

2010-10-14 BVPS BG 2.38-2.39 Switch to Niskama karma yoga

Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare, Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare Rāma Rāma Hare Hare Rāma Rāma Hare On these points, it's very important to note that the second chapter, though, is something that we probably know the most within the devotional philosophy, about we're not the body and soul and all that. But these very subtle elements that are there, that are very important to appreciate. Because if that's appreciated, everything else is based on this.

It's always that the Vedic concept is what's fundamental is not lost. It's not like on the bottom, and then everything else is piled on top. No, it's on the top, and everything extends down from there.

In other words, we're servant of Krishna, that's the eternal principle. We engage our conditioned nature or not, that's temporary. You understand? We have a conditioned nature, that's a temporary element.

We're servant of Krishna, that's eternal. And so why do we engage the conditioned nature if it's temporary? Because the eternal element of we engage our nature in Krishna's service. So if that nature is spiritual, that's engaged.

If it's material, we engage that. You understand? Because underlying the Sanatana dharma is the soul is Krishna's servant. And as his servant, he engages whatever facilities he has, whether it's spiritual or material, right? Material here meaning our conditioned nature, the body, the mind, the intelligence.

Does this make sense? So that's what we're doing. So these are very fundamental elements. So in other words, why on the, because we're saying here Arjuna's foolish for feeling bad about killing his relatives and all that, right? No? And then after that, having said that, then we announce today's a fast day because it's Rupa Goswami's or Bhaktisiddhanta Sarasvati Thakur's disappearance day.

Right? And then we fast a half day. So what's the difference? What's the point? Why are we saying that here the loss of the physical relationship is a sad thing? On the other, we're saying loss of the physical relationship is foolish. Yeah, one's connected to Krishna or not.

So what is lost when some great personality goes? His association, what is to be gained in that association? Remembrance of Krishna. Yes. Instructions, yes.

More important, instructions and their personal example, personal dealings in connection with Krishna consciousness. But at the same time, there's nothing to lament about because those instructions are eternal, the relationship's eternal. It's just there's that element of separation.

Does that make sense? When the gopis finish blinking their eye lid, Krishna's still going to be

there. Right? So that blink for 1 11th of a second, a nimisha. But is that anxiety for them because the interaction is not as it takes on a different flavor.

In other words, what is remembrance of it, while the other is the dynamic interaction. Does that make sense? So whether it's there, you spread it out a bit longer. But it's the same principle.

It's the same principle. Does this make sense? I might appreciate this ball on top of it, on the ball. OK.

Does this make sense? So there's something important here. So therefore, if we're looking at it, if it's a matter, OK, now let's say one does have a relative. Right? Then what is the real consideration in, as a devotee, of why you would have a relative? OK.

Relative is willing to connect to Krishna. So then if that's the case, what would your relationship be based on? Preaching, Krishna consciousness. So what's lost? Nothing.

Sure. Something must be lost. Maya's lost.

OK, so that's all that's lost when they die. Well, when they die. Yeah.

Yes, you're missing the opportunity for association. OK? Now let us drop it down a bit. You know, make it a little bit, you know, because that's real.

But let's make it a little bit, let's broaden the base of this. You know, in other, do you understand? What's lost? No one you can preach to. OK, that's there.

But the point is, is, yes? Emotional interaction. OK, but now the emotional interaction on its own, what's its position? It's temporary. So, and so, and so what is, what is the element that we would define it as temporary? The conditioning.

OK. And what makes it conditioning? Forgetting Krishna. Right? So in other words, you don't, yes, go ahead.

Yeah, OK. Yeah, that's what that would be. That would be like a third, third thing.

You understand? Is that, in other words, one's not seeing the broadest of vision. But the same thing would create, that broadest of vision would also create the proper vision here. Right? Does that make sense? So what is missing? Bodily connection, but what is that based on? Yes, and OK.

And so is there any actual problem in the emotions, the senses, the interaction of the senses? Is it? The object is not there, so on the temporary. OK, on the temporary level. The object is not there, you cannot have it.

You cannot have it. But just the basis of the relationship. Means, is the concept of a relationship a problem? No, so what's actually the problem here? Yes.

The body, but what's the problem? Because is the body a problem? You have a body, is that a problem? Yes, so how should it be approached then? How should we approach why we have family members? Because you know what I'm saying? In other words, parents have a child because they're thinking of that great dynamic spiritual association that's going to be there, right? Not necessarily, because you're not exactly sure what you're going to get. You know, Madhvacharya's parents, they, I think, fasted on milk for eight years or 10 years before they conceived him, right? And then they got Madhvacharya. So I'm not sure that many parents are working on that principles necessarily.

Means they want, so it's just a matter of how much they're committed, how much is that determination. Does this make sense? So in other words, what is the motive basically of the parents to have the child? OK, that could be on the lowest level, but OK, so let's say sex life. So what would be the next step up from there? Emotional attachment, so how are you going to get the kid? No, but are you going to get the kid through emotional attachment? OK, so the emotional attachment can lead to sex life.

But the point is that sex life is the mechanics for having children. But if it's only based on that, then it's quite a shallow relationship. So the kid will also be quite shallow, right? But if it's based on the emotions, then it will be of a higher nature, right? But then what would be above that? It's based on Krishna doctrine.

OK, but how? Because my point is here, because we're talking mechanics, is that's the point. But then how do we connect the two? Yes, by being involved in the way Krishna wants. And then? Meaning that the result of our activity is not ours.

OK, the result of our activity is not ours, so what kind of child is still up to Krishna? But does that mean that we don't contemplate what kind of child to have? We desire to have the best child so that he can preach and please Krishna above. OK, and so then what would that mean if that's the kind of child you want, having produced this child, what's the relationship? Your responsibility. In Krishna consciousness.

Now, because you're the parent, they have to? You're the parent, so they have to do what you say. I get a nod over there, I said, that's right. That's what I thought.

I said, what is that famous one? Don't do as I do, do as I say. Because I said so. Yeah, that's it.

OK, so now, if it's based on that, then what's the central element of the relationship then? OK, it means to be an example, but here it's a matter because the parent said it, that's why you have to do it. Now, the parent's saying chant japa or go to the temple, so they're all good things, they're Krishna conscious things. But what's actually the motive behind the parent thinking that because I said it, the child has to do it? Yes, the authority.

What else? Yeah, just that sense of authority. So that's the motive behind it. They want to be in that position of authority, they want to have that control.

Because if you have control, then what do you have? Enjoying. So you need to control the child, then whatever it is that you're looking for in having the child, you feel you can get. In other words, you think, oh, wouldn't it be nice if the whole family went to the temple now and it all went nice and we stayed together and took darshan and discussed the outfit and this and that.

So you're thinking, I will enjoy like that. And then your kid says, no, I don't want to go to the temple. So it spoils your enjoyment.

Even though your enjoyment's based on Krishna consciousness, this is the meaning of this element of the level of karma yoga. If the karma yoga is at the level of sakam or nisakam. Sakam means it's in line with something pious and good.

