

# Extremely Concerning Election Issues Discussed at the Khalsa Council Meeting

Here are points made at the Khalsa Council meeting on Saturday, September 24<sup>th</sup> by the Secretary General, members of the SSSC and the Office of Dharmic Counsel (ODC— “internal” attorneys for the SSSC), and our responses.

\*Note: our responses were not heard at the Khalsa Council meeting. Anytime anyone tried to question and reply with comments against the points made, they were shut down or muted, so we are sharing the points and our responses with the Global Sangat here.

## Chinese Voters

1. POINT MADE: if it is illegal for Chinese people to vote, they should not be allowed to vote

### RESPONSE

- a. Under what authority does the SSSC claim they can make the determination to exclude a whole group of voters based on a single legal opinion (read on for more details) which has not been adjudicated, rebutted and certainly not made settled law.

Don't the Chinese people and people of any country have the right to self-determination as to whether they are culpable under their own country's laws? It is demeaning and presumptive for members of the SSSC to think otherwise.

Currently, some Americans are trying to stop people of color in the state of Georgia from voting, for political reasons. Currently some Americans are trying to stop people of color from voting in the state of Texas, for political reasons. Now we also have some Americans on the SSSC Board who are trying to prevent people of color in China from voting for political reasons.

By trying to discount the votes from China, it demonstrates a racist and bigoted bias against the Chinese people by members of the SSSC who are trying to subdue the Chinese votes for political reasons.

Some people may say, no, suppressing the Chinese voters is not for political reasons – there are other good reasons—like acting “in the best interest” of the Chinese Sangat. The most notorious example of making decisions in someone else's “best interest” is what slave owners routinely said about making decisions in the “best interest” of their slaves. Racism and bigotry exist whenever and wherever this occurs.

People who want to suppress votes can always find “good reasons”, for example, people need “real IDs” to vote, etc.

The fact that the SSSC Board is even saying they are going to vote whether to determine what is dangerous or not for the Chinese people is representative of a totalitarian government, who does not allow people to make their own choices—exactly what they are saying the Chinese government is doing.

Any way you look at it, this conversation which the SSSC has started is racist and bigoted.

- b. Background on what has happened leading up to the Khalsa Council meeting regarding this issue:

Months ago, certain SSSC Board members brought up their concern that it was “dangerous” for the Chinese people to vote in an election for a “Religious Organization” and that they were ostensibly concerned for the safety of the Chinese voters.

A few people in our Sangat who are either ministers or lead trainers, and are either Chinese themselves, or have taught in China for years,

met with the SSSC attorney, Scott Browning, to explain that the assumption that there was danger to the Chinese people was incorrect; that there was no danger to the Chinese people; that the Chinese people are allowed to vote and to participate in any activity that follows Chinese law and is not against the Chinese government. It was a congenial meeting, and Scott told them if there were any further questions, they would be contacted again.

Instead, the SSSC hired an outside attorney in China to give an opinion and this attorney wrote a lengthy report.

After receiving this legal opinion from these outside attorneys in China, hired by the SSSC, the topic of whether the SSSC should exclude the Chinese voters was added to the agenda, to be voted on.

However, members of the SSSC protested, saying it was wrong to vote on this without first getting a response from Angad Kaur, who is Chinese and who met with Scott previously, and who is one of the Professional Trainers in China.

It was finally decided to allow her and her attorney to meet with the outside attorneys from China who the SSSC had hired, and with the SSSC attorney, Scott Browning.

Angad asked Scott for the written report from the outside attorneys in China, so she and her attorney could know what they said and prepare their feedback accordingly. Scott responded that the report was attorney/client privileged information and could only be shared with the SSSC board members. Instead, he had the outside attorneys he had hired send a summary of their report to Angad Kaur.

Summaries don't count. As we saw recently, in US politics, summaries can be deceptive and inaccurate. The US Attorney General, Bill Barr, would not release the Mueller Report investigation into the former US president's participation with Russian

interference in the 2016 US presidential election. Initially, instead of releasing the report, Bill Barr gave a summary, which years later, when the Mueller Report was finally released, was found to be deceptive and inaccurate.

The SSSC received a report with an opinion, and they are not sharing it with the Chinese Sangat, so they can be able to fully respond. Instead, the outside attorneys hired by the SSSC provided a “summary” of the report. What are they hiding by not sharing the full report?

In the initial communication from Scott, he suggested that both he and the outside attorneys have two meetings with Angad and her attorney – the first meeting would be for the outside attorneys to present their opinion and the second meeting would be for Angad Kaur and her attorney to respond. Angad Kaur agreed and requested that the meeting be recorded (so that the SSSC Board members could hear what she and her attorney had to say).

When through some email communications, it became apparent that Scott had decided not to attend the meeting and Angad Kaur had not received confirmation of her request for the meeting to be recorded, she responded to Scott that she had two requirements for her and her attorney to have the meeting: 1) she asked that Scott be present and lead the meeting, 2) (that because this is such a fundamentally important issue for our community, and the SSSC board members should hear from all sides before making a decision on this issue, and since none of them were to be present at the meeting), that the meeting be recorded so that all of the SSSC board members could hear the feedback from Angad Kaur and her attorney.

