

## 2010-10-26 BVPS BG 3.9-3.23

One who works in this way offers all the results of his activities to the Supreme Lord instead of enjoying them himself. So when you say all activities are done as a sacrifice, that means the results of them are being done for the Lord. You perform an activity, that result will go to the Lord.

So then if that is happening, then that frees one from, how do you say, that fruitive mentality. So then even though we're doing the activity of karma, one is not, the result is not for oneself. So the result is the essential point, right? This result is what you're looking for.

Any activities performed for a result, that result goes to the Lord, then it's no longer fruitive. So that's the point of nais karma. Not that nais karma means I don't do anything, I don't want anything, I don't do anything, because then it's still self-centered, right? So it appears very elevated, oh, I don't want any materialistic, so I do nothing, but it's still about oneself.

You don't want the result, that's why you're not acting. You want the result, you would act. But here's the point, is you're acting, but the benefit is for someone else.

So then that way, the results of actions being offered to the Lord, then that frees you from that act, the entanglement of that activity, right? Verse 9 introduces the important topic of sacrifice, which will be further developed in verses 10 to 16. Verses 10 to 16, human life is meant for yajna. Verses 3 to 9 describe karma yoga, or performing detached work for the pleasure of the Lord.

In verses 10 to 16, the Lord explains that if one cannot work without material desires, he should still perform his duties. Srila Visvanatha Cakravarti Thakura writes in his commentary on verse 10, Therefore, one with impure heart, unqualified for jnana-yoga, should perform actions without desire, karma-yoga, rather than give up action. Now, if you cannot be without desire in the actions, then you should still perform actions offered to Visvanatha with desire, and not give up actions completely.

So in other words, you're trying to always be engaged in the Lord's service. And so if you perform the activity, even if there's a material desire, then better that than not performing at all. Because if you give up the activity, there is no result, there's nothing to offer.

So if you perform the activity to please the Lord, then something is offered, even though you may have your own material desires. Does that make sense? So the offering is there, that's the essential point. It may be mixed, but the point is that it's being offered.

The mixed part, yes, will give some impediment, but the point is that it won't be as strong as what is offered. So when it continues like that, with the point of pleasing the Lord, even though one has material desire, then gradually, gradually, one will become purified. Yes? May or may not be, but the point is, is why are you doing it? To please the Lord.

So therefore, the intention is pure. Maybe the actual offering may or may not be so pure, but the point is, your intention is. You understand? In other words, your intention is to please the Lord, but within that, you have your own material desires.

You know, but that's just your state of existence. Right? But you see, it's the purpose of your existence to please the Lord. So gradually, gradually, then that all goes away.

Does that make sense? Yes? Would he have them do sacrifices simply, because later they would become more elaborate? Yes, because he's mentioned the books and mentioned because he was just beginning, you know, because even in the deity worship, the devotees, he introduced a few things like that. Like they have an arctic lamp, and someone would offer it, and the next person, they'd go offer it. And like that to everyone in the room was offered.

Like there's so many things. So they were very inspired. So they asked, oh, what are more things we can do? And Prabhupada said, if I told you, you'd faint.

You know, so he established the, then he established that there should be an archanpadati, right, that explains these things, that gives more. Right? Chaitanya Charitamrita, things are explained, Bhagavatam is explained. So you have the explanation of these things.

But even that, the devotees look at them very carefully many times, even that becomes bewildering. Right? So it's just a matter of time when things become, you become comfortable at them, then you can do so many things. You know, it's just like Prabhupada was showing cooking, and then devotees got enthusiastic, and I'm not sure where it was, maybe it was Houston or Dallas or some place like this, or I think it was there, but there was, you know, Indian community.

So then somebody from the Indian community, they invite them to the temple, show them how to cook some things, this, that. So they showed them something, right? And it would happen to be with mustard seeds. So then the devotee, you know, in his enthusiasm when Prabhupada came, cooked something for Prabhupada, you know, and using, at least in his mind, the recipe shown by this, you know, member of this Indian community.

And so the spicings with mustard seeds, so, you know, they probably used, you know, a million mustard seeds when it only needed, you know, five or ten or something, you know. So then Prabhupada just said, you know, just stick to, it's simple, just, you know, some cumin seeds, some chili, some turmeric, so like that, that's it. So then it was for many, many years.

You couldn't use any other spice, it was my, it was nonsense, because Prabhupada said. But the point was, is the devotee didn't know how to use them. Because if you use too much cumin, it still will work.

I mean, I remember once we were cooking something here, and I thought we had a bowl of cumin paste and a bowl of ginger paste, you know. And so then I put them both into the, you know, the chants. And then later on, someone brought the ginger paste.

So there were two bowls of cumin. But the subject came out fine. That's the thing.

Cumin, you can put, basically, you know, you can put it in a whole box and it still will work out. But something like mustard, if you don't use it exactly, it will be bad if you're very careful with mustard, right? You know, chili, people aren't going to do too much. It'll come too much once, it'll stop, right? But here the devotee's, no, no, but that's how much she put, you know, because it's like, you see something you've seen the first time, you know, everything looks bigger.

You know, probably each mustard seed looked this big, you know, and there were millions of them, you know, like that. But you put in a very small amount, you know, so it's very tricky, mustard seeds. So the point was, is they weren't very developed.

But in India, devotees were using so many spices and this and that, because they would know more how to cook, so it wasn't a problem. So it wasn't that the mustard seed was the problem, the problem is the cook wasn't expert enough to be able to use them. You know, not that there's a necessity, but if they were using them, then, does that make sense? So with time, all these things have developed.

You know, I mean, even though Prabhupada introduced the yajna and everything like that, it was based on, you know, Vaisnava homa and the names of the Lord, and Bhagavatam talks about doing a daily homa for the deity worship, it's part of the pancharatra deity worship. But devotees, every day when we were doing the yajna for the deities, they would come and say, but isn't this for Treta-yuga? You know, it's just like, no, that's like an ashram-medha yajna, you know, horse sacrifice, that's for Treta-yuga, you know, like that, you know, doing a yajna according to pancharatra, that's not for Treta-yuga, especially because then pancharatra wasn't a process, you know what I'm saying? So it took for years, I think from 84 until mid-90s, you know, basically every day, every couple of days, somebody would come up and say that, you know, any guest that's coming by, but isn't this, you know, aren't we just supposed to chant the holy name, like this? And this went on for years until one day, then in the West, they figured out there's an Indian community, and Indian community has money, and if you do yajnas, they're pleased and they give money. And after that, I never heard again about any complaints, because now, the yajna, instead of being something from Treta-yuga, now it's part of Sankirtan, you know, like that.

So then they stopped bothering, you know what I'm saying? So it's just a matter of time, and then devotees become, you know, accustomed with things and are able to find, you know, how they fit in, right? Is that okay? If one is unable to perform karma-yoga, he should engage in the karmakanda rituals described in the Vedas. Karmakanda brings material enjoyment and, more importantly, gives a chance for further progress to the stage of karma-yoga. The purification for the karmakandi is possible because he accepts the authority of the Vedas.

He partakes in yajna-sishta, sanctified food, and associates with learned Brahmin priests. Gradually, he realized that Viṣṇu is the supreme enjoyer of all sacrifices. Śrīla Prabhupāda writes in his purport to verse 11, Some of his yajnas are meant to satisfy particular demigods,

but even in so doing, Lord Viṣṇu is worshipped in all yajnas as the chief beneficiary.

It is stated also in the Bhagavad-gītā that Kṛṣṇa Himself is the beneficiary of all kinds of yajnas. Bokta-ram yajña-tapasam. Therefore, ultimate satisfaction of the yajnapati is the chief purpose of all yajnas.

In other words, the Vedas are written in such a way that the person, even if he's completely a materialist or an impersonalist, still has to follow a path that is connected to devotional service. So he's performing these yajnas, he's getting the remnants of the Lord, but because it's not being accepted in a devotional way, you won't get devotional benefit, right? You get ājñāta-sukṛti. Right? You know, you go out, like, you know, feeding the ducks in Regent Park.

It's not that the ducks went, you know, wow, bhagavad-mahā-prasādam and all this and that, you know. They just, it's something to eat, you know. And so they eat it.

