

2010-10-05 BVPS BG 1.12-1.26

Hare Krsna, Hare Krsna, Krsna Krsna, Hare Hare, Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare, Hare Krsna, Hare Krsna, Krsna Krsna, Hare Hare, Indirectly by the symbolism of the conchshell, he informed his depressed grandson, Duryodhana, that he had no chance of victory in the battle because the Supreme Lord, Kṛṣṇa, was on the other side, but still it was his duty to conduct the fight, and no pains would be spared in that connection." So, by blowing the conchshell, then they blow the conches before the battle, right? So it has that element. But Duryodhana is, you know, feeling anxiety, so to cheer him up, then he blows the conchshell so that it will, you know, that Bhīṣma is committed, which he is. But at the same time, in a sense, he's just blowing alone, and that was his answer, because he could have also said some words, or this and that, or, you know, given something to encourage the men.

He just blew the conchshell, but the conchshell also then represents the Supreme Lord. So then he was saying, and the conch is victory, so, but, so he's establishing that the Lord will be victorious, and the Lord's on the other side, so, you know, so, yeah, like that. But it's indirect.

When Lord Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna blew their divine conchshells, the sound shattered the hearts of the sons of Dhritarashtra. In verse 19, Śaṅjaya says, sargoṣo dhāto rastra-nam hṛdayāni vidhārayātha. That sound shattered the hearts of the sons of Dhritarashtra.

Since dhrita means captured and rastra means land, the statement can be translated as shattered the hearts of those who usurped the kingdom. Like that. This is the fun with Sanskrit.

You can get so much more out of it than you would get in other languages, like that. So then, actually, Dhritarashtra is the correct name, because he's not supposed to be king, but he is. So he's usurped the position.

Arjuna had Kāṇamana on his flag, a chariot given by Agni and, above all, Lord Kṛṣṇa, who is the master of the senses and the husband of the goddess of fortune, was personally present to guide him in such auspicious conditions arranged by the Lord for His eternal devotee. May the signs of assured victory. All right, so you have, have, Kṛṣṇa is blowing His conchshell, then you have the, the Hanuman.

It, it, it disturbed the enthusiasm of the enemy. He has a chariot given by Agni. On that chariot is the flag of Hanuman.

Hanuman's a great devotee of the Lord. He's always victorious. You know, and, and he has Kṛṣṇa Himself, you know, who is the Supreme Lord and the, how do you say, the husband of the goddess of fortune, so that means all prosperity, all glory will come.

So all the signs are there for the Pandavas, right? And we don't see any signs for the, I'm sorry, Dhritarashtras, right, the man-usurpers, right? Although Kṛṣṇa promised not to fight, He nevertheless accepted the Kauravas' challenge and blew His conch. The transcendental sound

cheered the Pandava army and shocked the sons of Dhritarashtra. In the Bhagavad-gītā, 11.36, we find another example of how the presence of the Lord invokes opposite reactions.

It's said that in the, in the lower planets, in the hellish planets, that when the Lord blows His conch shell, then the wives of the demons, they have miscarriages, right? So it's very powerful. So, so, you know, the conch has that effect, so imagine that on the kṣatriyas who are so powerful and all that, so, but, you know, they lose their enthusiasm, you know, and that's, you know, Kṛṣṇa could blow it louder, but, you know, there is a limit to, because He kills them all, but His conch shell, then His devotees, there's no fun and His devotees won't get the credit, right, but otherwise He could do that also. Arjuna said, okay, another example how the presence of the Lord invokes opposite reactions.

Arjuna said, O master of the senses, the world becomes joyful upon hearing Your name, and thus everyone becomes attracted to You, attached to You. Although the perfected beings offer You their respectful homage, the demons are afraid. They flee here and there.

All this is rightly done. Now here Arjuna said, this is rightly done. So if by chanting Hare Kṛṣṇa, presenting Kṛṣṇa consciousness, in a nice way, you know, we're directly Kṛṣṇa consciousness in a cultured gentlemanly way, but it's bold, and then some people will become attracted and attached to Kṛṣṇa, they'll take up the mission.

And others will flee in different directions, being afraid. That's correct. We shouldn't say, oh, they're fleeing, this is bad.

Poor demons, they're running away because we're being Kṛṣṇa conscious. That's not, that means when you think, then something mundane takes precedence. Right is established by something mundane.

You understand this? No, it's rightly so means you'll always have this, to say that, no, everybody will like you is bogus, because that person who thinks, tries to make everyone like him, factually speaking, no one likes him. Because to make everyone like you, then either you have to be God and you're so expert, or it's a matter of, you know, how do you say, on the material platform, then you have to be very shallow, because you can't go very deep into anybody's life, otherwise you would take on those qualities. So therefore, there's nothing there of substance for anyone really to be friendly with.

Does that make sense? So someone's a good devotee, everyone likes them, you know. Or they're, you know, they don't have any motives and all this and that, then you might find a broader range. But there are some people who still won't like.

Even Kṛṣṇa, people didn't like Him, right? But how much, you know, Kāmsa didn't like Him, on the other side, how much did, you know, the Yadavas like Him, right? So that's what's going to happen. So this idea is, oh, it'll all be this way, that's foolish. Energy never works like that.

If there's positive, there's always negative. And if there's no negative, then there can be no

positive. So that just means static, there's nothing happening, right? And because the jīva technically is not, how you say, able to exist without interaction, then that means stagnant.

Something will go wrong, because spiritual is ever-fresh, so you can only have stagnant in the material platform. So if you try to get a neutrality, it will be material, it won't be spiritual. Therefore liberation, even though it's beyond the material world, is still counted within material consciousness, right? It's beyond the modes, beyond karma, yes, but it's still within material consciousness, because there is no such thing as for the jīva of just being situated spiritually and not devotionally.

Kṛṣṇa can do that, but the jīvas can't, right? And even Kṛṣṇa is not inclined, otherwise why do you expand the creation? If sitting alone was great, why isn't He still doing that? Why are we here, right? We're here because interaction's better, you understand? So we have to give up this idea that everything will be perfect everywhere, you know, all the rings of the rainbows and the butterflies and, you know, people playing on their pan pipes and, you know, and all these kinds of things like that, you know. It's not real. If it doesn't exist, never has, never will.

Reality is you connect it to God, things become nice. You don't connect it to God, no matter how nice it is, it's extremely temporary. That's all, it's that simple.

The demons cannot tolerate the presence of the Lord. The same truth applies on the ādhyātmic level, where the holy name of Lord Kṛṣṇa drives away the demon-like material desires from the devotee's heart, right? And so the holy name, then, if you chant and you're focused on it, because ādhyātmic means yourself, the mind, it will drive away the demoniac mentality, right? The devotional will become attracted and the demoniac will run away. So not bad.

The Pāṇḍavas blew their conchshells immediately after Kṛṣṇa sounded pañcajanya. This signifies that they were Lord's dependent followers and acted on His behalf. On the other side, the Kauravas acted independently, pursuing their own selfish desires, right? In other words, Kṛṣṇa blew His conchshell, then the Pāṇḍavas blew theirs.

So that was because they're dependent upon Him, right? But the, and the Kauravas, Bhīṣma blew his conchshell, and then they blew theirs, but it's all just because that's what you do. It wasn't that they're dependent upon the Lord or dependent on Bhīṣma. They just independently blow theirs.

Each one thinks, I'm the great warrior here. But the Pāṇḍavas aren't thinking, I'm the great warrior. They're all thinking, Kṛṣṇa's special.

So it looks the same, but because of consciousness, it's very different. This erroneous mentality was the ultimate reason for their defeat, as it is confirmed in the Bhagavad-gītā, 18.58. If you become conscious of Me, you will pass over all the obstacles of conditioned life by My grace.

If, however, you do not work in such consciousness, but act through false ego, not hearing Me, you will be lost. So Kṛṣṇa's point is you will cross over all the obstacles by His grace, not by your

intelligence, not by that neat book that you found on the shelf in the self-help section, none of that. It's by Kṛṣṇa's grace.

So you make an endeavor, whatever that is, nice, but if it's not dependent upon Kṛṣṇa, it will never be successful. Right? Otherwise, the greatest personalities, where are they now? So powerful, where are they? People have changed the history. Where are they? Who cares? Who cares? So, this is the point, is that all obstacles... Now, Kṛṣṇa doesn't say, because you're connected to Me, there'll be no obstacles.

