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BVPM: **The *ksatriya* is not afraid during battle. He cannot be surpassed by others, even in times of great distress or great stress; his senses do not become fatigued. He is expert in accomplishing his tasks, even if his death is certain, he does not flee, turning his back to the enemy. Without restriction, he gives up his wealth. He shows power of domination over those who should be controlled and who transgressed the law, for protection of the citizens. These are the activities of the *ksatriya* arising from his previous impressions.**

**“Without restriction, he gives up his wealth.”** So there’s no consideration that he’s going to gain something from it, because that’s not his purpose. His purpose is protection. The *vaisya*, his purpose is profit, so there’ll be considerations there. But, for him, there’s not, which means he can give away his whole kingdom. You don’t hear of that. Businessmen may give away a lot of money, but they still have a lot left. A king can give away his kingdom, half his kingdom. They’re different in this way.

**“He shows power of domination over others who should be controlled and who transgressed the law, for protection of the citizens.”** In other words, most people need some control. If it’s not in place, things don’t work. Bhagavatam defines that the sun rises on time and all the different seasons, everything happens in the universe because of fear of the Lord. If they were not afraid, they’d be doing something else. They’d be busy.

He sees that everybody’s controlled, everybody does their job. If punishment is there, everybody is in line, everybody is good. That means the whole society goes very nicely. Those who need to be controlled, who can transgress the law, they can be the same persons, they can be different persons, and then, for the protection of the citizens, that’s the reason he’s doing this.

Here, he uses the word *isvara-bhava*, “for protection of the citizens”. So *isvara-bhava*, not just that you control everybody, you control for protection, if its just control, it’s not *isvara-bhava*. *Isvara* means the controller, and he controls for protection . The Lord controls the universe for protection. Maintainance means protection. IF he’s not protecting he’s not a *ksatriya*, there’s some purpose of gain there. All this is done to protect the citizens, not that you protect the citizens to get what you want. You do what you want to protect the citizens.

Q: Maharaja what if there’s a conflict between *varna*  and *asrama*? For example the temple president is a *brahmacari*, hes not supposed to protect women or *grhasthas…*

BVPM: So, if he’s not protecting them, what should he be doing? Exploiting them?

It’s like this. The *brahmacari’s*  in the temple in the city or something. So, according to that definition you gave, then the *brahmacari* should be out in the forest. No women out there, so no problem. Very few *grhasthas* out there. You might have to watch out for the unibomber.

Why do we accept all those different things, you don’t mind the Sunday feast, *maha-prasadam*, but shouldn’t you be out in the forest eating leaves fruits and roots, throw in a little bark for spice. This is the problem. We choose just what we want. Your problem was the *brahmacari* is having to protect women and *grhasthas*, you didn’t mention that the *brahmacaris* aren’t supposed to be in control. Not supposed to deal with money. You didn’t mention that part. That part’s okay, because that part then seems like a facility. But protecting the women and *grhasthas*, that’s a responsibility. That gives trouble, while the other one seems to give happiness, position. They go together.

*Brahmacari* means he’s a student. He focuses on menial service. He will be looking at it as menial service. He is protecting for following the order of guru. The guru wants the service done, its preaching. That’s what he’s looking at. So, to preach, you have to take care of the devotees who are involved in that. And you’re doing it under the direction of guru. You’re not independent.

Just by doing that, his senses are already engaged. It’s done, but the *grhastha* is in an environment where he has the position of being in that as a *grhastha* is basically purely emotional and sensual. You don’t get married because of an intellectual concept. Intellectual need is why you got married. You can go home and tell your wife “Wow, we just worked out the quantum theory of universal management!” “Great. Did you bring the cauliflowers? Nice nice.” That’s why one got married. Its purely emotional and sensual on this platform.

Of course, the foundation is religious, but religious means, you have a nature that needs to address the emotions and senses, so the religious platform is to engage that as a *grhastha*. Therefore, women are a prominent element. Now, it’s a matter of connecting the senses to the Lord through that medium, rather than just directly as a *brahmacari* does.

*Brahmacari* simply, the order of the spiritual master, he does that. The *grhastha* does the order of the spiritual master, but the field he uses is that of the *grhastha* environment. The approach is different. It’s not that you can’t deal with the same field.

The point is that we have to know what we’re doing. The difficulty is that we will take it that the rule is actually the point. The rule is for manifesting the point. Why do you go into a kitchen? To cook, not because you like playing with knives or fire. Someone who likes knives and fire, then cooking is a nice way to engage that. There might be other ways that are less nice.

It engages that pots and this and that and all the different things that go along with it. Those are all engaged, you like that medium, but the point is cooking. So, if you went in there and did all pots and pans, this and that, and nothing came out cooked, would somebody consider this valuable? No. So, therefore if one engages in household life and at the end of that, what comes out of it is not engaging the body mind and words in the Lord’s service, then it was a waste of time. It’s like the guy going in, banging the pots around and turning the fire on.

That’s what’s going on. Because people don’t know that cooking is what you’re supposed to do in the kitchen, therefore, everybody’s banging pots and doing that, and they all think that they’re great *grhasthas*. You sit down at the pub and talk about, “I banged on the pot in this way, it made this kind of sound. What did your pot do?” That’s what’s going on in the material world.

We doggedly stick on this point that the focus is on the rule. Here, we also see, **“He shows power of domination over others who should be controlled and who transgressed the law, for protection of the citizens.”** He’s not doing because morality must be upheld and we must say something, we must set an example. No. that’s all *vaisya* stuff. You just watch it. The guy that’s most upset about moral problems in the community, you probably if you check, he’s the most worried about money and business. They go together, justice morality and economics.

Those three comprise the *prana-maya*, extended sense gratification. That’s why you always notice that that class will be the most outspoken about it, which is important because it’s like this: If somebody can get away with doing something socially that’s not good. Behaving with something else, it means that they could steal your money. So, for them, if ethics is not in place, it means it could be economic loss. That’s actually the underlying point.

Not the ethics. They themselves, if they do something wrong, then everybody should be broadminded, its only everybody else, because they’re not worried they’re going to steal their own money. This is the difference between a *ksatriya* and a *vaisya*. We just say if he gets angry all the time, he’s a *ksatriya*. No, anger is in the mode of ignorance, so that means the guy’s a *sudra*, or he may be a *dvija*, but he needs to control his anger. Anger is not a symptom in all that we’ve read here, we didn’t notice that.

**“These are the activities of the *ksatriya* arising from his previous impressions.”** This also brings up the element of nurture or nature. The Christians have how many angels can dance on the head of a pin, or the Buddhists have what’s the sound of one hand clapping, so the educationalists, its nature/nurture. Everybody has their little thing to keep them busy.

Here “arising from previous impressions.” means its nature. But someone who has that nature, you can train them to use that in a very high grade way. You take the nature and nurture that. But, you can’t nurture something that’s not there. Like we take this rock and situate it very nicely, put it in the water, some sun, so it will turn into a nice tree. Right? Why not?

