

An e-mail exchange with *Héctor Rosario, Ph.D*

A Challenge to the IRM



A Challenge to the IRM



“The spiritual master must never be carried away by an accumulation of wealth or a large number of followers. A bona fide spiritual master will never become like that.”

(Nectar of Devotion, Chapter 14)



by Krishnakant

A Challenge to the IRM

This is an e-mail exchange with **Héctor Rosario, Ph.D**

Hare Krishna,

Krishnakant Prabhu:

Please accept my sincere obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

Yesterday, April 28th, I received some unsolicited mail from India, which I nevertheless welcomed. The envelope contained two "Back to Prabhupada" issues, including the **Special Summary Issue**. I read both magazines in their entirety and have decided to present a challenge to some of your principal arguments, based solely on deductive reasoning flaws.

As a matter of introduction, I shall state that I have no qualifications to speak about *Krishna-katha*, but that simply by the grace of the Lord, my mathematical brain handles deductive reasoning fairly well.

I shall also state what I expect from this debate: truthfulness. I shall treat you as a Vaishnava and as my worthy opponent, and as such, you will receive all due respect. I only pray that Krishna, by the grace of His humble servant Srila Prabhupada, will grant undisputable victory to one of us. The other one shall humbly accept defeat. Needless to say, I do not expect this debate to end swiftly, for as we progress, I hope more intelligent arguments and evidence will surface.

I shall also add that I will try to disseminate this debate as much as possible. I am confident you will do likewise. In addition, in order to clarify my relationship with Iskcon and not give the impression of having a hidden agenda, I shall state that I have asked H. H. Hridayanda das Goswami for *diksa* and he has kindly accepted. That is scheduled to happen this June in Atlanta at the *Panihati Festival*. I have not informed him of this initiative I have now undertaken and honestly do not know how he will react. As you say, let us "**Take action – discover the truth – live the truth.**" Hence, without any further delay, let us begin.

1. In "*The Final Order*" you claim to have six "*proofs*" to establish the *ritvik* case. However, there is a logical flaw in your purported Proof 4: One guru falls = no Gurus authorised. Certainly, it is shameful for a Vaishnava to fall to the depths many Iskcon gurus have. It is even more shameful that the GBC has sometimes hidden the information from devotees. That being said, allow me to proceed. You state:

"Hence the continuous falldown of the Gurus, in whatever system the GBC have adopted for manufacturing them, is itself proof positive that the whole operation is unauthorised. Thus, the fact that some ISKCON Gurus have not fallen down (visibly at least) does not in any way indicate they were authorised – the fact that their fallen colleagues were authorised via the same process is all the evidence we need that they were also not properly authorised, even though they may have not yet externally exhibited signs of gross sense gratification (which we know of)."

I will grant you that, given the axioms you have chosen, the conclusion would indeed follow logically. However, if we accept the argument as sound, then we must be able to apply the same reasoning to other cases. Let us apply it to the Gaudiya Matha. It is well known that 'some' of Srila Bhaktisiddhanta Sarasvati Thakura's disciples acting as gurus fell, or at least did not show the purity expected of someone holding such a post. Therefore, if we apply your rule of

"One guru falls = no Gurus authorised"

and its reasoning, then we would be forced to conclude that Srila Prabhupada is not bonafide. I do not think neither you nor I are willing to accept that. Hence we must revise or abandon the argument altogether. It would be wise to do the latter.

2. You claim that the original eleven *ritviks* are fallen. Some of them, perhaps the majority, clearly betrayed Srila Prabhupada. They should certainly not be accepted as gurus by anyone. However, they still deserve the mercy of Vaishnavas, as Vaishnavas are more than just - they are "magnanimous," as Srila Prabhupada teaches us in *The Nectar of Devotion*. How-

ever, for the sake or argument, let me accept your conclusion that none of the original eleven chosen *ritviks* are qualified to represent Srila Prabhupada. If the original *ritvik* system is defunct, how would you reinstate it? Srila Prabhupada chose those eleven devotees and you would not question his judgment. However, how would we choose the next *ritviks*? We could not vote for them, since you do not accept that means as a legitimate way of deciding the representatives of Srila Prabhupada. So what would your objective criteria be?

3. It is accepted that Srila Prabhupada did not authorize any successors. However, neither did Srila Bhaktisiddhanta. Should we reject all of Srila Bhaktisiddhanta's disciples as well, including of course, Srila Prabhupada?
4. I also have some comments to make about your magazine *Back to Prabhupada*. First of all, the editorial style (no offense meant) resembles more that of a tabloid than the style of a spiritual publication. In addition, you would present a stronger case if you would publish at least some letters to the editor that are in disagreement with the views expressed in the magazine. Do not discriminate against them for holding opposing views. That is akin to temple bannings against respectful IRM members
5. To help substantiate the claim above, for instance, when you give a summary of the original eleven *ritviks*, you do exclude important information about them, and simply present information that would seem to satisfy your agenda. For five of them you simply said that they left or were thrown out after

"caught engaging in illicit activity."

Now, being engaged in illegal activity, however minor, would automatically disqualify one to be a guru. However, in all fairness, you should state what the "illicit activity" in each case was. It is obviously not the same to smoke than to rape a child, and the *sastras* indicate that the latter is a far greater sin. Also, you mention that H.H. Jayapataka Swami is

"under police investigation for abetment to suicide."

First of all, you do not give dates for said investigation, and neither do you give information as to in what country or province the alleged acts occurred. You seem to be blinded by your conclusion that Jayapataka Swami is not an authorized guru, instead of being just and rational while presenting the information. Besides, those of us who have been politically persecuted know very well that anyone can present false charges against an individual. In fact, the argument can be so credible that someone might be given capital punishment...just to find out weeks after the execution that the alleged culprit was innocent. Again, at least be fair and give more information. If you claim that the GBC withholds information that is unfavorable to its interests, please avoid doing the same.

6. In all fairness to H.H. Hridayandanda das Goswami, if you wanted to attack him, you should have presented a stronger case. All you have to hold against him is that he

"went back to college to get education."

By the word 'college' in the United States it is usually understood a four-year college. However, he went to Harvard University to pursue doctoral studies. It is a tradition in Vedic culture for *sannyasis* to continue their studies through philosophical debate. If you read his doctoral dissertation, you will realize that he was preaching all the while, which leads me to the last point for now.

7. There is not a glimpse of *Krishna-katha* in you magazine. Devotees relish in relating the pastimes of Sri Sri Radha Govinda, yet you do not share with us your insights into those most intimate affairs. A little devotion might suit you better.

At the service of Srila Prabhupada,

Héctor Rosario, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor Department of Mathematics University of Puerto Rico,

Mayagüez Campus PO Box 9018 Mayagüez,

PR 00681

Post subject: Krishnakant's 1st reply

On Sun, 30 Apr 2006 20:24:16 +0530, IRM wrote

Dear Hector Prabhu,

Hare Krishna!

Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada. Thank you for your letter.

I will answer your points one at a time, moving on only after each point is concluded.

Beginning with point 1, you quote the *Back to Prabhupada Special Issue* thus:

"Hence the continuous fall-down of the Gurus, in whatever system the GBC have adopted for manufacturing them, is itself proof positive that the whole operation is unauthorised. Thus, the fact that some ISKCON Gurus have not fallen down (visibly at least) does not in any way indicate they were authorised – the fact that their fallen colleagues were authorised via the same process is all the evidence we need that they were also not properly authorised, even though they may have not yet externally exhibited signs of gross sense gratification (which we know of)."

However you have only quoted PART of the relevant passage from the *Special Issue*. Nobody quotes something beginning with the word 'hence' as being the reasoning offered, because the word 'hence' means that - what is to be quoted now DEPENDS on the reasoning just provided in the preceding sentence. And what reasoning does the preceding sentence - for which what you have quoted above is the conclusion - provide? It states

"And again, every one of these 93 individuals became guru in exactly the same way (via the Guru hoax part 2), proving that every one of these 93 Gurus was "not properly authorised and only on his own initiative" became Guru." (emphasis added)

So THIS is the reasoning I have offered IN ORDER to apply the rule of

"one guru falls = no guru authorised."

Therefore in order to apply THIS reasoning to the Gaudiya Matha, you would need to first demonstrate that Srila Prabhupada and all his Godbrothers who became guru, were all authorised in exactly the same way. Unless you can do this, your argument is defeated, for you have applied the reasoning and rule for one set of conditions to a completely different set of circumstances. If you had read the proof in question carefully, you could have avoided the above 'straw-man' logical blunder - falsely claiming that we say that

"one guru falls = no gurus authorised"

applies to all situations. It applies only when all the gurus in question were authorised in an identical manner. Unless you have any challenge to make to the above point (which is simply stating what I actually wrote in *BTP*), I will move onto your next point, No. 2).

I trust you will be gentlemanly enough to post this reply (and all other replies) in full on the HDG *Istaghosti* and all other places where you have sent your e-mail.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you very much.

Your servant,

Krishnakant

Post subject: A challenge to IRM 2

Sent: 01 May 2006 23:44

To: IRM

Subject: RE: A challenge to IRM

Hare Krishna,

Krishnakant Prabhu:

Please accept my obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

First of all, thank you for accepting my challenge to IRM. I reiterate my prayer that Krishna, by the grace of his pure devotee Srila Prabhupada, may grant undisputed victory to one of us in this debate. Srila Prabhupada's mission is much too valuable to be wasted in fratricidal battles. I will accompany my prayer asking for Srila Prabhupada's forgiveness for whatever offenses we may commit in attempting to render service to his mission. May you and I, and anyone who reads this exchange, attain *Krishna-prema*.

As I stated in my original message, I will disseminate this debate as much as possible. Unless directed otherwise by a recipient, I will continue to send the exchanges in an integral way to the same list. I suggest you also post it on your website, as well as publish the entire exchange in your magazine. I will accept your proposition of answering my original points "**one at a time.**"

However, let us not use that as an excuse to delay addressing other equally important points.

Point 1: I am aware that I only quoted part of the passage from your magazine because I took for granted that you were aware of your own words, and hence, only used it as a reference. However, your explanation only further weakens your argument. You assume that the 93 devotees became gurus out of their own volition in exactly the same way. First of all, any rational person would understand that there is a difference between the first eleven and the rest, being that the first eleven, upon the physical departure of their beloved Srila Prabhupada, took what they understood were the necessary steps to preserve Srila Prabhupada's mission. Then they made some decisions, which we may question, that resulted in today's situation, which obviously needs substantial reform. (In fact, I will submit some recommendations to the GBC as a service to Srila Prabhupada. I expect to publish them on an auspicious occasion very soon.)

Notice, though, that I am debating your arguments using your axioms (or "conclusions" that may be taken as axioms for deductive purposes). However, this axiom of yours, namely that they became gurus "in exactly the same way" is a blanket statement which is highly biased and lacks the seriousness required of a dignified debate. An axiom, by definition is "a statement accepted as true as the basis for argument or inference." It is also considered a "self-evident truth." Your axiom does not satisfy this principle, yet I played with it as if it were good to show you that in any case, the reasoning was faulty. Besides, a devotee knows that Krishna and Guru can manifest through the heart and in dreams and you do not know if and how Srila Prabhupada has manifested his wishes in those ways to at least some of those gurus, or whether he expressed his views in private conversations. (After all, remember that *Madhvacarya* was initiated by Srila Vyasadeva in a very mystical way since there is a gap of several millennia between their physical manifestations.)

This is not part of my reasoning, but simply an observation to keep in mind when you claim that they were authorized in the same way. It sheds a dark veil on your 'axiom' since it cannot be taken as 'self-evident'. However, taking your axiom as good (only for the sake of argument) you claim that I

"in order to apply THIS reasoning to the Gaudiya Matha, (I) would need to first demonstrate that Srila Prabhupada and all his Godbrothers who became guru, were all authorised in exactly the same way".

Given the information available to me, I must conclude that indeed they were. As you know, Srila Bhaktisiddhanta did not authorize a successor, and he did not need to. As far as I know, Srila Bhaktivinoda Thakura had only a *siksa* relationship with Srila Gaura Kishora das Babaji. Furthermore, Srila Bhaktivinoda did not authorize Srila Gaura Kishora to initiate his biological son. Furthermore, the initiation of Srila Bhaktisiddhanta was nothing like the ones Srila Prabhupada gave (in terms of external expression). However, we take it as a fact that they were all bonafide solely on Srila Prabhupada's conviction and words. Remember also, that Srila Prabhupada was given *sannyasa* by a godbrother. Was his godbrother authorized to do this? If not, then Srila Prabhupada would not be authorized to give *sannyasa* to his disciples. The matter becomes more involved as we go back in the *parampara*.

Thus, another question to you is, can you show that Srila Prabhupada and his godbrothers were NOT authorized in the same way to initiate disciples? I take it for granted that they were. Tradition is upheld: the *acarya* departs and he may or may not leave a successor. It does not matter much. This does not imply that the successor is the only one who takes disciples. For preaching purposes, if they are qualified, all his initiated disciples should become gurus. Hence, whether we object to the axiom or we use it, your claim crumbles. In the former case, we reject the line of reasoning and on the latter, we reject the conclusion upon finding an unacceptable conclusion when applied to an analogous setting, i.e. that of the Gaudiya Matha. Of course, it is unacceptable because it would a priori invalidate your "proof 1."

I will leave you with something else to consider before you reply. Last night I was watching a ten-minute interview given by Srila Prabhupada in Boston in 1971. You may find it on CD-13 of ITV's Prabhupada's DVD Library Collection. I find his words very appropriate to our discussion. Around the ninth minute of the interview Srila Prabhupada states in his lovely intonation:

“But Krishna is saying that anyone, that anyone who takes proper shelter of Me. This is very important. Proper shelter means to take shelter of Krishna. BUT in the PHYSICAL absence of Krishna, one has to take shelter of Krishna’s real representative. Then anyone who is understanding Krishna’s philosophy and he will be elevated to the highest platform of understanding” (sic).

Again, may Srila Prabhupada forgive any offenses may we commit in this exchange.

Wishing you Srila Prabhupada's *kripa*,

At his feet,

Héctor Rosario,

Ph.D. Assistant Professor Department of Mathematics University of Puerto Rico, Mayagüez

Campus PO Box 9018 Mayagüez,

PR 00681

Post subject: Krishnakant's 2nd reply

Wed, 3 May 2006

Dear Hector Prabhu,

Please accept my humble obeisances.

All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

Thank you for your letter.

You have said:

“You assume that the 93 devotees became gurus out of their own volition in exactly the same way. First of all, any rational person would understand that there is a difference between the first eleven and the rest, being that the first eleven, upon the physical departure of their beloved Srila Prabhupada, took what they understood were the necessary steps to preserve Srila Prabhupada's mission.”

Prabhu again I must humbly request that you actually READ what was written in the *BTP Special Issue*. There it is explained in great detail how the first 11 were NOT part of the 93 devotees you refer to above, and that they became gurus in a manner DIFFERENT to the 93. Therefore again your point above, like the previous point you made, is another 'straw-man' argument, which could have been avoided if you had actually carefully read the text you are supposed to be challenging. If you accept this point, (which is simply stating what I actually wrote in *BTP*), I will move onto to your other point below which addresses my last response.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you,

Your servant,

Krishnakant

Post subject: Hector - act 3

Hare Krishna, Krishnakant Prabhu,

Please accept my obeisances.

All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

I get the impression that you are diluting the discussion by apparently trying to clarify details. We do not want to become masters of evasion. Let us clarify details, but not stop the discussion as if all other issues depended on one particular detail. The truth is one, and if we are truly sincere and humble, it will shine quickly. Remember that our goal as sincere devotees is not trying to determine who has more endurance but to discover the truth.

In fact, I was informed that Ramakanta Prabhu defeated you and IRM in an 18-month long debate that finished with you silently dropping out of the discussion when you could not explain a quote from Srila Prabhupada. Ramakanta Prabhu asserted that you had misunderstood Srila Prabhupada's instruction to always compare guru with *sadhu* and *sastra*.

"You have to corroborate whether guru, what guru is speaking, whether it is there in the scripture; what scripture is speaking, whether that is in the character of guru, or in the *sadhu*, saintly persons, or spiritual master. So you have to always make comparison with three things: *sadhu*, *sastra*, *guru*."

(CC Madhya 20.119-121, New York, November 24, 1966)

Can you explain that quote now? Of course, whether he defeated you or not is not an issue in our debate, but please let us not extend it more than necessary. I am beginning to realize that I made a mistake by accepting your terms that we discuss the issues one by one. Take what ever time you need, but please answer then all at once. I trust you are intelligent enough to handle that.

Remember, there are potentially thousands of devotees reading these exchanges and we also want them to share the findings. Let us now proceed with the debate in an honest way.

You claim you do not assume anything, yet you assume that I did not "actually read" what you wrote, instead of suggesting I might have misunderstood your arguments. That is more respectful. I will rephrase your argument keeping the essentials, as mathematicians and logicians do. This will help avoid the verbiage that has characterized this debate so far.

SP's dictum: If guru falls, then guru was not authorized (bonafide).

Event: At least on guru falls.

Conclusion: Guru was not authorized (bona fide).

IRM's Assumption: All gurus were authorized in the same way. (Divide it in two sets, namely the first 11 and the other 93, and apply the same reasoning to both.)

IRM's Conclusion: Since at least one guru fell, the authorization process itself is not authorized (bona fide).

IRM's Corollary: No guru authorized in such way is authorized (bona fide).

Your assumption cannot be taken as objective and hence has little to no value, for the reasons I outlined in my second message, e.g. Vyasadeva- *Madhvacharya*, Goura Kishora-Bhaktisiddhanta, etc. Furthermore, even if we take the assumption as valid, the conclusion does not logically follow, unless SP's dictum is a bi-conditional statement. In the way I remember it from what I read, it is only a conditional statement.

As a bi-conditional statement, the dictum becomes: A guru falls if and only if the guru is not authorized. For our readers, it is not the same to say that: If it rains, then Prabhu takes his umbrella. If Prabhu takes his umbrella, then it rains. Hence, even if you can show that Srila Prabhupada's dictum is a biconditional statement, your assumption is unacceptable. It is your biased perception, and you and I suffer from the four defects, right? However, if we decide to accept your assumption, then we would have to apply the reasoning to the Gaudiya Matha and you would conclude that Srila Prabhupada is not bona fide (unless you can prove that he was authorized in a different way as those of his godbrothers who fell). If you are humble and sincere you will accept defeat at least on this point.

However, you have many other issues yet to address from the original challenge to IRM.

To recapitulate,

2. How would you reinstate the ritvik system if, according to IRM, none of the original 11 ritviks is a bona fide representative of Srila Prabhupada?
3. It is accepted that Srila Prabhupada did not authorize any successors. However, neither did Srila Bhaktisiddhanta. Should we reject all of Srila Bhaktisiddhanta's disciples as well, including of course, Srila Prabhupada?

4. Do you think there is an editorial need to include letters of dissenting opinions in your magazine, for the sake of fairness to your readers? (The tendency to cheat is there in us all, but as devotees we should shun it.)
5. Do you think there is a need to give more relevant information when talking about the fall of a disciple of Srila Prabhupada. "Illicit activity", although disqualifying for a guru however minor, is too vague a term. It borders on slander and libel when we do not present the information fairly.
6. Besides the 'proof' in point one (now defeated), your only objection to H.H. Hridayananda das Goswami (Srila Acaryadeva) being a guru is that he earned a Ph.D. from Harvard University. Have you read his doctoral dissertation? What else do you have against him?
7. As devotees, our main business is *Krishna-katha*. Do you feel that IRM's satisfies that criterion in its publications? The only thing that seems to qualify as such is the mahamantra at the bottom of each page.

And of course, I would be glad to hear your reactions about the importance that Srila Prabhupada how we take shelter of Krishna in His physical absence. This quote would seem to deny the very essence of those who vehemently oppose Iskcon's prerogative to initiate devotees through what they understand are the qualified devotees.

"But Krishna is saying that anyone, that anyone who takes proper shelter of Me. This is very important. Proper shelter means to take shelter of Krishna. But in the physical absence of Krishna, one has to take shelter of Krishna's real representative. Then anyone who is understanding Krishna's philosophy and he will be elevated to the highest platform of understanding" (sic).

I will wait for your careful and detailed response to all points. That will make it more relishable.

With all best wishes,

At Srila Prabhupada's feet, hector --

Héctor Rosario, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor Department of Mathematics University of Puerto Rico,

Mayagüez Campus PO Box 9018 Mayagüez,

PR 00681

Post subject: Krishnakant's 3rd reply

Thu, 4 May 2006 08:25:07 +0530

Dear Hector Prabhu, Hare Krishna!

Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

It has only been 3 days, and you already want to engage in evasion of your statement:

"I will accept your proposition of answering my original points one at a time." (Hector Rosario, 1st May, 2006)

I am sorry but I will not allow you to evade your agreement here. Because the most common technique of evasion in debate is to discuss any point one decides, along with any other number of points, at any time, as a way to try and hide one's defeat under verbiage. Which is exactly what you have done here. For I just rebutted your first point in response to my answer to your challenge point 1 - henceforward to be referred to as 'answer 1' - by stating:

"the first 11 were NOT part of the 93 devotees you refer to above, and that they became gurus in a manner DIFFERENT to the 93."

- Did you accept your defeat on this point in a straight-forward and honest manner?

No, you did not even respond directly to this point, and instead evaded it by asking me to start a completely different debate!

Thus in just a matter of days you are already trying to evade both the agreed points for debate and also the agreed manner of debate. I will not allow it. Therefore anything else you want to debate will be added to the list of your 7 points, to be answered after these 7 points have been dealt with in order. We are currently discussing your first point.

So I will ask you again, to directly state whether or not you accept:

"the first 11 were **NOT** part of the 93 devotees you refer to above, and that they became gurus in a manner **DIFFERENT** to the 93."

Please answer directly and honestly, either **yes** or **no**. (Please do not let me to have to ask you this question for a third time. Thank you).

If you answer yes, then you have been defeated on the first point you made in response to my answer 1, and we can then move onto your other point in response to my answer 1, regarding the authorisation of the Gaudiya Matha godbrothers of Srila Prabhupada.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you,

Your servant,

Krishnakant

Post subject: Hector - act 4

Hare Krishna,

Krishnakant Prabhu,

Please accept my obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

Prabhu, the only thing I am trying to evade is wasting time on non-essentials. Yes, I did make a mistake when I did not separate the first eleven gurus from the other 93, yet that does not alter the structure of the argument I presented in my third message. However, the logical flaws of your argument still hold.

Simply apply your

“one guru falls = no guru authorised”

rule to each case separately. I took the pains to strip your arguments of non-essentials so that we could better analyze the situation. If you have any objection to how I have presented your argument--by simply looking at the structure to test for logical flaws-- then please point where you think I have erred. Let us use that model with whatever adjustments we agree must be made. This is what logicians and mathematicians do precisely to avoid hiding behind words. Politicians do the opposite. I have no problem accepting to have committed a mistake, but I wonder why Ramakanta Prabhu does not appear on your website as a debater who defeated you. You list all those you think to have defeated, yet you do not mention this debate with him. Remember, as devotees we must shun the tendency to cheat. Furthermore, I have admitted another mistake, namely, having accepted your terms that we discuss the issues one by one.

Yesterday I suggested we do them all at once, but if you are afraid I may use that to confuse you, then forget it. We will continue to take them one at a time, but that means taking point one at once, not dissecting it into several fragments. Keep in mind, though, that if you extend this debate longer than necessary, the readers will get tired with your evasions and realize you are simply pretending to be sleeping; hence nobody will be able to wake you. Notice that in your response you do evade your own terms, for you again simply took part of the arguments and claimed I was trying to evade you. In fact, you did not address any of the issues in my third message. Let us be truthful.

I will repeat my argument. Also, remember that the Gaudiya Matha case belongs to point one. Follow your own rules and address it as part of point one. There is new text towards the end, so I will encourage you to read my words carefully. I have also added two more points to the list, as per your suggestion. Let them be points 8 and 9.

SP's dictum: If guru falls, then guru was not authorized (bonafide).

Event: At least on guru falls.

Conclusion: Guru was not authorized (bona fide).

IRM's Assumption: All gurus were authorized in the same way. (Divide it in two sets, namely the first 11 and the other 93, and apply the same reasoning to both.)

IRM's Conclusion: Since at least one guru fell, the authorization process itself is not authorized (bona fide).

IRM's Corollary: No guru authorized in such way is authorized (bona fide).

