

CHAPTER 1

BG 1.1

manuscript:

Bhagavatgita the widely read theistic science is summarised in the Gita Mahatma (Glorification of Gita) that one should read Bhagavat Gita very scrutinisingly from the person who is a devotee of Krsna and try to understand it without any motivated misinterpretations. The clear

Bhagavad-gita is the widely read theistic science summarized in the Gita-mahatmya (Glorification of the Gita). There it says that one should read Bhagavad-gita very scrutinizingly with the help of a person who is a devotee of Sri Krsna and try to understand it without personally motivated interpretations. (1972)

note: the phrase “with the help of a person who is a devotee of Sri Krsna” is added redundantly. From the manuscript it is clear that reading of Bhagavad-gita should be done from a person who is a devotee, means, that the commentary which is read must be done by a devotee of Krsna. No third person is actually necessary to help one understand the meaning of the Gita when its commentary is read from a devotee.

*

manuscript:

The Dharmaksetra is significant because in the battlefield of Kuruksetra the Supreme Personality of Godhead was personally present on the side of Arjuna and Dhritarashtra the father of the Kurus were much doubtful about the ultimate victory of his sons. In such modes doubts he enquired from his secretary Sanjaya 'what did they do' He was confident that both his sons and the sons of his younger brother Panḍu were assembled in that field of Kuruksetra on definite determination of engagement of war and still his doubtful enquiry about it is very significant. He did not want any compromise between the cousin brothers and he wanted to decide the fate of his sons in the battlefield. But because it was arranged to be fought in the place of pilgrimage Kuruksetra which mentioned in the Vedas also as the place of worship even by the denizens of heaven, Dhritarashtra became very much doubtful about the influence of the place. The influence of the place was however manifested in the person of Arjuna but there was no influence on the other party. Dhritarashtra knew it very well that it would influence the sons of Panḍu because by nature they were all virtuous. Sanjaya was student of Vyasa and therefore by the mercy of

The word dharma-kṣetra (a place where religious rituals are performed) is significant because, on the Battlefield of Kurukṣetra, the Supreme Personality of Godhead was present on the side of Arjuna. Dhṛtarāṣṭra, the father of the Kurus, was highly doubtful about the possibility of his sons' ultimate victory. In his doubt, he inquired from his secretary Sañjaya, “What did my sons and the sons of Pāṇḍu do?” He was confident that both his sons and the sons of his younger brother Pāṇḍu were assembled in that Field of Kurukṣetra for a determined engagement of the war. Still, his inquiry is significant. He did not want a compromise between the cousins and brothers, and he wanted to be sure of the fate of his sons on the battlefield. Because the battle was arranged to be fought at Kurukṣetra, which is mentioned elsewhere in the Vedas as a place of worship—even for the denizens of heaven—Dhṛtarāṣṭra became very fearful about the influence of the holy place on the outcome of the battle. He knew very well that this would influence Arjuna and the sons of Pāṇḍu favorably, because by nature they were all virtuous. Sañjaya was a student of Vyāsa, and therefore, by the mercy of Vyāsa, Sañjaya was able to envision the Battlefield of Kurukṣetra even while he was in the room of Dhṛtarāṣṭra. And so, Dhṛtarāṣṭra asked him about the

situation on the battlefield. (1972)

note: Here it says that the place of pilgrimage would have influence in favor of the Pandavas, so they would win the battle. But in the manuscript Prabhupada says that the place could have influenced the minds of all the fighters. The place of pilgrimage could have influence even his own sons to admit their fault in dealing with the Pandavas and thus they could settle-up the conflict and not fight. That was the actual source of his anxiety. The influence of dharma-ksetra has different meaning than presented in 1972 version.

