

Anne Peffer  
c/o Jon Meyer, Esq.  
Backus, Meyer & Branch, LLP  
116 Lowell Street  
Manchester, NH 03104

September 24, 2014

Addie Hutchinson, Investigator  
New Hampshire Commission for Human Rights  
2 Chenell Drive Unit 2  
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Ms. Hutchinson,

I have elected to withdraw my charge because the number of employees at the Open Stories Foundation (herein after referred to as the "OSF") during my employment is in question. As you know, under New Hampshire State law, if there were not at least six employees defined as the New Hampshire Commission for Human Rights would have them defined, I will lose any investigation into this matter regardless of any other evidence I provide. As I am withdrawing my charge, there is no reason to submit a formal legal response. This letter is therefore written by myself and assumes the audience to be, in addition to yourself, the OSF Board of Directors to whom, under standard Human Rights Commission practices, you will be mailing this response. I also assume the possibility that this letter may be read by students of Mormon history at some point in the future. I have no current intention of releasing this letter or any corresponding evidentiary or other documents I have prepared and will prepare to the public.

For the record, the powerlessness of my position during my settlement negotiations with the OSF was due the question of number of employees, not to any lack of evidence that could be presented to the Human Rights Commission on my behalf or because the OSF handled this situation appropriately. I did not accept the OSF's minimal settlement terms because I assume that they were using my relative powerlessness to force a settlement that would have been so insignificant as to make it appear as if:

- 1) Mr. Dehlin has nothing to hide from the public
- 2) That I made the charge falsely
- 3) That I was the sexual aggressor in my relationship with Mr. Dehlin
- 4) That I am an unwell woman who has sought to take power from Mr. Dehlin
- 5) That it has been my longtime objective to destroy Mr. Dehlin's career and that my primary incentive for making this charge was to hurt Mr. Dehlin

I assert that Mr. Dehlin is not the best person on whom to rely for an accurate presentation of my character. I acknowledge that it can be argued that I am not the best person on whom to rely for an accurate presentation of his character. I therefore ask readers to view the information in this response (and the information available in other evidentiary documents) as it relates to this charge and the surrounding circumstances as supplementary to other insight they may have into Mr. Dehlin and, perhaps, myself and, if they are interested enough in this unique moment in religious history, as a helpful guide to better interpret events they have witnessed or

are studying.

In regards to this charge and these circumstances, I assert that I am a woman who has wanted to continue on with her social justice work without suffering further retaliations at Mr. Dehlin and the OSF's hands, and who has wanted to protect her public reputation during a time when she was excluded and publicly intimidated into silence because women's identities tend to become entirely associated with public sex scandals. As a woman, anything I say or do publicly in my defense threatens the entirety of my future reputation and I believe Mr. Dehlin has intentionally taken advantage of this fact.

I assert that Mr. Dehlin has silenced me through excluding me from my community as he wove a self-protective narrative and used his podcast feed and access to traditional and social media to share that narrative with the public. As I do not have the status of a public figure, control of a large podcast feed, or control of the OSF social media venues from which Mr. Dehlin has banned me, and because I am a woman and my association with these circumstances will likely become my only public identity if I publicly contradict Mr. Dehlin's presentation of facts and provide evidence against him to the public, Mr. Dehlin was able to present his public narrative and perpetuate his retaliations and exclusions with confidence that I would remain silent about his self-protective incentives for choosing his narrative and its concurrent deception.

Further, I believe Mr. Dehlin used his power against me so excessively in hopes that I would be incentivized to leave progressive Mormonism, my community and my social justice work altogether in order to find a new community where my reputation was not as threatened and where I was not as powerless to protect myself. I believe Mr. Dehlin prefers my complete exit from my work and my community because my presence and the information and evidence I have threatens him.

I do not believe that there is anything productive in hurting the career of someone who is qualified and behaves according to appropriate ethical standards as I still believed, in August and September of 2012, that Mr. Dehlin followed. I admit, however, that the fact that I believed Mr. Dehlin followed ethical standards in August and September of 2012 is an indication of how pervasively the manipulation he had engaged in against me had colored my comprehension of him, myself and my situation. I have healed a great deal and can see more clearly now. I now also have the advantage of observing his manipulations of others for two years from the point of view of someone he is seeking to destroy and malign while he covers his own unethical actions. This new vantage point has helped me better understand the Mr. Dehlin I knew in 2011 and 2012 as well as the many actions he took to control me prior to my termination.

