

a response to: All Bluff, No Stuff (2)

Drutakarma

Fights Phantoms



Drutakarma Fights Phantoms



When I Order

'you become guru,'

he becomes regular guru.

That's all.

He becomes disciple of my disci-
ple."

(28th May 1977)



by Krishnakant

Drutakarma Fights Phantoms

a response to 'Krishnakant Desai: All Bluff, no stuff (2)'

Nov 21.1998 - In yet another unpleasant **carrot and stick rant** against those who sympathise with Srila Prabhupada's final instructions on initiations ("*Krishnakant Desai: All Bluff, No Stuff (2)*", posted on CHAKRA 17 Nov.) H.G. Drutakarma prabhu (henceforward the 'author') tries to win over *ritvik* orientated Temple Presidents by promising that as far as devotees under their charge:

"...the ultimate decision about engagement should be up to the temple president-not GBC or *diksa* guru. Hopefully, there will be cooperation among them, but if there are differences of opinion, the temple president should have the ultimate decision, even over the *diksa* guru..."

Thus the author seeks to give them a new concocted bogus system (De-emphasised *Diksa* Guru or DDG) which would seem to function almost identically to the *ritvik* system, only critically without Srila Prabhupada as the rightful object of devotional worship. In order to further obscure Srila Prabhupada's proper *diksa* status from ISKCON members (in particular from unfortunate CHAKRA readers) the author ignores, distorts and evades all arguments which defend the reinstatement of the *ritvik* system. The author even makes a virtue of his dishonest tactic:

"Krishnakanta Desai asks why I don't quote anything from his paper. It's simple. I cannot find anything in the document that is worth quoting. Srila Prabhupada is who we should be quoting. Not Krishnakanta Desai."

This simply begs the question-

- how can the author title his article an exposure of Krishnakanta's 'bluff, no stuff' when he point blank refuses to deal directly with any of our **ACTUAL** statements?
- How can he prove we are bluffing and giving no substance without giving examples?

An ounce of example is worth a ton of feverish rant. We shall once more demonstrate that the reason the author acts so evasively is because he cannot deal with our stated position, and so makes up what we say and deals with that instead. Since the author persists with this approach, even though it has already been pointed out to him **TWICE** - please see "*Drutakarma Caught in Knowledge Filter*"; and "*Drutakarma Continues to Strain the Truth*" - we can only conclude that he is deliberately seeking to mislead his readers. For him to do it a third time is nothing short of lying. The author is certainly intelligent enough to know what he is doing, and it is quite disturbing that he should even boast about his crooked approach.

The author once more seems to be bargaining on the fact that many readers of CHAKRA will not have seen our original articles exposing his lies, false assertions and contradictions. If anyone knows a CHAKRA reader it might be good to warn them.

The author's comments will be boxed in speech marks thus "", and our responses will follow. We will however ignore his continued medieval rantings as to how he will make sure all the *ritviks* are ruthlessly expunged etc. etc. Thankfully the culture in ISKCON is beginning to change. More and more devotees are looking for reasoned argument and evidence, rather than groundless self-contradictory ranting. In this article we shall concentrate on those sections of the author's article which at least have some remote semblance of philosophical content.

"Here is what Krishnakanta Desai has admitted so far: 1. The July 9 letter, although approved by Prabhupada, was not written by Prabhupada but was written by Tamal Krishna Goswami."

This is a red herring since the author is asserting something that was never disputed. There was never any dispute that Maharaja physically typed the letter. The issue was did Srila Prabhupada commission the letter, and did he agree with all the contents.

- If so how can the letter be any less valid than if the letter had not come via his secretary?
- And if it is not any less valid then what is the value in the author continuing to state this irrelevant point?

This is the third time we have made this point.

2. The July 9 letter does not directly mention Prabhupada's departure or what was supposed to happen after Prabhupada's departure regarding initiations. Therefore, it is clear that the July 9 letter does not represent a final order written by Prabhupada about how initiations were to go on after his departure. It is as simple as that.

This point has already been answered at least three times now. Since the author can not deal with our reply he just continues to repeat, like a broken record, the above point hoping that if he says it enough it will become truth.

