

2010-10-18 BVPS BG 2.45-2.59 Arjuna asks about culture

Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare, Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare. Okay, so then, continue the end of verses 38 to 53, Bhūti-yoga. Those who are bewildered by material desires are unable to make the obvious conclusion of their research and do not surrender to the Lord.

Because the obvious conclusion is, Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Lord, we're His servant. So that means we have to give up the idea of, I'm the controller, I'm the enjoyer. So that's the obvious conclusion.

So people don't want to do that. They don't want to give up the idea of controller and enjoyer. Because your materialist, he wants to control so he can enjoy, that's very direct.

And so he doesn't want to give up that opportunity for enjoyment. So he wants to keep that position. But now if you accept the evidence that we're the soul and all that, the impersonalist also doesn't want to give up.

Because then if he gives up, then it's not his endeavor that's bringing him to the Brahman platform. It's not by his work that is the cause of it. It means by the Lord's grace.

And it means that he's not the supreme controller and he wants to enjoy Brahmananda. So then this becomes a problem. So nobody will be able to come to the obvious conclusion unless there's the element of devotional service.

So that's the whole idea. Do you remember when we said the spirit of Gita? It means that spirit of approaching it, that we're servants. So look, Krishna's God, we're his servants.

So without that, no matter how intelligent someone is, they cannot come to the right conclusion. Because the right conclusion has to be based upon, I'm Krishna's servant. And my relationship is to serve through devotional service.

That will be the cause of my happiness. Because any other concept, one will not be able to work on this conclusion. Does it make sense? So one never has to think, well, maybe others will come up with these great ideas and everything.

They never can. Even if they come up with something clever, intelligent, it's always going to have a weakness that its conclusion, ultimate conclusion, will never be right. It can't be right.

Why not? Because the ultimate conclusion has to include Krishna. If you're actually looking into knowledge and understand the situation, then you have to understand God is there. And God is not understood by intelligence.

How will a very small amount of intelligence understand something very, very great, unlimited? How will a limited amount of intelligence understand the unlimited? It can't. And so that means

that by pleasing God only can you know God. Like if there's a person, you can't force that you'll know who the person is.

They have to like you. Then you can get close to them. No? So God is like that, but even greater.

So they can't. So if you don't understand your relationship with God, your position as a servant, you never actually can come to any full conclusion on anything. That's why in the world people only have little bits and pieces, fragments of truth.

And those fragments work. How much? Because it is truth, it'll work to some degree. But because that fragment's not connected to the whole, it will never work on a large scale, in a large scale way.

It can't. Make sense? You know, and we can see so many people have had big plans for the world, and they never work. Doesn't matter who they were.

It just doesn't work. Yes? Are there graduations? I can understand rationally that, OK, I'm not the controller, but still be attached to be a controller. So are these their graduations? Is that the bhakti process itself? OK, so how do we move from, I'm the controller and enjoyer, but understand Krishna's the supreme controller and enjoyer, and if we can kind of work out some kind of an understanding.

Yes, the process of devotional service means that it's understood that that conditioning will be there, but you are willing to work with giving up the idea, right? So one will still do things that one likes to do and be involved in such a way that one still is, you know, controlling an environment, and one may be pleased in that control of that environment or from the results of that environment. But that doesn't matter because ultimately it's connected to Krishna. Does that make sense? That's the whole thing.

And the person has cleared one moment you have to give up that he is a controller. Yes, it means ultimately it has to be given up, but it's a gradual process that to that degree it's given up, to that degree then one will advance. So in other words, and how is that given up? Not just to give up because otherwise the soul, what are they going to attach themselves to? So it's a matter as their trust in Krishna, that affection for Krishna, attachment to Krishna grows, then one will be able to give up the material.

That's why both are cultivated. One is cultivating the spiritual knowledge so you can understand the position and use your intelligence, but ultimately it's the devotion to the Lord that's important. It's not that, you know, the spiritual doesn't stand as important without Krishna.

So when we say spiritual, we mean devotional. But technically you can have spiritual that's not devotional. Because spiritual simply means not material.

So in other words, the understanding of how there's the soul and we're not the body, and the

eternal nature of the soul and the temporary nature of the world, so you can come technically to that platform without being a devotee. But it'll be temporary because the Lord's eternal, the soul's eternal, but you haven't connected the two. So that means, since that's the natural position that would be, then any situation like that would mean there's no proper understanding.

So it won't be on the eternal platform. So that's why sometimes in the discussion we'll just say spiritual, but sometimes in the discussion we'll say material, spiritual, and devotional. You understand? So occasionally, depending upon how we're analyzing.

In verses 45 to 51, Krishna explains that one who knows Him as the ultimate goal can achieve all the purposes of the Vedas. The Vedas mainly deal with the subject of the three modes of nature. Arjuna should rise above these and be situated in the Self without duality.

In order to do this, however, he should not prematurely abandon his ksatriya duties. In verse 47, the Lord reveals that Arjuna's specific adhikara, qualification, is not to renounce his obligations but to perform them with proper understanding. Then in a note, At that moment, Arjuna was unfit to practice jnana, described in verses 2.12 to 30, and bhakti, described in verses 2.40 to 45.

Therefore, Krishna recommends the process of naiskamya, described in verses 2.47 to 52. In other words, if one is appreciating that there's a spiritual nature, and appreciating that higher purpose of devotional activities, but at the same time one has the material attachments. And so if the prominence is there in that material absorption, then you put the focus on naiskamya.

It shouldn't be that you're... It's not so much of the renouncing of the fruit as giving to the other person. Let us say you buy a gift for somebody, for some occasion. Now, in your mind, what's the prominent element? This gift that you're giving to the person, and that giving it to the person, or that I bought this with my money, I went to all the endeavor to get it, and buy it, and make the arrangement, and think about it, and get it gift-wrapped, and all this, but I have to give that up, but I'm giving it up for a higher purpose, because giving it to a friend is a good thing.

Which of these two is what you're thinking about? And I better appreciate it. Yeah, and they better appreciate it, right. Sorry, I left that one out.

Okay, so... So, which of these two is prominent in your mind? The first one. The first one. Is the second one to even come up? Hopefully not.

Generally not? Hopefully not. Yeah, hopefully not. Occasionally you might wonder will they appreciate this, but the point is that it's not so much the concept that I have to give up my attachment for it since I went to all the trouble and put in the money and effort.

Right? You understand? So that first one, that's the bhakti, because it's focused on the devotion of offering things to Krishna. But if that's not so strong, then at least anyone can focus on the

thing of giving it up for Krishna. You understand? So that's why there's nice time in these processes.

There's something in between. Because nice karma is already included in bhakti. But if one, that bhakti element isn't the prominent aspect, then nice karma is brought out so that that becomes the medium for which then you think of doing it for Krishna.

Right? The other you're doing it for your friend because of affection. So if you're doing for Krishna out of affection, that's the bhakti element. Right? Does that make sense? But if you don't have that affection, then that may be the element.

Let us say, you know, there's some arrangement, okay, then because of your family connections and all that, you have to go to some program that honors or felicitates, you know, some person you've never seen in your life and couldn't care less about. You know, some, you know, big, influential, rich person that you really aren't that interested in. Right? You're not inimical, but you're not interested.

You never thought about him a day in your life. Then you find out from the other family members that, you know, the family has to go, you know, we have to do this, you have to present a gift. And so, you know, you have to work out the appropriate gift and you have to go and buy it, you have to, you know, arrange it, pay for it and everything like that.

In that case, then you might be considering it the other way. I'm going through all this work and this and that. This guy better appreciate it, you know.

You understand? But you know it's better so you give it up because you might think, well, this is nice. Why should I give it to him? I could keep it for myself, you know, like that. He won't even notice.

There's so many presents here, you know. If I don't put my present on the pile, you know, how will they know? Does that make sense? So this is where the daishakamya comes in and then you have to, you know, battle with the element of the sākāma. Does it make sense? So as you know the person and as that affection is there, then naturally the process of service becomes very natural and easy.