It means we're taking it. Could also not be, but I'm just taking in this conversation, because we'll always say, yes, Krishna, and it should be with Krishna, and like this. We'll say that.

But the point is, is the motive sakam or nisakam? Because Rupa Goswami, after explaining that one should be conscious of Krishna, then it should be favorable towards Krishna. So going to the temple and taking darshan is favorable to Krishna. You're conscious of Krishna.

Then he says, it should be free from karma and jnan. That's the last statement. So is your desire to take your family to the temple free from karma and jnan? Right? But the point is, it's more important, even if it's not, it's better than not at all.

Better that you're going to the temple for some other motive, but you're still going to the temple, because it's connected to Krishna. But one should contemplate this and see, well, actually, I could be looking at it that my duty to take care of my family, be Krishna conscious, be in that kind of association, and all that. Then what's going to happen? What's going to make the difference between if the child says no, and your motive is based on sakham, or the child says no, and your motive is based on nisakam? Your own sadhana won't be disturbed.

Your sadhana won't be disturbed? You find a way out. Exactly. In other words, you actually will preach.

Because the other one is, because I said it, you have to do it, because I'm the father, and you're the child. And the other one is that I'm the father, and this is the child. So therefore, I'm responsible to see that this devotee becomes Krishna conscious.

So as a preacher, if you go out on the street, and you go up to somebody, hi, how are you, you know, we're out here, we're talking about Krishna and that Krishna. Who cares about Krishna? And then you're going to go, wait, I'm a devotee, and you're a nonsense, carmy rascal. You can't talk to me like that.

Are you going to get very far? Are the other devotees in the temple going to say, yeah, you really told him, you know, those carmy rascal nonsense. Is it going to work? No, what's a good preacher? He adjusts to the nature of the person you're preaching to. Yeah, he adjusts to the

situation.

So then he says, no, Krishna, who cares for Krishna? No, so what do you care for? You know, like this, you find some way to go with him. His point is, I don't care. So OK, so you don't care.

Anything else, you don't care about, you know. You know, what about, you know, the political situation on Pleiades? You know, as he knows, then what else do you know? You know what I'm saying? So like this, you go on. You find something, and then you bring them around.

So that's going to make the difference. So that means, what is it going to mean? The person who's detached, or the person who's detached, who actually is going to be the better parent? The one who's detached. Well, generally, we think the one who's detached will be the worst.

So for those who are detached and are bad parents, is it real detachment? No, it's aversion, right? It's a lack of responsibility. They see the trouble. They don't want to take the trouble.

So it's attachment to the bad. Yeah, so it's attachment, but they can't get done what they want, so there's aversion. Because they don't understand the duties.

They don't understand it, so it's a lack of knowledge. So it's like Krishna says, don't ever be attached to not performing your duty. Yeah, never be attached to not performing your duty.

Because there are times when you can't do your duty. Then when you can do, don't be attached to not doing it. Because it does come up.

Let's say you get sick, so you can't do your duty. Then you get healthy. Then you say, well, it was really nice not doing anything, so now why should I do something? So the person who's detached will have a greater range of attachment than the one who's not attached to a specific act.

Yes, because when you're attached, attachment is a quality of what element? Mode of passion? OK. Yeah? Feminine nature? OK. But I said of what element? You have eight elements? Gross and subtle.

The mind. OK. Now, in naiskarmya, how do you function on naiskarmya? The intelligence.

The intelligence. So what's the difference between the mind and the intelligence in what they do? Knowledge. OK.

So the intelligence works on knowledge. That means your options of what you could do. While the mind just works on what it accepts and rejects.

So the options are less. Yes, so the options are less, because you've already chosen. So all it is is that I'm going to enjoy in this way by how I think it should happen.

You do that. It's nice. You don't do that.

It's not nice. So therefore, you'll get anger after frustration. Does that make sense? Well, if you're working on a naiskarmya, then you're working on intelligence.

OK, that didn't work. Then find a way to make it work. And you'll use your intelligence to come up with a variety of ways to get it done.

Does that make sense? You call this class. I say, Bhagavad Gita for better parenting. Nice seminar.

Yes. Can one be on the platform of naiskarmya and not be very intelligent? Can you be on the platform of naiskarmya and not be very intelligent? How do you define intelligence? You know what I'm saying? Because otherwise, there's so many ways you can define intelligence. Not having such a broad spectrum of ideas.

Not having a broad spectrum of ideas. Means yes, because point is, it's both the strong point and the weak point of being a parent. Why is the parent a parent? He's attached.

So if you're attached, that's your motive. So therefore, even if you haven't thought about it and don't have a broad range, because you're attached and want the results, then you'll endeavor to get it. You understand? But if you're working on the platform of intelligence, then you'll use your intelligence to think, well, maybe you didn't think of it now.

It's just like somebody said something, you didn't know what to say back. As soon as you walk away, then you immediately think of this great line that you could have said. So it always works.

So like that, then it will come. And then you use it later. So it's slower.

It's not immediate. But you will get it. You know what I'm saying? So you'll think about it, and you will get the results.

So it may take you longer, but you actually get the results. You know what I'm saying? So it means later when you go and look on Facebook, then your kid has a bean bag in their hand, rather than half a spaghetti tank top. You know what I'm saying? Like that.

So like this, then you can, you know, it may take longer, but it works. Yes? A parent is a parent because they are attached. Right.

And in order to be a good parent, one has to be detached. Yes. Now you're starting to understand.

That's why it's intubated data touch. These two can work at once. Your underlying motive to be involved may be attachment, but your actual application of it still has to be on knowledge.

Right? It means if you don't know the field and the results you can get from the field, then you can't perform the action. Right? So if you just think, because I feel this way, then everything will work out. You know? I mean, it's nice.

But in reality, it doesn't necessarily work like that. But the point is, is because you have that mood and all that and know what you want, right, then things will work out. Right? But the point is, is there supposed to be knowledge.

There's supposed to also be knowledge. Right? Does that make sense? So that underlying mood is important, but so with time you change it from attachment to what I want to attachment that I want that's connected to Krishna. Then it's attachment to doing things for Krishna, to attachment to just Krishna.

You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? So that the conditioned nature is left out, right? So the lower level is because I want it, but OK, I can connect it to Krishna. Then it's, OK, I'm doing this, and I want to give my result to Krishna. Then later on, it's just, I just work for Krishna.

Krishnamurti says, just work for me. That means you do the work just for him, though you're doing that work that you like to do. In other words, the difference is all three levels means the lowest level, you're doing the work because you may like to work, but you're more into the result, right? Then you come to the point where you're not into the result, but you're comfortable with that work.

Then you come to the point where you're just trying to please Krishna, and you use whatever facilities are available. Does this make sense? Now in this, we're not the, how do you say? So we see more here practical stuff. But there's the, how do we break down the emotional attachment? We have that emotional attachment.