We will repeat our answer yet again.:

"We simply state that the letter was issued to the managing officers of ISKCON to be applied in ISKCON and was to be put in force immediately, from that time onwards. It is the author who has decided that departure has some special significance for the application of the letter, having chosen that time to terminate the application of the letter, even though as he correctly points out the letter makes no mention of this. Also as long as there is no other instruction issued to ISKCON as to how initiations would continue in the society, it is by DEFINITION The Final Order on this subject"

(‘Drutakarma Continues to Strain the Truth’)

As we have repeatedly pointed out the issue of specific time-periods is irrelevant since the letter makes no mention that it was supposed to happen for any time period, even whilst Srila Prabhupada was present. It is as simple as that.

The letter is simply a policy document to be applied within ISKCON. It is the author who has invented a time period not mentioned in the letter at which he has decided to terminate the policy. By the author's own words the letter gives him no authority to do that, and thus he has helped substantiate our original contention that there is no evidence to terminate the letter at departure.

The applicability of the letter is simply tied to the institution in which it was to be applied by the managers of the institution, since the policy document does not state that it is a temporary policy, nor was the policy ever revoked. It is as simple as that.

"Krishnakanta Desai asserts that if we say the July 9 letter was not written by Prabhupada that is like saying that Prabhupada's books were not written by Prabhupada. That is not true. Srila Prabhupada's books were either directly written by him or they were dictated by him on tapes which were transcribed and minimally EDITED." (Emphasis added)

This is a lie. We never made the above statement, and challenge the author to produce it. Thus all the verbiage that the author has written to 'defeat' the above non-existent statement is irrelevant. What was ACTUALLY said was the following:

"But this argument that the letter is not Srila Prabhupada's 'DIRECT WORDS' is even more of a ludicrous argument, because by this logic, the author would also have to reject all of Srila Prabhupada's books since they also are not Srila Prabhupada's DIRECT WORDS, having been edited first by Hayagriva, and lately by the author's colleague H.H. Jayadwaita Swami. Thus the author must cease presenting any evidence from Srila Prabhupada's books unless he can first locate the appropriate dicatation tape and demonstrate that the book does indeed contain Srila Prabhupada's DIRECT WORDS."

(‘Drutakarma Continues To Strains the Truth’)

In fact the author simply substantiates our point above that Srila Prabhupada's books are not his DIRECT WORDS, since they have been EDITED. Thus we can see why the author has instituted a strict policy of NOT quoting us. If he did, in the above case at least, he would end up agreeing with us rather than doing what he does, namely shadow boxing a phantom opposing argument.

"On the other hand, what we have in the July 9 letter is Prabhupada's secretary's understanding of some things Prabhupada said on July 7 and May 28, written in the secretary's own words."

Again this is the author's speculation, unless of course he was hiding in the room on July 9th when the letter was written. The letter itself does not say that this is the 'secretary's understanding of some things Prabhupada said on July 7 and May 28th. In fact it does not even mention the July 7 conversation at all.

Further since the July 9 letter contains names which were not even mentioned on July 7th, we know that this letter cannot simply be H.H. Tamal Krishna Maharaja having decided to summarise what he thought had happened on those two days.

- Why does not the author just stick to the CONTENT of the letter instead of trying to endlessly speculate about how the letter was produced ?

"Just to give some idea of how there is a difference between a letter directly written by Prabhupada and signed by him directly and a letter written by Prabhupada's secretary and merely approved by him, we can consider the following:

Letter to: All Centers - Los Angeles 16 December, 1973 73-12-16.

Memo to All Centers.

Repeatedly Srila Prabhupada says, "I only want my disciples to take this Movement seriously.

"So, the punch line is that Prabhupada wants to initiate the following schedule: 1. Reside 4 months in India, 4 months in Europe and 4 months in the U.S.A. out of each year. 2. See or speak to no one except very important visitors wherever his is staying. 3. Be completely relieved of managerial affairs and have full time for translating. What this means to us is the following:

1. Don't ask Prabhupada to come to our Temple.
2. Solve all problems amongst ourselves and don't burden Prabhupada with them.
3. Continue to advance dynamically in Krishna Consciousness by keeping all our principles very strictly and vigorously preach and propagate the movement around the world. Now we have the GBC, the sannyasins, the presidents and so many qualified devotees. We have to give up the habit of placing everything on Prabhupada's shoulders. We must be responsible, mature, steadfast and convinced. Wherever Prabhupada is staying he will deliver morning lectures. Presidents, etc., may visit there and go on the walks with Prabhupada. Other than that we must take care of all affairs. Enough said. The rest is up to us. Haribol.

