



THE **TITUS** TRUST

Titus Trust

Documents relating to the Titus Trust's response to John Smyth's abuse

20 August 2021

- Statement from Titus Trust Trustees
- Timeline of matters relating to the Titus Trust's response to John Smyth's abuse
- FAQs

Statement from Trustees

We continue to reflect deeply on how we have responded to the appalling abuse that was carried out by John Smyth, both in the UK and in southern Africa. We are grateful to all those who have spoken frankly to us about how they have seen us respond, especially in light of the strong links which exist between the Iwerne Camps of the 1970s and 1980s and those camps run by the Titus Trust today.

We recognise that at times we have failed to show our concern for the victims and survivors of John Smyth's abuse. The welfare of every victim and survivor should always have been our main priority. We can see that we could have done more, perhaps alongside independent experts, to reach out to victims and survivors and work with them in shaping our responses. In seeking properly to discharge our regulatory duties and in establishing that we did not have legal responsibility for Smyth's abuse, we have not always displayed all the Christian love and compassion that should be expected of an organisation committed to making the Christian gospel known. We are deeply sorry for the additional pain that we caused for a number of these men and their families.

We believe that it is vital for the truth to be made known in a case like this. This is especially important for those who have suffered so much harm. We continue to believe that the best way for us to play our part in this process is through the review that the Church of England has commissioned Keith Makin to carry out. However, the publication of that review will be subject to delay and in the interests of seeking to be wholly transparent about the role and actions of the Trust during the period in question we are now publishing a timeline showing when the Trust became aware of John Smyth's actions, how much we knew and how we responded. We are also providing answers to questions and allegations that have been raised about these matters. All of this information has been provided to Keith Makin, who has welcomed our response and confirmed that it will not impede his review. We continue to co-operate fully with him and humbly look forward to the publication of his review and to learning from his findings.

We hope that this information will show that, while we readily acknowledge that we have made mistakes, there has not been – as some have suggested – any cover-up on our part. James Stileman (our former Operations Director), other former and current staff and former trustees, and others have been significantly misrepresented through numerous untrue statements and misleading speculations.

Our timeline and our answers to questions are published alongside this statement. The timeline focuses in detail on the period from 2012 through to John Smyth's death in August 2018. It includes a number of things that we wish we had done differently. The timeline shows that police and safeguarding authorities were involved from 2013 onwards. But we wish, for instance, that more questions had been asked within the Trust before summer 2014. For example, when, in December 2013, the then Chair of the Trust made a reference to something he 'was dealing with', all trustees should have insisted on knowing the nature and seriousness of the matter. We are sorry about this too.

Looking back, we wish that information about what John Smyth had done had been shared with other trustees before it was. While we recognise that such matters were often handled very differently 40 years ago, we certainly believe that Smyth's abuse should have been reported to the authorities when it was first discovered in 1982. But once the wider body of trustees became aware of what John Smyth had done in June 2014, they acted swiftly in seeking and following the best legal advice available, including ensuring that information was reported to the relevant authorities.

We are ultimately accountable to the Lord, as well as to others, for the way that we have responded to these matters. We are grateful for the contact we have had, and continue to have, with a number of the victims and survivors of John Smyth's abuse. We recognise that they have very different wishes and needs. We have sought to provide appropriate assistance including contributing, from March 2017, to a joint fund (with the Church of England and Scripture Union) to pay for counselling. We hope and pray that this has been of some help, but we recognise more fully now that the consequences of John Smyth's actions have a long and ongoing impact for the victims and survivors and we will therefore be approaching those who we can reach to see whether there is any further help that we may be able to provide. We welcome any of them to be in touch with us and we are sorry that we did not do more, sooner.

Titus Trust – Timeline of matters relating to the Titus Trust’s response to John Smyth abuse

The following timeline is not a comprehensive timeline relating to the abuse carried out by John Smyth. The timeline relates to the involvement of the Titus Trust when reports resurfaced in 2012 and through to his death in 2018. The timeline should be read in conjunction with the Trust’s Q&A, which are published alongside this timeline. Some historical detail relating to Smyth is included at the point in the timeline that the Trust were reporting it to the relevant authorities.

Date	Event or Activity
Background	<p>During the time of John Smyth’s (JS) abuse, the Iwerne camps were organised and operated by staff employed by Scripture Union as part of its independent schools work. Smyth was a Trustee of SU between 1971-79. The situation with regards to the oversight of the camps was complex. The Iwerne Trust, formed in 1945 and a charity from 1963, funded the employment of SU’s independent schools staff. Smyth was the Iwerne Trust’s chairman in a voluntary capacity from 1974 or 1975 until 1982 when his abuse became known. He had attended holiday camps as a volunteer leader.</p> <p>James Stileman’s (JSt) disclosure to police in September 2014 (see below) records what happened when JS’s activities were discovered in 1982. (A redacted copy of JSt’s e-mailed disclosure to the police is attached as an appendix to this timeline.)</p> <p>As has been documented extensively elsewhere, and is mentioned in this timeline, Smyth moved to Africa in 1984 and continued to carry out similar abuses.</p>
1 Dec 1997	<p>Titus Trust (TT) set up as a charity and company, and the Iwerne Trust’s (IT) assets were gifted across.</p> <p>TT took on financing of the Scripture Union (SU) Independent Schools work from IT.</p>
1 Jan 2000	<p>The Titus Trust took on the responsibility of running camps and employing staff fully from 2000, on the retirement of Tim Sterry (TS), head of Scripture Union in Independent Schools. The Iwerne Trust became inactive, with only two remaining trustees (Giles Rawlinson – ‘GR’ - and David Fletcher – ‘DF’). It was kept open to receive legacies, and any other gifts received for the work, but had no other continuing function. DF and GR stood down as trustees of the Titus Trust in January 2015, and a year later it was decided that there was no continuing need for the IT, because it no longer served its remaining purpose of receiving legacies or gifts for the work, so it was closed at that point.</p>
2000-2012	<p>Between 2000 and 2012, there was no reference to any specific historical abuse issue in the minutes of any TT Trustees’ meeting. There was also no mention of John Smyth’s name in the minutes of any TT Trustees’ meeting in this time period.</p>
20 Oct 2012	<p>Following the death of the broadcaster Jimmy Savile in 2011, and revelations about his past, Anne Atkins (‘AA’) published an article in the Daily Mail in the run-up to the first anniversary of his death. It highlighted her knowledge of an unnamed ‘eminent lawyer with considerable influence in a well-known public school’, who had beaten boys in his shed following Bible study. This article was picked up by the Church Times and other media. Various parties encouraged AA to report the matter to relevant authorities, which she later reported that she had done. The lawyer was not named in the article but was John Smyth.</p>

