

BA

LEWES CROWN COURT

The Law Courts,
High Street, Lewes
14th March 1995

Before:

MR. JUSTICE HIDDEN

R E G I N A

- v -

STEPHEN PAUL COOPER

(Computer-Aided Transcript of the Stenograph Notes
of Hibbit & Sanders, Official Shorthand Writers to the Court,
Wishdown, Wadhurst, East Sussex, TN5 6HN)

MR. R. CHERRILL appeared on behalf of the Prosecution
MR. J. TANZER appeared on behalf of the Defence

SUMMING-UP

Tuesday, 14th March, 1995

S U M M I N G - U P

MR. JUSTICE HIDDEN: Something happened, members of the jury, near the turning circle in the Scientology premises at East Grinstead about 10.30 on the night of Friday, 6th November, 1992. What happened? What did the Defendant do? What did he intend to do? That, in a nutshell, after all the talk, is what this case, which you are trying, is all about.

I say "this case which you are trying", because you will remember that right at the outset I told you that you twelve are the judges of the facts. I say "after all the talk", because in addition to the evidence that you heard you have also had the helpful speeches of learned counsel and now you have got to listen to a little more talk when I carry out the duty of summing the case up to you.

It is probably the best course, right at the start of this summing-up, to say to you a little about our different functions, yours and mine. Our functions in this trial have been, and will remain, quite different. It has been my duty to preside over the trial and to ensure that it has been conducted fairly, according to the law; and so it is now my duty to direct you as to the law which applies in this case and to remind you of the prominent features of the evidence.

Now, the directions I give as to the law you must accept and apply. However, when I refer to the evidence the position is quite different, and all questions of fact, all questions of evidence, are for you and you alone to decide.

A From the moment that the evidence in this trial begun you
will have been assessing the witnesses and the evidence which
each of them gave. When I have completed my summing-up, and
B sent you out to consider your verdict, it will be for you to
decide what actually happened; what was the state of mind of
the Defendant when he came to play the part that he did in
the events about which you have heard.

C You do not have to decide every single point which has
been raised. I am not going to go through a long list of
points raised and point to the ones there that you do not
have to decide; but let us look at just one for a moment: you
do not have to decide whether Scientology is a cult or a
D religion; whether a good thing or a bad thing. You have to
decide the facts which are material to enable you to come to
your verdict. You have to decide only such matters as will
enable you to say whether the charge laid against the
E Defendant has been proved. That you do by having regard to
the whole of the evidence in the case, forming your own
judgment as to the reliability of the witnesses whose
evidence is in dispute.

F You must decide this case only on the evidence which has
been placed before you. There will be no more. You are
perfectly entitled to draw inferences, that is, to come to
G commonsense conclusions based on the evidence which you
accept as reliable; but you may not speculate about what
evidence there might have been or allow yourselves to be
drawn to speculation.
H

A I have told you that the facts of the case are your
responsibility. Therefore, although you will wish to take
into account the arguments raised by learned counsel in their
speeches to you, you are not bound to accept them. Equally,
B in the course of my review of the evidence it is possible
that I may express a view concerning the evidence and the
facts of the case, or I may emphasise a particular feature.
That is something which I may do in an effort to assist you,
C but it is important that you should understand that if you
disagree with that view, or with that emphasis, it is your
duty to act upon your own views. Again, if I do not refer to
a feature of the evidence which you think is important, then
D you should have regard to it and give it such weight as you
think fit -- providing of course you have regard to apply the
principles of law which I shall explain to you. When it
comes to the facts of this case, it is your views that count.
E My views about the facts, in so far as I express them, are
there for you to accept or discard as you will. So you
decide the facts.

F Well, what are the facts, you might be asking. Well, the
facts are what you find them to be. Quite simply: what is
proved before you in this court.

G Now, who has to do the proving? Well, the Prosecution
bring the case and so the Prosecution must prove that the
Defendant is guilty. The Defendant does not have to prove
his innocence. In a criminal trial the burden of proving the
Defendant's guilt is, and remains throughout, on the
H Prosecution.

A Now, to what standard must the Prosecution attain? How
does the Prosecution succeed in proving the Defendant's
guilt? The answer to that is quite simple: by making you
B sure of it. Nothing less than that will do. If, after
considering all the evidence, you are sure that the Defendant
is guilty then you must return a verdict of guilty. If you
are not sure, your verdict must be not guilty.

C Now, there are two counts in this indictment. You must
consider the case against and for the Defendant on each count
separately. Now, what are those counts? What is it that is
alleged in the indictment against this Defendant? If you
D would turn up your copies of the indictment we will go
through it quite shortly. Count 1 is a count of attempted
kidnap. The particulars of offence reading: "Stephen Paul
Cooper on the 6th day of November 1992 attempted unlawfully
and by force to take or carry away Kathleen Ann Wilson
E against her will."

F Let us deal with the law as to that count before we move
on to Count 2. What is the offence of kidnapping in law? It
consists of the four elements that you have heard about in
argument from both counsel. They are: the taking or carrying
G away of one person by another. That is the first element.
By force or fraud, the second element; without the consent of
that person, the third element; and without lawful excuse,
the fourth. I will mention again, but in a slightly
different order, those four elements so they are clearly in
your mind right from the outset: first, the taking away of a
H person; second, the use of force or fraud; third the lack of

A

lawful excuse; and fourth, the lack of consent of the person taken.

B

C

Now, to strip it down even more, leaving out unnecessary words: the crime of kidnapping of Kathleen Wilson would consist of the taking of her away by force without lawful excuse and without her consent. I will come to those four elements a little later, but you may think that the only one of the four that you are really dealing with here is the last one: lack of consent of the person taken. You may be satisfied that the other three elements have in fact been established, so we will be looking in particular at the lack of consent, the fourth element.

D

E

F

G

H

It is not, of course, kidnapping that is charged here. What is charged is attempted kidnapping. Now, you will want to know how a person can be guilty of the crime of attempting to kidnap another. The answer is that the person is guilty of attempting to kidnap if, with the intent to kidnap, he does an act which is more than merely preparatory to the kidnap. So what must be proved here is an intention and an action. The intention to kidnap, and the action more than merely preparatory to the kidnapping. So the intention -- you will already have realised -- must be to take Kathleen Wilson by force, without lawful excuse and without her consent; and the action must be one that is more than merely preparatory to the kidnap. You are the judges of the facts of all that and therefore you twelve are the judges not only of the intention but of whether the action was one that was more than merely preparatory.

A

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

Now, those words which I have said four times, I suppose, over the last few seconds, "more than merely preparatory", need a little explanation; but do not worry, that explanation is easily given by a little example. Lets move away from the evidence of this case to a case of a money snatch which goes wrong: every evening a man locks up his shop and walks to his car with a satchel containing the day's takings. A would-be robber has the intention of robbing him of that money. That would-be robber, at his home, puts into his pocket a cosh; he drives a car to just around the corner from the shop; he leaves the engine running and waits immediately around the corner for the man from the shop to come out. As the shop owner comes round the corner the would-be robber swings out with the cosh with one hand and tries to grab the satchel with the other. The shop owner, who has quicker reflexes than had been expected, ducks away from the cosh and swings the satchel into the robber's face and is able to make off to the safety of his shop. The robbery has gone wrong. There was no robbery, but the offence of attempted robbery would be there.

In that little example the would-be robber had put a cosh in his pocket; he had got in his car and driven to the scene; he had left the engine of the car running while he waited around the corner. All those acts in that example were acts which were merely preparatory to the commission of the offence. So also would have been the act of taking the cosh out of his pocket as he waited, and standing there with it in his hand; but the act of swinging the cosh, and the act of

A grabbing for the satchel, were each of them something which was more than merely preparatory.

B If you apply that example to the facts of this case you may well conclude -- and remember the conclusion is one of fact and is therefore for you -- that in this case the Defendant's acts were more than merely preparatory acts. If that was the case, then you will go on to consider whether at the time of those acts the Defendant had the intention to kidnap.

C Now, there is another word that has a meaning in law: "intention". You may say: "Well, how does a jury decide about someone's intention?" You cannot slice the top off someone's head and look in. You cannot put an electrode on either side and dial in the day and the time and find out what the intention was. Well, the answer is, in law, that you can decide intention by deciding what the Defendant did, or did not do; and by what he said, or did not say. You should look at his actions before, at the time of and after the alleged offence. All those matters -- his actions before, his actions at the time of and his actions after the offence -- may shed light on the intention at the critical time. Equally, what he says, or does not say, before, during and after, can shed that light.

G That, then, is the law on the offence of attempting to kidnap. I will come back, at the end, just to summarise what I had to say on that count.

H Now, let us look at the indictment again and come to the second count, where the statement of offence says: "Affray",

A and the particulars of offence say: "Stephen Paul Cooper on
the 6th day of November 1992 used or threatened unlawful
B violence towards other persons and his conduct was such as
would cause a person of reasonable firmness present at the
scene to fear for his personal safety." Now, what is the
offence of affray? Quite simply: a person is guilty of
affray if he uses or threatens unlawful violence towards
another. That is the first element.

C The second element is this: and his conduct is such as
would cause a person of reasonable firmness present at the
scene to fear for his personal safety. So there is the use
or threatening of that unlawful violence, together with
D conduct which would cause that sort of person present to fear
for their personal safety -- a person of reasonable firmness.

Just one or two other things to tell you about it. The
threat cannot be made by the use of words alone. Where two
E or more persons use or threaten the unlawful violence, it is
the conduct of them both together that has to be considered.

Finally, no person of reasonable firmness need actually
be present at the scene, or likely to be there. It is the
F quality of the conduct that matters whether there is such a
person there or not.

