

**Excerpts from Harimedia Forum**

**Myths about Hari, so-called facts,  
and the skinny on it all!**

Copyright 2005-2024 Harimedia LLC  
All Rights Reserved



Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it all!  
by Hari » Sun Mar 27, 2011 3:26 pm

Comments by me to so-called "Facts" appearing in the internet and elsewhere...

Me= Robert Campagnola, also known as Hari nowadays, previously known as Harikesa Swami or Hariksha, or Vishnupada although I request everyone to simply call me Hari. I do not respond to the previous names.

I have found that after all these years there is a continuous undercurrent of negative reverberation about me. Although I do not think about it most of the time, it seems that whenever I try to present a more balanced image of my life or ideas, someone feels they have to comment to ruin anything I say. It seems that they think that I should suffer forever for the wrongs I did either to them, although there are few who were personally involved, or the wrongs they heard from some other source. It seems that they thrive on this negative confrontation and fighting somehow inspires their existence and justifies whatever they are. It is interesting how some individuals escape personal responsibility by pointing at another and saying, "He did this and that and he is the source of all our problems and my problems. Whatever I am today is because of the bad things he did to me or to ISKCON." Many victims out there, it seems...

I found Wikipedia to be an amusing study in this phenomena. To justify something in Wikipedia when it comes to a person who is not documented in research or substantial literatures, all you need is a statement somewhere on the web. I was considering to create a fictional person and making many web sites to describe and document this person's existence with references to external quotes and studies and then create a Wiki page. Basically this is what has been done to me. Myths and rumours and very selective information is verified by the wonderful internet rumour mill and considered as a fact. I tried to correct this impression by adding in other things, but this was considered to be unacceptable because it was not published anywhere. Autobiographical information is not considered neutral. However, myths are... As long as the information is not favorable, it is neutral... Strange...

So here are some "facts" people state. Here are some preliminary comments on these "facts." If you have more of these statements, comment on this text and I can respond.

\* You stole money, you took money

Not true. How can I prove I did not do something? Did any responsible leader at the time accuse me of this? No. Was there any police report? No. Why? Because it did not happen. Then why do you say it over and over again? Is it only because it makes a good story or it amplifies scandal and you like scandals? Or is it because you have already decided I am a bad guy and you then create the proof you need to believe it? Why not just dislike me without requiring false information to confirm your dislike? After all, you do not know me. What is the difference?

\* The GBC did not report you because you blackmailed them with secret information they could not tolerate you revealing.

Interesting. I have no idea what that information could have been. I already revealed about child abuse, women abuse, family abuse, everyone abuse and exploitation. I already spoke about the errors in the initial presentations, the value structure, the philosophy and in the Founder. I have spoken about the irrelevance of the GBC as a body. I cannot even imagine what more I could have said or what dark secrets were more serious than this. There are not

even any financial secrets that could have been revealed since the GBC body did not deal with finances in a manner that would have been relevant to some scandalous situation other than perhaps wasting money on something useless, but that is normal for organizations.

\* Why didn't the GBC tell the truth about your NOT stealing from ISKCON?

Good question. Jayadvaita Swami once told me that when someone had said I stole from the BBT or whatever, Brahma Muhurta said they should speak with him and he would deny that fact. But I consider the real facts to be far more interesting than the lies. [There had been a reference here where I quoted someone who told me that Prthu had misappropriated funds from the hospice in Vrindavan. Because the poor fellow feels insulted by me that I falsely accused him, he requires that I remove this. So I removed it. Interesting though, he can falsely accuse me, but I cannot falsely accuse him. Will he stop? Not sure, and don't actually care as I have no need to, but I still removed this reference because it was the right thing to do.]

Here is another interesting fact: A meeting was organized in Nice, France, to try to work out the problems that were occurring in Russia amongst devotees after I left. Before I agreed to go to the meeting, I asked Sesa, who was the GBC rep sent there to work things out, if he was fully authorized to make agreements on behalf of the GBC without needing further approval. This was required as there were only three days to work it all out once and for all and there was to be no second chance. He declared definitively that he was authorized and in touch with the EC and that we should do whatever required to settle affairs. In this spirit I engaged in the meeting. One of the resolutions, and I have the paper signed by all the delegates, was one where the GBC was to publish a document stating unequivocally that I did not steal from ISKCON or the BBT or anyone. For me, having people say these ridiculous things was intolerable as I wanted to somehow be remembered as a generous and charitable person (ha, fat chance!) and I wanted it to be cleared so the truth would be known. Yet, when the GBC yearly meeting came and the paper was to be issued, they denied it as they felt they "owed" me nothing and since I was a "traitor" I should not be given this even if it was true. In other words, they felt it was in their best interests to keep the myth going as it further demonstrated that no one should be connected to me.

\* All you really want now is to take people from ISKCON to yourself

Funny, although I have no problem with people leaving ISKCON, and do not mind if they restore their own personal integrity by taking responsibility for their own lives, I also do not want anyone to be a "follower" of me or anyone else. Since I have no organization, I have no economic interest in anyone being associated with me and since I offer everything freely, it would be totally contradictory for me to want people to "follow" me as I tell them is to follow their hearts and make their own decisions about all aspects of their lives. So this idea is false.

\* You are crazy. This was confirmed!

Strange how myths and rumours become certified in circular processes. Someone states a lie, another quotes it, another quotes them. Each time the lie is amplified somewhat and distorted according to whatever it is that someone wishes to prove to themselves by trampling others. Soon the lie in its various forms is everywhere and linked together in a mesh of statements. Everyone looks at this body of knowledge and says, "It is confirmed on the internet. After all, is this not how Wikipedia does it? If it is confirmed somewhere on the internet and published it means it is true and therefore worthy of being quoted in Wikipedia. Nothing else is truth, and if Hari says otherwise he is simply protecting his guilty ass." Gee. Sorry state for humanity says I.

There was a Dr. Dags, some psychologist who saw a video of me giving a class. He diagnosed from that video that I had serious psychological problems. Hmmm. One of the heads of the

German government's psychiatry ministry came to see me. Her son was a former devotee. The EC asked her to go to see me and make a diagnosis. After a discussion she revealed how she was so grateful to me that I exposed the various forms of what she labeled as abusive and exploitative elements in ISKCON and gave her a way to free her son. The EC came to see her to confirm that I was crazy. She looked at them and explained that they were like a group of crazed chickens clucking all around me. She advised them to cool off as I was fine and they were the problem. By the way, she asked me to make an official complaint to the government against Dr Dags as he had made a public diagnosis without any proper data, from a video, and without knowing me at all. She said he should have his license taken away for such malpractice. I said I was not into retribution or revenge and so I did not do it. I told her I thought whatever the ISKCON people said or did was in character and any sane and thoughtful person would see through it. Looking back on it, it seems that I was overly optimistic.

This was not enough for the EC. They demanded that I go to Trier to a clinical psychiatrist and get evaluated "for the sake of a trial against Hansadutta for the BBT." Transparently silly, but I had nothing to lose so I went. After discussing with the psychiatrist for a short while, he looked at me and said, "If I had to go through what you went through for all those years without any day off and under such pressure and stress I would have broken long ago. As far as I can see you are doing amazingly well considering your situation and there is absolutely nothing wrong with you. On the contrary, you are doing quite well!" And the next day he went on vacation. In the two weeks before he finished his letter certifying I was fine, there were multiple rumours in the mill that I had just been declared crazy by a psychiatrist. And when they got the letter, they were silent, as their purpose was not the truth, it was to discredit me.

\* You do not care about anyone but yourself

Well, go to harimedia.net. Listen to some of my lectures. Read my texts. Do they sound like a self-absorbed person only interested in themselves? Why do I not charge thousands of dollars like all the other teachers out there? Why do I broadcast for free? How about asking someone who does know me? Go to the forums and check in the Good Old Days Discussions. There are discussions there related to me that are heavy duty and no holds barred. Read 'em. Ah, but you are not interested! Sure, if your point is to find fault with me, then go ahead. You can find plenty of information on the internet. You do not need to hear what I have to say. After all, you confirm what you already think as you already made up your mind! There is only black and white in this world, no? It is either Krsna or maya. There is no in between. There is only guru and sastra. Fundamentalism is NOT a bad word, no? (The last four sentences are sarcastic.) Well, I do not follow this, therefore I am in maya and bad. Is this not so according to you?

\* You did bad things to people in ISKCON. You exploited them...

Maybe to some extent yes. I sent them out to sell books because that is what Prabhupada told me to do when he was using me (was this exploitation?) to accomplish his mission. He wanted things done in a certain way and I tried to do that. Yes, it was hard for everyone. Yes, we all felt pain. Yes, sometimes I had to make incredibly hard decisions in the continual battle to preserve the balance between group and individual. As I grew older and more experienced, it became easier to know what to do, but harder to actually do it. I was not perfect. I am not perfect. I tried my best, always. Sometimes I succeeded and sometimes I failed. I did good things, I did bad things. I always did what I thought was right at the time I did it. I could have done many things better. However, I did many good things too, but you will not know of them. And if I try to tell someone they just say this is a coverup. They say it is false propoganda. Actually, I did tons of cool things. Someday if someone is interested it would make a fantastic book. But there were problems for many people and try as I could to balance the needs of the group and individuals, I could not succeed to my own expectations and finally it caused me to leave. I believe that if you are not part of the solution you are part of the problem. I tried my best to

create a solution, I could not succeed, I refused to continue to be part of the problem, I left the problem as I felt there was no solution to it.

I am not sure what people mean when they say I did so many bad things. I know that I am lumped in with all guru problems because this is one of the many things I did. Guilt by association. Exactly what I did and when might be discussed and I might comment on it if motivated to do so. I have a hard time being motivated as I do not see much use to defend myself. The hardest thing to do is to present something to someone who is convinced of what they think.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Hari » Sun Mar 27, 2011 3:29 pm

The linked website in this original post no longer exists: More information on a particular historical subject just published in an interview. Check out the comments. They are interesting. I hope they expand this discussion more...  
[http://harekrishnawomen.wordpress.com/2 ... with-hari/](http://harekrishnawomen.wordpress.com/2...with-hari/)

Here is the original text where I answered some questions from Vraja Bhumi dasi in March 2011 (her questions are in italics):

1. When you left ISKCON it seemed that the leaders were trying to portray you as having a chemical imbalance, that you had "gone off your meds," saying you were literally mentally incompetent, and they actually tried to have you committed to a psychiatric hospital. When I read your side of the story, which you wrote at that time, it became obvious that there was in fact nothing wrong with you at all, that you had simply lost faith in Prabhupada's ideology, and had set out to change what you saw as damaging to so many -- especially women and children. It appeared that the ISKCON leadership was afraid of your influence, especially since you had the most disciples, the most money, and therefore the most influence. They decided to try to discredit your change of faith by portraying you as having lost your mind.

Now, with hindsight, would you have done anything differently with how you revealed your loss of faith to your followers and your desire to change ISKCON?

To properly answer this question, I first have to understand what it is that I wanted at that time and to see it in the context of what I want now. When I look back in time, I do so from the perspective of the present. Therefore, how I presently feel or think; more importantly, what I value and how I see myself in relation to others, is the most important part of this exercise. Thus the events and people of the past are far less important in my analysis of that time than is my present state of consciousness. This is both obvious and not at all obvious at the same time. If I take your question from the obvious, then the answer should also be obvious. Naturally, I have thought about what happened and should have ideas about how I could have improved my responses to the chaos around me. Yet, considering the not obvious aspect of hindsight, why should I?

If I at present have no desire to worry about followers nor any desire to change ISKCON, why would I wish to change my actions? As this is my present state of mind, I find it impossible to answer your question. Others have asked me if there was anything I would have done differently from that time in 1998 and I have considered it. There is only one event I would have avoided if do-overs were allowed in life and that is a conversation I had with Brahma Muhurta in August of that year. It was a product of my intense frustration at having been dealt with like I was. As everything else has worked out as it has, I can live with all the other events.

Before it is seen that I do not care about people or that I am unconcerned about the inequities in the socio-political aspects of ISKCON that have far greater impact on people than its spirituality ever did, let me explain.

I do not think ISKCON can change in the fundamental manner required to "satisfy" my requirements for a sane and effective spiritual institution. I do not think that one form of stating my personal philosophical transformation is superior to another and therefore I do not think that any communication I would have had with former disciples at that time would have been superior (in some abstract or even realistic sense) than another. My conclusions were directly opposed to everything that was held as sacred by all within the institution. Here are some examples:

\* I do not think it is possible to combine a socio-political organization and pure spirituality. It is quite possible, although not certain, that the term "spiritual organization" is an oxymoron in the sense that the elements required for a proper organization are more or less opposed to personal spiritual development in a relevant, meaningful and considerate manner. Unless the organization has the historical culture and capacity to work within the varna-ashrama context, it cannot succeed. And since this WAS only possible in India, in the distant past, how will this occur at all today?

\* Considering the above point, I concluded there is no way to change ISKCON to something that interests me. I was attempting to gradually implement social reform in ISKCON and specifically to create a more or less ideal community model in Mayapur, but that was short circuited by my inability to handle the reality of the movement.

\* I only care about people. I see whenever there is organization, there is inequity and conflict. I also see the only hope to resolve this on a truly meaningful level is to have people live in a village context and to have their own spiritual beliefs that they demonstrate in whatever manner they desire. To this end, I attempt to offer them the tools to do this.

