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I finished my Foreword to last year’s Annual Review by saying that St George’s House is “an institution with which I am proud to be associated”.

In his Report (later in this Review) the Warden of St George’s House writes of “the active assistance we receive in so many ways from members of the College community”. He says that this “reinforces the House’s position as part of the greater College of St George”. I think that support given to the House by members of the St George’s community in general is a sign of the fact that we are all proud to be associated with the House and with its aims.

Living and working as we do within the Castle walls, it would be excusable if we were sometimes to feel cut off from the so-called ‘real world’. Our meeting with so many of that ‘real world’s’ representatives, when they come to participate in one or other of our consultations, reminds us that we are making a much-valued contribution to the well-being of wider society.

At the same time, it seems to be the case that it is our being somewhat set aside from the noise and rush of so much everyday living that makes much of our contribution possible. A little distance can enable people to see things in a new perspective. A different way of looking at things is often a gift that our guests take away with them from St George’s House.

I must not, however, give the impression that the House is to be appreciated solely as a place of quiet reflection. Discussion is frequently energetic and demanding, and of course the staff will bear witness to the fact that an enormous amount of energy is spent behind the scenes. Nevertheless, a shared sense of purpose seems to engender genuine cooperation which, in turn, usually makes for a happy and positive experience.

You will see from this Review that 2014–2015 has been a year in which a significant number of issues have been explored at the House. The Warden, the Programme Director and his team are greatly assisted by the interest and guidance of Fellows, and members of the Board and Council. In the course of the year, Krysia Hudek and Michael Reiss have stepped down as Fellows, while Shomila Malik has resigned from the Board. They each have our sincere thanks for all that they have contributed to the life of the House. Meanwhile, we have welcomed to the Council: Mrs Elita de Klerk, Rabbi Dr Jonathan Romain, Lord (Mervyn) King, The Baroness Falkner of Margravine, Professor Sir Leszek Borysiewicz, His Grace the Duke of Abercorn KG, Admiral Sir James Perowne and the Right Reverend Dr Stephen Platten. We are all enormously grateful to them for what can be interpreted as their vote of confidence in St George’s House.
The Warden’s Report

A St George’s House consultation is carefully crafted to ensure that, whatever the topic, as many shades of opinion as possible are represented. The primary focus is on dialogue.

We want people to speak freely and cogently. We encourage participants to challenge their own and others’ opinions. Accordingly, we try to keep presentations short and to the point so that participants have as much time as possible to engage in rigorous discussion. This happens in plenary sessions and, often, in small group work. The formal programme is tightly structured but a great deal of work is done also in the margins, during coffee breaks, over meals, and on the way to and from the Vicars’ Hall. It is as if the topic under consideration becomes part of the fabric of the place. We like to think that conversations begun in this unique location will continue long after people have returned to daily life outside the Castle walls, that the wisdom acquired here will help make a difference in broader society.

Integral to any consultation is the opportunity to attend services in St George’s Chapel, particularly Evensong or Evening Prayer. Given that our participants are drawn from all faiths and none, you might think this is a subtle attempt at proselytisation. Far from it. Time and again we find that a short period of reflection in the Quire of the Chapel deepens and enriches the discussions taking place in the Vicars’ Hall. Sacred music, the poetry of prayer, and the sense of history everywhere about us gives a unique perspective to any consultation.

Elsewhere in this Annual Review of the year 2014-15 you will find a summary of the consultation programme. I hope you will be encouraged by the breadth of topics, social, ethical and clergy-focused therein. It has been a busy and fruitful year, greatly enhanced by the various external organisations we have welcomed to the House. We are grateful to them.

A good number of these external organisations are regular visitors to St George’s House, whether it is the Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce, Windsor Leadership, the Windsor Energy Group, the International Council for Caring Communities, the Gordon Cook Conversations, or Christian Responsibility in Public Affairs. They are most welcome.

Other organisations, such as the Cambridge Coexist Leadership Programme, with its increasingly vital interfaith work are becoming regular visitors. The same may be said of Relate, a hugely proactive and increasingly influential charity committed to supporting the wellbeing of both couple and family relationships.

The year under review has also brought visits by organisations new to St George’s House, among them the Royal Society for the Arts, The Prince’s Trust, Future Agenda and World Vision. We are grateful to them all.

In September 2014 we welcomed Professor Anthony Grayling to the Quire of the Chapel where he delivered the Elson Ethics Lecture on the topic, Good Lives and ‘The Good Life’. In
his introduction to the speaker, the Dean commended Professor Grayling’s ‘eloquent lucidity.’ His lecture bore witness to the Dean’s well-chosen words. We are again indebted to Ambassador Edward Elson whose generosity ensures that the lecture is an established part of the St George’s House programme.

March 2015 saw the latest lecture in our series of collaborations with Cumberland Lodge when a packed Vicars’ Hall played host to Dr Susan Liautaud. Her discourse, entitled Understanding the Ethics Behind the News: The Contagion of Unethical (and Ethical) Behaviour, generated eager debate and discussion.

The 2015 St George’s House Annual Lecture was given in June by The Rt Hon. The Lord Butler of Brockwell, KG, GCB, CVO, PC who took as his theme The Ethics of Spying. Given recent developments in technology, the threat of terrorism, and the Edward Snowden revelations, this was a tremendously apposite not to say skilful contribution to this distinguished lecture series.

With regard to St George’s House staff, we said goodbye this year to Mrs Sue Pendry who retired after seventeen years’ faithful service. We wish her well in her retirement and were delighted that she was honoured in the 2015 New Year’s Honours List, becoming a Member of the Victorian Order.

We welcomed back after maternity leave Jenna Tyer who now job-shares as Warden’s Administrator with Christine Chamberlain. New to the team also is Susan Suchodolska who has joined us as a Consultation Coordinator while Catherine Pryer became our new House Manager after a number of years as a Consultation Coordinator.

