**2011-03-31 BVPS BG 18.71-77 Maya's job and way of dealing**

BVPM: **Generally it is advised that Bhagavad-gétä be discussed amongst the devotees only, for those who are not devotees will understand neither Kåñëa nor Bhagavad-gétä. Those who do not accept Kåñëa as He is and Bhagavad-gétä as it is should not try to explain Bhagavad-gétä whimsically and become offenders. Bhagavad-gétä should be explained to persons who are ready to accept Kåñëa as the Supreme Personality of Godhead. It is a subject matter for the devotees only and not for philosophical speculators. Anyone, however, who tries sincerely to present Bhagavad-gétä as it is will advance in devotional activities and reach the pure devotional state of life. As a result of such pure devotion, he is sure to go back home, back to Godhead.**

**In the sixty-seventh verse of this chapter, the Lord explicitly forbade the Gétä's being spoken to those who are envious of the Lord. In other words, Bhagavad-gétä is for the devotees only. But it so happens that sometimes a devotee of the Lord will hold open class, and in that class not all the students are expected to be devotees. Why do such persons hold open class? It is explained here that although not everyone is a devotee, still there are many men who are not envious of Kåñëa. They have faith in Him as the Supreme Personality of Godhead. If such persons hear from a bona fide devotee about the Lord, the result is that they become at once free from all sinful reactions and after that attain to the planetary system where all righteous persons are situated. Therefore simply by hearing Bhagavad-gétä, even a person who does not try to be a pure devotee attains the result of righteous activities. Thus a pure devotee of the Lord gives everyone a chance to become free from all sinful reactions and to become a devotee of the Lord.**

So by preaching if it’s an open class, there’ll be people who are not envious of the Lord. They accept the Supreme Lord, but they’re not actually endeavoring to take up pure devotional service. They’ll be elvevated to those planetary systems where righteous persons are situated. They’ll become free from sinfull reacations, they’ll be elevated, but those who are more serious, they’ll take up the devotional practice, they’ll try to be a pure devotee.

When we talk about the serious element of being a devotee, we means someone who’s *sampradayic*. Someone who’s making a serious endeavor to become a pure devotee. Those who appreciate the Lord and are not envious, but are not trying to elevate themselves, they’re just being good and going on like that, then by this same process, they’ll be elevated to the heavenly planets. So, this also gives an idea of those who are trying to be pure devotees, their situation will be one thing, and those who aren’t, their situation will be another. They will be the ones going to the heavenly situation and planets.

Everyone gets benefit, that’s why it’s pointed out that Dhruva Maharaja is a pure devotee, they’ll get his association, and in this way there’s a chance of elevation. The reason the person’s there is not from doing pious activites like big *yajnas* and that, but by hearing Gita. So, then when one comes in contact with the pure devotees, theres a chance that one might relate on that platform, rather than just being absorbed in heavenly pleasures.

Q: Wont there destination be slightly different?

BVPM: It’s mentioned, *dhruva-loka*, so then it may be indicating that they would go to such places. It says “**Therefore simply by hearing Bhagavad-gétä, even a person who does not try to be a pure devotee attains the result of righteous activities.”**

**“If such persons hear from a bona fide devotee about the Lord, the result is that they become at once free from all sinful reactions and after that attain to the planetary system where all righteous persons are situated.”**

It would depend upon how much of a degree is that appreciation, I would think. *Dhruva-loka*, because he is there specifically a pure devotee, then you’d get that association. Those who are just going to the place where the righteous dwell, they would attain to the heavenly planets. But they attained all this, just by hearing Gita. People are just becoming freed from all sinful reactions, just by speaking Gita. That’s the element.

Everybody is benefiteed and from that a few are serious about devotional service. Its understood that as long as some are coming forward, then you can see that its quite dynamic.

Q: What about our members who like to sponsor the distribution of 1000 GItas.

BVPM: There will always be benefit for that. There, they’re doing good work. They haven’t heard much, but they’re supporting the same thing, so, if others get benefitted by reading, then they’ll definatey get benefit. In other words, there can be nothing wrong in preaching or distributing Gita. *Ma sucah*, don’t worry.

Q: It is also said that Lord Caitanya would not supersede the verse of the Gita that says you should not preach to the envious.

BVPM: The envious, you don’t bother with. In an open crowd, generally the envious will just leave. Then if one stands up and starts giving you trouble, it becomes obvious and then once they understand what it is, they won’t come back. You wouldn’t, having found an envious person, preach to him. But in an open class, it may not be devotees, but they have faith in God. That’s one of the things: the faithless. They have faith, but they’re not devotees. So just on that basic element of faith, you can start from there, because even the devotional process starts from faith. It starts from *sraddha.*

Q: What about Jagai and Madhai. Lord Nityananda was able to preach to the faithless.

BVPM: They weren’t preaching Bhagavad-gita. They were chanting the holy name. You don’t hear Lord Caitanya and Lord Nityananda sit down and start to discuss Vedanta with Jagai and Madhai. Therefore, that’s even more universal, just harinama kirtana.

Q: Now that Gita is so widespread not all of the preachers are coming from the angle of *bhakti*. Some are *mayavadis*.

BVPM: Then, you wont get any benefit.

Q: Will they go to the heavenly planets?

BVPM: No, I doubt it. The Isopanisad says that the *mayavadis* are killers of the soul, so they all go to hell. They’re destroying peoples opportunity to develop their relationship with the Lord, so they’re worse .

Q: They’re twisting it.

BVPM: They’re worse. A person who’s a sense gratifier, that’s not good, but he’s not twisting others opinion. People who do, that gets worse. You want to be a nonsense, fine. But if you want to influence others so they should also be a nonsense, that when it starts to get more difficult. You have attached nonsenses, then you have detached nonsenses.

Q: Then you have the Buddhists, who don’t even follow *sastra*. Is that worse, or is the Mayavada worse because they pretend to follow *sastra*?

BVPM: They’re all about the same. Just in general, as a philosophy it’s exactly the same. The Mayavadi is situated better because he has *sastra*. Because he accepts *sastra,* if you can defeat the argument, then they’ll take up the practice. But, a Buddhist, if you defeat the argument, still the culture and the who le thing is still a bigger step. At the same time, the impersonalist is not willing to admit that there is a higher postion, but some Buddhists accept that there is a person beyond everything. One sect of six different kinds of Buddhists are there in Japan.

Comment: In Cambodia also they have churning of the ocean. They carry this tradition that Buddha is an *avatara* of Vishnu.

BVPM: Yeah, because they were Hindu. They will be a little easier to deal with than those who never were. There are various degrees: dark, more dark, really dark, absolutely pitch black and then you have a black hole.

Q: So among the faithless, we discriminate between the envious and non envious?