But because it is offered to the Lord, they get purified. So next life they'll be human. Right? Does that make sense? And so this, but it remains as ājñāta-sukṛti.

When that builds up, then they're able to actually take up devotional service. But before that, then they're unable to take up devotional service. Right? So they're performing these rituals.

It's the same kind of ritual, same process that would be there if they were devotees. Right? Let's look at it. Karmakāndi has, wants to do a fruitive yajna.

Okay? Now, what are the requirements? If he wants to do the yajna, let's say, you know, what does he have to do? He has to do the yajna. So what does that include? He needs a priest, which will be a brāhmaṇa. So he has to be qualified brāhmaṇas.

What is the possibility in associating with a qualified brāhmaṇa? What might happen? Yeah, they might speak about Kṛṣṇa. If you're fortunate, he's also smarter, then you've got a problem. But at least you're respecting Vaiṣṇavas, you're expecting authority, you're respecting the Veda.

Right? Now, what condition does he have to be in to do the yajna? He has to be clean. Right? He has to respect the brāhmaṇas, he has to give in charity. Right? He has to distribute food, you know, that's been offered in the sacrifice.

Right? So in other words, he has to approach guru. It's based on the scriptures, he has to follow the instructions of the guru, he has to perform sacrifice in which the result is given to someone else, he has to distribute prasādam. Sound familiar? Right? But he's not devotional.

So he's doing the activities of devotional service, but not devotional. That's why it's called karma-kāṇḍa. Right? If it was done actually to please Viṣṇu, then we'd say it's karma-yoga.

Right? Because the yoga is there, like that. Does that make sense? What's the difference between a jñāna and a jñāna-yogi? The same point, is they're still, they have their guru, they're following śāstra, everything like that, but their speculation is only for their own purpose. A

jñāna-yogi means he's seeing the creation and how it's working in relationship to the Lord.

And so he understands his connection with the Lord. Right? But it's through intellectual process instead of through physical process. Would he be engaged in activity? Would he be engaged in activity? What does that mean? What do you mean by activity? Over here it says, one with an impure heart, unqualified for jñāna-yoga, should perform actions.

Yes, but what does this mean by actions? Devotional service. So, but if you said, if you put the word devotional service there, then you're saying someone unqualified for jñāna-yoga then would perform bhakti-yoga. Now that's exactly what the impersonalists say, right? Because you're not elevated enough for all this intellectual, so you need something more sentimental, so bhaktis.

So what do they mean here by karma, by activities? That the jñāni would not be performing. Okay, Prakashananda Sarasvati was a jñāni, he was a sannyāsī, had 10,000 disciples. They invited Lord Caitanya, you know, washed his feet, sat him, so anything there looks like varnāśra.

Means, see, between the ears there's this kind of lump there, you know, that if you operate it, things happen, and then the results of that should come out of the mouth as a symptom of having thought. Does that make sense? You've asked a question, so you're the one that has to give answers here. I mean, unless I should ask someone else.

One's duties, so what is the difference in duties? You understand, we're trying to work out what does it mean here, because the word action is used, but we see is that, you know, what is it meant by action? Anyone can help here. Yes, in other words, he's dealing in fruitive action. The jñāni doesn't involve himself in fruitive action.

The karmī will, right? But the highest form of it, as previously mentioned, means it's naishkarmī. So you're involved in the activities that would normally be used for fruitive gain, but you're not using it in that way. You know, not that, you know, the devotee's doing the āśramedha yajña just to please the Lord there.

You know what I'm saying? It means it will if it's the age, okay, Yudhiṣṭhira Mahārāja is doing because it's required as a king. But if he wasn't a king, he wouldn't be doing it, right, it's not a requirement. So in other words, basically we can take it meaning householder life, the activities of householder life.

You know, family life, money, facilities, all these different elements. That the jñāni doesn't technically require that. So he's not involved.

But he will have activities that he performs. Does that make sense? So in other words, if one is starting at that point, then there's no need to be involved, right? But if one's starting from the point where one is married, or one's planning to get married, right, then he will engage his activities. From that, knowledge will come, knowledge and detachment come.

So even within household life, he'll be functioning on the platform of jñāna yoga, though he's performing activities that you would attribute to karma yoga. But he's performing with that higher level of knowledge than, let's say, someone else on the level of karma yoga would be performing, right? So buddhi-yoga means it includes both. So it's just a matter of what's the proportion.

Is karma yoga more prominent, or is jñāna yoga more prominent? Does that make sense? But all of that's buddhi-yoga. Buddhi-yoga means whatever your activities are, whatever they are, if it's offered to the Lord, you know, for His satisfaction, right, then that becomes buddhi-yoga, okay? So sometimes we see that action only means, action generally means that, but it can mean any action. But in this connection, then it's meaning, you know, more involvement with the material energy.

Does that make sense? In verse 12, the Lord states that human beings should properly respect the higher authorities in the universe. The best way to do this is by worshiping the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Human society is fully dependent on the mercy of Kṛṣṇa and His representatives, the demigods.

The so-called independence achieved by scientific advancement is an illusion. In his purport to verse 12, Śrīla Prabhupāda writes, one should know, however, that all the necessities of life that the human society requires are supplied by the demigods, agents of the Lord. No one can manufacture anything.

Without the Supreme Lord there can be no profuse sunlight, moonlight, rainfall, breeze, etc., without which no one can live. Obviously, our life is dependent on supplies from the Lord. Right? In other words, they're thinking by science they're getting it.

No, it's not. You know, it's that the sun evaporates the water, the moon's influence turns it into vapor, right? That, that makes your clouds, then you get your rain. So that's all being arranged by the demigods.

And without rain, without sun and rain, then there is nothing. There is no food, there's nothing to drink, anything. So life is dependent upon, life is not dependent upon a computer or an iPod.

Of course, the, you know, I say corporate businessman wants you to feel that way, that, you know, there is no meaning to life if you don't have, you know, some of these modern, you know, fashion or accessories and all that. But in reality, it has nothing to do with your living. So they're taking what's there.

But even to have that intelligence, where does that come from? You say, no, it's my intelligence. So when you're 80 years old, let's see your intelligence. You know? Like that.

You know, so it's, it's not there. So they're using science to adjust what's already there. Right? I mean, it's not that they're doing something, you know, so they make their adjustments.

But where do they even get the facilities to make those adjustments that they're not thinking? Because if you think, then it means I'm not the supreme controller, which is not a conclusion that basically any materialist wants to come to. Right? Right? Means if you're, means you're successful because you're confident. And if you're confident, then you think, I am the controller and enjoyer.

As long as you think like that, everything works. As soon as you stop thinking like that, you become insecure. And when you're insecure, you do nothing.

Right? Does that make sense? So all processes are made to give you an identity, a material identity, so that you become very confident to endeavor materially. Does that make sense? This is the difficulty in going to modern methods of success, because all they're going to do, the main thing they're going to do for you, if the system you're able to use is to give you an identity of being a controller and enjoyer, then you're able to be successful. Right? Because without identity, then nothing else can function.

You can't get inspired unless you have identity. You can't have a goal unless there's identity. You can't make the endeavor unless there's identity.

Right? Right? And even without identity, how would you enjoy the results? You know? There's so many times, you know, somebody's raising their hand, you know, like that, and you call on them, and then they kind of look. Me? Someone else? You know? You raised your hand, you know? We called on you. No, but you mean me? You know? You just, like, they can't even accept the result of their endeavor.

They're so insecure. Does that make sense? It happens a lot in the beginning of the process, right? When we join. Yes.

We do lose identity, and we feel like... Yes. So, but that's why in the beginning, we saw that... It means nowadays it's talked about all this rah-rah and this and that's all bad, but why was so much happening earlier? Because we changed our identity. Yes.

There was an immediate... As soon as you walked in the door of the temple, you changed your identity. Anything you had before, you threw out. Of course, within that, they also threw out good things, but their purpose in throwing everything out was to please Krishna, and so they couldn't discriminate how they can use, you know, something like, let's say, before you joined, if you met somebody, you'd be pleasant and nice.