So naishkamya is just natural. It's not a matter of dry and renounce because devotees sometimes they hear, oh, naishkamya, renuncia, they think, oh, very dry and boring. No, it is if you don't know the person.

If you know the person, that's just normal. Does that make sense? You know, like the mother is working for the benefit of the child. That's naishkamya.

It's not a problem. It comes easily. They don't have to think about it.

Right? At least most of the time, right? After a year and a half of, you know, every night waking

up in the middle of the night, then, of course, then you kind of like, you know, then she kind of goes, your turn. You know, like that. No? Okay.

But the general principle is that the affectionate element. No? Yes? Naishkamya comes in when the desires not related to the person are prominent. Prominent means? Yes.

Prominent means that they are more part of one's conscious thinking process than the devotional. Prominent means whatever is bigger. You know what I'm saying? It's like here.

There's this. There's the rocks. So what's more prominent? This or this leaf over here? You know what I'm saying? Like that.

Does that make sense? So what happens is that because that devotion is not there so strong, we then deal that what we're trying to do is break that material attachment. So breaking the material attachment, then we use the spiritual process of Naishkamya. Because Naishkamya will bring you to the liberated platform.

It will situate you very solidly on the spiritual platform. But that's still not enough. It means the real spiritual platform.

Because we're saying non-material. That means material is temporary. So real spiritual platform means eternally spiritual.

So being on the liberated platform, liberation itself means the platform of Brahman is eternal. But our situation in it is not eternal. So the real liberation that Madhavacharya defines as developing, entering into one's natural relationship with the Lord.

So that's why the devotional process, the philosophy is studied. But along with that, the devotional process and the hearing about the Lord and his name, form, quality and pastimes. Because that's the point.

The name, form, quality and pastimes is to attract you to Krishna. So that we're willing to perform the activity for his pleasure. And then to that degree that that's not the strong point, then the Naishkamya is there to see that at least it's spiritual.

Because in the process of upliftment, being situated materially or being situated spiritually, spiritual is better. Because then from the spiritual platform, then it's easy to get to the devotional platform. Does that make sense? It's a fine point because generally when we always say spiritual, it means devotional.

Or when we say Ananda, it means the happiness of devotional service. So the level of consciousness of Anandamayi can also include the platform of Brahmananda. But that's not the permanent situation of the living entity.

So therefore it specifically means, Anandamayi means the happiness that comes from pure devotional service in love of God. That's what it means. But it can mean this other.

So we're bringing it out since we're analyzing what's happening here. So that we understand the fine differences. Because otherwise sometimes we think because it's spiritual, it's automatically devotional.

Spiritual is automatically devotional if it's done for Krishna. But if you're focusing just on the spiritual and not thinking of Krishna, then it's spiritual, but it's not necessarily devotional. Does the spiritual platform start on the... The spiritual actually starts from... You could say, well, it depends upon how you're looking.

Manamaya, that would be the perspective that one would start with and work with the material energy. But actually it's until Vijnanamaya, that would be where you call it spiritual. Because Dharma-Artha-Kama are generally considered your material.

Then Moksha is considered your spiritual. But that's the temporary aspect of spiritual. And then Bhakti is what's beyond that.

You know what I'm saying? In other words, if one's situated in Vijnanamaya, one is using that level of Manamaya as your social interface. Right? And your basis of your activity. You know what I'm saying? The medium of the activity.

But your focus is on freeing yourself from material contamination. Arjuna is advised to fight as a matter of duty without attachment for the result. In complete equanimity.

This is the definition of Naishkarmya given by the Lord in verse 48. In such surrendered compliance, all abominable activities are discarded. Instead of karmic bondage, Buddhi-yoga produces transcendental knowledge.

So in other words, ultimately you want to please the Lord. But because the drive is not that affection for the Lord, then one has to use the intelligence, use philosophy, therefore Buddhi-yoga. So Buddhi-yoga then means Naishkarmya.

You're performing the activities of karma with knowledge. And so with that knowledge, then you'll be detached to the results. Does that make sense? So that will make Buddhi-yoga.

This is a very powerful means to elevate oneself. And because it's consistent, it has all the elements within it, it's just where the proportion is. As you develop that attachment for Krishna, then the emphasis or need because of the attachment to the karma or jnana, or to the principle of doing the right thing and not being attached to the result, that starts to become less of the focus of one's contemplation, and it's more on pleasing Krishna.

Does it make sense? So it's not that, oh, this is a lower level, so I'll strive for the higher. No, that's what the sahajya means. Sahaj means easy.

No, this is the method. You just start here and you move forward. Because if this works easy for you, great.

Then you move through the process quickly. You don't jump. Striving for yoga, the art of working without karma reactions, Arjuna should act in Krishna consciousness.

The great sages freed themselves from birth and death by this process of buddhi-yoga and reached the destination where there are no sufferings. So striving for yoga. So here the yoga would mean that working without reaction.

So this is the point. The working is the karma. But without reaction, that's the nice karmic aspect that comes from the proper understanding and proper detachment.

Does that make sense? So that's why both of them will elevate you. Karma yoga will elevate you. Jnana yoga will elevate you.

Because this yoga is connected to the Lord, acting without karmic reactions. When they're combined, that's buddhi-yoga. As we'll see in the next chapters, Krishna will break it down like this.

One, then the other, then both together. Buddhi-yoga is a synonym of nice karmic, and it also means it includes jnana-yoga and karma-yoga. And it also means it's devotional service, it's bhakti-yoga.

But it just means you're mechanically applying the process of bhakti-yoga because it's not coming because of our natural spontaneous attraction to the Lord. Nice karmic is an element of buddhi-yoga, but that's the prominence of it. So when we say nice karmic, then we mean buddhi-yoga, because that's the active ingredient.

You have karma and you have jnana. But what makes that more elevated or more useful than both is that nice karmic. See, because karma, then you're working with material elements to get a result.

And so without that result, there's generally not an inspiration to work. So you have to be result-oriented. You have to work with the material energy, and you have to be result-oriented to work within the realm of karma.

But you have to connect that to the Lord. So then depending upon your desire, you make it more or less connected. But the emphasis is on the work itself and getting a result.

Jnana will be understanding the knowledge and freeing oneself from the material attachments that are there. But then in that, then the tendency is that one won't do any work, because you don't want attachment. Attachment means you're attached to the result.

So if you give up your attachment, the tendency is you won't do the work that gets that result, because jnana doesn't require that. Jnana doesn't require that you get the result and give it up. Jnana means, I don't work for anything that I don't want a result for.

Does that make sense? So in other words, same thing. Karma is focused on, I want the result,

so I do the work. Jnana means, I don't want the result, I don't do the work.

So Buddhayoga means you're combining that. You're doing the work and wanting the result, but the result's not for you. That's the nice karma.

Does that make sense? So if the result's for you, and then you give it to Krishna, you would generally call it karma yoga, right? And if they're more observed in the knowledge and don't like to get involved, you generally call that jnana yoga. But when the two are combined, that would be Buddhayoga. But because it includes the others, so even if they're acting on the platform of karma yoga, but if they're progressive, then it would still be within the realm of Buddhayoga.

It's just more, it's not as developed, that's all. So in other words, it includes it all, so then that process will get you through to that attachment to Krishna. So nice karma can also be used in the knowledge.

If you go to, when Mayavadis talk to large groups of Hindus, all they talk is nice karma, right? Because they know that the grihasthas won't be able to live the renounced lifestyle that they live, and live in that element of jnana, so they always like to do work, so they recommend nice karma. Because the point is, you perform an activity that's bona fide, without the desire for the result, that will liberate you. But for us, liberation without devotion to Krishna is useless.

So it's the technique to get you from material consciousness up to liberated consciousness. Nice karma. But for us, that's not enough, so it includes then the devotional element of connecting one's activities and that knowledge to Krishna.

