

not the rājasika and the tāmasika ones. In fact, the latter two, are not abandonment, in the true sense of the word.

A layman regards abandonment of actions, as real abandonment. But according to Lord Kṛṣṇa, real abandonment consists in abandoning attachment, and desire, which lead to bondage (Gītā 13/21).

If external abandonment, is regarded as the real abandonment, every dead person should attain salvation, because he abandons all the worldly possessions, as well as his body and he does not even remember, them. Therefore internal abandonment of attachment and desire etc., is real abandonment, which frees a man, from bondage.

Appendix—A man is more responsible to discharge his prescribed duty than to perform actions sanctioned by the scriptures. As the act of ‘watching’ by a watchman and ‘the supply of water’ by a water-hut-man are their duties—‘niyata karma’ for which they are specially responsible. If a person abandons his duty, he is considered very much guilty for it. Renunciation of one’s duty leads to commotion. Therefore a person should not abandon his duty whether he is paid more or less for it or whether it provides him more comfort or less comfort. In these days there is disorder in the society because people don’t discharge their duty. If a person does not discharge the duty allotted to him, what will be its consequences for him? If the duty is abandoned, out of delusion, it is Tāmasa abandonment and such a person sinks downwards to lower births and lower regions—‘adho gacchanti tāmasāḥ’ (Gītā 14/18).



दुःखमित्येव यत्कर्म कायक्लेशभयात्त्यजेत् ।

स कृत्वा राजसं त्यागं नैव त्यागफलं लभेत् ॥ ८ ॥

duḥkhamityeva yatkarma kāyakleśabhayātyajet
sa kṛtvā rājasam tyāgaṁ naiva tyāgaphalaṁ labhet

He, who abandons action, because it is painful or from fear

of physical suffering, does not gain the reward of relinquishment by practising such rājasika abandonment. 8

Comment:—

'Duhkhamityeva yatkarma'—Rājasika people, think that all the acts of sacrifice, penance and charity etc., sanctioned by the scriptures, are painful because in performing these, there are so many restrictions. Moreover, a lot of money has to be spent. They hold this opinion, because they have no faith in the scriptures, the next world, and the actions prescribed by scriptures.

'Kāyakleśabhayāttyajet'—Rājasika people, think that in the performance of actions sanctioned by scriptures, and the social decorum, they have to suffer hardships, by foregoing bodily comfort.* They feel dependent and sad, while discharging their duty, according to their caste (social order), and stage of life, and in obeying their parents, teachers and masters. But, they feel independent and happy, while they work according to their own will. They do not want to be governed, by scriptural ordinances. They want to lead a lazy, idle and carefree life of a Sādhu, or a pensioner, by abandoning household affairs, which involve physical and mental effort.

Here, a doubt arises, that in gaining true knowledge, there is mention of perception, of evil and pain (Gītā 13/8) while, here it is mentioned, that action which is abandoned, because it is painful or from fear of physical suffering, is rājasika relinquishment, and here, relinquishment of action is forbidden. These two statements seem contrary. The clarification is, that these are not contrary, but the topics are different. There, it is mentioned, that one should perceive evil and pain, in pleasure and so should abandon, pleasure. But here, it refers to performing, one's duty. So duty must not be relinquished, rather it must be performed. Perception of evil and pain, in pleasure develops dispassion, which leads to God-realization, while relinquishment of one's duty, because

* A man feels physical suffering because of his attachment to the body and the sense of mine with it.

it is painful or full of physical suffering, leads to bondage (Gītā 3/9). Fruit of both the rājasika and tāmasika relinquishment, is tāmasika, which leads people to sink deeply (Gītā 14/18).

Now a question arises, that a devotee, who attends divine discourses and listens to glories of the Lord, develops dispassions and so he renounces daily duties and is absorbed in devotion, and adoration, should his relinquishment not be regarded as rājasika? No, actually it is not so, because God-realization, is the aim of human life. So if a striver, renounces other action, and is engaged in devotion and adoration etc., he performs his real duty. He cannot indulge in heedlessness, and indolence. But, those who practise rājasika or tāmasika relinquishment, will indulge in evil propensities, such as heedlessness and indolence etc., because they are interested in pleasure.

'Sa kṛtvā rājasam tyāgam naiva tyāgaphalam labhet'—Peace, immediately follows, renunciation. But a rājasika person, does not attain peace, as fruit of his relinquishment, because, his relinquishment is meant to gain rest, comfort and luxuries etc., as this can be seen, even in animals. So, such a person instead of attaining peace, has to receive punishment, as a fruit of neglect, of his duties.

Appendix—Renunciation leads to 'Supreme Peace'—'tyāgācchāntiranantaram' (Gītā 12/12) and the fruit of attachment is 'pain'—'rajasastu phalam duḥkham' (Gītā 14/16). A person possessing the mode of passion does not attain peace, the fruit of renunciation; but certainly suffers pain, the fruit of attachment.



कार्यमित्येव यत्कर्म नियतं क्रियतेऽर्जुन ।

सङ्गं त्यक्त्वा फलं चैव स त्यागः सात्त्विको मतः ॥ ९ ॥

kāryamityeva yatkarma niyataṁ kriyate'rjuna
saṅgaṁ tyaktvā phalaṁ caiva sa tyāgaḥ sāttviko mataḥ

But, he who performs a prescribed duty (obligatory action),
O Arjuna, because it ought to be done, abandoning attachment