

APPENDIX 22

REBUTTAL TO THE GBC DOCUMENT ON THE CASE:

SULOCANA VS KIRTANANANDA

ON WOMEN TAKING INITIATION BY A NEW "GURU"

compiled by Sulocana das

CONTENTS

PART ONE

INITIATING WOMEN

THE FACTS--ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS	2
JURISDICTION	3
GENERAL PRINCIPLES	4
WOMENS GURU-- HER HUSBAND OR A "SANNYASI"?	4
CAN WOMEN BE INITIATED SEPRATE FROM THE HUSBAND?	4
KIRTANANANDA'S ONE AND ONLY ARGUMENT	5
WHY ISKCON'S "GURU'S" CANNOT IMITATE PRABHUPADA	6
GBC SAYS GURU'S DON'T HAVE TO BE PURE--BUT HUSBANDS DO.	6
KIRTANANANDA'S 10,000 "WIVES"	7
WHEN CAN A WOMAN LEAVE A FALLEN HUSBAND?	7
THE REAL QUESTION?	8
SINCERITY--COMPARING SULOCANA TO KIRTANANANDA	8

PART TWO

JUDGING A MAN

HOW THE "GURU'S JUSTIFY THEIR BEHAVIOR	9
WHAT IS AN "ACCIDENTAL" FALLDOWN?	10
JUDGING A MAN'S SINCERITY	10
ILLICIT SEX	11
INTOXICATION, SPORTS, MOVIES, ETC.	11
HOW THE VARNAS AND ASRAMS MUST BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION	12
WHAT MUST NOW BE DONE?	12
THE LEADERS--HOW TO JUDGE THEIR BEHAVIOR	13
IT'S A GRADUAL PROCESS--JUDGING A MAN'S PAST	13
JUDGING KIRTANANANDA--CASE CLOSED	14
SHASTRIC QUOTES ON THE CHARACTER OF KIRTANANANDA	14
CONCLUSION	15
THE GBC'S DECISION & SULOCANA'S DEMANDS TO KIRTANANANDA	16

CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS TO SECTION ONE: "THE FACTS"

The person Rupanuga refers to in his document as "Jamuna," is actually Jane, Sulocana's wife. The name "Jamuna," was given by Kirtanananda without Sulocana's awareness or approval. This is a direct breach of human decency what to speak of vaisnava behavior. It therefore represents an offense to Srila Prabhupada since the man exhibiting such heinous behavior, Kirtanananda, is claiming to be Prabhupada's representative.

Jane was sent to NV with one child from a previous affair and Sulocana's first son in her womb. Sulocana did not even know that she was pregnant when Jane took her "initiation." Sulocana found out Jane was pregnant at the same time he found out that she had decided to devote her life to another man. They had been married one year at the time.

Jane was lured into taking "initiation" by telling her, in effect, "It's not necessary to have your husbands approval. You are your own spirit soul. Sulocana is not a pure devotee. 'Bhaktipada' is a pure devotee. If you want to go back to Godhead, you have to take initiation from a pure devotee." This is of course the standard ISKCON line which they attempt to substantiate in their document.

Jane divorced Sulocana and immediately "remarried" a man whose character is so degraded that he had been grabbing other womens breasts, including the wife of Sri Galim, the headmaster of the Gurukula. He had been severely beaten by Bhagavatananada for attempting to seduce his wife. His name is Ragunatha. He had been attempting to get a "wife" for many years but most women laughed at him, seeing his desperate condition. He is also well known to be one of NV's dopers. Jane had been secretly associating with this person for some time. Kirtanananda told Sulocana, "I never so that" (encourage a woman to "remarry").

Jane is not actually remarried. In several letters, and the books as well, Prabhupada refers to a woman who does what Jane did as, "a prostitute" or "an enemy" or "keeping a paramour." He refers to men that do what Kirtanananda did as "wife stealers" or "Ravanas."

Jane was given a divorce and full custody of Sulocana's sons with the use of the temple's money and lawyer. The judge made the decision without thinking to ask if Sulocana had been notified of the hearing, which he hadn't. There is hard and undeniable proof of this. Jane's plea was; "cruel and inhuman treatment." Sulocana never hit his wife once or even looked at another woman. She has admitted to telling this lie in order to get the divorce, since, even mundane courts do not allow a divorce without any grounds. Also there is positive testimony, both from a local attorney and Jane herself, that she was given this decision because the local judge, Mr. Warmuth, "is very favorable to Keith Ham" (Kirtanananda).

Another fact not mentioned is that, by this time, Sulocana had two baby boys of his own, one three and the other one year old, both of whom he loves very much and has not seen now for one year. Both these boys were forcibly taken from Sulocana by six of Kirtanananda's men. They illegally entered Sulocana's motor home to do this.