So then it's called yoga. I mean, they'll call it yoga because they'll say you're connecting with Brahman, but that's not exactly how you connect with Brahman, because that means there's a relationship. Relationship means there's two.

If you have a relationship with yourself, right? Yes or no? Yes. Yeah? Okay, we'll talk about that later. You're a great guy.

Every morning you have a whole... Yeah, dialogue. Okay, does this make sense? Yes. You explained just now how karma yoga and jnana yoga, when they combine, then that is how you get nice karma.

No, it's what we call buddhi yoga. Buddhi yoga, which includes nice karma. Because then the point about it is that the karmic wants this fruitive result.

The jnana wants the opposite, a non-fruitive result. But nice karma means you're giving up both of those results to please the Lord. So my doubt is, in this comment by Visvanatha Cakravarti Thakura, it says that Arjuna was unfit to practice jnana, and therefore he was practicing nice karma.

My understanding from what you said was that nice karma includes jnana. It means jnana yoga

means that to be... jnana yoga means that you are seeing everything simply through the knowledge of jnana. Because that's going to come later in the end chapters of Gita.

So he's still... he's at this point just focused on, you know, performing his duties or not performing his duties. So therefore, if he can perform his duties without attachment, then that's nice karma. You understand? So, but to do that nicely, then one has to develop that knowledge.

So the point is, you can't really separate. Karma yoga has knowledge, but its emphasis is on the karma. Jnana yoga has activities, but the emphasis is on the knowledge.

So buddha yoga means that you're balancing and using those things together to attain to your position, but its element is nice karma. Right? Does that make sense? That's the working principle. Right? Because the other one, the working principle is, I do the work, but then I give up the result.

And, you know, but it's my... I've done my work, I've gotten my result, I give it up. Right? So that means it's renunciation. The other is, I don't want the result, I don't even get involved.

Right? But it's still for yourself. Both of them have that element for yourself. Nice karma means it's not for you.

So it's based on the principle of sannyas. The devotion of a ram, what would be the symptom of, let's say, a devotee who is more absorbed in the jnana yoga? Because they understand how the modes of nature are working and this and that, and that's what's creating the situations that he's, you know, enjoying or suffering in. Does that make sense? Depends upon what the service is.

But they might not be so enthusiastic with something that would be considered more on the level of, you know, material activities and results. You know, something to do with, you know, money or families or this or that. But it's not necessarily, but you'd find generally.

In other words, anything that actually gives trouble, they would be inclined not to be involved with. Right? While those more on the platform of karma, they're definitely involved with things that make trouble, but there's somehow another on the illusion or hoping that the trouble won't come. Right? So someone who understands it properly understands that the benefits and the trouble go together.

You can't separate them. But the point is, is you're willing to go through the troubles to get the result of pleasing Krishna. Does that make sense? Someone more in jnana has a tendency to avoid the troubles.

So that's why the buddha yoga will be higher, you know, the higher principle, because then with that, then you understand that material world is what it is. You know, God is who he is. I am who I am.

And then how to make that all work nicely together. So you perform activities without a desire for results. So you're not disturbed with the mundane disturbances or things that, you know, they go backwards of what you expect.

Yeah, reversals. Talking about the yoga for devotees, as it is said, striving for yoga is double aspect. It has aspect of striving to be free from attachment and striving to please Krishna by this action.

But the prominent is, is to please Krishna, not to become free from the material. See, the thing is, is if we put the emphasis on freeing ourself, that's more along the line of jnana yoga. Karma yoga is, you know, we do everything for Krishna and we live a good life.

You know, like that, it's comfortable. But here we're talking about striving to please Krishna through not being attached and absorbed in activities that, according to your nature, is what you would, you know, be comfortable involved in. Does that make sense? The central point is pleasing Krishna.

Yes. And here, for us, it's very easy because Krishna is in front of you, even though He's away for a while. In our lives, pleasing Krishna, what elements would be primary for us to understand that we are pleasing Krishna? Pleasing Krishna means the order of guru.

Means you'll come up, now, what chapter are you on in the Nectar of Devotion? I'm starting the third. Third. So when you get to the sixth, where it defines devotional service, there it will say for the preliminary activities to situate yourself properly in sadhana bhakti, this twenty.

But of that, three are the most important. I mean, surrender to the guru, taking initiation, following his instructions with faith and devotion. So if that's done, then that will make the process work.

So that's how you know what to do to please Krishna. Because otherwise, we don't know, right? So the spiritual master knows. So even in the future, even we know, but the spiritual master knows more.

So it's always, it's an eternal. The relationship of spiritual master and disciple is eternal because they're always moving forward. So how much we have learned, they know more.

Their experience is more, so it's always there. So here, yoga will mean connecting with the Lord. And then these are all the processes within yoga to do that.

In verse 52 to 53, the Lord says that Arjuna should not become bewildered by the heavenly delights promised in the Vedas. He should become indifferent to karmic rewards to be fixed in transcendence. In other words, you're not doing your duties because you get the benefit from it.

You're doing it because that should be done. And if you're willing to do that, now why, we

mentioned before, why if you don't accept the Lord, would it not be complete? Because why shouldn't you be working for the reward? Why should you be working to be indifferent from karmic rewards? What's the purpose? Why would you do that? But if you're not a devotee, then what? To be peaceful. Free of suffering.

But then that means it is a reward for your work. Because it's yours only. It's not that it's somebody else's, if somebody else is pleased.

So that's why that's as far as they can get. But then pleasing Kṛṣṇa means you're going beyond. Because that's why it's not karmic rewards, because this is how Kṛṣṇa likes one to behave.

You perform your duties without a desire for the result, to please Kṛṣṇa. Right? Mother Dashoda, she performs all the duties of a householder in connection with her family. Right? But not for herself.

So that's indifferent to the rewards. But to please Kṛṣṇa. Does that make sense? So that's the natural position of devotional life.

Because we have to remember devotional life is not just a philosophy. It's a lifestyle, it's a culture. So you can't separate.

The philosophy is defining the culture. The culture is the application of the philosophy. So if we think it's just philosophy and by that we'll get ourselves there.

But then that means that spiritual is different from material. In the way of material I have relationships and considerations and all that. In spiritual I don't.

But then that will be a problem, because when you get to the spiritual world, then you're back to the same element of cultural considerations. Does that make sense? So that's why one has to have that complete picture. So then one can connect getting out of the material world, getting out of the material world, and then into the spiritual world.

So what you're trying to do actually is just replace the material attachments with the spiritual attachment. That's what you're trying to do. But, so if you can just immediately transfer that, that's the best and direct and most easiest method.

But if you can't, then there are these processes to take one from that material attachment, break that material attachment, and bring it where there is no material attachment. So then it will make it easy for your spiritual attachment to grow. Does this make sense? I hope so.

Yes. So what is the relation of advancement becoming free from... We are practicing many processes at once, like in this one process. It's basically as one process has just different parts.

Just like you're talking and waving your arms around and scratching your head, and holding your pen, and keeping the book on your lap. It's many processes and breathing. Precisely ask about... We are practicing our Sanatana Bhakti, which is antaratic process, and we are also

practicing culture or neshkarma.

So advancement of antaratra bolsters our attachment to Krishna, and by neshkarma we are becoming free from attachment. Right. But the emphasis is on... What I'm saying is the emphasis is on pleasing the Lord, rather than getting free from material attachment.

Right. So the point is, why is there neshkarma? That's there. But what does neshkarma infer? Yeah, it's for someone else.

If it's not for you, then? Like you come into the kitchen, there's something there to eat, and then you want that. That's not for you. So what does that mean? Yeah, it's for someone else.

Does that make sense? So then the natural thing is, what's the next step? You come into the kitchen, there's something nice to eat, and they say it's for someone else. What's the next thing? What's the first thing you ask? What's for me? Oh, okay. That was a good one.

