

**JULY 2014**

This report was completed in 2004. It refers to a period of time in the history of Chichester Cathedral and the Diocese of Chichester from the 1970s until 2000, when a serial child sex offender was able to use church networks to gain the trust of children and parents and commit sexual offences. This offender was convicted of these offences in 2001 and sentenced to 16 years' imprisonment, after a lengthy and thorough investigation by Sussex Police.

Today, as we publish this report, first and foremost our thoughts are with the survivors and their families. The effects of abuse can last a lifetime, and the passing of the years may or may not have brought any kind of healing. It is our sincere hope that those affected by these crimes have found a measure of peace over time. Directly following this offender's conviction, a number of senior clergy expressed their profound sorrow for the victims' suffering. Now, in 2014, we wish to join our voices with theirs: as Christians we are profoundly ashamed of abuse that has happened in church or church institutions. We extend our most sincere apologies to survivors and their families, though we know that this can never repair the damage done.

Following the trial, the former Bishop of Chichester, the Rt Rev'd Dr John Hind, commissioned an independent author, Edi Carmi, to provide him with a report. Edi Carmi worked with a multi-agency steering group that was chaired independently by His Honour Judge Peter Collier QC. This process was designed to replicate the standard of Serious Case Reviews at the time, as defined in the government guidance, *Working Together to Safeguard Children 1999*. It was received by the Bishop of Chichester in 2004, and the recommendations were invaluable in informing practice in the Cathedral and across the Diocese. This report marked the beginning of a crucial process of self-reflection and learning that continued with the published reports by Roger Meekings, Baroness Butler-Sloss and of the Archiepiscopal Visitation. The learning gained from this process of rigorous scrutiny informs every aspect of our safeguarding practice today, which has moved on enormously since 2004.

At the time this report was received, Serious Case Reviews were not published in their entirety. Our decision to publish this report now has been informed by a number of factors, the most important of which has been our interaction with victims of sexual abuse in churches, who have consistently asked for the full facts to be brought to light, so that lessons are learned and everything possible is done to ensure these awful events are not repeated. Sexual offenders operate in the shadows of our communities and exploit any weaknesses in culture and process that exist, as has been shown many times recently in cases across the country in a number of different institutions. Reports such as this illuminate those weaknesses and the ways offenders use them, in the hope that future practice is improved and children are better protected. It is for this reason we are publishing this report today.

We are aware that for some the publication of this report may be enormously painful. Our intention is to shed light on past events, to aid learning, build trust and foster openness,

not to cause further pain. Preparations for publishing this report have included identifying sources of support for anyone who is affected. Anyone seeking support or who is affected by the publication of this report is invited to speak to Colin Perkins or Morag Keane from the Diocese of Chichester Safeguarding Team, or to directly contact the Saturn Centre in Crawley, which provides a range of services for anyone over the age of 14 who is a victim of sexual abuse. Contact details are provided at the end of this statement.

We are committed to doing everything we can to create transparent, open, trustworthy and safe church communities. It is in this spirit we publish this report. Finally, and most importantly, we are greatly indebted to the victims of this offender, whose courage in coming forward to the police during the investigation ensured this man's conviction and made this report possible.

Colin Perkins and Morag Keane are available at Church House, Hove on 01273 421021

The Saturn Centre are contactable on 01293 600469

**+Martin Cicestr**  
**July 2014**

**The Chapter of Chichester Cathedral**

DIOCESE OF  
CHICHESTER



CHICHESTER  
CATHEDRAL

### **Note regarding publication:**

What follows is the report produced by Edi Carmi, received by Rt Rev'd Dr John Hind, Bishop of Chichester in 2004.

In order to protect the identity of all those named in the original report, the report has been anonymised as follows:

- Convicted offenders featured in the report are referred to by the code CO, followed by a numeral; CO1, CO2, etc.
- Possible perpetrators are referred to by the code P followed by a numeral; P1, P2, etc.
- Diocesan and Cathedral Officers are referred to by their title, followed by a letter; Dean A, Dean B, etc.

The glossary of terms and abbreviations at the end of the report explains any such codes used.

In line with the publication arrangements for serious case reviews, the detailed chronology of events which formed an appendix to the original document, has not been published. Otherwise the document is as received by the original author.

**July 2014**

**CASE: CO1**

**CASE REVIEW**

**06.01.04**

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>CASE REVIEW PROCESS</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>Steering Group Membership</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>Terms of Reference</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>Conduct of Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>INFORMATION ABOUT THE CRIMES</b>	<b>13</b>
	<b>Age of victims</b>	<b>13</b>
	<b>How CO1 met his victims</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>Impact of abuse</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>CO1’S POSITION WITHIN CHICHESTER</b>	<b>16</b>
	<b>Chichester Cathedral</b>	<b>16</b>
	<b>Chichester Festivities</b>	<b>17</b>
	<b>Southern Cathedrals’ Festival</b>	<b>17</b>
	<b>School A</b>	<b>17</b>
	<b>CO1’s ability to access, groom and abuse victims</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Other alleged or convicted abusers</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>MANAGEMENT OF CHILD PROTECTION</b>	<b>22</b>
	<b>Implementation of Child Protection Policy, Procedure And Guidance</b>	<b>22</b>
	<b>Response to Allegations, Complaints and Concerns</b>	<b>23</b>
	<b>Pastoral Support following Allegations in 2000</b>	<b>27</b>

	<b>Vulnerability of Choristers</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>CURRENT POSITION</b>	<b>30</b>
	<b>Cathedral</b>	<b>30</b>
	<b>School A</b>	<b>37</b>
	<b>Links between Chichester Cathedral and School A</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>ADDENDUM</b>	<b>48</b>
	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>50</b>
	<b>GLOSSARY OF TERMS &amp; ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>51</b>

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Sincere thanks are owed to all members of the steering group who worked hard to support the work of the review, provide information and contribute to the final report.

Thanks are also due to those professionals who agreed to be interviewed and offer their experiences and ideas.

Thanks to the ex-choristers, ex-parents and members of the congregation, past and present, who provided valuable contributions to the case review.

Finally, our thanks to the victims and their families who despite the continued distress associated with this case made time to help us understand the culture within which the crimes were committed and the impact of this abuse on their lives. Through their courage in reporting the abuse to the police CO1 was stopped from abusing children

# 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## BACKGROUND TO THE CASE REVIEW

- 1.1 On the 2nd May 2001 Convicted Offender 1 (CO1) was convicted and sentenced at Lewes Crown Court, having been found guilty of 32 sexual offences against 12 boys over a period of 29 years.
- 1.2 CO1 had a long association with Chichester Cathedral and had been the Head Steward until his arrest. He met all but one of his victims through his activities in the Cathedral and met the remaining victim at another cathedral during the Southern Cathedral's Festival.
- 1.3 This Case Review was initiated following concerns being expressed at the way the Cathedral responded to the allegations made in 2000 and the lack of previous action over 25 years, despite alleged concerns about CO1.
- 1.4 The focus of the review was on the lessons that needed to be learnt so as to improve safeguards for children involved in Church activities and to improve working arrangements with statutory Area Child Protection Committee (ACPC) agencies.
- 1.5 The scope of the review covered 30 years and encompassed the management of child protection issues over this period primarily in relation to CO1, but also to other individuals suspected or convicted of child abuse during this period.
- 1.6 The review commenced in September 2001, but was temporarily suspended until December 2002 following a further police investigation, which led to the conviction of Convicted Offender 2 (CO2) in May 2003. He had been a teacher at School A, in 1976.
- 1.7 The methodology for the review process included both the provision of documents to the review, and the facility for victims, their families, ex-pupils and parents of School A and the Cathedral congregation to contribute their views and experiences.

## THE OFFENCES

- 1.8 CO1 pleaded guilty to 31 offences, was found guilty of one offence at the criminal trial and not guilty of a second offence. These offences involved 12 victims. A further 8 charges remained on file, involving 3 additional victims.
- 1.9 The convicted offences range from 23 charges of indecent assault, 5 of buggery, 1 of indecency with a child under 14 years and 2 of attempt to procure acts of gross indecency. The most serious offence of buggery without consent *first* occurred (as far as is known) in 1971.
- 1.10 CO1 was found not guilty of a charge of buggery without consent. The counts left on file involve 5 indecent assaults against males, 1 indecent assault against a female and 2 counts of perverting the course of justice.
- 1.11 All the convictions related to offences committed when the victims were aged under 16 years old. The ages at which boys were first abused varied. 3 were possibly as young as 11 years old (the date span of the offences commenced on the 1<sup>st</sup> January of the year they turned 12 years old).

## FINDINGS

- 1.12 The findings of the review are based primarily on documents and information from the police investigation, due to difficulties contacting the identified stakeholders and the limited numbers that did respond.
- 1.13 The reported impact of the abuse on the victims has been severe, resulting both in short term harm, such as disruptive adolescent behaviour and impaired educational attainment and long term emotional and mental health problems, including substance misuse.

### ***CO1's position in the Cathedral community and ability to access victims***

- 1.14 CO1 grew up in Canon Lane, living in the Treasury. When he left home to live in London, he returned there regularly to visit and, following the death of his mother, he was provided with alternative local Church owned property in 1994.
- 1.15 CO1's father was Head Steward in the Cathedral. CO1 helped him in this role and took it over after his father's death. This position meant that he was able to provide preferential seating within the Cathedral to those families with whom he was friendly. This gave CO1 a position of some perceived power and status within the Cathedral, reinforced by his social contacts with clergy and staff at the Cathedral.
- 1.16 All 15 victims were involved in Cathedral activities, 14 of them at Chichester Cathedral. 11 were or had been pupils at School A and 8 were or had been choristers. CO1's perceived high status in this community gave him the opportunity to access and 'groom' his victims.

### ***Management of child protection***

- 1.17 CO1 was one of several alleged or convicted child sex abusers that were involved in Chichester Cathedral within the last 30 years and some people were aware of allegations and concerns about him and others.
- 1.18 During the 1970's, within the historical context of the management of child protection, School A responded adequately to allegations against CO1 and CO2. CO1 was banned from school premises and CO2 was forced to resign. Both have now been convicted of the offences that were alleged at that time.
- 1.19 Unfortunately, no records have been found regarding the reason for the action by the school and subsequently staff were unaware of the reason for the ban on CO1, other than a belief that he was a disruptive influence on pupils.
- 1.20 The ban only operated within school premises and not within the Cathedral precincts. Whilst the ban continued in principle, CO1 was permitted use of workshop facilities at the rear of the Treasury (which had become part of the school) and entered the school to borrow benches for concerts. He therefore retained a position of some authority vis-a-vis the pupils and maintained access to them.
- 1.21 The only allegation (known to have been made) about CO1 in the early 1980's led to the pupil being instructed to stop seeing CO1, according to the information provided to police. This placed all responsibility with the child.

- 1.22 Rumours continued to circulate about CO1, but there is no knowledge of any further allegations made or concerns expressed to those in positions of authority during the remainder of this decade.
- 1.23 Allegations and concerns circulated about Convicted Offender 3 (CO3) and 3 other men during the 1980s without any discernable response by the recipients of this information within the Anglican community in the Chichester area, possibly partly due to issues around confidentiality and the clergy.
- 1.24 During the 1990's society as a whole became increasingly aware of the need for vigilance with regard to sexual abuse. The Anglican community in the Chichester area appear to have been slow to change their child protection responses. This was illustrated by:
- In 1991 an allegation about CO1's use of pornographic material with a 12 year old was inadequately dealt with and appears not to have been reported to the Dean of Chichester Cathedral at the time (Dean A).
  - In 1991 parents of 2 victims reported abuse by a member of the Choristers' Association and the Cathedral held their own internal investigation, without informing or liaising with the police
  - Allowing CO3 to resume his responsibilities as a lay vicar in mixed age activities following his release from prison
- 1.25 Finally in March 2000 the allegations about CO1 were not reported either to the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor (DCPA 1) or to the police. This was contrary to the existing diocesan child protection procedures (*The Protection of Children 1997*), which had not been implemented at that time by the Cathedral.
- 1.26 During the investigation and prosecution of CO1 the Church did not offer pastoral support to victims, partly due to being unaware of their identity and partly because the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor had established with the police that Victim Support was providing this resource.

### ***Current position***

- 1.27 Since CO1's arrest in 2000, there have been major changes in both the Diocese and the Cathedral. There is now a new Bishop [Bishop B], new Dean [Dean B] and some change in Chapter membership.
- 1.28 The Diocesan child protection procedures have been implemented in the Cathedral and a *Cathedral Child Protection Policy and Guidelines* (May 2003) introduced to ensure that staff and volunteers are recruited and vetted in accordance with diocesan policy. It includes advice about training and the reporting of child protection concerns and allegations, broadly consistent with diocesan policy.
- 1.29 The major challenges that remain centre around:
- The recognition of child protection issues by clergy, staff, volunteers and congregation
  - Further opening up of the Cathedral community
  - Strengthening the autonomy of School A
  - Lack of openness about sexuality, which has led to confusion between homosexuality and child abuse
  - Tensions between the issues of clergy confidentiality and the need to ensure that the welfare of the child remains paramount
- 1.30 The recommendations address further improvements to be made in the implementation of safe care of children involved in Church activities. These have been separated into those that apply to the diocese as a whole, those that apply specifically to the Cathedral and / or School A and some that will need to be addressed nationally within the Church of England.

