

Śrī Śrī Caitanya Śikṣāmṛta & Daśamūla Tattva #2

Lecture given in Bhaktivedānta Academy, Śrī Māyāpura, as part of Śrī Śrī Caitanya Śikṣāmṛta and Daśa Mūla Tattva Course, a Precursor course to the study of Śāstra Cakṣus of Bhaktivedānta Theological Seminary

LECTURE AUDIO

TRANSCRIPTION

*Hariḥ Om
saha nāvavatu
saha nau bhunaktu
saha vīryam karavāvahai
tejasvi nāvadhītamastu mā vidviṣāvahai
om śāntiḥ śāntiḥ śāntiḥ*

*Om jaya śrī-kṛṣṇa-caitanya prabhu-nityānanda śrī-advaita gadādhara śrīvāsādi-gaura-bhakta-
vṛnda*

*Hare Kṛṣṇa Hare Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Hare Hare
Hare Rāma Hare Rāma Rāma Rāma Hare Hare*

HH Bhaktividya Pūrṇa Svāmī Mahārāja: Which paragraph we were on?

Prabhus: Concerning authoritative knowledge...

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Oh, okay.

Reading from Śrī Śrī Caitanya Śikṣāmṛta & Daśa Mūla Tattva Study Guide: Concerning authoritative knowledge of the Vedas, the following should be especially noted. The Vedic statements are perfect and self-evident. There is no need for interpreting an indirect meaning. The meaning is understood by hearing the words with their direct meaning. "The son of Śacī is directly the son of Nanda." On hearing these words a person can understand that Lord Caitanya is none other than Kṛṣṇa. The phrase "cowherd on the Gaṅgā" however makes no sense by taking the direct meaning of the words. By indirect interpretation one can understand that the phrase means "A cowherd village on the bank of the Gaṅgā." In Vedic statements one should not resort to interpretation unless necessary.

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Does that make sense? In other words, the direct meaning, if it makes sense, should always be taken, that's the thing. You don't have to make an indirect meaning. What it is

saying is there. So only when it doesn't make sense as direct then it means it is showing something either more poetic or more hidden. Then one uses an indirect. Does that make sense? That's always the point. So when the śāstra says this, that is the way it is. It is not that, 'Oh, that was that,' or 'this was this,' or 'that was 5000 years ago, or 500 years ago, or 100 years ago, it doesn't apply now.'. No, it is direct. [*pouring water sound*] They always have something that is... Always... always something new. Things like every day, just day-to-day peaceful and boring, that they can't have, it has to be something to create the inspiration and the [*indistinct*].

Reading from Study Guide: *In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad it is said, "I surrender to the energy through Śyāma. I surrender to Śyāma through His energy." When a sensible meaning can be derived from taking the direct meaning of the words, why should we infer that the words "śyāma" means "the impersonal Brahman in the heart," as Śaṅkara does? Liberated persons worship the forms of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. This is the real meaning of the statement. Because of this, in the Caitanya Caritāmṛta it is stated that by resorting to indirect meanings the value of the Vedas as authority is lost.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: So, in other words, when you interpret the Vedas improperly then authority is lost. When authority is lost, that means it is lost everywhere. If you lose it in the Vedas then you lose it everywhere: culturally it is lost, everything is gone. Does that make sense? It is not that you can pick and choose where you lose authority. No, authority is a principle. So if it is lost, it gets lost everywhere. Does that make sense? So, one has to be very, very careful. One interprets, and then comes up with some things, and then 'Prabhupāda's statements aren't exactly correct,' and all this. Or one doesn't understand and one doubts the authority by interpretation. By losing the authority there then the people who were interpreting also lose their authority. And everything that is important to them loses its authority. Does that make sense? So that is the point: authority is very much doubted, so, therefore, we see in all spheres, in all circles there is no authority. Does this make sense? Yes?

