

Recorded Delivery

For the Personal attention of:

Rt Hon Justin Welby

Archbishop Of Canterbury

Lambeth Palace

London

SE1 7JU

22nd January 2018

Dear Archbishop Justin,

You will I hope be aware that I met Bishop Tim Thornton at Lambeth Palace on 23 November 2017.

As you know from our previous meetings and exchanges my life has been devastated by the abuse I suffered at the hands of the Church. This has been greatly compounded by the Church's failure over the decades to take ownership of this and by the callous and insulting settlement of £ 15,000, £10,000 of which was meant to cover therapy leaving £5,000 for damages.

As you know, your insurers are connected to the Church. They continue to deem this amount appropriate to cover (1) rape and molestation at [redacted] as well as (2) sexually inappropriate behaviour (also admitted civilly by the Church) much more recently directed to me as an adult by a senior [redacted] official despite, or perhaps even because of, him being aware of my abuse history. I acknowledge this latter behaviour did not take place at the [redacted] nor in working hours, but have been informed that the official remained in post without suspension long after my complaint to [redacted], where there was no safeguarding officer.

My lawyers accepted this paltry settlement, given that the alternative could have been for me to lose it and be liable for both sides' costs, very possibly a six-figure sum, which no survivor I know could possibly afford.

I had hoped that my meeting with Bishop Tim would provide some route to increase the settlement. It was a complete failure. I have therefore decided reluctantly to forward this to Martin Smith at The IICSA and for this to be an open letter although then my address must be redacted.

My meeting Bishop Tim was in part inspired by the *Statement on mediation with survivor Gilo* (15/10/17), of which Bishop Tim was a co-signatory, of which the following is part:

7. We recognise the cost to survivors in terms of the impact of the church's failure and recognise that there are many situations needing justice, healing and reconciliation. We are acutely embarrassed that it has been survivors who have over many years, decades in some situations, had to find the courage to drive forward change. We hope we can now match that with our own determination and bring our own necessary courage to the task. If healing and reconciliation is to happen we must for the sake of justice learn from the tenacity of survivors. And we as two bishops commit ourselves afresh personally to changing our culture and our structure.

Unfortunately, neither my meeting with Bishop Tim nor the follow-up electronic exchanges bore any relation to the above. He offered no possible way forward, and to be fair he never claimed he would. The experience into which I put a great deal of effort has left me even more frustrated and has added to my feeling of having suffered a further layer of institutional abuse.

When I asked him "What would you like to do to help me move on" he responded "I don't think I have got the ability to help you in the way you would like to be helped I hope you might find a way. You have done amazing work to get yourself to where you are now. I suspect you are the main driver that is going to have to continue that work."

I had told him that my fight for justice has so far taken 15 years. It has been devastating for my family as well as myself for all that time. After that meeting at Lambeth Palace I am no further forward, and Bishop Tim is in effect inviting me to continue my efforts indefinitely while not even directing me to any source of help or resolution that will make them any less painful and fruitless.

You will recall writing on 8 November 2017 to Gilo acknowledging "the failings of the Church". It included the passage: "The Bishop at Lambeth, Tim Thornton, will continue to be in touch on my behalf on this matter ["settlement of claims by survivors"] and will keep you informed."

And if even a meeting with your nominee has proved to be so worthless, the least I can do is, as a last resort, make you as the Church's leader aware of this and to give you the opportunity to take personal responsibility for resolution both of my own particular case but hopefully also those of Gilo and others in a similar position.

Would you confirm please whether the delegation to Bishop Tim was solely in respect of Gilo or other survivors too?

Crucially, Bishop Tim suggested that the only source of an increase in my settlement would be through EIG and its revised guiding principles. I can only assume that he had not read EIG's statement of 13 October 2017, for otherwise he would have found it hard to say in good faith what he did with no reference to the statement in our exchanges. Of particular relevance in that statement of EIG's is:

1. We are not responsible for the abuse perpetrated by those for whom the Church is accountable
2. We and other insurers are bound by comprehensive, industry-wide regulation that oversees the way we operate and handle claims, and by the civil justice system.
- 3. There is no basis to revisit the settlement agreed with Gilo and his lawyer on a full and final basis.**
4. Full and final settlements, which bring certainty to all parties within the civil justice system

and, most tellingly:

- 5. It is, however, in the Church of England's gift to provide further compensation as well as ongoing pastoral care to victims and survivors of clergy abuse if it so wishes.**

This echoes a passage in EIG's letter to the Bishop of Durham of 25 September 2017 whose addressees include Bishop Tim: "...The limitations of compensation as a financial transaction become obvious in comparison to pastoral care and counselling, and so reveal the limits of what insurance alone can hope to achieve in the reconciliation process between the Church and individual survivors."