The material world means obstacles, but you'll be able to cross over them because you're connected to Kṛṣṇa. We have the idea that because I'm connected to Kṛṣṇa, now there'll be no obstacles. Then unfortunately, it's a misunderstanding because then we're taking Kṛṣṇa consciousness and considering it karma.

Right? Because by good karma, you get good situations. So if I do practice Kṛṣṇa consciousness, I should always be in good situations. Right? And if I'm not, something's wrong with the process.

No, but you're able to cross over those obstacles by Kṛṣṇa's grace. So by depending upon Him, then we can cross. And so if everything is going nice, that's by Kṛṣṇa's grace.

Because the material world never is like that. We see everyone has problems. Even Brahmā, he's the top of the universe, still he gets chased by demoniac sons and all kinds of things.

He has problems like that. You see everywhere, because that's the material world. It's like saying, if you're going to go into the water but not get wet.

You jump in the water, get the cooling effect, the relaxation and recreation, but you won't get wet. That's not going to happen. So being in the material world, there's no such thing as no obstacles.

So if we're adjusted with that, then we'll find Kṛṣṇa consciousness is very dynamic, because we don't become bewildered because obstacles come up. And it's like, well, what's wrong? No. Obstacles come up.

That's just the way the material world is. Now, how you can deal with them and how you can cross, that's where you see how much Kṛṣṇa consciousness you're applying in your life. So if it becomes easy, easy meaning the focus is there and you're determined, and therefore it doesn't mean it's not hard work, but it's not going to mentally disturb you much.

So the more advanced, the less it will disturb you. Does that make sense? So like that. The fact that the pāṇḍavas did not sound their conch first shows that they would prefer to settle the conflict by conciliation.

That's also because Kṛṣṇa is a charioteer, right? So the first one to blow the conch should be

Yudhiṣṭhira, right? And then others will blow. Just like on the other side, Bhīṣma blows, then everybody blows, right? So the leader, the commander, you know, or at least, okay, Satyaki, he was the commander of the army. Then he would blow, you know, or Bhīma, right? But no, Kṛṣṇa was the first, right? Because they were dependent on Kṛṣṇa as the Lord, right? It means Bhīṣma blows and then the other warriors blow.

That's standard. But here Kṛṣṇa blows, He's the charioteer. Why would the charioteer blow the conch shell first, right? Because He's the Lord.

At the same time, what you see is that the Pandavas weren't blowing it first because they were hoping that there'd be some conciliation, they'd work something out. Even at this stage, they were hoping that Duryodhana would come to his senses and understand why kill all these people for something unjust, right? Dhṛtarāstra was hoping that the same thing, that the Pandavas would give up everything and just go to the forest, right? And the Pandavas are thinking, why won't they just be just and give us half the kingdom? They shouldn't give the whole kingdom, but okay, half, we'll settle. Like that.

So they're hoping that. But because they're devotees, when Kṛṣṇa blew His conch shell, then they blew theirs, right? Does that make sense? So the others are blowing their conch shells to fight, to support Duryodhana, but they're blowing their conch shells because Kṛṣṇa blew His conch shell. So we think that we're going to find these communities that are still protecting our lives in the sense that when we can see Kṛṣṇa in the situation, then we should act.

And until when we're acting from an emotional platform only, which is like us blowing our conch shells first, so then we can see the situation in relation to us being servants, then it's like you see Kṛṣṇa and then you can act. Yes, yes. Because the idea is that we're not, the conditioned nature is being engaged, but it shouldn't be the prominent element.

Right? Neophyte means it is the prominent element. Of course, Kṛṣṇa is more prominent. You know, on the spiritual platform, Kṛṣṇa is the most prominent, but on the material platform then your conditioned nature is the most prominent.

So, and the attachment to it, one's still working with it with the, because one appreciates the experiences and the gains that one gets from engaging with it. But it's connected to Kṛṣṇa, so therefore it's perfect. Right? So on the spiritual platform you have perfect, more perfect, most perfect.

Right? So the neophyte stage is perfect, but it's still there's more perfect than that. So the madhyam is still one's working with their conditioned nature, but it's not the drive of the conditioned nature, the need for that experiences or the need for those results. It's just that since it's the conditioned nature, it's easier to work with.

Right? I mean, that's what you have. It's easier to work with what you have than endeavor for something you don't have. Does that make sense? Right? So that's better.

Better than that is you're simply looking at serving Kṛṣṇa and sense the conditioned nature is what you have to serve Kṛṣṇa, that's what you use. So that we see with the Pāṇḍavas, is that they're servants of Kṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇa blew his conch, therefore then they're blowing theirs.

So because they're kṣatriyas, this is what service they can do. Kṛṣṇa wants to battle, so they can do this. So if you want to see Kṛṣṇa in what you're doing, then yes, that'll make it better.

Same time as things that are services to Kṛṣṇa, you know, that are standard practice, that you're regularly doing, even if you're emotional and don't necessarily see Kṛṣṇa in it, one can still go ahead with those activities. Right? But if it's, you know, endeavoring in some way that would be, you could say, more the platform of the conditioned nature, in that you should see that Kṛṣṇa's involved before you get too emotionally committed. Does that make sense? In other words, sadhana we go with, because sometimes sadhana we're absorbed, we're not absorbed, but that's why it's practice.

You just keep doing it by habit, you do it. You know, even if we're not inclined, you still chant year rounds, if you associate with Kṛṣṇa, one will be purified. But when it comes to the other part of, I mean, if āśrama includes family life, right, or elements of, you know, specific, or occupation, you know, or specifics of one's conditioned nature, you know, in the way of, you know, desires or other things, then in that you should see that Kṛṣṇa's connected before being so committed.

One may be doing things out of habit, but if you're aware of it, then you should include Kṛṣṇa. Because if you don't, then, you know, it won't go well for you. And one should be endeavoring to become more conscious of these elements that are not sadhana, and see that they're connected to Kṛṣṇa.

Does that make sense? Because sadhana, that's universal, that's for the soul, anyone can do it. It doesn't matter the culture, the background, the position, everyone can chant japa, go to Mangala Arte, worship Tulasī, guru pūjā, bhāgavata, everyone can do that, because that's the platform of the soul, that's the bhāgavata platform. But when you're dropping, and even the pancharatrik platform, then there are elements built in to purify you so you are of the standard.

That's why there's manasa pūjā, and ācman, and guru, all these different things before pūjā, to ensure the consciousness is elevated to that. But when you're dealing with anything that's within the Vedic realm, your family life, economics, anything else like this, sense gratification, liberation, then you must see that Kṛṣṇa is involved, otherwise then it's not very beneficial. Especially if one comes from a culture where the default setting is impious, rather than following the Vedic literatures.

Does that make sense? So we can distinguish, in āśrama you have two parts, the sādhana and the family life. And then with the family life, there's generally some variety of occupation. Does that make sense? Now if it's done for a Kṛṣṇa connection there, it becomes service.

But otherwise it's there because there's family. Occupation is there only because there's family. There's no family, there is no occupation.

Brahmacārīs have no family, so there's no occupation. The same activities are simply service. It's part of their sādhana.

Does that make sense? So that's why in the brahminical field, then, how do you say? The element of brahmacārī is sannyāsa. There is no varṇa aspect. You know what I'm saying? Technically, as far as occupation.

They may have the nature, but it's not as far as occupation, technically. And even if you have brahminical, where they're involved in deity worship or preaching, then technically it's service, though it's because they're doing that, their family is being maintained. Does that make sense? So therefore we can see from that, technically, then Prabhupāda established five out of eight positions of varṇa-āśrama.

All the aspects of āśrama and the brahminical occupation of varṇa. Because the brahminical occupation is no different from the āśrama occupation. It's not different.

It's different for kṣatriyas, vaiśyas and śrutas, but it's not different for brāhmaṇas. Because all the things defined in āśrama-dharma, which includes sādhanā, that is their service. Basically, but there are elements that will become indirect as it starts to take on the needs of your conditioned nature that aren't specifically connected.

You know what I'm saying? So things like that, that's another thing. That, how you say, that the hair is washed before doing puja, that's just part of the pancratric system. But that you maybe dye the hair or something, you put henna in it and make it orange or something, because you don't want people to see the gray hairs, then that is a consideration within the Vedic, not within the pancratric.

