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Preface

The Royal Commission

The Letters Patent provided to the Royal Commission require that it ‘inquire into institutional responses to allegations and incidents of child sexual abuse and related matters’.

In carrying out this task, we are directed to focus on systemic issues but be informed by an understanding of individual cases. The Royal Commission must make findings and recommendations to better protect children against sexual abuse and alleviate the impact of abuse on children when it occurs.

For a copy of the Letters Patent, see Appendix A.

Public hearings

A Royal Commission commonly does its work through public hearings. A public hearing follows intensive investigation, research and preparation by Royal Commission staff and Counsel Assisting the Royal Commission. Although it may only occupy a limited number of days of hearing time, the preparatory work required by Royal Commission staff and by parties with an interest in the public hearing can be very significant.

The Royal Commission is aware that sexual abuse of children has occurred in many institutions, all of which could be investigated in a public hearing. However, if the Royal Commission were to attempt that task, a great many resources would need to be applied over an indeterminate, but lengthy, period of time. For this reason the Commissioners have accepted criteria by which Senior Counsel Assisting will identify appropriate matters for a public hearing and bring them forward as individual ‘case studies’.

The decision to conduct a case study will be informed by whether or not the hearing will advance an understanding of systemic issues and provide an opportunity to learn from previous mistakes, so that any findings and recommendations for future change which the Royal Commission makes will have a secure foundation. In some cases the relevance of the lessons to be learned will be confined to the institution the subject of the hearing. In other cases they will have relevance to many similar institutions in different parts of Australia.

Public hearings will also be held to assist in understanding the extent of abuse which may have occurred in particular institutions or types of institutions. This will enable the Royal Commission to understand the way in which various institutions were managed and how they responded to allegations of child sexual abuse. Where our investigations identify a significant concentration of abuse in one institution, it is likely that the matter will be brought forward to a public hearing.

Public hearings will also be held to tell the story of some individuals which will assist in a public understanding of the nature of sexual abuse, the circumstances in which it may occur and, most importantly, the devastating impact which it can have on some people’s lives.
A detailed explanation of the rules and conduct of public hearings is available in the Practice Notes published on the Royal Commission’s website at:

www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au

Public hearings are streamed live over the internet.

In reaching findings, the Royal Commission will apply the civil standard of proof which requires its ‘reasonable satisfaction’ as to the particular fact in question in accordance with the principles discussed by Dixon J in *Briginshaw v Briginshaw* (1938) 60 CLR 336:

... it is enough that the affirmative of an allegation is made out to the reasonable satisfaction of the tribunal. But reasonable satisfaction is not a state of mind that is attained or established independently of the nature and consequence of the fact or facts to be proved. The seriousness of an allegation made, the inherent unlikelihood of an occurrence of a given description, or the gravity of the consequences flowing from a particular finding are considerations which must affect the answer to the question whether the issue has been proved to the reasonable satisfaction of the tribunal...the nature of the issue necessarily affects the process by which reasonable satisfaction is attained.

In other words, the more serious the allegation, the higher the degree of probability that is required before the Royal Commission can be reasonably satisfied as to the truth of that allegation.

**Private sessions**

When the Royal Commission was appointed, it was apparent to the Australian Government that many people (possibly thousands) would wish to tell us about their personal history of child sexual abuse in an institutional setting. As a result, the Commonwealth Parliament amended the *Royal Commissions Act 1902* to create a process called a ‘private session’.

A private session is conducted by one or two Commissioners and is an opportunity for a person to tell their story of abuse in a protected and supportive environment. As at 5 April 2016, the Royal Commission has held 4,962 private sessions and more than 1,543 people were waiting to attend one. Many accounts from these sessions will be recounted in later Royal Commission reports in a de-identified form.

**Research program**

The Royal Commission also has an extensive research program. Apart from the information we gain in public hearings and private sessions, the program will draw on research by consultants and the original work of our own staff. Significant issues will be considered in issues papers and discussed at roundtables.
This case study

In Case Study 21, the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse explored in detail the experiences of 11 survivors of child sexual abuse at or connected with the Satyananda Yoga Ashram at Mangrove Mountain and the response of the ashram to that child sexual abuse.

The public hearing was held in Sydney from 2 to 10 December 2014 and on 29 April 2015.

The scope and purpose of the public hearing of the case study was to inquire into:

- the response between 1974 and 2014 of the Satyananda Yoga Ashram at Mangrove Mountain, New South Wales, to allegations or reports of child sexual abuse made against Swami Akhandananda Saraswati
- the operation of the ashram between 1974 and 1989 in relation to matters of child sexual abuse
- the systems, policies and procedures in place at the ashram between 1974 and 1989, and currently, in relation to raising and responding to allegations of or concerns about child sexual abuse
- any related matters.

At the public hearing the Royal Commission:

- heard oral evidence from nine survivors of child sexual abuse at the ashram and received written statements prepared by two more
- heard oral evidence from six institutional witnesses and received written statements prepared by 13 more
- received written statements prepared by five parents of former child residents at the ashram.
In Case Study 21 the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse examined the institutional responses to child sexual abuse alleged to have been perpetrated during the 1970s and 1980s by the leaders of the Satyananda Yoga Ashram at Mangrove Mountain in New South Wales (the Mangrove ashram).

Satyananda yoga

Satyananda yoga was developed in India in the 1960s by Swami Satyananda Saraswati. It gained popularity in Australia in the early 1970s and 1980s.

Satyananda yoga’s key philosophies and practices are described as being based on the principle of the guru–disciple relationship and development of mind, body and spirit.

Those who are fully initiated as ‘sannyasin’ (someone who renounces all worldly and material goods and dedicates their life to spiritual pursuits) in Satyananda yoga may live in an ashram, which involves, to some extent, separation from mainstream community. In at least the 1970s and 1980s, it was expected that those initiated as sannyasin would practise celibacy.

The Mangrove ashram

A Satyananda yoga ashram was established at Mangrove Mountain in New South Wales in the early 1970s. In about 1974, Satyananda sent a disciple of his, Swami Akhandananda Saraswati (Akhandananda), to oversee the development of the Mangrove ashram.

Shortly after his arrival, Akhandananda began a sexual relationship with 17-year-old Shishy, whose parents were involved with the Satyananda yoga movement in Australia and were instrumental in establishing the Mangrove ashram.

A number of witnesses before the Royal Commission were involved with the Mangrove ashram from its inception or shortly thereafter.

Authority at the Mangrove ashram

Akhandananda was Satyananda’s chief disciple in Australia and was the ‘spiritual leader’ or ‘director’ of the Mangrove ashram until 1987 or 1988. Shishy was second in charge at the ashram and remained in a relationship, albeit an increasingly violent one, with Akhandananda until the end of 1985.

Shishy was responsible for the administrative affairs of the Mangrove ashram under the direction of Akhandananda. She also held a significant role in the care of the children who lived at the ashram.
Children at the Mangrove ashram

The number of children resident at the Mangrove ashram fluctuated, but there could have been between 12 and 22 at any one time. The children wore orange ‘dhotis’ (robes similar to sarongs) and had to have their heads shaved upon initiation as sannyasin.

To a large extent, children at the Mangrove ashram were separated from their parents, as traditional relationships were discouraged at the ashram in favour of the guru–disciple relationship. Parents and their children were discouraged from, and in some cases denied, contact with one another.

After primary school, children at the Mangrove ashram were primarily home-schooled under Shishy’s supervision. When the children were not at school or doing schoolwork, they were required to complete various chores around the ashram and also follow a strict regime of yoga practice starting each morning at 4 am.

There was no evidence before the Royal Commission of any written child protection policies at the Mangrove ashram between at least 1975 and 1987.

Sexual and physical abuse

Eleven witnesses described to the Royal Commission their experiences of child sexual abuse perpetrated against them by Akhandananda.

Two witnesses alleged sexual abuse perpetrated against them by Satyananda.

The Royal Commission considered in some detail Akhandananda’s complex relationship with Shishy and its significance within the context of the Mangrove ashram. The Royal Commission also heard evidence from Shishy of her own sexual abuse of a 14- or 15-year-old boy at the ashram.

One witness told the Royal Commission about her disclosure of her abuse to a registered psychiatrist associated with the Mangrove ashram some three years before Akhandananda’s arrest on child sexual abuse charges. That same witness also told the Royal Commission of her experience of disclosing her abuse some 10 to 15 years later to a senior Satyananda yoga practitioner associated with the Mangrove ashram and of that practitioner’s dismissal of the disclosure.

Fourteen former residents of the Mangrove ashram gave evidence of the culture of physical abuse and public humiliation at the ashram. Witnesses told of severe beatings and threats of harm meted out by both Akhandananda and Shishy.
Barriers to disclosure of abuse and awareness of abuse

The Royal Commission heard considerable evidence from former child residents about the isolated nature of life at the Mangrove ashram.

The Royal Commission heard evidence of sexual and physical abuse, the strict adherence to Satyananda yoga doctrine as interpreted by Akhandananda at the Mangrove ashram, and the complete subjection of residents of the ashram to Akhandananda, who held significant power. The Royal Commission considered those factors and their significance in the creation of an environment in which a survivor of child sexual abuse was faced with almost insurmountable barriers to their capacity to disclose their abuse.

The Royal Commission also considered the evidence of several former Mangrove ashram residents or associates and one current adult Mangrove ashram resident about their awareness of the sexual abuse of children at the ashram.

Disclosures of abuse and Akhandananda’s arrest

In or around February 1987, several of the child residents disclosed their abuse to their parents and the police were notified. In June 1987, Akhandananda was arrested and charged with child sexual abuse offences.

In March 1987, the then New South Wales Department of Community Services investigated a notification it had received about another child resident of the Mangrove ashram.

After his arrest, Akhandananda was released on bail. Between 1987 and 1991, the New South Wales Director of Public Prosecutions ran separate trials in respect of four survivors of Akhandananda’s abuse. In May of 1989, Akhandananda was found guilty of abuse perpetrated against one of the survivors. The remaining proceedings were discontinued. Akhandananda was later found not guilty of charges of sexual abuse against a fifth survivor. Akhandananda was sentenced to two years and four months imprisonment. After his release he did not return to the Mangrove ashram and instead moved to Queensland, where he died in 1997.
The responses of the Mangrove ashram between 1987 and 2015

Management

In 1987 and again in 1988, in the wake of the sexual abuse allegations against Akhandananda, Satyananda directed that Akhandananda pass management of the Mangrove ashram over to other selected Satyananda disciples.

In the early 1990s, many people left the Mangrove ashram and its management was restructured.

Child protection policies

In the 2000s, the ashram developed various management and human resources policies, including some relating to the protection of children.

Facebook apology

In 2013, several former child residents began a discussion on the Mangrove ashram’s Facebook page about their experiences at the ashram and, in particular, about their sexual abuse as children at the ashram.

The Mangrove ashram responded first by publishing an apology on its Facebook page. At around the same time, one survivor of sexual abuse by Akhandananda wrote an email to all Satyananda yoga teachers in Australia about the ashram’s Facebook apology and about her concerns for the reputation of Satyananda yoga teachers in the light of the history of the ashram. In response, the ashram decided to issue that survivor with a ‘cease and desist’ letter alleging defamatory conduct on the part of the survivor and threatening legal action.

Working Together Taskforce

In 2014 the Mangrove ashram formed the Working Together Taskforce (the Taskforce) to respond to the issues that the survivors of Akhandananda’s abuses had raised. The Taskforce’s membership included current management and some former residents of the ashram who had lived there or been involved while Akhandananda was the leader of the ashram.

The Taskforce (and thus the Mangrove ashram) decided to hold a special forum during the ashram’s 40th anniversary celebrations to acknowledge the abuses of the past. Of the 11 survivors who gave evidence before the Royal Commission, only two attended the forum.
Survivor Support Pack

The Mangrove ashram also decided to issue a so-called ‘Survivor Support Pack’, which included referrals to free Commonwealth Government provided services and one option of restorative justice services funded by the ashram. The Survivor Support Pack was not well received by the survivors who gave evidence before the Royal Commission. Some survivors told the Royal Commission that they found the pack unhelpful, patronising and even upsetting.

The public hearing

The Royal Commission heard evidence that Satyananda held ultimate authority within the Satyananda yoga movement. Before his retirement in or around 1988 and his death in 2009, Satyananda established, and for some time resided at, the Bihar School of Yoga in India. The Bihar School of Yoga became involved in the matters before the Royal Commission in 2014, when it corresponded with the Mangrove ashram about the ashram’s handling of the Royal Commission matter.

At the commencement of the public hearing, the Mangrove ashram issued an acknowledgement and apology to the survivors of Akhandananda’s sexual abuse. The apology and acknowledgement stated that:

- the ashram accepted that the child sexual abuse did occur
- the organisation had not responded in a way that was helpful to victims.

During the public hearing, the Mangrove ashram invited requests for compensation from some, but not all, of the survivors of child sexual abuse who gave evidence before the Royal Commission. This apparent distinction between survivors remained unexplained at the close of the public hearing.
1 Satyananda yoga

1.1 The origins and practice of Satyananda yoga

Satyananda yoga (or Bihar yoga, as it is known in India) is described as a system of teachings founded on ancient philosophies which synthesise different branches of yoga to address different kinds of personalities and temperaments.¹

Swami Satyananda Saraswati

Satyananda yoga was developed in India in the 1960s by Swami Satyananda Saraswati (Satyananda).² Satyananda was born in India in 1923.³ He became a sannyasin: someone who renounces all worldly and material goods and dedicates their life to spiritual pursuits.⁴ In 1964 he founded, and was the spiritual head of, the Bihar School of Yoga in Munger, India.⁵ He spent the next 20 years teaching the traditional branches of yoga as well as lesser-known branches, including kundalini and mantra yoga.⁶

Satyananda publicised his teachings while travelling around the world⁷ as well as through promotional literature,⁸ various extracts of which were produced to the Royal Commission.⁹

Satyananda retired from public life in 1988 and died in 2009.¹⁰ His student Swami Niranjananda Saraswati (Niranjan) succeeded him as the spiritual head of Satyananda yoga and the Bihar School of Yoga.¹¹

As recently as 2011, the current spiritual head of the Mangrove ashram (Rishi Hridayananda, also known as Mrs Mary Thomson) referred to Satyananda as ‘our supreme guru’.¹²

Key philosophies and traditions of Satyananda yoga

Satyananda yoga is based on a principle described as ‘living yoga’,¹³ which means living ‘a harmonious life in body, mind and spirit’.¹⁴ It is described as being ‘firmly based upon the principle of students having a direct link to a living master, or guru, and which systematically teaches a holistic yoga that works with mind, body and spirit, as well as an integral system of yoga that aims to develop the whole personality’.¹⁵

Ashrams

Practising ‘living yoga’ may involve living in an ashram.¹⁶

According to Satyananda, ‘the basic concept of an ashram rallies around the idea of hard work’.¹⁷ He described an ashram as a place ‘organized under the guru or preceptor’ where two types of hard work are undertaken: the spiritual effort for the evolution of the self; and the physical work for the ashram, which in turn also contributes to the evolution of the self.¹⁸
The Royal Commission heard that to follow the tradition of the ashram involves, at least to some extent, separation from ‘many aspects of the modern world’. According to Satyananda, the isolation that life in an ashram offers is necessary for the development of detachment from the influence of society, friends and family.

**Initiation into sannyasa**

After some time practising and training in Satyananda yoga, a person may be initiated into ‘sannyasa’. The Royal Commission heard evidence that taking sannyasa is likened to ‘being ordained but without formal vows’. Evidence was also given about initiation, which was described as ‘the beginning of a journey; a commitment to self-knowledge and a spiritual path’. Once initiated, a person is known as a ‘sannyasin’.

Satyananda described the moment of ‘taking sannyasa’ as follows:

Therefore, the moment you take sannyasa, forget that you were born to a family, forget that you were meant to love or be loved. The sannyasin has a twofold duty – to develop self-awareness and at the same time to spread the spiritual influence to as many people as possible.

The Royal Commission heard that sannyasins who live in an ashram are called ‘poorna’ and are given the title of ‘swami’. They are also known as ‘sannyasin swami’.

Satyananda yoga poorna sannyasins generally:

- live in an ashram
- adopt the title ‘swami’, a spiritual first name and the family name ‘Saraswati’
- abstain from sex, drugs, alcohol and meat
- shave their heads
- wear orange dhotis, which are robes similar to sarongs
- renounce all personal property, wealth and family ties
- practise ‘karma yoga’, described variously as ‘self-less service’, unpaid ‘hard physical labour’, ‘a volunteering ethos’ and ‘slavery’
- practise other physical aspects of yoga, including yoga poses, meditation, chanting, and nasal and stomach cleansing techniques.

**The guru–disciple relationship**

A key aspect of the practice of Satyananda yoga is commitment to the ‘guru–disciple’ relationship. Witnesses told the Royal Commission that the ‘gurus’ in Satyananda yoga are currently Niranjan and, even in death, Satyananda.
Satyananda was described by some witnesses and in Satyananda yoga literature as ‘divine’, ‘god-like’, ‘omnipotent’ and a ‘representative of God’.\(^{38}\) The disciple’s commitment to the guru was often described in terms of surrender, submission, obedience and devotion.\(^{39}\)

One former resident of the Mangrove ashram told the Royal Commission that ‘[b]lind devotion [to the guru] was heavily encouraged, and this involved being obedient without question’.\(^{40}\)

The Royal Commission heard some conflicting evidence on the degree of devotion and submission required in the guru–disciple relationship today. One current resident of the Mangrove ashram told the Royal Commission that she believed that, without a degree of devotion and submission, ashram life would be difficult.\(^{41}\)

Conversely, another current practitioner of Satyananda yoga told the Royal Commission that the concept of devotion and submission was not at all part of the philosophy of Satyananda yoga.\(^{42}\) However, she later said: ‘There has to be some devotion otherwise what attracts you?’\(^{43}\)

We are satisfied that the weight of evidence before the Royal Commission is that a key aspect of the practice of Satyananda yoga is a practitioner’s commitment or devotion to a ‘guru–disciple’ relationship.

The importance of the guru–disciple relationship and the impact of it on the children living at the Mangrove ashram is examined in closer detail in section 4 of this report.

**Initiation ceremonies**

Initiation ceremonies were considered an important part of life in an ashram. Evidence was given that sometimes this would involve a fire ceremony; at other times, it would not. One witness described an initiation ceremony as involving a guru sitting on a pedestal, who would then ‘dispense wisdom and directives’ for the individuals who were being initiated. Also:\(^{44}\)

> Each person would receive their new name, some orange robes and a mala (like a rosary). From then on they would take on that name and be the full ‘property’ of the ashram.

Evidence was also given that initiation involved renouncing all ‘possessions, my old life and my entire family and that the Ashram was now my family’.\(^{45}\)

A number of former child residents who gave evidence said they were initiated as sannyasins in ceremonies carried out by Swami Akhandananda Saraswati (Akhandananda)\(^{46}\) (discussed in section 2) or Satyananda.\(^{47}\)

The Royal Commission heard that young children were also initiated. One former child resident told the Royal Commission that she was initiated when she was just seven years old.\(^{48}\) Another said she was initiated at age 12, while her sister was about 10 or 11 years old when she was initiated.\(^{49}\) Other former child residents of the ashram were initiated in their early teens.\(^{50}\)
One witness told the Royal Commission that, before her initiation ceremony, she and the other initiates shaved their heads. They were then presented with a beaded necklace, an orange dhoti, a mantra, and a spiritual name with the same last name ‘Saraswati’. A former child resident said that, once initiated, a sannyasin had to renounce ‘worldly possessions and finances, children, and family relationships and any unnecessary contact with the outside world’.

**Celibacy**

A number of witnesses said that they understood that celibacy was part of being a swami and was to be observed by all swamis. One witness told the Royal Commission that she had assumed ‘that swamis were celibate, more monk-like’.

One of the witnesses before the Royal Commission also gave evidence in Akhandananda’s criminal trial that Akhandananda used to tell the swamis they should be celibate. She told the Royal Commission that ‘the ashram was supposed to be a celibate community’. Another witness said that she was told that swamis were supposed to be celibate. Dr Henry Sztulman, a medical practitioner who was involved with the ashram, told the Royal Commission that the message from Akhandananda was one of abstinence.

We are satisfied that, at least in the late 1970s and 1980s, there was an expectation amongst practitioners of Satyananda yoga in Australia that all of those initiated as a sannyasin, including the guru, would practise celibacy.

### 1.2 Satyananda yoga in Australia

In 1966, Australian yoga teacher Ms Roma Blair visited the Bihar School of Yoga in India and was initiated into sannyasa by Satyananda.

In 1968, at Ms Blair’s invitation, Satyananda visited Australia. He again visited Australia in 1969 to lead the Yoga Convention in Australia. At the convention, Satyananda met his Australian disciples, including Dr Brian Thomson (a psychiatrist) and his wife, Mrs Mary Thomson (a yoga teacher).

Around 1970, Dr and Mrs Thomson established a small yoga ashram in Manly, New South Wales. Several witnesses described attending a second Satyananda yoga centre in Bondi in New South Wales in the early to mid-1970s.
2 The Mangrove ashram in the 1970s and 1980s

2.1 Establishment in early 1970s

In 1973 or 1974, Ms Blair, Dr and Mrs Thomson, AQA and Ms Barbara Rivette together purchased land at Mangrove Mountain in Gosford, New South Wales. In his written statement prepared for the Royal Commission, Dr Thomson explained that the land was used in conjunction with the Manly yoga centre and was a place for people to go to at weekends and practise yoga.

Among those who visited the land at Mangrove Mountain in the early 1970s were AQA, her husband AQB, their son AQC and their daughter Shishy, who was 14 or 15 years old at the time.

Swami Akhandananda Saraswati

In or around 1974 Satyananda sent Akhandananda from India to Australia to run the yoga centre in Bondi and to oversee the development of the Mangrove ashram. Akhandananda was about 22 years old when he arrived in Australia.

In 1974, Akhandananda met Shishy at the Bondi yoga centre, which she had attended with her parents AQA and AQB since about 1971. When she first met Akhandananda, Shishy was 16 or 17 years old.

Akhandananda and Shishy commenced a sexual relationship around 1974 or 1975, when Shishy was about 17 years old. Later in 1975, Shishy went to live at the Bondi yoga centre with Akhandananda.

The nature of the relationship between Shishy and Akhandananda and its significance for this case study are considered in section 3 of this report.

2.2 Growth of the Mangrove ashram between 1975 and 1987

Satyananda yoga grew in popularity throughout the 1970s. By early 1975, weekend yoga courses and camps were held regularly on the land at Mangrove Mountain. A number of children attended those camps, including 14-year-old Ms Bhakti Manning, and seven-year-old APL and her younger sister APK.

First residents

In 1976, the first permanent residents moved to the Mangrove ashram. Among them were Akhandananda; Shishy; Shishy’s parents, AQA and AQB; and Shishy’s brother, AQC.

In October 1976, Satyananda visited Australia and presided over the International Yoga Convention in Sydney, which was reportedly attended by 2,000 people. While Satyananda was in Australia in
1976, he inaugurated the Mangrove ashram and initiated the first group of disciples into poorna sannyasa.78

Among those first initiated into poorna sannyasa were Dr and Mrs Thomson, AQA, AQB, AQC and Shishy.79 In 1978, Satyananda returned to Australia to preside over the World Yoga Convention, which was held at the Mangrove ashram and attended by over 1,200 people. Satyananda reportedly initiated over 700 people during his 1978 visit to Australia.80 The initiation ceremony was held at the Bondi yoga centre.81

The Royal Commission heard that around 1978 the Mangrove ashram began offering a three-year poorna sannyasin training course. The course required residency at the ashram and cost $3,000 per person.82 Many parents attended the course with their children.83

Other early residents and associates

Among the post-1978 wave of new Mangrove ashram residents were 17-year-old Muktimurti Saraswati (Muktimurti); Mr Clive Salzer; Mr Peter Wakeman; APT and her daughters APR and APS; APL and APK with their father (and later their mother); and APH and her parents, API and APJ.84

Muktimurti Saraswati

Muktimurti was born in 1961. She is currently a yoga teacher at the Mangrove ashram.

In her statement to the Royal Commission, Muktimurti described her involvement with the Mangrove ashram.85 Muktimurti first came to live at the Mangrove ashram in 1978, when she was 17 years old.86 She commenced a three-year sannyas training course to become a swami and then continued to live at the ashram until 1996, when she went to live at the Bihar School of Yoga in India. She lived at the Bihar School of Yoga for 10 years87 and then returned to the Mangrove ashram in 2006. She currently lives at the ashram.88

Mr Clive Salzer

Mr Salzer (who is also known as Adwaita) prepared a statement for the Royal Commission but did not give evidence in the public hearing. In his statement he described his introduction to yoga and his meeting with Satyananda at the Mangrove ashram in about 1977.89 After travelling to India in 1978, Satyananda told him to return to Australia to practise Kriya yoga.90

In his statement he said that in late 1978, when he was around 29, he sold all of his possessions, went to live at the Mangrove ashram and completed a three-year sannyas training course. He remained at the Mangrove ashram until around 1980, when he was sent to live at the ashram’s Gosford branch as a yoga teacher.
In around 1982 or 1983, Mr Salzer was called back to the Mangrove ashram, where he was asked to set up an accounting system. He remained there (with the exception of about one year between 1997 and 1998) until 2000.

