

ST VEDAST / ST JAMES INQUIRY

**Report of a Private Independent Inquiry
Commissioned by the Governors of St James Independent Schools
and held in London between 20 June - 06 October 2005**

INQUIRY CHAIRMAN: JAMES TOWNEND Q.C., M.A. (Oxon.)

GENERAL REPORT

CONTENTS

0. [Title](#)
1. [Genesis of the Report](#)
2. [Terms of reference](#)
3. [Modalities](#)
4. [Statistics & Bibliography](#)
5. [Evidence - General](#)
6. [The Future](#)
7. [Conclusion](#)

Appendices

1. [Terms of Reference](#)
2. [Chronology](#)
3. [Bibliography](#)
4. [Corporal Punishment](#)
- [A Brief History](#)
5. [Corporal Punishment](#)
- [Relevant Legislation](#)
6. [Overview of Evidence](#)
7. [School Lists](#)
8. [Punishment Book](#)
- [Anonymised Analysis](#)
[Part i.](#) | [Part ii.](#)

ST VEDAST / ST JAMES INQUIRY

**Report of a Private Independent Inquiry
Commissioned by the Governors of St
James Independent Schools
and held in London between 20 June - 06
October 2005**

**INQUIRY CHAIRMAN: JAMES TOWNEND Q.
C., M.A. (Oxon.)**

GENERAL REPORT

1. GENESIS OF THE REPORT

I was appointed to conduct the Inquiry which has led to this report by the Governors of the St James Independent Schools on the 1st June 2005. They decided, perhaps uniquely in the history of independent education in this country, voluntarily to institute and fund this wholly independent inquiry into their own schools. I believe that it may lead to a more thorough understanding of the reasons for this Inquiry and of the manner in which it was conducted if I set out here the circumstances in which the Governors reached their decision. The reasons expressed by the Governors for establishing the inquiry were:-

- Concern for the welfare of former pupils.
- The need to establish the facts and undertake a process of truth and reconciliation.
- Informal approaches made by former pupils communicating distress to Governors and the present Headteachers.
- The more general gossip conducted on the internet.
- The fact that allegations were being made against current members of staff.
- The Governors' wish to act conscientiously in the discharge of their duties as charity trustees and employers and to protect the present Schools from any slur or complaint relating to the past.

1.1 History of the Schools

1.1.1 Their origins

(a) The history of the Schools is intimately bound up with that of the School of Economic Science (“the S.E.S.”), the foundation of which preceded that of the Schools by some 40 years. The S.E.S. was the creation of Andrew MacLaren MP who started it in 1938 as a movement to promote economic justice through fair taxation and distribution of wealth.

(b) Andrew MacLaren had a son, Leonardo da Vinci MacLaren, a barrister, who like his father was for a time a member of the Labour Party. He left the Labour Party, however, in 1945 for the Liberal Party. More

important he became Chairman of the S.E.S. in 1947. Leon MacLaren, as he was always known, extended the remit of the S.E.S. to embrace the teaching methods, if not the basic beliefs, of the Russian philosopher P.D. Ouspenski and the Central Asian mystic, Gurdjieff. The S.E.S. became more orientated towards philosophy and less towards economics. In 1961 MacLaren became acquainted with the Maharishi Mahesh Yogi and through him was introduced to the practice of transcendental meditation. In 1965 he travelled to India and met the Shri Shantananda Saraswati, the Shankaracharya of the North, who was a teacher of the philosophy of Advaita Vedanta. From that time on the teachings of the S.E.S. became principally influenced by this Eastern school of thought as interpreted by Leon MacLaren, who continued to visit and consult the Shankaracharya regularly.

1.1.2 Foundation

(a) In about 1974 a number of members of the S.E.S., being parents of children, approached MacLaren and asked him to set up schools for their children. (In this connection it should be noted that in the late 1960s Sunday Schools had been opened for the children of members by the S.E.S.). It happened that MacLaren independently had been thinking of conducting an experiment along these lines.

(b) It must be remembered that from 1965 onwards selection by 11-Plus was gradually abolished and with it most other forms of competition between pupils. From 1970 LEAs began voluntarily to ban corporal punishment (although such remained lawful in certain circumstances for a further 16 years in State Schools and for 28 years in independent schools). By 1975 the comprehensive system of education was perceived by many to be failing.

(c) In January 1975 St James Boys' School and St James Girls' School opened, each with 3 classes of children aged 5 to 7. It was planned to have all-through schools with juniors from 5 to 10 and seniors from 10 to 18. Pressure was then applied by the parents of rather older children who wished to obtain the same education. Accordingly and not without some reluctance on MacLaren's part, separate St Vedast schools were established for older children, initially between 9 and 12.

(d) In 1985 the St Vedast Schools were closed and their pupils transferred to the St James Schools. St James Schools now had both junior and senior departments.

1.1.3 Expansion

In the first decade of the Schools' existence the pupil roll increased and there was an increase too in the facilities available both in terms of premises and teaching aids. The staff available also grew in size. By about the early 1980s it seemed that the experiment had succeeded. Sister schools were also established in other parts of the U.K. and in a number of other countries.

1.1.4 Evolution

(a) When the Schools had first opened almost 100% of the parents of pupils were either members of the S.E.S. or spouses of members. As at today only about 15% of parents are in this position and about 85% have nothing to do with the S.E.S. Unsurprisingly, this, together with changes in the views of society at large on the question of corporal punishment and discipline in general and ultimately as a result of changes in the law, appears to have effected a cultural change in the Schools, noticeable in their discipline policy.

(b) At the beginning the curriculum was more limited than it is today. With the extension of the curriculum to include, for example, the teaching of modern languages and of scientific subjects it has been necessary to increase the size of the staff. The schools now have a total pupil roll of 750 with about 120 staff. Originally the staff was composed almost entirely of members, both men and women, of the S.E.S. I am told that currently 75% of staff in the Senior Schools are members of the S.E.S.

(c) Leon MacLaren died in 1994 aged 83. Everyone who knew him speaks of him as being a brilliant and charismatic figure and a man of strongly held opinions. Many admired him, some with great affection. Others speak of him as a highly intelligent autocrat, with emotional limitations. During his life and up until his declining years in the early 1990s he seems to have maintained a very close interest in the Schools (as well he might as their Founder) and to have had a powerful influence over their running, not only in general matters but in matters of detail too.

(d) When he died he passed on the position of Senior Tutor, (Head) of the S.E.S., to Donald Lambie who has given evidence before me. Others, including members of staff, have given evidence to me about him. Although Donald Lambie is also a barrister and is, no doubt, an educated and intelligent man, I am satisfied that, although I never had the opportunity of meeting Leon MacLaren, the two men are very different from one another. Moreover the evidence supports the view that Lambie is less interventionist in matters involving the Schools than was Leon MacLaren.

(e) Although there is evidence available to me as to the greater separation between the Schools and the Senior Tutor of the S.E.S. than existed in MacLaren's time, I am nevertheless satisfied that as late as 1995, Lambie was in a position to exercise direct and real influence over senior appointments. He is still consulted over the appointment of Heads and Governors but the Heads report that he does not become involved in the schools' day to day management. None of this affects the position of the Governors in law: they remain responsible for the governance of the Schools.

1.1.5 Organisation

(a) St James Senior School for Boys is now at Pope's Villa, 19 Cross Deep, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 4QG. St James Junior School for Boys is now at Earsby Street, near Kensington Olympia, London W14 8SH as are St James Senior School for Girls and St James Junior School for Girls. All four schools have accreditation by the Independent Schools Council.

(b) The Schools are vested in the Independent Educational Association Ltd, a company limited by guarantee with charitable status.

(c) The Board of Governors is headed by Roger Pincham CBE, formerly a prominent member of the Liberal Party. Initially the Governors were chosen by Leon MacLaren. The position under Donald Lambie seems to be that, while he would probably be asked to approve a new Governor, it would be the Governors who would choose him or her. The Governors are also the Trustees of the Trust.

(d) For the purpose of discussing financial and general management matters and making recommendations to the Governors there is a Board of Management, consisting of the three Principals of the Schools, the Bursar and a Chairman, both of whom are also Governors.

1.2 Bad Press

1.2.1 The Newspaper Campaign

(a) On June 8th 1983, a newspaper carried an "exposé" of the S.E.S. and "its schools". This had been written by two investigative journalists, Hounam and Hogg, who later published their findings in a book (see Appendix 3).

(b) It may well be significant that when this campaign was continued on the next day, the day of the General Election, specific mention was made of the Chairman of the Governors, Roger Pincham, who was standing as a Liberal Candidate for Leominster.

1.2.2 Caning

Corporal punishment was effectively made illegal in maintained schools by the Education Act 1986. It remained legal in private schools, though public opinion progressively reduced the number of such schools actively employing it. As contrasted with such schools there was always a body of schools whose Heads favoured retaining the cane as a last option before expulsion. In such schools the cane remained an option for a time though largely an unused one. The St James Schools resisted abolition almost until the end. Corporal punishment was finally made unlawful in all schools when the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 inserted section 548 into the Education Act 1996. All corporal punishment at St James ceased in the Junior School in 1993 and in the Senior Boys School in 1996. Nicholas Debenham was regarded by certain sections of the media as a principal protagonist of the cane. He was on a number of occasions interviewed by the media and was not reluctant to express his views. It is interesting to observe that when the question of the abolition of corporal punishment arose in 1995, the pupils of the Boys' Senior School actually voted to retain it. In contrast to that, the Governors did not seek to join in the litigation resulting in *R (ex parte Williamson) v. Secretary of State for Education and Employment and Others* [2005] UKHL 15 where they might have sought to argue that the abolition of corporal punishment in schools was an unlawful interference with their Convention rights. In the event they may have been wisely advised not to do so.

1.2.3 The Effect

That all this bad publicity damaged the Schools and threatened their precarious income and financial position is amply borne out by a report by Marco Goldschmied, referred to below. In the words of the Report "The early growth was halted but not reversed."

1.3 The St James Schools Report

(a) This report by Marco Goldschmied, properly called "St James Schools Report", was produced in October 1996 at the request of Donald Lambie. Its author was a senior member of the S.E.S. and a Governor of the Schools for upwards of a decade. He sent five of his children to the Schools and is prominent in his profession as an architect. He gave evidence before me.

(b) The report set out a number of suggestions for change in the way the Schools were run. The principal purpose of the report was to increase the

pupil intake and improve the finances of the project. It called, inter alia, for a more open and transparent organisation, no S.E.S. involvement, and for the Governors to govern more proactively and to be seen so to govern.

(c) It concluded that the “St James set-up is, as yet, far from transparent.”, that it “is really still a school for the “S.E.S. families”, controlled by the S.E.S....” This may have been a little unfair since the Governors inform me that in fact at that stage (1996) only about 50% of parents were members of the S.E.S.

(d) It reported that in May 1995 the new Senior Tutor, Donald Lambie, regarded the position of the Heads of the St James Schools as depending on his (Lambie’s) consent.

(e) Lambie appears to have given this Report a very lukewarm welcome. The Governors were very reluctant to discuss it but finally did so at an unminuted meeting 3 months after its circulation. I only heard of this Report by a sidewind when it was mentioned by a complainant. By no means all of its recommendations appear to have been acted upon.

(f) The question which all this prompts is, “How much change has there been in the last ten years?” This is considered below in paragraph 6.

1.4 The Message Board

As explained in the Terms of Reference (Appendix 1) in about February 2004 an internet message board was established and a number of former pupils of the Schools began to exchange reminiscences of their schooldays.

A great many complaints were made about how pupils, individually and collectively, were mistreated, unreasonably punished and assaulted. Some complainants gave their names; some complaints were anonymous. Some were made about identified members of staff, some not.

1.5 Governors’ Decision

Some contact took place between the Heads of the two Senior Schools and some of the complainants in an attempt at reconciliation. However, little progress was made. These facts were reported to the Governors.

Accordingly at a Governors’ meeting in October 2004 it was resolved to establish an independent internal inquiry.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Terms of Reference of the Inquiry are set out in Appendix 1 to this report. A group of the original complainants were consulted about the draft Terms and a number of amendments were made at their suggestion although it is fair to say that the final form was not wholly accepted by this group. The Terms of Reference were approved by the Governors on the 10th June 2005. Later during the course of the Inquiry it became clear that parents of pupils who had attended the Schools wished to make representations and believed themselves to be excluded from so doing. Clarification of the position was achieved by a notice entered on the Inquiry Website and by a suitable amendment to paragraph 1 of the Terms of Reference.

3. MODALITIES

3.1. Evidence

3.1.1. Forms of Evidence

(a) This Inquiry was not bound by any of the rules of evidence. It had no power to administer oaths, though it was made plain to witnesses, either expressly or impliedly, that they were expected to tell the truth. Evidence was received by way of written statement, signed or otherwise identified by the maker. It was open to any maker of a statement to come and give oral evidence as well at the Inquiry. A few witnesses gave oral evidence without putting in a written statement. Hearsay evidence was not excluded but has in all cases been treated with caution and in some cases disregarded.

(b) A few witnesses for various reasons wanted to give their evidence anonymously. They were discouraged from doing this and it was pointed out to them, as is the case, that little if any weight could be attached to their evidence. One witness put in a statement and attended the Inquiry in person under a pseudonym. His evidence has been disregarded for this reason.

(c) Greatest weight has been attached to evidence supported by oral testimony, except in isolated cases where there is a very cogent reason for non-attendance (e.g. distance from London or ill-health) when greater weight has been attached to a written statement than would otherwise have been the case.

