how to get the mind to accept and think in this way that we’ve discussed.

Q: That would be a long one!

BVPM: Yeah. Its not a long book, but I think because we’ve gone through a lot, it would go much quicker. It would be much quicker to study it. That I think we could go through very nicely, and it would work nicely in the time.

Another would be to go through and study *nyaya*, but that I think would be better after we’ve got more used to the logical presentation. I’m kind of thinking that may be better next year, the Vedantic Psychology.

Q: How many weeks are we looking at, Maharaja?

BVPM: Now, we’re talking two months, no because of Nrsmha Caturdasi, we’re talking six weeks, no last year we stopped, so that means basically five weeks. Another consideration was to do these Vedic Courses, on the Vedic literature and not have them at that time. They wouldn’t be required course material, but if someone was here, they could take advantage, if someone was not here they wouldn’t have to, but it would be stretching it over three years.

If we did that, then we would start with *dharma-sastra* because that’s the only one that’s actually prepared. A condensed version. It doesn’t mean that we’re not going to get seriously off-track. The problem is that you get down to the essential points that someone should know, but the questions are always at the points that you cut out to get to the essential. That’s the difficulty with it I found. It’s always hard to run. You have to have some basis in the knowledge to get to the essence.

Q: Is the Vedanta Psychology a book we have to buy?

BVPM: It’s an Academy publication. Suhotra Maharaja put it together. He got interested in western psychology, and he would go into it and study whoever, Jung, Hume and all those madmen. They can’t get answers, they can’t put it all together. He started seeing that what they’re missing is in Vedanta. So then he just went into our philosophy, but understanding what were the elements they we’re dealing with and just showed how those are already there, so it becomes a very practical psychological study.

One advantage of going into that is that will bring out the element of Sankarshan, Pradyumna, Aniruddha and Vasudeva. Then we’ll try to bring out greater expansion of that. There’s a lot more expansion. I’m thinking to go with that.

Q: Should we acquire that book?

BVPM: You can. I’m thinking to just read through it, and go as we go. It depends, there’s only five weeks. There may be sections that need to be read. Then we’ll speak on certain points. It’s a small book, but theres a lot of things that its written, taking into consideration the western psychologists, so showing different things from them. This is not showing how all the things in the modern is there in the Vedic. I’m basically doing it the other way around. It will be the same thing, but we’ll emphasize on those things that are dealing directly with the philosophy and its application of how to deal with the mind, control the mind and all that. It think we have copies of it.

Q: Should we change the timing during *candan-yatra*?

BVPM: I’m thinking we possibly could do it during the evening. The problem is that its very hot. *Candan-yatra* is means it’s the hottest time of the year. Generally that was the reason we stopped evening classes, because it was so hot. Due to the combination of heat and humidity, its somehow or other creates a vertical challengement. Most people seem to be always at some angle instead of straight up. Except mataji, because she’s got the pillar, everyone else like slowly melts. That’s why we gave it up, but we can see. If everyone is enthusiastic, and acclimatized.

One other point just in consideration, I’m considering also that for next year the morning class is at this time, but the next class is from ten to twelve, then from four to six.

Comment: I’ve got two *gurukula* kids at home.

BVPM: Oh, that’s right. *Gurukula* kids at home. That’s true.

Comment: Buy them a Playstation.

BVPM: Buy them a Playstation.

Comment: Money can be used in Krishna’s service.

BVPM: You’re sponsoring? It’s said that advice is given if one is going to get it done. Otherwise, if we tuned into every living room, every garage, every bar in the world, then all the world’s political, social, and economic problems are being solved at every moment, by everybody. At least you can try. You’re being enthusiastic, trying to be helpful. That’s opposed to an Xbox?

Comment: We might have to go with the Xbox.

BVPM: You’ll have to do further analysis?

Comment: I’ll have to get back to you on that one.

Q: Can we do one hour, 3:30 to 4:30?

BVPM: No, because the thing is that it’s late enough in the day because of lunch. We used to run this class in the evening. It’s a good time, but it doesn’t work like that. It worked during ten to twelve then? Next class will be Vedanta Psychology then.