**Mr Peter Wakeman**

Mr Wakeman provided a written statement to the Royal Commission but did not give evidence at the public hearing. In his statement he said that his interest in yoga started in about 1981. Mr Wakeman first visited the Mangrove ashram that same year. The ashram subsequently engaged him to carry out some plumbing and building work from time to time. By the end of 1981, Mr Wakeman had sold his house and he and his wife had moved to live full-time at the Mangrove ashram. They lived there initially for two years. During the time Mr Wakeman lived at the ashram he formed a close relationship with Akhandananda.

**Dr Sandra Smith**

Dr Sandra Smith, a registered psychiatrist, said that in 1978 she and a colleague began attending the Mangrove ashram with their children. Dr Smith later became an initiated householder sannyasin, meaning that she was an initiate but did not live at the Mangrove ashram.

**Mr Philip Connor**

Mr Philip Connor provided a written statement to the Royal Commission but did not give evidence at the public hearing. He said that he first became involved with Satyananda yoga at the Mangrove ashram in 1976. He initially lived there for six months from about December 1979.

Between about July 1980 and about 1987, he ran a Satyananda yoga teaching centre in North Queensland and between 1987 and 1988 he assisted with the administration of the Mangrove ashram. Mr Connor was appointed a director of Satyananda Ashram Ltd in about 1987 and remained a director for about one year.

**Dr Henry Sztulman**

Dr Sztulman, a general medical practitioner, gave evidence that he was involved with the Mangrove ashram as a visitor from 1976. In 1979 he went to live at the ashram. He became the ashram’s resident doctor and began teaching yoga and therapy programs. In the early 1980s he was appointed to the board of directors of the Mangrove ashram.
Ms Helen Cushing

Ms Helen Cushing, a yoga teacher and writer, provided a written statement to the Royal Commission but did not give evidence at the public hearing.

Ms Cushing first became involved with the Mangrove ashram during 1976 and 1977, when she visited or stayed for the weekend. Ms Cushing then gave up yoga for about 20 years until 1996, when she again visited the Mangrove ashram.

In 2001, Ms Cushing visited the Bihar School of Yoga in India. Between 2003 and 2011 she managed a Satyananda yoga centre in Hobart. Between 2011 and 2013, Ms Cushing lived at the Bihar School of Yoga in India. In 2013, she returned to Australia and lived at the Satyananda Yoga Ashram in Rocklyn. In 2014, Ms Cushing became involved in the Mangrove ashram Working Together Taskforce, which is discussed in section 9 of this report.

Child residents

In the early 1980s, several children, including APA, Mr Tim Clark, Jyoti and Ms Alecia Buchanan, moved to the Mangrove ashram without their parents. Witnesses told the Royal Commission that by 1983 there were around 20 child residents at the ashram.

The circumstances of the children who lived at the Mangrove ashram, including their separation from their parents, are described below.

2.3 Authority at the Mangrove ashram

According to a number of former residents of the Mangrove ashram, a strict hierarchy operated at the Mangrove ashram between 1976 and about 1987. This section of the report primarily considers the roles of Akhandananda and Shishy within that hierarchy. The role of Satyananda as ‘supreme guru’ and ultimate authority figure in the Mangrove ashram is considered in more detail in section 9 of this report.

The Mangrove ashram as a corporation

The Mangrove ashram’s first corporate entity, Satyananda Ashram Ltd, was registered as a company in 1974. However, documents in evidence show that it was not incorporated until 21 January 1977. By resolution passed at the company’s inaugural general meeting, Satyananda appointed Akhandananda as director. Akhandananda remained as director until June 1988.
Shishy, Dr Sztulman and Dr Smith gave evidence that, although they were corporate office holders of Satyananda Ashram Ltd, Akhandananda made all decisions. They said that minutes of corporate meetings were created to reflect Akhandananda’s decisions but that no formal corporate meetings were actually held.

Several bank accounts were established between 1977 and 1981 for managing the Mangrove ashram and its centres. Company records show that Akhandananda was a signatory to all accounts.

**Akhandananda’s role**

A number of former residents of the Mangrove ashram told the Royal Commission that they regarded Akhandananda as Satyananda’s chief disciple in Australia – he was the ‘head-teacher’, ‘spiritual leader’ or ‘director’ of the Mangrove ashram and its centres and the person in charge of the Mangrove ashram, subject only to Satyananda. He was described as being ‘Satyananda’s representative for Australian disciples and he just – he was our guide’.

APL gave evidence in Akhandananda’s criminal trial that ‘[Akhandananda] always told us that he was [Satyananda’s] direct line, his direct energy channel from Satyananda so if you were dedicated to him we were dedicated to Satyananda therefore we would be dedicated to God’. The evidence before the Royal Commission was that residents were ‘conditioned to accept and not to question’ Akhandananda and that ‘anyone who spoke out against Akhandananda was either thrown out or really badly ridiculed and given such a hard time that life became unbearable for them’.

Akhandananda died in 1997. In 1989, during criminal proceedings against him, Akhandananda denied that ‘every person resident in [the Mangrove] Ashram was subject to [his] direction and control’.

Apart from this evidence from Akhandananda, which has to be seen in the context of him defending himself against serious allegations of criminal conduct, the evidence of witnesses together with the documentary evidence supports a conclusion that Akhandananda held a position of significant authority at the Mangrove ashram, subject only to oversight by Satyananda.

The evidence regarding Satyananda’s oversight is discussed further in section 7.

**Shishy’s role**

There was considerable oral and documentary evidence that, in the day-to-day running of the Mangrove ashram, Shishy was second in charge to Akhandananda.

Shishy told the Royal Commission that Akhandananda told her she was ‘the chosen one’. When she moved to the Mangrove ashram, she said that she ‘was really Akhandananda’s attendant ... I was available to him for whatever he wanted of me’. She initially described herself as Akhandananda’s ‘handmaiden’.
While Shishy ultimately accepted that she was, in effect, second in charge to Akhandananda, she also described herself as being in ‘the most powerless position’ and having ‘no choices at all’. Shishy said that she was ‘probably the highest one up on the ladder doing what [she] was told’.

Shishy and Akhandananda lived in the same hut, with separate beds. Shishy said she received ‘what could have been seen as special privileges such being in the proximity of the two Gurus, sleeping in Akhandananda’s room; sometimes having special food [sic]’.

Outside her sexual relationship with Akhandananda, Shishy’s primary roles were managing the business affairs of the Mangrove ashram on Akhandananda’s behalf and taking care of the children.

There was evidence that Shishy assumed these roles when she was around 18 or 19 years old.

**Management of the Mangrove ashram’s affairs**

In her administrative role, Shishy managed bank accounts, authorised expenditure (which she said required Akhandananda’s approval), used the ashram’s car to do the shopping, monitored incoming and outgoing mail in consultation with Akhandananda and held offices in Satyananda Ashram Ltd.

**Role with the children at the Mangrove ashram**

Shishy told the Royal Commission that her role with the children was ‘initially not much at all, but it did evolve over time into something quite big and complex’. She described spending a lot of time with the children, overseeing their schoolwork, buying their clothes and keeping track of and acknowledging birthdays and Christmases. Shishy also accompanied the children on trips away from the Mangrove ashram.

Shishy said that her role with the children evolved because she ‘just really liked them’ and ‘interacted with them’ but that she was never formally told, ‘you are responsible for the children’. Shishy said that she had no teaching or child care experience.

Shishy was a Justice of the Peace and in that capacity was involved in changing several children’s names by deed poll to their spiritual names. She also executed documents purporting to transfer legal guardianship of APL, APK, APA, APB, Tim Clark and APV to herself and Akhandananda. Shishy said she executed these documents because Akhandananda told her to and she did not intend to assume legal responsibility for the children.

Shishy said that she understood Akhandananda wanted the guardianship transfers in order to claim child endowment money. Other witnesses also said they understood this to be one of the reasons for the transfers. Payments of child endowment money were made to a bank account for which Shishy was a co-signatory.
Shishy was listed on index cards held by the then New South Wales Department of Education as the supervisor of various children, including APA and Ms Buchanan, while they undertook high school by correspondence.\(^{158}\) Shishy also organised yoga classes for the children, assigned them karma yoga tasks\(^ {159}\) and coordinated their recreational activities.\(^ {160}\)

Shishy accepted that the children appeared to crave her attention\(^ {161}\) and worship her\(^ {162}\). However, she did not accept that she encouraged the children to worship her. Rather, she said she would often ‘try and redirect it towards Satyananda’.\(^ {163}\)

Shishy accepted that she physically disciplined the children and had discretion as to when and how she did so. She said that some of the discipline she imposed on the children was on Akhandananda’s orders and some was not\(^ {164}\) (see also section 3).

**Evidence of other residents**

Many former residents described Shishy as a ‘mother figure’ or ‘mini guru’ to the children. The children wrote her love poems, played games named after her, wore T-shirts saying ‘I love Shishy’ and fought over her time and possessions.\(^ {165}\) They said the children were encouraged to be devoted to Shishy.\(^ {166}\)

Dr Smith and Dr Sztulman said that Shishy’s closeness to Akhandananda and her role with the children gave her power and status.\(^ {167}\)

**Shishy’s authority**

It is clear that Shishy gained status and authority at the Mangrove ashram as a consequence of her relationship with Akhandananda.

We are satisfied that Shishy was second in command at the Mangrove ashram. We are also satisfied that Shishy exercised control over the children and held a position of influence and authority over the children. We accept that her power and authority was subject to the orders and directions of Akhandananda and Satyananda.

### 2.4 Children at the Mangrove ashram

Witnesses said that the number of children at the Mangrove ashram fluctuated, but generally the evidence was that there could be 12 to 22 children living there at any one time and there were around 20 children in 1983.\(^ {168}\)
Separation of children from their parents

Shishy and Dr Sztulman said that the principles of Satyananda yoga were to discourage relationships between children and parents, family members and sexual partners. This was on the basis that a person’s only relationship is with their guru.

Many of the witnesses who lived at the Mangrove ashram as children told the Royal Commission that they lived there without their parents for various periods of time ranging from several months to many years. Among these former residents were Ms Buchanan, Jyoti, Mr Clark, APA, APB, APH, APK, APL, APR and APV.

In his published teachings, Satyananda said of the Mangrove ashram, ‘children like the ashram life so much that some of them come to live here before their parents’. This was true of several former residents, including Ms Buchanan, APA and Jyoti. Other children, including Tim Clark, APR, APL and APK, came to the Mangrove ashram either with or at the direction of their parents.

Shishy’s parents moved to the Mangrove ashram a few months after her. They then lived in other yoga centres for the next 10 years but returned to the ashram regularly.

Ms Buchanan and Shishy gave evidence that they, and other children, were required to renounce their family ties as part of their spiritual initiation ceremonies. In some cases children were initiated at a very young age.

Former residents gave evidence that Akhandananda and Shishy encouraged and enforced the separation of children from their parents at the Mangrove ashram by:

- housing the children separately from their parents, except when the children were very young
- teaching children and parents that disciples must be detached from their families and in one instance telling a mother that to be a good disciple she had to give up what was most precious to her, which was her children
- limiting children’s ability to contact their parents, including by requiring their permission to use the telephone
- instructing parents not to contact their children, and in some cases telling them they were bad parents and Shishy was ‘repairing their damage’
- regulating when parents and children could visit each other and punishing children for seeing their parents without permission
- telling parents that the family unit no longer existed and their children were no longer their own
- speaking badly to the children about their parents and in some instances telling them their parents were ‘toxic’ or ‘poisonous’ and that mothers’ connection to their children was ‘stupid’
- mocking and ridiculing the children for being homesick
• encouraging the children to call their parents by their spiritual names instead of ‘mum’ and ‘dad’
• encouraging the children to see Shishy and Akhandananda as parent figures and requiring all gifts to the children to be in Shishy’s name.

Shishy told the Royal Commission that she did facilitate the separation of family units. She said that she ‘probably did discourage’ Ms Buchanan from contacting her mother on one occasion that Ms Buchanan described during her evidence.

However, Shishy said that her actions in separating children from their parents was not something that she ‘just constructed for the sake of it’; rather, it was ‘part of the culture of the ashram’. Shishy gave evidence that she was required to renounce her family connections when Satyananda initiated her.

Several former child residents gave evidence that their parents also discouraged them from maintaining close attachments with them, telling them to stop being ‘sooks’ and to be good swamis and ‘learn from Akhandananda’.

Several survivors gave evidence that they gradually withdrew from their families.

Living conditions for children at the Mangrove ashram

There was evidence before the Royal Commission that children who lived at the Mangrove ashram slept in a range of makeshift accommodation, including two-person huts in the bush on the hillsides that the children reached at night by torchlight.

APV gave evidence that the children were completely dependent on the Mangrove ashram for everything. Many former residents gave evidence that they did not have adequate bedding, or shoes or warm clothes, during winter.

APR and APH described showering in cold showers in an open public area where both adult swamis and visitors showered. Shishy agreed that the children showered in ‘largely open’ showers.

APR described the wall separating the male and female showers. She said ‘there was a large gap at the top where male swamis could easily see over ... and [she] remember[ed] occasions where [she would] look up from the showers and see male faces.’

Schooling arrangements

Young children attended the local primary school. Older children who stayed in the Mangrove ashram studied high school by correspondence, supervised by Shishy, which Shishy said resulted in ‘reduced contact with the outside world’. She also described the supervision of the children’s schoolwork as one of her ‘unofficial roles’.
The Royal Commission heard that schooling was considered to be irrelevant or not important.\textsuperscript{206} The children were required to get up at about 4 am every day to do yoga and meditation.\textsuperscript{207} Children were also responsible for cleaning Akhandananda and Shisy’s hut\textsuperscript{208} as well as many other chores that were set to a strict schedule.\textsuperscript{209} When the children did their schoolwork, there was no-one to help them. APA gave evidence that ‘this made learning very difficult’.\textsuperscript{210} APR gave evidence that yoga in the morning would take two hours and the younger children who attended the local primary school had to get ready for school after that.\textsuperscript{211}

APA described in greater detail the correspondence schooling arrangements at the ashram. She said that every week a correspondence package would arrive and the children had to be self-motivated. The work needed to be completed by the end of the week.\textsuperscript{212} APA described in her statement that she ‘struggled with [her] schoolwork and got many beatings from Shisy for not finishing [her] work on time’.\textsuperscript{213} APR described the building where the children would complete their correspondence schoolwork as the ‘Darshan’ – a dormitory attached to the hall.\textsuperscript{214} Mr Clark described how he would rush to finish up to six weeks’ worth of schoolwork in about seven days so that he could go and play at the creek. He also described a normal day as follows:\textsuperscript{215}

A normal day at the Ashram involved getting up early in the morning before breakfast to do some yoga. Then I would spend the rest of the day doing school work and jobs which included working in the stables and others chores around the Ashram. During the period I was at the Ashram I completed Year 8 and only part of Year 9.

APT said that she was ‘not kept abreast of [her daughters’] progress and never received any of their reports’ and that ‘parents weren’t important at all in relation to the kids’ schooling’.\textsuperscript{216}

APA told the Royal Commission that Shisy frequently called her a ‘dodo’ because she was ‘so dumb’ and that no-one helped the children with their schoolwork, which made learning difficult.\textsuperscript{217} Mr Clark, APA and APL said that, when they reached year 10, Shisy ordered that they stop school and work full-time at the ashram.\textsuperscript{218}

The following excerpts from Satyananda’s published teachings suggest that the Mangrove ashram allowed for the schooling of its resident children but that the practice of yoga was considered more important than formal education:\textsuperscript{219}

[The children] have to attend school because it is compulsory by Australian law, but they are sannyasins first. The teachers find them very intelligent, open and disciplined. They never use bad words or talk about television. Whenever the teachers get angry, the children tell them, ‘Please practise yoga.’

All the children have shaved heads, and as soon as they get back to the ashram in the afternoon, they throw off their shirts and pants and put on geru. One girl of six years said, ‘Oh, we don’t want to read, we prefer to cook food at the ashram’.
Yoga practice and ‘karma yoga’

There was evidence of a strict regime of yoga practice at the Mangrove ashram. All residents were expected to rise at 4 am to complete two hours of yoga and meditation before completing their karma yoga. ‘Karma yoga’ means ‘self-less service’ and usually involved building, cleaning, gardening, looking after the animals, officework or maintenance.

Shishy said karma yoga was ‘working for no personal reward’. APL described it in Akhandananda’s criminal trial as ‘hard work without any payment, like as far as reward or money’. Mr Clark and APA told the Royal Commission it was ‘slavery’.

There was evidence that children worked long days in order to complete their tasks. For example, Mr Clark gave evidence that he was made to work 12-hour days, without payment, in the garden or in other physically demanding jobs.

Mr Clark also gave evidence that one of his tasks was to care for a former heroin addict who was a compulsive masturbator and who lived in a caravan in an isolated part of the ashram.

Children’s commitment to the guru–disciple relationship

APL told the Royal Commission that it was ‘drummed into the kids by Akhandananda and Shishy that a good disciple surrenders completely to the will of the guru’. At Akhandananda’s criminal trial, APL described Satyananda yoga as learning ‘how to be totally selfless and give yourself up to the master, like totally give yourself physically, mentally, emotionally’.

Jyoti said that she was ‘strongly encouraged’ never to question the guru and that she looked up and was devoted to Akhandananda as her guru and spiritual teacher.

Adult perspectives on separation and observations about the children at the Mangrove ashram

A number of the adults associated with the Mangrove ashram and parents of the children who lived at the ashram gave evidence about their observations of and experiences with the children at the ashram. Consistent with the philosophy of renouncing family ties within the ashram, there was evidence that the children were housed, taken care of and treated quite separately from the adults.

In his statement, Mr Salzer said:

[The children] did not have much to do with the adult swamis who were working and living at the Ashram. It was accepted that the children were not our business and that Shishy was their teacher. The children used to follow Shishy around like she was the mother duck.
He also said that he ‘felt that the children generally believed that they were superior or more evolved than us’.\footnote{231}

APT said, ‘The children at the Ashram were a force, and I felt they were like the children in “Lord of the Flies”.’\footnote{232} She said:\footnote{233}

although my children had been able to interact with the other children at the Ashram, they were unable to relate to their peers in the outside world. They weren’t as socialised and acted like members of a gang.

In his statement, Mr Connor gave evidence that the children would behave ‘in an unusual way towards certain adults, in what would sometimes border on hostility’.\footnote{234}

In her statement, APT gave evidence that she was ‘discouraged from having motherly feelings’\footnote{235} and that Shishy ‘became a mother figure and almost a guru to the children’.\footnote{236} Muktimurti said in her statement that ‘the majority of the older kids were at the Ashram without their parents and they slept in various locations around the Ashram’.\footnote{237} She said that Shishy took full responsibility for the children. While she did not know whether Shishy was their legal guardian, her perception was that:\footnote{238}

she was in that sort of a role with them. No other person was permitted to discipline the children or direct with what they did or didn’t do.

In her written statement prepared for the Royal Commission, Ms Elisabeth Buchanan, whose daughter, Ms Alecia Buchanan, moved to live at the Mangrove ashram by herself when she was 13 years old,\footnote{239} described Shishy as being ‘revered by the children and was seen as a mother figure to all of the children living there’.\footnote{240} Ms Buchanan also explained in her statement that her daughter rarely visited her and that her daughter told her that ‘Akhandananda ... refused to let her leave the Ashram’.\footnote{241}

In a statement prepared for the Royal Commission, APM gave evidence that, during a seminar at Mangrove Mountain in 1973, she told Akhandananda about her children and described them as precious. He said that if she ‘wanted to be a good disciple of Swami Satyananda [she] had to give up the things that were most precious to [her]’.\footnote{242} APM moved to the Mangrove ashram in 1979. Although she initially shared a hut with her children, APL and APK, they were soon moved into a children’s hut ‘so that the girls could undergo spiritual healing’.\footnote{243}

In a statement prepared for the Royal Commission, APY gave evidence that ‘we were encouraged to become detached from material things and also from our children, as part of our spiritual growth’.\footnote{244} APY was separated from her daughter when her daughter was eight years old. She stated:\footnote{245}

[Akhandananda] said it was time to be separated; that we were too attached. She was put in a hut with some of the other young girls up the opposite hill to where I slept. I complied with this, as it was part of the culture.
Shishy gave evidence that the sentiments expressed in the July 1982 edition of a magazine published by the Mangrove ashram and the Bihar School of Yoga, which contained teachings of Satyananda, Akhandananda and other swamis about the total submission required of disciples, were fairly typical of Satyananda yoga philosophy. Shishy said she could recall people ‘clamouring’ to read this monthly magazine.

Shishy gave evidence that the philosophies expressed in this magazine said to her that ‘I should not accept any responsibility for myself and that all of the difficult and painful and, now that I see, abusive treatment that I received was all for my own good’. This also applied to the abusive treatment she saw around her.

Between 1975 and 1987, the teachings of Satyananda yoga as interpreted and practised by Akhandananda promoted a subservient and devoted relationship between disciples and their guru or gurus. In the relevant period these gurus were Satyananda and Akhandananda. At the same time as those relationships were being promoted, other traditional relationships, including the relationship between parent and child, were discouraged.

Child protection policies and procedures at the Mangrove ashram: 1975 to 1989.

Muktimurti, who has lived at the Mangrove ashram since 2006 and who was also resident there between 1978 and 1996, told the Royal Commission that the Mangrove ashram had a strong policy about not allowing unaccompanied children to come and visit the ashram without having an adult with them but that she did not know if this policy was written or oral. Muktimurti said that she did not recall whether that policy came in until after Shishy’s departure in late 1985.

However, there was no evidence before the Royal Commission of any child protection policy or procedure, written or otherwise, applicable to or in place at the Mangrove ashram between 1975 and 1989.

In our view, if a policy such as the one that Muktimurti described had existed, it would have had little or no value or purpose because it would have been antithetical to the apparently accepted practice of separation of children resident at the ashram from their parents.

Furthermore, we consider that, if such a policy had existed, an accompanying adult would have offered little to no protection to a child given that adults in the ashram were apparently inculcated in the belief system which permeated the ashram, including complete trust in and devotion to Akhandananda.
3 Sexual and physical abuse

3.1 Sexual abuse

The Royal Commission received evidence from 11 adults who reported that they were sexually abused by Akhandananda when they were children living at the Mangrove ashram. Ten of these child residents were female.

Shishy and Ms Manning also said that they were sexually abused by Satyananda when they were 19 and 17 years old respectively.254

Ms Manning said she was also sexually abused by an Indian swami, Gorakhnath, who lived briefly at the Bondi yoga centre.

Mr Clark and APK alleged they were sexually abused by Shishy when they were children. Shishy denied sexually abusing Mr Clark and APK but accepted that she began a sexual relationship with APQ when he was under the age of 16.

APR and APA alleged they were sexually abused by other unnamed individuals connected with the Mangrove ashram.

The evidence of each former child resident is set out below, in order of the year in which they became involved with the Mangrove ashram.

Shishy

Initial involvement with Satyananda yoga

Shishy gave evidence to the Royal Commission that she had a fairly ordinary childhood.255 She became involved in Satyananda yoga in around 1971 or 1972256 together with her parents, who were very interested in spiritual and philosophical pursuits.257 At the time, Shishy was around 14 or 15 years old.

Shishy told the Royal Commission that what attracted her to Satyananda yoga was the ‘sense of community, the sense of a higher purpose, the sense of doing something really good for the world’. She said that ‘when [she] was a kid [she] actually wanted to be a nun at one point’.258

Shishy gave evidence that she learnt about the philosophies of Satyananda yoga through yoga classes and made a decision to live a life based on those philosophies. In particular, she said that the ‘devotional aspect of the guru/disciple relationship really struck a chord’.259
The early days of Shishy’s relationship with Akhandananda

Shishy gave evidence that Akhandananda ‘took a special interest in her’ and was ‘very affectionate’ with her from the time they met, and that he would watch her ‘intensely’. Shishy said she felt confused but ‘very special’ about his attentions. She told the Royal Commission that she was confused about Akhandananda’s affections because she understood and assumed that all swamis were celibate.

Shishy gave evidence that Akhandananda initiated a sexual relationship with her about six months after they met and that, by the time she was 17, she was his ‘secret mistress’.

Shishy told the Royal Commission that initially their sexual encounters occurred while she was staying overnight with him at the Bondi ashram, which was ‘from Friday to Monday, most weeks’. She said she moved into the Bondi ashram full-time with Akhandananda when she was 17, the day after she finished her HSC exams, and they lived there together for about a year.

Shishy also gave evidence that when the relationship commenced she was living with her parents. She was not reliant on Akhandananda for her personal needs such as food, shelter, schooling or financial support. She chose to move into the Bondi ashram with Akhandananda and did so independently of her parents.