(d) The closest focus of this Inquiry has involved events between about the years 1975 to 1985. There is quite naturally a great difficulty when trying to investigate the facts of something which occurred 20 to 30 years ago. Memory is fallible especially where the witness is trying to remember back to his/her youth. Moreover in some cases the event in question may have taken on the mantle of an oral tradition, giving wide range to

exaggeration or to unwitting fabrication.

(e) Examples exist where there has been clear misidentification of an alleged perpetrator, where extraneous evidence prevents the acceptance of the detail or substance of an allegation, where a witness is obviously unreliable or frankly lying. All this calls for caution in approaching the credibility of the evidence.

(f) It is clear from some of what has appeared on the internet and from the evidence itself that there has been much opportunity for contamination of evidence as well as actual such contamination. I have had to guard against this. I have not, however, treated anything which has only appeared on the internet as evidence at all, save where it may amount to an admission of wrongdoing. As part of my preparation for the Inquiry I read some of the messages from the Message Board which had been printed out for me as background information. Otherwise so far as possible I have made it my business to ignore the website although I have from time to time instructed the Clerk to post announcements there on procedural matters relating to the Inquiry.

(g) The position is also complicated by the fact that there has been active lobbying by both camps (that is both extensive lobbying by the complainants and some inspired by Debenham) during the run up to and the course of the Inquiry.

(h) Quite apart from the more ordinary sources of evidence, I have been referred to a number of books and other publications as background reading to improve my understanding of the S.E.S. and its philosophy.

(i) Assessing what weight to attach to any piece of evidence is obviously a task for me, as is choosing between those witnesses on whom I can rely and those on whom I would be unsafe so to do. I have, however, attempted to perform this duty with regard to the various factors listed above.

3.2 Onus of Proof

The burden of proving any assertion against another person or body must lie on the maker of the assertion. The burden does not shift. This is the principle which I have followed throughout. Complainants must prove their cases: it is not for those complained about to disprove them.

3.3 Standard of Proof

In a matter not strictly criminal but involving criminal or quasi-criminal allegations it seems proper to me to employ the test of a balance of

probabilities as applied by Lord Nicholls of Birkenhead in the case of **Re H & R [1996] 1 All ER1**. In that case he said:

“The balance of probability standard means that a court is satisfied an event occurred if the court considers that, on the evidence, the occurrence of the event was more likely than not. When assessing the probabilities the court will have in mind as a factor, to whatever extent is appropriate in the particular case, that the more serious the allegation the less likely it is that the event occurred and, hence, the stronger should be the evidence before the court concludes that the allegation is established on the balance of probability. Fraud is usually less likely than negligence. Deliberate physical injury is usually less likely than accidental physical injury. A stepfather is usually less likely to have repeatedly raped and had consensual oral sex with his under age stepdaughter than on some occasion to have lost his temper and slapped her. Built into the preponderance of probability standard is a generous degree of flexibility in respect of the seriousness of the allegation.

Although the result is much the same, this does not mean that where a serious allegation is in issue the standard of proof required is higher. It means only that the inherent probability or improbability of an event is itself a matter to be taken into account when weighing the probabilities and deciding whether, on balance, the event occurred. The more improbable the event, the stronger must be the evidence that it did occur before, on the balance of probability, its occurrence will be established.”

It seems to me that there is a great difference between an allegation against a schoolteacher which would amount to a serious criminal assault (e.g. an offence under s.47 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861, “assault occasioning actual bodily harm” or s.1 of the Children and Young Persons Act 1933 “assaulting [or] ill-treating a child in a manner likely to cause him unnecessary suffering”) and one of over-zealous hand slapping. The former would call for a more cogent body of evidence before the balance of probabilities was satisfied than the latter.

3.4 Attendance and Oral Evidence

Those witnesses, who attended the sittings of the Inquiry to make oral submissions, gave their evidence at Keating Chambers, Essex Street, London WC1. A very few witnesses who could not conveniently attend but who wished to give evidence orally gave their evidence by telephone. Almost all oral evidence given was recorded electronically and subsequently

transcribed. Hand written notes were taken throughout which provided back up in the very few cases of mechanical breakdown of the recording equipment.

3.5 Secretariat

The Clerk to the Inquiry was Mrs Christine Betts, a barrister employed by Veale Wasbrough Lawyers, the schools' solicitors who have been responsible for making the arrangements for the Inquiry. She was assisted by Kris Robbetts, a trainee solicitor with Veale Wasbrough Lawyers. Further office support was provided by Miss Michelle Mildiner. I was enormously assisted by all these persons and without their help and support my task would have been well nigh impossible.

3.6 The Chairman

(a) Despite the thanks expressed above, the Report is my Report. The views expressed in it and its conclusions are mine. Although I was appointed by the Governors I have been free to conduct the Inquiry and form my conclusions according to my own belief as to where the truth lies. I am not subject to instructions from Veale Wasbrough, the Governors, school executives or any other persons in my conduct of the Inquiry. I am not aware of any attempt improperly to influence me in my conclusions.

(b) I am aware that prior to my appointment the question of the identity of the Chairman was hotly debated. For the avoidance of doubt I attended both private preparatory school from the ages of 7 to 13 and public school from then until 17. In both cases I was a boarding pupil. In both schools corporal punishment was practised. For the avoidance of doubt I can also state that I am not and never have been a Governor of any school nor have I had at any time any connection with the S.E.S..

4. STATISTICS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Attached hereto as Appendix 2 are some statistics relating to the work done in conducting this Inquiry. A bibliography of the background and other reading made necessary for a full understanding of the issues is also attached as Appendix 3.

5. EVIDENCE – GENERAL

5.1 In this part of the Report I shall as envisaged in paragraph 30.1 of Annexe One to the Terms of Reference set out my conclusions generally on the former discipline policy and its application at St Vedast and St James

Schools. I shall not name any complainant or teacher, save where necessary to identify the Head of any particular school.

5.2 The Original Plan

5.2.1. As indicated above the original plan was to set up two schools, one for boys and one for girls, from the age of 4 ½ to the age of 18. This was the scheme devised by Leon MacLaren and supported by Nicholas Debenham and Miss Caldwell.

5.2.2. Accordingly St James (Boys) and St James (Girls) were set up in 1975. There were three forms in each school taking children from the age of 4 ½ to 7 approximately. Many of these children had not been to school before and those that had had only been for a short time. It was easier therefore to train these children to a novel school system since they had no or little previous experience.

5.2.3. The plan envisaged that year by year further forms would be added at the bottom of each school until the top form was composed of 10 year olds. This form would then become the lowest form in the Senior Schools. The annual growth would continue until there were 4 Schools (2 Junior and 2 Senior for Boys and for Girls.)

5.2.4. At this stage the 4 schools would contain a full complement of “home-grown” students inured to the methods of the Schools.

5.3 St Vedast

5.3.1 The parents, almost entirely S.E.S. members, of older children felt that their children were in danger of being denied the advantages promised to the younger children entering St James Schools. Accordingly they pressed Leon MacLaren to open Schools for their children. MacLaren was reluctant to do this as was Debenham. They foresaw correctly that older children would have more difficulty in acclimatising to a new and, to them, almost certainly more demanding regime. Nevertheless the St Vedast schools were opened in the Autumn of 1975.

Shortly thereafter as predicted by MacLaren and Debenham the behaviour of the boys at St Vedast began to give rise to concern. At this point for a number of reasons it is convenient to follow the history of the Schools' discipline policies and practices by separately considering the Boys' Schools

and the Girls' Schools.

5.4 Corporal Punishment – The Old Law

The Common Law allowed corporal punishment of pupils as long as it was “reasonable”, not “for gratification or personal rage” nor overly protracted or too severe (see **R v Hopley [1860] F & F 202**). In **Mansell v. Griffin [1908] 1 KB 947** Phillimore J said: ‘It is enough for a teacher to be able to say, “The punishment which I administered was moderate, it was not dictated by bad motives, it was such as is usual in the school, and such as the parent of the child would expect that the child would receive if it did wrong.” It is against this pragmatic standard that the lawfulness or the criminality of a teacher’s acts or omissions are to be judged.

5.5 Boys' Schools - Caning

5.5.1 Up to this point the cane had not been used but it was introduced to St Vedast by Debenham. It was first used in St Vedast and somewhat later in St James. Debenham maintains that St Vedast was never as happy a school as St James because of the essential flaw in its composition and, while there is some truth in this, this is not the whole story.

5.5.2 St Vedast was not a very happy school but nor, (during that period, 1975 to 1985), was St James for some of the boys who were sent there. Many speak of an overarching sense of fear during their school years – fear of harsh punishment, fear of unexpected physical pain inflicted on them as a result of their behaviour, sometimes unjustly. On the other hand many boys speak of their time in the Schools as a happy one. In this they are supported by the May 1984 Report of Inspectors of the Independent Schools Joint Council. This report of the first inspection of St James School stresses the general friendly atmosphere of the School and the calm, caring devotion of the staff to the pupils. This is less of a riddle than might appear to be the case. There will always be in any school children who will resist discipline more than others. These children are likely to receive more punishment than the more submissive. As one witness said, if you kept your head down and maintained a low profile you were more or less safe. Equally temperament will play a part and children will be affected to a greater or lesser extent by receiving punishment of any kind.

5.5.3 When St James had opened there had been no formal discipline

policy. It was accepted that teachers could deliver a smack with a hand or a slipper/shoe to a bottom or with a ruler to a hand for minor misbehaviour. Later in both St James and St Vedast this punishment was restricted to the use of a hand only.

5.5.4 Use of the cane was restricted to the Headmaster alone. To begin with the use of the cane was unrecorded and unwitnessed. Later in Autumn 1979 a punishment book was instituted by Debenham and purports to record the boy's name, the offence, the date of the caning and the number of strokes. This was kept for the rest of Debenham's time as Headmaster. Julian Capper, who became Headmaster of St Vedast in 1980, retiring from that position in 1985, kept a similar record but the book is no longer available. I accept Debenham's Punishment Book as a careful and accurate record. It has all the appearances of a genuine rather than a dishonestly fabricated record and is clearly more reliable than the victim's recollection back over 20 to 30 years. One boy said he had been beaten by Debenham on hundreds of occasions. The book gave the lie to this gross exaggeration. He had in fact been beaten on 3 occasions, a total of 8 strokes. It is worth noting that in the 1984 Report of the Inspectors, who would have seen the Punishment Book, caning is referred to as "infrequent".

5.5.5 The book does not cover the vital period prior to September 1979 when it seems that caning was probably at its height. Moreover even the best record-keeper may, like Homer, nod. I am satisfied, however, that the book is substantially correct in the period which it covers.

5.5.6 Later in time Debenham was advised by a School Inspector to have a witness present at all canings. He said that he had not always adhered to this advice. In fact witnesses are mentioned in the Punishment Book. There are very few such entries.

5.5.7 Debenham refers to 6 strokes as being the maximum and, with one possible exception, this appears to have been the case. He says that in all but one case he caned boys through their trousers. He says that he did not cause bleeding but I do not wholly accept this. I do not, however, think that it was his aim to do so nor do I believe him to have been motivated by sadism or any "bad motive" (see **Mansell v Griffin** *ibid.*). None of this punishment was *ipso facto* unlawful.

5.5.8 He says that beating of boys under 10 was rare. The punishment book shows that it was not as rare as all that.

5.5.9 There was an occasion when 2 whole classes of boys were caned for bad behaviour on the way to a swimming bath. This was a deterrent

collective punishment and on reflection Debenham believes that he over-reacted. I agree.

5.5.10 Caning was also used for a short-time to punish failure to pass a re-test (“ a mistake” per Debenham) and as a final totting-up sanction for the receipt of 10 black marks.

5.5.11 In the 1990s caning began to diminish in frequency at the Schools until it was abolished in 1996. Debenham remained until the end an advocate of retaining the option of the cane for boys and was not infrequently interviewed by the media about his views.

5.6 Boys' Schools – Other Punishments

5.6.1 As has been said, only the Headmasters could cane. Other teachers could slap bottoms or hands, order press-ups to be performed or circuit-training runs to be undertaken. They could also give other non-physical punishments including black marks.

5.6.2 Some teachers had their own preferred forms of punishment. One or two would insist on a boy taking his trousers (and sometimes pants) down before being slippered. Others used T-squares to strike boys with.

5.6.3 By the mid-1980s all forms of corporal punishment were restricted to the Headmaster only. It is not clear that the other staff all honoured this change in the regime.

5.6.4 Some staff members would send children to the Headmaster more readily than others. Although the action of sending a child did not necessarily result in a beating, in practice a beating often followed.

5.6.5 Some teachers were far more liberal with giving out black marks than others. Some were not averse to giving multiple black marks on one occasion with the consequently increased likelihood that the cut-off figure of 10 would be achieved.

5.7 Boys' Schools – Rough Handling, Physical and Mental Mistreatment

5.7.1 I am in no doubt that mistreatment of pupils took place in the Boys' Schools, mainly during the period 1975 to 1985. This took a number of forms. In my Confidential Report to the Governors I shall give full details

of those events which I find to have occurred together with the identity of the perpetrators. Here I will simply list the various types of mistreatment.

5.7.2 A small number of teachers had no proper control of their tempers. Whether this was as a result of inexperience, lack of training or, more likely, their innate temperament is difficult for me to say. As a result I am satisfied that several boys were subjected to rough handling. They were criminally assaulted by being punched in the face or in the stomach, cuffed violently about the head, had blackboard rubbers thrown at them causing injury in some cases, had cricket balls thrown at them violently when they were not looking at the thrower and were struck with the end of a gym rope. Other students were kicked, struck from behind, slapped about the face, thrown across a classroom. Whatever the provocation nothing could justify this mistreatment. It was clearly unreasonable and criminal.