Pancratric doesn't have scope for that. It's just deity worship. Bhāgavata doesn't have scope for that.

So that would be the Vedic. You understand? So when it steps out of these two, then it becomes. Does that make sense? Yes? We can see here descriptions of different signs.

How does it work? Different signs, like? Signs of victory. Oh, signs of victory. Okay, not, you know, Warsaw 50 kilometers or something.

How important for devotees is to understand and see the signs of nature around? How important is it for the devotees to see the signs like that, like in a teacup or something, or like that? How the cauliflower and the cheese and the peas fall on your plate and then, you know. I mean like Parīkṣit Mahārāja, when Lord Kṛṣṇa passed, so the signs of. Means like omens.

Omens. It's not so important. The point is that you look at the opportunity and see how Kṛṣṇa is

involved.

Signs only show you what is the situation. They don't tell you what to do or what you will do with it. See, people make a misunderstanding that predestiny tells you what you're going to do.

Predestiny only is the situation you'll find yourself in. That's all. Does that make sense? It's just like you come down the stairs, you know, from your house and you come into the living room.

That's predestiny, because there is no other path from upstairs, downstairs. It comes out in the living room. Now, once you get there, you can either sit there in the living room, turn around and walk back upstairs, go into the kitchen, go into the bathroom, walk out the front door, walk out the back door.

You know what I'm saying? But the situation, that's fixed. What you do with it, that's your free will. You know what I'm saying? So, the signs will only show you what the situations is or going to be.

That's all it's doing. So, you can read those, nice. You know, but if you can't read them, don't worry about it, because as long as whatever the situation appears, you engage it, connect it to Kṛṣṇa, then what's the problem? You know what I'm saying? Because otherwise people read into so many things and do nothing.

See, reading the signs and doing nothing is a waste of time. Because what do you do with the situation? If there's a situation, what's supposed to happen? Service. And then, what will be the result? Kṛṣṇa's pleas.

Yes, Kṛṣṇa's pleas. So, sammanda abhidheya prabhu. The situation is sammanda.

It's just part of the field. It's an aspect of the field. Right? That's why then, when you study the field, there is the field, but then there's what you can do with the field.

What's the purpose of the field? Right? The kitchen is a field. What's the purpose of the kitchen? You can cook. But so then, if you become inspired to cook, then what's the result? You have something cooked.

Right? So, that's the thing. That's the situation. Does that make sense? But the point is, is now you can cook for Kṛṣṇa or cook for yourself.

Or decide not to cook. You know, decide to get a box of cereal. But still, it's in the kitchen.

Does that make sense? So, like that. One has to be very, very careful about all these different sciences, these occult sciences and all that, because very much people take it, give it more credit than it's due. It only defines the situation.

Now, you define it, don't do anything with it. That's a waste of time. So, why see the situation if you're not going to do it? To be able to walk in.

You've studied about kitchens. You walk into the kitchen. While you're in the kitchen, you can point out, okay, here's the stove, here's the oven, here's the pot, here's the garbage disposal.

Here's the dog's bowl. All these different things. Great.

Now what? So, now you can pride yourself. Yes, I can tell all the signs of the kitchen. You know, I can tell.

You know, over there, I see this little black sooty thing. That's because when the cooking's there, then the smoke off that comes up like that. So, that also means that, you know, the gas ratio of the air to gas is not quite right, so it's creating some soot.

So, what? Now what? You're going to do something? No. He's just proud that he can see the omens. This is much of the time the mistake the devotees make when they go into these fields.

They learn all these things and sit there and do nothing. The slavers say they are already killed. They are? Already killed.

Yes, but the point is, because they're already killed, do the Pandavas sit back and go, hey, we don't have to do anything. Cool. You know what I'm saying? Right? What do they do? Fight.

They fight. That's the point. Signs are only to help you identify the situation.

Right? Astronomy shows you the position of the planet. They have an influence on the situation. They tell you what is the situation.

Right? The birth chart simply shows you what are the situations you'll be in. Right? The omens simply tell you what's coming up right now in the situation. You know? That's all.

Your prasna is then, on the situation you're in, it's defining, you know, making it clear the nature of the situation. You don't fully understand it. You want to know more about it.

But if it says, oh, yes, you know, this situation, it'll be very great, and it'll be expanded, it'll be very nice, but you have to do it. Just like Krishna said, I've already killed them. So that will be the result.

The results are only gained through endeavor. You know what I'm saying? Yes? Does that mean, like, if it says this will be the situation and you don't make it? It means you won't get any result in the future of that. Whatever is supposed to happen will go on, but you'll get nothing in the future.

You know what I'm saying? Like that. So the point is, since your living is consistent, your endeavor has to be consistent. Otherwise there'll be no results.

If every day you work, every day you have something to eat, you stop working, then after some days you're going to have nothing to eat. You know what I'm saying? So the point is, is your

duty is to work. What you're getting now, because what you have, that's the situation.

So the situations will keep coming based on your previous work. But what you do now determines what you get in the future. Does that make sense? It's like that.

So it's an overlap there. These two things happen at once. One has to be able to appreciate that one has to work.

That's what the Vedas are telling us. It's through work that things are gained. Right? Does that make sense? Through endeavor.

Yes. Baba's always talking about through endeavor. Right? But we're not interested in endeavor for fruitive results.

So that's why it's different than karma. The karmis are saying, give up fruitive work. So the jnanis think that means do no work.

No, we mean give up the fruitive mentality. Continue the same work. Give up the fruitive mentality.

Right? Does that make sense? Okay. The fact that the Pandavas did not sound their conscience first shows that they would prefer to have settled the conflict by conciliation. But when they were challenged, they accepted the fight.

Arjuna and Bhima particularly were so eager that they even broke the etiquette and blew their conchshells before Yudhisthira. The devotees should be ready to fight when the Lord desires so. Right? Because Krsna blew it should be Yudhisthira blows next.

But Bhima and Arjuna are so enthusiastic that they blew their conchshells. Right? And then after that, Yudhisthira. And then Nakula and Sahadeva.

But no one's worried because it's all for Yudhisthira's benefit. Verses 21 to 26. Arjuna confronted with his attachments.

Right? So now it will become obvious about the material considerations. Right? This is where one could say the conditioned nature then makes itself overly prominent. Right? Though we understand this is being arranged by Yogamaya because Arjuna doesn't have a conditioned nature.

Right? He's eternally Arjuna, you know, and serving with Krsna. So this is just arranged so that we can get some benefit. So then within his pastime, he serves as, you know, in the relationship of friendship, you know, in the ksatriya environment.

Right? That's his rasa. But because conditioned nature is a reflection of original rasas, you know, the principles of original rasas, therefore you can apply the same principle of God consciousness onto them. And you'll get the same kind of, same result as you would in dealing

according to one's rasa.

Does that make sense? Yes? No. Why not? Mother Yashoda is, her relationship with Krsna is as a parent. Therefore she has the form of a parent in the environment of a parent.

Right? There's a house. Right? And so in that house she feeds Krsna, takes care, does everything. In this material world, the reflection of that, then you have mothers, they have kids, they have houses, they have facility and all that.

It's the same duties. The occupation is the same. Right? But now the difference is that there they're conscious of Krsna, here they're not.

So the principle is being conscious of Krsna. The principle is not, well, Krsna is her son, and here they're not. No, the principle is she's conscious of Krsna.

She's just fortunate Krsna happens to be her son. Right? Does that make sense? But that doesn't mean that in the material world that the same principle of a mother being God conscious in relationship to dealing with her children can't be attained. Therefore her conditioned nature can get her the same results as mother Yasoda's natural rasa will.

But that doesn't mean that therefore that's the mother's relationship with Krsna in the spiritual world. No. So you're dealing with two things at once here.

There the nature and their rasa is the same. Right? And they're service rendered. It's all one package.

It's clear. But here the nature of the soul, the conditioning that's there, are two different things. But the principle is the same.

Servant of Krsna, serve Krsna. So the soul is acting on the principle of serving Krsna. And then they use the conditioned nature to do that.

But the conditioned nature is used according to what would be the original form. Right? Does it make sense? But in principle, so that's a detail here. But the principle is that the devotee is engaged his nature in Krsna's service.