Now, in that definition I of course have reminded you
that where there are two or more persons using or threatening
G ununlawful violence, it is the conduct of both of them
together that has to be considered. You only have before you
one person, the Defendant, but you have heard in the evidence
H about Barry Brown and what Barry Brown was doing. The

A

Prosecution's case is that this Defendant committed these two offences jointly with Barry Brown. Where an offence is committed by two or more persons each of them may play a different part, but if they are acting together, as part of a joint plan to commit the offence, they are each guilty of it. Put simply, the question for you is: were they in it together?

B

C

So you have to look at the conduct of this Defendant and the man, one Barry Brown, at the scene and decide if they used or threatened unlawful violence towards Kathleen Wilson, and whether their conduct was such as would cause a person of reasonable firmness present at the scene to fear for his personal safety.

D

E

That violence has to be unlawful violence. In certain circumstances it is lawful to use violence, for instance, to defend yourself or some other person, but the question of self-defence does not arise here.

F

Those are the two counts in the indictment. There is a little more that I will have to tell you as we go along, and the only matters I need deal with at present, before turning to the facts, are the law on the position where a defendant has not given evidence. The law is this: the Defendant does not have to give evidence. He is entitled to sit in the dock and require the Prosecution to prove its case. You must not assume that he is guilty because he has not given evidence. The fact that he has not given evidence proves nothing one way or the other. It does nothing to establish his guilt. On the other hand, it does mean that there is no evidence.

G

H

A from the Defendant to undermine, contradict or explain the
evidence put before you by the Prosecution. That is the way
you should approach that matter.

B There is one other matter of law which I can deal with at
the moment, and I will remind you of when I come to deal with
the Defendant's interview by the police, and that is how you
should approach that interview which, of course, is just an
C interview, one person talking to another in the police
station, which is not the giving of evidence on oath in
court. The Defendant's statement to the police contains both
incriminating parts and excuses or explanations -- what has
D been called "exculpatory parts", seeking not to take the
blame for certain things. You must consider the whole of the
statement in deciding where the truth lies. You may feel
that the incriminating parts are likely to be true -- for why
else would he have made them? You may feel that there is
E less weight to be attached to his excuses and explanations;
they were not made on oath, they have not been repeated on
oath and they have not been tested by cross-examination.
That is a direction in law that I have to give you in
F relation to that matter.

Now, members of the jury, we come to the evidence. I
shall not try to remind you of every single piece of
evidence; it is the important and relevant evidence that I
G should take you to. Remember, if I miss something out which
you think is important, give it importance; if I stress
something which you think is unimportant, ignore any stress
H there may be.

A Kathleen Wilson told you that she lives at Stonelands,
about three miles away from the Scientology premises in East
Grinstead. She hails from Cleethorpes where her mother still
is but came south, she said, in the summer of 1991 and lived
B in Bognor Regis. She shared with friends, and one was Lorna
Bowden whom you have also seen.

Kathleen Wilson eventually joined what she called the
Church of Scientology at Chichester; that was in the summer
C of 1991. She went to the headquarters at the Saint Hill
Castle outside East Grinstead and started work there in about
May 1992, so she had been there about six months before the
events you are considering. She started off by doing
D different types of work: gardening and cleaning, things like
that, and changed to administrative work. By November 1992
she was doing surveys and asking people questions.

E During that time she wrote to her parents. She did not
speak to her mother because they did not have a 'phone (her
father and mother). There came a time when she was asked if
she wanted to go to America by another staff man working
there, and that was about the beginning of November 1992.
F She said: "I wanted to go to America. I wanted to sort a few
things; to see my parents, et cetera; but I wanted to go. In
the end I did not."

G She was asked what her attitude was to Scientology, and
she said: "When I first went into it I found it was good. It
helped me and other people. I was working with other
Scientologists before and I decided to go to East Grinstead
H because it was helpful. I liked it. I like doing the work;

A that is why I was there."

B Then she was asked about Lorna Bowden, and she said: "I
knew her from school, since we were eleven. She was my
friend from secondary school; and I knew her after school."
C She was asked if she had made any arrangements to see Lorna
at this time, and she said: "When I was due to go to America
I made an arrangement to see her. I met her on Friday 6th
November at about 6.30 in the early evening. I was with two
other staff members, Barbara Bradley and Austin Leniston. I
spoke with her for quite a while, till just past seven, which
would be about 40 minutes. I met Stephen Cooper too. He
D came down to where we were later, and there was another
person who came down too, a man." You may think that that
must be Barry Brown. "I saw a car they had outside and a dog
like a Rottweiler. I spoke to Stephen Cooper. He was going
on holiday and was talking about his job. I can't remember
E exactly what we were talking about, but the talking stopped
about ten past seven when I told them I had to go to a
meeting and I had to leave at a certain time."

F "Later that evening I saw Stephen Cooper again. It was
about 10.30. It was outside the Castle with Austin Leniston
and Kevin McEnery. I was walking across the grounds to where
the turning circle is, where the bus is. I was getting a
G lift back to Stonelands. I was walking along. It was quite
dark and suddenly a man came towards me. He went to grab me
and grabbed me by my right arm. He never got hold of me by a
proper grip because Austin protected me." Then she said:
H "They touched me; they were tugging at me. Austin grabbed

A

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

hold of me so this person would not grab hold of me, and I went on to the floor. It happened so quick. I did not see his face; I saw a brown jacket. I was held at the side, the right side, by the waist. Austin was pulling one way because I was getting pulled the other way by the other person. That person was fighting Austin as well. I was kicking and things. After that I saw Stephen Cooper come towards me. He was trying to get Austin off me as well. I heard the words: 'Grab her'. I thought it was Stephen that said that. There was a dog as well. Somebody said: 'Get the dog.' Maybe the other person said that, but I am only guessing. The dog turned up but it did not want to come forward. I am not sure if it was Stephen trying to pull it forward. In the end though there were people coming to the bus. I was pushed onto the staff bus -- I am not sure who by -- and managed to get somewhere to safety from getting dragged."

She was asked just a little more about when she fell, and she said: "When I fell down my glasses got broken and my coat was all muddy. My arm, just above the elbow and below it, was bruised when I fell down on the floor."

She said that she met Stephen Cooper about 1986 and had seen him quite a lot of times since then because Lorna Bowden was his girlfriend and they used to live in the same building and see each other every day in Bognor Regis.

That was her evidence in chief when asked questions by Mr. Cherrill.

Mr. Tanzer asked her questions. She said: "I came down from Cleveland with Lorna. I thought she was a good friend

A until a few things happened and I fell out with her. Before
this I did not speak to her for quite a while. I had not
spoken to her for ages; that was quite a while before the
report in the Chichester Observer came out.

B Members of the jury, there were a lot of references to
the report in the Chichester Observer, and you saw it at the
end of the evidence for the Prosecution. At this stage it
C might be a good idea to look at it now and remind yourself of
what it says about these three people. It is Exhibit 3.
The heading: "Family fears over church". The passage that is
in it, on the right column, starts about an inch into the
right column and says: "Kathleen Wilson gave up her job in a
D Chichester shoe shop and joined the cult. Now she lives in
its East Grinstead base. Her friend Lorna Bowden, who lives
in Southbourne, kept in touch but said she has changed
completely. 'All she ever talks or writes about is
E Dianetics. She used to tell me everything. She is always
going on loads of their courses.' Miss Bowden and her
boyfriend, Steve Cooper, filled in personality surveys
Kathleen sent them." There are two more paragraphs about
F Mr. Cooper and his girl friend which I need not read out to
you now but you can always look at it later on.

To get back to Kathleen Wilson's evidence, she said:
G "Lorna was my best friend. She and I had many happy times
together." She looked at the photographs that were drawn to
her attention. You have got them, members of the jury, and I
need not take you to them. They are Exhibit 1. She accepted
H that there was another person, Lawrence, also in those

A photographs. She accepted that she put the writing on them,
and now perhaps we can look at them. The writing is under
all of them; and actually you can see the writing "1990" (in
B inverted commas) on three of the photographs, not just one,
one on each page. "1990" in inverted commas. She was asked
why she put "1990" on because her evidence was that it was
1991 that she came south, and she said: "Well I put the
writing on a few weeks after the photos were taken. I don't
C think I put the wrong year in there a few weeks after, but I
am not absolutely sure which year it was. I still think it
is 1991. I just do. It just sticks in my memory."

D Well, you will remember two things about that: 1. the
criticisms Mr. Tanzer made; and 2. the impression that she
gave you. You may also like to remember what Lorna Bowden
said about what she could remember, one way or the other,
about which year.

E She was asked about the work she did at the Castle. She
said the work was filing and clerical work, dealing with
students' materials, class packs and books. She said there
is always someone around. The supervisor she worked for was
F a man called Adam.

G She said that on the day in question she saw Mr. Leniston
and saw Barbara Bradley. Barbara Bradley was at the Castle
dealing with the public, public relations. Barbara Bradley
was concerned in this incident when Lorna and Stephen came to
the Castle and they had tea about 6.30.

H She was asked if she had spoken to Barbara Bradley after
the first day of giving evidence, and she said she did see

A her in the evening and did see her to ask what clothes she
was going to wear today: "....to talk about that because she
is good at knowing what to wear." She accepted that she
herself was quite good at knowing what to wear and was quite
B keen on clothes shops, but she said: "I have got a lot of
bright clothes. I like wearing bright clothes and I just
talked about what I should wear with her." She accepted that
she had a uniform that she normally wore; that was a Sea
C Organisation uniform, and she said she could have worn it to
court really if she wanted to but she wanted to wear
something else.