\* I do not believe in "guru" and find the concept to be at the root of the problems facing those who remain in ISKCON. Although the concept is touted as the grand solution to all problems, I see it as the root cause of the problems. How could I think of myself as a guru with followers with this vision? I could not. Considering this, the best thing I could do to initiate the process of freeing "followers" from the curse of following is to let them go. Those who have "come back," do so because they like what I say and find that it assists them in their own lives. I make no demands on them and have no expectations from them. I offer what I offer to them freely. If they like it, they take it, if they do not, they do something else. I am happy with this.

So to now answer your question in a context that is relevant to the present:

I would do nothing differently. I would not consider changing anything. I would not attempt to "break the news" in any other manner than the extremely limited manner I had at my disposal at the time. Considering that I was removed from ISKCON forcibly and that all my possibility to communicate with those I knew through the COM system (the only communication available at the time) was blocked, what could I have said anyway? And since the world was awash with strange statements about me that had little or nothing to do with me, why would I waste my valuable time trying to prove that I was not a thief, I was not a crook, I was not dependent on drugs, I was not a lusty madman or whatever? How would it have mattered? I mean, for anyone who actually knew me, these ideas were exceedingly questionable. Those who cared should have asked me about my own reality. For those who did not, they were ready to believe anything they heard if it fit their existing conceptions of gurus or gbc.

And yes, it is possible that someone can go suddenly nuts, especially in ISKCON due to the fundamentalist system and the repressive atmosphere. I mean, anyone with a heart who looked at what happened to the children, how husbands and wives saw loving relationships as stepping stones to degradation, how children were blank slates to be programmed by child

abusers, and how individuals were merely means to an end without much regard for their personal needs, all within the context of a sophisticated corporate environment, would have also lost their mind. One found the mind after leaving the organization. Therefore, the news that someone left the movement because they lost their mind is old news as this is the reason everyone left. Drugs, sex, madness -- these make good headlines in a repressed organization. So be it.

I can do nothing to change it. So I do not try. I simply am what I am and do what I can do and what I want to do. I enjoy doing what I do. I cannot tolerate stress so I avoid stressing others. I am not in anyone's employ as I am not controlled by other's money. I do not have to be nice to my donors, yet, I am nice as I am a nice person . I can be nice and care about people because that is how I feel. I am not saying that no one in ISKCON now shares this ideal because I do not know if they do or not and frankly I do not care.

2. We know somewhat the history of ISKCON after the departure of Prabhupada, but there is a big blank space for most people when it comes to how the original gurus came to gain their positions. Could you shed some light on what happened? Who and how the decisions were made in creating the new succession of gurus from Prabhupada's cadre of leaders?

I can share with you my personal story as I do not know all that much about the story of others. I promise you this is a correct version of my personal history. Obviously it is from my own point of view. I do not present this as objective reality. All history is simply a compilation of events from the point of view of the dominant voices at the time. History is not neutral, neither objective.

Sometime in the spring or so of 1977, Bhaktibhusana Swami (who at that time was still Sucandra das) received a letter from Prabhupada that said something like, "... and Harikesa Swami can initiate the more sincere of those as he likes.." or something like that. The letter should be in Folio, if Folio still exists and if it was not edited out. He came into my office and showed me the letter. We were totally bewildered as we could not understand what it meant. It was inconceivable at the time that Prabhupada would die (as I would not allow that) and therefore there was no relevance to anyone other than him initiating anyone. So I said we should not worry about this and perhaps it was some kind of mistake or there was more to it, but we should wait to see if there was a further communication. As the letter was not to me, I did not consider it further. I knew that if Prabhupada wanted me to do something he would tell me directly.

Approximately one month later, I received an official letter from Tamal Krsna Goswami, countersigned by Prabhupada, that said that in the near future he would be picking some disciples to initiate on his behalf as he wished to do that less. This letter is also certainly part of the public record. Some time later I received another official letter with a list of names on it of those who were supposed to initiate disciples as they wished without having to get approval for it. My name was on it.

I received no further information than that. There was no training for what was to come, no instructions. It was thrown at me. Despite this letter, I refused to believe that Prabhupada would die and leave us alone. Then he did.

I went to Bombay in January of 1979. I met with Pradyumna as he and I were very close friends. I asked him what he thought about this situation. He said that in the Gaudiya Math they had a small mat on the floor on a very short platform (maybe 1") and there was little distinction between godbrothers who all received equal respect. Initiation was something relevant to arcana, deity worship, and the disciple would have a very small photo that was placed on the altar during puja and removed afterwards. I thought that this was a great principle and it would



be the very best thing for us to do as it would avoid envy and interpersonal rivalry that must appear when there is a large difference between godbrothers. I felt confident that we could deal with the situation using this information.

I arrived for the GBC meeting a month later. The mood was solemn and the tension palpable. I was very uncomfortable. Unfortunately, at that time I had not yet learned the art of patience in dealing with groups like the GBC. In my youthful idealism, I truly felt they would embrace truth and practicality. It took me a few years to figure out that truth was not easily found in this group and effective practicality was rarely considered. Like all political organizations, there were multiple currents overt and covert that manipulated decision making. I could not tolerate politics, neither could I associate myself with any particular grouping as I have always been an individualist who wished to be his own person. The only time in my life I allowed this to change was in my respect for and devotion to Prabhupada and to a large extent he accommodated and facilitated my individuality.

Back to my impatience. The initial comments in the room indicated to me there was a serious potential for conflict. It scared me, yet I felt confident that Pradyumna's advice would save the day and give everyone room to breathe. So I presented this scenario of the limited guru to the GBC. For reasons far too complex to explain here, it was received with confusion and disregard. Perhaps some thought they did indeed want to be larger than life while others thought they should also be able to be a guru even though they were not on the list? Perhaps they disputed the list itself? I cannot say since I could not conceive of these hidden issues at that time. I was 29 years old.

Can you imagine this? I took Sannyas when I was 28. Later that year, just after my 29th birthday, I became a GBC and BBT trustee. A few months later a full fledged initiating guru in a global society that was (certainly! without a doubt!) the true and only true representative of the Supreme Personality of Godhead on this Earth! My God! Think about it. 29.

I am now 63. I cannot imagine it happening to me now, what to speak of then. But youth has a way to overlook the consequences of actions and to dream of a pleasant future. Ah, youth!

Well, as usual, my comments acted as a catalyst after they were tossed aside as irrelevant. Very intense discussions followed and I attempted to say that any solution other than the one I presented had too many pitfalls to be viable. Guru Krpa Swami spoke and emotionally said that we did not know what to do as we were too young. Prabhupada had said to him that we should go to HH Sridhar Maharaj, Prabhupada's Godbrother, to get advice on what to do. There was some discussion with most agreeing. I was vehemently against this as I knew what Prabhupada felt about him and knew that he had a strong inclination to disrupt Maths. Guru Krpa said, "Is this not true Tamal?" To this, Tamal looked down to the floor and nodded affirmatively. I freaked out. Jayatirtha, the chairman at the time, called the vote. All hands went up. He proclaimed, "It is unanimous!" I shouted out, "Take the no votes." He said why should he as everyone was in favor. I said, "Take the no votes because I want to go down in history as the only one against this insane resolution!" Jayatirtha said, "No's?" After my hand went strongly in the air, he derided, "Now you can go down in history."

So a delegation went off on a ferry to the venerable Swami. And he said that there are two kinds of people, the guru and the non-guru. Non-guru can never tell guru what to do because they are in a totally different category. Guru is above all managerial principles; connected directly to the Supreme. Guru needs his own house as guru is like a father in a family. Guru needs a high vyasasan to display his superior position, and so on. And in Vrindavan, where there is a common interest, there should be a group photo on the altar of all gurus. Godbrothers must support guru. He called all gurus as acaryas and implied directly that the "Acarya Board" will be superior to GBC.

And since it was the resolution, this was accepted in its essence although it was slightly modified in its description to the outside world.

I do not wish to start telling you how I felt during this meeting, neither how I saw the implications or ramifications of this implementation. I was worried enough of being in the position of either remaining against the entire GBC or going along with it. Very troublesome. It is important to me to maintain a balanced outlook on things so I can relate to the largest number of people. So I took the position of being the loyal opposition and remained so for many years until I just accepted that this was the way it was in 1984. I regret surrendering to this because right after I stopped fighting it great conflict started and I was dragged into it.

Back to history. Now the GBC was divided and within it was the Acarya Board that met to discuss what to do about this situation and how to avoid civil war. For reasons I cannot understand, Satsvarupa Maharaj, who at the time was looked upon as being learned, wrote the paper that was presented to the society. Again, I was the only one against the paper. I said it was simplistic and did not address the needs of Godbrothers and GBC. I was not heard. He presented the paper and was hammered with questions, none of which he could answer to the satisfaction of those who were angered by the paper.

So the root of the entire problem with dealing with Prabhupada's untimely demise was this idiotic idea to go to a person who was famous within Gaudiya Math for being a breaker of form and a destroyer of the Maths. And in one short meeting he set the scene for the ruination of peace in ISKCON by dividing the house against itself, placing young men in an elitist position far beyond the control of any other organization, and destroying the organization's capacity to correct the situation later on. He set everyone into camps and as we all know, camps tend to fight for supremacy. Well, the rest is more or less known.

3. Are you still in contact with old ISKCON leaders either in or out of their positions? e.g. ex-gurus like Bhagavan -- who has recently been speaking out in ways which immediately reminded me of the ideas and mood of what you have written in the past and present.

I am not in contact with Bhagavan as we were not friends before. I have met a few others with whom I had a friendship previously. I enjoy being with friends.

As my lectures and some writings are available on harimedia.net, anyone can read it. But that others might come to a similar conclusion is not unusual as most of it is quite obvious and mainly common sense.

4. What have you been doing since leaving ISKCON? I know you've been involved with a lot of music, that you're a talented guitarist and sing with a band. I also know that you have an online sangha, and an online radio show, and that you visit ex-followers in Eastern Europe. Can you shed some light on your current spiritual thoughts, and also your experiences with sharing your post-ISKCON music, ideas and philosophy?

I feel that we are spiritual energy that pervades our body and consciousness. We are not simply a dot of spirit encased by matter and absorbed in maya. I think that we can contact our own spiritual essence and energy by simply accepting our own energy. As our energy and the energy of the divine are one, we can easily connect to the divine by feeling our own spiritual frequency and tuning to that same frequency in the divine through our intention in focused concentration. I feel that the main thing blocking our direct connection to the divine, to Radha and Krsna, is our acceptance of the blinding principle that we are not good enough and therefore we cannot do so. I reject the idea that the most important principle is to understand the difference between ourselves and the Supreme. I embrace the idea wholeheartedly that we

are one in energy with the divine and true communion with the divine takes place when the interests of the lover and the beloved become one so that the distinction between them no longer matters. Purified oneness. There is indeed only One of Us as by this communion we create an Us. When we experience the spiritual being we are, experience the essence we are, and tune ourselves to the spiritual energy of the divine, we embrace the divine with full love. In this sharing of love we become a third entity, so to speak, an Us where the lover and beloved become one in essence.

ISKCON people find this idea bewildering as they are trained to concentrate on the difference. I say the difference does not bring bliss, only the oneness. We are one and different. The different does not mean we are worse or not good enough. It means that we are individuals who can find the one by accepting it. When we find the oneness between ourselves and the divine we find connection and the loving relationship we long for.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Hari » Sun Mar 27, 2011 6:09 pm

I present here a few links to topics in this forum where I was asked to address issues related to those good old days we love to hash over continuously in our attempt to find inner peace. These are interesting points. Some of the discussion is quite hot. More hot discussion is found elsewhere, but I limited these links to where I wrote something about how I see things...

[viewtopic.php?f=9&t=15](#) Who am I to former disciples?

[viewtopic.php?f=9&t=81](#) = About Gurus

[viewtopic.php?f=9&t=175](#) = Discussion about vibhuti ashes

[viewtopic.php?f=9&t=106](#) = About Prabhupada and the Gaudiya Sampradaya

[viewtopic.php?f=9&t=112](#) = The Purport of Guru

[viewtopic.php?f=9&t=73](#) What about vaisnavas Like Gaura Govinda Swami or others?

[viewtopic.php?f=9&t=83](#) About the Soul of ISKCON

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Hari » Sun Mar 27, 2011 6:45 pm

What's in it for me?

After putting in the initial text to this topic, I went to take care of the Deities. I found myself absorbed in the mind. This is interesting as I am usually not. My energy was wandering around the mental fields and seemed to find itself linking to various energy loops. I felt confused and wondered what was going on and if I would ever recover from this. Had I ruined myself irrevocably?

Then it hit me! I was captured in the huge mind that characterizes ISKCON! I was lost in the incessant discussion about history, the continuous judgment, the arguing and fighting about the errors of the past and the wrongs done to everyone! It made me think. What I managed to do when I left ISKCON was to let that mind go. I found that by letting go the past and immersing myself in the present through experiencing my essence as it is without considering if I was good enough to do it, I entered into a state that was clear, free, without burden and without obstacles to understanding what I knew was right. This morning I re-experienced the

horror of being captured in the polemic that was ISKCON at that time and that seems to continue in some people. Gee. I think they should let it go. Why bother proving anything anyway?

Everyone believes what they want to. Seems that most of the people one runs into who are into the past and embrace that all encompassing mind that does not let go have already made up their minds, have a set opinion, and have lost the capacity to listen to others. Any attempt I make to convince them otherwise is a waste of time. So why should I try?

Well, there are good reasons why. I personally care about the truth of history. I am well aware that history is whatever one makes it. More importantly in this information age, it is whatever you care to believe. I am not foolish enough to declare that my version of it is absolute and anyone who disagrees with me is wrong. I would not bother to accept such an untenable position. However, I know what I know because I was there. And I feel that I have just as much right to express it as anyone else. Since this is my forum I can do so. I do not have to worry here that others will think it their God Sworn Duty to negate what I say. I know what I say is true according to my perception, my memory, and my motivations and intentions. I have nothing to lose by being dishonest. After all, I left ISKCON in a fit of gritty honesty. Why should I backtrack now?

