



COSA NEW ZEALAND INCORPORATED
CASUALTIES OF FALSE SEXUAL ALLEGATIONS

There has been a five-fold increase in sexual abuse claims ('sensitive claims') to ACC, New Zealand's "Accident Compensation Corporation," since the law firm of Wakefield's sent out a million fliers in January 2002.

Was it sexual abuse, or the 'promise' held out by the Wakefield's fliers, of a "lump sum of up to \$25,000 and ongoing payments valued in excess of \$150,000"?

Was it the new legislation bringing back lump sums?

Was it all of these, combined with misunderstanding and opportunism?

How do the legislation and Wakefield's 'initiative' add up?

Would you be surprised to hear that what Wakefield's are on about has nothing to do with the new legislation?

Is the new legislation fair? Have they got it right? Is it therapeutic? Has anything changed?

In this issue we address the issues surrounding the new legislation, the Injury Prevention Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 2002

LUMP SUM PAYMENTS - catalyst for falsehoods and trauma, or rehabilitation and fairness?

Note that Lynley Hood in 'A City Possessed' backgrounds the establishment of the ACC scheme on pp 88-94.

1. Chronicle of recent changes and discussion re ACC: a confusing story

The legal firm of Wakefield Associates by means of its Accident Compensation Services section was going about its business for ACC claimants back in 1999. As the following shows, they had found a loophole where independence allowances are accumulated following successful claims.

While lump sums were abolished in 1992, a woman last year successfully argued before Judge Malcolm Beattie in the district court that she was entitled to what was in effect a lump-sum payment going back

No. 12 MARCH 2002

Lump sum payments - Catalyst for falsehoods and trauma, or rehabilitation and fairness?

Chronicle of recent changes and discussion re ACC: a confusing story

Firm's offer worries false abuse group
General information about the new Injury prevention legislation

An Auckland focus on the milieu of the new Injury Prevention legislation

The New Compensation Act

Conclusions: How good is the sensitive claims system going to be from 1 April 2002?

Other news about ACC and the assessment of abuse claims

Psychology reps and ACC managers talk - Nov 2001

ACC has a manager of ACC's relationship with the health sector

Former head of Social Welfare Psychology Team, working regularly for CYFS, fined and censured by Psychology Board

General news

Investigative journalist backgrounds false rape allegations

NZ Law Conference 2001 - papers relevant to sex allegation cases

'Expert' psychological evidence is rather questionable

Wenatchee sex allegations cases: evidence of misconduct, and lessons to be learned - paper by Jacqueline McMurtrie
New 'little' witchhunts

Christchurch: man's name suppression led to false rumours

Judge's 'porn site' visit

Australasian news

Governor-General declined patron role for survivor advocacy group

'PTSD', 'colonisation', 'Freud', US president of ISSD, Defence Department :
Australasian Trauma Stress Studies

many years. [In theory 1992 was the end of lump sums, but some sources put the actual cut-off date at 1996]. 'We didn't cotton on until about four months ago' when the woman argued this, said Gary Wakefield, Wakefield Associates. He said until a change in the law in 1997, people were paid a weekly independence allowance [at the time of the article it was \$61.68 pw], from the date they applied for it, but the 1997 legislation allowed people to backdate their claim to when the injury occurred and receive an accumulation of their weekly allowance. - *The Herald*, 1/2/99 p 5: 'People missing ACC payouts: lawyers' by Tony Stickleby

These accumulations possibly include accumulations of back-dated payments for counselling.

Nearly a year and a half later the move towards new Accident legislation was initiated. The then-Minister for Accident Insurance, Michael Cullen, announced in June 2000 that there would be new accident legislation called the **Injury Prevention, Rehabilitation and Compensation** Bill. A 4-fold increase in expenditure on accident prevention and the title of the bill revealed a major focus. - *The Herald* 7/6/00; *Cullen backs off ACC promises* by Richard Braddell and Dita de Boni.

The minister's framing of the bill divided attention between the reintroduction of lump sums, and accident prevention; the latter was now in place despite the strict meaning of 'accident'. [Is sexual abuse an accident? As a letter published in a Christchurch paper said, early in 2002, of a sexual abuse claim to ACC for mental injury, "If such a claim is accepted, how can the event possibly have happened by accident?" (D. Hamilton, Christchurch Star, 16/1/02 pB5). However, while this is true of the perpetrator, the person getting the support, the victim of the abuse, has no control over it.]

By December the Bill was ready for introduction to the House. The package was to include a \$100,000 limit over a person's lifetime, and a scale of payments. Opposition ACC spokesperson Gerry Brownlee (Ilam) criticised the

cap, saying that if someone became paraplegic, which entitled them \$100,000 compensation at that point, later lost their sight, they could get no more compensation yet they deserved it. He also said the way was paved for 'opening the floodgates' for lump-sum payouts under the category of mental injury for sexual abuse. - *The Herald* 1/12/01: '\$100,000 cap on lump sum ACC payouts' by Vernon Small.

How the cap related to sexual abuse claims, and where sexual abuse fitted into any scale, wasn't clear to the public at that time.

The Minister of Accident Insurance Michael Cullen responded to questions about the problems that lump sums for sexual abuse claims heralded, such as spurious claims, saying that 'tight constraints' were planned. He indicated that lumps sums and counselling were to be paid for, even while criminal convictions would not be needed to succeed in a claim, which was because it could 'disqualify many legitimate victims'. - *Dominion* 8/12/00 p8: 'ACC sex-abuse payments to be vetted, says Cullen' by David McLoughlin.

(Dr Cullen ought not to have been satisfied that ACC had evidence of the validity of all accepted claims. Gordon Waugh articulates where the problem lies: "Despite the fact that numerous Ministers of ACC, and ACC itself, have said in the past that "satisfactory, verified" evidence of abuse is necessary, counsellors do not investigate or corroborate claims" (Usenet 9/12/01).)

Gerry Brownlee, National MP for Ilam, in the Opposition, spoke up again but was weak on lump sums, and on lump sums related to sexual allegations, silent. He criticised the government's giving to ACC the sole-provider status for accident compensation insurance. - Gerry Brownlee 14/12/00 Press release 'Govt must take heed of ACC submissions'.

Mr Brownlee later indicated support for a wide range of health professionals remaining under ACC's system, and for keeping an eye out for detecting fraud or unprofessional behaviour. - Gerry Brownlee 22/1/01 Press

release 'Nats policy of more ACC providers successful'.

In March 2001, when the Accident Minister's portfolio (often called ACC) was passed on, Dr Cullen said of the new Minister, the Hon Lianne Dalziel, that it was in good hands, and that she had the experience and suitability for it.