BVPM: Yes. The point is that if someone is envious, you can’t do anything about it. But, if they’re non-envious, then you can cultivate.

Q: According to the quality they have previously developed.

BVPM: Yeah. Ok. Verses 72 and 73. Arjuna is determined to act according to Krishna’s instructions.

**O son of Påthä, O conqueror of wealth, have you heard this with an attentive mind? And are your ignorance and illusions now dispelled?**

**Arjuna said: My dear Kåñëa, O infallible one, my illusion is now gone. I have regained my memory by Your mercy. I am now firm and free from doubt and am prepared to act according to Your instructions.**

**The actual result of Gita. Krishna asked Arjuna if he has heard these instuctions with attention. He inquires as to whether his ignorance and illusion have now been dispelled. Arjuna says that he has regained his memory by Krishna’s mercy and his illusion is gone. He says he his free from doubt and he is firmly prepared to act according to Krishna’s instructions.**

**Srila Prabhupada’s purport to Srimad-Bhagavatam 2.4.19 explains: “In the beginning Arjuna placed himself as one of those who desire self-satisfaction, for he desired not to fight in the Battle of Kuruksetra, but to make him desireless the Lord preached the Bhagavad-gétä, in which the ways of karma-yoga, jnana-yoga, hatha-yoga and also bhakti-yoga were explained. Because Arjuna was without any pretension, he changed his decision and satisfied the Lord by agreeing to fight (kariñye vacanam tava), and thus he became desireless.”**

Here we see that real desirelessness does not mean without action, without endeavor, without engaging the senses. He had desire before, so now desirelessness means that you want to please the Lord. Desireless doesn’t mean the mind’s not active, the senses aren’t engaged. Sometimes we may make this mistake and think that if you have any desire, that’s wrong. No. If the desire’s in connection with Krishna, that’s desireless. The Mayavadis can’t understand this.

He didn’t have any pretention. He didn’t have any false ideas of himself, so he could appreciate himself as the soul, as not the body. Because of this, then he could connect himself very nicely with Krishna and be actually desireless. He wanted to please his own senses, so that’s desire. Now, he’s willing to engage his senses, to serve the Lord. That’s desireless. Otherwise, you may think “Oh! He’s giving up the desire for the kingdom and all that, and he wants to go to the forest. ” No. That was just another form of desire. “I want to be happy by fighting.” “I want to be happy by not fighting.” That’s desire; Its all about himself. Desireless is you’re willing to engage the senses to please the Lord, so that’s different.

**According to Srila Baladeva Vidyabhusana, in verse seventy-three, Arjuna says “Although living entities, such as *devas* and men have the conception of being their bodies, and being independent in their actions…”**

The illusion is that we’re independent in our action. We’re not. We’re part of a process that’s going on. We take part in it according to our desire. You choose to go on a particular ride at the theme park, but you’re not the one making the ride work. You’re not the one creating the emotions and experiences. You simply chose, but you’re thinking “No. I’m independent. I went on there.” Yes, you chose to go on it, but everything after that’s not. We’re only part. That men and *devas* think they’re independent in their action is that they don’t think of the Lord. It is He and His energies that actually make everything work.

It’s the interaction of the Lord, and His energies. That is what’s going on. It’s the Lord controlling these energies that makes all the manifestations. These two aspects, they don’t see.

**…Men worship the *devas,* and the *devas* bestow on men what they desire.**

Its, I scratch your back, you scratch mine. I do the worship that benefits them, they benefit us. Everything goes on, its really a great scene. But, who is the real Lord?

**I previously had the illusion (the opposite of knowledge) that *prakrti* is the cause of the world, because all material philosophies boil down to “The material energy is the cause.”.**

One can say “No, the soul comes from God.” What’s the soul madeof? “The soul’s made of dead matter.” “The body is the soul.” Some will say the mind is the soul. That means it’s coming from matter. What the Mayavadis and Buddhists will say is that there is no soul, but because of illusion, you’re conceiving that one is there. So it’s come from the illusion. One is saying that it comes from the grosser aspects, and the other is saying its coming from the subtler aspects.

In both cases, *karmis* and *jnanis*, they all say that life is coming from matter, just which matter it is, gross or subtler. The world itself is the cause, whether its coming directly from the matter itself, or the illusory aspect of the world. None of them actually accept that the soul is from God. They’ll talk about it, but they won’t. They get almost there, but not quite.

The point is you start with what works, then explain it properly. Then you’re able to bring it all the way. You want to hit the person in the head, but his arm’s sticking out, so grab the arm. That will get you closer to his head. In other words, what is in line, take that and then bring it to the proper conclusion. Don’t throw out the whole thing. No. Start with what actually is usefull. The Mayavadis are renounced. They say the world’s illusion. That much you can work with. But the idea that illusion means it doesn’t even exist at all, that’s where a problem starts. But, that there’s an illusion going on when people perceive the world, that’s correct.

They think there’s nothing there to perceive. There’s nothing there, and you’re saying something is there; that’s the illusion. But, the illusion that something’s there, but you see it illusorily and then saying that’s an illusion, that’s the common point. They don’t understand that it actually exists, but there’s an illusory perspective. They just see that there’s an illusory perspective. It doesn’t exist. So, you start with the one, and then you move forward.

The person wants to be successful; start with that. He want’s to be famous, he want’s to be happy. Start with that, because all of these qualities are actually Krishna.

Comment: Allen Ginsberg was telling Prabhupada that this was such a fallen age that Krishna had to come in a very gross form, so he came as LSD. Prabhupada said, yes you are absolutely correct, except it’s not LSD, it’s *kirtana.*

BVPM: Yeah, he just started with that. Then you let your guard down. He’s clever. The point is you want them to understand not to win. If you want to win, then you have to argue the point. Many times people are willing to accept a certain aspect, but we won’t let go on this little point over here, and that ruins it. No. Forget it. The other things will go away in time. They chant, associate, take *prasada*, these other little things will go away. As long as they’re willing to take *prasada*.

Comment: This is also what they say when you try to distribute a book. The more you speak, that’s how you ruin it. In the beginning he agrees; it’s a spiritual thing. Then you go too far, and they find that one thing that didn’t line up.

BVPM: I remember there was this one man who was a health food freak. He would come to the temple. He wouldn’t take many things. He wouldn’t eat the *halavah* because of sugar. He wouldn’t eat this and that, but he would eat sweet rice. He thought it was just milk and rice. He didn’t understand there was actually sugar in it. He would drink tons of sweet rice! He would glorify sweet rice and everything like that. You don’t tell him. You just let it go on. “Yeah. Take. Great!” Don’t worry about the *halavah.*

**In contrast to that, I thought the Lord was without qualities and form and was indifferent to men’s affairs.**

This is what most people think. He’s without qualities and form. They will say he’s omniscient, omnipotent, and list this whole thing, but at the same time will say, its not there. He’s indifferent to men’s affairs, otherwise, how are all these bad things going on? Why isn’t God doing something?