It’s not the nature. But no, nurture is the thing. It’s how you take care and everything. It may be the nature of the seed to grow, but if I just leave it in the corner somewhere it’s not going to grow. I have to plant it. The Vedic is always the proper balance between whatever the duality is that people have a problem over. That’s just the way it is. It’s a problem in the material world because it’s a materialistic view. Spiritual view means it’s balanced.

**Farming cow protection and business are the natural work for the *vaisyas*, and for the *sudras,* there’s labor and service to others.** So these are the natural things, so therefore business means in trade. It doesn’t mean in running a hospital or different things like this, that’s business, but those aren’t the natural areas, but they’ve turned it into business so that’s natural for them.

Farming and cow protection go together. If you have cows you can keep busy, so you have a farm. For *sudras* there’s labor and service to others. Following the nature of work, every man can become perfect. If he simply takes his nature and connects it to Krishna, he’ll become perfect. That’s *daivi-varnasrama*. The *asura varnasrama* is that there’s all these different levels and that’s it. It’s not a matter of engaging. So, in the *daivi-varnasrama* it doesn’t mean that because every man can become perfect by engaging his nature, he can do something that’s not his nature. The farmer engages the *sudras* in assisting in the farming. The *sudras* don’t tell him how to do business. The *vaisyas* are making money giving tax, the *ksatriyas* are giving protection. The *vaisyas* and *sudras* aren’t telling the *ksatriya* how to behave. The *brahmana’s* giving direction the other’s aren’t telling him what to do. That stays in place. That’s his nature.

If you go into the kitchen, all utensils are equal. No one utensil is more superior to another. God created all utensils equal, but do they all do the same thing? Take your pot, cut the vegetables. Then afterwords, put the knife of the fire, afterword throw the vegetables on top of the knife, make your barbeque.

It’s very important because what we do is say “Oh we’re devotees, we’re not the body, so we don’t have to care what the body is.” Okay so take the halavah, smear it on your head, lunch is done. Babies do it all the time, they’re happy. So why do you make this distinction? Isn’t that bodily consciousness? Babies, adults, isn’t that bodily consciousness?

One of the other difficulties in establishing *varnasrama* is that we can’t make the distinction between the spiritual and material. We’re saying because its spiritual it has nothing to do with material. That’s the *mayavadi* concept. You have your face, you have the reflection in the mirror, they have nothing to do with each other, no connection at all. No. It’s exactly the same. Whether its *daivi-varnasrama* or *asuri-varnasrama*, it looks exactly the same. *Daivi* means its connected to the Lord, *asuri* means its not. You accept God in all His opulence, that’s theistic, you don’t or you only accept half, that’s atheistic. It may only be half atheistic, but it’s still atheistic. “I have a glass , full of milk and full of poison.” Is it milk or is it poison? “It’s milk with a touch of poison in it.” No. I call it poison.

Therefore, we have to be very careful in applying this that there’s not another motive. It’s a system, it’s not a matter of a motive. It’s a matter of we have a nature, what is our nature, we engage that. *Varnasrama* is simply to be clear what our nature is.

Then, if you have these qualities, then you know, “Okay, that’s what’s there, so that’s what has to be engaged.” If I don’t have a quality, why should I engage it? If you don’t have a car, should you engage it in Krishna’s service. No. The point is, you have the quality, you engage it, if you don’t have the quality, you don’t. If it’s nice and pure and clear, great, if its mixed, that’s what you engage.

Q: Can a *brahmana* by occupation can he have a position of temple president in the temple?

BVPM: What’s the problem with that?

Q: He has to pay the taxes to the government.

BVPM: Whether he’s temple president or not, he’ll still have to pay the taxes.

Q: I just read that the *brahamana* doesn’t have to pay taxes.

BVPM: But what’s that have to do with being the temple president. Even if he isn’t the temple president, he still has to pay taxes. The IRS doesn’t come in and say “Oh, you’re a temple president! Oh, you’re a Brahmana!” It doesn’t work like that. What does temple president have to do with that?

Comment: In one lecture you said the temple president is the positon of a *ksatriya.*

BVPM: In the way of understanding the relationship between the GBC and temple president, the temple president has administration. The GBC does not need administration. He’s free to preach like the sannyasi. The position of the GBC and the postion of the *sannyasi*  as far as the field of preaching, is the same. The duty is to see to the standards of preaching. The field is the same. The methods are the same, but the temple president, he has a building, he has devotees, so he has administration. Therefore, it mimics in this like the *ksatriya.* But you’ll in that you’ll see that either *brahmanas ksatriyas* or *vaisyas* will run temples.

The *brahmana* temple, the atmosphere will be very nice, pleasant comfortable, festivals and other things. The interaction with the devotees is much less formal and that kind of nice practices and all that will be strong. If they have an administrative ability, then it will go very nicely, if not, generally what happens is it goes really great, its fabulous, and then they somehow or other can’t pay the bills, so they kick him out and bring in a new temple president who can. Generally because its money, they’ll bring in a *vaisya*. *Ksatriyas*, then the temple will be very organized, very strictly, everyone’s got their place, what they do works very nicely. It’s a very formal mood, but it works because it’s all very nice. The *vaisya:* good collection, good show, nice altars, nice this and that, but that’s it. Unless you can collect, that’s the only thing that’s prominent. Everything else is second rate. They have a great looking temple, nobody in it. The *brahmanas* have so many people in it, not so great looking. *Ksatriyas* have a balance. If you go around, you can tell what’s there.

Q: So when a *brahmana* takes the position of a temple president, that would be an emergency?

BVPM: Not emergency. What is a temple? There is a difference between a temple and a kingdom. What does the temple do? What’s its function? Worship, preaching, education. Notice any *ksatriya* areas there? Purely *brahmanical*. Temples all over India are run by *brahmanas*. They may have for day-to-day management someone who comes in and does this. I’m only saying this is that why we’re keeping to this formula is that the Western mind seems only to be able to work in this way. Whoever’s in charge: that’s it. It’s very hard for them to function on the Vedic system that the guy who’s in charge of administration is not actually on the top.

Traditionally, in temples and *mathas* and everything in India, you have a temple manager, but then you have the particular *brahmana* who is actually the head of the temple. But, someone else does administration. Not as a *sudra*. It is his charge, he takes care of that, so there’s a balance between them. They have to work together. That ability to balance that one has that spiritual lead, one takes administrative lead, and they can balance the two, but the spiritual lead is prominent, or the superior of the two, then that takes more subtlety. Generally the West can’t understand that.

Like in the school. Who’s the principle of the school? They take the best teacher, so that means he’s the he doesn’t teach anymore, so how will he remain the best teacher? That’s a problem. SO what they should have is an administrator and then they have a head teacher. So, because education is the most important thing, that should be the most prominent. At the same time, it must be practical, so it can’t be that they come up with options that aren’t going to be actually able to be applied. SO there has to be a balance.

The hospital can have an administrator, but its medicine that’s the prominent thing, not making money. So, there must be a balance. So, you have a company, you have a board. The board is to give that broadness to it that the one person running the company may not be able to do, but now the board’s in charge. It’s your company, you make it public, you get the money, you expand the business, everyone’s making money, but the board doesn’t like what you’re doing so they kick you out. It’s your company, but they can do that because now they own it.