Your servant, Karandhara das Adhikari

APPROVED: A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swami KDA:kdd

[note: here Kaumodaki Devi Dasi typed the letter, which was written by Karandhara Prabhu, and it was signed approved by Prabhupada]

I can imagine that some of the disciples of Prabhupada who were not "very important" might have wondered about this letter. Is it really true that Prabhupada does not wish to see us, or let us go on walks with him? They probably would have liked to hear that directly from Prabhupada. And what about the temple presidents who are admonished not to invite Prabhupada to their centers? Sure, it is a letter from Prabhupada's secretary, and there is Prabhupada's signature-approved. But I suspect there were many temple presidents who might have thought, "Hmm. I would like to hear that from Prabhupada directly that he does not want me to invite him to my temple." So certainly there is a difference between a letter by Prabhupada's secretary (even if signed "approved" by Prabhupada) and a letter written or dictated by Prabhupada himself. Maybe we'd like to see a tape of the conversation, or confirm it directly from Prabhupada-just to be absolutely sure."

Here we see the most pathetic speculation offered to date by the author.

- Having set out to show that there is a 'difference between a letter directly written by Srila Prabhupada' and one written by his secretary and 'merely approved' by him, what evidence does the author offer?

He offers his speculations as to how recipients may have reacted to a memo sent out by Srila Prabhupada that was 'merely approved' by Srila Prabhupada. The best the author can offer is: '**I imagine**', '**they probably**' and '**I suspect**'. And this is the author's evidence that there is a '**difference**' between Srila Prabhupada '**merely approving**' and '**writing a letter directly**'!!

The absurdity of this argument is that even if the author's speculations were correct they do not offer any evidence that there is factually a '**difference**', since the way someone may react to an instruction does not say anything about the validity of the instruction. Even if the above memo had been written by Srila Prabhupada directly, devotees may still have thought 'maybe Srila Prabhupada did not mean it, let me double check with him in person.'

- We can all speculate forever but what is the point?

This constant attempt to slyly undermine the authority of the letter by the author is both futile and foolish. The foolishness of the author's attempt is proven by the fact that even H.H. Jayadwaita Swami, a much more credible anti-ritvik than the author, wrote in his paper '*Where the Ritvik People Are Wrong*' (which in our opinion is still the best attempt to date to answer the ritvik position) the following regarding the letter:

'Its AUTHORITY is BEYOND QUESTION'

'CLEARLY this letter establishes a ritvik-Guru system'

Of course Maharaja disagrees that the letter should continue to be applied permanently, but as seen above he makes no distinction over the fact that Srila Prabhupada '**merely approved**' the letter. If the letter is **CLEAR** and its '**AUTHORITY is BEYOND QUESTION**' then the author's thesis regarding the origin of the letter is defeated by H.H. Jayadwaita Maharaja himself. What also is ironic, is that the word **AUTHORITY** comes from the word **AUTHOR**!

- Is Drutakarma prabhu now going to be brave enough to challenge Maharaja as well?

We shall see.

Since Srila Prabhupada did sign his approval to the entire letter, in attempting to undermine the authority of the letter the author is proposing one of the following options:

Although Srila Prabhupada signed the letter in approval, he did not really approve of it in its entirety.

&

Even though Srila Prabhupada approved the entire contents of the letter, still there is a distinct difference between this and if he had dictated the entire contents himself?*

Now, unless the author is suggesting that Srila Prabhupada did not know what he was doing, he has to go for option 2. But then he needs to explain precisely what the difference is between Srila Prabhupada approving a statement, and writing the statement directly himself. He must then go on to demonstrate precisely how this effects *The Final Order* on initiations. At present the author falls far short of this. For instance, can the author explain what difference it would make to the recipient were someone to write on Srila Prabhupada's behalf: '*every devotee must chant 16 rounds*', and if Srila Prabhupada dictated or typed the same statement himself?

*(Please note Srila Prabhupada offers no caveat to the letter stating that what he is really approving is his secretaries 'understanding' of the letter. Remember the contents and need for the letter came from Srila Prabhupada unless the author is arguing that H.H Tamal Krishna Maharaja, in his capacity as the secretary, ran ISKCON, and simply got Srila Prabhupada to sign off his decisions.)