OK, we accept it's a motive that you're going to be involved in a relationship. The principle of relationship is good, because ultimately, there's a relationship between you and Krishna, you and the devotees, right? So that you'll be involved, rather than just be in ignorance and not do anything or just worry about yourself, right? So you have that motive to benefit the other person. And that emotional interaction is the basis.

I mean, it's your prominent thing that you want to get from that relationship. How to connect that to Krishna? Knowledge. Knowledge, and what is this knowledge? It's already connected to Krishna.

Already connected to Krishna. And how is that already connected to Krishna working? Brahman and Paramatma. Brahman and Paramatma, what does that mean? Understanding the qualities, how they interact.

The qualities and the interaction. In other words, you're attached to a certain emotional experience. How does, mechanically, that emotional experience work? What is it about the emotional experience you want? Like the exam we gave before, the family going together.

So that feeling of togetherness, that common basis that together we're going and everything. Something straight out of the Jehovah's Witness magazine or something like that. All the

pictures, all that kind of thing.

So it's the togetherness that we're looking for. Because we're saying, if that happens, then I'll be happy. So our happiness is based on togetherness.

And that togetherness, then, the form of it's as a group, the family is going to go to the temple and stay together in the temple and have interactions based on what's in the temple. You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? So in other words, the sense of that togetherness, that's Krishna. And the mechanics of how you would be together, that's Lakshmi.

Right? So we can be servants to see that we perform those authorized forms. That's Lakshmi in serving Krishna as togetherness. Does this make sense? So that's the most technical and most intellectual.

Means, whatever you do, why can you do something? Like, why do dogs bark? OK, but that's the mechanics of how it works. But why doesn't it change? According to scientists, it should change. Why doesn't it change? And where is it given that way? Because what we're seeing, that's the creation of Brahma.

So where is it seen that dogs bark and wag their tails? I think dogs are the primary creation. The primary creation. Right? It means, in other words, Krishna manifests the creation.

In other words, as universal form, he creates everything and enters into everything. But it's that primary state. It's not manifest.

You don't see it. Therefore, then Brahma, when he, as the engineer, that's what Prabhupada says about the blueprints. Krishna's made the blueprints.

So everything that is in the world can happen in the world. All actions, all relationships, all results is already in the blueprint. So no one can do anything outside of the blueprint.

That's why you do something, it works, and do something else, it doesn't work. What works is in the blueprint. What doesn't work is not in the blueprint.

So that blueprint is the interaction between the Lord and his energy. Because the Lord does not consort with the external energy. He only consorts with the internal energy.

So in this example, then we're saying, therefore, all qualities means that everything that one does is based on a quality. We don't necessarily think of that way, especially in the modern age because of our consumerist training. But previously, it was based on relationships or religious ideals or something.

There was some other. It was about the mood that you'd get from it, rather than just happy that you have it. In other words, it would be the result of a relationship interaction.

Well, now it's just that you have it. There's a potential for the relationship. Does that make

sense? In other words, just like, let's say, I don't know how you would, what would be the correct term.

We don't want to use any pejorative terms here. But let's say your standard box office Hollywood movie, if it ends, then what are you ending with? Happy ending means the relationships are there and they're working. You've gotten the result.

And there's money. That's another thing. But you've gotten that.

Now, if we take an avant-garde ending, a film noir, something like that, what is the ending? The tragedy of life. Tragedy of life or a potential, just a potential. He could do this, he could do that.

They just leave it there. And so they're excited about that because it's potential. It's fresh.

It's new. Well, the other one is you've just got the ending. That's all boring.

Of course, a guy gets a girl. Hey, everything's up. But here, he could do this, he could do that.

It's like, you understand? It's just different attachments. One's attached to progeny. One's attached to options.

Does that make sense? And each one will say the other's movies are stupid. Does that make sense? Those who are into art films can't stand good endings. To them, it's the stupidest thing in the world.

And those who like standard movies, think the art films, they know it's like a waste of time, absolute waste of time. So both have this, where's the intelligence? Why, because options are intelligence. And result is the mind.

So one thinks, oh, yeah, it's too academic, too intellectual. And the other, oh, it's just too sentimental. You understand? But one is ending with what the mind's looking for, and the other is what the intelligence is looking for.

The option, right? Progeny is the field is there, and then you have options. So they spend the whole movie to get to options. Well, the other spends the whole movie getting through options, endeavor, and then failed endeavor, then refreshed endeavor, and then result.

So in other words, of the two, which one's more applicable in your life? The result, right? Because the options doesn't tell you what to do with them. Well, the other one has told you what to do. Whether it's right or not, you want to do what they do.

That's another thing. But all of these movies sell more, because even though it looks more pie in the sky, in one sense, it's cooler. Yes, because you've gone through the thing.

There's a field. You've made your endeavor. You've gotten your results, which is actually a complete pattern.

While the other one is just you look at the field and this, but this adds something to the field and changes it, and that adds something to the field and changes it. They keep just morphing it until they come to one point and go, OK, here's what I was trying to get to. Do you understand? So then it's a whole intellectual presentation.

But they don't do anything, and those who are into that won't tell you what is a real life, what you should do with it. While the others are very committed. No, you do this, and whatever is their lifestyle, they're very convinced of it.

While the other, they think, just being intellectual, that's a complete lifestyle. It means, in other words, being an armchair speculator is actually fulfilling. So they're both wrong, but at least the karmic, there's the concept of complete rasa.

But for the jnani, there's no rasa to them as stupid. So that's why it's easier to preach to a karmic than a jnani. You think, oh, he's intelligent, he's a professor, he's a this, he's a that.

He would be easier, but actually he's tougher, because he doesn't actually understand relationships. Yes, intellectual idea of not reaching a conclusion. Otherwise, why would that be fun? Because it's speculation.

The options are there to speculate, do whatever you want with. And they'll say, yeah, I came to an end, so it's finished. No, this is fresh, it's new.

And it's like, yeah, but what to do? So, yes? And what about the conception of breaking the attachment by understanding this material futility? I'm attached to my wife, she's just a bag of bones. OK, so she's just a bag of bones. OK, great.

And she probably, you know. Tell her that. What was that? No, tell her that.

Yeah, yeah, no, it's just like, no, no, but I'm just saying just a funny point on this is that one time I was here, it was probably, it would have been like, probably like 74 or something here in Mayapur. There's this one devotee named Bhaktijan, very, very far out devotee, very eccentric, but very intelligent like that. So he was always doing something like that.

And then this, I guess this new brahmacharini came to Mayapur, and he had his friend. You know, they'd always hang out, Bhaktijan, the son of a devotee. And then this girl came, she's very, very attractive.

And so then they both, she, I guess, just came in, and they both saw her. So the one then says, ah, just another bag of stool, or this or that, like that, and like that. And Bhaktijan said, yeah, but she's got all the stool in the right places.

So in a broad sense, what you're telling is, you lead to a community based on relationships rather than rules. Yes, based on relationship. Rules define so that the relationships Like, why say there should be fidelity in marriage? Because if there's not, the relationship breaks.