*

manuscript:

The topics of Dhritarastra and Sanjaya as described in the Mahabharata is the basic principle of the great philosophy and it is understood that the great philosophy evolved in the battle field of Kuruksetra which is a sacred place of pilgrimage from time immemorial of Vedic age. It was spoken by the Lord when He was present personally on this planet for guidance of the mankind. The mankind is now advanced in material science but they have failed to find out at the present moment oneness of the entire human race on the surface of the earth. Bhagvat Gita will solve this problem and intelligent class of men will find in this great theistic literature oneness of the entire human society. By thorough study of the Bhagavat Gita there is cent percent possibility that throughout the whole world there can be only one scripture namely the Bhagavat Gita, there can be God only i.e., Lord Sri Krsna the son of Devaki and there can be one hymn for chanting by the human race which is glorification of Lord Krsna's holy name. Such chanting of the holy Name of Lord Krsna was highly recommended by Lord Krsna and people are having practical effects by chanting HARE KRISNA HARE KRISNA KRISNA KRISNA HARE HARE, HARE RAMA HARE RAMA RAMA HARE HARE. In the western world (In New York) the chanting of this glorious holy Name has begun introduced by the INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR KRISHNA CONSCIOUSNESS INC and gradually it is spreading all over the world so that the human race can have only one religion, one God, one hymn and one engagement in the service of the Lord. That will bring up the so much anxiously desired peace in the world.

The Dharmaksetra is significant because in the battlefield of Kuruksetra the Supreme Personality of Godhead was personally present on the side of Arjuna and Dhritarastra the father of the Kurus were much doubtful about

The topics discussed by Dhrtarastra and Sanjaya, as described in the Mahabharata, form the basic principle for this great philosophy. It is understood that this philosophy evolved on the Battlefield of Kuruksetra, which is a sacred place of pilgrimage from the immemorial time of the Vedic age. It was spoken by the Lord when He was present personally on this planet for the guidance of mankind.

The word dharma-ksetra (a place where religious rituals are performed) is significant because, on the Battlefield of Kuruksetra, the Supreme Personality of Godhead was present on the side of Arjuna. Dhrtarastra, the father of the Kurus, was highly doubtful about the possibility of his sons' ultimate victory. (1972)

note: This whole portion about one scripture, one God etc. and about spreading Krsna consciousness throughout the world by ISKCON is completely left out from the purport in 1972 version.

BG 1.11

manuscript:

existence of Bhismadeva the victory of the Kurus depend. He was confident of the full support of Bhismadeva and Dronacharya in the battle because he knew it well that they did not speak even a word when Droupadi in her helpless condition appealed to them for justice while she was being forced to become naked in the presence of all great generals in the assembly. He also knew that those two general had some sort of affection for the Pandavas and that may be now completely given up by them as they had had it done during the gambling performances.

He was confident of the full support of Bhīṣmadeva and Droṇācārya in the battle because he well knew that they did not even speak a word when Arjuna's wife Draupadī, in her helpless condition, had appealed to them for justice while she was being forced to strip naked in the presence of all the great generals in the assembly. Although he knew that the two generals had some sort of affection for the Pāṇḍavas, he hoped that all such affection would now be completely given up by them, as was customary during the gambling performances. (1972)

note: The manuscript refers to the game where Pandus lost Draupadi and Drona with Bhishma gave up their affection towards the Pandavas. The 1972 version states it as a general principle, but actual the point is missed.

BG 1.23

manuscript:

Let me see those who have come here to fight for the matter of satisfying senses of the evil minded son of Dhṛtarāstra.

Let me see those who have come here to fight, wishing to please the evil-minded son of Dhṛtarāṣṭra. (1972)

note: why this change (satisfying the senses of vs. pleasing Duryodhana) was made? It's unnecessary.

BG. 1.30

manuscript:

I am now unable to stand here any more and I am forgetting myself because my mind is not working. I see just the opposite causes oh Kṛṣṇa the killer of the Keśi demon.

I am now unable to stand here any longer. I am forgetting myself, and my mind is reeling. I foresee only evil, O killer of the Keśi demon. (1972)

note: Arjuna doesn't foresee "evil" but he envisions the futility of fighting for the cause of regaining the kingdom. The result of actual victory will be opposite to the desired result - after the victorious battle there will remain no one to share the happiness of the kingdom with. The actual meaning of Prabhupada's words are lost in the 1972 translation.

