

The Independent Peter Ball Review

AN ABUSE OF FAITH

FOREWORD

“He said it was God’s will¹”

This report considers the serious sexual wrongdoing of Peter Ball, a bishop of the Church of England (the Church), who abused many boys and men over a period of twenty years or more. That is shocking in itself but is compounded by the failure of the Church to respond appropriately to his misconduct, again over a period of many years. Ball’s priority was to protect and promote himself and he maligned the abused. The Church colluded with that rather than seeking to help those he had harmed, or assuring itself of the safety of others.

Much of what we report has already been aired in the public domain but we have been surprised by how unclear the picture was, even to many who were quite close to what happened. In part that is a consequence of misinformation used by Ball. We hope that a clear and detailed account of what happened will help all involved.

Most of the events described in this report took place many years ago. Some beliefs, attitudes and moral norms have changed. The standards and expectations of safeguarding practice, both in the Church and more widely, were different then. We do not think that the Church now would conduct itself in the ways we have described.

We believe that the Church’s attitude to homosexuality at the time played a part in the failure to act appropriately. Ball’s abusive behaviour was trivialised and its consequences were set aside. The age of many of the victims was also significant – most were not children and the safeguarding of vulnerable adults nationally was in its infancy. There was little understanding that men might be vulnerable precisely because they were seeking spiritual fulfilment.

We were asked to consider changes necessary to ensure that safeguarding in the Church is of the highest possible standard. The Church has made significant progress in recent years in its understanding of abuse. We have no doubt that the Church has a genuine commitment to meeting its responsibilities towards the victims of abuse. However we can see how difficult it is to make change across the complex structures of the Church. Progress has been slow and continuing, faster improvement is still required. It is the leadership of the Archbishops and Bishops which will determine whether change is effective.

Our work has been assisted by many people, from within and outside the Church. A particular note of thanks must go to those who were abused by Ball, and to their families. Their contribution has been of the greatest help in understanding the reality and the enduring consequences of what happened to them, as well as the pressing need for the Church to continue to prevent exploitation and abuse now and into the future.

Dame Moira Gibb DBE
June 2017

¹ Neil Todd, in correspondence in 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	5
2.	THE PROCESS OF THIS REVIEW	6
3.	THE EVENTS LEADING TO THIS REVIEW	8
3.1	Peter Ball's background	8
3.2	1960 to 1992 - the early concerns.....	9
3.3	Ball's arrest in 1992	11
3.4	The police investigation and associated events	13
3.5	The period leading up to Ball's resignation	17
3.6	The period following Ball's resignation.....	23
3.7	Ball's return to good standing in the Church	25
3.8	The first review and subsequent events.....	29
3.9	Professor Mellows' report.....	32
3.10	The final years of Ball's ministry.....	35
3.11	The events leading to Ball's imprisonment.....	37
3.12	Matters arising following Ball's imprisonment.....	39
4.	THE PEOPLE AT THE CENTRE OF THIS REVIEW	41
4.1	Those who were abused by Ball.....	41
4.2	Peter Ball	44
4.3	Bishop Michael Ball.....	46
4.4	Lord Carey	47
4.5	Lord Williams	49
4.6	Those who sought to raise concerns	50
5.	THE CHURCH'S MANAGEMENT OF BALL'S CASE	51
5.1	The Church's initial reaction	51
5.2	The Church's response to evidence of wider abuse	52
5.3	The decision to caution	54
5.4	The failure to take action under ecclesiastical law	56
5.5	Ball's associations with other abusive clerics	57
5.6	An abusive bishop.....	59
5.7	The significance of homosexuality in these events	60
6.	CONCERNS OUTSIDE THE CHURCH.....	61

6.1	Ball’s status and connections	61
6.2	Ball’s links with public schools	63
7.	COMMENTARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	64
7.1	The context and the challenges	64
7.2.	Reparation.....	65
7.3	Messages from survivors	66
7.4	Vulnerable adults	67
7.6	Religious communities and other Church bodies	69
7.7	The role of the National Safeguarding Team	70
7.8	The legacy of the past.....	71
7.9	Protective measures, licensing and disciplinary arrangements	71
7.10	Good practice	74
8.	RECOMMENDATIONS	75
	APPENDIX A: Terms of Reference.....	77
	APPENDIX B: The Review Team.....	79
	APPENDIX C: Anonymisation in this report	81

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In October 2015 the former Bishop of Gloucester, Peter Ball, who was then 83 years old, was brought before the criminal courts. It had emerged that, over many years, he had physically and sexually abused and exploited boys and young men, including some who were particularly vulnerable. He had used his position within the Church to identify those whom he then abused. He admitted two offences of indecent assault and a further offence of misconduct in public office. He was imprisoned for 32 months.
- 1.2 A young man, Neil Todd, had come forward in 1992 and disclosed abuse by Ball. As a result Ball was given a police caution in 1993 and he resigned as Bishop of Gloucester. He retired and received a disability pension. No action was taken under the Church's disciplinary procedures. He was at first restricted from ministry but repeatedly challenged this and in 1995 was given "Permission to Officiate "(PTO) as a retired priest.
- 1.3 Ball's conduct again came under scrutiny in 2012 and the criminal investigations leading to his imprisonment began, led by Sussex Police. Soon after learning of this, and speaking to police officers and journalists, Neil Todd took his own life.
- 1.4 Following Ball's sentencing in 2015 the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) made a public announcement to the effect that mistakes had been made in 1993 and Ball should have been brought before the courts, not cautioned.
- 1.5 Concerns were expressed in the media, and by a range of organisations and individuals, that this failure to take the correct course of action was linked to Ball's position as a bishop and, at that time, a relatively well-known figure in public life. There were also concerns about the propriety of the part played by the Church in events leading up to the caution and thereafter.
- 1.6 The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Most Revd. and Rt. Honourable Justin Welby, wrote to a number of individuals apologising for the way they had been treated by Peter Ball. The Church issued a public statement of apology: "*We apologise unreservedly to those survivors of Peter Ball's abuse and pay tribute to their bravery in coming forward and also (acknowledge) the long wait for justice that they have endured*".
- 1.7 On October 5th 2015, the Archbishop of Canterbury announced that he had commissioned an independent review of these events and, in February 2016, appointed Dame Moira Gibb to lead that review. This is the full and final report of the process and findings of the review.

2. THE PROCESS OF THIS REVIEW

- 2.1 The full Terms of Reference for the review are at Appendix A. The composition and background of the team working with Dame Moira are set out at Appendix B. Neither the Chair nor advisers had any connection with the Church before taking on this task.
- 2.2 It had been recognised that there would be correspondences between this review and the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA), the statutory inquiry established by the Home Secretary in March 2015. That inquiry was charged with conducting “*an overarching national review of the extent to which institutions in England and Wales have discharged their duty of care to protect children against sexual abuse*”². IICSA had indicated that it would consider the case of Peter Ball.
- 2.3 Nonetheless the Archbishop determined that it remained appropriate that the Church should commission its own review, for publication, while liaising with and assisting IICSA as required. It was probable that there would be learning specific to the Church, and it would be helpful to identify and respond to that as promptly as possible. Most of those known to have been mistreated by Ball were not children at the relevant times and their abuse consequently fell outside the principal scope of IICSA.
- 2.4 From the outset we have sought to involve and learn from all those who were involved in or directly affected by Ball’s abusive behaviour. We have seen or spoken to every person known to have been abused by Ball who has wanted to provide an input to the review. In this report we refer to those people as both “survivors” and “victims” – mindful that one victim at the centre of these events has not survived.
- 2.5 Peter Ball himself has refused to meet us or submit a written statement. We have spoken to Ball’s twin brother, Michael, also a retired bishop (Bishop Michael Ball³). We have met or heard from a wide range of other people and agencies – seventy in total - who have played a part in the events under review or who have a view about them, although a number of those who were significantly involved have now died or have become too infirm to contribute.
- 2.6 This report does not disclose the identity of any of those abused by Ball, except Neil Todd. We have maintained that position in order to have a consistent approach even though some survivors have said that they would be happy to see their identity disclosed – some have already spoken publicly about their experiences. We have generally not disclosed the identity of the professionals involved but we do name those senior churchmen and some others involved in these events whose identity is in the public domain.
- 2.7 The Terms of Reference for this review set out four overarching objectives:

² This is from the opening statement of the IICSA.

³ In this report we generally refer to Michael Ball as Bishop Michael Ball to avoid any confusion with his brother. Otherwise we refer to the bishops who are mentioned in these events by their surname.

- a. *To review what information was available to the Church of England (within relevant dioceses, Lambeth Palace⁴ and central Church authorities) concerning Peter Ball’s abuse of individuals; who had this information and when. To provide a detailed timeline and transparent account of the response within the Church of England.*
- b. *To consider whether the response was in accordance with recognised good practice, and compliant with Church of England policy and legislation as well as statutory policy and legislation.*
- c. *To learn lessons about any necessary changes and developments needed within the Church of England to ensure that safeguarding work is of the highest possible standard; how complaints and disciplinary processes are managed and any other specific areas of Church behaviour and practice identified by the review.*
- d. *To produce a report, including recommendations, set out in a way which can be easily understood by professionals and public alike and suitable for publication. The report will be published on the Church of England website.*

2.8 Our first task therefore was to draw together and summarise a chronology of the relevant events. We have done so from Church records, from our own enquiries, the contributions of police and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and from the direct contacts we have had with individuals involved in these events and their aftermath. We have contacted every school with which Ball is known to have had a connection. We have invited submissions from Local Safeguarding Children Boards and Safeguarding Adults Boards in every relevant locality.

2.9 We have been encouraged by the Church to “tell the story” openly and in detail. Our report therefore starts with an account of Ball’s career, the evidence of his abusive behaviour, and the ways in which the Church and criminal justice agencies responded to that.

2.10 We have been greatly assisted throughout our work by the officers of Sussex Police. Two other police forces were involved in the matters under review – Gloucestershire, where Ball was cautioned, and Northamptonshire, where officers investigated Ball’s connections with other abusive priests. We asked both forces for information about their involvement. Northamptonshire Police refused to provide any information about their actions. Gloucestershire Police provided some information about the events in 1992/93 and clarified issues relating to the retention of criminal records. In the course of our enquiries we have not found evidence of any matters which might require investigation as potential crimes but were unknown to police.

2.11 We have received detailed accounts of some matters and there have been occasional inconsistencies in that detail – specific dates, for example, or the sequence of events. Many of these things happened more than twenty years ago and, for the

⁴ The London residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

purposes of this narrative, such inconsistencies are highlighted only when we judge they may be significant to the overall course of events.

- 2.12 The first part of our narrative describes Ball’s early career within the Church. It covers key events before 1991 and identifies a number of causes for concern about Ball’s conduct at that time. A number of matters arise from the Church’s response to Neil Todd’s disclosure of abuse in 1992, the consequent criminal investigation and the discovery of wider concerns. These events are particularly significant and are described in detail.
- 2.13 The narrative goes on to cover matters following Ball’s resignation, describing in particular how he inveigled his way back into a respected position within the Church. Finally, that first section of the report explains how Ball was eventually brought back into the criminal justice system, the consequences of that, and describes some relevant matters following his imprisonment.
- 2.14 We have commented on the part played by individuals at the centre of these matters: those abused by Ball, Peter Ball himself, Bishop Michael Ball, Lord Carey, who as the Archbishop of Canterbury was the senior churchman involved in the key events, his successor, Lord Williams, and then those who sought to raise concerns about Ball.
- 2.15 We have sought to identify key learning points for the Church taking account of the timescale of events and of relevant recent reports and reviews on safeguarding arrangements in the Church and have made recommendations accordingly.
- 2.16 The matters we have reviewed have implications not just for the Church. Ball exploited his position and the esteem in which he was held. He abused the faith and trust of others to harm vulnerable people. That can happen in other churches and other settings. In meeting our fourth objective therefore we have aimed to set out this report, in line with the requirement of our Terms of Reference, so that it can be read and understood by “*professionals and public alike*”.

3. THE EVENTS LEADING TO THIS REVIEW

3.1 Peter Ball’s background

- 3.1.1 Peter Ball was born in 1932. He was educated at the public school, Lancing College, and at Cambridge University before entering theological college in 1954. He was ordained as a priest in the Church in 1957. He began his ministry as a curate in Rottingdean, East Sussex, and then received monastic training at Kelham Theological College, which closed in 1972.
- 3.1.2 Michael Ball was also educated at Lancing College and Cambridge University. He then spent some years as a teacher before being ordained in 1971. He became the suffragan⁵ Bishop of Jarrow in 1980 and was the Bishop of Truro from 1990 to 1997 when he retired.

⁵ A suffragan bishop is a bishop subordinate to a diocesan bishop.

3.1.3 None of the survivors of Peter Ball's abuse have expressed any concern that Bishop Michael Ball might have been involved in any sexual abuse. We have seen no evidence of any sexual impropriety in his conduct at any time. However there are some significant issues arising from the part he played in the handling of these events and they are considered in section 4 of this report.

3.2 1960 to 1992 - the early concerns

3.2.1 In 1960 the Ball brothers founded a monastic religious community, the Community of the Glorious Ascension (CGA), which was affiliated to the Advisory Council on the Relations of Bishops and Religious Communities. Peter Ball became the Prior of the CGA. The CGA was said to be modelled on the spiritual practices of the Order of Friars (Franciscans), the Roman Catholic religious order founded by St Francis of Assisi. The brothers formally resigned as members of the CGA in 1988. The CGA continues to exist though now with only four members. The current Prior has told us that he was aware of longstanding concerns within the CGA about "favouritism" by Peter Ball.

3.2.2 In 1968 an old barn was purchased in Somerset and renovated, with five members of the community moving to live there. Ball has said, in the course of a psychological assessment conducted in 2009, that it was here, believing that the Church had "gone soft", that he began inflicting hardships on himself. These practices included sitting on a cold stone floor, praying naked in a cold chapel, fasting and self flagellation. He also reported hitting other members of the community and being hit by them. He said that it was here that "things began to go wrong".

3.2.3 Ball was seen in the Church from an early stage as a charismatic leader and a hard worker though there were concerns about his administrative skills and reliability. He was appointed as the suffragan Bishop of Lewes in East Sussex in 1977. He remained in that role until 1992. For the latter part of that period, 1984 to 1992, he was an "area bishop", with legally delegated responsibility for the locality of Lewes.

3.2.4 When Ball first became a bishop he announced that he would 'continue to live as a religious with some of his brethren' - an unusual way of life for a bishop. In 1980 Ball launched an appeal to young people in East Sussex to join new residential communities which would give them a time-limited experience of monastic discipline, spiritual development and practical Christian service. This initiative is variously referred to as the 'Year for Christ' scheme, or the "Give a Year to God" scheme, and participants were often referred to as "Schemers". Separate male and female communities were envisaged, the former based at Ball's own residence. From this time onwards Ball regularly had a number of boys and young men living with him. He usually employed no other staff to assist with housekeeping or domestic duties.

3.2.5 At some point Ball also formed the Little Brothers and Sisters in Christ (LBSC) community, as an offshoot of his Give a Year to God scheme. Bishop Eric Kemp, the Bishop of Chichester, had approved its establishment but the numbers involved were small and it was not affiliated to the Advisory Council on the Relations of Bishops and Religious Communities. The venture was said to be unpopular with the

CGA. The LBSC at some point moved to London, led by a man, Mr A, who was to play a significant part in subsequent events, and is now a priest. He himself has told this review of being sexually abused by Ball. As far as we have been able to establish the LBSC ceased to function in 1994/95.

- 3.2.6 Ball eventually handed supervision of the Year for Christ scheme to another priest, the Revd Vickery House. House had been closely involved in the daily routine of the scheme and was himself also to figure significantly in subsequent events as an abusive priest.
- 3.2.7 There is evidence of sexual abuse and improper conduct by Ball during the 1970s and 1980s. Whilst prior of the CGA Peter Ball combined those duties with several other roles, including three years as a vicar in Staffordshire. While there he established another CGA community and we have heard evidence of an incident involving one of the community members being beaten by Ball. That account was given to us by someone who went on to be abused by Ball himself and to make a statement about this in the prosecution of Ball in 2015. Another man who was a member of Ball's community for more than thirteen years told us of an incident in 1977 when Ball, complaining of phlebitis, asked the man to massage his legs. The man started to do so but stopped when he realised that Ball, unclothed below the waist, was sexually aroused.
- 3.2.8 As well as meeting boys and young men through the Give a Year to God scheme, Ball was a frequent visitor to some public schools and was a governor of several schools. He had a reputation as an entertaining and charismatic speaker and, having been invited into schools, he went on to form associations with a number of individual boys, sometimes offering intensive one to one "counselling". Of the 18 victims cited when Ball was sentenced in 2015, five had encountered Ball while they were still at school. At least one abusive encounter took place on school premises.
- 3.2.9 Ball also had associations during the 1970s and 1980s with other priests in the Diocese of Chichester, who we now know were involved in abusive behaviour. These matters are considered below, in the section of this report which considers the extent to which Ball may have been part of a network of abusive priests.
- 3.2.10 Ball's career and influence in the Church continued to thrive throughout the 1980s, though there is also evidence of rumours and rumblings of disquiet about his activities. In 1985 he was a candidate for the position of Bishop of Norwich but diocesan representatives opposed his appointment. They are noted to have reported that '*...we needed someone married and that Norwich really could not take a group of young men living with the bishop in the bishop's house – nor was this pastorally wise for the bishop.*'
- 3.2.11 Ball was appointed as Bishop of Gloucester in April 1992. Records indicate that the appointment process deviated in part from standard practice – he was chosen despite being the second of two options considered. There was initially a measure of

resistance within the Gloucester Diocese, linked to Ball's Anglo-Catholicism⁶. Ball was also opposed to the ordination of women whereas the Synod in Gloucester supported this change.

- 3.2.12 Former members of the CGA told us that Ball's lifestyle at that time was not consistent with his avowed austerity. We have similarly heard from former staff at Bishops court, the official residence of the Bishop of Gloucester, of an extravagant way of life. Household expenditure on food and alcohol increased significantly following Ball's arrival and the house was expensively decorated and furnished. The exception was Ball's bedroom which was small and sparsely furnished but contained three mattresses. Unlike his predecessors Ball chose a bedroom at the far end of the residence, away from the staff. Ball received many visitors, usually young men, some of whom resided at Bishops court for some time.

3.3 Ball's arrest in 1992

- 3.3.1 In 1991⁷ Ball had met a seventeen year old youth, Neil Todd, who lived in the Midlands. He was thinking of joining a religious community and wrote to Ball about this. He was invited to visit Ball and did so in October of that year. Over subsequent months Todd stayed at Crawley Down, a monastery⁸ in West Sussex and at Beacon House, the official residence of the Bishop of Lewes. He also stayed in London with what remained of the LBSC after Ball and Vickery House had ceased any direct involvement. Neil Todd stayed with Ball at Bishops court on at least three occasions in 1992.
- 3.3.2 Neil Todd and others subsequently reported that Ball repeatedly encouraged him to engage in 'spiritual' exercises involving nakedness and cold showers. In September 1992 Ball suggested that Todd should agree to be beaten while naked so that his body should '*bear the marks*'. This beating did not take place because of the intervention of a member of domestic staff at Bishops court, Mr J, who had become increasingly concerned at Ball's lifestyle and specifically his treatment of Neil Todd.
- 3.3.3 Neil Todd told Mr J that Ball intended to whip him and that he did not want this to happen. In order to avoid a confrontation with Ball, Mr J and his wife took Todd away with them on holiday. When they returned Neil Todd did not come back with them but is believed to have gone to London. They have told us that Ball behaved as if nothing had happened.
- 3.3.4 They remained worried and, later that year, came to London to share their concerns with Bishop John Yates. He was well known to them as he had been Bishop of

⁶ Anglo-Catholicism is a tradition within the Church of England which has its origins in the Oxford Movement of the mid-nineteenth century. It emphasises the continuity of the Church of England – both in terms of its identity and doctrine and in terms of its ordained ministry – with the undivided pre-Reformation Church. Anglo-Catholics emphasise the centrality of the sacraments in the life of the Church and in time ritualism became one of its notable characteristics. The revival of religious communities in the Church of England from the nineteenth century was one among a number of developments which Anglo-Catholics promoted.

⁷ We received one report of Ball first having contact with Neil Todd when he was 14 years old. We have not been able to find any other evidence to corroborate that suggestion. Sussex Police told us that they had satisfied themselves that the first contact was in 1991.

⁸ The monastery is part of the Anglican order of the Community of the Servants of the Will of God.

Gloucester immediately before Ball's appointment. He was now the Bishop at Lambeth, the head of the Archbishop of Canterbury's staff, and was to play a significant part in subsequent events. They have told us that they set out their concerns in detail, referring specifically to the proposed flagellation.

- 3.3.5 Bishop Yates is said to have listened but did not commit himself to any action. He suggested that if they remained concerned they might speak to another bishop they knew locally, the suffragan Bishop of Tewkesbury, Bishop Jeremy Walsh. Bishop Yates subsequently wrote to the staff in December 1992, thanking them for their concern but expressing regret that "*confidences had been broken possibly by police here in London*". (No further clarification of this comment has emerged from our enquiries).
- 3.3.6 Neil Todd returned to Bishopscourt in October 1992 and there was a further encounter involving explicitly sexual activity with Ball. Todd was very distressed by this, left Bishopscourt and went to Crawley Down and then to Brixton to stay with the LBSC. In mid-November Neil Todd attempted suicide. Then, apparently because he had learned of another young man going to stay at Bishopscourt and feared for his welfare, Todd decided that he should disclose what had happened to him.
- 3.3.7 He spoke to Mr A who contacted a local vicar in Brixton (where Mr A lived). That led to contact with Bishop Roy Williamson, Bishop of Southwark. Bishop Williamson told us that he remembered that they told him about Ball being involved in naked prayer. He spoke to Bishop Kemp, as Ball's superior when he had been in Sussex. On 25th November Mr A spoke directly to Bishop Kemp and told him of Neil Todd's disclosures, and of his suicide attempt.
- 3.3.8 Bishop Kemp immediately contacted Ball, who denied any sexual relationship with Todd. Ball then spoke to a superintendent in Gloucester Police, a friend of his, who gave him some advice about his situation. Ball faxed Bishop Kemp a statement stating that he had not had a sexual relationship with Todd but then asked him to destroy the fax. Bishop Kemp did so.
- 3.3.9 On 4th December Bishop Kemp met Mr A and the local vicar, and offered to see Neil Todd himself. That meeting took place on 10th December. Todd confirmed that there had been sexual contact between him and Ball at Ball's request. Todd was very upset, and said that Ball should admit what he had done and should no longer be a bishop. Bishop Kemp said that he would reflect on what he had been told.
- 3.3.10 On the same day the domestic staff at Gloucester, increasingly concerned, contacted Bishop Walsh as Bishop Yates had suggested. Bishop Walsh told us that he recalled speaking with them but could not remember when the conversation took place, nor the detail of what was discussed. Mr J told us that Bishop Walsh seemed shocked and wondered whether these matters might be linked to the illness of his chaplain who was unwell and possibly suffering from stress.
- 3.3.11 The chaplain has spoken to this review and described how he had become concerned for Neil Todd and tried to support him. He was also uneasy more generally about Ball's conduct. He himself had once been assaulted by Ball, who

had put his arms around him and asked him about his underwear. He confirmed that Ball often invited young men and schoolboys into the official residence and was openly referred to by the schoolboys as the “*gay old bishop*”.