Comment: Because he doesn’t care.

BVPM: They’ll think He’s indifferent. The point is, no, He’s only giving you what you want. You steal something, then you end up in jail. You can’t complain that “Why’d God put me in jail?” You wanted to be in jail. You stole. If you steal something, what’s the result? According to the state’s perspective you get punished, you go to jail.

Its not that you steal something so you have lots of money and you can enjoy and go to the Bahamas, and sit on the beach. No. That’s not what the government thinks. The government thinks, you stole, you go to jail. You think, “I stole and then I’m going to enjoy myself.” We don’t tend to put the two together.

I ran over someone’s dog. Someone will run over my dog. “How could this happen? Such a nice dog!” That’s just the way it goes.

Q: Why don’t people make this connection? Its so obvious.

BVPM: That’s *maya*. That’s why *maya* is so good. She’s good. It’s so obvious, but still it doesn’t work. The living entity wants to be the controller and enjoyer, that’s the bottom line.

As soon as one gives up the *purusa-bhava*, that “I want to be the controller and enjoyer.”, things are much more clear. It’s much more easy to see. Why would the illusion be important? You can enjoy from it. That’s one of the qualities that Krishna pointed out. One’s not looking for opportunities for sense gratification. Opportunities are there. All there is in this world is the senses and sense objects, then the mind is there deciding which ones you want or not.

The point is, if you’re not looking for opportunities for sense gratification, then there is no material existence.

If you’re simply looking for opportunities for service, if there’s service there, you take it. If there’s not, you don’t. There’s one Alvar, I forget his name. He had this place where he was staying and there was a little garden. He would pick flowers for Rangaji every day, and I think he used to fill his water pot. There was a gold pot where he’d get the bath water. That was his service. He was very advanced. He was picking flowers, and there was this extremely famous prostitute. She thought it was a nice garden, so she sitting in the garden, amongst the bushes just enjoying the niceness of it.

He’s out picking flowers. “Here’s a nice flower. Here’s a nice flower.” Then he came to where her face was and went “Here’s not a flower.” “Here’s a nice flower.” “Here’s a nice flower.” He’s just not looking for sense gratification. Of course the prostitute didn’t appreciate that, and she gave him a lot of trouble, but it all worked out in the end.

Q: Is that another story for another time?

BVPM: It depends. This is one of the twelve Alvars. These are like the previous *acaryas* of the Sris, whom we accept as great persons. Kulasekhara is one of the Alvars. Its not that we don’t quote them. Yamunacarya also.

Then the prostitute made a vow that “I will have this person running though the streets calling my name. ” In the Vedic concept, you have three levels of prostitutes. We have what’s called society girls. It’s a name that people understand, but they don’t really understand because they’re very educated, they’re very talented. They’re very cultured. The basic principle is on the intensity of femininity in a cultural environment. Generally there tendency is that they are working with somebody. It can be a one off thing, but it tends to be an ongoing relationship. Its more of a relationship so they tend to work in very high level groups of people, because they always do *yajnas* and give in charity, in that way they’re very pious, so they always do very big things. They’re in one category.

The second category then is they don’t have so much qualification. They don’t have the facility. They don’t have the education. They don’t have so many skills, but they have the feminine quality. That’s the prominence. They’re able to dress very nicely, and have some facility. The feminine charms are the main element.

The third level, there’ll be the feminine aspect, but it’s based simply on gross sense gratification. What we generally think of as modern prostitutes are the third level. Then, we get really fancy and we call them escorts or something. They’re working on the second level, but the Vedic had something beyond that.

Comment: Geishas were also qualified.

BVPM: Geisha would be more along that line, but geisha would be kind of in between because you don’t see them doing big religious acts. But it would be like that. That would be the closest thing to what is there, but you could say “Amoungst those who are at the top, and are respected on the levels of heads of state, ministers, the very wealthy and aristocratic.” That’s the level that would work at. Some of those geisha’s do work on that level, but most would be working down more on the second level.

Q: They’re part of the Vedic system?

BVPM: They’re part of the Vedic system, yes. It’s like this. A woman is religious, so its better that she stay religious. If a man goes from following nicely, to not following he’s bad, but women are more powerful, so if she was religious and goes to being irreligious, that’s worse. The man will be independent. He may take others down with him, or may not. Women are dependent, they will take others with them.

The Vedic concept is women aren’t supposed to be distracted from their religious position. If men have senses they can’t control, better they don’t bother religious women. Better they go bother these other women, because you’re going to have to pay anyway, so they don’t mind. It just keeps the religious element of the society working nicely. Those who can’t follow it properly, at least they don’t disturb those who can.

It’s not ideal.

Q: How would women end up in that position?

BVPM: They’re born into it. You’re mother’s a prostitute, generally you would be one, also. That’s pretty standard. There are also unfortunate situations; You lose everything, somebody comes and pollutes them, then they might end up this way. But it also mentions that such women, especially the first grade, they act as a wife. That’s the principle of the society girls. When they say perform the duties of a wife, they mean all the duties. It is not unknown in history that if some man has accepted a society girl as a wife, its not that they won’t make a good wife. That’s what they do. Its just that to each man who comes, he’s the husband.

Q: Would that be also what we call nowadays, a mistress?

BVPM: It depends on what level. A mistress could be from first or second. It depends on what level she’s functioning at.

Q: Prabhupada sometimes said girlfriend.

BVPM: Then it would generally be on that second level, just by the femininity and stuff like that. One night stand? That’s not so glorius. Can we go back to the story now? I was just trying to give some context. I know it’s a very intriguing conversation.

We’re trying to say she’s a society girl, and a top society girl. They’re very powerful. They’re very determined. They have a lot of wealth and facilities. They don’t just have a little room. They have houses or mansions, servants and managers: The whole thing.

She then went back, took off all her ornaments, everything. Just dressed in something simple and then came and just sat and started to singing very expertly for the Deity. After some time the *sadhu* noticed her and started engaging her. She would pick flowers. She would do everything. She was always super super super nice. Always helpful, always everything. She was there, every day. She’d just be there morning to night, morning to night, then she’d go home. As soon as it was morning, she’d come there again. It went on like this for a long, long time.

She waited until she saw that he was getting emotionally attached. Then at one point she just left. So he was running around looking for her. In going around looking for her, then he finds out that she’s a top prostitute, and where she lives. Then he goes and visits, and they inform him that “You can’t see her. Money first, and then we talk.” Like Sankaracarya “First take sannyasa, then we talk.” Here, “First show the cash, then we can talk.” And she’s not just a ten-paisa wala. Gold, Jewels: That’s the level.