5.7.3 Several of the teachers guilty of the behaviour set out in 5.6.2. above would shout loudly at boys, verbally berate them and find ways to humiliate them.

5.8 Girls – Punishments

5.8.1 This part of the report relates solely to the Girls' schools prior to the appointment of the present Headmistress, Mrs Laura Hyde in September 1995.

5.8.2 It goes without saying that the cane was never used in the Girls' schools, nor was spanking of girls performed by male teachers.

5.8.3 Miss Caldwell says that she never allowed any corporal punishment in either St James or St Vedast. She also says that she does not remember any complaint about corporal punishment being used. There is, however, clear evidence of a girl being spanked in the classroom for stealing another girl's clothing. It is said that the allegation against the girl was false. Whatever the truth of that, the matter was reported to the girl's father who complained. As a result Miss Caldwell spoke to the female teacher responsible and told her that all corporal punishment of girls was to stop. This would have been in about 1982.

5.8.4 Up until 1982, therefore, there was spanking of girls and hand slapping of girls with a ruler by some teachers but not all. The spanking was with the hand or a slipper/shoe on the bottom.

5.8.5 The girls appear to have been rather more law-abiding than the

boys and there is evidence to the effect that they, unlike boys, would listen to and act on verbal criticism.

5.9 Girls – Physical and Mental Mistreatment

5.9.1 A number of complaints have been made against some female teachers alleging that they smacked girls on their bare bottoms. I find one complaint (described above in paragraph 5.8.3) proven. However, I have considered other complaints against other teachers and do not accept them as proven.

5.9.2 A number of girls complained that they were subjected to various forms of verbal humiliation in front of their classes. Some were repeatedly shouted at and others told that they were stupid.

5.9.3 A particular practice, not wholly confined to the Girls Schools, was either publicly or privately to interrogate a subject at, if necessary, very great length, in order to obtain a confession. Confessions were usually obtained but I am satisfied were sometimes false and worthless. Sometimes in the course of this type of interrogation the subject would be attacked or criticised in hurtful and distressing ways.

5.9.4 Some girls were mistreated physically and mentally by male teachers but to nothing like the extent that the boys suffered.

5.10 For the avoidance of any possible doubt, I came across no evidence of any form of sexual abuse in any of the Schools.

5.11 The Causes of Mistreatment

5.11.1. Many of the teachers had academic and/or teaching qualifications. Several did not and several were without any or much experience in teaching. Inexperience, insufficient grasp of the subject taught, inability to keep order may all have led to loss of class control, loss of temper and over-reaction. Some of the worst examples of mistreatment involved, however, people who were well-qualified on paper to teach.

5.11.2. In a limited number of cases individuals may have been temperamentally unsuited to teaching. Uncontrollable bad temper is but one example of this. The method of choosing teachers from a relatively small

pool of S.E.S. members may also have had something to do with this.

5.11.3. In the early days there does not seem to have been any very effective line management to check on the teachers' behaviour towards the children. One has the impression of teachers, more or less dedicated (and dedicated head teachers), working on a shoestring so far as resources were concerned and working a long and tiring day.

5.11.4. There seems to have been little involvement of the Governors in staff appointments or in complaints by parents. Until the death or, at least, the decline of Leon MacLaren, this can be put down to the fact that the Governors were not in any real sense in charge of the Schools. They were MacLaren's people, as were the members of the S.E.S., and as the Senior Tutor, his word was very nearly law to all of them. The views expressed in this paragraph are the result of the distillation of a large body of evidence coming from impressive witnesses including ex staff members and ex members of the S.E.S.

6. THE FUTURE

6.1 Has Anything Changed?

6.1.1. Almost all who comment on this aspect are of the view that much has indeed changed. The schools are no longer teaching predominantly the children of S.E.S. parents. The curriculum is much wider than it was in the beginning. The Schools are now mainstream schools which also make provision for children with special educational needs. Pupils come from a wide range of ethnic and social backgrounds. The schools run courses consistent with the National Curriculum for children aged 3 -16 and, in addition, the Senior Schools run Sixth Forms. Corporal punishment is illegal and in any event ceased completely in the Junior School in 1993 and in the Senior School in 1996. Donald Lambie has succeeded Leon MacLaren as leader of the SES.

6.1.2. It is still the case that all the staff in the Junior Schools and two-thirds of the staff in the Senior Schools is composed of members of the S.E. S.

6.1.3. In addition to taking seriously their charitable responsibilities for children with learning difficulties and disabilities, the Schools are at present very successful. In the Sunday Times table of the top 500 independent secondary schools, following the Summer 2005 examinations the Girls'

School was placed 55th. The Boys' School was placed 352nd.

6.1.4. Has the transparency advocated in the 1996 Report really been created? Even after MacLaren's death, Lambie appointed Mrs Hyde as Headmistress in September 1995. However, the Governors readily ratified and approved this appointment.

6.1.5. That there has been a real change in the ethos and conduct of the schools is established by the evidence of those witnesses, not naturally well-disposed towards the S.E.S., who speak of them as happy places where there appears to be a relaxed atmosphere between pupils and teachers. This is a hopeful indication and one which is also reflected in recent inspection reports. Indeed the 2004 reports into all the Schools set out the many strengths of the Schools and speak in particularly glowing terms of the very successful Senior Girls' School under the leadership of Mrs Hyde.

7. CONCLUSION

7.1 Reconciliation and Closure

7.1.1. Some of those who have given evidence and others on the internet have suggested that they simply wish to have an apology for the mistakes which can be accepted by those who made them. A number of staff members have made apologies of greater or lesser width. I hope that for some this Inquiry and my findings may assist in bringing about closure and, perhaps in time, reconciliation.

7.1.2. None but the most negatively inspired will persist in seeking the destruction of the current Schools. Mistakes were made in the past and must be avoided in future, but much good has come out of the Schools too. Many boys and girls have happy memories of their time there. A number of very successful men and women have been sent out into the world from these Schools.

7.1.3. The other side of this is that undoubtedly some pupils were damaged by their experiences in the Schools. I saw some damaged witnesses and heard of others. I cannot say how or by what they were damaged and there is no medical evidence showing that it was the fault of the Schools. Nevertheless I am as sure as I can be that some of them are suffering from their experiences at school. There has to be an acknowledgment of this or talk of reconciliation is a waste of breath.

7.1.4. Let me close this section with a quotation from an apology received from a former member of staff (now long since retired). “I believe that my methods were harsh and now believe probably unnecessary, but I think that at the time they seemed to be so.... I certainly regret my tendency to rely on corporal punishment to reach what I then understood to be the process of discipline and order.... My own inexperience did not help me.... I realize [now] different times demand different approaches....I think now that the system was too rigid and outdated, and that somehow we harked back to a rather less sensitive recent past. Anyway I hope this does help in some degree to explain my hard and insensitive actions at the time, for which I cannot forgive myself, and hope that in some way you may find solace for your hard times at St Vedast.”

7.2 Appreciation

I should like to thank all those witnesses who tried to assist me by writing to the Inquiry and especially those who attended to give evidence.

James Townend QC

APPENDIX 1

Independent Internal inquiry into complaints from former pupils concerning past discipline policy and its application at St Vedast School and St James Independent Schools

Inquiry Chairman: Mr James Townend Q.C.

Clerk to Inquiry: Mrs Christine Betts

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. To conduct a wholly independent fact-finding inquiry, to be known as the St Vedast/St James Inquiry, into complaints about past discipline policy and practice at St Vedast School and St James Independent Schools. The Inquiry will deal only with complaints relating to former pupils of both the Girls' and the Boys' Schools and for the avoidance of doubt, contributions from parents will be welcome.
2. To make findings, to reach conclusions and, if so advised, to make recommendations.
3. To produce a report or reports to the Governors of the schools.

The general background and the aims, status and structure of the Inquiry are explained in the attached Annexe.

These terms of reference were approved by the Governing Body of St James Independent School for Boys on 10 June 2005.

ANNEXE ONE

St Vedast/St James Inquiry

St Vedast and St James

1. St James Independent Schools ("St James") were founded in 1975 in London with the aim of educating boys and girls from the age of four and a half to eighteen. The School of Economic Science (SES) inspired the initiative through its work of teaching philosophy and economics, which had been taking place with adults since the mid 1930s. The key philosophical principle guiding the development of the four day schools (senior boys, senior girls, junior boys, junior girls) is that each child should be reminded of God as the Creator; should learn to live by the Laws and Regulations of that Creator, as expounded in both Western and Eastern scriptures; and that each child should be helped to reach his or her full potential, spiritually, emotionally, mentally and physically. The core idea is that through discovery of an absolute intelligence in the heart of every human being, a spirit of unity can be understood which is beyond the divisions of race, colour, religion or gender. Education at the time was suffering from severe political interference and was generally regarded as being in decline. Standards of behaviour, and levels of discipline, were also generally thought to be declining. A group of parents, who were themselves students at the School of Economic Science, approached the Senior Tutor at the SES and asked for help and inspiration in setting up a new form of schooling which would re-establish some of the traditional English educational values, but which would also provide a new dimension of philosophical education. This form of philosophical education had not been tried before.

2. The original St James Independent School took boys and girls from the age of four and a half years to provide primary education.

However, in response to parental demand for secondary education, the governors decided to create St Vedast School. St Vedast ran from 1975 to 1985 when it closed.

The first Headmaster of both St James and St Vedast was Mr Nicholas Debenham, remaining as Headmaster of St James as it grew from a junior into a secondary school on its own account. In 1993 Mr Paul Moss was appointed Head of the Junior Schools (ages 4.5 years to 10 years). Mr Debenham remained in post as Headmaster of the Senior Boys (ages 10 years to 18 years) until his retirement in July 2004.

St James Senior Boys School is currently an independent secondary school for pupils aged 10-18. The current pupil roll is 294. The Headmaster since September 2004 is Mr David Boddy.

St James Senior Girls School is currently an independent secondary school for pupils aged 10 - 18. The current pupil roll is 240. The current Headmistress is Mrs Laura Hyde. There are two junior schools, one for boys and one for girls, each taking 135 pupils. The current Headmaster for both schools is Mr Paul Moss.

3. St James is an independent charitable school. It is an activity of the Independent Educational Association Ltd, a company limited by guarantee, with charitable status, company number 1222329, incorporated on 8 August 1975. The objects for which the company was established are -

"To promote advancement of education of children and young persons and in connection therewith to establish and conduct in any part of the world a school or schools to give instruction in all branches of education including the preparation of pupils to sit for public examinations whether academic, professional or otherwise"

4. St James is governed by a Board of Governors. Mr Roger Pincham having served as a Governor from 1975, is the only Governor from the period 1975-1985 still on the present governing body, although there are three Honorary Governors, Mr Bernard White, Mr Bernard Saunders and Dr James Armstrong, who served as Governors during that period.

5. During the 1980s, many of the Governors, staff and parents of these Schools had a shared background by reference to the School of Economic Science.

Background

6. During the 1980s, certain complaints and adverse publicity arose in connection with the School of Economic Science. There were a number of newspaper articles and in 1985, a book was published entitled "The Secret Cult". A later book "The New Believers" put forward alternative views. Both books will be made available to the Chairman of the Inquiry.

7. In about February 2004 the Governing Body of St James became aware for the first time of an internet message board called "Forum.whyaretheydead.net" on which a number of former pupils of St Vedast and St James were exchanging their recollections of experience as pupils primarily between 1975 and 1985.

8. Between February and May 2004 the correspondence began to increase but there was still no formal complaint to the Governing Body. There were, however, a number of private conversations between the message board correspondents, the Heads of the two Senior Schools and others when the possibility of a "truth and reconciliation process" was discussed.

9. The general nature of those discussions was reported back to the Governors. The Governors were also informed that three of the members of staff complained against are still employed by the company as teachers, two of them at the Boys' Senior School and one at the Girls' Senior School. Those members of staff were told of the message board and the informal discussions.

10. At a Governors' Meeting in October 2004 the Governors decided to establish an independent internal inquiry into complaints about discipline policy at St Vedast between 1975 and 1985 even though they had still received no formal notice of complaint. For this purpose they sought the assistance of Robert Boyd, a partner of Veale Wasbrough, a legal firm in Bristol specialising in advice to independent schools. Among other matters the

Governors took note that -

- 10.1. The complaints are between 20-30 years old. Memories fade and it may be very difficult, or even impossible, for the complaints to be formulated and answered with factual accuracy.
 - 10.2. The Governors have no power to require a current or former member of staff to take part in the inquiry.
 - 10.3. If any of the complaints amount to an allegation of criminal assault then those complained against are entitled to the privilege against self-incrimination.
 - 10.4. Those of the present Governors who were serving Governors between 1975 and 1985 may have a conflict of interests. Governors with any familial connection with the complainants may also have a conflict of interests.
 - 10.5. The Governors owe contractual duties to the School's insurers to act in accordance with the terms and conditions of the School's insurance policies.
 - 10.6. To have any credibility, the Inquiry must be conducted by a Chairman who is wholly independent of the governance and management of the Schools and the School of Economic Science. The Chairman should be at liberty to call on whomever he wishes for any assistance he may need as to the School regimes from 1975 onwards.
 - 10.7. An Inquiry will incur the School in substantial costs and costs need to be contained within reasonable limits.
11. There followed a period of discussion and consultation following which it was agreed to widen the scope of the inquiry to include St James' Schools for boys and girls as well as St Vedast and to remove the time period of 1975 - 1985.