Prabhu (1): *Mahārāja, how about these devotees that they say, 'We can accept only certain parts of the Bhāgavatam that is absolute, but those other parts that deal with universe and universal form, we don't consider them...'*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Means, are you talking about, is it generic devotees, or...? See, the basic thing is is that, one, is that means they are not well informed. It is nice that they accept those portions of the Vedas that they can appreciate, that are more obvious to them. But these other parts that they can't see the use in their life means that they are not very well informed, not very well trained and not actually as intelligent as they think. And so that is why I was just asking what quarters it [*is*] coming in from because if that is coming from those who are more influenced by academics, then it really shows that even though they think they are very intelligent, they are actually very... They are not applying their intelligence as well... How you say? They are not getting the full value out of their intelligence. Because the whole point is is, we got into this universe and this universe then has a nature how it functions, and therefore if we understand that nature and how we got in, we can reverse the process and get out. Just like, let's say, you got yourself, walked

into a maze. So if I explain to you how you start from outside the maze and bring it up to where you are standing, what can I do with that knowledge? You can go out. So now, those devotees that say, 'We don't accept these parts that are about the universe and its construction, and all the Sāṅkhya and all that' means that I want to stay in this material world because the very method to get out... Because Bhāgavatam opens in the Second Canto on technically how to see the universe as non-different from Kṛṣṇa. Means, the dead matter is dead matter, but what it is we are relating to is actually Kṛṣṇa's potencies, so Kṛṣṇa is sarva-śaktim, He has... All the energies are His, so that means then through anything in the world we can connect back to Kṛṣṇa. Now isn't that valuable? But they'll drop the Second Canto, Fifth Canto takes it more, Third Canto takes it more. In other words, they just want to deal with the rāsa-līlā and some nice pastimes, it is nice, that is good. So, that they have a sentiment for Kṛṣṇa, they have, that is very nice, it is strong. But the point is, is it strong enough? You know what I am saying?

If they are completely detached from the world, they are not worrying about their involvement in the world and then on top of they find that they are only interested in those pastimes dealing with rasa, that may be something to consider. Because those who are akiñcana-gocara can deal just with rasa. But if we find that at the same time they are making a stand in the material world and feeling their position in academics, in intelligence, in modern, and all these are valuable, then what is their chance of getting out of the material world? The very technical method that brought them in, their attachments to it, is being shown how to reverse it. You know, it is like someone throws a rope and then you say, 'This rope comes down, you grab it and we pull you out.' 'Oh, no, I don't accept this part. I only accept the nice things that are happening outside the well.' It is kind-of like, 'You want to get to those nice things and here is the rope.' So that is what is being shown. That is why the first nine Cantos are there. So if they are really intelligent, generally those who are really intelligent take pleasure in these parts. So therefore one doubts what kind of intelligence they have. You know what I am saying? It is an intelligence, it is there. That they can discriminate between these - that shows a symptom of intelligence. But is the intelligence used to its full advantage? So, otherwise it falls into the thing of just like, 'Oh, I only accept the Vṛndāvana pastimes and I don't accept the Dvārakā pastimes.' Sahajyās do that. So what does it mean 'I only accept the general pastimes, I don't accept the technical, analytical'? It is the same thing.

Prabhu (1): *I heard this from Oxford [indistinct]...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Yeah, so that is the whole point. That is one, why in the Oxford project nothing happens and why Cambridge now is the main university and not Oxford. So they have even in their intelligence connected themselves to the wrong university. You know what I am saying? Because Cambridge is trying, is developing, it is researching, like that, so therefore it has caught the attention of those who are young and dynamic. While the other one is just standing on its old tradition, which was good for a thousand years, but now it is not as good. Everybody is old and stuffy and so eluded in their academia that their mentality can't accommodate where people are moving forward to. People are looking for answers. They are happy with technical answers. You can give, you can speak on Second Canto Bhāgavatam, no problem and it doesn't matter who. I was talking to Australians Second Canto Bhāgavatam, all the technical stuff. And Australians are

famous for not being that interested in technical points. They just want to have a good time. But they appreciated it. They are not known for that. And then the people who claim to be academic, then are they really academics? Do they really understand what is going on? They can't penetrate it and understand what is there.

