Undefeated After a Quarter of a Century

The Final Order (TFO), the IRM's position paper, was presented to the GBC over a quarter of a century ago in 1996, and since then, numerous attempts have been made to answer it. That all have failed is epitomised by the fact that the GBC has felt the need to do yet another presentation against *TFO*, or what the GBC calls the "*rtvik* theory". GBC member and GBC voted-in guru **HH Badrinarayan Swami ("BAD")** explained in a lecture on 5/12/21 that there was a request in a "GBC discussion" for a "PowerPoint (slideshow) on this *rtvik*", and that the GBC asked him to prepare such a slideshow. Hence, he and another GBC member and GBC voted-in guru, **HH Bhakti Vaibhava Swami**, have prepared a slideshow presentation titled:

"The *Rtvik* Theory – A speculative assault on the timeless Vedic wisdom"

The full text of this slideshow is presented in the shaded boxes below, with our responses underneath each shaded box. All emphases added (except within the shaded boxes).

Rtvik Heresy

The rtvik theory claims that the disciplic succession should have ended with Srila Prabhupada and that none of Srila Prabhupada's disciples should have become initiating gurus.

1) We do *not* claim that the "disciplic succession should have ended with Srila Prabhupada". We simply state that he is the *Acarya*, which also means *diksa* guru, for his own Society, ISKCON. This point is proven by the GBC itself, as we show by quoting its statements verbatim in the book: *Srila Prabhupada: The Founder-Acarya of ISKCON – Presenting the Conclusions of the GBC Foundational Document*.

2) As long as Srila Prabhupada remains the current link in the disciplic succession, then the disciplic succession *continues* with Srila Prabhupada as that current link. And Srila Prabhupada remains the current link in the disciplic succession for ISKCON. We are not asserting that Srila Prabhupada is to be the current link in the disciplic succession eternally.

3) Obviously, if one does not answer what the "*rtvik* theory" *actually* states, then one will not be able to answer it – period! And, as will be seen, that is in fact what has happened here, with the slideshow being unable to address and answer what *TFO* or the "*rtvik* theory" states.

4) That the slideshow felt compelled to make its very opening statement a false one, merely highlights how weak the slideshow is, as we shall now document.

Srila Prabhupada should have remained the only initiating guru, continuing to take disciples after his physical departure through the medium of priestly functionaries called rtviks or officiating acharyas. This is a practice without precedent in Vedic tradition.

The GBC asserts that Srila Prabhupada remaining the "only initiating guru" of ISKCON would be "without precedent". However:

1) The GBC has stated that ISKCON itself is "without precedent":

"Whereas ISKCON is an unprecedented worldwide Gaudiya Vaisnava mission"
(GBC Resolution 316, 2009)

And the GBC obviously accepts that ISKCON is a bona fide organisation as that is the organisation that it is managing.

2) The GBC has also stated that its guru system is "without precedent":

"ISKCON's ethos of multiple diksa- *and* siksa-*gurus serving under the auspices of a global managerial board is unique in the history of Vaisnavism, and so is the challenge it poses."*
(GBC Resolution 318, Part A, 2014)

The phrase "unique in the history of Vaisnavism" means "never happened before", or "without precedent".

And the GBC obviously accepts that its guru system is bona fide as that is the system it itself has introduced.

Therefore, the GBC accepts that being "without precedent" is completely bona fide.

Hence, the GBC stating here that Srila Prabhupada remaining the "only initiating guru" of ISKCON would be "without precedent", would simply mean that the GBC accepts that this can also similarly be bona fide.

Rather the Vedic tradition is to accept a physically present spiritual master. This is a cornerstone of Vedic principles. This is one point that the impersonalists, personalists, shaktas etc. all agree on**.**

1) Srila Prabhupada never states that one must "accept a physically present spiritual master", or that this is a "Vedic principle".

2) If an instruction is not stated by Srila Prabhupada, then we obviously cannot use this nonexistent instruction to stop following an instruction – the *rtvik* system of initiation given in the July 9th, 1977, Directive issued to all the GBCs and Temple Presidents – which it is not disputed Srila Prabhupada *did* give.

3) The fact that there is no evidence from Srila Prabhupada for this "physically present spiritual master" claim is shown by the desperation in choosing impersonalists* and *shaktas*** as authorities for the claim!

** "The impersonalists masquerade as Vedantists, but actually they are defying Vedanta […] Lord Caitanya has depicted this impersonalist class of men as more dangerous than the Buddhists. […] Therefore*

Lord Caitanya has warned not to associate with these impersonalist mayavadis because they will spoil one's life by diverting one from devotional service." (Srila Prabhupada Letter, 14/3/69)

*** According to ISKCON Educational Services, "the Shakta tradition specifically worships Shiva's consort, in her various forms such as Parvati, Durga, Kali, etc. […] A notable aspect of Shaktism is animal sacrifice and even documented accounts of human sacrifice."*

4) Not only did Srila Prabhupada not teach the need for a physically present spiritual master, but he practically demonstrated the opposite by not physically meeting many of his own disciples and repeatedly preaching the exact opposite:

"So we should associate by the vibration, and not by the physical presence. That is real association."
(Srila Prabhupada Lecture, *SB*, 18/8/68)

"There are two conceptions of presence – the physical conception and the vibrational conception. The physical conception is temporary, whereas the vibrational conception is eternal. […] Such association with Krsna and the spiritual master should be association by vibration, not physical presence. That is real association."
(*Elevation to Krsna Consciousness*, Chapter 4)

All four Vaishnava sampradayas teach and practice the tradition of accepting initiation in an ongoing disciplic line. Even the Supreme Lord took initiation just to set the example. Rama and Laksman took initiation from Vasistha Muni. Krishna & Balaram took initiation from Sandipani Muni.

1) *TFO* does not dispute that one must accept an initiating spiritual master. On the contrary, it states that this must be done via Srila Prabhupada.

2) Hence, the above merely states what *TFO agrees* with. And it is not possible to *defeat TFO* by making statements that agree with it! Maybe the GBC should have selected someone to rebut *TFO* who understands this very elementary point of logic!

'Just try to learn the truth by approaching a spiritual master. Inquire from him submissively and render service unto him. The self-realized souls can impart knowledge unto you because they have seen the truth.'
BG 4.34

Srila Prabhupada: 'One who is now the disciple is the next spiritual master.'
Srimad Bhagavatam 2.9.43 Purport

1) Please note that the first quote is the changed version from the "edited" *Bhagavad-gita*. However, neither of these two quotes prevents Srila Prabhupada from remaining the *diksa* guru of ISKCON.