These are not natural positions. So it says according to nature. It’s not a matter that this can’t be done, it’s a matter of what are you dealing with? What’s actually the point? But, we’re saying the position though, is that because there is administration, so it should be that the *brahmana*, who is running the temple should be someone who can relate to management and things, because they’re there. What is a prime minister, what are these other ministers? They’re *brahmanas* who function in a *ksatriya* environment. But, if he’s smart he’s going to have other *brahmanas* who’s areas are preaching and teaching and these things.

Comment: So the reasone we don’t have *brahmana* temple presidents because they want to take the positon of Krishna?

BVPM: I don’t see that we have problems with them. We have problems with economics that some of them are good at it, and others are not. The problem is our misunderstanding, because when he does have a problem they bring in the biggest collector and make him the temple president. He pays the debt and everybody’s happy with that, but once he pays the debt, now where does he focus? It’s still just collection.

They had to pay the debt and so they made so much money, marathons, this and that, but this still goes on. Previously it was only the Christmas marathon, now every two months there’s a marathon. Somethings going wrong. Marathon means you’re pushing beyond what comes naturally. It’s natural to push, just like a festival. That means it’s a festival of collection. How many festivals can you have? Janmastami’s one day.

The problem comes then, now what do you do with all this? There’s not a balance there. The point is you have to get a balance between these things.

Q: SO, when they bring the big collector, they should just make him as an assistant to the *brahmanas*?

BVPM : He should take charge of the collection and those things, but the temple president still remains, but because we have it that the guy on top, he has to do everything, we can’t work with these things. WE have *isvara-bhava*, but it’s not real *isvara-bhava* because *isvara* is God. God protects.

Q: Can you discuss the point of when the TP arranges for collections for Food for Life, but then uses them for something other than Food for Life.

BVPM: If somebody gives money for a specific purpose, it must be used for that. If there’s a need for a change, an actual sincere change, you want to go for something else, then it has to be discussed with the donor. If not, you either use it for what you said, or you give it back, that’s Manu.

Q: SO the Christmas Marathon, they say they’re feeding homeless children, they use it for something else like temple maintenance, and say “Yes very good, the temple earned this much money on the Christmas Marathon.”

BVPM: We made the point, now you take it and apply it.

Q: They take the people and bluff them.

BVPM: Did the *brahmacaris* in the temple have a home? They’re also homeless people, not vagrants though.

Q: Isn’t that stretching it? I read the last *sloka* of Bhagavad-gita as the supreme instruction of morality.

BVPM: Yes it’s the supreme instruction of morality, but the supreme instruction of morality is in connection to Krishna. That’s the thing you’re looking for. The weakness is that. What’s the problem that they use it in this way and the temple goes on?

In one sense, even though in one sense, it would not be as straight forward as you would like, because Rupa Gosvami says you should be straight forward in ordinary dealings, still its connected to Krishna, now if they took that and did something else that isn’t as obvious, but still we have the tendency to consider “Why that one?” “Why not *grhastha* *asrama* so much of the time is just practical that they can’t attend programs or do different things, or money has to be spent in so many ways. “ That gets connected, but indirectly. So, we have a culture, where the indirect is the most prominent, because our focus is on the field of activities. If the field is in place, everything’s perfect. Here it’s that if the money’s being spent exactly right, then everything’s perfect.

That would be a symptom, but the real perfection is “Is it connected to Krishna?” Otherwise, yes, the person’s moral, this and that and that’s good, he’s ethical, that’s good, you want somebody like that, but at the same time, if the ethics doesn’t get connected to Krishna, it’s not actually real ethics because we’re thinking the world is functioning separately from the Lord. The highest ethic means it’s connected to the Lord, just like the highest management means its connected to the Lord. They’re the highest because they see that everything’s connected. This instruction’s the highest because it shows how to connect everything. You have to balance. What’s there is a sanyassi’s coming and saying this is great they did all this and that because he’s looking at the devotees’ commitment and enthusiasm to do something nice for the temple. The *brahmacari*’s doing his service, if the temple president spends it in some other way, it’s not the *brahmacari’s* fault. He gets full benefit. The temple president is the one that now there may be a consideration “Is he using the money in exactly properly or not? And the fun part is we’re just being practical in the modern situation and all that, but that line that we’re just collecting for the poor kids and all that dates back to the 1970’s. That’s 40 years ago, so what do we mean contemporary, modern and up to date?

Q: So that would be service in the mode of passion or ignorance when we do stuff like that, it’s for Krishna, so we can do whatever we want.

BVPM: If it’s for Krishna and it gets spent for Krishna then it works, but at the same time, if it’s so prominent, then the tricking itself, we have to remember that of trickster’s, Krishna’s the greatest trickster. We know that Krishna’s the greatest cheater, then we won’t be cheated, but if we think we’re doing quite well, then, Krishna always has a way of dealing with this.

Passion means it’s the fruitive results, ignorance means it’s done in illusion against the Vedic principles. Here you could say it’s against the Vedic principles of ethics, so on that level it is, but still the higher level that it’s connected to Krishna is more important, that’s why it works, but since its being offered to Krishna, why not bring them both in line? It’s just a matter of finding another angle. Businesses and administrations and different groups that have a particular focus, they’re constantly having to change the perspective or upgrade it or in some way give some new fresh way of looking at it to inspire the people.

That’s part of the work. That means they’re not actually doing their work. They’re paying the bills. They’re getting it done, but it’s also part of their job description to come up with a way to do it that will not create a problem.

Q: In one encyclopedia, the Hare Krishna movement is defined as something that was a very pure religious movement but in the 70’s got overtaken by street hustling.

BVPM: It could be defined that way, but the point is the street hustling is still connected to Krishna. Girl scouts go door-to-door with cookies, is that street hustling? By the pure definition of the term, yes, but the point is street hustling means it has a derogatory connotation already attached. No one minds that. People go door to door for UNICEF, they just want a penny. These things are standard, but the problem is when the *vaisya* element becomes so involved in it, then it takes on a different thing.

The weakness is if it’s connected to Krishna, or not. Of course, they do the street hustling so that people don’t feel hustled, that’s better. That would be a higher quality, but then you can go, “Well instead of street hustling, we’d do something else. That would better than that.” If you want to work on the top level people that give endowments, inheritance, that means that people like your ideology or feel protected, so then you’d have to preach and follow the Vedic culture.

Q: I think in the outside charities, they’re allowed to invest something like 80% of the money to upkeep the charity.

BVPM: I think it’s up to even 90. As long as something goes to something. The Sunday Feast, the different things like that, there’s something going on. You should have that. We look at it that it all should go. But UNICEF, these big big things 90% goes into administration, so that’s why. The more that can go directly, the better.

Q: The other aspect where it’s mentioning in *sastra*, if somebody earns their livelyhood honestly, that money spends for a long time.