This argumentation against the authority of the letter is rendered even more absurd when we consider that virtually with his next breath the author states:

"Of course, in the case of the July 9 letter, we do have a copy of the conversations that inspired the letter (July 7 and May 28), so we can be fairly certain that in this case the secretary faithfully recorded, in a general sense, Prabhupada's intentions."

So the author himself admits that the letter is an accurate rendition of Srila Prabhupada's intentions.

- So again what difference is there between this and Srila Prabhupada having directly written the letter down?

Further the author has contradicted himself since in his original article he stated the following:

"Tamal Krishna Maharaja's letter was simply his record of the July 7 conversation about what to do with the initiation backlog"

(Reply to Vijay Sharma' Drutakarma)

Having been chastened by our previous rebuttals, we see the author has dropped his original ludicrous theory that the letter was **SIMPLY** generated from a conversation that is not even mentioned in the letter. So to cover all bases, the author has now belatedly inserted the May 28th conversation as a source of the letter too. The reader may recall that in '*Drutakarma Continues to Strain the Truth*' we pointed out to him that the opening sentence of the letter alluded to a conversation involving the entire GBC, who as far as we know were not in the Garden on July 7th (*unless of course they were all 'hiding in the bushes'*). Unfortunately in doing this the author raises more contradictions since the GBC have already stated that the May 28th conversation only deals with after departure (DOMD), the very time frame the author wants to avoid linking the letter to.

"Specifically regarding the July 9 letter, we have to be careful about trying to read between the lines and put all kinds of hidden meanings into particular words, which may not have been directly chosen by Prabhupada."

Since no-one, except possibly the author, is attempting to do this, the above statement is either irrelevant or another '*straw man*' argument. Most likely both.

"But nowhere in the May 28 conversation, and even more importantly, nowhere in the July 7 conversation, which was the immediate cause of the July 9 letter, do we find any statement by Prabhupada directing Tamal Krishna Goswami to say that Prabhupada was going to continue to initiate disciples after his physical departure."

The author has seriously blundered here on two counts. By stating that Srila Prabhupada mentions '*nowhere*' about initiating after his departure on the May 28th conversation, the author is clearly trying to pretend the following exchange which opened the May 28 conversation did not even taken place:

Satsvarupa Dasa Goswami: Then our next question concerns initiations in the future, particularly at that time you are no longer with us. We want to know how first and second initiations would be conducted.

Srila Prabhupada: Yes. I shall recommend some of you. After this is settled up I shall recommend some of you to act as officiating *acaryas*.

Tamal Krishna Goswami: Is that called *ritvik acarya*?

Srila Prabhupada: *Ritvik*. Yes.

We would like to draw the author's attention to the words '*at that time you are no longer with us*', '*ritvik*' and '*yes*', which may have eluded the normally razor sharp mind of the author.

Secondly the author has again tried to state that the July 7th conversation is the '*immediate cause*' of the July 9th letter, and is thus once again contradicting the letter itself (and the GBC in DOMD) which makes no mention of the July 7th conversation, but rather some other conversation involving the entire GBC, not just H.H. Tamal Krishna maharaja.

"So whatever Tamal Krishna Goswami understood and wrote down in his own words was approved by Prabhupada, and Tamal Krishna Goswami certainly did not have the understanding that Prabhupada was saying he was going to continue to initiate disciples after his departure, especially after Prabhupada had just said on May 28 that his disciples were going to become regular gurus who would initiate their own disciples, who would be Prabhupada's grand disciples, disciples of Prabhupada's disciples."

Again the author has inserted his own creative speculation when he states that Srila Prabhupada was really approving '*whatever Tamal Krishna understood*'. The author is absurdly positing that what Srila Prabhupada actually approved was not his own intentions for the *ritvik* system as explained by the actual words in the July 9th letter, but the contents of the Maharaja's mind in regards to what he thought Srila Prabhupada wanted. This assertion is made more absurd when one considers the Maharaja's colorful history over precisely this issue of Srila Prabhupada's desires regarding initiation. Below we shall once more relish the history of H.H. Tamal Krishna Maharaja's record on this issue for the benefit of the author, since he obviously did not read our response to the GBC paper 'Prabhupada's Order':

Since the GBC are using the contents of Maharaja's mind as prime evidence, it is pertinent for us to carefully examine whether his record on this issue is solid and reliable. Below the reader will see for themselves how Maharaja has offered nothing but a mass of confusing and contradictory positions on what should have happened after Srila Prabhupada's departure:

1978

1): Maharaja agrees with the rest of the '11' that the 11 mentioned in the July 9 letter had been exclusively chosen as the '*material and spiritual successors*' to Srila Prabhupada. He enthusiastically participated and supported this system, with the big *vyasanas* etc. We can see that at the time Maharaja did not display any outward signs that he had any idea what the '*real*' meaning or context of the July 9 letter was. In a document he was party to issued at this time, it states:

"The GBC members met together in Vrndavana and prepared a few last questions to put before Srila Prabhupada. [...] Then he said that he would name the initiating gurus later. [...] Then one day in June he gave his secretary the names of eleven disciples who would be initiating the disciples. [...] A delicate situation may arise when in one ISKCON temple there are disciples of different gurus. The natural way to avoid this is for a guru to perform *diksa* in his own zone. Srila Prabhupada deliberately chose gurus in different parts of the world to arrange for this. [...] A second seat, however a little below Srila Prabhupada's *vyasana*, should be given to the initiating guru. [...] Those who are already empowered to initiate will extend the number by their consideration. In this way it will have spiritual characteristics. The eleven picked by His Divine Grace will extend themselves. [...] Now these godbrother's are worshipped by their disciples as genuine spiritual masters. This means for example, that they are to be considered, as stated in the Guruvastakam, as *nikunjo-yuno rati keli siddhyai* - intimate assistants in the pastimes of Krishna."

(*The Process For Carrying Out Srila Prabhupada's Desires For Future Initiations; A paper prepared by the GBC in consultation with higher authorities, Mayapur, 1978*)

Maharaja offered the following vivid understanding of what exactly he thinks happened at this time:

"The argument that after the departure of the spiritual master anyone of his disciples can give initiation, cannot be applied in the case of Srila Prabhupada who specifically named 11 persons only at first to fulfil this function. These 11 persons were named by Srila Prabhupada in the beginning of July, 1977, in Vrindavana in the back garden of his house. These names were dictated to me as I was serving as his secretary, and now he had me write a letter to all the GBC's and Temple Presidents which he also signed as approved on the 9th of July listing their names and defining their function. [...] Thus, we can understand, that in regard to the third definition of *acarya*, that Srila Prabhupada clearly appointed 11 successors for initiation. Whatever process may have been followed by past *acaryas*, Prabhupada chose to appoint. [...] Even after having these facts clearly explained, if some one continues to blaspheme the 11 gurus, their legitimacy, blasphemes ISKCON, the spiritual vehicle created by Prabhupada to fulfill his will, blasphemes the GBC - the approved driver of the vehicle - [...] he is not a disciple at all. Rather he is the killer of gurudev and his spiritual whereabouts is unknown.

(Letter to Upananda Das, 13/12/78)

As is accepted by everyone now including the GBC, Maharaja's understanding of what the letter meant, and the events that transpired after 1978 based on this understanding of the letter by Maharaja, was an understanding that was absolutely FALSE.

Thus from the very beginning Maharaja had misunderstood the meaning and context of the letter by his own later admission.

1980

2): By this time Maharaja's understanding of what Srila Prabhupada's desires for guru-succession were had become so deviant that even the GBC, who at that time were themselves following a deviated path, suspended him as GBC and guru. At the time Maharaja had become convinced, amongst other things, that (what to speak of his own disciples) even his godbrothers and godsisters could only reach Srila Prabhupada through him!

"Tamala Krishna Goswami, the leader of a large number of *sannyasa* and *brahmacari* preachers, insisted that he was now their via media in relating to Prabhupada and expected that his godbrothers follow HIM ABSOLUTELY."

(*'The Perils of Succession'*, 1996, H.H. Tamala Krishna Maharaja)

Dec. 3rd 1980

3): Having been suspended Maharaja now gave a new version of events at Topanga Canyon, California. He admits there that:

'Myself and the other GBC have done the greatest disservice to this movement the last three years because we interpreted the appointment of *ritviks* as the appointment of gurus. What actually happened I'll explain. I explained it but the interpretation is wrong.'

(*Topanga Canyon Confessions*, 3/12/80)

Here Maharaja is not only confirming that his understanding of the letter in 1978 was totally wrong, but also that now he has finally properly understood what Srila Prabhupada really wanted.