Also not mentioned is the fact that Kirtanananda was deliberately discouraging Sulocana from staying at New Vrndavana by denying him the service he was promised--managing the guest house. There are innumerable witnesses who will testify to this fact, including Narada Muni, who was in charge of the Indian program at the time. He was very disturbed about this since Kirtanananda's grounds for doing so were absolutely unjustified.

Some other important facts are these quotes by Kirtanananda to Sulocana: "If you want your wife back, you will have to surrender to me" and "Don't forget, I have an eternal relationship with your wife, yours is only temporary," also, (You are not welcome here because) "Sulocana, you're just not my man." and "I heard you are leaving. Don't try and take your wife! I told her I'd "protect" her."

Also not mentioned are the fact that Kirtanananda made no attempt whatsoever to counsel either the wife or husband to try to keep the family together. This is in itself proof of Kirtanananda's real intentions. As acknowledged by the GBC on page 5; divorce can only be recommended as a last resort. Kirtanananda made it the first.

These are just a few of the facts not mentioned in the GBC paper, all of which were known to the GBC. More of the story is contained in the preface to the upcoming book presently being compiled by Sulocana das.

Section 2--JURISDICTION

The GBC is stating that since there is no real system of dealing with such problems on the local level in ISKCON, the grievance committee is having to deal with it. What they are really saying is that since the GBC has never really studied or understood, or compiled anything on the relationship between husband, wife, and guru, either before or after Srila Prabhupada's departure, Sulocana das is now forcing the issue. There are some very obvious problems which arise when unqualified men pose as "gurus" and come in between husband and wife. But, since Sulocana das is the only one to date who has thoroughly studied the matter fully, and can speak autoritatively from Srila Prabhupada's books, and letters, backing every point with shastra, the GBC did not respond to hardly any of Sulocana's challenges.

Section 3--GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The general principle of the GBC is that ISKCON's "gurus" are bona fide. Since all the statements made by the GBC are based on this absurd proposition, the entire document is invalid. Sulocana's upcoming book proves conclusively that these "gurus" were never appointed. Most devotees realize this by now anyway. So, as Prabhupada often explains; If you start an equation with one plus one equals three, then naturally all the rest of the equation is going to be off. This is all that really need be said about the philosophical arguments presented by the GBC on women, marriage, and guru. Still, we will go into some of the points just to show the foolishness of the official position of the "GBC."

PART ONE

WOMENS GURU-- HER HUSBAND OR A "SANNYASI"

Everyone should have a bona fide pure devotee guru, including women. That does not mean that everyone should take initiation in the same way. According to the Vedic system, the husband takes initiation from a bona fide guru, and the wife serves that same guru by serving her husband. Prabhupada says, "The man becomes a devotee of Krsna, and the wife becomes a devotee of her husband." They are thus both initiated since they are "two halves of the same body." There is absolutely no difference if the wife has formally taken initiation or not. She is automatically the disciple of the husbands guru. If the wife devotes herself to another man, who the husband disapproves of, then the relationship of the woman to both "husband" and "guru" is illicit. No bonafide guru would allow such a thing. A wife is never initiated separate from her husband. In Vedic culture she is not initiated at all. When Jadurani first approached Srila Prabhupada for initiation, Srila Prabhupada told her to go find herself a husband amongst the devotees in the temple. Later he gave concession to women for the sake of engaging them, since he could plainly see they were not going to accept the Vedic standard. That is the only reason Srila Prabhupada initiated women in a separate ceremony. Factually, any woman is automatically Prabhupada's disciple if she marries a Prabhupada disciple. Wherever a woman's heart is, that is where her husband and her guru are. A woman cannot have two husbands or two guru's. Prabhupada says that an ordinary woman cannot imitate Draupadi by thinking she can equally serve and devote herself to more than one man, what to speak of a "sannyasi." A woman can only have one guru, her husband, and through him, she may devote herself to his guru, not separately.

CAN WOMEN BE INITIATED SEPERATE FROM THE HUSBAND?

The GBC argument that Prabhupada initiated women separate from the husband is not a valid argument for the above reasons. But Prabhupada also initiated single women? He could do that for several reasons. (1) He knew they would be marrying one of his

disciples, since, his standard order was that all women were to be married. (2) Even if a woman was not going to marry, but firmly decided to remain single as a nun, Prabhupada could also initiate nuns. Prabhupada could initiate anyone he wanted to, because he is an Uttama adhikari, completely pure devotee with no sex desire or ulterior motives in his heart. No one today can make that claim. (3) Because Prabhupada was such an elevated Uttama adhikari, he could adjust the standard religious principles for time and circumstance. Others, those not on that level, must follow his instructions, not imitate. Initiating women is just such an adjustment. It is true that time and circumstances are basically the same now (womens liberation) as in 1966, but there is one big difference. It is a very, very, very, big difference. These new "gurus" are light years from being Uttama adhikaris. If Prabhupada had wanted his neophyte disciples to imitate him after he departed, then why didn't he mention such a thing anywhere in his books or letters? Aren't we supposed to be following the instructions and not imitating? (4) Prabhupada initiated single women but he never initiated a mans wife if the man did not want to take initiation also--and vise-versa. At least he stated in several letters that he did not want to do such a thing. He was requested to, but he didn't comply. That would have been coming between a husband and wife. Prabhupada was a pure devotee, so naturally he would never do such a thing.