In the same month ACC published "Therapy Guidelines, Adult Survivors of Child Sexual Abuse" by Kim McGregor (ACC March 2001). It is a summary of a literature review undertaken by McGregor for a PhD thesis, from the Injury Prevention Research Centre at the University of Auckland. The booklet, astoundingly, is based around the view that adults who come to counselling will in fact have been sexually abused even if they 'do not know it'. This seems autocratic as not true, and thus dangerous. If ACC counsellors take this view, clients will be subjected to this influence, and this is likely to result in instances of false sexual allegations.

About the middle of 2001, Disabilities Minister Ruth Dyson was appointed Associate Minister of ACC. Disability issues and Injury issues seem to be moving closer to together, and they clearly do have overlapping areas. Of course the problem with sexual allegations being put into this paradigm is that they may never have happened, and any person pointed to, during allegations, as a 'cause', leads to a whole set of problems.

In August 2001 the New Zealand Law Society journal 'Lawtalk' showed that they had made submissions to the select committee about the IPR&C Bill. This article said that the Bill had incorporated some changes recommended by the NZLS, but not the 'no-fault' recommendation or the recommendations to include the word "accident" near "compensation" in the title. It also had not picked up the recommendation to rationalise the ACC legislation. - LawTalk 30/8/01; "*Select committee picks up NZLS recommendations*" by Don Rennie; see <http://www.nz-lawsoc.org.nz/lawtalk/568injury.htm> .

[Note that the NZ Law Society was constituted under the Law Practitioners Act 1955. The general functions of the NZLS are set out in Section 4 of the Law practitioners Act 1982. The LawTalk magazine put out by the society is in accordance with provisions in this legislation.]

Late in 2001 Wakefield Associates made the news in Taranaki, after a small distribution of its fliers about sexual abuse. *Re Wakefield Associates: Daily News, Taranaki 8/10/01 p 3: 'Big response to sexual-abuse flier' by Mark Birch.*

Then, in the new year, 2002, the whole country took notice after Wakefield's flooded the country with a million of their fliers, with most householders finding one in their letterbox.

The front of the A4 sized folded fliers said "Victims of sexual abuse have a legal right to ACC financial compensation". It went on "The compensation may include lump sum payments and ongoing entitlements". Inside, a large heading said: "You may be entitled to a lump sum of up to \$25,000 and ongoing payments valued in excess of \$150,000". The remainder of the flier was an "Authority to Act" form. There was no mention of sexual abuse in this, but the firm's charges were identified and contractual details of concern. A person who filled in the form and sent it off by freepost, as provided for, could retain only the other section, the one highlighting sexual abuse. They would have no copy of the contract that they signed such as for later reference.

The fliers were a top news item. They also raised the profile of the new legislation with respect to the sexual abuse component, and the two were assumed to be related. Editorials and leading articles across the country were explicit about the Wakefield fliers. They took as the context, sexual abuse claims skyrocketing under the previous lump sum regime, seeming to identify fraud as a possibility. These two things combined brought a public outcry, with people fearing a gravy train of false allegations. Someone caused an anthrax scare at Wakefield's. **However, Wakefield's figures do not relate to impairment levels**

or the lump sums as detailed since then in relation to compensation for sexual abuse claims under the new law (see later).

ACC and the Labour Department (it administers ACC legislation) lodged a complaint with the NZ Law Society and the Commerce Commission about the flier, and one or more private individuals - Wellington psychologist Karen Frogley at least - and COSA NZ also, laid complaints. (eg, 'ACC to file complaint...', *Press* 26/1/02, p 2; *Delays blamed on faulty forms*, *Press* 26/3/02 p3.)

After a special meeting, COSA formed a statement for the Christchurch 'Star' about Wakefield's flier, printed as "Firm's offer worries false abuse group" (see below). COSA laid its complaint about the Wakefield flier with the Canterbury District Law Society.

The new legislation, COSA discovered, requires that both the date of the claim, and the abuse, date from 1 April 2002 onwards. Taken together, we can see that claims made in the period after the distribution of Wakefield's fliers in January and before 1 April 2002, do not come under the new legislation. They do, however, come under the old legislation, as these various pieces have not been removed, eg, Accident Insurance Act 1998 is still relevant for historical claims.

The day after the fliers were first distributed, an item said that ACC sensitive claims manager Gail Kettle confirmed that people who claimed to have been sexually abused would be able to make successful sensitive claims based on the person's word. A day later ACC's lawyer Gerard McGreevy, making the inference that this had meant historical abuse, was recorded as saying:

"Ms Kettle's confirmation in yesterday's Dominion that victims would be able to get lump sums for abuse that happened years ago was wrong."

Mr McGreevy indicated without further comment on the preceding item, that existing clients would continue to be entitled to the independence allowance and other existing entitlements. - *The Dominion 'Cash for unproved*

sex abuse' 9/01/02 by David McLoughlin, p 1; The Dominion, Wellington 10/01/02 'ACC 'wastes money' on sex victim campaign' by David McLoughlin.

The old legislation allows for successful claims for 'historical abuse' to result in payment of independence allowances that can be backdated and accumulated as indicated earlier.

Still in January, in Wellington it was reported that ACC had sent out large numbers of claims cards to doctors. A clinic nurse said at her practice they looked after 500 people and they had been sent 100 cards. She saw the number as suggesting that ACC believed 1 in 5 of the staff (a workplace) had been abused, and accused ACC of soliciting in the same way as Wakefield. - *Dominion 10/1/02 ACC 'wastes money' on sex victim campaign by David McLoughlin.*

Gerry Brownlee (in a press release) said that privacy law prevents claims being scrutinised by interested parties. Such a party could be a person who realises that they have been, or are likely to have been, falsely accused. At the same time Mr Brownlee supported lump sums for some injuries but again criticised ACC's monopoly on compensation provision.

Peter Ellis said "It is clear New Zealand hasn't learned anything from the Civic case," and it reminded him of the antics of ACC staffers in 1992, during the developing Christchurch Civic case, who rushed up to parents waving claim forms long before any charges were laid against him. - *Quoted by Frank Haden, Sunday Star-Times 13/01/02 in: Money for old sex abuse.*

Then the following article, based on a statement from COSA NZ Inc., was carried by Christchurch's Star on 16/1/02, p 3.

FIRM'S OFFER WORRIES FALSE ABUSE GROUP

A Christchurch law firm's offer to help alleged sex abuse victims get compensation may prompt a flow of false abuse claims, warns a locally based group which supports victims of untrue allegations.

