

REDACTED

The Bishop of Tasmania
 Dr Rev J. Harrower
 125 Macquarie Street
 HOBART 7000

Dear Bishop, Hi

1. INTRODUCTION

Further to my meeting with Annette Sims on Friday the 10th of May 2013, and at your request, the following information is provided for your consideration regarding:

- 1a. my claim of sexual abuse whilst a student at Hutchins during the 1960s.
- 1b. the institutional response of the Hutchins school to my claim of sexual abuse.

I appreciate your interest and concern. This correspondence contains and briefly examines:

- personal details
- guiding objectives
- general responses – particular responses; and
- conclusion.

2. PERSONAL DETAILS

2a. My name is (commonly known as). I am 63 years of age, born on .

2b. I have been married to (nee) since 1975, some 38 years.

2c. There are three adult children from the relationship, aged 36 years aged 36 years and aged 32 years, and three grandchildren. and I were foster parents during the 1970s and 1980s and continue to have contact with our foster child, , aged forty-one years.

2d. In regard to education, I attended the for my primary years. My secondary education (years seven to twelve) were undertaken at the Hutchins School. Upon leaving Hutchins, I attended the University of Tasmania, graduating in 1975. Since graduating I have undertaken and completed various courses ranging from fitness training, vocational education to mediation and dispute resolution.

2e. In regard to my employment history, the following information is provided. On completion of university (1975) I was employed as a teacher with the Commonwealth Employment Service.

From 1977 until approx. 2001, I was employed as a practitioner, supervisor and manager for various periods of time, with state departments of Child Welfare, Health and Justice. Since leaving the public service, I have been employed within private enterprise and non-government sector as a child and family mediator, counsellor and workplace trainer. I am currently engaged in operating a small business and working within the Learning Centres of various secondary schools, and undertaking personal fitness training for clients.

2f. In regard to my employment and issues raised in 1. Introduction, especially 1b, the following is noted. During my employment I have specifically worked at a practitioner, supervisory and management level in the areas of child welfare – child protection – victim-offender mediation and restorative justice. In 2011 I was approached as an advisor to government in relation to “complex cases of child abuse and neglect”.

3. **Guiding Objectives**

In progressing 1a and 1b of Introduction with the Hutchins school over the past thirteen years I have sought and exclusively two objectives. The first of these is:

3a. Contextualisation i.e. was my sexual abuse at Hutchins during the 1960s an isolated occurrence or was it part of a widespread pattern of abuse affecting many? etc.

3b. Prevention i.e. if this was a widespread pattern of abuse, this needs to be recognised in order that, hopefully, measures are in place to avoid history repeating itself. etc.

The guiding objectives have never been e.g. compensation and/or apology even though at a meeting with the current head, Mr Warwick Dean, in late 2011, I was given an apology for (i) the abuse experienced at Hutchins during the 1960s and (ii) for the response of the school to my claim of abuse (i.e. institutional response). The head also offered compensation in the form of counselling fees.

The meeting with the head in 2011 followed from my letter to the head, Warwick Dean on or about the 5th October 2011 (see attached document). It is to be noted in that correspondence that formal interviews, etc. have taken place with Tasmania Police in relation to this matter.

4. **General and Particular Response in the Pursuit of Guiding Objectives**

4a. My employment experience, study, literature and current events etc in regard to sexual abuse in Australia and overseas suggests to me that organisations and institutions against whom a claim of sexual abuse is made usually react with some, or all of the following distinct, yet often interrelated ways, e.g.:

- Denial
- Dumbness (the failure to be proactive, see, hear, question, explore etc. nothing presented as information or evidence of abuse)

- delay
- distraction; deflection
- damage control
- intimidation
- contaminating evidence within a framework of
- breaches of confidentiality
- and distortions of categorisation; contextualisation; minimisation and relativism

The interesting phenomena is that institutions or organisations tend to act in the above manner even when it would appear to be advantageous for the institution to act in the opposite manner, e.g. accountability, transparency, openness etc.

Particular response

In my interactions with the Hutchins School in regard to 1a and 1b Introduction, I have experienced all of the above general responses to varying degrees. In regard to the contamination of evidence, I have only circumstantial and not substantial evidence and there may not have been actual contamination but the possibility was created by the school for this to occur. Secondly in the matter of being “set up” and on creating the situation where breaches of confidentiality were inevitable, I still find this hard to accept because it is such a distressing personal experience and realisation. In order to gain some perspective I have, whilst maintaining confidentiality, run the circumstances before a lawyer, school teacher and researcher who I regard as being objective. The three individuals consider that a “set-up” has occurred.

CONCLUSION

Given evidence, circumstances, information, talk etc. that has come to me over some forty years, but overwhelmingly in the last thirteen years when I started acting on 1a and 1b Introduction to obtain progress of Guiding Objectives, I have on the balance of probability, come to the conclusion that Hutchins in the 1960s and especially under the headmastership of Mr. D R Lawrence was a school where criminal activity and reprehensible activity occurred, and that the institutional response to criminal and reprehensible activity was a “cover-up” that continues to this time. I hope that I am wrong and would relish the opportunity of being shown/proven to be wrong.

I consider that there were incredibly powerful and influential forces in this community that have, and would, literally, stop at nothing to maintain “cover-up” for whatever reason. I will, hopefully, not be intimidated into silence and have taken measures to ensure that others, aware of history of this matter, are willing to “step up to the plate” should, for whatever reason, I am unable/unwilling to continue to pursue matters.

It is totally understandable that given the contents of Conclusion to this point, that there is a call for production of evidence, information etc. that supports assertions. I am prepared, if this is your wish, to share such with you under conditions and circumstances that are mutually determined. However, due to past experiences of such information I would need to be reasonably satisfied regarding the “security” of such information and that there would be some point to giving such information e.g. what could be achieved? It may be that from the

very start the process of "one to one" was unable to deal with circumstances presented and that the upcoming Royal Commission may be a more suitable forum and process for me to pursue matters? I would be more than willing to discuss these matters with you in any forum we mutually agree upon. Furthermore, if there are any matters that require clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Last but not least, it is important that there be some clarification regarding the present headmaster, Mr Warwick Dean, mentioned in this correspondence. I strongly assert that there should be no automatic, necessary connection drawn between issues raised for example, under Particular and General Response and Mr Warwick Dean.

My position is that I simply cannot fathom and/or understand where in this matter, the Headmaster is coming from or what the agenda is. Many matters regarding Mr Warwick Dean only seem to make sense or have any rationale if it is acknowledged that the Hpead himself may be under more powerful and influential forces that are determined to ensure an institutional response of "covering up". I do not know?

The writing of this letter has not been easy, another exhausting and emotionally draining experience in this ongoing matter that seems to find no justice or closure.

Yours faithfully
(SIGNED)

Mr.

P.S. Apologies for the handwriting but able "to flow" more than on computer.