The GBC's arguments simply reveal the well known tendency of the "guru's" to imitate Srila Prabhupada, and not to follow his instructions.

KIRTANANANDA'S ONE AND ONLY ARGUMENT

Sometimes, but very rarely, if the woman was interested in KC, but the husband was an out-and-out demon, Prabhupada would recommend that she live seperately from him in the temple. He never recommended that she remarry. Such instances are extremely rare--maybe only one or two letters. But in numerous letters Prabhupada encouraged the woman to tolerate her husbands weaknesses and be paitient. He directly told one devotee to cook meat for her husband (consult Baumadeva, Detroit). What Kirtanananda did, in essence, by telling Sulocana's wife to leave him, was directly call Sulocana a demon, and call himself, equal to Srila Prabhupada. His one and only argument was, "Sarvabhauma Bhattacharya told his daughter to leave Amogha because Amogha was blaspheming Lord Caitanya. So you are also an offender, so I told your wife to leave you." Since Kirtanananda considers himself a pure devotee, he compared Sulocana's failure to worship Kirtanananda to Amogha's blaspheming Lord Caitanya. Sulocana certainly never claimed to be a pure devotee, but he does claim that he never for a moment thought offensively toward Prabhupada, Lord Caitanya, or Krsna. Kirtanananda cannot make that claim. He directly attacked Prabhupada, calling him a tyrant, among numerous other elephant offenses (all the letters concerning this gurvaparada by Kirtanananda are in the book.)

WHY ISKCON'S "GURU'S" CANNOT IMITATE PRABHUPADA

If there were a completely pure devotee on the planet right now, equal to Srila Prabhupada in every way, such a pure devotee could act as Prabhupada did and initiate both men and women, whether they were married or not, and not fall down. But in the absense of such an Uttama adikari, we have to follow the instructions of the Uttama adhikari, not imitate him. Why does the GBC think Prabhupada wrote so many books anyway? To collect dust? Why does the GBC think that Prabhupada never even hinted in letter or book the concept of a woman having a guru independent of her husband? He never mentions it anywhere. He only refers to himself as a womens guru in a few places in all his writings. He almost always referred to the women as his daughters. He knew no one was qualified to imitate him in any way whatsoever. And he knew that no one would come along in his immediate aftermath on that level either. So he never mentioned it. He didn't want to encourage neophytes to imitate him after his departure. He only stressed to follow his instructions. The only example he encouraged them to imitate was the way he worked 24 hours a day in Krsna's service. The real Uttama adhikari's instructions are crystal clear. The wife should be devoted to her husband, and her husband should be sincere and devoted to Guru and Krsna. (innumerable references). And, to solidify that instruction, Prabhupada said, (paraphrased); Unless one is on the level of Haridas Thakura, Narada Muni, or Srila Prabhupada, then no one can accept service from, or give shelter to a woman. (ref. SB, 7.7.14) This underlined phrase defines what initiation means.

GBC SAYS: "GURUS DON'T HAVE TO BE PURE--BUT HUSBANDS DO"

How the GBC could have the audacity to deny this instruction of Srila Prabhupada's is inconceivable. This is the way they word it:

"The point that Srila Prabhupada was special, a nitya-siddha, eternally liberated pure devotee and cannot be imitated by his disciples is certainly true; but this is not an appropriate argument in this case (they give no explanation why they make this claim). It is true that no one can claim the infallibility or purity of Srila Prabhupada, but such perfection or equality is not required to perform the duties of diksa guru." (no further explanation)

So, they say the diksha guru does not have to be pure to give shelter to, or accept service from women. But what about the husband? What does the GBC says about the husbands requirments:?

"A husband cannot claim the status of a pati guru (husband guru) or ideal grhastha without strictly following the four regulative principles and devotional principles, such as a minimum of sixteen rounds, the morning program, etc. The rules and regulations of the grhastha asram are as strict for that ashram as the rules and regulations for any other asram...A

husband who does not act as a bona fide grhastha (defined above) cannot expect his wife to continue to respect him or be obedient to him. Such an unfortunate wife is certainly justified in seeking protection from her spiritual authorities (TP), including her guru."

We have in our possession a letter from the man who compiled this document, Rupanuga, written to Satsvarupa, which states that Jayapataka and Ramesvara both do not chant their rounds. But then these are minor things compared to the heavy offenses by all the "gurus." But, if an ordinary householder does not chant all his rounds, and perfectly follow all the principles, in other words, if he is not a pure devotee, his wife should neither serve or respect him. Instead, the GBC says she can leave him for the "protection" of her "guru." They say she has every right to grab his children, and run off to live with some popped out Temple President and a "sannyasi."