It is very obvious, Second Canto is saying that everything has to be connected to Kṛṣṇa. So they are showing how the stages go from being materially contaminated to seeing Kṛṣṇa in, seeing the Brahman element of Kṛṣṇa in what are their own material attachments; then from there realizing that Paramātmā is controlling that and all the interactions. And then that means, why is that happening? Because Kṛṣṇa cares for us. Otherwise why would He be doing it? So that brings it to Bhagavān. It is a natural step. So they are saying, you have to go through this whole academic process to become enlightened in their academia. So why wouldn't you go through the same intellectual thing there? They don't want to use, apply their intelligence to the Vedic, they only want to apply it to the modern. Why? Because it is speculative, it is more fun. The other one is actually you have to get down and do work. And if you don't apply it properly then you don't get the result. While in this you can go on for years, actually not knowing what you are talking about, as long as you got tenure and the university likes it, you are in. Right? You don't really have to go anywhere. Now and again publish an article, this or that, but you don't have to be that dynamic. You know what I am saying? If you are Kṛṣṇa conscious and you are not dynamic, you don't get the result. You are dynamic, you get the result. So it is a really unfortunate contamination. Prabhupāda said, 'Catch the fish, don't get wet.' They fell in and didn't catch the fish. You know what I am saying? So this is a problem.

They are saying, 'We are going into the academic line to establish the real truth about Indology, how India is the original, the Vedic literatures...' and all that, and what happens? They end up talking like the academics. So even in the modern contemporary thing there is a major theme that generally every one of those academics reads. It is called 'Animal Farm.' Right? So now, here are the pigs. Dressed up in little suits and everything like that, looking like academics, but they are not. They have just become like what they are claiming that they are going to adjust. Why? Because they want to save their backsides. Because if you don't talk like them then you don't get anywhere. You know what I am saying? Like Frowley he doesn't care for the academy. He is a PhD, he has got his position. Those who want to listen, listen and those who don't, don't. But he is considered crazy. And our own devotees think he is. Why? Because he is not getting in there and licking the proper shoes that they should be. But that is not your most dynamic preaching. Because a lot of those academics in their own private life, they study other books, they become Buddhists, they go to yoga studios, they take up all these things because in their private life... So why aren't we preaching that, you like academic preaching, go preach to the academics! But as a devotee, preaching to academics, giving them Kṛṣṇa consciousness. Why do we have to go in and prove it from there? Because their system is not meant to understand God, is not meant to find God. It is not what it is for. It used to be a thousand years ago, but that academy died in the 1800s or 1700s. So this academy that we are dealing with now - that is an atheistic one. Before that it was theistic. Not so developed, but theistic. Now it is atheistic. So, therefore, if you want to preach to them, preach to them as a theist

to someone who is interested in knowledge. If you are already an academic, great, then use your position and do what you can.

Prabhupāda, what did he take? Did he tell devotees and go and get degrees and then join the BI? He took people who are already there. So, therefore, you go out, you preach, you make more of those academics that are already there. Why in four years that you spent to get your degree, how many people could you preach to? At the same time with four years of direct preaching, how strong you would be? And how well you would know the academy, and how well you would know what to say to them! But otherwise you spent all that money and all that time, and then you become one of them? And then you claim, 'Yes we are doing dynamic preaching'? It is sad. It is sad that they can't see it. Really sad, you know. So, but what to do? That is why it says that one should be very careful about *asat-saṅga*. That is *vaiṣṇava-ācāra* but that, even that they will complain about, is *vaiṣṇava-ācāra*. They probably won't even accept mango *ācāra*, let alone *vaiṣṇava-ācāra*. You know what I am saying? It is, it is sad, it is really sad. Because they think they are so intelligent. You can find a fault, you can critically analyze something, so what? Anybody can do that. The taxi walas in London do that. You know what I am saying? They talk about politics as much as anybody else, analyze it, this one that one. Well, you can say he is uneducated, so what? He has the same opinion that you have. The only difference is is, he makes money and you are spending money. So it is a problem. That is really a problem. So as long as they keep their opinions to themselves, that is okay, but if they try to now give those opinions to others because they just spent 4 years or 6 years or 8 years wasting money and coming to your position, getting a degree, now they feel that devotees got to listen to them and then speak all this nonsense, then we are sorry. You know what I am saying?