Aim and status of the Inquiry

12. The legal status of the Inquiry is that it is "without prejudice" which means that the statements made to the Chairman, and the Chairman's report, will not be able to be used as evidence in any legal proceedings.
13. The Inquiry has been established by and for the Governors. It is to be a private proceeding whose objective is to understand what happened at St Vedast and St James during the relevant years, why it happened and what lessons can be learned.
14. The Inquiry is not a trial, nor a court, nor a disciplinary hearing. It is not a law suit in which one party wins and another loses. No one is on trial. There will be no parties. It is not the same as the legal process in a criminal or civil court.
15. Even so, the Inquiry may result in criticisms of an organisation or individuals who will have an opportunity to answer any criticism. This is not the same thing as sitting in judgement.
16. It follows that the Inquiry will be a fact-finding exercise without any adversarial approach or procedure and it is emphasised that although the Inquiry has been set up by the Governors it is wholly independent of the Governors. The final report will be the report of the Inquiry Chairman alone.

Structure of this Inquiry

17. The Inquiry will be held at a convenient location in Central London hired at the expense of St James. The fees of the Chairman of the Inquiry and the associated costs of a secretariat and the administrative arrangements will also be paid by St James.
18. St James will not be able to pay costs of legal representation of any complainants who wish to contribute to the Inquiry.
19. The Chairman will be asked to take account of what might be termed five distinct interest groups -

- 19.1. Former pupils who have specific complaints.
- 19.2. Former pupils who wish to contribute to the Inquiry but have no specific complaints.
- 19.3. Current and former members of staff who were employed at the Schools during the period of the complaints received from former pupils, including the former Headmaster.
- 19.4. Current and former Governors during this period.
- 19.5. The present communities of the three St James Schools.
20. The Chairman will set the procedures and the timetable and give directions to the Clerk to issue notices. At this stage it is anticipated there will be four phases.
21. **PHASE 1** - the collection of evidence. A number of statements have already been provided to the Clerk to the Inquiry in response to invitations on the "Whyaretheydead.net" website, the Seventh Form website and letters to former pupils from the current Headmaster of St James' Boys School. A number of other messages have been received indicating that the sender would wish to participate in the Inquiry once the terms of reference have been finalised and the Chairman appointed. The Chairman will, at his discretion, be able to accept any late interventions for consideration if they are deemed to be relevant to the Inquiry. The Chairman's ruling will be final. Those who wish to provide written information about their experience at St Vedast or St James will be asked to send their information to -
- Mrs Christine Betts**
Clerk to the St Vedast Inquiry
 Veale Wasbrough
 Orchard Court
 Orchard Lane
 Bristol BS1 5WS
- Confidential e-mail:** vedast@vwl.co.uk
22. The Clerk will collate all information received, together with copies of relevant information on the message boards and send it to the Inquiry Chairman, and to those complained against, who will be required to hold that information in confidence and not discuss it outside the Inquiry.
23. **PHASE 2** will be the Inquiry itself. Each person who has provided written information or wishes to give oral information will be invited to attend one or more private interviews with the Chairman. The Clerk will be in attendance.
24. The Chairman will consider anonymous information attaching such weight to it (if any) as may be appropriate.
25. The proceedings will be tape recorded and tapes will be transcribed the same or next day. Transcripts and tape recordings will be the property of the Chairman who will make a transcript of each interview available only to the interviewee and to each person complained against. That will be done on an understanding of strict confidentiality.
26. The Chairman will also interview each person complained against who wishes to respond.
27. Even though the issues have already been canvassed on the Message Boards, confidentiality remains important to individuals and to the School for these reasons -
- 27.1. Most of the issues relate to events between 20-30 years ago. Those are the matters and disputes the Inquiry is seeking to resolve. The Inquiry must not be allowed to prejudice the current school community of staff, parents and pupils.
- 27.2. Much of the information is sensitive and relates to possible child protection issues
- 27.3. The Inquiry should not be seen as a way of gathering evidence for the purposes of a criminal or civil

action; that emphatically is not its purpose.

27.4. The three members of staff who are still employed at the School have rights under employment law that the Governors are legally bound to respect.

27.5. It is in the interests of all concerned and the public interest that an Inquiry of this nature resolves rather than proliferates disputes.

28. Those complainants contributing information to the Inquiry and/or attending in person who wish to be assisted by a friend or legal representative may do so but at their own expense. The function of the friend or legal representative is to help the witness to give evidence and answer questions put by the Chairman. There will be no opportunity to question other witnesses.

29. The Chairman may ask questions of any witness or contributor. The Chairman will not appoint Counsel to the Inquiry. There will be no cross-examination by or on behalf of those persons appearing before or submitting written evidence to the Inquiry. The Chairman's principal role at this stage of the Inquiry will be to find the facts.

30. **PHASE 3** will be the report stage. The Chairman will write his report in this form -

30.1. There will be a general report on the former discipline policy and its application at St Vedast and St James during the period covered by the complaints received by former pupils. That report will not name individual complainants or teachers. However, the Chairman, at his discretion, might consider producing a confidential report for the Governors on individual matters.

31. If the Chairman's report, or one of them, contains criticisms of an organisation or individuals, he will send a draft of such Report to each organisation or person who is criticised. That organisation or person will have an opportunity to comment on the criticisms before the Report is finalised.

32. When the Report has been signed the Chairman will send it to the Clerk for distribution -

32.1. The full general report will be sent to each Governor, each person complained against, and each identified person who has made written or oral contribution to the Inquiry. It will also be posted on relevant web sites.

32.2. Any confidential reports on individual matters will be sent to the individual[s] concerned and to the Governors. At the Chairman's discretion such reports may be anonymised.

33. **PHASE 4** will relate to any action to be taken in consequence of the Inquiry's report. Where the report has made a recommendation that an organisation or person should take certain action the Chairman will write to that organisation or person requesting confirmation that the action has been taken. The Chairman has no power to compel compliance with any recommendations of the Inquiry but it will be part of his function to send a written notice to the Chairman of Governors and every other person directly affected, of a decision of any person not to comply with a recommendation, or an apparent failure to comply.

34. Upon sending such written notice or upon the Chairman deciding that no such notice is necessary, the function of the Inquiry shall cease.

* * *

APPENDIX 2

Chronology

Date	Event
1937	Foundation of Henry George School of Economic Science (see John Stewart's book " <i>Standing for Justice</i> ".)
1938	Renamed "The School of Economic Science"

1947	Leon MacLaren (son of Andrew MacLaren MP) became Senior Tutor of the SES. Fellowship of The School of Economic Science registered as an educational charity with the Ministry of Education.
1961	Leon MacLaren meets the Maharishi Mahesh Yogi.
1965	Leon MacLaren meets the Shankaracharya who was a teacher of the philosophy of Advaita Vedanta.
Late 1960s	The SES opens Sunday Schools for the children of members.
1974	Members of the SES propose founding a school for their children because of poor standards in the maintained sector.
1975	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In January St James Boys' School and St James Girls' School open at Queensgate, London. Each has three classes of children aged 5-7. The Heads are respectively Nicholas Debenham and Sheila Caldwell. They are assisted by teachers and parents working as volunteer classroom assistants, who also help with catering. 2. On 8 August a company limited by guarantee is formed to run the Schools and is registered at Companies House as the Independent Education Association Ltd (IEAL) and registered as a charity on 8 December that year. 3. In September the St Vedast Schools are opened for pupils aged 9-12 at East Heath Road, London NW3.
1979	Autumn - a punishment book is instituted by Nicholas Debenham.
1980	Nicholas Debenham ceases to be Headmaster of St Vedast. Julian Capper is appointed.
1983	Following a complaint by a parent the Governors decide that only the Headmaster may cane a pupil.
1983/84	Press and publicity attacks on the School of Economic Science.
1984	May - HMI accreditation visit of the Girls' and Boys' Schools.
1985	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The St Vedast Schools are closed. Their pupils transfer to the St James Schools. 2. Julian Capper retires as Headmaster of St Vedast but remains on the staff of St James.
1986	Maintained schools cease using physical punishment as a result of Education (No.2) Act 1986 s.47(1) which does not expressly ban the practice but removes certain defences. The Act does not apply to independent schools.
1987	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DES circular 7/87 provides guidance to maintained schools (provided as information to independent schools) and defines corporal punishment as: "... <i>an intentional application of force as punishment: this includes not only the use of the cane or the tawse, but also other forms of physical chastisement such as slapping, throwing missiles such as chalk, and rough handling</i>". 2. Regulations prohibit the use of corporal punishment against pupils on assisted places or publicly funded education. 3. The Schools are accredited by ISA.
1989	Regulations prescribe certain categories of pupils at independent schools on whom physical punishment may not be administered. Most independent schools to which this applies cease physical punishment from this date.
1993	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Education Act 1993 states that punishment cannot be justified if inhuman or degrading. 2. Paul Moss is appointed Headmaster of St James Boys' Junior School and discontinues physical punishment.
1994	Leon MacLaren dies aged 84. Donald Lambie, a barrister then aged 38 succeeds him as Senior Tutor. By this time the SES has 4,000 students in the UK.
1995	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In September Mrs Laura Hyde takes up her appointment as Headmistress of the Girls' School. 2. Senior Boys vote to retain corporal punishment

1998	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Independent Schools Inspectorate report. 2. School Standards & Framework Act finally abolishes physical punishment. 3. February - Independent Schools Inspectorate Review Visit - Senior Boys. 4. October - Independent Schools Inspectorate Review Visit - Girls' School.
2004	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. January-October - Independent Schools Inspectorate reports. 2. February - Independent Schools Inspectorate report on the Boys' School. 3. In February, former pupils establish an internet messageboard. 4. May-September David Boddy and Nicholas Debenham have informal meetings with three complainants during the summer. 5. Nicholas Debenham retires in July. David Boddy is appointed Headmaster of the Boys' Senior School. 6. In October the Governors of St James Independent Schools decide to establish an independent internal inquiry into past discipline policy and practice. 7. October - Independent Schools Inspectorate inspects the Senior Girls. 8. November - Independent Schools Inspectorate inspects the Junior Schools.
2005	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. June-October the inquiry Chairman, Mr James Townend QC conducts hearings. 2. Ex parte Williamson [2005] UKHL 15 is dismissed by the House of Lords. This was group litigation by a number of "bible schools" seeking the right to continue administering physical punishments in schools. Neither the St James Governors nor Headteachers supported this litigation at any of its stages.

APPENDIX 3

Bibliography

Note: The following documents have been considered by the Chairman of the Inquiry. Documents marked * are confidential to the governors of the St James Independent Schools.

Books

	Author	Description	Year	No. of Pgs
1.	Hounam, P. & A. Hogg	Secret Cult	1984	287pp
2.	Shaw, W.	Spying in Guru Land	1994	217pp
3.	SES	Purple Book	-	-
4.	SES	Purple Book	-	-
5.	SES	Science Book	-	-
6.	SES	Conversations	1976	179pp
7.	SES	Conversations	1971	143pp
8.	Crammond, J.	Sheila Rosenberg - A Renaissance Lady	2004	315pp
9.	Lachman, G.	In Search of P.D. Ouspensky: The Genius in the Shadow of Gurdjieff	2004	281pp
10.	Washington, P.	Madame Blavatsky's Baboon	1995	401pp
11.	SES	Rules - The Fellowship of the School of Economic Science	1996	23pp

Extracts

	Author	Description	Year	No. of Pgs
1.	Barrett, D.V.	The New Believers	2001	11 (Pgs. 266-77)

2.	SES	His Holiness, Sri Shankaracharya, on Education	-	10 (Pgs.10-20)
----	-----	--	---	----------------

Leaflets

1.	INFORM (Information Network Focus on Religious Movements)	About School of Economic Science	Nov 2004	2
----	---	----------------------------------	----------	---

Video

	Author	Description	Year	No. of Pgs
1.	St James Independent Schools	The Spirit of St James: St James Independent Schools, London	c.1984	-

Inspection Reports & Documentation

	Author	Description	Year	No. of Pgs
1.	Lucas, Milner Williams, Stroud, Taylor	Report of an Accreditation Visit to St James Independent School for Girls	15-17 May 1984	15
2.	Lucas, Higginson, Stroud, Moore	Report of an Accreditation Visit to St James Independent School for Boys	22-24 May 1984	13
3.	Vivienne Harrison	Letter from DfE to Nicholas Debenham re Boys' Junior School	13 Oct 1993	2
4.	D. Shield	Letter from DfEE to Paul Moss	13 Dec 1996	2
5.	ISI	Review Visit (Inspection) to St James Independent School for Boys (Senior School)	9-11 Feb 1998	30
6.	Independent Schools Inspectorate	Review Visit (Inspection) to St James Junior Schools for Boys and Girls	19-21 Oct 1998	36
7.	Independent Schools Inspectorate	Review Visit (Inspection) to St James Independent School for Girls	20-22 Oct 1998	24
8.	Laura Hyde	Letter to ISJC re ISA Review Inspection Report - Autumn Term 1998	14 Jan 1999	2
9.	Laura Hyde	Letter to Parents re Independent Schools Association - Review Inspection	18 Jan 1999	2
10.	ISI - Irvine, Belcher, Dowdles, Larkman, Leach, Roskilly, Williamson	Inspection Report on St James Independent School for Senior Boys	2-6 Feb 2004	19
11.	ISC / ISI - Watson, Batchelor, Cullen, Harrop, Merchant, Willmott	Inspection of St James Independent School for Senior Girls - Main Report	4-8 Oct 2004	35
12.	ISC / ISI -	Inspection of St James Independent School for Senior Girls - Summary Report	4-8 Oct 2004	6
13.	ISC - Salaman, Ellse, Hancock, Smith-Gordon	Inspection of St James Independent Junior Schools - Main Report	15-19 Nov 2004	33