## 2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 On the 2nd May 2001 CO1 was convicted and sentenced at Lewes Crown Court, having been found guilty of 32 sexual offences against 12 boys over a period of 29 years. CO1 pleaded guilty to 31 offences, was found guilty of one offence at the criminal trial and not guilty of a second offence. A further 8 charges remained on file, involving 3 additional victims.
- 2.2 CO1 had a long association with Chichester Cathedral and had been the Head Steward until his arrest. He met all of the 15 victims through his association with Chichester Cathedral and 14 directly through his activities at the Cathedral.
- 2.3 Following the conviction, the local media published reports and correspondence, which led to further concerns. These mentioned that ‘warnings have been going on for 25 years’ (p.2 *Chichester Observer 10.05.03*) and the Church had ignored them. Moreover criticism was expressed at the way the Cathedral responded to the allegations made by a victim prior to the involvement of the police, with headlines that ‘Dean denies cover-up’ (p.2 *Chichester Observer 03.05.01*), [Referring to Dean A]
- 2.4 Following CO1’s conviction the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor [DCPA2] arranged a ‘de-brief’ meeting with police and social services. The aim was to obtain information about the case and advise the newly appointed Bishop of Chichester [Bishop B] of the best way to ensure that children involved in Cathedral activities are better safeguarded in the future.
- 2.5 Edina Carmi, an independent social work consultant, was asked to chair the meeting, held on 12.06.01. She advised Bishop B to set up a case review modelled on the Serious Case Reviews outlined in government guidance. These are used by the Area Child Protection Committee agencies in cases where a child has died or been seriously abused (including sexual abuse) and ‘the case gives rise to concerns about the way in which local professionals and services work together to safeguard children’. (*Chapter 8.6, Working Together to Safeguard Children, Department of Health 1999*).
- 2.6 To ensure the independence and objectivity of the review it was overseen by a multi-agency steering group, chaired by Peter Collier QC and involving representatives from Sussex Police, West Sussex Social & Caring Services, West Sussex Education Department, East Sussex Victim Support, a senior clergyman (unconnected to West Sussex and Chichester) and the DCPA2.
- 2.7 The work of the review was to be undertaken by Edina Carmi in consultation and on occasions jointly with members of the steering group, and in particular the DCPA2.
- 2.8 Terms of reference were agreed by the steering group at its first meeting on 07.09.01. These covered a period of 30 years and were based on the principles of Serious Case Reviews, as outlined in *Chapter 8, Working Together to Safeguard Children, Department of Health 1999*.
- 2.9 The aims of the review focused on the lessons that needed to be learnt so as to improve safeguards for children involved in Church activities and to improve working arrangements with statutory Area Child Protection Committee (ACPC) agencies.

- 2.10 The methodology for the review process included both provision of documents to the review and the provision for victims, their families, ex-pupils and parents of School A and the Cathedral congregation to contribute their views and experiences.
- 2.11 The review was temporarily suspended in November 2001 whilst the police undertook further investigations into allegations of Perverting the Course of Justice and Misconduct in Public Office.
- 2.12 This second police investigation provided information about the activities of CO1 and other individuals already known or suspected of abusing children and how those responsible responded to the allegations. Charges were made against one individual in connection with allegations arising from events in the 1970s. This led to a conviction in May 2003. There was insufficient evidence for the instigation of further criminal proceedings.
- 2.13 The case review commenced again in December 2002 with slightly amended terms of reference. The police have contributed relevant information to the case review process.
- 2.14 The conclusions of the review are based primarily on information collected by the police due to the difficulties encountered in contacting the stakeholders mentioned (see section 3 Case Review Process) and the limited numbers that did respond.
- 2.15 The following report has been informed by and based upon documents, reports, information and advice provided by:
- Sussex police
  - Victims and their families
  - Chichester Cathedral
  - School A
  - The Cathedral congregation, ex-parents and ex-choristers
  - Diocesan Child Protection Advisors
  - Members of the Case Review steering group

- 2.16 The report is divided into the following sections:
- Section 3 describes the methodology of the review process and how this changed due to circumstances and responses of stakeholders to the process
  - The factual information about the crimes committed by CO1 and their impact on the victims is outlined in Section 4
  - Section 5 looks at CO1's role within Chichester and how he accessed and groomed his victims
  - Section 6 looks at contextual information relating to the police investigation, which provides information on other convicted or suspected abusers with links to the Cathedral or School A during the period
  - Section 7 considers specific child protection issues including the implementation of policy and procedure, the management of concerns during this period, the role of the confessional, the provision of pastoral support and the vulnerability of choristers
  - Section 8 looks at the current position and the changes made since 2000, as well as areas for further improvement
  - Section 9 reports on the conclusions and the lessons to be learnt
  - The recommendations of this case review are in Section 10
- 2.17 An addendum has been provided in section 11 to include information obtained following the writing of the report. This is derived from a later interview with Dean A, after his request to contribute to the review process.
- 2.18 The individual identity of contributors to the case review process have not been disclosed in the report, except where those quoted were interviewed in their official positions.
- 2.19 The contents of the following report and in particular its conclusions and recommendations represent a consensus view of the multi-agency steering group.

## **3 CASE REVIEW PROCESS**

### **STEERING GROUP MEMBERSHIP**

- 3.1 The steering group provided a multi-agency forum to guide the process and ensure objectivity. The group consisted of representatives from three West Sussex ACPC agencies (all with expertise in child protection), the clergy (with no Sussex connections) and Victim Support. DCPA2 provided the link between the group and the Bishop B.
- 3.2 The group was chaired by Peter Collier QC, a barrister who practices in both criminal and child care law; he has been a Crown Court Recorder since 1988 and Deputy High Court Judge in the Family Division since 1998.
- 3.3 Edina Carmi, independent social work consultant co-ordinated the work of the group, undertook interviews and drafted reports for the steering group. She specialises in working in the field of child protection and has undertaken several ACPC Serious Case Reviews, as well as having written several authorities' child protection procedures, including the London Child Protection Procedures.
- 3.4 Membership of the steering group was as follows:
- Chair: Peter Collier Q.C.
  - Sussex Victim Support representative
  - West Sussex Social & Caring Department representative
  - Sussex Police representative
  - West Sussex Education Department representative
  - Clergy representative (unconnected to Diocese of Chichester)
  - Diocesan Child Protection Advisor (DCPA2 - Diocese of Chichester)
  - Independent Review Lead: Edina Carmi

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

- 3.5 The steering group met for the first time on 07.09.01 and agreed the terms of reference for the review. These were slightly amended at the meeting on the 12.12.02 following the further police investigation mentioned below in 3.13.
- 3.6 The purpose of this case review was to:
- Establish, from this case, whether there are lessons to be learnt regarding the ways in which the Chichester Diocese (Church of England) can improve safeguards for children and young people involved in Church activities.
  - Establish whether there are lessons to be learnt regarding the way in which the Church of England, in the Chichester Diocese, can improve working arrangements with the statutory ACPC agencies.
  - Identify clearly the lessons to be learnt, how they will be acted upon and what is expected to change as a result.

- Develop a model of good practice to be made generally available to the Church of England including guidance regarding:
    - The conduct of Case Reviews
    - Relationships between Cathedral, school and wider community
    - Responses by the Cathedral to child protection concerns and during police investigations
- 3.7 The media references to cover ups and the possibility that some individuals had knowledge or concerns about CO1 in the past, said to be inappropriately investigated in the past, provided the starting point to the review process.
- 3.8 The methodology employed was to offer the opportunity for contributions from a wide range of stakeholders: victims and their families, then parents, ex-pupils and staff from School A, members of the Cathedral community, and its staff and volunteer helpers.
- 3.9 Additional information would be requested from the police and other agencies, the Cathedral and from specific individuals / roles within the school and Cathedral.
- 3.10 The focus of the case review was around the activities of CO1, but it was recognised that there may be allegations made about other individuals. All such allegations would be passed to the police.
- 3.11 It was agreed that if there are lessons to be learnt that will better protect children involved in Church activities, they will be relevant to the review, even if they arise from concerns about individuals other than CO1.

## **CONDUCT OF REVIEW**

- 3.12 Following the first steering group meeting in September 2001, the police passed a letter from Bishop B to all victims, offering them and their families the opportunity to contact Edina Carmi, in confidence, so as to contribute to the review. There was little response to this letter.
- 3.13 In November 2001, the police requested that the review be temporarily suspended as a second police investigation had been initiated into possible offences of Perverting the Course of Justice and Misconduct in Public Office. Interviews with victims and their families proceeded, but no further work was undertaken by the review until the criminal investigation was completed.
- 3.14 The steering group met again on 12.12.02 following the completion of the police investigation. No charges resulted from this very thorough criminal investigation into possible offences of Perverting the Course of Justice and Misconduct in Public Office, but allegations were made in connection with an ex-teacher at School A during the 1970s and he was charged, prosecuted and subsequently convicted in May 2003.
- 3.15 Much of the information derived during the criminal investigations is relevant to this case review and the police provided anonymised data for the purposes of this case review.

- 3.16 A major part of the methodology centred around providing the opportunity for victims, families, ex-pupils of School A, ex-choristers, parents, ex-parents, members of the Cathedral congregation, school and Cathedral staff and voluntary helpers with the opportunity to express any concerns or suggestions about arrangements to safeguard children involved in Church activities.
- 3.17 The response from victims and their families was limited. The involvement of the other identified stakeholders relied on the co-operation of the Cathedral and School A. Whilst the co-operation was forthcoming in principle, in practice arrangements to facilitate this have been extremely complicated, taken a considerable period of time and have limited the scope of the review process.

### **Information from parents, ex-pupils and staff of School A**

- 3.18 The headmaster of School A initially agreed in February 2003 to send out a letter to parents, ex-pupils and staff, providing information about the case review and contact details. However, this was subject to the agreement of the school governors.
- 3.19 At the end of March 2003, Edina Carmi was invited to attend a meeting with the Dean of the Chichester Cathedral (Dean B) in his role of chair of governors, the headmaster and three other governors. Concerns were expressed about the need to ensure the letter was expressed sufficiently sensitively, the difficulty of contacting ex-pupils and the difficult timing due to the approaching court case of CO2 as a result of the second police investigation.
- 3.20 Dean B undertook to take further advice regarding the timing and wording of letters to parents and the letter to staff would follow the same format.
- 3.21 Information was sent to parents about the CO2 court case, but it is understood that Dean B decided that the letter about CO1 should be deferred. An e-mail dated 18.06.03 from the Head Teacher confirmed that he was still awaiting the outcome of the Chapter meeting and further advice from the school governors.
- 3.22 An undated letter from Dean B to Peter Collier in July 2003 referred to the intention of the Head Teacher to put a note into the Parent Teacher Association Newsletter. No confirmation has been received that this occurred.

### **Information from the Cathedral community**

- 3.23 Dean B met with Edina Carmi in February 2003. At this meeting he expressed support for the purpose of the case review and agreed in principle to facilitate the process.
- 3.24 Following this meeting Dean B became increasingly concerned at the potential negative impact of the case review process, so long after the conviction of CO1.
- 3.25 The concerns of Dean B and Chapter, expressed at meetings and in letters included:
- Potential distress caused by stirring up issues so long after the event
  - Possible legal and financial implications
  - Apprehension that the process is that of an inquiry rather than a review
  - Likely responses to new allegations and to anonymous information
  - Scope of the final report

- 3.26 Confirmation was received that an entry was made in the 'Cathedral Notes' for 3 consecutive weeks commencing on the 20.07.03. This gave contact details but did not state CO1's name, but referred to him as a 'senior lay volunteer'. This item led to a small response from members of the community, despite being circulated during the holiday season and with no offer of confidentiality to the contributors.
- 3.27 Once the wording was agreed a similar note was to be given to staff and volunteers at the Cathedral. It is not known if this occurred. To avoid any type of 'fishing exercise' or feeling of intimidation, the intention was to enable all to contribute in confidence, rather than selecting specified individuals who may or may not have relevant information about CO1.
- 3.28 Interviews were undertaken with specific staff in relevant positions to provide the review with critical information. This involved the current Communar and Organist & Master of Choristers.

### **Information from Chichester Cathedral Choristers' Association**

- 3.29 In an effort to contact at least some ex-pupils, Chichester Cathedral Choristers' Associations was approached.
- 3.30 After careful consideration and discussion at a committee meeting in May 2003, they agreed to send out a letter with their newsletter. These were ready for distribution in June 2003, but no contacts with Edina Carmi resulted and the inference in the letter from Dean B to Peter Collier in July is that it was not sent.
- 3.31 The letter stated that '*Neither the Chichester Cathedral Chorister's Association nor we can accede to the request that former choristers be contacted...*'. The decision was made apparently on the grounds of data protection and the possibility that it would be deeply disturbing to CO1's victims '*who themselves have tried to put these events behind them...*'. This suggests that the letters were never sent to members.