- 3.3.12 It is not clear how much each person knew of events over the next few days and how far information was shared. We know that on 11th December Bishops Kemp and Williamson met in London and later that day briefed Lord Carey. Early the following morning it was learned that Neil Todd had again attempted suicide during the night. His parents had visited him and were taken aback by the level of his distress and angry not to have been informed that he had attempted suicide previously. Before taking him home to Nottingham they contacted the police at Brixton. Bishop Williamson spoke to Bishops Kemp and Yates, who again briefed Lord Carey on 12th December.
- 3.3.13 Peter Ball is then known to have contacted a number of young men who had stayed with him at various times, seeking either to enlist their support or to persuade them not to become involved in the developing events. They included a young man, Mr B, who was to be the subject of one of the charges eventually admitted by Ball in 2015. Ball told this man that Todd was making false allegations and tried to persuade him not to reveal the full extent of their own sexual encounters. Ball also contacted another man, Mr C, who gave a victim impact statement in the 2015 proceedings. According to the prosecution statement in 2015 Ball tried to get this man to agree that he (Ball) had never forced him to do anything he did not want to do.
- 3.3.14 Ball contacted Mr A on a number of occasions around this time, protesting his innocence while also seeking information about Mr A’s knowledge of the developing events. Bishop Kemp saw the Ball brothers together and Peter Ball again denied any sexual activity with Neil Todd, while admitting that they had taken cold showers together.

3.4 The police investigation and associated events

- 3.4.1 The Metropolitan Police passed the allegations they had received to police in Gloucester, where the relevant events had taken place. On 12th December a police investigation in Gloucester began, led by a Detective Inspector, now retired, Mr F. He went to Nottingham and interviewed Neil Todd. He told us that while there he received a notification that Sir Peter Imbert, the Metropolitan Police Commissioner (Chief Constable), had been in touch, seeking information about what was happening at the request of Lord Carey.
- 3.4.2 Over the next few days a formal statement was taken from Neil Todd and Ball was arrested on 14th December in connection with suspected indecent assault. He was accompanied on arrest by Mr Chris Peak, the Diocesan Registrar - that is, the solicitor for the diocese of Gloucester. Ball was released on police bail and, with his brother, saw Lord Carey in London the following day. He then disappeared from public view, staying at a convent in Wales. Media reports of his arrest began to appear.

- 3.4.3 Soon after the arrest Mr C received a call from Bishop Michael Ball who was trying to mobilise support for his brother. Mr F has reported that he subsequently contacted Mr Peak to express concern about this contact with a key witness, which could amount to an attempt to pervert the course of justice.
- 3.4.4 Lambeth Palace issued a press statement⁹ acknowledging the police investigations into alleged indecent behaviour by Ball. Lord Carey had instructed Ball to rest from his official duties, and, the statement announced, was praying for him. Around the same time Bishop Patrick Harris, Bishop of Southwell in the Midlands, met Neil Todd to offer support. Todd declined any continuing contact with the Bishop but he did receive support from a local parish priest and his wife, at that time a psychotherapist in training and now herself a priest. He saw her twice but then withdrew as the publicity about his complaints mounted. Bishop Michael Ball wrote to Lord Carey at the end of the year referring to the support his brother was receiving from prominent figures including, he claimed, two Cabinet Ministers and the Prince of Wales.
- 3.4.5 Mr Peak and the Ball brothers decided to engage someone to investigate the allegations, with a view to clearing Ball. A private investigator was identified, Mr D. He was both a former priest¹⁰ and former police officer. Although formally engaged by Mr Peak as Ball's solicitor, the lines of accountability appear to have become blurred. Bishop Kemp associated himself with the enquiries, received copies of his reports and helped pay for his services. Mr D submitted a report directly to Bishop Kemp towards the end of his involvement asking that it be seen only by the Bishop and the Archbishop. His recording suggests that he had sent it to Lord Carey but Lord Carey told us he had not seen it at that time. We have seen a memorandum from Bishop Yates to Lord Carey, dated 15th February 1993, which updates him and refers to Mr D's work and early conclusions, as follows: *"although he began with the supposition that (Ball) had been 'set up' by one or more of the young people involved, and while there might still be an element in the case, he has no doubt that there is a case to answer"*.
- 3.4.6 Mr D initially interviewed nine people (including Vickery House) who had known Ball through his activities with young people. All were supportive of Ball and denied any knowledge of his engaging in sexual activity. One did report that he had prayed naked with Ball, at Ball's suggestion. He had already reported this to police, who were now also researching Ball's background and relationships. In line with his police training Mr D kept full contemporaneous records of his investigations, and his notes from that period focus on Mr A. They paint a picture of someone devious, dishonest and manipulative. Mr D's thinking appears to have been that Ball was innocent and that Mr A was trying to discredit him. On 29th December Bishop Kemp wrote to Lord Carey describing the efforts in train to help Ball, including Mr

⁹ [Lambeth Palace press release following allegations.pdf](#)



Lambeth Palace
press release

¹⁰ After leaving the police Mr D had been ordained and exercised parochial ministry in the diocese of Chichester before being obliged to leave the priesthood after disciplinary action arising from his conduct – a matter handled by Bishop Kemp, who therefore also knew him personally. We were told that Mr D is now in very poor health and have therefore not attempted to interview him.

D's investigation, in the face of what he called a possible "*deliberate framing*". In a contemporaneous letter to another correspondent Bishop Kemp referred to "*a betrayal of kindness that (Ball) had shown to a particular young man*".

- 3.4.7 However during December Lambeth Palace had received seven letters containing potentially disturbing information about Ball. The first was from a man claiming a long and close association with Ball. He said he would be amazed if Ball had committed any indecent act but wished to reveal an incident that might throw light on the current allegations. He described how he and Ball had removed all their clothes and prayed together. The man was in his early twenties at the time. He had found the incident, which was never suggested to him again by Ball, '*a deeply meaningful spiritual experience.*' However it was clear that the suggestion that they remove all their clothes had come from Ball, an older man in a position of religious authority.
- 3.4.8 The second letter was from a man who had met Ball when exploring a possible vocation. He had no concerns about him but mentioned that '*A retired priest who has since died divulged certain personal matters about [Ball].... which I found it hard to believe.*'
- 3.4.9 The third letter was from a man who has spoken directly to this review and confirmed the content of the letter which states that, in the course of a "counselling" session on school premises, Ball asked him to masturbate in front of him. He was, he told us, fifteen years old at the time.
- 3.4.10 The fourth letter was from a man whose son, aged seventeen, had been staying with Ball after getting into some trouble at school and being excluded for a period. This was an arrangement, the man claimed, which had happened previously with other boys from this particular public school. Ball was said to have asked the boy what he wore in bed, and suggested that they share a bedroom (claiming, untruthfully, that there was a shortage of bedrooms). The boy declined and came to no further harm. However the man reported that he had discussed this with people in "*senior professional positions in Sussex*". They had told him that there was "*local knowledge*" that it was inappropriate that boys should be staying with Ball. This man has confirmed the above in correspondence with this review.
- 3.4.11 The fifth correspondent wrote that she had been greatly concerned about Ball's behaviour for a number of years. She expressed admiration for Neil Todd for coming forward. Lord Carey replied personally, suggesting she contact police or come back to him. She wrote back specifying that her son had been approached by Ball on a number of occasions with '*unwelcome suggestions of a homosexual nature*' while participating in the Scheme, and that Vickery House had made similar approaches. This letter was acknowledged.
- 3.4.12 The sixth letter, from a man who said that Ball was his godfather¹¹, invited Lord Carey to contact him about a private encounter with Ball which might be relevant to the current situation. This letter was acknowledged. Some months later the man made contact again and was told that matters were still under consideration.

¹¹ Ball is known to have been the godfather of a large number of young people.

3.4.13 Finally there was a letter from a priest who had been involved in the Scheme ten years previously. Ball had taken him into a chapel where, at Ball's request, he removed all his clothes. He had then reluctantly agreed to be involved in mutual caressing which Ball described as "*non genital love*". He knew of at least one other person who could corroborate this account of Ball's activities. Lord Carey, who had ordained this priest, responded personally thanking him for his '*moving, frank and somewhat shocking letter.*' He was unable to comment on its contents because of the current police investigation but he assured the correspondent that there would be no cover-up and that he would put these matters to Ball as soon as possible.

3.4.14 Bishop Yates provided a written briefing for the Archbishop to consider over the Christmas period. In sum:

- Advice was needed from Dr. Frank Robson, the Provincial Registrar (the Archbishop's principal legal adviser) on the seven letters they had received referring to questionable or improper conduct by Ball with young men.
- The matters raised in the letters should be investigated, to assess the truth of the accounts and whether the men and /or their families would seek publicity.
- Ball might have to resign but it would be wise to await further developments in respect of both Neil Todd and the subsequent allegations from others.
- Information about Neil Todd's situation should be sought as there was a need to show care for him.
- Discussions should be held with Gloucester diocesan staff on the prospects for the diocese if Ball did or did not resign.

3.4.15 Bishop Yates had also sought advice from the Archbishop's adviser on ecumenical affairs, who provided a note on Franciscan spirituality (which was subsequently passed to police). The aim of this was to evaluate whether Ball was justified in relying on Franciscan practice to support his professed belief in the spiritual importance of physical nakedness. The advice concluded that there was no Franciscan tradition of either individual or corporate nakedness as part of the expression of Christian spirituality.

3.4.16 On 29th December Dr Robson wrote to Bishop Yates. He explained the various types of sexual offence that might be at issue, advised on the options open if the CPS decided to prosecute and considered possible subsequent developments:

- If Ball admitted guilt he must resign as bishop. He should probably do so even if he pleaded not guilty because of the damage a trial and the attendant publicity would do to the Church and to Ball's ministry.
- The situation could still be difficult if a decision were taken not to prosecute in respect of Neil Todd. How could Ball return to his diocese as if nothing had happened? His activities might still be considered by the general public to be scandalous, and might also amount to an offence under the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1963 ("the Measure") – the legislation then in force governing clergy misconduct.
- The Press might publish discreditable stories which could not be denied.

Dr Robson advised that the matters raised in the seven letters received must be put to Ball and the Church should acknowledge any letters of concern but otherwise should take no further action for now. We have seen no evidence to suggest that Mr D was asked to include these letters in the enquiries he was making, or that he was made aware that they had been received.

- 3.4.17 Mr F reports that he came to London on 22nd December to meet Bishop Yates at Lambeth Palace, in order to take possession of any relevant evidence. Files at Lambeth Palace contain no record of this meeting. Mr F told us that the only letter passed over to him was the first one described above, which contained mainly positive comments. (Although their letters were not released to police by Lambeth Palace some of the other six correspondents came forward or were subsequently traced through the police's enquiries and were interviewed in the course of the 1992/93 investigation).
- 3.4.18 On New Year's Eve the Diocese of Gloucester issued a message from Lord Carey, to be read at churches throughout the diocese. This contained the following passage "*At my request Bishop Peter went away while the police are investigating the accusation. It was clear to me that he was under great strain. I want to say that I am as equally puzzled as you are... We all hope and pray that the investigation will clear his name...*". There was no reference to the situation of Neil Todd.

3.5 The period leading up to Ball's resignation

- 3.5.1 Early in the New Year Mr A wrote to Lord Carey expressing concerns firstly about Neil Todd's welfare and then that the Church had apparently already taken the view that Ball was innocent. Bishop Yates replied, assuring Mr A that all involved were being prayed for but without responding to the second area of concern. Mr A wrote again, asking that the Church consider its response to '*what appeared to be a biased opinion from the Archbishop*'. Bishop Yates replied, some five weeks later, noting his concerns and advising that the Archbishop must be free to make public statements as he thought appropriate.
- 3.5.2 In January Bishop Stephen Sykes, the Bishop of Ely, wrote to the Archbishop advising that a deacon in that diocese, Deacon K, had told him of receiving worrying allegations about Ball's behaviour from two people including a young man who had been a member of one of Ball's communities in Sussex.
- 3.5.3 Bishop Yates sent a prompt response directly to Deacon K advising that the Archbishop had recognised the possibility that further enquiries might be necessary. In fact the Archbishop did now appoint someone to make enquiries into the various concerns raised about Ball. This was a retired bishop, Ronald Gordon, Yates' predecessor as Bishop at Lambeth and now sub-dean of Christ Church, Oxford. He was appointed in the second week in January with a brief to follow up and assess: "*...the veracity and significance of:*
- all the letters received at Lambeth;
 - relevant telephone conversations with Graham James (suffragan Bishop of St Germans in Truro diocese);

- any further leads /points from the bishops of Truro, Southwark and Chichester¹².
- 3.5.4 In mid - January Bishop Michael Ball wrote to a senior official at Lambeth Palace. His letter begins: *“Thank you for all your help over this ...and thank you too for going back today to try to make some preliminary overtures to the Home Office”*.
- 3.5.5 In correspondence later in January with a former bishop who had written expressing concern both for Ball and the Church, Lord Carey wrote that *“the facts are very disturbing and fresh allegations have been made. We must let the investigation proceed, distressing though it undoubtedly is to [the Ball brothers] and others....”* Meanwhile Mr D had interviewed a priest in London who knew Mr A. His intention was to explore further his suspicions about Mr A. In fact this priest described contact with other young men who had raised concerns about Ball’s behaviour. They included a youth who had told him that Ball had persuaded him to undress and then masturbated him. Mr D made a record that he was shocked by these claims.
- 3.5.6 However, upon trying to explore his concerns further, Mr D met resistance. He approached Mr Peak saying that he wished to interview Mr A, the domestic staff at Bishopscourt and the young men who had raised concerns with the priest in London. It appears, from his records, that he was not given authorisation to carry out these interviews – possibly in an attempt to limit the expenditure arising from his investigations. Mr D recorded that *‘I was learning a lot of disturbing facts about Peter Ball.....I requested Mr Peak’s permission to interview Peter Ball, for I felt the need to know the truth from Ball himself and not to be fobbed off by hearsay evidence from the Diocese of Gloucester. This request was also refused.’*
- 3.5.7 Mr D was also centrally involved in the next significant development. In late January 1993, by his account, he attended meetings in Gloucester with Mr Peak, one of Mr Peak’s colleagues with a background in criminal law, Mr G, and a QC. Ball himself also attended for at least part of the time. Mr D felt that Ball was protesting innocence without understanding the legal context. He explained to Ball in simple language the definition of indecent assault. He recorded that Ball replied *‘Oh yes, I did do that.’* Mr D then explained what gross indecency was and recorded Ball’s response as *‘I did have an emission.’* Mr Peak is said by Mr D to have put the consequence of this to Ball: *‘So you admit these offences, in which case you must resign from the See of Gloucester.’*
- 3.5.8 It was from these meetings that an initiative seems to have emerged for Mr D, with the benefit of his background as a police officer, to try to negotiate directly with the police. It was arranged that Mr D should meet with Mr F. Mr D recorded being told by Mr F that the police investigation had revealed *‘very serious allegations from all over the country, covering many years of [Ball’s] life in the ministry. Statements had been obtained from young men in Cambridge, Oxford, Durham and Newcastle, and many other allegations had come to light ‘.*

¹² These are bishops who had already been significantly involved – Bishop Michael Ball in Truro, Bishop Williamson in Southwark and Bishop Kemp in Chichester.

- 3.5.9 There are a number of discrepancies and contradictions between Mr D's recording of these and subsequent events and what we have heard from Mr F. Mr D's account suggests that he played a significant part in determining next steps and persuaded the police that he should carry out some investigative interviews and report back to them. Mr F has told us that no such agreements were reached.
- 3.5.10 Meanwhile Ball had been in correspondence with Bishop Yates, asking generally for advice and querying whether the Church would contribute towards his legal expenses. In his response Bishop Yates referred to the allegations received about other young men and to Bishop Gordon's being asked to follow this up. This led to a meeting in Oxford in late January attended by Ball, Mr G, Dr Robson and Bishop Gordon.
- 3.5.11 Mr G summarised his knowledge of the progress of the police investigations. Police had statements from Neil Todd and two other young men. Mr G understood that the incidents involving the other men took place so long ago that they were either "time barred" or it would be inappropriate to prosecute. However, both could be called to give evidence about Ball.
- 3.5.12 Mr G confirmed that Ball had accepted certain facts which could amount to gross indecency, *'namely that he lay naked on a bed alongside a naked eighteen-year old'*. What was known of incidents involving four other young men (four of the seven referred to in the letters received at Lambeth Palace) was put to Ball. He variously denied, could not remember or minimised the significance of these reports. The concerns in respect of the other three correspondents do not appear to have been put to Ball.
- 3.5.13 Mr G understood that the police enquiries had closed and the files would soon be sent to the CPS. Ball's lawyers would then make representations to the CPS. Ball again said that he accepted this and was prepared to resign (though he hoped that the Archbishop would not automatically accept such a resignation). Both Bishop Gordon and Dr Robson, in notes they had separately taken, concluded that Ball's resignation was unavoidable. Bishop Gordon's note ended with a query: *"Should a member of the Archbishop's staff be making any contact with the office of the DPP in the hope of avoiding the case going to trial?"*
- 3.5.14 It seems that it was at this stage that a proposal emerged that Ball be dealt with by way of a caution – a disposal to be used in minor cases when guilt is admitted. Mr D recorded this and there is some partial corroboration of his account in a Gloucestershire Police report, obtained by the Sunday Times under Freedom of Information legislation in 2016. The newspaper claims that the police report describes a meeting between Mr F, a colleague and Ball's legal team (no names are recorded) in a Gloucester hotel. Mr F has confirmed to us that he attended such a meeting. Police were told that Ball had made certain admissions to the legal team and would be prepared to accept a caution for an offence of gross indecency. There is further corroboration of this, and of Ball's understanding of what was happening, in Ball's own correspondence with Bishop Yates. In January Ball wrote *"if I am offered a police caution, do I accept it? And what then about resignation etc, for to accept a caution means you agree to the allegations?"*

- 3.5.15 Mr D’s investigations were continuing, apparently still with a view to unearthing information that might discredit Mr A. He saw Dr David Hope, Bishop of London, who, he recorded, gave him information which might support Ball’s defence, including material about Mr A. Mr D made a record of passing this information to Mr F.
- 3.5.16 Mr D then visited two monks at Crawley Down. They spoke supportively of Neil Todd and one of the monks then revealed that he himself might have been exploited by Ball. He described two occasions when he had been given alcohol by Ball, had fallen asleep and had woken to find himself and Ball in bed, both naked. (Some years later Peter Ball, in correspondence with Bishop Kemp, accused this monk of attempting to “solicit” him.”) The monk had also heard from Mr C, then a student at Westcott House Theological College in Cambridge, that there were allegations of mutual masturbation involving Ball and ‘*various boys up at Cambridge at this time*’ (implying that these relationships started before the youths went to Cambridge).
- 3.5.17 Mr D visited Cambridge to see Michael Fisher¹³, a retired suffragan bishop who was Minister General of the Franciscan Order within the Anglican Church. Fisher was strongly critical of Ball’s interpretation of Franciscan practice, in particular his ideas about praying naked. Mr D recorded that he said ‘*This is all rot.....this is only an excuse for his lustful way of life.*’ Mr D further records Fisher telling him of a number of other complaints against Ball, going back over years, involving mutual masturbation.
- 3.5.18 Lord Carey had been visiting South Africa and returned on 31st January 1993. Two days later Bishop Yates sent him an update on the Ball case prior to a meeting the following day at which Bishop Gordon and Dr Robson were due to brief him on the outcome of the Oxford meeting. Bishop Yates summarised the content of telephone calls from Bishop Michael Ball. The key points were:
- determination on the part of Peter Ball – or at least his advisers – to avoid a public trial;
 - hope that this would be achieved by a police caution coupled with Ball’s resignation, which was now on offer; and
 - concern about Ball’s deteriorating health.
- 3.5.19 Bishop Yates mentioned that he had spoken to the Chief Constable of Gloucestershire, whom he knew from his time there as Bishop, and wrote that “*It could be important to ensure that no accusation could be levelled at you at a later date of trying to influence the DPP – for example by “offering” [Ball’s] resignation in return for a decision not to prosecute*”.
- 3.5.20 On 5th February, following his briefing, Lord Carey wrote to the Chief Constable. His letter, which is supportive of Ball, repeatedly emphasises that he would not want to interfere improperly in a police matter but suggests that, if Ball were guilty, such criminality would be “*unrepresentative of his style.*” While writing this, Lord

¹³ Fisher died in 2003. After his death evidence emerged that he himself had been involved in an abusive relationship with a young man. We have found no evidence of any connection between these matters and Ball’s abusive conduct.

Carey was aware that allegations had been received about Ball's improper conduct with other young men and had already appointed Bishop Gordon to investigate them.

- 3.5.21 There was a campaign of support for Ball from some of his friends, some of whom were well known people in public life. They included Lord Lloyd who was at that time a Lord Justice of Appeal. The thrust of the correspondence received was either to state that the authors had no knowledge of any sexual impropriety on Ball's part or simply to commend his character and ministry more generally. Ball's defence team subsequently claimed that they had received more than 2000 letters of support.
- 3.5.22 Mr D's notes now reflected "*that [Ball] had been involved in a sexually promiscuous way of life*". In correspondence with Bishop Yates he wrote that "*We must do all we can to co-operate with the Police in securing authority from the DPP to obtain permission for (Ball) to be cautioned...for this offence. Without doubt the Police have powerful evidence of years of masturbation and abuse of young men by (Ball)*".
- 3.5.23 On 9th February Ball's solicitors wrote to the CPS. The letter encouraged the CPS to advise the police to issue a caution. The letter included the assertion that "*police have recommended a caution*". In a further letter to the CPS dated 18th February, the solicitors stated that Ball would resign if he were to receive a caution.
- 3.5.24 The police file was sent to the CPS in February. The file contains a recommendation from police that the appropriate charge to bring against Ball was one of gross indecency. The file then considers the advantages and disadvantages of the various disposals, depending on whether Ball admitted or denied guilt. No specific recommendation as to disposal is made by police in the records that we have seen (although, as discussed in section 5.3 below, there is other correspondence which suggests that police favoured a caution).
- 3.5.25 In mid-February Bishop Yates updated Lord Carey to the effect that:
- Mr D was now advising that Ball undoubtedly had a case to answer;
 - an undisclosed source within the CPS had approached Ball's lawyers seeking confirmation that he intended to resign¹⁴;
 - Ball had signed a deed of resignation. This was to come to Lord Carey for counter-signature and would then be held undated by Ball's solicitor until the CPS announcement. If cautioned, Ball would resign.
- 3.5.26 Meanwhile Bishop Gordon had advised Bishop Yates that, if Ball did not resume his ministry, there was no need for further action in respect of the seven letters. (In fact, a few days later, one of the young men wrote again to ask whether action was being taken and Bishop Yates assured him that the matter was in hand). Bishop Gordon suggested that a copy of one of the letters should be sent to Bishop Kemp, because it also contained allegations against Vickery House in Sussex.