#### **Evidence, Investigation and Retaliations:**

I did not provide evidence during the potential investigation period at the OSF because I was too traumatized by Mr. Dehlin's many attacks against my character and the loss of my employment, community and social status. It is also accurate to state that I was very confused during that period because Mr. Dehlin had been manipulating me and cyclically attacking me and then apologizing for several months. Despite the strength I exhibited when I reported the incident to each board member individually after my termination and after Mr. Dehlin and the board president, Joanna Brooks, had covered up Mr. Dehlin's actions by not reporting the incident to the board as I had requested, it should not be assumed that I also had enough strength to

immediately undergo an investigation into such a personal matter. The fact that I didn't undergo an investigation is not evidence that I made false claims, it is evidence that I was not interested in destroying Mr. Dehlin or his career, but in retaining the job I had been unjustly terminated from, forwarding my social justice work, and in continuing to build a better business for the OSF donors. Many exciting business plans were on the table. I wanted to keep my job and put all forms of Mr. Dehlin's harassment behind me.

I was also not prepared in that moment to subject myself to an investigation regarding such intensely private matters because the OSF board had made it clear that Mr. Dehlin and I would be treated as equals in all matters despite the fact that he had far more power than me. Equal treatment was unethical because when equality is applied to a scale that is already out of balance, the side that has more power retains its power and the side with less power inherently loses. Thus, rather than applying equality, ethical human resources practices provide protection to the more disempowered party. I assert that the OSF's insistence on complete equality was a legal maneuver employed to align the foundation with Mr. Dehlin's determination to have me terminated and, I assume, came at the recommendation of an attorney retained for the express purpose of attempting to convince me to unknowingly revoke my own rights by willingly resigning and signing a waiver. The fact that the OSF board president and board members were willing to follow this unethical and strategic legal advice to treat us as equals indicates that conflicts of interests were not appropriately addressed.

Mr. Dehlin and I exchanged thousands of emails and texts between March of 2011 and August of 2012 making it possible for either of us to present selected written communications out of context in an effort to provide evidence for almost any claim. The value of any few individual private writings as evidential documentation of our interactions or the nature of our relationship is therefore significantly diluted. We have both conceded that we had a consensual sexual relationship and that it was mild in nature. That should be enough. The accurate use of emails and texts as evidence for any single argument would necessitate a coding and analysis of our written correspondence in its entirety. Any such analysis would also need to concede that our verbal interactions had been omitted. Providing evidential documentation of the kind Mr. Dehlin and the OSF use in their response to the charge is a misguided endeavor and one I have no inclination to engage in.

I assert, however, that Mr. Dehlin and the OSF do not have qualms about selecting texts or emails of mine to use against me that are not representative of my character, incentives or my actual interactions with Mr. Dehlin in order to promote items one through five above and that the inclusion of such private correspondence in the OSF's response to my charge was an intimidation and silencing tactic and a profound and impudent violation of my privacy. I intentionally wrote a gentle charge that would be the least harmful to Mr. Dehlin and the OSF if it were to become public. The private texts and emails of mine included as evidence in the OSF's response to my gentle charge were, contrastingly, selectively chosen, presented out of context, outside of the dates of the charge and have little to do with the defense of the charge as the charge itself fully admits that our relationship was consensual. I believe that Mr. Dehlin and the OSF submitted them in their response because they wanted me to be afraid of the public release of the document. The fact that the private emails and texts they selected support items one through five above rather than defend the OSF from the charge is evidence of Mr. Dehlin and the OSF's retaliations, silencing and intimidation tactics.

I understand the possibility that there may be some who might request that further private correspondence be released to counteract Mr. Dehlin and the OSF's claims. To speak in common parlance: *two wrongs do not make a right*. My response to that request is that invading Mr. Dehlin's privacy by releasing private email out of context for the purpose of proving a certain agenda would be harmful and destructive. Further violations of privacy are only justified when future harm may be prevented. I am willing to release documentation to official organizations that may feel they need it to prevent future harm, although I do not personally see the necessity considering that the consensual nature of our relationship and its existence are not in question and that the OSF's response to my charge and the many retaliations taken against me already stand as evidence against Mr. Dehlin. My intentions throughout this process have been to minimize as much collective harm as possible and I do not see any current benefit, only harm, in the releasing of more private correspondence than has already been injuriously released by Mr. Dehlin and the OSF.

Preventing future harm also includes providing more accurate information for future historical documents. Mr. Dehlin and the OSF have falsely represented me and history and I assume that Mr. Dehlin is aware of this fact. I take these misrepresentations very seriously. I will therefore adequately and privately document what transpired between myself and Mr. Dehlin between March of 2011 and August of 2012 in hopes that future historians will be able to use this information to more accurately interpret the history that has been presented to the public. I will not have a problem demonstrating that my primary objectives have been serving progressive Mormons, self-protection, protecting women and other vulnerable populations, and hoping that Mr. Dehlin will treat me professionally. I will be able to demonstrate that I was not the sexual aggressor in our relationship as well as the fact that Mr. Dehlin already knows that my intentions were never blackmail or the unjust receipt of money I am not due. I will provide context that allows readers to see the private emails and texts released by Mr. Dehlin and the OSF in different light. I do not believe that continuing the campaign to protect Mr. Dehlin and the OSF through discrediting, intimidating, excluding and silencing me will ultimately be successful; the campaign itself is evidence against Mr. Dehlin and the OSF and I would prefer it end.