BG 1.37-38

All though these men do not find out the fault, on account of being overtaken by greed at heart, of killing the family, quarreling with friends

Ch 1/38-39
and similar acts.

GEETOPANISAD

Page 22

Oh Janardan why should we engage ourselves in these acts of sin in spite of our knowledge of crime in the destruction of family.

○ Janārdana, although these men, overtaken by greed, see no fault in killing one's family or quarreling with friends, why should we, with knowledge of the sin, engage in these acts? (1972)

REFERENCES

BG 1.1 read from acarya:

“The rascals should not take example that: “Kṛṣṇa encouraged killing. Therefore everyone should kill. There is no sin.” Without understanding. This is the difficulty. The rascals they do not understand what is Bhagavad-gītā. They interpret for their favorable condition. That’s all. Here is Bhagavad-gītā. **They do not read the whole thing from ācārya—misunderstand.**”

Bhagavad-gītā 2.36-37 -- London, September 4, 1973

BG 1.1 dharma-ksetra

Now, both the parties were desiring to fight, and they assembled. Why he is asking question, kim akurvata: “What did they do”? Because he was little doubtful that “These boys, after being assembled in dharma-kṣetra kuru-kṣe..., they might have changed their ideas. They might have settled up.” Actually, the sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra might have admitted, “Yes, Pāṇḍavas, you are actually the owner. What is the use of unnecessarily fighting?” So he was very much anxious whether they had changed their decision. Therefore he is asking. Otherwise there was no question of asking, kim akurvata. He... Just like if you are given food, if I ask somebody that “Such and such gentleman was served with nice dishes. Then what did he do?” This is foolish question. He would eat. That’s all. (laughter) What is the question of “What did he do?” Similarly, when it is already settled up that they were to fight, there was no such question as kim akurvata, “What did they do?” But he asked this question because he was doubtful whether they had changed their opinion.

Bhagavad-gītā 1.1 -- London, July 7, 1973

So formerly people were religiously trained up. So they could not speak lies in a dharma-kṣetra. That is still the practice. Just like in the western world, the Christians go to the church, they admit, confession, “Yes, I have done it.”

Bhagavad-gītā 1.1 -- London, July 7, 1973

The suspect was that because the parties assembled in the dharma-kṣetra, so they might have changed their ideas. Still, in India, if there is two fighting parties, they go to a temple and ask that “You say the right thing.” So in the temple, still, in the villages, they do not dare to speak lies. Yes. The fighting and the misunderstanding becomes settled up. So Dhṛtarāṣṭra was thinking whether the two parties, they have settled up. He did not like that.

Bhagavad-gītā 2.1 -- Ahmedabad, December 6, 1972

But another thing is the dharma-kṣetra, effect of dharma-kṣetra was visible in Arjuna. Dharma-kṣetra. He, because he’s devotee of Kṛṣṇa... Yasyāsti bhaktir bhagavaty akiñcanā sarvair guṇais tatra samāsate surāḥ [SB 5.18.12]. Because he’s devotee of Kṛṣṇa, therefore he felt: “What is this? Why shall I kill these, my brothers?” Because he was devotee. This sentiment came into the mind of Arjuna, not on the other side, Duryodhana. He never thought. Although they were placed, both of them placed at dharma-kṣetra. The effect of dharma-kṣetra was manifest in the body of Arjuna, not Duryodhana. This is the... If one is pure, then the effects of dharma becomes manifest very quickly.

Bhagavad-gītā 2.1 -- Ahmedabad, December 6, 1972

So the effect of Kurukṣetra, dharma-kṣetra, was visible in the person of Arjuna, not in the person of Duryodhana. That is the difference.

Bhagavad-gītā 2.1 -- Ahmedabad, December 6, 1972

When the politicians cannot control the mass of people being dissatisfied, they make a clique to declare some war so that all their attention may be diverted. This is politics.