D She said that she normally went back from the Castle to
her home at Stonelands on a staff bus, normally always, and
she sat with a friend. She said that Mr. Leniston had
written to the police about this incident, but she did not
discuss this with either him or Barbara Bradley "....because
E we were told not to say anything." She said her Sea
Organisation uniform was one she is proud of because it is a
new design and is a smart uniform. "I could have worn it to
court, it is very smart, but I did not."

F She was asked what work she did before she came to work
for Scientology, and she said: "I lived in a couple of places
in Chichester and went to work for some Scientologists, quite
a while after I came down that was. I was interested in
G Scientology after I met them and then I went and worked for
them. I got a leaflet and I bought a book in Chichester
opposite where I live. They used to run different courses,
and the book I bought was about how to help people and how to
H

A

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

get along with them." She worked with some people at Poole for a time and those people told her about the Castle and she went there. She had been there a few times before she actually went there to work. She said: "You join; you work; you get paid; it is like a job. There is an allowance of £33 per week but we get all our accommodation and everything thrown in."

When first there she was gardening and clearing up; that was for the estates' project course. She had been on more courses. She had studied auditing, which is like counselling. "The aim is that when you have got problems, they can be dealt with. Another course was on processing. I was not being processed; I was just studying. I am not auditing or processing now. I have done it in the past and I will probably do it in the future; the last time was about two months ago. There are a number of levels, about eight. One of the levels is called a 'Clear'; another is an 'O.T.', which stands for 'Operating Thetan'. 'Thetan' is a spirit, a phrase used by L. Ron Hubbard", and you will remember that it was suggested that he was the founder of Scientology. "I am a Pre-Clear. In auditing you are asked questions and you answer the questions back, and the auditor asks the questions."

She told you about an E-meter, a device to pick up any reaction you have to things giving you trouble, anything you are distressed about: "It has a dial on the front and has numbers. It is not electric. There is something like two soup cans attached to it and you hold that in your hands; and

A you are not put into a light trance and you are totally aware. You are not hypnotised in any of these sessions. You are asked about things that cause you trouble and you have not told anybody about. It is kept confidential."

B Then she was asked about the Chichester paper and was asked about suppressive agents. It was put to her that what they had done in that article was a suppressive act, and she said that they could be declared a suppressive person. She said that if that happened, anybody outside the church, anyone in contact with them would be forbidden but not if they were in the church. She said: "When the article appeared I was shown it because I did not know anything about it. It could have been Mrs. Bradley that showed it to me." She was shown it, she thought, a few days before the 6th November when the incident happened, but she could not remember it exactly. "Nothing was discussed about disconnection. Disconnection is when you do not have any more conversation with someone. I am not sure now if it was discussed."

F She agreed that Lorna had been her best friend at school and she had got on very well then, and afterwards, with Lorna and Stephen Cooper "...but most of the time they were getting mixed up in all sorts of things, stealing, and I didn't want to have anything to do with that. I did not want to have anything to do with criminal things. It was a thing to do with a car and nothing to do with my rent money -- it had not been stolen."

A She said that when the article was shown to her, and the
question came up, she was not told Stephen and Lorna had
committed suppressive acts, and she was not told she could
not have any contact with them. She said, as far as having
B contact with people was concerned: "If I want to I can go
into East Grinstead and go to a tea shop and see them. There
is no reason why I could not see them. You can see who you
want, if you want. You get Saturday off, usually in the
C morning, I think until one o'clock; and sometimes it is all
day off on Saturday." She said she worked from nine usually
until ten o'clock, but that was not all work; that did not
include studying and meetings through the day.

D Then she was asked about the arrangement she made for
that meeting on 6th November. She said: "I asked Lorna and
Stephen on to the premises. The day before there had been
something suspicious going on. I was meant to meet Lorna at
E Stonelands but I missed the train from London because I had
been trying to get a passport. I would probably be going to
Los Angeles at the time for administrative training but I
didn't go to Los Angeles because I did not get a visa; and I
F did not go back to London after the first time. The reason
why I did not go was I did not want to leave and go to
America with all this happening", meaning the events of 6th
November.

G She said that she rang Lorna at Chichester and arranged
to meet her. Where they met was the Pavilion. "Barbara was
in charge and I had to get permission. I arranged a
H particular time in case anyone else wanted to use it.

A Mr. Leniston was at the meeting we had with Lorna. He was in
charge of looking after the Castle and making sure it was
secure. His job now is dealing with the public as the Ethics
B Officer, which is somebody who notes how students are doing,
whether they are doing well in class. There are ethics
persons if you committed harmful acts, something that goes
C against survival, or what is right, and that is something
that would prevent you living normally, such as taking drugs
or something like that. He does not work in discipline and
is nothing to do with a rehabilitation force."

With regard to Barbara Bradley and Austin Leniston: "I
wanted them there at this meeting; they were friends of mine;
D it was just a work relationship. At the meeting I was able
to speak freely. I mentioned the newspaper article and
things. My intention was to get the newspaper article out in
the open and finding out what it was all about. Things were
E really untrue in it and I wanted to clear it up. Barbara
Bradley and Mr. Leniston did not say more than I did. At the
meeting I could say whatever I wanted to. I was aware my
mother was concerned about me. I rang her up and wanted to
F speak to her about going to America. Lorna and Steve knew my
mum. They could say what they wanted to say. If I wanted to
say something to them I could say it that night. I could have
said I wanted to leave if I did want to leave. If I made the
G decision I could have said that. If you want to leave, you
leave, but you don't shout it around the staff. As a member
of the Sea Organisation you make an agreement for a billion
H years, but it is not 'once you are in you are in' -- a lot of

A people leave. You do not promise to obey."

B Then a question was asked of her and she said: "It makes
me sound like a robot, what you are saying". That was the
time the word "robot" was used, in the answer she gave. She
C said: "It being a religion, you have to uphold a certain
standard. You promise to increase the power of the Sea
Organisation and decrease the power of any enemy; and if I
wanted to leave I would speak to the people who needed to
know. I didn't want to leave. If I left, provided I told
the people in the organisation, that is alright. It is not
like leaving without telling anyone."

D "When they were there, Stephen and Lorna, they were not
asking about me and saying things like: 'Are you alright?'
They did not show their concern that way by saying things
like: 'Are you alright? How are you doing?'" She agreed she
E had to go somewhere at seven, a staff meeting, and she could
have missed it if she wanted to but she had arranged to go
there and she had to be there on time. That was the meeting
they had every week, a staff meeting.

F Then she talked about what happened at 10.30. She said:
"I came out to get the bus. That night I was going to get a
lift because I wanted to get a lift because I felt better
getting a lift and could get home quicker. Sometimes people
G have a car and you can have a lift, but usually I do not
bother asking people. Kevin McEnery had a car. He is a
security guard. The security guards sometimes had a mega-
light and a thing to communicate with, and I felt safer
H getting a lift because I felt the meeting was suspicious",

A meaning the meeting with Lorna and Stephen. "I wanted to go back with somebody."

B She then looked at the plan, Exhibit 2. She was asked about the lights and said: "It is quite dark. There were a few lights, one or two. On one of the buildings there is a light shining down, and there are the bus lights as well. I was with Austin and Kevin as I walked. I think Kevin was walking in front. Suddenly a man came out, and it happened very quickly. That person grabbed me by my right arm. It was after that that I saw Stephen Cooper come towards me. There seemed to be two people involved. I did not see the first person clearly because it was too dark. The first person was not Stephen as far as I could make out. A lot of people after that were pulling at me, and I am not sure if Stephen touched me. Austin was protecting me from the person who was coming towards me. He touched me. Kevin did not grab me. The grab from Austin took me down to the ground. I was pulled by my coat by the person that came up to me in the first place. Stephen was fighting with Austin and trying to fight off Austin and grab me. I am not sure if Stephen touched me. I heard someone say 'grab her.' It sounded like Stephen's voice. I am sure it was Stephen who said that. Everything happened too quickly, I am a bit unsure, but I am sure I was bruised; it wasn't really serious, it was just mild bruising."

H She agreed she made her statement three days afterwards and did not know why it took so long. She did not think she spoke to Austin Leniston about it but probably did speak to

A Barbara.

B She said she wrote to her mum about this, and they wrote quite a few times since it happened. She said she wrote before 14th March 1993, but agreed later on that the 14th March was the first letter where she deals with things.

C She was asked about the complaint in the East Grinstead County Court, and she said she knows about that claim. She had signed a thing, a paper, to say that he did not come on the property -- that is Stephen. It was a paper from the court. She had seen solicitors about it. The solicitor was Peter Hodkin; she could not remember the name of his firm, and she saw him at East Grinstead in his offices.

D As to why Lorna came to see her: "She just said she wanted to see me, and that is why I arranged the appointment. She did not give the impression that she was really worried." She said she did get the impression from the newspaper
E article that her mother was worried about her. She did not get that impression about Stephen because she was not really in communication with him. She did not really want anything to do with him when he came to the Castle that night. She
F had not invited him; she just wanted to see Lorna. It did not really occur to her that Stephen, the Defendant, might be worried about her. She said: "I wanted to get in touch with Lorna so I could get in touch with my mother. I rang Lorna's
G father to get in touch with my mother because my mother has not got a 'phone and Lorna's father had. The reason why I contacted Lorna's father was so I could speak to my mother and find out if she was well and what she thought about me
H

A going to America."

B In re-examination, as to whether the photographs should be written "1990" or "1991" underneath, she said: "Maybe I made a mistake on the photographs." She still thought it was 1991 rather than 1990.

