ISKCON Central Office of Child Protection
P.O. Box 1438 Alachua, Florida 32616-1438
904-418-0882 • FAX: 904-418-0982
EMAIL: dgovinda@aol.com

Official Decision on the case of Satadhanya dasa

I. Jurisdiction and Authority of the Panel

This determination, issued on January 25, 2000, was rendered in accordance with the guidelines for adjudicating cases of alleged child abuse established by the ISKCON Child Protection Task Force Report and ratified by the ISKCON Governing Body Commission. This judgment is the official decision of the ICOCP on allegations of child abuse allegedly committed by Satadhanya dasa. This panel is authorized by ISKCON, by dint of the GBC's ratification of the ISKCON Child Protection Task Force Report, to resolve all issues concerning Satadhanya dasa and his child abuse case. The ISKCON Child Protection Task Force Report provides the authority to investigate and adjudicate, by means delineated in the report, allegations, rumors, complaints, and other statements surrounding the treatment of children in ISKCON gurukulas, temples, farms, and other projects.

This decision defines the parameters of the relationship of Satadhanya dasa with ISKCON. The ICOCP advises child abuse victims, their parents, and all members of the ISKCON organization to report allegations of child abuse to governmental social service and law enforcement authorities. Further, the ICOCP recommends that all members of ISKCON learn and follow their local laws concerning child abuse and mandated reporting of child abuse.

II. Chronological Presentation of Evidence

This case involves accusations of child sexual abuse, as defined in the ISKCON Child Protection Task Force Report as follows:

"An act of commission (perpetration) where a child is coerced, induced, persuaded, enticed, seduced, or entrapped into sexual acts with another person. The coercion can be either physical or verbal. The other person could be either an adult, an adolescent (12-18 years of age), or even in extreme cases, another child (less than 12 years of age). The abuser uses his/her position of authority or power (size, age, social position, or cognitive differential) to exert control over the victim."

In 1991 the ISKCON Board of Education (IBE) investigated allegations that Satadhanya dasa sexually abused some boys in Mayapura in the 1980s when Satadhanya was a sannyasi. On March 18, 1991, the director of the IBE wrote to Satadhanya:

"...Because of the frequent mention of these past incidents, I felt compelled to make some discreet inquiries among the residents of Mayapur. What I have been able to understand, but not substantiate, is the following:

> "1. Devotees have told me that Satadhanya Prabhu made several unfortunate mistakes in the past concerning illicit sexual contact with two boys. They have mentioned that you were 'caught' and that this is general knowledge in Mayapur.
>
> "2. There also seems to be a strong sympathy that whatever happened was long ago and you were disciplined and/or rectified yourself, and therefore the residents of Mayapur do not see necessity for further action. It seems that your service is deeply appreciated and the attitude is 'Let's forget about this and move on to the future'.

"Unfortunately, devotees who are not residents of Mayapur repeatedly request the ISKCON Board of Education to thoroughly investigate these accusations...

"What I need to know is the truth, and you are the best person I can approach for it. If you could explain to me honestly and straightforwardly what happened, it would help me gain a proper perspective and assist me in dealing with these accusations in a manner most closely resembling the tolerance that our spiritual master showed towards devotees who rectified themselves."

On April 11th, 1991, Satadhanya dasa replied "About nine years ago, I, a sannyasi, had a 'falldown' and the two incidents mentioned in your letter took place." The two persons, Satadhanya explained, "were 25 and 23 years of age and not in any way connected to Gurukul...I went through all the trauma, embarrassment, etc., faced our GBCs, administrative council, devotees, world opinion and whatnot! I, some time later, gave up Sannyasa, got married, and tried to take shelter of Srila Prabhupada and Devotional Service....Since that time I've not had any fall-down..."

In July, 1991, a report on child abuse in the Mayapur gurukula stated that Satadhanya was the Chairman of the Mayapur Administrative Council (MAC). Later in 1991, while Satadhanya was traveling in the West, he was confronted by the testimony of a young man, a former resident of Mayapur, who alleged he had been abused by Satadhanya beginning around 1982, at the age of 11 or 12 years old. Satadhanya stated in a 1995 interview with Dawn Fisher, who conducted a psychological evaluation of Satadhanya, that he had suppressed the name of this underage victim for the previous nine years, from 1982 to 1991, and that news of this third victim, the first publicly known underage victim, was a revelation and a shock to people in general, including Satadhanya's wife of four years.

On March 5th, 1992, in light of the new victim, the ISKCON Board of Education (IBE) met in Mayapur and decided that Satadhanya must comply with the GBC directive that a child abuser desiring to live in an ISKCON community must have the approval of 3/4 of

the community grhasthas. The IBE also requested an explanation from Satadhanya as to why he had failed to mention the third, underage victim. On March 29th, 1992, Satadhanya wrote to the IBE, admitting to three incidents of abuse with the underage victim. He also wrote "I have no real excuse for having left out the above name in my previous letter to you." On March 29, 1992, Satadhanya also requested the IBE "that the part about informing the incident to all the local grhasthas and subsequent 75% vote be discarded in my case for the following reasons:

> "1. Since I am so well-known in all government circles, amongst the life-members, and the surrounding villages, informing the local bengali grhasthas will be tantamount to informing the government and press. I am the primary ISKCON representative interfacing with government in various important dealings.
>
> "2. I was certainly fallen for the period in question, but, for darn sake, I'm not a 'child-abuser' or 'homosexual' notwithstanding the incidents at the time."

On April 21, 1992, the IBE replied that while it could not waive the the 3/4 vote requirement altogether, the vote could be taken just among the non-Bengali grhasthas. The IBE also again requested from Satadhanya a full disclosure of his abuse. Indicating the new, underage victim, the IBE director wrote "I'm sure you can see there are currently credibility issues which make this more difficult to solve in a satisfactory way."

In September, 1992, the 3/4 vote for approval/disapproval was presented to the Western parents living in Mayapur by a member of the MAC. The MAC representative stated that the vote pertained to whether the parents felt Satadhanya was a direct threat to their children. It was indicated that if the parents did not consider Satadhanya to be a direct threat to their children, then they should vote for him to stay in Mayapur. The MAC representative also stated he did not agree with the idea of having a vote, declined to answer questions about Satadhanya's offenses, and became upset when the parents persisted with their inquiries. The Western parents believed their vote pertained not only to Satadhanya's current direct risk to children, which they considered to be fairly low, but to his continued prominence and authority on the dhama. The Western parents also expressed reluctance to vote on behalf of the Bengali parents without even informing them.

The MAC representative asked for a show of hands. The Western parents objected to this procedure, then voted using a private ballot, with a clear majority indicating they did not want Satadhanya to live at ISKCON Mayapur. The voters were apprehensive. "We even feared some reprisal may come to disturb our ability to continue living and serving in Mayapur," one voter wrote to the G.B.C Chairman later in September.