### **Outcome**

- 3.32 The steering group meeting of the 20.06.03 decided that the review should be completed at this stage, using whatever information was available from the police and other contributors. This decision was based on the difficulties contacting the various stakeholders originally identified, the lack of response from victims and their families, the length of time since CO1's conviction and the very thorough subsequent police investigation.
- 3.33 The focus of this case review process was therefore limited and restricted through the inability to hear from victims and others who may have knowledge about how CO1 was able to abuse children for over 30 years without detection.
- 3.34 This was partly due to lack of response, possibly connected to the delay in conducting the review process and partly due to the limitations imposed on making contact with stakeholders.
- 3.35 The information in this case review is based on an analysis of:
- Anonymised documents provided by the police
  - Interviews and documents provided by the Diocesan Child Protection Advisors (past and present)

- Interviews and documents provided by the Communar and Organist at the Cathedral
  - Interviews and documents provided by the Head Teacher of School A
  - Interviews with two victims
  - Interviews with two parents of victims
  - Interviews with one member of the congregation and ex-parent of choristers
  - Telephone conversation with an ex-chorister and an ex-parent of chorister
  - Two written contributions and one anonymous telephone message
  - Various meetings and conversations with the Dean B, Chapter, some school governors
- 3.36 Following the submission of a report to the Bishop in October 2003, the previous Dean (Dean A), now retired, requested the opportunity to contribute to the Case Review process. An addendum has been added to represent the information he has added to the review through this interview.
- 3.37 The steering group met with Bishop B and the national Church of England Child Protection Advisor on the 12.12.03.
- 3.38 This meeting resulted in limited changes of wording to some recommendations to maximise clarity.

## 4 INFORMATION ABOUT THE CRIMES

- 4.1 This case involves the systematic 'grooming' and sexual abuse of young children over a period of nearly 30 years. The offences start in January 1971 and continue until shortly before CO1's arrest in Spring 2000.
- 4.2 CO1 was charged with 41 offences over a period of 29 years. He was convicted on 32 charges: pleading guilty to 31 offences and being found guilty of one offence at the criminal trial. He was found not guilty of a further charge and eight have been left on file.
- 4.3 The convictions are against a total of twelve boys. Three further individuals made allegations and these counts have been left on file. One relates to indecent assault of a girl.
- 4.4 The convicted offences range from 23 charges of indecent assault, 5 of buggery, 1 of indecency with a child under 14 years and 2 of attempt to procure acts of gross indecency. The most serious offence of buggery without consent *first* occurred (as far as is known) in 1971.
- 4.5 CO1 was found not guilty of a charge of buggery without consent.
- 4.6 The counts left on file involve 5 indecent assaults against males, 1 indecent assault against a female and 2 counts of perverting the course of justice.
- 4.7 The indictment was drafted to include only periods when the victims of indecent assault were under 16 years old. Some of the counts, including the most serious, relate to specimen charges and the offences continued over a long period.

### AGE OF VICTIMS

- 4.8 There was a widespread assumption by members of the Cathedral and school that the victims were abused when they were aged at least thirteen years old and had left School A. There was shock during the review process when this assumption was challenged.
- 4.9 The Chapter and School A were extremely anxious about establishing details of the victims *at the time the offences occurred*. They requested information on their precise age, whether they were pupils at the school, whether or not they were choristers and if the offences occurred at times when they were in the care of the school or their parents.
- 4.10 It has not been possible to provide the precise details that have been requested due to the limitations of available information, which are based on what was required by police for the prosecution of CO1.
- 4.11 Most of the charges against CO1 were either 'specimen charges' that occurred more than once over a time period, or where the date of the offence is known to have occurred at an unknown date within a time span. The time span used commenced either on the 1<sup>st</sup> January of the year the crime was committed or on the victim's birthday (presumably dependent on whether the crime was said to have occurred within specific year/s or when the victim was a particular age).

- 4.12 The following data provides the youngest possible age of abuse of victim; this is calculated using either the earliest of the date range of the charges or where a specific date of offence is available, the exact age. Some of the ages given are therefore likely to be the youngest possible age at which the offence was committed, but are not precise.
- 4.13 The earliest age at which the 12 victims were known to have been abused is:
- 3 victims aged 11 years.
  - 2 victims aged 12 years
  - 4 victims aged 13 years
  - 2 victims aged 14 years
  - 1 victim aged 15 years

## **HOW CO1 MET HIS VICTIMS**

- 4.14 CO1 met all his victims at Cathedrals. He got to know 14 through his responsibilities in Chichester Cathedral and 1 when visiting Winchester Cathedral during the Southern Cathedrals' Festival.
- 4.15 Of the 14 victims met through his role at Chichester Cathedral 11 were at or had attended School A and 8 of these were or had been choristers. 3 other victims were involved in Chichester Cathedral activities as servers. The 15<sup>th</sup> victim met CO1 at Winchester Cathedral, when he attended the Southern Cathedrals' Festival, but was abused after visiting Chichester Cathedral to take part in the following year's Festival. He was also a chorister.
- 4.16 Of the 12 victims for whom CO1 was convicted of offences, 7 of those that attended School A were aged under 14 when the abuse started and may have still been in the choir and / or the school. 3 had left School A when the abuse commenced.

## **IMPACT OF ABUSE**

- 4.17 It is now beyond question that the impact of sexual abuse can have major long term effects on all aspects of a child's health and development, causing a deep impact on their self image and self esteem, and extending into adulthood. The impact may be demonstrated in disturbed behaviour 'including self-harm, inappropriate sexualised behaviour, sadness, depression and a loss of self-esteem...' *Working Together to Safeguard Children 2.13 p.7.*
- 4.18 This aspect of the abuse was one of the main points that were made by the victims and their families when interviewed and in the court case.
- 4.19 Sometimes the damage caused was apparent early with disruptive and out of control adolescent behaviour, impaired educational attainment, and misuse of alcohol. A parent described how their son was brought up to be honest and truthful. Through this abuse, with a person perceived as a highly respected and authoritative figure at the Cathedral, he was taught to keep secrets and be dishonest.

- 4.20 In other cases the severe impact on the victim's life only becomes apparent later. One victim described how at the time of the abuse he was shocked, but then 'it appeared to become like a dream' which he tried to keep at the back of his mind. After a successful career this man had a breakdown involving suicidal attempts. He has still not recovered sufficiently to be able to work.
- 4.21 Lasting effects of the abuse described by other victims in this case were mentioned in the court proceedings and include feeling dirty, sick, angry, helpless and suicidal over the years and in some cases confused about their own sexuality.
- 4.22 The victims interviewed described the need for psychiatric treatment and counselling. In one case this enabled the victim to report the abuse to the police. They have experienced an intermittent need for mental health treatment. Due to lack of sufficiently intensive or appropriate provision through the NHS, victims or their families have funded this themselves.

## 5 CO1'S POSITION WITHIN CHICHESTER

- 5.1 CO1 was born in 1938. His father was Chichester's town clerk and he was Head Steward at the Cathedral. The family lived at 'The Treasury' in Canon Lane from 1945 and he attended School A.
- 5.2 After the two sons left home the school required more space and CO1's parents moved into a flat within the converted building.
- 5.3 Following the death of his parents, CO1 was moved to alternative local Church owned property in 1994. The Dean stated to police that he wanted to develop the Treasury into a visitor's centre and no evidence has been found for any other reason for the move.
- 5.4 CO1 worked at the BBC in London during the 1970s and 1980s as a floor manager, living in Hammersmith, but frequently staying at Chichester at weekends and for several weeks over the summer, when he worked for the Festivities. He also worked at the Chichester Festival Theatre in its earliest years, later becoming a trustee.
- 5.5 CO1 had a very high standing within Chichester arising from his background and activities in various linked organisations that form the foundation of a particular sector of Chichester society. He was perceived to be close to Dean A and other clergy, frequently seen at social occasions, particularly at 'drinks parties'.
- 5.6 A written comment received by the review possibly demonstrates the position of CO1 and his family and the regard with which they were held:

*'CO1's family is well - known locally and have given generously of their time, talents and money particularly to the arts and the Cathedral for about half a century, for most of which they lived in the Treasury, in Canon Lane.'*

### CHICHESTER CATHEDRAL

- 5.7 CO1's father was the Head Steward at the Cathedral, with responsibility for seat allocation. He helped his father in this work and after his father's death in 1989 he took over the role himself.
- 5.8 This role was perceived to be a powerful position within the Cathedral, able to control the provision of privileged seating. The Communar, (who joined the Cathedral in 2001), heard that CO1 used to insist on having a row of seats in a favourable position under his patronage.
- 5.9 There is a general belief that this position was a voluntary one, and the Communar has not been able to find any evidence that CO1 was paid by the Cathedral.
- 5.10 It may be that he had a contractual relationship with the Cathedral, due to the close links with the Festivities. Police found Cathedral minutes from May 1990, which indicate that CO1 was a contracted employee to the Cathedral for managing the Festivities. Dean A was referred to as Vice Chairman at the time – presumably this refers to his own role in the Festivities.
- 5.11 Additionally CO1 and the Crudgemen (see 5.12) stage managed concerts held in the Cathedral, both during the Festivities and at other times.

## **CHICHESTER FESTIVITIES**

- 5.12 Since 1971, CO1 was involved with Chichester Festivities. His role was primarily in relation to running an organisation known as 'the Crudgemen' who organised matters such as lighting, seating and orchestra staging for the Festivities and also for other concerts in the Cathedral during school holidays.
- 5.13 This group of young boys and young men, were largely former choristers. CO1 gave these young people money for their work. He initially undertook this responsibility on a voluntary basis, but following his retirement from the BBC he was paid a fee.
- 5.14 The boys involved in the Crudgemen are variously said to be over 13 years old or over 15 years old. However one victim recalled being paid £5 a time when he was 10 & 11 years old, to assist with the 'numbering and lettering'. His mother recalled him putting out seats.

## **SOUTHERN CATHEDRALS' FESTIVAL**

- 5.15 The Southern Cathedrals' Festival (SCF) alternates between Chichester, Winchester and Salisbury. Once every 3 years, when the SCF is held in Chichester, it follows the Festivities and since 1975 CO1 continued the front of house and staging arrangements for the extra 3 days of the SCF.
- 5.16 The organist at the Cathedral was clear that no payment or fee was paid to CO1 for this work, either directly or through the Festivities.
- 5.17 Whilst CO1 may have attended concerts in the years when the SCF was held at Winchester and Salisbury, he went in an entirely private capacity, without any official function or role.

## **SCHOOL A**

- 5.18 The second police investigation established that in 1973 the then Head Teacher of School A held a meeting following an allegation of abuse on a pupil. The details of this allegation remain unknown, but the outcome was that CO1 was 'banned' from the school.
- 5.19 Subsequently it appears that staff at the school knew there was a ban on CO1, but were unaware of the reasons for it. The cathedral's Priest Vicar, who joined the school in 1974, told police that he was aware of the ban at the outset, but was never told of the circumstances, although he assumed it concerned boys.
- 5.20 The current headmaster learned after he arrived in 1982 that CO1 was persona non grata in the school. He cannot recall when, why and by whom he was told this. He understood it to be because CO1's over familiarity with the boys undermined school discipline. He referred to the fact that a former Priest Vicar used to be annoyed by the disrespectful attitude of the choristers when they were in the presence of CO1.
- 5.21 The Cathedral organist understood the ban to be due to CO1's behaviour: he was perceived as a nuisance whose presence could be disruptive. He might, for example, without permission borrow benches from the school hall for use in a concert in the Cathedral, commandeering school boarders to help carry them through.

- 5.22 Whilst this ban was thought to have been observed, the example cited above by the organist suggests that this ban was not total. Further evidence of this inconsistency has come to light:
- A former parent of a child at School A recalls seeing CO1 using the school's swimming pool in 1976. This was corroborated by his ex-wife.
  - A victim has provided a clear account of CO1's presence during the daytime at CO1's workshops at the rear of the Treasury building, long after he had moved out. Apparently he was allowed to retain use of these buildings for the work of the Crudgemen. The boys would pass him to / from their lessons in the Treasury building, providing opportunity for private conversations.

### **CO1'S ABILITY TO ACCESS, GROOM AND ABUSE VICTIMS**

- 5.23 Pupils at School A perceived that their teachers were deferential to Dean A, Bishop A and particular individuals associated with the Cathedral. CO1 was one of these individuals and was on Christian name terms with those held in highest regard and awe by the pupils.
- 5.24 Moreover, CO1 lived in Canon Lane and subsequently in nearby Church property and as Head Steward was responsible for the allocation of seats within the Cathedral. This was a position of some import and power to both choristers and their parents as he was able to determine which parents would be able to see their child easily at Cathedral services.
- 5.25 Through CO1's responsibilities in the Cathedral, he was able to get to know the choristers and their parents. His apparent high standing within this society meant some parents felt he must be trustworthy. During services he sat immediately behind the lay vicars, which indicated his high status and position in the hierarchy of the Cathedral.
- 5.26 The parents were flattered by his friendship; for some, the potential for being given preferential seating within the Cathedral would have made CO1's friendship most attractive. He would greet people on arrival and show them to their seats.
- 5.27 Although CO1 had no official role when the choir went elsewhere to sing, he was perceived to be part of the choir's organisation. One victim from another cathedral city described CO1 as close to the Deans of both Cathedrals, whilst a parent recalls that he accompanied groups of boys on a trip to France.
- 5.28 The boys were flattered by the attentions of such an important man who appeared to take their side against other adults and acted as their friend. His personality could be charming and persuasive. He was also perceived by the boys to be close to Dean A and other senior clergy, so was regarded as an important man.
- 5.29 A victim recalled that CO1 would wave to his favourites at evensong, which made them feel special. A member of the Cathedral congregation said that when her sons were in the choir they noticed that CO1 would leave notes on the pews for some boys and bought expensive gifts for favoured boys. A victim remembers being paid £5.00 by CO1 from the age of about 11 to put out seats and help with numbering.
- 5.30 CO1 took boys out to tea, bought them presents, meals and alcohol. At his home he used alcohol to break down inhibitions and would then proceed to introduce his victims to pornographic heterosexual and homosexual videos to start the process of abuse.

