

Dear Maharajas, Prabhus and Didis,  
Dandavat pranamas. Jaya Sri Sri Guru and Gauruanga. The following is a brilliant article written by Sripad Jnanadas Vanacari, a senior disciple of Srila Prabhupada who is now preaching throughout Russia on behalf of Srila Prabhupada and Srila Narayana Maharaja. Srila Maharaja was very happy to hear that Jnana das prabhu was writing this article on the actual position of Prabhupada and all pure devotees like him. As this important subject is so misunderstood at present, on his visit to Moscow two months ago, Srila Maharaja requested Jnanadas prabhu to post it on internet. If you have any questions, you are most welcome to write to Jnanadas prabhu directly at [jdd@eccosse.net](mailto:jdd@eccosse.net), or to myself.  
Your aspiring servant, Syamarani dasi

## **Direct Manifestation of Krsna**

by Jnanadas

In a previous article, Dravida Prabhu criticised Srila Narayana Maharaja for saying that Srila Prabhupada is omniscient, and maintained that we should therefore avoid Srila Narayana Maharaja's association. Now he has tried to defend his position against statements made by Srila Narayana Maharaja's disciple H.H. Aranya Maharaja. It is ironic that, whereas ISKCON devotees formerly criticised Srila Narayana Maharaja for supposedly minimising Srila Prabhupada, now they criticise him for glorifying Srila Prabhupada. Many critics of Srila Narayana Maharaja have written articles and papers trying to show that his philosophy is different from Srila Prabhupada's. Their attempts have failed, and they have ended up showing that it is actually their own philosophy that is different from Srila Prabhupada's. Dravida Prabhu's article is another in this series.

Dravida Prabhu states that the implication of Srila Prabhupada's omniscience is "horrendous". He writes: "Concerning omniscience, if Srila Prabhupada was omniscient during his manifest pastimes, then he must have known all the details of the child abuse taking place in gurukula. This horrendous conclusion, inevitably flowing from Prabhupada's supposed omniscience, was what prompted me to raise this issue in the first place in 'Two Troubling Issues.'"

---

He elaborates a little later: "Since we admit that Srila Prabhupada, while on the planet, COULD have been omniscient by Krsna's grace, why expend so much energy insisting that Srila Prabhupada was not omniscient? Again, because to accept his omniscience means to believe that he knew every detail of the child abuse that occurred in the 70's but did not remove all the perpetrators, that he knew every detail of the rampant illicit sex on the infamous women's traveling parties but did not shut them down, that he knew beforehand that Gaurasundara dasa would sell the Hawaii temple building in 1973 but did nothing about it, and on and on into absurdity and aparadha."

Dravida Prabhu states that it is horrendous, offensive and absurd to think that Srila Prabhupada would have allowed these things to go on, but his position is empirical, rather than sastric. He does not give scriptural evidence in favor of his conclusion. Now let us consider his logic.

Before going on, I want to say that this is a very delicate subject matter. I have no personal experience of abuse of the sort that is involved here, but I honestly try to maintain respect and sympathy for those who have suffered or are suffering. I hope that I may be forgiven if it appears that I lack the feelings that are proper in analyzing the philosophical background of this very distasteful and tragic subject matter.

While I was in Boston in the early 80's, the newspaper carried a story about a child with a rare and outlandish disease that caused him to die of old age when he was only 12. The father, a rabbi, wrote a book trying to show that God couldn't possibly exist. His theme was, "Why would God let bad things happen to good people?" Dravida Prabhu is using precisely the same argument.

Let us set aside for a moment the question of Srila Prabhupada's status, and ask ourselves whether Krsna knew that these things were going on. If we accept that Krsna is omniscient, then we have to accept that He did. Could He have prevented them from happening if He had wanted to? Yes, because we know that He is omnipotent. In fact, since not a blade of grass moves without His consent (*mayadhyaksena prakrtih*), Krsna not only knew that these things were happening; He is the ultimate cause of all causes, and therefore caused them to happen. We have to admit, then, that this was Krsna's will. If it were not, then He would have intervened directly, or through someone else's agency. But He did not.