Date	Event or Activity
8 Nov 2012	<p>A person ('R1') with links to Iwerne camps contacted the Trust Manager by email. She reported that the lawyer in the AA article was John Smyth ('JS'), and gave no further details but suggested that JS's activity had been criminal. She wrote: '... if you don't know about the case then your Trustees will tell you about it.' She asked whether 'this extreme form of discipleship is no longer operated?'</p> <p>The Trust Manager replied that day, saying that 'the sort of discipling with which you are concerned is not how we care for those that attend the holidays now.'</p>
6 Dec 2012	<p>R1 contacted the Trust Manager to ask 'has this historic situation been investigated/faced up to?' in the light of recent approaches to matters of abuse. The Trust Manager forwarded the email trail to three trustees (GR, who was the then Chair of the Trust; DF; and another trustee who was the then Vice-Chair and Safeguarding Trustee) as well as three other senior Trust employees.</p> <p>The then Vice-Chair and Safeguarding Trustee responded by email that he 'is vaguely aware of issues dating back 20+ years in connection with JS' and Winchester College, and that links JS had 'with camp were stopped.' <i>[NB. At this stage, neither the Vice-Chair/Safeguarding Trustee nor GR had read the 'Ruston report'.]</i></p>
25 Jan 2013	<p>The Trust Manager sent R1 an email, drafted in full by GR, including the following two paragraphs:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">'I can confirm that a specific investigation has been carried out by the Trustees since your enquiry, and they are assured that this matter was handled at the time, and that no criminal activity occurred.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">In the light of the Jimmy Savile revelations, the Trustees are also very mindful of their responsibilities in regard to the young people and young adults under their care, and therefore are also carrying out a review to ensure there are no other matters from the past which should be investigated further.'</p> <p><i>[NB. This email was discovered on 3 February 2017 (see below) when R1 forwarded it back to the Trust after the JS abuse was publicised by Channel 4. There is no evidence of a specific investigation having been carried out by the whole board of Trustees since R1's enquiry on 6 December 2012 and the wider Trustee body was not aware of R1's query regarding JS's abuse and potentially criminal activity. The only Trustees with knowledge of the correspondence were GR, DF and the then Vice-Chair and Safeguarding Trustee.</i></p> <p><i>This email was reviewed by GR in the summer of 2021. He has said that he acknowledges that saying that a 'specific investigation has been carried out by the trustees' could be misconstrued as meaning that the investigation had involved the whole Trustee body, when in fact it had only involved DF, the Vice-Chair/Safeguarding Trustee and the Trust Manager. However he notes that he reported this matter to the whole board of trustees at its next meeting on 12 Mar 2013 (see below), although the specific details were withheld, because at that point he had not read the Ruston Report, and he wanted to protect the victims.</i></p> <p><i>While no further evidence has been identified in minutes or emails that supports GR's assertion, he says that he believes that a subset of trustees and senior staff would have been asked to 'carry out a review to ensure that there are no other matters from the past which should be investigated further'.</i></p> <p><i>GR has said that he 'wishes to apologise to R1 and the other trustees at the time because the language in the two paragraphs [of the e-mail that he drafted] was less than crystal clear and unambiguous.'</i></p>

Date	Event or Activity
12 Mar 2013	<p>Trustees' meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 'Any Other Business' a reference was made to the October 2012 AA article, along with a reference to "the Winchester affair" and an enquiry from an external party. GR reported that the matter had been dealt with. There was no mention of historic abuse. Nothing was minuted, and the nature and the relevance of the issue to most trustees was not clear.
1 Sep 2013	<p>James Stileman (JSt) was employed in the role of Trust Operations Director. The Trust Manager left after a handover.</p>
5 Nov 2013	<p>JSt was called by the Bishop of Ely's Safeguarding Advisor (ESA), regarding two victims of abuse (V1 and V2) by JS in the late 1970s and early 1980s. She communicated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the nature and severity of the abuse, and that there had been a suicide attempt. – that young men were befriended on camp and invited to JS's home in Winchester. – that psychiatric help was offered to all at the time by Mark Ruston ('MR'). <i>[NB Having spoken to a victim we now understand this was not the case for some victims]</i> – that the Bishop of Ely (Stephen Conway) had contacted the Bishop of Cape Town, where JS lived. – that Cambridge and Chichester police had been informed and had advised that criminal proceedings were unlikely, given the extradition arrangements, the length of time, and because victims were not a vulnerable group. – that ESA had spoken to the National Anglican and Methodist Safeguarding Advisor, who knew something of the incident and suggested ESA contact TT. – ESA asked whether TT might be able to pay for counselling for V2. <p>JSt arranged to meet with GR at the earliest opportunity, which was the following week.</p>
12 Nov 2013	<p>JSt met DF and, separately, GR. DF identified V2 from his Christian name. He also noted that V1 had called him a fortnight before.</p> <p>GR produced what was later known as 'the Ruston Report' the sole document in an envelope which TS had given him on his retirement from SU (when giving GR this envelope, TS had explained that it was about JS and agreed with GR that it should not be opened until there was a need to do so). GR had not opened the envelope until this time. He and JSt read the report and saw that it fitted with what the ESA had said.</p>

Date	Event or Activity
13 Nov 2013	<p>DF and GR had decided they wanted to help V2 but would pay for the counselling themselves as private individuals as TT had not existed at the time of the abuse and therefore it was inappropriate to ask TT to pay for counselling. There was a concern not to inform more people than necessary to protect the identity of victims and therefore they felt it was inappropriate to tell all the TT trustees. ESA had made clear that the matter had been notified to the police.</p> <p>JSt spoke with DF and agreed that JSt would call V1.</p> <p>JSt spoke to ESA who had identified a suitable counsellor and wished to know about funding. GR and DF had asked JSt to arrange the payments on their behalf and had said that they would reimburse him. JSt offered for private individuals (GR and DF, not the IT or TT, as TT was not responsible for what had happened) to pay for 10 counselling sessions for V2 directly. ESA would let V1 and V2 know that funding had been obtained, so JSt did not call V1. Counselling commenced soon afterwards.</p>
7 Dec 2013	<p>Trustees' meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GR made a comment under AOB, alluding to an historical matter which he, JSt and DF were dealing with. Some trustees recall that the name JS was mentioned with passing reference to an AA article, but no detail was given. No detailed minute was taken, except to note that an issue relating to an historical matter had been mentioned by the Chair.
17 Mar 2014	<p>JSt spoke with the counsellor, who informed him that V2's counselling was progressing.</p> <p>JSt said that the invoice for the counselling should come to him and he would pay personally. JSt made it clear to the counsellor that the offer to pay was not made by TT.</p>
19 May 2014	<p>The counsellor emailed JSt to request further counselling sessions for V2. Further funding would be required.</p>
20-30 May 2014	<p>JSt discussed the agenda of the next TT Trustees' meeting with GR and suggested that the latest request for funding for counselling should be raised with Trustees. GR agreed and would speak to DF before meeting on 10 June.</p>