So the point is is, one wants to take what is there, what one can do is... Because Bhaktiviṇoda Ṭhākura is giving this treatise and he is making the point that intelligent people who have gone into the modern academy, have therefore come to the conclusion, having studied it, that Caitanya Mahāprabhu's philosophy and the Vedic literatures is the highest thing. Because they have studied it, they have gone into the other thing, and then they see: nothing matches with this. Nothing matches with the genius of Jīva Gosvāmī. There is no philosopher. So why would they choose something else? Why would they choose the authority of some old guy in the seat there over our Ācāryas? Very unfortunate. Very sad, but what to do? Okay?

So here it is meaning, it says Śyāma, this is Upaniṣad. "I surrender to the energy through Śyāma. I surrender to Śyāma through His energy." So, in other words, by the grace of Kṛṣṇa one gets guru, by the grace of guru one gets Kṛṣṇa. So the Upaniṣads are saying all that. *Raso vai saḥ*. They say that He is rasa. That is Taittirīya Upaniṣad. So the Upaniṣads reveal everything, just that it will not be as necessarily you will see all the connections. But if you take the direct meaning, it is much easier to understand. When you take the indirect then it is a problem. The point is is, they will say, 'It is an analogy,' like Purañjana is an analogy, 'So, therefore the Bhāgavatam is allegoric.' But the point is is, who is speaking that analogy? Nārada Muni to who? Prācīnabarhiṣat, two real people, sitting there, discussing Kṛṣṇa consciousness. So you can't tell stories to establish Kṛṣṇa consciousness? You can't give an example? That is part of the pañcāṅga-nyāya, how to set examples. So they don't even know this basic point of discussion and logic? They can't tell that this is part of the story? It says like that

the living entity is like a spark coming from the sunlight, a ray of sunlight. So you can say it is allegorical, therefore there is no meaning. But that God exists, the living entity exists and the sun exists, sun rays exist, you are just making a comparison, so that you can understand. So if they can't understand this, that means there must be some other motive there. Why would they be taking Bhāgavatam, which all the ācāryas accept, it is a paramahaṁsa literature and therefore make these comments? How do you attack the paramahaṁsas and think you are going to survive? It can't be done. They have to be very, very careful to not become bewildered by... In other words yukta-vairāgya means to use things but it doesn't mean that you become bewildered by them. Does that make sense? Very important. Because those who are academics, means they are intelligent. Means, they can study, they can analyze, so you have a lot of potential there that they can really understand the Gaudīya philosophy as Bhaktiviṇoda Ṭhākura is pointing out. But then if they misuse it, then *māyayāpahṛta-jñāna*, one becomes bewildered. Very intelligent people miss the point. Is that okay, or...?

Otherwise then authority is lost. They are saying this, but then they bring down authority of the Bhāgavatam, then what is the authority? Then who becomes the authority? So then nothing is the authority and it is just whatever anybody feels like. So then it comes out that anything goes, and whatever someone else is into, it doesn't matter. So then it comes down to the individual. Say it again?

Prabhu (2): [indistinct]

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Yeah. You wipe out everything and then that is your modern social and business environment. Because then whatever anybody feels like you do, you know. Like before it was that, first amendment meant, it was freedom of speech. But when the people who wrote that... They were religious people who understood that people are going to... Religious freedom of speech means you can speak philosophy, you can speak religion in a proper way. And nobody should stop you that you have your particular feelings in religion, that should be allowed. But now it is that you can talk on anything about anything and offend anybody else, people... Stuff that nobody else wants to listen to, you have the right to say it in a public forum. So your... In other words, it was going that people are by oppression not allowing you to speak, and now it is by oppression you are forced to listen. So they are misapplying, they miss the whole point of what they were trying to say. So when it says that there is these freedoms, these freedoms are God-given, based on God's laws. God-given rights are there, but that is part of His system of laws. But God-given rights don't function outside God's laws. So therefore you have freedom to contemplate and analyze and do all that, but within the sphere of understanding it is connected to God, it comes from God and it is to be used for God. We don't do that, then one has missed the whole point. Then one is not discussing Vaiṣṇava philosophy, one is making up one's own philosophy, one's own interpretation, the very thing Bhaktiviṇoda Ṭhākura here is saying it shouldn't be done. Who is he talking to here? Is he talking to the bābājīs sitting down on bank of the Ganges and chanting? He is talking to those who have already been educated in the British academics, who have taken up the modern thought. At the same time who have a sentiment or that of their Vedic roots or the Indian roots but they want to move forward, be progressive. So he is showing that the real progressive is in connection

with Kṛṣṇa consciousness. The modern is not actually going to get you the progressiveness. You know what I am saying? Because progress isn't that you have a car, progress is that you as a human being develop high-grade qualities and other people like to be with you. Otherwise you have your car, drive all over the universe, still no one wants to be your friend. What's the use? You know. Does that make sense? You had something?