¹⁴ We have not been able to confirm this. The CPS has told us that there is no record of any such approach.

- 3.5.27 On 26th February Mr F had a meeting with CPS senior solicitors in London. This was at their request and is not unusual following the submission of a report in a serious case, or a case with serious implications. At the close of the meeting it was concluded that the best way forward was a caution. The final CPS position would be determined personally by Dame Barbara Mills, DBE QC, the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP).
- 3.5.28 A subsequent submission by CPS to the DPP at that time concluded that *‘there was no prospect of successfully prosecuting Ball in respect of any earlier allegations than those advanced by Todd for the following reasons:- time bar or age bar in respect of gross indecency; consent of victims in respect of indecent assault.’* The submission went on to list a number of “public interest factors” which were judged to point towards a decision to issue a caution. These included the potentially damaging consequences of court proceedings for the victim. The inevitability of the end of Ball’s career was also seen as significant: it would prevent any further abuse or breach of trust. The submission from the CPS advised the DPP that: *“Had it been possible to bring charges against Ball in respect of more than one complainant, our unanimous view would have been in favour of prosecution on the basis of systematic breach of trust. In the circumstances as they are, however, we share the Police view that a caution would be a proper disposal and be in the best interests of all concerned”*. (Following Ball’s imprisonment the CPS acknowledged that this conclusion was unsound).
- 3.5.29 By this time Ball was receiving medical help. In a report written at the beginning of March and forwarded to Lord Carey, his treating psychiatrist reported that he was severely depressed. The delay and uncertainty about the criminal matters were said to be aggravating his condition. The following day, 2nd March, Lord Carey wrote to the DPP, referring to this report of Ball’s deteriorating health and urging that the matter be resolved without further delay.
- 3.5.30 On 6th March Bishop Michael Ball wrote to Lord Carey to say that it had been confirmed that his brother would be cautioned – presumably having been told this privately by police or CPS. A letter of 7th March from Ball himself to Lord Carey referred to his document of resignation, asking if it might be post-dated to 1st April as *‘it is worth four thousand pounds to me.’* On 8th March 1993 the CPS and Gloucestershire Police announced that Ball had been cautioned by the police for one offence of gross indecency and that a pre-requisite of this, as with any other caution, was a full admission of guilt. At the same time Ball announced his immediate resignation as Bishop of Gloucester. He also retired from the stipendiary ministry of the Church on grounds of ill-health and began to draw a clergy disability pension. He went to live at first with his brother at the bishop’s residence near Truro and then moved to a bungalow near the official residence.
- 3.5.31 Lord Carey submitted a witness statement, dated 25/11/14, in the criminal proceedings leading to Ball’s imprisonment. In that statement he says that *“I was worried that if any other allegations of past indecency were made then it would re-ignite a further police investigation”*. In sum, Lord Carey’s statement describes how, on 8th March 1993, he telephoned a man who he believed to be a senior officer in the CPS. He is unable to remember the man’s name. By Lord Carey’s account the man told him that *“any past indecency matters would not be taken any further”*.

Lord Carey states that he asked that this be put in writing to him but the man refused. Lord Carey statement goes on to say that “*I was as satisfied as I could be that this was indeed closure*”¹⁵.

3.6 The period following Ball’s resignation

3.6.1 There had been substantial media coverage of the criminal matters, including further (unsubstantiated) allegations against Ball. Lambeth Palace issued a press statement to the effect that Lord Carey had both co-operated fully with the criminal processes and launched his own investigations. “*Christian people*” were asked to pray for all involved.

3.6.2 Meanwhile Bishop Yates reported in writing to Lord Carey that he had been contacted by Mr A, on behalf of Mr B, and by Deacon K on behalf of two unnamed men at Cambridge. Both Mr A and Deacon K wanted the Church to apologise for the way in which Ball had misused his position, and demanded action to ensure that Ball was not entrusted with pastoral responsibility for young men in future. A note on Bishop Yates’ report, hand written and unattributed, states “*We resist such demands*”.

3.6.3 In mid-March Bishop Yates issued a memorandum to all bishops, seeking to demonstrate that:

- Neil Todd had been properly supported by the Church and that;
- criminal proceedings having been concluded, Lord Carey was better placed to drive forward his review of allied concerns which had been raised.

3.6.4 Dr Robson had given advice in general terms about disciplinary action which might be taken against a bishop under the provisions of the Measure. This appears, at least in part, to have been prompted by a number of private individuals writing to the Archbishop to express their concerns at the apparent inaction by the Church. Dr Robson does not appear to have given any written advice on whether the Measure should be used in the current situation to take action against Ball. Dr Robson noted that there was no reason why Ball’s name should not be added to the confidential “Lambeth and Bishopthorpe List” (“the List”). This is a register, maintained at Lambeth Palace (and Bishopthorpe Palace for the Province of York), of clergy involved in discreditable conduct. Ball’s name was never added to the List.

3.6.5 There was continuing cause for concern for Neil Todd. He had written to his local congregation, complaining that the Church was supporting Ball but had no time for his victims, of whom he claimed there were at least 50. He said that he had received no apology from the Church. This was reported to Bishop Yates. A number of other individuals and organisations, including Victim Support, wrote to express their concern for Todd.

¹⁵ Lord Carey’s legal representative has advised us that Lord Carey made this statement in 2014 at a time when he did not have access to the relevant records. Documentation from 1993 has now been reviewed by Lord Carey and his advisers and they have asked us to state that it contains no evidence of this telephone call having been made.

- 3.6.6 Mr Jeremy Dowling¹⁶, communications officer of the diocese of Truro, wrote to Lord Carey. He said that Bishop Michael Ball had not accepted the reality of his brother's criminality but believed he had been "*set up*" and was still looking to "*set the record straight*". He did not have support locally for this position and Dowling felt that Lord Carey should try to get Bishop Michael to come to terms with the facts. Dowling commented that, had another priest been in his brother's situation, Bishop Michael would undoubtedly be considering using the Measure. Lord Carey wrote back to the effect that he accepted Dowling's comments, and saying that "*Though I am deeply sorry for Peter.....there is clear evidence of misdemeanours that would have indicted any clergyman under the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure. We can't have two standards in the Church*".
- 3.6.7 At the end of March Mr D wrote to Bishop Kemp to terminate his involvement in these events. In that letter, which he asked be seen only by the bishop and Lord Carey, he explained how his position had changed during the investigation, so that "*I came to the conclusion he had been involved in abusing not only his Office but very many young men who passed through his care*". We do not know whether Bishop Kemp sought to bring this letter to Lord Carey's attention. Lord Carey told us he had not seen it although, as mentioned above, he had been briefed on Mr D's involvement by Bishop Yates.
- 3.6.8 At the end of March, apparently with a view both to progressing his attempts to help those allegedly abused by Ball and deciding what to do about Ball himself, Lord Carey wrote to police asking that they disclose the identities of Ball's victims. The reason for doing this is unclear as the Archbishop was already in possession of the letters containing allegations against Ball and had not made full enquiries into them though he had been invited to do so. Lord Carey wrote "*I am somewhat in the dark concerning the nature of his misdemeanour. This...affects what kind of discipline I put him under and what form of pastoral care he should have.....There are a range of options...from a total ban on ministry to a gradual re-introduction...into ministry again*". The Chief Constable replied promptly, explaining that police could not do this. The information had been provided to them in confidence, such an action could provide opportunities to Ball to challenge what had happened and it would be improper to release evidence to someone who was effectively the criminal's employer.
- 3.6.9 Bishop Yates then wrote to at least some of the seven correspondents who had raised concerns – three copy letters are on file. He said that the Archbishop's enquiries were continuing but it was judged that there was no need to trouble them further, unless they felt differently. The parent who had raised concerns about Vickery House was told that these had been passed to Bishop Kemp, who was sent an anonymised copy of her letter at the same time. We now know that this did not lead to any action which might have unearthed the abuse of which House was convicted.

¹⁶ Jeremy Dowling was himself imprisoned in 2015 after admitting sexual offences against children, committed when he was a teacher in the 1960s. He was subsequently convicted of further sexual offences, received another custodial sentence and remains in custody. We have seen no indication that Peter Ball and Dowling might have been involved together in any abusive activity.

- 3.6.10 The Ball brothers visited Lord Carey in April. In a letter of thanks the following day Bishop Michael Ball referred to his brother's pleasure that the Archbishop still had faith in him and wished him to minister again in some way in the future. He also hoped that in a few months' time his brother might be able to help out in the diocese of Truro. He commented that there had been "*a very nasty campaign to destroy him and others with him if they could*".
- 3.6.11 There was some wider support for Ball in the Church. The Bishop of Southampton, Bishop John Perry, wrote to the Archbishop after a large conference on evangelism. There had been discussion of Ball's situation and, he reported, an emerging view at the conference that after a proper process of penance and absolution he should be restored to public ministry. Lord Carey replied (less than six weeks after Ball's resignation) '*.....it may be that you haven't heard that he is actually retired on medical grounds, so the formula that some of you are asking for cannot happen. It will of course be my intention to see him in some retired ministry in the future, but there is still a lot of healing to be done.*'
- 3.6.12 There were also, at senior levels, some continuing misgivings. Bishop Gordon Roe, suffragan Bishop of Huntingdon, wrote to the Archbishop to express concerns which he said were shared by the Bishop of Ely. They had been approached by Deacon K and, as a result, Bishop Roe had spoken with Mr A. He spoke positively of Mr A, and queried why there had not been a clear, transparent process for the Church's response to the concerns he had raised. Bishop Yates responded to the effect that the Church had dealt with these complicated matters appropriately, though he did conclude that it might be useful for all those involved to get together and conduct a "lessons learned" analysis. (That is happening only now, 24 years later, through the commissioning of this review).

3.7 Ball's return to good standing in the Church

- 3.7.1 The enquiries being made on behalf of the Archbishop into concerns about Ball's conduct, led by Bishop Gordon, had effectively fizzled out without reaching any conclusion. From mid-1993 the emphasis of concern at Lambeth Palace was on whether, when and how Ball should be rehabilitated. Various initial steps were considered and discussed with Ball. The Archbishop of Cape Town, The Rt Revd Desmond Tutu, and Lord Carey corresponded about an invitation to Ball to minister in a diocese in South Africa. There was a suggestion that Ball might minister in prisons. These options were not acceptable to Ball. The energies of the Ball brothers were channelled into a drive to secure Peter Ball's return to public ministry.
- 3.7.2 Ball's resignation and retirement precluded the possibility of his occupying any further official post in the Church. The issue was whether, like other retired clergy, he might be granted 'Permission to Officiate' (PTO) in acts of public worship. A PTO is a concessionary ministry licence granted by a bishop, most commonly issued to a retired priest. A PTO allows the person to continue to perform the duties of their calling within that bishop's diocese, or a specified part of the diocese, for a defined period of time. Granting a PTO would be a matter for the relevant diocesan bishop to decide in consultation, given Ball's status as a retired bishop, with the

Archbishop. The relevant diocesan bishop here would be his brother, Bishop Michael, as Peter Ball was now resident in the diocese of Truro.

- 3.7.3 In July 1993, in response to a query from Bishop Michael Ball, Lord Carey commented that it would be unwise for Peter Ball to take on any public duties. Bishop Michael continued to correspond with the Archbishop, pressing the case that his brother might soon resume public ministry. Lord Carey's patience was clearly tried as both brothers repeatedly wrote to and approached him about finding a way to reinstate Ball. In one exchange of correspondence Lord Carey tells Bishop Michael that he is not prepared to be subjected to persistent pressure. The response from Bishop Michael is equally forthright, referring to the brothers' feeling isolated and unsupported, and to his concerns about his own position. He states his view that the matter had been handled by the Church with "*great personal kindness but incompetence*".
- 3.7.4 Peter Ball spent two days at Lambeth Palace in the first week of September 1993 as a guest of the Archbishop. This was followed by two letters from Bishop Michael Ball in the same week asking that Lord Carey do more to progress Ball's return to ministry. Lord Carey wrote to Bishop Michael reminding him that he had not placed Peter Ball's name on the List, and that he had considered this carefully. Bishop Michael responded angrily, remarking that he could take action unilaterally - as the diocesan bishop the permission to allow his brother to conduct public ministry in the diocese of Truro was in his gift, regardless of the Archbishop's views. The Archbishop consulted with Bishop Yates and Dr Robson before writing to Bishop Michael Ball to the effect that any such action on his part would be "*perilous*". Bishop Michael then confirmed that he would not contravene the Archbishop's wishes. Lord Carey agreed that permission could be given to Peter Ball to celebrate the sacrament of Holy Communion privately in a convent in the diocese of Truro.
- 3.7.5 The Ball brothers' campaign continued. The doctor treating Peter Ball reported that he was making progress and should in due course be able to return to ministry. There is also evidence that Ball was hoping to have his caution revisited, on the basis that Parliament was considering the issue of the age of consent in respect of homosexual activity. In March 1994 Ball arranged to be involved in "Quiet Days" in a deanery. Lord Carey learned of this and advised against doing so. In May Bishop Michael told Lord Carey that he was making arrangements for his brother to assist at a church in his diocese: the Archbishop again advised against this and the brothers did not proceed.
- 3.7.6 Lord Carey took advice from Bishop Yates in May 1994. Bishop Yates referred to the brothers' activities as "*manipulative*" and spelled out various options, including explicitly stating that no return to public ministry would ever be agreed. The bishop presciently felt that Ball would "*use any limited permission as a lever to extort more and more out of you, and perhaps other bishops, and you will have no peace*". Bishop Yates suggested that Lord Carey might take advice from other senior bishops. However there is no evidence that he did so, though he did meet and correspond with Bishop Graham James, the suffragan bishop of St Germans in the diocese of Truro.

3.7.7 Despite Bishop Yates' advice, a few weeks later in June 1994 the Archbishop wrote to Bishop Michael Ball agreeing to Peter Ball's return to limited ministry, in the diocese of Truro only, on condition:

- i. that his doctor agreed that he was fit for this; and
- ii. that Bishop Michael should first discuss the issue in detail with his senior staff team.

He added that Peter Ball should not exercise any ministry in keeping with the status of a bishop.

3.7.8 In fact, following the discussion with the senior team, Bishop James responded that there were doubts as to whether Ball's return would be welcomed in the diocese, particularly given the nepotistic interpretation that could be drawn. Lord Carey re-considered his position: he was content that Ball could minister at events such as small conferences and clergy retreats from October 1994 but, until the New Year, invitations should be accepted only from outside the diocese of Truro. Ball should not have any public ministry. The position should be reviewed at Easter 1995. The Ball brothers replied promptly, accepting this position.

3.7.9 From this point there is accumulating evidence of Ball seeking financial support from the Church. His requests relate to his legal costs and general living expenses, including the costs of refurbishing a property the brothers were buying. In October Ball approached the Archbishop asking that the Church pay for a QC to help him resist civil action being pursued by Neil Todd. He also queried whether the Church would help him mount a campaign in the press, to the effect that he had been punished enough. Lord Carey declined on both counts. It is reported that Ball eventually agreed to pay Neil Todd £15,000 in an out-of-court settlement.

3.7.10 Ball was a guest of Lord Carey at Lambeth Palace for two days in November 1994. Lord Carey suggested that in the New Year Ball should begin to exercise a limited public ministry - preaching, celebrating the Eucharist and visiting in two parishes in the diocese of Truro. This would be subject to local agreement - that is, the agreement of Ball's brother and the parish itself. He would be under the supervision of the parish priest.

3.7.11 In negotiating this with Ball, Lord Carey had apparently agreed to a request from Ball that he could be told the names of those young men or their families who had raised concerns about him in 1992. Ball asked that Lord Carey write to those individuals, seeking their "*goodwill*". Bishop Frank Sargeant who had succeeded Bishop Yates as Bishop at Lambeth early in 1994, advised against this and Lord Carey followed that advice. Bishop Sargeant's letter to the Archbishop also referred to the restricted ministry envisaged for Ball, describing it as '*one which did not bring him into touch with young people and children*'. We found no reference to this specific limitation in any of the formal correspondence with the diocese of Truro or the local parish.

3.7.12 For Ball a breakthrough came in early January 1995 when Lord Carey agreed that he could be given PTO in the parish in Cornwall in which he lived. The PTO was to take effect from March 1995 and was valid for six months. During 1995 Ball's

gradual return to ministry and the erosion of the Church's opposition continued. In January Lord Carey gave permission for Ball to go to the USA to lead Holy Week and Easter services in a parish there. In his correspondence with that parish the Archbishop wrote that "*Peter was Bishop of Gloucester but was deprived of his episcopal ministry two years ago because of a criminal act against a minor...Peter was possibly the victim of a plot but that, of course, cannot be proved*".

- 3.7.13 In March 1995 Ball sought permission to accept engagements as a priest outside his local parishes. In the same month he asked to be allowed to conduct the wedding of a godson in Gloucester but his successor as Bishop of Gloucester, Bishop David Bentley, was steadfastly opposed. Although the Archbishop originally supported Ball, he conceded and Ball did not officiate. In July Ball was permitted to conduct confirmations at a setting outside the diocese of Truro.
- 3.7.14 There are references in correspondence in 1995 and subsequently to Ball having been granted a "Provincial Permission to Preach" by Lord Carey. This is a permission granted by an archbishop to a member of clergy to preach (but nothing more) throughout the archbishop's province. It was not relevant to Ball's situation and there are no clear records to explain how and why it came into the picture.
- 3.7.15 There is some evidence of Ball deliberately avoiding the Archbishop's scrutiny. With reference to a request that he lead a service in March, there is a note of Lord Carey writing to Bishop Sargeant: '*I thought you and I decided he ought not to (do that).....Perhaps you could remind him that that we have given him permission to officiate in local parishes and so I am disappointed that he has taken this as carte blanche to accept any invitation!*' But, in any event, in September 1995 in line with a recommendation from Bishop Sargeant, the Archbishop agreed to the extension of Ball's PTO in his local parishes in Cornwall for a further three years.
- 3.7.16 In January 1996 Lord Carey agreed that Ball should be permitted to preach at a public school, provided that the school were made aware of possible hostile press interest. He further agreed in March that Ball could conduct confirmations and preach at two more schools. Ball was still the President of the Anglican Fellowship in Scouting and Guiding¹⁷ and the Archbishop agreed that he could attend their Annual General Meeting and celebrate the Eucharist at their headquarters in Gilwell Park.
- 3.7.17 In April 1996 Ball, who had not seen Lord Carey face to face since November 1994 asked for a meeting, ostensibly to hand over correspondence between Ball and the Prince of Wales with a view to it being held for posterity in the Lambeth Palace Library. (The Prince himself was not involved). Lord Carey's diary and Ball's health meant the meeting was postponed and took place in November 1996. No correspondence was deposited at that time¹⁸. At that meeting the Archbishop agreed that he would make a formal statement to all other bishops about Ball's situation. Ball subsequently wrote to thank the Archbishop and noted that he was "*not able to*

¹⁷ The Anglican Fellowship in Scouting and Guiding was formed in 1983. It is not clear when Ball's involvement with the Fellowship came to an end. The Scout Association has advised that Ball was also appointed to a sub-committee of the Association's Board in 1983. Indications are that any involvement with the Association was very limited.

¹⁸ A collection of such correspondence was deposited in Lambeth Palace Library by Ball in 2006.

defend myself a few years ago, being so ill and not having (an) independent solicitor who could draw out the truth... ”.

- 3.7.18 In January 1997 Lord Carey made a statement at a regular meeting of all bishops, to the effect that they could at their discretion allow Ball to exercise a full episcopal ministry – that is, to undertake acts reserved to a bishop such as confirmations – in their dioceses. He wished Lambeth Palace to be informed of any such instances because of possible press interest.
- 3.7.19 In May a note confirming this was circulated from Lord Carey to all bishops: *‘Bishop Peter Ball may now be regarded in the same way as any other retired bishop, but should he be invited to do any public episcopal acts, for his own protection, it would be helpful if you would let me know.’* There had been an earlier draft of the note, which included a reference to the *“best interests of the Church”*. Ball had re-drafted the note, replacing that phrase with the reference to *“his own protection”*.
- 3.7.20 Michael Ball retired as Bishop of Truro in 1997 and the brothers moved together to a house in the diocese of Bath and Wells which they rented from the Duchy of Cornwall.
- 3.7.21 In 1999 and again in 2000 Ball asked to be allowed to preach at services in Gloucester. On each occasion permission was refused by Bishop Bentley. Bishop Bentley had sought the advice of Lord Carey who had said that this was a matter for Bishop Bentley to decide, although he wrote in a memorandum to staff at Lambeth Palace in April 1999 that *“Bishop (Bentley) is acting in an unduly sensitive fashion”*. Lord Carey then wrote to Ball in May 1999 that *“I want you to have a wider role in the Churchbut regretfully, one diocese will remain a no-go area as far as public ministry is concerned”*. The dispute escalated in August 2000 when Ball sought to officiate at a wedding in Gloucester. Lord Carey had told the family that he had no objection but the request was then refused by Bishop Bentley. Lord Carey wrote to Bishop Bentley that *“He has my provincial authority to exercise non episcopal ministries and I really don’t think you have the canonical right to stop him. But I will not insist on this because it will only look very bad for the Church if I pressed the matter”*.
- 3.7.22 Ball went on to make full use of his PTO, accepting engagements in a number of dioceses, including the conduct of confirmations in a number of schools.
- 3.7.23 Bishop Kemp was to retire in 2001. Shortly before his retirement, following correspondence from Bishop Michael Ball, Bishop Kemp appointed Peter Ball as Emeritus Canon of Chichester – an award usually made in recognition of long and honourable service.

3.8 The first review and subsequent events

- 3.8.1 In September 2000 Lambeth Palace reviewed the events since 1993 because of a number of representations received, to the effect that Ball had been treated shabbily. This review was conducted by Bishop Richard Llewellyn, who had been appointed as Bishop at Lambeth and Mr E, an adviser to the Archbishop of Canterbury. In

fact they reached conclusions, set out in a detailed memorandum to the Archbishop, that Ball had been treated leniently, and that Lord Carey himself carried some responsibility for that. Lord Carey sent a reply dismissing their concerns and expressing doubt about the claims: “*So much (sic) of the claims...depend on various people’s interpretations of incidents. It was – and remains- difficult to find out what actually happened*”. He also expressed dismay that senior staff at Gloucester had behaved “*disgracefully*” in failing to support Ball at that time.