He doesn’t know what to do, so he goes back to his house and he’s very much in anxiety. Then, after some days at the door of the house of this prostitute, this young boy comes and brings this gold pot and says “This is for her.” She’s then asking, “Who sent this?”

“Oh, that devotee sent it.” Then, she was impressed because it was a serious gold pot. So, she went to visit him. When she came he asked, how is it that before I wouldn’t even be let in the door, and now you’re so happy to see and interact? Why? She said “No. You sent the gold pot.” He’s thinking “Sent the gold pot. I never sent the gold pot.”

“Your messenger said that you sent the gold pot and he was here representing you.” He was thinking and so he said “Where’s this pot?” She went and showed him the pot. it was the pot that he would take every day to bring water. He said, “What did the boy look like?” She said, “Yeah, he was nice, blue, nice eyes. He was wearing these kind of ornaments.” He said “Okay.” So, he left and went back to his service. He could understand.

The point of the story is that a devotee is so dear that even if he’s distracted, still the Lord is involved. The Lord doesn’t give up. We give up because of our material attachments, but the Lord never gives up.

Q: Did she become a devotee? She did some service.

BVPM: That I don’t know. That was not necessarily a main part of the story. Maybe she did, but in the extended story. A lot of times in these, they do, but, whatever.

Q: Isn’t the purpose of the Lords descent to protect the devotee?

BVPM: Protect the devotee, when He reminds him, but also He’s assisting.

Q: Assisting him? The devotee?

BVPM: We’ll continue on this, but I just want to step back so that devotees can observe. Notice the line of questioning, in the last two lines of questioning. They’re very specific to work out “Is there something I can gain from this, in my own perspective?” It’s different from just a generic understanding. There’s a specific line of thought going on here. Were you able to perceive that? It’s a very broad thing in the main, but they’ll pick on one little thing here, and then that becomes the whole point. No.

It only has value in context of that, but we tend to take it beyond. There may be some other thing, but as long as its seen in the overall context, then its always good. Questions are always valuable, but what you always have to see is that it doesn’t get distracted from that particular line of interest and that one forgets the overall.

In other words, the Lord is protecting the devotees, taking care of the devotee. You’ll want to eat, so food is available. You’re able to put it into your mouth and digest. Who’s actually arranging all that? Are you arranging?

A: Krishna’s arranging.

BVPM: The point is that He’s taking care of everything anyway. This desire, that desire, Krishna’s taking care, so Krishna fulfilling material desires, that’s not a big deal. We may make it into a big deal only when we can perceive what’s right and what’s wrong. We say “Oh, no, men and women are equal.” It’s wrong because they’re different. The needs are different, the mentality is different, the environments are different, how they’re perceived is different, so to say they’re equal is total ignorance.

But we won’t perceive that as a wrong, in fact, we’ll take it as a religious principle to make our decisions for our social and administrative, economic position. But, if it’s something that we would consider is not good, “Oh, somebody’s exploiting here.” Then, we would say “That’s wrong.”. But, in neither case, is Krishna consciousness the basis. We may say it is. Because Krishna consciousness is good, men and women are equal is good, so taking the platform that men and women are equal is Krishna conscious. That’s our logic. But, it’s a fallacy because who said, for one, that they’re equal, and who said that its good?

Who says it’s equal? That having this view is good, is that what *sastra* says? No. So, therefore, what one has to understand is that just because everybody agrees with it, doesn’t mean its *sastrically* based. Therefore, we have to be very, very careful that the Lord’s taking care of material desires all the time, and people are getting it. Prabhupada said he wouldn’t make Jamuna a GBC, why? She was a woman. But he said, as far as her determination, her focus in Krishna consciousness, knowledge of Krishna consciousness, she gives one of the better classes in our society, if you sit her down, tell her to talk about Prabhupada in the early days, she’s one of the best at speaking. There’s hundreds and thousands of Prabhupada’s disciples, but she’s one of the ones that are the best. Her, Sruta Kirti, Hari Sauri, but Prabhupada said no, because she’s a woman.

But, we will say “No, the equal thing. Times have changed.” No. Nothing’s changed. Women are no different than they were before. Men are no different than they were. Just illusions change. What is the illusion of the day? You go into a restaurant, “Soup of the day” or “Chef’s Special”, so we have illusion of the day, or Maya’s Special. Flavor of the month, illusory concept of the month. All of these different things are there, but we have to be very careful because Arjuna, in the beginning, is talking all kinds of seemingly really good stuff, and because of that, Prabhupada’s saying he’s so kind and compassionate, therefore he’s qualified to hear Gita. It’s said that one who’s envious, can’t. He’s not envious; He’s very compassionate. He’s willing to give up his life, willing to give up his kingdom, his position, everything so as not to have this war that will kill everybody.

In one sense, it looks very good, if he was a *brahmana.* But he’s not. He’s a *ksatriya*. He’s been challenged to a war. There was actual wrong there, and so its his duty to fight. If it wasn’t right, and you could prove that by *sastra*, it’s not my duty, he’s not obliged. A *ksatriya’s* obliged, but he’s only obliged if the challenge is given the proper arena for expression.

Therefore, the Lord fulfilling the desires of the living entity, that’s what’s going on. But, ones that we ourselves in the material viewpoint will count as correct, we’ll say “Okay.” even if they’re not supported by *sastra*. And things that we say aren’t correct, even if they are supported by *sastra*, we’ll say are wrong. The point is, if it’s separate from Krishna, it’s all nonsense.

 Something that’s sinful, something that’s pious, ultimately it’s all nonsense. But, we have to be able to discriminate between what is pious and what is impious. Otherwise, you cant tell the difference between goodness, passion and ignorance. But, we also have to be able to tell what’s the difference between the modes, and what’s transcendental. Of the two, that’s more important.

What’s matter, and what’s spirit, we have to tell the difference, and then in matter, it has three modes, and in spirit, then there’s God, and there’s the living entity. If you can discriminate this, then one can approach. One should not “Here there was a sinful activity, why did God do this?” No. Everything you do that is not Krishna conscious is sinful. Its just that there are those things that are closer in line with the *sastra*, or are in line with the *sastra* and so that is in line with the forms that God would like actual, devotional Krishna conscious interaction to happen, that’s the only reason it’s pious.