Prospectuses

	Author	Description	Year
1.	St James Schools	Prospectus - Girls' School	Mid 1980s
2.	St James Schools	Prospectus - Senior Boys	Current
3.	St James Schools	Prospectus - Senior Girls	Current
4.	St James Schools	Prospectus - Junior Boys & Girls	Current

Articles

	Author	Description	Year	Publication
1.	O'Leary, J.	'Few Still Cling to Discredited Stick'	1996	The Times
2.	Hounam, P. & A. Hogg	'The SES and its Strange Schools	1983	The Standard
3.	Green, P. (Principal, SES)	'Socratic'	1983	The Standard
4.	Unattributed	'Wealth all over the World'	-	-
5.	Roberts, Yvonne	'The Cult that can crush a woman'	1983	The Standard
6.	Grimble, A.	'Why I left the Humbug Cult'	1988	The Standard
7.	King, T.	'Love must come first but caning works, says head'	-	-
8.	Unattributed	'Secrets of the Sect'	1983	The Standard
9.	Unattributed	'Secretive Sect'	1983	The Standard
10.	Hounam, P. & A. Hogg	'Special Report'	-	The Standard
11.	Hounam, P., Hogg, A. & C. Adamson	'Cult Schools: parents seek a bigger say'	-	The Standard
12.	Kemble, B.	'Public school head faces caning probe'	1989	-
13.	Debenham, N.	'Beat Generation'	1989	-
14.	Bain, C.	'Caring headteacher who believes beating can be good for his boys'	1996	The Independent
15.	Hoare, S.	'The forbidden fruit of learning'	2004	The Guardian
16.	Woods, N	St James School Investigation	2005	Richmond Times
17.	Boddy, D.	St James is Happy to make Connection Clear	2005	Richmond Times

Staff Lists*

		Year	Pages
1.	St James Independent School for Boys	1976	1
2.	St James Independent School for Boys	1977	1
3.	St James Independent School for Boys	1978	1

4.	St James Independent School for Boys	1980	1
5.	St James Independent School for Boys	1982	1
6.	St James Independent School for Boys	1984	1

		Year	Pages
1.	St James Independent School for Girls	1975	1
2.	St James Independent School for Girls	1976	1
3.	St James Independent School for Girls	1980	1

		Year	Pages
1.	St Vedast School for Boys	1976	1
2.	St Vedast School for Boys	1982	1

		Year	Pages
1.	St Vedast School for Girls	1976	1
2.	St Vedast School for Girls	1978	1

Class Lists*

		Year	Pages
1.	St James Independent School for Boys - Seniors	1982	2
2.	St James Independent School for Boys - Seniors	1983	3
3.	St James Independent School for Boys - Seniors	1984	2
4.	St James Independent School for Boys - Seniors	1985	3
5.	St James Independent School for Boys - Seniors	1986	3
6.	St James Independent School for Boys - Seniors	1987	1
7.	St James Independent School for Boys - Seniors	1989	3

		Year	Pages
1.	St James Independent School for Boys - Juniors	Unclear	2

		Year	Pages
1.	St Vedast Independent School for Boys	1982	1

		Year	Pages
1.	St James Independent School for Girls - Seniors	1982	3
2.	St James Independent School for Girls - Seniors	1983	2
3.	St James Independent School for Girls - Seniors	1984	2
4.	St James Independent School for Girls - Seniors	1985	2

5.	St James Independent School for Girls - Seniors	1986	2
6.	St James Independent School for Girls - Seniors	1987	3
7.	St James Independent School for Girls - Seniors	1988	3
8.	St James Independent School for Girls - Seniors	1989	3
9.	St James Independent School for Girls - Seniors	1990	1

		Year	Pages
1.	St James Independent School for Girls - Juniors	1982	2

Other Documents*

	Author	Description	Year	No. of Pgs
1.	Goldschmied, M.	St James Schools Report	1996	45
2.	Debenham, N.	Punishment Book	1979-95	-

APPENDIX 4

Corporal Punishment: A Brief History

1944	Education Act	"in the exercise and performance of all powers and duties conferred on them by the Act, the Secretary of State and local education authorities shall have regard to the general principle that so far as is compatible with the provision of efficient instruction and training and the avoidance of unreasonable public expenditure, pupils are to be educated in accordance with the wishes of their parents."
1967	Plowden Report Children and their Primary Schools: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England) (Chairman: Lady Plowden) HMSO 1967	"the infliction of physical pain as a recognised method of punishment in primary schools should be forbidden."
1982	<i>Campbell and Cosans v United Kingdom</i>	Objection by two parents to their children being subjected to corporal punishment in state schools. Complained to the ECHR and had claim upheld - corporal punishment was contrary to article 2 of the First protocol.
1985	Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe Violence in the Family (Recommendation R85(4))	Member States should review their legislation so as to limit or prohibit corporal punishment.
1986	Education (No2) Act 18 July 1996 (Repealed with savings)	s.47: School teachers in maintained schools lost the right to administer corporal punishment to school pupils. Corporal punishment was also banned for all state-funded pupils in independent schools.
1989	Elton Report Discipline in Schools: Report of the Committee of Enquiry chaired by Lord Elton, 1989 HMSO	There is "little evidence that corporal punishment was in general an effective deterrent either to the pupils punished or to other pupils."

1990	Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe Social Measures concerning Violence in the Family (Recommendation R(90)2)	Emphasised the importance of the general condemnation of corporal punishment and other forms of degrading treatment as a means of education and of the need for a violence free education.
1991	Utting Report Children in the Public Care, re review of residential child care	Corporal punishment in children's homes was 'quite properly' forbidden under the Children Act 1989 but additional training was needed on control, restraint and physical contact with children in residential care.
1993	Gulbenkian Foundation One scandal too many...the case for comprehensive protection for children in all settings	Recommendation of the prohibition of corporal punishment in all settings where it was still allowed.
1993	<i>Costello-Roberts v United Kingdom</i> (1995) 19 E.H.R.R. 112 (25 March 1993)	The "slipper" of a 7 year old boy at a private school by his headmaster did not amount to degrading treatment under Article 3 of the ECHR nor did it compromise physical and moral integrity and breach Article 8.
1993	Education Act (Repealed by Education Act 1996, s 582 (2), (3), Sch 38, Pt I, Sch 39, Pt II, paras 9, 13, 21, 29, 36(1), 39(2) with savings).	s.293: Corporal punishment of children could not be justified if it was "inhuman or degrading."
1995	Utting Report Report of the Commission on Children and Violence	Recommended the immediate abolition of physical punishment in all schools.
1996	National Commission of Inquiry into the Prevention of Child Abuse Childhood Matters, 1996, HMSO; Recom. 34	Corporal punishment was unsatisfactory and ineffective and recommended that the law as it affects physical punishment of children should be amended to give children the same protection against assaults as adults.
1996		Parliament was informed that no official teachers' bodies were calling for the reintroduction of corporal punishment in state schools. Support for the proposed 1998 amendment was given by the Independent Schools Council and all the Teachers' Unions. A consortium of children's charities, including the NSPCC also supported the amendment.
1996	Education Act 1996 1 November 1996	Renders corporal punishment unlawful in all schools by removing justification for the provision of such punishment to a child being educated by school staff members.
1998	Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998 (01 September 1999)	s.131 inserted s.548 into the Education Act 1996. See above.
2001	<i>Z v United Kingdom</i> (10 April 2001)	Steps taken by the state should provide effective protection for children and other vulnerable individuals.

2005	<i>Re Williamson</i> (24 February 2005)	The extension of the Education Act 1996 to ban corporal punishment in all schools was not incompatible with parental rights under the European Convention on Human Rights. Whilst Parliament would respect a parent's belief that a school should use corporal punishment, it was entitled to decide that the manifestation of those beliefs in practice was not in the best interests of children.
------	--	---

APPENDIX 5

Corporal Punishment: Relevant Legislation

Definition

1. Corporal punishment is defined as anything which is done for the purpose of punishing a child and which would, apart from any justification, be battery.^[1] It does not include anything which is done for the purpose of averting immediate danger of personal injury to or damage to the property of any person, including the child.^[2]

Current Position

2. **s.548** of the **Education Act 1996**^[3] provides that corporal punishment is now unlawful in all schools. This is not conveyed directly, but rather as a consequence of the statement that the provision of corporal punishment by or on the authority of a member of staff to a child for whom education is provided (whether at school, or otherwise under LEA arrangements) cannot be justified on the ground that it was given in pursuance of a right exercisable by the member of staff 'by virtue of his position as such'.
3. Nevertheless, **s.550A** of the **EA 1996**^[4] provides that staff at a school may use such force as is reasonable for the purpose of preventing any pupil committing any offence, causing personal injury to, or damage to the property of, any person including the pupil himself and engaging in any behaviour prejudicial to the maintenance of good order and discipline at the school, or among its pupils, whether or not that behaviour occurs during a teaching session or otherwise. That power does not permit corporal punishment; rather it enables members of staff to take action when they have lawful control or charge of the pupil concerned.
4. Staff means teachers at the school and any other person the Head has authorised to be in charge of pupils.
5. Corporal punishment was abolished in maintained schools and in independent schools for pupils supported from public funds by **s.47(1)** of the **Education (No.2) Act 1986**.
6. **Section 293(2)** of the **Education Act 1993** amended the 1986 Act by providing that corporal punishment given to a pupil cannot be justified if that punishment was inhuman or degrading.
7. In determining whether the punishment was inhuman or degrading regard was to be had to '*all the circumstances of the case, including the reason for giving it, the manner and circumstances in which it is given, the persons involved and the mental and physical effects*' under **s.47(1)(b)**.

The Position before 1986

8. Historically, under common law teachers had the right, if delegated by the child's parents, to inflict moderate and reasonable corporal punishment on pupils under the age of eighteen.

9. The courts determined that corporal punishment inflicted within the following guidelines was lawful:

(i) It must not be administered for the gratification of rage or passion;

(ii) It must be moderate in its nature and degree, not being excessive or protracted beyond the child's powers of endurance;

(iii) It must be applied with suitable instrument, such as a cane or slipper, so as not to cause serious permanent or temporary bodily harm.

11. If punishment was administered illegally it could have been both a crime and a civil wrong.

Finding a Definition

12. None of the Education Acts up to 1986 made direct reference to corporal punishment. Prior to the abolition of corporal punishment in maintained schools in 1986, the **Education Act 1944** provided that *'in the exercise and performance of all powers and duties conferred on them by the Act, the Secretary of State and local education authorities shall have regard to the general principle that so far as is compatible with the provision of efficient instruction and training and the avoidance of unreasonable public expenditure, pupils are to be educated in accordance with the wishes of their parents'*.

Reasonable Chastisement

13. This concept refers to the administration of blows rather than the circumstances of that administration. Corporal punishment administered prior to 1986 in breach of local authority regulations could still come within the category of reasonable chastisement. However, teachers who acted outside of the regulations in this context could expect to be subject to disciplinary proceedings.

Use of Corporal Punishment in Schools circa 1985

14. In 1985 a total ban on corporal punishment was in force in 16 out of the 104 education authorities in England and Wales:

Avon, Brent, Derbyshire, Doncaster, Gwent, Haringey, Hounslow, Humberside, ILEA, Lancashire, Leicestershire, Manchester, Newham, Northampton, Sheffield, Waltham Forest.

15. 50 more authorities were either committed to abolition or seriously considering it. By mid-1986 nearly all those authorities abolished corporal punishment in their schools.

16. The position for students educated in the independent sector at that time was determined by the common law, as explained by paragraphs 9 - 11 above.

Annexe 1

Selected Case Law

R (on the application of Williamson & ORS) v Secretary of State for Education and Employment & ORS (2005) UKHL 15

The extension of the Education Act 1996 to ban corporal punishment in all schools was not incompatible with parental rights under the European Convention on Human Rights. Whilst Parliament would respect a parent's belief that a school should use corporal punishment, it was entitled to decide that the manifestation of those beliefs in practice was not in the best interests of children.

R v H (Assault of Child: Reasonable Chastisement) (2001) EWCA Crim 1024

Consideration of the right of a parent to chastise his son with regard to the Human Rights Act 1998 and case law. The jury should consider the following factors when assessing whether punishment was degrading: the nature of the defendant's behaviour (ii) the duration of that behaviour (iii) the physical and mental consequences of that behaviour on the child (iv) the age and personal characteristics of the child (v) the defendant's reasons for administering the punishment.

Jarman v Mid-Glamorgan Education Authority (1985) DC; The Times 11 February 1985

The mother of a child of compulsory school age who failed to ensure that her child attended school regularly committed an offence despite doing so because she disagreed with the administration of corporal punishment.

R v Manchester City Council ex parte Fulford (1984) 81 LGR 292

A local education authority acted ultra vires in taking a decision to abolish corporal punishment without first consulting head teachers.

Happe v Lay (1977) 76 LGR 313

The father of a child of compulsory school age who refused to return his son to school after he ran away to escape caning committed an offence.

Ridley v Little (1960) DC, The Times, 26 May 1960

The administration of two strokes with a cane on the clothed buttocks of a 12 year old boy was found to be reasonable corporal punishment because the child made no complaint and followed his usual routine, received bruising which did not "incommode him" and was examined by two doctors who found no need for treatment.

Ryan v Fildes (1938) 3 All ER 517

A ten year old schoolboy was hit on the ear by his female teacher and became deaf as a result of a ruptured eardrum. It was held that *"the blow although a moderate one, exceeded reasonable and lawful correction, but that the act of punishing the boy was within the general scope of the employment of the mistress"*.