But the Battle of Kurukṣetra was not that type of battle. One should be aware of the Battle of Kurukṣetra very nicely. It was dharma-yuddha. Dharma-kṣetre kuru-kṣetre samavetā yuyutsavaḥ [Bg. 1.1]. Why they settled up that the fighting should take place in the dharma-kṣetra? They are to fight, yuyutsavaḥ. It was settled they will fight, but why they selected the dharma-kṣetra? This is Vedic system. Even up to date, in villages, not in the cities... In the cities, as soon as there is some misunderstanding between you and me, we go to the court, either criminal court or civil court, to settle up, and it takes years to settle up the business. It goes on. I have seen for generation. One generation passed another generation; the fighting is going on in the court. But if people are Kṛṣṇa conscious, it could be settled within few minutes. Still among the villagers the system is current in India: when there is some fighting, they go to a saintly person or in a temple to settle up.

Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 1.8.46 -- Māyāpura, October 26, 1974

In the Vedas it is stated, kuru-kṣetre dharmam ācaret: “If one wants to execute ritualistic ceremony, he should go to Kurukṣetra.” And it is the system still now in India, if there is some disagreement or quarrel between two parties, so still they would go to the temple—temple is dharma-kṣetra—so that one may not dare to speak lie in front of the Deity. This was still going on. Even one is very low in mentality, still, if he is challenged that “You are talking this false. Now speak before the Deity,” he will hesitate, “No.” This is India still. You cannot speak lies before the Deity. That is offense.

Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 6.1.20 -- Chicago, July 4, 1975

BG 1.11 gambling:

So they defeated, they were defeated in the chess play, and the wife was taken by the other party

Bhagavad-gītā 1.36 -- London, July 26, 1973

BG 1.30 the opposite will happen

Prabhupāda: So viparītāni. Nimittāni ca paśyāmi viparītāni keśava. Viparītāni means “just the opposite.” “I have come here to fight to regain my kingdom. That is the cause for which I have come here to fight, but actually I am seeing it is just the opposite. My fighting will be useless. I came here to fight for some useful purpose, but now I see that viparītāni, just opposite. It will be useless.” Why useless? Because one tries to become rich man, opulent—this is material nature—just to show to his relatives, to his friends, to his family members, “Just see how I have become rich, opulent.” This is the psychology. A man works very hard day and night to become rich just to make a show that “My dear friends, my dear relatives, you see that how I have become now rich.” This is the only purpose. Nobody is working hard for serving Kṛṣṇa. This is māyā. And Kṛṣṇa consciousness means, the same hardship we shall take, but take for Kṛṣṇa. Just like our Mrs. Sharma. She was working in the family, but now she has come to work for Kṛṣṇa. And this is salvation. This is mukti. Not that we have to stop our working capacity. Simply we have to change the position. In the family life we work uselessly for so-called relatives, but the same labor,

when we employ for the service of Kṛṣṇa, every inch of it is utilized.

Bhagavad-gītā 1.30 -- London, July 23, 1973

So nimittāni viparītāni. This viparītāni, when we are materially conscious, we see that “Without happiness of myself, my family, my society, my country, my community...” They think happiness in terms of expanded selfishness. “First of all, my happiness, personal.” Just like a child. It does not think of anyone’s happiness. Whatever he takes, he wants to eat. So you, as we grow, we expand our happiness little more: “My happiness, my brother’s happiness, my family’s happiness, my community’s happiness, or my nation’s happiness.” So you can go on expanding the scope of happiness, but there is no happiness. There is no happiness. These foolish persons, they do not know. So Arjuna also is playing like an ordinary foolish person. Nimittāni viparītāni. “Where is my happiness? I came here to fight, to get happiness, and I have to kill my own kinsmen. Then where is my happiness? I cannot enjoy the property or the kingdom alone. There must be relatives, brothers. I will be very proud: ‘Just see how I have become king.’ So if they are dying, then who, whom I shall show my opulence?” This is the psychology. Nimittāni ca viparītāni paśyāmi. Just the opposite. This is illusion. This is illusion.