Yeah, relationship breaks. Or how deep can the relationship be if you never know from day to day who your partner's going to be hanging out with? It's just a couple of times a week, oh, you're home. Yeah, OK, great.

You know what I'm saying? How deep can it be? So in other words, the idea is you have material attachments, and you want to, therefore, be involved in material attachments. Wouldn't it be? If you have material attachments, you want to be involved in an experience that deals with that material attachment. So then, if the material attachment isn't technically fulfilled, will you be satisfied? No.

But if it's fulfilled, and the result of fulfilling that material desire is in an environment where it can be compared to fulfilling spiritual desire, and you can see the difference between them, would that be better? So now, would you want to compare a not really well-performed, and therefore, proper result material desire against the spiritual? Or would you want to compare something that's been properly done, you've gotten the full result that you can get in the material platform, and compare that to spiritual? Which would be the advantage? The second. Because the first, you may then think about that. I didn't really get it, so I can't really compare.

Yeah, because you might think that there's, if I'd done it this way, then it would have been nice. But that's why the Vedas explain how to, it means that dharma, artha and kama, they explain this, or moksha, because these are material concepts. But they explain, you want artha, this is the way to do it.

Because then you've done it, and then when you've done as much as there is, then you get bored. But is it possible that one may come to the same realization through a train wreck, or something? Means you can, but the point is, will it last? If it's strong enough to last, great. Like in the seventh canto, when Narada Muni is discussing with Yudhishthira Maharaja, varna-sandharma.

So he explains varna-dharma, right? In other words, what someone should do, and everything, what's like that. Having explained brahman-satya, vaisya, shudra, then after that he describes women. Because they'll have that nature, but then they'll have the nature of woman.

Then after that, then he describes maleccas, because saying is that the maleccha, by being so absorbed in their sinful activities, then they become, how you say, they lose the taste. It's just like you pour a little ghee on the fire, it gets bigger. You pour a lot of ghee, the fire goes out.

But the point is, is it's based on the principle of enjoying the senses, and doing whatever they like. So they've gotten a bad reaction, so at that moment they may take up inquiring to Krishna consciousness. And if they do, then they get benefited.

But now, when the pain of that situation, or in this case, your train wreck, or whatever it is, is over, then what are they going to be left with? What's their inherent way of behaving? Sensual gratification, however they feel like. So unless, if they've made enough advancements, or now

they have faith in guru-sadhu and sastra, and they won't do it by however they feel, and they'll do proper, then great. But if they don't, then what happens? They'll go back.

But then that means they have faith in guru-sadhu and sastra. But I'm saying is they don't necessarily. That's the weakness of it.

But it will work. But now, if you think about it, so many devotees who are not, who are dynamically practicing Krishna consciousness, now they're not. What is the basis of them not doing that? Devotees who before were more involved in direct Krishna consciousness, and preaching, and like this, and now they're not.

What is the basis for them not being involved? Which means? That's fair, but I'm just, yeah? They weren't emotionally satisfied. They weren't emotionally satisfied, because they want to do things however they like, and they go back to their sense gratification. You can say so many things, well, this one, this, and that one, that, or devotees, this point.

They get to go talk all day, but actually, it comes down to, all it is is they couldn't get past their malachite lifestyle. Because when they go back, they go back to the same lifestyle. You just remove the major impurities.

Right now, they're vegetarian. They don't gamble, like that. You understand? But a lot of us came from this category.

That's exactly what we're talking about. Yes. So a lot of us are in this situation.

Yes, so that's the point, is that that's why through knowledge, in other words, the mind has a particular kind of predilection. There's also another word like that, predisposition, like this, that in a way of thinking and culture and emotions, then how are you going to change it? By education. That's the easiest.

Otherwise, what's the other option? Experience, which means then you have to get kicked around the block a little bit more, right? So you've been kicked around the block enough. So now you're willing to take it up. Now if you take up intelligence, in other words, this section is called buddhi yoga, where we're supposed to discuss.

If you take that up, then you can change how the mind looks at things, right? How the mind looks at things. And then when it does actually need to actually deal with the senses and sense objects in a dynamic way, you'll have changed the basis of that. So instead of it being like a mleccha, it will be like a follower of the Vedic culture.

That's why Prabhupada always talks about varnasrama, which is better, mleccha culture or varnasrama? OK, so since a conditioned soul is going to follow a culture, or a, how you say, organized lack of it, like that, then which is better? A pious culture or an impious culture, right? So that's why Prabhupada talks about varnasrama, not that we really care about varnasrama. But since people are going to function in a religious environment, better one that's given by

God than one that we make up ourself. Could you summarize that we have had any failures and we are not enough? But no, it's never not enough.

It's a matter of whether we take it. The Buddha yoga itself is enough. No, I mean, in attending.

Oh, yeah, in attending. Because what was happening, like in the beginning of the discussion, when it came to something where it was very obvious about Maya and Krishna, what would we say? Say, pick Krishna. We'd pick Krishna, right? But the point is that thing that we were talking about, that mundane situation, and Krishna, was there a gap between them in practical application? Right? Because the grahastha thinks, I take my family to the temple.

That's Krishna conscious. They don't go to the temple. They're in Maya, OK? And because I'm attached, so therefore, just because I want it, it should happen, right? So now, they can't see that they're starting with this actual situation their family's in, and then the ideal that they want to get them to.

And they think, just because I feel like that, it should happen. OK, nice. If you feel, so that's spontaneous devotional service.

Great, you feel, so you serve. But are you dealing on that spontaneous spiritual platform with the family, or you're dealing on a spontaneous mundane platform, right? So those things that you can directly do, that's the best. You can't, then you see these social elements and other techniques and all that that would work better.

Then that's the next. And if that still doesn't cover the attachment, then you have to get down to what he's talking about, is seeing, breaking down the attachment itself, that actually, what you're attached to is still Krishna. But you think it's the body, and you think it's the relationships.

Yes? This middle concept, social element, I don't understand. Social element. Means, OK, I didn't get a good result by being so strong, so I should try being a little more soft.

Like when you go to a self-help seminar, they're going to tell you all this stuff. I can't remember the first part of it. The last part of it is, let God.

Let God. Oh, let go, let God. Yeah, like that.

It's like, in other words, I'm so attached to the thing, so I've got to distance myself a little bit. And so therefore, I'll let go a bit, and then I'll be able to see things better, and let God reveal something. Then I can do it.

So this is one based on understanding that in prayogina, it only comes by God's grace. But they're actually thinking that, I'll let God, and then I'll do it. So they all have their little things, like, what do you call it? Law of attraction, and what? Yeah, yeah.

Law of attraction is just you let it attract. So they take one part, and they get some idea. But it's still, does that make sense? What I'm saying is that's one level of dealing with the attachment, is

you're dealing with the application of the qualities.

But if that still doesn't fully connect it to Krishna, you can see it's OK. But the point is, why are those rules there? They're there by Krishna. Krishna said, this is how you're supposed to deal.

Krishna explains, you have this kind of relationship with these kind of people, and this is how you're supposed to deal. So you're basing it on that. Does that make sense? So either dharma, artha, and kama there.

