

1.  
STEVE BRYANT (SULOCANA), 2124 KITTREDGE #32, BERKELEY CA  
94704

### A REBUTTAL

TO THE SMEAR SHEET CIRCULATED BY KIRTANANANDA (KEITH HAM),  
ABOUT SULOCANA DAS, SEPT. 16, 1985, AT NEW VRINDABAN,  
W.VA. DURING A SUMMIT CONFERENCE.

To whom it may concern

I am writing this to both the media and ISKCON members and so a middle ground terminology has been used. The founder of our Society, Srila Prabhupada, has said, "Silence means acceptance." As such it is my duty to expose the lies and treachery contained in their document. I am not going to go point for point in this letter since their whole paper is so out of touch with reality. The attached affidavits from witnesses go into their points in detail. There is no argument that I was not perfectly following all of the four regulative principles of our Society (No meat, fish, or eggs; No illicit sex; No intoxication; and no gambling). I freely admit it, and I am not ashamed of it. I never claimed to be a saint. I was simply another victim of an "ISKCON" where if you don't want to kiss the feet of some bogus guru, then you get out.

So I got out, as did 90% of Prabhupada's original disciples. Once living outside, who in his right mind will condemn a devotee for not following those principles perfectly. Married couples are not expected to be able to follow as strictly as the so-called renunciates. I have proven this conclusion from Srila Prabhupada's personal letters. Two significant quotes in this connection are: "Naturally as a householder, he cannot follow everything perfectly, but why should he go away altogether?" (Letter to Karandhar) and "Not everyone is meant to be a brahmin (priest). Those who cannot follow so strictly should be encouraged to work on the farm." (Letter to Sudhama) There are hundreds of such quotes. Krishna consciousness is available to everyone, not just those who can strictly follow all of the above regulative principles. These points are fully covered in my book, "The Guru Business," available, \$10, from the address above.

So regarding this smear sheet on me, there are a few points that prove the entire thing as bogus:

1. First and foremost; The paper was not signed. It was not written by my wife and most likely she's never even read it. If she read this paper, she would be amazed. At least at one point she was an honest woman and maybe she still has some of that in her. Her new paramour wrote that paper and most likely someone else rewrote it to juice it

2.  
up. This document is 90% false. I hereby challenge Jane to make these statements to me personally in front of the witnesses who were present during our marriage. This can be done over the phone.

2. This man, Raghunatha, Jane's new mate, accuses me of smoking pot, but he, not me, is the regular dope smoker. At least he was a year ago. I have first hand proof of that. I also have testimony from Sri Galia, Raghunatha's supervisor, that Raghunatha had a serious problem with attempting to seduce other men's wives for which he had been severely beaten on at least one occasion. Sri Galia even told me personally, "Raghunatha grabbed my wife's breasts once." (Jane's ears of course have been shielded from hearing such things). If I were to put together a sheet on any of NV's "top" men, what to speak of the bottom men like Raghunatha, it would make this paper on me sound like a bedtime story for children.

For example, take the incident of Bhagavatananda's leaving New Vrindaban. He was one of the original devotees there. He left the commune in utter disgust because he caught Villa, (Kuladri, the president of the so-called spiritual community) having simultaneous oral sex with Kanka, an unmarried girl. In this religion, such behavior by a temple president is absolutely abominable. Bhagavatananda was outraged by this because he had just been condemned for having sex with his own wife (who also happens to be one of the wives Raghunatha had tried to seduce). There are hundreds of such stories about Villa but I am not interested to expose him. Most everyone already knows about his character. Ham is the culprit at New Vrindaban who still has everyone fooled.

3. In the very beginning of their paper they say my charges against Ham are groundless, but if that is so, they why can't they refute them with scripture??? That has been my question now for the past year and a half. No one in ISKCON has refuted--in writing--one single accusation that I have made against Ham, and I have made many. Jane of course doesn't know any of what's going on. She most likely doesn't even know that the GBC ordered Ham to apologize to me and return my sons. She is now a typical New Vrindaban devotee and very isolated from the real world. I'd be amazed if she even knows that I've compiled 400 pgs. of hard evidence against Ham and the other ISKCON conspirators.

4. If this paper were true, then why did the GBC Privilege committee decide in my favor? They investigated the situation thoroughly and personally interviewed my wife. If they could have thought of any reason whatsoever to justify Ham's behavior, they would have since they are on his side. Jane did not make such slanderous statements about me then because it was an internal investigation.