So in this case the nature happens to be the conditioned nature. But ultimate nature is servant. So he's engaging his nature in Krsna's service as a servant.

And the detail is his conditioned nature. Right? Well in the spiritual world everyone's engaged in Krsna's service. That's the nature.

The specifics is then what is the rasa. So it's the same thing. Just there it's consistent.

There's no difference between the soul and the form that they take. While here there is. So because there's a difference here, then... But that doesn't mean it's not dealt with.

But it's dealt with on the original methods that are given. Does it make sense? Yes. Arjuna doesn't have a conditioned nature.

Arjuna doesn't have, no. No, he's a jiva. But that's his relationship with Krsna.

He's always Arjuna. Okay. Means he never... Never... No.

Yeah, that's his service. But his service is within the material world. So Arjuna is only within the material world.

You know what I'm saying? So like that. Like... Like Kirudaksa Visnu is not manifest in the spiritual world. He manifests in the material world.

Material sphere. So in the same way as Arjuna, he's only manifest within the material pastimes. Does that make sense? Yeah.

So that's his nature. Yes. When devotees like Arjuna have their service in the material world, where do they go? They'll be with the Lord, because the Lord's always there.

So... You have to see. Mahadushin. Because he has all his associates.

Okay. See, you also have... You have a living entity who goes farther back. You know what I'm saying? So then you have the element that... If this is not manifest, just like... I'm sorry.

Hiranyagarbha and the Supersoul aren't manifest when Mahadushin breathes in. But it's not that they're not him. Because it's the element of creation and maintenance.

And destruction. But he's Visnu, so... He's... There is no creation, maintenance and destruction. But in the material creation, you do have that.

Right? So that's the added flavor. That's the difference between Vaikuntha and the material manifestation. Is that in Vaikuntha, God's mood is, I am God.

But in the material world, his mood is, I am the creator, maintainer and destroyer. Right? Does that make sense? So... Garbhodakasya Visnu... You know, creates and destroys. Right? And Kirodakasya Visnu will maintain.

Does this make some sense? So, these elements will be there. So when they wind up, so then there is somewhere where Arjuna is coming from. Right? Because eventually everything goes back to... There's Krishna.

And that's it. Then Krishna expands as he is. Surukshakti.

And so that's complete Godhead with complete energy. Now he expands, so many expanses. His potency also expands.

And therefore creates the internal, the external and the genus. Does that make sense? So,

everything that there is will have its origin somewhere. Does that make sense? You know.

So, like that, then... Does that make sense? Yeah. In a purport to verses 21 and 22, Srila Prabhupada writes, Although Lord Krishna is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, out of His causeless mercy, He was engaged in the service of His friend. He never fails in His affection for His devotees, and thus He is addressed herein as infallible.

As charioteer, He had to carry out the orders of Arjuna, and since He did not hesitate to do so, He is addressed as infallible. Although He had accepted the position of a charioteer for His devotee, His supreme position was not challenged. In all circumstances, He is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Hrsikesa, the Lord of the total senses.

The relationship between the Lord and His servitor is very sweet and transcendental. The servitor is always ready to render service to the Lord, and similarly, the Lord is always seeking an opportunity to render some service to the devotee. He takes greater pleasure in His pure devotees assuming the advantageous position of ordering Him than He does in being the giver of orders.

Since He is master, everyone is under His orders, and no one is above Him to order Him. But when He finds that a pure devotee is ordering Him, He obtains transcendental pleasure. Although He is the infallible master in all circumstances.

So here the infallible, we'll take it that infallible means He always gets done what He's doing, or in fact there's nothing wrong with Him. There's no fault. And because there's no fault, He always accomplishes what needs to be done.

But here it's being pointed out, infallible means, yes, this is true, but what's being done is a relationship with the devotees. So He never fails in that relationship. Therefore He's infallible.

Because the point is, we do something to get a result. That result becomes part of the field. Does that make sense? So the point is, the field is there for what? To interact in a relationship.

So Kṛṣṇa never fails in that. So the dynamic relationship, that's the point. Because the result technically is not the dynamic relationship.

You've gotten the result, then it becomes part of the field. The field's not dynamic. You understand? It gives opportunity for more dynamicism.

But it in itself is not inherently dynamic. That's why when it moves back to sambandha, one is inspired by that game. So therefore one wants to do something with the game and expand more.

Does that make sense? So that's the point. So it's actual connections with prajñāna. So it's still within the cycle of the dynamic relationship.

Because of that mood, the commitment. But factually it's just another thing in the field. So it's

the saṅkhya-saṅkhya.

But because having gained it, you're inspired now to use that. Therefore it's counted within prajñāna. Does that make sense? Prajñāna means inspirational.

It would be the inspirational aspect of the relationship. Because if you're not inspired, you do nothing. You have a relationship, you're not inspired, you don't do anything.

Does that make sense? Yes. I heard once, I'd like to double-check, actually the way the chariots were done, the kṣatriya actually had his feet on the grass. That's how you were telling me.

They were much bigger than what we see. I think it comes from the adhikara part. Therefore that's why the position of charioteer was really important, because you didn't have the feet on the grass.

Yeah, I'm not sure. Because you never really see it in any pictures of Brahmins. I haven't seen it.

You'd probably basically have to look at the Tārga Veda under making of chariots, and then see, maybe it'll explain. But you do see in some older pictures that the charioteer's seat was lower than the kṣatriya's. While in a lot of them, the more recent ones, you don't see that.

That's how you would indicate. Same time as they also know, because the point is, you've challenged a particular kṣatriya. You don't just fight indiscriminately.

You've challenged someone. So therefore, the charioteer has to know what will be the best position for the kṣatriya to fight from with that person. And you want to go right, but there happens to be a dead elephant there.

So then you have to go left to go around the elephant. So it's not exactly the charioteer. That's why they're special.

A sūta is what? What's the sūta? What's their background? And Brahmin. So that means they have that spirit, but they have the brains. You understand? Yes.

A kṣatriya, if a kṣatriya man marries a Brahmin woman, it's pratyuloma. So it's against the grain. Right? If a Brahmin man marries a kṣatriya woman, you get a kṣatriya.

Right? As a general rule. Sometimes there may be more, but it's not. If a kṣatriya marries a Brahmin, you get a sūta.

Right? Now, that sūta may take the occupation of a Brahmin, if it's more Dominic. You see, like, Romaharsana sūta, you know, Ugraśravaśruta. So that was that nature.

Or, you see, they take the nature of kṣatriyas, you know, like Yayati's sons, the three sons from Damayanti. So they took up the nature of kṣatriyas. Or they may take up the position of the charioteer, as we see, you know, Karna and that family he's from.

Right? That's there. Or, if it's really, you know, improper, you know, the consciousness and everything, then they might be someone who traps small animals. You know, they use little snares to catch small animals.

You know, that's... So they have basically these four occupations, depending upon, you know, what's the consciousness. Now, once they become sūtas, sūtas marry sūtas, and then they have more sūtas. So it's not that they're directly, they are sons of a kṣatriya and a brāhmaṇa.

So they may be, or it may be generations back since that happened. But generally, sūtas will marry sūtas. Does that make sense? Charioteers are called, in the Vedic system, Vedic culture are called mechanics, because they build the chariots.

They build them. They know how to drive, so they know all the mechanics of how to make things work. Excuse me.

So he's infallible in all circumstances. So it does mean that what he thinks happens, you know, whatever he endeavors to accomplish, then comes to, how do you say, come to pass? You know, so that is there, but the element Prabhupāda brings out is the infallibleness, is that the relationship is always there. Relationship is always the same.

It's consistent, so he's always there for that relationship. So, okay. So they clear in the chariot like that.

So they know how to do, because they can go out, means someone like Daruka, like Kṛṣṇa's charioteer, he can go out on the battlefield himself with the empty chariot, go out and destroy armies, because he knows how to drive them and hit them and, you know, kill everything, because he can make them fly, he can do all kinds of stuff with them. But the point is, is that's not how the charioteers work. A kṣatriya does that.

But if a kṣatriya becomes, is killed on the battlefield, depending on the situation, you might find they do that or not. They won't bother other kṣatriyas, but they'll wipe out their army like that. But it's only ones like Daruka or Makali that can do things like that.

So you don't hear about it much, you know. Otherwise then, why did, why did Karna run into trouble in fighting with Arjuna? He got stuck in the mud. But why did he get stuck in the mud? His charioteer betrayed him.