Significantly, Shishy accepted during her examination by Counsel Assisting that, when her sexual relationship with Akhandananda began, it was consensual. In response to examination by her solicitor about the nature of her initial consent, Shishy said:

Well, [Akhandananda] wasn’t holding me down or forcing me at that time, but I felt, even though I was kind of enamoured with him, I felt under quite a lot of pressure to comply.

Shishy gave evidence that she felt that being with Akhandananda meant she was ‘a chosen one’ and ‘an advanced being’ and that it made her feel ‘really elated’ and ‘really special’.

Ms Manning gave evidence that she witnessed an occasion in July 1975 when she saw Shishy convincing her (Shishy’s) parents to let her stay overnight at the Bondi ashram with Akhandananda and that her parents had reluctantly agreed.

Shishy said that her parents did not object to the living arrangements: ‘they thought it was an honour as did I’.

Although Shishy stayed overnight with Akhandananda at the Bondi ashram, she gave evidence that she did not believe the other members of the yoga community or her parents suspected that their relationship was sexual ‘because of their belief in him as a perfect spiritual leader’ and because they thought he was ‘very pure’.

Shishy said she did not disclose her sexual relationship to her parents at the time.
She said she ‘felt conflicted and ashamed’ and felt ‘some kind of discomfort, as well, about the conflicting requirements’ of being special on the one hand but also not being able to talk about her relationship with Akhandananda on the other.

Ms Manning gave evidence that she recalled several occasions at the Mangrove ashram when she witnessed Shishy ‘left in the [van in which she and Akhandananda drove to the ashram] crying and distressed for long periods of time’.

Shishy was initiated as a swami in October 1976, when she was 19 years old. Shishy said that, when she first became involved with the Mangrove ashram and later became a swami renouncing a ‘home, husband, children, career’, no-one warned her to take care or think very carefully about this path.

Counsel for Shishy submitted that, at the time that Akhandananda’s relationship with Shishy commenced, Shishy was a ‘child’ within the Royal Commission’s definition of ‘child’ (that is, under 18 years old). We are satisfied that Shishy was under 18 years old when her sexual relationship with Akhandananda commenced.

**Shishy and Akhandananda move to the Mangrove ashram**

Shishy and Akhandananda moved to the Mangrove ashram at the end of 1976. They shared a house at the ashram but had separate beds. Shishy said that Akhandananda swore her to secrecy about their relationship on the basis that others were not ‘as free-minded’ as Shishy and ‘won’t be able to understand’.

APL was asked during her oral evidence in Akhandananda’s criminal proceedings whether everyone in the Mangrove ashram knew that Shishy was having sex with Akhandananda. She responded:

> Well, no, no-one knew that, no-one would dare think that, no-one thought Akhandananda had a penis, everyone thought he had pink mist under his dhoti. He was supposed to be the pure one, the one that taught us to be celibate.

**Sexual abuse by Akhandananda**

Shishy said that throughout their relationship Akhandananda gradually began to exert more control over her life, including instructing her to not wear underwear so that she was ‘easily available’ to him. Shishy gave evidence that she ‘was available to him for whatever he wanted of [her]’.

Shishy’s evidence was that Akhandananda was violent with her early on in their relationship and that this came to include sexual violence. Shishy said this included Akhandananda putting a gun in her vagina and cutting her vagina with nail scissors.
Shishy gave evidence that, although it began consensually, the sexual relationship did not continue to be consensual and that ‘it began to really deteriorate around 82/83’ when Akhandananda ‘began showing interest in a couple of girls’. In 1982 and 1983 Shishy was around 24 and 25 years old.

The sexual relationship ended when Shishy left the Mangrove ashram in December 1985.

We accept Shishy’s evidence that Akhandananda was violent towards her.

**Consensual nature of the relationship**

In New South Wales today, and since at least 1975, the age of consent is 16 years. The Royal Commission’s definition of ‘child’ does not affect the legal question of whether a person has consented to sex under applicable state laws.

At 17 years of age, strictly speaking, Shishy was capable of legally consenting to having sex with Akhandananda and, as set out above, her evidence before the Royal Commission was that she entered into her relationship with Akhandananda consensually.

We are satisfied that the evidence supports a conclusion that, at the age of 17, Shishy entered into her relationship with Akhandananda consensually. We do not agree with the suggestion of counsel for Shishy that Shishy was incapable of giving consent because she ‘acquiesce[d] in the advances of a dominant individual’ in the circumstances.

However, we agree with the submissions of counsel for Shishy in that we consider it likely that ‘Akhandananda occupied a position of power and authority in relation to Shishy which continued through their relationship’. We are satisfied that the evidence supports a conclusion that, at the time Shishy commenced her relationship with Akhandananda, there was a power imbalance as a result of Shishy’s understanding of and devotion to the guru–disciple relationship and Satyananda yoga doctrine at the time.

**Shishy’s relationship with Satyananda**

Shishy gave evidence that she met Satyananda when she was 19 years old when he came to Australia for a big yoga convention in October 1976. She said that during that visit Satyananda spiritually initiated her and also commenced a sexual relationship with her. Shishy said that whenever she had sex with Satyananda, whether in Australia or India, his female ‘consort’ was always asleep in her bed in the same room.

Shishy gave evidence that she believed at the time that it was a great honour to have sex with Satyananda. Because of this she did not protest about having sex with him on the first occasion or any other occasion.
Impact of sexual relationships and abuse

Shishy told the Royal Commission the following about the impact upon her of her abusive relationship with Akhandananda:

I fell into a really abusive marriage and had to extricate myself and my children from that. I would say that was precipitated by quite a long-standing lack of self-worth, and I still tend to suffer from putting other people’s opinions about me and experiences about me ahead of what I know about myself. ... In childbirth, I tore three times for the three children that I’ve had along the slit, tore quite badly along the slit that was made with the nail scissors.

Ms Bhakti Manning

Initial involvement with Satyananda yoga and the Mangrove ashram

Ms Manning gave evidence that she first visited the Manly and Bondi yoga centres in 1974, when she was 14 years old. She first attended the Mangrove ashram in November 1974. She continued to visit it and the other centres until 1976.

Ms Manning did not live at the Mangrove ashram. She said she attended voluntarily because she enjoyed the community. She did not attend with, or at the direction of, her parents.

Sexual abuse by Akhandananda

Ms Manning gave evidence that she was sexually abused by Akhandananda on three occasions in 1975, when she was 15 years old.

Ms Manning said that the first two occasions were while she was travelling to yoga seminars in a van with Akhandananda and other swamis. Ms Manning said that on both occasions Akhandananda positioned himself in the back of the van under a blanket next to her and inserted his fingers into her vagina. She said that there were swamis in the van both times and that they were awake when this occurred.

Ms Manning said that the third time was at the Mangrove ashram. Akhandananda took her on a walk and told her to undress, began touching her vagina and said words to the effect of ‘Will you have sex with me?’ Ms Manning said no and then nothing further happened, as they were interrupted by other swamis.
From that time on, Ms Manning said Akhandananda gave her the ‘cold shoulder’ and she felt confused and upset.\textsuperscript{305} She said she felt that what he had done was a ‘betrayal’ of her guru Satyananda, whose teachings stated that there were to be no relationships between swamis.\textsuperscript{306}

There is no evidence before the Royal Commission that Ms Manning’s allegations were ever put to Akhandananda.

**Sexual abuse by Gorakhnath**

Ms Manning told the Royal Commission that in around September 1975 the swami Gorakhnath came to Australia from India and began making sexual advances towards her. Ms Manning refused and informed him on one occasion that in Australia it was illegal for a child under 16 to have sex.\textsuperscript{307}

Ms Manning said that shortly after her 16th birthday she and Gorakhnath had sex at the Manly centre\textsuperscript{308} and then again a month later.\textsuperscript{309} Ms Manning said that Gorakhnath then transferred to the Mangrove ashram before returning to India.

There is no evidence before the Royal Commission that Ms Manning’s allegations have ever been put to Gorakhnath.

**Sexual abuse by Satyananda**

In 1976, Ms Manning went to live at the Bihar School of Yoga, where she worked as an accountant. Ms Manning told the Royal Commission that soon after her 17th birthday Satyananda called her to his room and fondled her vagina.\textsuperscript{310}

Ms Manning gave evidence that she worked with Satyananda on a daily basis over the next seven years. She said that until 1982 she regularly had sex with him\textsuperscript{311} and that this was often aggressive, violent sex.\textsuperscript{312} She said that often they had sex when another female swami was in the room.\textsuperscript{313} She said she also had sex with Satyananda at the Mangrove ashram when she was 17 years old, when she returned briefly to Australia and Satyananda visited from India.\textsuperscript{314}

There is no evidence before the Royal Commission that Ms Manning’s allegations were ever put to Satyananda.
Impact of the abuse

Ms Manning described the impact of the abuse on her as follows:\(^3\)\(^{15}\)

Personal impact is I don’t feel I have a self. I have a body that has been used. ... I don’t have a sense of belonging, I don’t have a sense of direction. I have no knowledge of my sexual identity. ... I have a body that’s no longer used by anybody, but it now experiences constant trauma reactions. I can’t tell from day to day whether I am going to be fit and capable of doing something or not. ... I have children who have had to come to terms with this. I have a son who has seen his mother do things which – some little things like people with Tourette’s have to do – have to clench, have to make noise. ... But I see no path forward for me at this point of time. I don’t have relationships. I don’t have many friendships at all. I don’t have a sense of where my life’s going or whether it’s worth living.

Ms Alecia Buchanan

Initial involvement with the Mangrove ashram

Ms Alecia Buchanan gave evidence to the Royal Commission that she was introduced to the Mangrove ashram by her mother, Ms Elisabeth Buchanan, in 1979 when she was 12.\(^3\)\(^{16}\)

Initially, Ms Alecia Buchanan did not live at the ashram. She said that after regular visits to the ashram she made friends with the ‘ashram kids’ and ‘experienced the thrill’ of having Shishy pay her ‘special attention’, which made her feel ‘part of a special group’.\(^3\)\(^{17}\)

In 1980, when she was aged 13, Ms Buchanan moved to the Mangrove ashram with her mother’s consent, without her mother or siblings,\(^3\)\(^{18}\) and lived there until 1986.

Sexual abuse by Akhandananda

Ms Buchanan gave evidence that she was sexually abused by Akhandananda on multiple occasions between about 1982 and 1986.\(^3\)\(^{19}\)

Ms Buchanan said that in 1982, when she turned 15, Akhandananda began paying her more kind attention and initiating contact, including requiring her to massage his shoulders and later to attend his hut to massage him.\(^3\)\(^{20}\) Akhandananda soon began touching her breasts and this progressed to full intercourse.\(^3\)\(^{21}\)
Ms Buchanan told the Royal Commission that on one occasion she was sexually abused by Akhandananda in the room he shared with Shishy. She said that Shishy was in the room at the time.\(^{322}\)

Ms Buchanan said that on more than one occasion she was sexually abused by Akhandananda on overnight trips to other ashrams.\(^{323}\) She recalled an occasion when she was forced to have sexual intercourse with Akhandananda, who then directed her to leave and to send Shishy in.\(^{324}\)

Ms Buchanan told the Royal Commission that Akhandananda used threats of violence to prevent her from revealing the abuse, especially to her mother.\(^{325}\) He also reminded her that he had a gun that he kept in the corner of his room. On one occasion he showed her the gun.\(^{326}\)

Ms Buchanan gave evidence of Akhandananda’s increasingly erratic behaviour after Shishy left the Mangrove ashram at the end of 1985.\(^{327}\) Ms Buchanan’s evidence was that in around 1986 Akhandananda lost interest in her and, although he still occasionally had sex with her,\(^{328}\) he used her to get other girls to come to his bed.\(^{329}\) She recalled one occasion when he sexually abused her and APH in his bed.\(^{330}\)

Akhandananda was later charged and tried for offences against Ms Buchanan. Details of the criminal proceedings are set out in section 6 of this report.

**Other residents’ awareness of the sexual abuse**

Ms Buchanan recalled one instance when she said she knew that Shishy was in the same room and awake while Akhandananda was sexually abusing her. She gave evidence that Shishy shouted at a dog that had barked when she entered the hut and Shishy did so again during the intercourse.\(^{331}\)

Ms Buchanan stated that she never spoke to any other child or adult about her abuse at the time it was occurring.\(^{332}\) However, she said that the Mangrove ashram receptionist or Muktimurti often summoned her very publicly over the loudspeaker to go to Akhandananda’s room late at night.\(^{333}\)

Ms Buchanan said that there were times when Muktimurti would tell her late at night that Akhandananda required her in his bedroom. She said that she would have to leave four-year-old APO, who she was looking after,\(^{334}\) alone in her office asleep on the floor. She would walk to another building and be let into the ‘back room’ by Muktimurti or Shishy or both. She said she would leave APO alone and unsupervised for about 40 minutes to an hour while Akhandananda sexually assaulted her.\(^{335}\)

Shishy’s and Muktimurti’s awareness of Ms Buchanan’s sexual abuse by Akhandananda is considered in more detail in section 5 of this report.
Impact of the abuse

Ms Buchanan told the Royal Commission about the damaging effects of the sexual abuse on different aspects of her life, including her relationship with her mother and siblings and her physical and mental health.336 She gave evidence of health issues that have impacted on her wellbeing, including significant gynaecological problems that caused her to experience pain and required repeated treatment.337 Like other survivors of sexual abuse at the Mangrove ashram, she told the Royal Commission that as a result of the sexual abuse she had experienced years of deep sadness, depression and anxiety. Over many years she had spent ‘thousands of dollars’ on various types of counselling in an effort to alleviate her suffering.338

Jyoti

Initial involvement with Satyananda yoga and the Mangrove ashram

Jyoti gave evidence to the Royal Commission that in 1980 she began Satyananda yoga classes in Melbourne.339 In 1981, before she turned 16, she visited the Mangrove ashram and loved the environment.340 During that five-week visit, she said Akhandananda paid her a lot of attention and encouraged her to stay longer.341

In early 1982, when she was 16, Jyoti moved to the Mangrove ashram. Jyoti said her mother wrote to the Mangrove ashram asking the management to ‘watch out’ for Jyoti because she was young. Jyoti said Shishy told her she had received the letter.342

Jyoti gave evidence that after she moved to the ashram Akhandananda continued to pay her special attention. He gave her the Sanskrit name of Shakuntala, which meant ‘beautiful, peaceful and of bliss’.343 Jyoti said she regarded Akhandananda as her guru and teacher.344

Sexual abuse by Akhandananda

Jyoti gave evidence that she was first sexually abused by Akhandananda in November 1982 after being sent on a trip with Akhandananda and others to Canberra. On the first night she was groped by Akhandananda and on the second and subsequent nights she was forced to perform oral sex and then made to have sexual intercourse. The sexual abuse continued after she returned to the Mangrove ashram.345

Jyoti gave evidence of how confused and powerless she felt during and after the abuse, having been taught never to question the guru. She said that Akhandananda threatened to kill her if she told
anyone and made her recite long cover-up stories back to him so that no-one would find out.\textsuperscript{346} Jyoti said that Akhandananda became very paranoid about her being pregnant and frequently sent her to Gosford for pregnancy tests.

Jyoti stated that, in or around 1983, Akhandananda sent her away to the Perth centre. Jyoti said she was discouraged from having contact with her family. On one occasion, Akhandananda visited the Perth centre with Shishy and ignored Jyoti, which distressed and upset her.\textsuperscript{347}

Jyoti gave evidence that by the end of 1983 she began to question her faith in Akhandananda.\textsuperscript{348} In early 1984 she was disillusioned with the Mangrove ashram and left.\textsuperscript{349} Jyoti said she initially kept her abuse secret but then told an older swami named ‘Jeff’ and his partner in Melbourne, who were sympathetic but unsure of how to respond.\textsuperscript{350}

**Disclosure to Dr Sandra Smith**

Jyoti gave evidence that in 1984 she travelled to the Gosford centre. At the suggestion of someone at the Gosford centre, Jyoti then contacted Dr Smith to speak with her about the abuse.\textsuperscript{351}

As at the date of the public hearing, Dr Smith was a practising psychiatrist who had been involved with the Mangrove ashram and Gosford centre as an initiated non-resident sannyasin since 1978.\textsuperscript{352}

Jyoti gave evidence that she was unaware that by 1984 Dr Smith had formed a close relationship with Akhandananda; she had spent time with Akhandananda at the Mangrove ashram and had accompanied him and Shishy on two trips to India.\textsuperscript{353}

When Jyoti told Dr Smith that she had been sexually abused by Akhandananda over a period of time, it appeared to Jyoti that Dr Smith did not accept that she was telling the truth and that as a result she was insensitive in her questioning and her follow-up.\textsuperscript{354}

Jyoti’s evidence of her meeting with Dr Smith was as follows:\textsuperscript{355}

> My meeting with Sandra was in or around March 1984. It was awful. It was like an interrogation. Sandra sat me down and fired all sorts of questions at me like, ‘What happened?’, ‘When?’, ‘How many times?’. There was not the remotest sign of warmth or comfort or safety at all. It was a very traumatising experience. It wasn’t until much later on that I found out how close to Akhandananda Sandra had been.

Jyoti told the Royal Commission that while she had been at Gosford she had disclosed the abuse to her friend Ramthirtha, who had promised to stand by her.\textsuperscript{356} She knew that APO’s mother was also aware of her experiences.\textsuperscript{357} Jyoti later heard that Dr Smith, Ramthirtha and another swami went to the Mangrove ashram to confront Akhandananda. Jyoti said she was told Akhandananda denied the abuse and Shishy defended him, and that Akhandananda and Shishy said Jyoti was delusional, schizophrenic and on drugs.\textsuperscript{358}
Jyoti told the Royal Commission:  

I had gone out on a limb by telling these people about the abuse and in return I had been abandoned. I was shattered. I remember shaking uncontrollably with fear.

Jyoti gave evidence that in or around the time she spoke to Dr Smith she also telephoned Shishy to tell her what had happened and warned Shishy to find out if the other girls had experienced anything. Jyoti described Shishy’s response as hostile and that Shishy had said, ‘That is your bad luck if you can’t handle it’. She then threatened Jyoti with ‘libel action’ and told her to leave the Gosford ashram immediately.

Jyoti told the Royal Commission: ‘I was petrified. I felt completely unsafe and unsupported by Sandra and the swami around me at that time, and all my trust in people was shattered.’

APL told the Royal Commission that, when she was around 16, she was with Shishy at the Mangrove ashram when APO’s mother came to remove her son after she had found out about Akhandananda’s abuse of Jyoti. APL said APO’s mother confronted Shishy about Jyoti’s allegations against Akhandananda. APL said Shishy responded that APL was not her concern and that she should take her son and ‘get out’.

Jyoti said that she wrote to Dr Smith in around 2000, reminding her of their 1984 conversation and telling her how damaging it was not to be believed and supported. In a handwritten reply dated 15 September 2000, Dr Smith said she could hardly remember the incident, but she apologised for not ‘handling it better’.

Dr Smith’s evidence

During the public hearing, Dr Smith gave evidence that while she was at the Mangrove ashram she regarded Akhandananda as a ‘respected teacher and spiritual guide’.

Dr Smith said that she was ‘really upset’ about Jyoti’s disclosures in both 1984 and 2000. She told the Royal Commission that when Jyoti made the disclosure in 1984 she thought it was worth investigating and she and Ramthirtha went to confront Akhandananda about it.

Dr Smith said that Akhandananda and Shishy made up a story, which she believed. Although she could not recall their conversation exactly, she said it ‘probably’ happened as Jyoti had outlined — that is, Akhandananda and Shishy told Dr Smith that Jyoti was delusional and on drugs. Dr Smith recalled Shishy being engaged in that conversation.

In 1984, Dr Smith did not have a legal obligation to report suspected child abuse because the relevant legislation was not introduced until 1987. However, she gave evidence that she considered herself obligated to report suspected child abuse to police.
Dr Smith gave evidence that at the time she thought that Jyoti was in her late teens or early twenties and not a child (she was in fact 18 years old at the time). She told the Royal Commission that she understood, as at the date of the public hearing, that other children at the Mangrove ashram were sexually abused after 1984 and that she felt ‘extremely bad’ that she did not act to protect those children after Jyoti’s disclosure.

We consider that, in spite of the absence of a legal obligation to report, Dr Smith was a practising psychiatrist. At the very least, Jyoti’s report should have raised concern on her part about the potential risk to other children at the Mangrove ashram.

**Disclosure to Atmamuktananda**

During her evidence, Jyoti described visiting the Rocklyn ashram in 1997 or 1998, where she met with the head of that ashram, Atmamuktananda. Jyoti said she told Atmamuktananda about Akhandananda’s abuse and that Atmamuktananda responded, ‘Well, the girls were very provocative. … [Akhandananda] propositioned me once and I just said no.’

Jyoti gave the following evidence:

> I was horrified by [Atmamuktananda’s] comment that the girls at the Ashram (at Mangrove Mountain) were provocative. I felt as though she was suggesting that the children brought the abuse upon themselves. I have also heard Atma refer to the time of the abuses as a bit of a hiccup in the history, there was a bit of a disagreement, a difference of opinion.

**Atmamuktananda’s evidence**

Atmamuktananda gave evidence to the Royal Commission that she recalled visiting the Rocklyn ashram in around 1997 or 1998, after Akhandananda died in 1997.

Atmamuktananda said she recalled Jyoti raising the subject of Akhandananda’s abuse but could not recall whether Jyoti said that she herself had been abused. Atmamuktananda said she responded by saying that the girls were very flirt towards Akhandananda.

Atmamuktananda acknowledged that this was ‘probably not’ an appropriate comment to make to someone if they were in fact a victim of Akhandananda’s abuse. However, Atmamuktananda said that she did not say that she saw Jyoti specifically flirting with Akhandananda and she did not know if Jyoti was a victim. Atmamuktananda said that it was her ‘experience’ that she saw girls flirting, so that is why she said it to Jyoti.

Atmamuktananda did not accept, or did not understand, the proposition that Jyoti’s solicitor put to her that, as a person with authority at the Rocklyn ashram, she was condoning Akhandananda’s actions by suggesting to Jyoti that Akhandananda, in effect, ‘succumbed to the temptation of flirting girls’.
Atmamuktananda accepted that she told Jyoti that in around 1987 or 1988, before Akhandananda was charged, Akhandananda had propositioned her sexually while she was giving him a massage. Atmamuktananda said she rejected his advance and walked away.

We are satisfied that Atmamuktananda held a position of seniority and authority within the Australian Satyananda yoga movement at the time Jyoti disclosed to her. We are also satisfied that Atmamuktananda’s response to Jyoti’s disclosure was inappropriate and evidenced an apparent lack of understanding of how to respond to allegations of child sexual abuse within the Satyananda yoga community.

**Impact of the abuse**

Jyoti told the Royal Commission that it has always worried her that in 1984 others, including Shishy and Dr Smith, knew about the abuse but did nothing to prevent it. She told the Royal Commission, ‘If I had been heard back then in 1984, when I spoke out, the abuse could have been stopped right then and there saving the other girls several more years of abuse’.

Jyoti described the short-term and long-term impacts of Akhandananda’s sexual abuse on her. Her evidence included the following statement:

> Words can’t adequately describe how hard it was to adjust in those early years after I left the Ashram. Despite a few attempts, it has taken until now, 30 years later, to have my story properly heard.

> It still really stings when I talk about my sexual abuse. The loneliness and isolation was so terrible. I resent the impact it has had on my life, I have problems trusting people, I have felt worthless, because I have lived with the belief that I have to manage things alone and that my thoughts and feelings don’t matter. I have also had many problems with men. On and off over the years I have had therapy for post-traumatic stress and the effects of the abuse.

**APL**

**Initial involvement with the Mangrove ashram**

APL gave evidence to the Royal Commission that she was born in 1967 and first visited the Mangrove ashram in 1975, when she was around seven years old. Around three years later, APL’s father took her and her sister APK to live permanently at the Mangrove ashram, as their father wanted to complete the sannyasin training course. Their mother joined shortly afterwards. Her parents later separated.
APL gave evidence that when she first moved in she was aware of the custom of separating families and she told her father that she was terrified that would happen to them. 398 Although her father assured her that it would not happen, she was separated from him within months of moving into the ashram. 399

**Sexual abuse by Akhandananda**

APL gave evidence that Akhandananda first sexually abused her in 1983, when she was 15 years old, during a trip to the Bellingen, Lillian Rock and other New South Wales centres. 400 She said Shishy instructed her to go on the trip. 401

Throughout the trip, at each centre they stayed at, Akhandananda instructed APL to sleep in his room. 402 APL said that other people at the centres were aware they were sharing a room. 403 Each night, she said, Akhandananda told her to get into bed with him and take her clothes off and then he would ‘invade’ her with his hands and tell her she had to let him have sex with her.