KIRTANANANDA'S TEN-THOUSAND "WIVES"

So, in essence, the GBC is saying; "A guru does not have to be pure to initiate hundreds of persons, including other men's wives, thereby splitting up marriages and creating 'varna sankara,' but the husband has to be a completely pure devotee, to have one devoted follower, his wife." This claim has no shastric backing whatsoever. It is a serious vaisnava aparada to all those devotees who have had their families destroyed by this bogus philosophy. Can anyone imagine what would happen if all the women in the world, whose husbands were not following all the strict regulative principles perfectly, immediately grabbed the children and ran off to live with some bogus sannyasi posing as a guru. This proposal of the GBC is insanity but they are the ones in charge of the most important spiritual movement in the world. Just try and see the position. These men are not sannyasis or gurus or GBC, they are manipulators and exploiters living at the expense of hundreds of "wives." Some of them act exactly like pimps. In our book we go into elaborate detail on the wife swapping and illicit sex going on in ISKCON.

WHEN CAN A WOMAN LEAVE A FALLEN HUSBAND?

Prabhupada makes very clear in SB,7.11.28 the qualifications for a woman to leave her husband. That is the authoritative purport for this problem. It must be very carefully studied. First and foremost, Prabhupada says; that he has to be a nondevotee. If he is a devotee, then despite his weaknesses, "he is sinless (but not a guru)." So, the primary qualification for leaving a husband is not his flaws, but whether or not he has faith in Krsna. If he has faith in Krsna, he is a devotee. To justify leaving a husband, he has to be 'naradhamah,' a nondevotee, the lowest of men, and addicted to all the four sinful activities. Only when the husband is such a nondevotee, she can leave him, but she cannot remarry. She can live separately. (In one letter Prabhupada conceded that: "If both husband and

wife agree, she may divorce and remarry." Prabhupada gave that instruction in disgust). The GBC refers to this text also, but they do not mention that a woman who leaves such a degraded husband should not remarry. And, of course, they are implying that Sulocana is such a degraded person without knowing anything about Sulocana. And, of course, Sulocana's wife "remarried" a Kirtanananda man almost immediately after Kirtanananda broke up their marriage. And the character of the man he "re-married" her to...

THE REAL QUESTION???

So the real question is: Where do you draw the line in defining a devotee? Kirtanananda claims Sulocana is a demon. Sulocana claims KS is a demon. How to judge? At what degree of contamination is one considered not to be a devotee? Is subtle contamination not important? Many persons who were at one point strictly following the regulative principles, and considered advanced, even sannyasis, are now eating meat and blaspheming Srila Prabhupada. So were they actually advanced devotees while they were following strictly? If they were, how could they have fallen down so far? Is sincerity the only qualification for a devotee? If so, how do you judge sincerity? Does sincerity come and go on a daily basis? How long does one have to be strictly following the regulative principles to be considered sincere and advanced? Does artificially performing austerities mean one is sincere? or does it mean he is heading for a fall? Should ISKCON hire psychics to analyze a man's sincerity? Could Astrology help? Can regression under hypnosis reveal a man's motives? These are worthwhile considerations. Instead the GBC asks, "Can a imitation sannyasi "guru" advise a man's wife to leave him because he is not following all the regulative principles which are actually only meant for the brahmins?" Only a fool or a demon could propose such a thing.

SINCERITY--COMPARING SULOCA NA TO KIRTANANANDA

Sulocana's wife decided to take initiation on the grounds that Sulocana was not qualified to deliver her. She says he was not following the regulative principles strictly and therefore she assumed he was not sincere. He was chanting average 12-13 rounds daily and periodically he would go through a spell of getting intoxicated once a week. He frequently ate chocolate. At that time he was 29 years old and just starting a Krana conscious picture pendent business. Because he was not perfectly following everything, his wife thought he was not sincere. She thought she should take initiation from someone whom she was told was sincere. Makes sense. Right? Wrong. She did not stop to consider that she know absolutely nothing about this man. She did not know that when Kirtanananda was 29 years old, or Sulocana's age at the time she took "initiation," he was a fullblown, active homosexual, or second-cock in gay lingo, since he was the female counterpart of Hayagriva. We were tempted to vividly describe what such persons do in the evenings, but we will spare the

"sensitivity" of the "brahmins" reading this rebuttal. Then, when KS was 30, a year after taking "initiation," he stabbed Prabhupada square in the back in an attempt to steal Prabhupada's movement for himself. Had Jane known these documented hard facts about this man, she may have thought twice about his sincerity, despite what Kuladri was telling her about following some external principles. In India, any upper caste man automatically follows those principles, so that alone is hardly any the ultimate qualification. When Satsvarupa was this age, 29, he was a new devotee and was having sex with his wife every single night. At least Sulocana regulated his usage of that "concession" to twice a month. So, by comparing Sulocana with these two "big, big gurus" at age 29, Sulocana is far more advanced than both of them put together, and who knows where they will all be 30 years down the road? Sulocana never claimed to be a saint, but it certainly isn't Kirtanananda's position to judge him. No one else ever attacked Prabhupada the way Kirtanananda did. Prabhupada condemned Kirtanananda in more letters than all the other bogus gurus combined.