1982

4): Maharaja now changes his mind again and goes back to the version of events that he had supported in 1978 and rejected in 1980:

"I do not think that there is any problem in accepting the spiritual masters who Srila Prabhupada appointed. The first qualification which you should have before you decide on this issue is to chant sixteen rounds and follow strictly Prabhupada's orders. So far as I see anyone who is doing this is accepting these *acaryas*, except in a very few instances. The real proof however is to see that they are *acarya*, not simply by appointment, but by actions. Our movement is progressing and growing more and more, at least as much as it was during Srila Prabhupada's time. [...] You have enclosed a clipping from Back To Godhead in which Srila Bhaktipada is advertised as 'Bona fide Spiritual Master'.

You say 'this is something that seems a little strange to me'. Would you please explain to me what seems strange?

(*Letter to Gadai Prabhu*, 14/6/82)

1984

5): This metamorphosis of Maharaja's version of what happened in 1977 is completed by the publication of his book '*servant of the servant*' in which he states categorically:

Since the disappearance of our beloved spiritual master, we have seen such disenchanted persons come forward trying to cast doubt on the legacy left by Srila Prabhupada. When SP appointed from among his senior disciples eleven persons to continue the process of initiation, and when after their spiritual master's departure those whom he selected assumed their duties by his command, the critics began to bark their discontent. [...] The critics may argue that appointment alone is not a guarantee that one has actually achieved this perfectional stage of life; Prabhupada might have appointed disciples for lack of anyone better, or hoping that they might one day achieve the desired realization. To such irresponsible criticism we answer a decisive "No!" SP chose them because they merited his confidence. [...]

SP conferred his blessings upon these disciples, seeing that they had dedicated themselves heart and soul to assisting him in the preaching mission of Sri Caitanya Mahaprabhu. Thus he considered them to be *uttama-adhikari*, all highly advanced devotees worthy to be accepted as spiritual masters. [...] Critics may doubt whether our ISKCON *acaryas* are actually liberated. Do they know their *rasa* (liberated relationship) with Krishna, and will they be able to instruct their disciples similarly? But such questions bring one dangerously near the precipice of spiritual calamity.

(*"Servant of the Servant"*, Tamal Krishna Goswami, Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 1984, Pages 361-365)

Post 1987

6): Maharaja again changes his mind and whole-heartedly endorses the new reforms and agrees that what he and the other 11 had been doing and teaching for the last 10 years was wrong. To support this new understanding he agrees that in new versions of his book *'Servant of the Servant'* the above quoted passage should be edited out.

1992-95

7): Maharaja's understanding of *guru-tattva* takes a further twist. He now leads the formation of the '*gopi bhava*' club, preaching that Srila Prabhupada had not given us the 'highest understanding' but rather that he wanted us to consult with a '*rasika guru*,' who the chairman of the ministry that has sponsored PO considers:

'...a 'crooked' and 'talented pretender or imposter, who has seduced, beguiled and misled many people.'

(His Grace Ravindra Svarupa prabhu, *'Taking Srila Prabhupada Straight'*, 1998)

1995

8): Maharaja now realises that he was wrong in thinking that Srila Prabhupada had not given us everything and that he had wanted us to consult with the '*rasika guru*,' as he had himself done and also persuaded many others to do so, for the previous 4 years.

1996

9): Maharaja again accepts the '*appointment*' theory that he had rejected in the post 1987 reforms:

"6 months before his own demise, Prabhupada had announced that he would APPOINT some of his disciples to perform all of the functions of initiating new disciples as he had become too ill to do so. Those so initiated would still be Prabhupada's disciple while those who would be initiated after his demise would become his grand-disciples. Shortly thereafter, Prabhupada selected eleven disciples to begin assisting him, and asked his secretary to communicate their names to the rest of ISKCON. Following Srila Prabhupada's death and the fateful meeting with Prabhupada's godbrother Sridhara Maharaja, the eleven gurus NAMED by Prabhupada assumed the extra-ordinary position above all others."

(*'The Perils of Succession'*, 1996, H.H. Tamala Krishna Maharaja)

Further it will noted in the above that maharaja states that Srila Prabhupada's intention to appoint disciples to assist with initiation, as recorded in the May 28th conversation, (6 Months before his own demise), was motivated by illness **EVEN THEN**, and that the 'naming of the gurus' done in the July 9th letter flowed directly from the May 28th conversation.

