

Governor agreed. I then explained to Peter what I had done and said that I thought I could arrange a quiet meeting with the Governor of Dartmoor if he were interested to explore these matters. He said he would be, so I went ahead. The stuff in Peter's letter about being made to look a fool etc, is *nonsense*."

5. *Money* - You may well be on fairly weak ground here - but it all depends on what you said to Peter as there is nothing firm in writing. What is in writing is that:-
- i) You said you would try to get him £ **DPA** (see letters A and C).
  - ii) You sent him
    - £ **DPA** in May 1993 (see letter D)
    - £ **DPA** in January 1994 (see letter I)
  - iii) You would appear to have acknowledged that this was less than you had hoped to give - though I don't know whether that hope was ever expressed as a promise as he says it was (see letters H, I).
  - iv) You got him £ **DPA** from the Church Commissioners (see letters A, F, I). Letters B, E, H, J contain their requests for money from you.

In all he has received £ **DPA** but that still leaves him £ **DPA** short. He is obviously bitter about this and would have reason to be if that was what he was promised - but that's a big "if"!

6. *Meetings* - I note from his letter of 24 June that he is manipulating hard on this one again. I cannot see any purpose in this unless it is a one-off meeting for reconciliation, as you do not have the time to serve in the long-term as his spiritual adviser. On the other hand I am not convinced that he is prepared for such a meeting and I fear you would be regaled with a series of loving platitudes, and no serious wrestling with the demanding tasks of reconciliation.
7. *Episcopal Adviser* - JY writes: "When the Pastoral Advisers met in March I spoke to John Waller as the Archbishop had suggested. John asked to consider the matter overnight and telephone me the following morning (11 March). He said that he would see Peter if specifically requested by the Archbishop, but from what he already knew, coupled with what I had told him, he doubted whether he would have sufficient sympathy with Peter's position and approach to offer the support he appeared to need. He suggested that the question of location of the Adviser was not significant - the comparative expense of train fares to London etc should not be paramount in such a question. He thought that someone already under the discipline of the religious life might be more effective and suggested Brother Bernard. Failing that, an experienced diocesan bishop but one who would need to be tough. I reported this to ABC, but I do not think it was ever committed to paper."

My further comments are:-

- i) A lot has happened since June 14th. I note from his letter of 24 June that he reckons the granting of your permission is just round the corner. I am inclined to think that it is not worth trying to answer these points in detail. He appears to be incapable of hearing anything that gives him the responsibility for his life and would





interpret anything you write either to bolster what he sees as his rights or to provide further ammunition against you.

- ii) I note from Michael Ball's letter of 20 June that he is anticipating a certain amount of press criticism. As ever, I fear he grossly underestimates the damage this will threaten to do both to the Church and to your Ministry. Andrew Purkis writes: "On his press contacts, Peter is I fear deluding himself. Once the papers were on to a story about the disgraced Bishop, having accepted a caution for indecency, being allowed by the Archbishop to resume public ministry, one friend in the City page of one paper and one sub-editor in the Standard would make no significant difference at all."

In the past, for instance, your letter of 14 March (see letter M) and most recently in your one of 27 May (letter K) you have always said that Peter's return to Ministry was something that needed to be looked at in view of its implications for the wider Church.

As you have rightly judged some very searching questions are going to be asked if Peter returns to some form of public ministry during the autumn. I fear that Michael or Peter might well 'leak' this inadvertently to one of their journalist friends and we therefore need to be in a position within a week or two to answer the storm of questions and criticisms that may follow. I think these might include:-

- a) Is this the kind of length of punishment that other clergy who have admitted to illegal acts of this nature normally receive?
- b) Why has a Bishop who has admitted such a grave offence been treated so leniently?
- c) What are the signals the Church is sending to society as a whole about how it views betrayal of trust and child abuse?
- d) Did the Archbishop personally authorise Bishop Ball to recommence his ministry?
- e) What about complaints from clergy in the Truro Diocese that they have been let down by the Archbishop?

No doubt Andrew and Lesley will be able to add others and I feel it would therefore be good to get together with AP, LP and JY at the earliest possible opportunity to begin to work on them.

- iii) I note that Michael is agreeing that Peter should do no Episcopal ministry at present. My suspicion is that he will be asking for this sometime in 1995. Obviously your response to that will depend to a certain extent on what happens over the next few months, but I thought it worth flagging up at this stage.