The activities of this world we call pious by *sastra* are only pious because they are the forms in which someone who was Krishna conscious, those would be the most ideal forms to use to express it. Other than that, its just another form of dead matter. In the prison, you follow the rules nicely, so you’re a good prisoner. And someone who’s always fighting, he’s a bad prisoner. But, both are prisoners. Both are in jail. Just because you’re a good prisoner, doesn’t mean that you’re qualified to be outside. You have to be able to discriminate. You’re a good prisoner in the prison, but what’s good outside the prison? What would be the proper thing? That gets you to not be in prison.

Outside, you follow the rules. You got in prison because you didn’t follow the rules, so that you follow the rules, that’s a good step. But, unless you equate following the rules outside the prison as also the standard, you still aren’t qualified to be outside. You might follow inside, because it’s easy there. You get a little facility, you’ll get out earlier. “If I follow the rules of prison, I’ll get out earlier.” Instead of ten years, I’ll do six. If I told you “Do this, it’s ten years here, or do this, its six years.” Which would you take? The six. That means, I’m only doing it because it gets me out, but once I’m out, I’m still a criminal. But if I do it because I know that this is the actual proper sociological position that I should be taking to live properly with other living entities, that it was a mistake that I didn’t, therefore, I’m in prison, then his following of it both gets him out early and situates him properly in the society.

There are people who are very determined to be pious and good and nice in this world, but they’re not interested in transcendence. They’re doing it because then you will go to heaven. If you don’t you’ll go to hell. *Bas*. That’s it. Therefore, its not that glorious of a position, or that strong a position. You say “No. This is wrong! How could the Lord bring the pot?” Because anything you do here is wrong. Here’s a devotee. The devotee has a desire, Krishna’s arranging.

Q: Does the Lord always express His love through a pious form?

BVPM: Well that’s the culture *He* follows, but you have to be able to understand what’s pious form. You have pious on the platform of transcendental. You have pious on the platform of *dharma*, of *artha*, pious on the form of *moksa*. Pious means what is the right form to go with the result you want to get. Let us say you are in the kitchen. I have a cutting board. On the cutting board is a broccoli, just for variety. (all laughing)

Q: I don’t understand.

BVPM: Okay, lets say I have a potato.

Comments: Ahhh. (laughter continues.)

BVPM: Right example for the right person. So I shouldn’t have used heart of the banana tree. There’s a potato there. Next to the cutting board, there is a knife, and there’s a hammer; Which do you use?

A: Knife.

BVPM: Knife. Now, but what if you’re mother in law brought that potato? That didn’t make sense here. It’s a European joke, not an Asian joke. Therefore, you use the knife. Why do you use the knife? It’s easier to cut. That means that the hammer *could* cut, but not as easily. Would the hammer actually cut? No. It would break it, or smash it, squash it or something.

Now, if it was a sledgehammer, and you were making chips, then instead of cutting it thin, you just smash it and have one very big thin chip.

Comment: You could use it to make mashed potatoes…

BVPM: That’s only if you boil it. That’s interesting, that may be the exception. “No! But, what if we’re making…” Its pious because the knife cuts, the hammer doesn’t. Since you want to cut the potato, the hammer would be wrong. Therefore the knife is the pious application, the hammer would be the impious application, but it’s a smaller level. That you’re cutting this potato to cook it for yourself, that’s impious, but still the pious form has to be used. You cant use an impious form. Its just how small it gets.

The guy wants to snort some cocaine. Can he use a garden hose? No. Why not? It’s hollow. He could get his nose next to it. It would probably help if he was Jewish or something, then he’d have a big enough nose. Therefore, it has to be in line with what actually would work. But your purpose in doing it, the bigger circle of what you’re applying it in, and then what that’s for, then all those are wrong but its just how narrow it is, that’s why he’s successful.

Let’s say he uses a dollar bill. Will it work? Yes. Now, lets say he’s with all kinds of other wealthy very aristocratic kinds of people. Will the dollar bill work? No. What does he have to use? The hundred dollar, a gold tube, he could probably also use a 500 Euro. That would work. Better than a hundred bucks. In other words, what is your goal? Does it match? That’s the point that its God’s world, its God’s laws, so all that’s going on but we don’t see God in it. If we understood that this works because its God’s , then you’d start to think “Is this what I should be doing for God?” The point is it only works because its God’s laws. Therefore, yes. God only works through pious means. Things work because its in line with how he would do it. But the point is where does it go wrong?

It doesn’t go wrong that he used an appropriate element to imbibe the intoxicating substance, but that he’s intoxicated, he’ll get a reaction for that. There’ll be a sin for that, but there’s no sin that he used the proper implements because that was according to how it has to be done. But, he’ll get a sin because the bigger point is, he shouldn’t be intoxicated. He’s going to get a reaction for that, and not only that, somebody else finds out that he’s some big minister in the government, so now that’s bad for that. Now he loses his position.

It’s not that it won’t give reaction, but it didn’t give reaction up there. The capillaries in his nose wont go bad. Not that those won’t happen, but the work itself was done because of how he did. If I go into these really really wild examples no one has any questions on it. But if I gave a really pious one, they’ll find examples: “What about this? ” The exceptions are always taking it to the sinful. But, if you start with really grossly sinful, everyone’s like “Yeah!” That’s fine.

Comment: It feels like home.

BVPM: Probably, if it was a bunch of middle-aged hindus, then they might have questions. This is the fun pursuant to conditioning. It doesn’t authorize it, it just means that it still has to work according to God’s law. But here, because it’s a devotee, Krishna Himself is going out of the way. Otherwise, the modes of nature could take care. Its not a problem.

The modes of nature could just come by. Some rich guy could have just came and gave him a donation. No, the Lord, because of affection for the devotee, and by doing it in this way, it would bring the devotee to his senses. This prostitute is only willing to see him if he pays money. The Lord is willing to make the arrangement. The Lord actually loves him. The prostitute doesn’t. Seeing that, he’ll then consider and take the Lord.

Comment: This brings to mind the verse that Krishna personally takes care.

BVPM: Yeah, He personally takes care but that doesn’t mean that if one’s a gross neophyte, He’s out there arranging gold pots for prostitutes.

Comment: So He does it, otherwise the Paramatma, or the modes of nature?

BVPM: The modes of nature are doing it anyway, it just that you have these occasions where He personally Himself takes care. He personally does something. Like, you see with Raghunath das. He’s sitting down at Radha Kunda, chanting his *japa*, not worrying about a place to stay, not worrying about his protection: absorbed. So, it’s very hot out there, so Radharani comes and puts her cloth so that it covers his head. Then, a tiger comes along and thinks that he may be lunch today, he has a lunch appointment today with this gosvami. So, Krishna tells the tiger to go away. Rupa Gosvami, seeing this, tells him “You shouldn’t take service from the Lord.” Therefore, he built himself a hut. Then, the tigers won’t bother him, and the sun won’t bother him. That’s the point. He’s not looking for an opportunity for sense gratification, it’s an opportunity for service. He got distracted, but here’s an opportunity for service.