Aha. Is that any other perspective on the charioteer? He got cursed. He got cursed, of course, so that would happen.

Anything else? The driver made a wrong turn. Driver made a wrong turn. Yes, the driver made a wrong turn.

Who was the driver? No, Karna. When he got stuck in the mud, Karna was having to fight and drive the chariot himself because Śālyā left. Because Śālyā said, see, Śālyā was a comparable

driver on one level to Kṛṣṇa.

And so Duryodhana arranged that Śālyā would be the chariot driver for Karna because he's thinking, okay, Karna, Arjuna, Śālyā, Kṛṣṇa. So then you have an equal match here. Does that make sense? So now, Karna is telling Śālyā what to do, but Śālyā is more expert in how to position the chariot to fight than Karna is.

So his point is, is I'll drive the chariot as long as you don't tell me what to do. You understand? So then one might doubt whether the feet are on the shoulders. And even if they were, his point is, is you may say turn right, but I know it's better to turn left, so you go with that.

So whether it is or not, so it just brings up the elements that the charioteers can be so qualified, they know the better situation to be fighting. And that's why you should have a charioteer that's matched. So for Arjuna's fighting ability, that's why we're seeing Kṛṣṇa is the only one that could drive the chariot.

Others wouldn't know enough. Unless, of course, you've got Matali or something. But still, Kṛṣṇa will be better.

Does that make sense? So it's not... That's why these things, we can't get too attracted by them, because then they take something into a completely different thing. I mean, oh, the servant, yeah, underfoot, and this and that. It distracts from what it is.

Vidura, as the prime minister of Dhrtarastra, is still a śūdra, and he's still a servant. But his capacity as servant is so great, he can serve as a prime minister, but it's still as a servant. Well, if that was a brāhmaṇa, he's superior.

You understand? So you have these subtleties within the Vedic system that, unless the subtleties are appreciated, it won't be understood. Otherwise, how is it he's a prime minister? He's still a śūdra, but he has the qualifications to do it, and he does it out of service to the king. You understand? Well, the brāhmaṇa position, of course, you're of service to the king, in service to the king, but he's doing it because this is the śāstra position, that a brāhmaṇa doing this kind of... having this knowledge and doing this kind of activity, then they would... it's their duty to direct the king properly and to see the proper running of the kingdom.

But then that's coming from the brahminical platform. You know? If it's kṣatriya, then they're doing... like Bhīṣma will be doing... then it's coming from the kṣatriya platform. If Vidura is a śūdra, but he has the qualities to do this, why is he not... Because he's still acting within the social system, so he'll act according to the condition of nature.

Right? His wife will also be... His wife will be a śūdraṇī. So Bhīṣma was very careful to find a very qualified śūdraṇī to marry him. And so, he still has the family relations and still the position and everything like that.

Does that make sense? Now, if he went to the forest and took up just living in the forest and

devotional activity, there he may be considered as a brāhmaṇa, as opposed to as a kṣatriya living in the forest. Like when Pāṇḍavas go to the forest, they're kṣatriyas living in the forest. But if he went to the forest, he would probably be classified as a brāhmaṇa.

Does that make sense? Also, you have the element that he is Yamarāja, so that is a kṣatriya position. What I don't understand is that, like, if somebody is born as a śūdra, for example, but he shows the qualification of another brāhmaṇa, then he should be accepted as a kṣatriya. That's my understanding.

He should, as long as he's complete in that. But here, socially, socially he was comfortable with the position of a śūdra. But occupationally, he could do the duty of a prime minister, but he was doing it as a śūdra, a cis, a kṣatriya.

You understand? But here we're talking about brahminical in this case, meaning brahminical, you know, in āśrama and vāna. You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? So that's why you have to see that someone lives the lifestyle that's not brahminical, but does puja and this and that, then that's okay within the devotional environment, but he'll only get what he should get from that. You know, the temple will give you a place to stay and prasāda and a little this and that, and that's it.

But because his lifestyle is not brahminical, he may want more than that, so he'll try through brahminical methods to get more money, but that's wrong, so that's why then they shouldn't do it. So to say brahminical means it's a package. You know, because a brahmin means his vāna and āśrama are brahminical.

We don't mean that he's brahmin by one thing and not by the other. Does that make sense? So it's not that he wasn't, but he's comfortable in that, so he's not having a problem. He lives in the palace anyway, so he's not independent.

So whatever they arrange for him, whatever they do, he's comfortable with that. Is that okay? In his Purport to Bhagavad-gītā, 634, Śrīla Prabhupāda quotes an analogy from the Upaniṣads. In the Vedic literature, Kata Upaniṣad 1334, it is said, quote, the individual is the passenger in the car of the material body, and intelligence is the driver.

Mind is the driving instrument, and the senses are the horses. The self is thus the enjoyer or sufferer in the association of mind and senses. So it is understood by great thinkers.

Bhagavad-gītā, 634, Purport. Arjuna represents the living entity and Kṛṣṇa is the intelligence. Bhagavad-gītā, 710.

The Lord blesses His devotee with a proper understanding by which he can achieve Him. Bhagavad-gītā, 1010. The chariot is the body awarded by the demigods according to the law of karma.

Arjuna received his chariot from the demigod Agni. The white horses symbolize the purified

senses. Unless all senses are under control, there is every chance of fall down.

As a strong wind sweeps away a boat in the water, even one of the roaming senses on which the mind focuses can carry away a man's intelligence. Arjuna did not rush blindly into the fight. He first wanted to see the enemies and estimate their strength.

So, here is that... In other words, we see the driver is the intelligence. The reins are the mind. And the mind are connected to the horses or the senses.

So that means when this intelligence controls the mind, that controls the senses. But if you let go of the reins, or in other words, the intelligence does not control the mind, then the mind, the senses just go whatever they like. So this point is being made here that Krishna is the intelligence.

The chariot, which is the body, that was given by Agni. So the demigods award the body. So the demigod awarded the chariot to Arjuna.

So then you can make this comparison. So the point is, the intelligence must be in control. Therefore, buddhi-yoga.

Because if it's not buddhi or intelligence, then the problem comes up is that it'll just be the mind. And the mind is just connected to the senses. So what experience you can get out of something is all that will be considered.

But the intelligence considers beyond the experience. Yes, you may get the nice experience, but then right after that, it may not be so nice. Right? It's like jumping out of a 20-story building.

It may be exhilarating on the way down, but then at some point, it kind of abruptly ends. So therefore, the intelligence considers, OK, for 10 seconds, it may not be a great idea. Does that make sense? So that way, then you jump off the top of the building with a large rubber band tied around your feet.

I'm not saying that's intelligent either, but it's more intelligent than jumping without the rubber band. Is it also correct to understand that if the intelligence wants to control the senses, it has to be through using the mind? Like that? Through using the mind. Well, the point is that intelligence is driving the horses, right? Because intelligence is the master of the senses.

But how does it do it? Through the mind. So that means you have to deal with the mind in such a way that you actually get the engagement with the senses that you need. But still, the intelligence is the one who is dealing.

So it's still that masculine-feminine principle. The intelligence is masculine, the mind is feminine. So the intelligence controls the mind, but in a way that it actually gets the work done.

Yeah, in terms of mind. You pull on this one, the horses go this way. You pull on that one, the horses go that way.

You can't pull on this one and say, why are they not going this way? I'm the master here. I pull on the reins how I want, and they do whatever I want. That doesn't work like that.

Like that. Except when you're sitting in a pub with your friends, then it seems to work like that. At least in the discussions.

The theory seems to work like that. But unfortunately, when they walk in the front door of the house, all that theory seems to evaporate. Yes? No? Okay.

Arjuna did not rush blindly into the fight. First he wanted to see the enemies and to estimate their strength. In the same way, in the beginning of a spiritual quest, the devotee should be able to recognize the real enemies of the soul, Kam, Krodh, Lobh, and should know how to defeat them.

In other words, this is the point. You have to know what is there. Not that by knowing, then it's okay.

This is the problem. Well, if I don't know, then I can fight it, and if I do know, then it's okay. What's the big deal? We don't want to be fanatic.

No, you have to know what's there. How much, you know, Kam, Krodh, Lobh, what else is there? Then there's Moha, Matsarja. Missing one.