Towards the end of the trip they returned to Bellingen. That night Akhandananda had sex with APL for the first time. 404 APL screamed in pain and Akhandananda told her the pain was her ‘Kundalini energy rising’. 405 APL recalled feeling violated and devastated when they had sex. 406

APL said that Akhandananda would make her massage him, then ‘do really degrading things like sit on my face and press his anus on my nose and shove his balls into my mouth’. 407 She said that in front of the other kids ‘he would grab my boobs and my crotch’ and call her ‘frigid’ if she fended him off. 408

APL gave evidence that Akhandananda threatened to kill APL if she told anyone about the abuse. APL was so miserable that sometimes she wished he would kill her. 409 She felt that the physical isolation of the ashram meant she could not conceive of escaping. 410

After Shishy left the ashram in 1985, APL said that the sexual harassment became worse and she was repeatedly abused by Akhandananda until she was able to escape in 1986. 411 At the same time she was aware of his sexual interest in a number of other children at the ashram. 412

APL’s allegations of sexual abuse against Akhandananda later became the subject of criminal proceedings. Akhandananda pleaded not guilty and disputed APL’s evidence. He was convicted, but the conviction was overturned on appeal, as discussed in section 6 of this report.

**Disclosure of the abuse to Shishy**

APL said that when they returned to the Mangrove ashram Shishy asked what happened. APL told her what had taken place and she said Shishy seemed surprised. Shishy said something like ‘Really, did he go all the way?’ and asked whether they actually had sex. APL said they did. 413
APL gave evidence that after this conversation Shishy regularly summoned APL to have sex with Akhandananda in the cabin Shishy shared with him. APL said Shishy would summon her at all hours of the night by waking her up in her room or passing a note to her directly or through Muktimurti. APL told the Royal Commission that sometimes when Akhandananda had sex with APL Shishy was also in the room.

Shishy’s and Muktimurti’s awareness of APL’s sexual abuse by Akhandananda is considered in detail in section 5 of this report.

**Impact of the abuse**

APL told the Royal Commission that her childhood had ‘ruined her life’. She gave the following evidence of the devastating long-term impact of the sexual abuse on her:

I haven’t been able to hold down a full-time job for much length of time. I have to take some form of sedative to be able to attend training sessions and workplace meetings because I have panic attacks in group situations. I have not been able to accumulate superannuation. I have been on and off welfare all my adult life.

I can’t have close friendships because it is too easy for people to have power over me. I can’t have long-term relationships. I have been attracted to abusive people in my past. ...

I have long periods of agoraphobia, depression and anxiety. I have worked really hard all my life to manage panic attacks and trauma, but I am not functioning as well as other people my own age. I feel left behind holding all this damage, while my peers have established careers, families, finances and impressive skill sets. I still feel like I am waiting for my past to get out of the way so I can start my life.

**APK**

**Initial involvement with the Mangrove ashram**

APK gave evidence to the Royal Commission that she moved to the Mangrove ashram with her sister APL in 1978, when she was eight or nine years old, and remained there until 1986.

**Contact with Shishy**

APK gave evidence that in about 1982 or 1983, when she was 13 years old, she talked to Shishy about being upset over feelings she had for a boy at the ashram. APK said that Shishy told her, in effect, ‘one day you will experience sex and it will be a spiritual experience at the hands of your guru’.
APK gave evidence that at about the same time Shishy made her spread her legs and expose herself in front of a group of children and adults one lunchtime, telling her that she wanted to see what she looked like ‘down there’. APL said that although it was humiliating and she initially tried to resist, she felt she risked a beating if she did not comply and she would still have had to expose herself.421

APK also gave the following written evidence:422

When I was 14 years old I got my period. I remember Shishy inserting a tampon inside my vagina to show me how to do it correctly. I don’t know if this was done out of genuine concern for me or otherwise, but it was certainly an uncomfortable experience that made me feel violated. I learned to insert my own tampons very quickly because I didn’t want Shishy doing it for me. We weren’t given the option of using sanitary pads so tampons were they only things we could use.

**Shishy’s evidence**

During her oral evidence, Shishy said that she had a ‘completely different memory’ of APK’s version of events. Shishy said that her memory was that she thought APK had a tick high up in the groin and asked APK to show her the area. When she did, Shishy realised she was not wearing any underpants and then she said ‘perhaps we should go elsewhere’.423

Shishy also gave evidence that she ‘got involved with at least two of the girls’ in teaching them about how to use sanitary pads and tampons. Shishy said that, with one of the girls, she assisted by putting her hand over the girl’s hand and guiding the tampon in. Shishy said that in doing this she was genuinely trying to assist the girl. Shishy accepted that this was an incredibly intimate relationship for the child to have with Shishy.424

**Sexual abuse by Akhandananda**

APK said she was first sexually abused by Akhandananda when she was 14 or 15 years old on an overnight trip to Canberra with Akhandananda.425 Over a number of nights, Akhandananda made APK get into his bed, subjected her to sexual touches and tried to cajole her into having sex with him.426 When she returned to the Mangrove ashram, he continued to pursue her for sex.427

**Disclosure of the abuse**

APK recalled that soon after returning to the ashram she confided in APA. APA revealed that she was also being sexually abused by Akhandananda, that it had been happening for some time and that it was also happening to some of the other girls.428

APK said she gave a statement to the police about her sexual abuse, but her case did not proceed to trial.429
Impact of the abuse

APK told the Royal Commission that she thought that her life at the Mangrove ashram ‘and the control and abuse’ that she suffered there has had a severe impact.\(^{430}\) She gave evidence that, for example, she still has a deep unease with people, is quite reclusive and finds it difficult to interact with people on an emotional level.\(^{431}\)

APA

Initial involvement with the Mangrove ashram

APA gave evidence that she lived at the Mangrove ashram from 1980 to 1986, when she was aged between 11 and 17.\(^ {432}\)

APA said that her parents became involved in Satyananda yoga in 1974 or 1975. Her mother was suffering from depression and anxiety and thought the yoga would help.\(^ {433}\) APA attended a number of ashram kids’ camps alone between about 1977 and 1980.\(^ {434}\)

She gave evidence that at the age of 11 she asked her parents if she could move to the Mangrove ashram. Although her father protested, her mother thought it was an opportunity for a better life and she was ultimately allowed to go.\(^ {435}\)

Sexual abuse by Akhandananda

APA gave evidence that Akhandananda began sexually abusing her in 1983, when she was around 13 or 14.\(^ {436}\) She recalled that Shishy ordered her, APK and APL to go to their room to massage Akhandananda and that one of the young boys, APQ, was required to massage Shishy on another bed in the room. APA said that Akhandananda, who was naked, ordered APA to massage his buttocks and then he rolled over and put her hand on his penis.\(^ {437}\)

On many subsequent occasions, when APA was required to say goodnight to Akhandananda, she said he put his hands up her shirt and felt her breasts.\(^ {438}\)

APA described several occasions when she was sexually abused by Akhandananda during trips that she was required to accompany him on. The first time that Akhandananda sexually abused her was in Bellingen in 1985. He told her that she had to learn about sexuality and that he was doing it ‘for [her] spiritual growth and for [her] learning’.\(^ {439}\) Akhandananda told her that she must never tell anyone and that if she did she would be ‘cast out’.

On subsequent trips APA was made to perform oral sex and forced to have sexual intercourse.\(^ {440}\) She gave evidence of an occasion when she and APH accompanied Akhandananda on a trip away
and both girls were sexually abused. When she returned to the Mangrove ashram, Akhandananda continued to have sex with her on a regular basis.\textsuperscript{441}

APA said Shishy regularly summoned her to attend on Akhandananda. At other times Ms Alecia Buchanan or Muktimurti would find her, sometimes waking her up to tell her or passing her a note to go to Akhandananda’s room.\textsuperscript{442} APA told the Royal Commission that on some ‘occasions while Akhandananda was in the act of having sex with me Shishy would enter the room for something and once or twice I heard her in another bed in the room while Akhandananda was having sex with me’.\textsuperscript{443}

APA’s allegations of sexual abuse against Akhandananda later became the subject of criminal proceedings. Akhandananda pleaded not guilty and disputed APA’s evidence. He was not convicted. Details of the criminal proceedings are set out in section 6 of this report.

**Impact of the abuse**

APA recently sought counselling and was diagnosed with ‘Severe Post Traumatic Stress Disorder’.\textsuperscript{444} She outlined some of the negative impacts of the sexual abuse, stating that it had hindered her development and career activities and resulted in sexual, social and family dysfunction.\textsuperscript{445}

**APH**

**Initial involvement with the Mangrove ashram**

APH gave evidence to the Royal Commission that she moved to the Mangrove ashram in 1979 with her brother and parents when she was seven years old.\textsuperscript{446} Her parents were soon sent to establish an ashram in northern New South Wales. For the next eight years APH lived at the Mangrove ashram unaccompanied. In evidence, she reflected on the personal impact of being separated from her parents and how vulnerable it made her to sexual abuse.\textsuperscript{447}

**Sexual abuse by Akhandananda**

APH said Akhandananda first demonstrated a sexual interest in her when she was nine. His advances progressed to indecent touching and by the time she was 13 there was more intrusive sexual abuse.\textsuperscript{448} APH recalled an occasion when she and APA were taken on a trip to Queanbeyan in New South Wales. At the spa at the motel, Akhandananda tried to put his big toe between her legs.\textsuperscript{449}

APH gave evidence about another incident at the Mangrove ashram when she was 13 or 14, when Akhandananda insisted that she and Alecia Buchanan get into bed beside him and take their clothes off. APH said.\textsuperscript{450}
he tried to coerce me to participate in sexual foreplay and he was touching me. I didn’t like it and I told him so. He then had intercourse with Alecia while I turned my back to them.

APH gave evidence of further incidences of abuse.451

APH told the Royal Commission that, when Akhandananda summoned her to massage him, the receptionist, APT, would call her over the PA system.452

APH’s allegations of sexual abuse were not the subject of criminal proceedings. However, her abuse was investigated by the then New South Wales Department of Youth and Community Services (see section 6 of this report).

Impact of the abuse

APH told the Royal Commission of the difficulties she had adjusting to the outside world when she left the Mangrove ashram and the long-term impact of the abuse. For many years she had problems knowing whom to trust.453 She explained that she was still vulnerable to exploitation and sometimes trusted too much or trusted the wrong people.454

APR

Initial involvement with the Mangrove ashram

APR gave evidence to the Royal Commission that she went to live at the Mangrove ashram with her mother (APT), father and sister in 1978 when she was three years old.455 Her father left shortly afterwards. Although her mother remained at the ashram and worked as the receptionist, she was physically separated from her children.456

APR recalled that Satyananda singled her out during his visits to Australia as being ‘special’ and that after her initiation ceremony, when she was seven years old, he declared that she had healing powers.457

Sexual abuse by Akhandananda

APR gave evidence of sexual abuse by Akhandananda that was somewhat different to the other children in that she said she was sexually abused by Akhandananda when she was very young and in a ritualistic setting.

APR told the Royal Commission that the ritual occurred in about 1983, when she was seven years old. It was around the time of her initiation ceremony in a hut near the river. Her evidence was that during the ritual she was held down by about five male swamis and Akhandananda had sexual
intercourse with her. While he was doing that he cut the skin between her breasts with a knife, licked the blood and then threw the blood in the fire. APR also recalled several men putting their penises in her mouth. APR said she now has a scar about an inch long down the centre of her chest.  

APR described another incident that happened when she was seven years old, when she was gang-raped by a group of ‘bikies’ just outside the gates of the Mangrove ashram. She said she subsequently developed thrush. She showed her mother, APT, who obtained medication for her.  

APR gave evidence that some of her memories of the two incidents when she was seven years old were fragmented and were recovered through therapy.  

In her evidence, APR also set out several examples of child-on-child sexual abuse at the Mangrove ashram, including, she said, two boys at the ashram having sex with her when she was about five or six years old.  

APR said that her mother made her feel like her sexuality was ‘volatile and dirty’ and would say things like ‘Turn off that sexuality, you’re just sitting there looking for sex’. When APR started going to church when she was 16, she said APT told her she thought it was so APR could ‘increase [her] smorgasbord of available men’.  

APR said that APT used to say similar things about the ashram kids. Up until a few years ago APT would say the girls walked around like ‘little sluts’ without bras or tops on. APR said she would reply: ‘Why didn’t anyone take them shopping to buy clothes?’ APR said, ‘I remember the women at the Ashram were always very angry with the girls because the men would start ogling the kids as they got older’.  

APR described another incident where a male swami attempted to rape her while they were walking up on the hillside to the Mangrove ashram. APR said she ran down to the ashram and immediately told her mother, who said to her words to the effect that everyone has been the victim of attempted rape at some stage and was dismissive. APT’s evidence on this incident is in her written statement and is addressed in section 5 of this report.

**Impact of the abuse**

APR gave evidence of the impact of her sexual abuse as follows:

I felt the impact of my abuse strongly from an early age. For example, when I was eight, I kept trying to figure out how to kill myself. I felt so dirty and I couldn’t have enough showers. I used to get in trouble because the Ashram was on water shortage and I used to shower as soon as I got home from school and stay in the shower until the warm water ran out. Whenever I would be punished, I took a shower. Even now, whenever I feel emotional pain rising inside me, I feel the need to shower and I stay there until the water goes cold. The desire to hurt myself is very strong and I’ve had to learn how to manage it.

...
I also constantly have nightmares reliving memories of being cut, and of the ritual when I was seven. My husband has woken up many times to me when I am having this nightmare, and my hands and legs are flat down on the bed, as if I am being pinned down.

... I have frequently suffered from flashbacks and regressions to my childhood, and my husband has found me hiding, or shaking, or me not knowing who he is.

Mr Tim Clark

Initial involvement with the Mangrove ashram

Mr Clark told the Royal Commission that his parents sent him to live at an ashram in northern New South Wales in the late 1970s following his father’s nervous breakdown. He went first to the Lillian Rock ashram. After seven or eight months he was moved to the Mangrove ashram, arriving in 1981 or 1982. He recalled that at that time there were a couple of hundred adult swamis and about 20 children of various ages from five to 15 years.

Sexual and physical abuse at the Mangrove ashram

Mr Clark gave evidence that in addition to the sustained physical beatings he received from Akhandananda (referred to in more detail below), he was sexually abused by him when he was required to stand naked in front of others at the ashram.

Several of the survivors of Akhandananda’s sexual abuse who gave evidence before the Royal Commission spoke of their clear memories of the abuse that Mr Clark suffered. APK told the Royal Commission that she recalled him being beaten and humiliated by Akhandananda. She also recalled that he was made to stand naked while Akhandananda humiliated him in front of the adults.

Mr Clark said that in around 1982, when he was 13 or 14 years old, a number of the teenage kids started to have sexual relationships with each other. He also said that he was sexually abused by several female swamis. He recalled that on one occasion, when he was a teenager, an older woman took him to a paddock at night and had sex with him. Mr Clark said he could still recall the shame of not being able to ejaculate.

Mr Clark told the Royal Commission that when Shishy had discovered that he was sexually active she acted in a more sexual way towards him. He said that he admitted to her that he was having sex and that there were times when he was ‘randy’. Mr Clark said Shishy told him that if he felt that way again he could come to her and talk about it and she would ‘sort him out’.
After that conversation, Mr Clark said, Shishy acted in a more sexual way, ‘doing things like flashing her vagina’ because they did not wear underwear at the ashram.\textsuperscript{475}

Mr Clark gave evidence that both Akhandananda’s and Shishy’s attitudes towards him seemed to change around the time he became sexually active. He said Akhandananda became aggressive and ‘started to slap [him] around’ and Shishy’s attitude and tone towards him also became much harder.\textsuperscript{476}

\textbf{Shishy’s evidence}

Shishy was asked in evidence about her conversations with and conduct towards Mr Clark. She did not admit that she had acted in a sexual way towards him\textsuperscript{477} but said that there was an instance where Mr Clark told her ‘some of his feelings’ and she was ‘sort of uncomfortable about the conversation’, so she filled up his mouth with paan (Indian betel nut) and they had ‘a bit of a laugh about that’.\textsuperscript{478} Her memory was that she had said to him that if he had anything he wanted to discuss with her he could come back and they would chat about it.

Shishy told the Royal Commission that if she had exposed herself to Mr Clark it would have been completely accidental.\textsuperscript{479} She suggested that she ‘withdrew a little bit from Tim after [their conversation] because [she] just felt a bit uncomfortable being in the position talking with him about that’.\textsuperscript{480}

Shishy gave evidence that she did not discuss her conversation with Mr Clark with Akhandananda and she never got a sense that Akhandananda was jealous of Mr Clark with respect to Shishy.\textsuperscript{481} Shishy gave evidence that Mr Clark ‘had a really hard time in the ashram at Akhandananda’s hands’ but that she could not say if the beatings got worse for him over time.\textsuperscript{482}

\textbf{Impact of the abuse}

Mr Clark gave evidence of the impact of his experiences, including the following:\textsuperscript{483}

In the 1990s I experienced a full emotional breakdown. I spoke to one of the Navy psychiatrists and I remember just sitting there in a chair in tears remembering the things the people from the Ashram did to me. Before this episode, I had been a good sailor and I was a really competent weapons systems technician and I enjoyed the work I did. However, after the breakdown, I just went into an intense period of drug and alcohol abuse that nearly killed me.

... [The ashram] took my childhood, they brainwashed me with strange values that did not fit with society, they took away opportunity by enslaving me instead of educating me like every other kid. They wrecked families and lives.
APV

Background

APV prepared a written statement for the Royal Commission but did not give evidence at the public hearing. In her statement she said that, when her brother was sent to live at the Lillian Rock ashram, she was sent to the ‘Nimbin Healing Centre’ away from her parents and brother. At the age of 11 she was sent to the Lillian Rock ashram because her brother had left by then. She stayed there until she was 13 or 14. In 1983 or 1984, Akhandananda sent her parents to establish an ashram in Armidale in New South Wales and she accompanied them.

Sexual abuse by Akhandananda

In her statement, APV said that on a trip to Brisbane with Akhandananda and APA she recalled swimming in a hotel pool and Akhandananda walked into the shower while both girls were naked. APV and APA were made to jump up and down so that Akhandananda could watch their breasts bounce.

APV also stated that in 1983 or 1984 Akhandananda visited the Armidale ashram to speak at a seminar and arranged for her to stay the night in his hotel. She told the Royal Commission that her parents thought she was safe because she was in the care of Akhandananda and he was considered a ‘highly evolved spiritual man’.

APV said she was sitting in a room with another swami when she was told to go and look after Akhandananda, who had a cold. When she went in Akhandananda was lying on the bed wearing a short dhoti that just covered his genitals. He told her that she would be staying the night, made her put her face on his stomach and then started to stroke her face and push her head down into his crotch. APV quickly jumped up and left the room.

After that, APV said Akhandananda encouraged APV’s parents to allow her to move in to the Mangrove ashram and she lived there from 1985 to 1987. She gave evidence that she was often sexually harassed by Akhandananda, who would grope her breasts and buttocks and make comments of a sexual nature, and she saw that he regularly sexually harassed ‘all of the teenagers’ at the ashram.

Impact of the abuse

APV said that her life has now become ‘happy, productive and rewarding’. However, she said that over the years she has watched her brother and friends ‘struggle with their histories of abuse by Akhandananda and Shishy’ and she has ‘seen the effects that this has had on their lives in terms of self-worth issues, physical and mental health, relationships, parenting concerns and just trying to live a “normal” life, which has been very emotionally painful at times’. 
**Initial involvement with the Mangrove ashram**

APB prepared a written statement for the Royal Commission but did not give evidence at the public hearing. In her statement APB described how she moved to the Mangrove ashram with her mother in 1979 when she was six years old. Three years later her mother was moved to a yoga centre in Victoria and APB was left at the ashram alone.\(^{493}\)

**Sexual abuse by Akhandananda**

In early 1986, when she was 13 years old, Akhandananda began making sexual advances towards her.\(^{494}\) He began by lifting up her top and fondling her breasts and by putting his tongue in her mouth to kiss her. After these incidents Akhandananda would tell her not to tell anybody because ‘they wouldn’t understand’.\(^{495}\)

APB’s sexual abuse was later the subject of criminal proceedings against Akhandananda.\(^{496}\) He pleaded not guilty and was not convicted. Further details on the criminal proceedings are below at section 6.

**Impact of the abuse**

APB said that ‘[o]verall, I feel that my time at the Ashram was a positive thing. I am glad I had that experience. While there were some negatives that occurred, I choose to focus on the positives’.\(^{497}\)

**APQ**

APQ did not give evidence to the Royal Commission.

During her evidence, Shishy admitted that she had met APQ at the Mangrove ashram when he was around 10 or 11 and had begun a sexual relationship with him before she left the ashram, when he was about 14 or 15 and she was around 25 years old.\(^{498}\) Shishy denied that the relationship had been building towards a sexual relationship at any time before then.\(^{499}\)

When asked in evidence how she now felt about having begun the sexual relationship with APQ when he was 14 or 15, she said that it was the ‘most shameful thing of her life’.\(^{500}\)

Shishy said the only reason she started a relationship with APQ was because Akhandananda told her to. She said that Akhandananda told her to ‘start initiating [APQ] the same way’ that Akhandananda did to the girls and ‘he became extremely violent’ when she refused.\(^{501}\) Shishy said that it is one of
the things that she really resents Akhandananda for. Shishy gave evidence that, before she left the ashram, Akhandananda told her she had to ‘move on to the next boy’.

Shishy told the Royal Commission that the relationship with APQ continued for at least four years after Shishy left the Mangrove ashram and they had a child together. Shishy admitted that Akhandananda did not force her to be in a relationship with APQ after she left the ashram in 1985. Shishy was about 28 years old when she left the ashram and APQ was about 17 or 18 years old.

3.2 Physical abuse

Fourteen former residents gave evidence that they experienced and/or witnessed physical abuse of children by Akhandananda and Shishy at the Mangrove ashram. These children were then aged between four and 18 years and included a child with brain damage.

Evidence was given that the physical abuse ranged from slaps to repeated striking of the head and body with heavy objects. Discipline included hard labour, starvation, humiliation through public nudity, prolonged yoga poses and standing in the river. Mr Clark said, ‘I learned that if I dissented from things, I would get a slap or some form of punishment’.

There was evidence that the children were also exposed to public physical abuse of adults by Akhandananda. Such public abuse included Akhandananda beating adults with a stick and throwing men down a well.

Each day after dinner, the children and adults would be required to attend ‘satsang’, which was a lecture given by Akhandananda or Satyananda. Several witnesses said that they felt Akhandananda used satsang as an opportunity to mock or humiliate people. APR described Akhandananda calling her to the stage during satsang one evening when she was eight or nine years old and hitting her in the face several times for smoking.

Shishy gave evidence that Akhandananda physically abused her throughout their relationship. She said this included regular slaps, cutting with a knife and beatings with Akhandananda’s ‘Kundalini’ stick.

Shishy’s evidence

During her oral evidence to the Royal Commission, Shishy accepted that she physically disciplined the children but disputed that the discipline was as severe as alleged.

Specifically, Shishy said that it was ‘quite common’ for her to slap the children on the cheek, sometimes very hard. However, she denied hitting any child hard enough to affect their sight or hearing or ever using an object to hit a child.
In response to specific incidents of alleged physical abuse or neglect put to Shishy during her oral evidence, she denied that the incidents occurred or gave alternative recollections of the incidents or said she could not recall the alleged incidents.\(^{523}\)

Shishy told the Royal Commission that in disciplining the children she was following an ‘implied’ directive by Akhandananda to do so. However, Shishy accepted that she exercised some discretion as to how she did this.\(^{524}\)

Shishy also gave evidence that, at the time, she believed that her physical discipline of the children was for their own spiritual enlightenment. She said this reflected her understanding of her own physical discipline, which she said Akhandananda described to her as ‘prasad’ or a special gift.

**Former residents’ evidence**

Shishy’s account of why she hit the children contrasted with the evidence of the former child residents, who described Shishy as ‘terrifying’ and ‘unpredictable’, with a ‘fierce temper’ and who would beat the children ‘in a rage’.\(^{525}\) She was also described as being ‘quite mean to the children at times’\(^{526}\) and as being ‘violent’.\(^{527}\) According to APR, ‘the children used to joke about the “wrath of Shishy”. When Shishy hit you, she hit you hard. If you fell over, she hit you again. She had rages’.\(^{528}\)

Evidence was given that there was no predictable disciplinary routine established at the Mangrove ashram apart from the fact that ‘it was only managed by Shishy and Akhandananda’.\(^{529}\) Former child residents described various incidents, such as:

- Shishy sweeping into the room where the children were doing schoolwork and whacking one of the children with the full force of her open hand\(^{530}\)
- Ms Buchanan being smacked across the face so hard that she experienced temporary dizziness and an inability to see\(^{531}\)
- APA being hit by Shishy against a wall, resulting in her head repeatedly hitting the wall after every slap\(^{532}\)
- Shishy smashing APL across the head at random\(^{533}\) and on other occasions beating her\(^{534}\)
- Shishy cracking APL across the head for ‘being weak and sleeping on the job’\(^{535}\)
- Shishy beating APK numerous times, including on one occasion beating her so hard she was unable to control her bladder\(^{536}\)
- Shishy beating APA for not having completed her schoolwork on time\(^{537}\)
- the children having to line up to be slapped by Shishy\(^{538}\)
- being hit by Shishy for being dirty\(^{539}\)
- being badly beaten and physically abused.\(^{540}\)
Counsel for Shishy submitted that:

- any finding that Shishy used physical violence should be viewed ‘in the context of Akhandananda’s physical abuse of Shishy ... as the culture of discipline within the [Mangrove] Ashram’;\(^{541}\)
- some of the allegations that Shishy struck children ‘more forcibly or violently are inconsistent with the accounts given at an earlier time when recollections were undoubtedly more reliable’;\(^{542}\)

We understand that the reference by counsel for Shishy to ‘an earlier time’ is a reference to the criminal proceedings against Akhandananda.