PART TWO

JUDGING A MAN

These are points that the GBC should be considering. Instead they make these asinine statements that a diksa guru does not have to be free of sex desire to take hundreds of women disciples, but a husband has to be completely pure to deserve to keep the devotion of his one wife. The "gurus" base all their claim of divinity on BG,9.30, quoted below. They are all riding on the thin thread of this verse in hopes that no one will ever think about it. They claim a monopoly on using this verse to justify their behavior, but if anyone else exhibits weaknesses, they cannot quote this verse. "They are simply demons to be disregarded." The following is an in-depth analysis of that verse.

"Even if one commits the most abominable action, if he is engaged in devotional service he is to be considered saintly because he is properly situated in his determination." (BG,9.30)

Purport by Srila Prabhupada: "...Now in the conditional state, sometimes devotional service and the conditional service in relation to the body will parallel one another. But then again, sometimes these activities become opposed to one another. As far as possible, a devotee is very cautious so that he does not do anything that could disrupt his wholesome condition...No one should deride a devotee for some accidental falldown from the ideal path, for, as explained in the next verse, such occasional falldowns will be stopped in due course, as soon as a devotee is completely situated in KC...The words 'sadhur eve,' "he is saintly," are very emphatic. They are a warning to the nondevotees that because of an accidental falldown a devotee should not be derided; he should still be considered saintly even if he has accidentally fallen down. And the word 'mantavyah' is

still more emphatic. If one does not follow this rule, and derides a devotee for his accidental falldown, then one is disobeying the order of the Supreme Lord...On the other hand, one should not misunderstand that a devotee in transcendental devotional service can act in all kinds of abominable ways; this verse only refers to an accident due to the strong power of material connections...As long as one is not strong enough to fight the illusory energy, there may be accidental falldowns. But when one is strong enough, he is no longer subjected to such falldowns, as previously explained. No one should take advantage of this verse and commit nonsense and think that he is still a devotee. If he does not improve in his character by devotional service, then it is to be understood that he is not a high devotee."

WHAT IS AN ACCIDENTAL FALLDOWN?

Note: The word accident must be defined in order to understand what Prabhupada is saying in this purport. Generally an accident is accepted as being something that suddenly happens and is beyond our control. In that sense, it would be impossible to accidentally have illicit sex or accidentally get intoxicated. In the next purport Prabhupada says; "either by accident or intention." Actually, there is no such thing as an accident since everything is controlled by the Lord, and all activities are either one's karma, or Krsna's special mercy on a devotee. So when Prabhupada says "accident" he means engaging in abominable activity by force of habit. Prabhupada uses that phrase, "force of habit," in numerous places to describe one's occasional indulgences in illicit activities. So, we feel safe injecting that phrase here in place of the word "accident," which is confusing to many devotees, including "gurus." They tend to abuse this verse to commit their abominable activities. Prabhupada did not make a mistake in his wording. The devotees simply fail to understand the real meaning. So it is important to clearly define it. The translation to this verse does not in any way imply an accident. Prabhupada uses the word accident to mean; An act done without malicious intent and/or blatant disregard for authority. In other words, by force of habit. ISKCON's "gurus" say that, "if a devotee does something illicit more than once, then it cannot be an accident. So, if not an accident, the man must be a demon." With this argument they justify taking his wife and children away and getting her in bed with himself or one of his own men.

JUDGING A MAN'S SINCERITY

So this is a critical verse and purport and must be studied at great length. It is a subtle thing, something the gurus know little about. It means judging between one who remorsefully engages in base activities due to his past habits, and one who sinfully does so because he just plain doesn't care about any authority. That is the all important question. Determining the sincerity of one's heart is the essence of judging a devotee and that can be very misleading if one is not extremely perceptive.

There are a class of sahajiyas today who claim that it is not good to judge others. That is simply foolishness. One absolutely has to make such judgements daily if he wants to avoid bad, and accept good association.

