



Editorials

NEWS EDITORIALS FEATURES SUN BLOGS CLASSIFIEDS EVENTS RECIPES PodCASTS

Evidence Tampering: Rtvik Sleight of Hand, Part 2

BY: ROCANA DASA

Jul 09, 2011 — CANADA (SUN) — [Revised] As I stated in [Part One](#) of this article, while Dusyanta dasa didn't actually address the reason I mentioned the "rittik" issue in my [original article](#), he did use it as a springboard to introduce some of his own perceptions and realizations. I'd like to thank him for being diligent in presenting these ideas. In receiving some of the previous articles submitted by he and his wife, Ananda devi dasi, it has not been clear to the Sun editors whether he was promoting Rtvik-vada, or some derivation of it.

After a number of email exchanges, but mostly after the publication of his most recent article "[Ritvik or Rittik](#)", I think I understand his position much better. Dusyanta das is not promoting post-samadhi diksa Rtvik initiation on the strength of the July 9th Letter. [And, he is not promoting the 'living guru' conception of connecting to the Sampradaya. Instead, he is promoting something akin to a combination of siksa and the Book Bhagavat connection to the sampradaya.](#) He has not, however, clearly explained how we are to understand the application of diksa, as presented in sastra, in ISKCON. This is particularly evident in this interesting statement, made in his recent article:

"Leaving out the word "henceforward" makes no difference whatsoever to the meaning and definition and application of this process."

Dusyanta prabhu has offered comments on certain technical elements related to the July 9th Letter and the May 28th Room Conversation. Based on the evidence discussed in [Part One](#), when considering technicalities, we must consider that if Srila Prabhupada had studied the July 9th Letter before signing it, one would assume he'd have picked-up the misspelling, "rittik", and would have had it corrected. After all, it is a Sanskrit word, not an unfamiliar English word, and it was particularly emphasized by being put in quotations. Given the fact that Srila Prabhupada did not have it corrected, one might conclude that either the words was just the way he meant it to be, or he thought it wasn't important enough to be corrected.

The latter notion would be quite in conflict with the Rtvik assertion that Srila Prabhupada, by signing the July 9th Letter, was putting in place his full and formal instruction for how initiations were to go on after his departure – a post-samadhi diksa system that can be found nowhere in sastra, and thus represents a sea change in Gaudiya Vaisnava guru-tattva -- all hanging on one word, "henceforward". Of course, the equally important word, "ritvik" doesn't appear in the letter. In its place is the word, "rittik", which Srila Prabhupada did not change. Given the opening this presents for speculation and interpretation, we can understand why the Rtviks have been purposefully falsifying the July 9th Letter text all these years.

In reality, there are many other aspects of the July 9th Letter that are similarly open to discussion, and the same holds true for the May 28th Room Conversation. Dusyanta das has made some interesting assertions in his article, and I will be responding to them in

future articles so that his entire position is properly addressed. His approach in the article is generally to focus on definitions and contextual semantics of the Letter and Conversation, and how they fit into the succession discussion that what was going on in ISKCON at the time.

Likewise, my position in regards to both the May 28th Room Conversation and the July 9th Letter is that they must be consider in context. The circumstances in which they occurred cannot be ignored. A neutral outside observer would naturally study the context and circumstances in which such a conversation and letter took place in order to make sense of it. But unlike Dusyanta, I suggest that a much broader context must be considered than the aspects he presents in his article.

As we know, the July 9th Letter was not written by Srila Prabhupada, it was only signed by him. There is no transcription available of any conversation in which Srila Prabhupada instructed Tamal Krishna Goswami to get on with composing this letter, instructing him as to what the letter should say.

The absoluteness of the May 28th Room Conversation has also been called to question. In fact, the May 28th Conversation has become a critical element in nearly every camp's arguments on ISKCON guru-tattva. Whoever it is that's putting forth a position, you'll find ample references to the May 28th Conversation as evidence in support of their conclusions. My position, however, is not reliant upon either the July 9th Letter or the May 28th Conversation, neither of which serve, either alone or in tandem, as a basis for making a sea change in the Sampradaya's guru-tattva. A change so big as to cancel out, or set aside for countless years all the statements in Sastra on the eternal process of diksa initiation.