C "I have not been told what to say in court. I was at the Castle where I wanted to be in November 1992. When I was grabbed in this incident I did not want to go with the two people who suddenly emerged. I am not a prisoner. I sometimes get into East Grinstead; there is no problem going; no ban on meeting anybody. Lorna and Stephen have not, to my knowledge, been declared 'suppressive persons'."

D It was then, members of the jury, that she looked at the newspaper article. "I know some people have strong feelings of hostility towards the Church of Scientology, and I accept that. If you decide you want to leave, you can; it is a free decision. If I decided to leave, I would go to talk to someone who deals with that -- people leaving. People do that. They leave. I enjoy working there, helping people and dealing with people. I am not a robot. I did not want to worry my mother. I know she wanted me to go back home. I did want to go back home for a visit before this happened. I wanted to see her before I went abroad."

G Members of the jury, I have reminded you of that evidence in a fair degree of detail because it is important evidence, and you will remember the submissions made to you about it. We need not treat the rest of the evidence quite so comprehensively.

A The next witness was Kevin McEnery who came from Los
Angeles and told you about the evening of the 6th November
when he saw Kathleen Wilson: she had gone to the pavilion;
three people came on the base in a car. He was a security
B guard and reported to head office by radio, and then minutes
later he saw a Rottweiler in the car. The car came down from
the car park to go outside the pavilion and then left and
went to East Grinstead. He followed the car. There were
C three people in the car, two men and a woman -- you may think
it is clear -- the Defendant, Barry Brown and Lorna Bowden.
"I saw two of them later, the two males. I believe it was
about ten o'clock."

D He described the incident by the turning circle. He
said: "Kath Wilson and Austin Leniston were following close
behind and I was just about to get into the car. I heard
Kath scream and I looked around. I could just see Kath with
E one of the men I had seen earlier and Austin together. They
kind of fell to the ground." He said that the other person
was the taller of the two men; about the mid 20's, moustache.
"The struggle was five to ten yards from me. It was dark but
F there are lights from above, floodlights, which were meant to
illuminate another area, and path lights" which you have seen
in the photograph. "The lights were in the ground, throwing
up the light. The man was holding a knife. The blade was
G five inches long. He swung it towards me two or three times.
It was a switchblade knife or a jack-knife. He said: 'Get
back or I will cut you', words to that effect. The other man
was shorter with dark hair; late 30's possibly. At the time
H

A he was also struggling. I had seen him trying to pull Kath
away from the ground. Someone was saying: 'Let go of her.
B Let go of her or I will cut you. She is coming with us.' I
went over to assist Austin and Kath who were still both on
the ground, and that is when the knife was waved at me. I
was looking directly at the man holding it from four yards
away. I called for assistance on the radio and then other
staff appeared and one of the men shouted: 'Get the dog.' A
C third person appeared with a dog fifteen to twenty yards
away. I am not sure whether that third person was male or
female. As the dog arrived I do not think the third person
came all the way. The dog ran down. After staff members
D arrived the other people backed off and went off in the car."
He got into his car and followed the other car. The car
stopped and one of the nearside doors opened quite quickly
and an arm and leg appeared as if someone was coming out and
E he overtook and drove to the next turning and came back, and
by then the other car was not there.

F He was cross-examined, members of the jury. He said his
job was mainly to do with construction and renovation of the
premises because he was a plumber. He was a member of the
Church. He gave his statement on 8th November. He was then
employed as a security guard. He said he was a Scientologist
and he had studied the Scriptures. It was not the only
G reason to go to Los Angeles to attend classes. His uniform
was the Sea Organisation uniform. He had a radio and
handcuffs as part of the uniform, although he never actually
H used them. There was also a leatherman-tool which was five

A inches long and was used for changing a plug and things like
that. It was not a weapon. He was asked about mag-lights
and said he did not carry one around as a rule, but people
B who patrol at night would carry them. He described them, you
will remember, and said: "There are various sizes, from very
small to very long. Quite a bright light, and you can twist
the top to get a short beam or a long beam. It is in a case.
C I have never seen one used as a club. I did not have a
mag-light on this occasion."

He had had no orders before 6.30 about Kathleen Wilson
but he knew she was going to have visitors that day. As to
him giving a lift to Kath to go home, "it was kind of
D mentioned." Austin, as well as being a security guard, was a
friend of his and he mentioned it; he could not remember
whether it was on the radio or when he met him. He said that
there would probably be two to three hundred people in the
E grounds at any one time he would guess. Part of his job as
security guard, because there are so many visitors, would be
to show them where to go. On this occasion he was told the
meeting was in the pavilion so he knew where to direct them.
F There is a small sign there where you have to be directed to.
The visit was mentioned to him but it was not a case of
specific instructions being given. It might have been
G mentioned that they were friends of Kathleen but not whether
they were pro or anti the cult.

H He spoke about guiding Lorna towards the pavilion. He
said he did not go to the pavilion that evening and did not
see Barbara Bradley there. He described Mr. Cooper as being

A fairly tall and younger than Mr. Brown and a bit more clean cut; Mr. Brown being about six inches shorter. He said that the reason why he noticed was that usually people come into the reception area, and to sit on the steps was unusual.

B Part of the message he sent over the radio was to get someone to go and ask if they needed him because he was going to a different part of the property. Brian Craig-Smith came to the scene; he is another security person. He was not part of
C any pre-organized surveillance. People, when they come, in most cases they want a tour of the house and that is something that has to be arranged.

D As to how long the meeting was that evening, he thought it was less than an hour, possibly less than three quarters of an hour; it might be ten minutes; it might be twenty minutes. As to the time, 10.30 that eveing, he described the field where there had been, about five hundred yards away, a
E bonfire and fireworks. He said he was heading back to get his car and Austin asked for a lift. He was ten yards away from the car when the incident happened. He had himself been down by the fireworks for more than an hour, more like two.
F He had a radio, and it might be that it was on that radio that someone had asked him to go to a particular place.

G He said the bit in his statement that reads: "At about 10.30 that evening Austin Leniston and I were walking with Kathleen Wilson from the direction of the pavilion towards the steps of the Castle", was right. He said he had the keys to the car on that occasion. It was really a car used for
H renovation, and he gave a lift because he was asked to.

A "When the matter happened", he said, "I heard a scream.
I saw one of the men with a knife. It was Stephen Cooper,
the younger one. I would not swear to the size being exactly
three inches, but in my estimation that was the length of the
B knife. I did not see really the type of knife, as opposed to
knowing whether it was for eating dinner or carving beef,
most of the handle was covered." It was suggested to him that
it was actually not a knife that was there at all, because he
C was asked to identify a knife which it was suggested the
Defendant had that night but did not have it out in view.
You have seen that and you cannot see it there (indicated),
Exhibit 4, and you can take it out with you, and you have
D seen it already. He said that this was not the knife that he
saw: "That is definitely not the knife that I saw. That is
about two inches. I think I would have seen keys hanging
from it. Nothing tinkled. This was a jack-knife and was
E more like a hunting knife and slightly more pointed than
this. Nobody told me to say that there was a knife. It was
true -- there was one."

F He would not say that the people leaving Scientology were
firmly discouraged: "Anyone who wants to go is free to go. I
signed a billion year contract but you are free to go if you
want. I was not concerned that Kathleen might talk, that
G there was no fear that she might speak to the others one to
one. I did feel in danger from the knife." He was asked if
what was set out in his statement was right, were it says: "I
was in fear of my safety when I was with confronted with the
H knife. I didn't feel as though he was going to use it on

A me -- I just did not want to tackle him through fear of
injury." He said that this was right. What he meant about
him not feeling in fear of the knife being used was: "The
B Defendant was within the distance and could have reached
forward and taken a step forward if that was his intention,
and he did not walk towards me. The knife was two feet away
from me."

C "The police arrived that night and spoke to Kath,
Mr. Leniston and to me. That night we discussed what
happened briefly. There was no discussion really but just
odd comment the next day. For me it was not a traumatic
incident."

D In re-examination by the Crown, he said the suggestion
that he had made up the knife was false: "What I said was
true. The Defendant had a knife. He definitely had it. By
no means would I stand here if that had not happened." The
E reason why he felt as he did in relation to fear was with
somebody standing there in the dark who he did not know, who
was heavily built, saying: "Get back or I will cut you", it
was that sort of experience. He saw a cut on Austin
F Leniston. He did not see anything else in the incident that
night that could have caused that cut other than the knife he
had seen.

G He said, as to leaving Scientology: "I am definitely free
to go, be it temporarily or for good. A billion year
contract is something that I pledged as an agreement, but not
all the staff workers are happy; some leave but not many."
H The mark he saw on Austin Leniston was a mark on the side of

A the cheek. It looked like a scratch or a cut. As there was
B blood running out of it he took it that it was a cut. There
were two further cuts on Austin Leniston's arm. "I would
consider it a cut; blood was running from the two and a half
inch mark. A scratch does not normally show blood, but I did
not see it being caused."