Shortly after the vote of the Western grhasthas, a meeting of the Bengali grhasthas was organized. At this meeting they mainly discussed whether they considered Satadhanya to be a threat to the community. A second vote that included the Bengali grhasthas was held, and this vote was in favor of allowing Satadhanya to continue to reside in Mayapur.

In January, 1993, and at other times, the Mayapur GBC Committee expressed the opinion that Satadhanya dasa was punished sufficiently by being dishonored and being forced to give up his position as regional secretary. Representatives of the community submitted a written protest to the GBC committee:

"...Very few householders are thinking that he (Satadhanya) is currently a direct threat, but this ignores the fact that the children of this community are threatened indirectly by the seemingly lax attitude of the administration toward abusers... Allowing Satadhanya Prabhu to remain in Mayapur with full facility... simply increases our vulnerability. It's like we are saying, 'As long as your service is valuable you can get away with it.'"

In March, 1995, responding to complaints of Satadhanya's continued prominence in Mayapur, the international GBC resolved that Satadhanya should undergo a psychological risk assessment. "If he receives a 'low to no risk' approval, he can live on ISKCON Mayapur property", the resolution stated. The international GBC was apparently not aware that the risk of Satadhanya's again abusing children was not the key issue among the Mayapur residents whose 3/4 vote was meant to be decisive. The issue among these devotees was Satadhanya's continued prominence, and the absence of punishment, despite his record of child abuse. In July, 1995, in compliance with the GBC resolution, Satadhanya was interviewed by Dawn Fisher, a forensic clinical psychologist. Satadhanya informed Ms. Fisher of his sexual contact with three victims. In her report Ms. Fisher describes the abusive relationships as short-term, the longest relationship involving a few meetings between Satadhanya and the victim.

"Given the fact that his youngest victim was 16," Ms. Fisher wrote, "the evidence would seem to suggest that he is not interested in children sexually, but rather abused young men over whom he had authority...I would suggest," Ms. Fisher concluded, "that the risk level that Satadhanya poses is now very much reduced." With this assessment Satadhanya was allowed to remain in ISKCON Mayapur.

A year and a half later, in January, 1997, a senior devotee resident wrote to the Mayapura managers asking "Where is that (Dawn Fisher) assessment? Does the community have any right to know the results?" Mayapur residents were thereafter allowed to read the report in the office where the report was kept. The same January, 1997 memorandum to the leaders of the Mayapur project inquired regarding Satadhanya: "Do we have a policy regarding awarding positions of significant responsibility, authority and compensation to confirmed abusers? Does it make a difference that the criminal was never punished for his crime? Satadhanya was never punished. On the other hand he has received substantial perks for his service. Could this be deemed as corruption on the part of the leaders that handled this case? To what extent should the GBC or local authorities decide on a case like this without taking note of local community sentiments? The only time the community was consulted was back in 1992. At that time a significant majority of Western devotees were opposed to his staying in the community. There has never been an attempt since then to understand the sentiments of the community."

In February, 1997, in response to these and other questions, another community vote was scheduled, with provisions that grhasthas be given sufficient notice of the vote and told what was known of the history of Satadhanya's case. Mayapur leaders, in conjunction with other devotees, also agreed that Satadhanya should fund a library for protection and counseling of children, and that his service should be humble, with no control over devotees or influence with Mayapur leaders. Before the vote, Satadhanya agreed to move down the road from the ISKCON Mayapura property, and thus the vote did not take place.

In February, 1998, the ISKCON Mayapur community invited Yasoda dasi to teach a course on child protection, whose attendees included all Department Heads of the temple. During this visit Yasoda interviewed Satadhanya on more than one occasion. Also, Satadhanya received some education on the effects of child abuse to help him understand the ramifications of his actions. He was also asked to pay $3,000 in restitution to one of his victims. He paid $1,000 at that time and signed a statement promising to pay the balance of $2,000 within one year, which he did (To clarify, instead of paying $3,000 for a child protection library, Satadhanya paid this amount to one of his victims). Satadhanya was cooperative during this process, except that, as on other occasions, when he was specifically asked if there were victims other than those who had already disclosed, he denied that there were any other victims.

In February, 1999, a representative of the ICOCP interviewed Satadhanya in Mayapur. The interviewer emphasized to Satadhanya that it is very important that Satadhanya be completely honest. The interviewer told Satadhanya that if he fully discloses his offenses of child abuse, then the decision will be relatively lighter, and if it is later revealed that there are victims and child abuse offenses that Satadhanya did not disclose during the interview, then the decision will be more severe. Excerpts from the interviewer's notes read as follows: "Satadhanya says [ ] dasa was the only underage victim. He also had sexual relations with one or two brahmacaris. Satadhanya says the brahmacaris were 18 to 20 years old.... Also, when I asked Satadhanya whether there was more than one incident with [the underage victim] he answered vaguely, though when I pursued the issue he said it happened 'several times'... He said he doesn't remember the names of the brahmacaris. Also, he describes the incidents with the brahmacaris as involving only touching, and not being as severe as the incidents with [underage victim]. Satadhanya says there were no other incidents with minors, only [name of underage victim]. He explains that for a few months he felt extremely lusty, and this was the manifestation. Before and after he has had no homosexual encounters...Satadhanya takes responsibility for the sexual encounters with [underage victim], though he does maintain that it was consensual....Satadhanya stated that on two occasions the Mayapur community voted whether he (Satadhanya) could remain a member of the community. On the first (1992) vote the community voted that he should leave. But Satadhanya claims that [a senior member of the Mayapur community], who organized the vote, only included foreigners, not the local Bengalis. Then there was another vote, including the locals, and the community voted that he could remain...Currently, according to Satadhanya, and also Hari Sauri Prabhu, who was present during the interview, there are no explicit bans on

Satadhanya.....There's no ban against him associating with children, including at the boys asramas...I asked Satadhanya and Hari Sauri Prabhu to provide any documentation they have on the case. Satadhanya said he would provide the report from Dawn Fisher."

In May, 1999, an interview was obtained with the third victim, the only known underage victim, (the "16 year old" in Dawn Fisher's report), first revealed in 1991. The interview report is as follows:

"[The victim] reported that Satadhanya began to abuse him when he [the victim] was about 11 years old. It began in the Calcutta temple. Satadhanya asked a senior devotee to have [the victim] massage him. [the victim] massaged him for an hour or two, slowly moving up towards the gamsha. Then Satadhanya asked him to massage his private parts. [the victim] said no, but Satadhanya tried to convince him, and took (the victim's) hand and put it on Satadhanya's private parts. Satadhanya ejaculated. Satadhanya began to touch [the victim], and he asked [the victim] to suck Satadhanya's genitals. [the victim] refused. [the victim] said he felt embarrassed and he got scared and left. [the victim] told a devotee named _____, who was 25 to 30 at the time, and he told a devotee named _____. They told [the victim] not to tell anyone because [the victim] would be in trouble if he told. They told [the victim] that if he told, he'll be eating in the streets. So [the victim] didn't tell anyone else. A couple months later, in Mayapur, (a devotee) arranged for [the victim] to clean Satadhanya's room every day. [the victim] states that Satadhanya did penetrate him and Satadhanya had [the victim] give Satadhanya oral sex. This occurred from the time [the victim] was 11 to 14 years old. [the victim] said there was (another) boy about the same age who confided that Satadhanya was doing the same to him. The boy left the movement because he was so disgusted and hurt. [the victim] emphasized that his sexual relations with Satadhanya were not mutual. That is, [the victim] did not enjoy it and did not consent to it. [the victim] described that these relations cause him much pain, fear and embarrassment. He felt trapped, and there was no one to confide in. Currently, in 1999, [the victim] stated that he is 29 years old."

