

THE HARE KRISHNA MOVEMENT

ISKON or the International Society for Krishna Consciousness was created in the sixties by Abhay Charan De Prabhupada in New York.

The movement is fanatically devoted to the ancient Hindu god, Krishna. It advocates the chanting of the mantra, Hare Krishna, in order to win salvation from suffering and to develop a perfect love for God. The chanting is called Sankirtana. The chant is the mahamantra.

The cult has been known for telling lies to get new members and money and has been guilty of attempting to brainwash. It must be good at conditioning people when it offers an ascetic lifestyle in honour of an amoral god! The Perfection of Yoga (page 7), tells us that the guru who believes in and is authorised by the cult says only what Krishna says. The implication being that he should be obeyed as Krishna should be obeyed.

Krishna is infallible (page 273, 321, Bhagavad-Gita). And Krishna has to come first and everything must be done for his sake. One must do everything, even eat, just for him (ibid, page 15). One must not work to get anything from it but to please Krishna (ibid, page 8). Good has to be done for Krishna says it is good and not out of any self-interest (Bhagavad-Gita, page 296). Arjuna was told to kill in war because Krishna desired it in the scripture the Bhagavad-Gita and Prabhupada commented that everything ought to be done for the sake of Krishna (page 39). Being a slave for Krishna is silly enough when one is more sure of one's own existence than his but is worsened by the fact that the evidence for the existence of the historical Krishna is so feeble that it might not be evidence at all.

The religion makes the error of assuming that miracles prove that the incarnations of God like Krishna are indeed divine. But they believe in miracle-working demons and demigods! Prabhupada detested the notion that the miracle stories about Krishna were not meant to be taken literally (page 70, Life Comes from Life). The authors of the stories never said that they were fairy-stories so they meant them to be taken historically. Holiness is not a sign that if a person claims to be God he is God for God can do what appears sinful but it is not really sin (page 42, Sri Isopanisad).

The sect adores images of Krishna believing that he becomes the image in order to be more accessible to his worshippers (page 24, Sri Isopanisad). But when the mahamantra is all-important a person should not be looking for images at all but trying to awaken awareness of Krishna indwelling the heart. Why adore the image if Krishna is within you and if the material image is a distraction from focusing on his spiritual essence and presence in a spiritual manner? Would Krishna do such a stupid miracle as to become an image?

Incredibly, Prabhupada taught that the lake of Radha in India, Sri Radha-kunda, is as loved by her lover Krishna as much as she is (page 90, The Nectar of Instruction).

And it is disturbing that a person will be considered the best of the bunch if he says the name of Krishna (page 54, The Nectar of Instruction). Why not God? Why not Jesus?

The cult teaches that the Sankirtana, tears of love for God and ecstasy – the trance that the chant puts you in – get sins forgiven (page The Nectar of Instruction). God would not want people to be forgiven for going into a trance but for doing good. There is another problem. If the chant forgives sins then only a sinner can chant it. That is impossible and contradictory. A sinner cannot please God or have a real relationship with him. To stick to sin while doing good is telling God you will not fully love him so the goodness is really and wholly evil.

The cult asserts that the Lord's disciples are cleansed from sin because they eat food that they offer to God (page 59, Bhagavad-Gita). It is not offering the food you eat that should do this but good works. Nobody would merit praise for offering food for that is too easy. The Catholic Church is guilty of the same blasphemy against God for saying that the Eucharist does more to make you holy than good works.

According to Walter Martin (page 96, The New Cults) the sect believes that Krishna is impersonal for he is identical to the creation. Josh Mc Dowell and Don Stewart say the same thing (page 130, Concise Guide to Today's Religions). If it does then the cult is saying that all things are caused and controlled by something that ought not to be loved for the person is superior. Also, if God is as impersonal as a machine then how can they be sure that we his creation are not being deceived by him all the time? He cannot be trusted at all when he lets error and lies happen. We should deny the existence of this God in order to be able to trust our reason and our senses. He is an affront to human dignity.

