



A CAUTIONARY TALE – THE COVER UP BEGINS

Figtree Anglican Church v. the Dobbs family

In the article 'A Cautionary Tale', I wrote about how a 20-year-old young woman Emma Nicholls, a sufferer from Obsessive Compulsive Disorder and with other mental and physical issues, had been abused by her mother Lee Nicholls, by parishioners, staff and ordained and lay leadership of Figtree Anglican Church and by the then Senior Minister's wife, Helen Irvine, to conflate her pathetic delusion that there was a 'special chemistry' between her and the father of one of her girlfriends into accusations of child sexual abuse, grooming and sexual harassment. As that article noted, of the complaints made originally by the young woman's mother (who had intended to remain anonymous even from her daughter) seven were rejected by the diocesan investigator as unsustainable (including one of the only two complaints concerning Emma when she was under the age of 18), leaving only one complaint when Emma was aged 16 and four complaints over a short period November 2006 to January 2007 to be further considered. These are all denied by Dr. Dobbs.

Now the matter has been considered by a six-person Professional Standards Committee (PSC) of Sydney diocese. The story goes on and the injustice continues to be heaped on the whole family.

Louise Greentree
2008 revised January 2018

A Cautionary Tale – the Cover-up Begins.

Figtree Anglican Church & Emma Nicholls v. the Dobbs family.

By Louise Greentree¹

This article was first written in 2008 after the release of the report and recommendations of the Professional Standards Committee (PSC), the six members of which had, presumably, read and considered every one of the 330plus pages of statements, most of which were irrelevant to the complaint, correspondence, faxes and emails, file notes of telephone conversations and other documents that were bundled together as part of the report of the investigator, Ken Taylor of Kelly & Associates. On second thoughts: I do not see how they could have read them all and brought an objective and impartial as well as intelligent, understanding to the case, because the incompetence of the conclusions, even on the face of them, was breathtaking.

In February 2018, it will be 11 years since Lee Nicholls kept an appointment with Yvonne Gunning of Figtree Anglican Church, where neither she nor her daughter Emma were parishioners (being members of the Seventh Day Adventist Church), to continue cooking up a spurious complaint against Dr. Dobbs, with Helen Irvine, the then Senior Minister's wife in the background together with advice from the Professional Standards Unit (PSU) of the Anglican Church Sydney diocese. I have revised this article and others written at the time, not least the original one "A Cautionary Tale" that this article followed on from, as the PSU's bungled handling of the case continued.

The original introduction is reproduced on the title page.

And so, the story goes on:

No Child Sex Abuse or Grooming

The PSC has now rejected the second of only two complaints that related to a time when Emma was under the age of 18.² Thus it is acknowledged that there are no complaints that support the gross behaviour of the parish leadership and a number of parishioners firstly accusing Dr. Dobbs of these grave criminal offences and then, even worse, their pastoral abuse of his wife and children.

Those who have read the earlier article will not be surprised. There never was anything in these complaints that anyone with any intelligence could possibly have regarded as child sex abuse or grooming, and this was pointed out in earlier handouts to the Parish and by those parishioners who supported the Dobbs family during their ordeal. In fact, intelligence has been a notable absentee from the way in which this matter has been conducted by all of those involved in promoting and supporting

¹ BA LLB LLM(Hons) ProfCertArb Other articles on the Discipline procedures of the Anglican Church in Australia can be found on Louise's website: www.churchdispute.com and she can be contacted on louise@greentreeaustralis.com

² This was a 'sideways hug': Emma was seated on a lounge with a Dobbs daughter sitting next to her. Dr. Dobbs was either sitting on a separate chair next to the lounge or standing up or even perched on the arm (she cannot remember which). He then hugged her, using BOTH his arms, and put his mouth on her ear, making it wet. This, from an adjacent seated position, would have been impossible given Dr. Dobbs' height and the design of the lounge, which had a high back and arms. Equally, standing up while she was seated would have put a great deal of strain on the back, especially as Emma says he held this position for about 10 minutes. In either case, it would have been difficult to do this without attracting the attention of the Dobbs daughter seated next to her. The earlier article recommended that no-one try this at home for fear of physical damage to one's back. It is surprising that the investigator did not see the essential absurdity of this.

the accusations, let alone there being a Christian approach, let alone the proper approach urged by the National Church in its guidelines for dealing with such allegations.