If not, then you look at this moksha aspect. Actually, it's because ultimately, it's Krishna. What I'm looking for is Krishna.

So it's not dynamic there, because you're going to have to do something. So now, best is that you see it in that knowledge, and then you act in such a way that's also based on scripture. Does that make sense? It's approved by scripture.

Then it's balanced, because then your dharma, artha, kama, and moksha are all based on scripture. And you're doing all that in support of God consciousness, trying to serve Krishna. So what we're trying to say is that these things have to be practically applied.

Because the point is what Krishna's saying here is the body is temporary. It's going to die. There's nothing you can do about it.

And the soul is going to live forever. And the soul is so small, you can't do anything to it anyway. In other words, you can't kill the soul.

It's impossible. It's too small. And the body is never going to stay.

So why are you lamenting? The body is going to go, and the soul stays. You say, well, I can't kill the body, because you think they're the body. No, they're the soul, so they're not going to die.

And you think, well, I killed Bhishma. You never killed Bhishma, because the actual Bhishma is the soul, and the soul is still alive. So you can actually start to see is then you can break it down, which will be in these later chapters, how the work is going, how the understanding of that, how to combine understanding and work.

That's going to be the next three chapters. Yes? Is it possible to join soul, or kill the soul, some relationship with another soul? Based on what? Based on what he has. So like, what if I saw a person, and he has some relationship.

And then then, he's dead. Is it possible that we all know, like, a connection is there between one soul and another, and still losing the body? He's losing the whole physical part of the body. But this is my point, is what's communicating? Love, but what's it based on? Yes, but where does that feeling come from? Means there's, I mean, in English, you have the term fall in love, right? And now, this is something new, I think, started in the 80s, or something, fall out of love.

What happened? That's what I said, but they use it all the time. In other words, you love somebody, and now you don't. I know, but I'm giving you an example.

Where did the love come from? You have dead matter, right? You have two souls, right? So you just have two, one 10,000, the tip of the hair, floating around. Is that what's happening in your relating? I'm not talking about that. We've heard your question.

We're analyzing your question. So what's relating? Actually, the souls? What's the love for? The soul? Or it's for the particular conditioned nature that's there? In other words, two conditioned natures are attracted to each other, right? And because the souls relate to the conditioned natures, therefore, they think they're related to each other. OK, do you want an answer, or do you want to discuss it, or do you want me to say what you want to hear? OK, so we're going through the logical step of breaking down that, first of all, it can't be happening on the material platform.

Then we're going to look at, how can it be possible on the spiritual platform? OK? So the point is, is there is a physical, observable, how you say, body, right? And that has a particular personality, right? So the gross and subtle natures are there. So those gross and subtle natures may be connected, right? But the point is, why is the particular soul in that particular conditioned nature? What caused it? His desires? And the reaction of? Yes, in other words, their karma. And so the point is, is since there's only so much karma that you can do, so many varieties, there's going to be something that matches.

Does that make sense? This person performed this sinful activity, became a dog. That person performed that same sinful activity, also became a dog. Now they're friends, right? So it's not that the souls are friends.

The conditioned natures are friends. But the souls identify with it. So therefore, it appears that it's there.

But that conditioned nature has already been defined by Krishna. And the working principle behind it, as we said, is in the primary creation. Then there is the sense of that kind of interaction.

It's already defined there. Based on whatever it is, you say love, or attraction, or affection, or excitement, or whatever it is that you would say is the common element of the relationship. So that element then is originally in Krishna.

So therefore, it goes on eternally. The soul's connection with that conditioned nature, that's what's temporary. So in this life, then, they have this nature.

Those natures match. But that nature is always available. So any soul that performs the karma that ends up with that result will be attracted by the companion nature that it goes with.

You understand? So therefore, on this level, we can see that there is no material eternal

relationship between the souls. Can we just go to the next level? OK. So now, you can say, OK, on the spiritual platform, then you might have two souls that are connected and good friends, or whatever it is, forever.

But what's that based on? Right? Yes, service to Krishna. Like Mother Yashoda and other elder gopis, they're great friends. And they'll be great.

They always have been, and they always will be. But it's based on their particular service to Krishna. In other words, these rasas and that are defined by Krishna.

Krishna is the reservoir of pleasure. So what is the definitions of these? So whoever has that taste, then they have an eternal relationship, but based on Krishna and that service. On the material world, it's still based on Krishna and the particular activity you do.

But it's an illusion because you don't know the activity. Does that make sense? So in other words, souls can only have an eternal relationship based on service. You may like, but who's the you that's liking? The soul, but the soul is appreciating what? OK, yes.

The soul is appreciating those. Why? Because at this particular point, they identify with those qualities. And the other person identifies with them.

Otherwise, why would they have them? You know what I'm saying? You like nice clothes. Someone else likes nice clothes. So you appreciate their particular liking of nice clothes.

And they appreciate yours. You have some basis of relationship. It is mundane.

It is mundane, but soul has qualities also. Yes. So another question, basic question.

Do you have any? Why don't we try this? What is your purpose in asking the question? What answer are you looking for? Yeah, no, but there's a particular idea that you have that you want answered. You know what I'm saying? In other words, it's a concept that you have that you're trying to get to. No, if you don't, why is it you keep going back to something? Otherwise, you would have just asked the question and listened, but you keep going.

No, but what about this? What about that? What is it that you're thinking will happen? But what is it you don't understand? What's your point? Why would it matter? This is the question. Is attracted by another, not necessarily other sex, but to another person in the body, subtle and gross. Can it be based on their relationship in the spiritual world? No.

No, because the point is you're not seeing that. What you're seeing is the gross and subtle body. You're not seeing the qualities of the soul.

So no, it's not like that. That's the point. Let's say, at some point, I was a dog, and my friend were a dog, and we were acting together.

Yeah, you might have a similar karma, so that's why it says that the straws in the river come

together for some time. That some time can be a few minutes. It can be even a few lifetimes.

And at some point, it splits, because they are individuals. So when me and Rover are somewhere down the line, we become self-realized, we will still know each other. I mean, not like that we were a dog, but.

Not necessarily. I mean, so why would you talk about it? Why would somebody who's their absorptionist in Krishna talk about how when we were both worms eating stool, right? I'm just saying, would that soul be a part of the people I meet that I have a relationship with? The point is, is everybody's related to Krishna. Everybody's come from Krishna, so everyone's related.

You know what I'm saying? So the point is, is that Krishna is the basis. They may know what they've done, but it'll be more like in service, or this or that. You know, the things that you do here, you may come up in a conversation there.

May or may not. Remember that time that you stole my gulab jamun? You know, like that. Because the point is, is it's all happening there.

So whatever would happen here is happening there in its perfection. Here, you really thought you stole his gulab jamun. You never really seen real stealing of the gulab jamun.

There you see it. How cleverly they'll do it there will be much more clever than how they did it here. As we take up sadhana bhakti and get closer to the spiritual reality, are there relationships we're having becoming more based on the relationship we will have? No, it's what's the basis of the relationship.

