

One Last Try By Chakra

by *Krishnakant*



June 11, 1999 - Recently CHAKRA put up an article (Rtvikism: The Intraplanetary Nonsense by Vidvan Gauranga dasa), which as usual contains a combination of 'straw man' and already answered arguments. It seems that just before the upcoming debate on CHAKRA, when CHAKRA readers will be able to read what we actually say for the first time, some CHAKRA contributors are engaging in one last attempt to cheat the hapless CHAKRA readers, knowing full well that their easily exposed nonsense will not be seen by most CHAKRA readers on VNN.

As usual the comments from the article shall be in speech marks, thus " "framed, with our replying following underneath.

"However, if we examine this verse closely, (Bhagavad Gita 4:1), we wonder, where does the verse say that there was *diksa* in the first place in 4.1? It said *vivasvan manave praha*. Vivasvan taught Manu which means Vivasvan was Manu's *siksa-guru*. *Manur iksvakave 'bravit*. And Manu was Iksvaku's *siksa-guru*. So for Desai-anugas to propound the doctrine that 4.1 teaches interplanetary *diksa* is wrong.

Every *diksa* => transmission of transcendental knowledge. But every transmission of transcendental knowledge is NOT *diksa*. *siksa* is also transmission of knowledge but it is not *diksa*."

We had already pointed out to Vidvan prabhu, when he originally made this argument that if *diksa* is not spoken about here then why did HH Jayadvaita Maharaja quote this example (Bhagavad Gita 4:1) in his paper on ['plain vanilla' diksa?](#) This is all the more embarrassing due to the fact that the author of this article, Vidvan Gauranga prabhu, is also the compiler of another paper '100 Deviations of *ritvikism*', in which this same paper by HH Jayadvaita Swami is quoted. We did not receive an answer to this relevant observation then, nor do we receive one in this article.

"Another consideration is that it is not interplanetary in the sense of not being within the physical proximity of Vivasvan or Manu or Iksvaku when the teaching was handed over one to another. How can we say so? Because Vivasvan was the father of Manu who was the father of Iksvaku!!! Being a father to a son has nothing to do with physical proximity??? The transmission of knowledge from Vivasvan to Manu to Iksvaku had no connection with physical proximity??? Prabhupada even says that Iksvaku came from the sun-planet. So much for the bogus theory that 4.1 teaches "interplanetary" anything. Manu was given the entire bhu-mandala to rule over and he built Ayodhya for Iksvaku and installed Iksvaku as the first ruler of Ayodhya. No physical proximity between Manu and Iksvaku??? Or between Vivasvan the father and Vaivasvata Manu the son of Vivasvan???"

Here the author is trying to argue that the devotees concerned transmitted all the knowledge to each other by being in physical contact with each other on the same planet, something that would automatically flow from the fact that they were in the same family.

However later on he contradicts himself and concedes that such transmission did occur between different planets, albeit through inter-planetary travel:

"In the context of BG 4.1, Prabhupada explains that there were transportation service from one planet to another. Even if this transmission of knowledge is termed "interplanetary," because of such interplanetary transportation services in the universe, people can travel to another planet and be in the physical proximity of the teacher. Also the living entities in the higher planets (like the sun) have mystic powers to transport themselves with ease."

Thus having first declared boldly that:

"So much for the bogus theory that 4.1 teaches "interplanetary" anything"

The author now contradicts himself and states that there was definitely 'inter-planetary something', since they travelled to each other's planets.

So now the author is conceding that knowledge was transferred between planets, albeit through travel.

Indeed to prove the point about inter-planetary travel the author quotes the same lecture that we quoted from in 'The Final Order', only for some reason he **OMITS** the evidence that actually supports our case:

The author quotes:

"Formerly, there were transportation service from one planet to another.

That transportation service is still existing, but not with this planet, but higher planetary system there is transportation service from one planet to another by different kinds of airplanes. And in the Siddha- loka... There is another planet which is called Siddhaloka. In the Siddhaloka the living entities or human beings are so advanced in yogic practice that they can travel with this body from one planet to another.

This description are there in the Srimad-Bhagavatam, Second Canto.

"And in this planet also there are many yogis even still existing, they can travel in this planet very swiftly by yogic power. There are many yogis who daily take bath in four places; in Prayag, in Ramesvaram, in Jagannath Puri, and in Hardwar. Still there are some yogis in India. So they can transfer themselves, transport themselves, from one"

Prabhupada's Lectures on Bhagavad-gita 1968 (680824BG.MON)

We quote the conclusion to this passage which refers to this inter-planetary travel, but also adds something else:

"So there was no difficulty in communicating with Manu or Manu's son, Ikshvaku. The communication was there, or the radio system was so nice that communication could be transferred from one planet to another."

(SP Bg. Lecture, 24/8/68)

Srila Prabhupada clearly states that another method of communication was ALSO used - RADIO. We then added in 'The Final Order' after the above quote that:

"It would appear that *diksa* is not affected by the physical distances between gurus and disciples." (*The Final Order*', p 31)

Since the 'nice radio system' was also used so that 'communication could be transferred from one planet to another', our statement above is correct, since the physical distance was surpassed through the use of a radio system. The fact that inter-planetary travel may have taken place does not change the validity of the point we made above.

Thus in summary, the author makes 3 points:

1. B.g 4.1 does NOT involve *diksa*.
2. B.g. 4.1 does not involve 'inter-planetary anything'.
3. B.g. 4.1 did not involve communication without physical contact

As we have shown:

- a. Point 1 would appear to be seriously undermined by one of the author's own authorities.
- b. Point 2 is in any case later on contradicted by the author
- c. Point 3 is contradicted by the portion of the lecture he did not quote

In conclusion there is nothing that the author has presented which changes the statement made in ['The Final Order'](#) about Bhagavad Gita 4:1:

"It would appear that *diksa* is not affected by the physical distances between gurus and disciples." ('The Final Order', p 31)