Well, where's mine? You know, who is it for? Why is this? What's going on? So that's the thing. So then it's for Krishna. If it's not for you, then it's for Krishna.

So the focus goes on to Krishna. And then from there, then you can work out what you're going to get out of it. Interesting points.

You had this one. What was that other one before? You said, you better like it. These are all the ones that are definitely there, but are generally not talked about as much.

Taboos. Yeah, the taboos of the social circle. Okay, verses 54 to 72.

By practicing buddhi-yoga, one develops the qualities of sthita-prajna, a person fixed in divine consciousness. In verses 52 to 53, Krishna began describing the stage of divine consciousness. So do you understand what's happened here? This last one, the other one, and this one? End it with this.

It opens with this. This is called sangati. It's showing the connection between the previous points and the next point.

So the last one shows in a relationship to the last points, and this one shows in relationship to the coming points, right? Because there always must be sangati between one point and the next, a group of points and the other group of points. Then your chapters with another chapter, the particular point with the book, that book with other books, right? These are all the elements of sangati. You learn all about this in the third year.

Now in verse 54, Arjuna inquires about the symptoms of one who has achieved such a position. So you mention that it's there, and then you say, what is such a person like? Because Arjuna, when he understood there's such a person, then he asks. Okay, here he's asking.

Nice and done. The point that you come up, it's right there. Arjuna said, O Krishna, what are the

symptoms of one whose consciousness is thus merged in transcendence? How does he speak? What is his language? How does he sit? And how does he walk? Right? So now, having understood that such a position is there and such philosophy is there, what's Arjuna's first question? What's the culture? You understand? They go together.

So that's why Prabhupada says, philosophy without religion is mental speculation. Right? And religion without philosophy is sentiment. Right? So that's the difficulty.

Because, means, it's just like, let us say, let us say you take the Hindus. Okay? Now, basically if you go from one Hindu family to another, one Hindu group to another, is there much difference in their understanding of the culture? No. It's all the same.

You go to one house, they'll serve prasada the same way as in another house. Different preparations according to the locals, but the same mood, the same everything. Dealings between family members, dealing with guests, culture is the same.

Therefore, they're Hindus. Right? They're following the culture based on the Veda. Right? Now, what about their philosophy? They got a million philosophies.

Right? But culturally, they're homogenous. Okay. Now, you take the devotees.

Okay. Now, philosophically, they all say the same thing. Right? But now, where do they speculate on the culture? Do we have to do that? Why do we have to do that? We have to do this.

You know, what about this? What about equality? What about this? What about that? So, this is what Prabhupada means. The other one is they don't really have a philosophy. So, it's just a sentiment that they're following the religion.

And the other is that they have the philosophy, but they won't accept the religion. So, they speculate about what's right and what's not. Anybody can say anything.

Anyone can do anything. And then, you know, there's no right or wrong. Right? People will come up and criticize Prabhupada and point out faults and all that.

And then, if you say, this is not right, they say, well, this is not freedom of speech. This is not, you know, being intellectual and considering. I was only making a point, you know.

Where's the culture? What's the main thing? You know, I mean, because according to that, I can be sitting there with the person, and then they say something I don't like, and I pull out a baseball bat and whack them over the head. And then, if they complain, I was just expressing my feelings. That's actually how I felt.

Do you want me to be untruthful and restrain that within me, you know, instead of letting out so that you actually understand like that? You know, are you saying I should restrict myself and I should not be myself? Is that what you're trying to say? So, in other words, you can do

anything with it because there's no culture. There's no standard. So, this is the point.

Devotees means the... Prabhupada said we're Hindu by culture, but Vaishnava by philosophy. Right? So, when we say we're not Hindus, that means we're not Hindus by philosophy. You know, that's the kitchen.

No, we're Vaishnava by philosophy, but Hindu by culture. Right? So, devotees even have a problem here. If they have to deal with these Hindu groups, they ask, so, are you a Hindu? And then, much of the time, they'll say, no.

And then, the Hindu groups won't like us and then don't support us and then there's problems later on. It's something else. But the point is that, no, by culture we're Hindu.

Right? Only here, using the term Hindu meaning those on the other side of the Sindhu River that follow the Vedic culture. Right? But we're Vaishnava by philosophy. But now, if someone doesn't accept the Vedic culture, then they're Vaishnava by philosophy, but what's their culture? That's where the problem comes.

Because then, what culture will they fall back on? They'll fall back on the culture of whatever is their upbringing. Middle class. Yeah, basically middle class, somewhat cosmopolitan.

You know? Like that, a little mix of this and that. And that's all. Yes? It's the same arrangement of people who are devotees, for example.

Those who don't have any culture, they really don't understand the philosophy. Yes, they don't understand the philosophy. They will make a mistake, because that's the point.

Previously, those who are bewildered by material desires are unable to make the obvious conclusion of their research and do not surrender to the Lord. So they may philosophically understand, but they can't practically apply it. So therefore, the material attachments, they use the philosophy, because that's all they have, to justify their culture.

But the point is, the philosophy is supposed to establish culture, not justify their attachments. So it's a matter of emphasis where it is. And that's what's not understood.

They think the culture is the clothes, or the food, or the behavior. No. Those are manifestations of culture.

You understand? It's just like we see pictures of Prabhupada. He's wearing that famous one in pictures in Regent Park. He's wearing that black kind of overcoat with that black kind of hat.

Kind of like a little bit furry kind of thing. And so Prabhupada looks like a gentleman. Right? Like that.

Saying if he's not wearing that coat, he's wearing the traditional clothes, he still looks like a gentleman. Does that make sense? So in other words, his culture is consistent. Does that make

sense? And a lot of times, devotees, when they're wearing devotional clothes, they look like a slob when they put on the karmic clothes, and they look like some modern person.

They don't look like a gentleman at either. So you could say they're consistent. You understand? But they missed the point of the culture.

So the culture's lacking. Because they don't know why they're doing it. They can't connect what they're doing to the philosophy.

It's a matter of the philosophy defines us, rather than the philosophy just kind of makes it that it's not bad. Right? Because as we've been seeing, the point of Buddha yoga is, it's consistent in itself, it's consistent with the whole devotional process, and it has the ability, no matter how advanced or not advanced you are, you have a place within it. The same philosophy of Buddha yoga is still there and applies, whether one is on the platform of sākāma or on niṣkāma.

Does that make sense? It still works. Does that make sense? So that's the beauty of the Vedic, is that because you're dealing with the complete whole, then any emanation is also complete. Om Purnam adhah purnam idam.

Right? Means God is the complete whole. Anything coming from Him is complete. That means His cultural system is complete.

And because it's coming from Him, it is connected to Him. So you understand this, then you can do anything within the culture and have it perfectly connect to Kṛṣṇa. Does that make sense? Right? But these others, they're not connected with the philosophy actually.

They're just using it to establish certain things. So there's an inconsistency. There's not a natural transformation.

It means the consciousness has transformed into the mundane, so our process is to reverse that and transform it back. Right? That's our philosophy. This is the parinama and ibharta.

So which one are we? Parinama. So parinama means that there's a transformation. So you're trying to transform back.

That's why in our philosophy you always see these lines of transformation. Right? You have the Lord, then He expands as, you know, Garbhodakṣayi Viṣṇu expands as the primary creation. Then there's Brahma and then there's all the other aspects of the creation down to, you know, us sitting here.

So now you reverse that and you take it back. You transform it back. Right? In other words, you get rid of false ego, you move it back, the creation.

It's just by false ego that it's manifest. So you remove some false ego, it moves it back a little bit. Remove more, it moves it back.

You remove all of it, there is no material existence. There's a material manifestation, but there's no material existence. The material existence is because of false ego.

Right? Because you'll have removed it for yourself, you haven't removed it for everybody. Does that make sense? So that's just going, you're transforming. So therefore, then how does someone who understands this philosophy, because he says merge, that means then that is his lifestyle, the philosophy is his lifestyle.