It's just a social etiquette. But after joining, then you don't do that because that's all maya, right? You know, that's coming from the impersonalist concept. So, therefore, they can't deal properly with somebody they meet on the street, and then people think, you know, that was weird, you know, and stuff like that.

And then they come back, no, no, but, you know, we have to be, you know, like seen as normal people and all that. So then they throw out the devotional identity to be able to be a nice guy in

the street. And then, because there's no devotional identity, nothing happens spiritually.

And even they say, no, but, you know, this is a matter we need facility, we need money, we need this and that. But in the spiritual movement, how is that going to come, right? Because if you're depending upon material, who has got the material karma? You know what I'm saying? Go ahead, knock me out. Name all the people in this movement who are stinking, filthy rich by karma.

So, therefore, then these people saying, on the material platform, I'm going to get money, and therefore will be able to preach, and they're doing it without, depending on Krishna and all that. It's not going to happen. They don't have the material karma to produce anything that way.

That's why you see nothing. Well, before, people who didn't have the karma were depending upon Krishna. They were doing amazing things, right? Because they're dependent on Krishna.

So they have a higher identity so they can do higher things. You choose the lower one, that's exactly what you get. Punar musi kababa means, you're a mouse, you are a mouse.

By the mercy of the sage, then they were a lion. But their own karma, they're mice. You know what I'm saying? That's the whole point.

Does that make sense? The person is rich and powerful, then he joins Krishna consciousness. He'll take that lower position. Then if he leaves, he goes back to that rich and powerful position.

Then you have others, they come off someplace. You find them if you fish around in the gutter somewhere, drag them out like that, and then they take up Krishna consciousness. Then by doing that, they become rich and powerful and influential.

Then if they leave, they go right back to the gutter. But the illusionist thinking, I'm now so developed and sophisticated, I'll go out into that position. No, you go right back to where you are, the two different worlds.

You're standing on the ground, nothing's happening. You get on the carousel, you're going around. You think, if I get off the carousel, then I'll still be moving and things are happening.

No, you're just standing on the ground again. Does that make sense? So that's why it's because of the Lord that everything is happening. And because of not understanding the Vedic culture in society, people don't have faith that whatever is going on now is simply because people have followed.

Think about it. The Earth planet, here where we are, is one part of the Bhū Maṇḍala, right? And there's seven other islands. All of them were here for the Bhāgavatam.

They're all following Vedic culture. All the planetary systems above are following it. Even what we see from below, they're following it.

So this is the only spot in the universe where the option is there, you don't want to follow the Vedic culture, you can do it. So that means the whole rest of the universe, all the universes that are there, and then this is one quarter of the cause and manifestation. Of three quarters, everyone's following the Vedic culture.

So to think that anything's going on because of not following it, just by one's own intelligent endeavor, that's foolish. How do they have the intelligence? How do they have the intelligence? So because they don't understand rebirth, karma, and all this, that's the disease of the West, is that because they don't understand this one point, then they can't even come up with a proper philosophy in anything. Nothing that they come up with has much value, simply because they don't understand this.

When they're talking philosophy and culture and society, they can't come up with much. A mechanical machine, they do quite well. But where did the brains come from for that? Machines that they started making in the 1800s, early 1900s.

A guy like Da Vinci had already drawn them back in the 1400s, 1500s. So he had intelligence to do that, but no one else did. It took another 200, 300 years before people were able to even do what he had made.

So intelligence, it's not that it's not there. It's just that either it's there and they're not interested, or others aren't ready for it. Does that make sense? As already explained, in the material world everyone is forced to act, and material action invariably involves sin, inevitably involves sin.

As long as we are in the material world, we cannot be truly non-violent. Srila Prabhupada explains this in Message of Godhead. The law books known as the Smritis mention five kinds of sin which everyone inevitably commits, no matter how unwillingly they are as follows.

One, sins committed by itching. Two, sins committed by rubbing. Three, sins committed by starting a fire.

Four, sins committed by pouring water from a pot. And five, sins committed by cleaning the house. Even if we do not commit any intentional sins, we have to commit the above five kinds of sins without a shadow of a doubt.

Thus it is our duty to accept the remnants of offerings made to Visnu, to escape the reactions of all sinful actions committed unconsciously and unavoidably. Does that make sense? In other words, these five everybody commits. You can't avoid them.

It just doesn't happen. So, therefore, those who are involved in the area of karma, they are responsible for these sins. Those who are not, like the brahmacharis, the vanaprasthas, sannyasis, they are not responsible for these five.

But grhasthas are. And so, if one doesn't attend to these, then one is sinful, no matter how nice

one is, no matter how good one is. Yes.

How does one incur sin by doing these activities? Right, you think nobody is there between your finger and your skin when you itch? How big is a microbe? Small enough to fit. Yes, so there is at least one there, if not tens of thousands. So when you itch, you kill them.

If anything is rubbed, moved, you know, you move your book, you kill thousands of living entities. You sweep the floor, you kill thousands. You pour water, they get drowned.

You understand? You know, so all these different kinds of things. Starting a fire, that's always going to kill a lot of them. So this rubbing can be, that movement can be the mortar and pestle.

Now they don't use it. Your blender, you know, any of these kinds of things. Anything where one surface touches another, then somebody is going to get killed.

And then you add fire and you add water. So the various ways of surfaces meeting, then you kill living entities. That is there.

You have to take care of this. So this is what's called in Manu the five great yajnas. So for each of them, then there is something that has to be done.

Right? So the ultimate is, you know, worship Vishnu and accepting his remanence. But it's like you owe, and those also connect back to all these debts. We also hear in other places, Prabhupada, talk about rin.

The debts we owe, right, to the forefathers, to the demigods, to the sages, to mankind, you know, and to the other living entities. Right? So they're also connected with these. And so by performing the activities, like for the demigods, then you have to do yajna.

Right? But then of that, then you worship the Supreme Lord. The forefathers, then you have to offer the Shraddha rites. If you're worshiping the origin of all forefathers, then you don't have to separately worship them.

The sages, then you have to study Shastra. You have to live the Shastra. Right? Like that.

For humans, then you have to worship the Brahmins, because the humans and the Brahmins are the best. So by taking care of Brahmins and guests, and for all the other living entities, then that's why, you know, you take care of guests. You take care of, you distribute prasadam.

You do all these other things. So all these are standard parts of our, right, we study the Shastra under the authority of Guru. Right? We're performing various kinds of yajna.

These other, you know, yajnas. We're distributing prasadam. We're worshiping the Brahmanas.

Does that make sense? So it's part of the process. But as we said, it's karma. And karma, all these processes that are natural devotional processes, are brought into the, how do you say,

lifestyle of anybody, whether they're a devotee or not.

So that's why it's said, you don't follow this, then what is there? How is it service? You're not following any of these things. What are you doing? Right? You know, does that make sense? One says one's a devotee, but then the lifestyle is not necessarily as complete as it could be, if these things are considered. Does this make sense? We're talking about those who are involved in karma.

Activities, right? The household life. They're busy getting their money. They live separately.

They do all their things independently. You know, there's not a GBC telling them, okay, you've got to get up and go to work now. You know, stuff like that.

They're working on their own. So how is all that connected? They are chanting and all that, so that part of the life is connected. But these other parts are not.

Ultimately, if they take and somehow they and their family go to the temple, they give some donation, they do a little service, ultimately it's connected. But the point is, as we mentioned, the consciousness is not there. So all those other activities they're doing, their consciousness is not there.

So they're doing, in one sense you could say, it's not proper activity. And there's no proper consciousness. So the idea is recommendation.

You're doing proper activity with proper consciousness. There's also, you could be technically doing improper, just as you can do proper activity, like we're saying in the Karmakandis, with improper consciousness. You could do improper activity with proper consciousness.

Right. But why would you want to offer something improper to Krishna when you could offer something proper? Like that. Because the Shastra deals with everything.

Right here. Here they're dealing with your drinking water or turning on your stove in the kitchen. Or you go into the bathroom, hit the switch, and your electric water heater goes on, or your gas water heater goes on.

Living entities die. The Jains try to, they put little things so that they carry brooms, so that they sweep up ants, but they don't know. You saved 50 ants, but you killed 20,000 other.