Bhagavad-gītā 1.30 -- London, July 23, 1973

There is no happiness actually, expanding selfishness. Just like a national leader like Mahatma Gandhi in our country. He planned that “Let the Britishers go away. My countrymen will be happy. My countrymen will be happy.” But when the Britishers went away, giving the responsibility of Indian empire to the Indian people, Gandhi was thinking in the morning, “Oh, I am so unhappy. Now only death will please me.” And the next, the same evening, he was killed. He was so unhappy. Because everything was topsy-turvy. He wanted Hindu-Muslim unity. Now the country was divided. The Muslims became separated. The whole program was changed. There were so many things. He wanted that the government should be very simplified. But he saw that his disciples, his followers, were after office, simply for office. So nimittāni. He saw that “I shall be happy, my countrymen will be happy,” but at the end he saw viparītāni, all opposite. Everyone will experience that. So long he will be materially attached, he will find viparītāni. “I wanted to be...” Sukhera lāgiyā, e ghara bandhinu, aguṇe puriyā gelā (?): “I constructed this nice house for living happily, but there was fire and everything finished.” This is the way. You construct everything for happiness, but there will be something which will put you into the most miserable condition. This is called material world. They do not know. Therefore one who is intelligent, he thinks that “If I have to work so hard for so-called happiness, and here is Kṛṣṇa is canvassing, asking me, that ‘You work for Me,’ so why not work for Kṛṣṇa? Here I see viparītāni, everything is opposite. There is no happiness.” So that is intelligence. “I have to work hard. Kṛṣṇa says, ‘Just surrender unto Me.’ “ Sarva-dharmān parityajya mām ekaṁ śaraṇaṁ vraja [Bg. 18.66]. So Kṛṣṇa is asking to work for Him, giving up everything. That is clear, everyone knows. “Here also I am working very hard, but here I am working hard to be happy, but the viparītāni, I am becoming unhappy. So why not work for Kṛṣṇa?” This is intelligence. I have to work after all. Jīvera svarūpa haya nitya-kṛṣṇera dāsa [Cc. Madhya 20.108-109].

Bhagavad-gītā 1.30 -- London, July 23, 1973

So the Māyāvādī impersonalists, they cannot understand that serving Kṛṣṇa is simply pleasure and blissful. They cannot understand. Therefore they become impersonalists: “No. The Absolute Truth cannot be person.” That is another side of the Buddha philosophy. Impersonal means zero. That is also zero. So Buddhist philosophy, they also make the ultimate goal zero, and these Māyāvādīs, they also make the ultimate goal... Na te viduḥ svārtha-gatiṁ hi viṣṇum [SB 7.5.31]. They do not understand that there is life, blissful life, by serving Kṛṣṇa. Therefore, here Arjuna is playing just like ordinary man. So he says to Kṛṣṇa, “You wanted me to fight, to become happy, to get the kingdom, but by killing my own men?”

Oh, nimittāni viparītāni. You are misleading me.” Nimittāni ca paśyāmi viparītāni. “I’ll not be happy by killing my own men. That is not possible. How You are inducing me?” So he said, nimittāni ca viparītāni paśyāmi. “No, no.” Na ca śaknomy avasthātum: “I cannot stand here. Let me go back. Take my chariot back. I’ll not stay here.” Na ca śaknomy avasthātum bhramatīva ca me manaḥ [Bg. 1.30]. “I am becoming bewildered. I am puzzled now.”