**Conclusions**

The evidence of the former child residents of the ashram was consistent in its description of the physical violence that Shishy used and was contrary to her own account given during the public hearing.

We accept the evidence of Jyoti, Ms Buchanan, APL, APK, APA, APH, APR and Mr Clark. We are satisfied that Shishy used physical violence against Ms Buchanan, APL, APK, APA, APH, APR and Mr Clark on a number of occasions between 1978 and 1985 and that physical violence caused those children significant fear at the time.

We are satisfied that, in giving evidence before the Royal Commission, Shishy sought to minimise the extent of her physical abuse of the children. We accept that she had unpredictable and violent outbursts which induced considerable fear and distress in a number of children. We do not agree that the accounts of physical abuse given by witnesses before the Royal Commission are inconsistent with earlier accounts. Rather, we consider that any evidence of Shishy’s physical violence given during Akhandananda’s criminal trial must be understood in the context in which it was given – that is, it was a criminal trial of Akhandananda’s conduct; it was not an examination of Shishy’s conduct.

We are satisfied that the physical violence that Shishy used against the children should be viewed in the broader context of the culture of discipline at the Mangrove ashram.
4 Barriers to the children’s capacity to disclose abuse

The Royal Commission heard considerable evidence about the belief system and culture that operated at the Mangrove ashram between at least 1975 and 1987.

We are satisfied that Satyananda yoga doctrine in Australia at the relevant time and as interpreted and applied by Akhandananda, together with the particular belief system and culture at the Mangrove ashram, created significant barriers to the capacity of child victims of Akhandananda’s sexual abuse to disclose to adults or peers, both inside and outside the ashram, who may have otherwise been able to help those victims. This is so for the reasons discussed below.

4.1 Isolation

It is clear that initiation at a young age into a belief system which requires a person to devote themselves, at least to some extent, to a 'guru' and give up their name, their personal property, their hair, their clothes and their connection with mainstream community through schooling and other means results in a loss of identity and isolation from the mainstream whilst simultaneously creating a sense of belonging. In the case of the Mangrove ashram, we are satisfied that that loss of identity and simultaneous sense of belonging created a dependence upon those in positions of authority at the ashram.

We heard evidence from one former child resident about how special Akhandananda had made her feel when she first visited the Mangrove ashram and how he had encouraged her to stay there longer. We also heard evidence from at least one former child resident that the residents all understood that if they defied Akhandananda they would be cast out from the ashram. We also heard evidence that essential services such as schooling after primary school and medical services were largely undertaken by the Mangrove ashram under the guidance of Akhandananda, Shishy and Dr Sztulman.

We are satisfied that the degree to which the children at the Mangrove ashram were isolated from mainstream community services meant that they were unlikely to turn to outside authorities, such as the police or school, to report abuse.

4.2 Separation from parents

It is clear that the practice of isolating children further within the confines of the Mangrove ashram by separating them from their parents created a further dependence of those children on those who filled the void left by that separation – namely, Akhandananda and Shishy.

We heard evidence that children were limited in, and sometimes denied, the opportunity to speak to their parents, who had been sent by Akhandananda to work at other yoga centres and ashrams around the country. We received unchallenged written evidence of parents who tried to contact their children at the Mangrove ashram being denied that contact. We heard evidence of children being denied the right to leave the ashram to holiday with their families who lived outside the ashram. We also heard evidence of a cult-like dependence of a number of children on Shishy, who clearly played a significant role in their lives in the absence of their parents.
The teachings and practice of Satyananda yoga at the Mangrove ashram between 1978 and 1987 actively discouraged close relationships between parents and children. That provided children with less access to their parents and made it more difficult for them to disclose sexual abuse by Akhandananda to a trusted adult.

4.3  Fear of reprimand

It is clear that the culture of violence and humiliation that Akhandananda fostered at the Mangrove ashram gave the children who lived there a fear of reprimand that prevented them from disclosing their sexual abuse. The fact that Akhandananda’s violent discipline of adults and children alike was not challenged by any other adult in the ashram who gave evidence only served to fortify the children’s fear of reprimand. The level of both physical and sexual abuse at the ashram meant that violence was normalised for children resident at the ashram from a very early age.

We heard evidence of threats of significant harm, including death, by reference to Akhandananda’s gun. We heard evidence of grown men being beaten with a stick in front of adult onlookers. We also heard considerable evidence of beatings of children delivered by both Akhandananda and Shishy.

We are satisfied that the physical abuse that the children experienced or witnessed contributed to a culture of fear of Akhandananda that prevented children from disclosing their sexual abuse.

4.4  Guru–disciple relationship

It is clear on the evidence before the Royal Commission that the devotion to the guru–disciple relationship that was required in the practice of Satyananda yoga at the Mangrove ashram ultimately culminated in a complete and unquestioning trust by both adults and children alike in the erratic and irrational actions and directions of Akhandananda as the guru. Significant power was vested in Akhandananda and Satyananda, whom members of the Mangrove ashram community considered to be spiritually enlightened.

4.5  Conclusions

We are satisfied that the Mangrove ashram was a closed community which was underpinned by rituals and a belief system that made it untenable for the children to report Akhandananda’s behaviour to any adult or person subservient to Akhandananda. Specifically, Jyoti, Ms Buchanan, APL, APK, APA, APH, APR, APB, APV and Mr Clark were limited in their capacity to disclose any instances of abuse because of the closed nature of the Mangrove ashram community, which was led by the perpetrators of their abuse.
5  Awareness of sexual abuse in the 1970s and 1980s

5.1  Shishy

APA and APL told the Royal Commission that Shishy would sometimes be present in the room when Akhandananda was sexually abusing them. Ms Buchanan said that Shishy was in the room on at least one occasion. APA, APL, Ms Buchanan and APH all said that Shishy often summoned them to Akhandananda’s room, where they were then sexually abused.

Shishy gave evidence that between 1982 and 1985 she summoned a number of girls to Akhandananda’s room at Akhandananda’s request. She said that she was also asked to summon adult females and that she was aware that Akhandananda was summoning them for sex.

Shishy told the Royal Commission that, of the girls she summoned for Akhandananda, she only ‘knew for certain that he was having sex with [Ms Buchanan and APL],’ both of whom she believed were 14 or 15 at the time. Shishy said that she became aware that Akhandananda was sexually abusing Ms Buchanan and APL when ‘on separate occasions he brought them into his room where [she] was in another bed and had sex with them.’ Shishy said that these two incidents happened in around 1983 and that she ‘found it excruciating, and from then onwards [she] made every effort to never be there again.’

Shishy explained why she did not object or intervene:

When I (or any other women) had sex with Satyananda, his consort was always ‘asleep’ in her bed in the same room. When Akhandananda had sex with the two girls I knew about, this is what I was expected to do. I remember trying desperately to be asleep so that I couldn’t hear him conducting sexual relations in his bed across the other side of the room.

Shishy told the Royal Commission that, although she was concerned for the girls that Akhandananda was sexually abusing, she did not have any memory of ‘expressing concern to him about [the girls] specifically, because [she] accepted that that was the way it was’.

Shishy said she never challenged Akhandananda about being in the same room when Akhandananda was abusing APL and Ms Buchanan and she accepted that they might feel deeply betrayed about her being in the same room. She said she felt ‘deeply remorseful about it’.

Shishy told the Royal Commission that Akhandananda represented that sex with Ms Buchanan and APL was for ‘spiritual initiation purposes’. Shishy said that she believed him and that she genuinely thought that the sex was for the children’s spiritual enlightenment.

Shishy told the Royal Commission that she did not consider what Akhandananda was doing with APL and Ms Buchanan to be ‘abuse’ at the time. However, Shishy accepted that she had completed her HSC by that stage and knew what Akhandananda was doing was illegal under Australian law.
Other children

In relation to the other girls she summoned, Shishy said that at the time she believed they were only massaging Akhandananda. She acknowledged that now that sounds naïve.\(^{561}\) She also accepted that, if she had suspected that Akhandananda was having sex with other children, she would have assumed that that was okay.\(^{562}\)

In fact, there was evidence that Shishy suspected that Akhandananda was having sex, or intended to have sex, with APH and APK.

In her written statement, Shishy stated that in 1984 APH came to her ‘distressed at the prospect of accompanying [Akhandananda] on a trip’.\(^{563}\) Shishy said APH was around 14 years old\(^{564}\) and that this was after the period of time in which Akhandananda had slept with one of the children when Shishy was in the same room.\(^{565}\)

Shishy gave evidence that APH would not tell her why she did not want to go on the trip, but Shishy had ‘serious suspicions’ that Akhandananda ‘was either having sex with her or attempting to’.\(^{566}\)

Shishy said that she confronted Akhandananda and told him that APH ‘would not be going away with him’. She said that Akhandananda was very angry and beat Shishy along her shins in the ‘worst beating’ she had received.\(^{567}\)

Shishy also told the Royal Commission that in 1984 APK told her that Akhandananda ‘is always trying to get us girls’.\(^{568}\) Shishy said that what she assumed APK meant by this was that Akhandananda was trying to have sexual intercourse with the girls.\(^{569}\)

Shishy accepted that she knew by 1982 that Akhandananda had a liking for sexual violence and that one of the ways that Akhandananda would encourage people towards sexual intercourse was to ask them to massage him.\(^{570}\)

Shishy gave evidence that, retrospectively, she could see that she facilitated child sexual abuse by Akhandananda. However, she said that at the time she did not see it that way.\(^{571}\)

Shishy accepted in oral evidence that she exercised independent choice in removing herself from the room when Akhandananda was having sex with the children.\(^{572}\) Shishy accepted that she left the children while they were being sexually abused and went to do officework.\(^{573}\)

Reporting

Shishy gave evidence that the ‘climate’ in which they were living at the Mangrove ashram was not normal\(^{574}\) and she did not think to report the abuse to anybody because she did not see it as abuse.\(^{575}\) She said she did not fully appreciate how wrong Akhandananda’s conduct was until she left the ashram, but while she was there she had felt a growing sense of unease and discomfort.\(^{576}\)
However, she did accept that she could drive at the time Akhandananda began having sex with the children and she had opportunities to visit the outside world.577

Shishy gave evidence that she did not tell anyone while she was at the Mangrove ashram that Akhandananda was sexually abusing children.578 Shishy acknowledged that she did not act to protect the children from Akhandananda and said that it was one of the things that she now felt ashamed about.579

Counsel for Shishy submitted that ‘the physical and sexual violence used by Akhandananda towards Shishy and his control over her prevented her from protecting the children from [his] sexual abuse and from disclosing to others during her time at the [Mangrove] Ashram’.580

Conclusions

We are satisfied that Shishy was aware, based on her own observations, that Akhandananda sexually abused Ms Buchanan and APL in or around 1982 or 1983. We are also satisfied that Shishy was aware that Akhandananda’s conduct was criminal and she did not report his conduct to the authorities in a timely way to protect the children from further abuse. We accept Shishy’s evidence that she felt ashamed and deeply remorseful for not reporting Akhandananda’s conduct to the authorities.

We accept that Shishy’s relationship with Akhandananda became increasingly violent and that this, at least in part, was a reason why Shishy did not intervene to protect the girls from Akhandananda’s abuse. However, it is clear that at the time she became aware of the sexual abuse Shishy was an adult in a position of considerable authority (perceived or otherwise) at the Mangrove ashram. She knew that at least two children were being sexually abused by Akhandananda and did not at the time act to stop that abuse or seek the support and/or advice of others to stop that abuse.

5.2 Muktirmitri

Ms Alecia Buchanan said that Muktirmitri often summoned her to visit Akhandananda. She said in her statement that this occurred at a time when she was looking after APO, a four-year-old boy. She explained that when she was summoned she would ‘leave APO alone in my office, asleep on the floor, while I walked to another building and was let in through various doors to the “back room” by Muktirmitri or Shishy or both’.581

With reference to summoning Ms Buchanan to Akhandananda’s room, Muktirmitri told the Royal Commission that she ‘can recall absolutely and categorically it never happened’.582

APL also described Muktirmitri summoning her to go to Akhandananda’s room. She said that sometimes Shishy woke her up, but on other occasions Shishy ‘would have a note delivered to me by Muktirmitri’.583
In her statement Muktimurti said that ‘I don’t recall being asked to fetch any of the children for Shishy or Akhandananda late at night’.\textsuperscript{584} In her oral evidence, she said she did not recall taking notes from Shishy to APL during the night,\textsuperscript{585} although she agreed that it was her job to take messages, ‘so if I was called and asked to fetch somebody or to take a note to somebody, of course I would do it’.\textsuperscript{586}

APA had a similar experience and said in her statement:\textsuperscript{587}

\[
\text{[I] was regularly summoned by Shishy to go into their hut to have sex with Akhandananda. She used to make Bibble (Alecia Buchanan) or her assistant, Muktimurti come and find me, sometimes waking me up and tell me either verbally or by passing me a note to go into Akhandananda’s room. When I went to his room I was ushered in through a back door by Shishy or Muktimurti.}
\]

Muktimurti told the Royal Commission that she could recall none of these events and, in particular, that she ‘would never be told – tell somebody to come into the bedroom’.\textsuperscript{588}

Muktimurti also gave evidence that a loudspeaker system operated at the ashram and that it was used on occasions to call people to the office for a variety of reasons.\textsuperscript{589}

In her statement to the Royal Commission, Muktimurti described her involvement with the Mangrove ashram between 1978 and 1986. She came to live at the ashram in November 1978, when she was 17 years old.\textsuperscript{590} When she was 19, in 1980, she commenced work as Shishy’s office assistant and stayed in this role until early 1986.\textsuperscript{591} She described her role by saying she was ‘very much the gofer at the Ashram, and didn’t have any real authority. I was a junior sort of assistant’.\textsuperscript{592} Shishy agreed with this description, giving evidence that ‘Mukti was always just a gofer’.\textsuperscript{593}

In her statement, Muktimurti described herself in the ‘early years’ as being ‘very innocent and inexperienced’ and that ‘it never occurred to me that people were even having sexual relationships at the Ashram’.\textsuperscript{594}

We are satisfied that Muktimurti did play some part in summoning at least Ms Buchanan, APL, APA and APH to Akhandananda’s room. However, we consider it possible that Muktimurti did not know why she was summoning those children.

This possible lack of awareness may be explained by the culture and belief system inculcated into the adult residents at the Mangrove ashram. This belief system was underpinned by a blind trust that Akhandananda remained celibate and would only act to enhance his disciples’ path to enlightenment. Muktimurti presented as a vulnerable and dependent individual who was willing to accept the ‘belief system’ and culture of the ashram in an unquestioning way.
5.3 APT

APT prepared a statement for the Royal Commission but did not give evidence at the public hearing. In her statement to the Royal Commission, APT described how she came to live at the Mangrove ashram in around October 1978. She brought her two daughters, APS and APR, with her. Akhandananda initiated her as a sannyasin in February 1980 at her request. In about September 1981, she started working at reception. She worked there during the day but at times also late into the night.

In her statement, APT described how Akhandananda ‘used to carry APR around and give her special attention, but [she] did not suspect that there was anything sexual happening’. She also said that whenever she wanted to spend time with her daughter she ‘was always told by Akhandananda to get back to work’.

APT said in her statement:

While I was at the Ashram I did suspect that something was happening between APL and Akhandananda. I saw what I suspected to be sexual interactions between them at reception. For example, when APL was around 15 years old I saw Akhandananda sitting on the steps of reception and APL walk[ed] over [to] straddle him, facing him.

She said in her evidence that she ‘thought it was really inappropriate’.

In her statement, APT also said that Akhandananda had made sexual overtures to her but that she had rebuffed him. During a trip away, which was also attended by Ms Buchanan, APT gave evidence that she was called into Akhandananda’s room and he put his fingers inside her. He then asked her to send Ms Buchanan to his room, but she said that all she ‘could hear was a lot of giggling, no grunting or groaning which would suggest sexual behaviour’.

Ms Buchanan gave evidence that the receptionist or Muktimurti often summoned her very publicly over the loudspeaker to go to Akhandananda’s room late at night. APH also gave evidence that APT used to call her over the PA system and then call Muktimurti, who would tell her that Akhandananda wanted a massage.

APT said in her written statement that when APR was seven years old she came to her ‘saying that she was itchy in her vagina’ and that it ‘took all her courage’ to show APT. APT said she saw that APR had a ‘urinary tract infection or something similar, and her vagina was red’. In her statement, APT wrote that:

That was another time where I wasn’t there for [APR]. I just thought that the kids were just having it off with each other, because I had once sprung two kids having sex in the Hexagon together. I just thought that that’s what they were doing. I didn’t think. I must have seemed like such as stupid woman.
In her statement, APT described an occasion when her daughter, APR, who was seven years old, told her mother that a man had tried to rape her. APT’s response was ‘[d]arling, everybody’s been tried to be raped’. She also described seeing APQ (when he was 14) act in a ‘lovey-dovey’ manner with Shishy and that there were rumours that they were in a sexual relationship.

APT stated that it was not until 2007, after she had left the ashram, that APR told her she and other children had been sexually abused.

APA gave evidence that she told APT about an incident where a man had taken her on a motorbike ride away from the ashram and had insisted that she take off her clothes.

5.4 Dr Sandra Smith

As discussed in section 3 of this report, Jyoti gave evidence that in 1984 she told Dr Smith that she had been sexually abused by Akhandananda.

Dr Smith gave evidence that she now realises that other children were sexually abused after Jyoti made her disclosure to her and the fact that she did not act to protect children at the Mangrove ashram makes her feel ‘extremely bad’.

Dr Smith acknowledged that there were things that should have made her suspicious about Akhandananda (including that she knew he had attended tantric sex workshops, heard him comment inappropriately about APA’s breasts and saw Ms Buchanan waiting outside his hut late one night). However, she agreed that the relationship that she had with Akhandananda blinded her to the risk that he would sexually abuse children, notwithstanding her training and practice as a psychiatrist.

In about 1987, Dr Smith received further disclosures of sexual abuse. She gave evidence that she was ‘horrified but not surprised’ by these further disclosures given that she had seen Ms Buchanan outside Akhandananda’s hut.

Having received the further reports of sexual abuse, Dr Smith gave evidence that she told APD, who was then a police officer with the NSW Police at Gosford. She said that she and APD later (although it is unclear on the evidence before the Royal Commission how much later) went with a solicitor to the Gosford Police Station to report the girls’ disclosures.

In 1987, three years after Dr Smith received the first allegation from Jyoti, a number of girls (Ms Buchanan, APL, APK, APH and APA) disclosed abuse to Dr Smith. Dr Smith assisted in reporting that abuse to authorities and supporting the children who disclosed the offences at that time.
6 Disclosures, police investigation, Akhandananda’s arrest and criminal proceedings

6.1 Shishy’s actions and disclosures

Shishy leaves the ashram: 1985

Shishy gave evidence that she left the Mangrove ashram on 28 December 1985, when she was around 28 years old.  

APL said that Shishy left ‘in the dead of night when Akhandananda was away’ and that the night before she got APL to load up the ashram’s van with household items. APL said that the next morning ‘we were in total shock. All the kids felt abandoned’.

Several witnesses said Shishy left letters of goodbye. APL said Shishy also left a separate letter to her instructing her to ‘take extra special care of Akhandananda’s needs and move in with him and help him get over me leaving’ and saying that ‘he will probably be particularly distressed and angry with me, and you have to do your duty even more’.  

APL said she interpreted Shishy’s letter to mean that Shishy ‘wanted Akhandananda to abuse me as much as he needed, so it would be easier for her to get away’. APL said she felt ‘so betrayed’ and like she ‘had been served up like a lamb to the slaughter’.

Shishy gave evidence that when she left the ashram she left two letters for the children: the first she left on her desk, which she anticipated Akhandananda would read; and the second she left with her mother, which she said told the children that if they needed to contact her they were to go through her mother.

At that time Shishy’s mother, AQA, was still at the Manly ashram but was returning to the Mangrove ashram on weekends.

Shishy said she could not specifically remember what she wrote in the letter she left on her desk, because ‘it was the second letter that was the one that was the most important to [her]’. However, she accepted that writing something to the children to the effect that they should serve Akhandananda was entirely in keeping with what she thought should happen with the guru-disciple relationship.

Shishy accepted the proposition put to her by APL’s solicitor, which was that, from the perspective of the children who were sexually abused by Akhandananda, they might consider that Shishy ‘left them in the hands of a paedophile’ who Shishy knew was abusing them.
Shishy’s meeting with the children and trip to India: 1986

Shishy gave evidence that it was not until after she left the Mangrove ashram that she really appreciated that what Akhandananda was doing to the children sexually was wrong. She said that she did not immediately go to the police because it took a while to ‘find [her] mind again’. Once she had, she ‘arranged to have a meeting with the children, or, you know, the young people that were – because some of them were more like 17, 18 by then – a meeting with them up the road one night’. She said this meeting was more than six months after she left the ashram.

Shishy gave evidence that after meeting with the children she ‘went to India and confronted Satyananda unsuccessfully in around 1986. In her evidence, she said that when she got to India she met Niranjan at the gates of the ashram. The following day she met with Satyananda in his private quarters. She said she represented to Satyananda that the sexual abuse of children at the Mangrove ashram was wrong and that he had to fix it.

In response, Satyananda indicated that ‘it’s always been thus’ and pointed to the various women in the room, including Shishy, whom he had had sex with. Shishy said she could see that there was ‘nothing to come out of the conversation’ and returned to Australia.

APA gave evidence that Shishy told her she was going to India to confront Satyananda about the abuse. However, she did not understand why, ‘[b]ecause you report child abuse to the police, not to India’.

Shishy gave the following evidence:

It’s very hard to convey that I didn’t really understand anything much outside of the ashram system. I just didn’t. I still had some kind of false, ridiculous, ignorant hope that from the top down in the institution, something would happen to fix it. And it really wasn’t until that was unsuccessful and I came back to Australia and spoke to my lawyer friend that I guess I had a concept of, you know, the world that says this is wrong and that other action had to be taken.

Shishy’s disclosure to Mr Craig Leggat SC

Shishy gave the following account of what happened after she returned from India in 1986:

I actually rang and got a message to [APH], who was still in the ashram, and said to her, ‘Please start telling your parents, because nothing’s going to happen from India. Nothing is going to happen. Please start telling your parents and I will support you one hundred per cent’. I don’t actually know what happened in the scheme of things after that, but it wasn’t long after that that I spoke to my lawyer friend and he said – and it was then that we agreed that it would be reported, because he said to me, ‘This has to be reported’.
Shishy said that ‘it’ was reported ‘only a matter of days’ later.640

According to his written statement to the Royal Commission, Mr Craig Leggat SC said he received a telephone call from Shishy in 1986 or 1987. The telephone call was short and he took no notes.

Mr Leggat stated that Shishy ‘said something about allegations of sexual abuse of children at the Ashram’ and that he said, ‘This must be reported to the police. I am going to ring Gosford police’. Mr Leggat said that immediately after the telephone call he called the Gosford Police Station and spoke to a male detective. He told the detective he had been given information about alleged sexual abuse of children at the Mangrove ashram. The detective said he would call Mr Leggat back if he required any further information. Mr Leggat did not hear further from the police.641

Shishy accepted that she received a call from the police concerning Akhandananda’s sexual abuse of the children.642 She did not personally contact the police.

6.2 Ms Alecia Buchanan’s disclosure to her mother

Soon after Ms Buchanan left the Mangrove ashram in 1986 she disclosed to her mother, Ms Elisabeth Buchanan, that she and other children had been sexually abused by Akhandananda.643

Dr Smith said that around February 1987 Ms Elisabeth Buchanan came to her house and told her that her daughter Alecia had disclosed that Akhandananda had sexually abused her and other girls at the Mangrove ashram.644

Dr Smith said she was ‘horrified, but not surprised’,645 because she had once seen Alecia sitting outside Akhandananda’s room late at night.