I would have been very willing to settle and sign a waiver if I had been listened to, acknowledged and mature solutions had been sought. My position of relative powerlessness in comparison to Mr. Dehlin makes me, as the individual in the less powerful position, more willing to achieve *any* solution that might be safe for me. Mr. Dehlin has had no incentive to seek a solution that would have been safe for me as he had all the power and had the expectation that his power would ensure his success. From a more powerful position, kindness, compassion or charity might have incentivized him to treat me with respect, but the evidence does not demonstrate that he has been incentivized in any such manner. He did not have any qualms about misrepresenting me or the situation to the OSF board and others or continually retaliating against me despite my several repeated entreaties that he stop. He did not have any qualms about falsely misrepresenting the situation to the public. If the OSF had followed respectful Standards of Ethical Communication and Conflict Resolution, had not immediately sought attorneys to try to deceive me into revoking my own rights, had taken assertive actions to protect me after I made my report rather than to play the role of neutral mediator between myself and Mr. Dehlin, I would not have had any incentive to document these circumstances or to ever mention them again. It is therefore because of Mr. Dehlin and the OSF's actions, not my actions, that these documents exist. If these documents cause harm to come to Mr. Dehlin or the OSF, Mr. Dehlin and the OSF only have themselves to blame.

**Comments about the Private Emails and Texts Included to Intimidate Me:**

Mr. Dehlin's claim that we had an explicit long term agreement that I would leave my employment at his whim is self-incriminating, although I do not concede that any such agreement existed. Mr. Dehlin's many cyclical attempts to get me to leave my employment followed by multiple apologies and requests that I stay directly counter the notion of a long term agreement and nullify the validity of any written agreement to such terms Mr. Dehlin may seek to find among the thousands of emails and texts he has in his possession and to present as evidence of its existence. The fact that an agreement, if it did indeed exist, would be self-incriminating rather than a defense is further evidence that Mr. Dehlin and the OSF's presentation of evidence in their response to my charge did not seek to defend the OSF, but to intimidate me into silence through making me fearful that my private emails and texts would be released to the public. The OSF's response to my charge speaks against the organization and in my favor.

As they have little relevance to this charge, I will not respond more specifically here to the other emails and texts of mine that were a profound and impudent violation of my privacy and that Mr. Dehlin and the OSF used in an attempt to intimidate, silence and malign me. I would like, though, to mention that I have learned since my email apologizing for the role I played in my "affair" with Mr. Dehlin that I had not at that point in my life ever experienced real sex and that it was therefore a momentous exaggeration for me to call the very minimal sexual interaction that had occurred between myself and Mr. Dehlin an "affair." I now also believe my sense, at the time, that I was very much to blame to be a result of the extremity of the manipulations Mr. Dehlin had used against me during my time with the OSF and a mistaken understanding of my own culpability and shame based on teachings of the Mormon Church. With this said, I am proud that I was ready and willing to quickly apologize for harm I believed myself to have done. I am thankful I wrote the letter and see it as an indication of the best strength, integrity and hope I could muster under the circumstances. It is appalling that Mr. Dehlin and the OSF have sought to use my own goodness against me.

**In Regards to My Accusations Against Mr. Dehlin:**

I assert that Mr. Dehlin told me on multiple occasions that I had to leave a job I loved because he did not have the ability to treat me professionally because he loved me and that it was my fault that I was harmed by my employment. He would then apologize for his hurtful words and actions and ask me to forgive him and stay. His actions were cyclical, emotionally and verbally abusive, and were an extreme manipulation. On one occasion, Mr. Dehlin took an action against me that was criminal in the state of New Hampshire. Mr. Dehlin received my love, my protection through my silence, my work, a stronger platform for his own voice, more donations and a better business. In exchange, I received the opportunity to successfully work towards social justice objectives I had been considering for decades, termination, expulsion from my own community, and loss of the ability to claim my own work. Mr. Dehlin and the OSF's actions against me are serious and cannot be explained away by items one through five above. Fortunately, I have found the strength, determination and resilience within myself to reverse a small portion of the harm that was done to me.