Prabhu (2): *Mahārāja, devotees in that position, who study Bhāgavatam [indistinct], they would say, 'Oh, Prabhu, do you believe [indistinct]...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: They do believe, then how can you say that these are analogies, so that we don't accept them? That means you have partial faith. Yes, we agree and we accept that faith that you have. But our point is is, why not re-consider that maybe there is more to these sections that they are not appreciated. And not only that, they shouldn't be preaching that they don't. One doesn't have faith in something, one should not be preaching it. Those with faith, they preach, those without faith shouldn't be preaching. They should be working on their own sādhana, confiding in others, contemplating and trying to work out why they don't correct that lack of faith. Not cultivating it and preaching it. Does that make sense?

So we are not denying that they have faith. But we are saying is, those aspects that they don't have faith in, how are they going to develop that, by ignoring the very means by getting it? If you reject the means of conquest, how are you going to be victorious? Because you are dealing 'always remember Kṛṣṇa, never forget Him,' so those parts of the Bhāgavatam that talks about don't forget Kṛṣṇa they reject. So if you don't have the things that keep you from forgetting Kṛṣṇa, what will they be remembering? Not Kṛṣṇa. Because those things are there to make them forget. Therefore then they profess mundane values, mundane social perspectives, lifestyles, they profess them. Why? Because the elements that would connect all that to Kṛṣṇa, to allow them to liberate themselves through those particular values and attachments, they are rejecting. But the more you do that, where are you going to have the strength to always remember Kṛṣṇa? So it is not that they are sitting around and always 'Therefore I am always absorbed in just hearing about the pastimes.' I don't see that either. If that was there, then may be okay, they are trying that, may be if it works for them, then great. But the point is, that works if the attachments are less. Otherwise you have to use both together. Does that make sense? So it is that we were hoping that we would all be on the same side, but it happens. It happens.

Prabhu (2): *It's not a self-delusion context?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Self-delusion?

Prabhu (2): *[indistinct] I was thinking... [indistinct]*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Basically, that's one of the things. Everybody can make these mistakes, but you don't profess your mistake. If you don't know it is a mistake, that is one thing. But when Prabhupāda says one thing and you go against that, then that is a problem. If those parts of the

Bhāgavatam were not important, Prabhupāda would have just said, 'Okay, from this chapter to this chapter, these aren't important for us,' and then he wouldn't even comment on it. But why did Prabhupāda comment on it? He thought they are important. What verses did he comment on? Those that the ācāryas have commented on. So that means, Rūpa... There is ten commentaries on the Bhāgavatam, and so many of them deal with these Cantos and chapters that they feel are irrelevant. You know what I am saying?

Prabhu (2): *They actually say that?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: That's what he just said. I heard it through others that they say this, but I only heard this a few years ago, that they say it is allegorical, so it is not actually real. Now, that could be that it is, what they are saying is, it is an allegory, so there isn't a king Purañjana, and people are thinking that Purañjana existed. No, the allegory of Purañjana exists and it was told by that. So if that is what they are saying, that is fine. That's straightforward, somebody has made a mistake. But to say that the Bhāgavatam is allegorical and so it is not actually dealing with the real, and so we as a modern man in this age have to find the real because the Bhāgavatam is allegorical - that philosophy then is worth to giving your life to fight against. You know what I am saying? So the point is is, as long as people don't know, aren't trained, then they might go on buying this. But as soon as they are trained, they actually understand what the ācāryas, what Prabhupāda are saying, they put themselves in a weak position that they are going to be fought against as outside the circle of those interested in pure bhakti. And it is not a position I would want to find myself in. You know what I am saying? And just because they have that academic pride that they have cultivated, doesn't... That is not enough to establish their position. You know what I am saying? It is not enough. So one has to be very, very careful in that one doesn't become bewildered in the process. That is why so much analyzation is there, so that you can analyze, 'Am I on the path, or am I deviating?'