- 5.31 The abuse took place mainly at CO1's home, including the Treasury, the flat in London and the house in Chichester. Sometimes boys would stay with him at his house in Chichester and / or at his flat in London, when he would show them round the studios of the BBC.
- 5.32 The abuse continued after CO1's marriage and on occasions when his wife was asleep in the room next door.
- 5.33 One victim from the early 1980s was seen being embraced by CO1 in St. Richard's Walk. The victim recalls being kissed by him around the Cathedral grounds and precinct on a number of occasions.
- 5.34 CO1 joined one family in camping holidays where he abused the child.
- 5.35 One victim was taken to a hotel in Guildford, one to an all male sauna in London at the age of 13 and another one was taken to a sauna in Brighton. Two of the boys were sometimes abused in each other's presence.

## 6 CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION

### OTHER ALLEGED OR CONVICTED ABUSERS

- 6.1 Following CO1's arrest and conviction it was rumoured that he was only one of the men known or suspected to have abused children involved in Chichester Cathedral activities during the last 30 years.
- 6.2 The second police investigation attempted to discover more details of other possible sex abusers that were rumoured to have been part of the Cathedral and / or school community. The following information is largely based on their reports.
- 6.3 The names of the convicted offenders have been used, but P1, P2, P3, P4 and P6's identities have not been disclosed, as they have not been convicted. The use of 'P' to denote the suspected perpetrator is in accordance with the police report. The identity of the victims has not been disclosed and the letter 'V' has been used to denote victims.
- 6.4 CO1 will certainly have known CO3, P2, P3 & P4. The police did not find evidence that they acted together, although it is known that they socialised together and a mother recalls an evening when CO1 and P3 joined together to take out two of the victims for a meal.

### CO3

- 6.5 In 1990 CO3 was convicted of 5 indecent assault charges and confessed to sexual relationships with a further 8 children. He was a teacher at School B, a lay vicar (see glossary) at the Cathedral and ran the choir at a Church in Chichester.
- 6.6 However, this conviction is 4 years after the first allegations were made about him in 1986. Police have established that allegations were made to 2 members of the clergy, but were never reported to the police or social services.
- 6.7 In 1987 a second allegation was made to the school and police. No prosecution resulted, CO3 continued teaching, but received a warning following the school holding a tribunal (no further information is available on the status of this action, but presumably refers to a disciplinary hearing).
- 6.8 In 1989 parents of a third victim alleged abuse of their daughter to School B. This was not reported to the police. The headmaster suggested that CO3 see a priest to confess and it is understood that this occurred and CO3 remained a teacher and lay vicar.
- 6.9 Finally in 1990 the allegations by a fourth victim led to a police investigation, prosecution and conviction.
- 6.10 CO3 was released from prison in 1992 and eventually returned to the Chichester area and participated in the choir at the same church again. Police discovered Cathedral notes indicating that in 1996 CO3 was participating in choirs visiting the Cathedral and by 1999 Cathedral records show him acting as a reserve lay vicar. He is also said to have participated in choirs performing at the crematorium, at a funeral apparently attended by one of his victims.

## **CO2**

- 6.11 During the second police investigation an allegation was made that a teacher at School A in 1976 had abused a young boy. The Head Teacher at the time dealt with this by insisting the teacher resigned, but did not report the matter to the police. The parents understood the offence to be minor and did not wish to take it further.
- 6.12 CO2 was convicted of offences in May 2003.

### **Other allegations**

- 6.13 Whilst there are no further convictions for sexual offences against individuals known to be closely associated with Chichester Cathedral during this period, there have been other allegations made against at least four people.
- 6.14 The recent police investigation included an allegation about serious sexual offences committed in 1985 to 1986. The allegations against P2 concern a senior member of the clergy who was in a position of responsibility for children. In 1989 police interviewed P2 regarding an allegation of indecency between him and a choirboy, but no further action was taken. Allegations were repeated in the 2002 police investigation, but no further action will be taken due to insufficient evidence.
- 6.15 Between 1988 and 1989 a mother was told by one of the clergy that as her son, aged about 11 years old, was now a senior chorister he was entitled to 'treats' including nights out with P4 and week-ends on his farm. Although these parents refused various treats offered by this man e.g. trips to go swimming or to go to a London theatre, P4 was later investigated by the police and charged with offences against several boys, including this woman's son. P4 went to France and committed suicide. He was a leading figure in the Choristers' Association.
- 6.16 In June 2000 P3, a teacher at School B and another leading figure of the Choristers' Association was arrested for indecent assault on 2 boys. He was charged and admitted the offences against one boy, but charges were dropped when one boy became unwilling to give evidence in court. He no longer teaches at School B.
- 6.17 The latest police investigation was told by a victim of another boy having told him that he was abused by P6, a teacher at School A, who has since left the school and is no longer alive.

## 7 MANAGEMENT OF CHILD PROTECTION

### IMPLEMENTATION OF CHILD PROTECTION POLICY, PROCEDURE AND GUIDANCE

#### Societal Context

- 7.1 The scope of this case review covers 30 years. During this time the perceptions and recognition of child abuse have dramatically changed.
- 7.2 In 1974 the inquiry into the death of Maria Colwell highlighted a serious lack of co-ordination within child protection services and its report led to the development of Area Child Protection Committees (ACPCs), which co-ordinate the agencies responsible for ensuring the safety of children.
- 7.3 During the 1970s the focus of child protection work was on preventing physical abuse and it was during the 1980s that sexual abuse became increasingly recognised within professional child protection agencies, highlighted by the events in Cleveland resulting in the *Report of the Inquiry into Child Abuse in Cleveland 1987 HMSO 1988*.
- 7.4 During the 1990s there was increasing public recognition of child abuse, encompassing abuse within boarding schools, through Esther Rantzen's *Childwatch* television programmes and the highly publicised launch of the Childline charity.
- 7.5 The Children Act 1989, implemented in 1991 gave every child the right to protection from abuse and exploitation and the right to have inquiries made to safeguard their welfare.
- 7.6 Also in 1991, *Working Together Under The Children Act DOH (1991)* clearly stated the expectations of all agencies to work together to protect children, which was updated in *Working Together to Safeguard Children DOH1999*.
- 7.7 The passing of the Children Act in 1989 alerted Churches to some of the external demands regarding practice in work with children. The 1993 Home Office document *Safe from Harm* contained 13 good practice guidelines for all voluntary organisations about how to safeguard children within their organisations. This included the need to implement procedures to protect children and for volunteers, for any position involving contact with children, to be subject to the same safeguarding checks as staff i.e. taking up of references, exploration of previous experience and enquiring about any convictions for criminal offences against children.
- 7.8 Within the Church of England the response in 1995 was the House of Bishop's *Policy on Child Protection*, since updated in 1999. This provided a child protection policy for the Church and recommendations to dioceses about policy implementation.

## Diocesan context

- 7.9 The first Diocesan Child Protection Advisor (DCPA1) for the Diocese of Chichester was appointed in 1997 as part of the implementation of this policy. The policy clearly states the responsibilities of this post, which include the provision of:
- Child protection advice to clergy, paid staff and volunteers
  - Information and training to clergy, paid staff and volunteers
  - Advice when any allegation is made
  - Advice to the Bishop on the future employment possibilities, if any, for anyone convicted of an offence
- 7.10 One of DCPA1's first tasks was to write the diocesan guidelines *The Protection of Children*. The draft was presented to and accepted by the Bishop's staff meeting in the summer of 1997. Present at this meeting was the Dean of the Chichester Cathedral (Dean A) and the Archdeacon of Chichester, both members of the Cathedral Chapter at that time.
- 7.11 In September 1997 the document was sent out to all clergy for implementation and each congregation asked to provide a child protection representative to take responsibility for implementing the policy within parishes and to receive training.
- 7.12 At the time of CO1's arrest, in the spring of 2000, the Cathedral along with some parishes, had not yet approved the diocesan child protection guidelines, nor appointed a child protection representative nor asked for any training for their volunteers.
- 7.13 Child protection training is not mandatory. Some members of the clergy at the Cathedral have attended training. Cathedral Chapter members participated in safeguarding training variously between 1997 and 2000, with some undertaking training prior to joining Chapter, and others, including the Dean of the Cathedral (Dean A) and the Archdeacon of Chichester, not doing so until after CO1's arrest.
- 7.14 Following CO1's arrest, DCPA1 helped the Cathedral write their child protection policy, encouraged them to appoint a lay child protection representative who was not an employee of the Cathedral and conducted training sessions for volunteers and adult members of the Cathedral choir.

## RESPONSE TO ALLEGATIONS, COMPLAINTS AND CONCERNS

### 1970s

- 7.15 School A is known to have been aware of concerns about both CO1 and CO2 in the 1970s. Although the allegations concerning these men were crimes they were not reported to the police. Unfortunately this response, whilst not protecting other children, was possibly consistent with existing society norms of the day. At that time the focus of child protection was in relation to physical abuse.
- 7.16 Given the lack of recognition of sexual abuse at that time and the lack of any child protection procedures, the Head Teacher of School A took reasonable action by 'banning' CO1 in 1973 and forcing CO2 to resign in 1976.

- 7.17 There is no evidence that the Cathedral were involved in the management of any allegations involving CO1 during this period. However, the Dean of that period would have been chair of the governing body and likely to have known about the school's response to the recognised risk. Unfortunately the implications for choristers in the Cathedral were **not** addressed then or at any time in the subsequent 27 years.
- 7.18 In reference to the rumours circulating about CO1, the Priest Vicar between 1974 and 1982 confirmed to police that the Dean at the time and Bishop A would have been aware of concerns surrounding him.
- 7.19 The ban on CO1 at the school was generally maintained during the 1970s, but there was a report to the police that he used the swimming pool in 1976.

## **1980s**

- 7.20 By the beginning of the 1980's the ban on CO1 was still maintained by the school, but there was a misunderstanding about its origins. The new headmaster and others believed it was due to CO1's disruptive influence on pupils' behaviour.
- 7.21 Without a real understanding of the risks, the observation of the ban was only partial as CO1 acquired use of the workshops behind the Treasury and went into the school to 'borrow' benches for concerts, commandeering pupils to help him.
- 7.22 From police information CO1 was seen embracing one of his victims on Cathedral grounds in 1980 or 1981. This was apparently reported to the Priest Vicar (see glossary), but he has no recollection of this and no action was taken. The victim, a School A pupil, told police that the Cathedral authorities must have known about the rumours circulating about CO1.
- 7.23 The school Head Teacher and Priest Vicar (a senior teacher) were clear that the victim must not mix with CO1. However, there appears to have been a narrow focus on events inside the school, without addressing the risks caused by CO1 outside the school gates, within the Cathedral precinct. It may be that the Head Teacher would not have the power to challenge the way that the Dean and Chapter managed these issues.
- 7.24 During the 1980s there were no specific allegations to the school or clergy about CO1, other than the one above. However it does appear as if there was a wider knowledge that CO1 may be attracted to boys and the police were told that various key individuals warned parents about him.
- 7.25 The victim from 1980/81 also mentioned that rumours circulated about P3 at that time. He was a teacher at School B and a key figure in the Choristers' Association.
- 7.26 Allegations were made against P2 and investigated by the police during the 1980s, but the outcome of the investigation is unclear.
- 7.27 A concerning child protection practice in 1988/89 relates to P4. From the account given to police by the victim's mother, a member of the clergy introduced the concept that her son was entitled to treats as a senior chorister (aged 11). These treats were being taken out and staying overnight with P4 another leading member of the Choristers' Association. By this time the risks of sex abuse were well known in society and whilst the parents declined the offers, and knew this was unsafe, a member of the clergy appeared to approve of the behaviour.