Let me end this brief report by expressing once again my sincere gratitude to all those members of the College community and beyond who give so generously of their time, expertise and financial support to enable the House to continue its work. Our Council, Board, and Fellows are unwavering in their commitment while the active assistance we receive in so many ways from members of the College community reinforces the House’s position as part of the greater College of St George. My thanks to them all.

I hope, as ever, that this Annual Review reinforces the quietly significant role St George’s House can play in addressing the various and complex issues facing contemporary society. Our mission, to nurture wisdom through dialogue, remains steadfast. Your commitment, interest and support underpin everything we do. Thank you.
‘THE ETHICS OF SPYING’

BY THE RT HON. THE LORD BUTLER OF BROCKWELL, KG, GCB, CVO, PC

Mr Dean, my lords, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much, Mr Dean, for that very generous introduction. It is a great honour to be added to the list of very distinguished people who have previously given the St George’s House Annual Lecture. In this historic and beautiful place, the home of the Order of the Garter, the epicentre of English chivalry, I was worried that the second oldest profession was rather a grubby theme for the Annual Lecture. It was the United States Secretary of State, Henry Stimson, who said in 1929 when refusing to provide funding for the predecessor of the United States National Security Agency, ‘Gentlemen, don’t read other gentlemen’s mail’. But then I remembered that on the opening night of the 2012 Olympic Games, the Queen herself was seen to parachute into the Olympic Stadium with James Bond and so I began to think that it might have the Royal seal of approval.

It’s certainly a topical theme. There can never have previously been a time of such concern, partly stimulated by the revelations of Ed Snowden, that the state trespasses too far into all our privacy in the interests of protecting us from terrorism and serious crime. Libertarian groups bring legal action against the intelligence agencies alleging misuse of their powers. Last week, David Anderson, the independent reviewer of counterterrorism legislation, produced a 373-page report on the balance between privacy and security. Previously, the Intelligence and Security Committee of Parliament, of which I was a member, produced a very detailed report on the same subject, and, in the new parliament, we’re now awaiting government legislation on this subject.

We didn’t always agonise so much. In past times, we were prepared to trust our intelligence agencies without asking questions. MI5 and MI6 were founded just over 100 years ago in 1909 and GCHQ after World War I but there was no acknowledgement in the next 50 years that they even existed. We all knew that they did but nobody talked. It’s estimated that 10,000 people knew the secret that at Bletchley Park we could intercept and decipher German messages but nobody talked. Churchill said, ‘The people at Bletchley Park were my geese that laid the golden eggs and never cackled’. Of course, the intelligence services appeared in novels - The Riddle of the Sands, James Bond, John le Carré - but no one knew what the facts were, nor
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red bedspread. Police believe that the thief took a photo of one of the phones with a view to selling it online and this photograph popped up on a One Drive web account (which allows users to access photos remotely) owned by Alistair Mortimore, the coach of Henley Hawks. Meanwhile, Amy Atkinson, a player, managed to follow the movement of her stolen phone using a tracking application. Another player used the Trip Advisor website to search for hotels and bed and breakfasts on the Brighton seafront close to the last known location of Miss Atkinson’s phone. She then spotted a photo from a hotel that matched the bedspread in the photograph on the One Drive account. The club tipped off Sussex Police who went to the Atlantic Seafront Hotel and arrested a man. Police said, ‘that a substantial proportion of the women’s belongings were recovered and a 62-year-old man of no fixed address had been charged with theft’. I think we could all describe that as ethical spying.

So, it’s the change of technology. The fact that, however innocent we are, we’re all under observation all the time. But it’s not just that, I think there’s another factor as well, and that is the change of the targets. A hundred years ago or less, for example in the Second World War, we only spied on foreigners. We didn’t do it to our own people. But then, 40 years ago, with the rise of terrorism in Ireland and subsequently with the rise of Islamic terrorism, we are forced not only to use these means of interception and surveillance on foreigners but on our own citizens. That changes the game, so that it becomes necessary to have controls. When there are such powers in the hands of the intelligence agencies and the police and they can use them against the citizens of our own country, there is a need for controls over them.

There’s also need for controls over the media for whom hacking telephones was famously for many years a source of their best stories. But it’s the state I think we’ve got to worry about most. The laws that govern how these surveillance tools are used started during the mid-1980s and have grown like Topsy. Now they are a bewildering complex of legislation. Just to give you an example of the amount of laws that have been passed on this subject - the Telecommunications Act 1984 first governed the interception of telecommunications; the Interception of Communications Act 1985; the Security Service Act 1989 and another one in 1996; the Intelligence Services Act 1994; the Human Rights Act 1998; the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000; and then in the last few years, the Justice and Security Act 2013, the Data Retention and Security Act 2013, the Counterterrorism and Security Act 2015. This legislation like Pelion piled on Ossa, has become so complicated that no layman can understand it and some conspiracy theorists suspect that this was deliberate in order that the
authorities could find gaps that they could go through to spy on you and me. So, there had to be a structure of protection and this country has set up a very strong structure of protection.

What the basic laws say is that these means of surveillance, whether on our own citizens or indeed overseas, can only be used for very narrowly defined purposes and the two purposes are national security and the prevention or detection of serious crime. If the police or the intelligence agencies use their powers for any other purpose, they’re breaking the law. Also, the actions they take have to be capable of being shown as necessary and proportionate, that they couldn’t do without them and that the purpose for which they’re using them is proportionate to the intrusion. I think people don’t recognise quite how restrictive the law rightly is.