BVPM: Yes, but that’s why you see, where are the temples poor? It’s practical, it’s just the way it works.

We understand these difficulties we have with something are natural, but the real problem is actually the connection to Krishna, or not. That’s actually the problem. If we’re going to say “You start from wherever you’re at.” Then that’s the only mentality that can be done, then that’s where you start, connect that to Krishna. But it shouldn’t be that as you purify, and there are opportunities for improved situations and you have to take it and you’re not, that’s where the mistake comes in.

As mentioned, the *brahmana* doesn’t have facility for doing his *brahminical* occupation. He’s doing a business. Okay, that works. But now, if he has the opportunity to do a *brahminical* occupation he won’t take it because he feels he gets more money from the *vaisyas,* that’s where he loses his position, not that he’s a *brahmana* doing business. He’s a *brahmana* that could do *brahminical* activities and does business instead: That’s where the problem is.

So, if the mentality and that, the only way the see to make money is street hustling, that’s where you start, but as you get purified, then they should have the intelligence to branch out. The point is that in the 70’s we were going out and doing that and it worked very nicely. Mostly books and other things, but the thing there is that books again were getting into the element that it’s preaching, but at the same time it makes money for the temple and the temple preaches, it’s just that one’s more direct than that, but of it the books will last. You say something and people will forget, the books will remain, therefore that’s the superiority of the books over just speaking.

How did devotees live in the 70’s? Very austere. Temple president lived in his office. The *brahmacaris* lived in the closet, or in the corridor, but you kept your stuff in the BTG box in the closet. That’s how everyone lived, someone who lives like that, and they go out on the street, is anyone really going to complain? No, because what else do you have?

But nowadays, what’s the lifestyle? More sophisticated. So shouldn’t our method of generating funds be a little more sophisticated? It doesn’t mean one doesn’t go out on the streets. That’s what *brahmacaris* do, they go out. They go door-to-door. Why? Because that element brings in the aspect of humility.

Other plans that we have bring in prestige. “We’re this. We have this big thing. We’re great. You’re great. You’ve got a lot of money and we’ve got a big project, so greatness and greatness go together…” It’s good to do, but that’s more for the *grhasthas* business to do that. If *brahmacaris* can do that, great, that’s there. But if *brahmacaris* go out on the street, it’s not actually a problem. But, if that’s all you have, that’s a problem. That’s where the problem comes in because the *brahmacaris* are living the life of a *brahmana*. They beg, so the *brahmacaris* doing that, it’s not a problem, but the *grhasthas* should do something more unless they’re *brahmanas*, then that’s what they do.

We have to be able to get back to the principle, otherwise, one would just argue all day over the books, the money, how it’s being spent, this and that. It’s all connected to Krishna, but at the same time, we may not be seeing that connection. So, the weakness is, is it being connected to Krishna? Is it being seen in that light?

Q: *Brahmanas* are not supposed to take money for educating people. Is it okay to take money and pass it on to the temple or some project?

BVPM: Yes. But it should be that that’s what it’s for. That’s then what it is. Then its just expected that we’re using the temple facility, so we should be giving something to the temple for that. It’s not for himself.

Q: Then in that case, it’s okay to take as much money as possible?

BVPM: Bring out the sugarcane squeezer, bowl them over, run them through it again, until they’re about this big, last drop. You can do that. But not for yourself. But, that means that there must be a balance between what you’re offering and what you’re charging. That’s the point.

You have to be able to get to what’s the essential point. The money goes to the temple, the temple should give something for the person who’s educating. There has to be a balance. It’s not that he’s a paid worker. It’s a matter of the temple giving like this. One has to see the mentality. If we just go by rules, there’s never an exact rule, because ever situation is unique, so that means a rule has to be applied to every unique situation. That’s why only the principle can do that.

Q: Nowadays we have many *brahmacaris* in the world, who preach and they’re in paid services. They have very intimate contact with new matajis, and they’re also I see many have their own economy. They have their own jobs.

BVPM: How has that been generated? Was it there before? You go back in the society, was it there a long time before? No. Why not?

Q: Because Prabhupada didn’t set it up that way.

BVPM: Prabhupada didn’t set it up that way, but what’s the difference between that and now? What has changed?

A: The temple became dysfunctional in many places.

BVPM: That’s another thing. What’s dysfunctional?

A: Relationships.

BVPM: What’s not being done? The point is you’re preaching, women are coming. To preach, you need money. Who should be taking care of that? The temple. The *brahmacaris* aren’t being protected, so they’re going to preach. There are 5 *brahmacaris* in the temple, they deal with women having to collect the money and the 500 *grhasthas* couldn’t care less. Those 500 *grhasthas* outside, they could be taking care of all these ladies, they could be generating the money and giving to the *brahmacaris*, for just preaching. But they’re not. So does that mean the *brahmacari* will stop preaching? That’s the point. It’s not an ideal situation. But the *grhasthas* won’t take care of the women either. Because if the husband talks to the young *brahmacarini*, the wife’s not going to allow it. He cant.

Therefore that means the women should work out how to take care of these *brahmacarinis?* But they don’t want to take care. Who wants to take care of a young girl who doesn’t have any facility or this or that? She’s a trip. SO, the women don’t want to take care. What does that mean? The *brahmacarinis* have to take care of themselves. What does that mean? Catch a *brahmacari*.So which one do you catch? The one who’s making more money.

It’s a greater point. It’s not that “Oh the *brahmacaris* are doing this.” The *brahmacaris* just want to preach. They’re making the money because they’re going out and doing it. They have a job and they’re using it for preaching, that’s bad. The *grhastha* has a job he gives no money for preaching, that’s fine.

These kind of points are not “Oh, this is the thing, stop the *brahmacaris*.” Do that, you stop the preaching. It’s not ideal, but at least it’s going on. We have to look at the bigger social thing of how to actually create.

If we’re going to make a place, why aren’t the *brahmacarinis* satisfied doing full time service, this and that. Becaue there’s no facility, this and that. They’re expected to live in the same facilities as the *brahmacaries* would. That won’t work.

They have to have very nice comfortable facilities, with nice food, nice clothes, nice everything, then they’ll be comfortable there. Eventually, still they’ll need to get married, but they’ll do some nice years and they’ll get nicely trained before they do get married, but that’s not offered. Why? Who’s fault is that, the *brahmacaries?* No. That’s the *grhasthas.* They know this stuff. They don’t arrange that.

This is the problem. The social system’s not understood. No one wants to pay for what’s there, so they end up paying anyway, but not for Krishna. That’s the difference. You end up working hard, and paying for only your family, while previously, they would have worked that hard and took care of a whole temple.

The point is, women you have to spend money on them, but no one’s willing to do it, so therefore, the women have to make their own way. It’s a bigger social picture than just targeting a few points, because if we notice who we target, all the places we’ve targeted, the president because he’s an authority, not his responsibility, the *brahmacaries* because of money, ladies, *sannyasis* because they’re moving around. Why are they involved? The *gurus*. But if we notice, in all these discussions that we’ve had over the last four and a half months, not once have we ever asked a question about a *grhastha*.