C The next eye-witness as to what was happening was Austin
Leniston. He told you that Kathleen Wilson received a visit
from three visitors at 6.30. They were entertained at the
pavilion and he was present when Kathy had her visitors.
"She wanted me to be there. It lasted about 35 minutes." He
identified the people who came as being the Defendant, Lorna
D Bowden and what must have been Barry Brown. "I spoke to
these people. I also met a dog. The meeting ended about
7.15 when the visitors left. About 10.30 I going to
Stonelands where Kath lived. We were going by car and Kevin
E was going to drive. We were in the grounds with that object
in view. We got to the position where the coach was. Passed
the coach, in the turning circle, there was a car parked.
That was Kevin's car parked just ahead. Kevin went to do the
F doors, Kath and myself were just possibly at the end of the
coach, a few feet away; we had just passed two people getting
in. Kevin was two or three feet ahead. Somebody came
G between Kath and myself and grabbed Kath around the shoulder
and shouted very angrily: 'You are coming with us.' I cannot
say who it was because their back was to me. Kath screamed
out. At this point I swept the man to one side so I could
H get to Kath. The next thing I think I was on the floor with

A Kath. This man came back and started to tug at Kath to pull
her off the ground. He was grabbing her arms and yelling.
Kath was screaming still, something negative. She did not
want to go with him. I could feel blood on myself so I knew
B I was hit. I could feel something below my lower lip on the
righthand side. I noticed Kath was out of my hands although
she was still on the ground, and I got a glimpse of her
again. The man said: 'Let go of her mate or I will knife
C you.' It was coming from very close. It was the guy who was
standing over me. In the background was the coach lights. I
could see a knife; it was a sheath-type, with a blade of four
or five inches. Shortly after that, I felt a tingling to the
D left side of my face, near the eyebrow. I did not know at
the time what it was. I kicked up from the ground and kicked
the man in the stomach and he went back. Right after that
someone shouted: 'Get the dog.' I was on the floor on my
E righthand side. I looked over my shoulder and saw the dog
coming towards us. It looked like the dog we had seen
earlier. A couple of seconds later the gang ran off. I
picked Kath up and put her on the coach. The car went off.
F I was bleeding. I put my hand to my face and there was blood
under my left eye. There was a photograph taken that night",
and he identified the photograph, Exhibit 5, that you can see
when you go out. As they left he said he heard an angry
G voice saying: "We will be back to get her, you bastards,
tomorrow night."

H In cross-examination he said he noticed the blood below
the cut but the cut went over the left edge near the left

A eyebrow and continued under the eye, and he said this: "It
was not a big deal. It took a while to go, and you could see
the mark if you came up close", and he indicated one half of
B it when a mirror was given to him to find it. He said: "If
someone said it was a scratch, there was a lot of blood; it
was not like a scratch with tears." He had been down on the
grass but nowhere near any holly or anything else that would
scratch him, although a holly bush was fifteen or twenty feet
C away from where he was. He said he fell to the ground and
they were on the ground, he and Kath, for most of the
incident. He could identify one of the people concerned as
having white trainers and a brown jacket. He said: "I am
D sure I saw a knife."

He agreed he wrote lots of letters to the Sussex Police
and thought the main thing was to deal with the people who
were behind the kidnapping. He said "kidnapping" was a
E strong word, but after the incident it seemed appropriate.
"I did not expect anything before that", he said. They were
expecting Lorna and other people to come and meet Kath at
6.30. His job now in ethics. Ethics was helping people to
F do well. People can do a rehabilitation course or they can
go. A rehabilitation project force was not part of his post
particularly.

G He said that on 6th November he was not particularly
concerned about the contact between Lorna Bowden and Kath but
Kath wanted him to be there. Barbara Bradley was also there.
Conversation was free, and if Kath had wanted complete
H privacy he would have left the room if he had been asked. It

A was not his job to make sure that Kath was not left on her
own. He said: "It started the day before, the thing with
B Stephen, Lorna and Barry Brown, because of the dog; and,
anyway, they were very aggressive when they came on to the
property. We keep a watch on anyone on the base. It is of
particular interest if one of the staff members are being
threatened and there was the Rottweiler dog and a very
aggressive approach, and it was not usual for friends of the
C family to be that way. The newspaper report which Stephen
and Lorna had given mentioned in both cases that Kathleen had
begun to act strangely, and it was not appropriate when they
came down as great friends immediately after that newspaper
D report, especially with the dog. It was the dog, the
attitude the day before and the newspaper article which did
not quite look right. I would not use the expression
'potential trouble sources' -- a Scientology phrase -- about
E these people. Barbara Bradley was at the pavilion serving
tea and helping with the sandwiches. Kath just wanted me to
be there. There is a staff meeting once a week at 7.15. I
did not go to that meeting and I did not go to the fireworks.
F I had dinner and I had duties with security and went to the
Office of Special Affairs."

G He had come on duty some time in the afternoon; and
worked about eight hours or less most days and got £33 cash
per week but also got paid for auditing and training. He
agreed that Kath would normally get a bus but it seemed a
safer thing to do it in hindsight. "She could pick up the
H 'phone, could Kath, if she had liked, but that night she was

A very anxious that we took her home. As to time off, she could get Saturday morning off and every other week the whole Saturday."

B We will take a break, members of the jury, just for five minutes so you can stretch your legs.

(The court adjourned for a short time)

C MR. JUSTICE HIDDEN: Members of the jury, we have dealt with the major part of the evidence in this case, the three eye-witnesses, as to what happened at the turning circle. You will remember that Lorna Bowden, called later on, did not see what happened but I will remind you of her evidence a little later on.

E The next witness who could give any evidence relative to this matter was Sergeant Allum. You will remember that he was on duty the previous night and had gone to the railway station at East Grinstead at about 11 p.m. and had seen a blue Ford Fiesta parked almost directly outside the main entrance. He had seen two people in the rear seats and a lady -- who must be Lorna -- in the front seat. A man with a Rottweiler dog had come up to him and said to the police officer: "Have you come to speak to us?" Sergeant Allum (who was a Police Constable then) said: "Why is that?" and the Defendant -- as it clearly was -- stated to Sergeant Allum that he was at the railway station in order to try and see a person he wanted to see who was a member of the Church of Scientology. He explained that a relative of this particular

A person was ill and he was expecting the member of the Church of Scientology to go abroad to America and he wished to persuade her not to do so. What Mr. Allum then said was this: "Just so as you just try and speak to her and don't do anything silly." This person, the Defendant, replied that he wouldn't.

In cross-examination, Mr. Allum said that he had been in East Grinstead for five years. The Scientology headquarters had been there for that time. It was usual for the police to receive calls from concerned relatives, and it was because of that experience that he gave the advice that he did to Mr. Cooper: "Just so long as you just try and speak to her and don't do anything silly."

You heard the evidence of Police Constable Quayle who came down from Guisborough and told you that on 24th June 1993 at 6.30 the Defendant had attended, and that at 7.40 p.m. he had been cautioned and charged with the offence of attempted kidnapping and one of affray, saying: "Not guilty to both." Do not put anything against him that he said nothing else, members of the jury. When a person is charged they do not have to say anything -- they are told that -- so there cannot possibly be anything against him in relation to that.

You heard the evidence of Mr. Smith who took the photograph at 11 p.m. on 6th November of the injury to Austin Leniston. That is Exhibit 5, and you have seen that.

You also had the evidence of Doctor Enskat read to you -- he is the doctor who dealt with the injuries to Austin

A Leniston -- who said: I can state that on 7th November 1992 a
Mr. Austin Leniston, a patient of my colleague, Doctor
B Dunstan, was seen by me. I examined him and I saw that he
had a two inch long laceration to the left side of his face
near the outer aspect of the eye. There was no injury to the
C eye. I also noted a puncture wound at the base of his thumb
on his left hand. No treatment was considered necessary. I
have no other record, concerning Mr. Leniston, of this
incident. I am unable to recall any other detail due to the
time span since he was seen by me." You will remember that
that statement was only made recently.

D Finally, members of the jury, you had the evidence of
Detective Constable Beard. He told you that on 17th November
at 10.59 he had seen the Defendant who had voluntarily
attended at the police station -- that would be eleven days
after the event. He told the Defendant that he was
E investigating the attempted abduction of Kathleen Wilson at
East Grinstead on the 6th November of this year. "In respect
of this matter I am arresting you on suspicion of committing
this offence." After caution he made no reply. Again, you
F do not take anything against the Defendant for that because,
in the same words, that is a caution not requiring him to say
anything.

G At 11.26 he commenced an interview with the Defendant.
No other persons were present and the interview was tape
recorded. The tape is Exhibit 8 and the record, which is
just a summary of the interview which lasted for 39 minutes,
H is Exhibit 7.

A Members of the jury, you have that summary. If you just
look at it for a moment (I shall not take you through it).
You listened to the full tape and you therefore heard
everything said on it. You have the typed record of the
B summary, including parts that are verbatim and parts that are
summarised. That is something which you can look at, when
you go out to your jury room, and consider. Equally, when
you heard the tape played you will have heard other matters
C on it where the Defendant says things about what he was told
by Kathleen Wilson mother, what he was told by other people,
and puts his own views as to what would be the treatment by a
jury or by any court dealing with him. I remind you only
D that there is a difference of approach in relation to what
the Defendant said which is not on oath. I have told you
before, and I merely draw it to your attention now because
this is the moment at which you are considering this record
E of the tape recorded interview. What I said before -- and
that is a direction which is standard in these cases -- is
that the Defendant's statements to the police contain both
incriminating parts, also excuses and or explanations, so you
F must consider the whole of the statement. In deciding where
the truth lies, you may feel that the incriminating parts may
be more likely to be true, for why else would he have made
them? You may feel that there is less weight to be attached
G to his excuses or explanations; they were not made on oath
and have not been repeated on oath and have not been tested
by cross-examination.

H

A Members of the jury, I do not need to refer you further
to what was said in that statement because you have a copy
(as opposed to copies of all the other witness's evidence)
which you will be able to take with you to your jury room and
B consider it at you leisure.

 The last witness was Lorna Bowden. She said that she
came from Saltburn in Cleveland, and in 1992 was living at
Southbourne near Chichester with the Defendant; he was her
C boyfriend, Stephen Cooper. She had known him for five years
from when she was in college back in Cleveland. He was still
her boyfriend.