God, Krsna, is all-good, yet He allows terrible things to happen to good devotees. I am in Russia at the moment, and I have heard at first-hand some of the things that happened to the brave senior devotees here, who were imprisoned, abused and tortured for their faith. How could Krsna allow that to happen? There are two possible reasons why devotees suffer. Sometimes they may be put into suffering through no fault of their own, and although their past karma does not demand it. Faced with the inexplicable sufferings of the Pandavas, Bhismadeva could only conclude that this was due to the influence of time. "O King, no one can know the plan of the Lord. Even though great philosophers inquire exhaustively, they are bewildered."

The other possible conclusion is that devotees (including apparently innocent children) suffer abuse because of very heavy karma that they are carrying with them. Srila Prabhupada has explained how we should think in these circumstances: *tat te 'nukampa su-samiksamanah*. In this connection, Srila Narayana Maharaja has put forward a simple explanation: Srila Prabhupada saw that these children had very severe karma, which would demand this kind of suffering. However, while they were undergoing such unspeakable distress, at least they were in a devotional environment, and receiving incalculable benefit.

"If those who attended gurukulas, who performed bad activities in past lives, had not come in contact with Srila Swami Maharaja -- and instead of going to gurukula they had gone to any other school -- the same karmic reaction would have come to them because of their past

impressions. In fact, much, much worse things would have happened to them, and they would not have had the good opportunity to associate with a pure devotee -- to receive prasada from his hand, to receive so much mercy from him, and to have the chance to take up devotional activities later on. . . . Considering all these points we can understand that Prabhupada did not do anything improper. He was sarvajna, and he wanted to do good for all. It was not the fault of Prabhupada; it was the fault of their bad karma of past births and also this birth. We should realize this." [Srla Narayana Maharaja, Lecture, France, 1998]

This is in line with the teachings of Srila Prabhupada, who has also confirmed that we cannot diminish the painful effects of people's past karma.

"People are becoming now sympathetic that 'Whatever is done is done. Let this man be saved.' This kind of sympathy is no good. People are taking sympathy. A man is suffering from certain disease or certain miserable condition. They want to ameliorate it. This kind of sympathy is not sanctioned. He should suffer so that the reaction of his sinful activities in the past life should be diminished. If he does not suffer, then he will have to suffer more, continually, because he is condemned to suffer so much. If you minimize it now, that does not mean he will not suffer. He will suffer in his next life. . . . So how can you give relief to the suffering person who is condemned? If in your state law a man is suffering in the prison and if you feel sympathy or you may try to give him release and get him out by some hook and crook means, then both of you will be punished. Is it not? So how can you avoid the punishment by God's law?" [S.B. Lecture 1970, 701106SB.BOM]

Dravida Prabhu considers that Srila Prabhupada must necessarily have intervened if he had known what was going on, and that the fact that he did not intervene absolutely proves that he did not know, and is therefore not omniscient. This conclusion is faulty. If a person is destined to suffer because of their karma, what would be the point of Srila Prabhupada intervening? If something is Krsna's will, there is no reason to suppose that Srila Prabhupada would intervene. It is not necessarily true that Srila Prabhupada must necessarily have intervened if he had known the whole situation.

Srla Narayana Maharaja's instructions make perfect sense, and Dravida Prabhu's empirical arguments against Srila Prabhupada's omniscience are completely invalid. He is taking his own emotional response to the situation as absolute, which it is not. He has unjustly criticized Srila Narayana Maharaja, saying that he is offensive, and should be avoided.

In fact, Dravida Prabhu is criticising, not only Srila Narayana Maharaja, but Krsna as well. Dravida Prabhu says that it is horrendous, absurd and offensive to think that Srila Prabhupada would not have intervened. This is philosophically incorrect. Hence, Dravida Prabhu is implying that Krsna, who allowed this to go on, has a horrendous and absurd attitude towards the gurukula devotees who suffered this abuse.

Now let us examine the question from a sastric point of view. Dravida Prabhu puts forward his scenario to explain how Srila Prabhupada could be aware of things going on all over the planet without actually being omniscient. He writes: "Suppose I'm in Los Angeles in 1975, offering my obeisances to Srila Prabhupada, who's in India. Is the Supersoul in my heart not

hearing me? Can He not convey my devotion and thoughts to Srila Prabhupada? Of course He can. But can the Supersoul also choose NOT to reveal certain things to Srila Prabhupada for His own reasons? Of course He can. So Srila Prabhupada could hear my prayers and obeisances without being omniscient (literally knowing everything)."