Q: This story is really interesting in the context that one boy who I was teaching was really disturbed, and was contemplating suicide, but anyway, he used to say to me “Krishna wants us to suffer. He’s giving us all these desires and we can’t fulfill them. He want’s us to suffer.” But after hearing what you said, I started thinking about that. “Oh actually it’s not the case that Krishna wants us to suffer. He will give us what we need.”

BVPM: He’ll give us what we want, if we deserve it according to our good work. Just like if you go into a shop, it’s what you want, they’re selling it. They want to make money. You want to buy this material. They have this material. It’s not that they want it or need it. You deserve, then you get it, you don’t, you don’t get it. The point is that those desires are there because they’ve been cultivated. One’s wanted it, so if one says, I don’t want it, but you could also be emotionally saying that.

Let us say, you had a girl and she’s always wanted something , then the situation comes up where she actually gets it, but the situation how she got it wasn’t nice at all, and then she says “I don’t want this.” What do you do? Do you just say “Oh, you don’t want it. Yeah, forget it.”, or do you know that she actually want’s it, but for the situation, and you encourage? That would be the right way. So, the living entity, which is feminine, they want something and has been endeavoring for it for a long time, possibly lifetimes. Finally, when they get it, it gives them trouble, and then they say they don’t want it. So then, what would be the natural emotional proper way of dealing? “Are you sure you don’t want it? No. But, what about how you wanted it before? It would do this for you. It would do that for you.” That’s all *maya’s* doing. “Oh, this will give me trouble, endeavor for material existence.”

“No. You always wanted it in the past. It would give you position. It would give you facilities. You could enjoy yourself.” Like this. And if you just keep saying “No. No. No.” No. It’s a matter of the girl saying, “I wanted it all that time, but now having got it, I see that it’s not worthwhile. I just really don’t want this.” Then, you’ll say okay, and stop. So, when you do that, Maya will say okay, and stop. But as long as he says “No, but it was really good: The position, you’d really enjoy having some prestige.” And you’re thinking “Maybe…”, then she’s going to keep talking. But as soon as you say “No. Its not worth all this.”, then she’ll stop. That’s the point.

We take it that God, or Maya are up there, sadistically, but they’re not. They’re only dealing what we want. We’re not saying “I don’t really want it, okay, just give me this much, okay.”

Comment: It’s like when you eat at an Indian house.

BVPM: Then you’re like Aw! Half! Then you’re like, okay.

Comment: It also comes back to the point you were making about what I can handle, what the result is. Krishna knows what our real desire is and gives us the desire, ignoring those other ones, even though it seems…

BVPM: As a devotee, the thing is you’re not working just on *karma*, so He may mix it up a bit. You would, by *karma*, get something. Now you don’t. Or, you get something. That’s why you see in devotees charts a lot of times, it appears that it should work out in a particular way, but it doesn’t, because Krishna’s involved. *Karmi’s*, it will happen exactly like that, up to the moment. 3-2-1, okay! Wow, that was cool! Right on time! Set your watch to it.

That’s the thing. That’s why its called *krsna-karma*. There actually isn’t any *karma*. But, it’s your desires. Krishna deals will fulfill your desires but in such a way to remove them. Like we have these examples. That devotee, He did it in such a way that he removed it.

Comment: It’s not how we think it’s going to be. We think its just going to go. Somehow we think its not what we want.

BVPM: Yeah, because its relationship that’s being cultivated. Its not a matter of you have desire, you don’t have desire. It’s a matter of why do you want to not have a desire? Is it simply because these desires give you trouble? If that’s the only reason, that’s still within the realm of material, so being materially frustrated goes along with being materially ecstatic. They go together. But, if this frustration wakes you up to the fact that material doesn’t have anything to offer, and you want to please the Lord, by taking that up, that’s the real place. Then it works differently.

Otherwise, if you just say “Oh, no. I don’t want this because this is trouble.” You know the guy says “Oh you know this family life is so terrible, you have to work so hard. It says in the *sastra*, hogs, dogs, camels and asses. Working like an ass. No one appreciates you. This and that. ” So, therefore he puts on saffron, moves in the temple and hes a big big *vanaprastha*, because its so much trouble. Now, what happens if he meets a lady who he perceives as no trouble?

A: A relationship.

BVPM: Yeah. Because the real point of getting out was the trouble, not that “Now, I’ve seen that material doesn’t have anything to offer, so why am I endeavoring in this way?” So, there’s a difference here. Just as we have to discriminate here, one has to discriminate, “Is it Krishna conscious or not?” We’ll say “Okay. He’s leaving family life. That’s pious.” But its only actually pious if its Krishna conscious. We’re not worried about material piety. We’re not going to *varnasrama* because we consider this as pious and good. We going only if it’s favorable to Krishna consciousness. Like we were saying before. A senior man doing so many things, then steps back into being only one of so many faces in the crowd. But the point is that if that will help in Krishna consciousness, you let it go. Don’t get in to all “This and that. *Sastra* says this.” No. It’s a matter of if it works, good. But if it’s on the material platform, then yeah, it’s pretty useless.

Q: Could I say that in some sense its actually easier for a *sudra* to go back to Godhead?

BVPM: Not necessarily. Because he’s so emotionally involved, that it’s hard for him to necessarily use the intelligence. But, if you create a nice environment where he naturally picks Krishna, he’s an artist, so therefore the Deities are dressed nicely, the *kirtana’s* nice. The temple’s decorated well. The devotee’s deal very gently and nicely. He’ll be attracted. So, he’ll want to be in that environment. It matches his artistic nature.

Comment: Its more simple.

BVPM: It is, but the problem is they’re not independent. They can’t put themselves in that. But, *brahmana*, *ksatriya* and *vaisya* are. They can create the environment themselves. That’s why they’re independent and they create the environment for those who aren’t independent. Each has its strength and weakness. You could say that the man can more easily create the environment of Krishna consciousness but its in one sense easier for the woman to become Krishna conscious. If she’s situated in that Krishna conscious environment, she’ll take it because she likes all these fine things and emotional and all that. The men may, or may not.

Comment: Harinam Cintamani mentions in one place that Krishna doesn’t fulfill our desires that will lead one to ask for more and more material desires.

BVPM: Somebody will think that He won’t fulfill something that will take you away, unless you want to go away. Prabhupada even mentions in a purport that Krishna will bring people to the *dhama* because they want to make offenses. So, by being here, they can get 1,000 times the offense. If you’re sitting in the West, and you’re criticizing vaisnavas, one criticism, one bad credit. But here, you do one criticism, you get 1,000 bad credits, so very quickly you can go away. That also is there.