I was sexually and emotionally vulnerable due to circumstances I will address elsewhere when Mr. Dehlin initially approached me. Over time, Mr. Dehlin enticed me into sexual actions then lied about his sexual morality to the public and to Mormon authorities. I became complicit with his very public lies against my will and even though I disagreed with his tactics. I am an exceptionally honest person; I comprehended the severity of my own complicit dishonesty as well as the good I was accomplishing and the love I believed I had for Mr. Dehlin. I had strong desires to continue working towards my social justice objectives. I loved my job: I was forwarding my dream career, gaining a resume, and was in need of an income. I could foresee some, but not all, of the consequences that were forthcoming and did not know how to protect myself or to whom to turn under the circumstances. I was horribly stuck. In the end, I was not able to protect myself beyond the filing of this charge and the documentation I am now able to make in hopes of protecting my name and my character in history. The laws and the world do not protect women or the disempowered: the world flecks to the charismatic and the laws protect men and the powerful. Even though I knew I was in a terrifyingly precarious situation, I did not expect the consequences to be as devastating as they have been because I did not yet comprehend the full extent of Mr. Dehlin's duplicity, revenge or manipulation and intimidation tactics.

I am guessing that Mr. Dehlin has very much realized how much he underestimated me, my ethics and determination, and the strength of my commitment to social justice within Mormonism that day in March of 2011 when we sat at the table in Times Square and he took the role of psychologist and correctly assessed the weakness of my marriage before approaching me after my husband left the table. His approach was unique enough and my response hesitant enough that he felt compelled to call me the next day to apologize for being "creepy." After his phone call, we began what I initially hoped would be a professional relationship. I assume Mr. Dehlin has realized for some time that I was the wrong woman to select; events did not turn out as I he likely expected they would. I doubt he conceived that day in Times Square that I would succeed in forwarding the movement and the organization to such an extent that he would find himself in the position of my presence both benefitting and threatening him. This assertion of my own success should not be misinterpreted to mean, however, that my incentive was to use or harm Mr. Dehlin or to take power from him. My incentives were my career, my resume and my love for Mormons. Unfortunately, I also made the mistake of trusting Mr. Dehlin and believing in the love I thought I felt for him; it is very foolish to trust a man for whom betrayal and dishonesty are a norm.

I recognize now that I should never have allowed Mr. Dehlin to entice me and I should have left the organization and put my energies elsewhere the first time he broke his promise to not approach me sexually. Repetitive forgiveness and hope are not the right response when dealing with someone whose harmful and apologetic actions are cyclical, especially when one is vulnerable and alone and is therefore not adequately assessing the manipulations being used against her. It is also accurate to state that if I had done a better job of protecting myself and had left the OSF in August of 2011, the progressive Mormon movement would not be nearly as powerful as it is today. My work has positively impacted the lives of thousands and has catapulted the movement forward, changing it and progressive Mormonism forever. I feel proud of my accomplishments despite my poor judgment.

**In Conclusion:**

Again, It is *because* of Mr. Dehlin and the OSF's actions against me that this and other evidentiary documents exist; they do not exist because I seek to destroy Mr. Dehlin. On the contrary, they exist because Mr. Dehlin has sought to destroy me. Any destruction that comes to Mr. Dehlin comes at his own hand and because of his own actions. I will not accept responsibility for hurting him; he has hurt himself and me. Likewise, if his family is hurt, it is Mr. Dehlin who has put them in harm's way. My children are now safe from any harm that could come from media exposure because I have acted protectively towards them.

I believe that any attempt by Mr. Dehlin or the OSF to use this response as evidence that I am unwell or in an attempt to forward items one through five above will backfire. I am well and I can express myself articulately and effectively. I request that my privacy be respected as I *hope* that Mr. Dehlin and the OSF would like their privacy respected. I do not believe further media campaigns either explicitly or implicitly related to this matter will be productive nor do I believe it is beneficial for Mr. Dehlin to continue to behave unprofessionally while denying that his unprofessional actions have anything to do with me. That is a manipulation and an intimidation tactic that seeks to publicly shame me into silence. It evokes public outbursts and needs to stop.

Mr. Dehlin's attempts to cover his own actions and his very public refusals to treat me professionally since my termination have violated my privacy in a manner that I will never be able to undo. It is *not* an exaggeration for me to state that I would have preferred multiple, violent, physical and sexual assaults to having my sexual privacy exposed to thousands of people by a public figure manipulatively seeking to retain his public career. I have considered this many times and do not make this statement lightly or in an effort at hyperbole. Mr. Dehlin is a dishonest man who is inclined to hide behind his church, his family, and his intended profession and who is willing to be sexual with women then intimidate them into silence using the risk of public exposure and their consequent loss of reputation against them. I feel great compassion, love and respect for all the women in his life. Women can find great strength in learning how to deal with men like Mr. Dehlin.

It is my hope that all parties to this conflict would like it to end without further incident and will continue on with their work as productively and professionally as possible. I invite the OSF to end its bannings and its board members, aside from Mr. Dehlin whom I would only like to interact with professionally in public spaces, to begin speaking to me. I have social justice work to do.

Further documentation that won't go directly to the OSF through the New Hampshire Commission for Human Rights is available elsewhere.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Anne Peffer', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Anne McMullin Peffer