

A Cautionary Tale – the Cover-up Begins: Executive Summary¹

In her paper 'A Cautionary Tale',² Louise Greentree³ wrote about how a 20-year-old young woman called 'Harriet,' a sufferer from Obsessive Compulsive Disorder, has been abused by her mother, by members of the Parish and its then ordained leadership and by the then Rector's wife in order to conflate her pathetic delusion that there was a 'special chemistry' between her and the father of one of her girlfriends into accusations of child sexual abuse, grooming and sexual harassment. As that paper noted, of the complaints made originally by the young woman's mother (who had intended to remain anonymous) seven were rejected by the diocesan investigator as unsustainable (including one of the only two complaints concerning Harriet when she was under the age of 18), leaving only one complaint when Harriet was aged 16 and four complaints over a short period November 2006 to January 2007 to be further considered. These are all denied by Mr. A. Now the matter has been considered by a six-person Professional Standards Committee of Sydney diocese. The story goes on:

No Child Sex Abuse or Grooming

The Professional Standards Committee has now rejected the second of only two complaints that related to a time when Harriet was under the age of 18.⁴ Thus it is acknowledged that there are no complaints that support the gross behaviour of the parish leadership and a number of parishioners firstly accusing Mr. A of these grave criminal offences and then, even worse, their pastoral abuse of his wife and children.

Is the Church big enough to say 'sorry'? Is the church that preaches repentance to others going to repent of its own sin? Will we now see people who tried so hard to destroy the reputation and family life of Mr. A, who have sinned by being slanderers, and who have pastorally abused his wife and his children, and brought false and ridiculous complaints of child sex abuse and grooming against him repenting of their conduct and seeking forgiveness and reconciliation? I do not think the A family are holding their

breath for this to occur. It is however a litmus test of whether Sydney Diocese is as they boast to other dioceses truly: 'of the Spirit' or merely 'of the lower human nature'.

Cover-up

Rather than admit their mistake, the church continues to try to blacken Mr. A's character. The Professional Standards Committee's report, while dismissing the claims of child sex abuse or grooming which circulated in the parish still alleges 'low level unintentional sexual harassment of an adult' against him.

The 'Report' of the Professional Standards committee is foolish.

"This too is meaningless, chasing after the wind" (Ecclesiastes 4.4)

- (1) The Committee says it is 'comfortable' that it has the power to try a person who only makes coffee after church as if they were a minister or church worker in a position of leadership, power and trust.
- (2) The Committee has found a person 'guilty' and banned them from church work without anything approaching a fair trial, in the face of the denials by the accused person, and only based on largely irrelevant malicious gossip and innuendo and subjective comments unsupported by anything approaching evidence.⁵
- (3) It is perverse, expending enormous effort chasing the reddest of red herrings given the utter triviality of the remaining complaints.
- (4) The Committee says the church has already acted properly by removing Mr. A permanently from 'ministry'. What? Is it 'proper' to punish the person before they have even been tried? But it is worse than that. The Committee report is misleading: as is well-known, the church also excluded Mr. A and his entire family from attending church. Was that 'proper'?
- (5) The Committee has no power: they can do nothing to Mr. A. now that the church has excluded him and his whole family.

Beware - It is your fault if your good intentions are misinterpreted by a delusional person. The Committee says even if you are unaware of 'the

¹ See the full paper on www.anglicanfuture.org/louise

² See the full paper and an Executive Summary on www.anglicanfuture.org/louise

³ BA LLB LLM(Hons) ProfCertArb. Louise can be contacted by email

louise@greentreeaustralis.com

⁴ This was the 'sideways hug' while both were seated on separate lounge and lounge chair with other family members in the room. The earlier paper recommended that this not be tried at home for fear of physical damage to one's back.

⁵ The accused person is expected to answer such comments as that made by the then Rector's wife in her signed statement, talking about the A family children: 'The only concern that I had was that his daughters dress in a very sexy way, even when they're very young. Their hair is bleached blonde. It looks bleached.' How is one to respond to this piece of unprovoked spite against children, who are not even accused?

effect' you are having on a person, and despite you behaving with good intentions, it is your fault if that person misinterprets, even delusionally, what your intentions are⁶. With all due respect to the committee members, this is really making it up as you go along.

The thinking of the Committee is foolish: they claim the only remaining complaints are of 'low level' unintentional sexual harassment of an adult person: Sexual harassment is defined to be '*unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature*, whether intended or not', including 'making unwelcome physical contact such as touching, pinching, or patting'⁷ There are several problems with the diocesan 'case':

(1) Harriet put herself in the way of seeking physical contact, acting out her delusion, and therefore nothing was unwelcome, as is quite clear from her writings.

(2) Most of the alleged conduct is not of a sexual nature on any objective standard.

(3) There were potential witnesses to some of the incidents, none of whom Harriet or the investigator has been able to call as direct witnesses of fact. She says that there are no witnesses and so she is the sole witness of fact for the diocese.

The Committee has left hanging the virulent accusations by the then rector's wife. This shows they have not thought about an important problem with the whole case. She made a claim (soon known throughout the parish and beyond) that Mr. A had sexually abused female university students of the same age as Harriet.⁸ The documents show that there is no foundation for this claim. There are only 3 complaints⁹:

Complainant 1:

- (1) In 1999 he looked at her during tutorials, which he was conducting, and she was one of 15-16 students in the room. She says that she had no other contact with him.
- (2) In 2001 she was employed at another University as an academic: they met at a university function and he paid her a compliment, said he was happy she was doing academic work, sat at the lunch table with many other people and in the afternoon in the lecture hall they made eye contact.

⁶ One of the committee recommendations is for 'counselling or training as to his self-awareness and the likely effect this may have on other people, regardless of his good intent.'

⁷ See the Code of Conduct 'Faithfulness in Service' definitions.

⁸ The then Rector's wife was a colleague of Mr. A at the local University to the end of 2005.

- (3) About 1 week later in 2001, she answered an anonymous hotmail email address titled '*write to me if you're lucky*' signed '*a secret admirer*' and entered into an email conversation for a while before she stopped answering and the emails ceased. She does not know who sent the emails. She says later ones were signed *Scotty* but anyone can sign any name they like. She has not kept the emails and she says she does not remember what they said.

Complainant 2 'Girl Y': This is an anonymous woman who has not signed any statement. Her complaint¹⁰ is that she is frightened of him! There is nothing in the material to indicate anything for her to fear, other than her own neurosis¹¹.

Complainant 3 'Girl Z - Anna Maria': This complaint is not from her but by the then Rector's wife alone: that in about 1997-1998 Mr. A asked the department Head not to require him to share his office with Anna Maria. That is the totality of the 'complaint'.¹²

What happens now?

As the Committee's report is rejected, the Archbishop is now required to appoint a person to bring the complaint before the diocesan Disciplinary Tribunal for a proper hearing of the evidence in accordance with the rules of procedural fairness.

The only four remaining trivial allegations are set out in the full paper on the website, relating to a period November 2006 - January 2007 when Harriet was aged 20. The 'charge' of low-level unintentional sexual harassment of an adult person is denied.

Parishioners and other readers are invited to think very carefully about how what has been done to the A family could be done to you and your family.

Is this the parish to bring your friends to? I do not think so.

¹⁰ As reported by the then rector's wife

¹¹ The complaint is clear that he never touched her.

¹² For a full discussion see the paper '**The First Stone Revisited**' an examination of the extreme feminist ideology demonstrated by these complaints on www.anglicanfuture.org/louise