Your assumption cannot be taken as objective and hence has little to no value, for the reasons I outlined in my second message, e.g. Vyasadeva- Madhvacarya, Gaura Kishora-Bhaktisiddhanta, etc. Furthermore, even if we take the assumption as valid, the conclusion does not logically follow, unless SP's dictum is a bi-conditional statement. In the way I remember it from what I read, it is only a conditional statement. As a bi-conditional statement, the dictum becomes: A guru falls if and only if the guru is not authorized. For our readers, it is not the same to say that: If it rains, then Prabhu takes his umbrella. If Prabhu takes his umbrella, then it rains. Hence, even if you can show that Srila Prabhupada's dictum is a biconditional statement, your assumption is unacceptable. It is your biased perception, and you and I suffer from the four defects, right? However, if we decide to accept your assumption, then we would have to apply the reasoning to the Gaudiya Matha and you would conclude that Srila Prabhupada is not bona fide (unless you can prove that he was authorized in a different way as those of his godbrothers who fell). If you are humble and sincere you will accept defeat at least on this point.

However, you have many other issues yet to address from the original challenge to IRM. To recapitulate,

2) How would you reinstate the *ritvik* system if, according to IRM, none of the original 11 *ritviks* is a bona fide representative of Srila Prabhupada?

3) It is accepted that Srila Prabhupada did not authorize any successors. However, neither did Srila Bhaktisiddhanta. Should we reject all of Srila Bhaktisiddhanta's disciples as well, including of course, Srila Prabhupada?

4) Do you think there is an editorial need to include letters of dissenting opinions in your magazine, for the sake of fairness to your readers? (The tendency to cheat is there in us all, but as devotees we should shun it.)

5) Do you think there is a need to give more relevant information when talking about the fall of a disciple of Srila Prabhupada. "Illicit activity", although disqualifying for a guru however minor, is too vague a term. It borders on slander and libel when we do not present the information fairly.

6) Besides the 'proof' in point one (now defeated), your only objection to H.H. Hridayananda das Goswami (Srila Acaryadeva) being a guru is that he earned a Ph.D. from Harvard University. Have you read his doctoral dissertation? What else do you have against him?

7) As devotees, our main business is *Krishna-katha*. Do you feel that IRM's satisfies that criterion in its publications? The only thing that seems to qualify as such is the mahamantra at the bottom of each page.

8) What is IRM's position with regard to the importance that Srila Prabhupada gave to how we take shelter of Krishna in His physical absence?

"But Krishna is saying that anyone, that anyone who takes proper shelter of Me. This is very important. Proper shelter means to take shelter of Krishna. But in the physical absence of Krishna, one has to take shelter of Krishna's real representative. Then anyone who is understanding Krishna's philosophy and he will be elevated to the highest platform of understanding" (sic).

9) Do you accept that Ramakant Prabhu defeated IRM in a debate?

With all best wishes,

At Srila Prabhupada's feet,

hector --

Héctor Rosario, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor Department of Mathematics University of Puerto Rico, Mayagüez Campus

PO Box 9018 Mayagüez,

PR 00681

Post subject: Krishnakant's 4th reply

Fri, 5 May 2006

Dear Hector Prabhu,

Hare Krishna! Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

You have said:

"Yes, I did made a mistake when I did not separate the first eleven gurus from the other 93,"

I am glad you have finally directly admitted your mistake. If you had done this earlier, we could have saved time and words. You had earlier claimed that your withdrawn argument mentioned above was evidence of how my argument was 'weakened':

"However, your explanation only further weakens your argument. You assume that the 93 devotees became gurus out of their own volition in exactly ..."

Hence due to your grave charge that you had 'weakened' my argument, your point had to be firmly defeated, which it now has been.

Now we move onto your other point in response to my answer 1. I had correctly pointed out the condition required for your challenge 1:

"Therefore in order to apply THIS reasoning to the Gaudiya Matha, you would need to first demonstrate that Srila Prabhupada and all his Godbrothers who became guru, were all authorised ***in exactly the same way***."

You accepted this condition, and in response as evidence to demonstrate that Srila Prabhupada and all his Godbrothers were authorised in exactly the same way, you have responded:

"I take it for granted that they were."

This is not evidence that they were. Otherwise anyone could win any debate on any subject simply by saying **"I take it for granted!"**

Further asserting that Srila Bhaktisiddhanta did NOT leave a successor would be evidence of what did NOT happen. You have to demonstrate what DID happen - i.e. that all the subsequent gurus became authorised in the same way.

You have also said:

"Thus, another question to you is, can you show that Srila Prabhupada and his godbrothers were NOT authorized in the same way to initiate disciples?"

But it is not up to me to show the opposite. This is a logical fallacy called '*shifting the burden*'. YOU have asserted that my proof "crumbles", because:

"we reject the conclusion upon finding an unacceptable conclusion when applied to an analogous setting, i.e. that of the Gaudiya Matha."

So YOU need to prove your assertion that it was indeed an analogous setting. You cannot assert something, and then say either "I take it for granted", or that your opponent must prove the opposite. I am surprised I have to point out such an elementary logical fallacy to a supposedly 'mathematical brain'.

Hence your challenge is already defeated for lack of evidence.

In addition what makes your "I take it for granted" claim regarding gurus being 'authorised in the same way', is that you had previously stated that such an assumption is:

"a blanket statement which is highly biased and lacks the seriousness required of a dignified debate. [...] Besides, a devotee knows that Krishna and Guru can manifest through the heart and in dreams and you do not know if and how Srila Prabhupada has manifested his wishes in those ways to at least some of those gurus, or whether he expressed his views in private conversations. (After all, remember that Madhvacarya was initiated by Srila Vyasadeva in a very mystical way since there is a gap of several millennia between their physical manifestations.) [...] cannot be taken as objective and hence has little to no value."

Yet when it suits you, you are more than happy to apply such an assumption to the Gaudiya Matha!

(Further, as you will clearly see in *BTP*, ***we*** did not just assume the 11 and the 93 were authorised in the same way, but demonstrated it via the GBC's own statements. But this is NOT relevant here, since you have challenged to show the flaw in our proof accepting our 'axioms' as true.)

Therefore to summarise:

a) You challenged that our proof was flawed by asserting that when it is applied to an analogous situation - i.e. the Gaudiya Matha - the conclusion would need to be rejected.

b) However you have failed to demonstrate that the Gaudiya Matha was indeed an analogous situation in which you could apply our proof. You have simply

'taken it for granted'

(If you claim that it is not possible to be able to prove this, then your challenge still remains unproven.)

c) You have further conceded that you have no evidence for your claim, by committing a logical fallacy in asking me to show the opposite. But I do not need to show anything, since it is not my name which is Hector, nor am I challenging myself.

d) Further compounding all this, you have even destroyed the very assumption on which your unsubstantiated argument rests, by stating that such an assumption would in any case be "biased, not objective, of little or no value" etc.

So in conclusion your challenge 1 has failed due to lack of evidence, relying only on an assumption, buttressed with the logical fallacy of shifting the burden, and in addition you have further self-defeated even the assumption on which you hang your argument.

So unless you have can provide evidence that Srila Prabhupada and all his godbrothers were authorised in exactly the same way your challenge 1 is defeated, and we will move onto your challenge 2.

WARNING: Do not respond with methods of evasion like asking me further questions (they will simply go onto the end of the list), or any other unrelated verbiage, or complaining I have not answered something else, or been defeated by others etc. These things did not do you any good previously, nor will they help here.

Respond with anything short of the evidence requested above, and your challenge will still remain unproven, and I will simply keep pointing this out.

Thank you.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Your servant,

Krishnakant

Post subject: Hector - act 5

Hare Krishna, Krishnakant Prabhu:

Please accept my sincere obeisances.

All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

I followed your advice and went back to the *Special Issue* to carefully read your words and study your arguments, receptive to the idea of being wrong. Remember that I opened this debate with a prayer to Krishna asking that Srila Prabhupada would grant undisputed victory to one of us. His great mission deserves no less. Hence if you defeat me in point one, I will accept you have Srila Prabhupada's blessings. While going over your arguments, I realized I had overlooked a much simpler logical flaw that would have avoided much time and words in establishing the truth of point 1, that is, to establish the logical invalidity of your purported Proof 4 in IRM's *The Final Order*:

"One guru falls = no Gurus authorised."

Keep in mind that my assertion from the beginning in point 1 was that "there is a logical flaw in your purported Proof 4." So my responsibility was to find such flaw. In the process, I was deluded by pride, and Krishna, displeased by that, prevented me from seeing the truth. Please, forgive me for any offenses I might have committed against you while deluded by pride. Please, study this simple argument carefully, and you will immediately realize that 'proof 4' is no proof at all, since from the very beginning it suffers from a serious logical flaw.

In the *Special Issue* you write:

"Here is the proof recapped:

a) *Nectar of Devotion* states that when not properly authorised – sometimes the Guru falls.

b) Hence, if Guru falls, then he was not properly authorised.

c) But all Gurus authorised in exactly the same way.

d) Thus all Gurus not properly authorised.

e) *Ritvik* system authorised by July 9th directive remains."

Here is the flaw: B does not follow from A. Let us look at the logical structure of the statements. Let P be the statement "guru not authorized". Let Q be the statement "guru falls." Srila Prabhupada establishes in *The Nectar of Devotion* that

"But sometimes, if a spiritual master is not properly authorized and only on his own initiative becomes a spiritual master, he may be carried away by an accumulation of wealth and large numbers of disciples."

I will accept your interpretation that being **"carried away by an accumulation of wealth and large numbers of disciples"** constitutes a falldown. Now, there are at least two ways to show B does not follow from A. I do not think you will be much pleased with the first one, but I'll present it anyway.

CASE 1. The word '*sometimes*' is not conclusive, something may or may not happen. If a guru is not authorized, then he may or may not fall. We cannot conclude anything further than that.

CASE 2. For the sake of argument, let us ignore the word '*sometimes*': P: guru not authorized Q: guru falls Prabhupada's dictum becomes: If P, then Q. (I accept that I was deluded by pride and unintentionally changed Prabhupada's dictum in my previous messages to "If Q, then P") In B you claim, "If Q, then P", that is "if guru falls, then he was not authorized." If you can show that B holds, *independently* of A, then you would have the stronger biconditional statement: "P if and only if Q", which is an abbreviated form of saying "If P, then Q - AND - If Q, then P." The accepted rules of inference of logic show that A and B are different; so much so that the greatest joy in mathematics and logic is to find statements with this property. Consider the following example: If it rains in the morning, then Prabhu takes his umbrella. If Prabhu takes his umbrella, then it rains in the morning. Here, Q is the statement "it rains in the morning." P is the statement "Prabhu takes his umbrella." They are obviously different statements with distinct truth values, as discussed in mathematics and logic. Sometimes it is not so easy to see that two statements written in standard English are independent. That is why mathematicians and logicians look at the structure of arguments, precisely to avoid making false claims.

In summary, B does not follow from A. If you want to establish the validity of B, then you would need additional arguments. A direct quote from Srila Prabhupada stating "if a guru falls, then he was not authorized" will suffice. Find it and we will go, in order, to steps C, D and E of your recapping. Of course, we have unnecessarily already debated this at large. However, if you cannot show the validity of B *independently* of A, then the entire argument collapses and we can avoid much disturbance to our Vaishnava readers.

Until then, 'Proof 4' in IRM's "*The Final Order*" is no proof at all. I think my prayer has been answered.

At Srila Prabhupada's feet, hector

Post subject: Krishnakant's 5th reply

Mon, 8 May 2006

Hector Prabhu,

Hare Krishna!

Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

Prabhu, you really must stop doing this.

Every time you are defeated, you simply evade your defeat by making some new point. If you wish to make yet ANOTHER point which was NOT made by you in your original challenge, which is what we are debating, I can discuss accepting it, but ONLY after you FIRST concede defeat on the actual challenge you already made to me. To re-cap, your challenge point 1, was that:

"I will grant you that, given the axioms you have chosen, the conclusion would indeed follow logically. However, if we accept the argument as sound, then we must be able to apply the same reasoning to other cases. Let us apply it to the Gaudiya Matha. It is well known that 'some' of Srila Bhaktisiddhanta Sarasvati Thakura's disciples acting as gurus fell, or at least did not show the purity expected of someone holding such a post. Therefore, if we apply your rule of "One guru falls = no Gurus authorised" and its reasoning, then we would be forced to conclude that Srila Prabhupada is not bonafide. I do not think neither you nor I are willing to accept that. Hence we must revise or abandon the argument altogether. It would be wise to do the latter."

I just defeated this point of yours by demonstrating you have not been able to apply the above reasoning to the Gaudiya Matha.

If you are humble and sincere enough to actually accept defeat on this point, rather than just trying to evade the defeat, we can consider your new challenge for proof 4 below.

I even KNEW you would try and evade your defeat and HENCE I gave you the following warning:

"Do not respond with methods of evasion like asking me further questions (they will simply go onto the end of the list), or any other unrelated verbiage, or complaining I have not answered something else, or been defeated by others etc. These things did not do you any good previously, nor will they help here. *Respond with anything short of the evidence requested above, and your challenge will still remain unproven, and I will simply keep pointing this out.*"

We can only move onto new challenges once we have finished with the challenge you made to me and announced to the whole world on April 30th. If you concede defeat on this challenge point 1 (and if you wish you can withdraw the others), THEN we can discuss immediately answering your new challenge below. (as then it will not need to be added to the end of the list as challenge No. 10 as per the rules.)

Thank you.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Your servant,

Krishnakant

Post subject: Hector - act 6

Sent: 10 May 2006 22:35

To: IRM

Subject: A challenge to IRM[Final]

Hare Krishna, Krishnakant Prabhu:

Please accept my greetings.

All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

I am writing to inform you of the end of this debate. I have tried to treat you with all the respect a Vaisnava deserves, and have repeatedly asked for forgiveness for any offenses I might have committed against you or any other Vaisnava as we engaged in this exchange. Yet, you seem disturbed in your replies and hence it is wiser for me to avoid falling pray to anger, which might lead to vaisnava-aparadha. Nevertheless, I will leave you with a detailed explanation of the first and only point we were able to debate to help you see the falseness of your claim. Please, save it for future reference as you might never hear directly from me again.

Firstly, I have admitted to making mistakes in the progression of this debate, some of them pointed out by you. However, those mistakes only helped to refine the arguments and our search for truth, which is to what, as sincere devotees, we should aspire. I will leave here the best I can offer in terms of deductive reasoning, which I admit is not the proper way to understand spiritual matters. However, since you have attempted to use the deductive reasoning approach (i.e. the ascending process) to establish the 'veracity' of your claims, I used the same method to show you where your argument in IRM's "*The Final Order*" went wrong. If you want a verification of the pristine logic of the arguments hereby presented, look for the kind assistance of a mathematician or a logician. However, if you are interested in understanding spiritual matters, simply surrender to Krishna through His bona fide representative. The descending process of spiritual realization will then take place and you will be free to abandon all this nonsense, to which I have been part.

As I said in my previous message, I followed your advice and went back to IRM's Special Summary Issue to carefully read your words and study your arguments. Needless to say, I derived no spiritual benefit from the reading itself, but the reading gave me an opportunity to serve Srila Prabhupada by refuting your arguments. Remember Srila Prabhupada instructed us to use our writing abilities to spread Krishna Consciousness, not to become an impediment in such spreading.

My original claim in Point 1 was that your purported Proof 4 in IRM's *The Final Order*:

"One guru falls = no Gurus authorised"

was not logically sound. Again, please, study this simple argument carefully, and you will immediately realize that 'proof 4' is no proof at all, since from the very beginning it suffers from a serious logical flaw.

In the *Special Issue* you write:

"Here is the proof recapped:

- a) *Nectar of Devotion* states that when not properly authorised – sometimes the Guru falls.
- b) Hence, if Guru falls, then he was not properly authorised.
- c) But all Gurus authorised in exactly the same way.
- d) Thus all Gurus not properly authorised.
- e) *Ritvik* system authorised by July 9th directive remains."

Here is the flaw: B does not follow from A. Let us look at the logical structure of the statements. Let P be the statement "guru not authorized". Let Q be the statement "guru falls." You quote Srila Prabhupada in *The Nectar of Devotion* thus:

"But sometimes, if a spiritual master is not properly authorized and only on his own initiative becomes a spiritual master, he may be carried away by an accumulation of wealth and large numbers of disciples."

I will accept your interpretation that being

"carried away by an accumulation of wealth and large numbers of disciples"

constitutes a falldown, which is only the agreed interpretation of two conditioned souls. Now, there are at least two ways to show B does not follow from A.

CASE 1: Consider the word 'sometimes': The word 'sometimes' is not conclusive, something may or may not happen. If a guru is not authorized, then he may or may not fall. We cannot conclude anything further than that.

Let P and Q be the following clauses:

P: guru not authorized Q: guru falls

-P: guru authorized (This is the negation of P.)

-Q: guru does not fall (This is the negation of Q.)

Remember that by a conditional statement is meant a statement of the form "if...then." Using this notation, Srila Prabhupada's conditional statement becomes:

If guru not authorized, then guru falls OR guru does not fall.

(Notice that the inclusive "or" logically represents "sometimes." In the abbreviated notation, the statement becomes: If P, then (Q or -Q).

This conditional statement is always true, regardless of the truth values of P and Q. Nothing further can be logically concluded. B does not follow from A.

CASE 2: Ignore 'sometimes': For the sake of argument, let us ignore the word 'sometimes.' This might be an offense since we are changing Srila Prabhupada's words. However, I do it only to show you that 'Proof 4' is no proof at all, at least logically speaking.

Srila Prabhupada's dictum becomes: If P, then Q.

In B you claim, "If Q, then P", that is "if guru falls, then he was not authorized." This is called the inverse of the conditional statement. These two statements, namely the conditional and its inverse are not logically equivalent. A high school textbook on geometry or on introductory logic will help you see the truth of this. An introductory text on Boolean algebras will also do. After all, the entire structure of mathematical truth is built on these grounds.

In summary, B does not follow from A. If you want to establish the validity of B, then you would need additional evidence or arguments. A direct quote from Srila Prabhupada stating "if a guru falls, then he was not authorized" will suffice. However, if you cannot show the validity of B *independently* of A, then the entire argument collapses.

It gets a little worse than that for IRM if we consider the contrapositive of Srila Prabhupada's dictum (that is, ignoring 'sometimes').

As you might already know, a conditional statement is logically equivalent to its contrapositive, that is, the following two statements are equivalent:

i) If P, then Q.

ii) If -Q, then -P. Saying "If guru not authorized, then guru falls" is equivalent to saying "If guru does not fall, then guru is authorized." That was not your intended conclusion, but is what logically follows. Again, the introductory textbook on logic might help you with these fine points. If one is conversant with the rules of deductive reasoning, one should not attempt to use it, especially in spiritual matters, as one may commit many offenses. With the evidence you have provided in "The Final Order" one can reach a different conclusion than IRM's, simply by adhering to the standard rules of inference.

There is more that can be said about these matters, especially if one reads Srila Prabhupada's words carefully. In fact, there is a CASE 3 that can be considered to render your claim useless yet again. However, please do not waste your time on preparing a revised edition of *The Final Order* to make up for these mistakes. As a sincere devotee, that is the least you could do. You would not want to cheat others, having been warned of a logical flaw in your argument. Nevertheless, there is something much better you can do: focus on distributing Srila Prabhupada's books, and not your own.

Always remember that we must cultivate the hearing process as a way to promote the validity of the descending method for realizing spiritual truth. My only advice to you is to devote your energies to discussing *Krishna-katha*. Ask for forgiveness from all those you might have offended throughout the years, even if unintentionally, and take shelter at Srila Prabhupada's feet.

I will end this debate with a quote from our beloved Srila Prabhupada:

"The scripture known as the *Brahma-yamala* states: "If someone wants to pose himself as a great devotee without following the authorities of the revealed scriptures, then his activities will never help him to make progress in devotional service. Instead, he will simply create disturbances for the sincere students of devotional service." (The Nectar of Devotion, Chapter 7)

I pray not to have committed this offense.

At Srila Prabhupada's feet,

Hector

P.S.

Here is a list of Srila Prabhupada's quotes compiled by Madhudvisa Prabhu that serve as ample evidence of the falsity of the *ritviks*. You may post them on your website, along with our exchanges in their entirety.

761210DB.HYD Lectures So we got this information from His Divine Grace Bhaktisiddhanta Sarasvati Thakura, and that knowledge is still going on. You are receiving through his servant. And in future the same knowledge will go to your students. This is called *parampara* system. *Evam parampara prap...* It is not that you have become a student and you'll remain student. No. One day you shall become also guru and make more students, more students, more. That is Caitanya Mahaprabhu's mission, not that perpetually... Yes, one should remain perpetually a student, but he has to act as guru. That is the mission of Caitanya Mahaprabhu. It is not that because I am acting as guru, I am no longer student. No, I am still student. Caitanya Mahaprabhu taught us this instruction that we shall always remain a foolish student before our Guru *Maharaja*. That is the Vedic culture. I may be very big man, but still, I should remain a foolish student to my guru. That is the qualification. *Guru more murkha dekhi' karila sasana*. We should be always prepared to be controlled by the guru. That is very good qualification. *Yasya prasada bhagavat-prasada. Ara na kariha mane asa*. So we should become always a very obedient student to our guru. That is the qualification. That is the spiritual qualification.

660729BG.NY Lectures There is no consideration of material impediment. So it is open for everyone. *Catur-varnyam maya srstam*. That is a chance given, that you can become a *brahmana*, you can become a great devotee of Lord Krsna, and you can become the spiritual master of the world. That is the... And I think you should take seriously.

750406CC.MAY Lectures And to become *acarya* is not very difficult. First of all, to become very faithful servant of your *acarya*, follow strictly what he says. Try to please him and spread Krsna consciousness. That's all. It is not at all difficult. Try to follow the instruction of your Guru *Maharaja* and spread Krsna consciousness. That is the order of Lord Caitanya.

680817VP.MON Lectures Now, this spiritual master's succession is not very difficult. Of course, my students, they offer me so much respect, but all these respects are due to my spiritual master. I am nothing. I am just like peon. Just like peon delivers one letter. He is not responsible for what is written in that letter. He is not responsible for what is written in that letter. He simply delivers. But a peon's duty is that he must sincerely carry out the order of the postmaster and deliver the letter to the proper person. That is their duty. Similarly, this *parampara* system is like that. Every one of us should become a spiritual master because the world is in blazing fire. (aside:) You can give them *prasadam*. Now, of course, time is very high. So to understand the spiritual master... Spiritual master is not a new invention. It is simply following the orders of the spiritual master. So all my students present here who are feeling so much obliged... I am also obliged to them because they are helping me in this missionary work. At the same time, I shall request them all to become spiritual master. Every one of you should be spiritual master next. And what is their duty? Whatever you are hearing from me, whatever you are learning from me, you have to distribute the same in toto without any addition or alteration. Then all of you become the spiritual master. That is the science of becoming spiritual master. Spiritual master is not any... To become a spiritual master is not very wonderful thing. Simply one has to become sincere soul. That's all. *Evam parampara-praptam imam rajarsayo viduh*. In the *Bhagavad-gita* it is said that "By disciplic succession this yoga process of *Bhagavad-gita* was handed down from disciple to disciple. But in course of time that disciplic succession is now lost. Therefore, Arjuna, I am teaching you again the same philosophy."

Songs Purport to Sri-Sri-Gurv-astakam 690102PU.LA We should always remember that the spiritual master is in the disciplic succession. The original spiritual master is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. He blesses his next disciple, just like Brahma. Brahma blesses his next disciple, just like Narada. Narada blesses his next disciple, just like Vyasa. Vyasa blesses his next disciple, Madhvacharya. Similarly, the blessing is coming. Just like royal succession--the throne is inherited by disciplic or hereditary succession--similarly, this power from the Supreme Personality of Godhead has to receive. Nobody can preach, nobody can become a spiritual master, without obtaining power from the right source. Therefore the very word, it is stated here, *praptasya*. *Praptasya* means "one who has obtained." *Praptasya kalyana*. What he has obtained? *Kalyana*. *Kalyana* means auspicious. He has received something which is auspicious for all the human kind. *Praptasya kalyana-gunarnavasya*. Here is another example. *Gunarnava*. *Arnava* means ocean, and *guna* means spiritual qualities. Just like the same example is going on. It is very nice poetry. There is nice rhethorics and metaphor. The example is set, blazing fire, and it is to be extinguished with the cloud. And wherefrom the cloud comes? Similarly, wherefrom the spiritual master receives the mercy? The cloud receives his potency from the ocean. Therefore the spiritual master also receives his power from the ocean of spiritual quality, that is, from the Supreme Personality of Godhead. So *praptasya kalyana-gunarnavasya*. Such kind of spiritual master, one has to accept, and *vande guroh sri-caranaravindam*, and one has to offer his respectful obeisances to such authorized spiritual master. (end)

710718RC.DET Conversations Prabhupada: Yes. All of them will take over. These students, who are initiated from me, all of them will act as I am doing. Just like I have got many Godbrothers, they are all acting. Similarly, all these disciples which I am making, initiating, they are being trained to become future spiritual masters.