Date	Event or Activity
10 Jun 2014	<p>Trustees' meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the meeting was again given to discussions about structure and governance which had been underway over the course of several meetings. GR had been a Trustee since 1997 and Chair since then too. He stated his intention to step down as Chair, ideally once a successor Chair was in place. • Towards the end of the meeting, under safeguarding matters, JSt and GR thought that a "safeguarding matter which had been alluded to in the December meeting ought to be discussed further with trustees": <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The approach by JS victim V2 via ESA was explained, and that JSt, GR and DF had agreed that "sympathetic individuals", not the TT, would provide some private funding of counselling. <i>[NB. It is unclear when the other trustees discovered that the sympathetic individuals were GR and DF: months or years later, although they were certainly aware of this by the time Barlow Robbins' legal advice was circulated in September 2014 (see below).]</i> – The incident (where JS had beaten V2, who was over 18 at the time) had taken place in the late 1970s, not at camp, although the perpetrator, JS, had been a leader at Iwerne camps. When it came to light, the victims were offered psychiatric treatment. JS had departed to Africa soon afterwards. <i>[NB It has since become apparent that JS left for Zimbabwe two years later, in 1984.]</i> – Although the victim was a consenting adult, the beating could be regarded as criminal assault as blood was drawn. – GR noted that he had a copy of Mark Ruston's report on the matter, which had been passed to him by TS. – DF did not want the issue brought to light, at least in part because the victims were men who he believed wanted the abuse kept private. But some trustees were concerned that it might be wrongly perceived that they were seeking to protect the reputation of the Trust by hiding this information. There was frustration from the other trustees that they had not been informed previously about the approach from V2 and, more generally, the JS abuse. • GR was instructed by trustees to share what had been given to him by TS. JSt was instructed to engage legal advisors, advise insurers and to keep the trustees updated on a day-to-day basis.
30 Jun 2014	<p>JSt had a first conversation with a charity safeguarding lawyer at Barlow Robbins ('BR') solicitors, explaining matters at a high level and to explore BR's suitability to advise the Trust in a complex historical abuse situation.</p>
1 Jul 2014	<p>GR and JSt met and GR shared the Ruston report from the envelope and some accompanying documents.</p>

Date	Event or Activity
1 Jul 2014	<p>JSt's Update 1 to Trustees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contents of the envelope and accompanying documents included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – What became termed the Ruston Report (written in 1982, not 1981 as noted by JSt) – A copy of the 20 October 2012 AA article from the Mail – The email exchange between R1 and the former Trust Manager up until 6 December 2012 • Based on school recommendations and their expertise on safeguarding matters, JSt outlined his plan to approach BR for advice and assistance.
2 Jul 2014	<p>JSt met with DF to fill in the gaps in JSt's understanding of the Ruston Report, including that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The author had been Mark Ruston ('MR'), rector of the Round Church, Cambridge. – There were seven recipients of the original report, including DF and Tim Sterry. – The report mentioned 'S', victim-turned-perpetrator (V3) who had become JS's accomplice.
4 Jul 2014	<p>JSt met with BR to discuss the possibility of them becoming TT's legal advisers on these matters given their expertise in abuse and safeguarding. No papers were passed, as the trustees would first need to appoint BR formally. However, there was informal discussion including the following key areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The 1970s activity was likely to have been criminal as it appeared that four victims had been under 18 and still at school. BR would need more details to advise. – SU and the TT's Insurers should be put on notice. <p>JSt informed the Trust's Insurers.</p>
7 Jul 2014	<p>JSt's Update 2 to Trustees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of JSt and DF meeting on 2 July, as noted above. • Summary of meeting with BR on 4 July, as noted above. Trustees requested to advise JSt on whether to proceed with BR's appointment. • Note regarding meeting with Insurers.

Date	Event or Activity
11 Jul 2014	<p>JSt's Update 3 to Trustees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement to engage BR. • JSt will pull together a pack containing all he knows, with supporting information, to be circulated in numbered hard copy to all trustees. • To protect the identity of victims, JSt's report will exclude any names. • JSt confirmed that the AOB comment in the Trustee minutes of 7 December 2013 referred to the approach for counselling help. • BR had suggested that it might be appropriate for JSt to make contact with V2 to encourage him to disclose to the police. JSt to discuss further with BR about a possible meeting with V2.
22-24 Jul 2014	<p>Each trustee received a special delivery package of a numbered copy of JSt's full report <i>[NB. Some dates in the report were slightly inaccurate - in particular, references to '1981' should have said '1982']</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A covering letter and index (2 pages) - A summary for Trustees (3 pages) - The Ruston Report (3 pages) - The AA article (9 pages) - The correspondence with R1 and relating to R1's enquiry up until 6 December 2012 <i>[NB. ie not including the response provided by Trust Manager to R1 on 25 January 2013]</i> (5 pages) - A log of JSt's discussions and actions from ESA's call on 5 November 2013 through to 4 July 2014 (7 pages). - Other unrelated Trust matters (6 pages). <p><i>[NB. As in all organisations specialising in work with children, safeguarding and potential safeguarding issues were flagged when they arose. There were two other potential issues that trustees were dealing with at that time. These were numbered 2 and 3 on the cover letter with the documentation and were entirely unrelated to JS. These were the two issues addressed in the final six pages of JSt's report.]</i></p>
4 Aug 2014	<p>JSt's Update 4 to Trustees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation that all Trustees (except two – both presumed on holiday) had received the report. • ESA had proposed (and BR had agreed) that it would be appropriate for JSt and a Trustee (possibly as the Trustee with special responsibility for safeguarding) to meet with V2. She also proposed that proactivity would be good, to “minimise potential criticism of covering up”.

Date	Event or Activity
19 Aug 2014	<p>JSt's Update 5 to Trustees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GR and DF had proposed that DF should be the trustee to accompany JSt on meeting with V2. JSt had informed BR who were content for the meeting to go ahead.
2 Sep 2014	BR issued draft legal advice letter to JSt for review
5 Sep 2014	<p>ESA emailed JSt following her conversation with V2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – V2 did not wish to meet JSt and DF, or indeed to have any contact with anyone from the TT. – V2 wanted to know whether the TT had knowledge of allegations about JS's activities in Zimbabwe where a boy had died, or of that death. – V2 concerned that JS was "sent into exile" in the 1980s and that his abuse had been "swept under the carpet". He wanted to know what steps were put in place to prevent further abuse. <p>ESA's email noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Bishop of Ely had contacted the Bishop of Cape Town to warn him about JS and to establish a link between ESA and the Cape Town safeguarding advisor. – ESA had taken advice from local police and the Crown Prosecution Service, but "for legal reasons they felt there was insufficient evidence, especially after all this time, to get through the hoops for investigation and possible extradition". ESA therefore noted that her attempts to pursue matters further had failed. – ESA's impression was that V2 "believes there was a concerted cover-up by the organisation, despite the support that was offered to the original victims of Smyth at the time".
13 Sep 2014	<p>JSt's Update 6 to Trustees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESA had been instructed by V2 that he did not wish to meet JSt and DF or to have any contact with anyone from the TT.
24 Sep 2014	<p>JSt's Update 7 to Trustees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BR's first full piece of legal commentary and advice issued earlier on 24 September 2014 (a finalised version of the draft letter provided to JSt for comment on 2 September 2014): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – BR advised that the current trustees have a duty of care to TT...and that they must act in good faith, protect charity assets and act in the best interests of the charity. – BR draw a significant difference between GR/DF (who had known something as evidenced by their willingness to fund V2's counselling) and the other trustees who had just found out about the JS matters. – BR suggest that GR and DF should not take part in ongoing discussions relating to the JS matters.