If the police or the intelligence agencies want to look at the content of messages we pass to each other, if they want to listen to our telephones, if they want to open our letters, they have to get the authority of an independent person. In Britain, it’s a minister, the Foreign Secretary or the Home Secretary. In other countries, it’s the courts and the independent reviewer of counterterrorism legislation would like to see the courts and judges used to give that authority in Britain. That is a controversial matter. But the judges do come into it in Britain because there are commissioners, former judges, who audit what the Foreign Secretary and the Home Secretary approve, to ensure that it does comply with the requirements of necessity and proportionality and that it is only being done for the purposes of protecting national security and dealing with serious crime. But there’s also then a tribunal - I bet not many of you know this. If you think that your telephone is being hacked, and some of us do because we hear strange clicks on the line, you can go to the tribunal and ask them to look into it. The tribunal will look into it and they will tell you if this is being done improperly. They won’t tell you actually whether it’s being done but the answer you will get 99.99 per cent of the time is that, when the tribunal has looked at all the papers, the law hasn’t been broken. Now, that could mean you are a legitimate suspect and your phone is being hacked but it’s more likely to mean that no such thing has happened.

The intelligence agencies have ethics advisers and staff counsellors which they need and that’s to prevent the sort of thing that Ed Snowden thought it was necessary to do, to go to the press and, in his case, to go to China and Russia when he felt that things were being done which offended his conscience and he thought the world ought to know about. Finally, there is parliamentary oversight, the Intelligence and Security Committee, which I mentioned before, and of which I have served as a member. So, there is, in this country, very restrictive legislation which controls the actions of the intelligence agencies and the police but, nonetheless, people are very disturbed about it and they were particularly disturbed by the revelations of Ed Snowden. What disturbed them most I think about the revelations of Ed Snowden was his disclosure that the GCHQ can collect in bulk messages which are transmitted including phone messages, internet messages and so on, which they screen in order to pick out the ones that might be dangerous. This was felt in some quarters to be mass surveillance. It was certainly in accordance with the law and actually the remarkable thing about Ed Snowden, which should comfort us, is that he walked off with a million reports of the American National Security Agency and 60,000 of GCHQ’s which we had shared with the Americans and I am not aware that any of them showed that either of these agencies had acted in breach of the law.

When you think a million NSA reports, 60,000 GCHQ reports, what’s surprising is how little embarrassment that has caused. It’s caused shocking loss to the effectiveness of our security but it hasn’t showed either breaches of the law or, for the most part - I’ll come back to the tapping of Chancellor Merkel’s mobile phone - not things that were embarrassing. But, nonetheless, people have been shocked by his revealing bulk collection. As I say, the impression got around that everybody’s communications were vulnerable to interception. But the fact is that the agencies only have access to a very small proportion of the cables that carry the world’s traffic. They then have to decide which of those - that very small proportion of carriers - are most likely to carry traffic which might reveal terrorist plots. They then have computerised sifting devices which pick out communications that might be suspicious and this is long before any human being has looked at what this mechanism produces. When eventually a human being does look at any of these messages, it is an infinitesimally small fraction of the traffic. I think we in this hall can sleep easy in our beds that it’s not going to be any of our internet messenger.

Nevertheless, legitimate concerns remain and so, in this age in which electronic communication and the storage of data is set to be so dominant in our lives, and when the instruments of intrusion are so pervasive and so powerful, we have to decide what is good spying and what is bad. When I told a friend that the title of this lecture was going to be the ethics of spying, he said, ‘But that’s a contradiction in terms. Spying can’t be good’, and since spying involves stealing other people’s property, which they often don’t want you to have, you can see his point. Yet I’ve seen enough people
who work in our intelligence agencies to know that they are people of the highest integrity. They’re highly ethical people and, indeed, it is a criterion for their recruitment that they should be so. This is one of the qualities that the recruiters are most looking for. So, how do we resolve this paradox? How do we tell the difference between good spying and bad spying?

First of all, why do we do it at all? Well, let’s just remind ourselves of some of the benefits. In war these days, intelligence is absolutely essential, more essential than it has ever been. When we have precisely targeted weapons which can land virtually on a sixpence, we need to know which sixpence they should land on and that is information that is acquired by intelligence. It is crucial that we understand what are the enemy’s aims and, indeed, I’ll give you two instances where I think it played a vital part in preventing the outbreak of a third world war. I’m old enough to remember the Cuban crisis and remember when my wife and I were newly married, going home one night - and many of you may have similar memories - and not knowing whether by the next day the United States would have launched nuclear missiles at Cuba. Why did that not happen? Well, it didn’t happen because the United States had an agent in the Soviet Union, Penkovsky, who was able to tell the president that these missile sites, which had been seen from the air, were not armed and it would take several months before they were armed. So, the Americans were able to deal with the matter by a blockade and, in the end, the Russians drew back and the crisis was averted but, without the information, which Penkovsky gave, the Third World War could have been triggered.

Similarly, although it’s not comfortable to remind ourselves of this, the fact that the Russians penetrated NATO meant that they knew that NATO’s aims were defensive rather than aggressive. They were always deeply suspicious but through their penetration of NATO the Russians were able to satisfy themselves as to what the real intentions of NATO were. So, in war, spying is very, very important. But in peace time also, it helps - and we all know this, though we may not know the details - to prevent many terrorist attacks and serious crime and anybody who remembers 9/11 or 7/7, and everybody in this room will, knows that in dealing with terrorism, prevention is so much better than cure. So, intelligence collecting – spying - is crucial in our lives. So what is the borderline between good spying and bad spying? Because there is bad spying as well as good spying. How are we to draw the line?

Should we say that good spying is good when the spy is on our side? I don’t think that is a satisfactory basis for drawing an ethical distinction. As Edith Cavell said, ‘Patriotism is not enough’. Should we admire spies because they’re brave? Well, many of them are intensely brave but, again, that’s not a sufficient ethical qualification for somebody who’s good. A burglar can be brave. So, I think that the best way to solve this paradox is through the analogy of the just war. When we think about war, taking life is an evil but in most of the religions of the world, it can be justified to prevent the triumph of greater evil. So I believe it is with spying. It’s justified when it’s necessary and it’s proportionate to prevent a greater evil and when it is subject to the law - I described the laws there are in this country. So, if we think of the concept of the just war, we may be getting closer to a resolution of our paradox.Spying outside the law or when authorised by the laws of an evil regime is evil.