The warning from Casualties Of false Sexual Allegations NZ Inc came in the wake of moves by law firm Wakefield Associates to offer its services to people who believed they were entitled to ACC compensation because of sexual abuse. Last week the Christchurch Star reported how the firm distributed fliers around New Zealand saying it could help alleged sex abuse victims get lump sum payments of up to \$25,000 and on-going payments through ACC.

COSA chairperson John Lindsay said it was "a continuing concern" that, in the absence of corroboration or mandatory investigation, sexual abuse compensation may be based only on a counsellor's interpretation of the claimant's behaviour.

Legislation reinstating lump sum ACC payments for permanent impairment comes into force on April 1.

The group had grave concerns that the Wakefield initiative over legislation that had not yet come into effect ran the risk of creating false allegations for "physical gain" [COSA's statement had said 'fiscal gain' but the statement was taken down by phone] or advantage in custody matters and such allegations could lead to repercussions in the Family Court, he said.

"It is disappointing that the process of the legislation concerning ACC sensitive claims (sexual abuse) has not been adequately conveyed to the public and COSA finds itself analysing contradictory ministerial and departmental statements that now require clarification."

Emotive issue

The group believed the use of "a highly emotive sex abuse issue as a promotional contractual lever to encompass matters covered under ACC acts of 1972 and onwards, and including legislation not yet in existence, was "of dubious merit".

Wakefield Associates said it had had a lot of people responding to its flier who

were "absolutely thrilled" about the offer.

But ACC said the claim process was clearly defined and using a lawyer would not influence a person's eligibility for accident cover.

Chronicle contd.

Three weeks into February - and about 6 weeks after Wakefield distributed their fliers - reports out of ACC showed the 'Wakefield effect': ACC had received an average of 500 new sexual abuse claims a week in the new year; the rate before having been about 100 per week. - *The Press 21/2/02 p 1 Sex abuse claims up after leaflet - ACC.*

"Only 500 claims in a week? Girls, you're so bashful! Get in the queue!" said Rosemary McLeod in an opinion column. She finished up saying: "Yes, we must queue up quickly, while we can still get away with it. The time will inevitably come when nobody will believe we had the cheek - still less that we did it with a straight face". *SST 24/2/02 p A9 'The real abuse is of the system'.*

The new scheme was then the subject of an Insight programme on National Radio (17/3/02; a transcript is available at <http://www4.wave.co.nz/~brianr/ACC/>). Lynley Hood feared the scheme would act like a sign saying 'get your free money here', and said that for all 'injuries' except sexual abuse, ACC expected proof and confirmation. Gordon Waugh backed this up, saying that while sexual abuse happens, for ACC to accept sexual abuse claims and spend taxpayer's money on them, they should have evidence rather than just allegations. Victoria University psychology lecturer Maryanne Garry roundly criticised McGregor's therapy guidelines, saying she provided a kind of scaffolding, and what clients could be doing was "building, hanging information that they're creating, on this scaffolding". Dr David Rankin, ACC's manager of the health sector relationship, said ACC in a vigorous exercise has re-registered its counsellors, reducing them by a 3rd to 600, based on 'volumes and outcomes'. Minister Lianne Dalziel, and counsellors, also contributed to this radio programme.

ACC's stance was argued in an article the same day, with Hood reiterating her views. Fred Seymour, director of clinical training at Auckland University, disputing her, said ACC guidelines weren't responsible for producing false memories because clients "can't get ACC counselling until someone else has agreed the person qualifies to see a counsellor." Gordon Waugh - showing that the procedure was first (a) the claimant applies to ACC via a form, then (b) the client picks a counsellor,

and then (c) the counsellor makes a cover report - said Seymour's assertion was nonsense. Barry Parsonson, Hamilton clinical psychologist and president of the Psychological Society, also disputed the guidelines, saying it was his personal view that "not every client that comes is somehow hiding sexual abuse under an umbrella of another problem." (*'ACC: sex abuse cause ...'* by Donna Chisholm SST 17/3/02; *'Abuse humbug'*, Gordon Waugh SST 24/3/02).

2. General information about the new Injury Prevention legislation

In early February, Auckland's Herald published a very informative article, with an illuminating table, on aspects of ACC's impairment ratings, and lumps sums. No such material has appeared in Christchurch's Press. We reproduce the table and summarise some of the points made in the Herald's item. - *New Zealand Herald 4/02/02: Tough rules for bigger ACC payouts.*

Injury (description)	Level of impairment (prescription)	Compensation (amounts or ranges)
Common lower back injury	0-5%	Nil
Amputation - little finger or ring finger	5%	Nil
Back injury causing pain & muscle wasting	10%	\$2,500
Sexual abuse	0-20%	\$0 - \$6,459
Amputation - index or middle finger	11%	\$2,837
Amputation - thumb	22%	\$7,427
Total loss of vision - one eye	24%	\$8,465
Amputation - leg below knee	32%	\$13,409
Amputation - leg	40%	\$19,920
Amputation - arm below elbow	57%	\$41,424
Amputation - arm	60%	\$46,704
Paraplegia	80%	\$100,000
Total loss of vision	85%	\$100,000
Tetraplegia	90%	\$100,000

- The new scheme would pay lump sums to about 6000 people a year and cost 'only' \$55 million. [Sensitive Claims costs for 2000/1 totalled 'only' \$17.6 million (webpage containing 'injury-statistics-200.../sensitive-by-expenditure.htm). Also the estimate of 6000 (115 pw) is too low, with recent rates at 4 X that, 500 pw, so the cost estimate may be too low. Also see: 5. Conclusions.] The old lump-sum scheme paid more than 15,000 people a total of \$245 million in its 'last year' in 1991-92.

- Many claims under the old scheme were for historical sexual abuse claims, but the new scheme did not include these as it applied only to incidents after April 1 (Accident Insurance Act 1998 still covers 'historical' allegations).

- The new scheme will pay out only on the basis of permanent loss or impairment, not on "pain, suffering and loss of the enjoyment of life". Under the old scheme, the pain and suffering element was worth up to \$17,000, and for sexual abuse in par-

ticular this element was worth up to \$10,000. [A man has reported that, about 10 years ago, he was falsely accused in sexual allegations, and that later he was awarded ACC compensation for the harm it caused him; it seems to have been awarded for his 'pain and suffering'. While the new regulations, which do not work on the basis of 'psychological harm' ('pain, suffering and loss of enjoyment of life'), mean this won't be available for events after 1 April 2002, for prior events the status quo should remain.]