I am also aware that there are multiple negative things in my past. I look back on some situations and shudder. I remember some people and get chills up my spine. I wonder again and again why I stayed in an organization like that? But I did, so I have to deal with it. I did good, I did bad. Naturally I do not like to air all the bad things I did in this public forum because I am basically a private person. However, the things that most people say about what I supposedly did are not factually correct in many instances and are so twisted or distorted that it renders a disservice to a larger body of people. Therefore, I like to state what facts are, if I might be so bold as to call them that, according to me.

I have a hard time with a lot of history. Some of it is 30-40 years old. I know my memory cannot grasp detail so far back as I could then. I know that I do not like to reveal some things that relate to individuals as I do not want to smear the memory of departed souls and do not wish to cause trouble to those still living. Sometimes I have to do it to express the reality of the times. I know that how I said something or did something was considered by an individual or a group as terrible. I might have thought it was fine and proper, they might have thought it was awful. Perhaps they misunderstood me? Perhaps they did not have an understanding of the larger picture that was my reality, or perhaps they had received wrong information? So I write here to express my truth as I remember it now for better or for worse. It might have fault, but it is an honest expression.

I find it interesting that when someone defends something I said because they feel like doing so because it either resonates with them or they also experienced something similar, that the crowd has to rush to condemn them as followers who are championing my cause and who are blind to the truth and who therefore need to be crushed. Kind of like having seen the 9/11 attacks in any other way than was presented at the time and thus being against going into Iraq. You were instantly condemned as the worst possible sort of non-citizen! I find this consistently in discussions where I am mentioned. No one is allowed to see my side of the story for it is obvious that I am guilty of whatever they say I am guilty of, that the jury has already rendered a verdict and that it is so obvious that any discussion otherwise is simply motivated by personal interest and nothing more. How can a discussion take place in this paradigm?

Some argue that my expressions of historical events are meant to show that I am a victim and not the perpetrator of various evil deeds. Wow. Gee. I am not a victim. I was an active participant in all the aspects of my life and thus not a victim. I am a victim of false propaganda,

lies, rumors, myths and downright silly things and therefore I am now trying in some small way to demonstrate the mechanisms that keep this misinformation alive. I am not sure what I was a perpetrator of, but I certainly am not that now.

If someone wishes to hate me, hate me for the right reasons, not the wrong ones. If you state a fact to be true that includes me and I object to your facts, your history, and your interpretations of my motives and my integrity, I shall state that. I am well aware that you will not believe it because you simply do not want to. In the minds of those who thrive on negativity, any defense against what is said about me is simply an attempt to cloud the truth and sugar coat the horrible reality they believe. Yet, I disagree with this and present what I present simply because it ought to be presented.

I am not trying to change ISKCON. I have no motivation to present facts that support or deny any political position in ISKCON. I do not want to be captured by the all pervasive mind that is ready to devour me were I to attempt to enter into the locked domain that is ISKCON. All I am concerned with is a clear presentation of what I was aware of at that time. And even that does not interest me. I dislike lies being presented as truth.

I am not in ISKCON. I am not presenting myself as some spiritual leader. I have no followers. I am not trying to say that I am the real vaisnava and all the rest are not. I do not consider myself a devotee in the traditional sense (see links above). I do not want anyone to see me in the context of traditional culturally based religion as I do not believe in it. If something I say or some information I give assists someone to understand the past better and thus let it go in peace, I feel I have done some service of value and I like to be of service.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Nanda-grama » Mon Mar 28, 2011 9:05 pm

Dear Hari!

It is fine that you wrote about it here . Recently I rered the topic about you on Russian site хари-катха which was closed by admins at the last September because it was too popular and there were too many views . It is interestingly, although the topic is stoped it continues to be most popular and readable- there are 70600 views !

I remember that when I wrote there it was very hardly to stand against this negative and false information, but then I stoped to deny, conversely, I collected all this nasty and absurd information in one place and offered: ok, let look on the portrait of this monster what you created- and conscientiously reaped all their accusations- and all that seemed verisimilar when it was here and there by small parts, when it was placed in one text it became to look so grotesquely, ludicrously and non-really that even most rampant prosecutors lost their ardency and began to appologize and to excuse themselves. And admins who blocked me in most beginning then began to block this people and it is interestingly -now all this people are blocked whole year and some of them are even deleted forever. This image of monster ravens on pain which it causes and on rebellion, but if to look on him calmly he kills self himself. ISKCON's people disagreeably overcarried with negative qualities and it is too fabulously. If somebody has intellect a little he understands that if people glorify somebody boundlessly but then once without some transition began to hobnail the person - it shows some their big problems! Anyway, it has not any relation to reality.

You are what you are -and this is a challenge for people who lost himself in pursuit for authority and power or in tryings to become perfect. But it very inspires us who knows you a little and loves you, and it helps us to find ourselves.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by harsi » Fri Apr 01, 2011 12:18 pm

Hari wrote:

\* Why didn't the GBC tell the truth about your NOT stealing from ISKCON?

Good question. Jayadvaita Swami once told me that when someone had said I stole from the BBT or whatever, Brahma Muhurta said they should speak with him and he would deny that fact. But I consider the real facts to be far more interesting than the lies. For example, I gave Prthu around \$50,000 to make a hospice for old devotees in Vrindavan. ...

If I remember well what was written in 1998 on COM, it was so that there appeared indeed a small message by the so-called GBC in one conference, I guess it was the Varnashrama Dharma development and the German Forum, that you did not take any money with you from ISKCON when you left your management position there.

It's also interesting what you wrote about Prthu. I remember in this regard a letter exchange I had with him on COM. It was so that after you were forced by the leaders of that society to resign your positions there, someone wrote and published a letter on COM addressed to all this people. Shortly after that was published I wrote myself to all these guys apologizing for the how I found somehow harsh tone of the man who wrote to them. The first one who wrote me back was Prthu, appreciating my stepping forward in this regard, at the same time expressing his view on how everything will play out fine at the end of all this. Now by reading what you wrote about him I can somehow understand better what he may have meant by all this...

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Hari » Sat Apr 02, 2011 5:06 pm

I find it interesting how the main concern of people is money. This is often a big question in their spiritual lives. It has a lot to do with the values and behavioral modifications that formed our lives while in ISKCON. After all, there were large projects and temples to maintain and things to do and growth to be attained to fulfill the mission. This requires lots of money and that money is usually collected by using people to go out and get it. Since the process of collection involves much labor, sometimes at great cost, naturally people are concerned that the funds are used properly and misuse is dealt with appropriately. I understand this concern and have always understood it.

As idealistic as this sounds, the reality is quite different for even when funds are seemingly being used correctly there is potential for misuse. For example, is it more important to use funds to construct buildings that further add to the burden of labor to maintain them or is it better to devote funds for the benefit of individuals who are suffering due to the value structure of the organization? I dealt with this question when I left and concluded it was better to use money for the benefit of children, women, families, and members of the organization who were damaged in one form or another. I therefore wanted to use whatever funds were left when I left ISKCON to do this and this was a source of conflict with those who wished to maintain the status quo. Therefore they kept it all. Of course, they did this under the charter of the foundation I created to protect it. Naturally I am simplifying this issue and it is hard to fairly represent it in this brief reply.

When I officially was removed from ISKCON, the BBT, the Mayapur Project, the Ministry of Education and all connection with disciples, I was penniless. I was very upset with those who I supported, trained, facilitated and eventually handed all responsibility for money (a big mistake or not, remains to be seen) to others who, it seemed to me at the time, refused to support me in any way (no money for food even, can you imagine that?) and who, it seemed to me at that time, were intent on usurping everything under their own control and for purposes that were different from what I now saw as essential, namely, therapy, small loans, education and training for those who were exploited. This made me quite upset. I admit that perhaps I misjudged

them or misunderstood their intentions, but they were not dealing properly with me and did not give me credit as a human being. Worse, they judged me as crazy and refused to understand me. This hurt me a lot.

After this time, a few devotees from Russia came to see me and their attitude was quite different. They basically said, "We know you. We know what you can do and what you are trying to do now and we agree with it. We are here to support you." And they did. And for this I am ever-grateful. My situation was so tenuous at that time that these people seemed like angels to me. Indeed, here were friends who had faith in me as a PERSON, not as a POSITION. Most only had faith in me as a position, not a person. Even when some critics had never met me or knew me intimately, did not know me as a person, they found it easy to judge me as a position. Part of judging as a position is to link my fortunes to the fortunes of the movement. Although that was true and relevant and valid while I was in ISKCON, and I proved it by using all my daksina and funds for the benefit of others (and when I left I sold the last asset, the Vario RV, and gave all the money back to the person who bought it), this concept was considered by me to be null and void when I left. I left ISKCON and its values and since my position was dissolved and anyway I wished to let it go when I saw that it was part of the problem and not relevant to the solution, why should I be bound to the values and ideals of ISKCON? Indeed, all that I said and did after that point was related to transforming the philosophy and values that created an exploitative situation. I was happy to start all over again for it granted me freedom. I was happy living on the road and getting myself free from all connections and trying to heal my incredible wounds.

So I drove off to France. Why? The primary reason was to escape from connections to devotees that were filled with expectations. I did not want to start speaking to them about how everything they did was based in illusion. Remember, I did not know what they knew as I had no contact with anyone due to no email or conversations. I simply wanted to get away and think about everything in another context and figure out how to become peaceful, free from the stress that was literally killing me and to find my own way back to myself and my future. So I left. Once there, I realized that this was a nice place due to its isolation, its relative proximity to an airport, its extremely reasonable cost of living (the US, for example, is FAR more expensive to live in) and its incredible peace. So I stayed. At that time, the only people who were near to me were people who knew me as a person and who accepted me in that way. Again, of all of them only some former devotees from Russia stood by me and supported me. This included them arranging for me a living facility. This facility had nothing whatsoever to do with ISKCON funds and was from private people (householders) who were economically independent who had, out of their enormous grace and love, given a lot of charity to ISKCON projects. They assisted me with loans and help that allowed me to get a nice place extremely cheaply. Indeed, the cost of the place was less than what one has to pay where I live now for a medium, lower middle class house, but from the images that look so nice from the outside (and after all, it is in France!) one assumes, wrongly, that it was SO costly and that it was all gotten from stolen money. Gee. When I got the place it was a shell. And with the help of these same friends, it became a nice place. By the way, both my wife and myself come from large, well off, supportive families. We are independent in that way. After all, they love us as we are, wherever we are, whatever we do! Isn't that nice?

I will remain grateful to these former devotees who helped us at that time, some of whom are no longer with us, for believing in me when the rest of the world did not. I am grateful to those in Russia who thought that I could not be what rumor and proclamations said I was. After all, they came from the USSR where pravda was not what it seemed. They looked beyond the obvious misinformation being fed to them and asked questions. I am not sure what happened in Russia at that time or how it happened as all I knew were those few who took their valuable time and energy to come to where I was and assist me. I will always love them despite any changes in their mood or attitude to me, if any. This entire experience caused me to

understand friendship differently. No longer was it related to position, requirement, scripture, or what one had to do. It was now free to be there or not according to interpersonal love. I very much appreciated it. I was shocked when I saw how ISKCON devotees, including my former disciples, so easily threw me away as garbage to be ignored or neglected. I thought they knew me. I thought they knew my motives and desires; more importantly, my integrity and values! I was shocked to find out they did not. They assumed I was invulnerable. They thought I could not crack to pieces under a stress they could not even imagine. After all, I should handle anything that came to me and never change how I think as this was the "contract" between us, wasn't it? Sadly, it was not, as my personal reality changed. Their friendship was not friendship, it was something else and I am sorry for that because I was reciprocating with them as friends, not as disciples. I saw them as associates and partners who together did something wonderful. Sure, I was in charge, but I was quite sensitive to them mainly, although sometimes I was not. My seeming lack of sensitivity to them was not due to greed, it was due to ignorance as they did not express their needs. But that is another story.

I also find it interesting how people do not know that I worked hard to fix up the French place and increase its value. I am thankful that my wife and me are quite lucky economically and have gained when we moved. Our economy has always been transparent where it must be so. I see no reason to be transparent to anyone else now. I am not a public figure in the sense that I run a corporation, a charity, or something where I am using other people's money. I do take donations and all of them go towards financing the facilities that we all use under the Harimedia banner. Other than that I am independent. Our temple in Russia is a registered, authorized religious entity that does what it is supposed to. I am its spiritual head.

If and when our cooperative enterprise gets much larger, I will certainly adjust to that reality and create a structure that will accommodate all of those who contributed to it in a proper and transparent manner. As of now, Harimedia is more or less a one or sometimes two man show and we are supported by user donations.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by harsi » Mon Apr 04, 2011 8:18 am

Dear Hari, I gratefully acknowledge your full account in this regard. Your clarification with regard to this sensitive issue give the lie to the myth propagated by some people, on the Internet and elsewhere, that you have in the olden days stolen, misappropriated or lost some funds from ISKCON and used afterwards for your own purposes. Furthermore, what you've been through in the aftermath of the events from 1998, shows that declarations of affection if not complied also with helping each other in times of need, could probably be dismissed as meaningless, empty words. Nevertheless I would say that we all deserve a second chance.

