

On Apr 13, 2013, at 2:00 AM, "Arcita (das) ACBSP (Los Angeles, CA – USA)" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Maharajas and Prabhus,

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

Attached please find the BBT booklet RESPONSIBLE PUBLISHING in PDF format.

I'm sending this to you at the request of H.G. Vaisesika Prabhu. You are welcome to give this booklet to anyone who requests it or that you think would benefit from reading it.

Your servant,
Arcita Dasa

To unsubscribe from this mailing list, send an email to:

[REDACTED]

<Responsible_Publish#3FE85B4.pdf>

Robert Grant

Subject: FW: Responsible Publishing

From: Ramesvara <[REDACTED]>

Date: April 13, 2013, 3:22:46 PM EDT

To: Ramesvara Dasa [REDACTED]

Subject: Fwd: Responsible Publishing

From: "Robert Grant" <[REDACTED]>

Date: April 13, 2013, 8:44:12 AM EDT

To: "Arcita (das) ACBSP (Los Angeles, CA - USA)"

[REDACTED]
Cc: "Vaisesika (das) ACBSP (Burlingame, CA - USA)"

[REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Responsible Publishing

Hare Krsna. Pamho. AGTSP!

Thank you very much for sending this in PDF format. I have a printout that was given to me some years ago. It's the first thing I read when devotees started questioning me about a changes. The examples given in this paper are excellent examples of the kinds of changes that make sense. As I wrote to Sriman Vaisesika Prabhu, if the changes were limited to obvious omissions or obvious corrections, and did not include tweaking with little or no discernible change in meaning, we might not have had to continually deal with this controversy.

This is the great dilemma for the BBT- how can you be sure that there would never be changes in future generations approved by BBT Trustees and made by future generations of BBT editors? Where is the absolute moment where the change door is slammed closed forever? Because if that door isn't absolutely closed, the entire future of the Hare Krsna Movement and of Srila Prabhupada's mission is at risk.

There are other valid spiritual editing issues to consider than just those illustrated by the good examples and explanations given in the booklet. Playing devil's advocate- suppose someone wanted to write a 50 page booklet exclusively listing every instruction Srila Prabhupada ever gave about the disease of changing, and include verses and purports about Vaisnava literature, even if imperfectly composed, bringing about a revolution in the misguided lives of the people living in materialistic civilizations, and then added a few letters such as "rascal editors", added Prabhupada's instructions about the etiquette of not changing a comma in the books of a great departed Acarya, and finally threw in a few Prabhupada quotes about how his whole mission could be ruined by making changes to his books. And suppose in such a book, all the instructions from Srila Prabhupada on responsible editing were omitted, so that it was completely one sided...

The problem with the "Responsible Publishing" paper is that it is simply not the entire body of instruction, and its critics point out that it is one-sided and obviously leaves out many of Prabhupada's cautionary instructions against unnecessary change,

Several years ago (before I found the 1978-1979 Lilamrita memory transcripts) I took every change in the 2nd Chapter and put them in 3 columns: (i) obviously valid, (ii) needed further clarification to understand the justification, and (iii) seemed to add little or nothing, other than a tweak- compared to the original edition, and therefore seemed unnecessary.

I spent days discussing this with Sriman Dravida Prabhu, which was very helpful as we looked at the BBT site that explains every change, to especially clear up questions from my second category. But I have to tell

you, that after looking carefully at the reasoning behind the changes listed in the 3rd column with a completely open mind, I move very few (if any) out of that category. And the entries in that column represented about 1/3 of the total changes made to that chapter. That analysis with Dravida Prabhu left me with my deepest concern: if the changes didn't have substantial merit but were made anyway, then regardless of the justification of "making it better" the door, the "change disease" as Srila Prabhupada called it, had been dangerously opened for anything to happen in the future after we are all long gone.

That concern naturally should haunt every BBT Trustee who takes the duties of a trustee in the fullest sense that Srila Prabhupada intended – as fiduciaries to protect the precious main asset of the Trust, Srila Prabhupada's books. The Lilamrita interviews I found tell of Srila Prabhupada's direct instructions regarding the size of the books, the artwork to be kept in the books, etc. – things that have already been changed so many times in the past 20 years, without understanding of Prabhupada's orders, that it makes the "official" opening of this "change" door more ominous for the future, in ways we can't even imagine.

As I've written to Sriman Vaisesika Prabhu, his is a very complicated issue, and an absolute position has to be reached so that before we die, we know that within the BBT and ISKCON there could never again be one single change, for any reason, ever made to Srila Prabhupada's books.

