

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 Archbishop's 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

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

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

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 1st 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 DPA 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 1st 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 15th 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.

- 5.31 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.

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.

- 7.59 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.

- 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.

- 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.

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.

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

