

Jahnu Defends Evaders

BY KRISHNAKANT



Apr 12 1999 - In his latest article- ['Krishna Kant - Thrower Of Smokescreens'](#)- H.G. Jahnu prabhu demonstrates just how severely one's ability for rational thought can be damaged by serving the great Masters of Evasion. We should all bear in mind that his previous Master went completely bananas. I sincerely pray the same will not happen to Jahnu himself. He writes:

"Hridayananda Maharaja merely said, 'many dozens.' How does that make 48?"

I said 'at least 48', not exactly 48. Let us simplify things. Conservatively the word 'many' must be at least 4, and since $4 \times 12 = 48$ my statement is surely correct. Indeed most people would think the word 'many' would mean a lot more than four. I was being very generous in allowing Maharaja to get away with just 48 quotes. Is Jahnu incapable of such basic maths, as well as not understanding simple English? Does Jahnu think that the word 'many' can mean *less* than four? If so we should remember this when he says Srila Prabhupada ordered his disciples 'many' times to take disciples, since to Jahnu 'many' may only mean two or three. He says:

"I am quite proud of being the servant of the evaders, for it is true that ISKCON at all costs wishes to evade *ritvikvada*."

Yet the particular Evader Jahnu so faithfully served for years and years went completely bananas, took hundreds of thousands of dollars, and then started seriously blaspheming Srila Prabhupada. What is there to be so proud of? Better to serve the perfect Acharya than an impostor.

"The actual point is what Srila Prabhupada wanted, not that H.H.Hridayananda Maharaja may have exaggerated some numbers to drive home a point."

I agree entirely, all I asked for were the quotes where Srila Prabhupada is clearly referring to all his disciples acting as *diksa* gurus after his departure. Maharaja admitted he exaggerated, and that is fine, I do not hold it against him since we all do it sometimes. Maharaja then reduced his claim to 'many'. I then simply asked him to produce the 'many' which clearly referred to *diksa* after departure. What is wrong with that?

" Mr. Desai wants to make a great case out of the number 48, and he clings to it as if it were a number of great importance and revelation."

The above is rubbish. I was happy to drop the number once Maharaja admitted he had exaggerated. But since he still maintained there were 'many'. I simply requested he send them to me. That's all. I am always willing to be proved wrong or surprised by evidence I may not have seen.

"The fact is that Krishna Kant doesn't have a case and therefore he has to put up smoke screens like that."

How is asking someone to substantiate their claim putting up 'smoke screens'? What is Jahnu talking about here?

"Who cares how many times Srila Prabhupada expressed his desire for his disciples to carry on the disciplic succession? The point is that he wanted his disciples to become gurus, and that he said it many times."

Now Jahnu himself is making the same claim that [H.H. Hridayanada Goswami](#) made. He must be referring to *diksa* guru above, not instructing guru, so now he is making the same claim that Maharaja was unable to substantiate after an entire year with all the disciples and computers at his disposal.

"It is nowhere stated that the spiritual master has to repeat an instruction 48 times. This is yet another example of Mr. Desai trying to impose his own ignorant conditions on Srila Prabhupada."

I never tried to impose any conditions, I simply asked the Maharaja to substantiate his claim, that's all. What is wrong with that? Has Jahnu's training rendered him incapable of rational thought, whereby he simply accepts everything he is told like a robot? No wonder his previous Master's zone is in such a terrible mess. Srila Prabhupada said we should discuss philosophical matters threadbare, yet Jahnu will not allow one single little request for information. This is cult mentality, and will certainly not persuade any sane person.

" KK writes:

"Does Jahnu think he knows better than His Holiness Hridayananda das Goswami? In an instant Jahnu can produce relevant quotes Maharaja could not give in an entire year!?"

Reply:

It seems there is no end to the importance Mr. Desai likes to place on himself. Did it ever occur to him that Hridayananda Maharaja simply doesn't want to waste his time with KK , and is just politely putting him off? Does KK think that Hridayananda Maharaja has nothing better to do than produce quotes for his pleasure? If it were not so sad it would be hilarious. Krishna Kant Desai, a new bhakta, thinks he is in a position to tell Hridayananda Maharaja what Srila Prabhupada wanted, demanding of him endless quotes to prove him wrong. Just see how powerfully Krishna's illusory potency is acting.