2) Hence, putting forward statements that do not in any way challenge *TFO* will mean *TFO* is not challenged, but rather remains standing, undefeated. Maybe the GBC should have selected someone to rebut *TFO* who understands this very elementary point of logic!

During his lifetime, Srila Prabhupada prepared his disciples to take the role of guru after his departure.

Mohsin Hassan: After you, is there any decision being made who will take over?
Room conversation July 18th, 1971.

Srila Prabhupada's reply:

"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…

Whoever is initiated, he is competent to make disciples. But as a matter of etiquette they do not do so in the presence of their spiritual master. This is the etiquette. Otherwise, they are competent. They can make disciples and spread."

1) Srila Prabhupada answers that:

"all of them will act as I am doing".

If this was referring to acting as *diksa* guru, then it would mean that every single disciple of Srila Prabhupada *must* become a *diksa* guru, since Srila Prabhupada states that "all" "will" act. However, even the GBC does not agree that every disciple must definitely become a *diksa* guru. Indeed, the GBC has gone out of its way to make sure this does *not* happen, ensuring that only a select few are authorised to become GBC *diksa* gurus in ISKCON.

2) The second part of the answer quoted above, which begins **"Whoever is initiated…"**, is actually only *half* of the answer to another, different question, and both the full answer and this other question have deliberately been cut out from the above "reply" from Srila Prabhupada. The question, and full reply, unedited, are as follows:

Mohsin Hassan: "You have ten *swamis*. And outside of *swamis*, what's the lower…"

Srila Prabhupada: "Now, they're competent. They can…, not only the *swamis*, even the *grhasthas*, they are called *dasa adhikari*, and *brahmacaris*, everyone can, whoever is initiated, he is competent to make disciple. But as a matter of etiquette they do not do so in the presence of their spiritual master. This is the etiquette. Otherwise, they are competent. They can make disciples and spread. Become, too whom, I mean, recruit more members in this. They do, but they are being trained up. Just like here in this meeting, one of my disciples, he is acting as priest. Instead of myself; he is acting. So some of my students, they are acting as priest, some of them are *swamis*. So they are competent to make disciples."

a) Srila Prabhupada is explaining that the right to "make disciples" is not limited to "*swamis*", but rather is open to everyone who is initiated. This is a point of general principle.

b) Srila Prabhupada then continues to answer by equating "to make disciple" with "make disciples and spread" and "recruit more members", which Srila Prabhupada states is also being done by his disciples.

Therefore, rather than this being a directive for every initiated person to automatically become a *diksa* guru as soon as Srila Prabhupada physically departs, Srila Prabhupada is instead just giving a very general answer regarding broad principles to a student visitor, Mohsin Hassan, who knew very little about the movement.

"We are interested in preparing acharya [guru], but the etiquette is, at least for the period the guru is present, one should not become acharya. Even if he is complete he should not, because the etiquette is, if somebody comes for becoming initiated, it is the duty of such person to bring that perspective candidate to his acharya…"
Lecture April 6th, 1975

"And to become acharya is not very difficult. First of all, to become very faithful servant of your acharya, follow strictly what he says. Try to please him and spread Krsna consciousness. That's all. It is not at all difficult…"
April 6, 1975, Srila Prabhupada's public lecture in Mayapur

Both quotes above are from the same passage, and Srila Prabhupada states that to become "*acarya*" requires that one must "follow strictly" one's own *Acarya*, which for ISKCON is Srila Prabhupada. But, Srila Prabhupada, the *Acarya*, never gave any orders where he states:

a) That he is renouncing his position as ISKCON's *diksa* guru;

b) That he instead will be succeeded as ISKCON's *diksa* guru by someone else.

Without such orders, there is no question of one taking Srila Prabhupada's position as ISKCON's *diksa* guru. And the slideshow has yet to present such orders. Rather, above, Srila Prabhupada only states that such "*acaryas*" in ISKCON should just "spread Krsna consciousness".

"Every student is expected to become Acharya. Acharya means one who knows the scriptural injunctions and follows them practically in life, and teaches them to his disciples… Keep trained up very rigidly and then you are bonafide Guru, and you can accept disciples on the same principle… I want to see my disciples become bona fide Spiritual Master and spread Krsna consciousness very widely, that will make me and Krsna very happy."
Letter to Tusta Krishna/December 2nd, 1975

Srila Prabhupada was completely consistent in his statements about his vision for the continuation of the disciplic succession after his departure.

This is the 3rd quote presented as "evidence" for supposed *diksa* guru succession of Srila Prabhupada on his physical departure. We just saw earlier that the first quote presented, the discussion with Mohsin Hassan that begins "whoever is initiated", was edited, in that the full quote was not presented in order to give a misleading picture. The same has been done here, since the full quote above is actually as follows:

"Keep trained up very rigidly and then you are bona fide Guru, and you can accept disciples on the same principle. <u>But as a matter of etiquette it is the custom that during the lifetime of your Spiritual master you bring the prospective disciples to him, and in his absence or disappearance you can accept disciples without any limitation. This is the law of disciplic succession.</u> I want to see my disciples become bona fide Spiritual Master and spread Krishna consciousness very widely, that will make me and Krishna very happy."

The part underlined has been deliberately cut out. The reason for this deliberate omission is because the GBC does not even believe in or follow this "law of disciplic succession", having decreed that one can become a *diksa* guru in the physical presence of one's own spiritual master, as standard. Please see GBC 2021 Resolutions 701.02 and 702.02. Thus, the GBC is putting forward a "quote" which it itself does not believe needs to be followed! Hence, the GBC cannot claim as evidence that which it itself does not accept is evidence!

Vedic tradition

Following these instructions, and the example shown in Vedic culture since time immemorial, some of Srila Prabhupada's disciples, after his departure, have become gurus and accepted disciples of their own.

We have just seen that in regards to the three "instructions" that have been put forward:

1) The first one, "Mohsin Hassan", when it is presented in *full*, is *not* an order for every single disciple to automatically become a *diksa* guru successor, but rather is just a general explanation of the principle that there is no discrimination amongst non-*sannyasi* disciples.

2) The second quote, "*acaryas*", just talks about everyone becoming an "*acarya*" in general by preaching.

3) And the last quote, "the law of disciplic succession", the GBC does not even believe in!

Hence, there are no instructions presented which order Srila Prabhupada's disciples to replace him as ISKCON's *Acarya* and *diksa* guru.

Not all of these gurus have lived up to their responsibilities and this has naturally caused disturbances. But because rtvikism violates both the Vedic principle of disciplic succession and Srila Prabhupada's direct instruction that his disciples become regular gurus, ISKCON has rejected it.