Never. They are squeaky clean. Pristine, above all because they’re just being practical. What’s practical? I have needs and those needs must be taken care of and everybody can understand that, so therefore, that’s what happens. If anybody complains, we give some big emotional reaction, shut everything up, because this is just what I need. *Bas*. That’s as far as we go.

No more intellectuality than that. The point is if we say *grhasthas*  are the center of the community because that’s what Manu says, of all the situations, the *grhastha* is technically the most important, because without them the whole system doesn’t run. But it doesn’t mean they’re most respectable. They’re the most important, there’s a difference here. We say most important means most everything. No. Most important because the *grhasthas* produce *brahmacaries.*

*Grhasthas* produce the girls, the *brahmacaries* and the girls grow up and get married. The *grhasthas* retire from *grhastha* and become *vanaprathas*. The *grhasthas* are the teachers. They’re the administrators. They make all the money. They’re the most important in the *varnasram* system, but they’re not the most respectable.

Who’s more respectable? *Sannyasis* and *vanaprasthas*. How many are there? We may have 90 or 100 *sannyasis*. 81 *sannyasis*. I used to know every one of their names and where they were. That was when there were 20. So, 81. How many *grhasthas* do we have in our movement. Tens or hundreds of thousands. It’s not a big deal.

How many *vanaprasthas* do we have? I don’t even know if we could get up to 81. The point is we can balance this by knowing what’s what. If you don’t educate your *brahmacaries*, you won’t have *grhasthas*, if you don’t have *grhasthas,* the whole thing falls apart. The quality of your *grhasthas* depends on the quality of your *brahmacaries*, so therefore if education is not prominent, the society disappears. So therefore, who teaches? The *brahmanas*. That makes the *brahmanas* the most important to make it work. But the actual day to day running of it, that’s *grhasthas*.

The focal point is we have to have *satya-yuga* *sannyasis* at least *dvapara-yuga brahmacaries,* but we can have dyed-in-the-wool *kali-yuga grhasthas,* and that’s just normal. “We’re being practical.” It’s not balanced.

Q: Are the *brahmacaries* trained for becoming a good *grhasthas*?

BVPM: What does that mean, “training to be *grhasthas*.”?

A: The *brahmacaries* are given some idea of how to function as a *grhastha.*

BVPM: What are those ideas of how to function as a *grhastha*?

A: How to cooperate with the temple, how to support the temple.

BVPM: That’s an economic, that’s one thing. You have *dharma artha kama* and *moksa*. So *artha’s* been covered there. The other three? Nobody cares. As long as they give money, who cares? In the West, why do we cultivate the Indian community? Money. That’s all. We’re not making devotees. Some, but it’s not the point.

According to *gita,* what does that mean? We have to go back to what we’ve been talking about. If you want to learn something what is the first point?

A: Connect to Krishna.

BVPM: And within that, what do you connect with. When Krishna says there are 5 factors of action, what’s the first factor? The field. What’s the field for a *grhastha*?

A: House.

A: Wife.

BVPM: The wife. That’s the one point that will never be discussed. Why? Because you have to know what you’re talking about to discuss it. *Sravanam* *kirtanam*. No *sravanam*, no *kirtanam*. How much the guy learned down at the pub is not enough for *kirtanam*. What do you get at the pub? “I’ll show her who’s boss…” That’s about it.

That works for about one nanosecond, then there’s three days they don’t talk to you. SO, that one didn’t work and the amazing thing is that in so many thousands of years, the men have never worked that out.

What is the nature of man, what is the nature of woman? That’s *sankhya* philosophy. 3rd chapter, right after the 2nd chapter where we’ve discussed the understanding of *brahman* and how to see Krishna in everything, then *sankhya* is next which defines the masculine and feminine principle, the dynamics, then it works. You can apply it as a *brahmacari* into your field, and you can apply it perfectly in that field and you don’t have any need beyond that, you remain a brahmacari. If you can apply it perfectly but you want to apply it beyond that, then you become a *grhastha*. But, you don’t know that, technically, you don’t do as well as you could.

It’s not about giving money. Why do you give money to someone? You appreciate what they’re doing. If the temple does something the community appreciates, then money won’t be a problem. The problem is the temple’s not doing something to impress the community, and they’re demanding money because they’re the temple. But what’s the difference between the guy running the temple, and the guy in the community as far as his personal life? Not nessesarily much difference. Yes, maybe he’s at the temple more, he has the facility. That’s good, but he’s not any more inspiring, so why should you give him money? That’s the problem.

The temple does something inspiring, why won’t people give money? There are no collectors in Chowpatti. No collectors, but they have tons of money. Why? Because they do something that impresses the community, so the community gets together, they raise the money.

Comment: They have a policy, never ask for donations.

BVPM: They don’t ask for donations, they don’t make numbers.

Comment: I think Bhaktivedanta Manor also.

BVPM: That may be a newer thing. It works. In the past, you don’t have to say. People like to give. If there’s an opportunity to give, they give. Of course, that takes some thinking, arrangement and all that. I don’t want to make it too simplistic, here. The point is that they learn how to cooperate with the temple, and give to the temple, but what about service, time, energy?

That means training of the *brahmacari* means you train them what is the masculine and feminine principle, then that automatically divides the *brahmacaries* into those who have the *naisthika* perspective and those who have the *upakurvanta* perspective. It makes them both better *brahmacaries*.

You’re defining the principle on which its based, not techniques. The *grhastha* is the one that can give the best advice. Now, the thing is who gives the better advice, the guy in his twenties or thirties who’s a *grhastha*, or the guy in his fifties or sixties?

A: Fifties or sixties.

BVPM: Why?

A: Experience.

BVPM: Experience, but what has that experience brought out?

A: Realizations.

BVPM: Realizations in?

A: *Grhastha asrama.*

BVPM: In the *asrama*. In other words he’s speaking from principles more. When he’s twenty and thirty he did this, he got the job done, so when he tells his friend “Yeah, you do it like this, then it works.” He’s attached to that particular method, while the guy in his fifties and sixties is not. He understands the principle on which it works. So the Vedic concept is why wait until you’re fifty or sixt to figure out how things work. You should already be taught the principles from the beginning , so that when you do get married you have the knowledge of someone who’s a *vanaprastha*, but its knowledge, it’s not realization.

If you can realize it, then why would you get married? For the *vanaprastha* is the dynamic family life his focus? No. Why? Because he’s realized. So the *brahmacari* who understood what you taught him, he gets married. The *brahmacari* who understood and realized, he doesn’t. It’s that simple.

It’s not a matter of this and that about the men and women. It’s a matter of what is a man, what is a woman. The point is who’s God and what’s His creation? That’s the masculine and feminine principle. God: masculine, creation: feminine. God and His creation are exactly the same as any other male/female interaction. The same principles. Detail is different according to how you apply it, but it’s exactly the same.

Comment: IT’s a little difficult to understand.