1998

10): Maharaja now tells us that the issue of appointing the '11' as had occurred via the July 7th garden conversation and the July 9th letter was done independently of the May 28th conversation, though above he has just told us the opposite:

In writing this letter, it was an organisational letter to explain the practical matter of how things would be dealt with because nothing was really changing. Prabhupada was still their guru but at least the actual operational method of how Prabhupada would deal with new candidates was changed. It was very clear in my mind at that time that what we were discussing was the process of initiation in Prabhupada's presence, how things would go on after his presence, he had already instructed us when the 5 or 6 of us had met him on May 28th, one had nothing to do with the other.

(Class given by H.H. Tamal Krishna Goswami Maharaja on 6 August 1998, in Hong Kong)

Now we are told, that 21 years later, the best way to understand the July 9 letter and how it arose is to understand it from Maharaja, even though it is accepted that he did not understand it at the time, and that he has been greatly confused on this issue over the last 21 years.

Surely most normal, sane people would not consider the Maharaja a very reliable witness on this issue, with all due respect. The fact that the GBC have placed such store in his testimony in PO proves that they are utterly desperate. Possessing not one scrap of hard evidence, nor even a single sound argument, they are now pinning everything on the testimony of Maharaja. Instead of just reading the letter ourselves, we must for some bizarre reason accept the indirect interpretation of a witness who has merrily bounced from one deviant and contradictory position to another over the last 21 years. So instead of any factual **EVIDENCE**, Maharaja's mental projections must now become the basis on which to justify '**modifications a & b**' to the July 9th letter - the modifications that led to the abandonment of the *ritvik* system and the imposition of the previous, current and possibly a future ISKCON guru system.

We do hope the author will think twice before bringing the Maharaja into this issue. We return to the author's paper once more.

If it was Prabhupada's desire on July 7 that he change the direction he gave on May 28, then he would have explicitly said that he would continue to initiate his own disciples after his physical departure, and Tamal Krishna Goswami should have written this into the letter. But no where (in Prabhupada's entire life!) is there any statement in which Prabhupada has said he would give initiation to disciples after his own physical departure. In particular, nothing like that is said in the July 7 conversation, which was the immediate cause for the July 9 letter being written. There is not much more that really needs to be said on this subject, but as I predicted in my Thoughts on the *Ritvik* Heresy, Krishnakanta Desai has continued and will continue to recycle his same old arguments.

Again the author has repeated the already defeated assertions:

1. That the letter needs to specify specific time-periods to be operational in those time-periods.
2. That the July 7th conversation was the the immediate cause for the July 9th letter being written.

Please see above and our previous articles where we have continually defeated these assertions.

Also we 'recycle' these arguments because unlike the author's recycled defeated arguments our points have not even been addressed much less defeated, as we have continually shown in all our responses. And we shall continue to recycle them until the author either answers them or concedes he can not. Unfortunately this is unlikely since he is rather petulantly refusing to quote us.

For now there is not much more that really needs to be said on this subject.

"I defy Krishnakanta Desai to produce any statement in which Prabhupada directly says in his own words, "I am going to continue to directly initiate *diksa* disciples after my physical departure from this world."

As we have continually pointed out since Srila Prabhupada **WAS ALREADY** initiating and established as the *diksa* guru for ISKCON, the above statement would only need to be stated **IF**:

- A) Srila Prabhupada had stated that he was going to suddenly stop initiating at departure;

or

- B) Srila Prabhupada was somehow unable to initiate after his departure

In other words the above statement would pre-suppose that departure has special significance in preventing a *diksa* guru from initiating. This pre-supposition is the very premise that lies at the heart of the dispute, and which the author needs to prove, not just assume.

Without A) and B) above there is no **NEED** to state that he will initiate specifically after departure anymore than he needed to state in 1976 that he would continue to initiate after 1976.

Further, since Srila Prabhupada has not given any statement to the effect that:

"I want my disciples to initiate their own disciples on my departure"

the fact that departure **DOES** mark the time after which Srila Prabhupada's disciples **COULD** theoretically replace him if ordered to do so, does not also bear significance, since Srila Prabhupada has not stated that such a succession will definitely take place.

Of course Srila Prabhupada **DOES** state that the *ritvik* system **WILL CONTINUE** into the future - please see letters to Hamsaduta etc. in *The Final Order*.