"Statement by the ISKCON Governing Body Commission  
Place: San Diego, California,  
USA X-TE: July 14, 1998 (published on COM)  
Issued by: B. D. A., Acting Chair of the GBC Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee of the ISKCON Governing Body Commission (GBC) regrets to inform ISKCON and its supporters that H. S., aged 49, has recently suffered a serious physical and mental collapse.

It is not unusual that ISKCON leaders, when vigorously preaching Krishna consciousness even up to old age, follow the footsteps of great acaryas and tend to become aloof from bodily concerns. Consequently, leading preachers are sometimes afflicted suddenly with ailments that severely limit their ability to continue at their accustomed pace. In such cases, "slowing down"



is not a sign of "giving up." Rather, it shows that a "long-term" vision can give a spiritual leader many extra years to preach Krishna consciousness.

H. M. crisis resulted from an enormous overburden of work, the flare-up of many long-standing physical maladies and a fully committed attitude toward preaching. This attitude caused him to accept many more responsibilities than he could reasonably take on, especially in his weakened condition. We dearly love him and devotees should all intensely pray for his swift recovery. However, it will be some time before he can resume his preaching work. He is regularly meeting with godbrothers and disciples and is in excellent medical care."

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by harsi » Thu Apr 07, 2011 1:59 pm

You wrote ones in a letter to the GBC on 8 Dec 1998: "While meditating deeply about the situation of the children and seeing parallels in my own life, I came to understand that there were serious mistakes made in the conception of ISKCON by Srila Prabhupada." and "I understand that for ISKCON as an institution to come to terms with such an understanding would be almost impossible and I am in no illusion at present that it will happen soon. However, it might be required."

Prabhupada writes in a comment to a verse in his version of the Bhagavad-gita (see Vedabase) something which shows also the liberal side of his personality:

"The special qualification of the pure devotee is that he is always thinking of Krishna without deviation and without considering the time or place. There should be no impediments. He should be able to carry out his service anywhere and at any time. Some say that the devotee should remain in holy places like Vrindavana or some holy town where the Lord lived, but a pure devotee can live anywhere and create the atmosphere of Vrindavana... It was Sri Advaita who told Lord Caitanya, "Wherever You are, O Lord -- there is Vrindavana."

It seems Prabhupada, at times, had also a much broader vision related to spiritual matters, being aware of the deficiencies, conventional boundaries and traditions of the society he founded.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Hari » Tue Apr 12, 2011 1:35 pm

Harsi: I am not sure why you have posted the two comments you did, but if I were to guess your motivation, I would say that you felt that there was a possibility of reconciliation as the EC were really only interested in what was best for me and that Prabhupada was open to change and transformation.

Addressing this, my comment is that I can imagine that the EC had some measure of care and concern for me. I can also imagine that this care and concern was mixed with a majority concern for the continued management and well being of ISKCON and that this was far more important to them than me. I get this. It is natural. Anyone in such a position would write letters that appeased the sentiments of confused disciples. However, in their dealings with me their care and concern ignored me as a person, ignored what I was saying and the changes I felt had to take place, and took to role of instructing me to do what they wanted without considering what I wanted. Even if there could have been a reconciliation, I lost any desire I might have had to create one due to my rejecting the value structure of ISKCON. There was no need for me to forgive them (as a means to create the reconciliation) as there was nothing to forgive. They did what they thought they had to. I did what I knew I had to.

That Prabhupada could change according to circumstances is certainly true. After all, he was extremely intelligent. Indeed, to this day I have not met anyone as intelligent as he. However, I am not sure how this would be relevant to 1998 as he was not there to do anything about the situation. The movement was cemented into the values he left in 1977 and there was no possibility of it moving out of this structure. His words were absolute and people were and still are convinced that everything he said is right regardless of any other consideration. OK, not everyone thinks that way now, but in 1998 most did. There is no possibility to create fundamental change when the principles and ideals needing to be changed were instilled in us by the Founder. Being blocked like this, I had no choice but to remove myself from the situation. This was the hardest, most painful thing I have ever done and probably will do in this lifetime. Coming to this conclusion was the result of a long, hard process of analysis and meditation. If Prabhupada was still alive, naturally the situation would have been vastly different. Naturally he would have seen the results of what he created and would have changed it or perhaps it would have mutated to something quite different during his extended lifetime. But since he was not there to do this and since our reasoning process was limited by the frozen in time "values and ideals should never change," and since I had been hitting against the wall of "Prabhupada says" and other blocks, and since I could extrapolate that there was no hope for me to change things and trying to do so had cost me my life, I left.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by harsi » Sun Apr 24, 2011 11:06 pm

Indeed, Hari, in my nature I am somehow more of a pragmatic or how the dictionary explains this word someone who is "advocating behaviour that is dictated more by practical consequences than by theory or dogma." I just wanna say that you must use, I mean not necessarily you personally, also your own God-given intelligence to make up your own mind about things. You write for example: "That Prabhupada could change according to circumstances is certainly true. After all, he was extremely intelligent. Indeed, to this day I have not met anyone as intelligent as he." Now, intelligence means also that one can foresee things as they may appear and develop also in the future, which Prabhupada seems to not have been fully able to do, or not in a way that one may have expected of him in consequence of what he thought and probagated to his followers. Otherwise why would have there been evolved many such situations in the way they did. You seem to have evolved personally also to another level of spiritual realization than Prabhupada or are experiencing and viewing spirituality, God and self-realization or awareness, from another angle of vision than Prabhupada.

On a Russian website which publicized your programs in Russia appeared a quote by you, I hope the Google translater translates it well, which says: "I created a method that allows participants to get in touch (interact) directly with their own energy. To connect with ones energy means to be in contact with yourself. And since we all have a spiritual nature, by touching ourselves, we are coming in contact with the spirit. Having experience of such contact, a person learns to understand and feel the spiritual energy of others, in a wide range of its manifestations and qualities. And then perceives and feels the divine source of this spiritual energy." Now of course to explain this more in detail would require a whole lecture but could you please give a brief description what you really mean by writing this and what constitutes the difference, if any, from the way Prabhupada advocated and explained spiritual issues and the method of self and god realization, apart from you using some seemingly more appropriate terms in describing certain spiritual concepts and realities, like evolution, personal energy field or something alike used also in the modern times esoteric scene?

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Hari » Mon Apr 25, 2011 8:40 am

Now, intelligence means also that one can foresee things as they may appear and develop also in the future, which Prabhupada seems to not have been fully able to do, or not in a way that one may have expected of him in consequence of what he thought and propagated to his followers. Otherwise why would have there been evolved many such situations in the way they did.

Although this is true, it is unreasonable to think that people, even highly evolved ones, could fully manifest this capacity. Considering the tradition, the social culture, and the unique situation that Prabhupada was in when he did what he did, I feel it is unfair to demand that he should of or could of had the capacity to foresee how his choices would create situations he would not have been happy with. I understand that those who are in ISKCON or who consider themselves his followers might object to me seemingly belittling his capacity, but I see their objections as a product of their illusion as to his limits. Indeed, to consider one as possessing far greater power than one has is a technique to impersonalize and ultimately ruin a person. My conclusion is that he could not have seen the long term consequences of his choices as he did not have that capability. Although it is not pleasant to say it, it does restore a sense of sanity to history.

You seem to have evolved personally also to another level of spiritual realization than Prabhupada or are experiencing and viewing spirituality, God and self-realization or awareness, from another angle of vision than Prabhupada.

It is so. Therefore I speak from my own experience without requiring my experience to refer to anyone else's. I do appreciate or acknowledge the past and accept my part within it. I may not have been happy with my role all the time but I accept what is and deal with it as best I can. I know my experiences and they are my strength. I do not need my experiences confirmed by others. I do not need approval to be what I am.

Now of course to explain this more in detail would require a whole lecture but could you please give a brief description what you really mean by writing this and what constitutes the difference, if any, from the way Prabhupada advocated and explained spiritual issues and the method of self and god realization, apart from you using some seemingly more appropriate terms in describing certain spiritual concepts and realities, like evolution, personal energy field or something alike used also in the modern times esoteric scene?

Those who remain loyal followers of Prabhupada are not interested in my analysis or vision. Any description I would give here, however detailed or clear, would be met with resistance as their perspective is bound to Prabhupada's. As mine is not, they will not see what I say as relevant to them. Therefore, there is no use in me listing these differences for this group.

Those who have a more open mind in the sense that they can think for themselves and are not afraid to come to conclusions that are not in line with Prabhupada's presentation, also do not need a list. For them, I have posted recordings of my lectures and have written something they might find interesting. In other words, they will find relevance in the concepts I speak about. If and when a discussion of the concept requires a comparison to any other concept, I do it.

If former ISKCON people who formerly followed everything nicely are now listening to me, this means that they have already understood the key differences between what I say and what they heard in the past and find it relevant to how they feel and think. Those who cannot think for themselves would never listen to me unless they had a sentimental attachment or an idea that if they simply stuck around long enough I would eventually see the light and return to the proper path of knowledge. To the former I have nothing to say as I have no desire to challenge their belief system. To the latter my only comment is "get real." To those who have already embraced their personal responsibility for their lives and who find me supportive of their endeavors, I will continue to speak as I have as a service.

I do not like to create needless confrontations. I only engage in argument when there is a need to do so. At this moment in time, I do not see that ISKCON members have the required intelligence to hear something contrary to their belief system and accept it, even if in their heart

they know it to be true. There are simply too many reasons for them not to. I do not see a reason to openly declare "I think this and he thinks that," in this discussion thread. I am mainly concerned in this thread to state my point of view about history as a counter to the disinformation network that seems to surround ISKCON.

I am not happy with having a different point of view. I do not take pleasure in demonstrating how the belief system we all formerly accepted does not serve us as spiritual beings. I do it because it ought to be done, because I believe it to be so, and because I have seen and continue to see how I assist people to find the spiritual connection they seek.

In essence, I declare our capacity to find spirit within on our own through our conscious awareness, to connect to the divine as a natural right without impediments, and to express our loving service and healing energy as we wish. I declare our personal responsibility for our choices without requiring these choices to be in line with another person's opinion, some book, or a belief system. If and when we find information from external sources to be relevant to us, we take it. Where these sources have no relevance to our personal experience or where they attempt to restrict or limit our capacity to experience, I reject them. I am not interested in the idea that we require to have someone bring us to God, neither will I embrace not being good enough as the reason why I must deny my personal energy and capacity. But all of this is to be found in all of my lectures.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Prisni » Tue May 31, 2011 9:59 am

I see things differently than probably most others.  
I see things in a more kind of unity and global way.

Many expect Prabhupada to be a kind of superman, a super-god, that could put everything in place. I rather see it like - what is his service to Krishna?  
And when that is figured out, the question is - did he do his service good?  
And yes, the answer is yes. He did his service, his task very good.

Same thing about you Hari. From reading the interview, you got a paper from Prabhupada, and he listed a service for you. I guess he felt that you would understand and needed no elaboration.

So did you do your service well?

That is the question to ask, not to ask what you did not do.

How the service is done always depends on the person, time and circumstances.

So what I really miss from the story, and also the wikipedia article, is just that.

Time, place, circumstances and service. All that is missing. Instead it focuses on other side issues, details which not at all describe the whole picture. Details that hardly relate to you and what you did.

I think you did a great service. Maybe some say you were not qualified, but that was certainly included in the service description. Did you perform the service good? I think that is for yourself to answer, if you think you did what you could. And it appears that you think you did it good. Then that is good enough for me.

For a while I blamed Krishna - why did you give me a guru that fell down, I trusted you!

But I always get an immediate answer in my dialog with Krishna.

Krishna would say - what is wrong, you advanced, and you got realisation of me, and I fill in with the things that you guru could not. So what is your complain? I taught you what you missed, is that not good enough for you?

And I guess I should blush there and feel shameful a little bit.

Krishna/God fills in the missing pieces, if we only do our own part of it. That is the deal.

So you definitively did your task, your service, good, at least as far as I am concerned. You brought me to Krishna. So, what is the problem?  
Everything worked out very smoothly, and you had your part of it.

So from the higher viewpoint we all have our small services, and what counts is how good we do our task. Not if someone else fails with theirs. The problem always comes when we expect someone to do something which is not their job.

The problem with the world is always - how can God let bad things happen?

A similar thing of that - how could Prabupada let the bad things happen?

The answer to that, as I see it, is always that we don't see the whole picture. We don't see the different small services, tasks we have, and we want to blame others for one person in the chain failing.

We don't see the good some persons do, and only the bad some others do. And then we want to blame the good persons for the failures of others. That is not fair, and it is not spiritual consciousness.

That is how I see it. We just have to figure out our individual task, both spiritually and materially. That is also what "Varnasrama dharma" is all about. Figure out our task, and then do it good. Not try to do another person's task. That is when all havoc breaks out, when we stop listen to God, and when we start to have other contrary ideas. That is alright and allowed in this world, but if we don't want to listen to God, we won't.

The guru's task is to relay the message of God to the disciple who is not able to hear her/himself. Until the time when the disciple can hear God directly. Then the teacher's task is done, and it is perfect.

Maybe some are not ready to hear God directly, but rather want to do so many other things. That is not a fault of the teacher. He does his service with detachment, leading the student to the water. Then it is up to the student to drink.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Nanda-grama » Wed Jun 01, 2011 4:32 am

For a while I blamed Krishna - why did you give me a guru that fell down, I trusted you!

Generally, I always protest when I hear " Vishnupad fell dawn". This word scratches me. Does he stop to be a devotee? No. Does he stop to be connected with Radha-Krishna? No. Does he stop to be great teacher? No. He changed his asram. But why is it downfall? Sanyasa is unfavourable in the present time, isn't it? And ashram is " material" thing, isn't it? but when we speak about a devotee and about a guru, we look on his spiritual qualities, generally, to appraise a devotee to look on his body, his status and so on is offence, isn't it ? Then why are all doing it? Only because somebody said that it is so!