It is claimed that "*rtvikism*", or Srila Prabhupada acting as ISKCON's *diksa* guru:

1) "violates" the principle of "disciplic succession". However, no proof for this assertion is given. Rather, at the very outset, we only saw the slideshow falsely claim that the IRM states that the disciplic succession should have "ended" with Srila Prabhupada. If one simply lies, one can claim anything. But the purpose of this slideshow was supposed to be to address *TFO*, not just lie about it.

2) "violates" Srila Prabhupada's "direct instruction that his disciples become regular gurus". But, again, this is another fantasy, as no such "direct instruction" has been presented. Indeed, the term "regular gurus" has not even been mentioned by the presentation thus far.

Rather than whimsically changing the instructions of Srila Prabhupada, as the advocates of the rtvik theory have done, ISKCON prefers to address these problems by making better efforts to follow his instructions and to come to the standard he gave us.

As we just noted, there are no "instructions of Srila Prabhupada" that have been presented that we are "changing". Srila Prabhupada remaining the *Acarya* and *diksa* guru of his ISKCON Society from 1966 onwards did not lead to Srila Prabhupada "changing" his own instructions. And him remaining as ISKCON's *Acarya* and *diksa* guru does not lead to him changing his instructions now either.

Rtvik heresy

Advocates of the rtvik theory seek to justify their cause solely through a distorted and false interpretation of a single letter written by Srila Prabhupada's secretary on July 9, 1977. The July 9th letter does not mention Srila Prabhupada's departure nor does it refer to how he intended initiations to go on after his physical departure.

1) Basing one's entire presentation on lying, by making false statements regarding what the "*rtvik* theory" claims, is a sure recipe for failure. The result of making such false statements, by definition, is a false presentation. The slideshow did this at the very outset by falsely claiming that we state that the disciplic succession "ended" with Srila Prabhupada. And the slideshow does it again here by falsely claiming that the "*rtvik* theory" depends "solely" on a "single letter". If one actually reads *TFO* or *BTP*, one will see that we present many

evidences. The *BTP Special Issue,* for example, alone presents 6 proofs, only one of which is the July 9th, 1977, letter.

2) It is admitted that the July 9th, 1977, letter does not mention Srila Prabhupada's departure. Therefore, the letter does not, and cannot, direct that its instructions should be terminated on Srila Prabhupada's physical departure, because it does not even mention Srila Prabhupada's departure.

3) Srila Prabhupada's instructions for *ISKCON* were intended to be applied *for* and *in* ISKCON. The July 9th, 1977, letter was such an instruction, since it specifically states the initiation system to be applied in ISKCON. By admitting that this instruction does not reference its applicability to Srila Prabhupada's physical departure, the slideshow merely confirms that the July 9th, 1977, instructions were *not* tied to Srila Prabhupada's physical departure. Hence, Srila Prabhupada's physical departure has no relevance to their applicability in ISKCON. Which means they are to be applied in ISKCON, regardless of Srila Prabhupada's physical departure. Otherwise, every single instruction Srila Prabhupada gave for ISKCON would have needed to be terminated on Srila Prabhupada's physical departure. Which in turn would effectively have rendered ISKCON itself non-existent on Srila Prabhupada's physical departure, as there would no longer have remained any instructions that would have needed to be followed in ISKCON in order to keep it functioning.

Srila Prabhupada directed that a number of his senior disciples should answer the letters and conduct initiation ceremonies on his behalf, with the new initiates becoming Srila Prabhupada's disciples. So yes, Srila Prabhupada established a rtvik or proxy system in the latter part of 1977. It was for the few months he remained physically present and because the etiquette is that one does not initiate while one's own diksha guru is still present.

1) The slideshow bases its entire conclusion regarding the July 9th, 1977, letter on the unsubstantiated assertion that Srila Prabhupada established the *rtvik* system "for the few months he remained physically present". However, neither Srila Prabhupada nor the July 9th, 1977, letter state this. One has to prove one's assertions with *evidence*. If it was sufficient to simply claim whatever one wants to believe, then there would be no need to even make this slide presentation. The GBC can simply claim "we are right, and everyone else is wrong. End of." Which, by presenting no evidence for any of its assertions, is what this slideshow is effectively doing, only in a very long-winded and repetitive way. Such a presentation, however, will not appeal to any follower of Srila Prabhupada, who will expect all assertions to be substantiated by statements from Srila Prabhupada.

2) The "etiquette" that one "does not initiate while one's own *diksha* guru is still present" is correct. However, one also "does not initiate" unless one has been authorised by one's own *diksa* guru to become a *diksa* guru:

"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*."
(*SB*, 4.8.54, purport)

"A guru can become guru when he's ordered by his guru. That's all. Otherwise nobody can become guru."
(Srila Prabhupada Lecture, *Bg*., 28/10/75)

"Self-made guru cannot be guru. He must be authorized by the bona fide guru. Then he's guru. This is the fact [...] Similarly, bona fide guru means he must be authorized by the superior guru."
(Srila Prabhupada Lecture, *Nectar of Devotion*, 31/10/72)

But no such *diksa* guru authorisation was given, either in this July 9th, 1977, letter or elsewhere. We earlier extensively documented that no such *diksa* guru order has been presented by this slideshow.

The history

Srila Prabhupada asked the GBC members in Vrindaban to come to him with questions on any major points they wanted clarification and confirmation on. The conversation, the questions and Srila Prabhupada's answers, were recorded on May 28th, 1977. One of those questions the GBC asked of Srila Prabhupada was: 'Then our next question concerns initiations in the future, particularly at that time when you're no longer with us. We want to know how first and second initiation would be conducted.'

Srila Prabhupada's answer**:**

Srila Prabhupada starts by explain [sic] the system to be practiced while he is still physically present:

Satvarupa: Then what is the relationship of that person who gives the initiation and the...

Srila Prabhupada: He's guru. He's guru.

[...]

1) The question directly asks how initiations would be conducted "particularly at that time when you're no longer with us". Clearly, if Srila Prabhupada's answer to this is "*rtvik*", it completely destroys the GBC's guru hoax.

2) And that *is* what Srila Prabhupada answers, for this is his immediate and actual answer to the question asked:

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

Tamal Krsna Goswami: "Is that called *rtvik acarya*?"

Srila Prabhupada: "*Rtvik*. Yes."
(May 28th, 1977, Conversation)

So, this does completely destroy the GBC's guru hoax as Srila Prabhupada's answer to how initiations would be conducted after he is "particularly" "no longer with us" is "*rtvik*".

3) And the GBC *also knows this*, because the slideshow deliberately deletes this answer, and instead claims as shown above that Srila Prabhupada's *answer* is actually *Satsvarupa* asking another *question!* Thus, the slideshow deliberately deletes Srila Prabhupada's words in the hope that no one will bother to read anything other than the slideshow. This is the same approach of relying on the audience's ignorance that caused all the previous GBC attempts to answer the "*rtvik* theory", or *TFO,* to fail, and that is why this slideshow also similarly fails.