· "[Previously with lump sums] if you had been sexually abused it was \$10,000." said the ACC Chief Executive Garry Wilson. "Under the new scheme it ... will only be paid on disability, or ongoing impairment. So for someone who breaks an arm, they won't get anything apart from medical attention, because their arm will get fixed".

· According to Sensitive Claims Unit Manager Gail Kettle, fewer than 10% of the people who claimed ACC subsidies for sexual abuse that occurred after 1 April 2002 would qualify for lump sums, and then only after 1-2 years (counselling and support) if it became clear 'the abuse' had permanently impaired their daily activities. [Individual counselling (with up to a \$56 subsidy from ACC a week), and 'Groupwork counselling,' are part of the rehabilitation package.]

· People assessed with a permanent impairment of less than 10% impaired will get no lump sum compensation.

· Although the criteria for lump sums will be the same as for the existing independence allowances, ACC expected more people to apply for the lump sums - their projected figure of 6000 a year fits here - than applied for independence allowances, which only amounted to 364 new independence allowances last year. This was because many people did not bother to apply for independence allowances because they were only small weekly amounts. When the payouts become lump

sums, that can be expected to change, as people entitled to this compensation will see their applications as worth-while, Mr Wilson said.

3. AN AUCKLAND FOCUS ON THE MILIEU OF THE NEW INJURY PREVENTION LEGISLATION

'Unravelling secrets of sexual abuse' - Herald article of 2/02/02 by Simon Collins

In this article, three cases were cited including that of Gordon Waugh and his family, where they were subject to false allegations of their daughter, supported by her sister, of sexual abuse 30 years ago.

The writer followed through on Gordon Waugh's targeting of the Auckland University's clinical psychology training programme, in relation to the now-systemic problems.

'Did the programme only accept into its streams people who believe in recovered memories?' seemed to be the question the reporter put to people with links to the department. Dr Robert Mann, a former lecturer, seemed to affirm the possibility. Mike Corballis, currently a professor there, said however that while a few years ago he had been worried about the selection criteria ('there were rumours that [candidates] had to cry' to get into the course, he said), he now contributed to the selection committee. The implication was that things there were different now.

But Waugh and Mann are still suspicious because a co-director for the course is a Dr John Read, who, apart from being an outspoken survivor of sexual abuse, supports recovered memories, and has co-authored a paper about a purported sexual abuse-schizophrenia link.

Three unnamed former students and a former interview-attendee said that at interviews for entrance into the course, the subject of recovered memory of sexual abuse did not arise. However, one reported 'feeling ... that you ... have to basically agree with everything they say or you might have problems', but another argued that in the course there was

skepticism about recovered memory, so the students were exposed to 'both sides'. But 'Are practical help and reasonable indications as to where to draw the line, given?' a skeptic might ask.

The article also stated some rates of sexual abuse, supposedly derived from a University of Otago survey of 2000 women in the late 80s. It claimed:

- 32% of those surveyed were sexually abused by the age of 16 (ie, 640);

[Ed's comment: But the data given in the Herald account for just 166 women or 8.3% having remembered having either genital contact or attempted intercourse, before reaching 16 years of age.]

- there was a clear link between childhood sexual abuse and later mental illness;

- there was a higher rate of broken families in individuals reporting sexual abuse incidents, and

- there was a higher incidence of admission to psychiatric care in that group.

[Comment: Dr Harlene Hayne of Otago's Psychology Department thought the study referred to in the article was one by Judy Martin, Jessie Anderson, Sarah Romans, Paul Mullen, and Martine O'Shea, titled "Asking about childhood sexual abuse: Methodological implications of a two-stage survey", and published in *Child Abuse & Neglect*, volume 17, 1993, pages 383-392. This is a known paper from a study of 2000 Otago women. Dr Hayne wrote: "If this is the correct article, here are my comments regarding the story in the Herald:"

The Herald wrote: "An Otago University survey of 2000 Dunedin women in the late 80s found that 32 per cent said they had been sexually abused before the age of 16."

Dr Hayne wrote: "I think this statement does not adequately reflect the data. The target question was not about sexual "abuse." It was "Before the age of 16, did you ever have an unwanted sexual experience with someone older or bigger than you?" The answers to this question included rape and fondling, but it also

included "noncontact" events, such as exposure."

The Herald wrote: "Of these, 20 per cent had experienced genital contact, and 6 per cent actual or attempted intercourse. The perpetrator was a family member in 38 per cent of cases, an acquaintance for 46 per cent and a stranger for 15 per cent. One in 10 stepfathers and one in 100 natural fathers had sexually abused their children."

Dr Hayne wrote: "There were no details about these issues in the paper that I have. Perhaps they were published somewhere else."

The Herald wrote: "The study found a clear link between childhood sexual abuse and later mental illness. Even after allowing for other casual factors such as broken families, women who suffered sexual abuse involving intercourse in childhood were 12 times more likely than the average woman to be admitted to hospital for psychiatric care later."

Dr Hayne wrote: "Again, there were no details regarding this issue in the paper that I read".]

'Counsellors say', the article went on, that ACC has been much more restrictive about giving financial compensation for sexual abuse since 1997, when it began using American Medical Association guidelines to assess people's impairment by injuries. It noted that the weekly "independence allowances" had dropped from 2.7% of clients in 1996-97 to 0.8 % in 2000-01.

The article said a stabilisation concept would apply. This, apparently a new concept, is that each lump sum payment will depend on the person's impairment condition having stabilised.

ACC was tightening controls on '700' private sector counsellors who get ACC subsidies for sexual abuse cases (the Insight program later said they have recently been reduced to 600). Also, from later this year, a new group of clinical psychologists and psychiatrists will assess all clients independently after 10 counselling sessions, said Sensitive Claims manager Gail Kettle.

Sexually abused children admitted to Auckland's Starship Hospital dropped from 700 a year in the early 1990s to 300-400 in the past year. Criminal convictions for sex offences against under 17-year olds dropped from 2066 in 1996 to 1173 in 2000. This meant that 10 years after complaints peaked, there were tentative signs increased public awareness might be starting to change the actual level of abuse, said the author, journalist Simon Collins. [Equally it could mean the false component had decreased after advocacy and education had the right effect].

Ian Hassall, ex-Children's Commissioner, commented. Psychologist Miriam Saphira, and John McCarthy, of the Auckland Safe network program for abusers, theorised on why people abuse.

