



THE EVOLUTION OF A LIE

Chapter 10

The curious case of Anika Rose aka Lee Tran (Trang) aka Girl Y
Who was she?
Her 'anonymous' story to Helen Irvine, as told to Bruce Clarke.

Louise Greentree 2016/2017

Chapter 10

The curious case of Anika Rose aka Lee Tran (Trang) aka Girl Y.

I

Introduction

On 1st May, 2007, Figtree Anglican Church's Bruce Clarke took notes of Helen Irvine's telephone call telling him about Corinne Cortese, and Girls X, Y and Z (Anna Maria), all at UOW who, she said (unreliably as it happens), had complained about sexual harassment by Scott Dobbs. We will look more closely at Helen Irvine's involvement bringing the UOW Lie into FAC in a later chapter. But in this chapter, we will examine Helen Irvine's account of the curious story given to her by the woman calling herself Anika Rose on two occasions, once in 2005, and again on 30th April 2007, just a day before the telephone conversation with Bruce Clarke.

We will look at Helen's account of the story to Ken Taylor on 28th August 2007, just 5 months later, in the next chapter.

Of course, the story was irrelevant to the case of the complaint made by Lee Nicholls to FAC's Yvonne Gunning that her 20-year-old daughter Emma had 'fallen in love with Scott Dobbs'. Neither FAC nor the PSU had any authority to investigate Helen's complaint. But, none-the-less, Phillip Gerber did order an investigation by Ken Tylor, and the FAC leadership used these 'complaints' as justification for banning, not just Scott but Mabelle and their six children, from FAC on 2nd May 2007, even before the investigation had commenced some 2 months later.

II

Were there really four complaints of sexual harassment?

But first, to clear up Helen Irvine's misrepresentation to Bruce Clarke that there were four complaints of sexual harassment against Scott Dobbs by UOW female students: we find that there is in fact only one complaint, and that was based on a lie by Anika Rose to Helen Irvine and enthusiastically, and self-righteously, adopted by Helen Irvine to bring into FAC.

Girl Z's complaint had nothing to do with sexual harassment:

In fact, Anna Maria, who was identified by Helen Irvine as Girl Z, had complained to the Faculty about Scott's request that she not join him and the other PhD students in their already overcrowded room. So, her complaint to UOW was not a case of sexual harassment but of sexual *discrimination*, and then only briefly. This had to fail as there was already a female PhD student using the room.

And so, Girl Z was disposed of as one of four UOW complaints of sexual harassment by Scott. She was never asked to make a statement nor to be interviewed by Helen Irvine or Ken Taylor. To Ken Taylor, Helen Irvine tacitly acknowledged that the 'Girl Z' Anna Maria story did not constitute inappropriate behaviour or sexual harassment.

However, Helen did try to repackage her complaint, which we will also discuss as an example of the depths to which Helen Irvine was prepared to sink to try to create some story that would stick against Scott and, in this case, Mabelle also.

Girl X's complaint disappears after this telephone call:

Girl X also sank without trace, never to be followed up and interviewed by Helen Irvine, let alone by Ken Taylor. The story of this mysterious woman seems to have been an attempt by Anika Rose to make up something to indicate that there were many students who had a complaint against Scott, and, again, enthusiastically adopted by Helen Irvine.

At a later stage, Helen Irvine refers to her as the daughter of a Wollongong restaurateur, according to Anika Rose's story, and not even a student at UOW. She has remained nameless. It almost goes without saying that Scott has no idea who Anika Rose is referring to, let alone what were the details of that complaint.

Girl Y's complaint (Anika Rose) is demonstrably similar to that of Corinne Cortese:

Then we are left with Corinne Cortese and Girl Y. the latter was quickly identified by Scott Anika Rose when Helen rang him to get him to withdraw his defense to Lee Nicholls' complaint, even though she wished to remain anonymous. Even though from the diocese' point of view she could remain anonymous, she still refused to be interviewed. There is the overarching problem with her story, which is that we only know what Helen Irvine says it is. And not only did she say what Anika Rose was supposed to have told her, Helen also added some flourishes of her own.