Srila Prabhupada's answer**:**

Srila Prabhupada starts by explain [sic] the system to be practiced while he is still physically present:

Satvarupa: Then what is the relationship of that person who gives the initiation and the…

Srila Prabhupada: He's guru. He's guru.

Satsvarupa: But he does it on your behalf.

Srila Prabhupada: Yes. That is formality. Because in my presence one should not become guru, so on my behalf, on my order… Amara ajnaya guru hana. Be actually guru, but by my order…

1) We just noted that the "*rtvik*" answer Srila Prabhupada *actually* gave was in response to how initiations would be conducted for "particularly at that time when you're no longer with us". The slideshow not only deleted this answer, but also claims that Srila Prabhupada was answering for "while he is still physically present". But this is another fabrication, because Srila Prabhupada does not state that he is answering *only* for his physical presence. Rather, he was asked specifically for "particularly at that time when you're no longer with us", and that is the question he answered.

2) The *rtviks* Srila Prabhupada states he will appoint to conduct initiations for "particularly at that time when you're no longer with us", were to *begin* conducting initiations *whilst* Srila Prabhupada was still physically present, on July 9th, 1977. Consequently, *2* subsequent questions later, Satsvarupa asks *another* question about "But he does it on your behalf", and in response to *that* question, Srila Prabhupada re-iterates that one does not become guru either in his physical presence *or* without an order to do so: **"Because in my presence one should not become guru, so on my behalf, on my order… *Amara ajnaya guru hana*. Be actually guru, but by my order."**

After explaining how initiations would go on while he was still physically present, Srila Prabhupada then states how initiations should go on when he was no longer physically present.

Tamal Krsna: … The people who they give diksha to, whose disciple are they?

Srila Prabhupada: They're his disciple.

Tamal Krsna: They're his disciple?

Srila Prabhupada: Who is initiating. He is grand-disciple.

Srila Prabhupada: When I order, 'You become guru', he becomes regular guru. That's all. He becomes disciple of my disciple. That's it.

****

Srila Prabhupada maintained the Vedic tradition

His disciples should become regular gurus, with disciples of their own, but only after his departure and only if they were qualified.

1) We just saw that the slideshow fabricated that in the first part of the May 28th, 1977, conversation, Srila Prabhupada was hitherto *only* answering in regards to how initiations would be conducted during his physical presence, despite him having been asked *the exact opposite*, i.e. how would initiations be conducted "particularly at that time when you're no longer with us"! Now, the slideshow fabricates that suddenly now, and only now, is Srila Prabhupada going to talk *only* about his physical absence even though neither Srila Prabhupada nor the questioner states this.

2) However, the statement that Srila Prabhupada actually makes does not match at all the words that the slideshow has decided to put into Srila Prabhupada's mouth:

a) Srila Prabhupada does *not* say "He is" before the word "grand-disciple", because:

i) Srila Prabhupada only speaks <u>one</u> word before saying "grand-disciple", rather than <u>two</u> words.

ii) That one word is "his".

One can listen for oneself to Srila Prabhupada speaking this one word rather than two words, by going to the audio clip here:

iskconirm.com/his

The significance of the GBC making this change was explained in the *BTP* 52 article "Zonal *Acarya* Hoax Revival Continues!", which can be read here:

iskconirm.com/btp52

As we saw in this and the previous section, when your case relies on needing to delete and change Srila Prabhupada's words, then it proves you have no case. Otherwise, one could just

be honest and present Srila Prabhupada's words truthfully: one would not need to cheat and doctor Srila Prabhupada's words.

b) The slideshow claims that Srila Prabhupada states:

"His disciples should become regular gurus".

But Srila Prabhupada does not state this. He simply states that **"When I order you become guru, he becomes regular guru"**. Thus, he is stating that a regular guru emerges *when* he orders this. He does not state "his disciples should become regular gurus". These are two completely different things:

Srila Prabhupada: When I order -> regular guru.

Slideshow: His disciples should become regular gurus.

Because Srila Prabhupada is not stating one *should* become anything. Srila Prabhupada is only stating that one does become a regular guru if and when he orders this.

c) The slideshow also falsely claims that Srila Prabhupada is stating that his disciples "should" become gurus "only after his departure and only if they were qualified".

But there is no mention here of "departure" or "qualification". Indeed, departure is only mentioned by the questioner, Satsvarupa, right at the very outset, when he asks about initiations "particularly at that time when you're no longer with us", and to which Srila Prabhupada answers "officiating *acarya*"/"*rtvik*".

Thus, there are at least *5* deviations here by the slideshow from what Srila Prabhupada actually states:

i) Srila Prabhupada does not state "he is" granddisciple.

ii) Srila Prabhupada does not state "should become".

iii) Srila Prabhupada does not mention "departure" here.

iv) Srila Prabhupada does not mention "qualified" here.

v) Srila Prabhupada *does* mention him needing to give an order first, which the slideshow does not comment on at all!

<u>Summary</u>

In summary, just for this very short passage, the slideshow has engaged in *numerous* bouts of cheating:

1) It had to delete Srila Prabhupada's "*rtvik*" answer for "particularly at that time when you're no longer with us".

2) It had to claim that Srila Prabhupada's answer was for his physical presence, i.e. the *exact opposite* time period to the "particularly at that time when you're no longer with us" time period he was actually asked about.

3) It had to change Srila Prabhupada's one word "his" into two words "he is".

4) It had to *insert* "should become", because Srila Prabhupada said no such thing.

5) It had to *insert* "departure", because Srila Prabhupada did not state this.

6) It had to *insert* "qualified", because Srila Prabhupada did not state this.

7) It had to *omit* Srila Prabhupada stating "when I order".

In this way, Srila Prabhupada's *rtvik* order for "particularly at that time when you're no longer with us" becomes magically transformed into a "*diksa* guru order". If you cheat and change what Srila Prabhupada *actually* states, then of course you can make him "say" whatever you want!

If Srila Prabhupada were proposing such a drastic break from Vedic tradition, after so carefully presenting all of other aspects of philosophy and practice, one would expect to find many statements by him on this topic.

1) We already saw that this so-called "tradition" was substantiated not by any statements from Srila Prabhupada but by an appeal to "impersonalists" and "*shaktas*".

2) Thus, one cannot speak about a "drastic break" from a "tradition" that one cannot even quote Srila Prabhupada stating he is following! Hence, there would not even be anything for him to break from or speak about not following.