People puzzling about drop in child sex cases - *Herald article by Simon Collins of 2/2/02*

This article repeated the Starship figures previously referred to, and added that:

- CYF's findings of child sex abuse fell 20% to 1399 from 1997 to June 2000,
- convictions for sex offences against under-17s almost halved to 1173 in the four years to 2000, and
- sexual abuse claims to ACC dropped from 10,892 in 1992-3 to a low of 4872 in 1999-2000. Then in a reverse trend, they rose slightly in the year to June 2001.

Four out of five of the latter were adults reporting childhood abuse, he wrote.

Physical abuse and neglect referrals to Starship had fluctuated in the 1994-2000 period with numbers under 300 a year, the range being large (170-270), but of a factor of less than 100%. At the same time, child sexual abuse referrals after starting much higher had trended generally down, and by more than a 100%, ie, from 700 in 1994, to 550, 565, 500, 440, 410 and then 300.

Dr Kelly attributed some of the rise in the period prior to 1994 to changes in people's willingness (or incentives, COSA might suggest),

to report incidents, rather than changes in rates.

4. THE NEW COMPENSATION ACT

PART 1 of the Act states the purpose of the Act and definitions.

PART 2 of the Act determines whether a person has cover. **S21** says the act provides cover for a person who has a mental injury, when the mental injury is caused by an act performed by another person, when the injury was first felt inside or outside NZ, and when the injury was an act falling within certain criminal acts as listed in the Crimes Act 1961. These acts are defined in the 'Third schedule', which lists 20 criminal acts. 18 of these are sexual, about forced or deviant or inappropriate sexual acts, or related to sex organs (ie, female genital mutilation or related). One item is 'Assault on a child, or by a male on a female' and a note appended says that for the purposes of IPRC Act, the assault means a sexual assault; however, note that there is a gender discrimination in it. The remaining crime in the list is 'Infecting with disease'. It also needs to be noted that the following is listed as a crime capable of being covered by the act through mental injury: 'Anal intercourse' (not just a 'forced' or 'unwanted' instance). **S27** defines mental injury as 'a clinically significant behavioural, cognitive, or psychological dysfunction'. **S36** says that the date on which a person suffers mental injury is the date on which the person first receives treatment for that mental injury.

PART 3 of the Act comprises a code of ACC claimants rights, and procedures for claims (some of this promises future details will be added), and the process the Corporation must follow. **S53** delineates the timeframe for lodging claims. It says both that claims must be lodged within the time set (1 year), and that if a claim is late they must not decline it unless 'the claim's lateness prejudices the Corporation in its ability to make decisions'. In sections on the Corporation's processes, **S56** first distinguishes that mental injury comes under a special category called complicated claims

(along with some other injuries, eg, injuries caused gradually). **S57** states the corporation's process and obligations re complicated claims. These seem straightforward, except that the matter of extensions of time is mentioned. **S58** says if the corporation hasn't let the claimant know whether their claim has been accepted by their own deadline, 'the effect is that the claimant has a decision that the claimant has cover'. **S66** says the Corporation must keep every claim file for at least 10 years after the date of the latest action they record.

PART 4 sets out what the entitlements are, and in **S69** names them as (a) rehabilitation (comprising treatment, social rehabilitation, and vocational rehabilitation); (b) first week compensation; (c) weekly compensation; (d) lump sum compensation for permanent impairment; and (e) funeral grants, survivors' grants, weekly compensation for the spouse, children and other dependants of a deceased claimant, and child care payments. **S116** provides for lump sums to be subject to adjustments according to the CPI (Consumer Price Index). **S127** refers to weekly and lump sum entitlements of claimants outside New Zealand.

PART 9 is Miscellaneous provisions. **S326** Regulations relating to lump sums specify that the Governor General, on the recommendation of the Minister (eg, by Order in Council), may

- make regulations specifying when a claimant's condition is to be regarded as stabilized,
- make regulations that refer to or use the American Medical Association Guides or other guides (relating to the assessment of permanent impairment) including any mixture of them,
 - amend lump sums,
 - prescribe calculations and rules for cases where a person has suffered more than one personal injury that is a permanent impairment,
 - provide calculations and rules for determining and adjusting the whole-person im-

pairment score that take into account injuries received before 1 April 2002,

- prescribe a scale of lump sums so that the amount goes up exponentially or otherwise as the degree of impairment increases, and
- prescribe such other matters as may be desirable re these lump sums and their settings.

In advising the Governor General of changes, the Minister must have consulted with persons or organizations s/he deems most suitable to be consulted. Claimants must be allowed to inspect material referred to or incorporated by any of the regulations.

The **FIRST SCHEDULE** to the Act, in its **Part 3**, covers **Lump sum compensation for permanent impairment**. Under **55 Transitional limits** it says effectively that if a mental injury resulted from an act that occurred before 1 April 2002 there is no entitlement to lump sum compensation. But it also says 'If a person's eligibility for lump sum compensation for permanent impairment under this schedule is excluded by this clause and the person has suffered personal injury for which the person has cover because of section 36 or section 37 or section 38 [S37 and S38 are not relevant for sensitive claims; S36 is covered above], Part 4 of the Accident Insurance Act 1998 applies to the person for the purpose of deciding whether the person has an entitlement to an independence allowance.' (This is a clause that says the old legislation applies to them and they can make a claim for the independence allowance and receive it if their claim is accepted.[The Independence Allowance is \$64.39 per week; under the new Act, if applied, it may be graded down for impairment levels less than 80%.]) Under **56** it says where the amounts of lump sums are specified, that the minimum impairment to qualify is 10%, that the minimum lump sum then is \$2,500, that the maximum lump sum payable for a ('likely' - see 57(1) (b) (ii)) permanent impairment, of the highest level ie 80% is \$100,000. **57** says that for a lump sum, a medical certificate needs to be filed after

up to 2 years counselling, with the suitably-qualified doctor assessing that the injury is 'likely' to be a permanent impairment. If the person for which the claim is made is under 16, the matter is not assessed until they attain the age 16, unless there are compelling reasons for it being assessed earlier. The corporation is to pay the costs of the certificate. Under **58** it says the Corporation must appoint and pay as many assessors as it needs. Under **59** it says after the Corporation receives the notification that the client's condition is stable, the corporation must authorize an assessor to assess the claimant according to the Act. The assessor must note any previous lump sum claim paid, and the whole-person effect must be worked out. No person shall be claimed to have more than 100% whole-person impairment. Under **60** it describes the calculation to be applied to the lump sum (subtraction of previous amount for example from the amount applicable for the whole-person assessment), and the requirements of advising the claimant of the impairment assessment and the amount. **61** is about reassessment, and **62** about paying a person's estate if applicable.