770415rc.bom Conversations Prabhupada: "Like father, like son." You should be. *Gaurangera bhakta..., jane*. Everyone. Therefore Caitanya Mahaprabhu said, *amara ajnaya guru hana tara' ei desa*. He asked everyone, "Just become guru." Follow His instruction. You become guru. *Amara ajnaya*. Don't manufacture ideas. *Amara ajnaya*. "What I say, you do. You become a guru." Where is the difficulty? "And what is Your *ajna*?" *Yare dekha tare kaha krsna-upadesa*. Bas. Everything is there in the *Bhagavad-gita*. You simply repeat. That's all. You become guru. To become a guru is not difficult job. Follow Caitanya Mahaprabhu and speak what Krsna has said. Bas. You become guru.

750302BA.ATL Lectures So you are hearing this philosophy daily. Try to understand more and more. We have got so many books. And this is the mission of Caitanya Mahaprabhu and, by disciplic succession, Bhaktivinoda Thakura, then my spiritual master. Then we are trying our level best. Similarly, you will also try your level best on the same principle. Then it will go on. Same principle. It doesn't matter whether one is born in India or outside India. No. When Caitanya Mahaprabhu said, *prthivite ache yata nagaradi-grama*, "As many towns and cities and villages are there," He did not say it to make a farce. He is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. So sometimes I am very much criticized that I am making foreigners a *brahmana*. The caste *brahmanas* in India, they are very much against me. But this is not fact. When Caitanya Mahaprabhu said that all over the world His message will be broadcast, does it mean that it will be simply a cinema show? No. He wanted that everyone should become perfect Vaisnava. That is His purpose.

720518AR.LA Lectures So we have got this message from Krsna, from Caitanya Mahaprabhu, from the six Gosvamis, later on, Bhaktivinoda Thakura, Bhaktisiddhanta Thakura. And we are trying our bit also to distribute this knowledge. Now, tenth, eleventh, twelfth... My Guru *Maharaja* is tenth from Caitanya Mahaprabhu, I am eleventh, you are the twelfth. So distribute this knowledge. People are suffering. They are simply fighting on some false thing, *maya*. They should be given the real fact of happiness.

68-12-03 Letter: Hamsaduta Next January there will be an examination on this *Bhagavad-gita*. Papers will be sent by me to all centers, and those securing the minimum passing grade will be given the title as *Bhakti-sastri*. Similarly, another examination will be held on Lord Caitanya's Appearance Day in February, 1970 and it will be upon *Srimad-Bhagavatam* and *Bhagavad-gita*. Those passing will get the title of *Bhakti-vaibhava*. Another examination will be held sometimes in 1971 on the four books, *Bhagavad-gita*, *Srimad-Bhagavatam*, *Teachings of Lord Caitanya*, and *Nectar of Devotion*. One who will pass this examination will be awarded with the title of *Bhaktivedanta*. I want that all of my spiritual sons and daughters will inherit this title of *Bhaktivedanta*, so that the family transcendental diploma will continue through the generations. Those possessing the title of *Bhaktivedanta* will be allowed to initiate disciples. Maybe by 1975, all of my disciples will be allowed to initiate and increase the numbers of the generations. That is my program. So we should not simply publish these books for reading by outsiders, but our students must be well versed in all of our books so that we can be prepared to defeat all opposing parties in the matter of self-realization.

Post subject: Krishnakant's 6th reply

Fri, 12 May 2006

Dear Hector Prabhu,

Hare Krishna!

Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

1. Just a few days ago you challenged me to a debate, praying that victory will be granted to one of the parties. Now you have suddenly bowed out of the debate, being unable to concede your defeat on the inapplicability of my proof to the Gaudiya Matha. You have also said that the whole process of you trying to debate my points through logic and argument was "nonsense, to which I have been part."
2. Further the most basic qualities of a vaisnava are humility and freedom from passion and anger. Having been defeated in debate, not only are you now bowing out without having the humility to admit your defeat regarding your Gaudiya Matha argument, but you also no longer are able to offer your 'humble obeisances' to me as you have done in every mail so far. Now all of a sudden, you can only offer your 'greetings'! Additionally you say you must bow out of the debate because you will fall prey to anger. So in just a handful of exchanges, you have demonstrated both a complete lack of humility and inability to control your anger whilst debating, resulting in you needing to flee the battle-field. Hence your proud boast to the world how you were challenging me to debate hoping you would emerge victorious was all over in just a few days. Like they say - don't give up your day job just yet!
3. Further you have also decided that you are more intelligent than the whole of the GBC. For you have also decided to advise the GBC that they should all be dismissed from their posts, and a completely new GBC be established! In addition you have said that whilst this happens there should be a complete moratorium on initiations. To establish a new Bona Fide GBC and stop all initiation by the current ISKCON gurus, is of course also the goal of the IRM! It seems your defeat in this debate has had some effect in that you have come some way to adopting our goals!

Further you have asked for advice as to how to rectify ISKCON by asking:

"I understand you have serious resistance to how ISKCON does things. In all humility, what steps should be taken to correct the mistakes? Also, how would one go about deciding who is qualified to offer *diksa* so that the *parampara* is not broken?"

to one Madhudvisa Das, who is a self-confessed *ritvik*, having got the name Madhudvisa das via *ritvik* initiation. He also gave himself *ritvik sanniyasa* initiation, and was known for sometime as Madhudvisa Swami. Thus both your proposal to the GBC, and the source of your proposal, are heavily influenced by the *ritvik* idea, and this is all very apt, coming as it is after your defeat in a debate by a *ritvik*!

Conclusion

Since you have already been defeated in the actual debate you challenged me to, having withdrawn from it completely rather than concede defeat on your challenge 1, (about how you cannot apply my proof to the Gaudiya Matha), this debate is indeed over.

I thus forced you to withdraw from a debate which **YOU** initiated and challenged me to, in just **10 DAYS**.

However you have tried to distract from your defeat and subsequent withdrawal by giving a completely new challenge.

This will also now be defeated, so in just a matter of a few days, you will have been defeated in two different debates.

You have advised me to read some elementary texts on logic, but I will now show that you are not even aware of the definition of logic.

Logic is the process of drawing inferences from given truths (axioms).

In this case, our axioms are the statements of Srila Prabhupada, since they are self-evident truths. In both your case 1 and case 2 of your new challenge, you completely ignore this basic definition of logic.

Using the same notation you have given where:

P = guru not authorised Q = guru falls Srila Prabhupada states as you correctly say in case 1 that:

If P then Q or -Q.

You end your case 1 at this point, saying nothing further can be concluded.

You repeat the same point for Case 2 by telling us that:

If P then Q is a conditional statement, and its inverse If Q then P are not logically equivalent, and hence again nothing further can be deduced from if P then Q.

Both your arguments here ARE correct if we ASSUME that 'If P then Q' is a conditional statement. But it is not, it is a bi-conditional statement. A bi-conditional statement is where the INVERSE of a statement IS true e.g. in the statement "If I marry you, then you will be my wife" – in this case the inverse – "if you are my wife, I married you" – is also true.

Now usually one mistakes a conditional statement for a bi-conditional statement, and this is the logical fallacy known as 'affirming the consequent', and arises because in a situation where:

If P then Q, the inverse If Q then P, will NOT follow since Q can have OTHER causes than P.

E.g. If P = rain; Q = Streets are wet:

then whilst "if it rains the streets will be wet" (If P then Q), is true, the inverse, "if the streets are wet, it rained" (If Q then P), is not true, since Q (streets being wet) can have many other causes, than just rain. (P).

e.g. in addition to "if it rains the streets will be wet", other axioms are "if it snows the streets will be wet"; "if I am cleaning the street, they will be wet" etc. then we can see how 'If P then Q' is a conditional statement, and the inverse can NOT be inferred.

Thus a conditional statement depends on the availability of more than one axiom or truth. As soon as you have more than one available axiom or truth regarding how streets become wet, then If P then Q, becomes a conditional statement. However IF the only available axiom was: "If it rains, the streets will be wet", and NO OTHER truths about how the streets becoming wet were available, THEN if somebody found the streets wet they COULD correctly infer it had rained - for this would be the only known cause of wetness, as no other truths regarding wetness had been given, and the statement would become bi-conditional, and the inverse would become true.

Just as in the example regarding marriage and a wife given above, there are no other axioms available regarding how one becomes a wife other than marriage. But if there existed another axiom say such as "If you are my girl-friend for more than 10 years, you are automatically my wife", than in the example given, the statement "If I marry you, you are my wife" would be converted into a conditional statement, since now the inverse would no longer be true, as the result (becoming my wife) can have more than one cause, and it would cease to be a bi-conditional statement.

So logic is the process of drawing inferences from the GIVEN axioms or truths. If only one such axiom is given, then from this axiom we can correctly infer a bi-conditional statement. If more than one relevant axiom is given, then from any such axiom we can only infer a conditional statement.

Thus in both your case 1 and case 2, you have incorrectly assumed the relevant part of the statement in question (If P then Q) is conditional rather than bi-conditional, even though the only available axiom for a guru falling involves the guru not being authorised. There is no other statement from Srila Prabhupada giving the cause of guru fall-down outside of being **UNauthorised** – that is, nowhere does Srila Prabhupada state that a guru fall-down will occur as a result of a guru actually being correctly **AUTHORISED**.

Therefore by the simple definition of logic, proof 4 draws an inverse inference from the available axiom, and the conclusion it derives is correct, since no other available axioms which could change this conclusion exist, and therefore the statement was bi-conditional.

So sometimes if a guru is not authorised, he falls - axiom given by Srila Prabhupada.

If a guru has fallen he was not authorised - it follows: **AS NO AXIOM STATING THAT A GURU FALLS DUE TO BEING AUTHORISED EXISTS.**

Therefore given the available axioms, I have logically drawn the correct inference.

It is ironic that here, as in your mistaken Gaudiya Matha analogy, your arguments fail both times due to you being unable to demonstrate first with available evidence, the very premises you have assumed. A conditional statement **ASSUMES** the existence of other relevant axioms, just as asserting that my proof also applies to the Gaudiya Matha **ASSUMES** that the guru authorisation process for the Gaudiya Matha was analogous to that followed in ISKCON. In both cases your arguments were defeated due to your inability to substantiate the very assumptions on which your arguments rested.

You stated in last but one e-mail that:

"Remember that I opened this debate with a prayer to Krishna asking that Srila Prabhupada would grant undisputed victory to one of us. His great mission deserves no less. Hence if you defeat me in point one, I will accept you have Srila Prabhupada's blessings.

Hence if you defeat me in point one, I will accept you have Srila Prabhupada's blessings."

Since you have been defeated comprehensively on point one, please be happy that Krishna has granted your prayer.

Your servant,

Krishnakant

Post subject: Hector - act 7

16 May 2006 20:37

Hare Krishna, Krishnakant Prabhu,

Please accept my greetings again.

All glories to Srila Acaryadeva and Srila Gurudeva, the most faithful servants of Srila Prabhupada. By glorifying their names we can get the mercy of Srila Prabhupada; by offending them we can only condemn ourselves.

I have received authorization from Srila Acaryadeva (H.H. Hridayananda das Goswami) to proceed with the debate, if there is a purpose to it. As you know, I began this debate without authorization from my Guru *Maharaja*, but upon the suggestion of Shyam Krishna Prabhu from Vrindavana dhama, I requested the authorization of Srila Acaryadeva. The purpose then is to share with you my realizations, based on *shastra-guru-sadhu*, as to what to do when guilty of committing offenses against devotees. As an aside, I will summarize the arguments showing some of the logical flaws in IRM's "*The Final Order*" once again.

First of all, if I do not offer my obeisances to you any longer, it is not due to pride; it is simply due to respect for those you have offended. Remember, even if Srila Prabhupada might have said harsh words against some of his Godbrothers, it is not our position, as conditioned souls, to imitate him and utter harsh words against his Godbrothers. Hear from Srila Prabhupada:

75-05-11. Morning Walk. Perth

Devotee (2): So, Srila Prabhupada, isn't Lord Brahma the original spiritual master in our *sampradaya*?

Prabhupada: Yes. But we should take that it was his *lila* to show that "Even I am subjected. How much you should take risk here." We should take like that because he's our guru. We should not take him that he was subjected to lusty desires, but he made a show that "Even I am also subjected." And he gave up this, changed the body for that. Therefore we should not observe if there is a show of fault of the guru. We should take a different way. (Sanskrit). Just like the sun is soaking water from urine, but we should not imitate that, that "We also, let us take urine." Then you'll die. He can do so. (Sanskrit). The sun can do that. Still he is not affected. Everyone knows the sun soaks water from the urine. But should you imitate that: "Oh, let me take urine"? No. It is not for you. That is advised. *Isvaranam*, those who are *isvaras*, the controllers, there is no fault. You should not imitate them; simply you should imitate their instruction.

Hence, we should follow Srila Prabhupada's instructions and not his *lilas*. Never did he instruct us to blaspheme someone who has dedicated his life to spreading Krishna Consciousness. Indeed, it is the worst offense against the chanting of the Holy Name.

In particular, we should be extremely careful, if we are anxious at all to obtain Srila Prabhupada's mercy, not to offend the disciples of his who have dedicated their lives to such service. You have not cared for that instruction and have dedicated a substantial part of your life to such grave offense against the chanting of the Holy Name. You might claim that they are fallen devotees, but only a fool would fail to realize that Srila Gurudeva (H.H. Gour Govinda Goswami) is a pure devotee of the Lord. I doubt Srila Prabhupada will ever forgive you for such an offense. In 1977, a few months before his disappearance pastime, Srila Prabhupada begged to be with his beloved son, Gour Govinda *Maharaja*. Upon Srila Prabhupada's instructions, no recorders were allowed during his 17 days of intimate conversations with his most advanced disciple. This is unusual for Srila Prabhupada, who always wanted everything recorded. Yet, that was his mercy. That pastime reminds me of Lord Chaitanya's pastime with Ramananda Raya. Unfortunately, neither you nor I were qualified to receive the mercy of being present during those most intimate exchanges. Nor are we qualified to receive it now as sound vibration or in written form. In fact, they might be lost to us forever, unless they were revealed to someone intimately close to them who might later record such a wonderful *lila*, someone like Krishnadasa Kaviraja Goswami.

My advice to you is very simple: you must immediately ask for Srila Prabhupada's forgiveness. This realization is based on the pastime of Durvasa Muni and Ambarisa *Maharaja*. The only thing that saved Durvasa Muni from Vishnu's *sudarsana cakra* was asking for forgiveness at the lotus feet of Ambarisa *Maharaja*. In that mood, you must ask for Srila Prabhupada's forgiveness through Gour Govinda *Maharaja*. However, since he is no longer physically present either, you are forced to do it through any of his disciples. Take advantage of such an opportunity and ask for forgiveness from all those you have offended. That will be very beneficial to you. Dismantle the IRM and change the focus of *Back to Prabhupada* to discussing Srila Prabhupada's *lilas*, like his *lila* with Gour Govinda *Maharaja*. However, you must become qualified before you take to that path. If you are proud and do not follow this advice, you will certainly remember these words in your deathbed, if you get such a chance. By then, it might be too late.

To finish the debate, for you completely ignored my advice not to use deductive reasoning in trying to realize spiritual knowledge, I will clarify a few more points. However, always remember that spiritual knowledge is only received via the descending method, through the mercy of the guru. This deductive reasoning approach is as dry as a desert. Remember, we must swim and drown in the ocean of *Bhakti*: the ocean of tears for *Krishna-prema*.

As I have stated three times already, the original claim in Point 1 was that your purported proof 4 in IRM's *The Final Order*:

"One guru falls = no Gurus authorised"

was not logically sound. Again, please, study this simple argument carefully, and you will immediately realize that 'proof 4' is no proof at all, since from the very beginning it suffers from a serious logical flaw.

In the *Special Issue* you write:

"Here is the proof recapped:

- a) *Nectar of Devotion* states that when not properly authorised – sometimes the Guru falls.
- b) Hence, if Guru falls, then he was not properly authorised.
- c) But all Gurus authorised in exactly the same way.
- d) Thus all Gurus not properly authorised.
- e) *Ritvik* system authorised by July 9th directive remains."

Here is the flaw: B does not follow from A. Let us look at the logical structure of the statements. Let P be the statement "guru not authorized". Let Q be the statement "guru falls." You quote Srila Prabhupada in *The Nectar of Devotion* thus:

"But sometimes, if a spiritual master is not properly authorized and only on his own initiative becomes a spiritual master, he may be carried away by an accumulation of wealth and large numbers of disciples."

I will accept your interpretation that being

"carried away by an accumulation of wealth and large numbers of disciples"

constitutes a falldown, which is only the agreed interpretation of two conditioned souls. Now, there are at least two ways to show B does not follow from A.

CASE 1: Consider the word '*sometimes*':

The word '*sometimes*' is not conclusive, something may or may not happen. If a guru is not authorized, then he may or may not fall. We cannot conclude anything further than that.

Let P and Q be the following clauses:

P: guru not authorized Q: guru falls

-P: guru authorized (This is the negation of P.)

-Q: guru does not fall (This is the negation of Q.)

Using this notation, Srila Prabhupada's conditional statement becomes:

If guru not authorized, then guru falls OR guru does not fall.

In the abbreviated notation, the statement becomes:

If P, then (Q or -Q).

This conditional statement is always true, regardless of the truth values of P and Q. Nothing further can be logically concluded. B does not follow from A.

The inverse of this sentence is:

If (Q or -Q), then P.

That is, if guru falls or not falls, then guru not authorized. This is what we get with the out-of-context quote from Srila Prabhupada.

CASE 2: Ignore '*sometimes*':

For the sake of argument, let us ignore the word '*sometimes*.' This is an offense since we are changing Srila Prabhupada's words. However, I do it only to show you that 'proof 4' is no proof at all, at least logically speaking.

Srila Prabhupada's modified dictum becomes:

If P, then Q.

In B you claim, "If Q, then P", that is "if guru falls, then he was not authorized." This is called the inverse of the conditional statement. These two statements, namely the conditional and its inverse are not logically equivalent.

However, you decided to completely ignore the fact that we are changing Srila Prabhupada's words by deleting the word *sometimes* to make the conditional statement "If P, then Q". To change Srila Prabhupada's words to suit our needs is an even

greater offense. I only accepted the deletion to show you yet another deficiency of the argument. Instead, to salvage your argument, you decided to go around this offense by stating that this was a biconditional statement.

Nevertheless, even if we commit yet another offense and now add meaning to Srila Prabhupada's words, we still come to the following demolishing argument for IRM's *The Final Order*.

As you already know, a conditional statement is logically equivalent to its contrapositive, that is, the following two statements are equivalent:

i) If P, then Q.

ii) If $\neg Q$, then $\neg P$. Furthermore, whether the inverse of a statement is true or not, does not make any difference to the logical equivalence of the statement and its contrapositive. Hence, consider the contrapositive of Srila Prabhupada's modified dictum (that is, ignoring 'sometimes').

Saying "If guru not authorized, then guru falls" is equivalent to saying "If guru does not fall, then guru is authorized." Again, "If guru does not fall, then guru is authorized." With this reasoning, the result of our deletion of 'sometimes' your purported proof 4 not only collapses, but gives a conclusion contrary to some of IRM's conclusions.

Why should we bother to apply this reasoning to the Gaudiya Matha when the argument is self-collapsing? It was a mistake on my part to bring up the Gaudiya Matha for not having yet realized the gross logical flaws at the beginning of the purported proof 4. Only when Krishna impelled me to purge your arguments and use symbolic logic was I able to see the fallacy.

Please do not waste your time on preparing a revised edition of *The Final Order* to make up for these mistakes, but instead focus on distributing Srila Prabhupada's books and not your own. After asking for forgiveness from Srila Gurudeva through one of his disciples, this will please Srila Prabhupada very much and enhance his transcendental pleasure.

To address one more point that you brought up, anyone may fall down by misusing one's independence. It is better for me to simply quote Srila Prabhupada, since I am not qualified to speak on these matters.

70-02-27.Jag Letter: Jagadisa

"Regarding your questions concerning the spirit souls falling into maya's influence, it is not that those who have developed a passive relationship with Krishna are more likely to fall into nescient activities. Usually anyone who has developed his relationship with Krishna does not fall down in any circumstance, but because the independence is always there, the soul may fall from any position or relationship by misusing his independence. But his relationship with Krishna is never lost, simply it is forgotten by the influence of maya, so it may be regained or revived by the process of hearing the holy name of Krishna..."

Please, ask for Srila Gurudeva's and Srila Prabhupada's forgiveness through a disciple of Gour Govinda *Maharaja*.

That will be the beginning of your revived spiritual life.

At Srila Acaryadeva's feet,

hector

OM TAT SAT

Post subject: Krishnakant's 7th reply

Wed, 17 May 2006

Dear Hector Prabhu,

Please accept MY HUMBLE OBEISANCES.

All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

1. You stated in your last mail to me, that you were **"writing to inform you of the end of this debate."**

Yet 6 days later, you have written again to say that now you are ready to **"proceed with the debate"**.

Also you state in the current mail that what you write now will **"finish the debate"**.

So after you get defeated again now, will we really not hear a another peep from you again, or will your ego force you to once again do yet another flip-flop and contradict yourself in a matter of days?

2. When you began this debate with me, you stated that you would prove my arguments wrong

"based solely on deductive reasoning flaws."

Then after you got defeated, in your last mail you suddenly realised that deductive reasoning, **"is not the proper way to understand spiritual matters"**, and that having tried to use it yourself, you admit the debate was **'all nonsense to which I have been part'**.

And that this was one of the reasons you were ending the debate. Yet now you have written back attempting to use the same **'nonsense'** deductive reasoning to defeat my arguments.

So after you get defeated again now, will we really not hear anymore deductive reasoning from you, or will your ego force you to once again do yet another flip-flop and contradict yourself in a matter of days?

3. In your last mail you wrote you were ending the debate because **"it is wiser for me to avoid falling pray to anger, which might lead to vaisnava-aparadha."**

Therefore we can only assume that your return to the debate 6 days later is motivated by a desire to fall prey to anger and commit Vaisnava aparadha. Hardly the behaviour of a vaisnava!

4. You claim that you stopped offering me obeisances **"due to respect for those you have offended"**.

But those offences you claim were made by me way before this debate began, and yet you happily offered me full obeisances all the way through the debate until your last mail. Therefore by your own words, you have shown great dis-respect to all those I am supposed to have spent a **"substantial part of my life"** offending. Hence by your own reasoning you have already committed the Vaisnava aparadha you were supposed to avoid by withdrawing from the debate.

5. You also claim that you are responding to my proof 4 as presented in *"The Final Order"*. Actually the proof was not presented in the *"The Final Order"* but the *BTP Special Issue*, which is a different document. You obviously have a problem concentrating and grasping simple details.

6. In your last mail you asked me to not **"waste your time on preparing a revised edition of The Final Order to make up for these mistakes"**, and that **"my only advice to you is to devote your energies to discussing Krishna-katha."**

Yet YOU are more than happy to continue **"wasting time"** pointing out these same supposed **"mistakes"**, and are unable to follow your own advice to **"devote your energies in discussing Krishna-katha"**, having decided instead to once again enter this **'nonsense'** debate.

7. Belatedly, to rectify a breach of etiquette, you have only **NOW** decided to get authorisation from your would-be guru *maharaja* for this debate, and even then only when reminded by someone else to do so. Maybe this forgetfulness was due to your being too busy glorifying someone other than your own guru *maharaja* - namely Gour Govinda Swami. (Note to Hector: Keep this up and you may find your upcoming initiation cancelled. How about spreading around some of this glorification for your actual would be guru - HH Hrdyananda Maharaja!)

8. You advise that I should change the **"focus of Back to Prabhupada to discussing Srila Prabhupada's lilas, like his lila with Gour Govinda Maharaja."**

Yet just a few lines previously, you had stated that such a thing would not even be possible, for in regards to Srila Prabhupada's *lila* with GGS you state that

"unfortunately, neither you nor I were qualified to receive the mercy of being present during those most intimate exchanges. Nor are we qualified to receive it now as sound vibration or in written form."

So why ask us to discuss something which cannot even be discussed? Thus you are again speaking your usual flip-flop nonsense, only this time it took just a few lines, rather than a few days, for your contradiction to manifest.