This made what she reported to Ken Taylor hearsay, and therefore not able to prove the truth of what Anika Rose said. But Helen Irvine, as amateur investigator, was also compromised because she was deeply involved in trying to make at least one of the stories stick. This was because, firstly, of the collapse of Lee Nicholls' complaint, and, secondly, of her husband Rod's involvement in the brutal treatment of the whole Dobbs' family and anticipated repercussions from that for the whole of FAC as well as for the diocese.

Only Corinne Cortese was interviewed by Ken Taylor

In the end, only one woman from UOW actually gave direct evidence to Ken Taylor. However, for all the reasons discussed in an earlier chapter, her complaint would not have stood up to scrutiny and it received none because it was hidden from Scott.

III

What do we know about Lee Tran / Anika Rose?

The first interesting fact about this UOW student is that, as confirmed by Helen Irvine to Ken Taylor, Scott immediately and correctly identified her when Helen Irvine talked about an anonymous UOW student in her telephone conversation around Easter, 2007, which occurred from 6th – 9th April 2007. As he told Helen Irvine, she changed her name - when and by what means is not known - to Anika Rose and studied at the UOW under that name. Her Asian heritage is evident but her accent is Australian.

This leads to another interesting issue: why would this young woman choose to change her name to a name that was famous? Anika Rose is the name of an African-American actress and singer of considerable attainment, fame and glamorous appearance. What does this adoption of another identity at all, let alone one that is so different from her own, say of the psychology of this woman?

Scott has maintained steadfastly that Anika Rose's underground and anonymous story and its' spiteful fabrications arose because he was the person who rejected Anika

Rose's proposition of a sexual relationship, not the other way around.

In the same way that Yvonne Gunning used Scott's rejection of Emma Nicholls' deluded love for him to condemn him, so Helen Irvine - to what extent, if any, assisted by Anne Abraham, Anika Rose's PhD supervisor - made use of Scott's rejection of Anika Rose to encourage her to develop her story and to help Helen pursue her own agenda: to condemn Scott, to preserve her husband's reputation once the FAC Lie was collapsing, as well as to target the whole family, with unconcealed hatred and malice.

IV

What was the Anika Rose/Girl Y story?

There is no contemporaneous record of Anika Rose's story, neither when it was supposed to have occurred (2003 or 2004 – Helen Irvine is uncertain about even the year) because she did not make a complaint then, nor of her conversation with Helen Irvine in 2005. It is not until 2007 that the story is recorded, but by Bruce Clarke recording what Helen Irvine says to him that she said to Helen in 2005 and 2007.

An investigation of this story is ordered despite it being anonymous, irrelevant and hearsay:

Helen Irvine's version of Anika Rose's story was recorded quite extensively in Bruce Clarke's notes, as opposed to his notes about the other three, Corinne Cortese, and Girls X and Z. The shorter, handwritten version was written during the telephone conversation and then it was expanded into a comprehensive typewritten memorandum. From there, steps were taken within the FAC leadership to force Phillip Gerber to authorise and instruct Ken Taylor to make an investigation into this story, trying to find some 'hook' to hang it on, to give it relevance and to assert authority to investigate it. This 'hook' was an assertion that it demonstrated 'similar facts' and so the holes in Lee Nicholls' complaint could be plugged.

Most disgracefully, Phillip Gerber was prepared to authorise Ken Taylor to take details of this story despite the author of it insisting on anonymity, in defiance of the principles of natural justice and fairness, and the provisions of the Discipline Ordinance 2006.

Ken Taylor was also authorised to take the story into account (as if proved!) when making his conclusions and recommendations. And this he did, even though he had not given Scott a chance to read the transcripts or even the signed statements and answer the allegations until after Ken Taylor had prepared his report. In fact, Scott's only chance to answer these additional allegations was to come after the case had to be referred to the Disciplinary Tribunal, a serious fault in the Sydney diocesan process.