Date	Event or Activity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● BR advised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A report to the police, in particular as the Ruston Report suggests that minors were involved, which may not be known to the Cambridge and Chichester police forces who were already aware of these matters – A serious incident report to the Charity Commission – Seeking external support in managing the public’s interest in the matter – Informing SU – Notify former trustees of the IT – Review conflicts of interest – Review and update relevant policies ● BR assisted with correspondence with V2, resulting in an intention for DF and JSt to meet with him. However, V2 declined the meeting and instead requested written responses to questions.
25 Sep 2014	Following the legal advice and conversations with some other trustees, one trustee asked JSt to take specific legal advice on whether it would be appropriate to ask DF and GR to stand down.
26 Sep 2014	JSt contacted Hampshire police by phone and agreed a date to meet with them on 30 September.
29 Sep 2014	<p>JSt letter to ESA responding to her email queries of 5 September:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – To the best of the Trust’s knowledge, “until JS’s abuse became known to a small number of people in 1981, no camp staff or indeed anyone else connected with the camps knew anything about JS’s alleged activities, which it is believed took place away from the holiday camps.” <i>[NB: the year should have been 1982]</i> – By way of explanation: SU ran the camps; the Iwerne Trust had raised funds for staff expenses and holiday equipment. – As soon as JS’s activities came to the attention of DF (then the SU employee responsible for running the Iwerne camps), DF and MR conducted an investigation, during which they conveyed that Iwerne condemned what JS had done. – Armed with the information gleaned, DF challenged JS and he was required to account for himself before a group of senior leaders, but declined to attend. – DF proactively informed and warned various people and organisations about JS, including the Headmaster of Winchester College; SU; the Council of the Lawyers Christian Fellowship; the leader of a church JS tried to join; the Stewards Trust; and Church Society.

Date	Event or Activity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It appeared that the principal reason why JS was not reported to the police was because the young men interviewed by DF and MR felt that it was in their best interests not to make it public. Furthermore, the environment was different: corporal punishment was normal in schools at the time, and it was understood that the young men had consented. No-one who became aware of the allegations in 1982 (within Iwerne or other organisations) considered that it should be reported. By 2014 the safeguarding environment was very different. <i>[NB. We now understand that there might have been at least one person who was aware of the allegations in 1982 who did advise MR to report the matter to the police.]</i> - Regarding JS’s departure to Zimbabwe and South Africa: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ JSt understood that a senior Iwerne leader had written to JS in 1981 and suggested he may wish to consider leaving the UK and that he must stop working with young people. JS was an ex-trustee of the IT and ex-volunteer leader at Iwerne – those involved in running the camps had no authority over him. <i>[NB. We have subsequently been told that the leader in question did not advise JS to go overseas.]</i> ▪ DF did hear about beatings at a camp in Zimbabwe in the 1980s – a clergyman from there contacted DF and DF informed him about the allegations relating to JS in the UK. No-one involved in running Iwerne had heard about a boy dying at a camp in Zimbabwe until AA’s 2012 article. - Although the Trustees were aware that the police appear to have been notified about JS’s abuse at least twice already, they had instructed JSt to submit a report. In conclusion, JSt noted: “We at Titus Trust will do what we can to assist the police both in the UK and in South Africa.” <p>JSt confirmed that ESA may show the letter to V2, and asked ESA to inform him that DF, the Trustees and JSt are “deeply grieved by what we have been told has happened to [V2] and by his suffering and distress over the years.”</p>
30 Sep 2014	<p>JSt met with two Metropolitan Police Constables (arranged by Hants Police as JSt lived in London):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - JSt provided an oral report; date of discovery of the abuse was incorrectly relayed as 1981 instead of 1982. Having reported these details, JSt asked what the police wanted him to hand over. He was told that the information he had given was a “third party report”, and that, because the police did not know if the victim who approached the Trust wished to press charges, it was best if JSt gave him the crime reference number so he could get in touch if he wanted to. The police asked JSt to send the summary pages that he had used to brief them by email, but to remove any names of victims and to make it clear that the beatings had not taken place on the holiday camps. <p>Later in the day JSt emailed a summary of the matters reported, including the key facts from the Ruston Report plus additional background information. A redacted version of this emailed report to police is included as an Appendix to this timeline.</p> <p>The police received the email and called JSt asking for JS’s Winchester address, which JSt did not have.</p> <p>JSt contacted the National Director (NDSU) of SU to make them aware of the JS matters reported.</p>

Date	Event or Activity
2 Oct 2014	<p>Trustees' meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A special meeting of the Trust took place without GR present (so the meeting could discuss the chairmanship), organised with the intention of addressing governance and structure issues. • Iain Broomfield ('IB') was unanimously asked to take on the role as Chair of the Trust. • The meeting discussed whether DF and GR should stay on the Board in the light of recent events.
3 Oct 2014	<p>JSt's Update 8 received by Trustees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JSt had responded to ESA. • Noted that the police would not engage with the issue of V2 reporting as he had not come forward to them. However, the whole matter was to be referred to Hampshire CID "to decide whether to pursue", although JSt had been advised that they "are likely to take it seriously". • Advised that SU had been notified and that he planned to call their media advisor. • Serious Incident Reporting was with BR for their advice.
7 Oct 2014	<p>Trustees' meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GR was absent due to ill-health. • The meeting was informed that IB would be taking over as Chairman at the AGM on 29 November 2014. • It was also agreed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – GR and DF should be excluded from discussions relating to JS on grounds of conflict of interest (a commitment not to bring these matters into the public domain vs the Trust's obligation to address properly what had become known to them); and – GR and DF's position as trustees should be considered carefully prior to the AGM.
16 Oct 2014	<p>JSt emailed IB and another trustee with BR's advice that GR and DF should step down. This would address the conflicts of interest and demonstrate a desire to deal transparently with matters.</p>
17 Oct 2014	<p>Having discovered JS's former address near Winchester, JSt was able to provide this to Hampshire Police.</p>