9. You had previously asked your *ritvik* advisor Madhudvisa Das, in regards to the guru system in ISKCON:

“what steps should be taken to correct the mistakes? Also, how would one go about deciding who is qualified to offer *diksa* so that the *parampara* is not broken?”

(For the record Madhudvisa Das believes Srila Prabhupada set up a *ritvik* system for ISKCON, just as the IRM does. He adds however, unlike the IRM, that Srila Prabhupada also wanted his disciples to become qualified *diksa* gurus, but only by leaving ISKCON and setting up their own *mathas* in competition with ISKCON.)

Well Hector prabhu, your *ritvik* advisor has spoken and answered your heartfelt and earnest enquiry. He has told you to reject HH Hrdyananda Goswami as your guru, because, as he states, “if you accept the wrong guru your whole life is wasted”, and therefore he states, you should “find a qualified spiritual master.”

Now that your advisor has answered the question you asked him, will you do yet another flip-flop and reject the very advice you sought out? Or will you for once be consistent and reject HH Hrdyananda Goswami, as advised?

10. In regards to my proof 4 which you were challenging, you claim that “As I have stated three times already, the original claim in Point 1 was that your purported proof 4 in IRM’s The Final Order: “One guru falls = no Gurus authorised” was not logically sound.”

Your original claim in point 1, as sent out and read by the whole world, was that proof 4 was not logically sound **BECAUSE** one could apply it to the Gaudiya Matha. This assertion of yours was of course defeated, and you have made no attempt to defend this defeat. Rather to avoid conceding defeat you suddenly began a brand new debate having abandoned the actual debate you challenged me to, hoping that in presenting a flurry of ‘logic’ gobbledegook, everyone would forget that the actual debate you had challenged me to - **YOU HAD ALREADY LOST.**

When this diversion did not work, you simply ran away from the debate and claimed you no longer wished to continue. That also did not work, following my stinging and comprehensive rebuttal, and now you have returned again to the debate, trying to camouflage your defeat in the manner just quoted.

From the proceeding 10 points, it is very clear that you really have no idea whether you are coming or going, and given such mental instability, the last thing you should be attempting to do is have a rational debate. (HH Hrdyananda *Maharaja* could only have asked you to continue this debate due to his not having followed it closely thus far - which is reasonable given his busy schedule - or because he deliberately wants you to be made a laughing stock so he has an excuse to reject you for initiation, given that you have revealed yourself as a No. 1 fan of Gaura Govinda Swami, who, which as anyone who knows the history will tell you, was not exactly a favourite of the GBC or his guru godbrothers).

With such a comedy of errors (or is it more akin to a Shakespearean tragedy?) before we even **BEGIN** again dismantling the latest new argument you have presented, one has to seriously accept that it would be over-kill to continue and humiliate you even further. Compassion for you may call for me to stop at this point. However I owe a greater responsibility to all the hundreds of persons who are reading this ‘debate’, to demonstrate to them the gibberish the mind begins concocting when it tries to defeat the words of Srila Prabhupada. In this way you have performed a very valuable service, in that your contradictory ramblings have given everyone further confirmation of just how futile it is to try and defeat Srila Prabhupada’s words.

So we come to your response to my comprehensive defence of proof 4 as given in my last mail. You have essentially just repeated what you wrote previously with some additions. I will again comprehensively defeat your argument, as follows:

a) First I will demonstrate from Srila Prabhupada’s words how proof 4 is irrefutable.

b) Then I will demonstrate the same proof using a simple Boolean logic truth table.

c) Then I will use the foregoing proofs to once again demolish the statements you have made.

- **A)** Proof from Srila Prabhupada’s words Proof 4 as presented in the *BTP Special Issue*, is derived from the following words of Srila Prabhupada:

“The spiritual master must never be carried away by an accumulation of wealth or a large number of followers. A bona fide spiritual master will never become like that. But sometimes, if a spiritual master is not properly authorized and only on his own initiative becomes a spiritual master, he may be carried away by an accumulation of wealth and large numbers of disciples.” (*Nectar of Devotion*, Chapter 14)

From these statements we can conclude:

- a)** That an unauthorised guru sometimes falls down (where falls down refers to being carried away by wealth and followers).

Proof:

“Sometimes if a spiritual master is not properly authorized and only on his own initiative becomes a spiritual master, he may be carried away by an accumulation of wealth and large numbers of disciples.”

b) That an unauthorised guru sometimes does **NOT** fall down.

Proof: The word ‘*sometimes*’ in the statement quoted above.

c) A Bona fide guru **NEVER** falls down.

Proof:

“The spiritual master must never be carried away by an accumulation of wealth or a large number of followers. A bona fide spiritual master will never become like that.”

d) A Bona fide guru cannot be an unauthorised guru, because a Bona fide guru **NEVER** falls, but an unauthorised guru sometimes **DOES** fall.

Proof: Combining proven statements a) and c) above.

e) A Bona fide guru is therefore an authorised guru.

Proof: Proven statement d), states that a bona fide guru is not an unauthorised guru, and since ‘not unauthorised’ is simply a double negative leading to the converse, authorised, then if one is proven to not be an UNauthorised, they must be authorised. (Also if both unauthorised and authorised gurus fell, then a bona-fide guru could never exist (since he NEVER falls), as there are only two states of being, unauthorised and authorised, and the bona fide guru could not be either authorised or unauthorised.)

f) An authorised guru never falls:

Proof: Combining proven statements c) and e).

g) If a guru falls, then he was not authorised.

Proof: Combining proven statements a) and f).

h) Any other gurus authorised in the same way as the guru who fell, were also therefore not authorised.

Proof: The definition of the words ‘*same way*’.

This is a longer drawn-out version for proof 4 than given in the *BTP Special Issue*, which is what you are trying to challenge. I apologise for taking all these ‘*baby steps*’, but since you are clearly having mental difficulty, I thought it would be best. Every statement above is taken directly from the words of Srila Prabhupada, or follow automatically from such statements. It is therefore impossible to refute them, since the statements of Srila Prabhupada are axiomatic, or self-evident truths.

It is because it is impossible to refute the words of Srila Prabhupada, and therefore the proofs which are based on these words, such as proof 4 above, that you attempted to refute it using ‘logic’ gobbledegook, or ‘deductive reasoning’, since the words of Srila Prabhupada cannot be challenged. However the proof above is based on the ‘*descending process*’ of gathering knowledge since it comes directly from the words of Srila Prabhupada. Your attempts to challenge it however are based on ‘deductive reasoning’, as yourself admitted at the outset in your original ‘challenge’ e-mail where you stated to me that you had

“decided to present a challenge to some of your principal arguments, based solely on deductive reasoning flaws.”

You further add in your current mail:

“Only when Krishna impelled me to purge your arguments and use symbolic logic was I able to see the fallacy.”

So your whole argument is based, by your own admission, **NOT** on Srila Prabhupada’s words, as Proof 4 is, but on ‘deductive reasoning’ and ‘symbolic logic’.

So this alone should tell you why you have so far been singularly unable to dent this proof – since the proof is based on the descending process gathering of knowledge, and your arguments against it are based on the ‘ascending process’ of gathering knowledge, which in this case is deductive reasoning and symbolic logic, which you yourself admitted are ‘all nonsense’. However to satisfy you, I shall now present this proof in the form of a simple Boolean logic truth table.

• **B) Proof Presented as Boolean Logic Truth Table**

For the above proof, we can construct the following truth table:

	Falls	Not Falls
Authorised Guru	F	T

Unauthorised guru	T	T
-------------------	---	---

This tells us two things:

- a) If the guru does fall, the guru was unauthorised.
- b) If a guru does not fall, the guru could be either authorised or unauthorised.

Thus since the truth table tells us that **guru falls = guru not authorised**, it follows that anyone else who became guru in the same manner of authorisation, is *also* unauthorised, regardless of whether they fall or not, since unauthorised gurus also sometimes do not fall.

Therefore consider two gurus, guru A and guru B.

guru A and guru B became gurus in the same manner on the same date. Subsequently guru A is found to have been '*carried away by wealth and followers*'

– e.g. he marries a follower even though he is a *sannyasi* and uses 'guru money' to fund a new life-style, and leaves ISKCON. From the above truth table we can conclude that guru A was unauthorised. Therefore guru B is also unauthorised, having been authorised as guru in the same way as guru A, even though guru B has not yet been "*carried away by wealth and followers*". To see the example come alive, we can substitute any of the 11 zonal *acharyas* who have fallen for guru A, and any of the 11 zonal *acharyas* who have not yet fallen for guru B. Since they both became gurus via the same process of authorisation, we can conclude that guru B is also unauthorised even though he may have yet to fall.

- **C)** Applying above proofs to Hector's statements Now with the foregoing proofs, let us see how your statements stack up.

You have said, where P = guru not authorised; Q = guru falls:

"If P, then (Q or -Q).

This conditional statement is always true, regardless of the truth values of P and Q. Nothing further can be logically concluded." Here you have correctly applied the **BOTTOM HALF** the truth table given above, but you have ignored the top part of the truth table, which follows from the fact that **PART** of the above statement – If P then Q is bi-conditional, whilst the other part – If P then -Q is conditional – as is clear from the truth table. This was already explained to you last time, and having chosen to simply ignore this point, you again are easily defeated. You then go on to say:

"The inverse of this sentence is:

If (Q or -Q), then P.

That is, if guru falls or not falls, then guru not authorized. This is what we get with the out-of-context quote from Srila Prabhupada."

Again this is incorrect, because since **PART** of the statement is conditional, the inverse is not logically equivalent, as you yourself have stated just a few lines later:

"These two statements, namely the conditional and its inverse are not logically equivalent."

Another classic Hector flip-flop.

Moving on now to your '**CASE 2**' you say:

"However, you decided to completely ignore the fact that we are changing Srila Prabhupada's words by deleting the word sometimes to make the conditional statement "If P, then Q". To change Srila Prabhupada's words to suit our needs is an even greater offense. I only accepted the deletion to show you yet another deficiency of the argument."

This is another flip-flop. **YOU** are the one who '*deleted the word sometimes*' not me.

Here is the proof. On May 8th, you wrote:

"While going over your arguments, I realized I had overlooked a much simpler logical flaw that would have avoided much time and words in establishing the truth of point 1, that is, to establish the logical invalidity of your purported Proof 4 in IRM's *The Final Order*: "One guru falls = no Gurus authorised."

You then go on to state what you think is the logical flaw, by giving two 'cases', where my proof falls-down, and in 'Case 2', you state:

"For the sake of argument, let us ignore the word 'sometimes'."

YOU stated this, not me, unless now you have also become mentally confused about whether or not your name is Hector or Krishnakant.

Previous to your deletion above on May 8th, I had only written about how you were defeated in trying to apply Proof 4 to the Gaudiya Matha. It was then to **AVOID** this defeat, that you suddenly claimed that you had

“overlooked a much simpler logical flaw”,

and suddenly gave two ‘cases’ to make your point, with one of your ‘cases’ being ‘Case 2’, where you decided to delete the word ‘sometimes’, as quoted above. So to state that that

“WE are changing Srila Prabhupada’s words by deleting the word sometimes to make a conditional statement”

is just an outright lie, and to then say

“I only accepted the deletion”,

is a further lie, since you are speaking of a deletion **YOU** alone made, so where is the question of ‘accepting’ it?

What I actually did, was **RESPOND** to the argument you made using the deletion to show that it was in any case flawed, and then I applied **MY** argument to that **PART** of the statement ‘If P then Q or –Q’ which **IS** biconditional (i.e. the ‘if P then Q’ part, or the first part of the truth table), for as I say in my concluding statement to the argument presented by me my previous mail:

“Thus in both your case 1 and case 2, you have incorrectly assumed the ***relevant part*** of the statement in question (If P then Q) is conditional rather than bi-conditional,” (emphasis added)

Thus at **NO POINT DID I** delete the word ‘*sometimes*’. Rather I simply defeated **YOUR** argument which **YOU** made by deleting Srila Prabhupada’s words, and then applied my argument to the first part of the truth table (“relevant part of the statement in question”). The fact that I am referring specifically to **PART** of the statement (since the word ‘sometimes’ splits this statement into two), proves that I always took the word ‘*sometimes*’ into account when presenting **MY** arguments, even though **YOU** deleted this word.

You then go onto present another argument **AGAIN** deleting the word ‘*sometimes*’:

“Nevertheless, even if we commit yet another offense and now add meaning to Srila Prabhupada’s words, [...] Hence, consider the contrapositive of Srila Prabhupada’s modified dictum (that is, ignoring ‘**sometimes**’). [...] With this reasoning, the result of our deletion of ‘**sometimes**’ your purported proof 4 not only collapses, but gives a conclusion contrary to some of IRM’s conclusions.”

You **TWICE** state here (highlighted above) that your argument is based entirely on deleting the word ‘*sometimes*’. But proof 4 is based on **KEEPING** the word ‘*sometimes*’, so you are demolishing an argument which has **NOT** been presented by myself.

Therefore you are demolishing a ‘straw-man’ argument. This is understandable since you can **NOT** defeat the argument presented **AS IT IS** – but rather must **DELETE** the word ‘*sometimes*’ from it. But this word is the **KEY** to the proof, since it establishes the **TWO** parts of the truth table, with one part being conditional and the other being bi-conditional, which in turn, establishes the proof.

Conclusion

1. Your **ORIGINAL** challenge to me, consisted of claiming that *Proof 4* was incorrect because it could be applied to the Gaudiya Matha.

You further added also that it was a mistake to consider the first 11 ‘zonal *acharya*’ ISKCON Gurus as having been authorised in the same manner as the next 93. You subsequently admitted that you were mistaken in both your points:

“Yes, I did made a mistake when I did not separate the first eleven gurus from the other 93,”

(Hector Rosario, May 4th, 2006)

“It was a mistake on my part to bring up the Gaudiya Matha for not having yet realized the gross logical flaws at the beginning of the purported proof 4”

(Hector Rosario, May 16th, 2006)

So **YOU** are defeated comprehensively in the debate you actually challenged me to in front of the world on April 30th, 2006.

2. To hide this defeat you subsequently began a new debate, giving a completely different argument with which to oppose *Proof 4*, and then abandoned the debate altogether, only to return. This bizarre behaviour of yours has given rise to 10 acts of self-contradictory behaviour, listed at the beginning of this reply, which you have generated in just 2 weeks of ‘*debating*’. It is clear from this that you are not mentally stable.
3. The new argument you have presented to try and salvage your pride from the defeat you suffered in the debate you challenged me to, has also been comprehensively defeated due to:

- a) The fact Proof 4 is based entirely on Srila Prabhupada's words and is therefore irrefutable.
- b) The fact that your argument is based by your own admission on the '*ascending process*' of acquiring knowledge which you claim "*is not the proper way to understand spiritual matters*" and is "*all nonsense*". Thus by your own analysis, you should have been able to predict your defeat in presenting this argument.
- c) The fact that your argument ignores that Proof 4 involves **BOTH** a conditional and bi-conditional statement.
- d) The fact that part of argument is based entirely on a 'straw man' argument, namely **DELETING** the word '*sometimes*' from Srila Prabhupada's actual statement, even though the proof you are attacking depends on this word.
- e) The fact that due to this deletion of yours, you end up losing half of the relevant truth table, once the proof is translated into your '*symbolic logic*' method of debate. And it is this part of the truth table, which you lose due to offensively deleting Srila Prabhupada's words, which establishes the biconditional nature of the part of the statement made by Srila Prabhupada, hand in hand with the conditional nature of the other part of the statement, which establishes Proof 4.

Thus from every angle of vision, whether in terms of your actions, whether in terms of Srila Prabhupada's words, or in terms of your symbolic logic, you dear Hector, have been comprehensively and overwhelmingly defeated.

You had stated that if this could be done then,

"I will accept you have Srila Prabhupada's blessings."

Therefore be a gentleman, and at least **CONCEDE** defeat.

Thank you,

Your servant,

Krishnakant

Post subject: Hector - act 8

Hare Krishna,

Krishnakant Prabhu,

Please accept my greetings.

All glories to Srila Acaryadeva and Srila Gurudeva, the most faithful servants of Srila Prabhupada. By glorifying their names we can get the mercy of Srila Prabhupada; by offending them we can only condemn ourselves.

You claim:

>“Proof 4 as presented in the *BTP Special Issue*, is derived from the following words of Srila Prabhupada: **“The spiritual master must never be carried away by an accumulation of wealth or a large number of followers. A bona fide spiritual master will never become like that. But sometimes, if a spiritual master is not properly authorized and only on his own initiative becomes a spiritual master, he may be carried away by an accumulation of wealth and large numbers of disciples.”** >(Nectar of Devotion, Chapter 14)”

However, I based my argument on the quote you presented on the *Special Issue*, namely,

“But sometimes, if a spiritual master is not properly authorized and only on his own initiative becomes a spiritual master, he may be carried away by an accumulation of wealth and large numbers of disciples.”

Furthermore, your recapped ‘proof’ reads:

- A. *Nectar of Devotion* states that when not properly authorised – sometimes the Guru falls.
- B. Hence, if Guru falls, then he was not properly authorized.
- C. But all Gurus authorized in exactly the same way.
- D. Thus all Gurus not properly authorized.
- E. *Ritvik* system authorized by July 9th directive remains.

Hence, the part of the quote that you claim I am excluding was due to your excluding it in the *Special Issue*. You quoted Srila Prabhupada beginning with a ‘but’, something you had warned me not to do, yet you did it yourself in your widely distributed *Special Issue*. So, based on what you wrote on the *Special Issue*, it does not follow that if a guru falls, then he was not authorized. However, I will admit that if for A you instead use “A bona fide spiritual master will never become like that (that is, “carried away by an accumulation of wealth and disciples”),” then we can write: If guru authorized, then guru will not fall. The contrapositive of this statement (and hence logically equivalent) is: If guru falls, then guru is not authorized. Of course, this is the statement you want, but it does not follow from the quote you cited. You do not have, as you claimed, a biconditional statement. You simply have two conditional statements, namely,

- 1) If guru not authorized, then guru may or may not fall.
- 2) If guru authorized, then guru will not fall. Again, notice that you do not need the first conditional statement at all to show B. You simply needed to consider the contrapositive of 2). Therefore, your ‘proof recapped’ should change to:

A. *Nectar of Devotion* ‘states’ IF GURU AUTHORIZED, THEN GURU DOES NOT FALL.

B. Hence, if Guru falls, then he was not properly authorized.

C. But all Gurus authorized in exactly the same way.

D. Thus all Gurus not properly authorized.

E. *Ritvik* system authorized by July 9th directive remains. Now, that point is settled. I will accept B, which was proved *independently* of what you had for A.

Notice the simplicity of this argument, just consider the contrapositive of a quote you apparently ignored in your *Special Issue*. At least be a gentleman and admit that you never had a biconditional statement, as you claimed in your last two messages, although you do get the conclusion you wanted, namely B. Now, before we move on to C, we should address some problems with B. You claim: **“There is no other statement from Srila Prabhupada giving the cause of guru fall-down outside of being UNauthorised – that is, nowhere does Srila Prabhupada state that a guru fall-down will occur as a result of a guru actually being correctly AUTHORISED.”** Can you prove this claim? Furthermore, can you prove that you know every statement of Srila Prabhupada, even the non-recorded ones? Without knowing every statement, you do not have the complete set of axioms, and therefore you cannot conclusively say that above statement is true. Now, pay attention to the quotes I cited in my last message. That is why they were there. It would be offensive to say that an authorized guru has fallen. If our guru falls, then we should think that it was his *lila*. That is why I quoted Srila Prabhupada in my last message thus,

75-05-11. Morning Walk. Perth

Devotee (2): So, Srila Prabhupada, isn't Lord Brahma the original spiritual master in our *sampradaya*?

Prabhupada: Yes. BUT WE SHOULD TAKE THAT IT WAS HIS *Lila* TO SHOW THAT "EVEN I AM SUBJECTED. How much you should take risk here." WE SHOULD TAKE LIKE THAT BECAUSE HE'S OUR GURU. We should not take him that he was subjected to lusty desires, but he made a show that "Even I am also subjected." And he gave up this, changed the body for that. THEREFORE WE SHOULD NOT OBSERVE IF THERE IS A SHOW OF A FAULT OF THE GURU. We should take a different way. [...] You should not imitate them; simply you should imitate their instruction.

Notice that Srila Prabhupada warns us not to see fault in the guru. But that doesn't change the Vedic fact that Lord Brahma was chastised by Lord Siva for his apparent falldown, even though he was authorized by Krishna Himself. But he's the *acarya* of our *sampradaya*, so we offer our obeisances to him.

70-02-27 Letter to Jagadisa "Regarding your questions concerning the spirit souls falling into maya's influence, it is not that those who have developed a passive relationship with Krishna are more likely to fall into nescient activities. USUALLY ANYONE who has developed his relationship with Krishna DOES NOT FALL DOWN in any circumstance, BUT because the independence is ALWAYS there, the soul MAY FALL FROM *ANY* POSITION or relationship by misusing his independence. But his relationship with Krishna is never lost, simply it is forgotten by the influence of maya, so it may be regained or revived by the process of hearing the holy name of Krishna..."

We are warned not to see fault in the guru, yet Srila Prabhupada further warns us that ***anyone*** may fall down. That is the purpose of Lord Brahma's *lila*, that ANYONE may fall down. So, even though Srila Prabhupada did something logically equivalent to what you claim in B, that quote must be seen in the context of all his teachings, including these two quotes.

Therefore, we cannot proceed to C.

At Srila Acaryadeva's feet,

hector

Krishnakant's 8th reply

Dear Hector Prabhu,

Please accept my HUMBLE OBEISANCES.

All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

1. So having first said you were at the '*end of this debate*'; then that you were going to '*proceed with the debate*'; then that you will '*finish the debate*', you are once again continuing the debate. Neither are you able to keep to your previous promise to desist from using deductive reasoning to debate me, which you claim is '*all nonsense*'; nor are you able to devote all your energies to discussing '*Krishna-katha*', as you advised me to do, and so on. No, when Hector's ego and pride are at stake, he will happily turn on its head everything he has said previously, rather than be truthful to his own words. Obviously since you cannot even be truthful to your own words, it is no surprise that you are unable to accept the truth of Srila Prabhupada's words, as we will see once again.
2. I note that you have not again even tried to challenge my point that you have already lost the debate which you challenged me to. You had challenged me to debate that my proof was incorrect because one could apply it to the Gaudiya Matha. And in this connection you wrote:

"It was a mistake on my part to bring up the Gaudiya Matha for not having yet realized the gross logical flaws at the beginning of the purported proof 4"

(Hector Rosario, May 16th, 2006)

You simply tried to cover-up your defeat by trying to move seamlessly to a brand-new debate, not previously mentioned or accepted. Until you are gentleman enough to publically concede that "*Yes, Krishnakant defeated me in Point 1 of the debate I challenged him to, and therefore I am trying to debate him with a new challenge*", I will have to keep reminding everyone of your dishonesty. If you are unable to defend a point, then do not challenge people to debate it with you in the first place. **Simple.**

Right now I am indulging you in your new debate, even though you have yet to concede the original debate, because your pronouncements are a classic example of what happens when one tries to defeat Srila Prabhupada's words. So now to your latest contradictory ramblings. Below I will demonstrate how virtually every single statement you have written is either contradictory, mistaken or simply a lie. **Here we go again ...**

Hector's Bag of Tricks – 1

You begin with:

"Hence, the part of the quote that you claim I am excluding was due to your excluding it in the *Special Issue*."

I **NEVER** claimed **YOU** 'excluded' any 'part of the quote'. I stated an extra part of the quote, but I never said **YOU EXCLUDED** it, since as will be seen later, my proof does not **DEPEND** on this extra part of the quote.

Last time you falsely claimed I had deleted the word '*sometimes*', when I had not, and now you are falsely accusing me of saying you excluded part of the quote.

Hector's Bag of Tricks – 2

You state:

"So, based on what you wrote on the *Special Issue*, it does not follow that if a guru falls, the he was not authorized.[...] You do not have, as you claimed, a biconditional statement. [...] At least be a gentleman and admit that you never had a biconditional statement, as you claimed in your last two messages, although you do get the conclusion you wanted, namely B."

Realising that point B of my Proof **DOES** hold, **YOU** have re-worded the proof, to show that my proof holds only due to **YOUR** putting it together in the '*correct*' way with a new point A, and therefore though you **DO** concede Point B of my proof is correct, you argue my reasoning was flawed. In this way you hope to salvage something from your having to finally admit that the key point of the proof which you had challenged, *statement B* – that if a guru was carried away by disciples and wealth, he was not authorised – **is correct.**

This is the first time in a debate the opponent ends up proving the conclusion of his adversary, and then berates his adversary for not doing it right to begin with! You did not need to challenge me to a debate to do that. You could simply have written to *BTP* with suggestions for how we could make the arguments therein even stronger! Having got defeated so comprehensively in trying to challenge *BTP*, maybe you now want to switch sides, and show how valuable your '*mathematical brain*' could be for *BTP*?