BVPM: Ha. Yes. But this is where it starts. IF you understand this point, then you’ll understand how to train *brahmacaries*. If you don’t understand, you’ll never understand because repulsion doesn’t work. If you look in history, those who preach with the methods of repulsion, they’re all married, every last one of them, because that’s not the point.

Women are bad, so therefore, you don’t get married, but then what happens if you meet a woman who’s nice? Then what? You’re theory’s out the window.

A: Get married.

BVPM: And if we say “Because it’s all this trouble, and this and that”, then that’s renunciation in the mode of passion. Mode of passion is engaging of the mode of passion and attachment, so if its going to the negative, it works, but what happens when the pendulum goes back? Energy always moves both ways. When it comes back the other way, the get married.

Comment: Three times.

BVPM: They say, third time’s a charm. The point is what’s the principle of it. If I say “Okay. You can take a car to Calcutta, but it will cost you more money, and because you’re sitting right there in the front, you can actually see all the craziness that’s going on in the road, then you have to arrange it ahead of time, and the driver may be good, may not be good. All this and that. That’s there. But, you do have the independence that once you get to Calcutta, you can move around as you like, you can come and go at the times you please.

But the bus, you don’t have to make previous arrangements. You walk out the front gate, get on the bus. In three or four hours you’re in Calcutta. You’re farther back. You don’t see the insanity going on in the road, this and that, but once you get to Calcutta you have to get off the bus and run around, but there is one coming back in the evening, so you don’t have to worry about parking, this and that. Calcutta is small, so you can walk from one place to the next.

But there’s a problem if you have to pick up goods, you can’t carry that around. What you want to put up with. What are the benefits and what other things, then you make the choice. That’s training of *brahmacaries*. This is what a woman is. This is a what a man is. These are their common points, these are their differences.

Then, for the *upakurvanas*, “Oh, this is what it’s like, I can relate with that. I can, with confidence go into that.” And the nice thing is for the other one, its “Oh, I always thought there was something nice there, but I don’t need that.” If you’re teaching the mechanics of a car, it has nothing to do with the specific car. Mechanics are mechanics, then you can apply it to a specific car, but our problem is *brahmacari* training means we’re dealing with a specific car in the negative.

That’s why it doesn’t work. One of the points Vatsyayana mentions, is that one of the reasons women have a problem with men is because the men follow the advice of other men and try to apply that advice exactly to their own wife. Each woman’s different, but they can’t see the principle, they only see the external.

If the man explains “This happened in our family” he can either tell you the principle, or you can draw the principle, then you can take it and apply it, it will work, but if that guy who takes the advice used the advice exactly the way he applied it again, it won’t work because the situation changes. If he’s able to adjust it and make it work, he understands the principle, but he didn’t explain it to you, or you didn’t understand, so you applied the detail, so it fails.

Q: Where’s the quote from?

BVPM: Vatsyayana.

Q: The *brahmacaries* can learn the male and female principles from Bhagavad-gita in the matter of creation?

BVPM: He can learn from Gita, Bhagavatam gives more detail. It’s a principle. Feminine has a nature. It always works in the same way. it’s just a matter of what situation it’s applied. Masculine has a nature. It always works the same way.

Q: So, it’s mainly in Bhagavatam actually? This subject of male and female, how to interact?

BVPM: You can gain it from anywhere. It’s a matter of you have the knower of the field, and the field. The knower is the masculine position, the field is feminine. That means the knower of the field has something that they want to accomplish, but you can only accomplish it through the field, but the field will only respond in its own nature. The masculine principle has to deal with the feminine principle according to the nature of the feminine nature. And we’re dealing with the mode of goodness, the present. What is happening right now in that field? That applies in *grhastha* life, in business, in management, in art, anywhere. Everything’s only made of these two.

The science then is applied back into this. Bhagavatam, because it’s the greater manifestation of the Puranic element, therefore, one can see these things there. But Mahabharata has so many examples of this.

Draupadi is speaking very strongly about how they lost the kingdom. They’re out in the middle of nowhere. Duryodhana, who’s a nonsense is on the thrown and Yudhisthira, who’s good, is out in the forest. And Yudhisthira responds very calmly and very pleasantly. Though he says what he wants to say. He calls her an atheist. He says, what you’re speaking is atheistic, but he says it very nicely.

We have the examples, just we don’t pick them up.

Q: What about those self-help books. They also talk about how to interact between man and woman.

BVPM: Yes they do, but what’s the principle? Self-help book: The guy comes home and he says: Okay, what’s the plan? She says, “Why don’t we go out for dinner?” Or, not even that. She doesn’t even say that. She’ll say, “We never go out for dinner.” And so, then he’ll say, “what do you mean? We went out three days ago?” Then she gets upset and walks out. “What happened?” Facts.

She said we never go out. Wrong. We went out three days ago. Facts. Why is she so upset. Why is she so mental. Self-help books: What she meant is she wants to go out for dinner. So when she says we never go out to dinner, you can say “Where do you want to go?” If she says “I don’t know.” IF you say, “Well it’s your idea, come on. Don’t be so mental.” Then she walk off again. So then, when she says I don’t know, he’s supposed to come up with ideas, come up with something appropriate. Use his intelligence.

In all this you notice the woman is working from the platform of the mind. The man has to respond by intelligence. The man says “Why are you being so mental?” Is that intelligent? That’s just an emotional response. Why? “I’m frustrated because things aren’t going the way I like. I want to control it. It’s not going right, so I get frustrated.”

Do they ever explain that? No. Do they understand that principle? Do they understand the direct and indirect, the intelligence and the mind? No. So then he has to say “Last time, we did go out to that restaurant, so then Hey, we can go to this one.” She says “We always go to that one.” But the last time they went there was three months ago. He could say “make up your mind”, but then she walks off again.

The variety is necessary. She doesn’t know. If she knew, she might say, or allude to it. She just knows she wants to go out, but she’s not exactly sure so she wants the husband to help come to that decision. It’s when she’s decided, that’s when it happens. Intelligence creates options, mind agrees on one. That’s the way the mind and the intelligence function together.

That’s not in your self-help book. She needs variety. That’s also not in your self-help book. Why? Because God is *atmarama*, all the energies are there. One manifests the energies to taste that interaction. The energy is unlimitedly variegated. It’s the variety that gives that life to it.

You interact on these different levels, so the masculine doesn’t mind because he has all those attributes also. In other words, if the man follows the interests of the woman, it will be nice for him, too. It’s variety. But the field, that goes out is established by him.

This is the masculine/feminine principle. This is not in your book. All the book will say is that she’ll indirectly say like this. Therefore, be a little carefull. They’ll give one or two examples, and in that example it works, then you say “great!” But when it adjusts more than that, then it won’t work.

It’s not a matter of tricks. The self-help book is giving you tricks, but the trick is supposed to make you aware of the principle. That they can’t tell you. She says, “I don’t know” So , he says “Hey we can go to this place” She says “No, I don’t think so.” that means they go to about 5 or 6 places. So then “Okay, we’ve been to that one last week, then that one was there, that was the next best.” So then you have to try another one. “No. Oh we always go to those places.” So then, it’s not a matter of “Where do you want to go?” Or hecould, it depends on the mood. Do you want to go? Or it’s a matter of him saying “Hey I’ve heard of this new place Black out on Blinker, so we can check out that place.” So then she’ll say “Okay.” Or she’ll say “Oh yeah. That’s great.” So what’s going on here?