So that means what does that lifestyle look like? Right? What does that look like? So that's why I asked this question. Does that make sense? So we can't separate the two, yes. You can analyze them separately, but they're connected, yes.

Of? Karsha. Oh, culture. Well, it depends.

If you ask an Australian, it means yogurt. This is totally one Australian. What's the difference between an Australian and yogurt? The culture.

And the person who told it in his day was very uncultured, so one could not mind. He used to drive 22 wheel trucks, and now he organizes the Mayapur Academy. So that's called transformation.

Oh, wait, we're working here. So culture would mean, in other words, the lifestyle based on your philosophy, basically. You know what I'm saying? Because everyone, like let's say you have a street gang.

They have their philosophy, and so they have a lifestyle based on that. Or you have a bunch of businessmen. They have a philosophy, so they base their lifestyle on that.

They want to make profit, and they're going to do it by networking with other businessmen. So their idea is, I make profit, and I make profit by impressing these other people. So what are they going to wear? Impressive clothes.

Yeah, they're going to wear suits and other things that don't impress them. So all of them wear that, because that is the manifestation of the philosophy. Now, what if the guy is that this is, they want to make it.

Let's say the guy has made it. He is the biggest, richest, stinkiest, smelliest guy there. What does he wear? Yeah, he comes in whatever he likes.

So he might wear a suit, but he might not. And no one can complain, because he's the biggest. You understand? So everybody will wear according to their philosophy.

So that's why you can see how people dress and wear and behave, actually what their philosophy is. Does that make sense? They'll say, no, it's separate, but that's the Western idea. Is that the two separate? No, they're completely combined.

Does that make sense? So your culture is the external manifestation of your philosophy. In other words, the lifestyle that goes along that you obtain whatever it is you're trying to gain. In other words, what you value, it's the lifestyle that goes with it.

So that means cultures more than... See, generally in the Western or the European sense, then it's kind of been reduced down to culture. I mean, those finer elements in life, like music and drama and language and stuff like that. If you come to a particular program, you're dressed nicely, you'll say you're cultured.

You didn't dress nicely, you're not cultured. But it's more on the finer points rather than... And so they'll see it there. You see it when you're dealing with the higher elements of culture.

It's also how you sit at the table, how you use your fork and spoon and knife, how you talk, all these different things. But when they go home, unless that is their natural lifestyle, then they have a different value system. They may do that for the public, but they don't live like that.

But there are people who live like that. There are people who they wear a suit and tie no matter where they go. It doesn't matter.

They go to a discotheque, they'll wear a suit and tie because they're not riffraff like the other people. And people who appreciate that, they will talk to. And people who don't appreciate, they wouldn't want to talk to.

You know what I'm saying? So you do have all these... But then others are just being natural in that and they don't worry about it. Does that make sense? But it is how you deal with everything. But the Vedic takes it beyond because otherwise how does a cultured person brush his teeth or take a bath? How does he sleep? How does he interact with the family? How far do you take the culture? So you'll find that cultured people, they take the refined value system quite a ways into their lifestyle.

But they won't take it as far as the Shastra recommends. You understand? So for some it's that, OK, they do a few things like that. It's like, OK, if some guests are coming over, they clean up the house.

But if the guests aren't coming, they don't clean up the house. But there are people, even if no guests come, they wouldn't want to have a messy house. The house has to be clean and orderly.

That's for them. And that what they're keeping clean and orderly, that can impress guests. But being clean, that's just standard.

Does that make sense? So you have these different, based on their values, then there will be a manifestation. But that refinement is how far their refinement is. That's why we say the person who follows the Vedic culture is the most refined.

Does that make sense? Not necessarily sophisticated, but refined. That's also a problem with the Westerners, is they can't separate these two. You can be sophisticated, but not refined.

Or refined and not sophisticated. Let us say, as an example, in Versailles, I think it's a thousand rooms or something, or a hundred rooms, or something immense. And each room is so nice and ornate.

Really, one room is just for a clock. There's four doors, and a pillar, and a clock sitting on top. That's all that that room does.

So you want to know the time? You go to that room. It's so refined. We can say sophisticated in this way, and refined in an element.

But at the same time, there's not one toilet in Versailles. There isn't one. So what do they do for going to the toilet? Yeah, they use these bedpans and stuff like that.

And they say that they just put up a little thing in the hallway, and then they use it, and then the servants take down the thing. So that's not very refined. But it's quite sophisticated.

You understand? Sophisticated means it's more complicated. Refined means it's more cultured. So there's a difference between how sophisticated... You know what I'm saying? In other words, you can be sophisticated that you have, you know, three knives, three spoons, three forks, and, you know, so many glasses, and this and that.

So that's sophisticated. But how you use it will define whether you're refined or not. Yeah.

Or you eat shellfish with it. Depending upon who you are, how you define edible and non-edible. Because you just mentioned the pork, but what about the shellfish? That's also... The Old Testament also says one shouldn't eat that.

Is that okay? Yes. Raj, for somebody who wants to put this philosophy into practice in their life, what is the process for them to understand all of these cultural details? How do they understand? Well, first you have to have faith that the Vedic culture actually means something. Then it will be a lot easier.

It's just like you have to have faith in God, and that philosophy. So when we say you have faith in God, it generally means in the philosophy. But then you also have to have faith in the culture that God has created.

Does that make sense? So if that's there, then these things will mean more. And then by contemplating, you can see. Because what's the essential point? Why is it there? What are you trying to accomplish? Yeah, pleasing Krishna, and then remembering Krishna, and then in that particular medium, there's some purpose you're trying to obtain.

How you do that. Like you say, you're feeding devotees. So then how would you do that? Just with a big smile, bring out five buckets, three on each arm, and then put them down in the

middle of the floor, dropping a few, picking them up, pick up the pakoras, put them back inside.

And then go, oh, I forgot the spoons. And then run off and go get the spoons. And then, of course, you have to bring ladles.

And then put that in there. And then you go, Haribo, Prasad, everyone take. I mean, like that.

Or if you think about that, how do you see that everyone gets pleased? So then by properly serving. And then the attitude in serving. You don't just go around once and go, you need one anymore? But you just got, so you won't want more now.

Like that. So then they think, OK, everyone's satisfied, so you sit down and make your plate. Right? Up to now, I haven't.

I'm not exaggerating. I'm just giving practical, live examples. Right? In other words, by contemplating how to apply... Yeah, then it will make sense.

Because Prabhupada gave all these ways of doing, but devotees not understanding the, you know, refinement of the culture and the importance of the culture don't pay attention to it. Like now, we have 400 temples, how many of them you can go, you sit down and they actually serve you Prasad? Everyone sits in a line, you serve Prasad. How many do you know? It'll be hard to find one.

But that's how every temple in ISKCON did in the beginning. Because that's the way Prabhupada showed it. And if you ask them, why don't you do it? What's going to be their answer? It's not practical.

That's all. That's all. It's also, why would it be practical for a community to listen to a temple president? And why would they have to give their money to the temple president? That's also not practical.

They could use it for something else. You know what I'm saying? So in the same philosophy, you know, why should they do anything? Why is it that not practical means all the refinements of culture, the human elements, go, but anything to do with power and control and money remains? Why? Because it's a bourgeois culture. In a bourgeois culture, all that's important is money and influence.

That's it. That's the bottom line. Anything else can be sacrificed.

But you never sacrifice money and influence. Right? You might sacrifice one for the other, but you always have to end up with one of them. So at the end of the day, you got more influence or more money, and ideally both, then everything was worth it.

Everything was perfect. It didn't matter. You were just being practical.

So that's what we were talking about. That defines their culture. That actually defines their

philosophy.

And because of that, it is incongruous with the Vedic. So that's why they have problem with both the philosophy and the culture. More specifically culture, less with the philosophy.

But when it comes to actually dealing with the culture, then they actually start having problem with the philosophy. But if you don't touch on culture and just discuss philosophy, basically no one has any problems. But if you have to apply it, that's when the problem comes up.