Now, supposing that I (unqualified as I am) were acting as a (very low-grade) guru, and some devotees were trying to advance under my "insufficient guidance". Dravida Prabhu's scenario would describe the process by which I might or might not be aware of my disciple's devotion, for it is a description of how Supersoul might interact with an ordinary person like myself who took up these duties. I would have to depend on Supersoul to inform me of what my disciples were saying, doing, thinking, praying, offering etc., because I cannot know these things directly myself. However, Srila Prabhupada has stated that he is not limited in this way:

Bharadvaja: I understand, Srila Prabhupada, that the pure devotee can be as pervasive as Supersoul? By the mercy of Supersoul, he can be present in many places at once?

Prabhupada: Yes. By the grace of Krsna, a devotee can become anything.

Duryodhana-guru: So in other words that means the pure devotees can be omniscient?

Prabhupada: Everything. God is omniscient, so a pure devotee can become omniscient by the grace of God.

[Morning Walk Los Angeles, June 8, 1976 760608MW.LA]

Srila Prabhupada is not an ordinary person; he is "as good as God", so why should he have to depend on Supersoul, as ordinary conditioned living beings do? It is clear from Srila Prabhupada's own statements that this is not the process by which he accepted offerings. Dravida Prabhu says that Supersoul informed Srila Prabhupada about offerings, but according to Srila Prabhupada, when bhoga is offered, he personally offers it to Krsna:

"But offering the prasadam to present everything before the spiritual Master whose picture is also in the altar, means that the spiritual Master will take care of offering the foodstuff to the Lord." [Letter to Harer Nama: 68-05-28]

It was not (and is not) that Supersoul told him about our offerings; he accepts directly.

Q: In some of our temples, such as Vrndavana, the murti of Your Divine Grace has been installed and they are offering prasadam. So is it the same, that the prasadam is accepted by the guru?

Prabhupada: Yes. Saksad-dharitvena samasta-sastraih. Guru is nondifferent from Krsna. That is accepted by all the sastra. Saksad-dharitvena samasta sastraih ("It is said") that bhavyata eva sadbhiih, "and those who are advanced devotees, they accept it like that." [Nairobi October 27th 1975]

Srila Prabhupada made it clear that his murti was as potent as any other Deity:

"The murti of the spiritual Master should be treated as good as the Deity. Saksad-dharitvena samasta-sastraih, uktas tatha bhavyata eva sadbhiih/kintu prabhoh yah priya eva tasya,

The guru should be treated as good as God. This is stated in all the sastras. The difference is that God is master-God and guru is servant-God. So the installation ceremony for such a murti should be similar to that done for other Deities." [Letter to Karandhara: 76-01-29]

Srila Prabhupada's picture is also non-different from himself.

"There is no difference between me and my picture. . . . The name and picture are as good as the person in spiritual world." [Letter to Jadurani: 72-09-04]

"Next you ask if I am present in my picture and form? Yes. In form as well as in teachings." [Letter to Tusta Krishna: 72-12-14]

Dravida Prabhu's scenario depicts Srila Prabhupada as taking help from Supersoul, but Srila Prabhupada has stated that the spiritual master is himself a manifestation of Supersoul:

"Thus the spiritual master is not different from the Supersoul sitting within the heart." [S.B. 4.28.52, purport]

"So this Paramatma is also incarnation of God. And the same Paramatma, when He comes before you, being very much merciful upon you, to teach you from outside -- that is guru." [S.B. Lecture, 1972: 721001SB.LA]

"The spiritual master is external manifestation of the Supersoul." [Letter to Rupanuga: 72-02-22]

It is stated in many places that the spiritual master is a direct manifestation of Krsna, and it is also stated that he is a plenary manifestation. In Srila Prabhupada's purport to *Adi-lila*, 1.34, he writes, "Tat-prakasan [previously translated as 'plenary portions'] indicates the direct manifestation of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Nityananda Prabhu, and the initiating spiritual master." In *Adi-lila* 1.44, Sri Krsnadasa Kaviraja Gosvami writes:

"Although I know that my spiritual master is a servitor of Sri Caitanya, I know Him also as a plenary manifestation of the Lord." {C.c. A.l. 1.44}

The dictionary definition of 'plenary' is "Complete, entire, perfect, not deficient in any element or respect; absolute, unqualified." Srila Prabhupada writes in his purport:

"Every living entity is essentially a servant of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and the spiritual master is also His servant. Still, the spiritual master is a direct manifestation of the Lord. WITH THIS CONVICTION, A DISCIPLE CAN ADVANCE IN KRSNA CONSCIOUSNESS. The spiritual master is non-different from Krsna because he is a manifestation of Krsna." [A.l. 1.44, purport]

In the next verse (1.45), we read that, according to all the scriptures, the guru is *krsna-rupa*, the form of Krsna, and Krsna, in the form of the spiritual master, gives mercy to the devotees. In his purport, Srila Prabhupada writes:

"The relationship of a disciple with his spiritual master is as good as his relationship with the Supreme Lord. A spiritual master always represents himself as the humblest servitor of the

Personality of Godhead, but the disciple must look upon him as THE MANIFESTED REPRESENTATION of Godhead. [Adi 1.45, purport]

In the purport to A.l. 1.46, we read:

"Only out of His immense compassion does the Personality of Godhead reveal Himself as the spiritual master. . . . He is the Supreme Personality of Servitor Godhead. It is worthwhile to take shelter of such a steady devotee, who is called asraya-vigraha, or THE MANIFESTATION OR FORM OF THE LORD of whom one must take shelter."

As regards the instructing spiritual master, Srila Krsnadasa Kaviraja Gosvami writes in Adi-lila, 1.47 that the siksa-guru is 'krsnera svarupa' or Krsna's svarupa (i.e. original, spiritual nature), with two forms, namely the indwelling Supersoul and the best of devotees. This means that the bhakta-srestha form is not less than the antaryami form.

Srila Prabhupada has confirmed these instructions in many places:

"The spiritual master as the VISIBLE MANIFESTATION OF KRSNA is necessary, therefore, to direct the devotee on behalf of the Supreme Personality of Godhead." [Nectar of Devotion, Chapter 14]

In a lecture he explained how Krsna manifests Himself as the spiritual master:

"So in the Caitanya-caritamrta it is also said that spiritual master is the direct manifestation of Krsna. KRSNA COMES BEFORE THE DEVOTEE AS SPIRITUAL MASTER just like sun enters your room by the sunshine. Although the sun does not enter your room or your city or your country -- he is so many millions and millions of miles away -- still, he can enter everywhere by his potency, the sunshine. Similarly, Krsna enters everywhere by His different potencies." [General Lecture, 1967: 670316PU.SF]

The spiritual master is a manifestation of Krsna's mercy, and the full mercy of Krsna is to appear before us PERSONALLY. The true acarya is a manifestation of Krsna's mercy in a very strong sense.

"Only out of His immense compassion does the Personality of Godhead reveal Himself as the spiritual master." [A.l. 1.46, purport]

"The true acarya, the spiritual master of the entire world, must be considered an incarnation of Krsna's mercy. Indeed, he is personally embracing Krsna." [Antya-lila, 7.12, purport]

Krsna's mercy on the fallen souls is His most important glory [Krsna, Chapter 86], and the bona fide acarya is thus the incarnation of Krsna's most important glory.

At the same time, we have to understand the philosophy very clearly. It is Mayavada philosophy to think that the spiritual master is identical with Krsna Himself in every respect. The spiritual master is a manifestation of Krsna as SERVITOR Personality of Godhead.

"The spiritual master is called sevaka-bhagavan, the servitor Personality of Godhead, and Krsna is called sevya-bhagavan, the Supreme Personality of Godhead who is to be worshiped. The spiritual master is the worshiper God, whereas the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Krsna, is the worshipable God." [S.B. 7.15.27, purport]

Bhagavan means one who possesses six opulences in full, so sevya-bhagavan must also possess these opulences, including full knowledge.

To say that Srila Prabhupada did not know about events in his movement is to say that he is ignorant:

"When an actual fact is unknown to a certain person, this is called ignorance or lack of knowledge." [Krsna, Chapter 86]

This ignorance is a defect of materially conditioned souls, but no aspect of the pure Vaisnava acarya's appearance, body, mind or activities is in any way material. The bona fide acarya's identity is spiritual.

"The spiritual master is always considered either one of the confidential associates of Srimati Radharani or a manifested representation of Srila Nityananda Prabhu." {A.1. 1.46, purport]

He appears in the material world through the agency of the internal potency.