Unless you understand the masculine/feminine principle, how do you move with it? the man is saying, it’s got to be like this or that. But why should it be like that? I go out. I go to the coffee shop. I plunk down my money. I get my coffee and I get my donut. I go the next day. I put the money down. Then I get another donut and coffee. No problem. No one ever thinks that that is strange. Is it strange? Is there anything weird about it? No. But the guy goes out and gets a gift for his wife, and then she responds very nicely.

He thinks it will just keep on going like that, forever. But it doesn’t. Why not? You can’t go back and sit down and go “Hey, coffee and donut.” And they come with the bill, and you say “Hey, I paid yesterday.” This is where the brain’s not working because we don’t understand the nature. When it comes to things, men are very good at understanding the masculine/feminine nature. But if its conscious, they don’t apply it. That’s called stupid.

That’s why it says those attached to women are more stupid. If you have man and woman, man’s more intelligent, woman’s less, but a man attached to woman is less intelligent than the woman. Why? Because he doesn’t apply these principles. That’s not in your book. It will never be in your book because they don’t understand the principle.

They see a lot, so they can help a lot, but it only really helps when you’re able to understand that point they’re trying to make, and much of the time they can’t express it. So, when they say “Yeah, you do like this.” In their mind, they’re thinking of some principle, so it works for them. But, they give an example and when you try to use it, it doesn’t work. Why? Because the principle’s not being given. Either they can’t express it, or you can’t find it. That’s the difficulty with self-help.

Why does it say self-help? Because you’ve got to apply it. They’re not going to apply it for you. They help themselves, when you paid for the book. That helped them. Now, you can read it, but until you apply it, you have to do it yourself. So, it still comes back to self-realization.

I don’t want to discourage your in depth studies, but the point is there are principles. Unless you see those in relation to this, it’s not going to work.

Q: Four of the principles you mentioned before are the man has to be sensitive and sense-controlled, and the woman has to be chaste and satisfied. IS that a matter of long term training?

BVPM: No. That’s the central point. The *brahmacari* is sense-controlled. Only if you’re sense-controlled can you be sensitive. If your senses aren’t controlled, you can’t be sensitive. Not the others, just yourself, of course. Not to others.

If the woman’s chaste, she can be satisfied. The point is she’ll be chaste if he’s sense-controlled. She’ll be satisfied if he’s sensitive. The *brahmacaries* trained in these two things, and she’s trained in those because the woman follows the man, and he follows his duties. She’ll follow hers. IF he doesn’t follow his, how will she follow hers? Those are your two principles: Sense-control and sensitivity.

SNAG: sensitive new-age guy.

**By worship of the Lord, who is the source of all beings…**

Wow, we got through two sentences! I was thinking “Wow, we’ll get through a little more.” We’ve still got ten pages.

**By worship of the Lord, who is the source of all beings and who is all pervading, a man can attain perfection through performing his own work.**

“Source of all beings” means all souls are coming from Him, they’re all the same, they’re all equal in nature. That means the soul itself. That means there’s nothing that’s not connected and who’s all pervading. That means everything that’s going on, all energies, and how everything responds is coming from God, so that means there’s nothing else, so worship the Lord, a man can attain perfection through his own works.

Worship of the Lord who’s the source of all beings and can attain perfection through the performance of his works. We see *bhagavan* in the first, we see the element of *paramatma* and *brahman* in the other two. Source of all beings, who’s all pervading, man can attain all perfection. Seeing the Lord in all situations, ultimately to please the person in devotion, he can attain perfection through his work.

It doesn’t take another work. Whatever you’re doing, you start with that.

**Srila Prabhupada explains how one can turn his daily work into *bhakti* by the performance of *naiskarmya*. Everyone should think that he is engaged in a particular type of occupation by Hrsikesa, the master of the senses.**

Occupation means you’re engaging your senses. You’re using the senses to manipulate the material energy, and then that gives its transformation, and that transformation is supposed to be the profit. Ideally, that transformation is not your loss. But it’s through the senses, given by the Lord of the senses, by Krishna.

**And by the result of the work in which one is engaged, the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Sri Krishna, should be worshiped.**

So whatever’s the result, that has to be connected. The result of your work. You got married, so your marriage is connected. Now that marriage is connected, there’s children. Those should be connected to Krishna. By that, then now, you have a house. That house should be connected. Because of that, you need money, so that money should be connected.

 **If one thinks always in this way, in full Krishna consciousness, then, by the grace of the Lord, he becomes fully aware of everything.**

Full Krishna consciousness means being conscious of Krishna in everything. Whatever one’s dealing, but it could also be the full manifestation of Godhead, *bhagavan*, so, devotion.

**then, by the grace of the Lord, he becomes fully aware of everything.**

He knows how everything is functioning. He sees the Lord everywhere. Everythnig is working on these principles.

**That is the perfection of life.**

Now life is perfect because now one is transcendental. And ultimate perfection is because of devotion, that’s action. We’re not interested in perfection that’s not devotional. It’s temporary.

**The Lord says in Bhagavad-gita (12.7), *tesam aham samuddharta*. The Supreme Lord Himself takes charge of delivering such a devotee. That is the highest perfection of life.**

We see here, that is the perfection of life, you see God in everything and connect everything to God, and the highest perfection is the Lord delivers such a devotee who’s always absorbed in Him. You see here, in just a couple of sentences, Prabhupada said this whole thing of how to see the Lord on all these platforms, and to connect everything to Him.

Selfless work, work that’s been ordained by the Lord. You see your nature that’s been given by Hrsikesa, think that he’s been engaged in a particular type of occupation by the Lord, who’s the master of the senses, so the senses are engaged.

There’s authority. Then, *naiskarmya*, the result is for Krishna. But he’s able to see, by this knowledge, Krishna, everywhere and in everything. So, do your duty with knowledge, without attachment. Then, its being done to worship the Lord, for pleasing Krishna. Always remembering Krishna. We see that that has been said here. Now, each of these points will get one or many chapters to explain. It still comes back to this. That’s all it is. It’s always that simple.

**In whatever occupation one may be engaged, if he serves the Supreme Lord he will achieve the highest perfection.**

Perfection always means liberation, being transcendentally situation, the highest perfection, that means devotional service.

**Here, according to Srila Baladeva Vidyabhusana, Arjuna raises the question: “What if one possesses the nature and qualities of work of one varna, but wishes to perform the work of a different varna?”**

**The Lord answers in verse 47, duties performed according to one’s nature are free from sin.**

That’s what you’re supposed to do. Like the lion kills the deer, he’s free from sin. The man kills the deer, unless it’s been done in connection with sacrifice, then there’s sin. Doing your own occupation, there’s never a sin.