ILLICIT SEX

This is the most common problem devotees face. Say for example one spends his whole life, from puberty onwards, in gross illicit sex, but then later he meets a pure devotee like Srila Prabhupada and he wants to give up this bad habit. But due to the strong influence of material energy he cannot do so very easily. Still, he tries to regulate his sex life and makes strict vows to gradually decrease it. Such a person, who honestly and responsibly lives with his wife, and does not look at or pollute other women, can be considered sincere even though he may be having sex with his wife too often to be considered a disciple or a brahmin. The sex to him is like a material conditioned necessity or habit just like sleeping and eating. He cannot abruptly give it up, but he does not like being under its control either, and so he tries to gradually reduce it. Such a person may be considered sincere or even saintly as long as he is sincerely trying to serve Krsna. He is certainly not a pure devotee, yet, and he should not be treated as though he were. He may be respected, but only from a distance by those who want to advance quickly. (NOI)

But then you take someone else who comes to KC for ulterior motives and has sex, gross or subtle, with one woman after another, even other men's wives. Such a person should not be considered saintly or sincere, but on the contrary, he should be publically condemned so that sane persons can avoid his contaminated association. One perfect example of this is Sruti Kirti. He polluted at least half-a-dozen married women that we know of personally, destroying their marriages. Because he had this extremely demoniac tendency, he should not have been considered saintly just because he chanted Hare Krsna. But, out of ignorance he was considered saintly and so nobody wanted to publically expose him. Thus he was able to pollute on woman after another. He should have been publically condemned after the first one. Instead, Ramesvara continued to support this debauch right up through the sixth married woman he polluted. He even took Prabhupada's money and sent Sruti Kirti to India so the last husband who swore to kill him would not be able to. This is not an isolated incident. It is going on everywhere with the full blessing of the "gurus."

INTOXICATION, SPORTS, MOVIES, ETC.

The same principle goes for these habits. It may be unbearably difficult for a devotee to abstain from them, but if he honestly recognizes his fallen condition, and strives to reduce them, then eventually he will be able to give them up altogether. He should be sane and regulate his usage, gradually reducing. If he is sincere he will eventually be able to give it up as he contines

to chant Hare Krsna in the mood; "Krsna, I am so weak and fallen, please help me to overcome these weaknesses so I can eventually be fully engaged in Your service." Again we have a fine line between praying like this and committing sins on the strength of chanting the holy name, which is an offense. If one is determined to give up bad habits, and he makes a regular program to do so, then he may be considered sincere and should be encouraged by everyone, including his wife. But he must prove his sincerity by strictly endeavoring to reduce the habit. That is the meaning of this verse. If anyone disagrees, state your position, and we will debate.

HOW THE VARNAS AND ASHRAMS MUST BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION

A man may pray like that, but only to convince himself and others that he is really sincere. How else may one judge? One way is by seeing the amount of trouble and austerity one accepts for Krsna. There are different austerities for the different varnas and asramas. If one is a sannyasi, but he engages in eating very opulent foods three times a day, sleeps on a soft bed, freely associates with women, has little knowledge of shastra, but still lives off the money of others, then such a sannyasi can readily be recognized as bogus. So ultimately it boils down to how submissive one is to the instructions of guru, shastra, and sadhu, which apply to one's own varna and asrama. If one is acting according to shastra then he can be considered sincere. But shastra has to be clearly defined for the different classes before we can judge. A householder doing business and accepting all sorts of sense gratification and sex with his wife may well be more sincere, than a "sannyasi" who merely talks to women. Ramananda Raya would massage and dress beautiful women, and he was the topmost devotee of Lord Caitanya, who Himself set the example by stating that he couldn't even look at a wooden form of a woman without being agitated. Chota Haridas, because he was in the renounced order, was excommunicated for simply talking to a woman once in private. Thus he committed suicide. So one's position in the varnas and ashramas is a primary consideration in determining one's sincerity.

For ksatriyas, vaisyas, and sudras, such things as sports are not so degraded, but if a man claiming to be a brahmin indulges in them, we can understand differently. Everything has to be taken into consideration in determining the quality of one's association.

WHAT MUST NOW BE DONE?

It requires real brahmins to judge such things and advise devotees properly. Since there are few if any real brahmins in our society today, it is absolutely essential to thoroughly learn, and then stick as closely as possible to Prabhupada's instructions, not imitate him. That means fully indexing, categorizing, and scrutinizingly studying all the angles of interpretation in the association of serious devotees. That would have been a noble objective for the GBC to arrange right after

Srila Prabhupada's disappearance. Instead, they spent all their time holding mock debates and scheming how to fool the devotees into thinking they were bona fide gurus, and this, within days of Prabhupada's departure. So, until some serious devotees undertake this project of clarifying Prabhupada's teaching on these subjects, we will still be largely in the dark in determining how to act and how not to act? Who is a devotee and who is not a devotee? Who is a guru, and who is a demon?

THE LEADERS: HOW TO JUDGE THEIR BEHAVIOR

Generally most of the devotees are straightforward and basically sincere. They most likely will have some bad habits, having been brought up in the West, but they are genuinely attracted to becoming devotees of Krsna. But then there are others who are more interested in their personal glorification. How to tell the one from the other? One very good method of determining the sincerity of a devotee is to analyze his behavior in terms of how much pain he is causing others. A real devotee is humble and does not cause pain to others unnecessarily. Simple devotees may indulge in illicit sex and intoxication but basically they are only slowing down their own progress in devotional service by such behavior. Most devotees will not intentionally hurt others. But if a person is claiming to be a big leader, is demanding respect from others, is exploiting and discouraging others, then that person can safely be labeled a demon in the guise of a devotee. On the other hand, a leader may be seen periodically doing some nonsense, but if he is humble and doesn't demand that others worship him as a saint, then that devotee is to be considered saintly since he is humble and therefore becoming purified. It's a question of heart. Usually, one's heart can be determined by studying the outward behavior in relation to shastric evidence and a little common sense.