Instead the ordained clergy banned the whole family from attending the church they had attended for some 12 years, including the 6 young people, 4 of whom were under the age of 18, who were lively Christians and involved in the youth ministry leadership. All of those people promoting this case have been responsible for the spread of gossip around the parish that was as virulent as it was false and based on irrelevant and untrue matters, particularly lies concocted by Rebecca Clarke, elder daughter of the Figtree Executive Minister the rev Bruce Clarke, which, much later after causing maximum harm, she retracted in her interview with the investigator.

As the diocesan investigator himself noted in his report in this matter: *'The complaint against Dr. Dobbs appears to have been known and talked about within the church community. We note, for example, that a part-time administrative employee ... with no obvious involvement in the matter appears to have been aware of the complaint from a very early stage. ... the implied lack of confidentiality and the failure to afford a presumption of innocence could have the potential to impact negatively on the image of the church.'* He rates the risk of this damaging impact on the image of the church rather conservatively as 'High' and recommends daily monitoring. I would rate it as extremely high.

At the time I wrote this:

"Is the Church big enough to say 'sorry'? Is the church that preaches repentance to others going to repent of its own sin? Will we now see people who tried so hard to destroy Dr. Dobbs' reputation, marriage and family life, who have sinned by being slanderers, and who have pastorally abused his wife and his children, and brought false and ridiculous complaints of child sex abuse and grooming against him repenting of their conduct and seeking forgiveness and reconciliation? I do not think the Dobbs family are holding their breath for this to occur. It is however a litmus test of whether Sydney Diocese is as they boast to other dioceses truly 'of the Spirit' or merely 'of the lower human nature'."

At the end of this article I will briefly cover what did happen next and why this case is again active. Suffice it to say, at the time of writing, then and now, no apology has been offered nor repentance demonstrated. If anything, there has been hardening of the hearts of all those involved in the abuse of the family and denial of the injustice inflicted on the whole family.

Now follows the rest of what I wrote in 2008:

The case, now shrunk to only four complaints, will go to a diocesan Disciplinary Tribunal.

The complaints now all relate to a time when Emma was aged 20 and cover the period November 2006 to January 2007. In the words of the PSC even if completely true the complaints only constitute 'low level sexual harassment of an adult' (which, by the definition in Faithfulness in Service, can be so even if unintentional) by a person whose only claim to 'ministry' was to 'serve behind a coffee cart' 'or sexual exploitation'³. Although Emma has been called vulnerable,⁴ 'mixed up' was what she herself as well as the wife of a retired senior clergyman in the parish thought a more appropriate description. Her own doctor admits that she is delusional when it comes to her perception of the so-called relationship between her and Dr. Dobbs. He also says that she is unreliable as to her recollection.

³ For an examination of the inappropriateness of these 'charges' which are not supported by Emma Nicholls' evidence see my article *'Trial by Committee'*.

⁴ By the Director PSU and the diocesan investigator even though it is not a term that is used in the diocesan legislation, and which seems to have 'dropped out' of the Committee's report.

Her email to her friend and confidante SanDee (Sandra Hardwig) is clear evidence of this, especially when compared with the various versions of events to which she has signed her name, as well as the, in some parts bizarre, versions given by Figtree's Children's Minister and child protection officer Yvonne Gunning, and Emma's mother Lee Nicholls, neither of them direct witnesses. The most grotesque of these is specifically denied by Emma. Emma is the only direct witness. No-one else can support her claims from direct knowledge.

The final page lists these remaining few allegations of the 'low-level sexual harassment of an adult (even if unintentional)' or 'sexual exploitation', all of which are denied by Dr. Dobbs.

The 'Report' of the PSC.

With all due respect to the committee members, their report is actually foolish: -

- (1) The Committee says it is 'comfortable' that it has the power to try a person who only makes coffee after church as if they were a minister or church worker in a position of 'leadership', 'power and trust' (to cite the language of the two pieces of diocesan legislation that are applicable). So much for a considered opinion based on proper principles of legislative interpretation! Being 'comfortable' is not the professional and appropriate test of legislative interpretation. Then to compound the error, the PSC produced a convoluted, irrational piece of attempted legislative analysis, which was just plain wrong and could not by any stretch of the imagination, apply.