The Hare Krishna cult calls Krishna a person and the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Krishna is the supreme person in

the impersonal God or he is a person and not a person at the same time or he is just a person with an impersonal spirit attached! If God is impersonal then persons are illusions for God is all and personality cannot come out of impersonality when that is all there is. Prabhupada used this argument himself (page 29, The Path of Perfection).

The cult says that nobody can beat Krishna for tricking people and telling lies (page 204, Bhagavad-Gita). Krishna confessed his dishonesty. When it is sinners he has come to save and he feels entitled to lie to them or to cheat them by sending them to a religious fraud (page 91, Life Comes from Life) who can know if he is really saved? Krishna could be getting revenge for some misdeed done in a past life. What use is a saviour who you cannot trust and devotion to a God who may not be devoted to you? Such devotion would not be real but self-degradation. The errors in the scriptures of the cult and in its doctrine would count as evidence that Krishna is determined to make fools of its members.

The religion claims that all who really wish to find Gods' truth will come to the Hare Krishna teachers to find it. This makes the faith very divisive and self-righteous.

The cult defies science and says there is life everywhere in the universe even on the moon! (page 1, Life Comes from Life). The divinely inspired Prabhupada said this. Those who say that life came from non-living matter are stereotyped and castigated as rascals and frauds even though when life is made from matter it could have come from matter (page 15, 136, Life Comes from Life).

THE REAL KRISHNA

According to the Hindu tradition, the amoral and two-faced Krishna was the eighth avatar or incarnation of the usually compassionate god who controls human fate, Vishnu. He is the god who is the most loved even though his previous incarnations as Rama was characterised by goodness and courage. The difference in characters makes it likely that Rama and Krishna were not the same person.

This Krishna person who lived 5000 years ago according the Hare Krishna sect but between 850 BC and 650 BC according to better scholars (Baha'i, page 16) is turned into their only real concern. But he could have been invented. It was not difficult to invent people for that period. The vast majority of Hindus do not regard Krishna as the Supreme Being like the sect does but as one of many equal gods. This shows that the sect is just a fraud.

Krishna allegedly lifted a hill, Govardhana, to protect the people of Vrndavana from the rains sent by Indra. Hare Krishna literature often contains pictures of that spectacular event. The note for illustration 34 in the book, The Sacred Cow, tells us that the Vaisnavites devised this legend in fifteenth century. Does not that suggest that it is likely that his life story which was not recorded for hundreds of years after his return to his Heaven is unreliable? Rama was allegedly the avatar before Krishna and his story was not devised until about the time of Jesus. The fact that it took at least four hundred years for him to be recognised as an avatar and important god shows that the religion makers of India had little regard for history.

The supreme love of Krishna, the goddess Radha, was not added to his story until the twelfth century two centuries after she was invented (page 103, The World of Gurus). Why put a person who may not have been divine or have even existed before yourself and others? It is crazy. Any intelligent person can see that so the devotees of Krishna must be hypocrites who are only into religion for the thrills and whatever else they can get out of it.

The Sacred Cow (page 73) informs us that in the original Mahabharata there may have been no Krishna at all for he is not needed in the story. A Krishna, the son of Devaki, who could only have lived a short while before 650 BCE appears in the Chandogya Upanisad which seems to have been written in 650 BCE. I think the invention of the amoral god Krishna could have been based on this noble and wise man. It is like the story of the man went right out of control. The Krishna in the Mahabharata existed centuries before for the battle it describes must have happened about 3000 BC if it happened at all.

Krishna was an avatar, an incarnation of God. But "The Hindu doctrine of the Avatars or saviors of mankind developed relatively late in the history of eastern religion. The theory appeared during the empire of Kanishka, an Indian ruler from about 120 A.D. to 162, who converted to Buddhism. Its justification is found in the Bhagavad-Gita, a late scripture of the first century which teaches new doctrines of devotion and love for a personal God" (page 7, Jerry Exel, "The Search for a Genuine Guru", Right On, November, 1972, Berkeley Christian Coalition). The Gita could be and probably is later than the first century.

Many Krishna stories could have been inspired by the Christian religion. Some think that the battle Krishna won over the snake, Kaliya, comes from the Bible legend that Jesus conquered the Devil, the snake.