But there is still a distinction between spying and war. In war - and here I quote from the book, Just War, by my old friends, Field Marshal Lord Guthrie and Sir Michael Quinlan: ‘The just war tradition was not framed in the abstract. It represents a careful attempt, gradually and pragmatically developed over many centuries, to put some moral discipline, some humanity, into the business of armed conflict without imposing a straitjacket so rigid as completely to preclude effective action against grave wrong’. We have an international law of war, we have international agreements on the boundary of what is permissible, such as the Geneva Convention, but in the world of intelligence, despite the general principles in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and in the European Convention, international agreement on the ethical boundaries has not kept pace with the developments in the spying business. We are having enough trouble in this country adapting our law to the developments just in our country alone and, of course, many nations in the world do not respect the conventions on human rights.

So, many ethical problems remain and let me leave you with just a few to mull over. Firstly, is torture ever permissible as a means of extracting intelligence? I suppose we must make an exception for the theoretical case where we have someone who we know for certain knows the whereabouts of a nuclear bomb which will detonate in a few hours’ time and destroy thousands, perhaps millions, of people. But leaving aside purely theoretical constructs of that sort, we have to say that torture is never justified. Torture and other means of coercion such as blackmail or bribery are not only wrong in themselves but are not likely to produce reliable intelligence. As anyone experienced in intelligence collection will tell you, the only reliable agents are those whose motive is belief in your cause.
Should we ever spy on allies? Was it morally wrong for the United States National Security Agency to bug Chancellor Merkel’s mobile telephone? It was certainly very unwise because they didn’t get anything useful out of it but was it morally wrong? Well, I noticed that President Obama said that he would stop it, that he would not authorise the spying on allies, but he gave himself a little get-out and I think he was right to do so. He would only authorise it when issues of national security are at stake and, in those circumstances, I think we can’t rule it out.

Should some potential targets of interception be off limits because of the nature of their profession: priests, lawyers, journalists? Almost always but not if there is a reasonable suspicion that they themselves are involved in serious crime. Nevertheless, they should be entitled, in my view, to special protection. Should our citizens have greater protection than foreigners? In almost all the countries of the world, the citizens of the country have a greater protection because intelligence – gathering was a national activity against other nations and so most nations’ laws are built on that premise, but is that now out of date? All people have human rights and the requirement that intelligence collection should only be undertaken when it is necessary and proportionate for very limited purposes, should in my view apply to people of foreign nations and not just our own.

Then, also topical at the moment, how do commercial organisations such as Facebook, Yahoo and Google reconcile their duty to support law enforcement with their duty and interest to protect the privacy of honest citizens? The Intelligence and Security Committee, of which I was a member, examined the murder of Fusilier Lee Rigby. The only clue there was, which could have prevented that, was an internet message from one of the killers three months before the attack which said that he wanted to kill a soldier. It was only discovered after the event but could it have been discovered before and used to prevent that outrageous act? In some circumstances, communication providers do accept these obligations. They have mechanisms to close down accounts relating to child pornography and alert authorities to its perpetrators. They say that they will always comply with legal requirements. But, because there is no international consensus, they’re subject to conflicting laws in the different countries in which they operate. Some of these laws, for example, in the United States where many of them are based, are designed to protect data relating to the nation’s own citizens which prevents the divulging of data to the law enforcement agencies of other nations.

Since terrorism and crime are now international, likeminded countries will need to have a dialogue and to find a way of removing these conflicts in the law. There’s already much work going on but it won’t be easy and, of course, there are many countries which, in this respect, are not likeminded. So, many ethical and practical problems remain to be solved. Of one thing we can be certain; in our threatening world so full of dangers, in which technology enabling both communication across international boundaries between those who mean us harm and the means for its interception are developing so fast, there are going to be problems to occupy the minds of ethicists, of lawmakers and of diplomats in relation to the collection of intelligence for many years to come. This is a challenge which will not go away.
Programme Report 2014-15

As we approach our fiftieth anniversary, it is heartening to write that the purpose of the House has remained steadfast since its inception. When HRH The Duke of Edinburgh and the then Dean Robin Woods founded St George’s House in 1966, their vision made available a unique space where topics of real importance to society might be aired and explored by people in a position to make a difference. The programme of clergy, social and ethical Consultations remains constant to this day. People from all walks of life and from across the UK and beyond make time to grapple with issues of consequence in the public domain. Proximity to history and spirituality plays a significant part in deepening the conversations that happen here. Therefore, our Consultation programme invariably includes the opportunity to attend the daily religious services and to avail of a private guided tour of the Chapel. Normally, each Consultation will result in a report for dissemination which provides not just a record of the discussion but often a template for action and influence.

What follows is a snapshot of the internal Consultations we have hosted in the year under review.

Character and Voluntary Service in Youth Charities,
29 - 30 September 2014

This Consultation sought to explore how character is conceptualised by organisations running youth social action programmes in the UK. This will bring a better understanding of the ‘double benefit’ of undertaking youth social action – the benefit to society as well as the young person themselves – and the virtues that are often developed when 10-20 year olds undertake beneficial service to others. Working with the Jubilee Center for Character and Virtues at Birmingham University, the Consultation brought together a select group of senior representatives from the youth social action sector, the wider voluntary sector, government, education and business.