IT'S A GRADUAL PROCESS: JUDGING A MAN'S PAST

Purification is a gradual process. The very word purification implies gradual. One must be improving in his condition. It is not expected that everyone will be instantly cleansed or they can be labeled a demon. If one strictly regulates his sense gratification, then he will gradually improve. We know of no one today who is qualified to judge a man's soul simply at a glance. In any court of law, if a man is up for a crime, the judge will be lenient or severe depending on whether that person is a one time offender, or a habitual criminal. He has to investigate the man's past to determine this. Only then can he see if the man is improving or not. The same principle goes for devotees, but on a much deeper level. Judging a devotee is many times more difficult than judging a criminal. An illiterate, insignificant devotee, simply cleaning the toilets in 1985, may become a great powerful preacher 50 years down the road, if he remains humble. On the other hand we have already seen some of ISKCON's "big" leaders, because they were not at all humble, eating meat, having illicit sex, getting intoxicated and even blaspheming Srila Prabhupada

after just a few years. Therefore, judging a man's character is a serious thing and must be done very, very carefully before making accusations. A man's past must be taken into consideration.

JUDGING KIRTANANANDA: CASE CLOSED

Sulocana did not make public accusations against Kirtanananda until he had thoroughly studied KS from all angles, past and present. He interviewed other victims, past and present. He took the opinions of numerous devotees who knew KS from the very beginning. He studied Kirtanananda's own words. He read all the letters written by Srila Prabhupada about KS. Then he made it known to numerous devotees, both GBC, and otherwise of the patterns in Kirtanananda's behavior. No one was able to properly respond to the allegations. During this time that Sulocana was "patient," his wife was turned into a prostitute. At that point any other man would have gone to NV and blown Kirtanananda's brains out. But only then, several months later, when the evidence had become overwhelming, and the GBC continued muddling, did Sulocana come right out, and with full confidence, publically declare to the world in writing, that Kirtanananda is a out-and-out 'raksasa' (demon). And, sure enough, Kirtanananda's failure to respond in any way to Sulocana's challenge, proved Sulocana right. Case closed.

SHASTRIC QUOTES ON THE CHARACTER OF KIRTANANANDA

"Then he has to purify his existence. There are so many rules and regulations to be followed in the renounced order of life. Most important of all, a sannyasi is strictly forbidden to have any intimate relationship with a woman. He is even forbidden to talk with a woman in a secluded place... One has to follow the rules and regulations of a particular status of life in order to purify his existence. For a sannyasi, intimate relations with women and possession of wealth for sense gratification are strictly forbidden...not even enjoying them, but just looking toward them with such a propensity-is so condemned that he had better commit suicide before experiencing such illicit desires." (BG,16.1-3)

"In this verse, the royal road to hell is described. The demoniac want to make a show of religion and advancement in spiritual science, although they do not follow the principles. They are always arrogant or proud in possessing some type of education or so much wealth. They desire to be worshipped by others, and demand respectability, although they do not command respect. Over trifles they become very angry and speak harshly, not gently. They do not know what should be done and what should not be done. They do everything whimsically, according to their own desire, and they do not recognize any authority. These demoniac qualities are taken on by them from the beginning of their bodies in the wombs of their mothers, and as they grow they manifest all these inauspicious qualities." (BG,16-4)

"Those who do not follow the scriptural injunctions are supposed to be demons. Therefore it is stated here that the demons do not know the scriptural rules, nor do they have any inclination to follow them. Most of them do not know them, and even if some of them know, they have not the tendency to follow them. (BG,16.7)

"The process of speaking in spiritual circles is to say something upheld by the scriptures. One should at once quote from scriptural authority to back up what he is saying. At the same time, such talk should be very pleasurable to the ear." (BG,17.14: Kirtanananda is yet to defend his actions by shastra. He has had a year now to try and do so.)

CONCLUSION

The day for women to take a separate initiation is over, unless they want to become nuns. Then they can take spiritual instruction from a householder shiksha guru if his wife can agree to it. In essence that means the woman becomes a second wife, but in a non-sexual way. Such a relationship is hardly likely in many young westernized women. Since this movement is young, the practical application of this principle will not be seen for many years. Therefore Prabhupada frequently said that "all the women should be married." He never encouraged a "brahmacarini asrama." The letters to the real Mother Jamuna Dasi make that very clear. He simply had to put the women someplace until they got married. If the GBC wants to debate on this subject, they will have to study it. To encourage them, we are enclosing a printout--at our expense--of all of Srila Prabhupada's instructions on marriage from the letters. We will be expecting a more scholarly response soon. The chapter in our book entitled, ISKCON WOMEN: PROTECTED OR EXPLOITED, goes into all these points in much more detail.