Comment: The Discipline Ordinance 2006 is very specific in its' definitions of the persons against whom the provisions of that piece of Anglican church law can be applied: if not a parish clergy, then the person has to be, first and foremost, in a position of leadership. It then contains some quite specific examples of people who are in a position of leadership: clergy who are not in parish, wardens and parish councillors, the organist, choir director and members of the choir, various positions under other specified ordinances, such as Sunday School superintendent, or a person who has been appointed by the Rector (Senior Minister) or his delegate to a position of leadership. There was nothing in the voluminous material placed in the hands of the committee members that proved or even referred to this last part of the definition, which, later, the PSU Director Phillip Gerber admitted was the only possible part of the definition that could be applied to Dr. Dobbs making espresso coffee.

But in fact, all attempts at applying any part of the definition to a man who operates a commercial coffee making machine to serve coffee after church services has to fail, because the primary and over-riding requirement of the definition is that the person must be in a position of leadership. (See my article "*Leadership, Ministry and a Coffee Machine*".)

- (2) The Committee has found a person 'guilty' and banned them from church work without anything approaching a fair trial - without being able to make findings of fact, in the face of denials by the accused person and without having any 'evidence' from him and others responding to the huge quantity of largely irrelevant material that is submitted with the investigator's report, comprising gossip and innuendo to a great degree and subjective comments that are unsupported by anything approaching evidence. The accused person is not permitted know who they are, they are just faceless men and women. The accused person is given a short time to prepare statutory declarations answering such comments as

that made by Helen Irvine in her signed statement, talking about the Dobbs family children⁵: *'The only concern that I had was that his daughters dress in a very sexy way, even when they're very young. Their hair is bleached blonde. It looks bleached.'*⁶ How is one to respond to this piece of unprovoked spite against children, those who are not even accused?

- (3) Given the utter triviality of what the Committee even alleges, and given that they are supposed to be ridding the church of real abusers, they have been expending enormous effort chasing the reddest of red herrings. This is perverse.
- (4) The Committee says the church has already acted properly by removing Dr. Dobbs permanently from 'ministry'. What? Is it 'proper' to punish the person before they have even been tried? Before there has been even an investigation? But it is worse than that. The Committee report is misleading: as is well known, the church also excluded Dr. Dobbs and his entire family from attending church on the basis only of the hysterical gossip fostered by the parish leadership before the matter was investigated. Was that 'proper'?
- (5) Lastly it is foolish because the Committee has no power or authority. They can do nothing to Dr. Dobbs now that the church has excluded him and his whole family. They have no power over him. No power at all.

"This too is meaningless, chasing after the wind" (Ecclesiastes 4.4)

Consequently, the report and the recommendations of the Committee have to be regarded as being without proper foundation and even without support from the materials. In other words: a waste of time and effort. Their so-called recommendations deserve to be rejected, which they are.

Beware - It is your fault if your good intentions are misinterpreted by a delusional person.

The Committee appears to consider that even if you are unaware of 'the effect' you are having on a person, and despite you behaving with good intentions, it is your fault if that person misinterprets, even delusionally, what your intentions are⁷. Again, with all due respect to the committee members, this is really making it up as you go along. This has to be another cogent reason for abandoning the use of a PSC as a substitute for the reasoned consideration of the totality of the proper evidence by an independent senior barrister – one who would have to advise whether there is a case to be tried.

The thinking of the Committee has become foolish.

They claim the only remaining complaints are of 'low level' unintentional sexual harassment or sexual exploitation of an adult person.

The sources of the definition of sexual harassment of an adult are the Code of Conduct 'Faithfulness in Service' and (for this case) the Discipline Ordinance 2006 of Sydney diocese. The

⁵ One could ask: why would anyone of intelligence think that this is relevant? The only relevant thing that Helen Irvine said in her statement was: 'I do not know Emma Nicholls.'

⁶ Par 36 of her signed statement Dated 10 September 2007.

⁷ One of the PSC's recommendations is for Dr. Dobbs to undergo '*counselling or training as to his self-awareness and the likely effect this may have on other people, regardless of his good intent.*' (?) Does this include his effect on a mentally unwell woman who had conceived a delusional passion for him which he did not return and had done nothing to encourage? It seems irrational if it does.

Discipline Ordinance 2006 says that sexual abuse of an adult has the same meaning as in Faithfulness in Service. The Code of Conduct says sexual abuse of an adult means sexual assault, sexual exploitation or sexual harassment of an adult. Note that it does not say that it is in anyway related to whether the accused person is married or not.⁸ Sexual harassment is further defined to be '*unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature*, whether intended or not', including 'making unwelcome physical contact such as touching, pinching, or patting'⁹.