So they don't understand all these things. So the idea is that you're trying to connect your activities to the Lord. So that's why Krishna says, do your duty.

Who defines duty? Do we just make it up? Yeah, from Shastra. Otherwise, a young man's duty is going out, partying all night, hooking up with as many girls as he can, and avoiding as much responsibility as possible. As far as he's concerned, this is a very full program.

I mean, throwing a little bit of television and some other things like that, talking on your phone,

like that, riding around in your motorcycle, and hey, life's complete. But who defines duties? Right? Thank God defines. Why is it people have an occupation? Modern man worked out that you have to have an occupation.

Right? Why does it work? Why does having an occupation actually give a result? Yeah, that's the point. Varna means occupation. Does anybody in the world expect a student to work? No.

They may, to get a little money on the side, or the situation is not ideal or something, they have to. But as everything was going nicely, no one in any culture expects a student to work. Why is that like that? Who made that? Retired people, does anyone expect them to work? No.

Does anyone expect monks and this and that to work? Priests, they should go out and have a job. No. So isn't that ashram dharma? So who has to work? Those who are after students and before retirement, which generally means they're married.

If you say there's a guy, he's 40 years old, he's a lawyer, he drives a Porsche, but he lives with his mother and he's not married. Would you say that's normal? No. No, but it's there, there's lots of them.

All you have to do is go to Italy, there's hums of them. You understand? Yeah, because they figured out that, hey, no one cooks better than my mother. Like that, you know.

You understand? But the point is, people will think that you have a job. Why do you have a job? Because you have a family. You understand? Does that make sense? So these kind of things, where do these principles come from? They're given by God.

So people, that's what Prabhupada says. Varnashram's going on, it's just not scientific, because nobody knows what it is or how it's working. So they mix it up and make a mess of it.

But it's still working according to Varnashram, you can't get around that. You know, dharmamoksha, you can't get around that. You know, the three modes of nature, you can't get around.

These are already set. But people are in so much illusion, they think there is something other than God and His creation, God and His laws. So the process of karma is, whatever position we're at, how to take that and move forward.

I'm in illusion and I have all these attachments and all these mundane practices. How to take that and starting from that point, make it progressive and move forward. That's karma yoga.

So the immediate, the first thing to do is improve the consciousness, proper consciousness, whatever activity you have. When you improve the consciousness, naturally you try to improve the quality of what you're working with. Right? Well, the material is, is improve your material facility.

You know, your material position. You know, you're impious, become pious. You know, do good

work.

You know, give in charity, do all that. That's where you start. But what would be the motive? What would make them move from a lower position to a higher position? You know, just... Yeah, activity, but just to be good, just to be nice.

Why should you be good and nice? Better results. You know, so then you have to be motivated by better results. Now, who is motivated by bigger results? Karmis, but who is able to do it? Yeah.

In other words, the guys in Forbes magazine. Everybody else is not doing it. You know, they're doing a little bit.

But what I'm saying is, you know, go from that up. That's why they're in Forbes magazine, because they did something special and unique. No one else is doing it.

Right? So that's not going to work in this age. Right? You're not going to have a broad-based, you know, like, what do they have? You know, Forbes 500, you know. You know, but there's 6 billion people on the planet, so that's kind of limited its application.

Right? So to be able to get people to move up in the quality of their work, simply based on the material facilities and improvement in sense gratification that they'll get, how many people can do it? Because most people are in ignorance. Ignorance means your identity is not very strong, you know, or, I mean, it's not very progressive. And so it would be very hard to move up to the mode of passion.

Right? Mode of passion to goodness is quite close. Right? But ignorance to passion, that's quite big. Right? Because in goodness and passion, there's activity, and ignorance, there's no activity.

So there's something actually common in passion. So that's why passion, you can get it to ignorance more easily. But ignorance, there's nothing, you can't do anything with ignorance.

What do you do with ignorance? You know what I'm saying? Does this make sense? So the person's moving in passion, so you can just redirect it to bring it into goodness. But if they're not doing anything, they're getting no results, so there's nothing to work with. Because it's the result that you can work with.

Does that make sense? Right? The other is the identity is wrong. So here at least they think, I'm a go-getter, I get what I want, I do what I want, like that. So they're doing something useful in the way of this, it could be offered.

But if you don't have an identity and you do nothing, there's nothing to work with. You understand? That's why it's being recommended, better they do something than nothing. You know, this thing, oh, I'm so useless, I'll just go off in the corner and do nothing.

Because I'm just a disturbance. That's the Buddhist idea. That's the impersonalist idea.

Activity gives trouble, therefore I'll do nothing. Right? So whether it's done in confidence, you stand in the corner, or whether it's done without confidence. But in any case, the result's the same.

They do nothing. Right? Does that make sense? Religious doctrines which justify unnecessary violence or demand absolute non-violence for its own sake are speculative. Okay.

Four. Example of a religious doctrine which justifies unnecessary violence is Christianity. Srila Prabhupada comments in Message of Godhead, quote, according to the laws of man, a person may be hanged when he commits homicide, but he is not hanged when he kills lower animals.

But according to the laws of God, one commits the same sin by killing a lower animal as he does by killing a man. We are punished by the laws of God for either action. Those who do not believe in the laws of God or in His existence may go on committing such sins, and they may not come to their senses despite the countless sufferings they are put into for committing such sins.

But that does not affect the existence of God or His eternal laws. Example of a religious doctrine which demands absolute non-violence for its own sake, without connection with the Lord, is Jainism. Although the Jains follow rigid rules of ahimsa, they are forced to commit sins and accept the reactions for them because they refuse to acknowledge the existence of the Supreme Lord.

Srila Prabhupada writes in Renunciation Through Wisdom, one may succeed in avoiding many kinds of sins, but it is impossible to escape committing the five great sins called panca-suna. Willingly or unwillingly we commit sins. Thus, when a religion fabricated by the human brain promotes one to embrace the path of non-violence for its own sake, it inevitably gives advantage to one and difficulty to another.

So these are old ones. Something we could say is a more contemporary one. We discussed the other day, we won't go farther than this comment.

One example is what we call Degas. You're being non-violent, but at the same time there's nothing to connect that non-violence to the Lord. Does that make sense? So that's the difficulty.

Does that make sense? So it's a problem. And the Jains are the same. They also, you know, know animal projects.

So it's the same kind of thing. Yes. The other four.

Of the three. You know, it's like in Australia, they say there's four gunas. Yeah, there's Sethurajas, Thomas, and Kiwi.

Kiwi gun. Like that. The Australians and the New Zealanders don't seem to get on so well.

There's a fourth glacier. Fourth glacier. Yeah.

Adi? Administration. Administration, okay. Yeah, like this.

Another. And all that, I forgot your question. Oh, yes.

Why aren't the other three? Because they're engaged in activities of detachment. So they're following in that way, because what they're doing is not for themselves. The brahmachari, he's working for the spiritual master.

He's not working for himself. I mean, it's not that someone's not married, he doesn't have. No, it's if someone's working in that position.

So a bachelor, he gets the reactions to what he's doing. You understand? He's left the gurukul. He's on his own.

He's independent. You know, like that. Then he's getting the reactions, right? But he doesn't have much to engage.

So it's not an ideal situation. You know, the vanaprastha is just engaged in austerities and all that. The sannyasa is just engaged in that.

So on that level is that they're there, but they won't be. They're not held responsible. In other words, there's no sin.

Right? But it doesn't mean there's not reaction. Okay? Now, so with grihastha, there's sin and reaction. Right? So with that, there'll be reaction, but no sin.

Now, all of them, if they connect their activities to the Lord, then there's neither. Right? So even those in the renounced orders that are non-devotees, then there's no sin, but there's reaction. But if they're devotees, then there's also no reaction.

You understand? So that's why the exam was given here, even the Jains. They're still forced to commit these sinful activities. Sin means there'll be your, how do you say? Okay, let's put it this way.

Reaction would be you are put into the same situation in which you are giving that trouble. And you're on the other side. That's reaction.

Sin means going to hell for, you know, some time and going through all the animal species to be punished before you come to that situation. Does that make sense? In other words, the person who, let's say, according to the Vedic literatures, kills an animal in sacrifice, there is no sin. Right? He'll be elevated.