Nourishing the Pastoral Heart,
6 - 10 October 2014

Ministers of the Gospel are called (in the words of the charge to those about to be ordained Deacon in the Church of England and reflected in other Christian Church’s call to ministry) to proclaim the gospel in word and deed, and be agents of God’s purposes of love. They are to serve the community in which they are set, bringing to the Church the needs and hopes of all the people. They are to work with their fellow members in searching out the poor and weak, the sick and lonely and those who are oppressed and powerless, reaching into the forgotten corners of the world, that the love of God may be made visible.

This consultation, led by the Dean and Canon Woodward, explored the nature of pastoral ministry through three specific themes: Nourishment from the World (what we might learn as we look outwards at our society, and its cultures and communities); Nourishment in our own spiritual lives (how do we maintain the wells of our resources of prayer, reflection and wisdom?). Nourishment to those we serve (how might we offer to others an oasis of refreshment in the wilderness of modern living?). Our work together included worship, Bible study, group work, and input from speakers with an interest and understanding of this in their ministry.

Towards a New Democracy,
13 - 14 October 2014

Over the last 20 years the nature of political engagement in British society has changed dramatically. There is substantial evidence of incrementally growing citizen disenchantment with politics both in terms of behaviour and attitudes. Observational, focus and survey data all point in the same direction. Disaffection with politics and politicians is a recurring theme in public discourse. Working with Professor Gerry Stoker of the Public Policy Department at the University of Southampton, our Consultation sought to explore both the dimensions of the ‘problem’ of modern democratic politics and to look not only at solutions but also how such solutions might be implemented. What are the public confidence building measures that we need to put in place to make our democracy sustainable and future-proof in the digital age? We brought together parliamentarians, academics, civil society organisations, educationalists and others.

Canon Pastors Consultation,
12 - 14 November 2014

This Consultation brought together a number of Canon Pastors who received presentations on a number of themes: Pastoral Ministry in a Roman Catholic Cathedral; Cathedral Communities – Nurturing Vocations; Is theology practical?; The Work of St George’s House. The Dean, Canon Poll and Canon Woodward were all involved in the planning and delivery of the Consultation.

Shadow and Shelter,
9 - 10 December 2014

Led by the Duchess of Abercorn, this Consultation built on the atmosphere engendered by the respective State Visits to Ireland and the UK of Her Majesty The Queen and President Higgins. The focus of the Consultation was to further our understanding of how reconciliation might be made real and lasting. To quote from the background paper, ‘As President Higgins has so inspiringly told us, ‘Scath’ in Irish means both shadow and shelter, meanings which can yield potentially different associations and range of reference. In Eire and Britain, we can think of ourselves as islands and people living in each other’s shadow, either in the sense of being overshadowed by each other, or in the sense of offering shelter, shielding...
each other from a fierce sun. The Irish saying “Ar scáth a chéile a mhaireann na daoine,” meaning “People live in each other’s shadows,” reminds us that we all need each other, and we are ultimately united in that human need.’

**Back to Civvy Street: How can we better support individuals to lead more successful civilian lives after a career in the UK Armed Forces?**

11 - 12 December 2014

A recent Forces in Mind Trust Report states that, ‘around twenty thousand soldiers, sailors and airmen leave the United Kingdom’s Armed Forces each year. Many have had their lives enriched by their service, and they transition into civilian life, together with their families, without significant difficulty. For some, however, this transition is brought to the point of failure by mental health issues which range in complexity and severity, and which are caused by factors before, during and after military service.’ Whether it is soldiers coming to the end of their commission, or those forced by redundancy to seek alternative employment, issues of transition from military to civilian life are prominent in contemporary society. While mental health issues loom large in the forces, there are other areas that need proper debate also: retraining, employment, aftercare, are all elements that contribute to a successful transition. Our Consultation, in partnership with the Forces in Mind Trust sought to explore these issues.

**Cambridge Coexist Leadership Programme, 12 - 14 January 2015**

St George’s House has developed a medium-term partnership with the Cambridge Coexist Leadership Programme. This entails three Consultations per year (January, April and June) which bring together emergent leaders from the three Abrahamic faiths. Each programme lasts forty-eight hours, during which time participants work on various aspects of practical leadership as well as on scriptural reasoning. These Consultations reanimate a strand of interfaith work for which the House was highly regarded in previous years and which is timely in our contemporary society.

**Promoting Christian Principles through Schools, 9-10 March 2015**

There are a significant number of organisations that have, in different ways, an intentional purpose to promote and support Christian education, many with a specific remit regarding Church of England ethos, especially relating to schooling and religious education. There is a sense however that coordination is lacking. This in turn leads to duplication which is in turn wasteful of energy, creativity and resources. The Consultation sought to disseminate project information, identify common themes, encourage greater cooperation and consider the possibility of national coordination.

**Consultation for Her Majesty’s Lord Lieutenants, 13 - 15 March 2015**

An annual gathering for Lord Lieutenants at the invitation of the Dean of Windsor. This brings together a mix of experienced and recently appointed Lord Lieutenants to learn more about the role from each other and from specially invited speakers. The programme is made up of a number of presentations allied with an opportunity for participants to learn through informal discussion.

**Cambridge Coexist Leadership Programme, 20 - 22 April 2015**

The second of three Consultations as outlined above.

**RAF Senior Chaplains Training, 15 May - 17 May**

Canons Poll and Woodward led on this Consultation which brought together a group of Chaplains to reflect on their work, learn from each other and explore common issues as a way of enhancing their work in the services. Part of their purpose was to explore current tensions associated with the complexity of serving the imperative of the Gospel in a diverse military context.

**Cambridge Coexist Leadership Programme, 23 - 25 May 2015**

The third of three Consultations as outlined above.

**Corruption, Militancy and Protest, 25 - 27 June**

A partnership with the Justice and Security Research Programme at the London School of Economics. How does pervasive corruption in government relate to militancy and radicalism in society? What forms of corruption are politically radicalising? What is the role of international assistance and security cooperation in corruption? What policies can be adopted to mitigate corruption and its adverse political impacts? The Consultation took as its focus Nigeria, Afghanistan, sub-Saharan Africa and Ukraine. Participants attended from these countries as well as from the UK, USA, Ireland and Switzerland.