See <http://rangi.knowledge-basket.co.nz/gpacts/public/text/2001/an/049.html>.

We have highlighted only some elements of the legislation.

5. CONCLUSIONS: HOW GOOD IS THE SENSITIVE CLAIMS SYSTEM GOING TO BE FROM 1 APRIL 2002?

The system from 1 April 2002 will comprise both the old system and the new.

Thinking about the new system, the first thing that might be noted is the legal block on assessment of lump-sum-claims for alleged sexual abuse in children until they are 16. This is a good change, perhaps for deterring a carer from materialising false sexual allegations regarding a child - for the carer's gratification but to everyone else's detriment, the accused's in particular.

Any lump sum is an incentive for allegations, true or false, so this is a problem at the start. But, for adults, the introduction of a period of time of up to 2 yrs, before the assessment is made, could allow time for misdirected enthusiasm to be wane, be exposed, and/or be corrected. Formulating lump sums so as to depend on the client stabilising, will act to shorten some agony.

Turning to next year's counselling costs alone, using ACC's figure of 6000 new claims, this amounts to **\$33.6 million (max)**, based on the going rate of subsidy, \$56 per hour, and 50 hours for 2 years. This - their 'maximum' - is 5 times last year's counselling costs (which were 'only' \$6.8 million), and just under 2 times the whole costs last year.[In 2000/1, counselling at 38.9% was the largest component of ACC's Sensitive Claims costs. Total costs were \$17.6 million. The other items were 'Weekly Compensation' 26.2%, Independence Allowance 14%, Social Rehabilitation 11.5%, 'Other' 8.2%, and Medical Services 1.2%.] However, the recent rate would equate to 25,000 new claims, making for each element to be multiplied by 4, alarmingly.

The introduction of a referral stage, to an outside assessor, after 10 sessions, gives a hope that the ACC counsellors' approach will be 'audited' for professionalism and skills, but time will tell.

In terms of the legislation and regulations, the clear quantification of the 'impairment levels' in a table including placing sexual abuse at between 0 and 20%, and the overshadowing of this by conditions such as tetraplegia, and the graded lump sums associated with each of these, may act for the good, tending to contextualise and de-catastrophise some sexual allegations.

It is already apparent, as feared, that the re-introduction of lump sums for sexual abuse will be irresistible to claimants, whether factitious or real, but we hope that under the new system while the target carrot is there, mis-guided claimants may not be able to reach it. Of course, the top figure is \$6,459, not "\$25,000 and ongoing payments valued in excess of \$150,000" as Wakefield stated -

their figures being related to back-payments, not lump sums proper.

In respect of the old ACC legislation that remains in effect for alleged events before 1 April 2002, we can say that the false historical claims that have already been accepted will remain entrenched, along with their collateral damage, and the way is open for more to be added, especially with the incentive of back-dated accumulations still in place, via Wakefield's method.

In respect of the new and old legislations combined, if rigged claims continue to be pursued by misguided people because of acceptance by gullible counsellors, then human rights violations will continue to be brought down on unjustly targeted individuals even when they do not have access to their identification in claims as alleged perpetrators. Feeling they have no recourse, they and the public alike will remain seemingly hypnotised into inaction.

The meaning of the review, re-registration, and number reduction of ACC sensitive claims counsellors, by means of assessment of their 'volumes and outcomes,' is not transparent. It will be for the good if the less competent counsellors have been trimmed, but if ACC was guided in the process by its own autocratic 'Therapy Guidelines,' as seems likely, the more clear-headed counsellors who don't toe that line may have been culled as 'heretics' (as 'M' faced - see *A City Possessed*), and the situation made worse, with even more fertile ground for the growth of false sexual allegations. Maryanne Garry, Gordon Waugh, Lynley Hood, and Barry Parsonson have all challenged the stance of ACC's guidelines (and Felicity Goodyear-Smith also, see COSA #9, 5/01).

The system after 1 April 2002 is going to be a mixed bag. Real sexual abuse will arguably be better 'caught', but false sexual allegations will occur, because of human nature when there are financial incentives and because ACC's guidelines are wrongly accorded the high moral ground.

False sexual allegations, where the accused are aware, will take a severe toll on them, in terms of their physical and mental health, relationships, work opportunities and capacities, and legal costs, which - if any - are high, and their close kin will be dragged into this too. There will be damage to justice, and muddled complainants. Employers will pay higher ACC levies. Is this fair?

Other news about ACC and the assessment of abuse claims

PSYCHOLOGY REPS AND ACC MANAGERS TALK - NOV 2001

Representatives from the NZ Psychological Society and NZCCP (NZ College of Clinical Psychologists) met with ACC managers on 22 November in 2001, to discuss issues relating to:

"... counsellor accreditation; independent assessment criteria; peer review of counsellor applications; and processes for future consultation with professional bodies on matters relevant to members."

(seen at the New Zealand Psychological Society website www.psychology.org.nz/, but the item is no longer there).

NZCCP is a non-profit organization that is "the first professional services organisation for Clinical Psychology in New Zealand". They are "committed to public and professional education, the representation of the profession and the quality practice of Clinical Psychology in New Zealand" (<http://www.clinicalpsychology.org.nz/>). Currently their base is Dunedin.

The talk seems likely to have been related to the assessment of sexual abuse claims, and possibly to the new legislation. It also came just 2 weeks after the censure of a prominent child psychologist over false sexual abuse allegations (see below). The meeting of the parties can be cautiously seen as a hopeful sign that responsible knowledgeable groups are keeping an eye on counselling carried for ACC. We hope they have an understanding of false sexual allegations.

ACC has a manager of ACC's relationship with the health sector

A Dr David Rankin is the manager of ACC's relationship with the health sector, the Insight program on Radio NZ recently showed (as per another item). Dr Rankin could help mediate the different health interest groups and their approaches in relation to the quality and outcome of counselling services that ACC contracts.

He will benefit the health sector and society if he helps eliminate biased and bad counselling.

Former head of Social Welfare Psychology Team, working regularly for CYFS, fined and censured by Psychology Board

A former head of Social Welfare's psychology team, Prue Vincent, who works for the government unit called Child, Youth, and Family Services, has been fined and censured by the Psychologist's Board for botching a sex abuse investigation, reports said in December 2001.

In the background was a case involving a man left wrongly accused of molesting his young children. Reports said he had spent \$82,000 proclaiming his innocence. He cannot be identified to protect the children's identity. He still cannot see his children because of the proceedings against him. It was confirmed that it was he who had complained to the Board.