Hmm? Madha. Madha, yes. Bhaya.

Bhaya, fear. Bhaya. We have a lot of them.

So, Raghunath Das, when he starts off in the monastics, that's the first thing he starts with, basically. After he's offered his respects to the devotees, is that you have all these enemies that one has to control. So, unless one knows that, then how one's going to defeat them.

So by connecting everything to Krishna, there leaves no room for illusion. If there's no illusion, then these other elements don't come up. Krishna, the lord of the senses, obeyed the order of Arjuna and drove the chariot amidst the two armies.

In verse 24, Arjuna is called Gudakesha, one who conquers sleep. This implies that active persons are more receptive for the lord's guidance. Or as Srila Prabhupada says, God helps those who help themselves.

So we see here, activity is again brought out. You have to be active. Yes, so Arjuna is one who conquers sleep.

So that means even his sleep is connected to Krishna. He is conscious of Krishna, even in his sleep. It doesn't mean that the body doesn't rest, but he doesn't stop being Krishna conscious.

That's why we say 24 hours a day. Right? So that means, even then, they're dreaming about

Krishna, thinking about Krishna, absorbed in Krishna. No? Yes? How is that possible? How is it possible? How is it possible? Okay, let us say you're really worried about something in the day.

You know, trying to work something out and getting something done and something like that. At night, it doesn't come up in your time when you're resting? That's the dream, that there's a state before that. You're not thinking of those things because the body is resting.

Right? Yes? No? Yes. So it's just that if Krishna is the most important thing to you, you just think about him. Yes? No? That's another thing.

That's good. As long as you wake up also like that. I'll give an example.

Let's say someone, a famous example would be Jaya Dwaita Maharaj. So he'd be sitting in the class and by all indications, it would appear he was sleeping because he would be doing like everyone else is doing and that kind of dozing off. And so then, many a time, because he was considered like a big pundit and like this, then many a time, other sadhus and big personalities, especially the sannyasis and all that, they would kind of take delight in, ah, now we've caught him asleep.

And so they would ask a question to him. Right? And while he's down like this, they'd ask a question and then he'd come up like this saying what it was. So the body is basically asleep, but he was fully conscious of the class.

But it's possible. The point is, is he practiced Krishna consciousness. So in other words, for him, the body is tired, but for him, knowledge in the class is important.

Therefore, he's still conscious. You know, while the guy next to him, he's tired and the class is not so important. Therefore, he hits the ground with a thud.

OK. Does that make sense? So that's the difference, because it's valuable to him. Therefore, he doesn't lose consciousness, though the body is resting.

Does that make sense? So therefore, at least in this case, it's a good case. Whenever it happens, whenever Krishna is important to you, attachment then naturally means there's going to be, you know, more absorption of Krishna. Ruchi, there's going to be.

Basically, things start to get dynamic from Ruchi, you could say, you know, really quick. It's said, Visva says that when one comes to the clearing stage, then the offenses are like blown away, like leaves, dry leaves in a storm. But, you know, once you have a taste, then it's dynamic like that.

Does that make sense? So, you know, so... Hmm? Clearing, it'll start from nistha. But if you continue at nistha, then you get a taste. Right? Because at nistha means then the anarthas are not so prominent.

So they're not getting in the way of your chanting, but it won't be as dynamic as is the positive

of your taste for the Holy Name. You understand? Before that, there's no taste and the anarthas are getting in the way. So nistha means the anarthas aren't getting in the way, but there's not necessarily a taste.

So when that improves, then there's a taste, then it gets very, very fast. But still, nistha is fast compared to, you know, the neophyte stage. Because always these things, it's the consciousness and the position of it, not necessarily just the formal stage.

You know what I'm saying? Because anartha-nivritti, you know, having accomplished anartha-nivritti is known as nistha. Right? Because you've gotten rid of the anarthas that are getting in the way of your being fixed in devotional service. Right? But there's also the element that anartha-nivritti means the stage of bhava, because you've gotten rid of the anartha of the conditioned nature.

You know what I'm saying? So therefore, bhava can be called anartha-nivritti also. That's the thing, is that they have these levels. Does that make sense? But still, even bhava, there's still, until one perfects that, it's only a prema, then you could say, now this is, yeah, solid.

The nistha can be anartha-nivritti because that's when the anarthas are gone. It's not the stage of having conquered. But you have anartha-nivritti when you're dynamically trying to take care.

These will come up in the next devotional class. It is significant that Krishna poised the chariot just in front of Bhishma and Drona, the persons for whom Arjuna had strongest affection. Thus Arjuna was confronted with his most powerful material attachments.

It's huge. You've got to live in Akshagiri. You've got millions of people out there.

So he could have drove the chariot anywhere, but he drove right up in front of Bhishma and Drona. When one wants to surrender, Krishna reveals to him what his weaknesses are and how to overcome them. Then it is up to the devotee to take advantage and to develop his dormant Krishna consciousness.

In other words, being aware of what one's attachments are, many will make the mistake of that, oh, I'm going backwards in devotional service. No. This is you're becoming aware of the field.

Before that, you were not aware of the field, but very enthusiastic. Because many times enthusiasm, not aware of what's around you, it's just so nice and everything. So as one matures, one becomes aware of what the attachments are.

But that doesn't mean that one now doesn't deal with them. Because when you're made aware of them, you're also made aware of how to get rid of them. It's just whether you're willing to get rid of them.

That's all. Do what it takes to get rid of them. Because if somebody's doing something wrong,

they're attached, then you ask them, in an ideal scenario, what should someone do? They could tell you like that.

So then you do, oh, no, but it's so difficult. It'll immediately go back into the mind. For that moment, the intelligence comes out and very clearly says what to do.

So the attachment is revealed and the method to get rid of it is revealed. But now it's up to us, like Arjuna, now to do something with it. Or, like Arjuna in this case, to become overwhelmed by it.

So it's through the knowledge of the Gita, then we can get past that being overwhelmed by the anarta that we just figured out we have. Yes. The distance is our enthusiasm to apply it.

That's all. Like is chanting Hare Krishna difficult? Can anyone do it? So what keeps some people from chanting? Their unwillingness. So it's not that the chanting is hard.

Oh, it's so hard to chant. No, it's not hard to chant. You talk all day.

It's the same thing. It's just what words you use, you know. And that these words have gotten them parampara, of course.

You know what I'm saying? So it's not difficult, but it's their unwillingness. That's why until prajna is in place, no action happens, because you're not willing. Then when you're willing, then you start to look at it in a dynamic way and what's the goal, what are the processes, and then you'll do the activity.

But just you know the field, then you go, oh, you know, I got this, I got that, oh, this is so bad, how can I do it? But there's no enthusiasm. That's ignorance. You think, oh, I can't do this, that.

That's ignorance, right? So the field is in the position of ignorance, because it's the dead matter that you're going to deal with. So if you identify with the dead matter, then ignorance is prominent. You identify, I'm a servant of Krishna, I engage in some Krishna service, then you're dealing on the spiritual platform.

Then one's enthusiastic. You understand? So in other words, the knowledge of the Gita is so one contemplates so that one will develop enthusiasm. As we see, Arjuna is lamenting.

Right? In one sense you could say he has good cause. Questioner 3 asks a question in Hindi. Questioner 3 asks a question in Hindi.

Available anywhere, which is good, but at the same time also bad. So the devotee has to take it up. That's the whole point.

It's Arjuna. He's bewildered. He got the knowledge that the Gita applies.

From that, he was able to therefore conquer those anxieties and become enthusiastic to take

up the fight. So in other words, one is, why are we starting with this Vishada yoga? Because lamentation, that's the anxiety of being in the material world, the material existence. So then, with the knowledge of Gita, we can give up that.

We'll be doing the same activities, but now for Krishna. Right? So that's what Gita is giving us, is that now we're doing it for Krishna. It doesn't change the situation.

Arjuna didn't change the battle plan, nothing, by being Krishna conscious. This idea that what's spiritual must be some different mystical thing. Now the chariot rides upside down or something like that.

You know what I'm saying? It's not like that. This comes from the impersonal contamination that we think spiritual has to be different from material. No.

Material is simply a distorted reflection of the original. Not distorted. Perverted.

Because in some cases it could be an exact reflection. It's just perverted. Instead of it being Krishna as the center, we make ourselves the center.