**Therefore, one should better engage in his own occupation even imperfectly, than accepting another’s and perform it perfectly.**

He’s doing it perfectly, but still the sin is connected.

**Every endeavor is covered by some fault.**

You will make some fault, so that sin will come out.

**One should not give up the work born of his nature, even if it’s faulty.**

Every endeavor has a fault, so there’s going to be some mistake. The point is, one is always endeavoring to not have those mistakes there.

Q: Would you have the tendency to become whimsical if you try to do others work?

BVPM: Of course, but where does whimsical come from?

A: Mode of ignorance.

BVPM: Mode of ignorance, so that means one is not in proper knowledge. To do some other’s duty means you don’t understand yours.

We’ll use the thing, Oh I’m not this body, but the point is, what are you going to do the work with? The body. You’re not the body, so why are you using it? The rules are connected to the body, and you say, “Oh we’re not this body *prabhu,* we can do whatever we want.” So use the soul and do whatever you want, leave the body out of it.

The rules apply to the body, not to you. That’s true. That’s good. Good understanding, but the body’s going to function according to those rules, you follow the rules, it works, you don’t follow the rules, it won’t work. To think that I don’t need ot follow them is illusion, so therefore it won’t have a good result.

You’re doing your own duty, though it has mistakes, but it’s at least situated in the mode of goodness, while you’re doing someone else’s, It’s in the mode of ignorance, so even if you do it nicely, it still doesn’t work. Work means self-realization.

**Srila Prabhupada writes: “Although fire is pure, still there is smoke.”**

So always notice in here that Krishna’s very clear. There’s this and then there’s this. Much of Arjuna’s questions are a doubt that, what if there’s a mix. You always see these situations. What’s in one nature’s dealt with in that way, what’s in the other nature is dealt with in that way. It’s not something new, it’s still made of those two elements. You have to deal with each of those according to that aspect.

A chutney is a combination of the salty and the sweet so therefore, you won’t serve it in the middle of the salties, but you won’t serve it with the sweets. So where do you serve it? It goes in between. It’s connected with the salty, but it’s just before the sweets, so it’s like…

Comment: Bridge preaching.

BVPM: Bridge preaching. The chutney philosophy has to be brought out here.

**Although fire is pure, still there is smoke.**

Krishna says if you do your own duties, it’s pure but it doesn’t mean there won’t be some fault. We take the field itself exclusively as perfection, so if we think there’s a fault in the field, there’s a fault in the work. The real fault is if there’s a connection to Krishna and is your work being done for Krishna.

Now, because it’s being offered to Krishna, one will try to get the best result, free from fault. One’s always endeavoring to remove the fault, but it’s not that because the fault is there, there’s a problem.

**Yet smoke does not make the fire impure. Even though there is smoke in the fire, fire is still considered to be the purest of all elements.**

A person’s doing his duties, and if there’s some mistake, or someone’s always being situated nicely and he does something that’s not good, it doesn’t mean that him being situated in doing what he does becomes impure because of this other aspect.

Of course, you’re only going to get smoke from fire. But if you only have a few little sparks and coals and a huge room full of smoke, one really doesn’t call that fire. Then, one can say, maybe they should be doing something else.

Fire is still considered to be the purest of all the elements. Work is still considered to be the best. Where is the mode of goodness situated? In the present. That’s where the action is done. That’s the most pure. The past is ignorance, the future is passion. So, it’s considered the best.

You have the knowledge, *sambandha-jnana*, but its only useful if you apply it in *abhideya*. In *abhideya*, that’s when you see actually what someone’s doing.

**If one prefers to give up the work of a *ksatriya* and take up the occupation of a *brahmana*, he is not assured that in the occupation of a *brahmana* there are no unpleasant duties.**

“I want to give this up because of so much trouble.” But in the other duty, there’s also just as much trouble. You live in the temple, according to the way the temple commander tells you to live in the temple. You do in the temple, according to what the temple commander or president tell you to do. You dress how they say you should dress, you eat how they say you should eat. You spend your money how they authorize you to spend your money. That’s a problem. “I want independence.” So, then what do you do? You get married.

Comment: Big mistake.

BVPM: Not necessarily big mistake, but the point is, now instead of your temple commander telling you what to wear, now your wife tells you what to wear. Instead of you saying what’s for dinner, she says what’s for dinner. Instead of you spending your money, she tells you how to spend your money. It’s the same thing. Everybody has what’s there benefits and what’s there not. The two go together. It’s just by changing the situation, you will not get rid of problems. The point is, what problems you can live with, and which problems you can’t, but there’s no question of not living with problems. Most people who say, “I can’t live with this problem.” No. They can’t live with any problem.

**When in wintertime one takes a stone from the fire, sometimes smoke disturbs the eyes and other parts of the body, but still one must make use of the fire despite disturbing conditions. Similarly, one should not give up his natural occupation because there are some disturbing elements. Rather, one should be determined to serve the Supreme Lord by his occupational duty in Krishna consciousness. That is the perfectional point.**

How do you get variety if every time you go to do something if every time you go to do something, it will perfectly work in that way? Will you change it? No. Therefore, there’s variety. Obstacle is part of the variety.

**That is the perfectional point.**

One is determined to please the Lord.

**When a particular type of occupation is performed for the satisfaction of the Supreme Lord, all the defects in that particular occupation are purified.**

It doesn’t mean they go away, they’re purified.

**When the results of work are purified, when connected with devotional service, one becomes perfect in seeing the self within, and that is self-realization.**

You’re doing the work, connected to Krishna, which means the results will be connected to Krishna, and that will then purify. The results always move back to the field, so that means, then the field, you’re in that field of self-realization, knowledge about all these different things, that increases. By performing devotional service, automatically, knowledge is gained.

**Srila Baladeva Vidyabhusana further explains: The activities of all the *varnas* including those of a *brahmana* are contaminated by some fault. Since they are composed of the *gunas* it must be accomplished by using material ingredients.**

That’s just the way it is. You’re in the material environment.

**It is just like smoke covered by fire. By removing the smoke, which is a portion of fire, the portion containing heat is used to eliminate the cold. Thus, removing the fault from ones duties by offering the actions to the Lord, one should utilize the remaining portion which generates *jnana* in order to realize *atma*.**

You’re taking the smoke, which is a portion of fire, so of that smoke, a portion of that contains heat. The smoke contains the heat. That aspect is what’s used.

**Thus, removing the fault from ones duties by offering the actions to the Lord,**

Whatever’s the fault, it’s all offered to the Lord, then one should utilize the remaining portion which generates *jnana* in order to realize *atma*.

What’s left means you have to analyze, so that will generate the proper knowledge that you’ve done it in relationship to the Lord, that will give realization. The *samvit* is combined with the results for Krishna, which is then *hladini*, that combination is called *bhakti.* Action where result for Krishna is called *bhakti*, then because a result comes, that moves back to the *sambandha* position, so that’s *sandhini* potency. *Sandhini* gives realization. That’s technically how it works.

In this next section, Krishna will describe the progress from *jnana-yoga* to the ultimate conclusion of the Gita: Pure devotion.