- The real issue, which the author and the rest of the GBC have continued to dodge, is why did they decide to terminate the *ritvik* system at Srila Prabhupada's departure when he had specifically set up the *ritvik* system to be enforced in ISKCON from July 9th onwards, with no order for it to be terminated on his departure?

Our position is totally consistent with the actual instruction given: that the *ritvik* system should be enforced by ISKCON in ISKCON from July 9th onwards.

The GBC have absolutely no instructions to support their unauthorised termination, and it is this simple fact that will ensure the continued spread of the *ritvik* idea throughout ISKCON, and the author will be powerless to stop this unless he presents the evidence asked for - **Modifications A & B** from *The Final Order*.

It does not matter how many people he kicks out - **truth will always triumph in the end.**

He should carefully consider how history will judge his own obstinacy and intransigence over a clear cut, simple issue.

"I defy Krishnakanta Desai to produce any statement in which Prabhupada directly says in his own words, "I am going to continue to directly initiate *diksa* disciples after my physical departure from this world."

Some more inventive speculation from the author. There is no statement on the tape which states that:

"those taking initiation from the new gurus would be 'disciple of my disciple' and my 'grand-disciple'"

If such a statement exists, the author should produce this new tape. The May 28th tape (which is still inadmissible by the way) only states that the above entities would arise if Srila Prabhupada **FIRST** ordered Gurus, after having first stated that he **WILL** order *ritviks* to deal with initiations for after his departure. And subsequently these *ritviks* were appointed on July 9th. We have no record of these '**new gurus**' ever been ordered into existence. It seems the author in his desperation is trying to resurrect the already discredited zonal acharya theory when the 11 *ritviks* were indeed mistaken for the 'new gurus'.

The tape also makes no statement to the effect that:

"The Gurus would be 'regular gurus' but should wait until after his departure to accept disciples."

Just to refresh the author's memory, the tape actually states:

"... His Grand-Disciple ... When I Order 'you become guru', he becomes regular guru. That's all. He becomes disciple of my disciple."

NOT the above two fabrications.

Neither does Srila Prabhupada even mention 'regular gurus' **EVER** apart from this instance, what to speak of 'throughout his life'. Another fanciful fabrication of the author.

"Perhaps Krishnakanta Desai, the leader of the *ritvik* heresy, can tell us which of the eleven personalities mentioned in the July 9 letter he has taken *ritvik*-initiation from. And if he has not, perhaps he can tell us why not. One should practice what one preaches, shouldn't one?"

This statement of the author's is seriously flawed for two reasons:

Krishnakanta is not the leader of **ANYTHING** much less the '*ritvik* heresy'. This invention of the author's to set me up as the leader of the '*ritviks*' is simply to deflect from the fact that those seeking to follow the *ritvik* system are following Srila Prabhupada, not me. This childish attempt to dissuade devotees from accepting the *ritvik* system because then they will actually be following **ME**, will not have any effect, since even the author will recognise that Srila Prabhupada and not I, signed the July 9th letter.

Also we have never preached that one must presently take initiation from one of the 11. We simply state that Srila Prabhupada set up a system, initially involving the '11', to continue to accept disciples on his behalf, and which would be managed by the GBC. If the author had even bothered to read our position, which he claims he is refuting, he would have seen that we have stated many times that we will only endorse persons taking initiation from the *ritvik* system when it is done in the context of a GBC within a unified world preaching mission. Otherwise why does he think we are trying to reform ISKCON? Until that time, I at least am prepared to wait, and will continue to work for reform, regardless of whether or not the author has succeeded in kicking us out.

Conclusions:

The author continues to reach new depths of desperation in trying to refute the '*ritvik* heresy'. **As we have seen the author:**

1. Does not deal with the *ritvik* position, but simply '**defeats**' non-existent **phantom** arguments, which he creatively fabricates;
2. makes up statements that Srila Prabhupada never stated as evidence;
3. avoids answering the responses to his points and just repeats already defeated arguments;
4. contradicts his own statements;
5. contradicts the statements of other GBC supporters,;
6. speculates that Srila Prabhupada was approving whatever H.H. Tamal Krishna Maharaja thought the letter meant, rather than what **HE** meant.
7. tries to undermine Srila Prabhupada's policy documents by stating they were '**merely approved**' and through more creative speculation.
8. contradicts GBC papers.
9. dishonestly tries to win over Temple Presidents to his bogus DDG system by making it sound like the *ritvik* system.

www.iskconirm.com
irm@iskconirm.com