So this is the position, material world. We are always in problem, puzzle, and when something better is proposed to the materialistic person, that “You take to Kṛṣṇa consciousness, you’ll be happy,” he sees nimittāni viparītāni, just opposite. “What this Kṛṣṇa consciousness I shall happy? My family is in trouble or I have got so many problems. What this Kṛṣṇa consciousness will help me?” Nimittāni ca viparītāni. This is material condition of life. Therefore it requires time, little time to understand. That is Bhagavad-gītā. The same Arjuna, he is now finding, nimittāni ca viparītāni. When he will understand Bhagavad-gītā, he will say, “Yes, Kṛṣṇa, what You are saying, it is right. It is right.” Because after instructing Arjuna, Kṛṣṇa will ask him, “Now what you want to do?” Because Kṛṣṇa does not force. Kṛṣṇa says that “You surrender unto Me.” He does not force, that “You must surrender. I am God. You are My part and parcel.” No, He’ll never say that. Because He has given you little independence, He will not touch it. Otherwise what is the difference between a stone and a living entity? A living entity must have independence, although it is very little, minute. That Kṛṣṇa does not touch. He’ll never touch. You’ll have to agree, “Yes, Kṛṣṇa, I shall surrender unto You. Yes. That is for my benefit.” This is Kṛṣṇa consciousness. You must voluntarily agree, not hackneyed, mechanical. “Spiritual master says like this right. All right let me do it.” No. You have to understand very nicely. Teṣāṃ satata-yuktānāṃ bhajatāṃ prīti-pūrvakam [Bg. 10.10]. Prīti, with love. When you work, when you work for Kṛṣṇa with love and enthusiasm, that is your Kṛṣṇa conscious life. If you think that “It is hackneyed, it is troublesome, but what can I do? These people ask me to do it. I have to do it,” that is not Kṛṣṇa consciousness. You have to do it voluntarily and with great pleasure. Then you know. Utsāhān niścayād dhairyāt tat-tat-karma-pravartanāt, sato vṛtteḥ sādhu-saṅge ṣaḍbhir bhaktiḥ prasidhyati. You will find in our Upadeśāmṛta (3). Always you should be enthusiastic, utsāhāt. Dhairyāt, with patience. Tat-tat-karma-pravartanāt, niścayāt. Niścayāt means with confidence. “When I am engaged in Kṛṣṇa’s business, Kṛṣṇa’s activities, Kṛṣṇa will surely take me back to home, back to...” Niścayāt. And Kṛṣṇa says, man-manā bhava mad-bhakto mad-yājī māṃ namaskuru [Bg. 18.65]. “I will take you back.” It is stated. Kṛṣṇa is not a liar so we have to work with enthusiasm. Just... Not viparītāni. That will be accepted by Arjuna at the end. Kṛṣṇa will ask him, “My dear Arjuna, what is your now decision?” Arjuna will say, “Yes.” Tvat prasādāt keśava naṣṭa-mohaḥ: “My all illusion is now gone by Your mercy.” Kariṣye vacanaṃ tava: [Bg. 18.73] “Now I shall fight. Yes, I shall kill all my kinsmen.”

Bhagavad-gītā 1.30 -- London, July 23, 1973

So Kṛṣṇa, Arjuna is thinking of the śreyas and preyas. Actual śreyas means to achieve Kṛṣṇa consciousness. That is wanting in Arjuna. He is showing that feature of life, that he wants better the society, friendship and love. He does not want to kill them. Then everything will be finished. But actually the fact is that even after killing the so-called kinsmen, if he can satisfy Kṛṣṇa, that is his śreyas. That is his śreyas. That he does not know. And because he does not know, therefore this Bhagavad-gītā is there. He is playing the part that he does not know that Kṛṣṇa is the ultimate goal of life, not this so-called society, friendship and love. He is playing that part, that he does not know. He is thinking that “Kṛṣṇa is not important.” Kṛṣṇa has already asked him to fight, but he is considering that “Kṛṣṇa, You are asking me to fight, and I have to kill my own kinsmen. Then where is my victory?” So therefore he said... Here in the previous verse, he has said, paśyāmi viparītāni keśava: [Bg. 1.30] “You are asking me to fight, for my victory, for my happiness, but I see it will be just the opposite.” Paśyāmi viparītāni. This is his problem. And to solve this problem, Arjuna became the disciple of Kṛṣṇa, and Kṛṣṇa advised him this Bhagavad-gītā, and that is the prelude. Unless Arjuna plays like that, ordinary man...

Bhagavad-gītā 1.31 -- London, July 24, 1973