Date	Event or Activity
25 Oct 2014	<p>JSt provided Update 9 to Trustees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serious Incident Report is ready to be filed with the Charity Commission • SU recommended that their media adviser would be well-suited to advise the Trust in preparation for any future publicity. The potential conflict with SU was noted. However, the media adviser was familiar with the independent schools ministry and the camps' history, having served on the SU Independent Schools Committee overseeing the Northern camps in the early 1990s.
29 Oct 2014	<p>JSt filed the Serious Incident Report with the Charity Commission</p>
30 Oct 2014	<p>JSt was contacted by Hampshire Police. The officer had read the AA article. JSt provided the officer with pages from "Road to Winchester", the autobiography of the former Winchester College headmaster John Thorn, who had been in his role when the abuse came to light in 1982. The book mentioned JS's abuse (referencing, but not actually naming JS) on p.154.</p>
29 Nov 2014	<p>Trustees' meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the Trustees' meeting following the AGM (at which IB took over as Chairman from GR) GR and DF were unanimously asked to stand down. • It was noted that the Serious Incident Report had been submitted to the Charity Commission.
11 Dec 2014	<p>JSt met with National Director of SU (NDSU) and the media adviser. The media adviser was engaged on a retainer to support the Trust with PR matters and was provided with copies of JS related papers, including JSt's report of July 2014, the Ruston Report, and the BR legal advice.</p>
15 Dec 2014	<p>Letter dated 2 December from V2 (with a covering note from ESA dated 11 December) received by JSt and then circulated to Trustees by JSt – key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – V2 never wanted to be identified and never wants to be contacted directly by the Trust, only via ESA. – V2 considered that the common thread for every individual abused by JS was Iwerne, albeit some were recruited from Cambridge University. JS's "position at Iwerne, his status as a leader at Iwerne, gave him the respectability, the platform". – V2 raised concerns about what had been done to prevent ongoing abuse in Africa. – V2 asked whether "there had been any oversight of the other perpetrator" (identified in the Ruston report as "S"), who he noted was "still ... working with young boys". <p>JSt called ESA to acknowledge receipt and note that, as V2 had indicated that he would write again shortly, he would plan to reply once the subsequent expected letter was also received.</p>
16 Dec 2014	<p>JSt shared the letter from V2 with BR and media adviser.</p>
16 Dec 2014	<p>JSt started the process of contacting and informing the former IT trustees.</p>
17 Dec 2014	<p>TT receive an e-mail response from the Charity Commission, confirming that they have no regulatory concerns about the TT.</p>

Date	Event or Activity
24 Dec 2014	<p>JSt and a trustee correspond over the matter of JS's accomplice(victim-turned-perpetrator) 'S', and whether the Trust had acted appropriately in regard to V2's letter re S's work with children.</p> <p>JSt noted that, since his July report, he had learned the identity of S and that he worked with children.</p> <p>JSt clarified that he had informed the police on 30 September 2014 that S, initially only a victim 'would often administer beatings alongside JS' but eventually S 'also came to realise that he had been duped'.</p> <p>JSt, the media adviser and ESA agreed to wait until V2's further letter was received before preparing a response.</p>
6 Jan 2015	BR emailed JSt with advice regarding the legal implications of sharing information with SU.
8 Jan 2015	The media adviser issued his communications advice, including a press statement to make the matter public in the near future.
8 Jan 2015	JSt met with NDSU to discuss JS matters.
9 Jan 2015	<p>JSt provided Update 10 to Trustees, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An update on JSt's meeting with NDSU on 8 January 2015 • The media adviser's communications advice and proposed options. • JSt had been seeking to identify whether victim-turned-perpetrator 'S' had beaten anyone under the age of 18, especially since it had become clear from V2's letter that S worked with children. The media adviser had recommended that JSt should follow up that line of enquiry. • BR advice of 6 January 2015 about the documents which could be shared with SU – Trustee approval was required.
13 Jan 2015	JSt spoke to V1 (who had originally raised the matter with the Bishop of Ely's safeguarding advisor) to understand whether S had beaten those under the age of 18. V1 told JSt that to his knowledge S had not.
15 Jan 2015	Documents (including JSt's report of July 2014, the Ruston Report, the SIR to the Charity Commission, and the Charity Commission's e-mail response of 17 Dec 14) shared with SU, in line with BR advice (6/1/2015) on confidentiality.
19 Jan 2015	Further, detailed advice letter to JSt from BR recommending that GR and DF retire as trustees.

Date	Event or Activity
26 Jan 2015	<p>Trustees' meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GR and DF were again asked to stand down as trustees, and their resignations were offered and accepted. They left during the meeting. • The media adviser attended part of the meeting and presented scenarios and options with pros and cons before giving his recommendations. The Trustees agreed with his recommendations regarding the importance of transparency and honesty, cooperation in full with relevant authorities, condemning abuse and securing justice for victims. Actions were put in place for an independent review of safeguarding policies and practice. • The media adviser's proposed course of action was a proactive pre-emptive public communication about JS's abuse. He noted that this might anger victims who might not want the publicity. However, his advice was that this was the best way for the Trust to manage the timing and message, direct responsibility where it was due, do justice and distance the Trust from the offences, and give an opportunity to offer support to victims. Because V1 was not seeking publicity and V2 insisted on anonymity, and because BR's legal advice was to maintain victim confidentiality, the Trustees considered that in order to maintain a victim-focused approach, it was inappropriate to make the disclosure public. Moreover, there was also a concern that making what had happened public, and any resulting media interest, might have a negative impact on any further action that the authorities might want to take over this matter, which had been properly reported to them. • There was also a recommendation for an independent inquiry into the abuse. • The Trustees considered the appropriate action regarding the victim-turned-perpetrator 'S', following the letter from V2 identifying him as currently working in education in the UK. Given that he was also a victim, the legal situation was complex. JSt would therefore take further legal advice with a view to informing any relevant authorities.
27 Jan 2015	<p>JSt took legal advice from BR on the subject of his knowledge of S's identity and his role in education. It appeared that S had been groomed by JS, and it was unclear whether he should be seen as only a victim or as an abuser himself.</p> <p>BR advised that, in the light of V2's disclosure reference to "the other perpetrator" and JSt's awareness of S's identity, JSt should contact the police and explain that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - he had received a letter from an alleged victim of JS who has referred to "the other perpetrator"; - he knew the name of "the other perpetrator" and would prefer not to disclose it unless the police consider that it would be appropriate for him to do so.
10 Feb 2015	Letter from V2 to JSt, copied to ESA, asking questions about the oversight of JS and the other perpetrator and requesting further counselling sessions.
19 Feb 2015	JSt meeting with NDSU and the media adviser.
2 Mar 2015	After a series of emails sent and voicemails left during February, JSt managed to speak to the police about the victim-turned-perpetrator 'S', noting that he worked in a school. JSt offered to share his name (as recommended by BR), but it was not required.
9 Mar 2015	JSt spoke to BR regarding a request for the Trust to provide support for counselling sessions for V2.