3.

Their findings were that Ham must acknowledge his devious behavior and arrange that I get my sons back. Would they have said that if I were the monster depicted in their recent paper? The fact is, Jane has not made these statements about me. She is completely under Ham's influence and she says what he tells her to and that's all there is to it. Anything she says now is meaningless since she has to defend her "guru" if she wants to continue living at that commune and be his "disciple." Ham is well known for his lack of compassion toward women. He would have her kicked out of there in a moment if she refused to do as he says. ("The end justifies the means philosophy.") The fact is, this document was compiled because it is the only way they can try to stop me from exposing the place to the media. Not only are these claims after my marriage false, but my behavior as a devotee in ISKCON (before marriage) is exemplary as numerous devotees have testified to.

5. Jane could just as easily have taken my most inspired moments during our five years of marriage, and, with a few embellishments and flowery words, made me out to look like a saint. They make Ham out to be a saint and his unabridged history is the worst of any devotee in the entire Society without even a close second. I have proven this in my book. Words are easy to manipulate. Hard evidence is what counts, such as the testimonies of people who knew us well during our five years of marriage--who are not under Ham's control. I also have Jane's own statements and letters which I acquired immediately after we separated which contradict everything she is saying now. This is real evidence. It was because of this hard evidence that the local W.Va. media was not awayed by Ham's propaganda on Sept. 16th-20th.

6. There is only one point in their paper that I feel ashamed about. That was my failure to love her son as if he were my own. It is a noble quality to be able to love another man's son and my heart was not so noble, at least not at that stage of my life. I never physically mistreated him, but I regret I was unable to pay him the kind of loving attention a young boy needs from his father. I am not proud of my lack of compassion, and my inability to adopt him at heart, but that is not an unnatural, perverted, or demonic quality on my part either. (Especially since his mother had devoted herself to another man.) Such children are described in our scriptures as 'varna sanskara' (children of unmarried or separated parents). The vast majority of ISKCON children fall into this category and it has created many problems within the Society. Therefore Prabhupada has said, "There absolutely cannot be divorce." "A woman with child cannot remarry," "Once a woman gives her heart to a man, it is very difficult for her to take it back." There are hundreds of such quotes meant to discourage irresponsible

4.

marriages and divorce within our Society. So even though I am not proud that I was unable to love Jane's son as if he were my own, it is certainly an extreme exaggeration for her to say that I mistreated him. At the very worst, I am guilty of not giving him loving affection and for that I am very sorry.

Knowing this (at least subconsciously), I originally did not want to marry Jane. When it was proposed that I marry a girl who already had a child, I immediately rejected the idea. But fate arranged that it take place anyway for which I have no ill regrets at this time. A much higher purpose has been served by our marriage and I am confident that a reconciliation is forthcoming as soon as she realizes the real character of her "guru."

What I am now contesting is the corruption within ISKCON that allows neophytes like Ham to think they have the right to initiate women and then encourage them to leave their husbands. Srila Prabhupada never did such a thing. Our marriage may have worked out except for this interference. Unfortunately we will never know in my case but we can prevent the same thing from happening to others by exposing these men now.

A very interesting analogy that ISKCON members will appreciate comes from the epic story of Lord Ramachandra. Sita (Rama's wife) was kidnapped by a ten-headed demon, Ravana, King of Lanka. It was due to a very small error on her part. She voluntarily stepped outside of a mystical circle that had been created around her for her own protection. She was lured out of that circle by the demon because of--as Prabhupada words it--"Her simple and trusting nature as a woman." She did not leave the circle maliciously.

Jane was no more to blame for her abduction than was Sita. Neither am I to blame since I did not send Jane to New Vrindaban unprotected. I sent her with a note indicating she should not take initiation. Whatever she may have wanted at the time doesn't really matter in this case since the note clearly indicated that she was not to take initiation yet. I admit I was considering it. In our religion the women are under the protection of their husbands and so Ham had no right whatsoever to suggest that she didn't need my direct approval. But in a very similar way to Sita devi, she was lured away from my protection by Villa (speaking on Ham's behalf) who told her, "It isn't necessary to have his (your husband's) approval."

Sincerely

*Sulocana das*  
Sulocana das