What Bruce Clarke wrote that Helen Irvine said that Anika Rose said:

This is taken from Bruce Clarke's handwritten record of the telephone call as it concerned Girl Y, quoting Helen Irvine:

"SD said she suggested having an affair

Girl Y said SD tried to kiss him (sic)

Said SD told Y that SD only married MD because she was pregnant

Girl Y claims girl X had a problem with (sic)

On the next page, headed Girl Y, are what are 'quotes' that Helen Irvine seems to have reported as actual statements by Anika Rose:

*He is an actor – doesn't trust him
 Not mentally stable
 If he found it was me – afraid he would hurt me
 Maybe he would kill me if if (sic) he found out if I testified
 If you tell anyone – your word against mine
 I've had complaints before but it never stands up
 Sent emails
 I've had a vasectomy you can just enjoy me.
 You should ban him from church and tell all the others about him*

Then, Helen again:

She doesn't want to be named because she is very intimidated by him and thinks she (sic) is mentally unstable.

Helen Irvine dismisses Scott's defense to Anika Rose's claims:

Helen Irvine simply dismissed Scott's identification of Girl Y and his defense to her allegations. In the interests of truth and justice his statement to her meant that objective and independent direct evidence of what Anika Rose was saying was needed. Otherwise her story would likely be undermined by the suspicion that anything Anika Rose said was going to be the result of wounded pride, if not downright pay-back for his rejection of her sexual overtures.

As further evidence that her story was not reliable is the fact that Scott had already told Machelles all about Anika Rose's proposition well before Helen was coopted into running with the story, complaining that this student was acting towards him in an inappropriately seductive manner. But this was ignored, in just the same way that Scott's information that he had complained to Machelles immediately he left his study that Emma Nicholls had behaved inappropriately towards him there was ignored. It didn't fit the pattern that FAC personnel and Ken Taylor were all trying so hard to construct.

V

What Helen Irvine told Bruce Clarke that Anika Rose told her – the direct quotes.

"He is an actor – doesn't trust him"

But Scott is not an actor in real terms, it was several of the older children who were child actors in television and film. But it would be unlikely that Anika Rose would know this, although Helen Irvine surely did. Suggesting that being an actor should be taken as evidence that a person is untrustworthy, sexually predatory even, is to slander a large number of acting professionals.

And on the other hand, in what way does making a proposition indicate acting ability, especially an unsuccessful proposition? Or does she (Anika Rose or Helen Irvine?) mean that if Scott denies her story, it means that he is 'acting'? We will not know from Helen Irvine's uncritical interview with Anika Rose.

"Not mentally stable"

There is nothing to support this statement. Nor is it claimed that either Anika Rose or Helen Irvine are psychiatrists, So, as this is given as a lay-person's view and in the absence of evidence of mentally unbalanced behaviour, it has to be dismissed as an hysterical over-reaction by Anika Rose, again reported by the uncritical Helen Irvine.

In fact, this allegedly mentally unstable man worked and continues to work very long hours, at first as a seminar leader while a PhD student, and after gaining his PhD, as a lecturer; then, after leaving UOW, as an accountant doing further study for advanced professional qualifications in accountancy, financial advising and legal practice, and now with his own business as a chartered accountant and financial adviser, and with a law firm as a legal practitioner admitted to the Supreme Court of NSW.

He is robustly healthy physically and mentally with a strong and impressive intellect. He is not and has not been under the care of a psychiatrist. And yet, Clarrie Pratt told Ken Taylor in his interview that Scott's brain was adversely affected by youthful experimentation with drugs, growing up in California.

This is not the profile of a man who is mentally unstable and who is so intimidating that Anika Rose is right to fear for her life simply because she refused his one attempt at making her a proposition!

Comparison of this accusation with Corinne Cortese's story:

As we have seen, Corinne Cortese also suggests that Scott is 'extreme' and that he had developed a 'fixation' with her, to answer the suggestion that for someone to email a proposition that she go away with him without there being any other one-on-one contact is unusual behaviour.