There are several problems with the diocesan 'case'. The first is that the touching etc must be unwelcome. It is quite clear from Emma's writings and her putting herself in the way of physical contact that she was longing for contact and it was far from unwelcome, especially as demonstrated by her conduct in the first and last incident.

The second problem is that none of the alleged conduct is of a sexual nature on any objective standard.

Another problem is that there were potential witnesses to all but two of the alleged incidents, but she says that there are no direct witnesses to support her stories¹⁰ and so she remains the sole witness of fact for the diocese. No-one else can have anything relevant to say because they are simply embroidering what they say Emma said to them at some later stage¹¹.

As for 'sexual exploitation': there are two requirements to be proved by a prosecutor:

- (a) a form of sexual contact or invitation to sexual contact with an adult, and
- (b) that the adult be someone with whom there is a pastoral or supervisory relationship.

Although in this definition consent does not operate as a complete defense as in sexual harassment, there is the problem that none of the behaviour actually described (without coaching and disgraceful pressure brought to bear on her in her interviews) constitutes sexual contact or an invitation to sexual contact, and Dr. Dobbs was not in a pastoral or supervisory relationship with Emma Nicholls.

All these problems are clearly evident on Emma's own statements. (For an expanded examination of the flaws in the PSC's conclusions see "*Trial by Committee*".)

**The Committee has left hanging the virulent accusations by the then rector's wife, Helen Irvine.
This shows they have not thought about an important problem with the whole case.**

Helen Irvine, the wife of the rector at the time made a claim (soon known throughout the parish and beyond) that Dr. Dobbs had sexually abused female university students of the same age as Emma.¹² The Discipline Ordinance 2006 invites the Committee to consider other 'offences' by the accused person when considering what penalty to recommend. Their report does not indicate that they rejected the documents concerning this totally unrelated complaint.¹³ An examination of the documents relating to this claim makes it clear that there is absolutely no foundation to it. The claims by the only woman to make a signed statement are these (and only these):

⁸ The committee in its wisdom seems to think that it does.

⁹ The definition has ten categories but none of the others apply to this case.

¹⁰ And the investigator was not able to find any.

¹¹ Or, worse – what they say someone else said Emma said to that someone else some time later. Hardly reliable evidence, especially when coupled with malice.

¹² Helen Irvine was a colleague of Dr. Dobbs at the University of Wollongong, where he had evidence of bribery, corruption and soft marking practices (see '*A Cautionary Tale*' and '*The Evolution of a Lie*').

¹³ The complaints do not concern anyone in the parish.

- (1) In 1999 in one semester he looked at her during tutorials, which he was conducting, and she was one of 15-16 students in the room. She had no other contact with him while a student.
- (2) In 2001 she was employed at another University: they met at a university function and he paid her a compliment, said he was happy she was doing academic work, sat at the lunch table with some 60-80 people, not even near her, and in the afternoon in the lecture hall she says that they made eye contact. She had had no contact with him since she was his student for 1 semester in 1999.
- (3) About 1 week later in 2001, she answered an anonymous hotmail email address titled '*write to me if you're lucky*' signed '*a secret admirer*' and entered into an email conversation for a while before stopping answering and the emails stopped. She does not know who sent the emails. She says later ones were signed *Scotty* but anyone can sign any name they like. She has not kept the emails and she says she does not remember what they said. Later, clearly under pressure from the investigator she tells this story: that in the emails 'he' was asking her to run away with him. This seems to be at odds with signing at least the early emails '*a secret admirer*' – how was she to know who she was being asked to run away with? He denies being the author of the emails.

Apart from the ludicrousness of the complaints, which there are other real problems with Corinne Cortese's complaint:

- (i) she did not make any complaint to the UOW EED Unit, nor to anyone else, at the time in 1999;
- (ii) she was not a student, but a visiting academic from another university when they met 2 years later (with no contact in between) at the UOW function;
- (iii) likewise, she was not a student nor at UOW when the emails are supposed to have been sent;
- (iv) on her story, when she said she would not run away with 'him' and stopped the emails, they stopped on 'his' part also (it is still, barely, OK for an adult man to proposition an adult woman as long as it is respectful, and that her negative response is accepted);
- (v) she made this complaint 2 days before Dr. Dobbs was due to have his application for permanent employment considered by the committee: she signed a Record of Interview the next day in which she authorised it to be handed to the Chair of the committee. Dr. Dobbs never saw it or knew that it existed. Obviously, it was a beat-up to get Dr. Dobbs' application rejected, which is what happened. The reason? Dr. Dobbs was a potential whistle-blower about corrupt practices in the Faculty, where Helen Irvine was also an academic (not a party to these corrupt practices, although she admits to knowing about them). What did she get out of it? His job at the end of his contract, which would have fallen just as she completed her PhD. She wanted a job there in order to be near her mother who was ill (so she told the investigator).