Rex v Newport (Salop) JJ ex parte Wright (1929) 2 KB 416

A pupil under 16 years of age after having returned home from school smoked a cigarette in a public street. At the time the school had a rule prohibiting smoking by pupils during term time, whether on school premises or in public. The next day the headmaster administered 5 strokes of the cane to the boy for breaching the rule. The court held that the rule was reasonable and that both the decision of the boy's father to send his son to be punished at school and the punishment itself were reasonable.

Mansell v Griffin (1908) 1 KB 947

An action was brought by the father of a 10 year old girl struck with a short ruler on her clothed upper arm by a female teacher. The court ruled that an assistant teacher in a public elementary school has authority to inflict corporal punishment on a pupil if the punishment inflicted is moderate, is not dictated by any bad motive, is such as is usual in the school, and such that the parent might expect that child to receive if it did wrong.

Cleary v Booth (1893) 1 QB 465

'It is clear that a father has the right to inflict reasonable personal chastisement on his son. It is equally the law and it is in accordance with very ancient practice that he may delegate this right to the schoolmaster. Such a right has always commended itself to the common sense of mankind. It is clear that the relation of master and pupil carries with it the right of reasonable personal chastisement' - per Collins J

Regina v Hopley (1860) 2F & F 202

After obtaining the parent's permission to administer corporal punishment, a schoolmaster beat a boy with a thick stick for two and a half hours, until the boy died. In his direction to the jury, Cockburn CJ stated: *"By the law of England, a parent or schoolmaster (who for this purpose represents the parent and has the parental authority delegated to him), may for the purpose of correcting what is evil in the child, inflict moderate and reasonable corporal punishment always however with the condition that it is moderate and reasonable. If it be administered for the gratification of passion or rage, or if it be immoderate and excessive in its degree or if it be protracted beyond the child's power of endurance or with an instrument unfitted for the purpose and calculated to produce danger to life and limb; in all such cases the punishment is excessive, the violence is unlawful and if evil consequences to life and limb ensue then the person inflicting it is answerable to the law and if death ensues the verdict will be at least manslaughter"*.

Annexe 2

Views on Corporal Punishment

National Confederation of Parent-Teacher Associations (1975)

"corporal punishment in schools should remain to be exercised at the discretion of the headteacher and staff."

National Confederation of Parent-Teacher Associations (1977)

"As far as schools are concerned we are totally opposed to the use of corporal punishment as a means of educating. There may be times, however, when just as a wise parent may be forced to restrain or correct physically, so a teacher of small children may have to administer a short, sharp shock. This, however, must be very exceptional, and in all cases the teacher must be prepared to justify the action."

The Report of the Working Party on Corporal Punishment in Schools (1980), British Psychological Society

Submissions to the BPS from the major teaching unions and associations revealed the following points:

For	Against
Corporal punishment is supported and or requested by some parents. (Headmasters' Association ("HA"))	Alternatives to corporal punishment are available and should be encouraged. (AHM, AMMA)

Denial of the right to use corporal punishment would be the thin end of the wedge of denial of other rights attached to the 'in loco parentis' status. (NAS / UWT)	Where it is used and respect is retained, it is probably easily dispensed with. (AMMA)
Other sanctions are not effective for some pupils. (HA)	Discipline depends on establishing standards of effective management, not on corporal punishment. (AHM) The effectiveness of corporal punishment for persistent offenders is dubious. (AMMA)
Without corporal punishment teachers are deprived of adequate support. (Assistant Masters and Mistresses Association ("AMMA"))	Corporal punishment is ineffective if the teacher's feelings are of no importance to the pupil.
Corporal punishment is preferred by teachers to suspension and expulsion. (NAS / UWT)	Teachers are often reluctant to use it and may delegate its provision. (AMMA)
Corporal punishment is effective in the context of a positive and caring relationship. (AMMA)	Corporal punishment is illogical if violence is deplored. (AMMA)
Pupils prefer corporal punishment to certain other sanctions.	Preference by pupils for corporal punishment may be grounds for not using it. (AMMA)
Corporal punishment is needed for persistent offenders and defiant or aggressive pupils. (HA, AMMA, NAS / UWT)	The effectiveness of corporal punishment for persistent offenders is dubious. (AMMA) Corporal punishment is demeaning to the people using it and may cause resentment. (AMMA)

HA	Headmasters' Association
AMMA	Assistant Masters and Mistresses Association
NAS	National Association of Schoolmasters
UWT	Union of Women Teachers

National Union of School Students (1980)

Also quoted in the BPS Report was the view of the NUSS:

"because corporal punishment is degrading, it harms the self esteem of the school students who receive it. It breeds in them a sense of resentment and alienation which manifests itself in an aggressive and destructive response towards their environment."

Society of Teachers Opposed to Physical Punishment (STOPP) (1980)

1. [Physical punishment] creates an atmosphere of violence lending endorsement to the view that problems may be solved and the will of the more powerful person imposed by force.
2. Physical punishment conflicts with educational principles based on self-discipline and the love of learning.
3. It damages the general atmosphere of an educational community by impeding a good relationship between teachers and pupils.
4. Its mere availability deters, not the offender from offending but the teacher from acquiring more effective disciplinary measures.
5. It is sometimes inflicted in defiance of parents' wishes, making a mockery of the principle 'in loco parentis'.

* * *

APPENDIX 6

Overview of Evidence

Note: An "Observer" is a person who makes no adverse comments on the Schools or whose primary motivation is supportive of them.

Oral Evidence

- **18 days** of interviews were held between 20 June and 6 October 2005.

- **62 people** have been interviewed, some more than once.

- **14 women have been interviewed**

9 women are complainants; 5 of these complainants are parents.

0 women were interviewed as observers.

3 women are former members of staff, including 1 former headmistress.

1 woman is the current headmistress.

1 woman is an officer in the Metropolitan Police involved in Child Protection.

- **48 men have been interviewed**

21 men are complainants; 2 of these complainants are parents, another is a parent and former headmaster.

11 men were interviewed as observers.

2 men are current headmasters.

1 is a former headmaster.

3 men are current teachers.

4 men are former teachers.

1 is the current chair of governors.

1 is a former governor.

4 are representatives of the SES.

Written Evidence

- **151 written submissions have been received by the chairman**

50 are general observations.

81 are complaints (9 complainants making more than 1 submission each).

3 are observations from current teachers.

11 are observations from former teachers.

2 are observations from former headteachers.

4 are letters of support for the former headteachers.

APPENDIX 7

School Lists

Note: The following lists show the schools and dates of attendance of witnesses who divulged this information to the Inquiry. Only those who specifically provided this information are included.

St James School for Boys

Opened January 1975 at Queen's Gate, Kensington, London

1.	1980-97	Observer
2.	1976-81	Observer
3.	1975-82	Observer
4.	1975-84	Complainant
5.	1986-96	Observer

6.	1975-89	Complainant
7.	1984-93	Observer
8.	1984-unknown	Observer
9.	1975-84	Complainant
10.	1978-92	Complainant
11.	1975-86	Complainant
12.	1998-2000	Complainant
13.	1979-93	Complainant
14.	1982-87	Complainant
15.	1978-84	Complainant
16.	1982-96	Complainant
17.	1988-94	Observer
18.	1978-85	Complainant
19.	1983-90	Observer
20.	1975-88	Observer
21.	1976-86	Complainant
22.	1976-87	Complainant
23.	1976-84	Complainant
24.	1976-83	Complainant
25.	1977-88	Complainant
26.	1985-96	Observer
27.	1976-90	Observer
28.	1983-85	Complainant
29.	1975-89	Observer
30.	1976-87	Complainant
31.	1975-87	Observer
32.	1975-87	Observer
33.	1975-89	Observer
34.	1977-86	Observer
35.	1975-89	Complainant
36.	1975-85	Complainant
37.	1977-79	Complainant
38.	1980-93	Observer
39.	1976-87	Complainant
40.	1975-85	Complainant
41.	1975-86	Complainant
42.	1975-88	Observer

St James School for Girls

Opened January 1975 at Queen's Gate, Kensington, London

43.	1984-94	Complainant
44.	1976-83	Complainant
45.	1976-81	Complainant
46.	1981-91	Complainant
47.	1976-83	Complainant
48.	1975-82	Complainant
49.	1976-84	Complainant
50.	1978-83	Complainant

St Vedast School for Boys

Opened September 1975 at East Heath Road, London. Later moved to 92 Queen's Gate, Kensington and finally to Sarum Chase, Hampstead in 1980; closed 1985.

51.	1979-85	Complainant
52.	1979-84	Observer
53.	1975-79	Complainant
54.	1978-79	Complainant
55.	1975-80	Complainant
56.	1975-8	Complainant
57.	1976-81	Complainant
58.	1975-81	Complainant
59.	Unknown	Complainant
60.	1975-80	Complainant
61.	1976-80	Complainant
62.	1975-83	Complainant
63.	1975-79	Complainant
64.	1975-78	Complainant

St Vedast School for Girls

Opened September 1975 at 91 Queen's Gate, Kensington.

65.	1975-79	Complainant
-----	---------	-------------

[1] Section 548(4) of the EA 1996.

[2] *Ibid*, s.548(5).

[3] as substituted by s.131 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998.

[4] inserted by the Education Act 1997.

Appendix 8
Punishment Book - Anonymised Analysis
Note: This anonymised analysis shows the total number of strokes of the cane received by each pupil during the month listed, with the number of occasions indicated in brackets. Due to the Data Protection Act, the full contents of the Punishment book cannot be published. However, if any individual wishes to view the entry or entries referring to him, he can apply to the Clerk to the Inquiry (within one month of the publication of this report) for appropriate arrangements to be made.

St Vedast Boys		Spring			Summer			Autumn				Total
1979	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
Pupil 1								4 (1)				4
Pupil 2								3 (1)				3
Pupil 3									3 (1)			3
Pupil 4									3 (1)			3
Pupil 5									3 (1)			3
Pupil 6										3 (1)		3
Pupil 7										6 (2)		6
Pupil 8										7 (2)		7
Pupil 9										3 (1)		3
Pupil 10										4 (1)		4
Pupil 11										5 (1)		5
Total								7	9	28	0	44

1980		Spring			Summer			Autumn				Total
1980	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
Pupil 8	10 (2)								4 (1)			14
Pupil 10	3 (1)											3
Pupil 12	3 (1)											3
Pupil 13		3 (1)				3 (1)						6
Pupil 14		3 (1)			3 (1)							6
Pupil 15			3 (1)									3
Pupil 16					3 (1)							3
Pupil 17					5 (1)	4 (1)			6 (1)			15
Pupil 18					4 (1)							4
Pupil 19					3 (1)							3
Pupil 20						6 (1)						6
Pupil 21						3 (1)						3
Pupil 6									6 (1)			6
Total	16	6	3	0	18	16	0	0	16	0	0	75

St James Boys		Spring			Summer			Autumn				Total
1979	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
Pupil 22									3 (1)	5 (1)		8
Pupil 23										2 (1)		2
Pupil 24											4 (1)	4
Pupil 25											3 (1)	3
Pupil 26											3 (1)	3
Pupil 27											5 (1)	5
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	25

1980	Spring			Summer			Autumn			Total		
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Sep	Oct		Nov	Dec
Pupil 28	7 (2)											7
Pupil 29	7 (2)											7
Pupil 26	5 (1)											5
Pupil 30		4 (1)										4
Pupil 31					5 (1)							5
Pupil 32					3 (1)							3
Pupil 33						3 (1)			6 (1)			9
Forms II & III						3 each						-
Pupil 34							3 (1)	4 (1)				7
Pupil 35							3 (1)	4 (1)				7
Pupil 24								5 (1)				5
Pupil 36									3 (1)			3
Pupil 23									3 (1)			3
Pupil 37									3 (1)			3
Pupil 38									5 (1)			5
Pupil 39									4 (1)			4
Total	19	4	0	0	8	3	6	13	24	0	0	77

1981	Spring			Summer			Autumn			Total		
	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	Jun	Jul	Sep	Oct		Nov	Dec
Pupil 27	3 (1)										6 (1)	9
Pupil 40		3 (1)	3 (1)			3 (1)			3 (1)			12
Pupil 28			5 (1)									5
Pupil 41				3 (1)								3
Pupil 42					2 (2)	6 (2)	6 (1)					14
Pupil 43					2 (1)							2
Pupil 44					1 (1)							1
Pupil 45					2 (2)			1 (1)				3
Pupil 46					1 (1)							1
Pupil 37					1 (1)							1
Pupil 47					1 (1)			1 (1)				2
Pupil 48					1 (1)	7 (2)						8
Pupil 38					1 (1)	4 (1)			3 (1)			8
Pupil 35						2 (1)						2
Pupil 34						4 (1)				1 (1)		5
Pupil 49						1 (1)						1
Pupil 50						5 (2)						5
Pupil 51						5 (2)						5
Pupil 52						5 (2)						5
Pupil 53						3 (1)						3
Pupil 36						3 (1)			1 (1)			4
Pupil 54						3 (1)						3
Pupil 29						3 (1)						3
Pupil 55							3 (1)				3 (1)	6
Pupil 56							3 (1)				4 (1)	7
Pupil 57								5 (1)				5
Pupil 58								5 (1)			4 (1)	9
Pupil 59								1 (1)				1

Pupil 60								4 (1)				4
Pupil 61									4 (1)			4
Pupil 62										1 (1)		1
Pupil 63											3 (1)	3
Total	3	3	8	3	12	54	12	17	11	2	20	145