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by harsi » Wed Jun 01, 2011 10:08 pm

In todays democratic constitutional states, ruled like Germany by the rule of law, the fundamental principle in applying and interpreting 'criminal' laws, including the Indeterminate Sentence Law, is to resolve all doubts in favor of the accused. In dubio pro reo. When in doubt, rule for the accused. This is in consonance with the constitutional guarantee that the accused ought to be presumed innocent until and unless his guilt is established beyond reasonable doubt.

Wikipedia explains further: "The principle of in dubio pro reo (Latin for "when in doubt, for the accused") means that a defendant may not be convicted by the court when doubts about his or her guilt remain. It is often used specifically to refer to the rule of interpretation that dictates that when a 'criminal' statute allows more than one interpretation, the one that favours the defendant should be chosen. In German law this principle has constitutional status. The main principle in the sentence was part of Aristotle's interpretation of the law and shaped the Roman law.

Now you may ask what has all this to do with the controversial issue under discussion here among Prisni and Nanda-grama. The 'accusation' made that "Vishnupada" has "fallen down" (A '...' statute which in my opinion obviously "allows more than one interpretation" ). Can one establish beyond all doubt that this is the case here and what should or could that mean at all for those who may feel involved.

Hari wrote earlier in this thread, I quote: "In essence, I declare our capacity to find spirit within on our own through our conscious awareness, to connect to the divine as a natural right without impediments, and to express our loving service and healing energy as we wish. I declare our personal responsibility for our choices without requiring these choices to be in line with another person's opinion, some book, or a belief system. If and when we find information from external sources to be relevant to us, we take it. Where these sources have no relevance to our personal experience or where they attempt to restrict or limit our capacity to experience, I reject them. I am not interested in the idea that we require to have someone bring us to God, neither will I embrace not being good enough as the reason why I must deny my personal energy and capacity."

Obviously many things Hari declared here could be seen as controversial to those who follow or are cemented in their thoughts and concepts in the "olden days" but are they to be considered that he may have "fallen down" from the path of spiritual knowledge which may uplift us to the Divine and the divine understanding of things? That is a matter of "interpretation" in my opinion. I would "judge" this statements more as a mean by Hari to "distance oneself" from the way spiritual knowledge is applied and understood by Prabhupada and those who try to follow his statements. Thus Hari in my opinion could be considered more as a person who "moved away" from the concepts and spiritual understanding of his guru (or preceptor). Fallen off is in this connection a much better term one may use in this regard than fallen down.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Prisni » Thu Jun 02, 2011 6:43 am

harsi wrote:

Now you may ask what has all this to do with the controversial issue under discussion here among Prisni and Nanda-grama. The 'accusation' made that "Vishnupada" has "fallen down" I have no controversy with anyone on this, so just please leave me out of it.

Sects, New Age, and Other Jazz  
by Nanda-grama » Sat Jun 04, 2011 7:58 pm

Indeed, ISKCON's people use this words " fell down" automaticly when they want to tell that somebody gone out from ISKCON, stoped to follow the line of the group or done something what contradicted rules. By such way they put seal on all what demands participation of heart for it's understanding, not only repeatition what Prabhupada said. Because they fear to think and to feel ( they fear maya). But then this seal sticks to the person and all think- yes, he is

fallen , forget about him. I agree with you, Harsi, that Hari "moved out" from limits and restrictions of the conception, "fell out" from the matrix.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Hari » Sat Jun 04, 2011 10:41 pm

Interesting. A conversation has started in relation to Nanda's comments about "fall down." She said I changed ashram.

This is incorrect, I did not change ashram. I left behind entirely and completely the system within which ashram has any importance. In the real world, being married or not has little relevance to one's intellectual, political, economic or social status. Only archaic traditions that only tangentially connect with modern people consider this important. Indeed, if you look at the life styles of renunciates in ISKCON, it is easy to see how truly irrelevant ashram is.

Only someone who considers their organization, their opinions, their ideals and their values to be the most important aspect of life would think that a person who has left them has "fallen." Everyone else would say, "he left and did something else." When one is not interested in the person, not interested in their reasoning, not concerned with what they felt was important or not, one does not care to understand more than an easy and simplistic explanation of why what was done was done.

I find it interesting how people continue to "trash" me in their discussions. They take unusual pleasure in insulting me and gathering others around them who agree. They are extremely agitated when someone says something nice about me. They find it impossible to digest.

And so life goes on as it always has. "Change is impossible. Positive transformation is unthinkable. Unless one is married to the movement, one cannot have any value, importance, or capacity to be of service." I feel sorry for people who think this way and it is hard for me to be angry with them. I would rather pray for them.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by harsi » Sat Jun 04, 2011 10:44 pm

Well, I believe it's time to call a spade a spade. Why should we continue to avoid the real issue. Just let us tell it like it is. Hari is not teaching the conclusions and the way of understanding spiritual knowledge as it was presented by Prabhupada in the spiritual tradition of the Gaidyia Vaishnava sampradaya. I do not want to judge him and the way he is presenting spiritual knowledge and his conclusions in any way. I just see it as a given fact that he has "moved away" or whatever term you may want to use here from the spiritual understanding of Prabhupada and those people within the society founded by him who try to follow in his footsteps. Now you Nanda-grama write that "Hari "moved out" from limits and restrictions of the conception, "fell out" from the matrix." I dont know what you really mean by writing "fell out" from the matrix." The word matrix reminds me personally at a Hollywood film I saw ones so I can't make anything out of it. Maybe you can explain to me what you mean by writing this.

Sure there were certain "limits and restrictions" in the way spiritual life was and is practiced in Iskcon or any other society of people. Why do you think exist so much laws and restrictions as also guidelines to follow in a society of people. I personally am of the opinion that what "limits and restrictions" anyone is following or not, is his private affair and we should protect the private sphere of anyone, even of those people who follow another path than that of ours, in another society of spiritualists, or even within Iskcon.

Now the big question remains what spiritual conclusions and concepts is Hari really teaching? To this day I have my problems in finding that out completely. I mean how should I understand anything about Radha Krishna who are standing on the alter by avoiding to speak about any Krishna lila or what is written in some revealed scriptures about this divine personalities? Last edited by harsi on Sat Jun 04, 2011 10:57 pm  
, edited 3 times in total.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Hari » Sat Jun 04, 2011 10:54 pm

One comment about another issue that is continuously brought up by a persistent critic of my comments on the Hare Krishna Women blog. I was asked by the blogger to answer some questions and give the history of what happened. I did that. I do not know any way to describe it other than to honestly and frankly say what happened. The critic is upset because he has assumed that my description implies that I was a victim of the GBC and he considers this ridiculous since I am such a bad person and was part of all that was bad in ISKCON. Besides the obvious fact that I was part of an enormous amount of good in ISKCON, I think he has it wrong. I did not write the history with the intention of proving I was a victim or of justifying what I did. I only felt victimized by the GBC on one occasion, when they banned the Varnashrama book, since I felt that ISKCON could only last as a society by embracing the social structure natural to its philosophy. Other than that, I did not feel victimized. The history is what it is and my description is merely meant to give my take on it as factually as I can. The history does not justify me, it merely states that I did not agree with the GBC, their policies, and many of their decisions regarding the guru issues. To disagree with the GBC, even when one stands alone on an issue, is not to be victimized. I am quite happy to have dissented as my dissent represented my convictions. Any acts I performed that were compatible to some extent with some of the values embraced by that body were done of my own free will. I may have simply agreed to go along with the majority decision or done what was required within the complex ISKCON social context, but I do not see this as a fault. Cooperation means compromise, and compromise means that life is not a one way street. I lived with compromise for a long time. Although I still compromise, I do not accept principles or ideals that are against my experience or convictions.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by harsi » Sun Jun 05, 2011 6:58 pm

Hari wrote:

The history does not justify me, it merely states that I did not agree with the GBC, their policies, and many of their decisions regarding the guru issues.

In this regard I remember an incident you were also involved from the time I was a bhakta in the Nrsimhadeva temple community in Germany. It must have been around the year 1986 or so. At that time you were the only initiating spiritual master of ISKCON in Germany and other European countries. There was a meeting among the leading Prabhupada disciples on the Nrsimha farm where one Prabhupada disciple, I think his name was Maharama das or so, confronted you and others with the wish to become himself an initiating spiritual master of ISKCON in Austria. At least it was rumored like that among us living there at that time. I still remember the lecture you gave the next morning about devotees who seek name, fame and glory for themselves although being not fully qualified for such a high spiritual position you were in at that time as the only one. It seems to me that there was also a time in ISKCON where everyone was also thinking and taking care that they do not threaten the spiritual and leadership positions they were in by allowing also others to fill some positions within that society. Actually a comprehensible attitude one might well understand.



Regarding the "fall down" issue its interesting what another group of people are writing: "In reality every "guru" in ISKCON is fallen, since they have all disobeyed Srila Prabhupada by usurping his position as the sole authorised diksa Guru (initiating spiritual master) of ISKCON"

Quite revealing is also what I read on a website where it is written:

"Yoga student: Then preaching in Iran should be essentially to those people who have fallen away from their traditional path.

Srila Prabhupada: Yes. Everyone is fallen. They are simply amending and concocting. That is not good. Why should they amend? (Room conversation. Tehran, 14/03/75)

In Christianity there is also the understanding of the fallen angel who has fallen from the right path. And than the understanding within Vaishnava philosophy of the fallen souls who need to become purified in order to save themselves from the ocean of birth and death.

I would say in this regard we are what we are and and so let us all join together to do the best we can out of this situation. As I was reading quite recently somewhere: "We can join together in the name of peace and freedom to build our future in the twenty-first century."

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Hari » Sun Jun 05, 2011 7:25 pm

I will echo Prsni when I say to you Harsi, do not drag me into your version of history or any controversy included in it. Your text does not actually follow what you have quoted from me anyway!

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Hari » Sun Jun 05, 2011 7:28 pm

Now the big question remains what spiritual conclusions and concepts is Hari really teaching? To this day I have my problems in finding that out complitely. I mean how should I understand anything about Radha Krishna who are standing on the alter by avoiding to speak about any Krishna lila or what is written in some revealed scriptures about this divine personalities? Wow! Really? If after all this time you cannot figure it out, why do you bother? If you are so confused, what is the use?

Why do you avoid to speak about Radha and Krishna? Do you not like them? Are you against scriptures? Very strange.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by harsi » Sun Jun 05, 2011 8:35 pm

Hari wrote:

I will echo Prsni when I say to you Harsi, do not drag me into your version of history or any controversy included in it. Your text does not actually follow what you have quoted from me anyway!

Dear Hari, actually I was just allowing my thoughts to fly freely, while expecting at the same time what others, including yourself might response to them. You immediately felt yourself in the position of having to defend yourself. Something I was not expecting of you as I also had not in mind. I beg to disagree with you that my text had nothing to do with the text I quoted. In my opinion it was also related to "decisions regarding the guru issues," in the "old days" within ISKCON. So in some way it was well related. I also did not intended to drag you into my version of history or any controversy included in it, as I have no specific version of history other than what I experienced and went through myself.

Now to your second comment where you write as a response to my expressed confusion about the goals of your teachings:

Wow! Really? If after all this time you cannot figure it out, why do you bother? If you are so confused, what is the use?

Why do you avoid to speak about Radha and Krishna? Do you not like them? Are you against scriptures? Very strange.

I thought that for someone who is teaching it is also good and advantageous to hear sometimes what feedback he gets from his audience of listeners. So in this way I gave you my honest feedback according to the motto: "Whatever comments you may have, positive or negative, are welcomed!" It seems to me that to let my thoughts flow freely was not so welcomed. Sorry for that. Maybe I should have asked you in a private message this question related to Radha Krishna. My confusion is based upon the question of how to explain to an outsider something about Radha Krishna who are standing on the alter if I base my understanding just on the lessons I might draw from your lectures and not also any revealed scriptures which might describe their pastimes in this world.

Its the same with worshipping Their Lordships on the alter, until I did not saw how their Lordships where worshiped in a morning in St Petersburg I did not knew that this is really happening. I also do not know if the deities are served with daily prasadam meals there as I did not saw this as I know it to happen in the tradition of India. So many questions which bother me since quite some time. OK Kamalamala told me that you appreciated his printing and distribution in Russia of the Bhagavad-gita in text form without additional comments so one can say that you still vallue and apreciate Krishnas words revealed in this scripture.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Hari » Mon Jun 06, 2011 1:02 pm

Dear Harsi

Please re-read the title of this thread. Also, please re-read the reasons I stated for its existence. The point of this thread is to give me a forum to state what actually happened to me or about me. This thread started when I saw that so many misconceptions about what happened were floating around the ether being stated as facts. My comments were addressed to these "myths."

I understand you want to expand the discussion, but as you saw once before, expanded discussions do not belong in this thread. If there are comments, they should be in the format of, "It is said that you did this or that at that time..." Then I will consider my reply, if any, in the context of clearing up misinformation.

There is so much hurt amongst devotees and former devotees. So many things happened that were clearly harmful to many people. I cannot discuss all of these events, neither can I resolve the traumas that are felt. I do not wish to discuss these kinds of topics in detail as there is no end to them. I have seen that there are as many ideas of what went wrong as there are people who feel hurt; in other words, each person feels his or her hurt in their own unique manner and wishes that hurt to be resolved in an extremely personal manner. The task of healing these wounds is enormous.