You know what I'm saying? So you can see what is their philosophy. So you can see who is, you know, this bourgeois culture. You can see who is all this new age culture, just being nice and experiencing and kind of mystical kind of feelings.

You can tell this is their religion. So people say, oh, this is a religion. No, anything that anybody does is religion.

Their lifestyle is religion. It's just a matter of whether it's in line with God or whether it's not. And even if it's not in line with God, all it is that you don't know it's not in line with God.

Because it's in line with the modes of nature, which God created. So therefore you think I've created this. No, the modes of nature made it for you.

You just became attracted by those particular modes. So the lifestyle that goes with that modes, you've accepted. So depending on the combination of the modes, that's a combination of the lifestyle.

You know what I'm saying? You know, there's a touch of goodness. It looks nice. The house is filthy, but it looks nice.

It appears to be clean. It's not clean. Right? So there's only that little bit of there.

You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? So like this, the mixes of the modes makes the lifestyle. So that's the thing. Do you want it based on pure goodness? You know, so then it comes down to us, or you want to make up your own.

So you can make up your own, but then the problem is you have to stay here to live it. If you accept Krishna's, then you can go to the spiritual world and live it there. You know what I'm saying? Krishna's culture you can live in the spiritual world.

You can't live your material culture there. So you are attached to your material culture, then you stay here to live it. When I go back to God's head, you live Krishna's.

Very simple. This is what we mean by simple. It's not complicated.

Right? But God's unlimited, so there's unlimited aspects of detail in it. But if we're open to it, then it's simple. The culture Prabhupada gave is very simple.

Anyone can live it, and it's enough. Right? And then if you need more sophistication, then there's more stuff there. Then that will become obvious.

Okay? Srila Viswanatha Cakravarti Thakura reveals the internal meaning of Arjuna's questions. What qualities can describe sthita-prajna-kabhasa? What are the qualities of the person situated in samadhi, samadhistha? What will that person say in the face of happiness or distress, respect or disrespect, praise and condemnation? ki prabhaseta What will he say, either loudly or to himself? In what way will his senses remain unresponsive to the external objects, kim asita? In what way his senses respond to the objects, vrajeta kim? So in other words, he's talking, he's in that consciousness. He understands that conscious means he's not absorbed in the material energy.

So by not being absorbed, how will he respond? Does that make sense? Because the modern culture, or I didn't say the modern, the conditioned culture is because you have an emotion, because you have an attachment, therefore the emotions push you to do certain things. Right? Let us say, let us say, I think we discussed it the other day. Let's say you have the, the typical guy off the street who's a kind of a ruff, ruff, ruff, a ruffian off the street in, let's say, America.

Okay? Then you have a ruffian off the street, let's say, in the East End, right? In London. Okay? Now, both of them are going to be pushed by their, their emotions and what they want to get done. Now you've done something to upset them.

So now, but you'll see, so their ultimate goal is to deal with you in such a way that you become, you know, corrected. So that corrected, you know, may have a variety of manifestations. But in any case, one will find, means typically, that the American person, then you've upset them, so their emotions are there, and so they'll yell and scream, and this and that, and be right in your face, and so many things like this.

Right? And then they'll get about, go about the correction, or do them simultaneously. Right? But then we see typically the English person, he'll talk in a more calm voice, use very nice language, you know, like that, you know, tones of voice and all that. And then having said that, then he'll blow your brains out.

You understand? So there's a difference in the values, on whether you just let the emotions just run wild, or they're controlled and contained, and that's considered a higher principle. Right? In other words, the guy's a gangster, but it doesn't mean that he's not in some way kind of a gentleman. Right? Well, the other is that that's not the important element.

You understand? So we see in the cultures of the world is that how much they allow their emotions to be expressed or not is part of their value system. Right? So especially this more modern cosmopolitanism, the more you express it, the better. But the problem is once you express it, you can't take it back.

And so doing that, other people know how you feel, you know, and you've expressed it in a way

of how you felt, and so that will make other people feel insecure. So you generate this whole society of insecure people. Right? And then they'll create some kind of control on how you deal.

Right? You can express yourself and make under certain circumstances and make everybody feel insecure as long as you didn't, how do you say, it was generic in its presentation. Right? You know, in other words, you can tell everybody that you really didn't like that and that was terrible and you feel this and that, even though you may be completely wrong, but you can't, let's say, use ethnic slurs or other things like this. You know, as long as that happens, then it was okay.

But in other cultures, they would say, no, even that's not okay. You have something, then say it nicely. Wait for the right situation.

Don't blow up. Does that make sense? So there's the element is that according to your philosophy, then you're going to express yourself. So then he wants to know is, okay, they're situated, they're not materially absorbed, so what is going to drive them to interact? Why would they interact on the material platform if they're situated spiritually? Why would they? What's the game? Right? So this is then the questions.

So then Krishna will explain, because then this is, it will turn into karma yoga, because then there's duty. That's why Krishna always says, perform your duty. Just like, let's say, you, you, someone is, you're staging a drama.

Okay? And everybody knows their lines. And you've already, you know, done the staging, you know, who should stand where, who should do what, who says what, what are the hand gestures, everything you've already gone through. Now if somebody gets mental and, you know, feels inconfident that they can't do this and everything like that, then, but what is going to be the consistent point that will make them part of the drama? They follow just what they're supposed to do.

Right? Now if they follow what they're supposed to do, the play will go on. Right? But now if they do it with proper feelings and all that, then it will be a nice play. But if not, at least they took part in it.

It was the other, because if you don't say your lines, how do the others say their lines? You know, if you're standing in the wrong plot, how do the plays, how do they stay theirs? Does it make sense? So in other words, the basic point of perform your duty is the basic thing of how you have an interaction. So that's just supposed to be there. It doesn't matter how you feel, what's going on, that remains.

Does that make sense? It is like, let's say, in traditional families, the wife is upset with the husband. It doesn't mean she doesn't feed him, but it does mean she doesn't talk to him. You know, because that's the thing, you know, you're serving prasad, you know, you're eating, you're talking, talking all this, and smiling and laughing and all that.

But no, she'll just serve. No talk, no emotions, no nothing. Right? But you're feeding him, that's

your duty.

Right? But can he, you know, get full enjoyment and everything out of it? No. He knows something's wrong. You know, and so now he has to work hard to figure out what goes on.

Does that make sense? That's depending upon the response. Means first you say something nice, then if that doesn't work, then you throw the plates. But now you throw the iPod or you throw the phone.

And even better, you throw his stuff, not your stuff. Because before it was, I mean you could throw your stuff also, but generally it would be your stuff that's connected to him. Because then it has no purpose.

So if he gave you the plates, then definitely throw the plates. But if your grandmother gave you the plates, she wouldn't throw the plates. Right? So those ladies are throwing the plates, so there's the plates that their husband arranged.

Okay? Does this make some sense? Yes. Just we were discussing before how acting in nice comedy means we want to please the board, but we don't have that, so much affection. So we perform, we do the activity for the board, and then the affection, it develops as we hear more about the board.

So in the same way, in our material relationships, does it work the same way? That if we are not feeling the appropriate emotions for the people we're dealing with, anyway we perform how we're supposed to. Yes, you perform the duties and that, and then it comes. Like that.

That's why the basis is there's duties, because then you have a consistent culture that everybody will feel comfortable in, because they know what should be done and who will do what. But the point is, is you're doing it for the emotional, you know, results. Right? So if those aren't there, then you have to make adjustments in how you're dealing to make them respond.

The point is, is if you have a modern culture where there is no definition, how do you know what you're supposed to do to get them to respond? But in the Vedic, then you have a culture, so you know what you're supposed to do. And within that set culture, then it's a matter of adjusting how you're dealing with that to make it right. Because otherwise, like we said, the guy's on the stage, he's saying his lines, but he's saying it in a monotone, so it's not like, you know, anybody's overly impressed.