Yet the advocates of the rtvik theory have never produced even a single statement by Srila Prabhupada in which he says that he would continue to initiate disciples after his physical departure.

We just noted that when asked how initiations would be conducted "particularly at that time when you're no longer with us", Srila Prabhupada *does* answer with "officiating *acarya*"/"*rtvik*", thereby affirming that he would continue to initiate disciples via *rtviks* after his physical departure. An answer so damning, that, as we saw earlier, the GBC was compelled to delete it! In addition, the above argument put forward by the slideshow is a logical fallacy known as "assuming that which needs to be proven":

1) The above argument *assumes* that Srila Prabhupada must stop initiating once he physically departs.

2) Only if such an assumption is true would Srila Prabhupada need to counter such an assumption and state the opposite – that he would *continue* to initiate.

3) But if such an assumption is not correct then there would be nothing for Srila Prabhupada to counter, nor would he need to state that he can *continue* to initiate, when there is no bar on him initiating to begin with.

Yet, the GBC's whole case depends on this unsubstantiated assumption, that the spiritual master must stop initiating as soon as he physically departs. Without it, they have no case. Hence, they are forced to just *assume* that this assertion is true, since they have no evidence to prove that the assertion is true.

Rtvik heresy

Advocates of the rtvik theory think they are glorifying Srila Prabhupada but what they are actually saying is:

Srila Prabhupad [sic] was so spiritually powerful and potent, yet he could not produce one single disciple qualified to become a regular guru and accept disciples.

Followers of the rtvik theory may believe that Srila Prabhupada accepts them as initiated disciples, but where is the tangible confirmation of this? Rather, this view is only their wishful thinking.

1) We are not stating this at all. This is yet another example of needing to ascribe a false statement to us, because what we do state cannot be answered.

2) It is possible for Srila Prabhupada to both be spiritually potent and also remain the *Acarya* and *diksa* guru of ISKCON. What matters is that we must simply follow what he ordered, rather than speculate about what someone else is supposedly claiming, even though they do not claim it! If the GBC had any actual evidence from Srila Prabhupada, it would just present that, rather than instead try to compensate for such a lack of evidence with fanciful speculative theories regarding what we do *not* claim.

3) Srila Prabhupada stated via the July 9th, 1977, directive that he will accept anyone as his initiated disciple, as long as they are recommended by the Temple President, and they would then be given a spiritual name by the *rtvik* representative. Thus, the actual "wishful thinking" is the slideshow pretending that such an arrangement does not exist.

In 1990 the GBC officially rejected the rtvik philosophy, concluding that it violates the Vedic system and Srila Prabhupada's direct instructions.

<u>GBC resolution</u>

The doctrine that Srila Prabhupada continues to initiate direct diksha disciples after his departure from this world through officiating priests (rtviks) is a dangerous philosophical deviation. It is totally prohibited in ISKCON. No devotee shall participate in such posthumous

rtvik initiation ceremonies in any capacity, including acting as rtvik, initiate, assistant, organizer, or financier. No ISKCON devotee shall advocate or support its practice.

***

Change the practice and the lineage is lost. Lose the lineage and we are lost. We would be flying blind.

1) One can note the extreme weakness of the GBC's case that it is already just stating its belief, having failed to put forward any evidence for this belief!

2) It is the GBC that has changed the "practice" by replacing Srila Prabhupada with its many "colourful" voted-in gurus, resulting in a "lineage" in which the members of the *parampara*, according to **HH Jayadvaita Swami**, have behaved as follows:

"FACT: ISKCON gurus have usurped and misused money, and diverted other ISKCON resources for their own personal prestige and sense gratification.
FACT: ISKCON gurus have had illicit sexual intercourse with both women and men, and possibly children as well."
(*Where the* Ritvik *People are Right*, Jayadvaita Swami, 1996)

3) It is the IRM that is calling for no change to the practice, and for the lineage to stay the same – with Srila Prabhupada as the *Acarya* and *diksa* guru of ISKCON as he has always been.

Amongst gurus in a sampradaya, the founder-acharya holds a special position. He is the siksha guru for all the following members of his line.

He is also the *diksa* guru as well. So states both Srila Prabhupada and the GBC, as documented in the book:

*Srila Prabhupada: The Founder-*Acarya *of ISKCON – Presenting the Conclusions of the GBC Foundational Document*.

"The mystery of the sampradaya"
BG 18.75 / purport

The experience is direct via the spiritual master. As glasses serve as a medium to bring an object into focus.

**

"You should always pray to His Divine Grace because naturally he will be more affectionate to you than me. Generally one is more affectionate to the grandchildren than to the children directly. So I am sure that my Guru Maharaj will be easily inclined to your prayers than that of mine. You will do good always by offering your prayers to His Divine Grace

Bhaktisiddhanta Goswami Maharaj."
Letter to Brahmananda December 12th, 1968

**

My dear boys and girls, you are working so hard for broadcasting the glories of Lord Krishna's lotus feet, and thus my Guru Maharaja will be so pleased upon you. Surely my Guru Maharaja will bestow his blessing a thousand times more than me.
Letter to Ramesvara 4/15/1973

1) *TFO* fully agrees with the quotes above, and the sentiments expressed regarding His Divine Grace Bhaktisiddhanta Goswami Maharaja. And it is not possible to *defeat TFO* by making statements that agree with it! Maybe the GBC should have selected someone to rebut *TFO* who understands this very elementary point of logic!

2) If one wishes to claim that these quotes above mean that one will also get Srila Prabhupada's mercy even if he is not one's *diksa* guru, but the *diksa* guru of one's *diksa* guru, one needs to first prove that Srila Prabhupada has been replaced by one of his disciples as ISKCON's *diksa* guru. We have seen thus far that the slideshow has not presented a scintilla of evidence for this claim. Only false statements and cheating.

"Krsnadasa Kaviraja, who presented the deepest understanding of Lord Chaitanya and His teaching, was a grand disciple of Lord Chaitanya. He understood through his diksha guru, Raghunath dasa Goswami.

Krsnadasa Kaviraja Gosvami says that he has been able to describe these four pastimes of Sri Chaitanya Mahaprabhu by the blessings of Srila Rupa Gosvami. Krsnadasa Kaviraja Gosvami was not actually a direct disciple of Srila Rupa Gosvami, but he followed the instructions given by Srila Rupa Gosvami in the Bhakti-rasamrta-sindhu. He therefore acted according to the directions of Rupa Gosvami and prayed in every chapter for his mercy."
CC Antya 19.101 / purport

The answer just presented for the previous shaded box, applies equally here.

Q&A

Q: Could Srila Prabhupada install a rtvic [sic] system?