A few days later, Dr Smith accompanied Ms Elisabeth Buchanan to the Mangrove ashram and spoke with five of the girls down at the river: Ms Alecia Buchanan, APL, APK, APH and APA. Dr Smith said that they each told her consistent stories of being sexually abused by Akhandananda.646

As described above in section 5, Dr Smith said that she passed on this information to APA’s father APD, who was then a serving police officer. APD and Dr Smith then went with a solicitor to the Gosford Police Station to report the sexual abuse.647
6.3 APA’s disclosure to her father

At around the same time that Ms Buchanan told her mother about the abuse, APA, who had recently returned home to live with her father, APD, told her father that Akhandananda had been having sex with her. In his written statement to the Royal Commission, APD said that, when APA told him about some of the sexual abuse by Akhandananda, he believed her and acted immediately to assist her and other children who came forward with complaints at that time.

In a statement prepared for the Royal Commission, APD described how in February 1987 he confronted Akhandananda about the sexual abuse. He said that Akhandananda initially denied it, suggesting that the allegations were part of a plot by Shishy to take over the ashram.

APD gave evidence that he then spoke with his daughter again and was convinced that she was telling the truth. APD recalled that he spoke to Akhandananda again on 21 February 1987. In that conversation Akhandananda admitted he had sexually abused APA and other children.

In his statement APD described how he visited the Mangrove ashram on a few subsequent occasions to speak with other victims of abuse. Later he visited the police station to make a verbal report and provide a written statement. A police investigation then commenced, resulting in Akhandananda’s arrest in June 1987.

6.4 Disclosure to Department of Youth and Community Services

On 19 March 1987, the then Newcastle Community Welfare Centre received a notification of allegations of sexual abuse of two children at the Mangrove ashram. The children were APH and her younger brother. APH was 14 years old at the time. In March 1987, APH and her brother were living with her parents at an ashram in Newcastle.

In March 1987, the only Child Protection Officer with the then New South Wales Department of Youth and Community Services in the Newcastle area was Ms Shirley Hetherington. Ms Hetherington prepared a statement for the Royal Commission but did not give evidence in the public hearing.

In her statement, Ms Hetherington described how she received the notification and then made a number of telephone calls, including several calls to the police, before interviewing APH. Ms Hetherington said that she was aware that Akhandananda was under police investigation from the outset of her inquiry.
Meetings with APH and API

In early April 1987, Ms Hetherington and a ‘generalist’ officer from the department interviewed APH at Newcastle High School in the company of the school counsellor. In her statement Ms Hetherington said that her impression of APH was that she was ‘a confident, bright, strong and determined girl who would not hesitate in voicing or reporting her concerns’.

In oral evidence, APH was shown some handwritten notes apparently taken during the interview by Ms Hetherington’s departmental colleague. APH told the Royal Commission that the notes reflected her own recollection that at the time she:

- did not have concerns for her younger brother
- wanted Akhandananda charged for what he had done to her and others
- had told her parents that she did not want to be alone with Akhandananda.

In her statement, Ms Hetherington described how the next day she and her colleague interviewed APH’s father, API. She said that, when she spoke with API, she told him that she believed that his daughter had presented a truthful account of what had happened at the Mangrove ashram. Ms Hetherington described in her statement how she observed that API appeared to find it ‘difficult to be confronted with the fact that the police were taking the allegations against [Akhandananda] seriously’. However, Ms Hetherington recalled that API ultimately assured her that APH would not be left unsupervised in Akhandananda’s company.

In her statement, Ms Hetherington explained that, although she thought API may not be able to confront the truth of the allegations, she also felt that ‘he appreciated how serious the allegations were and he understood the obligations he had as a parent to APH and [her brother]’.

In her statement, Ms Hetherington explained that she believed that APH was telling the truth. She also believed that the police were investigating the abuse that APH alleged. She described how she had ‘full confidence’ that APH’s family ‘finally understood’ the gravity of the matter and would act accordingly. Ms Hetherington said that the school counsellor ‘also fortified [her] opinion that APH and [her brother] were safe to remain in their parents’ home’. Ms Hetherington explained that she concluded that APH was not ‘at risk and was not in need of supervision by the Department’ in part because of APH’s maturity and her ‘forthright character’. APH told the Royal Commission that it was ‘probably correct’ that she did not express any concern to Ms Hetherington that she needed to be removed from her parents’ care.

In her statement, Ms Hetherington described her role in the circumstances as being to ascertain whether APH and her brother were ‘safe to continue residing with their parents against whom no sexual wrongdoing was alleged’. Ms Hetherington’s understanding of her role appears to have been in accordance with departmental policy and procedure at the time, which was that ‘the objectives of the initial investigation are to ascertain the validity of the allegations and to assess the safety of the child’.
Closure of departmental file on APH and her brother

In her statement, Ms Hetherington explained that she decided not to keep a file open in relation to APH and her brother because ‘both children were safe and residing with their parents’.672 She explained that she would have discussed this decision with her manager in accordance with departmental protocol.673

Ms Hetherington’s evidence was unchallenged in the public hearing. During the public hearing a departmental document dated 18 August 1988 and entitled ‘Re: Ministerial Representations in Respect of Satyananda Yoga Ashram’ was tendered into evidence.674 That document, signed by Ms Hetherington, appears to have been a response to a request for information about the department’s involvement with children who had had contact with the ‘Ashram movement’.675 It records a chronology of the department’s response to the notification concerning APH and her brother.676 Curiously, however, the document recorded the following reason for closure of the file: ‘[o]n the basis of no abuse having been confirmed on the children, the matter was subsequently filed’.677

In her statement to the Royal Commission, Ms Hetherington was unable to explain why that reason had been given for the decision to close the departmental file in relation to APH and her brother. Specifically, she said, ‘[t]his statement does not accurately reflect my thought process at the time and the reasons for subsequently filing the case’.678

Conclusions

We are satisfied that, in circumstances where Ms Hetherington believed that APH’s sexual abuse, which she had been notified about, was under investigation by the police at the time of her inquiry, Ms Hetherington acted in accordance with departmental protocol as she understood it at the time to ensure the safety of APH and her brother in their family home. We accept Ms Hetherington’s evidence that she was satisfied that APH and her brother were not at risk in March and April 1987, when she conducted her inquiry and made the decision to close the file. We also accept that this decision was made in the knowledge that police were investigating Akhandananda for alleged criminal conduct against children.

We also accept Ms Hetherington’s evidence that the reason given in the departmental document of 18 August 1988 for closure of the file relating to APH and her brother was not an accurate reflection of her thought processes at the time.
6.5 Akhandananda’s resignation and arrest

It appears from the available evidence that in about February 1987, after the allegations emerged about Akhandananda’s sexual abuse of the children from the Mangrove ashram, Akhandananda resigned from the directorship of the Mangrove ashram.

Akhandananda’s resignation was announced to ‘The General Members’ of ‘Satyanandaashrams Australia’ in a letter from Satyananda dated 28 February 1987. That letter also advised of Atmamuktananda’s appointment as the chairman and director of the board. This letter and Atmamuktananda’s involvement, together with the evidence about Akhandananda’s continued involvement in the Mangrove ashram, is discussed in further detail in section 7.

Several months later, in June 1987, Akhandananda was arrested on charges of the child sexual abuse of Ms Buchanan, APL, APB and APA. He was released on bail.

6.6 Criminal proceedings and Akhandananda’s release from prison

Procedural history

On 2 June 1987, Akhandananda was arrested and charged with child sexual abuse offences in respect of Ms Buchanan, APB, APL and APA. On 1 August 1990, Akhandananda was charged with two counts of indecency, one count of inciting an act of indecency and one count of sexual intercourse without consent for offences against APH.

Between 1987 and 1991, the New South Wales Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) ran separate trials in respect of Ms Buchanan, APB, APL and APA. Shishy gave evidence against Akhandananda in all trials. Mr Chester Porter QC represented Akhandananda. The prosecutor was Mr Paul Rosser QC. The trial involving APL was nominated as the one that would proceed first. This trial commenced on 27 April 1989.

On 5 May 1989, Akhandananda was found guilty of three counts of committing an act of indecency with a child under the age of 16 years. On 8 May 1989 he was sentenced to two years and four months jail with a non-parole period of 12 months.

On 19 December 1989, the New South Wales Court of Criminal Appeal dismissed Akhandananda’s appeal against his conviction and ordered that any time already served would count towards his sentence. Akhandananda appealed to the High Court.

Akhandananda’s trial on charges of sexually abusing Ms Buchanan commenced in October 1990. He was found guilty on one count of inciting an act of indecency and was due to be sentenced on 29 August 1991 after the High Court matter concerning APL had been finalised.
In March and June 1991, Akhandananda appeared at a committal hearing in Gosford in relation to the four charges concerning APH. The Presiding Magistrate dismissed three counts and committed Akhandananda only on the charge of committing an act of indecency.

On 5 June 1991, the High Court allowed an appeal against the conviction concerning APL and ordered verdicts of acquittal on each charge.\(^{689}\)

The High Court held that, although Akhandananda was convicted for acts of indecency (\textit{Crimes Act 1900 (NSW)}, s 61E(2)), the underlying facts reflected the more serious offences of sexual intercourse without consent (s 71) and indecent assault (s 71E(1)).

The Crown prosecuted Akhandananda for acts of indecency because a statutory time limit in s 78 prevented his prosecution for indecent assault and sexual intercourse without consent given that more than 12 months had passed since the alleged offences.

The High Court held that a charge for an act of indecency could not be brought to circumvent the time limitation that applied to the more serious offences. Accordingly, the convictions were quashed.\(^{690}\) This meant that, in effect, no action could be brought against Akhandananda.

Following the High Court decision, the judgment on offences against Ms Buchanan was quashed and a verdict of ‘not guilty’ was substituted.\(^{691}\)

In June 1991 the Crown prosecutor recommended to the DPP that proceedings in relation to APB and APA be discontinued because, amongst other issues, the High Court decision meant that it was no longer open to the Crown to pursue Akhandananda for the acts of indecency offences.\(^{692}\)

On 1 July 1991, the Crown prosecutor submitted to the DPP that an ex-officio indictment should be presented against Akhandananda in respect of the two charges of indecently assaulting APH that had been discharged at committal.\(^{693}\) However, the following year the DPP declined to file an ex-officio indictment\(^{694}\) and Akhandananda’s trial on the single count of committing an act of indecency against APH began in September 1992.

On 17 September 1992, Akhandananda was found not guilty of an act of indecency against APH by directed verdict on the basis that there was insufficient evidence to prove the charge beyond a reasonable doubt.

In 1992, the \textit{Criminal Legislation (Amendment) Act 1992 No 2 (NSW)} repealed s 78 of the Crimes Act, thus removing the 12-month time limit for commencing prosecutions for various offences relating to sexual assault if the child on whom the offence was alleged to have been committed was at the time of the alleged offence between 14 and 16 years of age.

In their written statements, Muktimurti and Mr Connor both stated that Akhandananda did not return to the Mangrove ashram after his release from prison.\(^{695}\) Instead, he travelled to North Queensland and remained there until he died on 16 June 1997.\(^{696}\)
Experiences of the witnesses during the criminal proceedings

Despite the admission APD said Akhandananda had made to him in February 1987, Akhandananda maintained his innocence throughout the trial process.

There was evidence that a number of residents continued to support Akhandananda throughout the trial process, including APT, Dr Sztulman, Mr Salzer, Muktimurti, Mr Wakeman and Mr Connor.

APL remembered that during her trial she felt badgered by defence counsel, who had tried to suggest that she traded sex for alcohol and favours and, in her experience, ‘tried to make [her] look like a liar and a slut’. She told the Royal Commission that:

Swamis from the Ashram came to support Akhandananda in court, including [Mr Salzer], [Mr Connor], Muktimurti, [Mr Wakeman], [Dr Sztulman] and [APH]’s parents, [API] and [API]. It was very intimidating. Akhandananda would glare at me non-stop while I was in the witness stand. There was no support from the Ashram for the abused kids during or after the trial.

APR gave evidence that APT and Dr Sztulman took her to visit Akhandananda while he was in prison and that at the time APT told APR that he was in prison for fraud.

APA said that she was offered no support and found the process degrading. APH said that she was unprepared for the defence barrister’s attack on her credibility and that the lawyers she dealt with ‘did not understand the depth of the Ashram culture and how removed from the outside world [she] had been’.

Ms Buchanan described the whole process of going to court as ‘awful’. She said that ‘[d]uring the trial process, [she] was given no support from anyone attached to the Ashram’.

There was evidence that members of the community who remained at the ashram did not contact the survivors of sexual abuse to offer them support in the years that followed the criminal proceedings.

Ms Buchanan said that ‘[i]n 1986 and 1987 when it became public knowledge that Akhandananda had sexually assaulted me and other ashram kids, I was met with a wall of silence’.90

7.1 Atmamuktananda’s appointment in 1987

Atmamuktananda told the Royal Commission that some six months after she arrived at the Mangrove ashram in July 1986 Satyananda instructed her to ‘take over responsibilities from Akhandananda’. Atmamuktananda said that Satyananda told her that Akhandananda had resigned from his position as director of the Mangrove ashram.

Atmamuktananda said that, although she ‘received a letter from Swami Satyananda’, there were ‘no further instructions on [her] responsibilities on how to handle [the] matter’. Atmamuktananda said:

I came to understand that my role was not to oppose or judge, but to stabilise the situation. I gained that understanding through experience and of trying to manage the day-to-day operations. I was not involved in Akhandananda’s situation or what he was doing.

A letter dated 28 February 1987 to ‘The General Members Satyanandashram Australia’ from Satyananda advised that Satyananda was appointing Atmamuktananda as chairman ‘under the guidance of [Akhandananda]’. The letter also advised that Akhandananda then had the ‘full confidence and support of the Bihar School of Yoga and [Satyananda]’. Atmamuktananda told the Royal Commission that she herself never saw this letter from Satyananda.

In a letter dated 3 June 1988, Satyananda directed Atmamuktananda and Mr Connor (Swami Poornamurti) to ‘assume Joint Chairmanship of Sa$yanandashram, Australia [sic]’. With his letter, Satyananda enclosed a copy of a letter that he had sent to Akhandananda.

In Satyananda’s enclosed letter to Akhandananda also dated 3 June 1988, Satyananda advised Akhandananda to resign as chairman and to ‘resolve all the charges made against [him], not as the head of an organisation, but as a private citizen of the country’. Finally, the letter suggested that Atmamuktananda and Mr Connor (Poornamurti) could assume the roles of joint chair in Akhandananda’s place.

Atmamuktananda told the Royal Commission that ‘until he was gaoled’ in May 1989, Akhandananda ‘continued to have some role in the running of the ashram’, including appointing senior swamis to manage the Mangrove ashram’s affairs in his absence and sending her to the Manly ashram in late 1988 or early 1989.

Atmamuktananda said that, by the time Akhandananda was charged (in June 1987), she thought that all children had left the Mangrove ashram.

Atmamuktananda told the Royal Commission that in 1987, whilst she was at the Mangrove ashram, Akhandananda made ‘advances’ towards her when she was massaging his feet. She accepted that the advances were of a kind that she would have considered inappropriate if asked of a child. Atmamuktananda said that also in 1987 she witnessed one incident of a girl at the Mangrove ashram flirting with Akhandananda. Atmamuktananda was unable to recall if her observation of a girl flirting was before or after the allegations of child sexual abuse were first made against
Akhandananda in February 1987 (see section 6), although she said she thought it was before.\textsuperscript{720}

Atmamuktananda told the Royal Commission that, in spite of her observation and her own experience of Akhandananda’s advances, she did not become suspicious that there might be some sexual relationships between Akhandananda and the girls; that she ‘didn’t put the two together’.\textsuperscript{721}

Atmamuktananda said she told a male swami she was close with at the time about the massage incident with Akhandananda.\textsuperscript{722} However, she did not tell Niranjan (later Satyananda’s successor as the spiritual head of Satyananda yoga and the Bihar School of Yoga)\textsuperscript{723} or the authorities about the incident.\textsuperscript{724}

Atmamuktananda said that, when she spoke to the male swami about Akhandananda’s advances, she ‘probably’ didn’t convey what had happened ‘with any force at all’ because she had ‘rejected it’ and ‘it wasn’t harmful’ to her.\textsuperscript{726} She said: \textsuperscript{726}

\[
\text{[i] didn’t know about the children at that time, that the same thing was happening with the children, I didn’t know that. So I had – maybe it was just a one-off with me, you know, or with other adults; I don’t know. I didn’t have a cause to speak with any force about it. I didn’t feel I did.}
\]

\section*{7.2 Management restructure: 1996–2013}

By the early 1990s, a number of residents had left the Mangrove ashram and several centres had closed.\textsuperscript{727} The ashram then entered a period of management by group consensus,\textsuperscript{728} followed by development and implementation of a ‘matrix management’ model involving Mr Connor and others, including Niranjan.\textsuperscript{729} In his written statement, Mr Connor explained that the purpose of the change in management structure was to ‘avoid the problems of the past’ and to ‘make a complete break from the old organisation and start a new one’.\textsuperscript{730}

Between 1994 and 1996, Mr Connor and Mr Salzer, with the assistance of a solicitor, developed the articles of association for the Satyananda Yoga Academy Pty Ltd (SYA). Between 1996 and 2000, Mr Connor was president of SYA.\textsuperscript{731}

Between 2003 and 2008, Mr Bert Franzen, a human resources management consultant and principle of electAssociates, provided on a ‘donation basis’ ‘effective communication’ training to Mangrove ashram residents.\textsuperscript{732} In 2012, the Mangrove ashram engaged Mr Franzen to undertake an upgrade of its human resources policies and procedures, employment and volunteer contracts, and work health and safety systems.\textsuperscript{731} In a statement prepared for the Royal Commission Mr Franzen said that, as at the date of the public hearing, he was continuing to finalise implementation of those systems, including delivery of ‘online induction courses’, and provide advice to the Mangrove ashram where required.\textsuperscript{734} In his statement, Mr Franzen said that Mr David Mendelssohn is electAssociates’ ‘legal associate’, who has ‘more than 30 years experience in employment law and related matter [sic]’ and who ‘underpins [sic] the legal integrity of all our systems’.\textsuperscript{735}
7.3 Current roles: 2013–2015

As at the date of the public hearing, two entities were responsible for the Mangrove ashram:

- SYA, which is a registered training organisation and which owns the property on which the Mangrove ashram is located. SYA is responsible for the education courses run at the Mangrove ashram for the accreditation of Satyananda yoga teachers.
- The Yoga Association of Mangrove Mountain (YAMM), which is the Mangrove ashram itself and which runs retreats, lifestyle and other yoga and meditation courses separate from those run by SYA. YAMM is described by the current Chief Executive Officer (CEO) as an ‘affiliate’ of SYA. YAMM leases the property at Mangrove Mountain from SYA. Ms Sarah Tetlow, CEO of SYA, said that there is ‘no actual control or ownership between the different entities’.

The leadership team

The operations of SYA and YAMM are managed by a ‘leadership team’ to which the boards of the respective entities have delegated a degree of authority. Before February 2014, this team was known as ‘the coordination group’. The leadership team reports to the boards of SYA and YAMM and also to the spiritual head, or ‘Acharya’, of the Mangrove ashram, Mrs Mary Thomson. Atmamuktananda is a director on the board of SYA. She is also the Acharya (spiritual head) and director of the Yoga Association of Rocklyn. Atmamuktananda lives at the Rocklyn ashram.

From February 2014, and as at the date of the public hearing, the leadership team comprised Ms Tetlow, Ms Fiona Steiner (Director of the Education Department for SYA), Mr Antonis Makri (Head of the Skills and Lifestyle Department for SYA, which includes responsibility for human resources) and Samhita since September 2014 (Head of the Courses Department for SYA).

In September 2014, Ms Tetlow succeeded Mr Richard Rowe as CEO of SYA. Ms Tetlow is also the public officer and treasurer for YAMM. Part of Ms Tetlow’s role is to manage the finances of SYA and YAMM. Before she took on her current role, she worked in corporate finance specialising in risk management.

As at the date of the public hearing, Ms Steiner, Mr Makri and Ms Tetlow all lived at the Mangrove ashram. Ms Tetlow and Ms Steiner had been involved in Satyananda yoga since about 2003. Mr Makri had been involved since 2006. There was no evidence before the Royal Commission about Samhita’s involvement with Satyananda yoga.
8 Child protection policies at the Mangrove ashram as at 2014

8.1 Current policy on children and child protection

Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that, as at November 2014, the Mangrove ashram had no children staying at the ashram as residents. She said the ashram runs family yoga courses two or three weekends a year and a couple of courses that run for longer periods, including one in the summer holidays. Ms Tetlow said that all of the children who attend these events come with their families and that all children must have a parent or guardian responsible for them at all times.  

Child protection policies and procedures as at 2014

Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that it was her understanding that for at least the last 10 years, since SYA became a registered training organisation, the Mangrove ashram has had child protection policies in place.  

Ms Steiner gave written evidence that the Mangrove ashram has the following policy documents:  

- the SYA 2014 course handbook for the Diploma of Satyananda Yoga Training  
- the SYA policies and procedures manual dated January 2011 concerning delivery of the training for the diploma, which contains a Child Protection Policy (the 2011 SYA procedures manual)  

The relevant child protection policies and procedures that are in place at the Mangrove ashram include:

- that only individuals who have received clearance to work with children are permitted to work in the ashram (see the Ashram Guide)  
- a requirement that employees and volunteers appointed in the ashram sign a contract/agreement to apply for a Working with Children clearance  
- a requirement that individuals wishing to become residents at the ashram agree to apply for a Working with Children clearance  
- advice to parents who wish to undertake a long-term residential stay at the ashram together with their children that parents are responsible for supervising their children at all times  
- a requirement that students who enrol in modules of the yoga teaching course that may involve contact with children and/or vulnerable people at the ashram complete a prohibited employment declaration form  
- the ashram’s Grievance Policy (contained in the Ashram Guide), which sets out the procedure for raising and investigating grievances  
- the ashram’s Discipline Policy, which allows for immediate dismissal or referral to police if the grievance is considered to be serious or criminal.
Ms Tetlow said that all people who come to live at the ashram as residents must fill out an application form, which includes medical history and ‘other details’. When they are approved as residents they get an ‘HR briefing’, which includes a briefing on, among other things, Working with Children checks.767

Application of complaint-handling policies as at 2014

Ms Steiner and Ms Tetlow explained their understanding of how a complaint about child sexual abuse at the Mangrove ashram would be handled in 2014.

In her written statement prepared for the Royal Commission, Ms Steiner explained that a complaint of child sexual abuse ‘at the Ashram’ would be handled under Grievance Policy.768 That policy, contained in the Ashram Guide, does not deal specifically with the handling of allegations of child sexual abuse; rather, it deals with ‘gross misconduct’. The definition of ‘gross misconduct’ in the Ashram Guide does not specifically include child sexual abuse.769

Ms Steiner said that, if a complaint was made ‘in relation to the operations of the SYA’, the Child Protection Policy in the 2011 SYA procedures manual would apply.770

Ms Steiner said that under the Ashram Guide:

[A disclosure of child sexual abuse] would be taken to management, in particular Human Resources. Currently [Mr Makri] is the head of Human Resources. From there the policy is to report to DOCS as disclosed on page 27 of 44 in the ‘Child Protection Policy’ [sic].771

Ms Tetlow gave written evidence that, if an allegation of child sexual abuse was made to any member of staff, resident or volunteer at the Mangrove ashram, ‘this would be reported to a senior staff member’.772 She said that that person would then contact and consult with the Department of Community Services (DoCS). She said that Mr Makri ‘has a process (which he has never had to put into practice) of recording the complaint and then recording the action that has been taken after that’.773 In oral evidence, Ms Tetlow said that the current policy is that:

if there’s a suspicion or a complaint, then it would be taken to someone, a senior member of staff, most likely one of the leadership team. Then, depending on the nature of the complaint, it would be either reported to DoCS or escalated in other ways.

She described ‘senior members of the Ashram’ as having responsibility for receiving complaints of child sexual abuse, not just Mr Makri, and that ‘senior members’ refers to ‘people who were on the leadership team’.775
Ms Tetlow said that if the allegation concerned a staff member or resident ‘then the report would go directly to the [leadership team] and they would report it to DoCS and the Police as appropriate’. We assume that this is the procedure as documented in the 2011 SYA procedures manual.

Ms Steiner explained in her statement to the Royal Commission that if an allegation was made against a teacher then, separately to the report to DoCS/police, their accreditation as a teacher would also be suspended and they would have a two-week right of reply. We assume that the procedures Ms Steiner described are those documented in the 2011 SYA procedures manual and the Ashram Guide.

Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that there had been some training ‘in the past’ at the Mangrove ashram in the detection of signs of sexual abuse. She said that there were plans to hold more training in 2015 because of the changing nature of the population of the ashram.

Ms Tetlow was asked by the Royal Commission if she considered the Mangrove ashram to be at a level where it has ‘sufficient confidence in the training and in the policies and in the way the training is done that staff or other people that are residents of the Ashram would have sufficient confidence in knowing what to do and how to go about reporting, particularly if it was regarding perhaps a more senior member of the organisation’. In response, Ms Tetlow said that she was confident that the policies were there, but that where the ashram ‘fall[s] down at the moment’ is in implementation of those policies and in training. Ms Tetlow said that the ashram has contacted an external expert and is in the process of organising training at two levels: for those in senior positions at the Mangrove ashram to whom any incidents would be reported; and for those in the broader ashram community so as to ensure that everyone is aware of their reporting obligations under the ashram’s child protection policies.