Hence even if what you say here is accurate, statement B still holds, and all you have achieved is to demonstrate this via an alternative method. And I still win the debate, since you are unable to challenge **point B** of the proof, that a guru who falls was unauthorised. Thanks for demonstrating I was correct all along, and for finally conceding that you can not break **Proof 4**. But alas this was not necessary, for though the way you have re-worded my proof **DOES** give yet **ANOTHER** method by which to show that the conclusion – **if a guru falls, he was not authorised** – is correct, the way the proof was worded originally in the *Special Issue* also works just fine. I already explained 2 e-mails ago, and which you did not challenge, that:

The 'If a guru is unauthorised – guru falls' PART of the statement given in the *BTP Special Issue* – is a bi-conditional statement, since Logic is the drawing of inferences from the AVAILABLE axioms. Since no other axiom had been produced stating a bona-fide authorised guru getting carried away by wealth and disciples, then the axiom given in *The Nectar of Devotion* Chapter 14, (truncated version, as given in the *BTP Special Issue*), remains the only axiom regarding gurus getting carried away by wealth and disciples, and the statement is therefore automatically bi-conditional. The EXTRA part of the quote which I just provided in my last mail, (your new point A of the proof) was simply to demonstrate, that not only is there no axiom stating that bona fide authorised gurus get carried away by wealth and disciples, but that an axiom exists which states the contrary – that authorised gurus would NEVER get carried away by wealth and disciples.

So Hector, I hope you **FINALLY** get the point, and stop embarrassing yourself. Simply ignoring my argument because you cannot defeat it, will not help you. For I will simply keep repeating it, like I have done above. All you have achieved with this latest bag of tricks, is to simply give **ANOTHER** proof for the conclusion that

“if a guru falls, he was not authorised.”

Like I said before, **THANKS**.

Hector's Bag of Tricks - 3

You state:

“Now, before we move on to C, we should address some problems with B. You claim: “There is no other statement from Srila Prabhupada giving the cause of guru fall-down outside of being UNauthorised – that is, nowhere does Srila Prabhupada state that a guru fall-down will occur as a result of a guru actually being correctly AUTHORISED.” Can you prove this claim? Furthermore, can you prove that you know every statement of Srila Prabhupada, even the non-recorded ones? Without knowing every statement, you do not have the complete set of axioms, and therefore you cannot conclusively say that above statement is true.”

The above statement of yours is contradictory, since you have **JUST** finished showing there is **NO** problem with B, if we replace statement A, with **YOUR** version. What you refer to above relates to an argument made by me in relation to **MY** statement A (which I have just shown is in any case correct), but since you have replaced it, and then gone on to say that now B is '*proven*', and therefore has no problem, how can you again go on say there are '*some problems with B*'? So **EVEN** if you still do not accept **MY** way of arriving at B, since you have said B **IS** proven via **YOUR** way of arriving at it, then, there are **NO PROBLEMS** with B. Of course your points above can easily be refuted, but what is the need when you already accept there is no problem with B?

Hector's Bag of Tricks – 4

You state:

“If our guru falls, then we should think that it was his *lila*. That is why I quoted Srila Prabhupada in my last message thus: (quote about Lord Brahma follows)”

This is another bare-faced Hector lie to be added to shameful ones I have already pointed out. In your last message, you actually quoted the same statement from Srila Prabhupada for the following reason:

“Remember, even if Srila Prabhupada might have said harsh words against some of his Godbrothers, it is not our position, as conditioned souls, to imitate him and utter harsh words against his Godbrothers. Hear from Srila Prabhupada: [same quote about Lord Brahma]. Hence, we should follow Srila Prabhupada's instructions and not his *lilas*.”

So previously you had used the quote to claim that

“we should follow Srila Prabhupada's instructions and not his *lilas*.”

And now you are claiming to use the quote to show

“If our guru falls, then we should think that it was his *lila*.”

These are two different propositions, and your attempt to equate them to show you were arguing the same thing all along, has not only failed, but revealed you yet again as a liar.

Lord Brahma's Top Ten Defeats Hector

Now we come to the final and most shameful part of your message. Having not only failed to defeat my proof via your original challenge (Gaudiya Matha method), and having not only failed via your new argument (lack of a biconditional statement), but also having actually demonstrated my argument via another proof yourself, you resort to the last refuge of a scoundrel to save yourself when you have been thoroughly defeated from every angle in debate: to claim that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself. And you attempt to show that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself by offending Lord Brahma by trying to use his apparent fall-down to do this. Not only will your attempt be thoroughly defeated, just as with everything else you have ever stated, but your true nature as someone who will say anything to try and win a debate will also be exposed. Here in honour of Lord Brahma, I present 10 reasons why your following assertions:

"Notice that Srila Prabhupada warns us not to see fault in the guru. But that doesn't change the Vedic fact that Lord Brahma was chastised by Lord Siva for his apparent fall-down, even though he was authorized by Krishna Himself. But he's the *acarya* of our *sampradaya*, so we offer our obeisances to him. We are warned not to see fault in the guru, yet Srila Prabhupada further warns us that **anyone** may fall down. That is the purpose of Lord Brahma's *lila*, that ANYONE may fall down. So, even though Srila Prabhupada did something logically equivalent to what claim in B, that quote must be seen in the context of all his teachings, including these two quotes. Therefore, we cannot proceed to C."

to try and contradict Srila Prabhupada, using Lord Brahma's apparent fall-down, are both offensive and incorrect.

a) Nature of Challenge Contradictory

1). You have already **ACCEPTED** in unqualified terms, that statement B –

"Hence if Guru falls, he was not properly authorized"

is correct:

"However, ***I will admit*** that if for A you instead use "A bona fide spiritual master will never become like that", then we can write [...] If guru falls, then guru is not authorized. Of course, ***this is the statement you want***, but it does not follow from the quote you cited."

"*I will accept B, which was proved* ***independently*** of what you had for A. [...] Notice the simplicity of this argument, [...] although ***you do get the conclusion you wanted***, namely B."

As we noted earlier, you are accepting here that conclusion B of my proof is correct, because **YOU** had proved in 'your way'. Obviously getting 'carried away' yourself at having given such a 'brilliant' yet 'simple' proof for statement B, you cannot then state that there is anything wrong with it, and therefore your ego forces you to state in unqualified terms that statement B of my proof is correct, as we note above. Having done this, you realize a few seconds later, that though it is 'your' proof and thus has to be correct, you still do not want to concede the debate, and so immediately try and challenge the same proof which you had just claimed was correct, with the example of Lord Brahma's apparent fall-down. In doing so, you have contradicted yourself, for as you know, proofs are precise – they are either correct or they are not proofs at all. Hence either what you say above about statement B being 'proved' is **WRONG**, and therefore 'your' proof was not correct after all, **OR** your subsequent challenge to it based on using Lord Brahma is **WRONG**. You can't have it both ways – first claim statement B is correct due to your proof for it, and at the same time claim later it is not correct by stating that we are not able to move forward to Point C.

2). Also note that your proof to arrive at statement B depends entirely and only, as you boast, on Srila Prabhupada's statement:

"A bona fide spiritual master will never become like that",

(and therefore, you brag, is a much more efficient proof than mine). Thus you are arguing that Srila Prabhupada's words directly here lead to the conclusion that

"If a guru falls, he was not authorised".

However to then claim we cannot move forward to Point C, can only be if B is wrong (if it was correct, we could move forward). But since according to you B rests entirely on Srila Prabhupada's words, the only way B can be wrong is if Srila Prabhupada's words are wrong. Therefore the only way that B can be challenged is if Srila Prabhupada's words on which B is based are not correct. That is after having claimed that a Bona Fide guru **NEVER** falls, you would need to argue that Srila Prabhupada later claims the opposite. Therefore Hector, you are in effect trying to demonstrate that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself – a challenge which is self-defeating, for if it **WAS** the case that you 'showed' that Srila Prabhupada's statement

"A Bona Fide Guru spiritual master will NEVER become like that (carried away by wealth and disciples),"

was **WRONG**, then you would still lose the debate, since you would only have proven that you are contradicting your **OWN** proof, and you cannot win a debate by proving that you have contradicted yourself! Or, Srila Prabhupada's statement is **CORRECT**, in which case your challenge fails and you still are unable to defeat me. In short, the only way you can challenge statement B of my proof is to demonstrate that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself. Either way, your challenge is both offensive to Srila Prabhupada and foolish, for either way you still cannot win the debate – only commit offence.

b) Example Not Applicable

3). Srila Prabhupada states that the story of Lord Brahma's apparent fall-down was only a *lila* meant to teach something specific:

"We should not take him that he was subjected to lusty desires, but he made a show that "Even I am also subjected." And he gave up this, changed the body for that."

(Morning Walk, 11/5/75)

"There is a purpose for the exhibition of such a tendency by Brahma, and he is not to be condemned like an ordinary living entity".

(SB 3.12.48, purport)

Therefore one **CANNOT** from this one *lila* treat Lord Brahma like a regular fallen guru and deduce a general principle about fallen gurus from it, such as:

"if one has been properly authorized, he will be carried away by disciples and wealth",

which is what is needed in order to counter statement B, which you say is proven by the following direct words of Srila Prabhupada:

"A bona fide spiritual master will never become like that". (carried away by disciples and wealth).

4). Also, as it was only a special *lila*, it was also **NOT** a real non-*lila* fall-down like the one we are currently debating:

"But sometimes, if a spiritual master is not properly authorized and only on his own initiative becomes a spiritual master, he may be carried away by an accumulation of wealth and large numbers of disciples. *His is not a very high grade of devotional service. If a person is carried away by such achievements, then his devotional service becomes slackened*.

Srila Prabhupada makes it clear that here we are discussing genuine fall-downs, not temporary *lilas* meant for show, because as a result of the fall-down, the person is not of a "**very high grade of devotional service**", and his "**devotional service becomes slackened**." Whereas in the case of Lord Brahma, following his *lila*, neither was it the case that he was "**not of a very high grade of devotional service**" or that "**his devotional service became slackened**", for straight after performing his special *lila*, Lord Brahma immediately gave up his body and continued his devotional service without any interruption:

"Thereafter Brahma accepted another body, in which sex life was not forbidden, and thus he engaged himself in the matter of further creation."

(SB 3.12.49)

5). In commenting on this incident of Lord Brahma, you yourself state that this incident actually meant that:

"Hence, we should follow Srila Prabhupada's instructions and not his *lilas*."

Therefore by your own reasoning, what is important is **NOT** *lilas*, such as this *lila* of Lord Brahma, but an **INSTRUCTION** from Srila Prabhupada to the effect:

"if one has been properly authorized, he will be carried away by disciples and wealth"

which is what you would need to show Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself, and therefore defeat statement B of my proof. Do not forget, as mentioned earlier, the **ONLY** way you can defeat statement B of the proof, is to demonstrate that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself.

However **BECAUSE** you do **NOT** have such a contradictory **INSTRUCTION** from Srila Prabhupada, you are now resorting to a *Lila* from Lord Brahma. That is, having already told us that the example of Lord Brahma shows us that Srila Prabhupada's **INSTRUCTION** is more important than any *lila*, you are **NOW** arguing that this example shows us that a *lila* is what matters, not Srila Prabhupada's instruction! **Another classic Hector flip-flop!**

6). We have already shown that Lord Brahma's example was a *Lila* and therefore not applicable to the debate before us. Therefore the only way that Lord Brahma's example could even be relevant to the current debate is if the 34 ISKCON Gurus who fell were also all acting out some special '*lila*' to teach us something, just like Lord Brahma was. So Harikesa, who now preaches that gurus are not even necessary for spiritual life, along with all his other shenanigans, would actually be acting out some divine *lila*. So dear Hector, if that is your argument, then do enlighten us as to the real nature of the 'divine *lilas*' of Kirtanananda, Bhavananda et. al. Otherwise, Lord Brahma's incident has no connection to the fall-downs currently being discussed as described in *The Nectar of Devotion*.

7). Finally, Srila Prabhupada has given his verdict on anyone who dares to try and use this special this *lila* of Lord Brahma, to try and draw any conclusion regarding the nature of Bona fide authorized *acaryas*, just like you are trying to do:

Aksayananda: I was recently told by one devotee that the *acarya* does not have to be a pure devotee.

Prabhupada: What?

Aksayananda: That the *acarya* does not have to be a pure devotee.

Prabhupada: Who is that rascal?

Aksayananda: Well, he said it. - Who said it?

Prabhupada: Who said? Who is that rascal? The *acarya* does not require to be a pure devotee?

Aksayananda: He said it. Nitāi said it. He said it in this context. He said that Lord Brahm is the *acarya* in the Brahma-sampradāya, but yet he is sometimes afflicted by passion. So therefore he is saying that it appears that the *acarya* does not have to be a pure devotee. So it does not seem right.

Prabhupada: So who is that rascal? I want to know who has said. [...]

Prabhupada: He manufactured his idea. Therefore he's a rascal. Therefore he's a rascal.[...]

Aksayananda: So there's no doubt that Lord Brahma is a pure devotee?

Prabhupada: Whatever he may be, he is *acarya*. So you... Then Krishna is also passionate. Krishna is also passionate. Krishna danced with so many gopis; therefore He is passionate. They... These things are to be seen in this way, that "Such exalted person, he sometimes become passionate, so how much we shall be careful." This is the instruction

(Morning Walk, 10/12/75)

Srila Prabhupada here thoroughly condemns as a big rascal, one disciple who tried to apply the *lila* of Lord Brahma to draw a conclusion about the nature of *acaryas*, that they cannot be pure. Similarly you are trying to apply the *lila* of Lord Brahma to derive a similar conclusion about authorized *acaryas*, that:

"Authorized *acaryas* get carried away by wealth and disciples",

in order to defeat Srila Prabhupada's words and show him to be a self-contradictor. Srila Prabhupada states that trying to apply the *lila* of Lord Brahma is rascaldom, and you doing this specifically to contradict Srila Prabhupada is double-rascaldom. You will not agree if I call you a rascal, but at least listen to Srila Prabhupada.

c) Lord Brahma's Position Not Applicable

8). Yet another reason which mitigates against this *lila* of Lord Brahma having any applicability at all to the debate before us, is the fact that at the time this *lila* happened, Lord Brahma had not yet been authorized to assume his duties of transmitting the knowledge of the *Bhagavatam* through the *parampara* for us to currently receive:

"This extraordinary immorality on the part of Brahma was heard to have occurred in some particular *kalpa*, but it could not have happened in the *kalpa* in which Brahma heard directly from the Lord the four essential verses of *Srimad-Bhagavatam* because the Lord blessed Brahma, after giving him lessons on the *Bhagavatam*, that he would never be bewildered in any *kalpa* whatsoever. This indicates that before the hearing of *Srimad-Bhagavatam* he might have fallen a victim to such sensuality, but after hearing *Srimad-Bhagavatam* directly from the Lord, there was no possibility of such failures."

(SB, 3:12:28)

"In this way the Supreme Personality of Godhead informed Lord Brahma about the purport of the *catuh-sloka*. Again, Lord Brahma explained this to Narada Muni, and Narada Muni explained it to Srila Vyasadeva. This is the *parampara* system, the disciplic succession."

(Cc Madhya 25.97, purport)

"There are four verses written in this connection, and these are explained to Brahma by Lord Krsna Himself. In his turn, Brahma explains them to Narada, and Narada explains them to Vyasadeva. In this way the purport of the verses of *Srimad-Bhagavatam* come down through disciplic succession."

(Teachings of Lord Caitanya, 22)

"As already stated, Brahma is the original spiritual master for the universe, and since he was initiated by the Lord Himself, the message of *Srimad-Bhagavatam* is coming down by disciplic succession, and in order to receive the real message of *Srimad-Bhagavatam* one should approach the current link, or spiritual master, in the chain of disciplic succession."

(SB, 2:9:7 purport)

Therefore Lord Brahma was not at the time of his *lila* such a current link in the chain of disciplic succession, from whom one

could receive the real message of *Srimad-Bhagavatam*, since he had yet to hear the message of the *Bhagavatam* himself.

9). Further confirmation for the above argument demonstrating the non-applicability of the *lila* to the debate before us, is the statement that after Lord Brahma got authorized to transmit the message of the *Bhagavatam* through the *parampara*, he was blessed by Lord Krishna himself to:

“never be bewildered in any *kalpa* whatsoever. This indicates that before the hearing of *Srimad-Bhagavatam* he might have fallen a victim to such sensuality, but after hearing *Srimad-Bhagavatam* directly from the Lord, there was no possibility of such failures.”

(SB, 3:12:28)

Thus Lord Brahma’s position **AFTER** being authorized with the message of the *Bhagavatam*, matches the statement which you are now trying to contradict:

“A bona Fide spiritual master will NEVER become like that.”

Indeed as Srila Prabhupada states, after Lord Brahma became authorized to transmit the message of the *Bhagavatam* via the disciplic succession there was not even any possibility of such a fall-down happening to Lord Brahma. Therefore even though the apparent fall-down *lila* of Lord Brahma is not applicable for all the reasons given above, we see that it may not be relevant for an even more obvious reason. Lord Brahma had yet to achieve the type of authorized status which we are discussing in the current proof – authorized to transmit the message of the *Bhagavatam* via the disciplic succession - and indeed we see that once Lord Brahma achieves this type of status, his position of not ever falling down fits exactly with the proof in question.

d) Type of Fall Not Applicable

10). Now the above has made it very clear from so many angles, that Lord Brahma’s apparent ‘fall-down’ was not a fall-down that has any application to the debate before us. However even if we were to admit the example **COULD** in theory be applicable, the nature of the incident itself also gives mitigating factors. One thing which is sometimes forgotten in the rush to meditate on Lord Brahma’s ‘fall-down’, is that Lord Brahma did not actually **DO ANYTHING**:

“Brahma has a fabulous duration of life, but he was obliged to give up his body due to his grievous sin, even though he had merely contemplated it in his mind without having actually done it.”

(SB. 3:12:33)

Whereas in the discussion before us, we are discussing a very specific type of fall-down, which is a real external fall-down, where one actually gets carried away by wealth and disciples, not sins of thought. This is also made clear in the *BTP Special Issue*, where the whole article in which the proof under discussion is mentioned, deals only and specifically with external fall-downs. Similarly, again just comparing gross ‘like with like’ details, we are also not dealing with fall-downs, where after being ‘carried away’, the gurus immediately quit their body, as Lord Brahma did.

Hence even if Lord Brahma’s *lila* could be applied in theory, just the nature of the fall itself prevents direct applicability to the specific type of fall-downs the proof deals with.

So here you have 10 different reasons why Lord Brahma’s *lila* cannot be used to defeat statement B, which has **EVEN BEEN PROVEN BY YOU!** Any **ONE** reason is enough to establish the point, so unless you can refute **ALL 10**, you have no case. And **EVEN** if you ‘**thought**’ you had refuted all 10, you would only actually be refuting Srila Prabhupada’s words and trying to contradict him. (*And also contradict yourself*).

Further, as for your other quote (letter to Jagadish), where Srila Prabhupada is speaking specifically about the original fall of the souls from the spiritual world, and that falls from the spiritual world are not limited to those who are in certain *rasas* with Krishna, this does not prevent Krishna from blessing certain individuals acting in the material world e.g. a bona fide guru or Lord Brahma after he heard the *Bhagavatam*, to never be disturbed in the service they are performing for Him.

So there is **NO** contradiction between the statements of Srila Prabhupada.

As I said before, your approach is a losing proposition. Once you have proven something using Srila Prabhupada’s words, you must accept the conclusion and leave it alone. Not try and find fault with it, simply to save face in a debate, for even if you ‘**think**’ that you found such a fault, you would only show that you have contradicted yourself and still not win the debate.

- So why bother?

Conclusion

It has been demonstrated that:

1. You already lost long ago the actual debate you challenged me to.
2. You have also been defeated in the new argument (lack of biconditionality) you have used to attack proof 4.
3. Indeed you have additionally proven statement B in proof 4, via yet another route.
4. So you have been defeated in the current debate **TWICE** – once by my myself and once by yourself.
5. Given all this, to avoid defeat again, you have taken shelter of the last refuge of a scoundrel, which is to try and show that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself. For having accepted that the proof for statement B rests **DIRECTLY** on Srila Prabhupada's words, rather than just accept the statement is correct, you have now entered down the road of *guru-aparadha* to try and show that therefore Srila Prabhupada must have contradicted himself.
6. And to try and defeat Srila Prabhupada's words, you have engaged in equal rascaldom by trying to take advantage of Lord Brahma's *lila*, to show that Srila Prabhupada has contradicted himself.
7. I have given 10 different evidences that Lord Brahma's *lila* cannot be used to defeat **Statement B** of the proof, and therefore Srila Prabhupada's statement that a bona fide guru **NEVER** falls, stands in perfect harmony with Lord Brahma's *lila*.

Therefore dear Hector, I urge you to accept these evidences, and immediately end this offensive endeavour to show that Srila Prabhupada's statement that a "**bona fide guru will NEVER become like that**", is wrong, and subject to contradiction by Lord Brahma's *lila*.

Better to just accept simple defeat, rather than to also add the ignominy of being offensive to both Srila Prabhupada and Lord Brahma. For even if you thought you could defeat Srila Prabhupada's words, you would still lose the debate, since you will have only proven that you have contradicted yourself again, since you have already accepted statement B to be **PROVEN**.

Indeed since you have engaged in this offensive behaviour towards Srila Prabhupada and Lord Brahma simply to try and avoid defeat in debate by myself, to help put a stop to these offences, if you withdraw from this debate and therefore end this offensive behaviour, I am even willing to never mention that you were defeated in debate, nor to ever print or post this debate or forward it to anyone. You did not enter this debate to destroy your spiritual life. Therefore take the offer, and go back to teaching Maths, which I am sure you are probably good at. Otherwise if you continue, you will be like the Brahmana who lost his caste but was still hungry. You will sacrifice everything to try and avoid defeat in this debate, but still continue to get defeated and humiliated at every turn.

So will you choose the path of self-contradiction and offences, or bowing out gracefully with no loss of honour?

The choice is yours.

Thank you

Your servant,

Krishnakant

Post subject: Hector - act 9

May 2006 23:48

Subject: A challenge to IRM [9:Defeat?]

Hare Krishna Krishnakant Prabhu,

Please accept my greetings. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

You said:

Please accept my HUMBLE OBEISANCES. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

I am ready to offer you my obeisances repeatedly and place your feet on my head as soon as you sincerely and humbly ask for forgiveness for the offenses committed at the lotus feet of Sripada Gour Govinda *Maharaja* and His Holiness Hridayananda dasa Goswami Acaryadeva.

Remember,

“Humility means that one should not be anxious to have the satisfaction of being honored by others.”

[Purport to BG 13.8-12]

You said:

You simply tried to cover-up your defeat by trying to move seamlessly to a brand-new debate, not previously mentioned or accepted. Until you are gentleman enough to publically concede that “Yes, Krishnakant defeated me in Point 1 of the debate I challenged him to, and therefore I am trying to debate him with a new challenge”, I will have to keep reminding everyone of your dishonesty. If you are unable to defend a point, then do not challenge people to debate it with you in the first place. Simple.

Point 1 of the debate is about the logical validity of the argument of your purported proof 4 on IRM’s *Special Issue*. Bringing up the Gaudiya Matha case was a mistake on my part because I assumed (incorrectly) that the proof was sound. If you can show step by step that the proof is sound, then it would make sense to consider the Gaudiya Matha case. So far, I accept that B follows from A in the ammended version of your ‘proof’, with the AVAILABLE information. I do not need the credit.

Hence, we are debating this argument, which is the ammended and improved version of the purported proof 4: **“One guru falls = no guru is authorized”**.

- A. *Nectar of Devotion* ‘states’ IF GURU AUTHORIZED, THEN GURU DOES NOT FALL.
- B. Hence, if Guru falls, then he was not properly authorized.
- C. But all Gurus authorized in exactly the same way.
- D. Thus all Gurus not properly authorized.
- E. *Ritvik* system authorized by July 9th directive remains.

I showed you that with what you had for A on the *Special Issue*, B does not follow. However, this is only a minor point, since it doesn’t affect the validity of B, but you are unwilling to accept you made a small mistake. After all, as conditioned souls, we are fallible.

You said:

This is the first time in a debate the opponent ends up proving the conclusion of his adversary...