Scott responded that he would attend and lead the meeting. However, he said that due to open civil matters in the US, he could not allow the meeting to be recorded.

Angad Kaur then replied that a way to solve this would be for her and her attorney to meet with the full SSSC board to give their feedback.

At the time of writing this letter, Scott's response to Angad was "I just wanted you to know that this is now at the Board level for the Directors' consideration, so like you I am waiting to hear if the Board prefers this approach."

This whole situation certainly seems to be going the way of the AOB report:

- a. Do not tell anyone the allegations being made against you
- b. This in turn does not allow you to defend your position, because you don't know what is being said
- c. If someone does find out about what the allegations are and shares an opinion contrary to what you have decided (without hearing equally from the other side), you discount that opinion and take actions against the person/community anyway.

When Sangat members at the Khalsa Council meetings tried to question the points being made, they were either muted or shut down by saying (paraphrased: they are in a legal process with China currently, so they couldn't get into the matter any further).

2. POINT MADE: Chinese voters did not read the AOB Report and therefore should be disqualified to vote.

RESPONSE:

- a. The SSSC attorney, Scott Browning, has told the SSSC that the AOB report was just stories and he required 3HO and KRI to remove the AOB report from their websites. (SDI never acknowledged the report publicly, nor put it on their website – with the exception of communications from Gurujot Kaur as Secretary General of the Khalsa Council to members of the Khalsa Council and the Ministry). So, if the AOB report was not ever supposed to have been promoted, because it was just stories and in essence, the SSSC attorney, Scott Browning himself agreed with THE THOMPSON REPORT, how is it

that SSSC Board members are now saying that the AOB report will be translated into Chinese? And, if people from a country who did not have a translation of the AOB report should be disqualified to vote?

- b. In China, it is culturally and legally not allowed to speak ill of anyone who has died. Under the Chinese law, it is perceived as inhumane to prosecute a dead person. If a prosecuted person dies during the legal process, the case will be closed no matter how serious the crime is which that person is accused of committing.

If the SSSC is truly concerned about the safety of the Chinese people, they will not translate the AOB, which has been determined by their own attorneys to be simply stories.

By translating the misleading information of the AOB report, this could mean that the Chinese Kundalini Yoga community may be investigated and put into prison for being involved in a suspected cult with a criminal founder.

When this issue was brought up at the Khalsa Council meeting, it was stated that if there is no translation of the AOB report, the Chinese Sangat should not be allowed to vote.

- c. How can you require anyone to read anything in order to vote?
- d. How can you ensure that everyone (in any country) did or did not read the AOB Report?
- e. The AOB report is not listed as a requirement on the voter regulations and the voter application does not ask the question of any applicant as to whether they have read the AOB Report
- f. If you did somehow require voters to read the AOB report, then if you are truly neutral, you also need to require voters to read [THE THOMPSON REPORT](#) on [www.fairinvestigation.com](http://www.fairinvestigation.com). If you are truly neutral, you present all sides equally.

## International Voters

1. POINT MADE: People can't vote because they don't speak English and the registration forms were not translated into other languages.

RESPONSE:

Members of our Global Sangat asked the SSSC early on to translate the voter registration forms. Finally, there was a cumbersome translation in Spanish (the translation was separate from the form itself). Why didn't the SSSC make sure the voter registration form was translated in order for our Global Sangat to participate in the SSSC election?

2. POINT MADE: Different international regions must have had a "Positive Yogi Bhanjan" team working on a process to recruit people in different areas. This is wrong. There should not be any recruiting efforts. There were high numbers from a few areas of the world. This is suspicious.

RESPONSE:

- a. What exactly is the SSSC insinuating? People supporting all the SSSC candidates have put the word out and encouraged and helped people to register to vote. What is wrong with that? It seems their concern is that there are possibly more voters registered who support the candidates who they don't want to win.
- b. How do SSSC board members know anything about what geographic regions are represented by the registered voters?

Because of the "Egregious Conflicts of Interest" noted by members of our Global Sangat, the SSSC election was delayed, and the election process was moved from the SSSC and the Khalsa Council Executive Committee to a supposedly COMPLETELY INDEPENDENT company, Amanino.

If the election is being run by an independent, 3<sup>rd</sup> party company, the SSSC should not have any specific information, such as where voters are registering from, which can cause political actions of retaliation, which now seems to be happening.

## Election Authority

1. POINT MADE: When asked who has the authority of the final approval of the election? Who has the power to cancel or delay the election? Satwant Singh, Executive Director of the SSSC, responded that the election would proceed on time.

Then some people continued to push the question and he deferred to Amrit Kaur of the ODC (Office of Dharmic Counsel). She said the ODC has the authority (over the SSSC) to challenge or suspend the election.

RESPONSE:

To the SSSC and the ODC. Did we hear this correctly? Is that true?

How can that be true? Are the lawyers now in charge of this political process? Where in the SSSC by-laws is that authority given?

Where in the SSSC by-laws or any other SSSC document does it give the SSSC authority to make decisions about anyone's (especially people of color's) best interest in contested elections?

Here's a video prepared by Angad Kaur:

[Watch the video here](#)

The current path of the SSSC to exclude Chinese qualified voters from voting could put all that you have seen in this video at risk. That is what is really at stake.