Oh dear, what a strange distorted mind Jahnu appears to possess. He seems to believe that there is something fundamentally wrong in asking someone to substantiate a claim. A claim that Maharaja in any case admitted was false. Above we see Jahnu also seems to think he can read Maharaja's mind.

"Why should Maharaja feel compelled to waste his time digging up quotes that have already been presented to KK countless of times?"

I have only seen half a dozen quotes which come anywhere close to saying what Maharaja claimed. These were private unpublished letters and a conversation with a one-time visitor to the temple. That is all I have seen. If there are more then I have not seen them *once*, what to speak of 'countless times'. There is no reason why Maharaja should feel in any way compelled to reply to someone so insignificant as myself, however he did reply, and he did keep promising to send me the illusive 'many' quotes.

"KK, to begin with, couldn't care less about quotes from Srila Prabhupada. He is obviously not the least interested in getting to the truth of the matter, otherwise how can he keep bouncing back at you every time you defeat him with loads of direct quotes from Srila Prabhupada?"

Now Jahnu is once more repeating the claim made by Maharaja, only using the word 'loads' instead of 'many'. I have seen half a dozen, which in the less generous real world is neither 'loads' nor 'many'. If there are many more which explicitly refer to *diksa* after departure then I am always open to correction. If I 'couldn't care less', why would I waste my time asking for them? I am also very busy.

"Krishna Kant has tried to make the case that every time Srila Prabhupada stated in his letters and lectures that he wanted his disciples to succeed him as gurus he is only talking about *siksa*-gurus."

I have never said this. I have just admitted that there are half a dozen occasions where *diksa* is being referred to after departure.

"In this way KK offensively suggests that Srila Prabhupada didn't know how to express himself very clearly, that he kept reiterating a redundant point."

I have never suggested or implied any such thing.

"It was already understood that Srila Prabhupada's disciples were *siksa*-gurus. It is not something they had to wait until his departure to become. They were already acting as *siksa*-gurus."

To be a proper *siksa* guru is no easy thing. It means strictly following the instructions of the Spiritual Master. Srila Prabhupada never said his disciples had to wait till after his departure to act as *acaraya* in this way. I agree with Jahnu on that. The very fact that most of the orders to become guru do not mention departure, but are immediate, is the very feature which eliminates them as evidence supporting Jahnu's position (*taking into account the 'law of disciplic succession'*).

"Srila Prabhupada told one of his disciples, that he could initiate new candidates, but that the etiquette was such that he shouldn't do it while his own spiritual master (SP) was still present. If Srila Prabhupada were only talking about his disciples becoming *siksa*-gurus, how does this statement make sense?"

It would not. Jahnu is obviously talking about one of the handful of private letters to ambitious disciples I have already conceded refer to *diksa*. We conceded this way back in 1996 in 'The Final Order' which Jahnu was supposed to have read in order to do his pointless 'point for point rebuttal'.

"Despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary Mr. Desai maintains that the *diksa*-guru, at the time of initiation, doesn't need to be physically present on the planet. But Srila Prabhupada says:

"Krsna, He is within our heart. Hrady antah sthah. Therefore, as soon as we become a little inclined towards Krsna, then from within our heart He gives us favorable instruction so that we can gradually make progress, gradually. Krsna is the first spiritual master, and when we become more interested, then we have to go to a physical spiritual master. That is enjoined in the next verse. Tad viddhi pranipatena pariprasnena sevaya, upadeksyanti te jnanam jnaninas tattva- darsinah."

Here Srila Prabhupada clearly says that you need a physical (living) guru. Krishna Kant has tried to brush this quote off with the explanation that Srila Prabhupada is not speaking about a *diksa*-guru, but about a *siksa*-guru."

I have never said the above quote does not refer to *diksa*. Why is Jahnu so unable to properly understand anything, or correctly present his opponents actual statements? Nor does Srila Prabhupada say the 'physical' guru must be 'physically present on the planet' at the time of initiation. The quote simply does not say what Jahnu wants it to say. We dealt with this objection in ['The Final Order'](#) way back in 1996:

"On three occasions Srila Prabhupada states that you need a physical guru, and yet your whole position rests on the idea that you do not."