The animal will be elevated. You know, like that. It looks good.

As far as karma karmic goes, it looks good all the way around. Right? But there's still reaction that in the future, the person that performed the sacrifice will be the animal. And the animal

will be the person performing the sacrifice.

And now the animal will get to sacrifice you. Right? But it's all good. Right? It's all pious activities.

Right? But, you know, this is the downside. So reaction is there, but they won't go to hell for killing the animal and take birth in some of the animal species like that. It's still a circle.

That's the way it works. That's why one is intelligent, one worships Krishna and gets out of that because it's stupid. That's what I'm saying.

Even if it's on the nicest level, it's still stupid. Okay? So most of the time devotees, the two go together. When there's sin, there is reaction.

But what they don't know about, if you perform pious activities, you can have reaction without sin. Just like you can have a good reaction, there's no sin. You can also have a bad reaction without sin.

You understand? But technically, it's all considered sinful because it's not connected to the Lord. Right? That good and bad, if it's not connected to the Lord, it's called sin. Right? Remember we were talking about that overlap? The samdhi? So you have bad activity, bad consciousness, good activity, good consciousness.

But you can also have good activity with bad consciousness. Yeah, but that's more connected with the other because our point is that it's connected to the Lord or it's not. That's the two.

There's an overlap where you could be performing the activities that should be offered to the Lord and are technically offerable to the Lord, but you don't have the consciousness to do that. I have a question. How is it dealt with all the practices that are recommended for the devotees, let's say, or sometimes free from the action of the sins? For example, you take a bath in Ganga.

If you take a bath in Ganga, why would the materialist want to take a bath in Ganga? What's his purpose? He gets purified. What's he going to do with that purity? They try to elevate themselves to the heavenly planets or a better material facility. Why does the devotee take bath in the Ganga? Why do they want to be purified? And how will they better serve Krishna? What's the difference between a pure state and an impure state when you serve Krishna? It's offerable.

It's offerable. Anything else? More pleasing. More pleasing.

Why is it more pleasing? Because you don't have any personal issues. Yeah, you don't have any personal issues or something polluting it. Purity means there's nothing that's polluting the devotion.

So always remember Krishna, never forget. So the impurity is the forgetting Krishna part. So if the heart is inclined towards sin, then it will be thinking of sin or thinking of other things other than Krishna.

And so here, sin is defined as it's not connected to Krishna. So even one's thinking of very pious, nice things, it's still not connected to the Lord. Does that make sense? So these activities that purify one, then it makes it easier to be absorbed in Krishna consciousness.

So that's why we're not interested in just taking a bath, just to take bath. That's why it's always used in itself. Example, a religious doctor which demands absolute nonviolence for its own sake.

It's not for the Lord's pleasure. In other words, everybody should be very nice, and we should get together, everybody should come together, and that would be nice. Everyone should cook something, and we all come together, and we all take prasada together.

Wouldn't that be nice? What's its purpose? You understand? What's the purpose? In what I've said, what's the purpose? Takes prasada. Okay, Sanskrit avocation. Even you put that on the side.

Let's say that you're moving above Sanskrit avocation. Social? Social interaction. It's just, if you have nice social interaction, that's good.

Not having nice social interaction, or no social interaction, that's bad. That's the purpose of that, by what I said. You understand? And I just discussed devotees in the community coming together and taking prasada.

Right? Because it's not being seen as that, no, as a community, we should try to improve the quality of our service to Krishna. And if you do it together, that's all... Everyone does individually, but if you do it together, that's nice. Wouldn't it be nice if devotees could come together and do service for Krishna? Then that means that Krishna is the point of it.

And it's that simple. Well, that's what I meant. Then that's not what you said.

There's a good chance that actually, unconsciously, that's also not what you meant. You didn't mean Krishna. You were talking, you were focusing on, wouldn't it be nice, I don't even know my neighbor, and this and that.

Why do you need to know your neighbor? Who said knowing your neighbor is important? If it is, somebody better tell them in New York, you know, like that, you know. I know a devotee, he lived in an apartment building for 20 years and never knew, never even saw the people who lived next door. People did live next door.

In villages, where we see this more natural application of this relationship, everybody knows each other, right? Yeah, so that's why that's recommended more, because the more natural interaction and doing things together, in other words, the element of Sankirtan is more natural, right? In the city, it's got to be based more on getting something done. You know, okay, we'll do the Ratha Yatra festival. Then they'll get together.

But if there's no Ratha Yatra, no one gets together. While in the village, you can't avoid getting

together, right? There's no place to hide. So that's why it's a more natural environment.

Does that make sense? Yeah? Okay. We understand the point here? So it's not a complaint about devotees decide to have a lawn party. No, it's not that.

It's a point, what is the underlying motive? But the point is, is ultimately they got together, took prasada. That's better than sitting in the house doing nothing and not interacting, even if it was simply for social interaction. Still, it's better because there's activity.

And that activity here, in this case, is connected to Krishna. So that's the point. Activity is better than inactivity.

As long as it's proper activity. If it's improper activity, better they do nothing. Better he sat at home and watched television than got in his car with his machine gun and killed the guy next door along with five other mushrooms.

That would have been better. So we're meaning appropriate action here. That's what he's saying.

Okay. Real nonviolence is achieved not by speculation but by accepting the process given by the Lord. In verse 13, Krishna gives a practical method how to counteract the sins we inevitably commit while acting in the material world.

One should perform sacrifices for the pleasure of yajna. The foremost of these sacrifices is to honor the remnants of food offered to Lord Krishna. Yes.

You know what's the supreme, right? In order to save humanity from sin, the Lord appears as proper action, yajna. In other words, action that's proper, that becomes yajna. Because what's proper, there must be the element of working for someone else's benefit.

Krishna is alone, we could say. His Atmarama. The cosmic creation is unmanifest.

So when he manifests creation, what does he do in relationship to that creation? He interacts. The creation has to interact because it's dependent upon him. But he's not dependent upon the creation.

But the point is that he has manifested. Because not doing anything has a certain amount of pleasure. But interacting has more pleasure.

Therefore, action is always superior. So yajna means that you're interacting and it's for the other's benefit. When Krishna interacts with the devotees, he does it for his own benefit or for the devotees' benefit? Right.

He enjoys doing things to please the devotees. The devotees get pleasure doing things to please him. So that's the standard of interaction.

So according to this technical word here, that means yajna. Yajna means voluntarily giving up the results of action for someone else's pleasure. Right? So now that may be a fire sacrifice.

That may be out on Harinam. It may be whatever you do. So in other words, action is yajna.

When action is not done as yajna, then it's useless action. Because something done to just benefit yourself won't actually benefit yourself. You can only benefit yourself in relation to others.

Yes. The condition of activities. For example, if we're trying to be efficient in the renunciation service, then the service in the way it used to be gets disrupted or whatever.

What's there for us to take care of together? Which one's better? Which one's better? What shall we do? What's the rotation? What's the priority? Depends upon what the situation is. If it's in general, then aren't taking care of guests part of your defined duties? Yes? No? Yes. So therefore, guest means that they're not always there.

Right? Atithi means they come and stay. The definition of guest, or atithi, means a brahmana, basically an unknown brahmana comes unannounced, and you take care of them. But for one night.

Right? Past that, it is pious to extend that to three days. Right? If there's some way. But also guests have to know their position.

You know what I'm saying? Non-persons or relatives or friends and that, technically they're not atithi. So in other words, atithi means everything in the house stops and it's all about the guest. Right? So if it's someone else other than this, then that would mean it doesn't necessarily have to stop.

You'll accommodate, but you'll accommodate them in what's already happening. You know what I'm saying? In other words, an atithi, you make special arrangements to take care of them or feed them or do this. If a friend comes over, it's just whatever's available.

That's what you eat. Does that make sense? There's a difference. So it's a point of working it into what's going on there.

Does that make sense? So how you take care of atithi is your standard, but then you apply it to the time and place and circumstance of what's actually there. Right? So if you have some work that has to be done right now, then maybe you go, someone other member of the family takes care of the guest. And then you do that and come back.