I beg to remain your eternally aspiring servant in the service of the BBT,
ramesvara dasa
Sent from my iPad

Robert Grant

Subject: FW: CONFIDENTIAL Responsible Publishing
Attachments: Responsible_Publish#3FE85B4.pdf; ATT01261.htm

From: Ramesvara <[REDACTED]>
Date: April 13, 2013, 3:22:32 PM EDT
To: Ramesvara Dasa <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Fwd: CONFIDENTIAL Responsible Publishing

From: "Robert Grant" <[REDACTED]>
Date: April 13, 2013, 11:11:48 AM EDT
To: <[REDACTED]> Vaisesika Dasa"
<[REDACTED]>
Cc: "Ramesvara Dasa" <[REDACTED]>
Subject: CONFIDENTIAL Responsible Publishing

Hare Krsna. Pamho. AGTSP!

One final thought-

The "Responsible Publishing" (RP) paper has either a significant misleading or a significant historical inaccuracy. There are sites which claim to list more than 5,000 changes. Certainly there were thousands of changes. The RP paper states that every change to the translations was reviewed and approved by the Trustees, leading ISKCON devotees, the GBC, etc. Later the RP cites or implies in its endorsements that all the changes were approved. Of course, NO ONE other than the editors ever saw back in 1981 or 1982 ALL the changes.

As for the changes to the translations, ultimately there was a 5-member GBC / BBT committee charged with the approval, including Satsvarupa, Hridayananda, Bhagavan, Harikesa and myself. For myself, I have always admitted that my great failure as a trustee was not carefully reading every proposed change, and instead, relying on the endorsement of Hridayananda and Satsvarupa- along with Jayadvaita. I only reviewed examples of changes that seemed to be excellent- such as the paper itself includes. I know that in talking years ago with others on that committee, that they also admitted performing only a cursory review of the proposed

changes, being similarly impressed with the dramatic, obvious and excellent samples of proposed changes in a summary paper that we reviewed.

No one back then did their job or acted with full responsibility for what they were endorsing. I assure you that NO ONE on that Committee ever even asked to see all the changes, and we would have been astounded to have learned in 1981 or 1982 that there were thousands, maybe more than 5,000 changes.

I lazily assumed that the work done on manuscripts as close to the original as possible was the only thing that mattered. I failed to consider all the other Prabhupada instructions, the ramifications for making changes if they didn't ultimately change the meaning; the effect of changes that in some cases loses the flavor of the Gita we had been studying for 10 years, and most importantly, that breaks the etiquette of changing a Sampradaya Acaraya's books after His disappearance and opens the "change door" for possible future other changes over the decades and centuries to come.

The RP paper implies that the changes were carefully reviewed and approved throughout the leadership of the BBT, GBC and ISKCON. I am certain that by interviewing all the leaders of that time, we would find most guilty of the same mistake that I made.

It is true to state that the leaders of ISKCON at the time endorsed the changes.

However, it is overtly misleading to state or suggest that the leaders actually performed a careful review. And getting back to the fact that there are thousands of changes, no leader, including the BBT Trustees, was ever shown every single change. No one! That is the sad historical fact...

Your forever aspiring servant,
Ramesvara dasa

Sent from my iPad

Robert Grant

Subject: CONFIDENTIAL. Responsible Publishing

From: Ramesvara <[REDACTED]>

Date: April 14, 2013, 6:54:51 PM EDT

To: "Arcita (das) ACBSP (Los Angeles, CA - USA)" <[REDACTED]>

Cc: "Vaisesika (das) ACBSP (Burlingame, CA - USA)" <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Re: Responsible Publishing

PS

I find it embarrassing that on the site BBTEdit.com, in the section about editing posthumously, the only quote to support touching the works of a departed Acarya is that Srila Jiva Goswami was working posthumously on Bhakti Rasamrita Sindhu.

Seriously- how can any living entity compare themselves to Sri Jiva Goswami, or think because he touched the work of Sri Rupa Gosvami, therefore an editor in the lower stages of bhakti, not yet fully situated in the perfected stages of bhava (what to speak of prema) can touch and change the words of a departed Sampradaya Acarya.

Not a good example in my lowly view- it begs the question of what our editors think of themselves and their level of Krsna Consciousness.

Oh well...

Your lowly servant forever,
ramesvara dasa

Sent from my iPad