Ms Vincent, in front of the Board on 12 November 2001, pleaded guilty on a number of counts to conduct unbecoming, in relation to the man's case. She was fined \$5000 and given a letter of censure. The Board stopped short of stopping her from practising, and didn't intend publishing her name. However, the Dominion fought to have her named, and in response Ms Vincent fought them, in the courts, but ultimately she abandoned this, with the Dominion winning.

According to a report, the charges that she pled guilty to were that she:

- Allowed the mother to be present at interviews with the children. " Interviewed the children together.

- Used books dealing with sexual abuse during her assessment.
- Used leading questions during interviews.
- Did not observe the children in their wider environment or with their father.
- Did not interview the father as a reference source.
- Did not consider other explanations for the children's behaviour.
- Accepted "without question" the mother's testimony while asking the father to put his rebuttals in writing.

She also failed to make "a transition in methodology" from her initial role as an assessor with Child, Youth and Family, to that of a court-appointed psychologist during access hearings. It was during these proceedings when she had sessions with the children that they claimed to have been sexually abused.

Ms Vincent claimed later that she was not to blame for the decision made in the man's case in the Family Court, comprising a number of decisions between 1994 and 1999. She implied that since the court scrutinised her work and cross-examined her rigorously when she appeared, she was not responsible for the court decisions of abuse in those instances.

Chair of the Psychologists Board Sue O'Shea said after 5 hearings the Board found Ms Vincent's conduct to be 'a significant departure from expected standards', and the Board hadn't suspended or struck her off because her malpractice wasn't deliberate and she pleaded guilty.

Fine, censure in botched inquiry (Herald 4/12/01); Psychologist still working (Press, c 4/12/01); I am not to blame, says psychologist (Press 5/12/01 p6). Radio NZ interview of Sue O'Shea of c. 4/12/01

NB. The websites www.menz.org.nz/news.htm and <http://www4.wave.co.nz/~brianr/PrueVincent/> have more news on the affair.

GENERAL NEWS

Investigative journalist backgrounds false rape allegations

An alleged rape by 3 men in early January 2002 turned out to have been made up by a young woman who had been babysitting her 2 brothers in a suburban park. Journalist Sarah Prestwood responded by writing 'Rape: what motivates a false complaint'. Originally in Wellington's Dominion, her article was reprinted in Christchurch's Press (22/1/02 p 7).

Starting from the early January case in Porirua, Prestwood went on to expand on the milieu. She wrote of the South Auckland Police having a criminal profiling unit where they are profiling false rape complainants as well as alleged or real offenders, and she detailed aspects of several other recent false rape cases and their circumstances, one including a false ACC claim. She quoted Felicity Goodyear-Smith who emphasised that the acknowledgement of false rape claims was an important issue, just as the presumption of innocence in sexual allegations also was, and that there should be penalties for false rape complainants. Ms Prestwood spoke to Jan Jordan of Victoria University, who studies rape victims and the response of police; Ms Jordan said there aren't very many false rape complaints, but Prestwood noted that the police kept no figures.

In the article, COSA was in passing described as having disbanded, which clearly was wrong (The Press should have known this as it has carried clearly labelled notices of COSA's public meetings for a number of years in its 'Community Events' section.) COSA wrote to The Press asking for a correction and making additional points. A similar letter was sent to The Dominion, and the author of the piece was notified as well. There were no responses.

NZ Law Conference 2001 - papers relevant to sex allegation cases

Since the 'NZ Law Conference 2001' held in Christchurch in October, just a few days after Lynley Hood's book was published, material from papers has become available at the

web site <http://www.conference.co.nz/law2001/>. Links there take you to the programme or contributions.

Two papers that have a psychological perspective and that consider abuse issues in relation to the law, are "Expert evidence" by Dawn Elder, and 'Who's afraid of the big bad wolf' by Lew Richards, et al. Also, "Changing family" by Carol Smart may be of interest to some. However, two other papers are expanded on below; they are by Ian Freckelton and Jacqueline McMurtrie.

'Expert' psychological evidence is rather questionable

Ian Freckelton (Barrister-at-Law, and holding Professorial positions in law, medicine and psychology at Monash and La Trobe Universities, in Melbourne, Victoria), in *Whom do I believe?* contextualised some concepts that law sometimes uses in relation to contested cases. He instances acrimonious proceedings following marital discord and **child sexual allegations**. He plays down the promise of psychology's ability to contribute to evidence in such cases to a realistic level; suggests potential solutions; and critiques CSAAS (Child Sexual Abuse Accommodation Syndrome), showing the misuse of Roland Summit's notions. He clarifies that Summit has now said that the use of retractions to 'prove' abuse is not helpful in determining whether sexual abuse actually took place. Summit stated that he would now rather he had called it CSAAC (a condition). He had wanted the counterintuitiveness - ie, that reporting of real abuse can be well delayed - to be named and noted, and he had not expected or wanted his findings used for diagnostic judgemental purposes, such as when trying to separate true from false allegations. Freckelton says both Parental Alienation Syndrome (PAS) and CSAAS were misused like this. He adds that expert evidence about such matters is not generally permitted in Australian courts, although by contrast s23G of the New Zealand Evidence Act significantly opens the door to this kind of questionable evidence. <http://www.conference.co.nz/law2001/freckelton.pdf>

Wenatchee sex allegations cases: evidence of misconduct, and lessons to be learned - paper by Jacqueline McMurtrie

The abstract of Jacqueline McMurtrie's paper "Justice - a cautionary tale - The Wenatchee Cases" reads as follows:

In 1994 and 1995 in Wenatchee, Washington, over 60 adults were arrested on 29,726 charges of child-sex abuse involving children. When questions about the propriety of the investigation surfaced in 1998, Innocence Project Northwest (IPNW) gathered a group of lawyers who agreed to provide pro bono representation to 13 people who remained in prison. These 13 individuals were particularly vulnerable; they were poor, they no longer had a right to court appointed counsel and many were illiterate or developmentally disabled. Each of the imprisoned Wenatchee defendants was assigned a defense team of volunteer lawyers and law students. In all, over 40 law students and 40 attorneys, from solo practitioners to partners at law firms, donated their time. Over the next two years, ten of the clients represented by IPNW volunteers were freed through the representation of the IPNW legal teams and three clients were released from prison before their appeals were concluded. The attorneys and students received a pro bono award in December of 2000 from The National Law Journal, in recognition of the group's outstanding advocacy.