EIG could not have made their position clearer: they have no intention of revisiting historic settlements and they have made a convincing case that the law is on their side. For Lambeth Palace to imply subsequently that EIG is somehow now going to reopen these settlements is bordering on disingenuous.

Bishop Tim did not even hold out the prospect of plans for the Church to put any protocol in place to review and fund additional settlements despite acknowledging the Church's great wealth. He gave no indications of making recommendations to you, I can only assume because he thought it beyond his remit from you or more likely because he is content with the Church's seeming determination not even to reconsider manifestly unfair settlements reached in practical terms under duress, albeit I accept not in legal terms.

The responses from your Bishop at Lambeth could not be further from the CofE's assertion that "The Church of England is absolutely committed to its pastoral response to alleged victims and survivors...."

I request you to inform me how I or others are going to have our settlements *independently* reviewed consistent with pastoral care (indeed whether there is any protocol for this independent of EIG). Similarly, to the extent that higher pastoral supplemental settlements were deemed appropriate, which body would bear them? Or do you feel, as Bishop Tim made clear, that any additional settlements must be funded by EIG albeit they have explicitly refused to fund them?

As for the Church's attitude, I have been further appalled and saddened that, according to his email, Bishop Tim has not discussed with you my meeting with him at Lambeth Palace. That speaks volumes about how much importance the Church attaches to pastoral care for survivors. I am assuming that you are regularly apprised of developments in this area, particularly those that involve Lambeth Palace, so I am therefore similarly saddened that you have not raised the question of my abuse with him.

Bishop Hancock brazenly displayed a similar indifference to the plight of survivors when, despite being happy to be interviewed on another topic, he refused to be interviewed by the BBC Radio 4's *Sunday* programme on 17 December on Ian Elliott's latest concerns about his Review having been misrepresented. Presenter Ed Stourton was driven to comment on air "you-couldn't-make-it-up". I think many will be appalled that the bishop in charge of safeguarding for the whole Church refusing brazenly to be interviewed and be held to account by a serious radio programme expressing legitimate concerns.

The message given from the top is that the first priority to which all the Church's considerable power must be employed is to protect the institution. Pastoral aspects of abuse compensation must be avoided at all costs.

In drawing together material for this letter I came across an email concerning an earlier attempt of mine to achieve justice from you at Lambeth Palace in 2014. John Rees wrote to me (on 25 November copying pa.archbishop@lambethpalace.org.uk) to explain that you had no "rehabilitation fund" and:

"... I gave the Archbishop a very full account of your situation when I saw him last week, including your request for further support. I explained that he does not have access to uncommitted funds that could supplement the settlement arrangement ..."

Re-reading this, I now realise that you have already personally blocked any further payment to me in spite of having seen the paucity of what I have received. I am assuming that this is why I am making no progress now.

The idea that the Archbishop of Canterbury, the leader of the worldwide Anglican Communion and Church in England (which even Bishop Tim agreed had £8 billion in funds) is pleading poverty as a justification for not paying the modest sums I am seeking is beyond contempt and I am afraid does you no credit.

With Synod fast approaching could I remind you how far everything in this letter bears no relation whatsoever to your words to Synod on 07th July 2013

<http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/articles.php/5100/general-synod-archbishop-justins-statement-on-safeguarding>

"... so that we have a culture that looks first to justice for survivors, to clarity, to transparency, to admission of where we have failed. It must be done, this change, with the survivors – not to them. We have spent very very many years doing things to them. We

must only act with them. And that will mean much more than we imagine as we sit here listening to what we are listening and reflecting dark and desperate acts in the past.

“Practically, a change of culture will require resourcing. Not ‘a’ post, let alone half a post, but very dramatic increases in resourcing. “

The Archbishop of Canterbury has written the foreword to the July 2016 edition of Crucible on safeguarding.

<http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/articles.php/5756/ensuring-the-church-is-a-place-safe-for-all-archbishop-writes-for-crucible-journal>

“...To address that whole culture of silencing in the Church is vital. It is vital because failure to do so is a form of abuse for the second time, as bad if not worse than the first betrayal.”

The Telegraph 27 Oct 2014

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/religion/11190890/Justin-Welby-I-broke-down-in-tears-at-horror-of-Church-child-abuse.html>

“...The rule is survivors come first, not our own interests and however important the person was, however distinguished, however well known, survivors come first.”

I hope to hear that you have reflected on this and set out in detail with deadlines and accepting personal responsibility for some positive plans to pay generous supplementary “pastoral” settlements to those the Church has harmed so grievously and continues to do so by refusing their reasonable demands.

Gilo is aware of this letter and tells me he feels much the same way.

Yours sincerely

Julian Whiting