In tradition, Jesus had a foster-father. So had Krishna.

Mary had to travel while pregnant to take part in a census relating to tax. So had Krishna's mother, Yasodi.

Jesus was born in a stable with shepherds round about. Krishna was delivered in a shepherd's hut. He was adored by Akura like Jesus was by Simeon. There was a persecution of the innocents in both legends.

Read all about it in The Hindu World, An Encyclopedic Survey of Hinduism, Vol 1 (Frederick A. Praeger Inc. NY, pages 240-241).

The Bhagavad Gita has parallels with the gospels for it was revised up until the 9th century by Indian teachers who would have known something about Christianity. One cannot be fully sure about what is invented in it or not. It is no excuse for believing in Krishna.

Many are convinced that Krishna never existed. In Death of a Guru, the Hindu who converted to Christianity and wrote the book with Dave Hunt, Rabindranath R Maharaj, was told by his uncle that "Krishna never existed; neither did Rama. The Bhagavad-Gita and the Ramayana are just myths, beautiful stories" (page 89). Soon Rabindranath came to the same conclusion (page 145).

IMPERFECT ANSWERS

ISKON published an interesting little book called, Perfect Questions, Perfect Answers, which records the chats Prabhupada and a Peace Corps worker, Bob Cohen, had on the philosophy of the sect.

On page 1, Prabhupada says that God must only be called Krishna for Krishna means all attractive. It does not for Krishna means dark! He made the mistake of thinking that this name summarises everything about Krishna. But Krishna could have false attractiveness. Prabhupada admits as much when he says that rascals find Krishna attractive because he was one of the biggest rascals. He reasoned that if there were no mischief in Krishna it would not exist in the world. Yet he said that Krishna was all good (page 3). One wonders how the guru can say that all people will find Krishna attractive if he is really good for most of the worlds Gods who are regarded as different versions of Krishna are horrible. Krishna is just being called something he is not just because he is God.

Krishna will make a bad man rich for praying to him for wealth (page 4). Like Romanism, the sect employs double standards for how can a person who refuses to repent of sin really reach a good God? He is asking God for a favour though he will not do God a favour and say sorry and change. He is blaspheming God.

On page 13, if you make an image of Krishna it is the real Krishna. We read the same on page 88. The image of Krishna is Krishna appearing in the form of a statue or picture to you.

Page 15 says that sex should be given up for the Vedas say so. Sex is supposed to be the supreme enjoyment and so that is the reason. But what would be wrong with a person who engages in constant self-denial having sex once in a while? The Krishnas allow nice eating and sleeping in comfort which give pleasure and amount to more than the pleasure of sex. Bring out the insipid food and the boards to sleep on!

Page 31 says that we should not ask for anything from Krishna but should serve him. But the guru said that Krishna will hear the evil man who asks for wealth.

The guru said, "Because you have surrendered to your spiritual master, his order is final. So even if you don't like it, you have to do it. To please me" (page 49). This is disturbing. Page 39 says that we are part of Lord Krishna because we are made of his energy so Krishna should not tell us to obey a man but to hear and obey his voice in our hearts. And Prabhupada said that the best servant of the Lord does not preach but sees everybody as a devotee of the Lord (page 55). Prabhupada is preaching and yet he commands total submission before him.

The greatest sin is sinning believing that chanting will cancel the guilt out for that is using it as a licence to sin (page 82).

Krishna never lies to a person who is a true devotee (page 89). But can one be sure that this is any consolation for devotees are bad devotees to begin with?

Only the perfect devotee of Krishna will be free from the rule of reincarnation and be able to step into Heaven (page 87). But nobody can be perfect in this world.

On page 94, it is alleged that Jesus did not allow the eating of meat for he forbade killing and yet he ate meat. Prabhupada says that this is not contradictory for Jesus was Krishna could prevent the damage to the soul that meat eating does. So, Jesus had to do it under the circumstances for some reason regardless of the bad example. Prabhupada stuck to the dangerous religious doctrine that God's plans are strange to us.