We accept Ms Tetlow’s evidence in respect of the current deficiencies around training and implementation of child protection policies at the Mangrove ashram. We accept Ms Tetlow’s evidence that the ashram is in the process of improving its training for both senior staff and the broader ashram community.
9 Mangrove ashram’s response in 2013–2015

9.1 Facebook posts

Mr Tim Clark

Mr Clark gave evidence to the Royal Commission that, in or around November 2013, he visited the Mangrove ashram’s Facebook page and saw a promotion for a children’s yoga camp at the Mangrove ashram. In response, Mr Clark said he posted messages on the ashram’s Facebook page describing his childhood there, including his own physical abuse and Akhandananda’s sexual abuse of girls, and warning people to not trust the ashram with their children.

Between November 2013 and February 2014, several former child residents of the Mangrove ashram responded to Mr Clark’s Facebook post. In their posts they shared their experiences and expressed concern that the Mangrove ashram had never apologised for the abuse that had occurred during the 1970s and 1980s.

Facebook apology

On 27 February 2014, the Mangrove ashram published an apology on its Facebook page.

The apology read as follows:

On behalf of Mangrove Yoga Ashram we would like to acknowledge the events of the past and offer an apology to the children and adults whose lives were affected by the abuse and misconduct of those in charge of the ashram at the time.

It was a time that caused great pain for all involved. No doubt the failure of the ashram to publicly acknowledge these events has added to the pain and prevented many from finding a path to healing. We agree that at this anniversary time it is not only appropriate but also important to bring light to the shadows of the past and to this end a timeline of Mangrove’s history is currently being written for Facebook and our website.

The invitation for past residents to return for Mangrove’s 40th for free was given in the hope that some roads towards healing could begin at this time. We are consciously looking for the most sensitive ways to address the past. The findings of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse are being used for guidance, as are interviews with past residents to understand the picture better. Any calls or contact about this are welcomed. If you would like to talk to someone from the current management of the ashram or seek support please contact skillsandlifestyle@satyananda.net or phone 4377 1171 and ask for Skills & Lifestyle.
Several witnesses told the Royal Commission that they were disappointed and even angry with the way in which the apology was delivered and with its substance. Some pointed out that the apology was not individually addressed and that there appeared to be no genuine attempt to find out who the victims of child sexual abuse were.\textsuperscript{789}

After the apology was published there was further discussion on the Facebook page about the Mangrove ashram’s history and the child sexual abuse.\textsuperscript{790}

In her statement, Ms Steiner explained that the Mangrove ashram leadership team monitored the discussion published on the Facebook page and after some time became concerned that some of the comments were ‘libellous’.\textsuperscript{791}

On 2 March 2014, Ms Steiner wrote a message from her personal Facebook account to a number of people who had posted messages to the ashram’s Facebook page.\textsuperscript{792} Those people included Mr Clark, Mr Clark’s parents, Ms Alecia Buchanan, APV, APN, APP, APK, APD, APB, APL, APQ and APH.\textsuperscript{793}

In her message from her personal account, Ms Steiner invited recipients to a ‘healing ceremony’ that was to take place on the Thursday before the ashram’s 40th birthday celebrations, which were to be held over the 2014 Easter weekend.\textsuperscript{794} Ms Steiner received a number of replies to her personal message.\textsuperscript{795}

Ms Steiner, in her written statement, said that on or around 20 March 2014 the leadership team decided to remove the posts about the abuse from the Mangrove ashram’s Facebook page. It also blocked a number of contributors, including APV, Ms Alecia Buchanan, APP, APK, APA, APD, Jyoti, APH, Mr Clark and APZ, from posting further.\textsuperscript{796} Ms Steiner said that these actions were taken because the ashram lacked control over what was being posted to the page.\textsuperscript{797}

In her statement, Ms Steiner stated that she contacted the authors of the posts through Facebook to explain to them why they were blocked from commenting and that her message was met with ‘a fair bit of anger’.\textsuperscript{798} Ms Buchanan told the Royal Commission that she felt traumatised by the deletion of the posts.\textsuperscript{799} Jyoti said that it infuriated her because it showed her that ‘the Ashram wants the victims of the abuse to be silenced’.\textsuperscript{800}

In her written statement, Ms Steiner said that she did not think the Mangrove ashram’s ‘communication around [the blocking of contributors] was very good’.\textsuperscript{801} Ms Tetlow agreed that the decision to post an apology to Facebook and to block certain people from posting on the Mangrove ashram Facebook page were among the mistakes and errors that the ashram had made in 2014.\textsuperscript{802}
9.2 Cease and desist letters

On 16 March 2014, Ms Manning sent an email to all of the yoga teachers listed on the Satyananda Yoga Teachers Association (SYTA) website.\(^{803}\) The email discussed, among other things, the apology that the ashram posted on its Facebook page, the possibility of a Royal Commission investigation of the Mangrove ashram and her belief about the effect of any such investigation on SYTA teachers’ reputations.\(^{804}\)

On 18 March 2014, a person identifying as both Ms Mary Smith and Nityamani\(^{805}\) wrote an email to the yoga teachers listed on the SYTA website in which she referred to Ms Manning’s email of 16 March 2014.\(^{806}\) Ms Smith’s email included allegations that both Satyananda and Akhandananda had physically and sexually abused Shishy.\(^{807}\)

The Mangrove ashram also received a copy of Ms Smith’s email on or around 18 March 2014.\(^{808}\)

Between 19 and 21 March 2014, the Mangrove ashram leadership team and Atmamuktananda amongst others, and with the assistance of Mr Franzen, discussed and decided to issue a so-called ‘cease and desist’ letter to both Ms Manning and Ms Smith.\(^{809}\) Ms Tetlow said that she approved the issue of the cease and desist letters in her capacity as a member of the Mangrove ashram’s leadership group.\(^{810}\) She said that ‘at the time these letters were sent [she] understood that [Mr Franzen] was providing legal representation and assistance to the problems facing the Ashram’.

In his written statement prepared for the Royal Commission, Mr Franzen described how on 21 March 2014, on the instruction of the Mangrove ashram, he sent a cease and desist letter in identical terms to both Ms Manning and Ms Smith.\(^{811}\) The cease and desist letter was printed on the letterhead of Mr Franzen’s consultancy firm, electAssociates, and was signed by Mr Mendelssohn, solicitor.\(^{812}\) The letter named Mr Franzen as the person with whom the recipient should make contact.

The cease and desist letter alleged that Ms Manning’s email of 18 March 2014 contained statements defamatory to the ‘Satyananda Organisation’ and brand. It demanded that she immediately cease and desist her unlawful defamation of the Satyananda Organisation and required her to assure them in writing that she would avoid making further defamatory comments in future. The letter stated that, if she failed to comply with these demands, the Satyananda Organisation would be entitled to take legal action against her and that her liability would be considerable.\(^{813}\)

Ms Manning told the Royal Commission that when she received the cease and desist letter she felt distressed, hurt and angry,\(^{814}\) and betrayed by the Mangrove ashram, particularly by those people who were aware of her dedicated service to Satyananda yoga since she was 14 years old.\(^{815}\)

Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that, in about May or June of 2014, the ashram came to the realisation that it should never have sent the cease and desist letter to Ms Manning.\(^{816}\) Ms Tetlow said, ‘[i]n hindsight the cease and desist letter was an emotional response that we should never have sent as the letter from Bhakti Manning was quite balanced and reasonable.’\(^{817}\)
However, as at the date of the public hearing and the months following it, the ashram had neither issued an apology to Ms Manning nor formally withdrawn or retracted the letter.

9.3 Working Together Taskforce

In her written statement, Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that the Working Together Taskforce (the Taskforce) was formed following her discussions about the Facebook posts with Atmamuktananda and Ms Cushing (Ahimsadhara) at the Rocklyn ashram in March 2014.

On 21 March 2014, Ms Tetlow sent an email to various members of the Mangrove ashram and the SYTA advising them about the decision to form the Taskforce. Ms Tetlow’s email included a list of proposed Taskforce members. Ms Cushing explained in her written statement that the intention was that the Taskforce would provide support to the ashram management in dealing with various issues, including the ashram’s response to the Facebook posts and emails from Ms Manning and Ms Smith and preparation for the ashram’s 40th anniversary celebrations.

Ms Tetlow’s email of 21 March 2014 included a list of proposed Taskforce members, including:

- Mr Connor (Poornamurti)
- Mr Wakeman (Haribodhananda)
- Atmamuktananda
- Ms Cushing (Ahimsadhara), who was appointed chair of the Taskforce
- Ms Tetlow
- Mr Franzen.

In her written statement, Ms Tetlow explained that ‘it was decided that we needed a few people on the Task Force who had some knowledge about the events and who were present in the [Mangrove] Ashram at the time of the abuse’. She said that it was for this reason that Mr Connor and Mr Wakeman were asked to join the Taskforce. Ms Tetlow also explained that Mr Franzen was chosen to be on the Taskforce because he was ‘an HR specialist and because he had assisted the Ashram in the past’.

Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that ‘[i]deally it would have been good to have people who actually had child sexual abuse expertise’ on the Taskforce but that the Mangrove ashram ‘didn’t have anyone available in [its] community at the time that [they] knew of that could do that’. She agreed that the absence of such expertise amongst Taskforce members was a failing.

Ms Buchanan told the Royal Commission that she thought it was wrong of the Mangrove ashram to form a Taskforce whose membership comprised Akhandananda’s past supporters. She had conveyed this to Ms Cushing in an email in April 2014.
Ms Tetlow agreed that, at the time of Mr Wakeman’s appointment to the Taskforce, she was aware that he had lived at the Mangrove ashram in the 1980s and that he been a significant supporter of Akhandananda during Akhandananda’s criminal trials. In his written statement prepared for the Royal Commission, Mr Wakeman said that he had had some reservations about participating in the Taskforce for this reason. Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that she appreciated that Mr Wakeman ‘could have been seen as quite a poor choice’ as a member of the Taskforce and agreed that his appointment was a ‘poor decision’.

The purpose of the Taskforce

On 23 March 2014, Ms Cushing and Atmamuktananda emailed the Taskforce with the following proposed mission statement:

* to protect the mission and vision of Satyananda Yoga from the destabilising effects of sexual abuse and other events which occurred in the past
* to ensure that all possible policies and precautions are in place to prevent sexual and physical abuse on our properties and in SY yoga classes around Australia
* to help and support those who suffered under the leadership of Swami Akhandananda, including developing a relationship of trust in the current organisation.

Ms Cushing described in her written statement how one of the first tasks of the Taskforce was to work on the acknowledgement, at the Mangrove ashram’s 40th anniversary celebrations, of Akhandananda’s abuses. As part of that the Taskforce considered the idea of delivering an apology to the survivors of the abuse during the ashram’s celebrations.

Engagement of Mr Terry O’Connell of Real Justice Australia

Towards the end of March 2014, the Taskforce ‘acknowledged that [it] needed somebody with expertise in dealing with child sexual abuse’. For that reason the Mangrove ashram leadership team and the Taskforce engaged Mr Terry O’Connell of Real Justice Australia to provide restorative justice advice and services.

Mr O’Connell advised the Mangrove ashram against making an apology during the ashram’s 40th anniversary celebrations, instead suggesting that an acknowledgement of the abuses by Akhandananda would be preferable.

Mr Franzen’s advice to the Taskforce

In his written statement, Mr Franzen explained that he gave the following advice to the Mangrove ashram and to the Taskforce based on discussions with his legal representative/adviser.
• ‘as the Ashram had not been culpable in the abuse taking place, it appeared it did not have a legal responsibility to make financial reparation to the victims’
• ‘that the victims could have sought legal and financial redress from the perpetrator of the crime Swami Akhandananda Saraswatti [sic]’
• ‘that, as the abuse was by a single individual who was incarcerated and, as there had been not a single case of child sexual abuse occurring during the following 30 years, that the abuse cannot be classified as having been “Systemic” as referred to in clause f of the Royal Commission’s terms of reference’.

In her statement, Ms Tetlow also told the Royal Commission that Mr Franzen had advised the Mangrove ashram that ‘the Ashram did not have legal liability for the abuse that occurred’ and that ‘the abuse was outside the terms of reference of the Royal Commission’. Ms Tetlow said that she understood that Mr Franzen’s advice was based on advice that he had received from Mr Mendelssohn, who she believed to work for Mr Franzen. Ms Tetlow said that at no stage did she understand Mr Franzen to be a lawyer.

Ms Tetlow also said that, while the idea of hiring a private lawyer had been raised, there was ‘consensus on the [Taskforce] that we had [Mr Franzen] and his legal associate so that it was probably sufficient’.

9.4 40th anniversary celebrations

The Taskforce was involved in the planning of the Mangrove ashram’s 40th anniversary celebrations, which took place at the Mangrove ashram over the Easter weekend of 18–21 April 2014.

In her statement, Ms Cushing said that before the Easter weekend she sent a letter inviting abuse victims to attend the celebrations and described what the Taskforce had been doing. It is not clear, on the evidence before the Royal Commission, if those letters were sent to all survivors of Akhandananda’s abuse.

Ms Tetlow said that the 40th anniversary celebrations were also publicised on the Mangrove ashram’s Facebook page and that information about it was sent out to those people in the Mangrove ashram’s database.

The aim of the anniversary celebrations was to commemorate the 40 years since the foundation of the ashram. It was also to be used as an opportunity to recognise the experiences of those who had been involved with the ashram over that period.

Jyoti and APK refused to attend the 40th anniversary celebrations. Jyoti told the Royal Commission that she found the invitation to be ‘grossly insensitive’.
Survivors’ forum facilitated by Mr O’Connell

Mr O’Connell facilitated a forum for survivors of historical sexual abuse and their families on the Easter Sunday of the 40th anniversary celebration weekend. Ms Tetlow said that around 200 people attended the Easter Sunday forum. In his written statement prepared for the Royal Commission, Mr O’Connell explained that the purpose of the forum was to provide an ‘opportunity for anyone who wanted to talk about how the historical sexual abuse (or any discussions about this abuse) had impacted them personally’. He said that he considered the forum to have been a success because, among other things, the abuse was now out in the open and it had been an ‘opportunity for some to vent their emotions in a supportive and caring environment’.

The evidence before the Royal Commission is that the only survivors known to the Royal Commission who attended the forum were Ms Manning, APH and Ms Alecia Buchanan’s mother, Ms Elisabeth Buchanan.

Ms Manning said that, while she liked Mr O’Connell, she felt as though senior Mangrove ashram members, including contemporaries of hers from her time in India, were treated more respectfully than other attendees, including herself. APH described a similar experience.

Following the 40th anniversary celebrations, Ms Cushing, the chair of the Taskforce, wrote to some of the survivors stating that the 40th anniversary was a very successful event and had been very ‘healing for the victims’. APK said that she found this email highly offensive and wrote an email to the Mangrove ashram telling them so.

9.5 Survivor Support Pack

In early May 2014, the Taskforce decided to offer survivors a ‘victim support pack’, which was detailed in a document entitled ‘Survivor Support Pack’. In her statement prepared for the Royal Commission, Ms Tetlow explained that the Survivor Support Pack took ‘less than a week to formulate’ and that it was ‘ultimately approved on a consensus-basis of all … members of the Taskforce’ with input from Mr O’Connell.

Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that the Taskforce consulted Mr O’Connell on the content of the Survivor Support Pack, which included the offer of restorative justice services to be provided to victims and their families by Mr O’Connell and paid for by the Mangrove ashram.

The Survivor Support Pack contained four options. The first ‘option’ was Mr O’Connell’s ‘service’. The remaining three ‘options’ were referrals to free or Commonwealth-funded counselling services. If they were interested in support, survivors were required to apply to the Mangrove ashram by 31 August 2014.
The introductory page of the Survivor Support Pack stated, among other things, that:  

We have been advised that the events that took place do not fall under the domain of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse as the offence was not systemic and was dealt with under law; nor does the Ashram have any legal liability in relation to those offences.

Regardless, with respect to those individuals who were abused, the ashram management believes that there is a moral obligation to offer whatever assistance we can within our means.

Ms Tetlow explained in her written statement that the inclusion of the above introductory statement was based on advice received from Mr Franzen and his legal associate. In relation to the advice regarding liability, Ms Tetlow said that she did ‘not remember [herself] or anyone ever formally asking [Mr Franzen] for the advice … it was more of something that he offered to us, there were never any formal instructions’.

Ms Tetlow said that the Taskforce had agreed ‘that no financial compensation would be payable but that the Ashram would stay silent on this point and review every case on its merits’.

On 15 May 2014, the Survivor Support Pack was sent to some of the survivors.

Of the survivors who gave evidence before the Royal Commission, only Jyoti, Ms Manning, Mr Clark and APK said that they had received a copy of the Survivor Support Pack directly from the Mangrove ashram. APR told the Royal Commission that she had heard about the Survivor Support Pack but was never offered it by the ashram.

Several of the survivors of sexual abuse who had received the Survivor Support Pack told the Royal Commission that they found it unhelpful, patronising and even upsetting.

Ms Alecia Buchanan told the Royal Commission that she had never had ‘any meaningful enquiry from [the Mangrove ashram] as to what [she] need[ed] to overcome what happened to [her]’.

Jyoti said that the Mangrove ashram had ‘never asked [her] what [she] would like to see happen’.

APK said that ‘[n]o one from the [Mangrove] Ashram ever asked me or any of us about what we thought would be an appropriate resolution’.

We are satisfied that, in formulating the Survivor Support Pack offered to survivors of child sexual abuse, the Mangrove ashram did not consult or seek to engage with, or seek the opinion of, at least Ms Alecia Buchanan, Jyoti and APK. We also consider it highly unlikely that the Mangrove ashram consulted with any other survivor of child sexual abuse in formulating the Survivor Support Pack.

Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that as at November 2014 two former child residents abused by Akhandananda had accepted Mr O’Connell’s support services. She said that ‘after receiving
those initial applications the Ashram has not had much further communication from people in relation to the Survivor Support Pack’. 880

Ms Tetlow gave evidence that, as at the public hearing in December 2014, the work of the Taskforce had been handed back to the leadership team, so the Taskforce was ‘no longer made up of people from outside the ashram’. 881

We conclude that the Survivor Support Pack was ill-conceived and of little or no apparent assistance to the survivors of child sexual abuse. It is not clear to us what precisely the Mangrove ashram sought to achieve in formulating and offering the pack.

9.6 Involvement of the Bihar School of Yoga in India

Authority of Satyananda

In or around 1988 Satyananda departed from Munger, India, and handed the active work of his ashram and organisation over to his spiritual successor, Niranjan.882 Satyananda died on 5 December 2009. As at the date of the public hearing, Niranjan, aged 52, remained the spiritual head of Satyananda yoga in India.883

The evidence before the Royal Commission is that Satyananda had overarching authority at the Mangrove ashram (and its centres) in his role as the founder and guru of Satyananda yoga worldwide.

We are satisfied that, between at least 1976 and 1988, Satyananda was the ultimate authority at the Mangrove ashram. This is so because:

- Akhandananda was regarded as Satyananda’s representative in Australia and subject to Satyananda’s authority (see section 2)
- the residents worshipped Satyananda – for example, by renouncing all personal relationships other than with Satyananda (see sections 2 and 3)
- Satyananda appointed the directors of the Mangrove ashram – namely, Akhandananda, Atmamuktananda and Mr Connor (see section 7).

The role of the Bihar School of Yoga in 2014

Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that, although it is referred to in the YAMM constitution, the Bihar School of Yoga had not, in her experience ‘had direct involvement in administrative matters relating to YAMM, which operates independently’. 884 She said that the Bihar School ‘might have occasional involvement in the administration matters of SYA’, but she was not sure to what extent.885
Ms Tetlow said that the Mangrove ashram might consult Niranjan, as patron of the ashram, on big decisions, but that had not happened in her experience.  

Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that the Mangrove ashram had submitted documentation to remove reference to the Bihar School of Yoga from the YAMM rules of association.

**Communication from the Bihar School of Yoga in October 2014**

On 7 October 2014 the Mangrove ashram received an email from India demanding ‘an explanation and apology for how certain aspects of the Royal Commission matter had been handled’.

The email read, in part, as follows:

> What has been shown is that Australia is willing and happy to hide behind Guru’s dhoti, and suffer the ‘swamiji says syndrome’. Administrators of the institution are willing to involve him in the investigation of 20 year old sex scandals and tarnish his reputation, where they will not even dare to put their own names on behalf of the institution. ... 

> After a lifetime in support of Australia, Swami Niranjan and Bihar School of Yoga in disgust withdraw their association and support completely from SYAA, SRI and YAMM. Unless a full account, apology, and rectified system to ensure that such events will not happen again is received at Munger by 20th of October 2014 from those concerned, you are being informed that the following will become effective immediately from 21st October and this information will be sent out to all parties in Australia and other countries: ...

The author of the email then listed a series of actions, including that the Bihar School of Yoga would formally renounce all ties and association with the ‘institutions of Australia’, all links to the Australian institutions will be removed from the Bihar School of Yoga websites, and all permission to use the name or images of Satyananda or Niranjan or Bihar School of Yoga will be revoked.

Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that she assumed that the email had been sent by or on behalf of Niranjan. She said that the current and former members of the leadership group and the SYA and YAMM boards discussed the email and decided ‘that a full and unabridged apology would best satisfy India and allow [the Mangrove ashram] to focus on the important matters in Australia’.

On 21 October 2014, the Mangrove ashram replied to the Bihar School of Yoga with an email containing a lengthy and detailed apology. The email explained that, in responding to the Royal Commission, the Mangrove ashram had not intended to link Niranjan to the management of Mangrove. It advised the Bihar School that ‘all care will be taken to ensure that the autonomy of the Australian institutions is presented accurately’. Ms Tetlow acknowledged that the reference in the email of 7 October 2014 to the work of the Royal Commission as an investigation into a ‘20 year old sex scandal’ did not reflect the gravity and seriousness of what was being investigated. Ms Tetlow said that the Mangrove ashram did not raise this reference as an issue with the Bihar School of Yoga.
The Satyananda brand

Ms Tetlow initially told the Royal Commission that, if the Bihar School of Yoga did carry out its threat to withdraw its ‘association and support completely from SYAA, SRI and YAMM’ and prohibit use of the ‘Satyananda’ name, there would be ‘some commercial repercussion’ for the Mangrove ashram. She said that the name ‘Satyananda’ was integral to the function of SYA but was not so integral to the Mangrove ashram itself.

Ms Tetlow later agreed that, if the Bihar School of Yoga ‘formally renounced all ties and associations’ with the Australian institutions, it would ‘create quite a stir in yoga circles’. She agreed that removal of any reference to Satyananda, Niranjan and the Bihar School of Yoga from all ‘documents publicity material, websites, emails’ would have a significant impact on the Satyananda brand in Australia. However, Ms Tetlow said that she was not ‘convinced it would be disastrous’ and that the Mangrove ashram would have to ‘evolve, which is not necessarily a bad thing’.

The Bihar School of Yoga’s subsequent acknowledgment

The Bihar School of Yoga was represented at the public hearing by Mr Alex Terracini. After the close of evidence, Mr Terracini delivered a statement on behalf of his client. The statement expressed the Bihar School of Yoga’s support for the work of the Royal Commission and explained that, until hearing the evidence presented at the public hearing, the Bihar School ‘did not know the appalling extent of the abuse nor how widespread it was’. We note that the Bihar School restricted its statement and subsequent closing submissions to reference to allegations made against Akhandananda and Shishy and did not refer to alleged conduct of Satyananda.

In closing submissions Mr Terracini, on behalf of the Bihar School of Yoga, submitted that the Bihar School was ‘mistaken to refer to these tragic events with the label that did not properly reflect the gravity and seriousness of the evidence’. We are nevertheless satisfied on the evidence before the Royal Commission that, when those responsible for management of the Bihar School of Yoga first heard about the Royal Commission’s investigation of the sexual abuse of children by Akhandananda, their primary concern was to minimise the risk of damaging the reputation of Satyananda yoga. The Bihar School of Yoga’s response did not properly prioritise the welfare of survivors over the interests of the ‘brand’ of Satyananda yoga. There is no evidence before the Royal Commission of any expression of support by the Bihar School for the survivors of sexual abuse prior to the public hearing.