- 3.8.2 It is common practice for retired bishops to accept an honorary post of assistant bishop in the diocese to which they retire. However, Bishop Jim Thompson, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, declined so to appoint Peter Ball, having taken advice from Lord Carey. Bishop Thompson was also aware that one of the complainants against Ball in 1992/93 was now a priest in his diocese and still unhappy about Ball’s conduct. Bishop Michael Ball announced that he would not accept appointment as an assistant bishop unless his brother were also appointed and no such appointments were made.
- 3.8.3 In 2001 Bishop Thompson, having apparently changed his mind on this issue, asked if he could use Ball as an assistant bishop and the Archbishop agreed provided Ball did not conduct services in schools. However, a few days later, it came to light that Ball was already booked to conduct confirmations and other services in a number of schools. The Archbishop now said that it was never his intention that Ball should work in schools without restriction and advised Ball to withdraw. Ball referred the Archbishop to the permission he had been given in 1996 and Lord Carey’s subsequent circular to the effect that Ball be treated “*like any other retired bishop*”. He said that he had been involved with between 20 and 25 schools since then. It appears that Lord Carey had not intended his permission in 1996 to be interpreted so liberally but he withdrew his objections. However Ball was not appointed as an assistant bishop.
- 3.8.4 In May 2001 Bishop John Hind, Bishop of Chichester following the retirement of Bishop Kemp, wrote to Ball stating that he was willing for him to continue to accept one-off invitations to preside and preach in that diocese subject to the condition that there be no direct unsupervised involvement with minors.
- 3.8.5 In December 2001 there was a meeting between Ball, a barrister described as a friend of Ball, Bishop Llewelin and Mr E. Ball sought to re-visit the events of 1993 and raised a number of concerns about the validity of his caution. They included a view that there had been a conflict of interest in that the Diocesan Registrar, Mr Peak, was also acting as legal representative for Ball personally. Mr Peak himself has told us that he now accepts that it was inappropriate for him to represent Ball, though he remains of the view that Ball would in any event have had to resign on the basis of the facts known and Ball’s acknowledgment of them.
- 3.8.6 Ball raised a range of concerns also about the validity of his resignation as a bishop. He claimed that somehow Lord Carey had acted improperly in accepting his resignation; however he did not wish to embarrass Lord Carey and suggested that perhaps “*a quiet settlement*” such as a holiday would resolve the matter. His claim was put to Canon John Rees, who had been appointed as the Provincial Registrar to

the Archbishop of Canterbury. Canon Rees advised Bishop Llewelin that there was no substance to Ball's argument and wrote to Ball himself to confirm that.

- 3.8.7 In October 2002 Lord Carey retired and was succeeded as Archbishop of Canterbury by the Rt Revd Rowan Williams. In the same month Ball contacted the Chief Constable of Gloucestershire claiming that he had resigned as a bishop under duress, because his solicitor had told him that he would be taken to court rather than cautioned unless he did so. Ball asked whether in those circumstances the caution should be declared invalid. There is no evidence in the records held by the Church, nor in the (limited) information provided by Gloucestershire Constabulary to this review, of any response to this enquiry.
- 3.8.8 Bishop Peter Price had by this time been appointed in Bath and Wells to succeed Bishop Thompson. In 2003 Bishop Price wrote to Lord Williams to advise that Ball had again asked for a PTO as an Assistant Bishop in that diocese. Bishop Price wrote that Ball had never accepted that his actions had been "*immoral*" even though he might have been "*set up*". Lord Williams advised Bishop Price that he thought no change should be made to Ball's situation; in fact, Ball's refusal to accept that his conduct had been wrong served to underline his unsuitability to be an Assistant Bishop. Mr E had emphatically confirmed this in advice to Lord Williams. Ball then wrote directly to Lord Williams claiming his resignation had been "*invalid*". Canon Rees gave firm advice that there was no substance to this and there is no record of a reply to Ball's letter.
- 3.8.9 In March 2004 Mr E advised Lord Williams that Ball had renewed his campaign and the volume of correspondence was such that he would not pass every letter on to the Archbishop. However he advised that there was a difficult situation in Gloucester where Ball had accepted an invitation to preach in a school and then, retrospectively, asked for the permission of the new Bishop of Gloucester, Michael Perham. Bishop Perham was seeking to resolve the matter but felt that Lord Williams should be aware.
- 3.8.10 In August 2004 a routine criminal records check was carried out by the Church and indicated that Ball had no criminal record, when the check was expected to show that he had been cautioned. No action was taken. In December 2004 it came to light, following an enquiry initiated by Lord Williams, that Ball had been staying on the premises of a public school in Oxford and carrying out confirmations there. It is not clear how Lord Williams became aware of this. Ball had not sought any consent to do so. No action was taken by the Church.
- 3.8.11 In 2006 Ball became involved in the case of a priest in West Somerset. This priest had received a police warning for harassing an adolescent and as a result was in discussions with the Child Protection Officer (CPO, subsequently the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser, DSA) from the diocese of Bath and Wells. Ball advised the priest not to sign successive agreements about his conduct which were put to him by the Church. An agreement was eventually signed in January 2007. At a review meeting held in February 2008 Ball accompanied the priest. The CPO was unaware of Ball's background and he did not disclose this.

3.9 Professor Mellows' report

- 3.9.1 In the wake of national concern about clerical abuse in 2007 the Archbishop of Canterbury had announced that the Church would establish a "Historic Cases Review" to ensure that no outstanding matters remained unexamined. The Church had also established a new body, the Central Safeguarding Liaison Group, which was chaired by Bishop Anthony Priddis, the Bishop of Hereford.
- 3.9.2 Lambeth Palace received a letter from a man, (a nationally known academic and theologian), who had been present to support one of the young men interviewed by police in 1993. The letter argued strongly that Ball's case should be reviewed. An initial search of files at Lambeth also indicated grounds for concern about how Ball's case had been managed by the Church. This led to the establishment of a formal review of his case which was conducted during 2008 under the chairmanship of a lawyer and academic, Professor Anthony Mellows. It concentrated on the way Lambeth Palace handled the events of 1992/93 and did not consult diocesan files.
- 3.9.3 While Professor Mellows was carrying out his review, Lambeth Palace was contacted by police from Northamptonshire, who were investigating the abuse now known to have been committed by the priests Colin Pritchard and Roy Cotton. Police knew that Ball had connections with Cotton and Pritchard and suspected there might be a network of abusive priests. After taking legal advice and contacting victims or their families, the seven letters received in 1992 were disclosed to police. One of the victims referred to in those letters, a priest, while giving consent, wrote that *"I was ostracised as a "whistle blower". This was because, at the time, Lambeth Palace somehow breached confidence. I was approached by a number of Diocesan clergy and given a "warning" by my Director of Training."*
- 3.9.4 Northamptonshire police were able to contact four of the correspondents from 1992 but took no further action in respect of Ball. Cotton died during the course of the investigations. In July 2008 Pritchard was convicted of a number of sexual offences against boys in the 1980s and was jailed for five years.
- 3.9.5 In September 2008 the DSA in Chichester wrote to Bishop Hind, to advise that she too had been contacted during the Northamptonshire enquiries and had discovered that *"Peter Ball still has a PTO (albeit possibly only on paper) in this Diocese."* There is no record of any action in response to this concern, although Bishop Hind has told us that he thinks it unlikely that Ball did have PTO in Chichester, and recent enquiries have found no record of PTO having been granted in that diocese.
- 3.9.6 Professor Mellows reported in December 2008. He reached clear conclusions on a range of claims made by Ball since his caution, in which he had sought to demonstrate that he had been unfairly and / or incorrectly treated. He rejected repeated claims by Ball that he had been the victim of entrapment. He also dismissed claims made by Ball that, for various technical or procedural reasons, his resignation should be seen as invalid.
- 3.9.7 The Professor then addressed the issues of:
- disciplinary action against Ball by the Church following his caution;

- the subsequent PTO , and
- arrangements for ensuring that Ball could cause no further harm to children.

Professor Mellows stresses at the start of his report that Neil Todd was 17 years old, not an adult, at the time of the offence for which Ball accepted a caution. He details how a number of informants had written to Lord Carey in the 1990s, making allegations about Ball's conduct. There was a common theme involving nakedness. The informants referred to matters such as stripping naked and caressing, being asked to masturbate in front of Ball and sharing the same bed as Ball. There were further suggestions of "*genital contact*" and assault or flagellation.

- 3.9.8 Professor Mellows comments that it was extremely regrettable that these concerns were neither passed to police for investigation nor subjected to any forensic investigation within the Church. His judgment is that "*they present a pattern; and, had the incidents been investigated and substantiated, it is likely that all or most of them would have justified the institution of either or both criminal or ecclesiastical proceedings*"
- 3.9.9 The report goes on to consider generally Lord Carey's management of the problems arising from Ball's conduct and specifically the way in which Ball was incrementally allowed to exercise ministry as a priest and a retired bishop. The decision to take no action under ecclesiastical proceedings is criticised but Professor Mellows concludes that no practical purpose would be served by taking such action at this point (2008).
- 3.9.10 The headline recommendations from Professor Mellows' report were that:
1. no ecclesiastical proceedings be taken against Ball at this stage;
 2. Ball should be offered a "forensic assessment" to assist in determining the extent to which he might exercise any public ministry;
 3. arrangements should be made to separate out any pastoral care for Ball from any responsibility for decision-making about his future;
 4. the Church should seek to contact the informants from 1992 to tell them about the outcomes of this review.

The first three matters were followed up but we have found no evidence of any attempt to contact the 1992 correspondents to advise them about the review.

- 3.9.11 Events moved slowly following the submission of Professor Mellows' report in December 2008. The report sat with Lord Williams until April 2009 when Mr E was sent a copy, after he had twice chased this up. Lord Williams' covering note to Mr E advised that the report should have a restricted circulation, and specifically should not be sent in full to Bath and Wells. Instead Mr E sent a summary of the report to Bath and Wells and received a reply, from Bishop Price, commenting that it made for uncomfortable reading: much that should have been done in 1992/93 was not done and procedures had been followed "*lamentably*" by today's standards.
- 3.9.12 The CPO in Bath and Wells became involved in setting up the forensic assessment but experienced a great deal of opposition. She has reported that Ball began a campaign of telephone calls and letters disputing the decision. He threatened to

involve the Prince of Wales. He claimed ill health (and was supported in that by the psychiatrist who had first started treating him in the period leading up to the 1993 caution). The CPO was contacted by a number of senior establishment figures who supported Ball's resistance, including a member of the House of Lords and a senior cleric.

- 3.9.13 Ms P, a former police officer now working for the Church, had been a member of Professor Mellows' Review Panel. She felt that the treatment of Ball by the Church in 1993 was more lenient than she had seen in many other cases she had considered as "Past Case Reviews". She noted that "*no proceedings were taken under the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure, his name was not placed (on the List) and he did return to some form of ministry*".
- 3.9.14 It was agreed in May 2009 that she should further review those matters. She did so and reported in the same month. Her review focussed on Ball's abusive activity itself rather than, as the Mellows report had done, the Church's reaction to it. Her report set out some detail of what had been known at Lambeth in 1992/93 about Ball's conduct. Ms P confirmed her initial view that Ball had been treated leniently but at that stage did not identify any specific further action in respect of Ball.
- 3.9.15 Eventually, more than six months after the Mellows report was submitted, the forensic assessment which it recommended was carried out by a psychologist and professional assessor, Mr S. It was conducted in June and July 2009, in the face of opposition from the Ball brothers and others. It concluded that while the residual threat posed by Peter Ball was not high, he had manipulative and controlling tendencies and had not come to terms with the seriousness of his abusive activity. It highlighted Ball's recent public support of an abusive priest, referred to above. The report concluded that it would remain important to deny him unsupervised access to young people.
- 3.9.16 In September 2009, on consideration of the report from Mr S, a contract and a formal "safeguarding children" agreement were put in place between Ball and the diocese of Bath and Wells. Ball's PTO was limited to one parish. A meeting was held to confirm this, which Ball attended (and at which he challenged those present to be sure that he was not in fact his brother). A referral was to be made to the Independent Safeguarding Authority¹⁹ (ISA) and to the Local Authority Designated Officer²⁰ (LADO).
- 3.9.17 Bishop Price wrote in October 2009 to notify Lord Williams of this, advising him that parishioners had been misled by Ball about the events of 1992/93, so that there had been some local shock and resistance to what was happening now but this was being managed. In February 2010 Ball himself wrote to the Archbishop, stating that he had now been told by Bishop Price that he could minister in the diocese "in the normal way" – he made no reference to the limitation to one parish.

¹⁹ The ISA existed until 1 December 2012, when it merged with the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) to form the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS).

²⁰ Local authorities were required to identify an officer who would be involved in the management and oversight of allegations against people that work with children

3.10 The final years of Ball's ministry

- 3.10.1 Bishop Hind had learned that the Ball brothers were considering returning to live in Sussex. In April 2010 he told Ball that he would not be given PTO in that diocese. He received in response a letter from Bishop Michael Ball, complaining strongly about his brother's treatment, saying "*People almost queue up to have him baptise their babies (he is doing two at this moment), marry their children and so on*" and alleging that "*the assessor saw no reason why he should not continue to minister and the child protection officer said ...that he was no danger to anyone*".
- 3.10.2 A subsequent letter to Bishop Hind from Bishop Michael a few days later complained that Lord Williams was not treating them fairly: "*we found it very distressing that when Peter did exactly what (Lord Carey) told him to do, another archbishop sixteen years later told him he ...was going to hang him after all and put him through a very painful process before doing so*".
- 3.10.3 Bishop Hind sought the advice of the Chief Constable of Sussex. The Chief Constable agreed that police officers would review Ball's files at Lambeth Palace, to assist the Bishop's decision on PTO. Officers considered the files and liaised with police in Northamptonshire. They concluded, at the end of 2010, that, while there was insufficient evidence to initiate any new criminal investigation, it was clear that there were a number of allegations of questionable behaviour by Ball. It was not apparent, from those files at Lambeth, what action if any had been taken to follow those matters up. Police took no further action but advised Bishop Hind that it would be prudent to oppose any application for PTO in the light of these potentially unresolved matters. The Ball brothers did not return to live in Sussex.
- 3.10.4 In May 2010 the DSA in Chichester wrote to Bishop Hind, having reviewed the information that had been passed to Northamptonshire Police. She had picked up the association between Ball and Vickery House and noted that this might require further action. Later that month Ball was finally referred to the ISA, as agreed in September 2009.
- 3.10.5 In the summer of 2010 the Ball brothers considered moving to another part of Somerset. This led to a series of discussions in which Bishop Michael Ball suggested they could become involved with the Fleet Air Arm Memorial Church at RAF Yeovilton, which is outside the diocesan remit. This would have had implications for the safeguarding contract to which Ball had agreed, and there were difficult discussions between the Church's safeguarding officers, the Ball brothers and others. Eventually this plan was dropped and the brothers remained in the same area.
- 3.10.6 In August 2010 Ball wrote to Bishop Price, asking that his PTO be renewed, but commenting that "*three years after my Caution in which Archbishop George kept me in the wilderness, he wrote again and said that now that my CRB was clear, he regarded the Caution as past*". There is no record of any such communication from Lord Carey, but there was some substance to Ball's assertion. We have noted that there was a clear Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) check in 2004 and his file also contains a CRB check dated 28/9/10 which states "None recorded" for convictions, cautions, reprimands and warnings. Gloucestershire Police have advised that

cautions were not entered onto the Police National Computer until 1996 (Ball was cautioned in 1993). Consequently the caution did not automatically appear when CRB certificates were issued.

- 3.10.7 We have noted, from files held by the Diocese of Bath and Wells that, in submitting his application for PTO, Ball reported that he had committed an offence with a “*19 year old boy*” – Neil Todd had in fact been 17 years old when he was the victim of the offence for which Ball was cautioned.
- 3.10.8 Bishop Price subsequently replied advising that Ball should not continue to seek PTO. Ball responded to the effect that he suspected this was Lord Williams’ decision and asserting that other bishops had asked him to move to their diocese so that they could grant him PTO.
- 3.10.9 In October 2010 the Ball brothers received a press enquiry about Peter Ball’s association with Roy Cotton, and asking also about Peter Ball’s response to being denied PTO in Chichester. The brothers referred this to Lambeth Palace, with an email from Bishop Michael stating that his brother had no knowledge of Cotton’s abusive behaviour.
- 3.10.10 In December 2011 Lord Williams appointed Bishop John Gladwin and Chancellor Rupert Bursell QC as “Commissaries” to carry out an enquiry, properly known as a “visitation”²¹ in the Chichester diocese. This was in response to the evidence that had emerged of what are described in their first report as “*disturbing aspects of the diocese’s safeguarding failures*” in a diocese that had become “*dysfunctional*”. They were tasked with advising the Archbishop on any steps that should be taken to ensure the highest possible standards of safeguarding in the diocese. This involved examining current child protection arrangements as well as making recommendations for the future.
- 3.10.11 The visitation led to a detailed interim report in August 2012 and a final summary report in May 2013. This report (which contains no direct reference to Peter Ball) was extremely critical of the extent of abuse that had taken place in the diocese, and of the “*profoundly unhelpful and negative culture in parts of the diocese that led to its failure to take the action needed*”. The interim report contained an extensive range of recommendations both local to Chichester and for the Church nationally.
- 3.10.12 By the end of 2011 Ball’s public ministry had ceased.

²¹ Every diocesan bishop has the power to carry out a visitation of his diocese; and every archbishop has the power to carry out a visitation of any diocese in his province. A visitation is a formal, legal process under which the archbishop or bishop enquires into matters relating to the government and discipline of the church and, having done so, takes steps to correct things that are found to be amiss. While the clergy are legally obliged to co-operate with a visitation, formal discipline over the clergy cannot nowadays be exercised by way of visitation but only through the statutory disciplinary procedures established by the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1963 and the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003. A visitation can be carried out by the archbishop or bishop in person or by a commissary (i.e. a legally constituted deputy). During an archbishop’s visitation, the diocesan bishop’s ecclesiastical jurisdiction is suspended except to the extent that the archbishop gives leave to the bishop to continue to exercise jurisdiction.

3.11 The events leading to Ball's imprisonment

- 3.11.1 Despite his withdrawal from public ministry there was continuing hostile media coverage of the Ball case, including allegations of cover-ups and interference in the criminal process. In 2012, after advice from the Church's National Safeguarding Adviser, Ms Elizabeth Hall, Lord Williams decided that all the information about Ball from across the Church should be brought to Lambeth Palace and reviewed centrally. As a result files from the Provincial Registrar and from the dioceses of Chichester, Truro and Bath and Wells were moved to Lambeth and reviewed by Ms P.
- 3.11.2 No files from Gloucester were transferred in to Lambeth. Mr Peak told us that no records of the events in 1992 had been kept by the diocese at the time. He had kept records of his own work as Peter Ball's personal legal representative but he had subsequently sent those records to Truro, at the request of the former Diocesan Registrar there, Mr Martin Follett. He understood that Mr Follett wanted the files because he was dealing with financial claims arising from Peter Ball's conduct. Records at Lambeth Palace indicate that Mr Follett was asked for the files in 2012 but advised that they had been destroyed.
- 3.11.3 In any event Ms P had now unearthed the reports drawn up by Mr D in 1992/93. These records referred to the evidence of Ball's abuse of a number of boys and young men, and Ms P saw them as significant new evidence. She drew up a report, as an addendum to her 2009 report, setting this out. The report also summarised information on other clergy connected with Ball suspected of abuse and identified other individuals who might have information about him. She recommended that all the information now in Lambeth's possession should be passed to Sussex Police. She liaised with Elizabeth Hall who took advice from the then Director of the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (CEOP) whom she knew. He confirmed the seriousness of what had been uncovered and he himself referred all these matters to the Chief Constable of Sussex.
- 3.11.4 On receipt of that information Sussex Police began an investigation, Operation Dunhill, in July 2012. Early press coverage prompted a new informant to come forward and disclose abuse by Ball. For police purposes this was important corroboration of the concerns under investigation.
- 3.11.5 In July 2012 police made Neil Todd aware of the recent developments. Todd was now living in Australia, where he had built a successful career in nursing and was in a stable long-term relationship. He was also contacted by members of the press. In August 2012 Neil Todd took his own life.
- 3.11.6 The police investigation focussed initially on those who were "Schemers" in East Sussex in the 1980s and 1990s. At an early stage the investigation identified Vickery House as a suspect. Ball and House were simultaneously arrested in November 2012. At that stage police had evidence of concern in respect of eight individuals in Ball's case. Ball was de-arrested following expressions of concern about his age and health. However, the arrests led to publicity as a result of which another seven men came forward alleging abuse by Ball.

- 3.11.7 Due to his age and professed frailty Ball was never personally interviewed by police²². Instead interviews were carried out by correspondence. Initially Ball claimed that the majority of allegations were legally time-barred, and that when he had been cautioned in 1993, the caution had covered all the matters investigated as well as any future allegations about those events. He was to continue to protest his innocence, and mount a series of legal challenges throughout 2013 and 2014.
- 3.11.8 He variously argued that as a bishop he was “not in public office²³”, that he had never obtained sexual gratification from the practices he engaged in and that the complainants had been spiritually energised and refreshed by their activities with him. He did not accept that what he had done was a criminal abuse of the public's trust in him. He denied that he had used various Christian practices, and the teachings of St Francis of Assisi, to disguise his criminality. None of these challenges was successful but they served to delay his trial until late 2015.
- 3.11.9 Toward the end of the investigations there was a decision that the charges against Ball and House be separated. In January 2014 House was charged with eight offences against six victims. He denied the charges and in due course went to trial. He was convicted of sexual offences against men and a boy, committed in the 1970s and 1980s, and sent to prison for six and a half years. These offences pre-date the letter, received at Lambeth Palace in 1992, which raised concerns about both Ball and House. The offences therefore might have come to light earlier had the allegations against House been passed to police by Bishop Kemp in 1993. House has refused to meet us or otherwise assist this review.
- 3.11.10 Ball was brought before the courts in October 2015. He admitted two indecent assaults and a charge of misconduct in public office. This charge derived from his admission that he had misused his position and authority to manipulate and prevail upon others for his own sexual gratification. Had he not admitted these matters the Crown would have called up to 18 witnesses to give evidence of the harm he had caused them. The earliest such evidence dated from 1969 – more than twenty years before Ball met Neil Todd.
- 3.11.11 The prosecution had decided that they would not proceed with two other matters of indecent assault, although they did not accept Ball’s contention that he was innocent in these cases. Nonetheless, the alleged victims in those matters, both children at the relevant times, had agreed that the charges should not be put before the courts, and the Crown judged that it would not be in the public interest to proceed.
- 3.11.12 In his sentencing remarks the judge, Mr Justice Wilkie, set out the full nature and scale of the harm Ball had done, and the extent to which he had sought to avoid justice. Ball had not admitted any offences at the earliest opportunity, so that there was significant delay in bringing these matters before the courts. This had compounded the damage already done to those he had harmed.

²² Police have told us that while it is unusual not to interview a suspect, the decision was carefully considered after taking independent medical advice.

²³ Ball originally argued that a bishop was not a ‘public office’ for the purposes of the offence of misconduct in a public office. A preliminary hearing was held at which counsel for the Crown and for Ball argued the case. The judge held that the office of bishop in the Church of England was a public office. It was only after that decision that Ball pleaded guilty to the misconduct offence.

3.11.13 Mr Justice Wilkie acknowledged Ball's age and infirmity, and advised the court that he had received 17 testimonials, from individuals in various walks of life, praising Ball's qualities as a humble and holy man. However the learned Judge then made it clear that, by eventually pleading guilty to the matters against him, Ball had "*expressly*" – an adverb used repeatedly by the Judge - accepted a number of matters.