I offer my service in the healing of these many wounds through the concepts and experiences I share. I share the means to resolve these issues by understanding their root cause, their reverberating manifestations, and their lack of relation to spiritual issues. I also demonstrate how everything that one wants can be attained in an easier manner when one has cleared out

these various misconceptions that are unrelated to the core essence we are as spirit. I think I do this fairly well.

Many of the wounded have decided that I am the root cause of all their problems. I cannot address issues that are not related to me as there is no use in doing so. I do not care to be placed in a position where my thoughts, decisions, or arrangements are judged in this open forum, as I do not wish to waste my energy in a futile attempt to make others feel better about themselves by wrestling their past to the ground. This is something only they can do for themselves. Everything that I share is meant to facilitate that process. As your texts tend to place me in a position where I have to speak in a manner that contradicts what I am or do, I do not wish to address them and at times I feel quite put off by their mood or tone. Perhaps you are not fully aware of the implications of what you write or question?

Your comment about not being able to understand what I am teaching is interesting and is something I am addressing right now within me. I do not want to make a list of my beliefs as what I speak about are not beliefs. I am not saying what I think as much as I am sharing my experiences. As I am sharing my experiences and my consciousness, lists and specified concepts that fit within some system are highly inappropriate as my consciousness does not accommodate these things. I am very different than the systematized philosophical theology to which you are accustomed. Indeed, I am very much free form, just like my music, and it is destructive for me to be placed in a formalized system complete with its inherent demands and expectations.

So if you seek lists and systemization, well, you know where to find them! I give you something quite different.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Nanda-grama » Tue Jun 07, 2011 9:02 am

Harsi wrote:

Now the big question remains what spiritual conclusions and concepts is Hari really teaching? To this day I have my problems in finding that out completely. I mean how should I understand anything about Radha Krishna who are standing on the alter by avoiding to speak about any Krishna lila or what is written in some revealed scriptures about this divine personalities? I am surprised at your ability, Harsi, to listen to Hari during so many years and understand him so less!

At the past summer I had necessity to systematize for myself what Hari told and I listened again all old lectures and did meditations and what was interestingly- although this lectures looked extemporaneous and were on different topics I found clear picture of step for step exposed knowledge which was also very practical!

I also have not some problems with what Hari doesn't retell Krishna-lilas, I know where to find it if I want to read it. Hari teaches how to perceive directly Their energy and to connect with Them-and it would be strange a little if you would stay in front of somebody and instead of association with him would read a book with description of his lilas.

I had a talk with people from one gaudia-math and they told me that they meditate on what how Krishna massages Radha's feet but if I want to meditate on what how Krishna puts his head on Radha's knees I should go to another math. I asked them- but can Krishna do that and this and something else what was not described before and can I meditate on all it at once?- and they looked at me as at an injurer

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Nanda-grama » Mon Aug 15, 2011 6:05 am

it is interestingly that the topic about Hari in Russian site хари-катха is opened again!

<http://forum.hari-katha.org/index.php?s ... ntry375485>

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Hari » Mon Aug 15, 2011 2:17 pm

Seems like some people like to hash over the past again and again. An old friend asked me to reply to some of their arguments. I did that but this last one I thought I would share as it contains some information that I think should be public. So here it is:

I hear about how I threatened the GBC. I did not threaten any individual GBC man and none of them can say so honestly. Threatening the GBC body is meaningless as it only exists as an idea or an ever changing group that meets once a year to create resolutions after long discussions and great expense, even if it is registered in Calcutta. Demanding money from the GBC at that time is utterly absurd as they had no money to demand. Why would I demand money from those who did not have it to give?

What most people do not understand, is that whatever money was gotten was obtained through a group of householders who earned it. I was a member of that group. I assisted them to use that money in a very wonderful way for the sake of ISKCON and the Mayapur Project by determining which projects would greatest benefit from funding. I did not take it for my personal gain. During my health crisis and my transformation of awareness, other persons assumed ownership of money that was neither theirs, neither theirs to determine how it was used. Besides my having nothing and barely finding a way to eat (no I was not starving), I had no control over how these funds were to be used. This was a source of agitation not only to me, but to those others who were intimate partners in the creation and use of those funds. The anger and agitation this caused was boundless. Our main purposes with these funds was to repair the damage created by the way in which children were dealt, the repression of women, families and devotees, and the creation of a comprehensive social community development project in Mayapur that would address these issues in a meaningful and practical manner to create a viable model for ISKCON. It was for this reason alone that those who worked to create the money from Non-ISKCON funds allowed me to use it for the greater good. From the start it was declared that the money was not ISKCON money although we would use it for the sake of ISKCON. Now I do understand that this declaration might be disputed as some think that any and all funds any leader or even individual creates within ISKCON belong to ISKCON (are all of you living as if all that you have belongs to ISKCON? No? Well, then you share the same mentality as those who created the funds in the first place) but that is not how we saw it and we openly stated it without opposition. Indeed, the ISKCON GBC's Minister of Finance was Naveen Krsna das at that time. During multiple meetings he attended it was frankly and clearly stated that what we gave to ISKCON projects was a donation, was conditional on it being used in certain ways, and the funds did not belong to ISKCON neither would we accept ISKCON management or decision making over them. He not only accepted this, he embraced it at that time as he also felt ISKCON was mismanaged and had its priorities all screwed up. I was upset with Naveen for many years for not defending me against all the accusations that were leveled at me for stealing until I met him many years later and he explained he left ISKCON right after I did and therefore there was no one left who knew the actual situation of the creation and management of these funds except those who desired to usurp the funds for their own purposes.

Now the important point is that I did indeed want to get back whatever money remained after a large portion of it was lost for various reasons. I will not go into the details because most of these individuals involved are still living (except the most mismanaged of them all and I do not like to speak badly about the dead), and I respect their privacy and their situations. In short, they felt that they were being cheated out of everything they had and ISKCON was using it. I find it fascinating that the rumour created in ISKCON is that I stole from it or I wanted it to give

me money. In reality, quite the opposite occurred and this is the reason there was so much anger on the part of the Russians and Armenians involved. It was money they created and although they joined with me in using it for the greater good, they did not divorce themselves from it as they were minute by minute active participants in the fund.

I created a foundation to insure that the funds would be managed if I were to die or to be incapacitated. Naturally I could not have conceived of what did occur. Using what I created as an excuse to usurp the money (indeed, money rules all things in ISKCON) the managers I appointed invoked a clause that said if I did not follow the faith, I could be removed as the founder of the trust. Now I found myself trapped in a web of my own creation. This was a very difficult situation for me, but it was far more difficult for those who had lost everything due to the cheating of one (now deceased) individual who later was to be embraced by ISKCON management. Now on top of that loss, our funds were now being usurped by a group of people who had nothing to do with its creation. Although these persons who created the money were trustees on the fund, they were rapidly removed simply because they agreed with me.

Now we had a situation where real theft took place. And to deal with that real anger was used. We saw at that time that the money was going to be used in ways that we did not agree. And indeed it was. Because these new owners did not share my vision, as they are mainly managers who do not have an expanded understanding of how to benefit a lot of people with funds, they naturally used it in financially expedient ways that did not continue the ideals of the trust. Although they had not yet done this when I got angry at them, I saw that this would occur due to their personal nature and the manner in which they insulted and dealt with me. I was not only insulted, deeply insulted, but I saw that whatever was remaining would also be lost due to their choices. So I tried to change it in the only way I could at that time. Not only not successful, my anger did not represent who I am as a person and how I really feel about these individuals. After all, these leaders of the trust were people I loved deeply and trusted totally. One only gets that angry with people who you love and trust as your own family and whose betrayal of everything you worked for was unexpected, impossible to believe, and as cruel as you could imagine, or at least that is how I felt at that time. Now I see it is obvious considering their personal quality and inability to deal with others, but that is another issue. I also understand that my own sudden and unexpected transformation shocked them and therefore they struggled to find a cause. They could only understand that I was insane. I regret that neither they, nor any authority in ISKCON bothered to take the time to deeply understand the situation or what I was going through.

The manner in which the others who felt intensely cheated by a group of their own peers who they now considered as insignificant thieves, is legend. Their anger and actions are not related to me, were not invoked by me, neither were they encouraged by me. Indeed, I did not even know what they did or said and to this day I do not know the full story as I do not wish to hear it as it just increases my sadness. It is what it is. Neither I, neither those with whom those funds were created are thieves. How can you steal what is rightfully yours? Not only is there no fault in it, but since we did not succeed to get back the funds, there is also no act to discuss.

Angry words aside, look at the actions. Who took what from whom? But to determine this requires an open mind, a clear heart, and a desire. As all of these factors are missing, you all shall possibly continue to create a straw man and hang him. So be it.

I think most of you all, meaning those God Brothers and others who are still extremely upset with me, are having the most trouble with me stating what I did about Prabhupada. I think money is an excuse to rationalize your anger. So let me address that.

My reasoning and logic behind my departure is difficult for others to understand for a few reasons. As I am the only one who knew all the factors involved, I am uniquely qualified to

comprehensively understand it. However rational and reasonable my point of view might be, it will seem otherwise to those who do not share my experiences and conclusion. Everyone has to determine their own truth in their own way over time. Therefore, I will avoid getting into detailed recounting of the thought process that led me to reach the conclusion I did. I think all of you are expert at discussing the past, so my input into it would probably not enhance that exchange.

Yet there is an important point to be made here. I remember during those darker days when I decided that I could not follow any longer, Abhirama came to see me. He asked me why I felt as I did, so I told him. He said something interesting and I remember it always and it is the reason that I avoid anything that presents Prabhupada in a negative light. Indeed, anyone doing so in my forum is deleted. He said, "Even if there were faults in Prabhupada, I do not wish to hear them as it hurts my heart as all I have left is my loving memory and I want to preserve it as it is." That deeply impressed me and I always consider this when I speak.

One can go on for hours about how I do not represent Gaudiya Vaisnavism, am not a proper devotee, that I break all the basic understandings about guru and disciple, and so on. To this I reply, no contest. I do not attempt to defend myself as a devotee, even though I am a vegan who does Deity worship and probably follow more principles than a large number of Alachuan (again, only because I like to, not because I have to). I state clearly that I am not a "devotee" in the ISKCON sense of the word. I am not a follower of Prabhupada. I do not believe in the present day concept of guru at all. I think we can serve others by being mentors to them, by facilitating their growth and development, and by sharing our personal experiences and realization to assist their spiritual evolution. I do not believe in "guru" because the word has so many ancillary implications that demand far more from an individual than is advantageous for them. Again, this is my own opinion. I think so, and I am not in a closet. When it comes to sastra, that part that resonates with me is fine with me, but there are aspects of it that do not resonate with me, so I do not bother with it. I embrace the essence of bhakti. So there is little to be accomplished proving that I am not a follower as again, no contest: I am not a follower. To state that is wrong according to sadhu-sastra-guru is correct, yet who really cares? Not sure what you are trying to state here. Do you wish me to apologize? To who and for what? Are you God? Are you Prabhupada? Who would I apologize to? Those individuals who I feel I have dealt with harshly, including those who cheated me, I have expressed my feeling of sorrow for being so angry, although I do not see how it could have played out differently due to the time, place and circumstances. I have no problem with God and no problem with Prabhupada. If you wish to label me as "offensive" and "to be rejected" because of it, you are free to do so but I think that your label is incorrect and does not serve your own needs as well as you think. I seriously doubt you will influence me to change my consciousness. And why would you do so? Do you really want me back in ISKCON? Of course not! You do not like me and you did not like what I did at that time. Not sure why really, but it is so. Fine. We agree to disagree. Remember, truth drowns in an ocean of lies.

You cannot call the love I have for Prabhupada (the person, not the founder acarya) an empty sentiment. You cannot tell me about the quality of my love. I know that you will, but these are your (empty) opinions only and should be clearly stated as such. Indeed, the term "empty sentiment" is an oxymoron. A sentiment cannot be empty by definition. My sentiment towards Prabhupada is, if you are interested, deep and it is anything but empty. He was the only one who appreciated me for what I am, who engaged me accordingly, and who respected what I could do and encouraged it. He saw the me who usually hid and worked behind the scenes and he brought that person out into the forefront. I therefore gave my life for him and his service. I dedicated myself to him and our Lords. My appreciation for what he did for me in recognizing my potential and capacity and investing in me as he did will remain throughout this life. I do not regret anything I did in his service and I do not feel in any way I have lost, or wasted, or was exploited. My appreciation runs deep. That appreciation is independent of me

remaining in a flawed organization filled with controversy, debate, endless disputes, and extreme negativity against me for reasons that are either born of fantasy or are motivated by others inner trauma that my life seems to awaken.

Yet, when I was faced with dealing with what ISKCON had become, I had a very hard time to understand why. It was easy to simply say that it was all our own fault, that we were bad and did not properly follow Prabhupada. It is way easier to blame me, as I am not around to defend myself, or other leaders as they are easy targets. This does not require intelligence to say. But to understand why there was such systemic abuse and exploitation of the weaker elements of society requires a much deeper look into the psyche and heart of the people within ISKCON. The real question to be addressed is why? Any man on the street can say "this is wrong, they did that, they are wrong" but none of these opinions change things in the ultimate issue. As these do not know why things went wrong, they simply elect new leaders who are equally wrong only to become frustrated again. I do not wish to get into extreme details as this would take far too long and should be the subject of a book. My conclusion, right or wrong, reached after incredible soul searching and painful recognition of facts and feelings, was that it all boiled down to the value structure that we embraced and the incredible wall of obstacles thrown up each time I tried to fundamentally change the manner in which we made decisions and created plans in ISKCON by the brahmastra of "Prabhupada Said." This phrase cancelled the attempt to use logic and reason, feeling and experience derived from the moment and the events leading to the situation needing resolution. It creates a situation where one is suddenly at odds with one's beloved guru, the Founder and Acarya of this Great Institution. When it came down to very critical junctures that required a new way of thinking and a different value structure, this super block phrase was used by some people. Due to social pressures, even though many would disagree with what he said or felt that had he been alive today he would have obviously said something else, devotees often bowed to social expectation and what was right was not done. It is kind of like being in post 9/11 USA and saying that perhaps Al Queida did not do the bombs. I myself felt that great pressure. I felt I could not change things significantly.

