

**From:** "Svami Sivarama" <[srs108@mac.com](mailto:srs108@mac.com)>  
**Date:** 6 June 2016 at 2:10:45 PM AEST  
**Cc:** "Leadership Discussions" <[Leadership.Discussions@pamho.net](mailto:Leadership.Discussions@pamho.net)>  
**Subject:** Re: Correspondence Vote on CPO funding  
**Reply-To:** "Svami Sivarama" <[srs108@mac.com](mailto:srs108@mac.com)>

I am in agreement that the GBC has not provided the financing for the CPO that is require

It should. No argument.

However 1% of construction does not equal the CPO shortfall. It far exceeds it.

And what additional financial needs does the CPO have. there is no figure.

Therefore this 1% formula is completely arbitrary and I remain against it.

I suggest the GBC first discuss how it wants to "tax" its temples. The purposes for which the tax is used—including CPO. The amounts needed. And when we know how much we need, and where it comes from, then fix a formula that connects income to expense.

That will then provide CPO with the funds it needs.

In the meantime the problems in Mayapura and Vrndavana are now being addressed, but their solution is not based on finances, but by the will and action of local GBC men.

On 06 Jun 2016, at 01:25, Badrinarayan Swami (San Diego - US) <[Badrinarayan.Swami@pamho.net](mailto:Badrinarayan.Swami@pamho.net)> wrote:

I am not adverse to waiting until the Oct. / Juhu or Feb. / Mayapur meeting so that we can have a more substantial discussion. How about this current vote be to take a "sense of the body" i.e. see how the majority of the GBC feels in principle about this proposal?

Frankly, to me the issue of child abuse is so toxic and our response has been so anemic (at least in regards to funding) that the need to address funding in a serious way is starkly clear. Don't forget that child abuse and even more so, the abysmal response of its leadership, are what has tarnished the Catholic Church's reputation beyond repair.

Your servant,  
Badrinarayan Swami

-----Original Message-----  
On Behalf Of Svami Sivarama  
Sent: Sunday, June 5, 2016 10:03 AM  
Cc: Leadership Discussions <[Leadership.Discussions@pamho.net](mailto:Leadership.Discussions@pamho.net)>  
Subject: Re: Correspondence Vote on CPO funding

I personally do not favour this proposal. It is a knee-jerk reaction to the recent video.

I am all in favour of stable and ample funding for CPO. But this formula appears unfounded and is not based on a statement of a clear financial need.

Moreover CPO is just one of an endless list of projects that ISKCON could sponsor such as: BI/Scientific preaching, care for elderly devotees, farm development and Varnasram, to name a few. Do we tag another 1% on to

construction projects every time someone successfully embarrasses the GBC for neglected programs entrusted to them by Srila Prabhupada?

I suggest tabling this proposal and working on a more wholesome and global formula that taps into ISKCON income/expense stream to assist programs otherwise neglected. And that funding could be on a application for grants basis, which naturally includes high priority projects like the CPO.

Lets not make unplanned and unthought out decisions.

On 05 Jun 2016, at 17:57, Ananda Tirtha das (GBC Corresponding Secretary)

<[Ananda.Tirtha.das@pamho.net](mailto:Ananda.Tirtha.das@pamho.net)> wrote:

Dear Devotees,

Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

Kindly find below a proposal for correspondence voting prepared by the EC. As per the regular rules for correspondence voting, there will be a three week period for discussion on this conference, following which the voting GBC members can submit their votes to me.

Hare Krishna.

Your servant,

ATD

---

Whereas the protection of children is an utmost priority for ISKCON and its leadership;

Whereas ISKCON's Child Protection Office would be greatly benefitted in its efficiency by increased funding;

Whereas construction projects attract more donations than any other cause;

RESOLVED: That the GBC Body empowers the GBC Executive Committee to immediately prepare a plan which would channel 1% of all construction project funds to the Child Protection Office. The plan should consider how new construction projects will be identified and how the funds will be utilized.

The GBC Body will formally endorse the proposal at its next meeting.