10.1 The Mangrove ashram’s apology at the public hearing

At the commencement of the public hearing Mr Aaron Kernaghan, solicitor appearing for the Mangrove ashram, read an acknowledgement and apology on behalf of his client.905

Ms Tetlow adopted that acknowledgement and apology, including that:

- the Mangrove ashram accepted that the child sexual abuse, evidence of which senior members of the ashram had seen in the form of signed witness statements prior to the commencement of the public hearing, did occur906
- the ‘events occurred within the organisation, so regardless of the fact that none of us there now were personally responsible, ... we do accept that the organisation apologises for that’ and that ‘any other response would be insensitive and inappropriate’907
- ‘the way the organisation has responded has not been helpful to the victims’908
- the ashram has attempted reconciliation and has ‘often made mistakes and errors of judgment in those efforts.’909

Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that the ‘mistakes and errors that have been made this year’ included:910

- the decision to block certain people from posting on the Mangrove ashram’s Facebook page
- the decision to issue the cease and desist letters911
- raising issues of child sexual abuse in the context of the Mangrove ashram’s 40th anniversary celebrations
- the decision to issue the Survivor Support Pack.

Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that the Mangrove ashram had formed an Institutional Response Taskforce, comprising herself, Ms Steiner and Jayatma, who was the former administration director for the Mangrove ashram and who has experience and knowledge of the history of the ashram.912 She said that the Institutional Response Taskforce had ‘been given delegated authority by all of our entities to handle this matter and to look at what’s gone on, what’s happened in the past, what we could do to do it better and where we go next’.913 We assume that the Institutional Response Taskforce was formed to deal specifically with the Royal Commission’s investigation and public hearing.

Ms Tetlow accepted that the ashram’s response to survivors was impulsive and, at times, hostile and defensive and that that response has not served the ashram well.914

Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that:915

One of the realisations is that ... perhaps before we haven’t really appreciated what it’s like to be on the other side, to be one of the victims ... I had no idea of the depth of – the impact that this had had on these people and, if we’d appreciated that, really appreciated that before, we would have responded differently.
Ms Tetlow said that it was the Institutional Response Taskforce that instructed Mr Kernaghan to deliver the ashram’s apology at the start of the public hearing. She also said that the terms of the apology were also discussed with the Mangrove ashram’s leadership team and the three directors of SYA: Atmamuktananda and Dr and Mrs Thomson. Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that there was no ‘dissent ... To the fulsome nature of [the] apology’.

Atmamuktananda’s evidence about the Mangrove ashram’s responsibility for Akhandananda and Shishy

Notwithstanding Ms Tetlow’s evidence as to the terms and adoption of the apology, Atmamuktananda, who was at the time of the public hearing a director of SYA, told the Royal Commission that:

“It must be remembered and very clearly understood that [Akhandananda] and [Shishy] were not the ashram and their mistakes were to do with them only. [Akhandananda] was asked by [Satyananda] to attend to [the mistakes] privately and deal with whatever the outcome was and what this meant for his private life.

Atmamuktananda told the Royal Commission that by ‘the ashram’ she meant ‘the people that lived there’. She accepted that Shishy and Akhandananda held positions of power and were first and second in command at the Mangrove ashram when they were behaving inappropriately. She also accepted that the offending took place inside the organisation and that Akhandananda was the head of the organisation but said that ‘the whole organisation was not of that’. She said that the behaviour of Akhandananda had to be separated from the organisation to avoid the whole organisation ‘getting lumped in with one man and one woman’s personal downfall in their life’.

Atmamuktananda’s evidence about the institutional responsibility of the Mangrove ashram for the behaviour of individual ashram members is in direct contrast with the evidence of Ms Tetlow, the CEO of SYA at the time of the public hearing. Relevantly, Mr Kernaghan, on behalf of the ashram, submitted that ‘to be abundantly clear – any view contrary to that stated in the public apology issued by the Ashram at the commencement of the hearing ... does not reflect the current thinking nor position of the Ashram as an organisation’.

Despite these submissions there does appear to be have been a divergence of views as between Atmamuktananda and the other members of the SYA, who accepted that Akhandananda’s abuse occurred in the context of the Mangrove ashram.
10.2 The Mangrove ashram’s offer of compensation during the public hearing

Following APK’s oral evidence before the Royal Commission, Mr Kernaghan, on the instructions of the Mangrove ashram, asked APK and her sister, APL, to ask their lawyer to make a request for compensation from the ashram.925

Following APA’s evidence, Mr Kernaghan asked a similar question of APA. Specifically he said, ‘I’m instructed to indicate to you and to the Commission that my client will do what it can to pay that’.926

No similar offer was made during the public hearing to other survivor witnesses and the Mangrove ashram offered no explanation for this absence of further offers.

Mr Peter O’Brien, solicitor appearing on behalf of Jyoti, APK, APL, APA, Mr Clark and APH, asked Ms Tetlow if ‘there will be an offer of financial compensation’ from the Mangrove ashram to his clients ‘in the foreseeable future’. Ms Tetlow told the Royal Commission that she expected ‘that we will engage with individuals and look at each case on its own terms’.927 She later agreed that the ashram would ‘consider all requests for assistance, whatever they might be’.928

While we accept Ms Tetlow’s evidence that the Mangrove ashram will consider all requests for assistance, we find the approach taken by the Mangrove ashram during the public hearing in inviting some, but not all, survivors to seek compensation from the ashram to be inconsistent with the sentiment expressed by Mr Kernaghan, and later adopted by Ms Tetlow, in the ashram’s acknowledgement and apology.

10.3 The Mangrove ashram’s treatment of the evidence of survivors in submissions

After commencing with the apology outlined above, Mr Kernaghan, on behalf of the Mangrove ashram, submitted (in closing submissions after the conclusion of the evidence).929

In passing, it is important to note that the Ashram sought to conduct itself at the hearing in a way that departed from a conventional defensive posture. It did not seek to test witness complaints, it did not seek to disrespect nor challenge evidence received by the Commission that could have been challenged. It did so in deference to the interests of openness and candour and having careful regard to the focus of the Royal Commission not on what happened but on what was done about complaints about what happened. The Ashram apologised for what part it played and recognised its responsibility.

We assume that, in referring to ‘evidence received by the Commission that could be challenged’, Mr Kernaghan has qualified his characterisation of the way in which the Mangrove ashram sought to
conduct itself in the public hearing. We also assume, though it is not explicitly stated, that the evidence to which Mr Kernaghan referred included ‘allegations that were not fully stated until the hearing of evidence at the Royal Commission’ and that evidence which ‘would be inadmissible in any court’. We accept that, as Mr Kernaghan submits, the Mangrove ashram’s apology was a ‘legitimate and entirely appropriate step’. However, while the ashram may thereafter have ‘sought to conduct itself at the hearing in a way that departed from a conventional defensive posture’, for the reasons set out below we do not agree that this was ultimately the case.

The offers of compensation and subsequent closing submissions

During the course of the public hearing the Mangrove ashram, without explanation, asked some but not all survivors who gave evidence before the Royal Commission to approach the ashram for compensation.

Mr Kernaghan, on behalf of the Mangrove ashram, submitted in closing submissions that the Royal Commission should ‘put to one side the totality of the evidence given by APA, APH, APK, APL, Jyoti and Tim Clark’ on the basis that they had made a claim for compensation of $1,000,000 each after the close of evidence through their solicitor Mr O’Brien.

Mr Kernaghan submitted on behalf of the Mangrove ashram that the claim ‘demonstrates a potential financial interest in the outcome of the Royal Commission which could be based (to a significant extent) upon the evidence they were to give and ultimately did give’ and that the other parties ‘were denied the opportunity to explore this issue in cross-examination’. Mr Kernaghan further submitted that the ‘seriousness of the allegations put by each of [APA, APH, APK, APL, Jyoti and Mr Clark] require a greater exercise in caution before they are accepted as truth because it can now be seen that those allegations (including as to damages) are vested with an interest in a potential $1,000,000 windfall from the Ashram’.

The Mangrove ashram’s treatment of Ms Manning

Mr Kernaghan, on behalf of the Mangrove ashram, cross-examined Ms Manning about her recollection of the date of a children’s yoga camp at which she said Akhandananda first abused her. During that cross-examination Ms Manning became visibly distressed.

In closing submissions Mr Michael Taylor, the solicitor for Ms Manning, submitted that Ms Manning ‘was an impressive witness’ and that she ‘gave cogent and detailed evidence of the abuse she suffered and the effect of that abuse upon her’.

In submissions in reply, Mr Kernaghan, on behalf of the Mangrove ashram, submitted that ‘the evidence of Ms Manning was defensive, frequently unresponsive and deliberately vague – when tested’. Mr Kernaghan also submitted that no useful assessment of Ms Manning’s ‘demeanour
nor the reliability nor credibility of her evidence in chief’ could be made because the evidence that she gave was ultimately read out for her by Mr Taylor.\textsuperscript{940}

In his closing submissions in reply on behalf of the Mangrove ashram, Mr Kernaghan conceded that the Mangrove ashram did not invite a claim for compensation from Ms Manning. He submitted:  \textsuperscript{941}

\begin{quote}
the Ashram is not simply opening its doors and blindly accepting whatever everyone says ... That approach may mean that certain accusations and claims are rejected. We reserve our right in that respect with regard to Ms Manning.
\end{quote}

Mr Kernaghan, on behalf of the Mangrove ashram, also submitted in closing submissions in reply that ‘Ms Manning is outside the scope of the Royal Commission and irrelevant to it’.  \textsuperscript{942}

On 29 April 2015 during oral submissions, the Mangrove ashram sought to tender a statement of a Mr John Ransley (the Ransley Statement). Mr Kernaghan submitted on behalf of the ashram that the information contained in the Ransley Statement was ‘at odds with that evidence given during the hearing by [Ms Manning]’ and ‘put in issue the reliability’ of some of Ms Manning’s evidence. \textsuperscript{943}

Mr Kernaghan submitted more generally that the purpose of seeking tender of the Ransley Statement was: \textsuperscript{944}

\begin{quote}
it goes to show that the history given may not be as reliable in some parts as may first appear, and it is part of a submission that [he had] made elsewhere about seeking a degree of circumspection in the approach to contemplating the history of the matter by reliance wholly on contemporary recollection by survivors.
\end{quote}

He said that the proposed tender was not ‘an attempt or an assertion by the ashram to hold out [Ms Manning] with disregard’. \textsuperscript{945}

Ultimately, in oral submissions Mr Kernaghan, on behalf of the Mangrove ashram, did not did not give any detail about why the Mangrove ashram said that the information contained in the Ransley Statement was inconsistent with evidence already before the Royal Commission. \textsuperscript{946} Instead, the Mangrove ashram was invited, and did agree, to provide a document setting out that basis by close of business the following day. \textsuperscript{947} The ashram did not ultimately provide the information or detail sought by the Royal Commission. Instead, on 7 May 2015, it advised the Royal Commission that it withdrew its application to tender the Ransley Statement. \textsuperscript{948}

\textbf{Conclusion}

We consider that the Mangrove ashram, contrary to its own characterisation of its approach to the public hearing and in direct contrast with the sentiments expressed in the ashram’s apology made at the commencement of proceedings, adopted an approach that was at times insensitive, defensive and legalistic – in particular, in relation to Ms Manning and her evidence.
When deciding whether to hold a public hearing such as this one, we consider whether it will help us to understand systemic issues and give us an opportunity to learn from previous mistakes. This provides our findings and recommendations a secure evidence base.

As the Royal Commission moves forward, our public hearings and consultation processes must focus on systemic issues that affect how institutions respond to child sexual abuse. We will address the following issues to fulfil our Terms of Reference:

- the scope and impact of child sexual abuse
- prevention of abuse
- reporting and responding to abuse
- regulation and oversight of institutions working with children
- compensation and redress schemes
- the criminal justice system.

We must also examine systemic issues across the full range of institutions. This includes both the different types of institutions and the different entities that operate them.

The systemic issues arising in Case Study 21 are:

- power imbalance where there is a charismatic leader of an isolated institution
- the isolation of children from their parents and the broader community
- meeting the needs of survivors of child sexual abuse.
Appendix A: Terms of Reference

Letters Patent dated 11 January 2013

ELIZABETH THE SECOND, by the Grace of God Queen of Australia and Her other Realms and Territories, Head of the Commonwealth:

TO

The Honourable Justice Peter David McClellan AM,
Mr Robert Atkinson,
The Honourable Justice Jennifer Ann Coate,
Mr Robert William Fitzgerald AM,
Dr Helen Mary Milroy, and
Mr Andrew James Marshall Murray

GREETING

WHEREAS all children deserve a safe and happy childhood.

AND Australia has undertaken international obligations to take all appropriate legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to protect children from sexual abuse and other forms of abuse, including measures for the prevention, identification, reporting, referral, investigation, treatment and follow up of incidents of child abuse.

AND all forms of child sexual abuse are a gross violation of a child’s right to this protection and a crime under Australian law and may be accompanied by other unlawful or improper treatment of children, including physical assault, exploitation, deprivation and neglect.

AND child sexual abuse and other related unlawful or improper treatment of children have a long-term cost to individuals, the economy and society.

AND public and private institutions, including child-care, cultural, educational, religious, sporting and other institutions, provide important services and support for children and their families that are beneficial to children’s development.

AND it is important that claims of systemic failures by institutions in relation to allegations and incidents of child sexual abuse and any related unlawful or improper treatment of children be fully explored, and that best practice is identified so that it may be followed in the future both to protect against the occurrence of child sexual abuse and to respond appropriately when any allegations and incidents of child sexual abuse occur, including holding perpetrators to account and providing justice to victims.

AND it is important that those sexually abused as a child in an Australian institution can share their experiences to assist with healing and to inform the development of strategies and reforms that your inquiry will seek to identify.
AND noting that, without diminishing its criminality or seriousness, your inquiry will not specifically examine the issue of child sexual abuse and related matters outside institutional contexts, but that any recommendations you make are likely to improve the response to all forms of child sexual abuse in all contexts.

AND all Australian Governments have expressed their support for, and undertaken to cooperate with, your inquiry.

NOW THEREFORE We do, by these Our Letters Patent issued in Our name by Our Governor-General of the Commonwealth of Australia on the advice of the Federal Executive Council and under the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, the Royal Commissions Act 1902 and every other enabling power, appoint you to be a Commission of inquiry, and require and authorise you, to inquire into institutional responses to allegations and incidents of child sexual abuse and related matters, and in particular, without limiting the scope of your inquiry, the following matters:

a. what institutions and governments should do to better protect children against child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional contexts in the future;

b. what institutions and governments should do to achieve best practice in encouraging the reporting of, and responding to reports or information about, allegations, incidents or risks of child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional contexts;

c. what should be done to eliminate or reduce impediments that currently exist for responding appropriately to child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional contexts, including addressing failures in, and impediments to, reporting, investigating and responding to allegations and incidents of abuse;

d. what institutions and governments should do to address, or alleviate the impact of, past and future child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional contexts, including, in particular, in ensuring justice for victims through the provision of redress by institutions, processes for referral for investigation and prosecution and support services.

AND We direct you to make any recommendations arising out of your inquiry that you consider appropriate, including recommendations about any policy, legislative, administrative or structural reforms.

AND, without limiting the scope of your inquiry or the scope of any recommendations arising out of your inquiry that you may consider appropriate, We direct you, for the purposes of your inquiry and recommendations, to have regard to the following matters:

e. the experience of people directly or indirectly affected by child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional contexts, and the provision of opportunities for
them to share their experiences in appropriate ways while recognising that many of them will be severely traumatised or will have special support needs;

f. the need to focus your inquiry and recommendations on systemic issues, recognising nevertheless that you will be informed by individual cases and may need to make referrals to appropriate authorities in individual cases;

g. the adequacy and appropriateness of the responses by institutions, and their officials, to reports and information about allegations, incidents or risks of child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional contexts;

h. changes to laws, policies, practices and systems that have improved over time the ability of institutions and governments to better protect against and respond to child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional contexts.

AND We further declare that you are not required by these Our Letters Patent to inquire, or to continue to inquire, into a particular matter to the extent that you are satisfied that the matter has been, is being, or will be, sufficiently and appropriately dealt with by another inquiry or investigation or a criminal or civil proceeding.

AND, without limiting the scope of your inquiry or the scope of any recommendations arising out of your inquiry that you may consider appropriate, We direct you, for the purposes of your inquiry and recommendations, to consider the following matters, and We authorise you to take (or refrain from taking) any action that you consider appropriate arising out of your consideration:

i. the need to establish mechanisms to facilitate the timely communication of information, or the furnishing of evidence, documents or things, in accordance with section 6P of the Royal Commissions Act 1902 or any other relevant law, including, for example, for the purpose of enabling the timely investigation and prosecution of offences;

j. the need to establish investigation units to support your inquiry;

k. the need to ensure that evidence that may be received by you that identifies particular individuals as having been involved in child sexual abuse or related matters is dealt with in a way that does not prejudice current or future criminal or civil proceedings or other contemporaneous inquiries;

l. the need to establish appropriate arrangements in relation to current and previous inquiries, in Australia and elsewhere, for evidence and information to be shared with you in ways consistent with relevant obligations so that the work of those inquiries, including, with any necessary consents, the testimony of witnesses, can be taken into account by you in a way that avoids unnecessary duplication, improves efficiency and avoids unnecessary trauma to witnesses;
m. the need to ensure that institutions and other parties are given a sufficient opportunity to respond to requests and requirements for information, documents and things, including, for example, having regard to any need to obtain archived material.

AND We appoint you, the Honourable Justice Peter David McClellan AM, to be the Chair of the Commission.

AND We declare that you are a relevant Commission for the purposes of sections 4 and 5 of the Royal Commissions Act 1902.

AND We declare that you are authorised to conduct your inquiry into any matter under these Our Letters Patent in combination with any inquiry into the same matter, or a matter related to that matter, that you are directed or authorised to conduct by any Commission, or under any order or appointment, made by any of Our Governors of the States or by the Government of any of Our Territories.

AND We declare that in these Our Letters Patent:


**government** means the Government of the Commonwealth or of a State or Territory, and includes any non-government institution that undertakes, or has undertaken, activities on behalf of a government.

**institution** means any public or private body, agency, association, club, institution, organisation or other entity or group of entities of any kind (whether incorporated or unincorporated), and however described, and:

i. includes, for example, an entity or group of entities (including an entity or group of entities that no longer exists) that provides, or has at any time provided, activities, facilities, programs or services of any kind that provide the means through which adults have contact with children, including through their families; and

ii. does not include the family.

**institutional context**: child sexual abuse happens in an institutional context if, for example:

i. it happens on premises of an institution, where activities of an institution take place, or in connection with the activities of an institution; or
ii. it is engaged in by an official of an institution in circumstances (including circumstances involving settings not directly controlled by the institution) where you consider that the institution has, or its activities have, created, facilitated, increased, or in any way contributed to, (whether by act or omission) the risk of child sexual abuse or the circumstances or conditions giving rise to that risk; or

iii. it happens in any other circumstances where you consider that an institution is, or should be treated as being, responsible for adults having contact with children.

law means a law of the Commonwealth or of a State or Territory.

official, of an institution, includes:

i. any representative (however described) of the institution or a related entity; and

ii. any member, officer, employee, associate, contractor or volunteer (however described) of the institution or a related entity; and

iii. any person, or any member, officer, employee, associate, contractor or volunteer (however described) of a body or other entity, who provides services to, or for, the institution or a related entity; and

iv. any other person who you consider is, or should be treated as if the person were, an official of the institution.

related matters means any unlawful or improper treatment of children that is, either generally or in any particular instance, connected or associated with child sexual abuse.

AND We:

n. require you to begin your inquiry as soon as practicable, and

o. require you to make your inquiry as expeditiously as possible; and

p. require you to submit to Our Governor-General:

i. first and as soon as possible, and in any event not later than 30 June 2014 (or such later date as Our Prime Minister may, by notice in the Gazette, fix on your recommendation), an initial report of the results of your inquiry, the recommendations for early consideration you may consider appropriate to make in this initial report, and your recommendation for the date, not later than 31 December 2015, to be fixed for the submission of your final report; and
ii. then and as soon as possible, and in any event not later than the date Our Prime Minister may, by notice in the Gazette, fix on your recommendation, your final report of the results of your inquiry and your recommendations; and

q. Authorise you to submit to Our Governor-General any additional interim reports that you consider appropriate.

IN WITNESS, We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent.

WITNESS Quentin Bryce, Governor-General of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Dated 11th January 2013
Governor-General
By Her Excellency’s Command
Prime Minister

ELIZABETH THE SECOND, by the Grace of God Queen of Australia and Her other Realms and Territories, Head of the Commonwealth:

TO

The Honourable Justice Peter David McClellan AM,
Mr Robert Atkinson,
The Honourable Justice Jennifer Ann Coate,
Mr Robert William Fitzgerald AM,
Dr Helen Mary Milroy, and
Mr Andrew James Marshall Murray

GREETING

WHEREAS We, by Our Letters Patent issued in Our name by Our Governor-General of the Commonwealth of Australia, appointed you to be a Commission of inquiry, required and authorised you to inquire into certain matters, and required you to submit to Our Governor-General a report of the results of your inquiry, and your recommendations, not later than 31 December 2015.

AND it is desired to amend Our Letters Patent to require you to submit to Our Governor-General a report of the results of your inquiry, and your recommendations, not later than 15 December 2017.

NOW THEREFORE We do, by these Our Letters Patent issued in Our name by Our Governor-General of the Commonwealth of Australia on the advice of the Federal Executive Council and under the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, the Royal Commissions Act 1902 and every other enabling power, amend the Letters Patent issued to you by omitting from subparagraph (p)(i) of the Letters Patent “31 December 2015” and substituting “15 December 2017”.

IN WITNESS, We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent.

WITNESS General the Honourable Sir Peter Cosgrove AK MC (Ret’d), Governor-General of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Dated 13th November 2014
Governor-General
By Her Excellency’s Command
Prime Minister
## Appendix B: Public hearing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The Royal Commission</strong></th>
<th>Justice Peter McClellan AM (Chair)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justice Jennifer Coate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Bob Atkinson AO APM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Robert Fitzgerald AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Helen Milroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Andrew Murray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Commissioners who presided</strong></th>
<th>Justice Jennifer Coate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Helen Milroy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Date of hearing</strong></th>
<th>2–9 November 2014 (eight days) and 29 April 2015 (oral submissions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Legislation</strong></th>
<th>Royal Commissions Act 1902 (Cth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Commissions Act 1923 (NSW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Leave to appear</strong></th>
<th>Shishy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Henry Sztulman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yoga Ashram Mangrove Mountain &amp; Ors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terry O’Connell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shirley Hetherington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhakti Manning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bert Franzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alecia Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jyoti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bihar School of Yoga, Swami Niranjan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Swami Satyananda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Sandra Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Legal representation | Dr P Dwyer and Dr H Bennett, Counsel Assisting the Royal Commission  
K McGlinchey, appearing for Shishy  
M Ainsworth, appearing for Dr Henry Sztulman  
D Staehli SC and G Wright, instructed by I Fraser and S Anderson, Crown Solicitor New South Wales, appearing for the State of New South Wales  
A Kernaghan, appearing for Yoga Ashram Mangrove Mountain & Ors  
A Brady, appearing for Terry O’Connell  
R Mathur, appearing for Shirley Hetherington  
M Taylor, appearing for Bhakti Manning  
D Lagopodis, appearing for Bert Franzen  
J Dooley, instructed by J McLachlan, appearing for Philip Connor  
S Hall, appearing for Alecia Buchanan  
M McKenzie, appearing for APR  
P Skinner, appearing for APT  
P O’Brien, appearing for APA, APH, APK, APL, Jyoti and Tim Clark  
A Terracini, instructed by P Ryan, appearing for the Bihar School of Yoga, Swami Niranjan and Swami Satyananda  
T Watts, appearing for Dr Sandra Smith |

| Pages of transcript | 959 pages |

| Summons to Attend issued under Royal Commissions Act 1902 (Cth) and documents produced | 26 |

| Summons to Attend and Notices/Summons to Produce Documents issued under Royal Commissions Act 1902 (Cth), Royal Commissions Act 1923 (NSW), Commissions of Inquiry Act 1950 (Qld) and Evidence (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1958 (Vic) and documents produced | 63 summonses, notices or requirements to attend and produce documents issued, producing 3,981 documents |
Number of exhibits 34 exhibits

Witnesses

Alecia Buchanan  
Former child resident, Mangrove Mountain Ashram

Jyoti  
Former child resident, Mangrove Mountain Ashram

APL  
Former child resident, Mangrove Mountain Ashram

APK  
Former child resident, Mangrove Mountain Ashram

APA  
Former child resident, Mangrove Mountain Ashram

APH  
Former child resident, Mangrove Mountain Ashram

Bhakti Manning  
Former child ashram visitor and member

APR  
Former child resident, Mangrove Mountain Ashram

Tim Clark  
Former child resident, Mangrove Mountain Ashram

Shishy  
Former resident, Mangrove Mountain Ashram

Dr Sandra Smith  
Former ashram visitor

Dr Henry Sztulman  
Former resident, Mangrove Mountain Ashram

MuktiMurti Saraswati  
Current resident, Mangrove Mountain Ashram

Atmamuktananda Saraswati  
Director of Satyananda Yoga Academy Pty Ltd and former ashram resident

Sarah Tetlow (Suryamitra)  
Chief Executive Officer, Satyananda Yoga Academy Pty Ltd, and current resident, Mangrove Mountain Ashram
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