But if it's something that, okay, you could do it later, then you do it later. Does that make sense? This may be the time you change your japa, but no, you take care of the guest. Does that make sense? But if it's a matter of you're dressing Radhamatava, so if you stay at home and take care of the guest, then the curtain's open and nothing, you know, what? Why is he still wearing his

night outfit? Do you understand? So you have to find the proper balance.

Is that okay? So what would be the definition of someone who's coming to the temple on a daily basis? Is he a guest or is he a friend? Coming to the temple. Yeah, like a regular visitor, like one of the devotees who are coming to the temple, should we treat him as a guest or as a friend? If he's a regular part of the scene, then you're going to treat him according to what his position is. You know what I'm saying? He's one of the devotees, and whatever's your general program, you just see that facility is there.

You know? Does that make sense? You know, you have ten asanas, but now twelve devotees are coming, so you get two more asanas and stuff like that. So simple things, just whatever's a natural thing. Now, a person comes in, he's a very powerful person, a very rich person, somebody respected in the community for something, then there might be a little extra attention for whatever it is he wants to get his charita first because he's got to go to his board meeting or stuff like that.

So little things like that you're looking at. You know what I'm saying? In other words, everyone gets according to their position because there's also the order of respect, what are the levels of respect. So by devotion, by knowledge, by influence, by wealth, by fame, by age, by performance of sacrifice like that, religious duties, these are considerations.

So whoever has any of these, that is to be respected. Whoever has more of those, they're more respected. You know what I'm saying? You have the younger devotee, he's the temple president, okay? But he's only been around for, you know, five years, okay? And, you know, things were just normal and going on and, you know, nothing out of the ordinary.

You know, he's doing good. He's the president, you know, he's to be respected for that. But then there's a devotee who's been there in that yatra for thirty years, you know, and he, you know, was the temple president, you know, back when, before the dinosaurs were extinct, right? But, you know, he's done so many things, gone to government, you know, spent so much difficulties and so many things for that temple to establish it.

He's done more sacrifice than the temple president. So the one is to be respected for what his age and that and his sacrifice. But as far as authority goes, the temple president is the temple president.

So when it comes to administration, the temple president's the boss. It doesn't matter who he is or who he thinks he is. But at the same time, the temple president respects him for what he's done, right? Does that make sense? So the Vedic thing is you have to be able to accommodate all that.

Then you're called human, right? So it's not just black and white. I'm the president so everyone else can jump. No, it doesn't work like that.

But the basics should still be there, that we should give them the time and the scope of the

prasarana. Yeah, yeah, all those things are there, you know, if it's, you know, all that's there. Because the point is, that means part of pancharatra is taking care of the guests.

But here it's not specifically guest meaning, it's specifically atithis, you know, but it's guest meaning that they come to the temple. So there's association with the devotees and it's taking care of those who visit the temple. Like that.

I mean, they must be not ordinary because if you have to do puja and there's a crowd of them and you have to move through that crowd, by touching them, you don't become impure for doing your puja. You can't say, well, now I have to go take bath. So they can't be ordinary because they've come to the temple to see the Lord.

So that means there is some, you know, purity of purpose there. You know, how much realization, these things, that's another thing. In order to save humanity from sin, the Lord appears as proper action, yajna.

Performance of yajna is the only way to make progress in life. Sacrifices are born of prescribed duties found in the Vedas. The Vedas are directly manifested by the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Thus, the transcendental Lord is ever situated in the acts of sacrifice. One who does not follow the regulations of this cycle lives a useless life full of sin, engaged in sense gratification only. So that basically, that paragraph sums it up.

You understand? In other words, you're going to do action, but the action to make it actually proper has to be yajna. It has to be sacrificed. The sacrifice comes from performance of proper duties.

Proper duties are defined by scripture. Scriptures come from the Lord, right? So in other words, if your activities are not being done to please the Lord, then whatever you're doing is basically useless. It doesn't matter how nice it is.

It's still useless. Yes? Maharaj, if someone's performing an activity that is not a prescribed duty... It is not a prescribed duty. ...and they offer the results of that in sacrifice, is that considered sacrifice? They're doing something that's not a prescribed duty and they're offering it as... For someone else's benefit.

But it depends what it is. What does that mean? What would be an example? You know what I'm saying? Because it's something so general. Well, for example, if somebody steals something... Somebody steals something, okay.

And then? And then they give part of that for somebody else. They give part of that for someone else. Okay, so what part of that are you considering yajna? Yajna is the bit that you're giving for someone else.

Well, that was your question, no? Is it sacrifice? So how is it sacrifice? I'm just saying. We have to analyze. Because he's giving it for somebody else's benefit.

He's giving it for someone else's benefit. Why is he giving it for someone else's benefit? Because he knows that performing sacrifice is good. How does he know performing sacrifice is good? Because he heard from authority.

He's heard from authority. Okay, getting closer. And what are these authorities? Shastra.

Shastra, okay. So, you're saying he's heard from bona fide devotees based on scripture that one should offer sacrifice. So, but the point is, is it just generic sacrifice? Or is it also the element of connection to the Lord? So what's the, you know, I'm just saying.

So you have these two. They could have performed the sacrifice. He stole something and gave some to someone else for their benefit.

But it could also be connected to the Lord or not connected to the Lord. So what does it mean if it's not connected to the Lord? Why is he giving it? He's heard that he should be sacrificed. So he's elevating himself.

He's purifying himself, definitely. You know, it doesn't mean that he's not going to get a reaction for stealing. But it means he's elevating himself by giving some of that to someone else.

But he's heard from authority, so he's doing it. But what's his motive? So he will get a better result. Yes, so he'll get a better result.

So therefore, it comes within the element of karmakanda. But because it's going to give him a reaction, now when he gets caught for stealing, then what? Right? Then he'll be punished. So that means his performance of duties won't be able to continue.

Right? In other words, you should be doing activities in such a way that they will continue. Right? Why do an activity that's not going to continue? Right? The soul likes things to be pretty steady. You know, eternal kind of works for the soul.

Right? Does that make sense? So that's why sinful activities aren't recommended. Because there's always a bad reaction that will stop your performance of whatever you're doing. Right? But you do good work, you'll get good facility.

You can continue doing what you're doing. You know what I'm saying? By stealing nicely, it doesn't give you the ability to steal more nicely. You understand? By going in and following all the rules of stealing so that you perfectly pull off the perfect crime and don't get caught, that doesn't give you the piety to now be able to steal more.

You understand? Does that make sense? You get better at stealing? You get better at stealing until the point you get caught. Okay. You know what I'm saying? So it ends.

But so the point is, let's say you do something pious. Then you get a good result. Then you have more facility to perform more of that piety.

You understand? So that's why pious activities are what's recommended to use as a platform of prescribed duties as opposed to impious. And why is that? Why would there be this difference? One can continue and expand and the other can't. Yeah.

One expands and one doesn't. Simple. Remember, we're in the third chapter of Bhagavad Gita discussing yajna.

Coming from the Lord. Okay, well, because one of them is pleasing to Krishna and the other is not. Okay? As far as activity goes, one is pleasing, one is not.

But what's the important element? Yes, the important element of activity. Get a result? Okay. But then, is that enough? It should be connected to Krishna.

Okay? So in other words, the activity being connected to Krishna, that's the main point. So that he's doing this, he's offering sacrifice, he's giving part of his results of his stealing to someone else. And he's based that on hearing from authorities that this is a good thing to do.

Right? Even as far as his own benefit, he will, that aspect will elevate him. So either at some point he'll become purified and give up the stealing or he'll be caught punished and he'll give up the stealing. Something will work because he'll move up on that.

Does that make sense? Because it's sustainable. But the point is that if it's connected to Krishna, that's the important element. So the point is that being connected to Krishna, that's a good thing.

Why not connect good, why not connect activities that Krishna considers good? You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? If there's a choice, why wouldn't one accept something better? Right? Does that make sense? So that's yoga. So since this yajna has to be offered to the Lord, why not offer that which is better? Is that okay? So still the active ingredient is this connection to the Lord. That's why you go to so much trouble.

Otherwise someone would say, oh, stealing is okay. As long as you give some of it away to someone else. But that's not the point.