Comment: People come to Mayapura because they hear that Lord Caitanya doesn’t take offence.

BVPM: Still, one should be careful. The holy name will protect, this and that. But, its not that you won’t get troubled. Now, the point is that if by fulfilling the desire, let’s say, you need some facility, or whatever it is, some material aspect. If by getting it you have more faith, “Oh, Krishna’s so nice.” Then you’ll get it. If by getting it, you’ll go away, you won’t. By not getting it “Oh, I guess Krishna didn’t want, yeah, material world.” Like this. Then you won’t get it. Its said that Krishna will take away in the beginning, but more fortunate is one who He gives to. He’ll only give when you’ll use it properly.

Comment: That’s what happened in the beginning of the movement. So much was given, then…

BVPM: But, how was it taken away? *Dharma* gets *artha*. what stopped? We’ll say its “Oh, the guru’s fell down. The sannyasis. This.” No. Its because devotees gave up appreciation of authority. The point was why was it coming? Because devotees were worshipping gurus, so the opulence was there. That’s not the problem, but people have a problem with opulence. “He has. Why don’t I have? They’re *sannyasis*, *gurus*. I’m a *grhastha*. They fly to India three, four times a year, I can only go once every two years. Why is it they have the money? I’m the *grhastha*. I’m the one who’s supposed to enjoy. I should have the money. These *sannyasis*, they should have nothing. They should be crawling on the ground, and they shouldn’t mind when I run them over with my truck because they’re humble.”

 The thing is what’s the point of that? They’ll quote *sastra*, but they don’t actually need *sastra* because since when did it say that *grhasthas* are supposed to enjoy? No, they have the facility. It doesn’t mean they will.

Comment: Maybe that’s one of the things they need to learn.

BVPM: Yeah, because the point is if you accept authority, you have that, then why wouldn’t you have money unless there’s some other reason. Then, if one’s envious and jealous, that’s not going to make more money. Laksmi’s a person. She just disappears. Did you ever notice, you have lots of money, then suddenly you have no money. What happened?

Comment: It’s been there for more than half a year. Now I’m seeing that happen.

BVPM: It’s starting to happen. At least it took half a year.

Comment: In Denmark, it wouldn’t take so long.

BVPM: About two weeks. I have a question for you. Another example. We had the cutting board, the potato and the knife and the hammer. What happens if we have a table and this leg is loose where you have to put a screw? So we have a table, a screw, a knife and a hammer. What would you use? Of course, hammer. Knife! But, is that still pious?

Comment: According to the situation, it is.

BVPM: According to the situation, it is, but ultimately? A screwdriver you require. The hammer will get it in, but it will ruin the screw. It won’t bother the hammer. The knife, it will get it in, but it will ruin the knife, so the knife can’t be used. The screwdriver’s the right thing. The ideal screwdriver. So that’s what you have to see. If you don’t have a screwdriver, then, if you have time, knife is better, unless you have those fancy ceramic knifes, then you wouldn’t bother. Then you’d use the hammer. Depending upon the value, this and that.

 The knife would do better, if you can avoid minimal damage to the knife. The hammer will get it in if you don’t have time, or it will put it in, but the problem is it will ruin the thread, so ultimately it will fall out again, and you’ve ruined your future ability to put a screw in properly. So you’ll actually have to drill it. Put in another piece of wood, all that. It will be a much bigger deal. But if it’s a matter that you have two seconds before the whole thing falls over, then you use the hammer. You have to see what’s exactly the situation.

**I now know the Lord who is the famous possessor of form and powers**.

He has form, He has power. That’s the law of God, the combination between these. You could also say “Who has” He’s the possessor of. That means there’s Him, then the feminine is form and power. That’s why the feminine aspect always has a form or a situation or the different elements in the situation, and then there’s the potency to actually do it. Certain forms have certain potencies.

**A form of knowledge and bliss, who’s an ocean of good qualities such as omniscience, omnipotence and *satya-sankalpa.* Who is the friend of His devotees, though the Lord of all.**

So, he’s giving all of these contradictory elements, things that we’re looking for. But, at the same time, we’re looking to be the Lord of all, at the same time, the friend of everyone. *Suhrdam sarva bhutanam*. He’s the friend. We’re trying to be, but it doesn’t really work.

**Who creates the variegated bodies of the universe according to *karmas* of the *jivas* just by His will, through His energies of *jiva,* time and *prakrti.***

The energy, *jiva* has the desire, then in due time, by *prakrti,* then it all happens. *Prakrti* is the elements, then time is what moves them. But it’s the desire of the *jiva*.

**Who treasures the selfless devotee to whom He gives even Himself.**

That’s what you get. The others, He may give these different facilities, and we think, “Oh, that’s so great!”, because we think material facility is the all in all, but for Krishna, that’s nothing. Material nature is dead matter anyway. What’s the big deal? What’s important to Him is that devotion to which He gives Himself. If He gives Himself, then you can think, “Okay.”, but if its some stuff, don’t be too worried about it.

**And I understand that the Lord is You, the son of Vasudeva, situated as my friend. Therefore, I surrender to You. You will never abandon me. This doubt has been destroyed.**

We’ve come here to the material world. We completely ignore Him, but He hasn’t abandoned us. He comes in our heart, goes with us wherever. That means He doesn’t abandon. We abandon someone if we think its not good for us, this or that, but He won’t abandon.

**This doubt has been destroyed. You gave Your goal of ridding the earth of its burden, and You want me, who have surrendered to You, to do it. Then, I will obey Your words.” Thus Arjuna rose with bow in hands.**

He want’s to rid the world of its burden. That’s the actual thing that’s going on. Not this whole family, and whether he get’s something out. That’s looking for opportunities in the performance of his duties. Performance of duties: He’s a *ksatriya*, he fights. It’s a religious war, the proper place, the proper people, proper arrangements, so what’s the problem?

But, he’s looking for sense gratification within this, then he’s seeing that “If we win, we enjoy the kingdom, but then everyone we want to enjoy it with has been lost, so I’m not going to enjoy this. Therefore, I don’t want to get involved.” No. It’s your duty. Now, he’s seeing it from the perspective of Krishna consciousness. Krishna wants to rid the earth of its burden of all these demoniac *ksatriyas* and all that, so Arjuna, as a *ksatriya*, could help. If it was someone else, then that wouldn’t be their job.

Sudama Brahman, He didn’t ask to rid the world of the burden of all the demoniac *ksatriyas*. That wasn’t what He asked him to do. That’s not his duty, but Arjuna, that’s what he can do. Now, he’s seeing it from the proper perspective. We can see that perspective is extremely important. Perspective, meaning Krishna’s perspective. What is in line with Krishna’s perspective, that’s useful. What’s not, that’s not worthwhile.