 Then she was asked about when she came down south from
D Cleveland, and she said: "I am terrible with years, but I had
just left college, and that was when I was eighteen; and I
was born on 23rd June 1971" -- so she would have been
eighteen on 23rd June of 1989. And as to what she knew about
E years, and what she did not, she said: "Kath moved down about
1991. I could not tell you the exact year. I first met her
in secondary school. Her birthday is a couple of days after
mine. We got on very well; we were the best of friends. She
F used to live in the next village and would stop over at
weekends. We did everything that best friends do. I moved
away from Cleveland first and she moved to join me." There
was then that enquiry about the year. "I moved down south
G for work. After a while I went up back north and I told her
how good it was and she packed her bags and came with her."

 She talked about Kath, who stayed (inaudible) and did not
H like it. She talked about Kath staying for a couple of

A weeks; then moving to Bognor Regis and getting a room there;
and then moving into the address that they shared with
Stephen. They kept in touch and did things together. Kath
B moved to Grove Road, Chichester, after a while. She had
various jobs, including as a sales assistant in a shoe shop
in Chichester. "Kath went to a party in Poole and met
C someone and said she had got a job as a nanny in Poole. She
'phoned from that nannying job a couple of times a week when
the employer had gone out, saying on the 'phone that she
D could not cope with various things. She just 'phoned for a
chat. Then she said she was moving to do some art work at
Saint Hill Castle. She was good at art. We were still good
friends and had good talks but we did not see each other. We
had good talks on the telephone."

"She moved into the castle. It was quite a long time
afterwards, a fair while, but I cannot say how long before
E the 6th November 1992." So again she was not very clear on
dates there. "The contact just stopped. I wrote a couple of
letters but did not get any reply, so I thought she must be
F busy. I got a 'phone call from her parents one night. There
was no indication from Kath just prior to that at all, but as
a result of the 'phone call I got that night I was given a
number to 'phone Kath but Kath in fact 'phoned me first.
G This was just a couple of weeks before 6th November. She
said she would like to see me; she had not seen me for a
while. I was just doing temporary jobs at the time and asked
her when she had got a day off, and she said she had not but
H she could meet me. The arrangement was that I was going to

A go over and see her the next day to go for a coffee at East
Grinstead about three. I had a car and I went over at about
three o'clock. That was the Thursday." As to who went, she
said: "I went with Stephen and his friend from the campsite,
B Barry Brown. Barry went because he wasn't doing anything."

She told you how she went to Stonelands but could not
find her there. They came back after three and it was
suggested she go to Castle, so she went to the Castle and
C somebody there, a lady with a foreign accent, said that Kath
had gone to London and would be coming back on the train so
why not go to East Grinstead Station? The three of them did,
getting there about half past six perhaps. They were there
D for a long time till she, Lorna, said: "We will go at about
eleven o'clock." She said why they waited there for that
long time was: "I wasn't doing anything else, and I had
nothing really to go back for. I was waiting for her because
E she was my friend and I could see her off the train and I
could offer her a lift home if she wanted." It was at about
that time that Stephen spoke to the policeman, Mr. Allum, but
she was out of the car with the dog and she did not hear him.
F "I was there because I just wanted to say to her: "How are
things going? How is work going? and to make arrangements
about the weekend when she had a day off. Stephen just came
as my boyfriend because he knew Kath."

G Then she moved to the Friday. "Kath 'phoned me at 10.30,
apologised for not meeting me Thursday, the day before, and
said she was in London. I said: 'What day did you next want
H to meet?' and she said: 'Today about six o'clock at the

A Castle steps', and I agreed to that."

B She said the same people went to the Castle. She said:
"I went down the steps. She was not there." A guard met her
and asked her what she was doing, and she said she was there
C to meet a friend and the guard said: "We are expecting you",
and took her down the steps and another man met her who took
her to the pavilion. "He had 'Security' on his badge. There
were quite a lot of them that day as well as the day before.
D He was big and he had a beard. At the pavilion there was a
lady making sandwiches and tea and she me to come and sit
down." You may think that that was Barbara Bradley. "The
place had the wrong feel because I was not expecting to stay
E where I thought was work. Kath had a uniform on. I could
not tell if she was pleased to see me because she did not
show any emotion. She just said: 'hello'. I tried to speak
to her, like asking 'how work goes'. The other two were busy
F trying to see, trying to talk to me and take the conversation
away from Kath mostly. During the half an hour I was there
she said very little to me. In fact, apart from a number, I
can't remember the things she did say to me. Mostly the man
with the beard" -- you may think Mr. Leniston -- "was doing
the talking. The cutting from the Chichester paper was
discussed", Exhibit 3. "The lady passed it to Kath and said:
G 'Do you know anything about this?' to me. I had seen it
before, and I am mentioned by name. I did not say much about
it because I did not go there to talk about it. I just went
to see Kath. I did not go there to talk about Scientology; I
H did not know anything about Scientology. I thought it was

A just a place she went to for her art work. I had no feelings on it or anything. I could not get a word to Kath. I felt that I was there to see her. It was not what I was expecting. I was expecting to go and have some dinner."

B "Steve Cooper came down the pavilion later. She just said 'hello'. We had the dog in the car. She had had a dog in the old days and she loved animals. Just before she left she looked down at the dog and then she left. I just thought she left because she was late. Just before she left she said she would be going home at half ten. I did not know if she wanted a lift. We went for a drive. I wanted to tell her her mum was worried about her, and so I came back at about 10.30. My intention would have been to pick her up and give her a lift back home and talk to her. She had changed such a lot since I had last seen her."

D "I parked by the turning circle in front of the buses", and she indicated where. "Steve said: 'I will just pop out and see her, let her know we have got the car and does she want a lift back?' As he got out Barry jumped out as well. There were about two buses there at the time. They went down towards the steps", from the position you saw in the photograph. "I could see them until the bus obscured my view. There were a lot of people about. There was a lot of activity there. It was dark. There was a bit of flood-lighting but there was not a bright light. Stephen and Barry jumped out and started walking down, and there was a lot of people and Steve shouted: 'Jess! Let the dog out", and she went trotting down. Steven had got out as soon as I had.

A stopped, and Barry had got out at the same time. It had just
seemed like a minute before Steve shouted: 'Jess! Let Jess
out", and I stood at the door. The dog started running
towards the people. The Rottweiler was like a poodle really,
B soft and a bit frightened of people because she has been
abused. I just stood at the door and waited for them to come
back. Steve and Barry brought Jess back and just jumped in
the car. They just said: 'Well have to go. They won't let
C us see Kath.' They said that the big man with the beard had
his arm round Kath and wouldn't let anybody near her."

"I drove off straightaway and I heard people shouting:
'Get them', and there were a lot of flashlights about. I had
D not expected any trouble. Stephen, Barry and I had not gone
there to make trouble. I had just wanted to go there to see
how my friend was; I had not seen her for a long time. I
just wanted to talk to her and about her trip to the States."

E "I don't know what a jack-knife is. I know Steve has got
a little penknife on a ring, Exhibit 4. I have not seen him
with a bigger knife, and I did not find a bigger knife in the
car after that. I did not want to kidnap Kath. She is my
F best friend; I would not do anything to hurt her." That was
the account that Lorna Bowden gave in answer to Mr. Tanzer.

G She was asked questions by Mr. Cherrill. She agreed she
and Kath were both 21. She agreed she was old enough to know
what she wanted to do with her life so far as she was
concerned, Lorna Bowden. She said: "Kath was perfectly sound
in mind, I suppose. She was 21, able to make up her mind
H where she wanted to be. In November 1992 when I saw her she

A was fit, healthy and well-dressed. We had been best friends and had a good relationship for six or seven years."

B As far as Stephen Cooper was concerned, the two of them were boyfriend and girlfriend. "We have known each other for that long too, six or seven years", and they told each other everything.

C Mr. Cherrill put to her some words that you may have heard on the tape, that Stephen Cooper had uttered to the policeman, Mr. Beard. Those words where: "We tried to do a snatch which was legal." She was asked: "Was that her understanding of what they were doing then?" and she said: "No, that is not the truth." She said Steve had not told her D that they were going to do a snatch; and she had gone down purely to speak to her and to see if she could get a chance to ask her to go and see her mother. Miss Bowden said: "I cannot imagine Steven planning to do a snatch and not telling E me. I was not aware of a plan to take her away to some institution. If Stephen had in mind to snatch her, he did not tell me. If there was a plan to snatch her they, Stephen and Barry Brown, did not tell me. Stephen just said: 'I will F pop down to see her.' I was only going to see Kath to pass on a message to go and see her mum. There was no plan to grab her and drive off. If that night she had said to me: 'I don't want to get away from here', I would have asked her: G 'Why not?' and then just said: 'Fair enough'."

H Ladies and gentlemen, that is all the evidence. Questions of fact, as you know, are for you. I have directed you on what the law is, and you will remember those

A

directions. You have to look at Counts 1 and 2 as separate counts. You can, when you have considered them separately -- as you must -- end up by coming to the same conclusion about each of the counts as to guilt or innocence, or to different conclusions. That is to say, you could find the Defendant not guilty of both Count 1 and Count 2; or guilty of both Count 1 and Count 2; or not guilty of one but guilty of the other. The decision on that matter is for you.

B

C

What I have to say to you in relation to the law has mainly been said, but what I can tell you in particular now is to what is a defence to these matters and what is not. It is not a defence to say about someone that you attempt to take away by force: "I think she would be better off away from this place." Equally, it is not a defence to say: "Her mother thinks she would be better off away from this place." Equally, it is not a defence to say: "If I take her by force away from this place she will come round after a few weeks and then she will agree with it." Such beliefs would not amount to any lawful excuse in law.