You have to understand what's the principal point, what's the detail. What's the principal point of a relationship here? Since that was your conversation, why not? That was your example, so let's go with that. OK, and in the spiritual world, you have two devotees.

What's their relationship based on? Pure devotional service to Krishna. OK, but what's the common element, whether it's pure or not? Krishna. And what about Krishna? Devotion to Krishna.

Devotion to Krishna. Service to Krishna. That's the basis of the relationship.

So you have a relationship here based on service. Then you can have a relationship there based on service, whether you're doing the same service or this. That's not the point.

That's a detail. It's just like you're here with somebody who's a friend here in Mayapur, and you do one thing together. And then later on, you're somewhere else in another temple, another situation, doing something together.

It's completely different from what you did here. Does it matter? No, you're going to base it on what you did there. Does that make sense? So the point is this relationship based on service to Krishna is the fundamental element.

Does that make sense? That's the point. We get attached to these little details because it sounds nice. But the point is that that's not the principle.

Point is that it's there. Because if you get attached to something here, then when that's not happening anymore, you'll be disappointed. If it's based on that we do this specific service, and when they're not here, then you can't do that.

But if it's based on serving Krishna, when they go, then it's just a matter of time. Does that make sense? Are souls completely identical? Are the souls completely identical? What do you mean by identical? Are they all exactly the same one 10,000 at the tip of the hair? Well, I'm trying to figure out the personality and material conditioning. Material conditioning is what's set by the modes of nature.

There's 8,400,000 species of life, and then a little detail within that. So would a soul in the spiritual sky like all other souls equally much? Or is there some kind of... Why would they have to like equally much? What's the necessity? No, the point is, is each soul is uniquely individual. So they have their own perspective on serving Krishna.

But it's compatible because Krishna's the center. Like when Prabhupada gives the example of throwing one rock into a pond, how many circles do you get? You get one circle? You get so many, however big the thing is, you get that many circles, right? So what's the important aspect of the analogy? There's only one rock, so there's one center. And then unlimited circles can go around one center.

So the point is, is each circle is different from the other. They're all circles, but each one has a different size. So that means each soul is individual.

But each soul is centered on Krishna, so therefore they have no problems working with each other. And so depending upon what service you have, that's where you're going to make your friendship. Mother Dashoda's going to hang out with who? Yeah, the other elder gopis, right? That's going to be her friends.

What about younger gopis? Are they her friends? No, they're like daughters, yeah. What about the cowherd boys? They're more like sons, right? You know what I'm saying? But they're going to be friends. The cowherd boys, right, who are they going to hang out with? Yeah, you know, and what about the older gopis? They're like mothers.

So in other words, you interact with these different groups, but your friendship, your closeness is in with those who like-mindedly serve Krishna, right? But there's a difference. Otherwise, what's the importance of expanding the souls if they're always all exactly the same, right? Then why do you need everybody, yeah? No, but each one's unique. Same time as Radharani is the complete energy of the Lord.

So whatever variety there is in any aspect of Krishna's unlimited energy, which means unlimited variety, that's found in her. That's why she's the perfect devotee. On us, we will be different

from another soul, but only we'll have a particular range of qualities.

But it's finite, right? While another soul has a different range of qualities, right? But you know, someone who's bigger in their position, they have a broader range, right? But Radharani has the broadest. That's why she is the only one who can completely fulfill all of Krishna's desires. So everybody else can assist in that, according to their nature.

So in their nature, since Radharani's unlimited qualities to serve Krishna, the qualities that that individual jiva has, he assists in those qualities of Radharani, right? So in other words, she's already serving Krishna, plus you have another living entity who's adding to that service in those qualities. And that way, then, unlimited souls can be assisting Radharani serving Krishna. Does that make sense? Yes.

No, you can develop with the devotees, but it's based on service. It's not based on anything else. The service is important.

So I should not be upset because any feeling of being upset that there is not that role anymore here is material. Any? OK, what about that you inspired each other in making garlands? Is that material? So then, why do you say that's the only basis of a relationship? Yes, but the point is the problem is not the attachment. It's what you're attached to, how you see it in relationship to Krishna.

So if you're attached to that they do service for Krishna nicely, and you're inspired by that, then that attachment's not bad. If you're just attached to it because you just, on the mundane platform, like that particular quality, then that's a bit mundane. But at least that then you use it to socially deal properly, and then you're emotionally balanced, so therefore you can do your service nicely, then that's good.

Or some don't have friends at all, and so they're emotionally unhinged, and they can't do anything properly. Does that make sense? Is it important to consider if the people with whom we're performing service, if our relationship with them will continue in the spiritual world? No. You don't have to go.

Are you going to be there in the spiritual world? Let me fill out this question here. Where will you be in the spiritual world? Which particular realm of the spiritual world do you live in? The ladder. Yeah, yeah, what's your answer? You live on the first gully or the second gully? But you're generally served by who has the same philosophical determination in line.

There's got to be some commonality in your service to Krishna. Is that what you're saying? Determination has to lie. It means, in other words, someone else who wants to go to Vaikuntha, and you are going to Vrindavan, what's going to be the basis of your relationship? Appreciation for Krishna.

OK, as long as they appreciate. They're into Andals prayers and stuff, so they may appreciate what you're doing. So there'll have to be some common point there.

But the point is, ultimately, they're going somewhere else than you. You know, just that's the truth. So how deep it will be, there'll be an appreciation of it.

It may not be that deep. It may be something else. They're just so focused and determined in their service to Vishnu, and that inspires you to be determined to serve Krishna.

So you may appreciate that quality and stuff like that. Then you have a good relationship. But ultimately, they're going somewhere else.

In other words, the point was where we were before the mystical element came along. Yeah, the point is, what are the relationships based on? Do we base it on the philosophy? Can we see the philosophy in that relationship or not? If we're able to, then we understand what the second chapter is talking about. If not, then even though we've heard the words, we haven't realized.

You understand? So the point is, by contemplation and practice, that's how we get realization. So you shouldn't take, oh, this is just the second chapter. You know, then you don't take it seriously.

Point is, this is the basis of the whole Gita. So everything else will be based on this. This is that the whole Gita is contained in this chapter.

Yes. So verses 38 to 53, bhuta yoga. In verses 10 to 30, the Lord defeated Arjuna's sentimental compassion for the bodies of his relatives.

And in verses 31 to 37, the argument based on sense enjoyment was rejected. It was the bodies of his relatives, because he's seeing that that's the relationship. No, it's actually based on the soul.

So you're trying to serve Krsna. They're trying to serve Krsna. And you have compatible conditioned natures to serve Krsna with.

So that's the relationship, not the body. In other words, the parent wants to serve Krsna through training a child. And the child wants to have a parent to raise them.

So you have compatible relationship. But the basis is becoming Krsna conscious. Does it make sense? And then the argument based on sense gratification, that's temporary anyway.

So you can't base something on that. It has to be on something more. You base a relationship on sense gratification.