On June 14, 1999, the ICOCP received a signed statement from another young man alleging sexual abuse over a period of four years in the early 80's, beginning when the young man was 13 years old. The statement is as follows:

"Statement of alleged child abuse from the victim,_____dasa (legal name included)

June 14, 1999

"Beginning from 1981 I suffered a continual onslaught of sexual and emotional abuse from Satadhanya dasa (then Maharaja) whilst living in Sridham Mayapur. The abuse was consistent for two years, approximately twice a week, and then for the next two years there were three incidences in Calcutta. I was 13 years of age when the sexual abuse started. I am originally from (country) and was sent to Mayapur Gurukula by [ ] Prabhu at 13 years of age. I did not stay long in the Gurukula and had moved into the brahmacari asrama to do general duties around the temple. I was young and very dependent on the temple for guidance and shelter for I had no monetary support from my family nor any

ability to protect myself. Satadhanya dasa called me to his room on top of the long building and asked me to massage him. Being enthusiastic to serve a sannyasi I immediately jumped at the chance. I felt that there was nothing wrong with going to his room for this service. I began the massage and Satadhanya started to touch my body all over and kept moving his hands to my genitals. I kept pushing his hands away and became quite scared and frightened as I did not know his intentions. He was a lot stronger than myself and forcibly took my dhoti off. He ordered me to hold his penis and masturbate him and then proceeded to do the same to me. I did not know what it was that he was wanting me to do as I had not had sexual contact before but I felt dirty and disgusted. Satadhanya then performed oral sex on me and tried to force me to do the same by holding down my arms and forcing his body on top of mine. Then ordering me to perform anal sex and I refused. Every time I refused to do something he wanted me to do or I would complain and say no he would become angry and would force himself on me more. He continually tried to penetrate me anally either with his penis or with his fingers and would become frustrated and angry as I would begin bleeding. Whilst this was going on he would have the door locked and would be saying things to me like, 'I am a sannyasi and I am doing this, why are you not wanting to do this?' He would also threaten me that if I told anyone there would be trouble. I was very scared for my safety and also felt that if anyone found out about this I would be kicked out of the temple and feared being left alone in Mayapur. I did not even know how to get back to (home) if I needed to. I had no money and no way of escaping this. Twice a week Satadhanya would call me to his room under the same precedent of massaging him and the same would happen each time. The abuse became more and more extreme each time and I feared him more and more with every threat. The episodes would go for one and a half to two hours a time. This continued for two years. My self worth hit rock bottom and I felt as a devotee wearing saffron cloth I was living a lie and my life was ruined. I have lost all respect for the idea of there being sannyasis for this person was parading as one and was committing the worst kind of assault on me. He showed no remorse for his actions when I would become scared or try to fight off his advances. Satadhanya was a physically powerful person within ISKCON at the time and everyday I feared retribution if I let it be known to anyone what was going on.

"After I was initiated by [ ] I was taken back to (home temple) by the then temple president [ ]. I tried telling him of what happened to me but I still felt pressure of what might happen if Satadhanya found out. The following year I attended Calcutta Ratha-yatra. I was told by some devotees that Satadhanya (still Maharaja) wanted to see me. He told me to go with him in a taxi. I had thought we were going for some service or to the temple. He took me to a warehouse or storage facility where the temple books were kept and where the Ratha-yatra carts were stored and he sexually abuse me again in the same way he did in Mayapur. This happened twice whilst I was there and then again when I returned from (home temple) later the next year for a festival. He had an emotional stronghold over me. I felt I couldn't escape the mental and physical fear he use to threaten me with. I did not return to Calcutta or Mayapur after that time until Satadhanya had taken to the grihasta ashrama. By this time I was getting older and by being in (home temple) I was trying to build my self-esteem and ability to protect myself and so I would stay far from him.

"I still associate Mayapur with this horrific ordeal and cannot bring myself to go there, especially now that Satadhanya is back there. I feel cheated that I cannot look upon the holy dhama as other devotees do, with joy and enthusiasm. This has left my emotional being shattered. I felt that as a young boy aspiring for brahmacari life, I was cheated. My innocence has been taken away and my faith destroyed. I have deep rooted emotional trauma that has affected my health and my relationships. My first marriage failed and now am married again. Only by the help of my wife do I feel I can bring this out to the open and deal with the pain I feel inside everyday.

signed (legal name)

signature witnessed"

In June, 1999, this alleged victim was directed to counseling by a member of the local Child Protection Team. The CPT representative reported that:

"Initial psychological assessments state that (the above victim) presently is suffering from Post-Trauma-Stress associated with child sexual abuse. He suffers from depression, insomnia, flashbacks, anxiety, loss of concentration, and sexual inhibition. He also has other issues of co-dependency, low self-esteem and lack of worth, finds it difficult to trust and have lasting friendships and relationships. There have been health-related issues symptomatic of this type of prolonged abuse... Some of these are stomach problems (ulcers), constant constipation, and the worst of all irregular bleeding from the penis due to forced sexual acts."

The victim's (June 14th) statement was the first time the ICOCP had heard this person's name, his age, or any of the details of his alleged abuse. In August, 1999, Satadhanya was questioned about the above (June 14th) accuser. He was provided enough information to identify the accuser, though not informed of the accuser's specific statement. Satadhanya wrote:"The allegations are true. As a sannyasi, being celibate, I became sexually agitated. Somehow, bereft of my discrimination and intelligence, I sought to relieve my agitation in an abominable and regrettable way--by arranging a teenage boy to massage me and then approach him sexually...I was in a position of general authority and he was a younger temple devotee. I took advantage of his submissiveness to have him massage me and approached him sexually to relieve my agitated state. The same thing was repeated several times." To further questions, Satadhanya confirmed that he had touched _____ dasa's private parts in a sexual manner. When asked whether he had anally penetrated _____ dasa with his penis or his finger, Satadhanya replied "Not as I recall" and "I do not remember".