D

E

F

I have directed you on the law, and the position is this: that the law does not recognise as a lawful excuse the conduct of anyone who goes to kidnap some other person, whether or not they are related to that person, unless it can properly be said that necessity has arisen, recognised by the law as such, causing the would-be kidnapper to act in that way. That is what a higher court than this one has said is the law. No question of necessity arises in this case.

G

H

Necessity would involve at least a reasonable belief in the

A Defendant that if he did not do what he was contemplating,
death or serious physical injury would result. That is not
the position in law in this case, and I have ruled therefore
that no question of lawful excuse can arise in this case. So
B it is not a defence to say, believe, think: "She would be
better off away from the place; or her mother's belief that
she would be better off away from the place; if we take her
away maybe in a few weeks time she will come to think
C something different." That is not lawful excuse.

Equally, it is not a defence -- as you may have heard it
being suggested in the answers to the police -- to say: "I
believe it is legal to use force to take her away." It is
D not a defence to say: "I have been told it is legal to use
force to take her away." Neither of those matters are
defences, nor anything like a defence, because a mistake as
to the law is not a defence. So those matters are not
E defences available to this defendant.

But there is a defence which is available to him, which
is the one advanced on behalf of the Defendant. That is:
that the Prosecution has not shown that Kathleen Wilson did
F not consent to the taking of her away. It is one of the
elements that the Prosecution must prove, that is to say,
that the attempted taking was without her consent. The
Defence say that the Prosecution have not proved that Miss
G Wilson had sufficient intelligence and understanding (as
Mr. Tanzer put it) necessary for the giving or withholding of
the consent. That is what the Defence say. The Prosecution
say that it has so proved that she had the intelligence and
H

A the understanding necessary for giving or withholding the
consent. That, members of the jury, is a defence available
to you on Count 1. That is the issue for you.

B In short: the Defence argue that by her evidence given in
the witness box, and the other evidence of other witnesses,
you can see that it may be that she had the intelligence and
understanding necessary to consent taken from her by the
processs of Scientology; that would be enough for an
C acquittal on Count 1.

D The Prosecution, on the other hand, argue that you have
seen her in the witness box; you heard her evidence that she
had not consented to be taken away and that she liked the
work that she was doing and wanted to stay there. The
Prosecution also point to the answers given by the Defendant
to the police. Those are the matters, the matters that you
have to consider on Count 1.

E As to Count 2. Look at the matters I have already
covered with you. One of the matters that you will want to
look at in relation to Count 2 is what you decide are the
facts as to what the Defendant had with him. Did he have
F with him a knife? Did he use it? Did he cause the cut on
the face of Austin Leniston? The burden is, as you know it.
The Prosecution, for the offence of affray, must prove that
there was a use or threatening of unlawful violence; and also
G must prove the second element, that such use or threatening
would cause a person of reasonable firmness present at the
scene to fear for his personal safety. The Defence say that
they have not proved those matters, or they may not have.
H

A proved them; and if they may not have proved those matters, then that is sufficient for an acquittal. The Prosecution say that they have so proved those matters. The issue is therefore there for you.

B I said that I would pull the threads of the matter together at the end of my summing-up. I said that I would draw together those four elements in kidnapping to you and indicate to you that really you may think that what you are considering is only the fourth element, the element of the consent of the victim. The Defendant admitted, in the course of the interview, that it was his intention to snatch Kathleen Wilson. He further admitted -- and Miss Wilson was not challenged on the point -- that she had never asked to be rescued from the Scientologists. Whatever force you decide may have been used, it is not disputed that the Defendant, with Barry Brown, tried to grab Kathleen Wilson away from Mr. Leniston. The Defendant therefore admits that he attempted to take Kathleen Wilson away, and to do so by force. Those are the first two matters the Prosecution have to make you sure about, and there is no dispute about them.

F Equally, no question of lawful excuse can arise here. It is not possible for that defence to succeed in the state of our law, so the first three matters are proved before you.

G It is the fourth matter you will want to consider. It is also for the Prosecution to make you sure that the Defendant attempted to do all this without the consent of Kathleen Wilson. Miss Wilson said that she did not want to be taken away, had never asked to be taken away, and that she did not

A consent. She was unequivocal about this in what she said to
you in court. What was said to her by the Defendant (in his
interview shortly after the event) was put to her in
B cross-examination, namely, that she had undergone a number of
sessions during which she had been deprived of her power to
agree or not to agree, in other words, that she had been
C brainwashed, and she denied that this was the case. You have
seen her in court and you will be able to evaluate what she
says. If the contention put forward by the Defence is or may
be right, she would sincerely believe that she was telling
you the truth but would be deprived of the intelligence and
understanding necessary to decide whether she was consenting
D or not. If you think that this was, or may have been, the
real state of affairs, then the Prosecution would have failed
to make you sure the Defendant acted without her consent and
the Defendant would be entitled to be acquitted; that would
E be the end of the matter so far as the first count of the
indictment is concerned.

On the other hand, if you are sure that Miss Wilson was
quite capable of making up her own mind, and that she told
F you that she neither wanted to, agreed to, or would have
agreed to go with the Defendant, then you may think the
Prosecution has made you sure that what the Defendant did was
without the consent of Miss Wilson.

G There is very little more, members of the jury. You may
think that the way to approach this matter is to concentrate
on keeping your eye on the ball at all times. As I said to
H you at the beginning: you do not have to decide every single

A

point which has been raised. You do not, for instance, have to decide why Miss Wilson spoke to Miss Bradley about what she wore in court. It is not a matter that you need to

B

decide. You may think it is perfectly logical for one girl to ask another what she thinks about clothing when coming out into the public world like this; but whatever you think about that simple issue, you may think does not matter. You have to concentrate on the specific matters which are relevant to this case.

C

D

As I have told you, you do not have to decide whether Scientology is a cult or a religion. That was not before you and it is not necessary for your decision. You have to look at the facts. You have to decide the facts, and you have to apply your good commonsense to those facts. I have told you what is not a defence and I have told you what is a defence. It is for you to concentrate on the defences indicated in this case.

E

F

Just a few more words and then you will retire. You will be given luncheon, do not worry about that. The first is really help, not a direction of law; it is just something designed to help you. You may think that the first thing you need to do when you get into the jury room is, if you have not done it already, to elect a foreman. The reason for that is obvious: when three or four people are all in the one room, talking about something, there is always a tendency to talk at the same time. If that happens with three or four, it is much more likely with twelve, and then the person with the lightest voice may not get a chance to get their points

G

H

A across. If you conduct your discussions through the
foreman -- which can be a man or woman -- you may think
everyone will get a fair hearing.

B If you find at some stage that your twelve memories of a
particular piece of evidence, or a particular direction of
law, cannot actually resolve the question, then you have
every right to ask me a question. The way you do that is to
C get the foreman to write the question down on a piece of
paper and give it to the jury bailiff. The jury bailiff will
bring it to me and I shall discuss it with counsel before
calling you back to give you the answer. I say that not to
indicate that the moment you get outside you can start
D barraging me with a plethora of questions, but just so that
you know how you can do it you want to. Do not, in those
questions, in any way indicate by percentage or proportion
which way your minds are going. I am not entitled to know
E that, and I must not be told.

That brings me to the last direction of law I have to
give you, and that is in relation to your verdict. Everybody
now knows that in certain circumstances there can be not a
F unanimous verdict but a majority verdict, but those
circumstances do not arise in this case at present. You must
reach, if you can, a unanimous verdict. However, as you
know, the law permits me in certain circumstances to accept a
G verdict which is not the verdict of you all. Those
circumstances have not yet arisen, so when you retire I must
ask you to reach a verdict upon which each one of you twelve
is agreed -- the verdict of all twelve. Should, however, the
H

A

time come when I can accept a majority verdict I will give you a further direction.

B

When the jury bailiff is sworn, you will go to consider your verdict. Take with you all the originals of the Exhibits which are down there (indicated), and your notes, and come to your conclusion in the privacy of your jury room.

C

(The jury retired at 12.53 p.m. and returned into court at 2.02 p.m.)

D

E

F

G

H

March 19, 1995, Sunday

SECTION: THE OBSERVER NEWS PAGE; Pg. 4

LENGTH: 1494 words

HEADLINE: 'THEY MADE HER SIGN UP FOR A BILLION YEARS. WHAT KIND OF PEOPLE ARE THEY?'

BYLINE: Lisa O'Kelly

HIGHLIGHT:

Lisa O'Kelly meets a man who tried to rescue a friend from the Scientologists', evil grip and failed

BODY:

STEPHEN Cooper admits he is a physical coward. 'If I see a fight, I cross to the other side of the road. Any trouble and I'll talk my way out of it sooner than use my fists,' he says.

Yet one night, two years ago, Mr Cooper broke into the British headquarters of the Church of Scientology, taking on an army of uniformed guards, in an effort to reach his friend, Kathleen Wilson, whom he believed had been 'brainwashed' and imprisoned there. 'I still can't believe I had the courage,' he says. He wound up with his face mashed into the ground, his arm nearly broken and a prison sentence hanging over his head.

That last threat was lifted a few days ago when Mr Cooper, a 27-year-old newsagent, was cleared at Lewes Crown Court of attempted kidnap and affray. His fears for Ms Wilson's safety persist. She remains with the Scientologists at Saint Hill Castle, East Grinstead, West Sussex. She told the court she did not wish to leave, but Mr Cooper still thinks she is being held against her will. He daren't attempt another rescue, but he and his girlfriend Lorna Bowden, 23, once Ms Wilson's best friend, worry that the next time they see her 'it will be in a coffin'.