The point is, where is it connected? Why would one be giving something away to someone else? You know what I'm saying? So what is this motive, what's behind that? You have to analyze. Sorry, Robin Hood, right? Robin Hood, yeah. Steal from the rich, give to the poor.

So it's nice. It would be pious in this way. He wants to benefit the poor people.

But at the same time, the rich work for it. And if the rich deserve that, why should he feel he can steal it? You know what I'm saying? Does that make sense? So you have all these conflicting elements on the material platform. On the spiritual platform, there's no conflicting elements.

As Krishna is action, he is that sacrifice. And if it's connected to him, then there's no contradiction. So that's what we were saying before.

Good work done with good consciousness, then that's what we're trying to obtain. So the important element is the consciousness. Because if that's there, even if the work is not ideal, still one will be elevated.

But if someone's doing bad work with a good consciousness, if they remain there, it means their consciousness is not good. It means they remain for some time, but after some time, then it's a problem. Like we see, I think it was kind of early 70s, like that.

Then there was around the world, there were like, I kind of remember, there were like three or four, they were devotees. But it means they were drug dealers. And then they became devotees.

So they continued their occupation. And they would use the money to do things for the temple. So that went for some time, they're becoming purified.

But instead of becoming purified, because they make lots of money, they could have done something else, invested in something else, figured out some way to make money. Because if they're making money, they're smart, so why don't they do something? But they didn't, they just kept doing what they were doing. So they considered, it's fine to do this.

No, as a beginning, it's a place to start, but you don't remain like that. So all over, then this was going... Means not all over, means they were saying this, there was somebody on the West Coast, I think someone in Hawaii, someone in England, someone like this. There were a few like this.

And then, interestingly enough, I think it was within a few weeks, all of them got caught at once by the police. All of them. So Krishna arranged that they weren't moving forward.

So then they got like that, so then you go to jail. You know, you sit in jail, you got to think about things. And then when they came out of jail, then they weren't dealing drugs to raise money for Krishna.

You understand? In other words, they had, in one sense, proper consciousness, improper activity, but, as you said, because the activity is improper and they were continuing with that, so it would affect the consciousness. So at some point, then it's not progressive to be in that situation. So then Krishna arranged they were not in this situation anymore.

Does that make sense? It was about that temple he was in, but... Oh, okay. He was always... Yeah, yeah. Oh, it was his own family business.

So he could start a, how do you say, a table for mocktails or something. Yeah. Marge, maybe you can correct me if I'm wrong in this story, because this goes way back to those days you just

mentioned, where some of these devotees gave Prabhupada a rather large donation, and then it came to... I mean, this may be a Prabhupada sense story, so that's why I'm placing it.

So, they gave a rather large donation to Prabhupada. He became aware of where the money came from. So, I was told that Srila Prabhupada said, because you have given this to Krishna, there's no reaction.

But because you've gotten this money the way you did, you don't get the benefit. Could be. But this is what we mean, there's no sin.

You know. I'm not sure, like that. But the point is, the benefit will be less because of the consciousness that would be involved to gain money in that way.

Does that make sense? Because it'll take a certain consciousness to do it. That's why it's always recommended that one is performing activities according to prescribed duties, you know, which is, generally speaking, easy enough to do. It's just a matter of if one is comfortable working actually at the position that is your nature.

That's generally the difficulty, acknowledging that, you know, this is all, this is what I got. You know. Like that.

Verses 17 to 35. In order to set a proper example, Arjuna should perform his duties without attachment. Performance of yajna gradually transforms the karmakandi into a karma yogi.

Karma yogi's objective is no longer material sense gratification, but liberation. By performing karma yoga, the karma yogi becomes completely detached from material activities. Still, in order to set a good example for others, he carries on his prescribed duties.

Generally, nobody works unless he is motivated by sense enjoyment. Arjuna refused to perform his duty because he could not see how he would gain from the fight. To defeat this primordial selfishness of the conditioned soul, the Lord introduces the principle of sacrifice.

If one lives only for oneself, he lives in vain. Verse 16. In order to progress in life, one should learn how to serve others.

The best way to serve others is to serve the Supreme Personality of Godhead, right? Otherwise, you can try to water each leaf. You're not going to get much. If you water the root, then all the leaves will benefit.

In 247, Krishna already stated that Arjuna is not qualified to renounce his duties. Now the Lord reveals that even those who are qualified to stop the work do not abandon their prescribed duties because this would be a bad example for the common people. A self-realized person is motivated to act, although he is not attached to the results of his action.

His motivation comes from a desire to serve others by giving them a proper example to follow. Even the Lord himself acts as a matter of duty because the ultimate authority he has to set, as

the ultimate authority has to set the proper standards for all living beings. See, it's because you're going to have the element where one's realization, because the process is very powerful, one's realization may come quicker than the natural end of those duties.

Does it make sense? Someone will be, enters grhastha life for his own purpose, right? But he wants to connect it to Krishna and everything like this. Then he's engaged in the grhastha asrama and he's following all the proper duties. So he's trying to see everything in connection to Krishna.

In doing that, it may come with time that he advances to the point where he actually doesn't require to be married. His realization is such that he doesn't require to be in the asrama. But at the same time, the duty would continue because if that's favorable or that's the point in the asrama, then, you know, there's no harm in doing that.

Because the point of doing it is to have that realization. You have that realization. What does it matter if you do it or not? Does that make sense? Before one was doing it because one had to.

Now one could do it or not do it. So what's the problem in doing it? Right? What would be the problem in continuing? Right? Does that make sense? So in this way, one, it becomes a comfortable situation of which to perform one's service because one is adjusted with it. So it's not a new situation to get used to.

Two, others involved in the family, they're comfortable with it because it's running nicely because of the person being actually properly realized and doing everything in connection to Krishna. And three, here is what Krishna is pointing out, is that they set a proper example for others. Right? Because others should be performing the grhastha duties on that platform of realization.

That's what it's for. But they're not. So this person could set example.

Does that make sense? So it's not just purely to set example. The point is you use some medium to serve Krishna, some form of yajna. So since he's doing this, he's comfortable with this, so therefore he continues that.

Right? There's no reason to give it up. That's why the vanaprastha ashram is there. It can either mean basically completely giving up the grhastha ashram or not, depending upon the situation.

If the grhastha ashram is favorable to his Krishna consciousness, there's no need to leave it as such. It's just one switches the mode from grhastha to vanaprastha. So in other words, the focus instead of it being on... It means the situation is still a family living together, but the focus on making the family prosperous switches to making the family simply engaged in sadhana.

Right? Does that make sense? So instead of making money, it's a matter of preaching and association and that. Does that make sense? There's a difference in that. But if that situation is not favorable, then it may be left.

Right? In other words, if you've had the realization, then you can leave. Right? Like we see Prabhupada. He tried so much to make the family Krishna conscious.

So now with his time in the life just to devote to that, if the family wanted to follow, he was going to run the business and do everything, so he would have continued as a vanaprastha. But they weren't interested, so he had to go off and start on his own. Right? In that situation, that is, Godbrother said, so it takes some youngs.

Does this make sense? Yes? Yes. Generally we hear that someone is recommended to take vanaprastha after age 50. Yes.

But if that realization comes and he makes that focus, switches it from economic development to increasing the sadhana of the family members before 50, Well, the point is that if it's sacrifice, then if we take sacrifice to its meaning, volunteering, working for others' benefit, that one would move into that vanaprastha early. Who is it a sacrifice for? Who's benefiting? Everybody. Are they benefiting? The wife.

The wife. The wife is still young, and so she's really happy that now you're not buying her any more saris or perfumes or taking her on vacation to Puri anymore, because now all you do is sit in the temple and chant japa. You are benefiting.

Yes, so you are benefited, but the point is you have the responsibility of the family until 50. You get married, you're stuck. It's not a matter of, you know, tomorrow I got married today and then tomorrow I become self-realized, and so I take sannyas.

It doesn't work like that. You know what I'm saying? It's a commitment. You know what I'm saying? If the whole family has like that, then great, then move on.

They're not interested in all this stuff. They'd rather, you know, work more on preaching and all that, then great. But the point is it has to work together.