When I had a lot of money I could change things. It is easy to change things in ISKCON with money. You just support those areas that have value and you do not support those areas that should die away. You support people who are progressive and know how to do the right thing, and you do not support others who do not. It is rather easy. Even members of the GBC who did not usually like me, often for the wrong reasons, suddenly liked me very much and wanted to work with me when they saw I had the funds to do all kinds of interesting things. Sri Ram, bless his departed soul, who often did not like me said to me, "You know, even though I don't like many things you do, one thing I greatly respect, you never use money as a bribe to force others to change their opinions or actions." And it was so. My role was to facilitate others to become great in their own way. I liked that very much. I still like it.

I decided that I could no longer be bound by having to follow the opinion of someone else. I decided I had to ultimately do what I think is right because I could not continue following something I think is wrong and is fundamentally flawed. At that point I saw that I could not change ISKCON because ISKCON was bound to its founder, as you all point out in your texts. So I said I am no longer bound, I no longer follow, I make my own choices because I feel they are the right thing to do. This is why I am not a "devotee" who has pledged allegiance to Prabhupada in any and all circumstances regardless of my own personal feeling. I have placed my right to make my own choices based on my own conscious awareness and quality firmly in my own hands. At that time, coming to such a conclusion was equivalent to a volcano erupting. You cannot imagine what this realization did to me and the power it unleashed (for better or worse). As you cannot conceive of this, you also cannot understand how I felt and therefore my actions or words immediately afterwards seem inconceivable to you. Do I feel the same way now? Of course not. Did I feel the same way one week later? No. But my

conclusions reached on that fateful day in the forest remain instilled in my consciousness as they came directly from my heart.

This was my own choice and decision and I do not insist or push anyone to share my reasoning or my conclusions. I have often said that if you wish to hate me, do so for the proper reasons, not for mythical ones. Because I separated myself from Prabhupada, the GBC freaked out and assumed that I would make a movement to take all the devotees away from ISKCON, which would mean massive financial loss. Therefore, they attacked me with all their power. They assumed that if they were to totally discredit me in all ways by turning me into this monster who was so fallen and crazy that no one in their right mind would consider following me, they would protect what they had. They thought they would preserve Prabhupada's legacy. I suppose it worked! Unfortunately, it was all over-kill as I did not wish to steal away people as I did not and still have no group or organization to steal them to. I do say that everyone should take care of themselves and make their own choices as no one else will do it as well. But that is just my opinion. I heard months later that over a thousand devotees left their places and gathered in St Petersburg, but this had nothing to do with me directly. Interestingly, all the attacking the GBC did simply created unsurmountable walls between what became two groups. The more they pummeled my reputation, the more they became hated. I think the strategy of burning straw men is not an advantageous political methodology, yet as the GBC at that time was not very mature, they took that path and I still have to deal with hate mail and strange texts now 13 years later. People in the regular society comment when they hear this is still going on, "Don't these people have lives?"

If you are a person who follows Prabhupada in all circumstances and who will quote sastra, sadhu and guru about how bad I am for not doing so, then you can save your energy. No contest. And I am not sure who you are trying to convince after all these years. Why are you still so concerned with this 13 years after my departure? How do I threaten you so that you feel you have to defend yourself? Prabhupada and Krsna do not need this defense as I do not attack them, and besides, I am a nothing compared to them, isn't it? How could I be a threat? Do you honestly think they fear me? That is silly! I am living my life, keeping to myself, sharing with those who wish to hear what I have to say, assisting others to do what they wish to do. Indeed, I have consistently given ISKCON and BBT people valuable information and perhaps insights into how to do what they do better. So why do I remain a problem for you? I find it interesting. Do you think that smashing me down more will help you rise to greater heights? That is a strange logic, but one that has historical precedent.

During my 22 years as a GBC/BBT/Guru, I certainly did some things that some people do not like, some people hate with all their heart, some people think were kind of good, some people adore, or some could care less about. This is natural. It is to be expected. I see no value in defending what I did. I see great value in making sure that what we state as facts are correct as it annoys me that fiction is now accepted as historical fact. When I can contribute to clarifying what happened from my personal experience, I do so. But defending it and speaking about it do not interest me that much. After all, everyone maintains their own opinion so long as that opinion serves them.

Hari

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by harsi » Tue Aug 16, 2011 9:56 pm

Dear Hari

If you anyway wanted to "bloop" Iskcon why havent you take care that everything will unfold according to your plan. As far as I know many leaders in Iskcon had also their privat bank



account where they accumulated their money received from their disciples. At least I know that Suhotra Swami did it like that. Please don't be upset with me if I ask you so boldly. Why you haven't gone to the USA first so that you would have been in the country you feel secure. I know from my time in Iskcon that many leaders cared less if someone wanted to "bloop" Iskcon or did it, often these people asked them that they should be given some money back from the money they gave to the temple, some gave quite a lot. But the leaders in Germany trusted the German welfare state laws who will take care of those who "blooped" without any money for living in their pocket. In this way the responsibility was shuffled completely to the German state and its social welfare.

Another thing I know from my past conversations on COM in 98 is that many people were upset that the money you used in this connection for Iskcon was made by gambling at the Moscow stock market thus breaking one of the four regulative principles, at least many understood it to have been like that.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Hari » Tue Aug 16, 2011 10:59 pm

What an interesting question! I never thought of it. I did not "anyway want to 'bloop'" as you stated. Indeed, the thought never crossed my mind. All that happened was entirely overwhelming and most of it was out of my control. Worrying about money, taking care of myself, or preparing for a future outside of ISKCON never entered my consciousness. All I could do was to get through each day, one after another. I had no private bank account and no personal money. All of this was managed through others. I did not sign on an account and therefore how could I have put money in one for me?

I did not go to the USA because I had no idea to go anywhere. I was simply trying to get myself together. If it was not for some wonderful souls in Russia, I would have been totally and completely lost.

I left ISKCON when I was thrown out of ISKCON. One cannot plan for the event of being thrown out when the concept is inconceivable.

The money was created by a business that dealt in financial affairs. It was created by householders and others who worked on their own. I did not directly engage in its functioning. I encouraged its creation and assisted the influx of a great amount of wealth in ISKCON by saying when stocks should be sold. They offered me money to do good in ISKCON and that is precisely what I did. I doubt you will hear complaints from those who were recipients of my charity.

ISKCON receives money all the time from people. It is absurd to conclude that all of it came from sources in line with those famous principles. ISKCON takes the money nonetheless. I do not wish to start explaining how Prabhupada got some of his money to do some of his projects as this would be needless, but let us simply say that at no time was a principle stated that one can only accept money earned in a manner consistent with regulative principles. Money comes from all kinds of sources. What one does with it determines one's personal quality and motive. To say that financial dealings are gambling is an interpolation. Nowadays, simply putting your money in a bank is gambling, or simply holding your country's currency. The value goes up and down constantly and banks fail. Giving money to your country's social insurance is gambling as they might not be able to pay it back to you in the future, as we see now happening in the US. Linking these two things sounds good in theory, but in reality it is not. Anyway, if they wish to think this way and condemn all that money that was given to ISKCON and Mayapur, they certainly may. Who can stop them? I, however, do not agree. It was what it was and it did real substantial good while it did. Much of that remains today. The Child Protection Office, the

Ministry of Education, the Oxford Project, the continued existence of New Vrindavan, the French farm, the children's books, the people who started new lives, and a lot of land in Mayapur, are nothing to sneeze at. The purists should sell all of these things and give the money back to ISKCON because it was ill gotten gain?

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by harsi » Thu Aug 18, 2011 10:55 pm

When reading your response: "I left ISKCON when I was thrown out of ISKCON." one could have the impression that you still miss the time of being in Iskcon as it was not really your desire to leave that society of people or so called devotees of Krishna. I just wonder how you think that this would have been worked out as in the meantime it became clear to me that some of your spiritual conclusions and the way you explain spiritual matters and the Supreme seem to not have much in common with that what Iskcon stands for. How do you think would that have evolved if you would still have been a member of that society? What were according to your opinion the real causes that those in ISKCON took such kind of drastic measures to "throw out" one of their most famous members and financially a very generously as well.

If that was indeed so, 'they were truly idiots', to say it with the words of Gorbachev as one can read in an interview in Spiegel Online, and besides that some very ingrate one's. How can you behave in such a way with the hand which may feed you financially over such a long period of time?! That resembles with a planned coup d'état at a week point of ones life. I just read this days in Gorbachevs memoirs, which appeared in German a few years ago, how he became also very disappointed that the man who he most trusted in his government and personally selected for the post of defence minister turned aggainst him in the famous coup from August 1991 to overthrow his power and establish the backward directed rule of a branch of his political party by force. The same happend to you when the man who you most trusted, Brahma Muhurta, whom I have known and valued also personally since the time he used to engage me on my Sunday visits of the Heidelberg temple in the early 1980ies in the production of the magazine "Wie Es Ist", the German version of "Back to Godhead", turned aggainst you and caused you so much anxiety and pain. But most others in your team of intimates in Iskcon conducted themselves no less bad. I just remember what Gurushakti wrote on COM about the meeting he had with you in France. Or Raktambara and Mukhya, the admistrators of COM, who deleted at that time your account there. Other ones to whom the word 'idiot' may apply in this regard. But what can one say "nothing is so hard as man's ingratitude," as the proverb goes.

Now regarding the money earned by means of some shady bussiness like doing speculations at the stock market, which may, according to the opinions of some people, have broken some 'regulative principle' it is indeed so that "there's nothing wrong with money," or "money is not to be sniffed at," as another proverg goes. That must have thought also those who accepted that money you offered within ISKCON. I read somewhere that Prabhupada also accepted it for the building of his temples and printing of his books although he was informed that in some cases it was some kind of "dirty money" which was earned by all kinds of shady ways by some of his disciples. I heard that even by drugs or in later years by all kinds of bumper stickers and similar things. He defended the opinion that money used in service of Krishna becomes spiritualized and thus 'clean' according to his definition.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by tgcarr29 » Sun Aug 21, 2011 5:37 am

Dear Hari:

I don't know a lot about you, but it appears that a lot of the bad stuff about you online is from ritviks, who need to make failures of as many ISKCON gurus as possible. To one of the groups

you are just another statistic in their body count of the fallen. Delving deeply into circumstances is not a thing which appears to interest these critics. Therefore it is completely unimportant to them that no charges were ever filed, nor that you were never indicted or convicted of anything. Maybe the greatest "crime" of all would be your marrying your therapist, to them. So I wouldn't necessarily feel the need to defend myself to such an extent, but your level of candor is fairly remarkable among the alleged downfallen.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Hari » Mon Aug 29, 2011 12:13 pm

I didn't marry my therapist.

But thank you for your comments!

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by tgcarr29 » Tue Aug 30, 2011 6:51 am

Dear Hari:

I'm sorry, it seems that the virus of being ill-informed about you is catching. Anyhow, it was described somewhere, probably "Back To Prabhupada," magazine as you "running off with therapist and cash" etc. Whatever the story, I think the ideology motivates how they frame it, which is generally to put ISKCON gurus in the worst possible light, not that there haven't been a few who appear to have engaged in criminal behavior, and even went to jail in at least one case. I like what you're doing now. To go off the topic, have you ever heard of Steve Bohlert, aka Subal Das? He's written a couple of books on Universal Radha-Krishnaism, as he calls it. He seems headed in the same open-minded and open-ended direction as you, and may be even less interested in being a leader, though you may disagree with that. Anyway, neither of you has crowned himself guru of the world.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Sanaka Kumar das » Thu Sep 06, 2012 3:41 am

I must confess I've started this post a few times over the last year and again left. I did wish to contribute to clarifying the situation around those memorable 1998 events but simultaneously felt like my voice would make no difference. Anyway, I thought, people would consider me just 'another follower'.

But at least you, Hari, can attest that I'm not exactly your 'follower'. At least, not in the way a 'follower' is generally understood. My relationship with you – an issue well worth addressing, at some later time - is a mystery even to me, perhaps as much as you yourself are a mystery. I do treasure our relationship dearly, but not at the expense of other relationships. So I haven't split ways with ISKCON either though admittedly, I see it very differently from how I used to see it earlier. I hold no official positions within that glorious organization and have no plans to ever accept any, but I'm still around and still willing to extend whichever little help I can. I'm often asked to give classes and the like, so I'm happy to still be perceived as a well-wisher, which I definitely am. So one can hardly find any objective reason to consider me any 'more' a follower of yours than that of ISKCON; actually, it may rather look the other way round.

Anyway, it's funny how it dawned on me just now, while writing, that among those who signed the agreement drawn during that historical meeting in Nice, France, I was perhaps the only one who was not representing any organization, was not a party to anyone or against anyone, and had no interest of his own. I was present, shall I say, as kind of witness whose only interest was a fair deal. Just an observer to a scene of truce after the battle.