Right? Does that make sense? So, in other words, everybody has problems in the material world, obstacles, anxieties, due to material attachment. Right? And so this knowledge of Gita can overcome that and then we continue with that same enthusiasm to serve Krishna. Does that make sense? Right? So it doesn't change.

So that's why, one may say, well why do we need this first chapter? No, there's not much in this chapter. But we can see the whole thing of surrendering to Krishna, taking up that devotional mood and what are the moods there, it's bringing out. Does that make sense? Questioner 2 Yeah, basically.

Basically. But then at the end of the 18th, it'll have to give a conclusion. Because you're going to have to have all three positions.

You know, so Arjuna's ready to fight, follow his order, and, you know, then Sanjaya says they'll be all victory. So, you know, I say, happiness was short-lived. In other words, the first chapter of Gita looked pretty good to him.

The other, you know, mostly then to the end of the 18th, he's not quite sure. And then the end of the 18th chapter, then it's not looking so good again. You had something? Questioner 3 Yes.

Yeah, yeah. But there there's a situation. Yeah, OK.

But there the utopia is the facilities. And that there's no material anxiety. So they have an understanding that, OK, Vaikuntha has no material anxieties, but their focus is on, they don't mind the material facilities.

They just don't want the, how do you say? The anxiety, but there's the, you know, the downside

of the material things. The inconvenience. Yeah.

Of the material. So, therefore, in that case, heaven is basically a material place that doesn't have any problems. So it's the heavenly planets.

Right. And, you know, even when you say you were saying in the Orthodox Judaic tradition, even going to heaven doesn't mean it's a permanent thing. Right.

You can come back again. So, therefore, it's even more close to the concept of the demigods. Only difference is, is they want to come back while the guys that are up, once you're up there, they don't want to come back.

So there's something, something, something, something got lost in the translation. So. Yes.

Anxiety is not a problem. Just like let us say you're having some guests over and they're very important to you and you know what to do, but you're in anxiety that everything will be perfect and on time. Is that anxiety bad? No.

And then when, you know, everything's ready and the guests come and everything's nice and they're happy, then it gives rise to the happiness that comes up from it. You know what I'm saying? So, the obstacles aren't actually the problem. It's that we perceive them as a problem.

Let us say, we'll give a very, not necessarily relevant example, you know, but hopefully we'll get the work done. Let us say someone somewhere in the universe is having a bad hair day. Okay? And, you know, they're grumpy.

So they come out of their house and then a bunch of kids run by yelling and screaming and they have to stop at that. Now what's going to be their reaction? Angry, annoyed and all that. Now let's say something's happened and they're on the top of the world and everything's perfect and they walk out of the door and these kids run by.

Then what happens? Oh, kids, you know, they're stupid. Right? So, were the kids actually an obstacle? No. We perceive it as one, or not.

You know? Because, so that's the point. When we have greater ideals, when we're functioning on our ideals, we're inspired. But when we're just looking at what we have and there's no inspiration, that's where there's anxiety.

You know? Because the difficulty comes is why that would be there. One, of course, the soul being eternal is looking for eternal happiness. But situation is in the position of sat.

Because in the spiritual world it's sat. In the material world it's ignorance. So the situation is founded on the principle of sat.

So, the jiva being eternal, and so in that position that's where sat is. Right? Sat-cid-ananda, the soul. So, the situation, then they think, is eternal.

So it's bad and it's eternally going to be bad. Everyone else says, no, no, it's not that bad. It's not that big of a deal.

No, no, but you don't understand. Because they're having that feeling. So they're in contact with the eternality of it.

Because, actually the situation is Krishna. Krishna is eternal. So then they're experiencing that eternalness.

So then they'll think, oh, this is going to be forever. But nothing in the material world is forever. You know? So, so one can be, be, how do you say, heartened by no bad situation will last forever.

Yeah. But any time, because it's the emotion, because the intelligent goes, because intelligence means that there's calculation, there's discrimination. Then there's time.

So then you can see, oh, this is going to be, you know, for this long, or this or that. Or if we do this, we can correct it. But the mind is simply experience.

And experience means you're in touch with something. You know, what you're actually in touch with is Krishna. So therefore you have that eternal experience.

Right? But, because you don't see it as Krishna, therefore you don't get the spiritual inspiration. Then you're dealing with the mundane. And mundane is always, how do you say, gives a, what comes up, basically what comes to mind is like boring.

But, you know, in other words, that feeling from boredom is just like there's nothing here. It's empty. Despair.

Yeah, despair. Vishala yoga. Yeah, okay.

Does this make sense? So, it's the mind that is there. Because the women will work predominantly more on the mind. The man is supposed to work more on the platform of intelligence.

But, as we pointed out, the intelligence is controlling the activities through the nature of the mind. Right? It means, in other words, the horses are the senses. That means what activities are done.

So the intelligence is controlling the activities, but through the mind. So you have to pull on the reins, how how will be appropriate for what you want to get done. So the problem is, is most don't.

They just either don't bother with the reins, or do whatever they like, or do too roughly, and then when it doesn't go right, then they want to blame, they want to blame the mind, or blame the senses. No, it's just their driving ability is not very good. You know what I'm saying? Because

that's just the way it is.

In order to please Krishna, Arjuna had to give up his attachment for all who are on the wrong side. This test comes in life of every devotee. Devotee who wants to surrender to the Lord will have to give up his selfish desires.

He decides to keep them and to run away from the battle, following the path of least resistance. His progress in Krishna consciousness will be checked. He will be in the position of a person who wants to possess a precious gem, but does not want to pay the price for it.

So Arjuna, that was Krishna, Arjuna's first thing, he'll run away. Right? But what we see is that one could say, well, isn't that better? And he's like, you know, all this and that. Yes.

But what's the position? Why that determination? Right? Why is it better not to fight and not to create problems for anybody and just go and live in the forest? What is the inspiration? Passion for the bodies? Yes. Okay. That could be something.

Avoiding the difficulty? This avoidance of the difficulty in this case is generated from what mode? From the mind. But you could say that would be there, that would be there, so that would be the ignorance. But there's one other one that's very important that we generally miss.

Goodness. Goodness. Okay.

Yes, because one of the symptoms of devotional service in the mode of goodness, you want no problems. Right? So it's not that you're intelligent to work out a way that there's less problems. Your motive is not to have any problems, rather than problems get in the way of the progress of whatever service you're doing.

Therefore, removing the problems makes the service go better. You just don't want any problems. There's a difference there.

That's the difference between pure goodness and goodness. Because one is actually connected to Krishna. The other one is you don't want any problems because that's what liberation means.

No problems. Right? So we endeavor for goodness? No, we endeavor for pure goodness and at least you, fall into goodness. Oh no.

Yeah. You know, so on a bad day, then you fall down to goodness. Because goodness is enlightening.

It's uplifting. So that's why it's, even though it's mundane, it's a better position. Like that.

Does that make sense? It's a better position. Okay. So, yeah, so it has to do, so Arjuna doesn't want to pay for it.

But, because the Krishna conscious thing is Krishna wants this, therefore he fights. So whatever

the obstacle is, that's not the problem. That's, that's what he deals with.

But he wants to run away from it because of that. So much of the time we might find that we will say that something's not good because, you know, it's not good on the worldly platform. It's not good for pranamoy.

It's not good for anamoy. It's not good for, how do you say, vijnanamoy. Right? For liberation.

Like that. Problems in the material world. Either, you know, we don't want to hurt other people so that's pranamoy.

You know, we know if we do like this we'll get some problems so if we go into that we'll have less problems. So it's anamoy. Right? But it's generally never based on dharma.

Unfortunately. You know, that this is the nature so you shouldn't be doing this. In verse 23, Arjuna wants to see the enemies who have come to fight on the side of the evil-minded Dhritarashtra.

On seeing them face to face, however, Arjuna shifts his perspective and takes them to be his relatives instead. Thus he feels compassion and lists several reasons why he should not be asked to fight with them. This is an important point, is perspective.

Because here you have, he says, let's see who has come to fight. Right? But once he sees who's there, he shifts it from, these are the enemies, to, these are my relatives. Right? So now, Arjuna, the Bhagavad-gita shows one how to adjust the perspective so that one can see from the spiritual platform.