"Justice - a Cautionary Tale" will review the evidence of misconduct that was uncovered during the course of the IPNW investigations. Children who denied being victims of abuse were told what others had disclosed and accused of either hiding something or lying. Many children were subjected to multiple interviews with some interviews lasting as long as six hours. Children who recanted were ordered by social workers to be taken to mental health facilities out of the area. Adults were considered suspects before there was an alleged victim. Coercive measures were used during lengthy interrogations to extract confessions. Public defenders were underpaid and few were experienced in handling complex cases. The miscarriages of justice that

occurred in Wenatchee were pervasive and systemic, but they are not unique. The presentation will conclude with lessons we can learn from the Wenatchee cases about the need for reform within the legal system to guard against conviction of the innocent.

See <http://www.conference.co.nz/law2001/pdf%20files/McMurtrieF2.pdf>

NEW 'LITTLE' WITCHHUNTS

Christchurch: man's name suppression led to false rumours

Christchurch in February 2002 was afflicted by a minor witch hunt over a man who reportedly made arrangements to procure a 12 year old girl for sex. Her mother, actually a police-woman, in a sting operation, who talked about a 12 year old as her daughter but who didn't exist, led him to understand the girl was available. The man was charged and found guilty. He got name suppression 'to protect his employees'. Then rumour-mongers identified different men as the culprit, including a high-profile car dealer, the owner of KBs bakery, and the businessman behind Paul Hunter Furniture.

None of these were correct.

Many articles were written about the affair, including 'Businessmen still in limbo over name suppression' by John Henzell (The Press 22/2/02 p 1). As well, the matter was addressed in editorials (eg, The Press wrote two), and in a flurry of letters, across the country. Also, a member of the judiciary criticised The Press for overplaying an aspect of the case.

During the fracas, the Dean for the Christchurch Anglican Cathedral was moved to write in his column about the 'Vicious Squad'. This severely castigated rumour-mongers and character assassins. He used terms like mean spirit, cowardice and stupidity ('A great week for the Vicious Squad' by John Bluck, The Press 18/2/02). He mentioned the Civic case as an aside.

Governor-General declined patron role for survivor advocacy group

COSA extends sympathy and understanding to those businessmen wrongly victimised in such a malicious way.

The man convicted was named, after an appeal, and he turned out to be a nobody to the public.

Judge's 'porn site' visit whips up a storm-in-a-teacup

The other incipient mass response or witchhunt was over Judge Fisher, who had visited 'a sex site' on a judicial computer during work hours. These sites were not about illegal activities, it has been stated, and not disputed. While the bottom line is that he was doing nothing legally wrong, or even morally wrong, some would say a society that accepts all this is less than ideal.

Unrelated to any argument about content, Lynley Hood sent off a cracker, when, in a bout of real annoyance, she wrote to The Press saying she recognized a witchhunt in the making (22/2/02 p6). She was criticised by D. Cresswell (Press 5/3/02 p 8) for her forceful language. Ms Hood has since indicated that she wrote quickly, and as strongly as she did, in the first flush of her response on the matter. She wrote quickly because Prime Minister Helen Clark and Attorney General Margaret Wilson had started to express a preference for seeing the Judge removed, which, as she saw it, was to bow to pressure by over-reacting. She felt to stop a witch-hunt over something legal and not uncommon, was the prime objective. There **was** a community feeling beginning to rise and it **did amount to** more than the situation justified, and this overreaction has been averted. Lynley Hood's intuition to respond as she did seems to have been correct.

Shortly after Hood's letter, people got the courage to write (or perhaps it was the papers that got the courage to publish), items taking a moderate line and advancing varied views. As one retired judge said, I once watched a murder mystery, so did it mean I shouldn't have adjudicated on a murder case?

Emotive headlines in recent newspaper reports suggested that the Australian Governor-General Dr Peter Hollingworth, Archbishop of Brisbane in the 1990s, had a lack of support for child sexual abuse survivors. The recent furore, with calls for his resignation, over alleged sexual abuse, and cover-ups, in the church, distorted the level of knowledge and awareness that he and his advisors actually seem to have. They are very well informed. That is not to say that all of the allegations relating to abuse and cover-up are false. There may be rather questions of proportion, and of assessment of truth, where these will be the deciding factors in what amount of attention is due to any real abuse, and to imagined.

A 2001 report shows one aspect of what's behind the affair, when it says:

"When Peter Hollingworth succeeded Sir William Deane as Governor-General last year, he refused to take over as the patron of a child abuse charity, Advocates for Survivors of Child Abuse. At the time, Hollingworth's senior adviser, Kevin Davidson, told ASCA the new Governor-General was deeply concerned about child abuse and supported initiatives that would lead to its eradication. "However . . . the extent of debate that surrounds therapy relying on recovered memories, with which ASCA is closely associated, is such that there is an unavoidable risk of the office of Governor-General becoming involved in controversy," Davidson wrote." In these circumstances, Dr Hollingworth must regretfully decline your invitation." - 'Hollingworth withdraws backing ... *The Australian*, 22/12/01 p4

The Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists has asked Hollingworth to defend his continuing role as its patron. It has put 9 questions to him about his attitudes towards child sexual abuse and the protec-

tion of institutions from legal action by victims (NZ Herald 1/3/02).

More may be heard, maybe around the time of the 37th Congress of the College in Brisbane this year (28/4/02-1/5/02).

'PTSD', 'colonisation', 'Freud', US president of ISSD, Defence Department - at Australasian Trauma Stress Studies conference

The 9th annual conference of the Australasian Society for Trauma Stress Studies (ASTSS) "Beyond PTSD: Clinical and Societal Implications of the Emerging Trauma Paradigm" was held in Auckland on 7-10/3/02, during the furore over Dr Hollingworth, and as another Australian row occurred: a Senator Heffernan made false sex allegations about a Judge Kirby, and was made to apologise (not resign; this is a correction for this newsletter, made since it was first posted). We don't know if these timing coincidences are connected.

Keynote speakers at the ASTSS included Celia Lashlie on 'societal implications of trauma and violence', NZ Associate Minister of Maori Affairs Tariana Turia, on 'cultural trauma and colonisation', and Joyanna Silberg (President of the US group the ISSD; see our Newsletter Issue 9 of May 2001 for more details), on 'the links between trauma, dissociation and various child and adult disorders'. There was a contribution from the Australian Department of Defence. A Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson (Jeffrey Masson), a Canadian living in Auckland (his wife Leila, is a pediatrician), spoke on 'Freud, Ferenczi and the abandonment of trauma'.

We would hope that good sense prevailed there.

Opinions expressed in this newsletter are not necessarily those of COSA New Zealand Inc.