On October 26, 1999, Satadhanya, having reviewed his ICOCP case file and read for the first time the (June 14th, 1999) statement above, replied to the ICOCP:

"...it seemed fairly obvious, from the language and usage, that someone else helped him write it or wrote it for him. Maybe _____ dasi, forgive me if I am wrong. The

discrepancies seem to follow a fixed pattern designed to paint a false picture of myself as having used substantial force, even violence, in subjugating the said victim. The descriptions of the sexual encounters and dialogue therein have certainly been altered and manipulated. ...I would not, ordinarily, in the situation I'm in challenge his statement, but this is a whopper and I cannot remain silent. It should also be noted that no other victim has described such behavior on my part."

The assertion of Satadhanya that "no other victim has described such behavior on my part" is incorrect, as evidenced by the May, 1999, statement provided above.

Satadhanya also stated in the October 26 message: "There was no FORCE and no ORDER. In fact, no one spoke. He was totally passive and never moved." (Satadhanya's capitals, here and below)

"He never spoke at all, what to speak of REFUSE, COMPLAIN or say NO. Neither did I become ANGRY nor FORCE myself on him MORE. Neither did I CONTINUALLY try to penetrate him analy and nor did I PENETRATE HIM ANALY WITH MY PENIS. Neither did I ever become FRUSTRATED AND ANGRY and neither did he BEGIN BLEEDING. Someone has introduced an element of fiction here to intensify a regrettable but passive incident...As I've said, there was never any conversation at all....Someone is trying to create a scene by projecting what he thought should be the conversation which could elicit the desired response...There was no FIGHTING OFF, as I told he was absolutely passive, nor did he appear scared at least externally. [the victim] is a very simple person so how does the intangible concept of NO REMORSE come about. This is made-up and is a give-away. It is more than paraphrasing another's comments, it is interpolation of the worst kind...Someone else other than [the victim] is clearly speaking about concepts of POLITICS and RETRIBUTION. It is ghost-written. He might have been afraid to tell but not because of anything I said or imposed...Someone is writing a false novel here and using words like 'fear' and 'threat' redundantly. It is not my intention herein to underestimate nor belittle the detrimental effects and condition of [the victim] due to the abuse he suffered at my hands. However, his benefit is certainly not well-represented by the attempt of some person more clever than [the victim] to alter his statement with false descriptions and concocted dialogue to ensure a calculated response from the concerned authorities and devotees. In a court of law, such a case would be thrown out for misrepresentation and perjury. My only point is that it is neither acceptable nor fair to permit this."

On November 8, 1999, Satadhanya clarified that his (June 14th) accuser was not one of the three victims whom he had previously disclosed. This was, he stated, a newly revealed, fourth victim, "recently disclosed and therefore not included in Dawn Fisher's report (95) or letter to (IBE director)(91)".

On November 12, 1999, an ICOCP representative obtained a telephone interview with _____ dasa, one of the two victims Satadhanya referred to in his first letter to the IBE in 1991. The victim estimated he was 18 or 19 when Satadhanya abused him. By his

age, this victim may not technically be under the jurisdiction of the ICOCP. Still, we are including references to this case since it was clearly abusive, as Satadhanya used his position and authority to sexually exploit this young man. Excerpts from the interview report with this victim are included below:

"He said he was Satadhanya's servant for one or two weeks in the early 80s. Satadhanya sexually abused him, although [the victim] was reluctant to speak about details..... He said that what Satadhanya did was like what husband and wife do... [the victim] is very angry with Satadhanya. He said that Satadhanya never apologized. [the victim] expressed great disgust with ISKCON. He said he wants one million dollars, and if he doesn't get it he'll sue for three million.....He repeated several times that what Satadhanya did to him was disgusting, though he didn't go into details. He spoke often during the conversation about hypocritical sannyasis, and how he is going to sue ISKCON if he doesn't get one million dollars...."

On November 16, 1999, the above victim called and left a message on the ICOCP answering machine. ICOCP returned the call, but the victim was not able to speak when the ICOCP representative called, so they arranged to speak on November 17, 1999. Notes from the Nov. 17, 1999, phone conversation are included below:

"It seems the trauma of the abuse he suffered is surfacing at this time in his life. He expressed great rage towards Satadhanya. He said that after the abuse occurred, many years ago, he went and vomited. He said that recently, when he thinks about what Satadhanya did, he vomits. This has happened twice in the past few days. [the victim] said that after the abuse happened he told _____, by whom he [the victim] is initiated, about what happened, and [the victim] said _____ didn't do anything. .... [the victim] has never had any mental health therapy. I discussed this with him, and he is open to the idea, although he said that he doesn't want to pay for it.....[the victim] emphasized that he is not interested in 'small" money. He wants one million dollars, at least. [the victim] said that he is especially furious with Satadhanya because Satadhanya never apologized to him."

On Friday evening, November 19, 1999 an ICOCP representative spoke in person with _____ dasa, the underage victim who disclosed in 1991 and previously interviewed in May, 1999. Excerpts from the interview report are included below:

"[the victim] said he is now 29 years old, soon to turn 30. He said the first incident was in 1981 or 1982. He explained that there were several incidents, more than 7. And after that Satadhanya tried again two more times, but [the victim] successfully resisted. [the victim] said that the last time Satadhanya tried was about 12 years ago. [the victim] emphasized that the incidents were not consensual.

"Regarding what should happen to Satadhanya,[the victim] said that Satadhanya has already paid some restitution. [the victim] said that many years ago Satadhanya did call him and apologize...[the victim] is not too concerned, on a personal level, whether Satadhanya stays in Mayapur. [the victim] also expressed consideration for Satadhanya's

wife and child. [the victim] did state that Satadhanya hurt a lot of people, especially by misusing his influential position. [the victim] emphasized that for many years he was afraid to tell anyone about the abuse because Satadhanya was so powerful in Calcutta and Mayapur. [the victim] said that if he had told before he came to the United States, he probably never would have been able to come to the United States, because Satadhanya would have blocked it.

"I talked to [the victim] about his psychological state. He described, and I concur, his situation as one of coping fairly successfully. Coping however doesn't mean addressing the issues. He has seen a counselor on a few occasions, and he said that this was helpful. He explained that sometimes when dealing with people, such as at work, he feels a great frustration and irritation, and he can identify that a lot of this stems from his past child abuse. He knows that he has a lot of anger connected with that, but he is able to manage his life fairly well without resolving the issues stemming from the abuse. At this time his anger is not directed towards Satadhanya, at least not intensely."

III. Mitigating factors

Satadhanya dasa has faithfully served ISKCON at Sridhama Mayapur since the early seventies, and for several years prior to that in other parts of the world. He has played leading roles in preaching to life members in India and in spreading Krsna consciousness to villages in Bengal. Over the years he has developed expertise in dealing with all levels of the Indian government as well as with Western embassies in India, and has steadfastly used that expertise to further the interests of Srila Prabhupada's ISKCON movement and to facilitate the service of ISKCON devotees. In the enthusiastic and expert prosecution of his service, Satadhanya has earned the trust and respect of those with whom he has worked. He has taken his personal association with Srila Prabhupada to heart and has made many dedicated sacrifices for Srila Prabhupada's pleasure.