- 7.28 There was further concerning professional practice during the 1980s in relation to CO3 who was eventually convicted in 1990 at Lewes Crown Court of 5 indecent assault charges and confessed to sexual relationships with a further 8 children.
- 7.29 As early as 1986 and 1987 two members of the clergy were provided with an allegation of rape. This was not reported to the police despite the clear knowledge that a serious crime had been alleged.
- 7.30 In 1987 another allegation was made against CO3 and reported to the police by the parents. No further action resulted from this other than a warning following a school tribunal (see 6.8). If the allegations made by the previous victim had been available to the police the outcome may well have been different and subsequent victims would have been protected.
- 7.31 In 1989 a further allegation was made against CO3. This was not reported to the police by School B. It is understood that CO3 went to see a priest to confess, but no further action was taken. CO3 remained a lay vicar and teacher.
- 7.32 Finally, when a fourth victim made an allegation to police in 1990, CO3 was finally prosecuted for his offences.
- 7.33 During the 1980s it appears as if the changed attitudes to child protection within society had not had an impact within the diocese. Clergy appear not to have reported allegations and choristers were encouraged, by at least one clergyman, to have treats that involved unsafe exposure to adults,

## **1990s**

- 7.34 In 1991 a 12 year old victim alleged that he had been shown a pornographic video at CO1's home in the Treasury in 1991. The grandmother reported the matter to the then Bishop's (Bishop A) wife and the parents were summoned to speak with a Canon. The Bishop's wife is said to have inferred that there had been previous problems with CO1, whilst the Canon is reported to have made the parents feel they were making too much of a minor incident.
- 7.35 The child, parents and grandparents quite clearly perceived this incident was worrying, yet those in authority appeared not to share the concerns and demonstrated a lack of appreciation of the risks associated with CO1's behaviour.
- 7.36 A member of the congregation and parent of ex-choristers was able to confirm that another mother warned her about CO1 during the 1990s. Although there was no specific incident mentioned, there was an understanding that CO1 was interested in young boys. This was thought to be fairly common knowledge.
- 7.37 In June 1991 two young men made allegations that they had been abused by P4 in the past. This was reported to Dean A and Head Teacher of School A. Dean A conducted a taped interview with P4, where he admitted the allegations and resigned his positions in the Cathedral. This internal investigation could have impacted on any subsequent prosecution.
- 7.38 Although the matter was referred to the school as well as Dean A, they did not inform police or social services, presumably because it was seen to be the Dean's decision.

- 7.39 The parent of one victim told police that Dean A was most concerned with the implications for her son, the school and the Cathedral should the matter appear in the papers. It appears as if the focus was on ensuring that decisions were taken internally and the matter kept out of the media.
- 7.40 However, parents did later report the matter to the police, P4 was charged and subsequently committed suicide. Following the matter being reported Dean A was perceived by the parent to be angry at her, complaining that he was having to carry the 'can' and denying any responsibility.
- 7.41 Whilst Dean A acted responsibly in terms of getting P4 to resign his responsibilities in the Cathedral, he did not report the alleged crimes to the police. Although pre-dating *Safe from Harm* many would have recognised a moral responsibility to report such crimes to the police by this time, so as to prevent harm to other children.
- 7.42 Also during the second half of the 1990s CO3 returned to Chichester and resumed his role in the choir at his local church and performed at the Cathedral and the crematorium.
- 7.43 DCPA 1 attempted to prevent CO3 being in a position to have contact with children. She arranged the provision of expert advice for Bishop A from the Wolvercote Sex Offenders Clinic in Surrey; the head of this clinic met with her and the Bishop to discuss the issue. However, Bishop A supported the parish priest and rejected the advice given that CO3 should not be part of a mixed age choir.
- 7.44 By this point, the gap between the way child protection was managed elsewhere and the responses of the Cathedral and diocese to concerns and risk, appear to have widened to an unacceptable level.

## 2000s

- 7.45 On the 29<sup>th</sup> March 2000, a victim and his mother went to see Dean A, made allegations against CO1 and mentioned another victim, whose identity the Dean instantly guessed.
- 7.46 The victim told police that Dean A advised that he was going to Germany and would discuss the matter on his return and the victim should act on his conscience as the Dean could not act on mere allegations.
- 7.47 By this stage there were clear child protection procedures, both in West Sussex and in the Diocese of Chichester. *The Protection of Children, 1997* states on p.17 that 'the parish priest will discuss the concerns with the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor who will decide what action to take'. It also reminds the reader that it is the social services responsibility to decide whether to investigate.
- 7.48 Dean A did not report the matter to the DCPA 1, the police or social services. Fortunately the father of another victim, on hearing about the abuse the next day, reported the allegations to the police.
- 7.49 DCPA 1 was not informed of the allegations against CO1 until she was called by the Communar, on the 10<sup>th</sup> April 2000. This was the date CO1 was arrested and also the date that Dean A called a Chapter meeting.

- 7.50 DCPA 1 contacted the police immediately to offer any assistance required. She ascertained that support was being provided for the original two complainants, but was not provided with the details of any subsequent complainants.
- 7.51 The parents of one of the victims met with Dean A on 11.05.01. The handwritten notes made by Dean A of that meeting suggest that he felt accused of not doing anything about the situation. The notes state that 'I got him out of the treasury flat!! – (somebody is obviously relaying private conversations)'. The notes continue that the 'mother knew all about the P4 affair.....even mentioned \*\* and P3.' He states he cannot get rid of these people without proof. Dean A's notes continue that 'parents agreed to sons being with CO1 and others'
- 7.52 These notes imply that:
- CO1 was moved out of the Treasury due to some unknown concerns
  - The basis of Dean A's lack of reporting concerns or allegations to the police lay in his mistaken belief that it was up to him to decide if there was sufficient proof
  - Dean A mistakenly believed that if parents agreed to their sons spending time with CO1 (and others) this made a difference to the situation
- 7.53 Dean A's lack of action on hearing of the abuse was at variance with *West Sussex Child Protection Procedures* and the diocesan *The Protection of Children*, implemented in the diocese in 1997.

## **PASTORAL SUPPORT FOLLOWING ALLEGATIONS IN 2000**

- 7.54 Pastoral support was arranged for CO1's wife from a retired clergyman: he was perceived to be supporting CO1 at the criminal court hearing and for victims and their families this appeared to suggest that the Church was openly siding with CO1. This was contrasted to an apparent lack of support to the victims.
- 7.55 In practice it was difficult for the Church to offer support to victims whose identity was unknown. However, with hindsight the Diocesan Child Protection Advisors, past and present, recognise that it may have been possible for a letter offering pastoral support to be forwarded by the police.
- 7.56 The identity of two victims was however known to Dean A and presumably to the Chapter. An offer to provide support to the victims and their families would have been appropriate.
- 7.57 Within a month of CO1's arrest the parents of one victim met with Dean A and asked if their son would be offered the support provided to CO1. The notes the father made of the meeting indicate the Dean A's response was that his door was always open and when was asked if the boy was capable of seeking this support, Dean A said he felt he was able to do so.
- 7.58 The parents comment at the total lack of contact towards them from the Cathedral. The Head Teacher of School A commendably did initiate contact with a father to express his sorrow at what occurred, but in that case he only wrote to one parent of a divorced couple.

- 7.59 The parents interviewed both spoke of the way that clergy and congregation avoided talking to them after the allegations were made. When the father told his local village vicar about what had occurred, the vicar did not respond and subsequently appeared to avoid contact in the village.
- 7.60 Clergy and Cathedral congregation are also reported to have avoided the parents and were said to cross the street to avoid contact, despite one parent having been part of this congregation.
- 7.61 This parent's faith and involvement in the Christian community had been a central feature in her life, and presumably would normally have played a major part in supporting her through such tragedies. However, the lack of support and ostracism from the community meant that this was unavailable and appears to have had a significant effect on her faith.
- 7.62 It does appear as if the dislike of exposing the Cathedral to criticism, mentioned previously in association with Dean A, may have been a widespread part of the culture of the Cathedral resulting in a resentment against those that initiated the process: they tend to be spoken about with anger or condescension, even by those who did not know them personally.
- 7.63 The lack of support was therefore exacerbated by a hostile environment, which appeared to blame victims and families, rather than be grateful for their courage in reporting the matter to the police.
- 7.64 The DCPA 1 and Bishop A did meet with one parent, and it has been recounted that the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor was helpful and supportive.
- 7.65 Victims and their families mentioned that the most helpful form of support was that which arose from meeting other victims and families, but that this requires external help to arrange and possibly facilitate.
- 7.66 One victim mentioned the longer term need to be able to access peer support and was attracted to the possibility of some form of on-line survivors' network, if it was possible to ensure that this would be safe to use.

## VULNERABILITY OF CHORISTERS

- 7.67 The contributors varied in their views of the life of a chorister. One described it as a harsh regime and very stressful. He described very long days except Wednesday, whilst two ex-parents although agreeing on this, felt their sons enjoyed the experience overall. Another chorister, although enjoying the experience felt that boys are treated as 'working, disposable items' rather than children requiring adequate care and protection.
- 7.68 It has been reported that alcohol was said to be consumed by clergy at social occasions. It was alleged that pupils were sometimes allowed to drink on these occasions and a victim reports that no action followed when they were seen clearly inebriated, sometimes in front of the Dean himself.
- 7.69 The School A Head Teacher was not aware of any pupils ever consuming alcohol on these occasions. They were always accompanied by a member of staff to and from such functions, including the annual Candlemas party.
- 7.70 Alcohol was sometimes given to boys by both CO1 and a Canon of the Cathedral. CO1 is reported as giving one boy a crate of beer. The Canon was said to give pupils alcoholic drinks in exchange for performing odd jobs, such as cutting his lawn.
- 7.71 Whilst both Head Teachers during this period expected high standards of care for the pupils within the school, once out of the school buildings, attending the Cathedral and social functions within the Cathedral precincts, the pupils appear to have been exposed to varying standards of care.
- 7.72 Given the ban on CO1 within the school, there was surprisingly no action taken to protect the children from CO1's presence once outside the perimeters of the school boundaries, in the Cathedral and within Cathedral precincts, by CO1 workshops at the rear of the Treasury (where there were further classrooms) and at social functions in Canon Lane and other Church property.
- 7.73 School A was unable to deal with child protection issues beyond its own perimeters, for example when the boys were exposed to CO1 within Cathedral precincts.
- 7.74 Another limitation to the school's ability to manage child protection concerns appears to have occurred when Dean A dealt with allegations: the 1991 allegation against P4 was reported to the school and Dean A. Dean A dealt with the matter and neither organisation reported it to the relevant authorities (see 7.37).

## 8 CURRENT POSITION

- 8.1 The elements of safeguarding children effectively involve:
- Provision of 'safe' care which minimises the vulnerability of children and provides adequate supervision
  - Recognition of child protection issues
  - Response to child protection issues which facilitates appropriate enquires and investigations by social services and police
  - Whistle-blowing systems and other forms of external links
- 8.2 Following the arrest of CO1 the Diocese, the Cathedral and School A have reviewed and amended their procedures and practices so as to better protect children. This section looks at the changes and the current position in the context of safeguarding children.

### CATHEDRAL

- 8.3 There have been a great many changes within the diocese since CO1's arrest in 2000. Both Bishop of Chichester (Bishop A) and the Dean of the Cathedral (Dean A) retired during 2001 and the composition of the Chapter has changed with a new Communar, 2 new Canons and the first lay female member of Chapter.
- 8.4 There have been a number of changes within the administrative staff and with the arrival of a new Dean (Dean B) there is a determination to achieve greater teamwork.
- 8.5 The Cathedral accepted diocesan child protection policy following CO1's arrest and a Cathedral Child Protection Policy & Guidelines was written and adopted in October 2000. This was amended and revised in May 2003 and includes the following provisions:
- All staff and volunteers who are likely to have unsupervised contact with children are vetted through the CRB and subject to two references
  - All staff and volunteers will have clear job descriptions explaining to whom an individual is accountable
  - Regular child protection training is provided
  - Arrangements for reporting child protection concerns
  - Advice about the detailed recording of actions taken and subsequent events
  - Prohibition on anyone with a 'conviction for or a caution about a sexual offence against a child' holding a post or being a volunteer 'in a position that will bring them into contact with children'
- 8.6 Other major changes include:
- The appointment of the Communar as the child protection officer for the Cathedral
  - Appointment of a named independent person, outside the Cathedral administration, that is available for children to contact

- Attendance of key people at child protection training provided by the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor
  - Vetting of all those with unsupervised access to children, including the choir and those attending for educational purposes
  - Vetting procedures changed to incorporate CRB checks
  - In-house child protection briefings for volunteers involved in the Cathedral education programme
  - Introduction of specific regulations concerning choristers and the handover of responsibility for their protection from school to Cathedral and vice-versa
  - All those involved in the stage management for concerts or festivities must be over 18 years of age, including those employed by the Festivities
  - The stewards are no longer able to reserve seats for their friends etc
- 8.7 There have been major changes during the last 3 years and the Chapter has responded to advice from the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor. The focus has changed to one that incorporates current good practice on the provision of safe care, which has looked at improving methods of staff and volunteer recruitment, supervision and management as well as the supervision of children on activities.
- 8.8 Several people interviewed made special mention of the Cathedral organist's continuous help and support to choristers and ex-choristers. He is described as always being honest and committed to the choristers' interests.

### **Recent Management of Child Protection Issues**

- 8.9 The Cathedral took appropriate action when a potentially worrying individual was identified attending evensong: he appeared to be taking an exceptional interest in the choristers. The Communar did contact the police, who confirmed that the individual had a conviction for an offence involving children. He was invited to the Cathedral and signed a written agreement restricting his movement and limiting his seating to be away from the choristers.
- 8.10 The Cathedral took prompt appropriate action following the identification of potential concern. However, the risk was recognised initially by the Diocesan Child Protection Adviser (DCPA 2) and Edina Carmi during a visit to the Cathedral, not by the lay vicars or other clergy, staff and volunteers who presumably would have had the opportunity to observe this man.