When sense gratification is not there, the relationship breaks. So then that's the most temporary of anything. The emotions are a little longer.

The Krsna consciousness, that's the eternal position. In verses 38 to 35, 53, Krsna defeats Arjuna's argument that fighting will bring about sinful reactions. His commentary to verse 238, Sri Baladeva Dibhushan writes.

Did we do this? How far did we get? In other words, in results, that paragraph. So in verses 38 to 39. Yeah, so in other words, Arjuna is making a, you could say, a point that Shastra supports.

Right? But in applying the Shastra, what do you have to consider? Time, place, circumstance, right? Because you're taking a body of knowledge, right? Which is jnana, right? What are you studying, right? What part of speech do you study when you look at the field of activities? Nouns. That's all you can study, is nouns. You know, or past action, but then you're looking at it from that aspect of how it transformed the nouns.

Right? But if you're going to apply that knowledge to the present, the application is done through what part of speech? To the verb. And the verb controls what? The object. Complements the object, but it's dealing with, what does it directly deal with? The time, the place, and the circumstance, right? In other words, the mood, you know, the situation, you know, past, present, and future.

Does this make sense? So this is what it deals with. So if one doesn't apply that, so that's for the weakness. Because one can say, Arjuna's argument is nice.

I will attain sin by not fighting because I give my duty. But still, I should not fight because sin will arise from killing Brahmins and gurus in a war to gain a kingdom. So that's true.

But the point is, is he actually dealing, in this case, with Brahmins and gurus? He's dealing with ksatriyas. No, he's dealing with ksatriyas on the battlefield, because that's the position they've taken. In other words, his point is valid if it was applied in the right situation.

But it's not applied in the right situation. That's why many times devotees get confused, because two devotees are giving valid arguments on one point. But the question is, are they actually applied in the right situation? So it's very important to understand this, because otherwise then some devotees reject the scriptural evidence and scriptural argument because of this point.

Oh, you can prove anything with the shastra, because the shastra deals with everything. So isn't that a good thing? But the point is, is you have to be educated enough to know how to apply it. So fighting in ignorance means you actually don't know the situation.

The fighting in knowledge then is not unrighteous. So in verses 38 and 39, so here we could say, is Arjuna, he has knowledge of the scriptures, and he's saying you can't kill gurus and brahmanas. So would he be in ignorance or in knowledge? In knowledge.

OK. But he's misapplying the knowledge. So that's ignorance.

So you have these very subtle things. Just as if it's not connected to Krishna, it's material. It's nonsense.

In other words, if Bhagavatam's definition of pious and impious is connected to Krishna, it's

pious. It's not connected to Krishna. It's sinful.

Then within, let's say, that sinful, then you have that which is supported by scripture and that which is not. Because the point is, is if you have black and white, that's nice. Works for Americans.

Why not? But the thing is, the point is, does black always stay black and does white always stay white? How do you get, is the idea to transform black into white? Yes. So that means you have to have gray. You have to have something that's in between.

Does that make sense? In other words, now that gray, what would be two ways you could define it? Being less white or being more black and white. Yeah. More black, more white.

Yeah, more white. In other words, it's white with a certain amount of percentage of black, or it's black with a certain percentage of white. But the point is, is that it's combined.

That's what makes it gray. So in other words, it's called devotional service as long as Krishna is involved in the activity that you're performing. Now, we look at the black and white here in the gray.

We analyze the gray is, what is the motive behind it? Is it *sākāma* or *niṣkāma*? How much is Krishna's involved, but is it according to śāstra? Then we can define the quality of the service. Then we can add more white to the black. You know what I'm saying? But some point out, oh, it's black.

Yes, that black is there. Otherwise, why is it gray? Oh, this devotee did this. Yes, of course, they're conditioned.

They're going to do stuff like that. But are you able to see the white? Can you see the God consciousness? You can see that. Then you can properly define.

But if you can only see black, that means what's the big deal? You develop the quality to understand the shades of gray. You understand the shades of gray when you know what gray is made out of. So when you know what is spiritual and you know what is material.

In other words, that's *sambandhi-jñāna*, *cit-acit-īśvara*. You know what is the supreme consciousness. You know what is the minute consciousness.

And you know what is the material world. When you know these three, then you know their combination. So that's why in this chapter that's brought out, knowledge is knowing *cit-acit-īśvara*.

You don't know that, you're not knowledgeable. So now Arjuna is speaking here. Then what is the part that's missing? What is he quoted now? He's talking about not killing brahmins and gurus.

So what aspect? Dharma-śāstra. Dharma-śāstra, but what aspect of it? Means in connection with cit-acit-īśvara. What does he describe? Acit.

Ignorance. Right? What is he leaving out? Īśvara. Īśvara and cit.

Right? So, Kṛṣṇa is not saying there's a problem when He's quoting śāstra. He's saying is that you're quoting śāstra only knowing acit. You have to know śāstra along with cit and īśvara.

Does this make sense? So that's what Kṛṣṇa is adding. So when you add cit and īśvara, does the acit change? Right? If I have a potato and I'm going to cook it for myself and then somebody tells me, says, no, you know, you have to offer it to Kṛṣṇa. Does the potato now magically change? No.

No. It's the same potato. That's after you've offered it.

Okay. Now let us say you have cooked this potato and you've offered it to Kṛṣṇa. Right? Now you're going to eat and then someone tells you, oh, it's a fast day.

Now what? You understand? So there's these different considerations. So having that understanding is not enough. You have to be able to see it in relationship to Kṛṣṇa.

So what's missing in the first, all of Arjuna's arguments, right, all through the Gītā, means, you know, as he goes it gets better, but in this first and second chapter is he's only seeing acit. He's only seeing the material arrangement. Because the point is, is why can you not kill brāhmaṇas and gurus? Who has given that definition? Kṛṣṇa.

But he's not relating it that Kṛṣṇa has established this, and why would Kṛṣṇa establish this? To present authority, but why do you need the principal authority? Represents him, and why do you have to have him represented? Okay, so what is that in relationship to then? Yes, for the jīvas, you understand? In other words, you have the laws of God that are established so that the jīvas can relate to him. So in other words, here it's just material energy is relating to material energy, and so that's going to change anyway, so that you're saying that it's temporary and it's going to change, and you're lamenting about that. That means you don't even know acit, because the cit will change.

That's why it's acit. It will change. Yeah, well he doesn't even recognize cit and āśvara.

He's not even recognizing, he's just seeing dharma on its own. Dharma stands on its own as good, and devotees will make these arguments. Oh, they can't be in this community because they're bad.

But what is bad? Right? What is bad? Bad is not connected to Kṛṣṇa. So the rules of dharma or the rules of morality and justice, right, rules of saṁskṛta, these are all based on Kṛṣṇa's rules and how the soul will interact with God, or the soul will interact with other souls based on their relationship to God. Does that make sense? Now, let us say, mother Yaśodā, okay, is serving

Kṛṣṇa, right? How does she serve Kṛṣṇa? Taking care? Parental rasa, okay, so she is the mother in the relationship.