Satadhanya dasa sincerely regrets his past activities of child sexual abuse. In his 1995 interview with Dawn Fisher he honestly describes his behavior as "sick" and "perverse" and laments not being "sensitive to the terrible repercussions both for myself and the victims". At many other times as well, Satadhanya has consistently expressed disgust and deep regret for his actions. He sincerely desires to end the suffering he has caused to his victims, his family, and himself. "In conclusion," he wrote the ICOCP in November, 1999, "I can only pray to Srila Prabhupada, Sri Sri Radha Madhava and Sri Sri Prahlada Nrsimhadeva to forgive me for my abhorrent and hellish activities of the past and my temporary departure from sanity and human civilization. I especially beg forgiveness from those who I mindlessly victimized, not considering the repercussions and degree of pain and damage inflicted upon them and their families."

To a large degree, Satadhanya dasa has cooperated with efforts to deal with his abusive activities. Considering the sporadic, inconsistent, and often contradictory nature of the attempts to deal with his case, Satadhanya's occasional frustration and annoyance with his investigators is understandable. Satadhanya has suffered by giving up sannyasa and enduring years of embarrassment. Further, rumors connected with this case sometimes

exaggerated matters out of proportion, causing additional difficulty for Satadhanya. From reports we've heard, Satadhanya dasa has conducted himself as a respectable householder for the past several years, enduring continued criticism and embarrassment along with his wife while rendering service to Srila Prabhupada's movement in circumstances that would cause many others to leave the organization and become inimical. Additionally, he has paid some financial restitution to one of his victims.

IV. Credibility

Pattern of Disclosure

Investigators have repeatedly asked Satadhanya to fully disclose his abuse, and have warned him that his credibility suffers when he does not. In 1992, shortly after learning of Satadhanya's first underage victim, and after granting Satadhanya the option to include only non-Bengali grhasthas in the Mayapur community vote, the ISKCON Board of Education requested:

"It would also be very helpful if there was some way we could be reassured that we understand the full extent of all the incidents that took place during that time period. I'm sure you can see there are currently credibility issues which make this more difficult to solve in a satisfactory way."

On August 20, 1999, the director of the ICOCP again wrote and requested full disclosure from Satadhanya:

"Yes, definitely rectification and continuing with determination in devotional service in Srila Prabhupada's movement will be considered in your favor. However, another consideration is your degree of forthrightness. For instance, when I interviewed you in Mayapura (on 2/15/99), with Hari Sauri Prabhu also present, I emphasized that the decision towards you will be particularly severe if you do not disclose everything concerning your transgressions with underage persons during the interview. It is clear that you didn't disclose everything at that time. This diminishes your credibility, and I suspect that the judges may consider that there are further offenses of child sexual abuse that you may have committed, but have not revealed because you have not been forced to. .....Again, even at this late date, it will be in your best interest to be completely candid and disclose everything."

The pattern persists that Satadhanya appears to admit to child abuse only when confronted with allegations and evidence that would be very difficult for him to deny, and even in those admissions consistently provides incomplete and misleading information. Here is a summary of that pattern, taken from documentation in the case file, using only Satadhanya's testimony:

-- When informed in 1991 that there were allegations of abuse against two victims, he admitted to two victims, ages 23 and 25. He also implied that there were only "two incidents" altogether, both occurring at about the same time in 1982.

-- When confronted with a third victim later in 1991, the first known underage victim, he admitted to this third victim.

-- For eight years, from 1991 to 1999, Satadhanya steadfastly maintained that there were only three victims, and that there was only one underage victim.

-- In August, 1999, Satadhanya was confronted with a fourth victim's name and admitted to sexually abusing this person, though not revealing the duration or severity of the abuse.

-- In November, 1999, when questioned again by the ICOCP, Satadhanya clarified that there were four victims, and admitted to previously overestimating the ages of some of the victims, when he had estimated their ages as being 25 and 23 years old.

-- On February 15, 1999, Satadhanya dasa told an ICOCP investigator that one of the Western parents opposed to him organized the 1992 vote and excluded Bengali parents. That is, in 1999 Satadhanya tried to make it seem that he (Satadhanya) was opposed to excluding the Bengali parents at the time of the vote. In 1992, however, Satadhanya specifically advocated against informing local bengali grhasthas about his transgressions, as described in the section entitled Chronological Presentation of Evidence. The excerpt from that section is included below:

"On March 29, 1992, Satadhanya also requested the IBE "that the part about informing the incident to all the local grhasthas and subsequent 75% vote be discarded in my case for the following reasons:

> '1. Since I am so well-known in all government circles, amongst the life-members, and the surrounding villages, informing the local bengali grhasthas will be tantamount to informing the government and press. I am the primary ISKCON representative interfacing with government in various important dealings.
>
> '2. I was certainly fallen for the period in question, but, for darn sake, I'm not a 'child-abuser' or 'homosexual' notwithstanding the incidents at the time.'

On April 21, 1992, the IBE replied that while it could not waive the the 3/4 vote requirement altogether, the vote could be taken just among the non-Bengali grhasthas."

-- Satadhanya often claims to have forgotten names or incidents. When asked whether he penetrated his victims, Satadhanya has replied vaguely with "kind of", "sort of", or by saying there was not "full-on" penetration, and by using phrases such as "as far as I can remember", "I don't think anything else happened" etc. When asked in August, 1999 "Did you try to anally penetrate (4th victim) with your penis?", Satadhanya replied "Not as I recall". When asked during the same interview "Did you try to anally penetrate (4th victim) with your finger?", Satadhanya replied "I do not remember." However, when confronted with the testimony of victim #4, Satadhanya hotly denied any anal

penetration. In response to victim #4's (June 14th) testimony, Satadhanya wrote: "Neither did I become ANGRY nor FORCE myself on him MORE. Neither did I CONTINUALLY try to penetrate him anally and nor did I PENETRATE HIM ANALLY WITH MY PENIS..." (Satadhanya's capitals). Thus, Satadhanya's memory of these incidents is very clear when he wants to deny the victim's statements, but his memory fails him when asked to remember on his own, without knowledge of the victim's specific accusations.

Credibility of the Victims

The panel didn't find significant discrepancies in the testimonies of the three victims we were able to contact. Furthermore, there are similarities in their accounts of Satadhanya's abuse. All three stated they were brought into Satadhanya's association on the premise of service to a sannyasi. All three independently stated that the abuse involved coercion and intimidation. Two indicated that the abuse involved oral and anal sex, and that it was not consensual. Two victims named the same time span, 1981 to 1984, as the principal period of abuse, with less frequent abuse, or attempted abuse, occurring after that. The three victims, testifying at different times in widely separated geographical locations, give very similar descriptions of Satadhanya's modus operandi. All the victims had to overcome fear and embarrassment to testify. Two expressed concern for the safety of their family members if they testified.