THE KRISHNA TRILOGY

Prabhupada wrote the three-volume work on Lord Krishna, called Krishna, which was financed by the Beatle George Harrison. It is supposed to give an authentic account of the life of Lord Krishna on earth.

The most shocking thing about the book is its matter of fact approach to Krishna's stupendous super-miracles. Krishna allegedly lifted a hill. His expansion, another self, Lord Balarama, was going to pull a city into the River Ganges with his plough (Vol 2, page 132). There is no evidence for these obvious fairy-tales.

Krishna could decapitate enemies with his magic disc and he did that to a man he thought was in possession of the Syamantaka Jewel only to end up confessing to Balarama that this was a mistake for the man hadn't got it (Vol 2, page 16). This was evidently murder and what kind of God would make a mistake? Krishna is unworthy of worship. But just a couple of pages later the silly Prabhupada inconsistently asserted that "Krishna is the Supersoul in everyone and knows everything going on in everyone's heart" (page 18).

Krishna and Balarama were the same person but in different bodies at the same time and yet Krishna complained that Balarama did not believe him when he said that he jewel was with Akrura (Vol 2, page 18).

The Krishna scriptures claim that anybody who hears the story of the Jew will be freed from bad karma and reach perfect peace in salvation (page 19). That is like saying that anybody who hears the parable of Jesus about the pearl of great price will inevitably and certainly be saved! This is not religion but magic. What is more, the story is not even slightly edifying.

Krishna accepted the unscientific delusions of astrology for he used it to work out the best time to marry Kalindi (Vol 2, page 27). God would not have needed to go to the trouble. This Krishna is said to be self-sufficient because he is the wonder of the universe! (page 29).

Far from being concerned about the poor Krishna took a huge dowry that included 900,000 chariots and 9000 elephants when he wed the princess Satya (page 32).

Krishna confessed that a man should be content with one wife though he had 16,000 wives (page 49). He said he could not please all of them. Even though he was omnipotent and could divide himself into thousands of Krishnas! How impossible!

He said he didn't know how to be well mannered to women (Vol 2, page 50). He blamed his childhood in little village for that.

Krishna even told one of his wives that she could have married better than him (page 51). And we are called upon to hail that fallible weak human being as God! He confessed that he could not help her for the next life at all and another man could do so (page 52). Krishna then went back on this and said he was joking when he realised that his wife had taken him in earnest. But still he blackened himself – albeit temporarily. He gave the impression that he did not even realise that he was hurting her but he must have despite the subsequent disavowal. He said he was sorry (page 54). Some God! This is what the Krishnas rely on to get them into their Heaven.

Krishna did not really love his wives and had no need for even one wife (page 65). He had sex with them for the production of children only (page 66). A God shouldn't need to have sex at all to do this!

Krishna did not tell his brother Balarama that the killing of Rukmi was unfair and murderous in case he would upset him (page 71). This god has no principles and would preach morality with one eye on the opinion polls. He is a politically correct hypocrite. Worse, Balarama was Krishna's full or plenary expansion (page 155). And a plenary expansion is as powerful and omniscient as the original Krishna (page 347).

Scandalously, the biggest disgrace to a family is a girl having sex outside marriage! (page 77). That is what the Vedic culture says and Krishna claimed that the Vedas were divinely inspired.

Krishna said that we should let evil brahmanas walk all over us (page 102). Yet he said he was the friend of all. And he boasted of his supreme power, his omnipotence, and of his unlimited causeless mercy (page 112). Then why can't he forgive bad karma?

Siva, a manifestation of Krishna, led Sudaksina to believe that he could murder Krishna (page 116). Another manifestation, Balarama, was into drugs (page 120).

After we all have read it comes as a shock to read that "Krishna is always one, and for him there is no differentiation" (page 148). This is immediately after we are told that Krishna is Brahma and the other gods.

Then we are told that Krishna is his body and that his body is his soul and that he can smell with his hands and see with his feet. This is meaningless and confused. Why not simply say that Krishna is a partless spirit? A spirit cannot be a body.

The story of one half of Jarasandra being born from one woman and another from another and the two halves being put together by witchery and Krishna knowing this and using to for the reason to have him killed by ripping him in two is absurd beyond belief (page 179).