**Science and Religion: The New Conversation, 3 - 5 July 2015**

A continuing partnership with the Centre for Theological Inquiry at Princeton. Scientific research in all fields presents major challenges for society at large. This is especially true on questions of science and religion but the challenge extends to many other areas of public interest such as climate change, bioethics, or the search for life on other planets. Too often the public debate and media coverage focus on sensational reports and conflicting viewpoints on science and society. All the while some scientists and scholars in the humanities have been holding a different conversation, one that is by contrast mutually respectful and informative but too little known. The Consultation reflected on this new conversation with participating scientists and theologians from CTI and science correspondents and practitioners from the UK, asking how it might become the new story in the media and public mind.
God: Some Conversations,  
6 - 16 July 2015
Led by Canons Finlay, Woodward and Canon Peter Johnson, twenty-four clergy gathered to look at a range of topics and the implications for their ministry. Themes this year included: Today’s Church; The Mission of the Church; Privacy – Dark Aspects of the Net; Sustainability; Democracy/Politics; God and the Arts; Crime; National Health – Healthcare. Each topic involved a presentation from an expert in the field followed by plenary discussion and, occasionally, detailed group work.

Roots and Shoots,  
30 July - 6 August 2015
We welcomed back a range of international participants from the Jane Goodall Institute who spent a week at the House working on organisational development and addressing a variety of topics pertinent to the Roots and Shoots programme across the globe. Participants this year came from Australia, New Zealand, the Far East, the Middle East, Africa, Latin America, North America and across Europe.

LECTURES
The 2014 Elson Ethics Lecture was given by Professor A.C. Grayling who took as his title, Good Lives and the Good Life.

This year’s St George’s House Annual Lecture was given by The Right Honourable The Lord Butler of Brockwell, KG, GCB, CVO, PC whose lecture title was The Ethics of Spying.

The St George’s House lecture partnership with Cumberland Lodge continued this year with the House hosting a lecture by Dr Susan Liautaud on the topic Understanding the Ethics behind the News: the Contagion of Unethical (and Ethical) Behaviour.

EXTERNAL PROGRAMME
Alongside the internal Consultations the House played host to a range of external organisations whose work is in keeping with the ethos of St George’s House. Regular visitors included the International Council for Caring Communities, the Windsor Energy Group, Windsor Leadership, the Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce and the CEO Collaborative Forum. We were delighted also to host the Prince’s Trust, the Royal Society of Arts and a number of other external organisations.

ST GEORGE’S HOUSE TRUST (WINDSOR CASTLE)  
(A company limited by guarantee without a share capital) Registered Company No. 3597496 Registered Charity No. 1071186

TRUSTEES’ REPORT  
YEAR ENDED 31 AUGUST 2015

The trustees, who are also directors for the purposes of company law, present their report and the financial statement of the company for the year ended 31 August 2015.

REFERENCE AND ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS
Reference and administrative details are shown in the schedule of members of the board and professional advisers on page 1 of the financial statements.

THE TRUSTEES
The trustees who served the company during the period were as follows:

The Right Reverend D J Conner, KCVO
The Reverend Canon Dr H E Finlay
The Reverend Canon Dr J W Woodward
The Reverend Canon M G Poll
Admiral Sir J M Burnell-Nugent, KCB, CBE, ADC
Mrs S Malik
Ms L C R Minghella, OBE
Professor H E Montgomery, MB, B, S BSc, FRCP, MD, FRGS, FRI, FFICM
Sir Mark Moody-Stuart, KCMG
Mr J L Newbegin
Dame B M Ogilvie, AC, DBE, FRS
Dr R D Townsend
STRUCTURE, GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT

St George’s House Trust (Windsor Castle) is a charitable company, company number 3597496, and registered charity number 1071186.

Memorandum and Articles of Association, established under the Companies Act 1985, govern the House. New Articles were adopted on 25 November 2013. The company is limited by guarantee without any share capital.

The Board consists of The Dean of Windsor, not more than four Canons of Windsor and at least seven but no more than 10 other Trustees, at least two and not more than four of whom shall be members of the Council of St George’s House. The Board meets as required to consider and advise the House on its programme of work. The Board of Trustees appoints the Finance and General Purposes Committee. The number of members of the company is unlimited but every member has to be approved by the Trustees.

The day to day operations of the House are controlled by the Warden and the Programme Director.

St George’s House Trust (Windsor Castle) forms part of the College of St George. In recognition of the large capital sum invested by the House into the buildings it occupies, St George’s Chapel continue to provide the premises on a rent free basis and in accordance with a mutually agreed license to occupy. The Chapel also provides a Canon to act as Warden of the House. Other than that which has already been noted, St George’s House Trust (Windsor Castle) is not materially dependent upon the support of any individual, corporation or class of donors.

Newly appointed Trustees undergo an orientation session to brief them on their legal obligations under charity and company law, the content of the Memorandum and Articles of Association, the Regulations of St George’s House, the business plan and recent performance of the company.

The Board is required to meet twice yearly although it is custom to meet more frequently.

The Board is responsible for strategic planning to meet the House’s objectives and develop strategy in relation to finance, administration and marketing. The Finance and General Purposes Committee advises upon investments policy, monitors risk management and prepares business plans and annual budgets. The Programme Director and the Warden allocate Consultation support funds in line with the principles approved by the Board.

The Trustees are satisfied that the accounts comply with current statutory requirements and the Charity’s governing documents.

OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

The charitable objectives of the Company as outlined in the Articles are as follows:-

“The Objects for which the Company is established are primarily the provision of a residential study centre for those of the clergy or laity who wish to explore the moral, spiritual and practical implications of their various concerns and secondly other religious, educational and other purposes of the Company as the Trustees may from time to time decide.”