This simply shows that, in all honesty and humility, I am willing to concede defeat if you provide unequivocal evidence or logical arguments. I take the opportunity to thank you for clarifying the inapplicability of Lord Brahma’s *lila*. Your arguments have indeed saved me from committing further offenses at the lotus feet of the *Acarya* of our *sampradaya*. I pray Srila Prabhupada will forgive me for these offenses. I hereby express my sincerest and deepest gratitude to you.

The quote from SB 3.12.28 sufficed. Namely,

“This extraordinary immorality on the part of Brahma was heard to have occurred in some particular kalpa, but it could not have happened in the kalpa in which Brahma heard directly from the Lord the four essential verses of Srimad-Bhagavatam because the Lord blessed Brahma, after giving him lessons on the Bhagavatam, that he would never be bewildered in any kalpa whatsoever. This indicates that before the hearing of Srimad-Bhagavatam he might have fallen a victim to such sensuality, but after hearing Srimad-Bhagavatam directly from the Lord, there was no possibility of such failures.” [SB, 3:12:28]

You said:

'If a guru is unauthorised – guru falls' PART of the statement given in the *BTP Special Issue* – is a bi-conditional statement, since Logic is the drawing of inferences from the AVAILABLE axioms. Since no other axiom had been produced stating a bona-fide authorised guru getting carried away by wealth and disciples, then the axiom given in *The Nectar of Devotion* Chapter 14, (truncated version, as given in the *BTP Special Issue*), remains the only axiom regarding gurus getting carried away by wealth and disciples, and the statement is therefore automatically bi-conditional.

First of all, it is not a biconditional statement with the available axioms, even though you do not want to accept it. Nevertheless, THERE IS ANOTHER AXIOM. Indeed, there are TWO more axioms. My wife found them yesterday while following the instructions of our bonafide guru to read *Teachings of Lord Chaitanya* to clarify some doubts she had about *avatars*.

Here it is.

“If one is attracted by a large number of disciples and FORGETS HIS DUTY AS A BONA FIDE SPIRITUAL MASTER, the growth of the [Bhakti] plant will be impeded. Simply by TAKING ADVANTAGE OF MATERIAL CONVENIENCES one may become addicted to enjoying material comforts.”

[Teachings to Rupa Goswami in Teachings of Lord Chaitanya, p.30]

Srila Prabhupada is so merciful that he not only has provided one, but two more axioms that may be the cause for the fall-down of a BONAFIDE guru, namely,

1) Forgetfulness of duty

2) Taking advantage of material conveniences Hence, if a spiritual master FORGETS HIS DUTY AS A BONA FIDE SPIRITUAL MASTER, then he may fall. Certainly, only a bona fide spiritual master can know what the duties of such a position are. Moreover, it can be inferred that such forgetfulness might come from TAKING ADVANTAGE OF MATERIAL CONVENIENCES. However, since forgetfulness comes from Krishna, you might be able to explain how forgetfulness should be understood in this context. I am not yet qualified to enter such topics. I am simply taking Srila Prabhupada's and Krishna's words as factual.

“I am seated in everyone's heart, and from Me come remembrance, knowledge and forgetfulness.” [BG 15.15]

Therefore, since we have two more axioms, B becomes:

IF (guru falls), THEN (he was not authorized OR he forgot his duty as a bonafide spiritual master OR he took advantage of material conveniences).

Do you accept Srila Prabhupada's words as evidence? Do you accept his axioms?

If you do (or even if you don't), then 'proof' 4 of IRM's *Special Issue*, and therefore the argument in *The Final Order*, unequivocally collapses.

With this information that appears in one of the most fundamental books for us as faithful followers of Srila Prabhupada, we are in a better position to understand what might have happened in ISKCON with the fall of so many of its gurus.

If an ISKCON guru falls, there are at least three possible reasons Srila Prabhupada gives for his falldown, namely, unauthorization, forgetfulness of duty, and taking advantage of material conveniences. How would one know which was the reason in each individual case? Only Krishna knows.

Nevertheless, one likely scenario is that, given ISKCON's vast material opulence, some gurus took advantage of material conveniences and in the process forgot their duty as bonafide spiritual masters. As a result, they fell.

This should not surprise us, since Srila Prabhupada had already warned us (in the letter to Jagadisha Prabhu) that:

“Usually ANYONE who has developed his relationship with Krishna DOES NOT FALL DOWN in any circumstance, BUT because the independence is ALWAYS there, the soul MAY FALL FROM *ANY* POSITION or relationship by misusing his independence.”

Any position means any position; anyone means anyone (unless specifically excluded). Pardon the tautologies, but as you have repeatedly emphasized, there is no contradiction in Srila Prabhupada's words.

You said:

Further, as for your other quote (letter to Jagadish), where Srila Prabhupada is speaking specifically about the original fall of the souls from the spiritual world, and that falls from the spiritual world are not limited to those who are in certain *rasas* with Krishna, this does not prevent Krishna from blessing certain individuals acting in the material world e.g. a bona fide guru or Lord Brahma after he heard the *Bhagavatam*, to never be disturbed in the service they are performing for Him.

Certainly nothing prevents Krishna from offering such blessings. Yet, nothing forces him either.

You said:

Indeed since you have engaged in this offensive behaviour towards Srila Prabhupada and Lord Brahma simply to try and avoid defeat in debate by myself, to help put a stop to these offences, if you withdraw from this debate and therefore end this offensive behaviour, I am even willing to never mention that you were defeated in debate, nor to ever print or post this debate or forward it to anyone. You did not enter this debate to destroy your spiritual life. Therefore take the offer, and go back to teaching Maths, which I am sure you are probably good at. Otherwise if you continue, you will be like the Brahmana who lost his caste but was still hungry. You will sacrifice everything to try and avoid defeat in this debate, but still continue to get defeated and humiliated at every turn.

You have my authorization to post all messages in their entirety and in sequence. Devotees might benefit from these exchanges.

It is interesting to note, however, that I have treated you as a worthy opponent throughout the debate, with all the respect that a Vaisnava is due. Furthermore, I have repeatedly asked for forgiveness for committing any offenses against you or against anyone else. Yet, you have repeatedly chosen derision instead of chivalry. No wonder devotees ignore after a few exchanges, rather than debate with you. One needs to at least attempt to be free of false ego before challenging you.

Perhaps until now you had indeed dominated the debate, to use your own words, from almost "every angle." Yet, you have lost from the decisive angle. Or shall we call it, The Final Angle?

But in any case, let Srila Prabhupada have the last word.

So will you choose the path of self-contradiction and offences, or bowing out gracefully with no loss of honour?

The choice is yours.

The two additional axioms provide a different picture now. Do you honorably and humbly concede defeat?

The choice is yours.

Srila Prabhupada ki! Jaya!

At Srila Acaryadeva's feet,

hector OM TAT SAT

Post subject: Krishnakant's 9th reply

Fri, 26 May 2006

Dear Hector Prabhu,

Please accept my HUMBLE OBEISANCES.

All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

It seems you will not learn. You are still trying to attempt to show that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself, even though you were warned last time that trying to do this is very offensive, and injurious to one's spiritual life. Only now you have abandoned the attempt to do this via the example of Lord Brahma, but instead are now using an even more offensive method, which is to manufacture the words you claim Srila Prabhupada spoke.

As per the usual custom, I will once again demonstrate how virtually every line you have written is mistaken, contradictory, or just a bare-faced lie.

Here we go again ...

Hector's Bag of Tricks - 1

You state:

"Remember,

"Humility means that one should not be anxious to have the satisfaction of being honored by others."

[Purport to BG 13.8-12]

a) Correct. And this is why at no point have I REQUESTED you offer me obeisances. I have simply NOTED your flip-flop in happily offering me obeisances through the first half of the debate, and then suddenly discontinuing offering me obeisances so as to not be disrespectful to all those I am supposed to have offended. Which meant you were perfectly happy to disrespect the same personalities for the first half of the debate when you were offering me obeisances.

b) Humility also means that one is READY to offer all honour to other VAISNAVAS. You claim later in the same message:

"that I have treated you as a worthy opponent throughout the debate, with ALL the respect that a Vaisnava is due,"

yet you cannot even bring yourself to pay obeisances to someone you claim is a 'vaisnava'. How can 'ALL the respect' a VAISNAVA is due, not even involve the paying of obeisances? Another contradiction on your part. I have no desire to have you pay obeisances to me, but I will continue to point out your contradictory gibberish, which is an offence to genuine Vaisnavas everywhere.

Hector's Bag of Tricks - 2

You state:

"Point 1 of the debate is about the logical validity of the argument of your purported proof 4 on IRM's *Special Issue*. Bringing up the Gaudiya Matha case was a mistake on my part because I assumed (incorrectly) that the proof was sound."

Point 1 of the debate, as stated by you is:

"1) In *"The Final Order"* you claim to have six "proofs" to establish the *ritvik* case. However, there is ***a logical flaw*** in your purported Proof 4: One guru falls = no Gurus authorised. I will grant you that, given the axioms you have chosen, the conclusion would indeed follow logically. However, if we accept the argument as sound, then we must be able to apply the same reasoning to other cases. Let us apply it to the Gaudiya Matha."

(Hector's Challenge To Debate, 30th April, 2006)

Thus Point 1 of the debate as stated by YOU, is that ASSUMING the proof is valid, there is ***A logical flaw*** in the proof, this being that one can apply the reasoning of the proof to the Gaudiya Matha. THIS was point 1 of the debate, as written and challenged by you.

There is a huge difference between the general logical validity of a proof, where one tries to actually ascertain **WHETHER** or not the proof is correct, and **ASSUMING** the proof is correct and claiming on this basis its application would lead to a logical flaw. You challenged me to debate the latter proposition, that accepting the proof as correct one could show a logical flaw in it by applying it to the Gaudiya Matha; a flaw you were singularly unable to substantiate, as proven by the fact that you abandoned this challenge and instead came up with your new challenge to show that the proof itself was incorrect. If you abandon the actual argument you challenged someone to debate, just because you cannot substantiate it, and come up with a brand

new argument, you have conceded the debate.

Thus you were defeated in point 1 of the debate you challenged me to.

Hector's Bag of Tricks – 3

You state:

"I showed you that with what you had for A on the *Special Issue*, B does not follow. However, this is only a minor point, since it doesn't affect the validity of B, but you are unwilling to accept you made a small mistake. After all, as conditioned souls, we are fallible. [...] First of all, it is not a biconditional statement with the available axioms, even though you do not want to accept it."

But the **ONLY AVAILABLE** axiom which had been presented thus far, is that only if a guru is unauthorised does he get carried away by wealth and disciples. You claim that

"it is not a bi-conditional statement with the available axioms even though you do not want to accept it",

even though you have yet to even try and address the argument which I have now made twice to prove that it **IS** a bi-conditional statement, and hence you are actually saying

"I am right because I say I am, even though I cannot answer your argument."

Of course through this creative technique, one can win **ANY** debate! For the 3rd time, I will explain **AGAIN** how the statement is bi-conditional, and for the 3rd time, we will see that you will once again be unable to respond to it:

The inverse of a conditional statement is **NOT** logically equivalent **BECAUSE** there is **NOT ONLY ONE** cause for the effect. In such a situation though the cause can be said to give rise to the effect, one cannot assume given the effect, what the cause was, since there could be more than one possibility. When however there is **ONLY** one given cause for a given effect, the conditional statement collapses into a bi-conditional statement, since now it is true, that:

If Cause -> Effect; the Effect -> same Cause, as now there is **ONLY ONE** cause for the effect. Therefore **IF** it can be shown that **ONLY** as a result of being unauthorised leads to one being carried away by wealth and disciples, then we can also conclude that **IF** one is carried away by wealth and disciples, then one was unauthorised. And since to date you have yet to produce an axiom which states that an **AUTHORISED** member of the disciplic succession, will also get carried away by wealth and disciples, then the '*available axioms*' are still only **ONE**, and the statement remains bi-conditional.

- So I will ask you for 3rd time, what in the above paragraph do you still not understand?

Not what you will **IGNORE** and just claim you are right, but what is actually incorrect with the above explanation. I will keep asking until you are gentleman enough to concede your mistake, instead of just childish claiming: "I am right, but I don't know why, nor will I explain."

Srila Prabhupada Defeats Hector 7 Times

Now we come to your continued shameful and offensive behaviour in trying to show Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself. Having not only failed to defeat my proof via your original challenge (Gaudiya Matha method), and having not only failed via your new argument (lack of a biconditional statement), but also having actually demonstrated my argument via another proof yourself, you continue to resort to the last refuge of a scoundrel to save yourself when you have been thoroughly defeated from every angle in debate: to claim that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself. You now attempt to show that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself by the following statement in *The Teachings of Lord Caitanya*:

"If one is attracted by a large number of disciples and FORGETS HIS DUTY AS A BONA FIDE SPIRITUAL MASTER, the growth of the [Bhakti] plant will be impeded. Simply by TAKING ADVANTAGE OF MATERIAL CONVENIENCES one may become addicted to enjoying material comforts."

[Teachings to Rupa Goswami in, *Teachings of Lord Chaitanya*, p.30]

Not only will your attempt be thoroughly defeated, just as with everything else you have ever stated, for it is not possible for Srila Prabhupada to contradict himself, but your true nature as someone who will say and do anything to try and win a debate will also be exposed. Here in honour of Srila Prabhupada's nature as a flawless personality who never contradicts himself, I present 7 reasons why your assertion that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself via the above statement is both offensive and incorrect.

1) Challenge Self-Defeating

- a) When discussing or debating Srila Prabhupada's instructions, as we are here, it is AXIOMATIC that Srila Prabhupada is a Bona Fide Guru who does not contradict himself and is free from error. Otherwise, if we accept that Srila Prabhupada's

statements contradict each other, the debate becomes meaningless since we will never know which of the contradictory statements are correct and which are in error. If you do not accept this axiom then you have already lost the debate, for your arguments and position rest on Srila Prabhupada's authority as a perfect personality whose statements are free from error. In short, you would simply defeat yourself by 'showing' that Srila Prabhupada statements were in error and therefore nothing can be concluded definitively. You cannot win a debate by showing the debate can **NOT** be won. For let's be clear. Having accepted that Srila Prabhupada states:

"A Bona Fide spiritual master will NEVER become like that",

(and therefore my proof holds), you can **ONLY** challenge my proof by assuming the above statement is **NOT TRUE** (i.e. that Srila Prabhupada is in error), and 'finding' that somewhere else Srila Prabhupada states the **OPPOSITE** of the above and contradicts himself.

- b) Since your challenge is **PREDICATED** on the notion that Srila Prabhupada has contradicted himself, it can **NEVER** succeed, since Srila Prabhupada is a perfect personality. Srila Prabhupada clearly and unequivocally states:

"The spiritual master must never be carried away by an accumulation of wealth or a large number of followers. A bona fide spiritual master will never become like that. But sometimes, if a spiritual master is not properly authorized and only on his own initiative becomes a spiritual master, he may be carried away by an accumulation of wealth and large numbers of disciples."

(Nectar of Devotion, Chapter 14)

This states that an authorised bona fide spiritual master will **NEVER** be carried away by wealth and disciples, but sometimes if the guru is unauthorised, he will. One cannot make a statement clearer and more emphatic than this. Thus at this point, given Srila Prabhupada's emphatically conclusive statement from *The Nectar of Devotion* above, any person who claims to be a follower of Srila Prabhupada, would accept that Srila Prabhupada's statement is **TRUE**. But not you Hector. Like a scavenger, you continue to hang around, hoping against hope that you can hunt down and dig out some place where Srila Prabhupada has contradicted himself.

- After Srila Prabhupada has clearly written that a Bona Fide spiritual master will **NEVER** become like that, **HOW** can Srila Prabhupada suddenly go and say the **OPPOSITE** somewhere else?
- How can you assume Srila Prabhupada is someone who does even remember what he wrote previously?

Such a hellish and offensive mentality, is proven by the fact that when you **THINK** that you have found Srila Prabhupada contradicting himself you state bizzarely:

"Srila Prabhupada is so merciful that he not only has provided one, but two more axioms that may be the cause for the falldown of a BONAFIDE guru, namely,"

- Pray tell what can possibly be 'merciful' about finding that Srila Prabhupada has contradicted himself?

I made these points when you tried to use the example of Lord Brahma's *lila* to show that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself, to prove to you why your challenge was doomed to fail, which of course you yourself now concede was the case. I make the points again to show why your challenge is doomed to fail here again as well. Indeed why your challenge is always doomed to fail, for Srila Prabhupada is a perfect personality who never contradicts himself.

2) Hector's Big Whopper – 1

Since it is impossible for Srila Prabhupada to contradict himself, you have done the only thing possible to try and challenge my proof, which is to **MANUFACTURE** Srila Prabhupada contradicting himself. For the statement quoted earlier from you from the Teachings of Lord Caitanya, as your 'evidence' that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself, is **FABRICATED**.

You state that the first sentence in the quote says:

"If one is attracted by a large number of disciples and FORGETS HIS DUTY AS A BONA FIDE SPIRITUAL MASTER, the growth of the [*Bhakti*] plant will be impeded."

(Teachings of Lord Caitanya, P30)

But **IT DOES NOT SAY THIS**. The key word "**SPIRITUAL MASTER**" is not mentioned in the quote. It only says '**MASTER**'. If all those reading this do not believe me, go and pull out your copy of '*Teachings of Lord Caitanya*'; and look it up. The word '**SPIRITUAL**' has been **ADDED** by Hector himself, because he knows that the quote as it stands does **NOT**, and could not, allow him to demonstrate that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself, and therefore he has **HAD TO CHANGE IT**.

- Otherwise if it was possible to make the case that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself from the actual words Srila Prabhupada used, then why not then just make the case from what Srila Prabhupada **ACTUALLY** said, instead of shamelessly

FABRICATING what Srila Prabhupada said?

I will repeat this point, as this is crucial to understanding what has happened:

- ***Otherwise if it was possible to make the case that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself from the actual words Srila Prabhupada used, then why not then just make the case from what Srila Prabhupada ACTUALLY said, instead of shamelessly FABRICATING what Srila Prabhupada said?***

When one is desperate to win a debate and save face, one will do anything, from not only trying to show that Srila Prabhupada was in error and contradicted himself, but also **FABRICATING** what Srila Prabhupada said in order to show this contradiction on Srila Prabhupada's part.

3) Hector's big whopper – 2

But the fabrication and outright deception does not stop there. For this is not the **ONLY** thing you have **MADE UP** that Srila Prabhupada states.

Again you state the first sentence in the quote says:

"If one is attracted by a large number of disciples and FORGETS HIS DUTY AS A BONA FIDE SPIRITUAL MASTER, the growth of the [*Bhakti*] plant will be impeded."

(*Teachings of Lord Caitanya, P30*)

But there **IS YET ANOTHR FABRICATION**. You have **MISSED** out a whole part of this sentence. After the phrase "*large number of disciples*"; Srila Prabhupada also says "*and material conveniences offered by these disciples*". All those reading this can once again go and pull out their copy of '*Teachings of Lord Caitanya*'; and look it up. The phrase in question has simply been **DELETED** by Hector, because he knows that the quote as it stands does **NOT** allow him to demonstrate that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself, and therefore he has **HAD TO CHANGE IT**.

- Otherwise if it was possible to make the case that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself from the actual words Srila Prabhupada used, then why not then just make the case from what Srila Prabhupada **ACTUALLY** said, instead of shamelessly **FABRICATING** what Srila Prabhupada said?

NOTE: These fabrications on the part of Hector cannot be **ACCIDENTAL**. For he has first **DELETED** a whole phrase, and then immediately **ADDED** another word which is not there. It is not possible for such an operation to occur by accident or genuine error. It can only occur via deception and fabrication.

So again at this point the debate is again lost. I already demonstrated in point 1, that since your challenge **DEPENDS** on finding Srila Prabhupada contradicting himself, your challenge will always fail, since Srila Prabhupada does not contradict himself. (And even if you think he did you still cannot win the debate). Now to further **CHANGE** Srila Prabhupada's words to try and win the debate, shows that the original words as they stood would have led to defeat, otherwise there would have been no need for one to change them, as one could have just argued from the original text. To summarise the fabrication:

Srila Prabhupada's **ACTUAL** words as given in '*Teachings of Lord Caitanya*':

"If one is attracted by a large number of disciples and material conveniences offered by these disciples and forgets his duty as a bona fide master, the growth of the plant will be impeded."

Hector's words as given in the '*Teachings of Hector*':

"If one is attracted by a large number of disciples and forgets his duty as a bona fide SPIRITUAL master, the growth of the plant will be impeded."

4) Context of Quote Shows Subject Matter Different

The section in which the quote in question appears is discussing a very specific topic, which is not the fall-down of authorised members of the disciplic succession, as Hector would have us believe. The section begins with a **NEOPHYTE** receiving the seed of devotional service. Srila Prabhupada then gives a **WHOLE** list of all the things which someone desirous to make progress on the path of *Bhakti*-Yoga must avoid lest the *Bhakti* plant will be impeded. The section begins with Srila Prabhupada stating:

"Lord Caitanya pointed out to Rūpa Gosvami that there was a certain danger to be encountered while watering the root of the devotional plant,"

and finishes with:

"If one is not particularly careful, even by watering the plant of devotional service, unnecessary weeds will grow

and hamper progress.”

IN BETWEEN these two sentences, Srila Prabhupada gives the following list of all the dangers to be avoided:

- a) Offending a pure devotee – mad elephant offence
- b) Ten offences against chanting the holy name
- c) Becoming distracted by material conveniences offered by would-be disciples
- d) Desiring liberation
- e) To not follow the 4 regulative principles So nestled in the middle of this list, is Hector’s star evidence, albeit altered, and for good reason – for it is clear that Srila Prabhupada is not suddenly in the middle of this list describing the fall-down of an authorised member of the disciplic succession, but simply listing the dangers to be avoided by a *sadhaka* desiring to make progress in *Bhakti*-Yoga, such as not breaking the 4 regulative principles, not committing offences against chanting of the holy names etc.

5) *Sadhaka* Advances But Not Perfected

That we are dealing only with a *sadhaka* who is advancing on his progress in growing the *Bhakti* plant, and not someone who is a perfected and authorised member of the disciplic succession, is made clear from the sentence **BEFORE** the fabricated version of the quote which Hector provides, and which of course is not quoted by Hector, lest the true context becomes clear:

“Along with this plant the weeds of material desires also grow. When a person advances in *Bhakti*, it is natural that many persons will come to him requesting to become disciples and will offer him some material gains. If one is attracted by a large number of disciples and material conveniences offered by these disciples and forgets his duty as a bona fide master, the growth of the plant will be impeded.”

(Teachings of Lord Caitanya, REAL Srila Prabhupada version)

Thus the quote refers not to an authorised member of the disciplic succession, but a *sadhaka* who is advancing in *Bhakti*, and who then needs to make sure he does not allow his progress to get checked due to persons offering to become his disciples due to the advancement he is making. In the section leading up to the above quote Srila Prabhupada summaries the growth of the *Bhakti* plant:

- a) One receives the seed from the authorised Bona Fide spiritual master
- b) It is watered by chanting and hearing
- c) It then begins to grow freely
- d) After being fully grown it surpasses universe
- e) Then it penetrates Brahmajyoti
- f) Enters Goloka Vrndavana
- e) Produces fruit love of Godhead

Thus it is clear, that in the quote in question, Srila Prabhupada is simply describing the pitfalls the *sadhaka* may face as his plant tries rises up these levels, and not an authorised member of the disciplic succession.

6) Real Meaning of Quote - 1

- Having seen that we are **NOT** dealing here with the fall of authorised members of the disciplic succession, then what **ARE** we dealing with?

Let us once again look at the **REAL** quote from the ‘*Teachings of Lord Caitanya*’, and not the version from the ‘**Teachings of Hector**’, and see what it **ACTUALLY** means:

“When a person advances in *Bhakti*, it is natural that many persons will come to him requesting to become disciples and will offer him some material gains. If one is attracted by a large number of disciples and material conveniences offered by these disciples, and forgets his duty as a bona fide master, the growth of the plant will be impeded.”

Srila Prabhupada has not used the words ‘*Authorised/bona fide Spiritual master*’ here, which would assist Hector in ‘*proving*’ that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself, because Srila Prabhupada used these phrases earlier when beginning the section

preceding this quote, and here he states:

“Such devotees are empowered by the Lord to distribute devotional consciousness, or Krishna consciousness, to the people in general. They are known as authorized spiritual masters, and it is by their mercy that a conditioned soul gets the seed of devotional service. The causeless mercy of the Supreme Personality of Godhead is first appreciated when one comes in touch with a bona fide spiritual master who can bring the conditioned soul to the highest position of devotional life.”