You know what I'm saying? You all understand? Yeah? No, monotone. He's saying, no inflection. Hi, how are you today? You know, there's no emotions like that.

But at least from there, then it's not a matter of, why do you say your lines? Then you just say, where's the emotion? Where's the meaning? What do you mean by that? You understand? So the culture doesn't change. The expression, but it's the emotional content of it. Does that make sense? So you work on that.

But then the other thing is that they don't even do the duty. Right? So he comes upset, so he goes and sits, you know, goes into the garage and does something, doesn't do any of his other work, doesn't interact, doesn't nothing. So then what's the basis to work things out? There's nothing to work with.

Do you understand? Yes? It is. But the point is, is can she? You know what I'm saying? If the wife is so emotionally disturbed by something, can she? It does. But then what does that, what does that mean that the wife should always be pleasant in her interaction? What does it mean? What's the full meaning of that? She has to be satisfied.

So what does that mean? It means, that means the husband has to act properly. So if the husband acts properly, then she should make the endeavor to be pleasant. But if he doesn't act properly, then how will she respond pleasantly? What I'm saying is, is that the form of the drama is going on, but the emotional content is not there.

But you have something to work with. Just like this. If you have a director, and they're trying to put on this drama, but no one knows their lines, no one can remember where they're supposed to stand, they always come out with the wrong costumes on, can you do anything with them? No.

But if they all remember their lines, they know what they're supposed to do, they do all that perfectly, but it doesn't have the emotion that should be there. Can a director do something? Yes. You understand? So that's, does that make sense? Yeah, the spiritual master, you know, senior developer, whatever it is, whoever is the one who would be giving some direction.

Like that. You had something? Oh, OK. Chavan and Sukanya.

You know Chavan Prash? That's the guy. Well, but the thing is, there is, why was he grumpy? If he remembers, he's grumpy because now he's blind. And why is he blind? Because she poked his eyes out.

So now, is it all right that he's grumpy? OK. And would she therefore make an extra endeavor to be nice? OK. So it's not, it's not out of balance here.

Because then, because she responds properly according to her duty, then what does Chavana do? Right? You don't remember the story. It's kind of vaguely, all you know is there was a grumpy husband and the wife had to behave nicely. That's all the stuff.

In other words, in other words, either you remember that to try to inspire yourself or the husband has pointed that out. Why are you so grumpy today? Well, Sukanya didn't say that to Chavana. OK.

So then Chavana, then because he was powerful, when he was pleased with her that, you know, he understood her sincere in performing her duties, then he called the Ashwini Kumaras, who are the physicians, who are the demigods. And because they had lost their position of getting a

share in the sacrifice, because they're doctors, right? Doctors are not considered that high in the Brahminical level. They're within the level of Brahmins, but they're on the bottom of being Brahmins.

I mean, they're being higher than, let's say, musicians or something. So they weren't getting a share in the sacrifice. Indra didn't allow.

So then he told them that, OK, you work it out. I'll get you your share in the sacrifice, but you have to give me my eyesight back and my youth back. Because she was very young and he was very old.

I mean, like, wrinkly old, you know, like that. But because of the position, her good training, then she didn't mind marrying him, even though she's a very young girl. He's a real old man, and he's blind and grumpy.

He could be a trailer or something. Yeah. So does that make sense? And so then, so then, you know, they wanted to be sure also, because it's kind of like he's saying he's doing this because of her chastity.

So then they, they, then they think one, one is that such a qualified girl, you know, would be very, is very attractive at the same time and then there's also this test that she really is chaste. So then, you know, she has to help him down to the river and then from the river to Ashwini Kumaras and these Saikas are identical twins. So they go with him into the water, they go down to the water and when they come out, there's three of them and they all look exactly the same.

Right? So then, so then, then the Ashwini Kumaras, I mean, whatever it is, then they say, whoever, it means they're all the same, so whoever you choose will be your husband. And so she looks and looks and looks, she can't figure it out. So then she prays the Ashwini Kumaras to reveal.

So then they're very pleased and so then they say, yes, this is your husband. So, in other words, she, she worked to please him, but he was working to please her. Right? So it wasn't like the initial thing, so he comes in to establish, relationship was already established based on that she had already done, you know, put him in a difficult situation.

You know what I'm saying? So he didn't have to start off being nice. You know, so he or she had to prove that she would, you know what I'm saying? Then once it is, then it went back to its normal position where the husband tries to make nice arrangements. Like that.

So you do see that. Or, or, though he hadn't done something wrong, then you had Kardama and Devahuti. She's, she's a princess.

He's a, a Brahmin. Right? So he lives in the forest in a grass hut. She's lived in palaces.

So, he first sees that she's going to be an equal. Right? Because you don't have children when

someone is not an equal. Because otherwise, then you'll get an unequal child.

Or, or, alias, Varna Shankara. Right? So then, then, he sees that she's comfortable with that lifestyle. And when she's comfortable with the lifestyle of Brahmin, then, because it's within his power, like Savanna, then he arranges for a palace, because she's used to living in a palace.

You know, palace and two thousand maidservants. Like that. Does that make sense? You know, then it starts going that way.

So in other words, if the lady is trying to be nice, but, just because she's nice doesn't mean that the husband shouldn't be trying to create the environment in which she'll be comfortable to be nice. So, both are there. In other words, he's trying to create the atmosphere and she's trying to respond nicely in that atmosphere.

Right? Because she could also not respond. So, the proper thing is to respond. But he should be doing something to respond to.

Does that make sense? Right? So, so that means it comes back again as we were saying here. The point is duties. You perform your duties.

Then you have something to work with. Then you can develop the quality of the relationship based on the performance of your duties. The duties of the medium.

So, you perform the duties of devotional service. Then you can work on the relationship with the Supreme Lord. Yes? What is the line between duty and where this is a future that we can already deal with the situation? Means what? It means they're going to be connected, but the point is the duty is some is a particular activity that is to be performed.

What is the emotional content in which you do it? That's based on the quality of the relationship. Does that make sense? You know, in other words, the lady is comfortable if she cooks properly and doesn't burn anything. She's angry.

It doesn't mean she burns things and this and that. It may mean she puts more chili. You know what I'm saying? But it doesn't mean that she'll cook bad because this is a duty that she's expert at this.

So she'll do that very nicely. You know what I'm saying? But there may be something else that's emotionally involved that, you know, a bit more chili. You know, the food talks more, but you don't talk.

So then you know something's wrong. You know what I'm saying? Like Lord Caitanya when he told Jagadananda Pandit that he was very angry and then he agreed that he would come out of... He'd locked himself in his room for three days. He would only come out if he could cook for Lord Caitanya.

Lord Caitanya agreed. And he said... And he turned to, I think, Srutadhamana and said, an

angry cook always cooks nicely. You know? Because there's more flavor in it because they're so passionate that they put more.

Yes. In verse 55, the Lord explains how a person in divine consciousness reveals his position. He is detached from sense gratification.

All his needs are fulfilled by his spiritual practice alone. In verses 56 to 57, Krsna answers Arjuna's second question, how he speaks. Okay, so then first one... What's that? Okay, in other words, in this, he's detached from sense gratification.

Right? His needs are fulfilled by spiritual practice, but he's practicing. In other words, it's an activity. Duties are being performed.

But there's no trying to get any result from it for themselves. In verse 56 to 57, Krsna answers Arjuna's second question, how he speaks. Or in other words, how are his mind and words affected by others? He is not disturbed by the onslaught of the threefold miseries, indifferent to attachment, fear and anger.

I have a question about this. He is detached from sense gratification and his needs are fulfilled by spiritual practice alone. Does this mean that, like, the specific anarthas for different material enjoyment will be there, but he doesn't focus his activity in that direction? No, this is the sthita prajna.

This is your, you know, your realized person. Means we'll have, in the practice of it, there'll be some symptoms of that as it comes. You know what I'm saying? They'll come.