"The Lord comes to this material world through the agency of His internal potency, and similarly, when a devotee or associate of the Lord descends to this material world, HE DOES SO THROUGH THE ACTION OF THE SPIRITUAL ENERGY." [S.B. 7.1.35, purport]

He is completely spiritually situated, he does not have a material body, and all his activities are spiritual, not material.

---

"Such a person is an eternally liberated associate of the Lord, and his body is completely spiritualized. Although he is visible to material eyes, he is spiritually situated, and all his activities are spiritual. By the will of Krsna, such a devotee is understood to possess a spiritual body." [Antya-lila, 5.49-50]

The devotee lives in his spiritual body, and not his material body:

"An advanced devotee, therefore, does not live within the material body but within his spiritual body, just as a dry coconut lives detached from the coconut husk, even though within the husk. The pure devotee's body is therefore called cin-maya-sarira" (spiritualized body). [S.B. 4.22.26, purport]

Although we think we see the movement of the pure devotee, actually what we see is not his movement at all:

"Just like the example is given of the shining moon covered by the cloud. When the cloud moves along with the peeping moonshine, it appears that the moon is moving. Anyone who has seen such movement of cloud in the sky must have this experience. So, the moving of the cloud may appear to the layman's eyes as moving of the moon, but that is not a fact. Similarly, **THE MOVING OF THE BODY OF THE PURE DEVOTEE IS NOT THE MOVING OF THE PURE DEVOTEE.**" [Letter to Hamsaduta: 70-01-23]

One cannot use empirical observations of the spiritual master's external activities to draw conclusions about his inner state. This procedure is completely invalid.

"It is said, vaisnavera kriya-mudra vijne na bujhaya: even the most learned man depending on direct perception of knowledge cannot understand the activities of a Vaisnava." [C.C. M.I. 7.66, purport]

Therefore we have to understand the qualities of those who are liberated from those who are liberated. Srila Prabhupada explains that material defects are absent in those who are liberated:

"Such liberated persons as Vyasadeva are perfect **NOT ONLY BY THE POWER OF VISION AND WISDOM**, but also in aural reception, in thinking, feeling and all other sense activities." [S.B. 1.5.13, purport]

"Liberated means perfect knowledge, perfect vision. That is liberation." [S.B. Lecture, 1974: 740119SB.HAW]

Srila Prabhupada confirms that we only accept knowledge from one who is in full knowledge, free from defects. (Thus, we can understand that he is himself full in knowledge and free from defects):

"Therefore we should accept knowledge from such a person who is beyond these four defects of conditional life. What is that? Illusion, mistake, cheating, and imperfectness. ... That means tri-kala-jna. Mahamuni, he is liberated. He is an incarnation of God. He knows past, present, future, and everything. That knowledge is perfect. One who knows past, present, and future perfectly, we should take knowledge from him. That is our Krsna consciousness movement, that **WE DON'T ACCEPT KNOWLEDGE FROM A PERSON WHO IS DEFECTIVE IN SO MANY WAYS.**" [S.B. Lecture, 1971: 710816SB.LON]

It must be literally true that the pure devotee possesses all knowledge, because he possesses all eight yogic siddhis.

"A person who is cent-percent engaged in the service of the Lord is the emblem of all knowledge. Such a devotee of the Lord in full perfection of devotional service is also perfect by the qualification of the Personality of Godhead. As such, **THE EIGHTFOLD PERFECTIONS**



OF MYSTIC POWER (asta-siddhi) constitute VERY LITTLE OF HIS GODLY OPULENCE.  
[SB 1.5.6]

Srila Prabhupada also confirmed that the compiler of sastra must be tri-kala-jna:

"Sastra means tri-kala-jna. The writer of sastra should be a full cognizant of past, present, and future. That is called unmistakable. Past, present, and future." [S.B. Lecture, 1972: 720930SB.LA]

"Tri-kala-jna. The sastrakara, or the compiler of the sastra, must be liberated person so that he can describe past, present and future." [S.B. Lecture, 1973: 731224SB.LA]

Here is a summary of various statements made by Srila Prabhupada about sastra. "It is sabda, Vedic or transcendental literature, the infallible revealed scriptures, which are above the defects of conditioned life, and which contain the statements of Bhagavan and His representatives (the sadhus), and descriptions of their activities. We cannot throw sastra away, because it is not temporary, but for all time. It is enunciated by sadhu, and rules us by giving regulated life. We can consult it and it will guide us for the ultimate goal and perfection of life." This definition of sastra certainly applies to Srila Prabhupada's books, and we must therefore accept that he is tri-kala-jna.