"Therefore, as soon as we become a little inclined towards Krsna, then from within our heart he gives us favourable instruction so that we can gradually make progress, gradually. Krsna is the first spiritual master, and when we become more interested then we have to go to a physical spiritual master."
(*SP Bg. Lecture, 14/8/66, New York*)

"Because Krsna is situated in everyone's heart. Actually, he is the spiritual master, *Caitya-Guru*. So in order to help us, he comes out as physical spiritual master." (*SP S.B. Lecture, 28/5/74, Rome*)

"Therefore God is called *Caitya-Guru*, the spiritual master within the heart. And the physical spiritual master is God's mercy [...] He will help you from within and without, without in the physical form of the spiritual master, and within as the spiritual master within the heart." (*SP Room conversation, 23/5/74*)

Srila Prabhupada used the term physical guru when explaining that in the conditioned stage we cannot rely purely on the *Caitya*-Guru or Supersoul for guidance. It is imperative that we surrender to the external manifestation of the Supersoul. This is the *diksa* Guru. Such a Spiritual Master, who is considered a resident of the spiritual world, and an intimate associate of Lord Krsna, makes his physical appearance just to guide the fallen conditioned souls. Often such a Spiritual Master will write physical books; he will give lectures which can be heard with physical ears and be recorded on physical tape machines; he may leave physical murtis and even a physical GBC to continue managing everything once he has physically departed.

However what Srila Prabhupada **never** taught was that this **physical guru** must also be **physically present** in order to act as guru. As we have pointed out, were this the case, then currently no-one could be considered his disciple. If the guru must always be physically present in order for transcendental knowledge to be imparted, then once Srila Prabhupada left the planet all his disciples should have taken 're-initiation'. Furthermore thousands of Srila Prabhupada's disciples were initiated having had no contact with the *physical body* of Srila Prabhupada. Yet it is accepted that they approached, enquired from, surrendered to, served and took initiation from the *physical* spiritual master. No one is arguing that their initiations were null and void by dint of the above three quotes.

Jahnu continues:

"But if Srila Prabhupada is speaking about a *siksa*-guru why does he emphasize the guru's need to be physical? Everyone knows that the *siksa*-guru does not have to be physical, that he can also act after his departure, just like in the case of Srila Prabhupada, who is still acting as everyone's *siksa*-guru. This is the actual issue that Krishna Kant continuously tries to avoid."

The issue Jahnu constantly avoids is that since, on the absolute platform, *siksa* and *diksa* are non-different; if the *siksa* guru need not be physically present, then neither does the *diksa* guru. If this were *not* the case then Jahnu would have to argue that all the following quotes, where Srila Prabhupada discounts physical presence, are *only* referring to *siksa* not *diksa*. Let us see how Jahnu evades the following:

***Physical* presence is immaterial. Presence of the transcendental sound received from the Spiritual Master should be the guidance of life. That will make our spiritual life successful. If you feel very strongly about my absence you may place my pictures on my sitting places and this will be source of inspiration for you.**

(Letter to Brahmananda and other students, 19/1/67)

But always remember that I am always with you. As you are always thinking of me, I am always thinking of you also. Although *physically* we are not together, we are not separated spiritually. So we should be concerned only with this spiritual connection.

(Letter to Gaurasundara, 13/11/69)

So we should associate by vibration, and not by the physical presence. That is real association.

(Lectures SB, 68/08/18)

There are two conceptions, the *physical* conception and the vibrational conception. The *physical* conception is temporary. The vibrational conception is eternal. [...] When we feel separation from Krsna or the Spiritual Master, we should just try to remember their words or instructions, and we will no longer feel that separation. Such association with Krsna and the Spiritual Master should be association by vibration not physical presence. That is real association.

(Elevation to Krsna Consciousness, (BBT 1973), Page 57)

Although according to material vision His Divine Grace Srila Bhaktisiddhanta Sarsavati Thakura Prabhupada passed away from this material world on the last day of December 1936, I still consider his Divine Grace to be always present with me by his *vani*, his words. There are two ways of association - by *vani* and by *vapuh*. *vani* means words and *vapuh* means physical presence. *Physical* presence is sometimes appreciable and sometimes not, but *vani* continues to exist eternally. Therefore, one must take advantage of the *vani*, not the physical presence.