Now, I don't want to say, by indulging in this fit of self-aggrandizement, that others didn't care for that fair deal. I'm pretty sure this was the main motive of yours, as well as of some others – first of all, Bhakti Vijnana Gosvami, still Vaidyanath at that time. He was the pusher behind the scenes, and if not for him, the meeting would have hardly taken place at all. He obviously had no interest of his own, and only God knows how much the effort cost him. Sesa was another such person. From what I felt, I don't think their motive was just fear for the glorious organization they represented, although some did think it was.

So after ceremoniously appointing myself the Only True Witness, informed and disinterested, now I feel almost like duty-bound to state, even if no one cares, that your description of this VTF financial controversy – and of other events, for that matter - is accurate, to the best of my knowledge.

It's so frustrating sometimes to see how precious little we can do for each other. But we can at least try to do justice. So doing justice to you would be admitting that what was done to you & Co was just awful. Ordinarily, people get impressive criminal sentences for such things. And you probably were not even the 'worst' victim. The worst case was perhaps of – hmm – let us call him B. I see no problem using his actual name – to me, he's an unsung hero with justice to be done to as well. But you seem to be discrete about certain things, so I leave this up to you.

Actually, for one who is not willing to listen to your version which is lucid enough, your case is perhaps just too 'explosive' to expect much clarity from – it's so laden with controversy, emotion, clashing interests, rumors, suffering, and what not, possibly even intentional misinformation, - so trying to see through it is as effective as seeing through a tornado. So I suggest benefitting ourselves by shifting focus to the other guy's case.

His story is simple and transparent. He started that stock market business which eventually became a huge income-generating scheme pumping out millions for ISKCON-related projects. Later it became a teamwork relying heavily on your vision and guidance, but he remained the front man legally in charge. So externally, he was perceived as the one responsible for the loans taken and debts incurred, and by the time this VTF controversy broke out in the wake of Russian economy crash those debts amounted to more than 10 million. Not in roubles, of course.

Some of the creditors were what they call 'serious' guys. In Russia, everyone knows that category of people who can screw your head off your neck and say it's just the way you used to be since your very birth. But due to their incredible seriousness everyone, including police and courts, believes their version of truth. So when the Russian economy collapsed and the company went bankrupt our dear B. had to spend his unhappy, impoverished last years hiding from those people and as we know, ended up committing suicide.

According to a paper with bank data which I still have from that meeting in Nice, the company donated or invested in ISKCON-related projects at least 50% more than the debt mentioned amounted to. The profits generated from some of those investments constituted like another 50%. And that definitely was not everything that was given. In other words, those debts might have been covered long ago. Why this was not done I do not know, but this perhaps just reflects his priorities, or the priorities all of you had at that time. Anyway, this was the risk he himself wished or agreed to take - in other words, the choice was his.

However, when the last funds of this bankrupting company were saved by transferring them out of the collapsing country to the VTF account, those two loyal ISKCON members in charge of the account chose to use them in the interests of ISKCON and against their owners' will. In that way, our dear B. was deprived of his choice over financial matters, including dealings with his creditors.

Of course, it's easy to rationalize that anyway, those funds – though a significant few million sum - were not enough to cover the debt, and that anyway even he himself would not have spent them for that purpose. This reasoning by itself might be right, but the point still is - that was not his choice anymore. So instead of him sacrificing himself he was sacrificed by somebody else.

The only reason I am not wondering why anyone in his sound mind would be willing to implicate himself in the possible consequences of such an act is that I know from my sad experiences that Krsna does take care to put you in a circumstance where you yourself have to take a similar decision just to understand it better, and finding myself taking such decisions is about the last thing on Earth I would desire.

Honestly, I tried my best to understand the logic behind this decision. Some of the explanations sounded very strange – like a sannyasi is not supposed to own money. Well, we can all rejoice they stopped just short of taking away his wife which sannyasi is also not supposed to have (although she marched into the picture later). The normal logic would be to take his sannyasa away, and not the money nor the wife. That's the only thing you have given him – the title or post, of swami, guru, GBC, BBT, or whatever. So this is what you can take back, if need be – and even if your decision is faulty, it's still your dharma, but why would you encroach upon that which was never allotted to you by anyone. Besides being common sense, this is also the philosophy of Gita and Isa Upanisads.

The way I was brought up makes accommodating such things difficult. I still have a memory from some early childhood when I brought home three roubles and reported having found them in the street. My parents, thank them, responded by asking, 'Have you put them there?' to which I naturally replied, 'No'. 'So go and put them back in place'. Although I cannot boast of following this golden rule consistently I would consider it safe to take to when one wakes up in the morning and accidentally finds some few millions in the account he was essentially just sleeping on.

All this said, I still would not exclude the possibility it was Krsna's will. He likes to play tricks, and this famous 'Hari' trick is one of His favorites. Who knows. Time will show.

I personally lost nothing in this transaction, but still probably everyone can feel I was annoyed, so what to speak of those whose only assets were disposed of in such a gracious manner. Retrospectively, I have no difficulty understanding how those who did it might have been driven by the best intentions and how the immense burden of responsibility for the decision and the short time they had for it might have contributed to the confusion affecting their best judgment. Given the fact that they did go out of their way to correct the situation later, in Nice, I tend to feel this was the case. However, at that time it was hard to feel so. Besides, no one knew then what the consequences will be. They also had other consequences to think about – like what would happen to those ISKCON projects that used to be fed by the VTF money. So although the situation had changed, they followed the habit of transferring VTF money to ISKCON accounts. Following habits is natural in times of confusion – that saves you from the need to think much.

The main cause of the confusion, however, was likely the 'Oath of Loyalty' which every sannyasi and guru of ISKCON is supposed to make. For those who may not be familiar, it boils down to a simple idea – if officials representing a noble cause of ISKCON receive some donations and later change their minds by choosing not to continue as officials anymore, the donations should remain with the noble cause and not with the personalities involved. The idea seems to be transparent and laudable – just to make sure the individuals, especially anonymous, who donated presumably to that noble cause, are not deceived.

However, this hardly was the case at hand since the 'donors' were not anonymous and not even 'donors' either – rather, they clearly and unanimously stated the money was not intended as a donation for the official in question but rather as an asset they themselves wished to exercise their will over. Little by little, this and other inconsistencies dawned on some ISKCON officials, though others among those few whom I have met remained unreceptive.

Alas, it was too late, the train was gone and the money spent, the passions inflamed and the battle conchshells sounded. Fortunately, the reason came to prevail, and the initiative of Bhakti Vijnana and some others bore fruit in the form of that meeting in Nice where an attempt was made to admit and correct the mistakes that happened. Some of the corrective measures did take place and some eventually failed, due to various reasons, but the overall impression of the affair once again convinced me, more or less, that misunderstandings happen in this world much more often than instances of just pure ill-will. It also opened my eyes to the hopelessly heterogeneous nature of ISKCON management – as variegated as the rest of the world. While the mainstream line turned out to be satisfactory after all, the opinions within it differed greatly, and while some individuals seemingly underbehaved others acted like real sadhus. So nothing new under the sun... To err is human; to forgive, divine.

I do not know why the statement clarifying Hari's innocence was never issued by some formal ISKCON entity – though it was supposed to. But I wouldn't be surprised if the reason was not an ill-will, once again. At that time tension around the assets forcibly taken from the BBT was still very strong as well as the tendency to suspect others of shady maneuvering behind the scene, so it was natural not to hurry too much with such statements. But time has shown who is who quite clearly, and I'm still naïve enough to think this statement might work out. At least, now I've contributed towards this end whatever I could, and I'll probably try to remind some others of this issue at some opportune time.

Lastly, I must shyly admit I am not the best informed person in the fiscal matters discussed. There are others who know the facts better, the most informed person being perhaps Hari. I am writing for just those who may not be willing to listen to his version with a very, very faint, unlikely hope that mine might be more acceptable to some. I was not directly involved in those financial transactions although some of my closest and most trusted friends were. So that's essentially how I gathered my understanding. Needless to say, everyone is welcome to use whatever is stated here in any surroundings, ISKCON or otherwise. There is nothing private here. Do feel free to ask any questions or request clarification on any points. I also beg to correct me if I misstated something, albeit unintentionally.

I hope to continue to take part in this noble congregational effort to distinguish reality from illusion for the welfare of all.

Thanks for your kind attention.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by harsi » Thu Sep 06, 2012 7:24 pm

Thank you Sanaka Kumar, your stepping forward in this regard is very much appreciated by me as well, I think, by many others concerned.

Truth has a way of coming out: slowly, surely, inevitably it finds its way by which the story of what really happened back then in 1998 is reconstructed.

Please tell us the name of this poor guy who invented at that time the scheme of multiplying "Krishna's" money. He deserves, I would say, that his name is mentioned and glorified within our Forum.

Goloka Dhama in Abentheuer, Germany, the place where this whole unpleasant story for all concerned started to roll.

Although one could say on the Whole, (I write with capital letter on purpose) nothing is made and done (?!) that does not have a purpose, at least in retrospect ...

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by harsi » Thu Sep 06, 2012 10:03 pm

In this connection I would like to relate a telling story I was reading the other day in a book by a well-known German author. It is a story taken from real life. In a town in Japan there was living the Zenmaster Hakuin. He was highly regarded and the people came to him to accept spiritual instructions. Now it so happened that the young daughter of his neighbor became pregnant. When her disgruntled parents scolded at her and asked her who would be the father of the child, she responded finally it would be Hakuin, the Zen master. Then the parents were running indignantly to Hakuin, were reproaching, blaming, him and were telling him disgustedly that her daughter would have confessed to them that he would be the father of the child. All that what Hakuin replied was: "is that right?"

The whole scandal spread like a wildfire across the whole city and beyond the city borders. The master lost his reputation. He wasn't perturbed (bothered) by that. Nobody was visiting him anymore. That also didn't affect him either. When the child was born, the parents of the daughter brought the child to him. "You are the father, so please take care for him." The master looked and took care lovingly after the baby. One year later the daughter confessed to her parents remorseful that the real father of her child was the young man from the grocery store from next door. Totally contritely the parents went again to Hakuin to apologize and beg for his forgiveness. "We sincerely regret, we come to take the child back. Our daughter confessed to us that you were not the father." "Is that right? should Hakuin have answered and gave them the child back. The moral of the story is that the master responded to both (good and bad) news the same. "Is that right?" or "Is it so?" as the German original says. He accepts and permits the present moment the way it is, if good or bad, and therefore he is not being dragged in the human drama. For him only the present moment counts and that present moment is how it is. Our life unfolds, we live - now.

..Video: Krishna Kshetra leads a Krishna Bhajan - Kirtan Mela, 6.9.2012, Limbach-Oberfrohna, East Germany.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it  
by Sanaka Kumar das » Mon Sep 10, 2012 4:15 am

Don't mention it, Harsi-ji. If it was of any use, you better scold me for not doing this earlier. Lazy bones.

I'm still reserved about the name. Visnupad was mentioning him earlier in some post but not using his name, so this is why I follow the suit. I believe there might have been some reason, so I leave it up to him. Kamalamala, of course, knows everything as well, so you may ask him. I'm just a newcomer here, don't feel sure.

Maybe I misphrased things a little in my post. Although he started the business, it became big-time with Visnupad's guidance.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it all!

by kamalamala1 » Tue Aug 04, 2015 7:02 am

Hi Sanaka jee

I read your post most of things you mention is right but i want point that Unfortunately the reasons why Vaidyanath organized that meeting in France was not his own free will out of his kindness but the act to save his own skin.

He was captured by the B-s creditors and they forced him to organize anything just to get there money.He did it out of deep fear to save himself not at all out of love to Hari or to anyone.That all/

Maybe he is trying to show his kindness by wards but in acts he didnt yet ,let see wath he will do in future .

They had no capacity to understand and apreciate wath Hari did for them in that time and still doing ,maybe in future they will understand how wrong they was.

By the way i like very much wath Hari wrote.

"In essence, I declare our capacity to find spirit within on our own through our conscious awareness, to connect to the divine as a natural right without impediments, and to express our loving service and healing energy as we wish. I declare our personal responsibility for our choices without requiring these choices to be in line with another person's opinion, some book, or a belief system. If and when we find information from external sources to be relevant to us, we take it. Where these sources have no relevance to our personal experience or where they attempt to restrict or limit our capacity to experience, I reject them. I am not interested in the idea that we require to have someone bring us to God, neither will I embrace not being good enough as the reason why I must deny my personal energy and capacity. But all of this is to be found in all of my lectures."

This is much better then the slave mentality wich was in Iscon.

Althought for so called gurus slave mentality is a good thing for there spiritual buissness.But i believe some of them is good people and soon or later they will really apreciate Haris statments,and the harm of making people there slaves.

Re: Myths about Hari, so-called facts, and the skinny on it all!

by kamalamala1 » Tue Aug 04, 2015 9:09 am

About falling down or off.

This very stupid definitions concoted by all kind of sects to make people feel bad, since they some how doesnt agree with there concept, to feel people forever guilty,and by this confirm themselves as only right guyes.

Actually if we are looking acording scriptures, Sanyasy doesnt have to have money or any prperty but we know well that Prabhupad and now most of all Iscon Sanyasis have property and money also .

I am personally doesnt at all care about this statuses and all kind of things.

But for Iscon guyes it should be clear that nobody was in ISCON Sanyasi according to Manu Samhita, including Prabhupad since they all had money and property.

(This by the way doesnt make for me Prabhupad less saint.)

But in Hari bhakti vilasa also wrieten that if one is pure devotee of Lord Vishnu or Lord Shiva he is automatacally considered Sanyasy,and one who is enaf clever can understand why it is so.

Since Haris devotion and contact to Lords is abvious and it was and is so deep, then where can this questions come?

Actually he shows the best godly quality of humans to not cheat people making them brainless slaves zobis but letting them develope/