The victims were not apparently motivated by restitution. One victim did not speak of restitution. One initially spoke up years before there was any grant program to recompense victims of abuse, and later expressed some satisfaction with the token restitution he had received. And the third, genuinely angry and disturbed, said he would sue for three million dollars-- not the kind of money he expects for talking with an ICOCP investigator. What to speak of restitution, after up to eighteen years of little or nothing being done, the victims do not appear to expect much at all to happen, except perhaps more fear and intimidation. Speaking about the abuse is at best upsetting for them. The psychological condition of the victims is also consistent with the abuse they describe. At least two victims also have chronic physical ailments consistent with the abuse they describe.

Contrasting Credibility

Given the wide gulf of difference in credibility between Satadhanya and his admitted victims, this adjudicatory panel tends to believe the victims rather than Satadhanya in instances where there are discrepancies between Satadhanya's statements and the statements of the victims:

-While Satadhanya maintains that force and intimidation were not used, and that the incidents were consensual, all the victims say it was not consensual. They also say that force and intimidation were used.

-While Satadhanya either denies or is vague or forgetful about anal intercourse with his victims, two underage victims have directly stated that there was anal intercourse.

-While Satadhanya's statements put the victims' ages at 16, 18, and 20, revised from his original estimate of 25 and 23, the victims's statements put their ages at 11, 13, and 18 at the beginning of their abuse. Satadhanya has admitted to abusing four victims, and the identity and age of one of the four victims is unknown to the Child Protection Office.

-During an interview in February, 1999, Satadhanya claimed that he remembered the name of only one of the three victims who were known at that time. A few months later, when presented with the name of another of the three victims, he acknowledged that the person of that name was a victim, and insisted that the case

of this victim was dealt with in the past, and thus Satadhanya was not forthcoming about this name during the February, 1999 interview.

V. Conclusions and recommendations

Over the years, from the original revelation of abuse to the present, the controversy surrounding Satadhanya dasa's case has often appeared to revolve around the question of whether Satadhanya is a pedophile, and the degree of risk he poses to children in Mayapur. There was an attempt to make these questions the basis for the Mayapur community vote in September, 1992. Again in 1995 these questions were placed as the basis of the GBC resolution requiring Satadhanya to undergo a risk assessment, and as the criterion for whether or not he was allowed to live at ISKCON Mayapur. Although grhastha residents of Mayapur to whom the 1992 vote was submitted consistently asserted that the risk of recurring abuse is not the central issue, an underlying assumption for some seems to be that if Satadhanya dasa is not a pedophile or otherwise a direct current sexual threat to children, then his case should be closed. In a message to the director of the ICOCP on October 26, 1999, Satadhanya dasa reiterates and elaborates upon this theme:

"The essential question that the Judges and you must answer is to determine what I am --- a pedophile, a serial child molester, a deranged and sick reprobate, a violent criminal, a rampant homosexual, or a Sannyasi who could not maintain celibacy, sought sexual relief in an abominable and aberrated manner by misusing his authority over several teenage youths for a limited period of time, and who, since that time many years ago, has performed his devotional service without interruption nor even a trace of suspicion of falldown. The latter scenario is definitely a true one and is not a question of belief."

This ICOCP panel firmly believes that the questions of pedophilia, violent criminality and other deviant labels, however important, are not central to this case, but have instead served to significantly divert attention from the investigation and prosecution of the actual incidents of abuse and from concern over the state of the victims, and even from awareness of their existence. Debating pedophilia is like talking about someone who has

robbed several people and arguing whether or not he is by nature a thief, while forgetting to charge him for his acts or to comfort and compensate his victims. Pedophile or not, Satadhanya's case cannot be closed until all the victims have been disclosed, their abuse understood, their legitimate grievances redressed, and appropriate consequences for the perpetrator imposed. Although this panel is of course concerned about protecting children in Mayapur and all of ISKCON, a more central and immediate concern specifically related to this case is to determine appropriate consequences for the crimes of child abuse committed by Satadhanya dasa. These consequences must naturally include restrictions on Satadhanya that will protect children.

In addition to "pedophile", another word that this panel believes has clouded this case over the years is "falldown". In ISKCON "falldown" is a general term that may commonly refer to a man and woman having illicit sex, or to breaking one of the other regulative principles. Certainly child sexual abuse is a falldown, but the ICOCP, not only for this case but as a general policy, does not want child sexual abuse to be grouped with falldowns by or between consenting adults.

Satadhanya's testimonies show that his credibility in relation to this case is very low. He has regularly denied allegations until he had no choice but to confess, then admitted only to what he believed was known while consistently overstating the age of his victims and understating the severity and duration of the abuse. Dawn Fisher, while sensitive and professional, accepted that the youngest victim was 16. She also accepted, based on Satadhanya's statements, that there were only three victims, and that their abuse was of a relatively mild character. Fisher wrote "It was put to Satadhanya that he had stated that there had only been three victims and only three victims have now disclosed, and it was therefore possible that he may have abused other people who may not have disclosed...but [Satadhanya] was adamant that it was only the three victims that he involved himself with..."

The case file shows that there were repeated and respectful complaints from devotees in Mayapur and elsewhere about Satadhanya's continuing influence in Mayapur and about the nearly total absence of punishment he received for his known offenses. The file also shows that the protection afforded Satadhanya by managers in Mayapur in the face of these complaints went beyond what can be explained by naivete, ignorance, or simple forgiveness. During the Mayapur vote in 1992 and at other times there was also significant resistance to divulging the known facts of the case.

Therefore, this panel strongly recommends that the Mayapur administration and projects affiliated with ISKCON Mayapur participate in the restitution of Satadhanya's victims. In recognition both of Satadhanya's long and dedicated service to Mayapur, and of its own role, undoubtedly well-meaning, in keeping him in a prominent position despite his record of abuse, we feel the Mayapur management has an obligation to Satadhanya's victims.

If purity is the force, then the rectification of this abuse is at least as important an ingredient in the development of Mayapur as bricks, marble, and architectural drawings. This panel would like to emphasize that any restitution or apology is only a token, a small beginning. The victims associate Mayapur with suffering, exploitation and lust, and with neglect and callousness on the part of Mayapur's leaders. The actual restitution is to make the victims again, or perhaps for the first time, feel welcome, safe, honored and transcendentally blissful in Mayapur--something any resident or guest should be able to take for granted. Mayapur's supporters and donors should understand the necessity of making child protection a cornerstone of all future development in the holy dhama.

Regarding ISKCON Mayapur, the ICOCP hereby recognizes and appreciates that ISKCON Mayapur has established an active Child Protection Team (CPT). Although the history, prior to 1992, of child abuse in Mayapur is one of the worst in ISKCON, the Mayapur administration, especially during the past three years, has shown commitment to various aspects of child protection, including supporting a CPT, investigating and adjudicating allegations of child abuse, implementing child protection education programs for students, teachers, and managers, preventing child abusers from having access to children and the property, caring for and assisting victims of child abuse, and endeavoring to rectify child abusers as a condition for their continued connection with the organization. Since the establishment of the ICOCP in April, 1998, the Mayapur CPT and management have been very cooperative with the ICOCP in investigating and adjudicating cases and in furthering the other aspects of child protection.