So that is why it is very, very important that for those who are intellectual, these technical points are for them. The simple people it is just 'Remember Kṛṣṇa and don't get involved too much in your attachments, and try to connect that to Kṛṣṇa, find some...' So then they do it very simply. Because there is not much distraction for them. It is more sentiment, so you give nice sentiment towards Kṛṣṇa, they move towards Kṛṣṇa. They hear a nice class, they hear some nice stories, a nice kīrtana, nice prasāda, they move forward very dynamically. Because they don't have the intellectual analytical needs to get in their way, to create doubt. The prasāda is nice, the Deities look nice, the kīrtana is nice, the story that the Svāmī told was nice. And so like that, they get absorbed, they are simple, so therefore then it works.

For those who are more intellectually complex, they have to analyze everything, find fault in everything. So do that, but do it according to śāstra, don't do it against śāstra, you lose. God will always win. God is there in every atom, between every atom, He wrote the śāstra, He expects you to follow it. You don't follow it, you are the one that is going to be in trouble. It doesn't matter if there is another tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands, or millions of academics who say otherwise. They are all going to be destroyed. Every last one of them. The only thing of value is

what is connected to Kṛṣṇa. And what is not connected to Kṛṣṇa is not very useful. That's all, it is that simple.

So one should not try to take on Kṛṣṇa and the ācāryas, you will lose. And the bigger your ego, the more painful it is going to be when you are destroyed. But you can tell that it is not an intellectual platform, otherwise why when the platform is questioned you don't get very pleasant, nice, clear, analytical, academic answers? You get very strong, hot, committed, emotional reactions. Because it is misgivings. You are not dealing with that they are just using the path in such a way that is so sophisticated that the ordinary person can't understand. They have their own material attachments and just figured out how to cover up those attachments with their academic viewpoint to make it look glorious. As opposed to 'I am attached, this is not good, but I am working on it,' to 'No, it is fine. What's the problem? Why should I feel bad about my attachments?' But it is not... It is still, it is ignorance. They are both in ignorance, but one is sincere, you know, 'I am so useless, I am attached, but so now what can I do about it?' So it is progressive. The other one is 'I am just proud,' so that is where it stays.

Why? How can we say this so strongly and, how you say, confidently? Because this is what Kapila Muni, probably one of the sections that they don't accept, says about devotional service in the mode of ignorance. It is based on one's erudition and other things like that that one has from the mundane platform and one thinks one is better than all the other devotees because you have this knowledge. And that is what it stands on. It doesn't stand on guru, sādhu and śāstra. 'Because I have some material skill or material knowledge that is why I am better. I am more sophisticated, I am more developed, the common devotee doesn't know.' It is not based on śāstra. So it is devotional service in the mode of ignorance. Very dangerous. They are also a separatist, means they don't have the same mood as Kṛṣṇa and the ācāryas. They have their own separate opinion. So those in the modes of passion and ignorance, they have separate opinions. Those in the mode of goodness have the same opinion, though they can get conditioned by goodness and not take the drive to get out, to develop love for Kṛṣṇa. They are only interested in getting out of the material world. They are not willing to take the risk for Kṛṣṇa. Do you understand? That is their weakness. But at least in philosophy it will be right, it is just that their attitude needs to be brought forward to pure unalloyed devotional service. Does that make sense?

Prabhu (2): *It is obvious what Prabhupāda has said and has given, then how can one justify to oneself taking opposing stands?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: How can one justify, you have to ask them. Some will say it didn't work. I say it wasn't applied properly. Prabhupāda says, 'Use this knife, cut the vegetables, you can cook nice lunch. The person goes in, uses the knife, cuts their finger and all that, and then say, 'These knives are useless.' Means, it is not good to get cut by a knife, be careful. But what the ācārya says is true. That is what the strength is: following the ācārya. Reject the ācārya, then one has... Where does one stand? You know, as it said: "I surrender to the energy through Śyāma." Okay, so that means I get situated in devotional service by surrendering to Kṛṣṇa's authority, Kṛṣṇa's position, taking shelter of Kṛṣṇa. Then I am able to take up devotional service. Then, "I surrender to Śyāma