And the spiritual platform means one is not then dealing with attachments, you know, other than attachments to Krsna. Does this make sense? So... If we pursue the analogy that, you know, Krsna puts us in front of our, you know, another, is it also that at some point, you know, we should, like, oh, this is part of me, or, you know, like... We should or we shouldn't? We shouldn't, but... We shouldn't, yeah, we shouldn't. ...doing like Arjuna, oh, this is part of me, or... No, I don't quite understand the point.

Like in the analogy... No, that I understand, though, why are you making the point? You've given the analogy as an example of your point. I didn't quite catch the point. The question is, is it that also that when we meet the enemy, we also identify with the enemy? Yes, that's the problem, is we, like Arjuna here, we shift the focus, so then we change the identity.

Here, it's, I'm a warrior and here are the enemies, so you have the field and there's enemies, right? And so, but then when he got there, he changed it and the field was family. So he's using the wrong perspective. So that's the difficulty, is that in seeing one's anarchist, then one may identify with it, because one identifies with the mind.

So to avoid identifying with the mind, then, then, one has, that's why the philosophy is there.

Right? So that one can look at it without identifying with it. Because the philosophy is beyond the conditioned nature.

So that's why it's used as the tool for doing that. Does that make sense? So, that's why we were mentioning before, is we must do this, but we must be aware that once seeing it, we don't identify with it, and therefore say, oh, I'm so bad and become insecure, or gain confidence and ah, what's the big deal, we're not fanatic and all that and then move the other way. Because you see, generally devotees have a tendency to do one of these two.

You know, they see their own shortcomings and then they become insecure and they feel that they're useless as devotees and they won't, they're not inspired to do anything because they're so useless. Or the other is, he's inspired to do things but it's not necessarily spiritual, because to, to be at peace with himself, that, you know, okay, I have these bad qualities but, you know, what's the big deal? Everybody has bad qualities and this and that. So he identifies with them and then where is his enthusiasm? To act in relationship to those anarchists.

Not spiritual. So he said, we're not fanatic. That's fine, we're not fanatic.

Yeah, we're not. But then, the result should be spiritual endeavor. But the result's material endeavor.

So therefore, you can understand it's not philosophy to say, oh, it's fanatic. It's what we were talking about before. The unscrupulous, materialistic mind is using spiritual philosophy to, to establish its position.

You understand? So the person goes, oh, you know, but he's got all these anarchists or, you know, what does it matter? We're chanting Hare Krishna, we do our best for Krishna. You know? Then, then you can understand that's actually understanding we're not fanatic. But not fanatic doesn't mean not committed.

Right? Because if the position of not being fanatic was good, then let us propose a, a position for everyone's contemplation. So if being fanatic is bad and being stuck to one thing is good, why are we, why, why are we, why do we see on one level that if it's according to the modern kind of scenario that people are committed to relationships, that that's good. Because isn't that fanatic? You know, so it's only if it's Vedic, then you're not so fanatic and committed to it.

So, so then the point is, is that then committing yourself to a role in a relationship is fanatic. So therefore, if we're really broad-minded, shouldn't we be more liberal and anyone can do anything in any relation as they please? But people immediately say, no, because then they, then they get insecure about their relationships. So all it is is there's something above or below their standard of relationship.

That, they can't do. Right? If it's below the standard, that's maya. If it's above the standard, that's fanatic.

Because they're both seen as impediments to their own standard and their own identity. Does this make sense? Yes. Three minutes.

You said there in the first sentence. Right, and then when you say you said means that I did something wrong here? No. No.

Okay. I always get worried when someone says, you said. What did I say? You must mention I see.

that first Fortuna thought that he was great, that he's worried, and here are, there are enemies here. And then next, he, he understand that we are my family. For example, if Fortuna continues thinking even, even when there are any among his allies, if Fortuna continues thinking that I'm worried, I'm worried, and they are enemies, so let them kill.

I don't care. They are my relatives. It doesn't mean that with this consciousness, he will commit sinful activities.

Will he commit sinful activities? Not knowing other people. Yeah, OK. Not means not looking at it from the spiritual perspective, but going out there as a warrior on the battlefield, will it be sinful? No, because he is acting according to the religious principles of a kshatriya, but it will only be piety.

He is leading the battlefield, that will be sinful. But Krishna is giving a third alternative, that is performing those activities that would be considered pious, but without any fruitive desire, right? Because that becomes then Krishna, Bhugya Yoga, becomes Krishna conscious. So, in other words, he thinks, I am the warrior and I am the man, so it's a problem, right? But he is confident and willing to do something.

Then he thinks, oh, you know, this is not a nice situation. We will lose everything and the family and the whole reason for fighting is for the family. So then that's another position.

But what Krishna is doing is he is giving the spiritual perspective, but it takes the active role. It still takes the position of proper performance of duties. It's not that, you know, does that make sense? So this is being applied here.

There are other examples given in the Upanishads where one sees it's there, but there is a higher duty, the spiritual, right? But the Pandavas also showed that. It's time for Krishna left and they just went for the, you know, headed to the mountains, that's it. Does that make sense? So you have to know where it applies.

So what did Yudhisthira say about when Krishna left, you know, in the Bhagavatam? What was his point about the position of Krishna's relationship to them? He established that because of Krishna, then we had our kingdom, we had our positions, our weapons, our family. Everything was going nice because of Krishna's arrangement, right? Because this was the basis of interaction. But if Krishna is not there, there's no need of these, right? Because that was to

serve him in that capacity.

So now they serve him in this other capacity. So now they leave all that and go to the forest. So as long as someone has that identity and need for these things, then one works with them.

But not as Arjuna first came out on the battlefield, right? But as Arjuna after he's enlightened. So in other words, someone has a need for family environment, but if he just identifies with it and deals with it in that way, it's still going to create problem. Even if he deals in the nicest way in his pipe, it's still going to make problem.

But if he understands it in connection to Krishna, and then if he says, oh, this is all my end, gives it up, like a lot of devotees. They're married, but they don't actually involve themselves and interact. They take no emotional responsibility and they try to take as minimal spirit, I mean, how you say, yeah, physical and material responsibility as possible.

But they're very careful about taking care of their own needs of what they all want to preach. I need a computer. I need this.

I need that. But, you know, they can't pay the bills for the family. You know what I'm saying? So this is actually Arjuna running away from the battlefield and claiming it's spiritual.

Right? So Arjuna is then, so then the point is, is that it must be seen in connection to Krishna. And therefore these duties are given by Krishna. Religion comes from Krishna.

What's it? Dharma tu saksat bhagavat-panitam. Dharma comes from God. So God's given.

This is the way to deal if you have these inclinations. And so then through those inclinations, you can connect that to Krishna and therefore do service to Krishna. Does that make sense? So Arjuna, therefore, is fighting on the battlefield, though originally it was for his kingdom and revenge to Duryodhana, is being done simply as service to Krishna, to please Krishna.

Then what results come? They get a kingdom or not? That doesn't matter. Because as soon as they get the kingdom, they're not interested. And very soon everybody starts heading for the forest anyway.

Like, you know, as soon as they get back, then Kunti leaves for the forest. Like Dhritarashtra goes to the forest. Vidura goes to the forest.

You know, and then a short time later, they go to the forest. So getting a kingdom and all this and that, that's not the main thing, is service to Krishna. Does that make sense? So it's the third perspective.

So the problem is devotees take one or the other. But when they're taking the one, it's not necessarily based unless they're generally Hindus. It's not necessarily based on dharma.

You know, it'll be based on some, you know, modern social concept, which may be based on

something pious or may not be. You know, or they run away from it, which is anyway sinful. Or, so Krishna's saying, no, you engage your nature in his service.

That's actually the perspective. So that's why, that's what we'll see in the next chapter, why Arjuna is bewildered. Because Krishna talks spiritual life and he thinks spiritual life will replace the activities you perform.

Because that's the idea. Spiritual means you don't do anything what's here. But Krishna's saying, no, you add spiritual to what you're already doing.

That's what makes sense. Does that make sense? So that'll be discussed more in the second chapter. That's the topic there.

OK. So then then tomorrow we'll deal with this versus 27 to 46. Arjuna's reasons not to fight.

And then we'll give out the essays. Great. OK.

So after the class tomorrow, we'll give out the essays. What's that? Thursday. Yes, true.

Good point. Good say. So Śrīla Prabhupāda Kī.

So Śrīla Prabhupāda Kī.