THE GBC'S DECISION AND SULOCANA'S DEMANDS TO KIRTANANANDA

Those of you reading this who have not seen a copy of the GBC paper should know that the official GBC decision confirms Sulocana's accusations--that Kirtanananda had no right to interfere in Sulocana's marriage. The GBC makes some insane statements that Sulocana was "offensive" in calling Kirtanananda names, and that he should apologize, but at the same time they acknowledge that Kirtanananda's act was "injudicious" and that he should now rectify his blunder. Needless to say, it is not necessary to apologize to a man who steals your wife and sons, especially when his "mistakes" prove him to be far from a pure devotee. We are assuming that the compiler of the document, Rupanuga, had to say that to make it look like he was still on the side of the "gurus." The GBC decision is that Kirtanananda must acknowledge his "mistake" and arrange for Sulocana's sons to be returned to him. This is a direct order from the GBC to Kirtanananda. There is only one way for Kirtanananda to do this:

- 1) He must humble himself before Jane and admit he made a major blunder. He must convince her that he polluted her real marriage and she must accept this wholeheartedly.
- 2) He must convince Jane's paramour, Raghunatha, that he had no right to marry him to Jane and that he now must forget her and go back to masterbating.
- 3) He must send her back to live in California where Sulocana can be with his sons. She does not have to live with Sulocana or serve him but she must return Sulocana's sons. If she refuses to leave Kirtanananda, then she must return the sons alone. Sulocana will accept her back after some time has elapsed if he is convinced that she was only another one of Kirtanananda's victim, and not herself demoniac.
- 4) KS must pay a \$5,000 token damage fee to Sulocana to help set Jane up in a house since Sulocana's business went down the drain during this struggle.
- 5) Kirtanananda must circulate a letter throughout ISKCON stating that Sulocana had every right to make the accusations he did, and that anyone who may have wanted to kill or malign Sulocana should give up that idea wholeheartedly.

If these bare minimum conditions are not met in full by Kirtanananda before Sulocana's book is finished, then the book Sulocana is compiling will be sent to every major media in the world. Sulocana guarantees that this book contains enough filth on the new "Gurus" to burn their little kingdoms to ashes--the fire starting at New Vrndavana.

Comments and inquiries may be sent to Steve Bryant, 2124 Kittredge #32, Berkeley CA 94704 Post date: July 19th, 1985 This version was re-edited on July 29th.

Chapter III

"CHEAP GURUS, CHEAP DISCIPLES"

"THE TRUTH ABOUT THE SPIRITUAL MASTER"

140 "The first thing, I warn Achytananda, do not try to initiate. You are not in a proper position now to initiate anyone... Don't be allured by such maya. I am training you all to become future Spiritual Masters, but do not be in a hurry... You don't be attracted by such cheap disciples immediately. One has to rise gradually by service... These services are most important. Don't be allured by cheap disciples. Go on steadfastly to render service first. If you immediately become Guru, then the service activities will be stopped; and as there are many cheap gurus and cheap disciples, without any substantial knowledge, and manufacturing new pradayas, and with service activities stopped, and all spiritual progress up. You have already mentioned one such non-bona fide sampradaya, Jaya Sampradaya. So let me know immediately what you are going to do, in respect my above three important businesses entrusted to you..." (Achytananda, 8/21/68)

141 Note: Of course ISKCON's "gurus" say: "We were not in a hurry; we waited until six months after Prabhupada's departure to officially declare ourselves worshipable spiritual masters." It takes eight years to earn a license to pull teeth or practice medicine - but getting a throne in ISKCON less than that. Maybe that could be advertised. It could attract a huge following, which is the verification of a bona fide movement. Right?

142 "As for your next question; "Can only a few pure devotees deliver others?" Anyone, if he is a pure devotee he can deliver others, he can become spiritual master. But unless he is on that platform he should not attempt it. Then both of them will go to hell, like blind men leading the blind." (Tusta Krishna, 12/14/72)

143 Note: Pure devotees of Krsna are not a dime-a-dozen as in ISKCON today. Even the madhyam status of pure devotee is difficult to attain. The topmost platform of pure devotee generally takes a lifetime of sincere, humble, and serious hard work, and only one among thousands achieves it. (BG, 7.3) Prabhupada was a pure devotee from birth. He set the example for us. He waited eleven years before taking initiation. Why today this impatience? Initiation is a serious thing and not something one does whimsically. No sane person rushes into it. Chant, study, and serve Prabhupada through his books with a competent, humble devotee. Krsna sends a pure devotee when the sincere seeker is ready.

Naturally it is helpful if there is an advanced devotee