(Teachings of Lord Caitanya)

Srila Prabhupada then goes on to mention the list of dangers given in point 4 above, to be avoided by the neophyte who has had the seed of devotional service planted by the Bona fide spiritual master. Thus it would therefore be ludicrous for Srila Prabhupada, to say:

“The bona fide spiritual master plants the seed of *Bhakti* in the heart of the neophyte and subsequently as this *sadhaka* advances, this BONA FIDE SPIRITUAL MASTER must be careful to make sure his *Bhakti* plant does not get impeded!”

and hence only the word ‘*master*’ is used. ***Because ANYONE, who is approached by others who seek to be his disciples, can be referred to as being their MASTER, simply by virtue of the fact people are asking to become his disciples*.**

And this is why Srila Prabhupada has used the word bona fide Master rather than bona fide spiritual master here - to distinguish between the actual bona fide spiritual master who has planted the seed of *Bhakti* in the heart of the neophyte - and the *sadhaka* who having had this seed planted in him, must then be careful when dealing with those who approach him to become his disciples due to his having made some progress in *Bhakti*. Thus the **CONTEXT** makes it clear **WHY** the word ‘*master*’ is used, and how in this case it does **NOT** refer to an authorised Bona fide Spiritual master who is a member of the disciplic succession.

(There **IS** one place where Srila Prabhupada does use the word ‘*master*’ interchangeably with ‘*spiritual master*’, but that is made clear from the **CONTEXT**, where the word ‘*master*’ is used in the very next sentence after ‘*spiritual master*’ is used, and spiritual masters are the subject matter of the discussion. However, as seen above, this is not the context in the quote produced by Hector, where the subject matter being discussed is not bona fide spiritual masters, but *sadhakas*, who as soon as they make some advancement, happen to find themselves approached by would-be disciples).

7. Real Meaning of Quote – 2

Similarly we can understand that Srila Prabhupada uses the phrase ‘bona fide’ with the word ‘*master*’, because Srila Prabhupada states that the *sadhaka* has **ALREADY** fallen **DUE** to taking advantage of material assets, and he forgets his bona fide duty as a master to those who have approached him to be his disciples:

“If one is attracted by a large number of disciples and material conveniences offered by these disciples and forgets his duty as a bona fide master, the growth of the plant will be impeded.”

Thus if one gets enamoured by the material conveniences offered by disciples, one will have deviated from being their bona fide master, as being a bona fide master to those who wish to be your disciples because you are more advanced than them, will not involve being attracted to taking advantage of any material gains they may offer.

Summary

- i) Note how the real meaning of the quote is deliberately obscured via the alterations Hector made to Srila Prabhupada’s words. The addition of the word ‘*spiritual*’ tries to make us think we are dealing with an authorised member of the disciplic succession, rather than a *sadhaka* struggling in his progress in *Bhakti*. And the deletion of the phrase “**and material conveniences offered by these disciples**”, hides how the *sadhaka* deviates from his duty as a bona fide master to those who have approached him for guidance as disciples. Additionally by this deletion, Hector is also able to generate ‘*two*’ rather than one so-called new ‘*axiom*’, by separating out this deviation of the *sadhaka* from the first sentence of the quote.
- ii) Thus the phrase ‘*bona fide master*’ here refers not to an authorised member of the disciplic succession, but a *sadhaka* who deviates from his duty of acting properly towards those who have approached him to be his disciple because he is more advanced than them, by taking advantage of what they have to offer.
- iii) My explanation is supported by the **ACTUAL WORDS** used, the whole **CONTEXT** in which those words are used, and most importantly, my explanation is supported by the axiom which supercedes all others – that Srila Prabhupada does not contradict himself – for my explanation, as always, allows Srila Prabhupada’s statements to be in harmony with each other.
- iv) Your explanation is supported neither by the words used (indeed you needed to change them), the context in which they are used, and is actually **BASED** on the premise that Srila Prabhupada contradicts himself.
- v) Therefore my explanation will **ALWAYS** be accepted by **ANY** follower of Srila Prabhupada, whether from the GBC or the

IRM, because even your Guru *Maharaja* and the GBC offer arguments for why the IRM is wrong without needing to resort to saying that Srila Prabhupada has contradicted himself, like you do. Hence we are **ALL** united on the belief that Srila Prabhupada never contradicts himself and is free from error. You Hector, stand **ALONE**, separated from both ISKCON and the IRM.

In conceding you got defeated over your use of the Lord Brahma example in your previous attempt to show Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself, you stated one reason was enough to have defeated you, and hence I need not have given **10**. Hence I have eased up this time, and only given **7** reasons!

Conclusion

- a) Hector's bag of tricks cannot obscure the fact that he had previously already been defeated 4 times:
 - i) Original challenge made against proof using Gaudiya Matha analogy
 - ii) Next challenge made claiming statement in proof was not bi-conditional
 - iii) Defeat via his own argument proving statement B of proof
 - iv) Conceding defeat in his use of the Lord Brahma's *lila*
- b) He has just been defeated again, caught trying to fabricate a quote of Srila Prabhupada, to try and show that Srila Prabhupada was contradicting himself.
 - How much more offensive behaviour do we need to tolerate before you stop?

You are hell-bent on showing that Srila Prabhupada makes mistakes and contradicts himself, which is a hellish mentality, which you then tried to show by greatly offending Lord Brahma, more hellish offences, and now you have tried to show it by changing the holy words of Srila Prabhupada – a triple whammy of super hellish offences.

- What possible offences are you going to commit next?
- Are you not satisfied yet?

You claim that I treat you with derision.

- What do you expect if your whole argument is based on the offence that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself?

No self-respecting follower of Srila Prabhupada, regardless of his opinion on the guru issue, will stand for such blasphemy.

Dear Hector, please accept that Srila Prabhupada does **NOT** contradict himself, and that therefore you will **NEVER** be able to show a contradiction to Srila Prabhupada stating that an authorised bona fide guru will **NEVER** be carried away by wealth and disciples.

So WHY continue to bother looking?

Surely the very fact that in your **TWO** attempts to try and contradict Srila Prabhupada, you had to **FIRST** get super-offensive to Lord Brahma and try and use his inapplicable *lila*, and now you have had to **FABRICATE** the words supposedly used by Srila Prabhupada, should be enough evidence for anyone to give up this fruitless and offensive exercise, which is simply destroying your spiritual life.

Thank you.

Your servant,

Krishnakant

Post subject: Hector - act 10

26 May 2006

Subject: A challenge to IRM [10:Defeated]

Hare Krishna Krishnakant Prabhu,

Please, accept my greetings.

All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

I just called my wife to check on the quote (I don't have the book with me) and she confirmed that I did make the two mistakes you point out while transcribing. Nevertheless, the two mistakes from my transcription do not affect the outcome, namely, your defeat. In the Vedabase it says,

“If one is attracted by a large number of disciples and material conveniences offered by these disciples and forgets his duty as a bona fide master, the growth of the plant will be impeded.”

The phrase you claim I intentionally deleted -

“material conveniences offered by these disciples”

- makes it even clearer that this statement refers to a *diksa* guru. Thanks for bringing it up. Bona fide means bona fide. And do they go to this bonafide master for spiritual instructions or for instructions on how to play Bingo? It is obvious Srila Prabhupada refers to a spiritual master. Your attempt to go around it is pitiful.

Besides, Srila Prabhupada is not contradicting himself. If one takes his teachings in their entirety, then a rational being will understand that he says: A bonafide spiritual master will never become like that, **UNLESS** he forgets his duty as a bonafide master. Forgetfulness might come from taking advantage of the material conveniences offered by these disciples. This is not a contradiction, but an exception Srila Prabhupada clarifies as a way to warn us.

To summarize, we have at least one more axiom that may be the cause for the falldown of a **BONAFIDE**, if you do not want to accept the second one, namely:

1. Forgetfulness of duty
2. Taking advantage of material conveniences Hence, if a spiritual master **FORGETS HIS DUTY AS A BONA FIDE MASTER**, then he may fall. Certainly, only a bona fide spiritual master can know what the duties of such a position are. Moreover, it can be inferred that such forgetfulness might come from being attracted and taking advantage of material conveniences. Therefore, since we have two more axioms, B becomes: **IF** (guru falls), **THEN** (he was not authorized **OR** he forgot his duty as a bonafide master **OR** he took advantage of material conveniences).

Even if you do not accept the second axiom, we still get:

IF (guru falls), **THEN** (he was not authorized **OR** he forgot his duty as a bonafide master).

In either case, 'proof' 4 of IRM's *Special Issue* and *The Final Order* miserably collapses. Don't be so stubborn and arrogant. I realize now that all the insults you showered on me were simply a reflection of your own crooked nature.

Simply concede defeat. Ask for forgiveness for the offenses committed against Sripada Gaura Govinda Gurudeva and Sri Srimad Hridayananda dasa Goswami Acaryadeva. Also, do not forget to ask for forgiveness to all the other Vaisnavas you have insulted. In addition, at least publically recognize that Ramakanta Prabhu had already defeated you long ago. Do not make a show of infallibility. Stop offending the lotus feet of Srila Prabhupada. May Lord Nityananda have mercy on your soul.

Again, simply concede defeat.

Srila Prabhupada ki! Jaya!

At Srila Acaryadeva's feet,

hector

Post subject: Krishnakant's 10th reply

Sun, 28 May 2006

Dear Hector Prabhu,

Please accept my HUMBLE OBEISANCES.

All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

I note you have not even **ATTEMPTED** to respond to any of the points I made in my previous mail, which could have been predicted if we review your history in this debate. For so far, all throughout this debate, every single time you **HAVE** tried to respond to my arguments, you have committed huge blunders:

- a) You began by challenging me that my proof was incorrect because it could be applied to the Gaudiya Matha. You realised you had blundered and withdrew the challenge thus conceding the debate. You also blundered and conceded that you made a mistake in not separating the first 11 gurus from the next 93. So that was the original debate finished.
- b) Then you blundered by claiming a bi-conditional statement was conditional, which you were able to argue only by **DELETING** the word '*sometimes*' from Srila Prabhupada's actual statement. 3 times it has been proven to you that the statement is bi-conditional and 3 times you have not even been attempted to respond.
- c) Then you withdrew from the debate admitting you had blundered big time by even starting the debate since it was '*all nonsense*,' and you were part of this.
- d) Then you returned to the '*all nonsense*' debate and conceded your previous blunder in challenging my proof by now claiming that statement B in my proof was correct after all, only it must be proven '*your*' way.
- e) Then you blundered by trying to apply the *Lila* of Lord Brahma to show that members of the authorised disciplic succession fall.
- f) And then we finally came to the mother of all blunders - you were caught well and truly with your hand in the cookie jar, as you tried to change a whole sentence from Srila Prabhupada to try and win the debate. We can note this is a Hector habit, since as we noted in point **b)** above, that he had previously also tried changing Srila Prabhupada's words to make his argument.
- g) So having made such a huge catalogue of blunders **EVERY** single time you have had an exchange with me, you do the only thing that a master of blundering can do now – and this is to say **NOTHING** at all, so as to avoid any further blunders. Rather you simply **REPEAT** your already defeated point from your previous mail, prefaced by a handful of sentences simply **DISMISSING** and **IGNORING**, but not **ANSWERING**, my rebuttal to the defeated argument you are once again simply repeating.

Anyone can look through the exchanges and see that the summary made here is accurate, and further that **NONE** of the points above are even disputed by Hector, which means he concedes them, for as Srila Prabhupada states:

"Since Sri Caitanya Mahaprabhu could not escape Sanatana Gosvami's argument, He remained silent on this point and thereby indirectly accepted Sanatana's statement."

(CC., Madhya, 20.365)

Therefore, as can be seen from the above summary, so far in the debate, for every single point I have made, Hector has either refused to directly rebut what I have said, or conceded what I have said, and therefore Hector has been defeated on every point made by me. Therefore throughout this whole debate, Hector has managed to achieve nothing except to prove he is a master blunderer.

However we will now see, that even his latest attempt to avoid further blundering, by refusing to even respond to my detailed arguments, he has still somehow managed to commit another array of non-stop of blunders from the little he has said.

So here we go again ...

Blunder 1

You say:

"I just called my wife to check on the quote (I don't have the book with me) and she confirmed that I did make the two mistakes you point out while transcribing."

How can anyone accept that your adding and deleting a whole bunch of words when copying just **ONE** sentence, was an innocent mistake, especially when co-incidentally the changes made just happen to support the arguments you go onto make!?! Even an 8 year old child can accurately copy one sentence from a book without adding and deleting a whole bunch of words,

and yet we are supposed to believe that an Ivy league graduate and Maths Professor no less, is not able to do it. I am sure everyone believes you prabhu!

Blunder 2

You say:

"And do they go to this bonafide master for spiritual instructions or for instructions on how to play Bingo?"

Yes, he will be sharing spiritual knowledge with them, but authorised member of the disciplic succession is **NOT** defined as **ANY** devotee, even if he is a *sadhaka*, who teaches disciples less advanced than himself. And to apply such a definition is very offensive to the *parampara*, that any master regardless of his level of spiritual advancement is automatically equated to being a member of the *parampara*, simply because he has disciples and he does not deviate from his bona fide duty of teaching them rather than taking advantage of them.

Blunder 3

You say:

"It is obvious Srila Prabhupada refers to a spiritual master. Your attempt to go around it is pitiful."

So 'obvious' and so 'pitiful', that you cannot even explain **WHY** its so obvious and pitiful, except to **REPEAT** that the mere presence of the word 'disciples' and 'bona fide master' makes it so, even though this point was already rebutted in my last mail, which you refuse to even address, because you cannot. As I noted in my last mail, this is a Hector technique of debating, whereby due to his refusal to even attempt to rebut my arguments, he is actually childishly saying:

"I am right, but I don't know why, nor will I explain."

Blunder 4

You say:

"If one takes his teachings in their entirety, then a rational being will understand that he says: A bonafide spiritual master will never become like that, UNLESS he forgets his duty as a bonafide master."

Only Srila Prabhupada does **NOT** say this. He does **NOT** say a Bona fide spiritual master will never become like that, **UNLESS** something else. This again is a statement from the *"Teachings Of Hector"* and not from Srila Prabhupada. This is what Srila Prabhupada actually states:

"A bona-fide spiritual master will never become like that"

Note the **LAST** character in the above sentence. Its called a **PERIOD**, which is apt, because the above is what Srila Prabhupada states, **PERIOD**. To **THEN** claim, as Hector does, that in **ANOTHER PLACE** entirely, Srila Prabhupada says:

"A bona-fide spiritual master **DOES** become like that", is a **MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE** statement to what Srila Prabhupada has already stated, and is therefore called a **CONTRADICTION**. You cannot claim that Srila Prabhupada makes two mutually exclusive statements in different places, and that you can just **JOIN THEM TOGETHER**, and it will not be a contradiction! This is more childishness.

Here is an example. If someone says in one place: *"Krishna never falls in maya"* and then states in another place:

"Krishna does fall in maya" then according to the Hector school of understanding statements, you can simply **STICK** these two statements together, to produce a statement which says: **"Krishna never falls in maya, UNLESS HE DOES"**, and therefore the above two statements are not a contradiction! And further this is 'rational'. Hector's talent is obviously wasted in ISKCON. Such word-jugglery would be very much appreciated any *advaita mayavada* school, where all is one!

Blunder 5

You say:

"Forgetfulness might come from taking advantage of the material conveniences offered by these disciples. This is not a contradiction, but an exception Srila Prabhupada clarifies as a way to warn us."

But later on you claim this so-called 'exception' is not an exception but actually an **AXIOM**:

"Therefore, since we have two more axioms, B becomes: **IF** (guru falls), **THEN** (he was not authorized **OR** he forgot his duty as a bonafide master **OR** he took advantage of material conveniences)."

Further this so-called 'exception' is actually an axiom that sits as a regular cause of fall-down **ALONG-SIDE** another cause of fall-down, amely *"being unauthorised"*, which according to you also is not an exception, but a standard cause of fall-down. This

according to you we have not an exception to a rule, but actually **A RULE** itself, which is what an axiom is.

So in summary, simply sticking together two mutually exclusive statements, and calling one an 'exception', is both contradictory both by the definition of mutually exclusive statements, and by your own acceptance of this 'exception' actually being an axiom. Therefore it is proven once again, that you **ARE** claiming that Srila Prabhupada is contradicting himself.

Blunder 6

You say:

"I realize now that all the insults you showered on me were simply a reflection of your own crooked nature."

This must win an award for 'hypocritical statement of the year'. **YOU** have just been caught manufacturing Srila Prabhupada's words to try and win a debate, yet it is I who is supposedly 'crooked'!

Poor Hector. This time you tried to say very little, completely trying to avoid even responding to my rebuttal of your arguments, and **STILL** you manage to produce your regular quota of blunders. Next time, maybe just say nothing at all, and just keep repeating your already defeated argument and calling for me to concede 'defeat', as you have done here.

Since we have seen Hector simply refuses to even **ATTEMPT** to answer my arguments, because he cannot, then by the following axiom:

"Since Sri Caitanya Mahaprabhu could not escape Sanatana Gosvami's argument, He remained silent on this point and thereby indirectly accepted Sanatana's statement."

(CC., Madhya, 20.365)

I win every time. So here **AGAIN**, are all the points with which I defeated Hector last time (re-packaged with one extra!), which he has not even attempted to respond to this time, and which therefore, by the above axiom, ensures this debate is already won by me.

8 Reasons Why We Are Dealing With A *Sadhaka*

The debate before us is simple. Is the following statement describing the activities of the authorised bona fide members of the disciplic succession, such as Srila Prabhupada, Bhaktisiddhanta Sarasvati etc., **OR** is it describing the activities of a *sadhaka* as he progresses in cultivating the *Bhakti* plant:

"If one is attracted by a large number of disciples and material conveniences offered by these disciples and forgets his duty as a bona fide master, the growth of the plant will be impeded."

(Teachings of Lord Caitanya, Page 30)

1. Srila Prabhupada's Axiom Since Srila Prabhupada states:

"The spiritual master must never be carried away by an accumulation of wealth or a large number of followers. A bona fide spiritual master will never become like that."

(Nectar of Devotion, Chapter 14)

we know that Srila Prabhupada cannot later go on to say the opposite, otherwise we would unnecessarily be foisting a contradiction on Srila Prabhupada. Otherwise if we were to just **DIS-REGARD** what Srila Prabhupada says above, then it would be self-defeating, for then you could just dis-regard what Srila Prabhupada says anywhere and debate becomes meaningless. Therefore the above axiom from Srila Prabhupada proves that the statement from the '*Teachings of Lord Caitanya*' given by Hector, can **NOT** be referring to an authorised member of the disciplic succession, as such a personality **NEVER** gets carried away by disciples and material conveniences. Thus at this point the argument is over. Because one cannot defeat an axiom. Hence all the other arguments below are just for completeness, demonstrating **HOW** Srila Prabhupada's axiom is correct, and why the quote produced by Hector does not indeed refer to an authorised member of the disciplic succession, a fact which was already adduced from this axiom.

2. Context For Quote - 1

The section in which the quote appears, begins with a **NEOPHYTE** receiving the seed of devotional service. Srila Prabhupada then gives a **WHOLE** list of all the things which the neophyte must avoid lest the *Bhakti* plant will be impeded. The section begins with Srila Prabhupada stating:

"Lord Caitanya pointed out to Rupa Gosvami that there was a certain danger to be encountered while watering the root of the devotional plant,"

and finishes with:

"If one is not particularly careful, even by watering the plant of devotional service, unnecessary weeds will grow and hamper progress."

IN BETWEEN these two sentences, Srila Prabhupada gives the following list of all the dangers to be avoided:

- a) Offending a pure devotee – mad elephant offence
- b) Ten offences against chanting the holy name
- c) Becoming distracted by material conveniences offered by would-be disciples
- d) Desiring liberation
- e) To not follow the 4 regulative principles So nestled in the middle of this list, is Hector's quote, and therefore Srila Prabhupada is not suddenly in the middle of this list describing the fall-down of an authorised member of the disciplic succession, but simply listing the dangers to be avoided by a *sadhaka* desiring to make progress in *Bhakti-Yoga*, such as not breaking the 4 regulative principles, not committing offences against chanting of the holy names etc.

3. Context For Quote – 2

Independent confirmation, that the subject matter of the quote in question is **NOT** the fall of authorised members of the disciplic succession, but *Sadhaka's* progressing in *Bhakti-Yoga*, is provided from the *Caitanya Caritamrta*, from which the 'Teachings of Lord Caitanya' is summarised. The quote in question comes from chapter 1 of the "Teachings of Lord Caitanya", called "Instructions To Rupa Goswami", which itself is simply a summary of the same chapter in the *Caitanya Caritamrta*, which can be found in *Madhya-Lila*, Chapter 19. The sections just before and after the quote in question are summarised from verses 157 to 160 of this section of the *Caitanya Caritamrta*. Anyone can check and see an exact correspondence between the two sections in the *Caitanya Caritamrta* and the *Teachings of Lord Caitanya*, which is not surprising, since one is a summary study of the other! So here are quotes from the *Caitanya Caritamrta* which bound the section from which the quote in question is from:

"While the *Bhakti* creeper is growing, the devotee must protect it by fencing it all around. The neophyte devotee must be protected by being surrounded by pure devotees. In this way he will not give the maddened elephant a chance to uproot his *Bhakti* creeper. When one associates with nondevotees, the maddened elephant is set loose."

(*Caitanya Caritamrta*, Madhya 19:157)

"If one is misled by unwanted creepers and is victimized, he cannot make progress back to Godhead."

(*Caitanya Caritamrta*, Madhya 19:160)

This is clearly describing the progress of neophyte and his progress in *Bhakti*, and not the perfected members of the authorised disciplic succession.

4. Immediate Context in Quote

Now from the context it is very clear, that the quote in question does not involve speaking about members of the disciplic succession, but *sadhakas* making progress in devotional service, as this is the subject matter of the whole section. Now someone may make a perverse argument that though this maybe true, when we come to the actual quote in question, the subject matter suddenly **SWITCHES** to speaking about members of the disciplic succession, even though all the discussion **BEFORE** and **AFTER** the quote relates to the progress of *sadhakas*. But even this perverse argument is defeated, when we look at the sentence just before the quote:

"When a person advances in *Bhakti*, it is natural that many persons will come to him requesting to become disciples and will offer him some material gains. If one is attracted by a large number of disciples and material conveniences offered by these disciples and forgets his duty as a bona fide master, the growth of the plant will be impeded."

(*Teachings of Lord Caitanya*, Page 30)

Thus the sentence before makes it clear we are dealing only with a *sadhaka* who is advancing in his progress in growing the *Bhakti* plant, and not someone who is a perfected and authorised member of the disciplic succession, and the *sadhaka* who is advancing in *Bhakti*, needs to then make sure he does not allow his progress to get checked due to persons offering to become his disciples due to the advancement he is making.

5. Authorised Bona Fide Spiritual Master Distinguished

Srila Prabhupada has specifically not used the words authorised spiritual master or Bona Fide spiritual master, in the said quote, which is what we would expect if Srila Prabhupada was actually contradicting himself and we were dealing with authorised members of the disciplic succession. The actual term used is '**bona fide master**'. Nor is this term being used interchangeably with '*bona fide spiritual master*' here, for the latter does not appear anywhere in the vicinity of the section to be inter-changed with. Nor does the context support that we are dealing with the authorised members of the disciplic succession. Rather the difference is because, at the beginning of the section in which the quote appears, Srila Prabhupada states:

“Such devotees are empowered by the Lord to distribute devotional consciousness, or Krishna consciousness, to the people in general. They are known as authorized spiritual masters, and it is by their mercy that a conditioned soul gets the seed of devotional service. The causeless mercy of the Supreme Personality of Godhead is first appreciated when one comes in touch with a bona fide spiritual master who can bring the conditioned soul to the highest position of devotional life.”

(Teachings of Lord Caitanya)

Srila Prabhupada clearly states that the neophyte is the RECEIPIENT of the seed of *Bhakti* from the ACTUAL Authorised bona fide spiritual master. Srila Prabhupada then goes on to mention the list of dangers given in point 2 above, to be avoided by the neophyte who has had the seed of devotional service planted by the Bona fide spiritual master. Thus it would therefore be ludicrous for Srila Prabhupada to then say that the GIVER and RECEIVER of the seed of *Bhakti* are both the same Bona Fide spiritual master:

“The bona fide spiritual master plants the seed of *Bhakti* in the heart of the neophyte and subsequently as this *sadhaka* advances, this BONA FIDE SPIRITUAL MASTER must be careful to make sure his *Bhakti* plant does not get impeded!”

and hence only the word ‘master’ is used to distinguish the advancing *sadhaka* who has attracted some disciples, from the actual authorised bona fide spiritual master who planted the seed of *Bhakti* in him in the first place.