Dravida Prabhu has used half-hen philosophy to arrive at the conclusion that Srila Prabhupada was not omniscient when he was physically present. He has started from a false assumption based on his natural emotional response to abuse. He has ignored Srila Prabhupada's many statements which directly contradict this assumption, and he has tried to substantiate it by referring to one occasion when Srila Prabhupada said that he did not know everything. However, this statement was made to disciples who were confused. Srila Prabhupada was talking to a devotee who was observing apparent discrepancies from a critical, material viewpoint. Srila Prabhupada wanted him to understand that his viewpoint was wrong, but his disciple persisted, "For instance, sometimes the acarya may seem to forget something or not to know something. So from our point of view, if someone has forgotten, that is an imperfection." Srila Prabhupada then proceeded to explain that the spiritual master's perfection is that he is preaching bhakti; he doesn't necessarily know everything "like God". [Morning Walk, Mayapur, April 8, 1975: 750408MW.MAY]

In context, this is not the best statement to take as Srila Prabhupada's definitive view on the point, for on many other occasions, as we have seen, he has made statements to the contrary. Acaryas often adopt a mood of humility and minimise themselves, and Srila Prabhupada is no exception:

"Sometimes I think that even though I am crippled in many ways, if one of my disciples becomes as strong as Dhruva Maharaja, then he will be able to carry me with him to Vaikunthaloka." [S.B. 4.12.33, purport]

He has explained that this humility is the standard for exalted souls.

"Thus Kasyapa Muni was an ideal spiritual master. He was not so foolish that he would present himself as an exalted personality, as good as God. . . . Kasyapa Muni did not falsely

declare himself to be jagad-guru, although he actually was jagad-guru because he advocated the cause of Vasudeva." [S.B 8.16.20, purport]

This being the case, we cannot accept as absolute Srila Prabhupada's statement that he does not know everything, since it contradicts his other statements, as well as Vaisnava siddhanta.

The logic on which Dravida Prabhu based his presentation is faulty. There is no logical or sastraic justification for assuming that Srila Prabhupada was not omniscient when he was with us. Dravida Prabhu has denied that he regards Srila Prabhupada as an ordinary man, but this is nonetheless the conclusion that he has tried to establish. Srila Narayana Maharaja has rightly protested against this, and Dravida Prabhu's criticism of him is totally unjustified. This is a very dangerous position. After all, Srila Narayana Maharaja is also an advanced Vaisnava establishing his preaching mission, and we should avoid criticising such personalities.

"The devotee does not do anything not sanctioned by the Supreme Personality of Godhead. As it is said, vaisnavera kriya mudra vijneha na bujhaya. Even the most learned or experienced person cannot understand the movements of a Vaisnava, a pure devotee. No one, therefore, should criticize a pure Vaisnava. A Vaisnava knows his own business; whatever he does is precisely right because he is always guided by the Supreme Personality of Godhead." [S.B. 9.4.68, purport]

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead and His devotees who come to this world are executing a mission, and therefore sometimes they act in a way that is very difficult to understand. It is said, therefore, vaisnavera kriya mudha vijne na bujhaya: even if one is a very learned and intelligent scholar, he cannot understand the activities of a Vaisnava. A Vaisnava accepts anything favorable for executing his mission. But foolish persons, not knowing the purpose of such exalted Vaisnavas, indulge in criticizing them. That is forbidden. Since no one can understand what a Vaisnava does for the purpose of executing his mission, to criticize such a Vaisnava is the offense called sadhu-ninda." [Adi-lila, 15.22]

Dravida Prabhu has unsuccessfully tried to establish that Srila Narayana Maharaja's attitude is horrendous, absurd and offensive. The accusation has been made, and these words are out, but they cannot be applied to Srila Narayana Maharaja. Where will they settle? Where do they belong? It is Dravida Prabhu's responsibility to decide this. He is in a dangerous position, for he has minimised the position of his own spiritual master, and seriously criticised the senior Vaisnava who corrected him.