There are two other instances cited by the Helen Irvine as further 'evidence' to support her claim. One is from an anonymous woman, called 'Girl Y', whose complaint (delivered through Helen and not by any signed material from the woman herself) seems to be that she thinks she is frightened of him! There is nothing in the material to indicate anything for her to fear, other than possibly her own neurosis¹⁴. The third is called Girl Z 'Anna Maria'. This complaint is not from her. It is by Helen Irvine alone: that in about 1997-1998 Dr. Dobbs asked the department Head not to require him to share his

¹⁴ The complaint is clear that he never touched her.

office with Anna Maria, which was already occupied by three other PhD students. That is the totality of the 'complaint'.¹⁵

The inappropriateness of bringing these complaints in all their paucity of content is another scandalous aspect of the behaviour of the Parish leadership as well as an indictment of Helen Irvine.

What happens now?

In the words of the Chair of the Committee Archdeacon Howell in his letter dated 6 June 2008 to Dr. Dobbs: *'I also notify you that if you do not accept the Professional Standards Committee's recommendations within fourteen days of the date of this letter, proceedings will be taken against you in accordance with clause 36.'* Thus, after 20 June 2008 in this case, under clause 36(4) the Archbishop is required to appoint a person to bring the complaint before the diocesan Disciplinary Tribunal for a proper hearing of the relevant evidence in accordance with the rules of procedural fairness (*clause 71*).

The remaining allegations:

1. ***On a date in 2006: February 2006 (according to her mother) or November 2006 (according to Emma) or possibly 3 December 2006 (according to Emma's email to her friend and confidante SD):*** when, uninvited and against house rules, Emma entered Dr. Dobbs' study, going through two rooms, one of which was the master bedroom, to find him alone there working in the dark on his computer: she admits that she stood close beside him; she says he put an arm around her waist and she placed one hand over his on her waist and her other hand on his hair. She says that he leaned back into her chest, but not only does Emma find it impossible to describe the physical logistics of this, but also on her description it would be difficult if not impossible to do this. He says that he looked up and saw in the light from his computer screen that it was her, not his daughter as he had supposed, hastily got up and ran from the room. **Not sexual conduct and on Emma's account not unwelcome.**
2. Later in the evening, she alleges Dr. Dobbs sat on a lounge and she in an armchair and he massaged her hand, with others including Mrs. Dobbs and at least two Dobbs daughters in the room and homestay student sitting next to Dr. Dobbs on the lounge. **On Emma's account not unwelcome.** She could always have stood up and moved away but on her own admission she did not, because she writes in ecstatic terms about it. **Denied, but in any event not sexual conduct,** because she admits that in her own family this is also done, and her family have a name for it: they call it 'the tickly thing'.
3. ***In January 2007:*** These have to be regarded as tainted by coaching and possibly her recruitment as an *"agent provocateur"* by parish leaders. Helen Irvine at least, is well aware that Dr. Dobbs has information of corruption where they both worked which if leaked to the press would also negatively impact on the parish. Emma is still in the full flush of her obsessive love and sexual desire for Dr. Dobbs which is not suspected let alone returned. No-one has approached Dr. and Mabelle Dobbs to warn them of Emma's obsessive behaviour and delusions, which would have been a sensible and honest approach to the problem that Emma was now presenting¹⁶. There is also the issue of the intrinsic unreliability of Emma's recollection and interpretation of events due to her medical condition, which her doctor acknowledges in his interview and signed statement.

¹⁵ For a full discussion see the paper *'The First Stone Revisited'* an examination of the extreme feminist ideology demonstrated by these complaints on www.churchdispute.com

¹⁶ And much more compassionate and kind to Emma instead of exposing her delusions in this callous way.