This panel recognizes Satadhanya dasa's long and enthusiastic service to Mayapur, and honors his plea, as well as the plea of many others, that a devotee is to be considered saintly despite grievous faults. However, forgiveness does not obviate

the importance for a society to invoke appropriate consequences for misconduct, especially misconduct that threatens its children.

Satadhanya has expressed general apologies, and to some degree these are genuine efforts. But the panel also has grave reservations about the extent to which Satadhanya has expressed remorse for his misdeeds of child sexual abuse. For example, Satadhanya originally made no specific admission, what to speak of

specific expression of remorse, for the victim who disclosed on June 14th, 1999, eighteen years after the abuse began. Then on October 22, 1999, after extensively denying the distressed statements of this most recently revealed victim, Satadhanya wrote of his victims overall: "I bow down in the dust of their feet to forgive my offenses, for they are Vaishnav devotees of the Lord and only by their forgiveness and mercy can I truly be absolved." At best such formulaic apologies ring extremely hollow. The one direct apology we have on record-- to the first underage victim-- was minimal, though appreciated by the victim himself.

It is commendable that Satadhanya dasa, after his difficulties in the early and mid eighties, determined to correct his deviant behavior and has, as far as we have heard,

succeeded in doing so. What has not been corrected, however, or recognized in more than a superficial way, is that while Satadhanya may have worked to reform his immediate gross personal behavior, his victims suffered, and continue to suffer, the effects of their abuse in fear and silence.

Satadhanya succeeded in suppressing the identity of his first known underage victim for 9 years, and of his second known underage victim for 18 years. A third victim, about 18 years old at the time of abuse and therefore possibly not under ICOCP jurisdiction, remains extremely bitter to this day about the lack of concern shown by Satadhanya and ISKCON. These victims suffered greatly during their adolescence from Satadhanya's abuse. Then for the balance of their formative years and long into their early manhood to the present moment they have suffered severe after-effects of abuse. This panel has therefore concluded that the mistreatment did not end 12 years ago. What to speak of ending, it is clear that by Satadhanya's suppression, indifference and denial, despair resulting from the abuse has to varying degrees become more profound as the years and decades have passed. A fourth victim remains unidentified and the degree of his abuse and suffering remain unknown.

Satadhanya dasa has also suffered. In his 1991 letter to the ISKCON Board of Education he cites "trauma, embarrassment, ...world opinion and what not!" And in his October 26, 1999 message to the ICOCP he wrote "All these years, I and my wife have endured tremendous suffering for what I have done, facing numerous and endless trials, mental and physical beleagurement and the ensuing ignominy. We are daily reminded of it in the faces of every devotee who looks our way." We too desire that Satadhanya's sufferings should end and we sympathize that the suffering has extended to his family. If this is what Satadhanya has endured while also enjoying the emotional, financial, and spiritual support of the Mayapur administration, then we can only imagine the suffering his victims endured in silence, for over 18 years, with no such support.

The following conclusions, directives and recommendations have been unanimously accepted by this panel. The conclusions of this panel are:

1) For severe and prolonged child sexual abuse at Sridham Mayapur, and for persistently suppressing the names and extent of abuse of the two currently known underage victims for 9 and 18 years respectively, Satadhanya is banned from the Mayapur/Calcutta area for a period of ten years, beginning March 1, 2000. This ban means that he may not serve, reside at, or visit ISKCON properties or affiliated projects in Mayapur/Calcutta for that ten year period. Because of Satadhanya's sincere efforts to rectify his primary abusive behavior, he may, after ten years, reestablish connection with ISKCON Mayapur/Calcutta, contingent on compliance with all elements of this Official Decision.

Compliance with the conditions listed below is required for Satadhanya to have any connection with any ISKCON project or any organizations affiliated with ISKCON, or to visit any ISKCON property or the property of a project affiliated with ISKCON.

2) Satadhanya must write apology letters to each of the four victims mentioned in this document. In each apology letter Satadhanya must describe in detail, with regards to actions and frequency of those actions, the acts of child sexual abuse that he committed against the victim, and Satadhanya must take full responsibility for every incident of child sexual abuse. Also, in each letter Satadhanya must make a genuine apology to the victim. Further, in each letter Satadhanya must offer to make amends for his heinous misdeeds of child sexual abuse. Although the fourth victim is as yet unnamed, Satadhanya must also write a letter of apology to this victim. That is, the letter will be written to an anonymous victim. All of these letters should be sent to the ICOCP, and not directly to the victims. This adjudicatory panel will determine whether Satadhanya's apology letters are adequate to lift the complete ban from ISKCON. A major factor in this determination will be the opinions of the victims. For example, if any one of the victims expresses the opinion that Satadhanya, as he has done in the past and up to the present, continues in his apology letter to avoid full disclosure of his crimes of child abuse, to minimize the severity of his misconduct, and to avoid taking full responsibility for the child sexual abuse that he committed, then it is very possible that this adjudicatory panel will institute a complete ban from ISKCON for Satadhanya. Satadhanya must satisfy the victims with the honesty and genuineness of his apology letters. Satadhanya will be completely banned from ISKCON until he submits the four apology letters to the ICOCP and complies with the other conditions of this Official Decision.

3) Satadhanya must make minimum financial payments to each of the three victims mentioned in this document in the amount of $1000 annually for the next 5 years. Any restitution that Satadhanya has already paid to any of the victims may be subtracted from this amount. Each of the three victims must have received at least $1000 before Satadhanya's complete ban from ISKCON is lifted, and each victim must receive at least $5000 by 5 years from the date of this Official Decision.

If Satadhanya dasa complies with the above directives then he may have connection with the ISKCON society under the following conditions, all of which are in effect for the duration of this lifetime:

4) Satadhanya dasa must show this document to the Temple President of any temple he visits, or the manager of any ISKCON project he visits, and obtain a signed statement that the president or manager has read this decision. Satadhanya shall send the signed copy of the decision to the ICOCP. If Satadhanya only visits a temple once or twice during public functions, such as Sunday Feasts, then he does not need to obtain a signed statement from the temple president or manager. If he visits a temple more than two times, then he must obtain such a signed statement.

5) Satadhanya dasa must not assume any leadership positions in ISKCON. This includes a prohibition from leading kirtana and giving class on ISKCON property or at an ISKCON function. This directive is effective for the duration of this lifetime.

6) Satadhanya dasa must not assume any position of influence that is connected with ISKCON. This stipulation also includes a prohibition from representing ISKCON. For

example, he is not permitted to represent ISKCON to an embassy or to any governmental entity. Also, Satadhanya must not assume any leadership position or position of influence, or position wherein he serves as a representative, in any organization affiliated with ISKCON. Satadhanya misused his position of authority to abuse children, and therefore it is very important that he does not again possess a position of authority in ISKCON.