1982	Spring			Summer			Autumn			Total		
	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	Jun	Jul	Sep	Oct		Nov	Dec
Pupil 42	3 (1)											3
Pupil 31	3 (1)											3
Pupil 64		3 (1)				3 (1)						6
Pupil 55		3 (1)										3
Pupil 61		3 (1)	3 (1)		4 (1)	2 (1)						12
Pupil 62		3 (1)	3 (1)									6
Pupil 27		6 (1)	3 (1)				4 (1)			4 (1)		17
Pupil 65		3 (1)										3
Pupil 66		3 (1)										3
Pupil 40		3 (1)										3
Pupil 29			3 (1)								3 (1)	6
Pupil 63			3 (1)							3 (1)		6
Pupil 60			3 (1)									3
Pupil 34			3 (1)		3 (1)							6
Pupil 67					3 (1)							3
Pupil 68					2 (1)							2
Pupil 69					2 (1)							2
Pupil 70					3 (1)							3
Pupil 58						3 (1)						3
Pupil 41						3 (1)						3
Pupil 36						3 (1)						3
Pupil 71							1 (1)					1
Pupil 57									6 (1)			6
Pupil 72									3 (1)			3
Pupil 24									3 (1)			3
Pupil 73										5 (1)		5
Pupil 74											4 (1)	4
Total	6	27	21	0	17	14	5	0	12	12	7	121

1983	Spring			Summer			Autumn			Total		
	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	Jun	Jul	Sep	Oct		Nov	Dec
Pupil 75			1 (1)									1
Pupil 29			3 (1)									3
Pupil 76			3 (1)									3
Pupil 27			6 (1)									6
Pupil 40					6 (2)	3 (1)						9
Pupil 77					3 (1)							3
Pupil 70					4 (2)		3 (1)					7
Pupil 74					3 (1)				4 (1)			7
Pupil 78					3 (1)							3
Pupil 79					5 (1)		2 (1)					7
Pupil 24						1 (1)						1
Pupil 61						1 (1)						1

Pupil 35	3 (1)										5 (1)	8
Pupil 24	3 (1)											3
Pupil 90	3 (1)											3
Pupil 99	3 (1)										3 (1)	6
Pupil 97	1 (1)											1
Pupil 61		3 (1)						3 (1)		3 (1)		9
Pupil 40		6 (1)										6
Pupil 85		3 (1)						3 (1)				6
Pupil 72		3 (1)						3 (1)				6
Pupil 91		3 (1)										3
Pupil 71		3 (1)										3
Pupil 100		3 (1)										3
Pupil 101		3 (1)										3
Pupil 48		3 (1)										3
Pupil 102		3 (1)										3
Pupil 36				3 (1)								3
Pupil 103						2 (1)				6 (2)		8
Pupil 104						1 (1)						1
Pupil 105						4 (1)						4
Pupil 106						3 (1)						3
Pupil 48						3 (1)				4 (1)		7
Pupil 42							4 (1)		12 (2)	4 (1)		20
Pupil 76							4 (1)		3 (1)			7
Pupil 107							1 (1)					1
Pupil 108							1 (1)				3 (1)	4
Pupil 109									2 (2)			2
Pupil 110									3 (1)			3
Pupil 111									3 (1)			3
Pupil 112									6 (1)	9 (2)		15
Pupil 113									6 (1)			6
Pupil 114									1 (1)			1
Pupil 75									1 (1)	3 (1)		4
Pupil 115									3 (1)			3
Pupil 116										3 (1)		3
Pupil 117											1 (1)	1
Pupil 118											5 (1)	5
Total	5	22	33	0	6	13	10	0	49	32	20	190

	Spring			Summer			Autumn					
1986	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
Pupil 119	3 (1)											3
Pupil 120	3 (1)					3 (1)	3 (1)					9
Pupil 121		3 (1)			4 (1)	8 (2)			3 (1)			18
Pupil 42		6 (1)			3 (1)		4 (1)	5 (1)			4 (1)	22
Pupil 84		3 (1)										3
Pupil 122		3 (1)										3
Pupil 123		4 (1)										4
Pupil 124		3 (1)										3
Pupil 110			3 (1)									3
Pupil 125			1 (1)									1
Pupil 126			3 (1)									3
Pupil 127			3 (1)		1 (1)				1 (1)			5
Pupil 128					13 (3)							13
Pupil 103						3 (1)				3 (1)		6

Pupil 150											6 (1)	6
Total	3	13	14	0	26	12	3	15	13	14	9	122

	Spring			Summer			Autumn					
1988	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
Pupil 151	1 (1)											1
Pupil 152	3 (1)				1 (1)							4
Pupil 138	3 (1)											3
Pupil 153	3 (1)											3
Pupil 115	5 (1)	4 (1)										9
Pupil 154		3 (1)			1 (1)	4 (1)						8
Pupil 155		3 (1)	6 (1)		1 (1)	4 (1)						14
Pupil 156			3 (1)									3
Pupil 157			4 (1)									4
Pupil 137			4 (1)									4
Pupil 124			4 (1)									4
Pupil 158			4 (1)									4
Pupil 159					1 (1)							1
Pupil 160					2 (1)	4 (1)						6
Pupil 61					1 (1)							1
Pupil 84					1 (1)							1
Pupil 162					1 (1)							1
Pupil 163					2 (2)							2
Pupil 142					2 (2)							2
Pupil 164					3 (3)					1 (1)		4
Pupil 165					5 (3)							5
Pupil 166					1 (1)							1
Pupil 167					2 (2)							2
Pupil 168					1 (1)							1
Pupil 169					2 (2)							2
Pupil 108					3 (1)							3
Pupil 170					1 (1)							1
Pupil 171					1 (1)							1
Pupil 172					5 (1)							5
Pupil 148						1 (1)						1
Pupil 127						1 (1)						1
Pupil 111						3 (1)						3
Pupil 147									3 (1)			3
Pupil 131										3 (1)		3
Pupil 125										3 (1)		3
Pupil 173										1 (1)		1
Total	15	10	25	0	37	17	0	0	3	8	0	115

Reasons for punishments and number of strokes as stated in Punishment Book St Vedast 1979

Pupil 1	4	Lying to form master about cheating in Greek
Pupil 2	3	Smoking in school uniform at bus stop
Pupil 3	3	Rude to lady teacher in lesson
Pupil 4	3	Swearing in hearing of master
Pupil 5	3	Stealing and lying about it
Pupil 6	3	Stealing and lying about it
Pupil 7	3	Truancy: 4 days absent
	3	Same again: one day
Pupil 8	4	Truant to avoid consequences of lying to form master
	3	Persistently deliberately late
Pupil 9	3	Cheating
Pupil 10	4	Smoking
Pupil 11	5	Stealing property from another boy and lying about it

St Vedast 1980

Pupil 8	5	Truancy on last day of term and taking younger brother with him
	5	Truancy and lying
	4	Stealing and lying about it
Pupil 10	3	Lying to me
Pupil 12	3	Stink bomb
Pupil 13	3	Swearing and lying
Pupil 14	3	Missed detention and lied to master
	3	Poor behaviour in music lesson
Pupil 15	3	Lied to master
Pupil 16	3	Poor behaviour in music lesson
Pupil 17	5	Lying to master
	4	Lying to form master
	6	Stealing and lying about it
Pupil 18	4	Insolence to two master & refusal to apologise
Pupil 19	3	Misbehaviour in philosophy class
Pupil 20	6	Stealing from class mate and lying about it
Pupil 21	3	Disrupting meditation, after repeated warnings
Pupil 6	6	Stealing and lying about it

St James 1979

Pupil 22	3	Telling lies
	5	Deliberately cut detention
Pupil 23	2	Taking another boy's watch and lying to form master about it
Pupil 24	4	Stealing and lying about it
Pupil 25	3	Cheating in exam
Pupil 26	3	14 bad marks
Pupil 27	5	Rudeness to form teacher

St James 1980

Pupil 28	3	Truancy at end of term
	4	Truant again
Pupil 29	4	Lying
	3	Black marks; failing to report
Pupil 26	5	Black marks
Pupil 30	4	Black marks
Pupil 31	5	Rudeness & insolence to adults at a public lecture
Pupil 32	3	Serious lying to mother about form teacher

Pupil 33	3	Destruction of other boys' property
	6	33 BMs
Pupil 34	3	Rudeness and disobedience to member of public at Waterperry
	4	Bullying another boy telling incomplete tale of it
Pupil 35	4	Bullying another boy telling incomplete tale of it
Pupil 24	5	Bullying another boy telling incomplete tale of it
Pupil 36	3	Xs BMs
Pupil 23	3	Xs BMs
Pupil 37	3	Xs BMs
Pupil 38	5	Lying and disobedience
Pupil 39	4	Sent to HM for fooling in class after 3 warnings (to cover 10 BM also)

St James 1981

Pupil 27	3	Repeated cheek to form master
	6	Disobedience to FM; last straw
Pupil 40	3	Firing gun in lesson
	3	Walked out of school when rebuked by master
	3	Giving the school a bad name by very inconsiderate conduct
	3	Misbehaviour in lesson
Pupil 28	5	Repeated annoyance in lessons to HH
Pupil 41	3	Sent by teacher for misbehaviour in class
Pupil 42	1	Disobedience
	1	Sent by teacher for Persistent misbehaviour in class
	3	Bad marks and very poor grades
	3	15 Xs bad marks
	6	Stealing from another boy
Pupil 43	2	Insolence to master
Pupil 44	1	Sent by teacher for Persistent misbehaviour in class
Pupil 45	1	Sent by teacher for Persistent misbehaviour in class
	1	Spitting at each other
	1	Misbehaviour in lesson
Pupil 46	1	Sent by teacher for Persistent misbehaviour in class
Pupil 37	1	Sent by teacher for Persistent misbehaviour in class
Pupil 47	1	Cheating in Latin test
	1	Misbehaviour in lesson
Pupil 48	1	Cheating in Latin test
	3	Cheating and lying about it
	4	20 Xs bad marks
Pupil 38	1	Spitting at each other
	4	Erased 'rewrite' in ex book and lied about it
	3	Cheating and lying about it
Pupil 35	2	Stealing to play space game (owned up)
Pupil 34	4	Lying to head master re space game
	1	Misbehaviour while sent out of class
Pupil 49	1	Sent by teacher for trouble in lesson
Pupil 50	4	Sent by teacher for trouble in lesson
	1	Sent by teacher for trouble in lesson
Pupil 51	2	Misbehaviour in singing
	3	14 Xs bad marks
Pupil 52	2	Sent by teacher for trouble in singing
	3	15 Xs bad marks
Pupil 53	3	14 Xs bad marks
Pupil 36	3	15 Xs bad marks
	1	Misbehaviour in lesson
Pupil 54	3	Giving the school a bad name by very inconsiderate conduct
Pupil 29	3	Giving the school a bad name by very inconsiderate conduct
Pupil 55	3	Disobedience to Mr Hodgkinson
	3	Disobedience
Pupil 56	3	Swearing sotto voce at teacher

	4	15 bad marks
Pupil 57	5	Disruption of form and cheek to master
Pupil 58	5	Smoking
	4	17 bad marks
Pupil 59	1	Misbehaviour in lesson
Pupil 60	4	Misbehaviour in lesson + 10 bad marks
Pupil 61	4	Bad marks (most disobedience)
Pupil 62	1	Misbehaviour while sent out of class
Pupil 63	3	12 bad marks

St James 1982

Pupil 42	3	Lying to form master
Pupil 31	3	Cut detention for non learning
Pupil 64	3	Ditto
	3	Disobedience to a master
Pupil 55	3	Disruption to lesson and deception
Pupil 61	3	Xs bad marks
	3	Xs bad marks
	4	Fighting and breaking a window
	2	Xs bad marks (again)
Pupil 62	3	Xs bad marks
	3	Xs bad marks
Pupil 27	6	Absconding + 6 bad marks
	3	Xs bad marks
	4	Insolence to teacher
	4	Xs bad marks
Pupil 65	3	Fighting
Pupil 66	3	Fighting
Pupil 40	3	Swearing
Pupil 29	3	Dishonesty re report card + xs b. marks
	3	Xs bad marks
Pupil 63	3	Xs bad marks
	3	Disobedience to form master
Pupil 60	3	Xs bad marks
Pupil 34	3	Xs bad marks + lost report card twice
	3	Rudeness to lady teacher
Pupil 67	3	Writing remarks about master
Pupil 68	2	Fighting and breaking a window
Pupil 69	2	Written abuse of teacher
Pupil 70	3	Lying repeatedly to teacher
Pupil 58	3	Disobedience to a master
Pupil 41	3	Stealing
Pupil 36	3	Stealing
Pupil 71	1	Insolence to teacher
Pupil 57	6	Writing insulting words on teachers
Pupil 72	3	Caused fight, 12 bad marks, failed to report
Pupil 24	3	Insolence to form master
Pupil 73	5	18 bad marks and disobedience
Pupil 74	4	Xs bad marks & disobedience

St James 1983

Pupil 75	1	Lying
Pupil 29	3	Disobedience and idleness
Pupil 76	3	Rebellious obscenity in ex bk
Pupil 27	6	Disobedience + truancy
Pupil 40	3	Insolence to form master
	3	Rude to form master