Rather, I assert that both the Conversation and the Letter must be understood in context, taking into account things like who the parties were (the pure devotee and his neophyte, ambitious followers); Srila Prabhupada's health at the time; and relevant history, e.g. Srila Bhaktisiddhanta's actions regarding succession, etc.

So before we proceed with our reply to Dusyanta das's comments, which point to just a few aspects of context and circumstance, let us first revisit some of the statements that have been made by the Rtvik camp regarding the May 28th Conversation, which they (and others, including Dusyanta) refer to often as primary evidence in support of their guru-tattva position.

In much that same way that the Rtviks demonstrate an appalling degree of hypocrisy and dishonesty in trumpeting the absoluteness of a July 9th Letter that they have altered to suit themselves – while at the same time preaching "no change, no change, no change", we find that the Rtviks employ a similar kind of sleight of hand when it comes to the May 28th Room Conversation.

If one were to do a Google search, they would be amazed by how many Rtvik-authored documents and postings exist in which they simultaneously insist that the July 9th Letter means what they say it means, and the major corroborating proof of this is the May 28th Room Conversation. Many of these documents also contain reference to *The Final Order*, which the Rtviks embrace as absolute, authoritative, undefeatable proof for the Rtvik position. Yet the author of TFO himself, Krishnakant, has clearly stated that **the May 28th Conversation has been disqualified as a piece of evidence**. The Rtviks themselves have gathered forensic proof that this evidence has been falsified (much like their July 9th Letter), and therefore it is disqualified. Of course, that hasn't stopped Krishnakant or other Rtviks from going right ahead and demanding that the July 9th Letter be accepted as absolute because it is vetted against the May 28th Conversation. Again, this is nothing but hypocrisy and Rtvik sleight of hand.

Following is an excerpt from the article entitled, "[Chakra's 'Army' – Fires Blanks](#)" by Krishnakant (1998):

"For the last twenty years the GBC have relied on just one astra to support their disbanding of the *ritvik* system, and the subsequent transformation of the original

eleven *ritviks* into fully fledged *diksa* gurus ([modifications A and B](#) from 'The Final Order'). That astra was the famous [May 28th conversation](#). Even as recently as last year a GBC paper (*disciple of my disciple*) relied totally on this conversation to support its position. 'The Final Order' discussion paper pointed out that aside from the fact that four different transcripts of this conversation had been offered, and that the GBC had given four different 'official' interpretations of this very same evidence. The conversation itself only factually supported the idea that the *ritvik* system was meant to be continued.

This May 28th astra has now been completely disabled. Under the auspices of the GBC, the tape from which the conversation was extracted was given a preliminary analysis. This analysis showed the recording exhibited '**strong signs suggestive of falsification**'. Some GBC members tried to argue that although parts of the tape may have been edited, the section in question seemed to be all right. When this was put to the forensic examiner himself his response was clear and unequivocal:

"If the copy contains SIGNS SUGGESTIVE OF FALSIFICATION, that copy could not be relied upon as a faithful and accurate rendition of the original."

"If the preliminary analysis discovers any area that is significantly suggestive of falsification, then the ENTIRE recording is in question and a Forensic Analysis should be done".

(N.Perle, 13/10/97 & 14/10/97.

In response to query as to whether **ANY** portion of the May 28th tape can be taken as authentic and '*intact*', after a preliminary analysis had discovered irregularities).

Thus the May 28th conversation, already highly dubious evidence to start with, is now completely inadmissible. The only way this conversation could even be considered, as any type of evidence at all is if a full forensic analysis is done on the **ORIGINAL** tape. For some reason the GBC seem reluctant or incapable of doing this."

So according to the Rtvik pandit Krishnakant himself, in considering the merit of arguments and evidence put forward by the Rtviks, one must take every reference to the May 28th Conversation and judge it based upon the characterizations given above:

"Thus the May 28th conversation, already highly dubious evidence to start with, is now completely inadmissible."

Krishnakant's final remarks in his paper:

"In conclusion, the GBC will need to equip their army with more effective weaponry than this if they have any hope of defeating the ritvik position."

Would be more aptly stated as:

In conclusion, the Rtviks will need to equip their army with more effective weaponry than this if they have any hope of defeating those who have disproved their *ritvik* theory.



| [About](#) | [Submit an Article](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Advertise](#) | [HareKrsna.com](#) |

Copyright 2005,2011, HareKrsna.com. All rights reserved.