A: Of course he could. But it is not a question of our willingness or unwillingness to accept that Srila Prabhupada, as the Founder-Acharya, could establish a new system of initiation. Rather it is a simple question of knowing and accepting what he actually said. And what he said is *grand-disciple, disciple of my disciple, regular guru.*

1) What Srila Prabhupada established was not a "new system of initiation". For ISKCON, the system whereby everyone becomes an initiated disciple of Srila Prabhupada following a recommendation from the Temple President, was the system of initiation that virtually everyone in ISKCON was used to.

2) Unfortunately, just *deleting* and *changing* Srila Prabhupada's words won't make them go away. He actually said:

"Officiating *acarya*"/"*rtvik*" and "*rtvik*" in both the May 28th, 1977, conversation and the July 9th, 1977, directive. And the former was specifically in answer to the question of how initiations would be conducted "particularly at that time when you're no longer with us."

3) Srila Prabhupada also said "his grand-disciple" and "when I order" in respect of "regular guru".

One must take all of Srila Prabhupada's words together, as they are, rather than try to fabricate them as being evidence of *diksa* guru successors having been ordered.

Q: Although Srila Prabhupada wrote and spoke about his disciples becoming regular gurus, didn't he change his mind as he prepared to leave the planet, seeing that they were not qualified?

A: When Srila Prabhupada was asked whether he was dissatisfied with his disciples (as Srila Bhaktisiddhanta was) he said *No*. Rather, he said that he was satisfied. When asked if he was leaving any work unfinished, he said, *Yes, I have not established varnashrama-dharma*. This certainly would have been an appropriate time to state that he had not been able to create disciples qualified to be gurus upon his departure. But he did not.

This refers to some "Prabhupada said" statements. There is no record of the statements claimed above. If the GBC wishes to make its case, it should at the very least have statements from Srila Prabhupada that it can be established Srila Prabhupada definitely spoke. So far, the GBC has relied only on:

- Changing or deleting Srila Prabhupada's statements;

- Assertions not supported by Srila Prabhupada's statements;

- And now claimed statements from Srila Prabhupada for which there is no record.

Any neutral observer would have to objectively conclude that this means that the GBC has utterly failed to prove its case by presenting Srila Prabhupada's actual statements.

Q: If regular gurus is the system Srila Prabhupada wanted, why have we had so many problems with it?

A: We have had problems with gurukulas, sannyasis, marriages, etc. That we have a problem establishing the order of the guru does not mean the order or our understanding of it are wrong.

The GBC is unable to even state *what* the "regular gurus" system is. Is it:

a) The system whereby one becomes a "regular guru" via first being appointed as a *rtvik*? If not, then how did the first *diksa* gurus in ISKCON emerge, given that they were only ever appointed as *rtviks*? If yes, then where does Srila Prabhupada ever speak about this *rtvik-diksa* guru system?

b) The system whereby whenever Srila Prabhupada states "become guru", he is actually ordering "regular gurus"? If yes, then why does Srila Prabhupada also connect such orders with stating that even a "child" can do it, and no qualification is needed, when in this slideshow presentation it is claimed that Srila Prabhupada ordered that "regular gurus" had to be qualified first?

c) The system whereby one needs to first get the required number of GBC authorisation votes?

In this slideshow, the GBC has not been able to present any orders from Srila Prabhupada directing that he be replaced as ISKCON's *diksa* guru with such "regular gurus".

Q: Wouldn't rtvik be a better system? Or couldn't we have both systems simultaneously; some initiates can opt for ISKCON gurus, some can opt for rtvik from Srila Prabhupada.

A: Our duty and salvation is in following the orders of our founder-acharya. Many thought the zonal acharya system sounded great, but in time it bore unexpected and bitter fruits. The great acharyas are trilocana, they can perfectly see past, present, and future. Again, our duty and guarantee of success is in simply following the orders of the acharyas.

1) Since it is accepted that the *acaryas* are *trilocana*, then one cannot claim that Srila Prabhupada appointed those 11 "zonal *acaryas*" as *diksa* gurus, since virtually all of them subsequently "fell down". But if they were not authorised to become *diksa* gurus, then this would mean that they were to not have changed into *diksa* gurus after having been first appointed as *rtviks*. In which case they should have remained as *rtviks* and the current ISKCON *diksa* guru system would never have even emerged.

2) Yes, we must simply follow the orders of the *acaryas*. But there are no orders from ISKCON's *Acarya* Srila Prabhupada authorising the current GBC guru system. The only order we have is his *rtvik* order, as given both in the May 28th, 1977, conversation (as deleted by the GBC), and the July 9th, 1977, directive.

Q: Aren't written orders more important than spoken orders (the May conversation being spoken; the July letter being written)?

A: *Guru mukha padma vakya*… Narottama dasa Thakura enjoins us to be purified by the words emanating from the mouth of the spiritual master. Also, the May conversation was not just any conversation. It was an extremely formal and sober discussion. Srila Prabhupada had personally petitioned the GBC to meet together, decide if there were any important issues that needed further clarification before he departed, and then to come before him to discuss the issues. The questions were in writing, and the answers were written down and entered into the GBC minutes books and signed by all the GBCs present.

1) If the GBC believed that Srila Prabhupada's words in the May 28th, 1977, conversation are so holy that we should be "purified" by them, then it would not have *deleted* them, as we caught it doing above!

2) Here is what the GBC minutes book claims Srila Prabhupada supposedly answered in the May 28th, 1977, conversation –

"2) Srila Prabhupada said he will appoint several devotees who shall perform initiations in the future even after his disappearance. The disciples they accept shall be their disciples and Srila Prabhupada will be their grand spiritual master."

– in response to the following questions:

"3) In the absence of Srila Prabhupada what is the procedure for first, second and sannyasa initiations?

4) What is the relationship of the person who gives this initiation to the person who he gives it to?"

Thus, according to all the GBC men who signed this book, Srila Prabhupada "appointed" 11 *diksa* guru successors as the solution to how initiations would continue in ISKCON after Srila Prabhupada physically departed. There is no mention of any "regular guru" system, nor that anyone else should become guru. Rather, <u>the</u> initiation system was to be the system whereby only 11 appointed *diksa* gurus initiate, i.e. the zonal *acarya* guru hoax, which was the system the GBC followed straightaway for almost a decade. The same zonal *acarya* hoax that we just quoted the slideshow admitting was not authorised in the previous quotation we presented from the slideshow.

So, by promoting the GBC minutes book, the GBC is simultaneously also promoting the zonal *acarya* hoax which it claims was false.

Q: Doesn't the July letter prove that Srila Prabhupada wanted a proxy system?