Pursuant to this the Company runs a residential study centre for clergy of all denominations; to be a place where people of influence and responsibility in every area of society can come together to explore, develop and communicate their ideas for the benefit of society. Participants are drawn from diverse sectors of society.

These objectives are met by means of the provision of appropriate Consultations. Such Consultations are designed after taking advice from a range of knowledgeable parties.

The aim of the Consultations is to draw together people who might not otherwise have the opportunity to debate key issues with each other. The Consultation format encourages active participation by all present and allows them in an atmosphere of understanding and trust to challenge conventional thinking and to develop new insights.

Care is taken to ensure that Consultations involve a wide cross-section of society.

Signed on behalf of the Board of Trustees
The Right Reverend DJ Conner KCVO, Trustee
### Financial Summary

**ST GEORGE’S HOUSE TRUST (WINDSOR CASTLE)**

**Summary Statement of Financial Activities**

For the year ended 31 August 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Endowment Funds</th>
<th>2015 Total Funds</th>
<th>2014 Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Designated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Incoming Resources

Incoming resources from generated funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates’ subscriptions</td>
<td>23,486</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations and gifts</td>
<td>49,919</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49,919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities for generating funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>30,589</td>
<td>167,834</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>198,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incoming resources from charitable activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income from course fees (turnover)</td>
<td>615,247</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>615,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other incoming resources</td>
<td>69,312</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Incoming Resources**

788,553 - 167,834 - 956,387 876,413

#### Resourses Expended

Costs of generating funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of generating voluntary income</td>
<td>26,369</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment management funds</td>
<td>4,436</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>23,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course related expenditure</td>
<td>521,058</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>97,058</td>
<td>618,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and House related expenditure</td>
<td>113,228</td>
<td>7,667</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>167,709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governance costs

32,315 - - - 32,315 28,496

**Total Resources Expended**

697,406 7,667 97,569 70,607 873,249 855,453

#### Net Movement in Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfers into funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers out of funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers between funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net (expended)/incoming resources for the year

91,147 (7,667) 70,265 (70,607) 83,138 20,960

#### (Losses)/Gains on investment assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realised</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealised</td>
<td>(18,552)</td>
<td>(10,200)</td>
<td>(107,501)</td>
<td>(136,253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18,552)</td>
<td>(2,235)</td>
<td>(107,501)</td>
<td>(128,288)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net movement in funds

72,595 (7,667) 68,030 (178,108) (45,150) 228,612

Fund balances brought forward

968,550 47,739 309,493 4,489,424 5,815,206 5,586,594

Fund balances carried forward at 31 August 2015

1,041,145 40,072 377,523 4,311,316 5,770,056 5,815,206

All of the above results are derived from continuing activities. All gains and losses recognised in the year are included above.

### Independent Auditor’s Statement

To the Directors ST GEORGE’S HOUSE TRUST (WINDSOR CASTLE)

We have examined the summarised financial statements set out above.

#### Respective Responsibilities of Trustees and Auditor

The Trustees are responsible for preparing the summary financial statements in accordance with applicable United Kingdom law. Our responsibility is to report to you our opinion on the consistency of the summary financial statements with the full annual financial statements and the Trustees’ Report, and its compliance with the relevant requirements of section 427 of the Companies Act 2006, and section 377 of the SORP. We conducted our work in accordance with Bulletin 2008/3 issued by the Auditing Practices Board. Our report on the company’s full annual financial statements describes the basis of our opinion on those financial statements and on the Trustees’ Report.

#### Opinion

In our opinion the summary financial statements are consistent with the full annual financial statements and the Trustees’ Report of St George’s House Trust (Windsor Castle) for the year ended 31 August 2015 and complies with the applicable requirements of section 427 of the Companies Act 2006, and section 377 of the SORP.

MENZIES LLP, Chartered Accountants & Statutory Auditor, Lynton House, 7 - 12 Tavistock Square, London WC1H 9LT
SUMMARY BALANCE SHEET
31 AUGUST 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unrestricted funds £</th>
<th>2015 Restricted funds £</th>
<th>Endowment funds £</th>
<th>Total funds £</th>
<th>2014 Total funds £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible assets</td>
<td>46,749</td>
<td>9,555</td>
<td>1,221,134</td>
<td>1,277,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>575,094</td>
<td>65,576</td>
<td>3,079,321</td>
<td>3,719,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>621,843</td>
<td>75,131</td>
<td>4,300,455</td>
<td>4,997,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtors</td>
<td>68,529</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at bank and in hand</td>
<td>560,618</td>
<td>302,392</td>
<td>15,702</td>
<td>878,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>629,147</td>
<td>302,392</td>
<td>15,702</td>
<td>947,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amounts falling due within one year</td>
<td>(169,773)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(4,841)</td>
<td>(174,614)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net current assets</td>
<td>459,374</td>
<td>302,392</td>
<td>10,861</td>
<td>772,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets less Current Liabilities</td>
<td>1,081,217</td>
<td>377,523</td>
<td>4,311,316</td>
<td>5,770,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets</td>
<td>1,081,217</td>
<td>377,523</td>
<td>4,311,316</td>
<td>5,770,056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital and reserves Funds

Endowment funds
- Capital fund - - 1,232,191 1,232,191 1,279,005
- Director of Studies Fund - - 1,576,199 1,576,199 1,643,595
- Consultation Support Fund - - 1,404,488 1,404,488 1,464,111
- Elson Ethics Fund - - 98,438 98,438 102,713