6. No Evidence of Authorisation

An authorised member of the disciplic succession would be someone who has been authorised by his own Bona Fide spiritual master to take up this service:

“One should take initiation from a bona fide spiritual master coming in the disciplic succession, who is authorized by his predecessor spiritual master. This is called *diksa-vidhana*.”

(4:8:54)

Yet there is not even a HINT that the *sadhaka* ‘master’ in the said quote has been thus authorised. All we are told is that his Bona fide spiritual master plants the seed of *Bhakti* in his heart, and then the dangers he must avoid to make progress. Rather it says is that others approach him because he is making some advancement in *Bhakti*, and THIS is why he starts taking disciples, with no mention of either that he must now wait until his own Spiritual master must leave the planet before initiating or that now he must take permission to be authorised by his own Guru before he can take disciples. Rather the situation is merely opportunistic – the *sadhaka* is making some progress in *Bhakti* and because of this he gets approached by others to be his disciples. There is no evidence this is someone who has officially previously been authorised by his own Guru, but all the evidence only states he is some ordinary *sadhaka* who just gets approached by others for discipleship as he advances.

7. Bona Fide Master

Firstly ANYONE who is approached by disciples, can be referred to as being their MASTER, simply by virtue of the fact people are asking to become his disciples. This is not in dispute. But the word master therefore does not automatically mean ‘authorised member of disciplic succession’. It will be made clear from the context, what type of master we are dealing with. And as the context has made it clear, we are dealing with a *sadhaka*, who simply after making some progress, attracts disciples. And as soon as he, instead of helping those who have approached him, takes advantage of them, he will not be behaving in a bona fide manner. And this is ALL the quote in question states. Thus the term ‘bona fide master’ is used to denote a *sadhaka* who does not take advantage of those who seek to be his disciples, with the word ‘bona fide’ denoting that he must not take advantage of them. The meaning of words is made clear by the context. One cannot just jump on a word, and ignore the context, and try to make one’s case in this way, as Hector does. He simply JUMPS from the word bona fide master to an authorised member of the disciplic succession, but there has to be some supporting context for this. As the same word will mean different things according to the context. Here is an example, using the same *Nectar of Devotion* verse used earlier to establish the axiom which makes Hector’s argument impossible, as Srila Prabhupada does not contradict himself:

“The spiritual master must never be carried away by an accumulation of wealth or a large number of followers. A bona fide spiritual master will never become like that. But sometimes, if a spiritual master is not properly authorized and only on his own initiative becomes a spiritual master, he may be carried away by an accumulation of wealth and large numbers of disciples.”

(Nectar of Devotion, Chapter 14)

Here we see that the FIRST use of the word ‘spiritual master’, actually refers to an authorised bona fide spiritual master, and is used interchangeably with the word bona fide spiritual master, which appears in the next sentence. Then in the third sentence, the word ‘spiritual master’ does NOT refer to a bona fide spiritual master, but actually refers to an unauthorised spiritual master. So the same word CAN mean different things, depending on the context.

Therefore, in this case, the CONTEXT will make it clear, WHAT type of ‘master’ we are referring to. And once it is clear what type of master we are referring, IF he performs his duty as that type of master, then he will be bona fide. Thus the words ‘bona fide

master' and 'disciples' in themselves do not establish that we are dealing with an authorised member of the disciplic succession. We would have to look to the context for that, and as we have seen above, the context not only does **NOT** give **ANY** supporting evidence that the master referred to is an authorised member of the disciplic succession, but rather gives **ABUNDANT** evidence that the master is just a regular *sadhaka* progressing in *Bhakti*.

8. Example Of Hrdyananda Maharaja

This is a reason that would work for Hector, but not anyone else! Since Hector believes that Hrdyananda *Maharaja* **IS** an authorised member of the disciplic succession, then if he **REALLY** believes that the quote in question refers to an authorised member of the disciplic succession, then he must accept that its description applies to Hrdyananda *Maharaja* as well. So according to all the evidence just presented above, it cannot be disputed that the quote in question refers to:

Some neophyte, who after having had the seed of *Bhakti* planted in his heart, makes some initial progress by following the rules and regulations of *Bhakti*, and thus gets approached by others for discipleship.

Therefore let Hector declare boldly that:

YES, the above description matches Hrdyananda *Maharaja*, **OR NO**, my Guru is not some *sadhaka* who has only made some initial progress in *Bhakti* If Hector answers **YES**, then it really does not say much for Hector's opinion of Hrdyananda *Maharaja*!

If Hector answers **NO**, he concedes the debate.

But the conclusion has to be **ONE OR THE OTHER**. This is what happens when one tries to twist Srila Prabhupada's words simply to win a debate. You end up with a conclusion you did not really intend!

Summary

- a) Hector **BEGINS** with a proposition, that an authorised *Bona Fide* spiritual master gets carried away by wealth and disciples, which means Srila Prabhupada had to contradict himself, since Srila Prabhupada states the opposite. Therefore just on this point alone Hector is defeated, and we know the quote in question cannot be referring to such a spiritual master. For any follower of Srila Prabhupada, there is no need to go any further, as we know Srila Prabhupada is a perfect personality who does not contradict himself, and therefore even before we begin to look at the quote, the debate is over.
- b) Then looking at the quote in question, we know Hector needs to find a quote which speaks of an authorised bona fide spiritual master falling. But the quote does not mention either an authorised spiritual master or bona fide spiritual master.
- c) Then we examine the **CONTEXT** to the quote, and it becomes crystal clear that we are not dealing with authorised members of the disciplic succession, but the dangers that *sadhakas* must avoid in their cultivation of the *Bhakti* plant.

So from every single angle – from Srila Prabhupada's other axiomatic instructions, from the words of the quote, and the context of the quote – there is not, nor can there be, any evidence that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself and stated that an authorised member of the disciplic succession gets carried away by wealth and disciples.

Any **ONE** of the 8 reasons above is enough to establish the case, so Hector would need to refute **ALL 8**. So far as we have seen he has not even dared to try and even attempt to refute **ANY** of them.

Conclusion

- a) Hector has made huge blunders in **EVERY** single exchange of the debate so far.
- b) He did not even attempt to answer the arguments which I gave in my last mail, presented again above, because he cannot, and therefore he is defeated by the axiom that silence means acceptance.
- c) It is established conclusively that Hector's whole argument is based on assuming Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself.
- d) Srila Prabhupada does not contradict himself, and therefore the proof given in *BTP Special Issue*, and as proven by Hector himself, stands.

Thank you.

Your servant,

Krishnakant

Post subject: Hector DOESN'T get initiated

Dear Ganesa Prabhu,

Please accept my humble obeisances.

All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

Thanks to you and all those who have shared their views about this proposal.

I am glad to see that these ideas are being discussed, even if by way of mockery. For the sake of honesty and clarity, I must share a few recent developments caused by this proposal, in particular, what happened this weekend with Hridayananda das Goswami.

First of all, I sincerely apologize to any Vaisnava I may have offended by presenting these views. I simply tried to be of service, but have realized that many people are upset with me as a result. I've been called everything from fanatic to lunatic to ignorant to neophyte to you-name-it. I might be all of those things combined and worse. I will chant and read more to correct those faults. I will also stop writing for a while.

I went to the Panihati Festival in Atlanta this weekend, with great expectations and enthusiasm about my *hari nama* initiation by Hridayananda das Goswami. However, things turned out not exactly as planned.

I had been recommended for initiation by both the temple in Puerto Rico and by a beloved friend and disciple of Srila Prabhupada's, Mahapurana Prabhu. For reasons outside of his control, Mahapurana Prabhu could not be present at the meeting, but his good wife was. From the start to the end of the longer-than-an-hour meeting, *maharaja* severely chastised me for having written this proposal. Although it was his *sannyassa* anniversary offering, I must clear his name from thinking he endorsed it. He thought I did a very poor job in studying the matter carefully and suggested I might have disrespected (not offended) senior disciples and good GBC officials. Certainly, that was not my intention, yet I apologize for it. In all honesty, however, I must add that *maharaja* admitted not having read the proposal. I think that, with all due respect, he should have read it before chastising me. It's simply a matter of fairness, besides being a rational necessity. Perhaps it was Srila Prabhupada's mercy that my initiation did not take place.

Nevertheless, one cannot help but notice a contrast between the reaction to this proposal and the reaction to the challenge to IRM in April and May. Perhaps about a dozen previously unknown devotees to me, including Jaya Advaita *Maharaja*, thanked me in Atlanta for challenging IRM and lauded my writing. That doesn't include the dozens of emails I've received with the same purpose. What is most ironic, though, is that IRM's Krishnakant had cynically warned me, and I paraphrase, that by writing such a proposal my future in ISKCON was doomed. **I hate to acknowledge Krishnakant was right**, and I can only hope he is wrong. This message by Ganesa Prabhu makes me feel that there are rational devotees who are willing to objectively look at the facts and understand that the GBC needs some substantial change. For instance, the GBC must stop harboring sexual predators by allowing them to continue to tarnish the *sannyassa asrama*. For instance, a *sannyassi* who falls prey to lust or greed should not be allowed to remain a *sannyassi*.

I believe it was either Bhaktivinoda Thakura or Bhaktisiddhanta Sarasvati who taught us that when a spiritual master deviates, it is the duty of the disciple to request an audience in a solitary place and respectfully question the guru. If that is the case with one's guru, what about an administrative body like the GBC? We are following *sastra-guru-sadhu* by questioning their behavior and proposing alternatives. We owe it to Srila Prabhupada and we owe it to ISKCON. If we simply want to ignore the problems, then I do not see how things will get better. Certainly reading all of Srila Prabhupada's books will help one to understand spiritual life. That's why we read them. Their reading will also help us understand practical matters, like how to properly administer a GBC. However, one need not read all his books to realize there are problems.

What should you do if you suspect a child is being molested? What should you do if you suspect a husband will kill his wife? Should you wait until you have all the evidence to make a decision to remove the child from such a situation or wait until the woman is dead? That is exactly what we do when we suggest something analogous to interviewing every past and present GBC and read all minutes from every GBC meeting as a qualification to offer solutions. That is a very irresponsible yet clever way to drag the problem. Nevertheless, the problems remain and will come back to haunt us, as they constantly do.

I will add one more thing. A devotee close to the GBC mentioned that, even though IRM is wrong about its explanation for the falldowns of so many of ISKCON gurus, IRM nonetheless has an explanation. ISKCON hasn't even attempted to offer a public theological rationale. And we desperately need it.

You may heed or ignore the words of this fallen soul. You may take the good ideas of this proposal or discard it in its entirety. However, at least respect that I meant well and that whatever I did was to help ISKCON. If I failed, please forgive me.

Your servant,

hector

Post subject: Hector - act 10, His wife enters the fray; Scene 1

Sat, 27 May 2006

Subject: IRM is defeated

Dear *Maharajas*, Prabhujis, and Matajis,

Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

I pray this message finds you well in your Krishna Consciousness. My husband, Héctor Rosario, felt the spiritual urge to challenge IRM last month. He therefore initiated a debate with Krishnakant desai. I will briefly summarize the results of said debate for the benefit of ISKCON members. Towards the end of the message, I will explain the intimate reason for my husband's challenge. We hope that the entire chain of messages will be posted soon at the **Hare Krishna Cultural Journal** website maintained by our Godbrother Krishna Kirti Prabhu.

As a way of introduction, our family members are aspiring disciples of Sri Srimad Hridayananda dasa Goswami Acaryadeva. My husband will finally receive initiation from Srila Acaryadeva next week in Atlanta during the Panihati Festival. Less importantly, my husband is an assistant professor of mathematics at the University of Puerto Rico, and holds a Ph.D. from Columbia University in New York City. He simply tried to humbly put his God-given intelligence to Srila Prabhupada's service by helping expose IRM.

During the debate, my husband tried to maintain a level of decorum worthy of a Vaisnava. Nevertheless, the gentleman from IRM became irritated and offensive, choosing derision over chivalry in almost every instance. Before I give the conclusion of the debate, I will like to share with you Srila Prabhupada's words with respect to the use of logic in establishing religious truth. We thank Ramakanta Prabhu for making this quote available to us.

"It has been described in the *Bhagavata* that *tarko 'pratisthah*. If you want to establish religious truth, you cannot establish it by your logic and argument. It is not possible because I may be a very perfect religious man, but I may not be a very good arguer; another strong man who can argue very strongly, who knows logic very nicely, he can defeat me. He can make my all conclusion null and void. So therefore, simply by argument or logical conclusion one cannot reach to the truth, to the religious truth. It is not possible. *Tarko 'pratisthah srutayo vibhinna*."

(Bg. 3.21-25 Lecture, New York, May 30, 1966)

If the gentleman from IRM would simply humbly meditate upon these transcendental words of Pramahansa Prabhupada, a perfect personality by his own admission, then his devotional life could develop. Unfortunately, he has disregarded Srila Prabhupada's instructions and become '*asara*' or useless.

Worse than that, he has become a disturbance to devotional service.

Srila Prabhupada quotes the *Brahma-yamala* thus:

"If someone wants to pose himself as a great devotee without following the authorities of the revealed scriptures, then his activities will never help him to make progress in devotional service. Instead, he will simply create disturbances for the sincere students of devotional service."

(The Nectar of Devotion, Chapter 7, pp.60-61).

Keeping Srila Prabhupada's words in mind, I will summarize the arguments.

The crux of the debate revolves around two quotes, one from *The Nectar of Devotion* and another from *Teachings of Lord Caitanya*.

1) The spiritual master must never be carried away by an accumulation of wealth or a large number of followers. A bona fide spiritual master will never become like that. But sometimes, if a spiritual master is not properly authorized and only on his own initiative becomes a spiritual master, he may be carried away by an accumulation of wealth and large numbers of disciples.

(The Nectar of Devotion, Chapter 14, p.116)

2) If one is attracted by a large number of disciples and material conveniences offered by these disciples and forgets his duty as a bona fide master, the growth of the plant will be impeded. Simply by taking advantage of material conveniences one may become addicted to enjoying material comforts.

(Teachings of Lord Caitanya, p.30)

The IRM bases one of its 'strongest' arguments against the authorization of ISKCON gurus to offer initiation on the first quote. In the Special Summary Issue, IRM presents a truncated 'proof' of the one appearing in *The Final Order*. The recap is the following:

1. *Nectar of Devotion* states that when not properly authorized – sometimes the Guru falls.
2. Hence, if Guru falls, then he was not properly authorized.
3. But all Gurus authorized in exactly the same way.
4. Thus all Gurus not properly authorized.
5. *Ritvik* system authorized by July 9th directive remains.

My husband made the mistake of assuming the argument was sound and hastily attempted to apply it to the Gaudiya Matha to show an undesirable result.

However, once he realized that the ‘proof’ was no proof at all, he understood that the battle was even easier. Certainly, steps C, D, and E are not quite based on logic, but on questionable assumptions. Nevertheless, one needs only to consider a case in B which IRM ignores. It comes from the second quote above (from *Teachings of Lord Caitanya*).

First of all, B does not follow from A, as my husband showed the IRM gentleman. However, my husband conceded that if you substitute A, for “if guru authorized, then guru does not fall,” which appears in the same quote the IRM gentleman took the quote from, then one simply need consider the contrapositive of this statement and derive B. Hence, the debate considers the following chain of arguments.

1. *Nectar of Devotion* ‘states’ if guru authorized, then guru does not fall.
2. Hence, if guru falls, then he was not properly authorized.
3. But all gurus authorized in exactly the same way.
4. Thus all gurus not properly authorized.
5. *Ritvik* system authorized by July 9th directive remains.

However, when one considers the quote from *Teachings of Lord Caitanya*, it says that a bona fide master may fall if he “**is attracted by a large number of disciples and material conveniences offered by these disciples and forgets his duty as a bona fide master.**”

IRM contends that ‘*bona fide master*’ and ‘*bona fide spiritual master*’ refer to two different things. However, IRM admits that Srila Prabhupada elsewhere uses the two terms interchangeably. Therefore, by its own admission, Srila Prabhupada is inconsistent in the way he uses his words. However, inconsistency leads to contradictions. Hence, this would imply that Srila Prabhupada contradicted himself, which, in all fairness, is something IRM never intended to claim or conclude.

Besides, from the context, it is obvious that Srila Prabhupada refers to a *diksa* guru in both quotes. To summarize, we have at least one more axiom that may be the cause for the falldown of a bona fide guru, in case the second one raises some questions, namely:

1) Forgetfulness of duty

2) Taking advantage of material conveniences Hence, if a spiritual master forgets his duty as a bona fide master, then he may fall. Certainly, only a bona fide spiritual master can know what the duties of such a position are. Moreover, it can be inferred that such forgetfulness might come from being attracted and taking advantage of material conveniences.

Therefore, since we have two more axioms, B becomes:

IF (guru falls), **THEN** (he was not authorized **OR** he forgot his duty as a bona fide master **OR** he took advantage of material conveniences).

If the second axiom is rejected, then we get:

IF (guru falls), **THEN** (he was not authorized **OR** he forgot his duty as a bona fide master).

In either case, ‘proof’ 4 of IRM’s *Special Issue* and *The Final Order* collapses.

If we now attempt to apply this reasoning to ISKCON’s history, then we are in a better position to understand what might be the cause, based on Srila Prabhupada’s *shruti*, behind the fall of so many of ISKCON’s gurus.

If an ISKCON guru falls, there are at least three possible reasons Srila Prabhupada gives for his falldown, namely: unauthorization, forgetfulness of duty, and taking advantage of material conveniences. How would one know which was the reason in each individual case? Only Krishna knows.

Nevertheless, one likely scenario is that, given ISKCON’s vast material opulence and resources, some gurus took advantage of material conveniences and in the process forgot their duty as bona fide spiritual masters. As a result, they fell.

This should not surprise us, since Srila Prabhupada had already warned us that:

“Regarding your questions concerning the spirit souls falling into maya’s influence, it is not that those who have developed a passive relationship with Krishna are more likely to fall into nescient activities. Usually anyone who has developed his relationship with Krishna does not fall down in any circumstance, but because the independence is always there, the soul may fall from any position or relationship by misusing his independence. But his relationship with Krishna is never lost, simply it is forgotten by the influence of maya, so it may be regained or revived by the process of hearing the holy name of Krishna...”

(70-02-27 Letter to Jagadisa)

We pray this is the end of IRM, but only Krishna will decide when this disturbance shall perish.

My husband’s intimate reason for engaging the IRM gentleman in debate is the following. My husband first came in touch with devotees in 1994, as a freshman at the University of Puerto Rico. He began to make steady progress in devotional life. However, perhaps too early in his devotional life, he came in contact with IRM. Perhaps five years ago in New York City he noticed two devotees at a subway station and happily approached them to associate with them and buy a book. He told them, “I go to the Brooklyn temple. Are you new in New York?” hoping to start a conversation. However, the gentleman seemed quite annoyed by my husband’s innocent and friendly question. He replied in a dry and almost angry tone that he had nothing to do with those people in Brooklyn. My husband felt he could not talk to him any longer, since he was hostile. He paid his obeisances and decided to leave.

Nevertheless, he took the gentleman’s card and attempted to visit their meeting place once. He wanted to be fair and listen to what they had to say.

Nonetheless, by the grace of the Lord, he never found the place. My husband was so disgusted and confused by the meeting and the subsequent reading of IRM’s website that as a result, he momentarily abandoned his devotional life. Afterwards, my husband gave away all his Srila Prabhupada’s books, including the *Vedabase*. He simply didn’t want to have anything to do with Srila Prabhupada. After completing his PhD, my husband returned to Puerto Rico and began associating with the local devotees. He has been blessed with the association of many good devotees, who have helped him cultivate the seed of *Bhakti*. Last year he decided to devote his life to chanting and reading. He chants 32 rounds daily and 64 or more on *ekadasi* and other special occasions. He also voraciously reads Srila Prabhupada’s books. I should add that he feels very much inspired by Sripada Gour Govinda Swami’s and Srila Acaryadeva’s works. He is overjoyed that his devotional life was not permanently impeded by IRM. Those weeds have been removed.

Srila Prabhupada says in a purport from the *Caitanya Charitamrita* that

“One must judge every action by its result.”

(CC Adi 12.8)

Please, judge my husband’s actions by their result. If at least one devotee has been able to recover or strengthen his or her spiritual life as result of this debate, then my husband’s task should be considered successful.

My husband prays that the *parampara* will forgive him for any offenses he may have committed in the discharge of his devotional service. May Lord Nityananada have mercy on us all and may this victory be transcendently relished by all faithful followers of Srila Prabhupada.

I remain, My husband’s sati,

At Srila Acaryadeva’s feet,

Verónica

“Wherever there is Krishna, 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.”

(BG 18.78)

Post subject: Krishnakant replies to Hector's Mrs

Mon, 29 May 2006

Dear Prabhus,

Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

I wish to clear up a case of mistaken identity made by the wife of Hector prabhu in her recent mail, in which she claims to summarise the debate between her husband and myself.

She states:

"Before I give the conclusion of the debate, I will like to share with you Srila Prabhupada's words with respect to the use of logic in establishing religious truth. We thank Ramakanta Prabhu for making this quote available to us.

"It has been described in the *Bhagavata* that *tarko 'pratisthah*. If you want to establish religious truth, you cannot establish it by your logic and argument. It is not possible because I may be a very perfect religious man, but I may not be a very good arguer; another strong man who can argue very strongly, who knows logic very nicely, he can defeat me. He can make my all conclusion null and void. So therefore, simply by argument or logical conclusion one cannot reach to the truth, to the religious truth. It is not possible. *Tarko 'pratisthah srutayo vibhinna*."

(Bg. 3.21-25 Lecture, New York, May 30, 1966)

If the gentleman from IRM would simply humbly meditate upon these transcendental words of Pramahansa Prabhupada, a perfect personality by his own admission, then his devotional life could develop. Unfortunately, he has disregarded Srila Prabhupada's instructions and become 'asara' or useless. Worse than that, he has become a disturbance to devotional service."

However, as the following will show, she has confused her husband with myself:

1. **30/4/2006** - Hector challenges me to a debate, in which he decides to

"challenge to some of your principal arguments, based solely on deductive reasoning flaws",

and he goes onto boast that he is able to do this because his

"mathematical brain handles deductive reasoning fairly well"

2. **4/5/2006** - Then Hector continues, stating he

"will rephrase your argument keeping the essentials, as mathematicians and logicians do."

3. **4/5/2006** – He continues to argue, using only logic, stating

"the logical flaws of your argument still hold."

He also describes the arguments he is presenting by boasting that

"This is what logicians and mathematicians do precisely to avoid hiding behind words."

4. **6/5/2006** – Hector again trumpets his use of logic to establish the truth:

"I realized I had overlooked a much simpler logical flaw that would have avoided much time and words in establishing the truth of point 1, that is, to establish the logical invalidity of your purported Proof 4",

and he summarises his argument thus:

"The accepted rules of inference of logic show that A and B are different; so much so that the greatest joy in mathematics and logic is to find statements with this property:"

5. **10/5/2006** – Hector summarises his arguments presented by stating

"If you want a verification of the pristine logic of the arguments hereby presented, look for the kind assistance of a mathematician or a logician."

6. **16/5/2006** – He continues to present a new argument as follows:

“I will summarize the arguments showing some of the logical flaws in IRM’s “The Final Order” once again”, admitting that “Only when Krishna impelled me to purge your arguments and use symbolic logic was I able to see the fallacy.”

And indeed his whole argument is full of such ‘symbolic logic’, which speaks of the ‘logical equivalence’ of statements, and their ‘contrapositive’, and what can be ‘logically inferred’ etc.

7. **18/5/2006** – Hector presents a logical proof for statement B of my proof, in which he states

“Notice the simplicity of this argument, just consider the contrapositive of a quote you apparently ignored in your Special Issue”,

and refers to his proof he stating that

“even though Srila Prabhupada did something logically equivalent to what you claim in B,”

8. **24/5/2006** – Hector again trumpets the supremacy of logic by stating

“I am willing to concede defeat if you provide unequivocal evidence or logical arguments.”

So right from the beginning to the end of this debate, Hector has championed the use of logic to establish religious truth. I however have made no such statements. Therefore, according to the word’s of his own wife, Hector has:

“disregarded Srila Prabhupada’s instructions and become ‘asara’ or useless. Worse than that, he has become a disturbance to devotional service.”

I do not think I could have put it better myself.

Hector should listen to his wife on this point.

Thank you.

Your servant,

Krishnakant

www.iskconirm.com
irm@iskconirm.com