

Concerns about SSSC Attempt to Shut Down the SSSC Voter Base in China

After the [“Egregious Conflict of Interest in Relation to the SSSC Election Process”](#) document was made public earlier this week, it has become clear that the concerns brought forward are warranted.

Even prior to the document being published, when certain SSSC board members (some of whom are running for reelection) started to understand that there was a large pool of voters from China who would most likely be applying to vote in the SSSC election, they asked the question, “What are we going to about the 200 Chinese voters?”

One of their ideas was that “China doesn’t know about the allegations so they CAN’T qualify to vote”. Apparently, they think that only those potential voters who have been told about the allegations should vote. So, in China, that means only students who have been told about the allegations by their Kundalini Yoga Teachers can be voters. There are many things which are disturbing about even suggesting this idea.

First of all, this is completely against democratic principles. Does this mean that a rural farmer in the countryside, who is not educated, or not “up on the news” from other parts of the country should not be allowed to vote in their country’s election?

In regards to the allegations themselves, the new SSSC board attorneys, Lewis Roca, researched the whole AOB “investigation” and the subsequent AOB report and they provided the SSSC board

with a 200+ page “White Paper” which determined that the [Thompson Report](#) was accurate – that there had not been a proper investigation and the AOB report was simply stories; there had been no proof of wrongdoing by Yogi Bhanjan. (Note: the aforementioned “[Thompson Report](#)” was provided to the SSSC board in December 2020, which essentially said the same thing and the SSSC never acknowledged it publicly, or even responded to it.) Why hasn’t this information been communicated to our community?

The SSSC’s attorneys told the SSSC that because there was no substantiated proof of the allegations (other than stories), that all of the legacy non-profit entities founded by Yogi Bhanjan had to remove any mention of the AOB report from their websites. This has now been completed.

This indicates that the narrative about the allegations which the SSSC purported to our global community, by issuing the flawed AOB report, and which was subsequently also shared extensively by KRI and 3HO to their global constituents, is actually not valid information. And so therefore, not only should the narrative of the “allegations” as presented through the AOB report NOT be shared with the Chinese community, but it should be corrected for all of our community, to set the record straight.

In addition, there was an “inclusion statement” in the above mentioned “White Paper, where the SSSC attorneys gave a directive that Yogi Bhanjan should be a part of all of the organizations he founded. This information was supposed to be communicated to the community. This has not happened. Why not?

Besides all of this which is troubling in itself, in China, it is illegal to make unsubstantiated claims against a person who is no longer living. They have laws which clearly state that no one can make slanderous allegations against a person who has died, because that person cannot defend themselves.

Also, from a cultural perspective, slander of a person who has died is generally understood to be "inhumane".

The following was shared by members of our community:

It is the Chinese culture and integrity NOT to SPEAK BAD THINGS about our teachers, any teacher of any kind, especially a Spiritual Teacher with a legacy. For example, if a Buddhist practitioner does not trust Buddha, he will simply leave the Buddhist path. The same goes for the Chinese sangat. Therefore, they DO NOT understand why the Western Sangat speaks so badly about their Spiritual Teacher. If they do not trust their Teacher any more, they can choose to leave the path.

Also, it is part of the Chinese culture and integrity NOT to SPEAK BAD THINGS about anyone who has passed away.

From the traditional Confucius, Buddhist and Daoist teachings the same thing....

"When a person is dead, everything is gone with him."

Under Chinese law NO LEGAL CASES are filed against anyone who has died. Even if a serious criminal dies during a legal process, the whole case is closed. This is another perspective the Chinese sangat does not understand - why there is such turmoil going on after Yogi Bhanan passed away so long ago.

As you can see, it is NOT in the Chinese Trainers best interest to talk about unproven allegations, and therefore for the most part, they have not chosen to attend the Trainers Forums in the last couple of years and they do not discuss the allegations with their community.

The Chinese government monitors all of the media and even if a founder of an organization is suspected of improper behavior, the Chinese government would assume that the people who are part of the leader's community COULD BE A CULT, and then ALL of the Kundalini Yoga students and their families would be investigated by the government and would not be allowed to practice Kundalini Yoga.

Therefore, all the Chinese trainers do not spread these allegations to their communities—this is an unspoken (mutual) understanding.

So, for the SSSC board to suggest a requirement that in order for people in China to vote, the Chinese teachers need to tell their students about allegations, which have not been proven in a court of law, allegations which are also against someone who is no longer living, it is alarming and intimidating for potential voters in China.

But wait, that's not all... some SSSC board members directed their attorney to contact Chinese lawyers to find out whether it would be legal for Chinese voters to vote in a US based "religious" election, ostensibly "to protect the Chinese people".

Then the question arises, is this is a "religious" election?

Maybe originally it was, but now, it seems with the electorate being opened up to Kundalini Yoga students/teachers who have "lived our lifestyle for the last seven years", the electorate no longer need to be Sikhs. And, while the current SSSC board

members are required to be Sikh ministers, some SSSC board members have also suggested opening that requirement up to include Kundalini Yoga Teacher Trainers, many of whom are not Sikhs.

So, which is it? Are we a “religious” organization conducting a “religious” election? Or are we a “lifestyle” organization which allows others who “follow our lifestyle” to vote in our “non-religious” election? You can’t have it both ways.

Of course, all of this is deeply disturbing in many ways to anyone acting with integrity.

By even thinking about ways to control the votes of the SSSC electorate, to guide the electorate to the outcome you want, demonstrates how low some of the SSSC board members will go to maintain their positions of power, and confirms the concerns expressed in the [“Egregious Conflict of Interest in Relation to the SSSC Election Process”](#) document.