through His energy." Then through that devotional service, then I can attain to pure unalloyed devotion to Kṛṣṇa. Does that make sense? So the point is, it is Kṛṣṇa that's... By rejecting Kṛṣṇa, by rejecting His authority is not going to... They will say, 'Oh, we don't reject Kṛṣṇa,' but then you are rejecting the śāstra, which Kṛṣṇa gave. Bhāgavatam is written by Vyāsa, is he a fool? He wrote it in his maturity. What is it doing? Kicking out all kinds of unuseful things. So why would he have allegories and therefore it is not useful? He wrote it for the Kali-yuga, so they can't say, 'Oh, it is Kali-yuga, the śāstra doesn't apply.' It was written for the Kali-yuga. That was the inspiration. And what is he going to do? He is going to revolutionize the lives of people who are misguided. What are the pictures that show it? People engaged in all the nonsense that is going on now. It doesn't... Not pictures of people engaged in nice, proper, Vedic activities, but miss the point and didn't quite understand Kṛṣṇa, and therefore it is going to revolutionize their lives. It will do that also. But the pictures of people who are completely off the wall, nothing to do with Vedic culture, nothing to do with reality, these kind of people. So they can't say, 'Oh it doesn't apply now.' You know what I am saying?

Means, to say that we are so unique and different that God's laws don't apply to us and the śāstras don't apply to us, you have to be very proud to take that stand. God's laws apply to everybody. God's rules apply to everybody. You go to the jail, in the prison, I heard it was some really high amount, maybe of the 80s or 90s percentage of them think, 'I don't deserve to be here.' So the criminal mentality is such that 'I don't deserve this. Why should I follow?' So why would we want to cultivate the criminal mentality by rejecting the scriptures? They don't understand it, use their brains. Try to understand it. But if you use your brains to not understand it, Kṛṣṇa will give you that kind of intelligence. Kṛṣṇa says in the Gītā that those who want to worship the demigods, Kṛṣṇa Himself has to give him that faith and conviction to do it because the demigod can't do it. Academics can't give you that conviction to be anti-Vedic. Kṛṣṇa has to give that, too. That's the point, because Kṛṣṇa loves us, then that is what you want, okay, that is what you get. It is not good for us. One suffers from it. So, hopefully these things will... How you say? Be corrected, because you have a lot of very nice qualified people who you can get so much benefit from. But if they don't have faith in guru, sādhu and śāstra, then they themselves won't get benefit, let alone being able to give anyone else benefit. Is that okay? Yeah?

Reading from Study Guide: *There are many varieties of interpretations.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Okay, now he is giving different kinds of interpretations.