Where was the problem before? These modern platitudes of goodness, then the problem is the perspective is not in line with Krishna.

Verses 74-78- Sanjaya’s prediction.

**Saïjaya said: Thus have I heard the conversation of two great souls, Kåñëa and Arjuna. And so wonderful is that message that my hair is standing on end.**

**By the mercy of Vyäsa, I have heard these most confidential talks directly from the master of all mysticism, Kåñëa, who was speaking personally to Arjuna.**

**O King, as I repeatedly recall this wondrous and holy dialogue between Kåñëa and Arjuna, I take pleasure, being thrilled at every moment.**

**O King, as I remember the wonderful form of Lord Kåñëa, I am struck with wonder more and more, and I rejoice again and again.**

**Wherever there is Kåñëa, the master of all mystics, and wherever there is Arjuna, the supreme archer, there will also certainly be opulence, victory, extraordinary power, and morality. That is my opinion.**

Sanjaya’s heard the conversation between Krishna and Arjuna directly, by Vyasa’s mercy. It is so wonderful that his hair is standing on end. Whenever he recalls this wonderous and holy discussion, he feels pleasure being thrilled at every moment. He remembers the wonderful form of Sri Krishna and is struck with wonder, more and more and he rejoices again and again. He concludes that wherever there is Krishna, the master of all mystics, and wherever there is Arjuna, the supreme archer, there will certainly be opulence, victory, extraordinary power and morality.

**In his commentary on text 76, Çréla Prabhupäda describes the perceivable result of Kåñëa consciousness: “The result of Kåñëa consciousness is that one becomes increasingly enlightened, and he enjoys life with a thrill, not only for some time, but at every moment.”**

What is happening? The result. But, there’s a thrill. But, according to our discussions, where does result come, and where does thrill come in *sambandha, abhideya,* and *prayojana*? *Prayojana*, and then? Back to *sambandha*, because where is excitement? *Sambandha.* The point is that the result always goes back. So, the Krishna consciousness is always enlivening thereafter it comes back and therefore one does more. One is always absorbed, one is always serving. For there to be a thrill, it means there has to be a good result. One’s not thrilled, no good result.

**Çréla Viçvanätha Cakravarté Öhäkura ends his commentary after text 73. He says: “I made a commentary on the following five verses, in which are found the essential purpose of the entire Gétä. But Lord Gaëeça sent his mouse-carrier to steal the two pages I had written. Not wanting to interfere, I have not rewritten those pages. Let Lord Gaëeça be pleased; obeisances to him. Thus I complete the Särärtha-varñiëé commentary on Çrémad Bhagavad-gétä. May it please the saintly devotees. May this sweet Särärtha-varñiëé, “the commentary that rains down the essential meaning,” give delight to the cätaka birds who are the Lord’s devotees all over the world. And may its sweetness also shine in my own heart.”**

Cataka is one who they live just off the rain. Cakora lives off the nectar coming from the moon. They go up high to catch that. Cataka, the only water they drink is what comes as rain. Cakravaka, they’re water birds that you see around here. They make a lot of noise when you get close to their nest. They’re wag-tails, so they’re of three different kinds. He’s saying that these last five are giving the essential purpose of the Gita, to be always absorbed in Krishna consciousness, to be inspired by Krishna consciousness, so he didn’t write again. That would mean that the devotees are only living off what comes from Krishna. That rain of nectar coming from Krishna. Krishna’s instructions, the instructions of the devotees: That’s what sustains them. So, he’s saying that’s then the important thing.

**Çréla Baladeva Vidyäbhüñaëa ends his Gétä-bhüñaëa, with the following words: “Attaining the fulfillment of my desire, I immersed myself in the milk ocean Gétä, but I have not been able to lift the jewel of wonderful meanings out of the ocean, though I have understood them to some degree. In this way, my master the joyful son of Nanda, with great delight, shows his affection for me. With care, Vidyäbhüñaëa has attended on this commentary called Çrémad-gétä-bhüñaëa. Oh devotees who are greedy for the prema of Çré Govinda, and are filled with mercy, please purify this work.**

**In his purport to 18.1 and 18.78 Srila Prabhupada summarizes the entire Gita.**

**“In every chapter of Bhagavad-gétä, Lord Kåñëa stresses that devotional service unto the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the ultimate goal of life. In the first six chapters, stress was given to devotional service: yoginäm api sarveñäà... . "Of all yogés or transcendentalists, one who always thinks of Me within himself is best." In the next six chapters, pure devotional service and its nature and activity were discussed. In the third six chapters, knowledge, renunciation, the activities of material nature and transcendental nature, and devotional service were described. It was concluded that all acts should be performed in conjunction with the Supreme Lord, represented by the words oà tat sat, which indicate Viñëu, the Supreme Person. The third part of Bhagavad-gétä has shown that devotional service, and nothing else, is the ultimate purpose of life. This has been established by citing past äcäryas and the Brahma-sütra, the Vedänta-sütra. Certain impersonalists consider themselves to have a monopoly on the knowledge of Vedänta-sütra, but actually the Vedänta-sütra is meant for understanding devotional service, for the Lord Himself is the composer of the Vedänta-sütra and He is its knower. That is described in the Fifteenth Chapter.**

The fifteenth was talking about the field. The Yoga of the Supreme Person, the tree of material existence, how its nourished by the modes how you’ll get beyond the modes by situating yourself in the service of the Supreme Person. They’ll just take it up to*brahman.* They think they have a monopoly, but they don’t really understand, because then the Lord is gone from the picture. How would you be actually free from the modes, if you’re not worshiping the Lord. The devotees are the ones who actually understand. The *mayavadis* will take it that this ability to see the difference between the knower and the known, this is Vedanta. Others don’t. *Nyaya* is just about logical. *Vaisesika* is seeing how “Everything just goes back to the atoms so, why are you so worried about what’s going on on this level?”. The *sankhya* they’re analyzing the matter very nicely, but if they don’t distinguish between matter and spirit, the soul and the Supreme Spirit, then it doesn’t really get anywhere. They can tell to some degree, but they don’t get to the Supreme Lord. Patanjali then, you have the Supreme Lord, but at one point, its not significant, the difference between the soul and the Supreme Lord. Jaimini, he’s going to establish the analyization of the material energy itself, what to do properly, and the see the soul is eternal, in all of these schools of course, the soul is eternal, but just by doing the pious activity you’ll enjoy here, and the Lord is left out of it, and the transcendent is not even breached. The *mayavadis*, they’ll take it that “You’re making a difference between matter and spirit.” But they don’t actually make a difference in spirit. So, we see that all of them have a weakness that they don’t understand.