### **Areas for further improvement**

- 8.11 The most critical issue is the recognition of child protection concerns. The ability to do this is largely dependent on knowledge, training and culture.
- 8.12 The latest Cathedral *Child Protection Policy and Guidelines* (May 2003) provided by the Communar to this review, refers to regular training, but does not specify which staff and volunteers must receive this training, the type of training required and the frequency at which it is provided.

- 8.13 These cathedral guidelines state that where appropriate staff and volunteers should be provided with copies of this document. However, it is vital that all staff and volunteers, whether or not they have unsupervised access to children, need to know about the Cathedral *Child Protection Policy and Guidelines*. Most should have a basic training in recognition of child abuse and neglect and those with more specific child care responsibilities should have more advanced training and be familiar with the diocesan document *The Care and Protection of Children*.
- 8.14 The basic training on recognition of child abuse and neglect should also address the issue of reporting concerns. This will need to address obstacles to recognition and response in the past. All staff and volunteers must have:
- Permission to be concerned by the behaviour of anyone, whatever their social standing in the community
  - An understanding that concerns need to be reported and explored, regardless of the level of evidence available – this does include ‘gossip’
  - Understanding of the child protection system and whose task it is to decide to take matters forward, including the role of social services and the police
  - Provision of choice in reporting systems, including ‘whistle – blowing’ options and opportunities to make reports outside of the normal management systems
- 8.15 The new Cathedral *Child Protection Policy and Guidelines* only mention the reporting of ‘allegations’. This should be widened to include ‘concerns’ as ‘allegations’ suggest a complaint about a specific incident. Many of the worries about CO1’s and others related to wider issues, such as provision of alcohol, gifts, taking children out on treats, overnight trips etc. and would not have fallen into the scope of specific allegations. This would then be consistent with the diocesan procedures *The Care and Protection of Children* which refer to ‘any suspicion’ on p.19.
- 8.16 A member of the Cathedral congregation spoke of the difficulty of knowing how to flag up concerns, without wishing to spread malicious rumours. Effective publicity about the current guidelines and advice on reporting should also be provided to members of the congregation.
- 8.17 Furthermore, the Cathedral procedures instruct the reader to report allegations immediately to the Communar, the Cathedral’s child protection officer, who will consult the Dean or Canon-in-residence before informing social services, the police and the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor.
- 8.18 Whilst this system may be perfectly acceptable in the majority of cases, it should be expanded to include provision for those who feel uncomfortable with this route e.g. if the concern is about the Communar, the Dean, someone associated closely with the Chapter or any other reason. Alternative routes should be made available directly out of the Cathedral including a ‘whistle blowing’ process and advice about direct access to the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor, social services and / or the police.
- 8.19 The diocesan procedures *The Care and Protection of Children* do cater for the provision of alternative reporting routes on p.19, but neither diocesan nor Cathedral procedures address the issue of anonymous reports of concerns.

- 8.20 During the review process an anonymous letter arrived at the Cathedral. The envelope was addressed to 'Cathedral Offices. Private and Confidential to chairperson of new committee looking at CO1's issues'. However, it was opened in error at the Cathedral before being passed on with an accompanying letter, which stated that '...since it was anonymous and the allegations unsubstantiated, there was no further action to be taken....'.
- 8.21 This comment was of concern, as it appeared that anonymous information would be ignored rather than considered on its own merit. Also, the issue of allegations being substantiated is equally worrying, as this was understood to be a reason for not reporting allegations about CO1 to the police.

## Potential obstacles to improving safeguards for children

### *Closed community*

- 8.22 A feature of closed groups is the tendency of members to be predisposed to think well of each other. Those with a high status within the community are most likely to be regarded as completely trustworthy. Aspiring members may be particularly keen to get the approval of those within the community and may be less likely to be critical of members' behaviour.
- 8.23 It was suggested by several contributors that to be accepted as part of the Cathedral 'community' is a desirable social goal for aspiring parents. It is perceived to be a small closely involved group, providing each other with mutual support and an enjoyable social life.
- 8.24 As with all institutions, risks to safeguarding children increase where there is a 'closed' system, which allows individuals to exert power and influence without checks and balances. Any reporting of concerns outside of such a closed group may be perceived as a betrayal, potentially exposing the community to criticism.
- 8.25 Those responsible for disclosing the abuse to the police in this case report feeling that they experienced the animosity of members of the cathedral community.
- 8.26 During this review process, there was a tendency by some within the community to emphasise the personal problems of those courageous enough to report the matter to the police. The apparent inference appeared to be that personal issues made the victim more liable to abuse and provided the motivation to report the matter to the police.
- 8.27 An example of the view of some in the Cathedral community is in the written comments received by this review. One states that those who have instigated this case review '*know little about the \*\*\* family, a family School A and Cathedral community had struggled to help .....*'.
- 8.28 In practice the parent who reported concerns about CO1 and subsequently highlighted historical issues about the management of child protection has, verbally and in writing, made measured statements focusing clearly on the need to ensure that safeguards for children are improved in the future.

- 8.29 Two of the responses from the congregation are broadly antagonistic to this case review looking at the matter of CO1 again and fear it will *'provide an opportunity for certain individuals to keep the whole subject alive.'* The view is that the matter is now over, lessons already learnt and may only upset people further and be *'deeply hurtful to CO1's friends and relatives, in particular to his wife..'*
- 8.30 This may reflect part of a deeper cultural issue that may take strong leadership to change: the acceptance that it is alright to discuss concerns about sexual abuse and that this involves an openness with others outside of the community, rather than a defensive barrier against all external interference.
- 8.31 Dean B's pro-active approach with the media following CO2's conviction provided a good contrast and elicited a positive response.
- 8.32 A contributor to this case review, who is a current member of the congregation and parent of an ex-pupil at School A, has commented positively on the change in atmosphere since 2000. In the past there was a feeling of being an outsider despite having attended services for many years. There is now a more inclusive atmosphere.
- 8.33 Special mention was made of the abilities of the Precentor, the Chancellor and Canon Residentiary, and the Treasurer of the Cathedral to make people feel included. However, it was felt that the Cathedral still retains many practices that may serve to deter others entering the building. Examples cited were the symbolic message that may be given by closing the rear doors in summer and the use of a sandwich board stating service in progress deterring entry.

#### ***Attitudes to volunteers within the Church***

- 8.34 The Chichester Observer of June 7<sup>th</sup> 2001 quotes an article published that week in the Church Times which reflects a view that was represented in some verbal communications to this case review about CO1:
- ' Which makes the better story? BBC producer abuses boys or.....that the Church of England failed to prevent him?...One quite sees that the church connection helped to put him in touch with boys. But he doesn't seem ever to have had any official church position supervising children, in the way that a priest might.'*
- 8.35 This perception that CO1's voluntary status within the Cathedral is somehow relevant to the child protection responsibilities of the Church may still be a current issue. A member of the congregation pointed out that the use of the term 'senior lay volunteer' within the Cathedral Notes, providing information on this review, appears to minimise the role of CO1 as Head Steward.

#### ***Attitudes to Sexuality and Sexual Abuse***

- 8.36 One of the features of this case review process was the surprise of Dean A, Chapter, Organist and Head Teacher at School A to the idea that any of the boys were abused whilst they were in the choir or at the school. There was a request to establish the exact age abuse started, where it occurred and who was responsible for the child at the time i.e. did it happen during periods of boarding or in the holidays / home leave periods.
- 8.37 Whilst there was some understanding that CO1 would have groomed his victims at a younger age, this was perceived as a separate activity to the actual abuse itself.

- 8.38 When explored, this surprise appeared to arise from a variety of perspectives including:
- Apparent perception of the crimes seemed to change from underage homosexual relationships to child sex abuse
  - Responsibility and liability of the school
  - Responsibility and liability of the Cathedral
- 8.39 Throughout the period within the scope of this review (and most likely even earlier) there were rumours circulating about CO1's sexual proclivities. It would be unlikely that those in positions of responsibility in the Cathedral were unaware of these.
- 8.40 One of the explanations for the lack of any appropriate response may be connected to the complex views of homosexuality within this fairly closed society.
- 8.41 The meaning of Dean A's alleged comments to a parent on 11.05.00 that the 'entire subject was made the more difficult by the House of Lords and Commons voting to bring down the age of consent from homosexual acts to sixteen' is unclear. It may be based on his understanding that the abuse occurred when the victims were aged 16 and 17 years old, and that the change in law meant that this behaviour would not be illegal in the future. This comment suggests Dean A did not appreciate that child abuse was the concern, not homosexuality.
- 8.42 One contributor was able to be honest and reflect on their own view of homosexuality. Although implicitly disapproving of the act as unnatural, they were aware of the need to be tolerant and non-judgemental. Whilst suspecting that CO1 was a homosexual and would wish to convert others to his sexuality', this contributor did not suspect that abuse was occurring at the time, just that the boys' sexuality was being converted for the future. This view, stemming from an intolerance of homosexuality, could not be expressed, but may have made the individual blind to the grooming process for abuse and any visible inappropriate behaviour. This would have been perceived in terms of converting boys to future homosexuality.
- 8.43 It may be that a factor operating in this case was the selective 'blindness' towards behaviour caused by intolerance of homosexuality, but awareness that this was not acceptable and a consequent suspension of judgement to the behaviour of those perceived to be homosexuals.
- 8.44 This confusion between homosexuality and child abuse is concerning. Unless those involved in the Cathedral and Church are able to be open about sexuality, such misunderstandings will continue and dangerous behaviour will go unchallenged.
- 8.45 Another worrying view that was encountered was articulated in writing by a contributor to the review, a member of the Cathedral community at the time of CO1, and an individual with significant status and responsibilities. In a discussion about the need for forgiveness the following comment was made:
- '...if possible to help (if not to pray that) the young men forgive CO1 for what he did and forgive themselves for quite possibly enjoying the "improprieties" at the time (since they voluntarily went back for more)'*

- 8.46 Firstly the view that the victims were *young men* is not an accurate representation of reality in this case, most were groomed from a very early age and the *oldest* age at which abuse commenced was 15, still legally a child and below the age of consent.
- 8.47 Secondly, the writer mentions that the boys went back for more. This demonstrates a lack of understanding of the nature of abuse and the harm that is caused. The power differential makes it more likely that children will be abused again, and the fact of physical pleasure does not minimise the abuse at all, and may even cause more guilt and loss of self esteem for the abused child.

### ***Confidentiality & the clergy***

- 8.48 There is no knowledge of the use of the confessional by either CO1 or any of his victims. Whilst clearly allegations were made about CO1's abuse, the lack of adequate response by clergy appears not to be associated with issues of confidentiality, rather a lack of understanding of the meaning, nature and required response to the allegations reported to them.
- 8.49 The issue of confidentiality and the clergy arose twice in relation to CO3.
- 1986/7 - two members of the clergy were informed of allegations of historical abuse by CO3, including rape (see 7.29)
  - 1989 – CO3 was advised by the head of School B to see a priest to confess following an allegation that he had sexually abused a child (see 7.31)
- 8.50 Clergy may be faced with disclosures from abusers. The diocesan procedures make it clear that whilst there is a general *'presumption in favour of confidentiality....this cannot apply in the case of disclosures concerning the abuse of children.'* and makes it clear that in any conflict between the needs of the child and the adult the welfare of the child is paramount.
- 8.51 The current diocesan procedures *The Care and Protection of Children* states clearly that *'any suspicion, allegation or disclosure that a child is suffering or is likely to suffer significant harm, must be referred to the local Social Services Department'*.
- 8.52 With regard to reports of historical abuse by victims, the current diocesan procedures clarify that although it is the responsibility of an adult to decide if they wish to seek legal redress, it is the responsibility of the parish, following consultation with the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor, to decide whether there might be children currently at risk. This would now apply to the circumstances of 1986/7 mentioned in 7.29.
- 8.53 In many cases this procedure regarding historical allegations might be adequate. There is however the risk that the parish and the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor will have inadequate information on the alleged abuser's circumstances. They may decide that there is no current risk to children and leave it to the adult to decide whether to report the matter to the police. However, police and social services may have access to further information, which would identify a current risk to children.
- 8.54 The situation is however different with regard to any disclosure of abuse within the confessional. The 'Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy' states:
- 'Abuse of children or adults may be admitted in the particular and privileged context of confession. While the seal of the confessional is absolute, nevertheless a priest should not only urge the person to*

*report his or her behaviour to the police or social services, but may indeed make this a condition of absolution or withhold absolution until this evidence of repentance has been demonstrated.'*

- 8.55 The diocesan procedures reflects this guidance, stating that *'the 'seal of the confessional' is absolute'*, but advises on the need for clarity between a confessional and other forms of pastoral conversation and the possibility of making absolution conditional on self reporting the matter to the police.
- 8.56 The current diocesan procedures are in line with the Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy.
- 8.57 The views of the Steering Group were divided on this issue. Some believed that the current Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy emphasise the seriousness of child protection issues, the damage that abuse causes, the risks posed by abusers and the rightness and importance of withholding absolution unless and until the genuineness of the repentance has been demonstrated by, for example, the penitent reporting him/herself to the appropriate authorities.
- 8.58 Others on the steering group were of the view that through not reporting such information, received in the confessional, to the relevant authorities, the welfare of the child is not being placed as paramount. Those members of the group felt that this indicates an area where the current thinking in the Church is inconsistent with modern child protection practice. This position potentially may enable an on-going abusive situation (known to the priest) to continue, with the abuser accepting the absence of absolution.