Restricted funds
- Annual Lecture - 59,172 - 59,172 68,268
- Elson Ethics Fund - 8,150 - 8,150 7,042
- Director of Studies Fund - 12,072 - 12,072 10,827
- Clergy Bursary Fund - 4,890 - 4,890 4,890
- Windsor Meetings - - - -
- Consultation Support Fund - 293,239 - 293,239 218,466

Unrestricted funds - designated
- general 40,072 - - 40,072 47,739
- 1,041,145 - - 1,041,145 968,550

1,081,217 377,523 4,311,316 5,770,056 5,815,206

Approved by the Board of Trustees on 13 November 2015 and signed on its behalf by
DJ Conner
The Right Reverend DJ Conner
TRUSTEE

TRUSTEES’ STATEMENT
The trustees have pleasure in presenting the summary financial information for the year ended 31 August 2015. The summary financial statement is only a summary of information in the charity’s annual financial statements and trustees’ annual report. This summary financial statement does not contain sufficient information to allow for a full understanding of the results and state of affairs of the charity. For further information the full annual financial statements, the auditors’ report on those accounts and the trustees’ annual report should be consulted. The auditor’s report on the charity’s annual financial statements and on the consistency of the trustees’ annual report with those financial statements was unqualified. The auditors’ report contained no statement under sections 498(2) or 498(3) of the Companies Act 2006. Copies of the full annual financial statements, the audit report and the trustees’ annual report have been filed at Companies House and with the Charity Commission and can be obtained from Companies House at: www.companieshouse.gov.uk or Charity Commission at: www.charity-commission.gov.uk.

The annual financial statements and the trustees’ annual report were approved on 13 November 2015. These summary financial statements have been signed by The Right Reverend DJ Conner on behalf of the Trustees on 13 November 2015.
COUNCIL OF ST GEORGE’S HOUSE, WINDSOR CASTLE

AUGUST 2015

REPRESENTATIVE KNIGHTS OF THE MOST NOBLE ORDER OF THE GARTER

HRH The Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, KG, KT, OM, GBE
The Right Honourable Lord Carrington, KG, CH, GCMG, MC, PC, DL
His Grace The Duke of Abercorn, KG
Field Marshal The Right Honourable Lord Inge, KG, GCB, PC, DL
Lord Mervyn King of Lothbury, KG, GBE, FBA

THE DEAN AND CANONS OF WINDSOR

The Right Reverend David Conner, KCVO, The Dean of Windsor
The Reverend Canon Dr Hueston Finlay
There Reverend Canon Dr James Woodward
The Reverend Canon Martin Poll

OTHER MEMBERS

Her Grace The Duchess of Abercorn, OBE
Sir Leszek Borysiewicz, FRS, FRCP, FMedSci, FLSW
Mrs Elita de Klerk
The Baroness Falkner of Margravine
Sir Mark Moody-Stuart, KCMG
Dame Bridget Ogilvie, AC, DBE, FRS
Admiral Sir James Perowne, KBE
The Right Reverend Dr Stephen Platten
Rabbi Dr Jonathan Romain, MBE

HONORARY FELLOW & LIFE MEMBER

Sir Claude Hankes, KCVO
The House acknowledges the assistance which it receives from its many supporters and sponsors. In addition to the support of individual associates, the House is grateful for that given by trusts and corporate bodies. Those who have contributed to the work of the House in the past year include:

The funds for the Annual Lecture were provided by the Trustees of the Sir Val Duncan and Sir Mark Turner Memorial Trust which was established by Rio Tinto plc in memory of Sir Val Duncan and Sir Mark Turner.

The funds for the Elson Ethics Lecture were provided by Ambassador Edward Elson.

---

**SPONSORS & CORPORATE ASSOCIATES 2015**

**THE HOUSE ACKNOWLEDGES THE ASSISTANCE WHICH IT RECEIVES FROM ITS MANY SUPPORTERS AND SPONSORS.** In addition to the support of individual associates, the House is grateful for that given by trusts and corporate bodies. Those who have contributed to the work of the House in the past year include:

- The Cambridge Coexist Leadership Programme
- The CEO Collaborative Forum
- The Duke of Edinburgh’s Charitable Trust
- Mrs Anne Engelhorn
- The Kirby Laing Foundation
- Koc Holdings
- Lord Leverhulme’s Charitable Trust
- Sir Mark Moody-Stuart

The Mulberry Trust
- Peninsular & Oriental Steam Navigation Company
- Mr I A Pirie
- The Political Studies Association
- The Princess Anne’s Charities
- Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce
- The Robin & Henrietta Woods Charitable Trust
- Mr Robert Woods

---

**HOUSE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AS AT 31 AUGUST 2015**

- **Warden:** The Reverend Canon Dr Hueston Finlay
- **Programme Director:** Mr Gary McKeone
- **Directors of Clergy Courses:** The Dean and Canons of Windsor
- **Warden’s Administrator:** Miss Jenna Tyer & Mrs Christine Chamberlain
- **Programme Administrators:** Mrs Patricia Birdseye & Mrs Susan Suchodolska
- **Finance Manager:** Ms Fiona McNeile
- **House Manager:** Miss Catherine Pryer
- **Honorary Administrator:** Mr Colin Oakley

---

**COMPANIONS & FELLOWS OF ST GEORGE’S HOUSE**

- **Companions:** Mrs Drue Heinz, DBE
  Mr Eric Hotung, CBE
- **Honorary Fellows:** Dr Carolin Engelhorn
  Sir Claude Hankes, KCVO
- **Fellows:** Mr Peter Ashby
  Sir David Brown
  Mr Richard Carden, CB
  Dr David Coates
  The Reverend Canon Peter Johnson
  Mrs Patsy Knight
  Dr Annette Kramer
  Rabbi Dr Jonathan Romain, MBE
www.stgeorgeshouse.org

The website provides information on the concept of the House, its background and facilities. Regularly updated, the website includes reports on Consultations, as well as Clergy Consultations and other forthcoming events.