Reading from Study Guide: *Jagadīśa mentions in Śabda Śakti Prakāśika that there are countless types of interpretation, such as jahatsvārtha, ajahatsvārtha, nirūḍha and adhunikā. However, none of these interpretive means can be used to define the nature of something spiritual. Rather, in doing so, they give rise to misinterpretation. Śaṅkarācārya argues that direct meaning of words cannot be used in relation to indescribable phenomena; therefore, the indirect interpretation must be used for find the meaning of Vedic statements.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Right? You catch Śaṅkarācārya's trick? He is saying, because it sounds logical that... Means, that the spiritual can't be described by mundane words, so therefore we can't take the direct meaning. We have to make the interpretative meaning to find the actual hidden meaning in it. Right? And then the idiots he is speaking to, they buy it, but he is still using the same kinds of words that are used in the śāstra. So what is the difference? So Śaṅkarācārya is laughing and all these impersonalists, Māyāvādīs are going to hell. Does that make sense? So this is the fun, 'It can't be interpreted, it can't be understood, so we have to use the indirect because...' It sounds great to the mind, but if you look at it technically, how does it work? Means, if what you are describing is in the same category as *māyā* as the śāstra you are getting it from. But that is why language is there, to convey these things. Because otherwise, if the śāstra can't explain it, how can Śaṅkarācārya explain it? Why would, if śāstra can't, but Śaṅkarācārya's commentaries can? Same Sanskrit, same grammar, same words. Does that make sense? So these are the tricks of the material energy. You have to remember, this one is who is the Lord of the material energy. He has made this trick, and he has done well. [Laughter] A lot of people buy it, and that means the whole academy, if they do get into Indology, they follow this man. And then the idea is, they are going to overturn this man and establish pure Vaiṣṇavism, but use his same method. Right? Just like India wants Swaraj to free themselves from the oppressive British imperialistic destruction of their culture and everything like that, their managing, and so we are going to kick it out we go back to Rāma-rāja. So they would kick the British out, but keep the culture. Right? It didn't happen what they said Swaraj was going to be. They were talking about Swaraj for a hundred years. It was supposed to be, we have had the Muslims here, now he have had the British here, kick them out, so we can practice our Vedic culture as we are supposed to. But they kicked out the British as the managers and took up the same thing. Not only that, they took it farther. The British left the kings in place and allowed that the justice and law was done by Manu-saṁhitā. All they did was economically exploit. But they thought that they could get more by educating them, and then by educating them then these people went against them. But it wasn't that they say they are going against them to put it back to the Vedic, but they didn't do it. So in the same way we go into the Academy and then we say that Śaṅkarācārya has taken over the academy, so we will kick him out and put him in Gaudīya Vaiṣṇavism. We kick out Śaṅkara, but we keep the same interpretative methods? So then what is the difference? Therefore we say, "Animal Farm." Yeah?

Reading from Study Guide: *Madhvācārya has objected to this as follows:*

"In examining the power of words, it is seen that where direct meaning is not accepted, interpretation also has no place. Where there exists no village, can one argue about its extent or size? Where there is no father, can one speak of his son?"

HH BVPS Mahārāja: So that is his whole point: if you can't talk about the one, how are you going to talk about the other? To say it is not there, you can't speak about it, but then you are saying... What do you speak about? Does that make sense? So if the direct meaning is not there, how can you get an indirect? Because your indirect, you are taking is now, this is the actual meaning. Because direct means, this is the meaning. So if the direct isn't used, the indirect has no power. That's why if you cut down the authority of the Vedas, you cut down the authority in everything. These people cut down the authority in the Vedas, they cut down their own authority,

they cut their own roots. It is just time. You cut the roots of a tree, it takes a little time for the leaves to dry up. So we will end here for today. Today is what? Tuesday. So Thursday we will continue.

*Om Hare Kṛṣṇa Hare Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Hare Hare Hare Rāma Hare Rāma Rāma Rāma Hare
Hare*

Jaya!

[end of lecture]

Prabhu (3): *This is the introduction... [indistinct]*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Introduction of...?

Prabhu (3): *[indistinct] śāstra...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Oh, okay, okay. So this is the first thing we will start?

Prabhu (3): *[indistinct] ...how...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Okay, but I am saying, this is your plan, is you start with it? Okay, so after the Ānvīkṣikī then you are going to this. Okay, okay, so you want me to go through it? Okay.

Prabhu (3): *[indistinct] ...which we go...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Okay, oh, I see, what are the Vedas, that was his next thing. Okay. So then we can see. In any case, it's whatever he has written is used and then you fill out.

Prabhu (3): *[indistinct]*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: The thing is is, he is more one indirect. [Indistinct] But I am kind-of cutting short because I don't want to... I have spoken more directly before but it's like I realize some people get really... Like today we were speaking, probably one of the strongest we had was kind-of saying... [indistinct]

Prabhu (3): *[indistinct]*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Because otherwise then it is seen as critical and it is just two parties fighting. We are saying, there is not two parties. There is only one party, God's party, and then we have others who don't accept, that's all. And of the other party, the others, there is many. But there is only really one party, that is God's party. Everybody else has missed the point. So we are not proud that we are in the God's party, no. God's party is there for everyone, the authority is given, that is given to us by the ācāryas. Everybody can follow it. If you profess something else, why would you

be doing it? Because then you are on your own. You are not standing on authority of a bona fide line.

Prabhu (3): *[indistinct]*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Yeah, yeah, but the thing is is, they have to be careful. As long the strong points come up... [break]

[end]