## **SCHOOL A**

### **THE DIOCESAN CHILD PROTECTION ADVISOR ROLE DOES NOT INCLUDE ANY RESPONSIBILITY FOR CHILD PROTECTION IN CHURCH SCHOOLS EITHER IN THE STATE OR PRIVATE SECTOR.**

- 8.59 School A use West Sussex ACPC Child Protection Procedures and no issues have arisen from either social services or the police about their implementation within the school. Social services have been involved in INSET days with staff.
- 8.60 Following CO1's arrest there was a review of all internal policy and procedures and both the National Safeguarding Adviser and DCPA 2, have met with the Head Teacher of the school to look at their child protection arrangements and advise on training. The DCPA2 will be providing training at the school on 12.09.03.
- 8.61 The head and senior teachers take responsibility for inducting new staff into these procedures, including non-teaching staff, all of whom are subject to enhanced CRB checks. The staff handbook provides further useful guidance on child protection and specifically on bullying and visitors to the school. There is a code of conduct and further guidance documents are provided to staff covering 'signs and symptoms of abuse', 'behaviour & discipline policy' and 'policy on the use of force to control or restrain pupils'.

- 8.62 The school has changed and adapted over the years in an effort to improve safeguards for children. To address concerns about the isolation of boarders, there has been an increased level of contact with parents encouraged on Sundays and Wednesdays, including possible overnight stays. This is overall a positive move, although an ex-parent and ex-chorister commented that this can make the children left behind (i.e. those who are not local) feel very isolated and possibly more vulnerable to abuse.
- 8.63 CCTV has been introduced at the entrances to the school and pupils are escorted by staff whenever they leave school premises, including journeys to / from the Cathedral or to classrooms located at the Treasury.
- 8.64 Parents are provided with a booklet of information on the school so they are able to support their children and understand the expectations upon them. Choristers are provided with a special document, which includes a section on the welfare and supervision of choristers.
- 8.65 Chorister parents are advised that if they are concerned by the particular attention paid to their child by any adult, they should bring their concern to the Head Teacher.
- 8.66 During the period of the case review process concerns were articulated about the adequacy of 'safe' care arrangements within the school.
- 8.67 One ex-pupil interviewed alleged that in the past a senior male teacher had been involved in the showering of young children, despite this role being the responsibility of matron. The current position remains that the matron has the responsibility for ensuring pupils are showered adequately and the teachers are not involved in this. However, by the time a pupil reaches School A, they should not require assistance with their washing, other than ensuring that they have a shower / bath.
- 8.68 Recently concern was expressed that choristers were provided with a 'treat' when they were allowed to watch a video at a teacher's own home. Whilst there was no allegation of any inappropriate behaviour at all, the school has decided that in future no visits to staff homes will occur.

## **LINKS BETWEEN CHICHESTER CATHEDRAL AND SCHOOL A.**

- 8.69 The convicted or alleged abusers span some or all of Chichester Cathedral, School A & School B and Chichester Cathedral Choristers' Association in various capacities.
- 8.70 Of particular focus to this review process are the inevitably strong links between Chichester Cathedral and School A, who provide its choristers.
- 8.71 In 1982 the governing body consisted entirely of Dean A and Chapter members, with various lay people in attendance.
- 8.72 The governing body is now chaired by Dean B, has 2 other members of the Chapter, 1 member of the college of canons nominated by the Chapter, 2 further members of the college of canons, 1 elected parent governor and 4 representative governors appointed by the Chapter of whom the majority should not be in Holy Orders.
- 8.73 Currently there are only 3 representative governors, who include a solicitor (who is an ex-parent), an ex-headmaster and the chair of the Finance Committee.
- 8.74 During this case review process it became apparent that the links between the two organisations are very close, which in many ways is a strength in ensuring close co-ordination of day to day arrangements.
- 8.75 Dangers of close overlapping organisations can however arise if their relationship prevents a system of independent checks and balances, with constituent parts able to act independently to challenge worrying behaviour within their own and each other's domain and report concerns to the responsible authority.
- 8.76 There were examples in the past that the school was unable to act independently with regard to some child protection concerns (see for example 7.37 and 7.72).
- 8.77 A victim described the feeling that the two organisations were one and the same. Dean A was perceived as the most powerful individual, more than the Head Teacher. He appeared to be friendly with CO1 and the perception was that none of those in charge could be trusted.
- 8.78 When the victim wanted someone with whom to discuss his concerns, there was no-one that he felt was sufficiently independent of CO1. Matron was the Head Teacher's wife and not perceived as independent of those in positions of power.
- 8.79 In the present, the system remains unchanged and during this case review the school's response was critically dependent on decisions made by Chapter, possibly arising from issues around the potential legal liability of Chapter members.
- 8.80 Perhaps the most critical issue for the school is the extent to which the system ensures there is the autonomy to provide required responses to all child protection issues, regardless of the relationships between individuals within the two organisations.

## 9 CONCLUSIONS

### The abuse

- 9.1 This case involves the systematic 'grooming' and sexual abuse of young children over a period of nearly 30 years. CO1 was charged with 41 offences over a period of 29 years. The offences start in January 1971 and continue until shortly before CO1 arrest in Spring 2000.
- 9.2 CO1 was convicted on 32 charges: he pleaded guilty to 31 offences and was found guilty of one offence at the criminal trial. He was found not guilty of a further charge and eight have been left on file.
- 9.3 The convictions are against a total of 12 boys. 3 further individuals made allegations and these counts have been left on file. One relates to indecent assault of a girl.
- 9.4 The convicted offences range from 23 charges of indecent assault, 5 of buggery, 1 of indecency with a child under 14 years and 2 of attempt to procure acts of gross indecency. The most serious offence of buggery without consent *first* occurred (as far as is known) in 1971.
- 9.5 CO1 was found not guilty of a charge of buggery without consent.
- 9.6 The counts left on file involve 5 indecent assaults against males, 1 indecent assault against a female and 2 counts of perverting the course of justice.
- 9.7 This abuse involved children as young as 11 years old, some of whom attended School A and were choristers at the time the abuse commenced.
- 9.8 All 15 victims had an association with Chichester Cathedral, 11 had attended School A, 3 were involved in Cathedral activities and 1 attended another choral school and performed at Chichester during the Southern Cathedrals' Festival.
- 9.9 The impact of the abuse has been severe involving both immediate and long term damage including feeling dirty, angry, helpless, suicidal and involving substance misuse, particularly relating to alcohol.
- 9.10 Long term and intermittent mental health services may be required to support some victims. The appropriate support of the type and / or intensity that one victim found beneficial was not always available on the national health, and had involved some considerable expense.
- 9.11 The victims and the parents interviewed all spoke of a desire for an apology from the Church about the abuse they have suffered.

### CO1's access and 'grooming' of victims

- 9.12 CO1 was part of the relatively closed and influential Chichester Cathedral community and primarily through his role as Head Steward in Chichester Cathedral was able to access and 'groom' his victims.

- 9.13 His apparent high standing within Cathedral society and within the Festivities made him appear trustworthy to parents and children. His ability to provide preferential seating was an added inducement for some parents to be pleased to be friends with him and permit friendship with their child.
- 9.14 Children appear to have been exposed to alcohol at quite a young age with CO1 and a canon providing them with alcoholic drinks and, despite not being allowed to drink at school, there appears to have been a 'blind eye' turned towards such activities by senior clergy on some social occasions.
- 9.15 CO1 used alcohol and pornographic material to break down the boys' inhibitions.
- 9.16 CO1 was one of at least 5 convicted or suspected abusers operating over the last 30 years within the Cathedral community. At least 4 will have known each other and had links with the Cathedral and School A of whom 3 had an involvement in the Choristers' Association and 2 were teachers at School B.

### **Response to child protection issues**

- 9.17 Within the historical context, during the 1970s School A demonstrated examples of responsible management of child protection issues. CO1 was banned from the school in 1973 following an allegation of abuse against a child and CO2 was forced to resign in 1976.
- 9.18 At that time the school's governing body was composed entirely of Cathedral Chapter members, so presumably the Dean of the day would have known the grounds for the ban. However the Cathedral took no parallel action to limit CO1's contact with children and School A were unable to enforce the ban on CO1 outside the school gates.
- 9.19 There appear to have been no records made of the reasons for the ban and by the 1980s, with a change in senior personnel at the school, the origins were misunderstood and thought to be associated with CO1's disruptive influence on pupils.
- 9.20 The misunderstanding of the origins of the ban led to CO1 being allowed to use the buildings at the rear of the Treasury for workshop facilities, despite the fact that pupils passed these to / from their classrooms in the building. CO1 also used to enter the school to borrow benches for concerts, commandeering pupils to provide assistance.
- 9.21 During the 1980s the recognition of child abuse within society increased rapidly, but the review findings suggest that this was not reflected amongst the Anglican community in the Chichester area. This lack of recognition of risk to children was demonstrated by the lack of or limited response to the following concerns:
- CO1's public embrace of a pupil led to the school forbidding contact within school grounds, but without Cathedral action the risk outside the gates was not addressed
  - Rumours circulated about CO1 and P3 during the 1980s and 1990s, which are likely to have been heard by Dean A and Chapter, but there was no discernable response
  - At least one clergyman involved with the choir appears to have encouraged parents to view outings and overnight visits to P4 as a treat for choristers
  - Two clergymen within the diocese did not report sexual abuse allegations concerning CO3.

- The authorities of School B did not report allegations about CO3 to the police following the Head Teacher's agreement that CO3 sought confession.
- 9.22 By the 1990s the divergence in response to child protection issues between other agencies and the Anglican community in the Chichester area had become even greater:
- Despite knowledge of previous concerns about CO1, the apparent lack of effective response of the Chichester diocese, at the highest levels, to the allegation that CO1 showed pornographic material to a 12 year old
  - The attempt by Dean A to deal with allegations about P4 internally, through the use of a tape recorded investigation, was at variance with practice and procedure at the time. Whilst the Dean ensured P4 resigned his positions in the Cathedral, the lack of police involvement would have meant that P4 would have been free to abuse children in other places
  - On release from prison CO3 was allowed to resume his responsibilities as a lay vicar in mixed age activities in his local Church, at the Cathedral and at the crematorium, against the advice of the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor (DCPA 1) and the Director of the Wolvercote Sex Offenders Clinic
- 9.23 The response by Dean A to specific allegations about CO1 in 2000 was inadequate. Whilst it was up to the young man to decide whether or not to seek legal redress, other children were at risk and therefore, as outlined in the House of Bishop's *Policy on Child Protection* appropriate steps include reporting the allegations to social services or the police.
- 9.24 The lack of an appropriate and safe response to a range of child protection issues by the Church appears to stem from a variety of reasons:
- Mistaken belief that so called malicious gossip should be ignored
  - Mistaken belief that only allegations supported by evidence are to be reported
  - Mistaken view that it was up to the Dean to decide whether or not an allegation was substantiated
  - The internal management of complaints presumably to avoid scandal
  - Lack of understanding about the addictive nature of sexual abuse and the continuing risk posed by abusers, even those that have been punished and / or have confessed their sins and repented
  - Issues around the confidentiality of pastoral responsibilities
  - Mistaken view that it was entirely up to the individual to decide whether or not to report concerns to the responsible authority, and the lack of recognition of the Church's responsibilities
  - Confusion between sexual abuse of children and homosexuality
  - Mistaken perception that 'pillars of the community' are always to be trusted and could not be guilty of abuse of children
  - Mistaken belief that the Church has little or no responsibility for those who are involved in activities in a purely voluntary capacity

- 9.25 School A uses the ACPC West Sussex Child Protection Procedures and has generally responded appropriately to child protection concerns. However, the efficacy of their actions has been limited by:
- Deferring to Dean A and Cathedral in management of response to allegations against P4 in 1991 (see 7.37 and 7.38)
  - Considering that action taken by the school to prevent contact with CO1 on the premises somehow absolved the school for responsibility for what happened to pupils when they are within the Cathedral precincts
- 9.26 The Cathedral did not implement the diocesan child protection procedures *The Care and Protection of Children* in 1997 and clearly did not observe its principles in subsequent action concerning CO1 and CO3.

### **Provision of pastoral support**

- 9.27 The victims and families commented both to this review and earlier to the press at the lack of any pastoral support. This was exacerbated by the public appearance at court of a clergyman with CO1 and his wife which was viewed as a demonstration of the Church's support of CO1.
- 9.28 The Diocesan Child Protection Advisor (DCPA 2) established with the police at the beginning that the first 2 victims were receiving support and subsequently the cathedral was unaware of the identity of the remaining victims.
- 9.29 This lack of support was exacerbated by a perception of apparent indifference, or at times hostile response, of members of the Cathedral community to those believed to have reported the matter externally, maybe due to a worry that they had brought scandal on the institution.