- a. **January unidentified date:** giving Emma a kiss on the neck while walking with her up the driveway of her home, in front of two of Mr. A's daughters sitting in the car. **Denied.**
- b. **22 January:** a long hard hug and rubbing her back when they were alone together in the A family home This had been previously said to have taken place in the foyer of Figtree Anglian church during the day on 22nd January 2007, where Dr. Dobbs had been serving coffee to parishioners, staff, clergy and visitors at the church for the commencement of Summerfest 07 sessions held during the day and evening. The venue was changed after Dr. Dobbs pointed out that in that case there would have been an abundance of possible witnesses. **Denied.**
- c. **28 January:** after Emma wrote 2 letters, one to Machel Dobbs apologising for staying in a son's room overnight the previous October against the rules of the house (*nothing happened*) and a strange one to Dr. Dobbs¹⁷, she said she wanted to discuss her letter as he was setting up his coffee machine in the church foyer just before the end of the evening service. From this arose a cluster of allegations from that one period of time amounting to probably less than an hour, in full view of parishioners, Machel Dobbs, one of her sons who was helping his father with the espresso machine, and for a time, Emma's mother:

** Making a joke about Emma's letter.* Agreed. Neither he nor his wife knew what Emma was talking about. **Not sexual conduct. No physical contact**

Saying 'I'm sorry' to Emma.* Not recalled. **Not sexual conduct. No physical contact

Saying, in what Emma says is a nonsexual and non-romantic fashion that he loves her, she is a great lady.* Possible – the whole family used to tell her they love her. It is part of their language of encouragement. **Not sexual conduct, which is acknowledged by Emma. No physical contact.

Kissing her twice on the neck.* **Denied. Emma says she has no witnesses and yet it was in a public place with many parishioners around.

Touching her (briefly) on the waist, hip and back* as Dr. Dobbs served coffee to parishioners. Agreed as possible as described above, in order to indicate that she was in the way and should move. **Not sexual conduct and according to Emma's behaviour, not unwelcome. His second eldest son was with them behind the espresso coffee machine. The extravagant version originally given by her mother (who did not see anything improper at the time) and which was edited out of her signed statement is unreliable and a second version by Emma must be regarded as the result of coaching.

¹⁷ She kept a copy. Dr. Dobbs threw his original out after Mrs. Dobbs had read it, but Mrs. Dobbs retrieved the original. Emma's copy said: *'Can I talk to you about something important? (These words are partly crossed out) I've been a bit confused about the way I've been relating to you lately. I'm not sure if its just me, that I've misconstrued everything, but I'm feeling that the way I've been relating to you at times has been inappropriate. I feel as if I haven't utilized appropriate boundaries & I wanted to apologise to you if my actions in anyway have caused this. You, (your wife), & your children are really important to me & I love you all dearly & value the friendship I have with you very much and I wouldn't want to damage that in anyway.'*

Putting his hand over hers* to guide it onto one of the levers on the espresso machine while showing her how to make coffee, on her insistence. Agreed as possible, has done so to others when teaching them how to use the machine. **Not sexual conduct and according to Emma's behaviour, not unwelcome. This was rejected by the investigator Ken Taylor despite Emma's insistence that it was 'sexual'.

This is now the totality of the allegations by Emma that will be tested by a Tribunal hearing. What a waste of time and effort all because the parish leadership behaved so badly and abusively in the beginning, and no-one of any intelligence considered the matter clearly and objectively.

It is a very grave disgrace to the parish and to the Anglican Church Sydney diocese.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

What is happening now in 2018.

The present Archbishop of Sydney Dr. Glenn Davies, now convinced that a grave injustice has been visited upon the whole of the Dobbs family, now wants to make the long-delayed announcement to the congregation of Figtree Anglican Church containing his personal apology to the Dobbs family and to start the reconciliation process which would see them welcomed back into Figtree Anglican church should they wish to attend. It will be a great day when this happens, and it is to be hoped and prayed that those who were so quick to condemn Dr. Dobbs and Machel Dobbs without knowing the facts, even without knowing Emma Nicholls and her considerable mental and physical problems will receive from God the grace to turn away from hard-heartedness and to embrace the truth.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Available on www.churchdispute.com about Figtree Anglican Church and the Dobbs family:

Articles

- A Thumbnail Sketch of "the Figtree case."
- A Cautionary Tale.
- A Cautionary Tale – the Cover-up Begins.
- A Mother's Story.
- Leadership, Ministry and a Coffee Machine.
- Whispers and Lies.
- Sex, Lies and Videotape.
- Trial by Committee (The PSC).
- The Evolution of a Lie.
- The First Stone Revisited.
- Emma's remaining Allegations.

Open Letters:

- An Open Letter to Archdeacon Deryck Howell and the Members of the Professional Standards Committee.
- An Open Letter to the Members of the Disciplinary Tribunal.