A: It proves that he wanted a proxy system for the remainder of the time he was physically on the planet, as everyone has agreed all along. It was intended as a time-bound system, put in place until Srila Prabhupada's physical disappearance.

1) The slideshow already admitted, as we quoted it stating earlier, that the July 9th, 1977, letter was not a "time-bound system" since it did not mention being bound by time at all:

"The July 9th letter does not mention Srila Prabhupada's departure"

Thus, one cannot claim that a system which specifically does not mention being bound by time, is a time-bound system!

2) Nor can one claim that a system that specifically does *not* mention "Srila Prabhupada's physical disappearance" was put in place "until Srila Prabhupada's physical disappearance". Such an assertion would be as absurd as claiming that the system was put in place until the "Queen of England's physical disappearance", because in both cases there is no mention of either "time-bound" condition. Otherwise, one could arbitrarily invent any "time-bound" condition one wanted to for the July 9th, 1977, letter, if such a time-bound condition does not require to even be mentioned by the letter.

Q: Srila Prabhupada's will mentions his initiated disciples. Doesn't that indicate that even in the future everyone will be Prabhupada's disciple?

A: Again, history and context shed light on the situation. Review of the conversations surrounding this event shows that Srila Prabhupada's concern was that the trustees / directors be "initiated devotees", not merely top donors or friends of the movement.

However, one can ask: *But why use the word my? Surely this means that all initiates in the future will be direct disciples of Srila Prabhupada.*

This refers to Srila Prabhupada's Last Will and Testament stating that Directors for ISKCON's permanent temples in India would always be "my initiated disciples", where the "my" referred to Srila Prabhupada. As the question above correctly states, the inclusion of such a provision by Srila Prabhupada *"means that all initiates in the future will be direct disciples of Srila Prabhupada",* i.e. they will be Srila Prabhupada's initiated disciples. The GBC's answer below, confirms that this indeed is the case:

But remember, at the time, everyone was a disciple of Srila Prabhupada. All the names listed as trustees / directors *were* Srila Prabhupada's disciples. Additionally, the future of a world without Srila Prabhupada being physically present had not yet become a reality for his followers. Giriraja Maharaja, who was intimately involved in drafting the will, recalls: *We*

weren't used to thinking like that. In retrospect, it was very naive. Interview / January 26, 1996.

As presented earlier, ultimately, all future initiated devotees *are* Srila Prabhupada disciples in that they are following him and connected to him via the guru-parampara system. In this sense, by the grace of Srila Prabhupada, one can become not only his disciple but at the same time the disciple of Srila Bhaktisiddhanta Sarasvati Thakura, Srila Bhaktivinode Thakura, the six Gosvamis, and all the other acharyas in Srila Prabhupada's line.

Thus, this "non-answer" just states that:

1) We can all become non-initiated disciples of Srila Prabhupada and others in the *parampara*. Which does not even address the fact that the Will specifically states that the Directors must be Srila Prabhupada's *"initiated"* disciples. The fact that one can become the *opposite* – a non-initiated disciple of Srila Prabhupada – does not change the fact that the Will states that one must be an "initiated" disciple of Srila Prabhupada. Thereby, this "answer" just confirms the fact that the GBC has no answer to this requirement given in the Will, and thus the conclusion that "*Surely this means that all initiates in the future will be direct disciples of Srila Prabhupada"*, remains unchallenged and thus stands.

2) It also claimed that the "future of a world without Srila Prabhupada being physically present had not yet become a reality for his followers." However, the slideshow just claimed the opposite. We quoted the slideshow just above stating in relation to the May 28th, 1977, conversation that:

"Srila Prabhupada had personally petitioned the GBC to meet together, decide if there were any important issues that needed further clarification <u>before he departed</u>, and then to come before him to discuss the issues."

And the third question the GBC wrote down to ask was:

"3) In the <u>absence</u> of Srila Prabhupada what is the procedure for first, second and sannyasa initiations?"

And the very first question asked in the May 28th, 1977, conversation, was:

"Then our next question concerns initiations in the future, <u>particularly at that time when you're no longer with us.</u> We want to know how first and second initiation would be conducted."

It seems the slideshow itself is making it clear that the leaders were very aware of a world without Srila Prabhupada, at least when it came to the issue of initiation at the end of May 1977, which was right before the Will was drafted a few days later at the beginning of June.

Q: The will states that the system of management should not change. Doesn't this mean no change from the proxy system established in the July letter?

A: The quote is taken out of context. In the will, system of management refers to the management structure of ISKCON. A change from proxy to regular gurus does not change the operational procedures for the management of ISKCON. Rather, this transition from proxy to regular gurus is the traditional evolution that has taken place since time immemorial when the diksha guru is no longer physically present. At that time the responsibility to carry on the disciple succession is naturally transferred to the shoulders of qualified disciples of the diksha guru.

1) The GBC actually states that what happened in ISKCON with the introduction of its GBC guru system was not at all "traditional", but unique:

"ISKCON's ethos of multiple diksa- *and* siksa-*gurus serving under the auspices of a global managerial board is unique in the history of Vaisnavism"*
(GBC Resolution 318, 2014)

2) The "system of management" means how ISKCON is managed. How someone joins and is inducted into the movement is a key part of how ISKCON is managed. Without this activity, the movement would effectively cease to be a preaching organisation, and lose it very *raison d'etre*. How someone joined and was inducted into the movement changed radically once the simple July 9th, 1977, 'everyone-gets-initiated-in-the-same-way-by-the-same-person' *rtvik* system was replaced by multiple GBC gurus now competing for disciples.

Q: Srila Prabhupada said *When I order, you become guru.* When did he give the order?

A: Taken out of context, the sentence could seemingly point to a future order, but in fact Srila Prabhupada made this statement in the context of the May 28th conversation, as part of a detailed explanation. Just previously in that conversation, Srila Prabhupada had said, *So on my behalf, on my order… Amara ajnaya guru hana. Be actually guru, but by my order.*

1) However, referring to this supposed order for "regular gurus" in the May 28th, 1977, conversation, the slideshow had claimed earlier that:

"His disciples should become regular gurus, with disciples of their own, but only after his departure and only if they were qualified."

The *"amara ajnaya guru hana"* "become guru" order, Srila Prabhupada had previously given without connecting it to departure or being qualified. Rather, Srila Prabhupada uses the order to refer to even children becoming gurus:

"Therefore Caitanya Mahaprabhu… *Yare dekha tare kaha 'krsna'-upadesa*: "You become guru. No qualification required. […] Anyone can do it, even a child."
(Srila Prabhupada, Room Conversation, 26/1/77)

Hence, this is not referring to qualified *diksa* gurus being ordered for when Srila Prabhupada physically departs.