Date	Event or Activity
16 Mar 2015	BR provided detailed advice regarding funding counselling sessions, recommending that the Trust should not pay as it did not bear the responsibility for JS's actions.
19 Mar 2015	<p>Trustees' meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JSt's discussions with the police re S were noted. • JSt also noted that the police had implied that appropriate action had been taken to follow the matter up with the authorities in South Africa. JSt was asked to try and get written confirmation of this by the police. • BR had advised that the TT should not pay for further counselling. A letter of response to ESA would be drawn up with BR's assistance. • The Trustees considered that an independent review could be beneficial. The scope of this would be drawn up by a trustee sub-group in April/May. • There was discussion about alerting Winchester College, albeit that they would be aware of the issue from John Thorn's autobiography. To date BR had not considered it necessary. JSt would revisit with BR. • There was discussion about ongoing difficult relations with GR and DF regarding ongoing differences of view as regards their conflict of interest.
30 Mar 2015	The police confirmed in writing what could be communicated to V2 about their action related to JS overseas.
16 Apr 2015	JSt sent a letter (drafted with the help of BR) to V2 answering his questions, stating that it was not appropriate for the Trust to pay for further counselling, and quoting the police. This letter also listed the actions TT had taken to report the matter to the authorities.
5 Jun 2015	<p>JSt provided Update 11 to Trustees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JSt had spoken with (and then had a note from) NDSU with further reflections on an independent inquiry.
23 Sept 2015	Police case reference number and explanation of why a LADO (Local Authority Designated Officer) report had not been made shared with SU (following a request from them on 7 Sept 15).
1 Jun 2016	JSt left his employment with the Trust.
Jan 2017	Channel 4 News approached the Trust for comments on its forthcoming investigation into John Smyth. The media adviser who advised the Trust in January 2015 had approached Channel 4 in 2016 with details of Smyth's abuse.
1 Feb 2017	<p>First Channel 4 News investigation into John Smyth was broadcast.</p> <p>The Titus Trust statement read out on the programme said: "These are very disturbing allegations and our thoughts are primarily with all those affected. It was only in 2014 that the board of The Titus Trust was informed about this matter, after which we submitted a serious incident report to the Charity Commission and provided full disclosure to the police. The allegations are very grave and they should have been reported to the police when they first became known in 1981."</p>

Date	Event or Activity
2 Feb 2017	<p>Following the Channel 4 broadcast, TT Chairman received an indirect report of abusive behaviour by Jonathan Fletcher, who was one of the longest-serving Iwerne leaders as well as being the retired vicar of Emmanuel Church in Wimbledon in south London and the brother of DF. The report was not made by a victim and there was no information about where this alleged abuse happened or to whom. The Trust reported this the same day to the Southwark Diocese Safeguarding Officer who informed the Merton LADO.</p> <p><i>[NB. A separate statement relating to the Trust's action with respect to Jonathan Fletcher will follow in due course.]</i></p>
3 Feb 2017	<p>R1 emailed the 2012-13 email correspondence she had with the Trust Manager back to the Trust. This was received by the Trust Administrator and passed on to the Acting Operations Director (OD). R1 noted that the email reply of 25 January 2013 (drafted by GR and sent by the Trust Manager) was at odds with the Trust's statement of 2 February 2017 that the Trustees did not know of the JS abuse matters until 2014.</p> <p>A senior staff member phoned R1 to tell her that the Trust was looking into her concerns. In a call later that day, he explained that not all Trustees had been aware of the email exchange with R1 in 2012/13.</p>
8 Feb 2017	<p>Phone conversation between the Acting OD and R1 in which he explained that the trustee who drafted the reply to R1 on 25 January 2013 (GR) and the other trustee who had known of the JS abuse (DF) had both stood down in 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Acting OD found the email from GR to the Trust Manager from 25 January 2013 in the email archive and forwarded it to the Trustees (see above). <p><i>[NB. Until the events of this week, the Trustees had been unaware of the assurance that had been given to R1 in 2013.]</i></p>
8 Mar 2017	Meeting of representative Trustees with representatives of the Church of England to discuss the Trust's response to the JS abuse matters.
26 Mar 2017	Agreement, along with CofE and SU, to share the costs of counselling being offered to victims.
11 April 2017	V3, the victim turned perpetrator (also referred to above as "S"), was identified on the BBC in an interview with one of his victims.
July 2017	V3 died, aged 56
Jul-Sep 2017	Victim 4 ('V4') contacted the TT. Email correspondence with Operations Director continued until 8 September 2017.
11 Aug 2018	JS died in South Africa, aged 77

Glossary of abbreviations

Organisations

TT	Titus Trust
IT	Iwerne Trust
SU	Scripture Union
BR	Barlow Robbins solicitors (now Moore Barlow)

Individuals

JS	John Smyth
MR	Mark Ruston
NDSU	National Director - SU
TS	Tim Sterry
AA	Anne Atkins
V1	Victim 1
V2	Victim 2
V3	Victim 3 ("S")
V4	Victim 4
R1	Person reporting a matter to the Trust

Titus Trust Staff

JSt	James Stileman (2013-2016)
-----	----------------------------

Trustees during the period 2012-2019 who are mentioned in this report

GR	Giles Rawlinson
DF	David Fletcher
IB	Iain Broomfield

Appendix

James Stileman's covering e-mail to the police, sent on 30 September 2014, with the summary that was attached to that e-mail

[NB. Names of people and organisations have been redacted for reasons of confidentiality. References to '1981' in this report should actually say '1982'.]

12/24/2014

Outlook.com Print Message

[Print](#)

[Close](#)

Crime/incident number [REDACTED]

From: **James Stileman** (titustrust@outlook.com)

Sent: 30 September 2014 12:57:00

To: [REDACTED]0@met.police.uk

1 attachment

Summary of Joh Smyth affair for police (30.9.14).docx (23.8 KB)

Dear PC [REDACTED],

It was good of you and [REDACTED] to come to my house this morning.

I have prepared the attached summary of what happened and have taken the names of victims out as you suggested.

Do let me know if there is anything that is unclear.

Kind regards,

James Stileman

James Stileman

Operations Director

The Titus Trust

12 Lime Tree Mews, 2 Lime Walk, Oxford, OX3 7DZ

Tel: 01865 760 944

<http://www.titustrust.org>

Charity no. 1066751

Summary of the John Smyth affair

Prepared by James Stileman for PC [REDACTED] on 30th September 2014

- The affair appears to have lasted four years: from 1978 to 1981.
- John Smyth was a lawyer (QC) living in Winchester. He was a volunteer on Iwerne Holidays (which ran Christian summer camps for independent school children, and still do). The activities described below did not take place on the holidays.
- It began when John Smyth (JS) offered a 17-year old Whykehamist (Winchester College school boy), who he had caught shoplifting, the choice of being reported to his parents (and/or the school), or being beaten at JS's home.
- Unknown to any of the Iwerne Holidays leadership team, for a term or two, beatings continued with four 17-year olds. The boys were persuaded that being beaten was a suitable deterrent to masturbation and they voluntarily accepted the punishment which was administered using a gym shoe in the summer house in JS's garden which was padded to muffle the noise.
- From the summer of 1979 the beatings gradually escalated and JS seems to have focused more on undergraduate men than schoolboys. The scale and severity of the practice intensified. These men were promising senior campers or young leaders at Iwerne Holidays, several of whom were at Cambridge and attended the Round Church where Mark Ruston (MR) was rector.
- By the end twenty-two young men were involved, one of which became his 'protégé' and would often administer the beatings alongside JS. This man later confessed that he beat as hard as he could 'for Jesus' sake'.
- The men were conned into accepting the beatings as necessary for Christian wholeheartedness and a means to combat sin. The protégé also came to realise that he had been duped.
- A garden cane was used and blood was frequently drawn. The victims were either semi or fully naked.
- There was an attempted suicide by one of the men.
- The practice was discovered in 1981 when David Fletcher (DF), the leader of Iwerne Holidays, received an anonymous note saying "when will someone stop this disgusting activity going on in John Smyth's garden shed". The same day DF received a phone call from MR to say that one of the victims, a Cambridge undergraduate, had consulted him about the appropriateness of the practice.
- DF met with this victim to find out what had been going on and then MR met the victims one by one. When interviewed by MR the victims defended JS to the hilt.
- DF confronted JS about the practice and MR followed this up in several meetings with JS. JS was due to attend a meeting with several senior Iwerne camp leaders but pulled out at the last minute.
- DF was about to tell JS that he couldn't continue to serve at Iwerne when the latter resigned from camp and as Chairman of the Iwerne Trust.
- JS tried to join a number of other organisations (e.g. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] church in [REDACTED]) but DF and others warned them off.
- [REDACTED] wrote to JS and advised him to leave the country. This was advice not an instruction.
- JS took his family to live in Zimbabwe where he stayed for 17 years and ran a boys camp. There were reports of beatings taking place there. Indeed some parents took him to court but he seems to have been acquitted. He was forced to move to South Africa where he now lives and works for the Justice Alliance of South Africa.
- MR offered psychiatric help to the victims in the UK. ([REDACTED], the Bishop of Ely's safeguarding advisor, considers this to be a good response for those days.)
- DF has met JS a few times since 1981. JS is oblivious of any wrong doing.
- JS visited the wife of one of the Iwerne Holiday leaders in Cambridge about 18 months ago.