You know what I'm saying? It has to be done in such a way that it still works, right? Prabhupada still ran the business. The family still benefited. But they wanted more and more, then that's not going to happen, because he's already at that age that he doesn't have to.

So if they cooperate, then, you know, Krishna's involved, they're taken care of, it works nice. If they don't cooperate, then at some point then, you know, he has to take care of himself, because now is the time when he can take care of himself. Before that, no, you take care of the family.

But connect that all to Krishna. So that's yajna. So you have to move at the nature of the family, right? And that's why then you have to make sure that your family is the same nature as you.

Right? Does that make sense? You know, some of the brahminical nature, marry some of the brahminical nature, some of the kshatriya, kshatriya, vaisya, vaisya, shudra, shudra. Otherwise,

then you're not going to be satisfied. Does that make sense? Okay, so, in other words, one is learning to serve others, right? So brahmacarya, what does he do? Yeah, he's serving others.

What does a grhastha do? Serving the family. You know, what is a vanaprastha doing? Serving Krishna, but also, but just in the social element. Teaching the community, right? Because they don't go into the forest and disappear like the sannyasis.

What do the sannyasis do? They visit and serve everyone by teaching and preaching. Yes, teaching and preaching. Does that make sense? So everybody is learning to serve.

That's the whole thing, right? The brahmin is serving the shastra, so he's performing yajna. The kshatriya, who is he serving? The community. Yeah, the community, by offering protection.

Right? The vaisya, how is he serving? Providing. He gives in charity, like that, does good works, you know, and he gives tax to the kshatriyas. Right? And the shudra, how is he serving? In the service.

Yeah, in the service. Straight definition, right? Like that. Very obvious.

That's the problem. It's so obvious, no one wants to be this shudra. That's the problem.

It's just too obvious. Okay? So now Arjuna is not in a position to renounce his duties. Right? He's a grhastha, and he's fully absorbed in that.

The reason he's on that battlefield is because of his social considerations. Duryodhana and his brothers have insulted him and his family. They've taken their kingdom, and now they want to rectify all that.

Does that make sense? So, therefore, he shouldn't abandon his duty. Right? And even if he was qualified to, since he's in that situation, you know, no one would expect, you know, a middle-aged man to take sannyasa. If he did, okay, great.

But if he doesn't, no one's going to say anything. Right? But when he gets older, then they might expect that. So, until he gets to that age, then he sets example as a proper grhastha.

Then when he gets older, then he sets example as a vanaprastha, or as a sannyasa. Does it make sense? You know, so if it... So, this is the beauty of prescribed duty, is that if you're working in a detached way, then that means you have to be able to perform an activity without motive. Right? Why does somebody do something? Why is a material activity performed? Yeah, they want something.

There's a motive. Now, if you become realized and there's no motive, would you want to be doing activities that are not good, good, that are not beneficial? Right? Means you can do a bad activity as long as you see yourself getting some benefit. But if you're not working for your own benefit anymore, why would you want to do an activity that's not beneficial? You understand? Yes, until there's some attachment.

But if there's no attachment, why would you want to be stuck with that? So, that's why prescribed duties are recommended, because a prescribed duty, whether you want the result or not, is still beneficial. You understand? So, because the idea of the Vedic, it's not like the Mayavadis, that material is one, spiritual is another. The material and spiritual are seen, it means it's a non-different, because it's Krishna's energy.

It's running under Krishna's laws, so everything has to be connected to Krishna. Right? So, if it's connected to Krishna, that means whatever activities I'm performing should be connected to the Lord. So, whether I'm self-realized or not, the activity itself affords that opportunity.

So, the same opportunity, if I'm grossly attached to my senses and everything, the activity is still valid. And as I advance, and I become less and less attached to my own sense gratification, my own purposes, then the same activity becomes useful. Now, is that not efficient? Right? That's a non-dual system.

Right? It matches the Lord. He's non-dual. It matches.

Right? But now, the Mayavadi system, that's a dualistic system. Right? So, dualism automatically means mundane. Right? Because there's a difference between dead matter and the soul.

You know? Then there's good, bad, this, that, based on that. Does it make sense? Isn't this interesting? The Mayavadis, though they're monists, you know, they follow a dualistic system. And the Vaishnavas, though they're, they, you know, they're dualists, but they follow a non-dual system.

This is always the trick. I always find this really, really fun. You know, is that the way it works? Okay.

The self-realized person should show others how to perform their prescribed duties for the pleasure of the Lord, Srila Prabhupada writes in *Renunciation Through Wisdom*. Like others, sages who are in knowledge of the Absolute Truth maintain their bodies. But the difference is that the goal of all their activities is to satisfy Lord Vishnu.

Wrong and simply bad association has tightly bound up the innocent populace in mean activities. But the learned man, the karma yogi, can show society how to perform all these activities for the satisfaction of the Lord. So he's maintaining himself, but just to please the Lord.

So that's the point. He's setting an example for others. That's not his goal, is to just set an example.

He's doing it to please the Lord. That sets the goal. I mean, that sets the standard.

You know, sets the example. Does that make sense? Because setting an example on its own, what is the meaning? You should set an example. Why? Why should you set an example?

Because everyone follows you.

Okay. Now, you're setting this example. Everyone's following you.

Now, how are you benefiting them? They're performing their prescribed duties. Okay. So they're performing their... You do prescribed duties to set example.

They see that. They follow. And they perform their prescribed duties.

How have they benefited? They're following. But all they've done is... They get elevated. But on what platform? Okay.

Platform of accepting authority. So now, up to now, all this is very pious. It's just karma.

Good karma. You understand? So, what's the real example? Yes. It's connected to Krishna.

So, you're not just following to set a good example. You're following it to please Krishna. That sets the example.

So, what is the example? Perform your prescribed duties to please Krishna. Otherwise... I'm only doing this to set an example. Then you set example to perform prescribed duties.

Others may take that example, the heart, and perform their prescribed duties. So, it's pious. It's good.

But it's not spiritual. You understand? So, when they say... When Krishna says they're setting example, he means that you are Krishna conscious. Right? And you're performing this activity, you know, to please Krishna.

You don't have to do it, but you're doing it simply because others can see how to perform this duty to please Krishna. That's the example. You understand? What have we done here? We haven't changed the point.

We've changed the focus. Yes. So, it connects to Krishna.

In other words, like all these things, you're performing sacrifice. It only means sacrifice is connected to Krishna. So, setting example only has meaning if it's connected to Krishna.

Right? Otherwise, you say, someone did something wrong in the community. Okay, we have to punish them. We have to set an example.

Okay, great. But what does that mean, set an example? Set an example of what? Yeah, no one else should do it, and this and that. So, no one else should do what? What's wrong with having done what they did? What's the problem? Devotee made service a little more difficult, but that activity wasn't so favorable to service.

Okay, devotee wasn't so favorable. They've done, you know, something wrong, whatever it is,

and the management tried to take, you know, power, or this, or facility, or, you know, something else that we would consider socially. But what's actually wrong with it? But the example does not set a positive impetus for the person to connect to Krishna.

Yes, that's the point. Is that when we say, well, we have to set example, set example of what? Unless it's an example of how if you do like this, then it connects to Krishna, how if you don't do like this, it doesn't connect to Krishna. So, if you connect to Krishna, you become Krishna conscious.

If you don't connect to Krishna, then you get entangled in material consciousness. So, unless the example brings that out, then what is the example done? It will become an example of rules. Yeah, rules.

People, it will be seen negatively. So, people will know if I do this, if I do anything wrong, then the community is going to come down on me in this way. So, therefore, do I want to be involved in such a community because I'm fallible, I may do something wrong.

In fact, I may already be doing wrong what they're complaining about, I just haven't gotten caught, you know. So, I better not jump. Yeah, yeah.

Or the person who's jumping up and down, he's also doing, but if you yell and scream at someone else, no one will notice him. It's standard. It works, right? You know, things are falling apart in your country, so you declare war on another country and everybody looks over there, you know.

It's standard. It's a standard political technique. You know what I'm saying? So, what's the real motive behind? So, if it's to inspire people in Krishna consciousness, then setting example is that.

No, the person needs to be corrected for their own benefit. Oh, we're already over time. We'll end here.