	3	Pornographic drawings in lesson
Pupil 77	3	Misbehaviour in singing
Pupil 70	1	Deliberate missing of run
	3	Cut cricket match
	3	Cheating
Pupil 74	3	Rude to form master
	4	Pop music in school and subsequent truancy
Pupil 78	3	Conspiracy to cheat & lying
Pupil 79	5	Conspiracy to cheat & lying
	2	Cheating again
Pupil 24	1	Sent by singing master
Pupil 61	1	Sent by science teacher
Pupil 34	3	Disobedience, bullying and bad marks
Pupil 80	3	Stealing sponsor money
Pupil 81	3	Disturbance in law lesson
Pupil 51	3	Disturbance in law lesson
Pupil 82	3	Graffiti
Pupil 73	6	Cheating in Greek lesson
Pupil 83	3	Cheating in test
Pupil 84	3	Cut Saturday School & detention
	3	Disobedience
Pupil 85	3	Swearing at a prefect
Pupil 86	3	Cheating in test
Pupil 57	4	Swearing
Pupil 44	3	Exam paper insulting to teacher
Pupil 42	3	Insolent to prefect
	3	Cut detention and lied about it
Pupil 38	3	Walking out after 'unjust' punishment
Pupil 87	1	Xs bad marks
Pupil 39	3	Sent by master

St James 1984

Pupil 72	3	Illegal activities after school and lying about it
Pupil 40	3	Illegal activities after school and lying about it
	3	Disobedience, laziness & truculence after stern warning to class
Pupil 84	3	Refused to come to school on Saturday
Pupil 42	3	Cheating in test
	3	Cut C/T & hid in lavatory
Pupil 48	3	Fooling in class (after 'last' warning)
Pupil 79	1	Missed punishment parade
Pupil 88	3	Rude to master when on report
Pupil 85	3	Disobedient to prefect
	3	Disobedience, laziness & truculence after stern warning to class
Pupil 89	3	Disobedience, laziness & truculence after stern warning to class
Pupil 61	1	Misbehaviour in singing
	1	Sent by music teacher
	1	Sent for disturbance in Greek lesson
Pupil 90	1	Misbehaviour in singing
Pupil 91	4	Obscene scribbling in lesson
Pupil 92	1	Sent by music master (class given last warning)
Pupil 93	1	Cheating in test
Pupil 69	1	Sent by music teacher
Pupil 24	1	Sent by music teacher
	1	Insolence to master
Pupil 35	3	Ink bomb and failure to report when told
	3	Dodged circuit and lied about it
Pupil 94	3	Failed to hand in punishment (+ totally ignored homework)
	1	Swinging on gym apparatus, contrary to safety instructions
Pupil 95	1	Continual distraction in singing

	3	Disobedience to master four times running
Pupil 96	1	Cheating in test
	3	Lying to form master
Pupil 49	3	Truant for five hours, missed school + missed school Rugby match
Pupil 97	1	Swinging on gym apparatus, contrary to safety instructions

St James 1985

Pupil 95	2	Sent by singing master for disruption (after final warning) + sent by prefect
	3	Took another boy's lab coat & lied about it saying it was his
Pupil 98	3	Disobedience to master (after 2 warnings)
Pupil 41	3	Stink bomb
Pupil 53	3	Stink bomb
Pupil 94	3	Bullying
	3	Disgraceful behaviour during church service
Pupil 35	3	Bullying
	5	Disgraceful behaviour during church service
Pupil 24	3	Bullying
Pupil 90	3	Bullying
Pupil 99	3	Bullying
	3	Disgraceful behaviour during church service
Pupil 97	1	Bullying
Pupil 61	3	Disobedience many times over
	3	After many warnings, on report, late for everything
	3	Fooling repeatedly in singing
Pupil 40	6	Disobedience to a most strict instruction from headmaster re associating with a girl; plus lying about it
Pupil 85	3	Meeting girls illegally repeatedly, of which eventual consequence was obscene phone call to lady teacher
	3	Smoking during singing practice
Pupil 72	3	Meeting girls illegally repeatedly, of which eventual consequence was obscene phone call to lady teacher
	3	Smoking during singing practice
Pupil 91	3	Meeting girls illegally repeatedly, of which eventual consequence was obscene phone call to lady teacher
Pupil 71	3	Meeting girls illegally repeatedly, of which eventual consequence was obscene phone call to lady teacher
Pupil 100	3	Meeting girls illegally repeatedly, of which eventual consequence was obscene phone call to lady teacher
Pupil 101	3	Meeting girls illegally repeatedly, of which eventual consequence was obscene phone call to lady teacher
Pupil 48	3	Meeting girls illegally repeatedly, of which eventual consequence was obscene phone call to lady teacher
Pupil 102	3	Meeting girls illegally repeatedly, of which eventual consequence was obscene phone call to lady teacher
Pupil 36	3	Sent by teacher (third time in 3 days)
Pupil 103	2	Disobedient to form master
	3	Cut detention, after direct instructions by F/M
	3	Swearing on rugby field
Pupil 104	1	Silly noise in singing
Pupil 105	4	Sent twice by master after last warning
Pupil 106	3	Dishonestly putting his name on another's lab coat + lying about it
Pupil 48	3	Disobedience to Mrs Wilfred re tutorial
	4	Lying to form master
Pupil 42	4	Cut Saturday school
	6	Cheating in test, destruction of text book, failing to see master, late for games, and other minor matters
	6	Cut lunch (though on report) + total disregard for rules & accumulation of disrespect for staff inc. headmaster
	4	Smoking and other misdemeanours
Pupil 76	4	Cut Saturday school

	3	Cut detention
Pupil 107	1	Sent by singing master
Pupil 108	1	Lying to a prefect
	3	Bad language
Pupil 109	1	Rude to lady teacher
	1	Bad misbehaviour in lesson
Pupil 110	3	Stealing from local shop
Pupil 111	3	Cheating
Pupil 112	6	Cut lunch (though on report) + total disregard for rules & accumulation of disrespect for staff inc. headmaster
	3	Smoking
	6	Smoking <u>again</u>
Pupil 113	6	Cut lunch (though on report) + total disregard for rules & accumulation of disrespect for staff inc. headmaster
Pupil 114	1	Bad misbehaviour in lesson
Pupil 75	1	Repeated offence for which just punished by master
	3	Assaulted a younger boy
Pupil 115	3	Firework in school (report for that) + gross misbehaviour following it
Pupil 116	3	Disrespect for form master
Pupil 117	1	Swinging on apparatus when no master present
Pupil 118	5	Disgraceful behaviour during church service

St James 1986

Pupil 119	3	Stole £3 from another boy
Pupil 120	3	Stole £3 from another boy
	3	Lying to headmaster about lines
	3	Disobedience four times over
Pupil 121	3	Disobedience
	4	Bad marks (after warning) and lying about it
	3	Disobedience (oft repeated) to prefect
	5	Ignored punishment set by headmaster, plus continued distraction of class
	3	Shocking report
Pupil 42	6	Serious rudeness to lady, & lying about it
	3	Letting off CS gas in the kitchen
	4	Disobedience to form master
	5	Failed to report to H/M when told to do so. Original offence was disobedience. Cut C/T following day
	4	Smoking in street - to nuisance of locals
Pupil 84	3	Disobedience (cut boat race deliberately, after special warnings)
Pupil 122	3	Disobedience (cut boat race deliberately, after special warnings)
Pupil 123	4	Smoking
Pupil 124	3	Rude to form master (after warning)
Pupil 110	3	Disobedience to master - three times
Pupil 125	1	Swinging on apparatus illegally
Pupil 126	3	Double truancy & much trouble to parents
Pupil 127	3	Double truancy & much trouble to parents
	1	Cut circuit
	1	Deliberate avoidance of C/T
Pupil 128	6	Serious misconduct on several occasions, & idleness throughout, while on report
	1	Cut circuit
	6	Disobedience
Pupil 103	3	Disobedience to form master
	3	Obscene behaviour
Pupil 75	3	Flicked elastic band at boy's eye in lesson
Pupil 129	3	Disobeyed form master
Pupil 130	4	Ignored punishment set by headmaster, plus continued distraction of class
Pupil 131	6	Smoking an lying repeatedly about it to headmaster
	3	Smoking in café, aided & abetted by elder brother
Pupil 48	5	Failed to report to H/M when told to do so. Original offence was disobedience. Cut C/T following day

	4	Smoking in street - to nuisance of locals
Pupil 93	1	Sent by master for rudeness
Pupil 111	5	Bad case of bullying
Pupil 132	6	Bad case of bullying
Pupil 94	3	Smoking in café, aided & abetted by <u>elder</u> brother
Pupil 96	3	Deliberate avoidance of C/T
Pupil 133	3	Deliberate avoidance of C/T
Pupil 134	1	Deliberate avoidance of C/T
Pupil 135	1	Deliberate avoidance of C/T
Pupil 136	3	Disobedience (several warnings)
Pupil 137	3	Disobedience (to prefect) but after last warning
Pupil 138	1	Dirty words in ex bk
Pupil 76	4	Smoking in street - to nuisance of locals
Pupil 53	4	Smoking in street - to nuisance of locals

St James 1987

Pupil 84	3	Cut detention deliberately after 2 reminders
Pupil 139	3	Very rude to prefect
Pupil 61	3	Disobedience on very many occasions
	1	Report card lost (again); much trouble caused
Pupil 90	4	Flick knife in school; dishonesty; & trying to obtain money by menace
Pupil 93	3	Sent by master
Pupil 140	1	Sent (twice) by staff within an hour
	3	Bullying (i.e. deliberately destroying a boy's property to annoy him) immediately after warning by HM
Pupil 75	1	Cut circuit
	3	Twice cut detention for same master
Pupil 141	1	'borrowing' games clothes from a younger boy
Pupil 103	3	Provision of - and enthusiastic reading of - pornography on school coach
	4	Cut detention
Pupil 116	1	Enthusiastic reading of - pornography on school coach
	3	Excessive misbehaviour in Latin lesson
Pupil 142	1	Enthusiastic reading of - pornography on school coach
Pupil 143	1	Enthusiastic reading of - pornography on school coach
Pupil 144	1	Enthusiastic reading of - pornography on school coach
Pupil 117	4	Threw pepper in another boy's eyes
	3	Cheating in Greek test
Pupil 110	3	Disobeyed prefect twice and called him a "Paki"
	3	Very rude to master
Pupil 118	3	Idleness & and bad language to master
Pupil 145	3	Swearing
Pupil 131	3	Blowing chalk dust in a boy's eye, in lesson
	3	Lying to his mother in order to stay at theatre after school production, & deliberate late arrival next day
	3	Using a water squirt in lesson
Pupil 94	4	Lied (persistently) to form master
	3	Smoking
Pupil 132	3	Rude to master
Pupil 109	3	Excessive misbehaviour in Latin lesson
Pupil 35	3	Smoking
Pupil 146	3	Bad language - lots of
Pupil 127	3	Bullying (i.e. deliberately destroying a boy's property to annoy him) immediately after warning by HM
Pupil 147	3	Bullying (i.e. deliberately destroying a boy's property to annoy him) immediately after warning by HM
Pupil 135	3	Bullying (i.e. deliberately destroying a boy's property to annoy him) immediately after warning by HM
Pupil 148	1	Cheating in test
	3	Cheating in test
Pupil 111	4	(1) Swore at prefect (2) cut games

Pupil 149	3	Swearing on Rugby pitch
Pupil 121	3	Swearing on Rugby pitch
Pupil 115	3	Disobedience (straight refusal) to master
Pupil 104	3	Obscene literature on Rugby coach
Pupil 150	6	Shoplifting. Shop decided not to prosecute if school dealing

St James 1988

Pupil 151	1	Swearing in class
Pupil 152	3	Bullying younger boys
	1	Sent by singing master
Pupil 138	3	Same offence: parents raised possible objection (agreed 26/1)
Pupil 153	3	Cheating in Greek test
Pupil 115	5	Spreading disgraceful rumours about his friends, & then denying responsibility
	4	Cheating in test
Pupil 154	3	Minor offences, repeated after several warnings
	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
	4	Bad case of stealing: these three conspired together to steal from another boy in their own class - & lied about it. <u>Witness: WR</u>
Pupil 155	3	Hiding conduct book & not owning up for long time
	6	Writing extremely obscene and malicious reports about another member of their class, implying also insults on staff + (in DF's case) lying on another occasion
	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
	4	Bad case of stealing: these three conspired together to steal from another boy in their own class - & lied about it. <u>Witness: WR</u>
Pupil 156	3	Ducked school Sat am to play ice hockey
Pupil 157	4	Writing extremely obscene and malicious reports about another member of their class, implying also insults on staff
Pupil 137	4	Writing extremely obscene and malicious reports about another member of their class, implying also insults on staff
Pupil 124	4	Writing extremely obscene and malicious reports about another member of their class, implying also insults on staff
Pupil 158	4	Writing extremely obscene and malicious reports about another member of their class, implying also insults on staff
Pupil 159	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
Pupil 160	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
	4	Bad case of stealing: these three conspired together to steal from another boy in their own class - & lied about it. <u>Witness: WR</u>
Pupil 161	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
Pupil 84	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
Pupil 162	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
Pupil 163	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
Pupil 142	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
Pupil 164	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
	1	Cheating in Latin test
Pupil 165	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
	3	Extremely insulting to prefect
Pupil 166	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
Pupil 167	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
Pupil 168	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
Pupil 169	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
	1	Talking out of turn - sent by FM
Pupil 108	3	Misbehaving in lesson (while on conduct report - 2nd offence)
Pupil 170	1	Sent by singing master
Pupil 171	1	Sent by singing master

Pupil 172	5	Frequently, and obscenely, insulting younger boys' mothers in order to annoy them
Pupil 148	1	Sent by singing master
Pupil 127	1	Sent by singing master
Pupil 111	3	Stealing leaves out of Mr Bedford's book, thus preventing others from using it, and lying about it
Pupil 147	3	Very rude to master
Pupil 131	3	Ditto [Cheating in Latin test]
Pupil 125	3	Smoking
Pupil 173	1	Rioting immediately after warning