Okay. So, for it to be a nice family, then what else is there? Father, that's Nanda Bābā. Okay.

Now, if Nanda Bābā is there, right, and that's a constant principle, how much time does she have to think about Kṛṣṇa? Okay, let's take it a step further so it makes more sense. Okay. Now, if there was not the principle of a husband and wife have, you know, you know, how you say, as long as their relationships last, they have fidelity, then mother Yaśodā would have to spend time trying to find another husband, another guy to be with.

Right? Now, will that take away from her service to Kṛṣṇa? Right, because the mother, her whole focus is on the child. Right? Yeah, but now she has to look about for her own partner. Where's her focus? On the new partner.

Or finding the new partner. Developing that relationship, being comfortable. So, where's the time for Kṛṣṇa? You understand? That's the principle.

That's why in the material world, then somebody gets married, expected they'll last, because point is, that whole trip of getting to know this and that, that takes a lot of time. Right? What happens when someone first gets married? You know, does their full-on service and full commitment, does that continue as it was? It reduces. Why? Because they're getting to know, they're getting comfortable.

And then you come back a few years later, then it starts to balance. You come back a lot of years later, then it works very smoothly. Right? So now, by them breaking up and then having to find a new partner, is that going to be beneficial for their Kṛṣṇa consciousness or not? No.

Because it'll take away time. That's why, therefore, in the Vedic system, you know, a husband and a wife stay together. You understand? So, the principles that work in the spiritual world are applied here.

And when people see these rules here, without understanding, you know, ācitta-īśvara, then they don't know the nature of the material world, so then they think that it's going to last eternally. You know? They don't understand the nature of the soul, you know, and the soul's servant of Kṛṣṇa. They don't understand Kṛṣṇa and His relationships with the living entities.

So therefore, they either don't understand the Vedic system, or they misapply it. Right? That's what Rūpa Goswami means by niyamagraha. Right? You reject the rules, you don't understand them, or you misapply them.

Right? So here's an example. He's a pious person, so he's not going to come up with some modern, you know, concepts. Though, Kṛṣṇa will bring them up.

Right? That's one of the arguments that he uses for us, you know. Why are you worried? You

know? There's no soul, it's just the body. You know, it's a bag of chemicals, so then, you know, or a bag of bones, but, you know, like that, you know, so then what's the big deal? Does this make sense? Yes? Does mother just show to serve her husband? Would you have a problem with that? So, in other words, if you get to the spiritual world, will you have to serve a husband? So, it means there's enough trouble here, and spiritual shouldn't be like here, so, you know, are they more liberated in the spiritual world? Are they more, you know, how you say, progressive in the spiritual world than here? But the point is, is serving Vaiṣṇavas a problem? So, then, what's their relationship based on? What is mother Jaśodā and Nanda Bābā going to talk about when they're alone? Kṛṣṇa, and what are they going to be discussing? Next service, how to make nicer arrangements, mother Jaśodā wants to get some new gold ornaments and this and that, do they have the money, or this and that, or Nanda Bābā's thinking about doing this, Kṛṣṇa's favorite cow, he wants to create a new facility, you know, so like this, so that's what they're going to discuss, it's all about Kṛṣṇa.

Yeah, when the Vaiṣṇavas cooperate together to serve Him, then He's happy. And then, there has to be some basis of how they interact, there has to be some difference, so then how they'll interact, and that will create something more. Right? Does that make sense? You know, means the parents are going to, means, how you say, let's say, Nanda Bābā with other men, or mother Jaśodā with the other elder gopīs, then they're going to discuss from the same point of view.

So, one, there's a cooperation, so that's very nice, and that's going to be the major platform. But now, Nanda Bābā discusses with mother Jaśodā, there's a difference of nature. Right? And so that discussion, that will bring out things that may not have come by just the men with the men, women with the women.

Right? So it's going to add another flavor to the relationship. So, they are going to act in their capacity. Does that make sense? Yeah.

So, it's all there. The point is, is why there's rules here is because that's what's there. Okay? So, in verses 38, 38 and 39, the Lord shifts the subject from sākāma karma to naiṣkāmya, or buddhi-yoga.

In verses 38, Kṛṣṇa directly instructs Arjuna to follow of fighting because he desires the battle. Arjuna should do this without considering the results. There will be no sin.

so it means sākāma means it's, you know, you would call it karma-yoga, specifically. But when that karma-yoga is performed with proper understanding, right, and without a desire for the result, then that becomes naiṣkāmya. So, buddhi-yoga is the platform of naiṣkāmya.

So that combination, yes. Is sākāma karma the same as karmakānda? Is sākāma karma, no, it depends on is the sākāma in connection with Kṛṣṇa or not. If it is, it's karma-yoga.

If it's not, then it's karmakānda. Oh. Does that make sense? Yes? Uh-huh.

I faced an inconsistency. It's written that Kṛṣṇa now would reverse the previous number forty

steps explained bhakti-yoga. No, it says buddhi-yoga.

No, but if you take a look on the page twenty-seven on the commentary, it's written there. Yeah, but is there a difference between bhakti-yoga and buddhi-yoga? Uh, in the highest principle of buddhi-yoga, no. No, no.

The point is, is buddhi-yoga is the detail of bhakti-yoga. Yeah. Just like if we say cooking, okay, you know, this devotee is cooking, right? Oh, where is he? Oh, he's cooking.

Okay. And then you ask, what is he doing now? And then you can't just say, well, he's cooking, but you can break it down so you can say, well, he's cutting the vegetables. Then you know what stage he is in the cooking.

Just like acting in Kṛṣṇa consciousness. That's why the fifth chapter is called that, no? Because it's combined, the third chapter, karma-yoga, with the fourth chapter, jñāna-yoga. So the combination of those two, that's buddhi-yoga.

Because jñāna-yoga means you have the knowledge you're not working for the result. Karma-yoga means you're working for the result. Right? So when they're combined, that's buddhi-yoga.

So you can't have lower levels where you're still attached to the result. You know, so then it's not very well situated. Then we specifically call it karma-yoga.

But it would be sākāma-karma-yoga. But niṣkāma-karma-yoga is also there. That means you're commenting on that they're performing the activity and the result they're not wanting for themselves.

But technically that's called buddhi-yoga. That's there, but fully connected means what? Means what? Huh? Prema. You understand? So the point is is there a discussion? You know what I'm saying? Means we can analyze where it is, but to say the statement that it's not, that's already understood.

Visvanatha makes it clear. Bhakti begins at prema. Below bhakti it's not, below prema it's not bhakti.

It's in pursuance of bhakti. Right? So that's why we specifically make the distinction pure unalloyed devotion. Because you may have pure devotion, but that the prema we're looking for only comes at the unalloyed platform.

Does that make sense? Oops. Trying to stop. Ok.

Om Hare Krishna Hare Krishna Krishna Krishna Hare Hare Hare Rama Hare Rama Rama Rama Hare Hare