On Apr 13, 2013, at 2:00 AM, "Arcita (das) ACBSP (Los

Angeles, CA - USA)"

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

$3LEE$3311;$153113;'IEEQQZESemau to:

<ResponsibIe\_Publish#3FE85B4.pdt>

Robert Grant

Subject: FW: Responsible Publishing

From: Rmsvara

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

To: Ramesvara Dasa-

Subject: Fwd: Responsible Publishing

From: "Robert Grant"

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

To: "Arcita idasi ACBSP ILos Angeles, CA - USA)"

Cc: "Vaisesika idasi ACBSP iiurlingame, CA - USA)"
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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 BET 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 every 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", aded Prabhupada's instructions about

the etiquette of not changing a coma 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 ot 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

it‘s 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 thejustification, 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 BET

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

BET 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 BET,

ramesvara dasa'

Sent from my iPad

Robert Grant 7

Subject: ' FW: CONFIDENTIAL Responsible Publishing

Attachments: Responsible\_Publish#3FE8584.pdf; ATTo1261.htm

From: Ramesvara M

Date: April 13,201

To: Ramesvara Dasa

Subject: Fwd: CONFIDENTIAL Responsible Publishing

From: "Robert Grant"

Date: A 1-i113, 2013,11:11:48 AM EDT

Cc: "Ramesvara Dasa"

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 CBC, 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 theirjob or acted with full responsibility for

what they were endorsing. l 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 BET, CBC 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

BET Trustees, was ever shown every single change. No one! That is

the sad historical fact...

Your forever aspiring servant,

Ramesvara dasa

Sent fiom my iPad

Robert Grant

Subject: CONFIDENTIAL. Responsible Publishing

Date: April 14, 201

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

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

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 J iva 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