Krishna's other self, Lord Balarama, killed Romaharsana by hitting him with a blade of grass because God can change physical laws (page 225). Needless miracles destroy reason and why don't we see Krishna's miracles now?

Krishna would be infinitely delighted when anybody offers him a morsel of rice out of a bundle (page 251). He is so stupid that he is impressed by measly and stingy offerings. It is not as if you can't eat what food you offer yourself!

It is a lie to say that the Vedas are Krishna's commands for they certainly do not recognise him as supreme personality of Godhead or give him any importance. Yet Prabhupada tells us that lie (page 264).

The water of the Ganges is alleged to have power to cleanse form sin (page 286). With the law of karma, it is hard to believe that anybody who steals can just wipe the slate clean by doing something so simple.

Telling the story of Krishna is Krishna (page 306). Even Krishna cannot be a human action.

Krishna wants his devotees worshiped (page 320). Unless they are adored like him he cannot accept any worship he gets.

Strangely "although everything is a transformation of the energy of Krishna, He is not present everywhere. He is simultaneously present and not present. By His energy He is present everywhere, but as the energetic He is not present everywhere" (page 334). So, he is present everywhere only in the sense that he acts everywhere and not because he is personally present everywhere. Spirit is without composition and is its own energy. This completely contradicts what Prabhupada said about Krishna being a spirit. Not surprisingly, it is letter stated that Krishna is present everywhere (page 342). This is said in such a way that what comes before is about digestion and what comes after is on about Krishna being present in the body. He just says he is everywhere to introduce us to the idea of Krishna indwelling the body. So, they can't say I am taking that statement out of context and that Prabhupada didn't mean that Krishna was everywhere.

The spurious free will defence makes an appearance on page 368 as an excuse for Krishna permitting suffering.

Altruism which is nothing more than hypocrisy and impossible is encouraged in devotees when they are told to serve God for himself and not for themselves (page 427).

Lust is attachment to material delights which is in opposition to Krishna Consciousness. Yet the gopis lusted for Krishna which got them the highest salvation (page 476). Another tiresome contradiction! The Krishnas would probably say that it is bad to lust after people but it is good and right to lust after God. But lust is lust and one would have to think of Krishna as a man of flesh and blood to be able to do it and awaken the lust. Why not lust for God and people? They are afraid to lust for people and things are transient but God is permanent. Even Krishna himself did not lust for his wives for he is above and beyond materialism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- An Introduction to Asian Religions. EG Parrinder. SPCK. London. 1957
Bhagavad-Gita As It Is. Prabhupada. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust. London. 1981.
Concise Guide to Today's Religions. Josh Mc Dowell and Don Stewart. Scripture Press. Bucks. 1988.
Cows, Pigs, Wars & Witches. Marvin Harris. Fontana. Glasgow. 1978
Death of a Guru. Rabindranath R Maharaj Hodder. Christian Paperbacks. London. 1978
Life Comes From Life. Prahupada. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust. Los Angeles. 1981.
Return to the Centre. Bede Griffiths. Fount. Glasgow. 1984.
Sri Isopanisad. Prabhupada. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust. New York. 1975.
"That Thou Art" from The Thousand Teachings of Sri Samkara AJ Alston Editor Shanti Sadan, London, 1982
The Mystical Maze. Pat Means. Campus Crusade for Christ. Los Angeles. 1976.
The Nectar of Instruction. Prabhupada. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust. New York. 1975.
The New Cults. Walter Martin. Vision House. California. 1980.
The Perfection of Yoga. Prabhupada. Bhaktivedanta. London. 1972.
The Sacred Cow. A.L. Basham. Rider. London. 1989.
The Truth About the Gita: A Closer Look at Hindu Scripture. V R Narla. Prometheus Books. New York. 2010.

The World of Gurus. Vishal Mangalwadi. Good Books. New Delhi. 1987.

The World's Religions, Lion, Herts, 1982

Transcendental Meditation. Lit-sen Chang Presbyterian Reformed Publishing New Jersey 1978.