3.11.14 Those matters included:

- abusing his position as a Bishop of the Church of England;
- exploiting, over many years, boys and vulnerable young men for his sexual gratification;
- denying his wrongdoing, again over many years, despite the continuing damage this in itself caused to his victims;
- deliberately using practices connected to his approach to religion to identify and harm young men;
- misrepresenting the teachings of the Church and of St Francis of Assisi;
- exploiting his high office in the Church to deny the experience of his victims and delay his crimes being brought before the courts;
- damaging the reputation of the Church and "*its collective sense of itself as a just and compassionate body*".

3.11.15 The Judge concluded that the threshold for a custodial sentence was clearly passed. The appropriate sentence for Ball's misconduct in public office was 42 months in custody, which was reduced to 32 months in recognition of Ball's late admission of guilt. For each of the two offences of indecent assault, where the Judge set out multiple aggravating features, Ball was sentenced to 15 months in custody, all three terms to be served concurrently. He began his prison sentence on 7th October 2015. His earliest release date would be in February 2017.

3.12 Matters arising following Ball's imprisonment

3.12.1 Ball's conviction generated significant media interest. Consequently four previously unknown victims came forward and a new police investigation, Dunhill 2, began. In August 2016, with the knowledge and agreement of those four individuals, it was decided that no further charges would be brought. This decision took account of Ball's age and frailty, the fact that he had already been, and remained at that time, imprisoned, and that he also remained under public scrutiny as a result of both this review and IICSA.

3.12.2 On 11th January 2016 Peter Ball was sent, from Lambeth Palace, the following notification of a penalty under the Clergy Disciplinary Measure 2003: "*After consultation with the Bishops of Winchester and London, the Archbishop of Canterbury has imposed upon you a penalty of prohibition for life with effect from 23rd December 2015*". This is the most serious penalty that can be imposed under the CDM and permanently bars Ball from performing any of the functions of his Holy Orders.

- 3.12.3 During the process of this review, in March 2016, there were press reports that Ball had appeared in the past at various events, masquerading as his brother. The Church received this report from a parish in the diocese of Truro: *“On 18th June 1995, we held a Midsummer Medieval Festival, and invited Bishop Michael to give a blessing and officially open the event. He duly came, or so we thought, was charming and gregarious, and led a brief service of dedication in our church. Right at the end, he said ‘You all think I’m the Bishop of Truro, but I’m actually his brother.’ He went on to explain that, as Michael was very shy and he, Peter, was outgoing, he was happy to take on engagements of this kind”*.
- 3.12.4 This was quickly followed up by the media and Bishop Michael Ball was “doorstepped” on television. He said that his brother would never have pretended to be him. However, during this review there have been other allegations that this did happen. The Diocese of Truro carried out an investigation. Bishop Michael has told the current Bishop of Truro that there were no occasions when his brother took services in his place but that *“there may have been one or two events”* which Peter attended in place of Bishop Michael.
- 3.12.5 While in prison Ball started to write to one of the men who had made a statement about the harm Ball had done him. Those letters have been submitted to this review. The recipient told us that he was very distressed by their content. Police were concerned that they amounted to harassment and Ball was seen in prison. He received an “adjudication” for writing to a witness under the disciplinary procedures used in prisons and was given a three-month suspended sentence. Prison authorities also took action to monitor his correspondence and prevent any further such correspondence.
- 3.12.6 Ball was released from prison on 3rd February 2017. His early release was, as is commonly the case, “on licence” – that is, subject to certain conditions. He was dealt with under the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements²⁴ (MAPPA) in Avon and Somerset. The Church of England co-operated with the MAPPA process and worked with the National Probation Service in drafting additional licence conditions, appropriate to this situation. The bespoke licence conditions in this case were that Ball should:
- adhere to Church of England safeguarding agreements as directed by his supervising officer;
 - not wear any customary robes or other insignia that might identify him as having a clerical status or a status in a religious order;
 - not purport or hold himself out as having any permission or authority to exercise holy orders in the Church of England.

²⁴ This provision was introduced by the Criminal Justice Act 2003. Local criminal justice agencies and other bodies are required to work together to deal with sexual and violent offenders in the community.

4. THE PEOPLE AT THE CENTRE OF THIS REVIEW

4.1 Those who were abused by Ball

4.1.1 A number of those abused by Ball have chosen not to speak to us. Some have not responded to our invitations – we are aware that they include at least one person with a serious and enduring mental health problem, which his family have said was linked to his abuse by Ball. Some have told us that they still find these matters too distressing to discuss. Others have said that they have successfully put these things behind them. Some have decided that they would prefer to involve themselves only with the statutory inquiry, IICSA. Some are in negotiations with the Church and have followed their lawyers' advice that they should not see us.

4.1.2 Some people approached us to ensure that we were aware of the positive qualities they perceived in Ball and the good they felt that he had done. They included:

- those who continued to deny or minimise any harm he might have done;
- some who were clearly unaware of the full nature and extent of his crimes, and that he had admitted those crimes;
- those who had heard rumours about him over the years but had dismissed them in the face of what they felt to be overwhelming evidence of his “godliness”;
- those who now accepted the reality of what he had done but retained a loyalty and an affection for him;
- those who had been abused by him, and even submitted personal statements when he was sentenced, but told us that they also saw the good that Ball had done in his time as a monk and a bishop.

There can be no doubt that Ball moved many people such as the correspondent who wrote that *“I would simply ask that the Independent Review consider the extraordinary inspiration of Peter Ball and his example of Christian living to those who were lucky enough to know him for decades”*.

4.1.3 We started our work with survivors by contacting all those known to the Church and/or the police to have been abused. We have met with or spoken to all of those who asked to speak to us, a total of sixteen people.

4.1.4 Eighteen individuals made witness impact statements in the legal proceedings leading to Ball's imprisonment, and four more contacted police subsequently. Neil Todd wrote of being aware of at least 50 victims and another former “Schemer” told us he thought there would be more than a hundred.

4.1.5 We have summarised the evidence of Ball's abusive behaviour as there are striking similarities across the accounts of those abused by him. He had a well worn “modus operandi”, in which he would target and groom boys and young men. His abuse was charged with religious intensity. The men we interviewed spoke of how he *“exploited the significance, particularly within the Anglo Catholic tradition, of ritual”*. For Ball religious rites became *“a mask for abuse, and theology (was) used as a way of justifying abuse”*. The evil of what he did was *“compounded by his message that this made the victims more special and more holy”*.

- 4.1.6 We were told how Ball would “groom” some young men, telling them that they had great potential for holiness. They would then be chosen to share his bedroom. One man told us how as a teenager he contacted Ball to talk about joining his community. He was told by Ball that it would be a requirement that he take naked cold showers. He reluctantly agreed and was watched doing so by Ball. Sometimes the abuse involved cruelty. One man told us of being asked in confession whether he had masturbated. For doing so he was required to serve a penance which was to roll around in snow naked, before being towelled dry and beaten by Ball, to the extent of drawing blood. This man was one of those whose abuse Ball eventually admitted, accepting that beatings had taken place on three occasions and that, as described in the opening speech at Ball’s sentencing, “*on the third occasion he suffered a lot of bruising to both buttocks... (which) lasted about three days*”.
- 4.1.7 Some men reported Ball anointing their penis while they were naked. Ball would tell them that it was a way of enabling every part of their body to be part of God. One described how he was “*taken aside in a chapel, told he had a special future as a priest, asked to remove all his clothes, anointed with holy oil and touched intimately. The curtains were drawn, the doors were locked and he was told never to discuss what had happened with anyone*”. (Ball was aware that this young man had been sexually abused in childhood.)
- 4.1.8 One man was abused for many years. He made efforts to leave the situation but Ball persuaded him that his unhappiness was appropriate, that it evidenced the sacrifices he was making for God. This man described how there was some awareness in their community of how controlling and deceitful Ball was – he was referred to (covertly) as “Snidey Pete”. However he was skilled in exploiting an ethic of forgiveness – he would express contrition and, in that religious environment, it was always expected that he should be forgiven for what he had done.
- 4.1.9 The evidence from that man, who was first abused in the late 1960s, and from others highlights how long Ball’s abusive behaviour had persisted. There is also evidence that concerns about his behaviour were not new when he resigned in 1993. A witness, a priest, told us of an incident in 1982 when he was approached by two young people who had been invited to go on retreat to Peter Ball’s house. They wanted his opinion as to whether they should go, as they had heard rumours of “*inappropriate conduct*” on such occasions. This priest approached a Suffragan Bishop, who has since died, who advised him “*in confidence that there were problems of a sexual nature between Bishop Peter and young people*”.
- 4.1.10 Many of those who spoke to us were still generous and forgiving. One priest abused by Ball, spoke of the ways in which Ball himself was a victim of prejudice and poor theology in respect of sex and sexuality – particularly as someone who he felt was “*not called to celibacy*”.
- 4.1.11 Ball has never spoken publicly about his sexuality but he is known to have abused only men and boys. Another witness commented on how the Church should accept some responsibility for what happened, to the extent that its teaching about sexuality may have prevented Ball from forming an enduring, loving relationship and consequently contributed to the development of his perverse exploitation of the

vulnerable. Ball himself has never made any such claim in mitigation for his actions.

- 4.1.12 While many of Ball's victims were adults, there are clear accounts of him sexually abusing schoolboys. When support was being mobilised for him in 1993 there was much talk of his special talent in helping young people and even of his success in attracting them to the priesthood. But he also targeted troubled boys who, like some of the adults he abused, were seeking to explore their faith and trying to resolve doubt and confusion about religion and other aspects of their identity. His betrayal of both their personal commitment to him and their unfolding relationship with religious faith cannot but have caused enduring harm for some of them.
- 4.1.13 Some of Ball's victims were particularly open to exploitation. Notably, Neil Todd was in some ways a troubled young man, trying to cope with the demands of his spiritual journey - though we have heard of no history of mental ill health before he became involved with Ball. It remains very difficult for those who have been abused to come forward and disclose what has happened to them. It will have been even more difficult in the prevailing social mores in 1992. His courage and determination are striking.
- 4.1.14 There is no evidence of contrition in Ball's attitude to Neil Todd after the caution. Indeed he maintained a vindictiveness towards him and vigorously contested Todd's legal action before eventually making a financial settlement. Neil Todd had come a long way since the 1990s, establishing a stable relationship with his long-term partner and forging a successful professional career. There can be little doubt that his death was connected with the re-emergence of Peter Ball in his life.
- 4.1.15 As described above Ball would not admit charges of abuse of two boys in their teens at the relevant time. No plea was entered which meant that Ball's denials were not accepted. The CPS has referred us to the general guidance in such situations but has not provided an explanation of why they decided not to proceed in these cases.
- 4.1.16 This course of action had the benefit, for the victims, that a trial was avoided: they would not have to give evidence and be cross-examined. There was consultation about this decision with the two men and police have told us that the men accepted that this was, in all the circumstances, the most appropriate way forward. Nonetheless, we know that at least one of those men remains upset that Ball has not been brought to justice for the abuse he suffered at Ball's hands.
- 4.1.17 Accusations have appeared in the press to the effect that the Church sought to persuade those abused by Ball that they should not make complaints. Similarly some of our interviewees told us they thought that others had been "warned off" by the Church. We have set out in full the failures and contradictions we have identified in the Church's management of these matters. Some individual Church members appear to have favoured secrecy over transparency. But it is right to say that we have not found evidence to substantiate suggestions of deliberate attempts by the Church to conceal matters in this way.
- 4.1.18 However it was disappointing to establish that, as recently as 2008/9, the Church had failed to give an appropriate weight to its responsibilities toward those who had

been abused by Ball. Professor Mellows' report recommended that they should be advised of the outcomes of his review (when police enquiries arising from the cases of Cotton and Pritchard had been concluded). Correspondence from that review to Lord Williams emphasised that the Church's direct contact with the victims, even at that late stage, was "*at least as necessary if no action was taken by the police as if it was*". We have found no evidence that the Church took any action in response to this recommendation.

- 4.1.19 After the sentencing of Ball in 2016 Archbishop Justin Welby wrote to all those known to have been abused by Ball. That is the only formal contact of which we are aware that there has been between them and the Church (other than in cases where there are legal proceedings against the Church).
- 4.1.20 This is not a review of the actions of agencies other than the Church. Nonetheless it is right that we acknowledge the overwhelmingly positive feedback we have received from those abused by Ball about Sussex Police, and specifically the officers most closely involved in the criminal proceedings. There are certainly lessons to be learned from the way they approached their task, where unstinting support for survivors was a cornerstone, and continued long after Ball was imprisoned.

4.2 Peter Ball

- 4.2.1 Peter Ball was twice invited to meet us, while he was in prison and then after his release, but did not agree to do so. He was invited to submit a written statement and also declined that offer. He was provided with excerpts from this report for comment but did not respond.
- 4.2.2 Between 1993 and 2015 there is little evidence of penitence from Ball. Instead we see him repeatedly seeking to minimise or deny any wrongdoing or culpability. After the caution he wrote "*I regret with great penitence and sorrow the circumstances that have led to this caution*" - referring to his heavy workload, while failing to acknowledge the harm he had done. He then conducted, with his brother, a vigorous campaign to promote his own interests.
- 4.2.3 There is no genuine acknowledgment of the harm he has done. Bishop Michael Ball spoke to us of letters of apology sent to victims but we have seen no such evidence. As Ball walked into court to be sentenced he spoke to journalists about the remorse he felt. He has similarly professed remorse and his continuing commitment to the Church in letters written during his time in custody. His decision to withhold his co-operation with this review does not sit well with those declarations.
- 4.2.4 Ball was undoubtedly a man with charisma and a powerful orator. Both of the former Archbishops of Canterbury to whom we spoke during this review testified to his eloquence. He inspired trust and commitment. He was regarded by large numbers of people as a deeply holy man with a major influence on people. He had commanded and, as we have found, to some extent still retains a body of support across the Church. That appreciation was even echoed by a number of those he abused. One told us that he severed contact with Ball after 13 years but "*for the first 10 years I was inspired by him*".

- 4.2.5 He was also a manipulator and a master of self-deceit. The psychologist's assessment conducted in 2009 is revealing: *"What he failed, at any stage to acknowledge was the harm he may have caused to others by his behaviour... it was clear that the emphasis was rather on his own experience as a victim of the system"*. That self-deceit and self-centredness is further demonstrated in the contradiction between Ball's professed dedication to a monastic way of life and the repeated evidence of his reluctance to submit to the authority of the Church.
- 4.2.6 Ball's desire for recognition from authority figures comes across strongly in his voluminous correspondence which makes frequent reference to his connections with royalty, government figures and well-known public schools. By founding and leading a religious community he created a cohort of devoted disciples. He actively sought high office and elicited the support of well-connected individuals to further his cause. A picture emerges of a man driven by a desire both for followers and for the endorsement of the establishment.
- 4.2.7 Ball achieved the high regard in which he was held by convincing many to recognise him as a deeply spiritual man - a monk committed to an austere and authentic practice of his Christian faith. But any strong personal convictions were combined with a capacity for self-delusion, denial and manipulation. He vindictively continued to try to traduce the reputations of Neil Todd and Mr A for many years. He exploited the respect and the faith attaching to his position in order to abuse boys and young men, in the face of a professed celibacy. His household expenditure was reported to be extravagant but he continued to wear monastic robes long after he had resigned from his religious community. There was an essential dishonesty in his resigning as a bishop on grounds of ill health, which enabled him to receive a disability pension. There is no evidence at that time of any enduring disability and his campaign to resume clerical duties commenced only weeks after his resignation.
- 4.2.8 The former staff at Bishops court reflected on the change there when Ball became Bishop of Gloucester. While his predecessor had generally sought out some way to help the many people, often homeless and rootless, who came to the official residence to beg for money or seek some other assistance, Ball refused almost entirely to engage with them. His ministry appears to have focussed on the upper echelons of society and we heard little of his being involved in ministry to any poor or challenged community, school or individual.
- 4.2.9 An ability to inspire without a corresponding capacity to understand the position of others made him dangerous. That is particularly the case in a religious context. Those who trusted him and were consequently abused were trying to understand the most profound dimensions of our existence. That gave rise to a vulnerability complemented by their youth and often their innocence.
- 4.2.10 But it would be a mistake to think that Ball had a combination of talents, virtues and perversity unlikely to recur with therefore fewer lessons to learn. The Church will of its nature produce charismatic and inspiring leaders who are able to hold significant sway over the behaviour of individuals. One priest who had been abused by Ball and gave evidence to this review stressed that there is still a powerful *"cult of personality"* among priests, including some *"high profile"* priests, while bishops

still have a degree of “*absolute power*”. The Church’s safeguarding arrangements need to take account of such a possibility.

4.3 Bishop Michael Ball

- 4.3.1 An inescapable peculiarity of the circumstances under review is that Peter Ball had an identical twin brother who was also a bishop. We have judged it right to comment on Bishop Michael’s part in these events. Our Terms of Reference require that we “*review what information was available to the Church of England (within relevant dioceses, Lambeth Palace and central Church authorities) concerning Peter Ball’s abuse of individuals; who had this information and when. To provide a detailed timeline and transparent account of the response within the Church of England*”. Lord Carey’s statement to this review comments that Peter Ball “*exercised a continued influence through his brother in spite of his resignation*”. Michael Ball was a bishop of the Church, with all the responsibilities that carries. His involvement²⁵ was significant and revealing. We cannot but question whether his approach to those responsibilities was always appropriate.
- 4.3.2 Unlike his brother Bishop Michael did contribute to this review. He said that he had little contact with his brother during the period when it is known that Peter Ball was abusing boys and young men, because he was living in the north of England²⁶. He said that he had no knowledge of his brother’s misconduct before 1992 and had never discussed these matters with his brother.
- 4.3.3 He said that he had no memory of some significant matters, such as the commissioning of the private investigator, Mr D, although Bishop Michael was involved in making those arrangements and had known Mr D before he was engaged to carry out his investigations. Bishop Michael has been consistently loyal to his brother and supported him through all the events leading to this review. There are times when we believe his loyalty overtook his judgment. In early correspondence with Lord Carey he described his brother’s criminal conduct as “*silly*” – a term which trivialises what was done yet still indicates that he knew that conduct was wrong. In trying to mobilise support for his brother in 1992/93 he contacted potential victims and witnesses which, according to police at the time, “*had come perilously close to perverting the course of justice*”.
- 4.3.4 Bishop Michael’s lack of balance is displayed starkly in correspondence. Writing to Lord Williams in 2010 he accused the Archbishop of having “*set out carefully and cunningly to destroy Peter physically, personally and in his ministry*”. His priorities are illustrated again at the end of his career when he declared on retirement, almost petulantly, that he would not accept appointment as an Assistant Bishop unless his brother were also appointed to such a post – and indeed he never did. After he was cautioned Peter Ball repeatedly denied or minimised any wrongdoing and was at the same time supported by his brother in his attempts to return to favour in the Church. Bishop Michael’s unswerving support may even have served to shore up his brother’s persistent failure to acknowledge the wrong that he had done.

²⁵ The nature and extent of Michael Ball’s involvement is referred to below and earlier in this report - see paragraphs 3.3.14, 3.4.3 - 3.4.5, 3.5.4, 3.5.18, 3.5.30, 3.6.10

²⁶ Michael Ball was Bishop of Jarrow between 1980 and 1990.

- 4.3.5 We have not seen any evidence that Bishop Michael allowed his brother to impersonate him in conducting religious services. A priest who had been his chaplain told us that he knew of no such event and this would have been quite out of character. However Bishop Michael has accepted that there were “*one or two*” times after his brother’s resignation when he allowed his brother to attend functions in his stead. His legal representative has written to us to say that Bishop Michael “*either informed those at the event that it was his brother and not him who would be attending or asked others (including his brother) to do so*” and that, when his brother attended an event in his stead this was “*a result of some other urgent commitment arising unexpectedly*”.
- 4.3.6 The Diocese of Truro has also provided evidence which suggests that there were more than one or two such occasions, and that those instances were not all ecclesiastically or spiritually insignificant. For example, “*A serving Priest ... remembers that when she had her final interview to become a Reader it was conducted by Peter Ball who introduced himself as Michael Ball. ... (who) knew this lady well ... It appeared obvious to her that it was not Michael because he asked questions about her family which Michael would have known (and) hid his lack of knowledge by seeming very confused about everything*”.
- 4.3.7 As Peter Ball has not agreed to co-operate with this review we have been unable to ask him about this. However we have received no evidence to corroborate the assertion that anyone was ever advised that Peter Ball was attending an event in the place of his brother. Bishop Michael Ball has seemed unaware that this was at best a discourteous action which many, particularly those attending those functions and those abused by his brother, might find insulting. There is also a fundamental question of why Bishop Michael judged that it was acceptable for his brother, who had no official role in the diocese for which he, Michael, had responsibility, to attend events in his place – particularly if this happened when Peter Ball’s ministry was restricted.
- 4.3.8 It appears to us extraordinary that a bishop should, at best, be so careless as to allow himself to be impersonated, and particularly to be impersonated by a former bishop who had resigned in the circumstances detailed above. However the Church has considered these matters and has taken no further action. That may be appropriate in the light of Bishop Michael Ball’s age, and status as a retired bishop.

4.4 Lord Carey

- 4.4.1 While many senior men of the Church were involved in these events the Archbishop of Canterbury is the “Primate of All England” and “first among equals” in his relationship to the other bishops of Anglican churches. Lord Carey’s extensive involvement in these matters has rightly come under particular scrutiny.
- 4.4.2 Lord Carey was significantly involved in:
- The events leading to Ball’s resignation;
 - The way in which the Church treated Neil Todd in 1992/93;
 - The failure to ensure that complaints about Ball’s conduct were adequately followed up or passed to police;

- The failure to take action under the Measure after Ball’s resignation;
- The decision not to include Ball’s name on the List;
- The provision of funds to assist Ball;
- Enabling Ball to return to ministry.

4.4.3 Lord Carey had chaired the Commission that led to Ball’s appointment as Bishop of Gloucester. Lord Carey told us that he had never been aware of any concerns about Peter Ball’s conduct before the events leading to his resignation. He had found Peter Ball “likeable” and “charismatic”. He had been impressed by the number of young men brought to ordination through their involvement with Ball.

4.4.4 In a statement²⁷ to this review Lord Carey commented on the unusual background to the situation: “*The Balls presented the church with a unique, unprecedented and probably never to be repeated situation. Their evident success as gifted charismatic communicators and successful evangelists from the Catholic tradition meant they were widely admired*”.

4.4.5 Lord Carey was concerned that the role of other agencies should not be overlooked: “*For all of the authorities involved in the Peter Ball case there has been a history of failure*”. In his meeting with this review Lord Carey referred to a belief that the police were at fault because they did not give a sufficiently “clear lead” about the nature of Ball’s crimes. Yet the accounts of Ball’s behaviour were clear, the briefings provided for Lord Carey, principally by Bishop Yates, were thorough, the seven letters explicitly raised serious concerns and Lord Carey was aware of the concerns raised by Deacon K.