### **Current Position**

#### ***Cathedral***

- 9.30 Since 2000 the Cathedral has accepted and implemented diocesan child protection procedures *The Care and Protection of Children* and issued a Cathedral *Child Protection Policy & Guidelines* (May 2003) which ensure that staff and volunteers are now recruited and vetted according to diocesan policy, that there is advice about the reporting of child protection concerns and allegations, broadly consistent with diocesan policy, and outlines the provision of child protection training.
- 9.31 The management of the Cathedral has undergone a great deal of change with a new Dean (Dean B), change of many Chapter members and a new Communar. The Communar is the Cathedral's Child Protection Officer and a named independent person, outside the Cathedral administration, has been appointed for the children to contact.
- 9.32 Areas for further improvement in the Cathedral *Child Protection Policy & Guidelines* are required to ensure that all staff and volunteers are provided with a defined minimum level of induction and training, that concerns (including from anonymous sources) as well as allegations are reported and that there are external reporting options including some form of whistle blowing process.

- 9.33 The major challenge will be the recognition of child protection concerns by clergy, staff, volunteers and congregation regardless of the status of those involved.
- 9.34 Another cultural change already commenced, but requiring further development, is the opening up of the community to new people, a less defensive attitude whereby feedback is welcomed, including complaints and concerns, and perceived as opportunities to improve safeguards to children, rather than a source of potential scandal that requires silencing.
- 9.35 Most critically, in this case, there was confusion between homosexuality and child abuse. Until the Church is able to confront prejudice about sexuality and provide an environment where individuals are able to be open about this area of their life, the risk is that this mistake will happen again.
- 9.36 The diocesan procedures make it clear that whilst there is a general *'presumption in favour of confidentiality...this cannot apply in the case of disclosures concerning the abuse of children.'* and makes it clear that in any conflict between the needs of the child and the adult the welfare of the child is paramount.
- 9.37 If information is received in the confessional, the priest must not pass this to the appropriate authorities, although s/he may refuse to provide absolution to any abuser disclosing offences without appropriate action of contrition and reparation e.g. self reporting to the relevant authorities.
- 9.38 The views of the steering group were divided on the issue of information obtained during the confessional: some believed the current position is adequate, whilst others felt that it does not place the welfare of the child as paramount.

#### **School A**

***School A observes the ACPC West Sussex Child Protection Procedures, and has reviewed and strengthened its internal arrangements and has responded during the review process to improve the standards of 'safe' care provided.***

- 9.39 The major issue in relation to the school is the need to ensure that it is always able to act autonomously in relation to child protection issues. This needs to be explicit within the system and not dependent on the particular personality or relationship of Head Teacher, Dean and Chapter.

## 10 RECOMMENDATIONS

The diocese, Cathedral and School A have already implemented changes to improve safeguards for children since 2000. The following recommendations focus on areas for further improvements.

### *Diocese*

- 10.1 All clergy, staff and volunteers within the Church must be provided with a basic induction on child protection recognition, responsibilities and required responses, in accordance with diocesan and national policy. This induction must be provided to everybody, regardless of whether or not they have unsupervised access to children.
- 10.2 Further training must be provided for those volunteers and staff whose activities bring them into direct contact with children.
- 10.3 Records of training courses attended must be maintained for all clergy, staff and volunteers.
- 10.4 The Church congregations should be provided with periodic information about child protection issues and advice on what to do if they have any concerns or worries.
- 10.5 The provision of 'whistle blowing' processes to be considered for all staff and volunteers in the diocese.
- 10.6 The diocesan procedures must address responses to anonymous expressions of concerns or allegations, which ensure they are considered on their merits and are not disregarded.
- 10.7 All issues about child protection must be recorded fully in accordance with diocesan child protection procedure.
- 10.8 All records relating to child protection must be stored securely and maintained in accordance with diocesan policy.
- 10.9 Support should be offered to all parties involved during the investigation of an allegation, as described in the 2002 diocesan procedures.
- 10.10 Further detail should be provided to this procedure to ensure the structure of support includes the following principles:
  - Seeking advice from the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor
  - The victim and their family are offered support from their place of worship
  - Alternative provision to be offered if the victim and / or family wish to receive support from elsewhere
  - The alleged abuser should be offered support from an alternative parish where there is no likelihood of them being in contact with the source/s of the allegations
  - Supervision to be provided to clergy and relevant others in the church community
  - Support to be provided for the congregation both during and after any investigation

- 10.11 Whilst enquiries and / or investigations are proceeding, precautions should be taken to ensure that the involvement of the alleged abuser poses no risks to other children in any parish. Advice should be taken from the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor.
- 10.12 The Bishop to put into effect a system to report on the implementation of the recommendations of this review.

### ***Cathedral***

- 10.13 A formal expression of sorrow should be expressed by the chapter to those abused by CO1 (if the letter written by the Dean in 2001 was not sent to the victims) .
- 10.14 The criteria for the level and frequency of training <sup>a</sup> should be stated in the internal Cathedral *Child Protection Policy & Guidelines* for the different clergy, staff and volunteers.
- 10.15 Records of training courses attended must be maintained for all clergy, staff and volunteers.
- 10.16 The Cathedral *Child Protection Policy & Guidelines* should be amended to make it clear that any concerns or suspicions, not just allegations, about the possibility that a child may have been harmed or be vulnerable to harm must be discussed with the child protection officer.
- 10.17 The Cathedral congregation should be provided with periodic information about child protection issues and advice on what to do if they have any concerns or worries.
- 10.18 The Cathedral *Child Protection Policy & Guidelines* should be amended so, like all parishes in the diocese, to ensure that:
- A choice is provided in child protection reporting systems, outside of the specified channels of the Communar and the Dean i.e. the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor and the Cathedral Child Protection representative
  - Delays are avoided when individuals choose to report concerns via internal processes
- 10.19 The Cathedral procedures should address responses to anonymous expressions of concerns or allegations consistent with any advice from the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor.
- 10.20 The recording of child protection concerns should be consistent with diocesan policy, including the maintenance and storage of records.
- 10.21 The Cathedral to consider how further to ensure that the congregation is open and welcoming to all who wish to participate in services and events.
- 10.22 A code of conduct should be agreed about the use of alcohol at functions held within the Cathedral precinct and attended by children and young people.
- 10.23 A report on child protection within the Cathedral to be presented to the Chapter annually.

### ***School A***

- 10.24 The Articles of Association, which define the relationship between the school and the Cathedral, to be reviewed in order to address the need for a system which ensures that the school retains autonomy over the management of its own child protection issues, in accordance with those of any other school.
- 10.25 The composition of the governing body is of critical importance in ensuring the school's autonomy and the review should consider the:
- Balance of clergy to non-clergy
  - Balance of Chapter members to non-Chapter members
  - The small representation of current parents (only 1 current parent at present)
  - Where the responsibility should lie to appoint representative governors
  - Whether the chair should always be the Dean or a member of Chapter or independent from the Cathedral
  - Representation of the local education authority on the Diocesan Board of Education
- 10.26 A report on child protection within the school to be presented to the governing body annually.

### ***National Church of England issues***

- 10.27 A national policy and procedure should be introduced to facilitate the enforcement of safe child protection practice which addresses the following circumstances:
- The Diocesan Child Protection Advisor role in providing advice to clergy on matters relating to children's safety
  - The role of the Bishop where there is disagreement between clergy and the Diocesan Child Protection Advisor
  - Where the parish incumbent refuses to implement the Bishop's decision
  - Where the Bishop and Diocesan Child Protection Advisor fail to agree on a solution
- 10.28 There is a need to address the confusion between homosexuality and child abuse that arises partly from the lack of openness about sexuality within the Church. This is part of a wider national issue that the Church has to address about sexuality.

## 11 ADDENDUM

- 11.1 Dean A contacted the DCPA 2 in November 2003. The Dean expressed his wish to contribute to the review and subsequently DCPA 2 and Edina Carmi interviewed him on 08.12.03.
- 11.2 The content of that interview is included here as an addendum in so far as it provides a different perspective or additional information to that provided in the body of the report.

### ***Information relating to CO1***

- 11.3 When Dean A came to Chichester Cathedral in 1989 he was not told of any concerns about CO1 in relation to child sexual abuse. He was also not aware that CO1 was not allowed on the premises of the School A.
- 11.4 Dean A assumed that CO1 was homosexual, but was not aware of any sexual relationships.
- 11.5 Dean A described CO1's role in the Cathedral as steward in the choir area under the authority of the chief steward. He was never paid by the Cathedral, but received money from Chichester Festivities for his work as a stage manager for their events. Dean A himself was the Vice President of Chichester Festivities.
- 11.6 CO1 was asked to leave the Treasury due to the need to use the building as an Education Centre, but he retained the use of the workshop beside the house.
- 11.7 Prior to March 2000, Dean A had never been informed of any concerns relating to CO1, with the sole exception of a complaint from Bishop A's chauffeur regarding the excessive party noise made by the 'Crudgemen' using the room under Bishop Bell Rooms. The Chapter advised the Chichester Festivities of this complaint and the noise ceased.
- 11.8 He was never aware of any concerns or complaints about CO1's use of pornographic videos with children. He was surprised to hear that a Canon of the Cathedral knew of this concern in 1991 and did not report it to him.
- 11.9 Dean A spoke of the events leading to the arrest of CO1. A mother and son (V20) came to see him at 6.00pm one evening. The son spoke of having a drink with a friend and asking him if anything untoward had happened with CO1. The friend had denied it. Dean A states that at this point the nature of the concerning behaviour was not made clear, but indicated that he had thought it might be sexual.
- 11.10 Dean A was going to Germany the next day and advised that he needed evidence before proceeding. V20 should speak to his friend again and return to the Dean following his return from a few days in Germany.
- 11.11 When Dean A returned from Germany, there was a letter dated 02.04.00 from V20's mother, stating that the police were now involved and that he must 'do nothing' and 'speak to no-one' other than the investigating police officer. He spoke with the police who confirmed this advice.

- 11.12 Dean A did not plan any further contact with CO1, but visited his house on the day when he knew CO1 was to be arrested to provide pastoral support to CO1's wife. However, CO1 had been charged and released and was present at the house. This was the last contact between CO1 and Dean A.
- 11.13 The allegations against CO1 were a shock to Dean A and Chapter. Two of the Canons had sons who were associates of CO1's circle of friends. Both sons denied to their fathers any knowledge of such sexual activities.
- 11.14 Dean A recalled an acrimonious meeting with V1's parents. He made notes of what they were saying about him and stated that he wanted to have a solicitor present in view of the accusations that were made.
- 11.15 The Chapter did not offer support to CO1 during the trial. The support provided at the trial, by a retired priest, was authorised by Bishop A. Dean A had been concerned by this plan of action.
- 11.16 Following CO1's conviction, Dean A wrote a letter for all victims, which was passed to the police for distribution. He does not know if the police in fact ever sent the letters, as he did not receive any responses.

***Information relating to others***

- 11.17 Dean A was informed by the assistant organist of the arrest of CO3. On his release from prison legal advice was obtained that there should be some distance between CO3 and the Cathedral. This caused some difficulties because although CO3 himself attended a church in Chichester, his wife was involved with Cathedral music.
- 11.18 After two years the Chapter decided to allow CO3 to sing in the Cathedral again, following Dean A's consultation with the parent of a child CO3 had abused. The parent's response was apparently that they would never forget, but had learnt to accept the distress and had no objection to CO3 singing. The Head Teacher at School B expressed his concern, in writing, about this course of action.
- 11.19 Dean A had no knowledge of any concerns about the behaviour of P3 until after CO1's arrest.
- 11.20 Similarly he had no concerns about P4 until informed by the Organist that P4 was the subject of an allegation. Dean A immediately acted to request P4's resignation from the Choristers Association and recalls that the police were involved by the time he was aware of these concerns. This account of events is in contrast to information reported by a parent to the police, which suggests that Dean A's intervention occurred prior to police involvement.
- 11.21 The only other person that Dean A was aware of ever being the subject of concerns was a man lodging with one of the Canons. The police found pornographic pictures of young men in his flat, but were unable to ascertain the ages of the individuals and no charges were made. Dean A insisted that the man leave the flat immediately he was aware of the discovery.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*Chichester Observer*

*Child Protection Policy and Guidelines*, Chichester Cathedral May 2003

*Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy*, 2003

*Policy on Child Protection*, House of Bishops 1999.

*Report of the Inquiry into Child Abuse in Cleveland 1987*, HMSO 1988.

*Safe from Harm*, HMSO 1993

*The Care and Protection of Children*, Diocese of Chichester 2002

*The Protection of Children*, Diocese of Chichester 1997

*West Sussex Child Protection Procedures* West Sussex Area Child Protection Committee 1995, revised 2000

*Working Together Under The Children Act*, HMSO 1991

*Working Together to Safeguard Children: A guide to interagency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children*, Department of Health 1999

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS & ABBREVIATIONS

ACPC	Area Child Protection Committee
Chapter	Governing body of the Cathedral
CO	Convicted Offender
Crudgemen	CO1's organisation of young men (aged 14 and over) who arranged the seating and lighting for concerts at the Cathedral and at Chichester Festivities
Communar	Responsible for Cathedral finance and administration. A member of the Chapter.
DCPA	Diocesan Child Protection Advisor
Head Steward	responsible for organising the volunteers who see people to their seats within the Cathedral
Lay Vicars	The adult singers in the Choir
P	Suspected perpetrator
Priest Vicar	A clergyman attached to the Cathedral; not a member of the Chapter
SCF	Southern Cathedrals' Festival
Server	Lay member of the cathedral community who assists the ceremony of worship (may be a child or an adult)
V	Victim