Summary attached to e-mail to police – 30 September 2014 – Page 1/2

The desire of DF and others at the time to protect the identity of the victims

- JS's protégé and several other victims are now high profile individuals. At the time of the practice some of the parents were well known public figures. No parent has ever been in touch about the affair but it would appear that some knew about it.

Disclosures since 1981

- A top psychiatrist was told about the practice and invited to a meeting in order to advise the Iwerne Holiday leaders.
- ██████ told ██████, Director of the Scripture Union, about the beatings after JS had been removed from Iwerne.
- In the mid-1980s the ██████ were alerted to the issue so as to prevent him speaking at a ██████ meeting.
- In 1989 John Thorn, headmaster of Winchester 1968-1985, published his autobiography entitled Road to Winchester. In it he referred to the practice above obliquely. Pages 153-155. He had been told about the beatings by Mark Ashton, the chaplain at Winchester, as soon as it came to light.
- On 20th October 2012, in response to the allegations of child abuse against the late Jimmy Savile, Anne Atkins wrote an article for the Mail Online in which she alluded to the JS affair. JS was a friend of Anne's parents and her father was a headmaster in Cambridge.
- Following the Anne Atkins article an old Rushmore leader who knew about the JS affair got in touch with ██████, as the Titus Trust's Child Protection officer, to be reassured that "this extreme form of discipleship is no longer operated." They emailed back and forth from 7th November 2012 to 6th December. In her emails the leader mentioned that: " Anne Atkins has tweeted that she has now reported those two matters mentioned to the police, in response to a storm of criticism"
- In November 2013 when ██████ the Bishop of Ely's safeguarding officer contacted James Stileman and invited the Trust to finance counselling sessions for one of JS's victims, ██████ mentioned that she had taken advice from both the Cambridge and Chichester police. They had told her that they were unlikely to pursue because:
 - There is no extradition treaty with South Africa
 - It was too long ago
 - Victims were not a vulnerable group. (As far as ██████ is concerned the victims were all consenting adults. We now know this not to be true.)

Since August 2013 the Bishop of Ely has been in touch with the Bishop of Cape Town to warn the latter about JS.

Frequently Asked Questions

1 Why wasn't the Trust's initial response in 2014 warmer and more compassionate towards victims?

When all the Trustees first heard about John Smyth's appalling abuse in 2014, they sought legal advice and followed it very carefully, ensuring that reporting to the police, Charity Commission and other statutory authorities was as thorough and detailed as possible. However, we recognise that at times our response was shaped more by legal and statutory responsibilities than by our Christian compassion, and we are very sorry that we did not show more of our concern for the victims and survivors of this abuse.

2 Why didn't you approach victims directly in 2014 to see how you could help them?

The two victims whose identities were known to others at the Trust indicated that they did not want to meet with anyone from the Trust or engage with us further on this. Only one Trustee (David Fletcher) did know the names of all the victims and he would not share those names because he wanted to protect their identities. Without knowing who the victims were, the Trustees could not reach out to them directly at all.

3 Why didn't the Trust go to the police in 2012 when they were first asked about John Smyth's activities?

Following the death of Jimmy Savile in 2011, Anne Atkins published an article in the Daily Mail (October 2012) highlighting her knowledge of an unnamed 'eminent lawyer with considerable influence in a well-known public school' who had beaten boys in his shed following Bible study. Someone subsequently approached the Trust reporting that the lawyer in the article was John Smyth and seeking confirmation that the 'JS matter' had been 'investigated/faced up to' in the light of recent approaches to matters of abuse. This enquiry was handled by three Trustees. The matter was referred to in the trustees meeting on 12 March 2013 but details were not shared with the whole Trustee body. As soon as the whole board of Trustees were made aware in June 2014 they immediately sought advice and reported the matter to the police although they were aware that Ely Safeguarding Advisor had already disclosed the matter to the police in 2013.

4 Why didn't Giles Rawlinson and David Fletcher disclose what they knew to other Trustees before June 2014?

The Titus Trust was first approached by the Safeguarding Adviser at Ely Diocese in November 2013 because she was told by a third party that the Trust was the successor of the Iwerne Trust and because she thought that the Iwerne Trust had run the Iwerne camps on which JS served. However, SU ran the Iwerne camps until 2000. Therefore Giles Rawlinson and David Fletcher initially took the view that this was not a matter for the Titus Trust. Moreover, every indication they had received at this stage led them to believe that the victims and the families that knew about this abuse did not want it to be made public, and that therefore it would be better not to involve more people than were necessary. They also saw no need to report the matter, since they knew that the appropriate authorities were already involved (a CofE safeguarding officer was dealing with the matter, the Bishop of Ely was in touch with the Bishop of Cape Town, and two police forces had been told key details about what had happened).

Looking back, however, we wish that the rest of the board of Trustees had been made aware of this matter earlier.

5 When did the Trust go to the police and what information was given to them?

The Trust went to the police in September 2014, knowing that the Cambridge and Chichester police forces were already aware of these matters. They gave a full oral report to the police detailing all that was known about John Smyth's abuse including the number of young men they then knew to be involved (22), the ages (some were under 18), the severity of the beatings and the impact on victims. At the request of the police, the names of victims were withheld. The police asked James Stileman to send them the summary from the start of the report that he had sent to trustees in July (the 'Stileman report', which James also used to brief the police), so this was emailed to them following the interview.

The Trust continued proactively to be in regular contact with the police, responding to questions and requests for information. In July 2017 the Trustees chose to send the police the Ruston report as they wanted them to have the full report to help with the investigation even though the police had only requested a summary in 2014.