4.4.6 Lord Carey has expressed some regrets about these events. He says that “*Peter Ball was a plausible character and was highly manipulative. He deceived many of us who dealt with his case*”. Lord Carey admits that some mistakes were made but the extent to which he accepts any personal responsibility is limited. Almost every expression of regret is in the plural - “*we undoubtedly let down the victims of Peter Ball*” - and is tempered by a reference to the failures of the wider Church. It was “*the Church of England (which) enabled Peter Ball to continue in ministry*”. The absence of attention to Ball’s victims was a “*widespread failure of the church*”.

4.4.7 Lord Carey played the lead role in enabling Ball’s return to ministry – that was not a decision taken by anyone else. He wrote to police saying he was considering this before the end of the month in which Ball resigned. He had a degree of personal compassion for Ball that is not matched by an understanding of the nature and consequences of Ball’s abusive conduct. He wrote to Bishop Michael Ball in September 1993 that “*I had to face the searching question – if the same allegations and admissions had been made against and by a parish priest, would one not have expected the diocesan bishop concerned to have put him on the List? I did not do so, for in the end I believed him to be basically innocent, and ... my personal regard*

²⁷ [Lord Carey's submission to the Review .doc](#)



for him is very high". This reference to Ball being "*basically innocent*" is alarming – Ball was basically guilty and had admitted that. Lord Carey was also aware that the Church had received further allegations of potentially criminal actions by Ball.

- 4.4.8 Lord Carey was not without advice. His chaplain wrote to him in June 1994, concerned about the "*storm of questions and criticisms*" they could anticipate if Ball returned to ministry. The chaplain pointed out that they would be asked "*Is this the kind of length of punishment that other clergy who have admitted to illegal acts of this nature normally receive? Why has a Bishop who has admitted so grave an offence been treated so leniently? What are the signals the Church is sending to society as a whole about how it views betrayal of trust and child abuse?*"
- 4.4.9 Less than a month later Lord Carey, in a letter to Ball, set out the matters which he felt were important: "*The background as I see it is still the need to protect Michael and yourself from possible attacks from various quarters. In Michael's case I have a responsibility to protect him as far as possible from attacks from any accusation that his brother is being given a liberty to minister in his diocese that would not be regarded as acceptable in the case of any other priest who had accepted a police caution in respect of sexual offences and only 18 months after his resignation. In your own case there is a need to offer a credible defence if attacks upon you erupt again in the tabloid press...I also need to bear in mind that further publicity would not only damage your reputation and mine but the good name of the whole Church at a sensitive time in relationships between the Church and the media*". There is no reference to the matters highlighted by his Chaplain – nor whether reinstating Ball was fundamentally the right thing to do.
- 4.4.10 Lord Carey wrote to Bishop Llewellyn in 2000 that "*Peter Ball lost everything... I stand by a man who, overall, has been a wonderful priest and bishop.*" Lord Carey set the tone for the Church's response to Ball's crimes and gave the steer which allowed Ball's assertions that he was innocent to gain credence.

4.5 Lord Williams

- 4.5.1 It was under Lord Williams' leadership that the Church began its Past Cases Review which ultimately led to the criminal case against Peter Ball being reopened. Lord Williams then commissioned the Mellows review in 2008 and in 2012 took the decision to draw together of all the information held across the Church about Ball. That decision was prompted both by media allegations about the propriety of the criminal processes in 1993, and by the continuing concerns of safeguarding staff within the Church.
- 4.5.2 Lord Williams had known for many years that there were concerns about Ball. Deacon K, whom he knew and described to us as "*entirely trustworthy*", had contacted him for advice when the facts of Ball's abuse of Neil Todd were emerging in 1993.
- 4.5.3 When he became Archbishop of Canterbury Lord Williams continued to receive reports about concerns relating to Ball's conduct and his failures to comply with the restrictions placed upon him. Lord Williams learned in March 2004 that Ball had accepted an invitation to preach in a school without seeking permission, as he was

expected to do. No action was taken. Something similar happened in December 2004 when Lord Williams learned of Ball staying at another school and carrying out confirmations there. Again no action was taken although it is most unlikely that Ball would have been given permission to stay at a school and carry out confirmations, if he had sought permission to do so.

4.5.4. The Mellows review was commissioned by Lord Williams after he received representations from someone with a national reputation within the Church. That correspondent made his concerns very clear, writing that what he had learned of Ball's conduct "*stands in a class of its own for the level of deception dressed up in the cloak of holiness and piety*". Yet, when the review was concluded, the report sat with Lord Williams for five months before any action was taken. One of its most important recommendations, that the Church should contact Ball's victims, was not followed up.

4.5.5 Lord Williams inherited a confused situation regarding Peter Ball but he and his staff missed the opportunity to review and clarify it at the start of his time in office. He did oversee real change but at a pace which now seems lamentably slow.

4.6 Those who sought to raise concerns

4.6.1 We should recognise that there were those who saw Ball for what he was but were unsuccessful in persuading the hierarchy of the Church to take notice. The most obvious evidence lies in the seven letters received expressing concerns about him in 1992/93. Others also expressed concern to no avail. They include some who feel that their careers in the Church were adversely affected by raising these concerns.

4.6.2 We have seen that Deacon K came forward while the criminal investigations were in train in 1992/93. That approach did not lead to any appropriate action by the Church. She has told this review that she continued to express concerns about Ball and the Church's management of the situation in subsequent years but those concerns were never adequately followed up.

4.6.3 There were many letters of support for Peter Ball around the time of the caution and we know that Bishop Kemp and others organised a campaign to prompt individuals to write such letters. However there were also about 30 individuals or organisations, members of the Church and others, who wrote to the Archbishop highlighting the lack of care for Ball's victims or complaining that he had been treated by the Church with undue generosity.

4.6.4 In March 1993 a priest (who has since died) wrote to Bishop Yates, as follows: "*I have been trying to offer counsel to one of the young men involved...I believe he is but one of a number of people over the years who have been caught in a powerful if not always obvious manipulation and abuse, spiritual, emotional and physical : a heady brew of power irresponsibly used.... it does seem to me that justice and healing demand something more than a 'caution' and a resignation as Bishop of Gloucester.*" Bishop Yates replied to the effect that no further action was necessary.

- 4.6.5 The Church’s policy statements do now recognise the importance of enabling and responding appropriately to “whistleblowing”. It should be easier for those with concerns to come forward and there should be an appropriate and thorough response to those concerns. In Ball’s case those he abused and their advocates were consistently ignored.

5. THE CHURCH’S MANAGEMENT OF BALL’S CASE

5.1 The Church’s initial reaction

- 5.1.1 Bishop Kemp said in his autobiography²⁸ *“Although it was not realised at the time, the circumstances which led to [Ball’s] early resignation were the work of mischief-makers”*. It is not clear who the bishop thought these mischief-makers were, but his comment characterises a view that was held both at the time of Ball’s resignation and subsequently.
- 5.1.2 Throughout this review we have tried not to use today’s standards to evaluate actions taken in 1992/93. Formal child protection arrangements were then in their infancy with little if any consideration of the vulnerability of adults. The first government guidance for the protection of children was published in 1991, the year before the abuse of Neil Todd came to light, and long after Ball’s abuse of many other young men and boys had been perpetrated. The first Church of England procedures on child protection came out in 1993. Public understanding of sexual abuse was less well developed than is the case today. Now public agencies including the Church have more codified and systematised arrangements for responding to worrying situations, and processes to help think through how best to respond to them.
- 5.1.3 However, looking now at what happened, one is immediately struck by the extent to which Ball was seen by the Church as the man in trouble whom the Church needed to help. It is notable that the earliest press releases from the Church in 1992 seek prayers only for Ball, who was portrayed as a victim. There is little evidence of compassion for Neil Todd even though from the outset it was clear that he was a vulnerable young man who had come to harm.
- 5.1.4 Ball was legally represented by Mr Chris Peak, the Gloucester Diocesan Registrar. The office of registrar of a diocese is provided for in legislation, Section 4 of the Ecclesiastical Judges and Legal Officers Measure 1976. It is clear from the provisions of the 1976 Measure that the role of the diocesan registrar is to act as legal adviser to the bishop in the latter’s official, rather than personal, capacity. Yet Mr Peak took on the role of Ball’s personal solicitor. There was a general rush to support Ball in 1992 and the conflict of interests between the post of bishop and the individual holding that post was not taken into account.
- 5.1.5 There was a significant national context. Lord Carey in his written submission to this review describes how *“the Church of England had just voted to ordain women to the priesthood. This was the greatest challenge I faced as Archbishop of*

²⁸ “Shy but not Retiring: the memoirs of the Right Reverend Eric Waldram Kemp” (2006)

Canterbury with the very real possibility of a major schism in the Church of England. The country was in the midst of a Royal divorce...”

- 5.1.6 As the immediate and substantial press interest in such a salacious story developed the Church appears to have been most interested in protecting itself. The unfolding events were seen by some as having the potential to cause profound damage to the Church as an institution in what were perceived as troubled times. Understandably Ball’s case was dealt with at the highest levels within the Church from an early stage. Lord Carey had been briefed about the emerging concerns the day before Neil Todd took his second overdose and before any matters were reported to police.
- 5.1.7 Lord Carey’s statement to this review contests concerns about his approach to these events: *“Allegations by some that my actions amounted to a cover-up or collusion with the abuser are wrong”*. Cover-up and collusion fall on a spectrum that includes carelessness and partiality. In a letter to Bishop Michael only three days after Peter Ball’s arrest Lord Carey wrote that *“If the police do not take this to prosecution – and I don’t think they have grounds for doing so – then we could find the matter ends then and there. That is my hope and fervent prayer”*.
- 5.1.8 Lord Carey may have been unaware at this point of the unusual step taken by Bishop Kemp, Bishop Michael Ball, Mr Peak and perhaps others. This was the appointment of Mr D, whose approach was principally to seek to discredit Mr A. There is an irony in the fact that Ms P’s discovery of Mr D’s reports in 2012 was a turning point in resurrecting the investigation of Ball’s crimes.
- 5.1.9 Bishop Yates was to some extent providing wise counsel to the Archbishop - flagging up Neil Todd’s needs, raising the possible resignation of Ball and stressing the need for legal advice from Dr Robson. At the same time, given Bishop Yates’ responsibilities as “Chief of Staff”, one questions whether he might have done more to guide Lord Carey towards distancing himself from the Balls. Bishop Yates also figures prominently in the way that the concerns raised about Ball were never thoroughly investigated by the Church nor passed to police. It was he, Mr F told us, who provided police with only one of the “seven letters”.

5.2 The Church’s response to evidence of wider abuse

- 5.2.1 The Church’s management of those seven letters, containing allegations against Ball, is perhaps its greatest failure in these events. The letters came from a range of families and individuals quite independently of each other. They raised concerns which were all either indirectly or precisely suggestive of sexual impropriety, or worse, by Ball. These were not people who were at war with the Church or had any axe to grind. In fact some of the correspondents go to great lengths to try to avoid rancour and find a constructive way forward. Lord Carey had been briefed about the matters raised and replied personally to two of the letters.
- 5.2.2 Lord Carey had appointed Bishop Gordon to investigate these emerging concerns, a sensible action given the need for the Archbishop to maintain some distance while the facts were established. However that investigation was entirely inadequate. There was no attempt to go back to the correspondents to elicit any further detail or corroboration of the matters raised. It appears that Mr D, who could have been

asked to do this, was not made aware that the letters had been received. The response to the letters appears to have consisted of an inconclusive conversation between Ball, Dr Robson, Mr Peak and Mr G in which Ball denied any wrongdoing and was not challenged. Matters had been raised by seven correspondents but only four of them were put to him. Ball made a basic error in saying that he had discussed with police the concerns raised by the parents of one young man whereas in fact that incident was not reported to parents or police at the time – suggesting that Ball was being dishonest or was confusing this with another matter, of which we may still be unaware, or both.

- 5.2.3 In due course Bishop Gordon wrote to Bishop Yates: *‘I’ve been having a final look at the letters the Archbishop received ...from (the complainants). If [Ball] resigns, or is sent to trial, I feel sure no more need be done about them. If he were to resume ministry as [bishop of Gloucester] it might be wise to prepare a defence against the possibility of any of these correspondents complaining that no notice had been taken of their representation’*. The emphasis continues to be on protecting the Church rather than unearthing abuse or ministering to those who may have been mistreated.
- 5.2.4 At the end of March 1993, after Ball had been cautioned, Bishop Yates wrote to some of those victims and relatives who had raised concerns. He said that the Archbishop’s enquiries were continuing but it was judged that there was no need to trouble them further, unless they felt differently. One, who had raised serious concerns about Vickery House, was advised that this issue had been passed to Bishop Kemp in Sussex. Bishop Kemp was in due course sent a copy of her letter but we have seen no evidence that this led to any investigative steps, or indeed any action at all.
- 5.2.5 Bishop Gordon’s review did not proceed beyond this point and no subsequent action was taken in 1993. Some of the most senior clergymen in the country were dealing with this – we have identified nine bishops and an archbishop who were involved even before the caution. Yet serious concerns about an abuse of power and privilege were not adequately investigated, and matters which might constitute allegations of a crime were not passed to police.
- 5.2.6 Concerns about this are not new. Professor Mellows’ report in 2008, discussed in section 3.6 above, commented that it was extremely regrettable that these matters were neither passed to police for investigation nor subjected to any forensic investigation within the Church. Mellows’ judgment, which we endorse, is that *“they present a pattern; and, had the incidents been investigated and substantiated, it is likely that all or most of them would have justified the institution of either or both criminal or ecclesiastical proceedings”*.
- 5.2.7 The question of whether there was a deliberate “cover up” to protect Ball and the Church is unavoidable and important. We have looked carefully at what happened and spoken to all of those who might throw light on the events although two of the key figures, Bishop Yates and Bishop Gordon, have died. We have noted that police did, as a result of their own enquiries in 1993, speak to some of those who had raised concerns about Ball and that, according to police, their evidence was taken into account in the discussions leading to the decision to caution.

- 5.2.8 We have noted above (Para 5.1.2) that these were different times. As Lord Carey says in his submission to this review *“In 1992 our understanding of the abuse of children and vulnerable adults was woefully lacking. We had no child protection procedures or safeguarding advisers ...”* It may not have been quite so evident then that these reports were clearly a matter for police to consider. Lord Carey’s apparent failure to recognise that homosexual activity was at the heart of these matters might also be more understandable in that historical context.
- 5.2.9 However we have been unable to find any good reason for the decision – and we believe it must have been more of a decision than an omission – not to make police aware of the letters which raised concerns about Ball. The failure to pass six of the letters to police, reported to us by Mr F - while providing them with the one which was of least concern – must give rise to a perception of deliberate concealment.

5.3 The decision to caution

- 5.3.1 In August 2014 Mr Peak, in correspondence with the Church on another matter, wrote that *“I handled a ...crisis involving Bishop Peter Ball over 20 years ago. I managed to keep the matter out of Court, upon the basis that he admitted guilt in respect of gross indecency and indecent assault offences, accepted a formal police caution and resigned as Diocesan Bishop. I thereby saved the Diocese and the Church enormous embarrassment, to say the least”*.
- 5.3.2 We are concerned with the actions of the Church but we cannot tell that story without setting out the part played by others, in so far as we have been able to ascertain it. There is clear evidence in 1992/93 of a range of communications between the Church, the Home Office, the police and the CPS. The fact that discussions took place between these institutions has led to public concern that some sort of deal was done, to protect the interests of both Ball and the institutions involved. The key issues are whether the charges put to Ball and the subsequent disposal, a caution, were appropriate.
- 5.3.3 There was apparently at least one contact between staff in the Home Office and the Church on this matter, mentioned by Bishop Michael Ball in correspondence in January 1993. We have not found any note of this meeting, nor any further reference to it in official Church records. There is no evidence of any action taken by the Home Office in these events and this may have been no more than normal liaison between the established church and the Government, although Bishop Michael Ball had specifically welcomed the contact in his correspondence.
- 5.3.4 The CPS has now expressed regret about its actions in 1993. In a statement issued when Ball was brought before the courts in 2015 the CPS said that *“In order to prosecute this offence today, we have had to conclude that the decision to caution was wrong - there was sufficient evidence and it was in the public interest to prosecute at the time. ...Furthermore, in order for a caution to be given, a suspect must first make full and frank admissions to the alleged offence... such admissions were not made in the appropriate way.”* Ball had not unequivocally or formally admitted guilt - a prerequisite for a caution. Both the police and the CPS were aware of that.

- 5.3.5 The CPS has also written to this review acknowledging that *“other charges of assault (which were not subject to statutory time limits) could have been considered on the basis that injury had been caused. The incorrect conclusion had been drawn that some charges could not proceed due to difficulties in proving a lack of consent”*.
- 5.3.6 At that time the DPP’s consent was not required for the police to issue a caution and police could not be directed by the CPS to deal with a matter by way of a caution. But having consulted the CPS and having been advised that the DPP herself had reviewed the case and was in favour of a caution, it is perhaps understandable that police would accept that this was the right course of action.
- 5.3.7 Mr F has maintained consistently that police did not recommend any specific disposal. The most reliable contemporaneous evidence is the extract from the 1993 police submission to the CPS which has been released under Freedom of Information provisions. It is a heavily redacted document and we have only seen that extract, not the whole document. It sets out advice on a range of steps that might be taken, and does not specifically recommend a caution.
- 5.3.8 However, the information submitted to this review by Gloucestershire Police, referring to the meeting on 26th February 1993 between CPS staff and police officers, including Mr F, states that *“The note of the meeting prepared by the Crown Prosecution Service confirms that the CPS shared the Police view that a caution would be a proper disposal and be in the best interest of all concerned”*. There may have been no explicit recommendation from police but it seems clear that this was a decision reached and agreed by both agencies.
- 5.3.9 The extract from the police submission to the CPS does also stray into territory which may be outside their remit. It dwells on whether or not Ball would or should resign. It criticises the Church and the Archbishop for their handling of the affair while noting that *“these allegations must have been of (sic) a great shock to the Church and proved difficult to handle”*. It suggests that charging Ball would *“have a devastating effect on the Church which is already in turmoil”*.
- 5.3.10 Our task is to consider the Church and its actions but the Church will not have been helped by some aspects of the way in which other arms of “the establishment” approached their duties.
- 5.3.11 In February 1993, as described above, Lord Carey wrote a letter to the Chief Constable in Gloucestershire. In that letter Lord Carey is at pains to avoid any implication that he might be seen to be influencing the authorities inappropriately. The letter also gives a clear impression that he saw these matters as entirely out of character for Ball, saying: *“the testimony from many young men whom he has helped over the years – and the list must run in hundreds – is such that if he is guilty of unprofessional behaviour it is quite unrepresentative of his style....”* The propriety of the Archbishop seeking to intervene at all is questionable. To claim that the allegations against Ball were *“unrepresentative”*, when he was already aware that the Church had received letters raising concern about Ball’s abuse of other young men, was wrong.

5.3.12 Lord Carey also wrote, quite appropriately, to the DPP to advise that Ball's health was declining so that an early decision on the action to be taken would help him. However the letter refers to "*a meeting last Friday between the Bishop's representatives and officials of your department*". We report this because it could suggest that some sort of negotiation or bargaining might be taking place, and that the Church had knowledge of that. We have found no other reference to this meeting and the CPS has no record of such a meeting. Lord Carey may simply have made a mistake, because there was a meeting between police and CPS on that day, 26th February 1993, which both agencies have confirmed did take place.

5.4 The failure to take action under ecclesiastical law

5.4.1 In March 1993 Bishop Yates told Lord Carey that Dr Robson had provided advice on the procedure involved in taking disciplinary action against a bishop under the terms of the Measure. Dr Robson's advice does not address the issue of whether this would be appropriate in Ball's case. There is no evidence of any further consideration of such a step.

5.4.2 It is perhaps not surprising that this was what happened. All involved will have been relieved that the situation had apparently been concluded. Ball was at the time unwell and had resigned. In many professions and callings we have seen disciplinary processes avoided by a resignation. One can perhaps understand why there might have been a view that, in all the circumstances, disciplinary action was unnecessary. It was the easy option but it was not the right option.

5.4.3 Dr Robson did advise that there was no reason why Ball's name should not be added to the List but that was never done. Lord Carey has said publicly that he now regrets that he did not use the List. He has suggested that such a step might have prevented Ball's incremental return to ministry. He was swayed at the time by Ball's presentation of himself as unwell and unlikely to return to ministry, supported by advice from a psychiatrist. However that presentation changed rapidly and Ball was soon very actively challenging the actions taken against him, apparently unconstrained by any ill health.

5.4.4 The Ball brothers mounted a campaign in which the Archbishop repeatedly gave ground. The brothers will have been encouraged by the cordial relations maintained by the Archbishop. He had them to stay with him immediately after the caution and paid for a brief holiday for them. Peter Ball then stayed again at Lambeth Palace in September 1993 and November 1994. Ball also received an unusual degree of financial support from the Church. The Archbishop's chaplain, Colin Fletcher, now the Bishop of Dorchester, wrote to Lord Carey in 1994 as follows:

"You said that you would try to get him £20,000 ... You sent him £5000 in May 1993

£2500 in January 1994

You got him £5000 from the Church Commissioners

4 letters (attached) contain the Balls' requests for money from you...In all he has received £12500 but that leaves him £7500 short... he is obviously bitter about this"

We have also seen evidence of other relatively small payments to Ball authorised by Lord Carey.

- 5.4.5 Lord Carey told us that this was not special treatment and that he might have done the same for other churchmen. But in these particular circumstances his approach appears unwise. It is likely to have led people in the Church to believe that Ball was essentially innocent, and to have encouraged the Balls to persist when a firmer line would have been advisable. Lord Carey told us that in this respect he would do things differently now.
- 5.4.6 When they reviewed events in 2000 Bishop Llewellyn and Mr E wrote to Lord Carey that *“one might have expected Peter Ball to have been asked to resign and be put on (the List) ... for a minimum of five years. ...Even after five years, precedents suggest his restoration to ministry might have been more gradual, since there is little or no apparent acceptance of responsibility or recognition of the harm he has done to his victim(s) and the Church more generally. There are only brief glimpses of penitence or remorse and these vanish altogether once the Ball brothers retire and live in the same house”*.
- 5.4.7 Lord Carey responded brusquely: *“I am sure it was right to be compassionate and tender. I don't have any qualms in this area”*. Bishop Llewellyn sent an emollient reply, noting that *“All my statements in the earlier memo about your pastoral response and indeed gifts of money were not in any sense meant critically but were placed there to record how totally inaccurate it is of people to say that Bishop Peter (was treated shabbily)... In the light of your conviction at the time that it was Bishop Peter who had been wronged more than anyone else, and in this - as you say - you were fully supported by Bishop John Yates and Bishop Frank Sargeant²⁹, it is understandable that he was not put on the Caution List”*.
- 5.4.8 The failure to take any action under ecclesiastical proceedings was first formally reviewed in the Mellows report. The decision to take no action is described notably by Mellows as *“one of the least elegant aspects of this matter”*. Professor Mellows goes on to conclude that *“The treatment of Bishop Ball in this respect (as in other respects) contrasts with that generally accorded to parish priests. If a parish priest committed an offence of gross indecency, it is almost inevitable that his or her name would be put on the List, and this would have been so both in the early 1990's as well as at the present time. The fact that Bishop Ball's name was not listed could readily give rise to the impression that he was being treated with undue leniency and that other clergy whose names were Listed were being treated unfairly”*.