(CC, Antya 5 Conclusion)

Therefore we should take advantage of the *vani*, not the physical presence.

(Letter to Suci Devi Dasi, 4/11/75)

I shall remain your personal guidance, physically present or not physically present, as I am getting guidance from my Guru Maharaja.

(Room Conversation, Vrindavan, 14/7/77)

It is sometimes misunderstood that if one has to associate with persons engaged in devotional service, he will not be able to solve the economic problem. To answer this argument, it is described here that one has to associate with liberated persons not directly, physically, but by understanding, through philosophy and logic, the problems of life.

(SB 3:31:48)

I am always with you. Never mind if I am physically absent.

(Letter to Jayananda, 16/9/67)

Paramananda: *We're always feeling your presence very strongly, Srila Prabhupada, simply by your teachings and your instructions. We're always meditating on your instructions.*

Srila Prabhupada: **Thank you. That is the real presence. Physical presence is not important.**

(Room Conversation, Vrindavana, 6/10/77)

You write that you have desire to avail of my association again, but why do you forget that you are always in association with me? When you are helping my missionary activities I am always thinking of you, and you are always thinking of me . That is real association. Just like I am always thinking of my Guru Maharaja at every moment, although he is not *physically* present, and because I am trying to serve him to my best capacity, I am sure he is helping me by his spiritual blessings. So there are two kinds of association: *physical* and preceptorial. Physical association is not so important as preceptorial association.

(Letter to Govinda Dasi, 18/8/69)

As far as my blessing is concerned, it does not require my physical presence. If you are chanting Hare Krsna there, and following my instructions, reading the books, taking only Krsna prasadam etc., then there is no question of your not receiving the blessings of Lord Caitanya, whose mission I am humbly trying to push on.

(Letter to Bala Krsna, 30/6/74)

'Anyone who has developed unflinching faith in the Lord and the Spiritual Master can understand the revealed scripture unfolding before him'. So continue your present aptitude and you will be successful in your spiritual progress. I am sure that even if I am not physically present before you, still you will be able to execute all spiritual duties in the matter of Krsna Consciousness, if you follow the above principles.

(Letter to Subala, 29/9/67)

So although a *physical* body is not present, the vibration should be accepted as the presence of the Spiritual Master, vibration. What we have heard from the Spiritual Master, that is living.

(General lectures, 69/01/13)

Devotee: *...so sometimes the Spiritual Master is far away. He may be in Los Angeles. Somebody is coming to Hamburg Temple. He thinks 'How will the Spiritual Master be pleased?'*

Srila Prabhupada: **Just follow his order, Spiritual Master is along with you by his words. Just like my Spiritual Master is not physically present, but I am associating with him by his words.**

(SB Lectures, 71/08/18)

Just like I am working, so my Guru Maharaja is there, Bhaktisiddhanta Sarasvati. Physically he may not be, but in every action he is there. To serve master's word is more important than to serve *physically*.

(Room Conversation, Vrindavan, 2/5/77)

So that is called Prakata, *physically* present. But that does not mean, Krsna is dead or God is dead. That does not mean, Prakata or Aprakata, physically present or not present, it does not matter.

(Lectures SB 73/12/11)

So, spiritually, there is no question of separation, even *physically* we may be in far distant place.

(Letter to Syama Dasi, 30/08/68)

I went to your country for spreading this information of Krsna Consciousness and you are helping me in my mission, although I am not physically present there but spiritually I am always with you.

(Letter to Nandarani, Krsna Devi and Subala, 3/10/67)

We are not separated actually. There are two - *vani* or *Vapuh* - so *Vapu* is *physical* presence and *vani* is presence by the vibration, but they are all the same.

(Letter to Hamsadutta, 22/6/70)

So in the absence of physical presentation of the spiritual master, the *vaniseva* is more important. My Spiritual Master Sarsavati Goswami, may appear to be physically not present, but still because I try to serve his instruction, I never feel separated from him.

(Letter to Karandhara, 22/8/70)

I also do not feel separation from my Guru Maharaja. When I am engaged in his service, his pictures give me sufficient strength. To serve master's word is more important than to serve him *physically*.

(Letter to Syamasundara, 19/7/70)

I hope the above clear evidence will help Jahnu to stop defending the Evaders, and start serving Srila Prabhupada, our *diksa* guru.