6 What is the 'Stileman Report' and why were sections of it redacted before it was shared with the police and others?

This was a status report that James Stileman, the Operations Director of the Titus Trust at the time, prepared for the Trustees in July 2014 to update them on three safeguarding issues, one of which concerned John Smyth. The majority of this report related to Smyth, and the key details of this section of the report were submitted in summary to the police in September 2014. A copy of this report was sent to the police in August 2017 at the initiative of the Trustees, although, as agreed with the police, the final six pages which had no bearing on the John Smyth case were not included and relevant names were redacted from the covering letter in accordance with safeguarding best practice on confidentiality.

7 How and when did the Trust report to the Charity Commission?

The Trust filed a Serious Incident Report with the Charity Commission in October 2014 and responded to follow up questions. The Trust followed this up with regular updates and this continues.

8 What advice did your media adviser give in 2015 and how did you respond?

A media consultant advised the Trustees in early 2015. The Trustees agreed with a number of his recommendations, regarding the importance of transparency and honesty, cooperation in full with relevant authorities, condemning abuse and securing justice for victims. They also put actions in place for an independent review of the Trust's safeguarding policies and practice.

The media adviser presented three options for the trustees to consider, with pros and cons for each option. He also recommended that the Trust commission an independent investigation of John Smyth's abuse. Initially this idea was received positively by the Trustees. However, following further discussion and in consultation with the Trust's legal advisers, Trustees decided not to follow this recommendation, due to the risk (noted in the media adviser's advice) that victims might be angered by this response. The concern for privacy expressed by the few victims with whom the Trust was then in contact meant that it was thought this action would not be welcomed by them. The Trustees were also concerned that making what had happened public, and the likely resulting media interest, might have a negative impact on any further action that the authorities might want to take over this matter. Given that the matter had been properly reported to the authorities, Trustees left this matter with them.

Later, the Church of England commissioned the independent review by Keith Makin and this seemed to be the best means to bring everything to do with John Smyth to light. The Trust continues to co-operate fully with Keith Makin.

9 Did the Trust reach out to and offer any practical support to victims?

The Trust was glad to share with the Church of England and Scripture Union in financing the counselling support offered to victims in 2017. We still do not know who many of the victims are, but we wrote to those we knew in late 2020 offering to meet with them. We are sorry not to have done more to offer support and are approaching those we do know again to let them know that we would be glad to offer further help. We invite any victims we do not know to contact us to talk more about this.

10 Why was the abuse committed by John Smyth not acted upon for so many years?

The abuse took place many years before the Titus Trust came into existence. We recognise that such matters were often handled very differently back then. Some action was taken when John Smyth's abuse was first made known. Although the matter was reported to a number of organisations including Scripture Union and Winchester College, it was not reported to the police by those who were aware of it. We hope that Keith Makin's independent review into the Church of England's handling of the abuse will provide the comprehensive exploration of why this was the case, so that mistakes and learning can be made known.

11 How could John Smyth have been allowed to work with young people in South Africa and inflict ongoing harm?

This an important issue to be explored in Keith Makin's review. John Smyth left the UK and moved to Zimbabwe and subsequently to South Africa.

When the whole board of trustees were told about his abuse in 2014, they were also made aware that Ely Diocese had contacted church authorities in South Africa. In reporting the matter to the police in 2014, the Trust also requested the police to alert the authorities in South Africa as well.

12 What action did the Titus Trust take once the whole board of trustees became aware of the abuse of John Smyth?

The whole board of Trustees became aware of the abuse in June 2014 and immediately began to gather relevant information about what had happened alongside engaging legal advisors. They then reported to the police and Charity Commission and informed former trustees and Scripture Union.

13 Why was so much charity money spent on lawyers?

When the trustees were informed of potential action against the Trust related to the actions of John Smyth they were legally bound to act in the best interests of the charity and sought legal advice to ensure that these duties were discharged properly. A detailed review concluded that the Titus Trust was not responsible for running the Iwerne camps in the 1980s when Smyth's appalling abuse took place. The trustees could not voluntarily assume responsibilities and liabilities which are not those of the Titus Trust and this resulted in a settlement with those who were planning to bring the action. We heed the discomfort with this, and are sorry that more was not done to support victims.

14 To what extent, if any, was there a cover-up by the Titus Trust?

From the Titus Trust's incorporation in 1997 the only trustee who was aware of John Smyth's abuse was David Fletcher. He acted consistently to protect the identity of the victims. This informed the response to the person who contacted the Titus Trust about Smyth's abuse in November and December 2012. It also informed the initial response to the Ely Safeguarding Adviser's request for financial support for counselling.

James Stileman co-operated fully with the Bishop of Ely's Safeguarding Adviser following her first approach in November 2013, knowing that she had said that the abuse had already been reported to the police. As explained above, Giles Rawlinson and David Fletcher did not think that this was a matter for the Titus Trust, since the camps on which John Smyth served were run by SU, and so did not make the other Trustees aware of this matter, since they wished to protect the identity of the victims. When the whole trustee body was made aware of the allegations in 2014 they took legal advice to ensure that the information was properly reported to the relevant authorities.

15 What learning and action has been taken as a result of these sad events?

The emergence of details about the abuse by John Smyth has caused us to reflect deeply on our current culture and the historic influences upon us. Although the culture of the camps that The Titus Trust runs today has changed significantly from the Iwerne camps of the late 70s and early 80s we still wanted to look hard at our traditions and practices and to make any changes necessary to ensure that we are following best practice in all areas.

This has included:

- A full independent review of our safeguarding practices which took place in 2018, and which was undertaken by thirtyone:eight. The recommendations of this review were implemented in 2019 to ensure that we operate best practice across all our camps to protect the children and adults involved in our activities. Among other things, this has included receiving further training in pastoral care and supporting survivors of abuse and training all our staff in the area of mental health.*
- training our trustees in their safeguarding responsibilities and working to develop a culture where trustees (and potential trustees) are encouraged to ask any questions about the past and present activities of the Trust and to take their responsibilities to do due diligence very seriously'*
- An internal Cultural Review has been carried out that considered aspects of our traditions and practices and identified risks to and ways of building healthy cultures across our leaders' teams.*
- An independent Culture Review was commissioned in 2020. This is also being carried out by thirtyone:eight, who have invited feedback from a wide range of individuals and organisations to enable us to look honestly at our culture and its impact on individual behaviour. This review will be reporting in October 2021.*

16 Who is investigating and reporting on these matters?

The Church of England has commissioned an independent review led by Keith Makin. The Titus Trust is cooperating fully with this review. We continue to believe that this is the best way for us to play our part in this process and hope and pray that this review will bring clarity and truth to all that has happened.

17 Are you confident the Trust's current culture is healthy and allows for the running of safe events?

We keep up-to-date with best practice in safeguarding and safer recruitment, working closely with our safeguarding advisers at thirtyone:eight. We take very seriously the feedback that we receive from parents and the young people who attend our activities. But we never want to be complacent about these things, which is why we have commissioned thirtyone:eight to carry out the Culture Review which is due to report in October 2021. We look forward to receiving the recommendations of this review, and will consider them very carefully indeed. We long to honour Christ in every way, both in what we do and in the way that we do it too.