

TO MR. JOHN ANDERSON 9817 4371

John, some reflections on the affidavit/.

1. I imagine most of us have trouble recalling real events of twenty years ago and my memory these days is far from brilliant.

Having said that, I would have to say that I have absolutely no recollection of anything described by DD in the affidavit. I would not even have recalled that GS was in the community there at the time. X

One would think that, if the nature of the accusations raised by DD were seen to be serious, then someone would have remembered them. It seems that JH and JM have no recollection of anything of this nature. And there would certainly not have been anything like a conspiracy of silence.

2. Does this mean that I think DD invented this? I would find it difficult to believe this. However I would not find it difficult to believe that his recollection of what he said to various people has been coloured by subsequent events. The expression "words to the effect of...." occurs a number of times and then there are expressions such as "potentially serious"... "may be interfering with..." It is not difficult to see the possibility of hindsight wisdom entering into the picture there

Moving GS to Sydney for counselling on the misgivings of DD and without the testimony of JH would be unthinkable. But what I could imagine is that, if a new Brother does not seem to be doing so well in a school, he might be moved to another

school with a more expert headmaster. Incidentally, DD was never technically a Headmaster although he would have had some responsibilities for the primary section of the school.

X I used to keep notes on interviews with the Brothers but these are long since swept.

3. A complicating factor in all this is the personality of DD and his relationships with the Brothers generally. I think it is fair to say that, in general, he would have been seen as someone of goodwill but lacking in judgement. As a result he would have lacked a certain credibility with many of the Brothers and others. This factor could have been operative in a number of ways including a possible lack of sensitivity to any complaints DD may have had about the behaviour of GS. But it could also have been operative in "justifying" Denis and in colouring his views and the vocabulary used in his recollections of what was said and done.
4. I find it difficult to believe that, if Denis believed that GS was actually interfering with children, that he was not confronted by Denis himself, or by JM or JH, and subsequently by myself.

C. Howard

Er. Charles Howard, 7th March 1997