5.5 Ball's associations with other abusive clerics

- 5.5.1 It was gradually recognised that there was a particular cause for concern about abuse perpetrated by clerics in the diocese of Chichester, where Peter Ball had first been a bishop. A review, the “Historic Cases Review”, had been commissioned by Bishop Hind and carried out by an independent person with a background in safeguarding, Mr Roger Meekings, in 2008/9. That wide ranging review led the diocese to ask Mr Meekings specifically to review matters relating to the abuse perpetrated by Colin Pritchard and Roy Cotton. Meekings' review of Cotton and

²⁹ Bishop Sargeant has told us that he did not take the view that Ball had been wronged more than anyone else.

Pritchard was then augmented by the review led by Baroness Butler-Sloss, eventually published in 2012.

- 5.5.2 Ball's connections with Pritchard and Cotton are well-evidenced. An account of Ball abusing a 13 year old boy in the presence of Pritchard and Cotton led to one of the charges which he did not admit when imprisoned. This connection and others prompt a consideration of whether Ball's activities extended to involvement in some sort of organised abuse.
- 5.5.3 There is evidence of Ball associating with other abusive priests. Three men have made statements to the effect that they were abused by both Ball and Vickery House. One of House's victims had complained to the police in 1993 about Ball's sexual pestering. Another youth wrote to Ball expressing concerns about House's activities. Ball replied advising that the matter was being looked into and would not happen again. There is no record of Ball taking any action.
- 5.5.4 Ball is known to have associated during the 1970s and 1980s, with other priests in the Diocese of Chichester for whom there is cause for concern related to abusive behaviour:
- In 1978 a woman approached Ball to complain that a priest had abused her daughter. Ball is said to have arranged for the priest to be moved to another diocese but to have taken no other action in response to this report of a serious crime.
 - In May 1984 a priest was convicted of gross indecency involving a 14 year-old boy and served a custodial sentence. On release he stayed with Ball's 'community' in Sussex following which Ball gave him a positive reference recommending an early return to work.
 - In about 1986 Ball received complaints from the wife of a priest that her husband had sexually abused a young child. The priest was a friend of Ball, who had lobbied for him to be appointed to his position. Ball again arranged for this priest to stay with him. The Church has a record of this priest subsequently admitting to a "*weakness with children*".
- 5.5.5 Most recently we have noted above that Ball became involved, between 2006 and 2008, in the defence of a priest in West Somerset who had received a police warning for harassing an adolescent.
- 5.5.6 All those victims of Ball's abuse to whom we spoke were asked about the possibility or likelihood of his being involved with others. We received one account of Ball and another cleric taking a young man on a tour of gay bars while on a trip abroad. One of those abused by Ball was adamant that Ball, House and another man, who is the subject of a current police investigation, colluded in their abuse of him.
- 5.5.7 Most of those we spoke with would not go so far as to say that there had been an organised "ring" of abusive priests. However some felt that there had been particular issues relating to the Chichester diocese, where the conditions were right for "like minded" people to come together. Chichester had certainly seen at least collusion and a failure to challenge evidence of concern by those in positions of power. That was recognised in the decision to conduct the Visitation.

- 5.5.8 Ball's associations with other abusive priests are unlikely to be coincidental. They are also significant in that not only did Ball collude with others but he certainly contributed to the concealment of abuse. Finally, his support for abusers increased the likelihood of subsequent abuse.
- 5.5.9 There will be different degrees of organisation and association within a category of "organised abuse". We have not found evidence of organised abuse in the sense that there were clear mutual arrangements between perpetrators to identify, groom and abuse victims. Sussex Police told us that they were reluctant to reach such a conclusion after their extensive enquiries into Ball's conduct. An insightful comment on this aspect of the situation was made by one of those who spoke to us about his direct experience of being abused by Ball. He said that what made Ball's consistent involvement in organised abuse most unlikely was "*Ball's hubris - his arrogance and conceit made him a "lone wolf".*"

5.6 An abusive bishop

- 5.6.1 Survivors of Ball's abuse have spoken of their anger that he remained entitled to style himself as a Bishop and use the designation "Right Reverend". There is no provision for deposition from holy orders under the CDM 2003; there remains such provision under the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1963 but only in respect of offences involving matter of doctrine, ritual or ceremonial.
- 5.6.2 We have seen that Ball was:
- older than those he abused;
 - in a position to identify and exploit troubled boys and young men;
 - able to rely on and exploit connections with famous and powerful people.

But, most significant of all, he was a bishop. In the structures of the Church, a bishop has a crucial and central role, underpinned by an essential autonomy. Even a retired bishop could draw on a particular spiritual authority over those he might seek to exploit.

- 5.6.3 We were struck during this review by a manifest culture of deference both to authority figures in the Church, particularly bishops, and to individuals with distinctive religious reputations – or both. This deference had two negative consequences. Firstly it discouraged people from "*speaking truth to power*". Then, on the few occasions where people did speak out and were rebuffed by a bishop – the summit of the hierarchy – there was nowhere else to go. That reinforced the barriers to stepping up in the first place.
- 5.6.4 We have received evidence from the Church of arrangements now in place to underpin the appointment of bishops. They include detailed provision for checks and interviews, with a number of measures which aim to ensure that adequate account is taken of safeguarding requirements. For most leadership positions there are job descriptions and specifications of standards that explicitly refer to safeguarding responsibilities. The Church's two archbishops insist that all newly

appointed bishops undertake additional safeguarding training prior to their consecration as bishops.

- 5.6.5 In 2014 the Church established a development programme for those aspiring to senior leadership positions. The curriculum includes consideration of current legal issues including those relating to safeguarding. The programme also seeks to develop skills which have a bearing on promoting safeguarding such as effective team working. The Church now also has a programme of Continuing Ministry Development which includes an appraisal in which leaders can proactively address areas for specific development including safeguarding.
- 5.6.6 The Church has overhauled its disciplinary processes (a long and time consuming process given that primary legislation is required). The Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 introduced much revised and improved rules and procedures. This includes provisions which deal specifically with the disciplining of a bishop subject to investigations for misconduct. Following his conviction Ball received a sanction under this measure.
- 5.6.7 Yet the possibility remains that an abusive candidate could come through selection and training processes, or adopt abusive behaviour once in post. No religious organisation can absolutely guarantee to prevent harm being perpetrated by a manipulative person who has the power that comes with seniority and protected access to vulnerable people. Consequently the Church needs to maintain a continuing vigilance and a readiness to “think the unthinkable”. Safeguarding arrangements need to be sufficiently resilient to enable an effective response to another abusive bishop or person with similar seniority. The responsibility for that sits with the House of Bishops.

5.7 The significance of homosexuality in these events

- 5.7.1 When Ball was first a priest, and a bishop, homosexuality was the subject of clear legal and religious proscription. There was also a higher and more overt level of societal prejudice against homosexuality than there is today. For clerics and the faithful these religious, legal and social pressures served to reinforce a strong taboo. It was extremely difficult for those such as Ball’s victims to speak openly to family members, others in the church or in authority about their experiences and concerns. They had good cause to fear legal action, social ostracisation and damage to their careers. This gave Ball confidence that his victims would remain silent about their experiences. The taboo may have contributed to what appears to be his own denial and self-deceit.
- 5.7.2 There was, in some parts of the Church, an inexperience and naïveté in relation to homosexuality, certainly during the early years under review. Ball successfully conflated abusive sexual activity with practices which were towards the margins of intense spirituality. There was also a trivialisation in the Church of the nature and consequences of conduct which was known to be wrong – Roy Cotton was ordained despite having an acknowledged conviction for the sexual abuse of a boy, while, for the same matter and in the same era, he was permanently excluded from the Scouting movement. That overall context of confusion and denial contributed to the inadequacy of the Church’s response to Ball’s misconduct. It promoted the view

that a person of Ball's religious stature was incapable of truly abusive behaviour, so that the accusations against him must be misguided or malicious.

- 5.7.3 This issue continues to be a source of division and debate in the Church, and an important concern for some of Ball's victims. We would simply emphasise that the Church must promote an open and accepting culture in which everyone, regardless of their sexuality or their views about homosexuality, is clear about their responsibilities towards those who might be abused or who might want to raise concerns about abuse.

6. CONCERNS OUTSIDE THE CHURCH

6.1 Ball's status and connections

- 6.1.1 There has been public speculation that the response of the Church (and of public authorities) to the allegations against Peter Ball, his caution and his subsequent requests to return to active public ministry, was improperly influenced by Ball's connections with prominent and influential figures, and that he was able to use those connections to obtain preferential treatment by the Church (as well as by public authorities). There is no doubt that Ball did have such connections. There is also evidence that he sought to use his connections to his advantage in his dealings with the Church authorities. For example, in a letter to Lord Carey in August 1998 he said *"I get more and more invitations.... to let you know some of them I have spoken to 400 voluntary workers in Eastbourne with the Lord Lieutenant... I am shortly to preach to the Grenadier Guards in their Chapel; preach at Wellington College, confirm at Radley College and next year preach at Dartmouth to what looks like a full turn out of the Royal Family"*.
- 6.1.2 Ball clearly intimates on many occasions, to Lord Carey and others, that he enjoys the status of confidant of the Prince of Wales. He ensured that Lord Carey was aware that he corresponded with the Prince (see paragraph 3.7.17 above) and that he visited Highgrove House. There are frequent references in Ball's letters to Lord Carey and others to his attending royal functions and to meeting members of the Royal Family. Following the retirement of Bishop Michael Ball, the brothers lived together in a house which they rented from the Duchy of Cornwall after the Duchy had acquired the house specifically for that purpose. Ball publicly claimed that it was the Prince of Wales who "allowed me to have a Duchy house". The Duchy has made it clear that the house was purchased, and let on a commercial basis, by the Duchy estate, not by the Prince.
- 6.1.3 Ball himself, both in his correspondence and in his public statements, sought to exploit his contact with members of the Royal Family in order to bolster his position, particularly in the eyes of Lord Carey and others from whom he hoped to receive sympathetic treatment. We have reviewed all the relevant material including the correspondence passing between the Prince of Wales and Ball held by the Church and found no evidence that the Prince of Wales or any other member of the Royal Family sought to intervene at any point in order to protect or promote Ball.

- 6.1.4 There is evidence that a number of prominent figures took an interest in Ball's case, both while he was under investigation in 1992/93 and subsequently. As soon as Mr F began his investigation he was contacted on behalf of the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, reportedly at the request of Lord Carey, to establish what action was being taken.
- 6.1.5 The CPS has publicly stated that it had neither received nor seen any correspondence from a member of the Royal Family when Ball was under investigation in 1992/93. It has disclosed in slightly redacted form eleven supportive letters received at that time from other prominent people in society. Those people were Lord Carey (as discussed above), another former Archbishop of Canterbury - Lord Donald Coggan, one diocesan bishop, two MPs, two public school headmasters, one former headmaster, senior staff members from another public school and Lord Justice Lloyd.
- 6.1.6 Lord Lloyd's letter in 1992 was, like the other correspondence, a character reference for Ball. It specifically avoided any reference to the charges Ball faced. Lord Lloyd continued to support Ball after his caution. In late 1994 Ball was considering trying to persuade the police or the DPP that the handling of his case had been flawed because publicity had prevented his mounting a proper defence. Lord Lloyd reminded Ball that he had admitted the offence by accepting the caution.
- 6.1.7 Lord Lloyd subsequently went to see Bishop Sargeant who had by then succeeded Bishop Yates as Bishop at Lambeth. According to Bishop Sargeant's note of the meeting, Lord Lloyd disagreed with the policy of barring Ball from public ministry, and was suggesting a way in which that might be reversed. Bishop Sargeant's notes describe this as an '*old boy arrangement*', where a '*powerful group of friends (were)...coming to Peter's aid*'. (Lord Lloyd has told us that this characterisation of the events was wrong, that his view at the time was that Ball had admitted a "*not very serious offence*" and, being unaware of any other evidence against him he - with others - was seeking to find ways in which Ball could resume ministry). Lord Lloyd's proposal appears to have proceeded no further.
- 6.1.8 No doubt many of Ball's supporters were unaware of the evidence leading to the caution in 1993, or were convinced by his protestations of being hard done by. They may also have been influenced by the Church's inconsistent approach to his status. A strain of opinion persisted that he had cause for grievance.
- 6.1.9 We have considered whether Ball's connections may have affected or influenced the way he was treated. It is unlikely that the decision to caution Ball in 1993 did not take account of his position as a bishop as it was mentioned in the police report to the CPS at that time. The decision to caution was considered and supported personally by the Director of Public Prosecutions.
- 6.1.10 But there is no firm evidence that the support of prominent public figures materially affected the way that Ball's situation was handled by the Church. In fact there is evidence of the Church resisting, for example, the overtures of Lord Lloyd on Ball's behalf. Mistakes made by the Church, which we believe are well evidenced in this review, are the responsibility of the Church. But the Church cannot be held

responsible for any lack of good judgment from those who perhaps unwisely continued to support Ball.

6.2 Ball's links with public schools

- 6.2.1 We have noted the links between Ball and public schools, and have been reminded by a number of survivors of the extent to which Ball had connections with such schools. We have found specific references to ministry in seventeen public schools. He was a governor of at least one school for many years and that school has confirmed that he had unsupervised contact with pupils there after he had been cautioned. He continued to have links with that school until at least 2007.
- 6.2.2 Ball's connections with schools often arose from his personal relationships with the heads of those schools. Some of them championed his cause when he was under investigation in 1992/93, and continued to support him publicly following his resignation.
- 6.2.3 In the course of this review we contacted every school with which Ball is known to have had any connection. None has reported any concerns about his conduct.
- 6.2.4 However we know of instances where troubled teenagers from some of these schools were directed towards Ball for advice and help. That is what happened to one of the complainants whose letter to the Church was not passed to police in 1992. This boy was subjected to an improper approach from Ball. We have heard directly from one man who, at the age of 15, was seen on school premises by Ball and asked to masturbate in front of him. That man had also contacted the Church about this in 1992. Another survivor, who was not identified until the most recent proceedings, told us graphically how *"what happened in those little rooms (was) little boys being told to strip off and pressed against his erection"*. We now know of five public schools whose pupils were abused by Ball.
- 6.2.5 We have not seen evidence of Ball abusing boys in school after his caution. But one of the first ways in which he sought to restore his good standing was by re-establishing links with schools. There seems to have been no coherence in the Church's control over such activities. We have seen that in 1996 Lord Carey agreed to Ball carrying out priestly duties in schools. Some years later he raised concerns about Ball's presence in schools, apparently forgetting that he had already sanctioned this. There is evidence that Ball then sustained his connections with some public schools for many years – he himself claimed to have been involved with between 20 and 25 schools after he had been cautioned.
- 6.2.6 A number of recent Serious Case Reviews have commented on the potential for exploitation and abuse of children educated in the private sector where child protection arrangements may not be as firmly established as they should be in public sector schools. The Church would do well to look at its own responsibilities in this area. There will, quite properly, be relationships between schools and the Church, and relationships between senior teachers and senior figures in the Church locally. There will be situations where troubled young people, perhaps living away from their families, may be assisted by contact with a priest or someone else from a church.

6.2.7 The Church should routinely take account of the possibility that “special” relationships can give opportunities for abuse or improper conduct. We believe that, at least where there are ongoing chaplaincy arrangements in schools, the Church should establish that all necessary checks have been carried out appropriately and that there are no concerns on Church records which would preclude the priest from exercising a ministry with young people.

7. COMMENTARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 The context and the challenges

7.1.1 Peter Ball betrayed his Church and abused individual followers of that Church. The Church, at its most senior levels and over many years, supported him unwisely and displayed little care for his victims. Much of what we have described took place in different times and should be viewed from that perspective. But such perverse and sustained abuse by a senior figure in the Church and the Church’s failure to safeguard so many boys and young men still casts a long shadow. The Church needs firmly to reassert the priority it places on achieving the highest possible standard of safeguarding practice.

7.1.2 The task faced by the Church in addressing abuse from the past is substantial and complex. The Church needs to respond properly to evidence of such abuse at the same time as developing and improving its current safeguarding arrangements. Concerns have continued to come to light while the Church is trying to implement a large number of recommendations from cases which have already been reviewed. The demand on resources is formidable and the pace of change can be slow. We have sought to ensure that we do not unnecessarily compound those difficulties by producing a raft of detailed recommendations. We have focussed on what we consider to be the key challenges in the tasks of responding appropriately to victims while making the Church safe now and into the future.

7.1.3 The Church has already taken steps to understand better the theological implications of abuse. We have considered the Faith and Order Commission’s³⁰ two reports, “Gospel, Sexual Abuse and the Church” and “Forgiveness and Reconciliation in the Aftermath of Abuse”³¹. These works represent a determined effort by the Church to provide a firm theological basis to its responsibility for preventing abuse and responding well when abuse does take place. They seek to mitigate any risks that distorted Christian teaching, or teaching which over-simplifies issues of forgiveness, might create conditions in which abuse goes unchecked or where the harm of abuse can be compounded.

7.1.4 The reports consider Christian theological and biblical discourse in the light of contemporary social and psychological expositions on abuse and have considerable

³⁰ The Faith and Order Commission of the General Synod advises the House of Bishops, the General Synod and the Council for Christian Unity on ecclesiological and ecumenical matters and acts as a theological resource for the Church of England as a whole.

³¹ This second report was circulated in draft while we were carrying out this review and is now being prepared for submission to the House of Bishops.

potential to shape culture within the Church. They complement the Church's efforts to ensure that policies and procedures effectively meet safeguarding requirements, so as to constitute a more holistic approach which is particularly relevant to the nature and mission of the Church. They provide a reminder of the psychological complexities in the experience of both survivors and abusers and the need for professional expertise in addressing this. The reports refer to the requirement for restorative action to be manifest in genuine repentance. They contain appropriate and repeated references to the need for justice and the expectation that abusers should demonstrate genuine remorse and commitment to change – in sharp contrast to Peter Ball's sustained denial of responsibility which went largely unchallenged in the Church.

- 7.1.5 To achieve these goals the Church will need to promote a culture in which the exercise of leadership is consistent with the pastoral nature of its mission and squarely meets its safeguarding responsibilities. The Church must aim to ensure that the high value it places on compassion, pastoral concern and forgiveness is matched by a thoroughgoing clarity of focus on accountability and justice. That will require commitment from the whole church, but particularly from its leaders, the archbishops and bishops. They must be ready to call each other to account. They alone are in a position to improve the pace of change.

Recommendation 1

The House of Bishops should reaffirm and take steps to demonstrate the individual and collective accountability of bishops for the safety and protection of everyone within the Church.

7.2. Reparation

- 7.2.1 This is the first time since 1992 that the Church has provided an opportunity for those abused by Ball to be heard – albeit heard by our review team and not yet by the leaders of the Church. What those men have told us most emphatically is that the Church must not stop listening, with genuine openness and empathy, to the experiences and concerns of those who have been abused and their advocates. They made those comments with a view to the future not the past. Churches will always be a target because they profess authority and enable access to vulnerable people. Leaders should recognise that and take responsibility for ensuring that their Church is properly equipped to listen, support and take action. Most importantly those leaders should take steps which demonstrate their active engagement in the Church's safeguarding provision and which enhance the determination, clarity, consistency and accountability of their leadership.

- 7.2.2 Ball's conduct has caused serious and enduring damage to the lives of many men. Some of those men have gone to great lengths to assist and inform this review. We have tried to reflect faithfully and fully what we heard from Ball's victims but we are not the Church. Those men have not had the opportunity to put their experiences and their views directly to those who can speak for the Church as a whole. We believe they should be given that opportunity and that this direct contact would benefit the Church in a way that is beyond the reach of our review.

Recommendation 2

The Church should make arrangements that would enable those abused by Peter Ball, who wish to do so, to meet and share their experiences and views with senior clergy. That offer should be extended to those bereaved by the death of Neil Todd.

7.3 Messages from survivors

7.3.1 The Church has made significant progress in recent years in its understanding of abuse, its nature and its consequences. We have no doubt that the Church has a new and genuine commitment to meeting its responsibilities towards the victims of abuse. We do not think that the Church now, faced with evidence of abuse such as that perpetrated by Ball, would respond in the ways we have described.

7.3.2 However it is also clear that the Church faces a continuing challenge in responding effectively to those survivors who were abused in the past. We have noted that the Church is still working to develop additional resources and strategies to support and engage with survivors of church related abuse. That work should be informed by key learning points emerging from this review (some of which are already identified in the Church's safeguarding guidance and can be seen in the good practice of those supporting the survivors of Ball's abuse):

- For many years Neil Todd lived in the shadow of the knowledge that he had not been believed by many in the Church, while he was vilified by Peter Ball. The harm done to him was compounded by the lack of support he received.
- Offers of support cannot be "one off" as was the case with Neil Todd. Support arrangements made by the Church must be underpinned by a recognition that the harm caused by clerical abuse is enduring and offers of help may need to be sustained and renewed in the face of rejection.
- In our contact with people who had been abused by Ball we were struck by the fact that some still found good things to say about him. They had perhaps been spiritually helped and emotionally / psychologically harmed by him. The Church's victim support strategy needs to appreciate and work with that complexity.
- The criminal processes leading to Ball's imprisonment took some three years. Working with victims through legal proceedings which may be complex and lengthy demands a particular knowledge and expertise. The provision of appropriate support services has to be balanced with the requirement to protect witness evidence.
- Some of those Ball abused only found it within themselves to come forward once he had been imprisoned. In any similar situation the Church should be resourced and prepared for such a "second wave" of people who might need support.
- Survivors can be helped by the Church. That succour can be found both in strong and appropriate leadership and in good professional practice. There are positive lessons to be learned from these events.

Recommendation 3

The Church's services to survivors of clerical abuse should be designed and resourced to take account of:

- a) the complex and enduring nature of the harm caused by clerical abuse;
- b) the need for specialist victim support services.

7.4 Vulnerable adults

- 7.4.1 Ball abused both boys and men. Some of the men he abused had difficulties which would be widely recognised. But many had no vulnerabilities outside their struggle to establish a more meaningful course to their lives. That vulnerability may not have been apparent because they were otherwise successful and well. They were looking for spiritual peace and completeness and were therefore particularly open to abuse by their spiritual director. The trust accorded to clergy (and laity in positions of power and authority in the Church) can bring an exceptional level of power, perhaps not apparent to others, over the lives of those seeking assistance or direction.
- 7.4.2 The Church adopted formal guidance on the safeguarding of vulnerable adults in 2006. That guidance recognises some of the particular complexities and issues we have identified. However there is some way to go before the Church can feel that this area has received the level of recognition and provision now demonstrated in its response to its child protection responsibilities. Moreover, given the age profile of the Church's membership, there may be more risk for the Church in the issue of adult safeguarding. Many dioceses have identified this as a challenge and a number of those with whom we spoke also identified it as an area for development. A particular investment in adult safeguarding would constitute a suitable tribute to those exploited and abused by Peter Ball.

Recommendation 4

The Church, recognising that it still has further to travel in relation to adult victims of abuse, should make a particular effort to secure a fuller understanding and more consistent good practice in that area.