7) Satadhanya dasa must not reside or stay overnight on an ISKCON property, though he may attend temple functions, such as Mangala-arati, Srimad-Bhagavatam Class, Sunday Feasts, Ratha yatras and other festivals, within the parameters described in this Official Decision.

8) Satadhanya dasa must not have ISKCON service, or service with an organization affiliated with ISKCON, that involves connection with minors.

9) If any of the victims of Satadhanya dasa attends a function at an ISKCON temple where Satadhanya is present, then Satadhanya must leave the premises, unless the victims give uncoerced permission for Satadhanya to remain. This directive also applies to the period after the ten year ISKCON Mayapur/Calcutta ban.

10) Satadhanya must not be shown any special privilege or preference at an ISKCON temple or in an ISKCON project, or in a project or organization affiliated with ISKCON. For example, he should not be offered the special privilege of garlanding Srila Prabhupada at an ISKCON program.

11) Satadhanya dasa should not visit ISKCON schools, or schools affiliated with ISKCON, or other ISKCON projects primarily designed for children, unless such visits are necessary for Satadhanya to care for his biological child(ren).

12) Satadhanya should not be alone on ISKCON property with children who are not his biological children.

Satadhanya dasa has family members, and the ICOCP wishes to minimize their suffering. Therefore, this decision should only be shared with persons who absolutely need to be aware of the contents of this decision in order to implement it and protect the children of Srila Prabhupada's movement.

If Satadhanya dasa violates any of the above conditions, then he is prohibited from any connection with ISKCON until his case is reviewed by the ICOCP.

If, based on credible evidence that the ICOCP deems to be valid, it is later determined that Satadhanya dasa sexually abused children other than those who are described in this Official Decision, then Satadhanya dasa will be completely banned from all connection with ISKCON and ISKCON-affiliated organizations for 15 years from the date that the ICOCP determines the new allegations to be valid. After the period of this 15 year ban, Satadhanya dasa may apply to the ICOCP for reinstatement to the ISKCON society. This

15 year ban will include a prohibition from visiting the property of any ISKCON temple or project, as well as a ban from visiting the property of any project affiliated with ISKCON. If Satadhanya dasa admits to the existence of additional child sexual abuse victims before March 1, 2000, then this 15 year ban will not be applied. If Satadhanya reveals the existence of additional victims, the ICOCP will ask that he genuinely apologize to those victims, and that he compensates them in an amount commensurate with the amount prescribed for other victims in this Official Decision.

The Child Protection Office requests that anyone, including alleged victims themselves, with information concerning child abuse allegedly committed by Satadhanya dasa, please report this information to the Child Protection Office. The Child Protection Office will investigate these allegations.

As described above, Satadhanya dasa has been steadily dedicated to Srila Prabhupada's ISKCON. This panel humbly requests him to continue in that mood by abiding by this Official Decision and continuing to perform valuable devotional service within Srila Prabhupada's movement.

If Satadhanya dasa fully complies with all the items described above, then as of February 28, 2005, he may apply for the complete ban from ISKCON Mayapur/Calcutta to be lifted. That is, he may apply for the ban to be reduced from 10 years to 5 years. In considering his application the ICOCP will consult with the Mayapur CPT. If Satadhanya does not apply for a reduction in the banishment period, then the duration of the ban will remain 10 years.

The above judgments for Satadhanya dasa constitute the minimum restrictions that an ISKCON organization must place on Satadhanya. Any specific ISKCON organization may choose to invoke more stringent restrictions.

ISKCON Mayapur's Responsibility

As described above, the ICOCP has great appreciation for the efforts of the Mayapur administration in addressing the issue of child abuse and in creating a safe atmosphere for children in Sridham Mayapur. The recommendations below are meant as further encouragement for ISKCON Mayapur to continue in this direction.

1) The Governing Body Commissioners of ISKCON Mayapur along with the Mayapur Administrative Council (MAC) should write letters of apology and remorse, signed by each MAC and GBC member, to each of Satadhanya's child abuse victims. These letters should appropriately take responsibility for the organization's role in favoring Satadhanya and neglecting the welfare of Satadhanya's child sexual abuse victims. Further, the letters should genuinely welcome the victims to visit and reside at ISKCON Mayapur, and the letters should apologize for allowing Satadhanya to retain an influential position in ISKCON Mayapur, thus adding to the victims' feelings of pain and intimidation. Similar

letters of apology should be written to the devotee community at large in Mayapur, and to the ISKCON community at large.

This panel understands and has expressed above that the current management in Mayapur has made great strides in reversing a dark past in ISKCON Mayapur regarding child protection. Assuming a responsible position in an organization entails inheriting the benefits, burdens, and mistakes of the organization's past. The recommendation for writing these apology letters is submitted by the ICOCP to assist ISKCON Mayapur to show the world that the present management of the organization takes responsibility for the mistakes of its past, and is committed to a future wherein the same mistakes will not be repeated.

2) This panel recommends that ISKCON Mayapur and affiliated projects assist Satadhanya dasa, who has rendered them dedicated service over the years, in the payment of Satadhanya's restitution to his victims of $1000 annually for the next 5 years for each victim. Satadhanya cannot return to Mayapur unless these amounts are paid. Satadhanya should personally pay at least 60% of the restitution.

3) This panel recommends that ISKCON Mayapur and affiliated projects contribute at least $10,000 annually for at least the next ten years specifically for the purpose of child protection. At least 50% of this money should be directly allotted as grant money for persons who suffered child abuse while under the care of ISKCON Mayapur. The remainder should be used for the establishment and operation of a Child Protection Office in Mayapur, whose functions should include investigation and adjudication of child abuse cases, administration of the grant program, and organization of child protection trainings and educational programs. This panel believes, based on the past history of child abuse in Mayapur, that these contributions of $10,000 annually to child protection in Mayapur are an important investment in Mayapur, as well as a basis for the success of ISKCON Mayapur. This suggestion is meant to facilitate Mayapur to become an inspiring example of child protection.

Appeal of this Decision

According to the ISKCON Child Protection Task Force Report, Section 5, in cases where allegations of child abuse are determined to be valid, the accused may appeal the Official Decision to the GBC Executive Committee and the ISKCON Minister of Justice within six months of the date that the accused receives the Official Decision. The Official Decision described in this document is effective immediately, and the perpetrator must abide by its guidelines during the appeal process, should he choose to appeal this decision.

Case Record

Full documentation of this case is in the ICOCP. This documentation is open to review at the discretion of the ICOCP.

Panel Members

Members of the adjudicatory panel serving on this case were Mathuresa dasa, Nanda dasi, and Pranava dasa. The Case Manager for this case was Dhira Govinda dasa. The Director of the ICOCP at the time of this Official Decision was Dhira Govinda dasa.