2) Thus, the question still remains: When exactly did Srila Prabhupada give this order for qualified *diksa* gurus for when he physically departed – the supposed "regular gurus" order?:

a) The slideshow is arguing that it is not a "future order".

b) Nor was it given in the May 28th, 1977, conversation itself, because there Srila Prabhupada only says "when I order".

c) And we just saw that it was not Srila Prabhupada's *"amara ajnaya guru hana"* order.

Hence, according to the slideshow, we would still be left with the conclusion that such a *diksa* guru order was never given by Srila Prabhupada.

Q: What about the Topanga tapes? Didn't Tamal Krsna Maharaja reveal that there was a conspiracy to cover up Srila Prabhupada's desire for a proxy system?

A: In the Topanga conversations, Tamal Krsna Maharaja says that it was a mistake to not expand the number of gurus sooner in ISKCON. He concedes that the zonal acharya system was wrong. He says that Srila Prabhupada wanted all his disciples to become qualified and become regular gurus. Tamal Krsna Maharaja never said that Srila Prabhupada wanted a rtvik [proxy] system.

a) Here is what **Tamal Krsna Maharaja ("TKG")** stated on the "Topanga tapes":

"Actually, Prabhupada never appointed any gurus. […] He appointed eleven rtviks*. He never appointed them gurus. Myself and the other GBC have done the greatest disservice to this movement the last three years because we interpreted the appointment of rtviks as the appointment of gurus."*
(TKG, Topanga conversation, 3/12/80)

And here is what the GBC minutes book, which this slideshow promotes, states:

"2) Srila Prabhupada <u>said he will appoint several devotees</u> who shall perform initiations in the future even after his disappearance. The disciples they <u>accept shall be their disciples</u> and Srila Prabhupada will be their grand spiritual master."

Thus, this means that, according to TKG, the GBC minutes book contains a pack of lies.

b) Further, TKG states that the *rtviks* would only stop becoming *rtviks* and turn into *diksa* gurus through their own initiative and desire, and not from being authorised to do so by Srila Prabhupada:

"So it stands to reason that after Prabhupada's departure, they would go on, if they so desired, to initiate."
(TKG, 3/12/80)

Thus, by putting points a) and b) from TKG together, we have that -

a) Srila Prabhupada *only* authorised *rtviks*;

b) These *rtviks* only became *diksa* gurus on their own initiative rather than being authorised to do so by Srila Prabhupada

- which means we are left with the conclusion from TKG that Srila Prabhupada only authorised *rtviks*, period.

Conclusion

The rtvik advocates present a complex set of speculative arguments. But they cannot provide one single piece [sic] evidence to answer the key question: *Where did Srila Prabhupada say that he will continue to accept disciples after his physical departure?*

The fact is that their whole case is built on sand. It is "smoke and mirrors". It is a bluff only.

Repeating the same false point multiple times does not make it any truer. We will repeat the answer to this false point above, which we already gave earlier:

We just noted that when asked how initiations would be conducted "particularly at that time when you're no longer with us", Srila Prabhupada *does* answer with "officiating *acarya*"/"*rtvik*", thereby affirming that he would continue to initiate disciples via *rtviks* after his physical departure. An answer so damning that, as we saw earlier, the GBC was compelled to delete it! In addition, the above argument put forward by the slideshow is a logical fallacy known as "assuming that which needs to be proven":

1) The above argument *assumes* that Srila Prabhupada must stop initiating once he physically departs.

2) Only if such an assumption is true would Srila Prabhupada need to counter such an assumption and state the opposite – that he would *continue* to initiate.

3) But if such an assumption is not correct then there would be nothing for Srila Prabhupada to counter, nor would he need to state that he can *continue* to initiate, when there is no bar on him initiating to begin with.

Yet, the GBC's whole case depends on this unsubstantiated assumption, that the spiritual master must stop initiating as soon as he physically departs. Without it, the GBC has no case. Hence, it is forced to just *assume* that this assertion is true, since it has no evidence to prove that the assertion is true.

The bottom line

Srila Prabhupada was formally asked by the GBC:

Our next question concerns initiations in the future, particularly at that time when you're no longer with us.

Srila Prabhupada answered:

Regular guru/ Grand disciple
Disciple of my disciple

(the end)

No. For those of us who can read, and do not rely on *deleting* Srila Prabhupada's answer, this is what Srila Prabhupada actually answered in response to the above question:

Srila Prabhupada: "Yes. I shall recommend some of you. After this is settled up I shall recommend some of you to act as officiating *acarya*."
Tamal Krsna Goswami: "Is that called *rtvik acarya*?"
Srila Prabhupada: "*Rtvik*. Yes."
(May 28th, 1977, Conversation)

That is actually the "bottom line": the GBC is defeated so badly by Srila Prabhupada's "*rtvik*" answer that it was forced to delete it.

References

"May 28th, 1977 Vrindaban" / Conversation: Srila Prabhupada and GBC members (Folio)

"Disciple of my disciple" (GBC paper)

"Where the rtvik people are wrong" (Jayadvaita swami)

"Rtvik Heresy" pamphlet (Drutakarma dasa and Badrinarayan Swami)

100 refutations of Rtvikism (Compilation by multiple ISKCON authors)

The above are papers the slideshow has drawn upon to compile its arguments. Each one of these papers was already thoroughly defeated at the time, as can be seen at the following links:

"Disciple of my disciple" (GBC paper)
https://www.iskconirm.com/docs/webpages/final_order_still_stands.htm

"Where the rtvik *people are wrong"* (Jayadvaita Swami)
https://www.iskconirm.com/docs/webpages/a_reply_to_jayadvaita_swami.htm

"Rtvik *Heresy"* pamphlet (Drutakarma dasa and Badrinarayan Swami)
https://www.iskconirm.com/docs/webpages/gbc24.htm

100 refutations of Rtvikism (Compilation by multiple ISKCON authors)
https://www.iskconirm.com/docs/webpages/100_deviations.htm

Hence, it is no surprise, as we have just documented, that the slideshow derived from these papers was also thoroughly defeated as well.

Conclusion

Rather than answer *TFO* or the "*Rtvik* theory", we have been able to show that this GBC slideshow merely highlights that:

1) Srila Prabhupada ordered *rtviks* for when he was 'particularly no longer with us'.

2) Srila Prabhupada's *rtvik* system as given on July 9th, 1977, was not terminated on his physical departure.

3) The slideshow does not answer *TFO* and the so-called "*rtvik* theory", but instead presents false statements about it, buttressed with assertions which are not substantiated by statements from Srila Prabhupada.

Consequently, *TFO* still remains standing and undefeated over a quarter of a century after the GBC first attempted to answer it.