But what we're saying is that he's performing his duties, results are coming, but they're not for him. It doesn't mean that his senses aren't engaged. Right? That's the impersonal concept, is that spiritual means the senses aren't engaged.

No, his senses are engaged. But he's not doing, he's not engaging his duties for the sense gratification. Like that? So he's satisfied by the proper performance of his duties.

Right? While someone else is satisfied by the result gained from those duties. Does that make sense? Yes. Sthita prajna means samadhi means at least maha or? Depends, I'm not sure what they're, how they're defining here, but I would think that that means that.

But at the same time, it can mean that just they are fixed. Like that. So it just depends upon what level.

But you would definitely take it that this would mean the liberated person. So we would generally put that at both. Okay.

So how does he speak? He means, so he's indifferent to attachment, fear and anger. So if someone speaks nicely or doesn't speak nicely, it doesn't bother him. And he's not going to, to speak in anger or fear or attachment.

Right? So in other words, his speaking will be based on this. Do we understand that, does this make it clear what we're talking about in the, as culture? Here? Right? Because in other words, the culture is he's not disturbed by the onslaught of the threefold miseries, indifferent to attachment, fear and anger. So that will manifest in a particular way.

Right? Now someone is practicing Krishna consciousness for practicing the Vedic culture. Right? For the purpose of elevating themselves. Now, let us say they're on this platform, then are they going to do anything wrong in relationship to the rules of the Vedic culture? No.

That's why they are beyond the rules. They don't have to follow the rules because they know what the rules are for, so they will obtain it. Does this make sense? Okay.

But now, let us take the person who's practicing coming to that platform, becoming sthita-jnana. Now, will he always be able to practice it? No. Sometimes he'll be successful, sometimes not.

So what are the rules for? Yes, to go to... See the point? Okay, beyond rules. Okay, but I'm saying, both of you have given, you know, I'm saying appropriate. What's the other... There's another side.

Same what you've said. Keep him in the culture because he might act outside of that culture because of being affected by, you know, attachment, fear and anger. Right? So the rule stops him from going outside to keep his lifestyle consistent with what he actually wants to do.

Right? Does that make sense? These are what the rules are for. So when people take it that you just have rules and following the rule is the purpose, this is Niyamagraha. And then the people... So the people who are pious and have that kind of nature, they follow it just to follow it because they're pious.

Then the people who are impious, they don't understand... They didn't understand it. Then the... Also those who don't understand, who are impious, they'll say, why do we have to follow this? What's the importance? And they'll throw it out. This is what we were talking before about if you don't follow the Vedic culture, you're going to make your own.

And what are you going to do? You're going to throw out... Basically, you're going to throw out... What is an atheist? Yeah, one who throws out theism. Right? So the point is, they'll throw out... They'll specifically target Vedic. But if they have something, you bring in new age that came from China or something picked up from the Philippines or Indonesia or, you know, there's a little thing, the cultural practice of the pygmies in Papua New Guinea.

You know, all these things will be included in their, you know, nice, modern, you know, new agey kind of lifestyle. Why did all those things get included? Their mom didn't teach them that. You know what I'm saying? But they'll accept... But it's specifically Vedic is the one that's rejected.

Does this make sense? The culture... Yeah, what you see is manifesting the principle. That's why I'm saying this here, is in answering these points, did they say what he would speak? No, they're saying what is the principle behind his speaking? The principle in philosophy. Yeah, like that.

But the point is is that it's the principle that we're talking about here. You know what I'm saying? In other words, it's which side you're emphasizing. Right? You know, so the positive, you know, that they both mentioned is that the rules keep you in line with trying to move forward.

But there's also things that keep you from moving backwards. Right? Because you want to move forward, you shouldn't move backwards. So the same rule will keep you moving forward.

It'll also keep you from moving backwards. Right? If you don't forget Krishna, you'll remember him. If you remember him, you haven't forgotten him.

It's just a matter of which side you look at depending upon whether the positive is more prominent or the negative is more prominent. But it's the same thing. So this is what's important.

When the Vedic culture is a set of principles, but then its manifestation would be consistent with those principles. Right? So when someone says the Vedic culture is a group of principles, but they don't connect those principles to the modern lifestyle they choose to live, then they can't claim that they've obtained the principles of the Vedic culture. Yes, so there's no realization, there's no understanding there.

Though they have understood its principles. But then you have to actually act on those principles. Otherwise, it's not Vedic.

So therefore, there may be many manifestations of those principles. Right? According to time, place, and circumstance. But the principle is obtained.

Does this make sense? Right? So sometimes we think, oh, how do they do these things? You know, how is it? Why is it? That's why devotees say, oh, it's all philosophy. No. It means the practical is based on your philosophy.

So the philosophy is practical. If you can't see philosophy as practical, it means you're not actually, you don't work on intelligence, you just work on your feelings, your emotions, your needs, your desires, that's all. So philosophy means, it points out how the actual mechanics of how you work.

So then I say, because there is no fear, there is no attachment, there is no anger. So if you're not attached, then you're going to speak in a balanced way. If there's no fear, you don't have to in any way try to establish yourself.

Because fear means you're fearful of losing your position or having lost your position. So you're

comfortable with who you are. There's no anger.

Because there's no attachment, there's no anger because there's no frustration. Frustration comes that you can't obtain your attachments. So that means the person will always be able to speak in a proper way.

Because then there's your duties. How do you speak to others? You speak according to these methods. So you'll speak according to those.

And because they are established by God, they will carry all the emotional content and everything. That's the thing. Then they'll say, oh, but then it's just a drama, it's just a play.

It is just like that. But I've had people really melt down on this. So it's not real, you're just saying it's this and that.

Where's the realness? Where's the substance? As if illusion is substance. That feeling for my child, that's real. No, that's illusion.

Your attachment to your child is because Krishna's potency of childless is in your child. That's why you're attached to it. So it's like that.

Otherwise you say, but from my body. So you combed your hair and all that hair that came out of your brush also came from your body. You're not attached to that.

Because Krishna doesn't put any potency in there. Does that make sense? So like that, every day when it's detached from things from the body, you clip your nails, you blow your nose. Does that make sense? So it doesn't make any sense.

But the point is, you want to express the feeling, but you have to actually know what real feelings are. You have to know what's the basis of real feelings. It's just because they feel it, but that's animal.

Human means there is some meaning to it. There's some direction, there's some control. Then it goes to higher levels.

Otherwise it's just the same as the animal. So you get the same experience, but through a higher medium. That's the point.

The duties then create human life. Krishna performs what pastimes? Human. So therefore you have to have the rules define human.

The demigods don't follow those rules. Urvashi was telling when Arjuna came to, or when she went to visit Arjuna, and she came in a conjugal mood, but he said, I can't deal like that. Because in our line, you are the wife of the great kings before.

Like that. Her thing is, that's human stuff. We're demigods.

We don't care for that, Chad. You know. So it's like, you know, there's different rules.

So the human pastime is the one that's the most, because it has enough restrictions to create variety. Right? You know what I'm saying? Is that what it is? You know, when you hear the demigods, what goes on up there, it's pretty simple. When you hear what happens with the kings on earth, there's much more complicated.

You understand? So there's more there to work with as far as drawing out rasa. Does that make sense? Okay. So then, yeah.

In verses 58 to 63, we're done. Okay. Is that point clear? Is that these principles that are being given here in the second chapter, will be given to the book.

That's what you perform the external or observable duties with. That you perform the observable duty perfectly, but you've missed the point of these principles, it's not right. So that's why you'll see times where Prabhupada's talking about doing certain things, and then there's other times he'll talk about doing that thing without the proper mood is useless.

The devotees don't make a connection. They just think, well, here Prabhupada's saying this is not good, and here he's saying it's good, so I'm confused. What is it supposed to be? No, you're supposed to perform that with the proper devotional understanding.

Does this make sense? Yes?