7.5 The dioceses

- 7.5.1 The Church of England is not a single monolithic institution structured around hierarchical managerial arrangements. Rather, it might be seen as a family of essentially autonomous office holders and charitable institutions, from ancient ecclesiastical corporations to modern statutory bodies. There are 42 Dioceses, 12,557 parishes, 42 Cathedrals and more than 50 religious communities which are not under the jurisdiction of the dioceses. There are around 8,000 full time, paid Anglican clergy in dioceses and a further 1,500 in paid chaplaincy (primarily in hospitals, prisons, armed forces and education). There are 3,100 licensed unpaid

clergy and around 5,700 active retired clergy have PTO. A number of paid child and youth workers in parishes and dioceses work alongside a wide range of volunteers, including church wardens and licensed readers.

- 7.5.2 The dispersal of authority across these structures has had an impact on the way in which responsibility for safeguarding has developed. It is a complicated environment in which to ensure consistent and high standards. Nonetheless the emphasis on safeguarding in the Church has risen sharply and we have seen that important progress has been made. There has been a significant increase in the profile and the resourcing of the National Safeguarding Team. We have been told about a raft of new initiatives and we note that the Church's actual expenditure on safeguarding, which was less than £40,000 in 2010, was more than £1million in 2016.
- 7.5.3 We have noted the work underway in response to a range of other reviews of abuse in the Church, and the lessons emerging from audits of safeguarding conducted in dioceses across the country over the last two years. The Church has developed a range of policies as a result and has sought to clarify roles and responsibilities. However we suggest that there is a need for further clarity about the roles of the Church at its centre and the Church in the dioceses and parishes.
- 7.5.4 Some previous reviews arising from abuse in the Church have promoted the need for the Church's safeguarding provision to be delivered and directed through a national service run from the Church's centre. We believe that the basis for safeguarding arrangements of the highest standard should be focussed in the dioceses. The Church is built round a model of dispersed power and authority and to seek to centralise responsibility for safeguarding may be to swim against the tide. Dioceses must of course follow national church policy where it exists and should not seek to determine their own approach. But giving the dioceses an unequivocal lead responsibility would properly complement the emphasis on the role of the bishops which forms our first recommendation.
- 7.5.5 Such a shift in emphasis should provide enhanced opportunities for the Church to draw together its local efforts and maximise the use of resources. Most importantly, it is only in the dioceses and parishes, in a context of constant, informed vigilance and alertness to any "early warning" signs, that abuse can be predicted and prevented. For safeguarding purposes the Church should make the leading role of the dioceses explicit and should ensure that those arrangements are resourced and supported appropriately, with less variation than is currently the case.

Recommendation 5

The Church should ensure that the responsibility for delivering robust and reliable safeguarding arrangements is clearly located in the dioceses.

- 7.5.6 The experience of having safeguarding concerns and specifically concerns about sexual abuse will be a relative rarity for any individual church member. The process of seeing, identifying and having the confidence to report possible abusive

behaviour is complex and challenging. Research³² has highlighted how this is likely to be even more difficult in a religious environment where an underlying belief that individuals are good is assumed and affirmed, and could mask the ways in which individuals can be both good and harmful. It is therefore important that organisational culture promotes both accountability and supportive reflection. A dispersed model for safeguarding arrangements would need to be underpinned by clear national policy and guidance which dioceses must follow.

7.5.7 Revised arrangements also need to take account of the position of the DSA, a potentially isolated role. In reviewing these events we noted that three DSAs had left their posts during a time of considerable pressures, both internal and external, and insufficient support. The resourcing of DSA provision within a diocese currently ranges from one part-time DSA covering both vulnerable adults and children to an entire team of four people with administrative support. There are also variations in the expectations of a DSA's professional background and experience and in the arrangements for supporting and supervising DSAs. Some dioceses have arrangements for oversight which are supported by independent people with a background in safeguarding but this is not the case everywhere. There is currently no information that would assist the Church in measuring need and enabling each diocese to know what an appropriate level of resourcing would be. This would be a useful area for development nationally.

7.5.8 The role of the Church's lead bishop for safeguarding is more clearly recognised than in previous years. However that bishop has to accommodate the demands of the national role with their continuing local duties. That is not "just" a set of responsibilities for developing policy and practice: the role has sometimes required a demanding and time-consuming personal commitment to very needy survivors. There is no dedicated resource to support the lead bishop in that key role. We believe that is a fundamental weakness in the Church's national arrangements.

Recommendation 6

The Church should:

- a) establish clear specifications and minimum national standards for the safeguarding services that dioceses should provide, taking account of the issues identified in this review;
- b) support the dioceses to evaluate the resources required to meet those standards;
- c) review and enhance as necessary the arrangements for supporting the Lead Bishop for safeguarding.

7.6 Religious communities and other Church bodies

7.6.1 Much of the abuse we have seen in this review took place within a religious community and was facilitated by that context. It was easier to perpetrate and harder to detect. A religious community may attract people who are vulnerable, perhaps

³² "Hear no evil, See no evil. Understanding the failure to identify and report child sexual abuse in institutional contexts". Munro and Fish. A report for the Royal Commission (Australia) into institutionalised responses to child sexual abuse 2015.

because they are troubled or because they are seeking direction. The separate nature of a community could equally attract a predatory perpetrator. Non-ordained members of religious communities could foster the same level of trust and confidence as ordained clerics, without the same degree of supervision and control.

- 7.6.2 The Church has sought to address the raised level of risk attached to a closed institution, with the implementation of new guidance, but recognises that there is more to be done. Current arrangements remain disparate and separate which makes it hard to develop and embed strong safeguarding arrangements. We believe that for safeguarding purposes the religious communities should work with their local diocesan arrangements as indeed should the other non-diocesan institutions such as chaplaincies, cathedrals and the so called “Royal Peculiars³³”. A diocese should be responsible for overseeing all safeguarding duties within its geographical area. That would be the most straightforward way to ensure clear accountability, consistent standards and compliance with those standards.

Recommendation 7

The Church should review its organisational arrangements so that, for safeguarding purposes, all Church bodies come within the relevant diocesan arrangements where safeguarding capacity and expertise can be both concentrated and deployed most efficiently.

7.7 The role of the National Safeguarding Team

- 7.7.1 The explicit identification of the dioceses and bishops as leading safeguarding in the Church has consequences for the central safeguarding service, the NST. That team has made significant progress in developing policy, guidance and awareness of safeguarding issues. We believe that the NST’s principal task should now be to assist the dioceses, parishes, communities, cathedrals and the House of Bishops in meeting the responsibilities which they share.
- 7.7.2 The NST should support and challenge the dioceses – serving as an in-house “critical friend”. The team would develop policy, as it does now, but policy written always with the parish and diocese in mind. The team would create tools to support the regular training being delivered in dioceses; deliver or provide access to specialist advice when necessary, and maintain a quality assurance model to ensure learning and improvement in and between dioceses. The team would gather adequate information to enable a clearer grasp of scale, trends and pressures in the work being done, so that the Church could better plan its safeguarding services into the future.

³³ A Church of England parish or church which is exempt from the jurisdiction of the diocese in which it lies and is subject to the direct jurisdiction of the monarch.

Recommendation 8

The role and responsibilities of the National Safeguarding Team should clearly reflect an emphasis on planning and supporting continuous improvement in diocesan safeguarding services.

7.8 The legacy of the past

- 7.8.1 We have noted that the Church faces significant challenges in delivering an appropriate response to evidence of abuse from the past. That task can be particularly demanding of time and resources. The complexity of cases and the harm done is likely to be compounded as years have gone by. The burden of responsibility can slip too easily into the work of the NST, which could prevent them making faster progress on improving current arrangements, and when the response would be best led from the relevant diocese.
- 7.8.2 There is now a good deal of experience in the Church, both nationally and at a local level, of good practice in responding to these challenges. That experience should inform the development of protocols to be followed in dioceses, supported nationally when particular experience and skills are required. Such systematic arrangements, particularly if they form part of the routine evaluations undertaken nationally by the Church, should reduce the requirements for lengthy reviews.
- 7.8.3 In sum, the Church needs to balance its commitment to reviewing historical cases with the need to promote and deliver the most reliable safeguarding arrangements now. There are various steps that could be taken to adopt more streamlined and uniform arrangements across the Church. We believe that the Church, through the NST, should develop and evaluate those options, with a view to producing a model of best practice.

Recommendation 9

The Church should develop:

- a) a model of best practice for deciding when and how to carry out reviews of historical abuse;
- b) arrangements for disseminating the learning from high profile historic cases.

7.9 Protective measures, licensing and disciplinary arrangements

- 7.9.1 Abuse in the church is not only about the actions of priests. Lay people who are active in their church can use that activity to find and exploit opportunities for abuse, and are not as easily monitored as priests. In one diocesan review of historic cases³⁴ 42 of the 68 cases of abuse were by lay people. But this review arises from the actions of a priest and raises issues about the Church's arrangements for, and the relationships between:

³⁴ Oral evidence to the Review

- safeguarding those who seek ordination;
- disciplinary action against priests —“the Measure³⁵”;
- protective measures following misconduct by priests, the Archbishops’ Caution List – “the List³⁶”;
- the granting of a licence to continue to minister as a priest, generally following retirement – the Permission to Officiate (PTO).

7.9.2 This review raises two issues in relation to people who seek ordination. Firstly they may be at risk of exploitation as they explore fundamental truths and beliefs and seek support in doing so. They may be young people with the vulnerabilities of youth and particularly susceptible to inappropriate conduct by someone who presents with a captivating charisma. Secondly potential abusers may, at least in part, be motivated to join the priesthood because of the abusive or exploitative opportunities afforded.

7.9.3 The Church provided us with evidence about current arrangements for the selection, training and continuous development of its clergy. This provided significant assurance in regard to the steps the Church now takes to address safeguarding risks throughout the whole pathway of selection and training of its clergy. This is applied both to safeguarding the wellbeing of candidates throughout this process and to how they will address issues of safeguarding in the exercise of their ministry. There is now a substantial leadership development programme for current and future leaders in the Church in which safeguarding and the contextual matters relating to it are also addressed. Governing Bodies of the 24 Theological Education Institutes which train clergy, and the Ministry Division which has oversight of that responsibility, will need to evaluate their auditing practices to assure themselves that these are effectively measuring the impact of the policies and procedures in place. In 2017 the Church is undertaking a review of the guidance relevant to clergy selection and training, and it would be wise to ensure that the review takes full account of safeguarding considerations.

7.9.4 One of the notable aspects of Ball’s case is that no action was taken against him under the Church’s disciplinary arrangements (until he was imprisoned). There is no evidence in 1993 of any formal consideration of whether the Measure should be used. It seems simply to have been accepted that in the circumstances this would not be appropriate³⁷. We have noted that the Code of Practice now issued under the Measure (2003) clearly applies to all clergy, however their ministry is authorised, and continues to apply when they are no longer active in their ministry.

7.9.5 The List has existed from the early twentieth century. It was maintained by the Archbishops and was originally non-statutory. (The Measure (2003) put the List on a statutory footing). Clergy included on the list were those in respect of whom the Archbishops considered there were concerns as to their suitability to exercise ministry. A person could be included on the list without his or her knowledge and

³⁵ Now the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 (CDM) and, at the relevant times in this case, its predecessor, the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1963 (EJM).

³⁶ Properly known as the Lambeth and Bishopthorpe Register.

³⁷ Resignation would not, as a matter of law, have prevented Ball from being dealt with for misconduct.

without an opportunity to have his or her inclusion on the list reviewed. It would routinely have been used in such a situation in 1993. Lord Carey, in his statement to this review, has expressed regret that it was not used in Ball's case.

- 7.9.6 There remains a lack of clarity and guidance about the purpose of the List and how it should be used. The List cannot be directly accessed by the Church's safeguarding officers – access is restricted to bishops, registrars and the National Safeguarding Advisor. The List does not include lay people who have used a position in the Church to identify and abuse vulnerable people. We suggest that these arrangements should be reviewed.

Recommendation 10

The Church should review the arrangements for the Lambeth, Bishopthorpe and Archbishops Lists. This should include making provision for the Lists:

- a) to be accessed directly by Diocesan Safeguarding Advisors;
- b) to include non-ordained members of religious communities and lay employees who have been disciplined or convicted of abusive conduct, or for some parallel arrangement to be introduced.

- 7.9.7 The issues arising in these events in respect of PTO illustrate the possible tension between the responsibilities of bishops and those of archbishops, between the Church at large and the centre, and the possibility of disparity across dioceses. There are no "minimum standards" to inform the decision to grant PTO and there are currently no plans for introducing such minimum standards or requirements. Documentation in Ball's case was poor so that we could not absolutely clarify what were apparently erroneous references to a "Provincial Permission to Preach" (see paragraph 3.7.14) and to Ball having been granted PTO in Bath and Wells (see paragraph 3.9.5).

- 7.9.8 The Archbishops' Council issues advice³⁸ – and it is no more than advice – on how the Church should work with and deploy clergy with PTO. That advice contains one reference to safeguarding:

"There is no specific legal requirement, but failure to participate in Continuing Ministerial Development on matters such as safeguarding when required by the bishop can be a disciplinary offence and could lead to the bishop withdrawing permission to officiate".

- 7.9.9 The Church's requirements for priests with PTO should be stronger and more uniform. For safeguarding purposes the same considerations should apply to both retired and active clergy, although the detail of the processes and requirements should be tailored to their different circumstances.

³⁸ [deployment of clergy with licences and pto june 2014.pdf](#)



Deployment of
clergy with licences

Recommendation 11

The Church should:

- a) establish clear and consistent national guidance for granting and reviewing PTO in the case of clerics who have been the subject of substantiated safeguarding concerns;
- b) introduce arrangements for a national register of clergy with PTO;
- c) ensure that relevant safeguarding arrangements are applied consistently to retired clergy who are exercising ministry through a PTO;
- d) audit those arrangements to enable a regular report to the House of Bishops.

7.10 Good practice

7.10.1 Reviews like this can fail to recognise things that have been done well. We have already referred to the positive feedback we received from some survivors about Sussex Police. The support provided to survivors by the Diocesan Safeguarding Team in Chichester, through protracted legal proceedings, has similarly been remarkable. More generally we were struck by the tenacity and thoroughness which some individuals brought to their duties. It is because of the diligence of a small number of people within the Church (as well as persistent campaigning by survivors) that the nature and extent of Ball's wrongdoing were exposed. We hope that the Church, as well as implementing our recommendations will find ways in which this and other evidence of good practice can be shared and disseminated across its safeguarding networks and beyond.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The House of Bishops should reaffirm and take steps to demonstrate the individual and collective accountability of bishops for the safety and protection of everyone within the Church.
2. The Church should make arrangements that would enable those abused by Peter Ball, who wish to do so, to meet and share their experiences and views with senior clergy. That offer should be extended to those bereaved by the death of Neil Todd.
3. The Church's services to survivors of clerical abuse should be designed and resourced to take account of:
 - a) the complex and enduring nature of the harm caused by clerical abuse;
 - b) the need for specialist victim support services.
4. The Church, recognising that it still has further to travel in relation to adult victims of abuse, should make a particular effort to secure a fuller understanding and more consistent good practice in that area.
5. The Church should ensure that the responsibility for delivering robust and reliable safeguarding arrangements is clearly located in the dioceses.
6. The Church should:
 - a) establish clear specifications and minimum national standards for the safeguarding services that dioceses should provide, taking account of the issues identified in this review;
 - b) support the dioceses to evaluate the resources required to meet those standards;
 - c) review and enhance as necessary the arrangements for supporting the Lead Bishop for Safeguarding.
7. The Church should review its organisational arrangements so that, for safeguarding purposes, all Church bodies come within the relevant diocesan arrangements where safeguarding capacity and expertise can be both concentrated and deployed most efficiently.
8. The role and responsibilities of the National Safeguarding Team should clearly reflect an emphasis on planning and supporting continuous improvement in diocesan safeguarding services.
9. The Church should develop:
 - a) a model of best practice for deciding when and how to carry out reviews of historical abuse;
 - b) arrangements for disseminating the learning from high profile historic cases.
10. The Church should review the arrangements for the Lambeth, Bishopthorpe and Archbishops Lists. This should include making provision for the Lists:
 - a) to be accessed directly by Diocesan Safeguarding Advisors;

- b) to include non-ordained members of religious communities and lay employees who have been disciplined or convicted of abusive conduct, or for some parallel arrangement to be introduced.
11. The Church should:
- a) establish clear and consistent national guidance for granting and reviewing PTO in the case of clerics who have been the subject of substantiated safeguarding concerns;
 - b) introduce arrangements for a national register of clergy with PTO;
 - c) ensure that relevant safeguarding arrangements are applied consistently to retired clergy who are exercising ministry through a PTO;
 - d) audit those arrangements to enable a regular report to the House of Bishops.

APPENDIX A: Terms of Reference

Background

On October 5th 2015, the Archbishop of Canterbury announced the commissioning of an independent review of the way the Church of England responded to the case of Peter Ball, the former Bishop of Gloucester. The review follows the guilty plea by Peter Ball to two charges of indecent assault and one charge of misconduct in public office. The review will be conducted by an independent Review Group, who will examine the Church of England's response to the abusive conduct of Peter Ball.

1. Objectives

- a) To review what information was available to the Church of England (within relevant dioceses, Lambeth Palace and central Church authorities) concerning Peter Ball's abuse of individuals; who had this information and when. To provide a detailed timeline and transparent account of the response within the Church of England.
- b) To consider whether the response was in accordance with recognised good practice, and compliant with Church of England policy and legislation as well as statutory policy and legislation.
- c) To learn lessons about any necessary changes and developments needed within the Church of England to ensure that safeguarding work is of the highest possible standard; how complaints and disciplinary processes are managed and any other specific areas of Church behaviour and practice identified by the review.
- d) To produce a report, including recommendations, set out in a way which can be easily understood by professionals and public alike and suitable for publication. The report will be published on the Church of England website.

2. Review Group

- a) The Archbishop of Canterbury, having consulted the National Safeguarding Panel, will appoint a person to Chair the Review Group. That person will not be a member of the clergy and will not hold a senior diocesan or national position in the Church of England. He or she will have experience of safeguarding inquiries and complex case reviews.
- b) The Archbishop of Canterbury will also appoint a person with relevant experience to provide a detailed timeline and transparent account, as per 1a.
- c) The Chair will appoint people with the relevant experience and skills to be specialist Advisers to the Review and professional administrative support.
- d) The Chair will be professionally supported by the National Safeguarding Team, the Legal Office and other relevant staff, and may seek other independent professional expertise as necessary.

- e) The Chair will present their report to the Archbishop of Canterbury for publication.
- f) If during the course of its work the Chair identifies any matters that have not previously come to attention, it will report these to the Police and the National Safeguarding Team.
- g) The Chair will keep the National Safeguarding Panel informed on its progress with the review, including the time within which it expects to complete the review.
- h) The review will proceed independently from the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse as part of the Church of England's commitment to learning and further developing good safeguarding practice.

3. **Scope of the Review**

The Review team will:

- a) Have access to all of the material and files on this case within Lambeth Palace, and the Dioceses of Chichester, Gloucester, Bath and Wells and Truro and other locations as deemed appropriate.
- b) Consider relevant material provided by victims of Peter Ball, their families, and other individuals.
- c) Provide opportunities to victims of Peter Ball to share their experiences and the impact of those experiences on them.
- d) Provide opportunities to those within the Church of England (nationally and at Diocesan level) who worked closely on this case to share their experiences, in relation to each of the Objectives laid out in (1).
- e) Liaise and consult with relevant local statutory bodies to ensure appropriate sharing of information.

It is expected that the Review will be completed within a year.

APPENDIX B: The Review Team

Dame Moira Gibb DBE: Chair of the Review

Moira Gibb is a social worker by background.

She worked in a number of local authorities, including many years as Director of Social Services in Kensington and Chelsea. She was then Chief Executive of the London Borough of Camden for almost 9 years until 2012. She was President of the Association of Directors of Social Services in 2000-01.

Dame Moira chaired the Social Work Task Force in 2009 and the Social Work Reform Board from 2010 to 2012. She chaired a local authority Improvement Board from 2012 -2014.

She is now the Chair of Skills for Care, the workforce development body for adult social care and the Chair of City Lit adult education college. She is a non-executive director of NHS England and of the UK Statistics Authority. She is a member of the Council of Reading University.

Kevin Harrington: Adviser and Investigator

Kevin Harrington trained in social work and social administration at the London School of Economics. He worked in local government for 25 years in a range of social care and general management positions. Since 2003 he has worked as an independent consultant to health and social care agencies in the public, private and voluntary sectors.

During that time Kevin has worked on some 50 Serious Case Reviews (SCR) in respect of children and vulnerable adults. He has a particular interest in the requirement to publish SCR reports and has been engaged by the Department for Education to re-draft high profile SCR reports so that they can be more effectively published.

Kevin has been involved in professional regulatory work for the General Medical Council and for the Nursing and Midwifery Council, and has undertaken investigations on behalf of the Local Government Ombudsman. He served as a magistrate in the criminal courts in East London for 15 years.

Heather Schroeder CBE: Adviser

Heather Schroeder has spent more than 40 years involved in delivering and developing services for vulnerable adults and children and has been committed to their safeguarding throughout this time.

She has held senior positions in social services and children's services in a number of local authorities including the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham and the London Borough of Camden. Since her retirement from her post as Director of Children's Services at Camden in 2008 she has held a number of interim director posts and consultancy positions including serving as Independent Chair of the Improvement Board in the Royal Borough of Kingston and Programme Director of the Serious Youth Crime Board.

James Reilly: Adviser

In the fifteen years before his recent retirement as Chief Executive of Central London Community Healthcare NHS Trust, James Reilly has held executive positions in the NHS, local government and professional associations. In these roles he has exercised board level responsibility for the conduct of professional health and welfare staff. He has served on a number of commissions tasked with recommending improvements to services, their governance and that of the professionals working in them.

Barbara Chapman: Administrator

Barbara worked as a Personal Assistant in both the private and public sectors, supporting staff at a senior level, for 40 years. She worked in local government for 18 of those years, before semi-retiring in 2013. Since that time she has spent some time in the third sector and now works as an independent administrator.

APPENDIX C: Anonymisation in this report

Designation	Description	First reference
Mr A	A former member of Ball's communities who raised concerns about Neil Todd	3.2.5
Mr J	A member of staff at the Bishop's official residence in Gloucester	3.3.2
Mr B	A man who was to be the subject of one of the charges admitted by Ball in 2015	3.3.13
Mr C	A man who gave a victim impact statement in the 2015 proceedings.	3.3.13
Mr F	The Detective Inspector, now retired, who led the 1992/93 investigations for Gloucester Police	3.4.1
Mr D	A private investigator engaged by Ball and his supporters in 1992	3.4.5
Deacon K	A cleric who raised concerns about Ball in 1993	3.5.2
Mr G	A lawyer who assisted Mr Peak	3.5.6
Mr E	A member of staff at Lambeth Palace	3.8.1
Ms P	A former police officer now working for the Church	3.9.13
Mr S	A psychologist and professional assessor,	3.9.15