It seems that this was the PSU and diocesan line: to overcome the sheer improbability of a man making a proposition to Corinne in such circumstances, and to make it reasonable for Anika Rose fear for her life on the basis of one face-to-face encounter when she rejected his proposition (but, as we will see, had quite a conversation) even 3 or 4 years later with no contact, it has to be alleged that Scott's personality and mental balance is defective in these ways.

"If he found it was me – afraid he would hurt me"

Again, no evidence is offered for this very serious allegation of apprehended assault. Again, why would Helen Irvine report this uncritically, which is on the face of it just another hysterical over-reaction by Anika Rose? Surely only to try to further discredit Scott and to justify Anika Rose being excused from an interview by Ken Taylor and signing a statement so that Scott would be allowed to defend himself.

"Maybe he would kill me if if (sic) he found out if I testified"

And so, Anika Rose goes to the extreme of serious accusations, still without any evidence to support them, such as actual threats.

So why did Helen Irvine not apply some intelligent analysis to this woman's story and not see that these quotes worked against the credibility of Anika Rose's story; that these unsupported allegations of apprehended violence could be viewed rather as evidence of Anika Rose's own mental instability and, at best, hysteria or, at worst, her malice.

"If you tell anyone – your word against mine"

When this was supposed to have been said to Anika Rose we do not know. It seems that Anika Rose only had one conversation with Scott, and yet this would seem strange thing to say during it. Did Anika Rose threaten Scott with going to Mabelle or

Faculty colleagues or the EEDU? But why? He had not succeeded. Reporting would not have resulted in anything other than a reprimand.

We will never know the answers to these questions because Helen Irvine tried ineffectually to play investigator.

“I’ve had complaints before but it never stands up”

But this could not have been said by Scott because he had not had ‘complaints’ in relation to female students. He had had one complaint by a group of overseas students alleging that he was racist when he told them he was taking steps to prevent them from cheating. What stopped this complaint from ‘standing up’ was a petition from other students in his class praising Scott and pointing out that the overseas students did cheat and that they were disruptive in class.

He was not informed of Corinne Cortese’s ‘complaint’ at all, and it was not until Helen Irvine told him about Girl Y around Easter 2007 that he became aware of her ‘complaint’.

“Sent emails”

So, what did the emails say? Helen does not know. How many were there? Did Anika Rose reply (like Corinne Cortese)? Did she ask him to stop sending them, or just direct them to Trash? When were they sent? Helen does not know.

Did she do anything to repair this gap in her knowledge by speaking again to Anika Rose before talking to Ken Taylor in August 2007? No. Instead she gives two contradictory accounts of what Anika Rose said about these, which is discussed later.

“I’ve had a vasectomy you can just enjoy me.”

Helen Irvine’s contradictory account about this to Ken Taylor is examined in chapter 12.

“You should ban him from church and tell all the others about him”

This is all too obviously a malicious response to Helen Irvine’s disclosure that the purpose of her interview on 30th April 2007 is to justify throwing Scott out of FAC. It is a pity that Helen Irvine did not take the opportunity to tell Anika Rose that Christian churches were places for sinners, even for people who tell lies, not just for people who think they are perfect. And that belief in Jesus Christ offers the chance for repentance and forgiveness, at least by God if not by the leadership of FAC.

And again, this statement demonstrates an hysterical over-reaction by Anika Rose to such a simple isolated incident that took place so many years before. Another flag supporting a conclusion that Anika Rose’s story is unreliable, and a least should not be accepted without her giving an interview.

VI

Surprisingly, Scott is unsuccessful.

What makes Anika Rose’s story, even on the face of it, so incredible and unbelievable is the fact that Scott, handsome and personable, was so unsuccessful. He didn’t manage to kiss her; he certainly didn’t manage to persuade her to have an affair with him; his supposed emails were unsuccessful (and the content unmemorable), and he has

had absolutely no contact with her since he left UOW and for some time before that.

Apparently, according to her story, once she said “no” he respected that and did not seek her out and ardently press his cause, nor even send her flowers on Valentine’s Day.