If this sounds melodramatic, you need only witness Mr Cooper and Ms Bowden clutching nervously at each other's hands to realise they are serious.

Born into the small community of Brotton, Cleveland, they met six years ago through a shared interest in classic cars and would have married already had it not been for the strain of the trial.

They had not heard of Scientology until they moved to Bognor Regis five years ago in search of work and persuaded Ms Wilson to join them. She and Ms Bowden had been friends since school, where Ms Wilson, a shy, only child of elderly parents, was in the remedial class. 'I took her under my wing and for years we did everything together, so I missed her,' Ms Bowden says. 'We were the brother and sister she never had.'

The three of them lived in a small flat and the women worked in a garden centre until Ms Wilson found a job in a shoe shop in Chichester and moved there. 'Then one night she said she was going to a party with a lady who lived opposite her, which came as a surprise because she never went to parties,' Mr Cooper recalls. 'It was only afterwards that we realised the lady was the Scientologists' recruiting officer.'

Ms Wilson came back saying she had met a man who had offered her a job as a nanny to his children. 'That seemed odd, too, since she had no experience with kids and couldn't cook,' Mr Cooper says. For months the couple saw and heard little of her, apart from a Scientology personality test she posted to them.

'We filled it in to please Kathleen, sent it back and went to see the recruiting officer,' Mr Cooper remembers. 'She wanted us to take a course costing pounds 50 each.' When they said they could not afford it, the woman tried to sell them a copy of the book Dianetics, the extraordinary confusion of techno-babble, sci-fi speak, naval jargon and biblical parody with which L. Ron Hubbard founded the Church of Scientology 40 years ago. They declined but were pursued for weeks with daily phone calls. 'Eventually we got ourselves disconnected.'

Ms Bowden's fears that Ms Wilson might have been overwhelmed by such attention intensified when her friend rang to say she was moving to the Scientology headquarters, where she had been given a job. That was in early 1991. Despite repeated attempts to get in touch with Ms Wilson, the couple heard nothing, save for one letter saying 'I'm OK - it's a lovely place', until 4 November the following year. 'First Kathleen's mother rang to say she was worried. Kathleen had rung her to say she was going to America but did not really want to. They were forcing her. Then Kathleen rang. She wanted to meet and say goodbye.'

They arranged to see her at Saint Hill Castle, where Ms Wilson was ushered in by a security guard. 'I was shocked and frightened. Kathleen was dressed in a blue uniform like an army officer and showed no emotion towards me at all. There was another woman there who started making small talk. Every time I asked Kathleen a question, she would answer for her.'

After a few minutes, the guard tapped his watch and Ms Wilson got up to leave, but whispered to Ms Bowden that she would be catching a bus to the station at 10.30pm. Convinced this was a cry for help, the couple decided Mr Cooper should return to try to 'get her into a position where she could make up her own mind what she wanted to do'. As the court in Lewes heard, he was overpowered before he could get close to her and Ms Wilson was spirited back inside the castle.

Furious at the intrusion on its 'privacy' - and the damage the attempted 'kidnap' could do to efforts to improve the church's image - Scientology leaders pressed charges. Ms Wilson cut an unfamiliar figure on the witness stand. 'She looked so glamorous, like an air stewardess. She used to wear bright clothes, purple leggings and yellow T-shirts. Everything she said sounded unnatural and rehearsed. It wasn't like her at all.'

The most worrying thing, Mr Cooper says, was the expression on her face. 'She smiled at me once when she wasn't being watched by the guy with her and it was a real smile. Then she saw him looking and she snapped back into this weird, fixed stare.'

In the United States, Scientology has in recent years gained tax exempt status and such recruits as Tom Cruise, John Travolta, Demi Moore and Lisa-Marie Presley. But Mr Cooper thinks its old image as a sinister and manipulative cult, preying on vulnerable people, is nearer the truth. 'They made her sign a contract for a billion years. What kind of people are they? They've taken her life away.'

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 21, 1995

March 18, 1995

LENGTH: 335 words

HEADLINE: RELIGIOUS CULT LAUNCHES BID FOR CHARITY STATUS

BODY:

ONE of the world's largest and most controversial cults, which boasts hundreds of members in the North-East, is set to become an official UK charity.

The Church of Scientology has already approached the Charity Commissioners with a view to gaining registration as a religious organisation.

The organisation founded 40 years ago by American science fiction writer L. Ron Hubbard claims to have around 10,000 members in the UK.

Hundreds have been recruited through the Scientology centre in Sunderland one of a handful of satellites spread throughout the country.

Scientologists say people have nothing to fear from them. But opponents have vowed to fight any moves they make to gain official respectability.

The move comes after a NorthEast newsagent was cleared of trying to kidnap his former flatmate from the cult's headquarters at Saint Hill, East Grinstead.

A jury at Lewes Crown Court in Sussex cleared Stephen Cooper, 27, from Saltburn, in Cleveland, of trying to snatch Scientologist Kathleen Wilson.

In America, a two year investigation by the Internal Revenue Service the longest in U.S. history decided the cult operated "exclusively for religious and charitable purposes".

Following this investigation cult members in the UK approached the Charity Commission.

Peter Mansell, the Scientologist's spokesman in East Grinstead, agreed charitable status would give the cult respectability.

"Registration as a charity will help redress the balance as far as we are concerned," he said.

"There are some evil people who will stop at nothing to discredit us.

This will go some way to showing that we aren't a sinister organisation that brainwashes people." However, opponents of Scientology last night vowed to oppose any moves towards charitable status.

One North-East campaigner, who asked not to be named, said: "Anybody could complain to the Charity Commission as a private person. I would think there will be thousands of letters if this goes ahead.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: September 17, 1997

March 16, 1995, Thursday

SECTION: FEATURES; Pg. 11

LENGTH: 1233 words

HEADLINE: When sects and cults take over This week's acquittal of a man charged with kidnapping his flatmate from a church, highlights a worrying rise in alternative religions Britain is home to more than 500 religious groups - and the numbers steadily increase as the millennium approaches. Elizabeth Grice looks at how families win back their loved ones

BYLINE: By Elizabeth Grice

BODY:

LIKE some modern miracle-man, the Rev John Celia is converting his cult-witching fundraisers into counsellors. Not because his organisation, Christian Rescue, doesn't need the money but because a pre-millennial boom in cults has brought more and more anxious families to his door looking for advice about how to reclaim "lost" children. "The Armageddon boys are out on the street," he warns. "Deliverance groups are becoming more varied and more extreme. Everything has a demon that needs casting out." John Celia's Christian Rescue is a counselling and support service for people who are trying to leave cults or for the friends who are worried about them. He has 25 unpaid full-time workers covering the British Isles, but they are not enough to cope with the problems caused by an upsurge of cultish groups. This is not a happy prospect for the four or five self-financing organisations in Britain who are already struggling to keep up with "exit counselling" for those leaving cults as well as to support the families of the entrapped. At a Cults and Counselling conference last year, it was revealed that Britain is home to more than 500 religious cults, with around 500,000 believers, but this looks like a conservative estimate. There are almost 2,000 groups on the database of Inform (Information Network Focus on Religious Movements) - from the London Church of Christ to flying saucer worshippers. The splinters of New Ageism are increasing faster than any other cult and apocalyptic groups.

Trading on the message that they alone stand between an individual and extinction in the year 2000, they have begun to recruit a "fear-following". Many new groups are harmless fringe religions which have moved into the spiritual vacuum left by the collapse of organised religion, but others are more controversial. Allegations of "brainwashing" were raised by the defence in this week's Kathleen Wilson Scientology "kidnap" case at Lewes Crown Court. Wilson and the church denied them. The jury, however, acquitted Stephen Cooper of the charge of trying to "kidnap" his flatmate from the church. Inform was founded in 1988 by Dr Eileen Barker, professor of sociology at the London School of Economics, to offer objective, up-to-date information about the mass of spiritual and pseudo-spiritual beliefs and practices that form one of the biggest paradoxes of our supposedly secular age. Her team does not use the word cult, preferring the neutral phrase "new religious movements". Prof Barker also refuses to demonise all cults or accept that they are all necessarily alarming: some, she argues, offer a sense of direction in life. "It's not true that they all brainwash members and have sexual orgies." But others have the capacity to induce personality changes in their followers, cutting them off from their families. Faced with the question of differentiating between a harmless new religion and a dangerous cult, most cult experts agree that the insidious organisations are those that seal their members from the outside world. What people believe is not the concern of the "cultbusters", so much as the groups' methods of manipulation. Cult characteristics to beware of are the self-appointed messianic guru/leader, the use of psychological coercion to recruit, a rigid set of rules (some against the law of the country), a hierarchical structure with the reward of becoming an "elite", strict obedience enforced with punitive action, peer group pressure to achieve conformity, control over sexual behaviour, skewed religious concepts and pooling of finances. Carole Tyrrell, of Families Action Information Rescue (Fair), says: "More and more groups have got mind control off to a fine art. In some, people are even persuaded that their own children don't belong to them. It is nothing to do with religion but with power and, frequently, sex." Their recruiting officers usually target people who are drifting - caught between relationships, between school and university, between jobs. "Out of the 20,000 cult calls I have received," says Ian Haworth, founder of the Cult Information Centre, "I have not met one person who has joined a cult. They do not join; they are recruited. "These cults appeal to the young, mainly those of above-average education and intelligence, generally from middle-class or upper-middle class homes,

psychologically fairly well-adjusted," says Prof Barker. "Some are from over-protective homes and need to make a statement . . . when they cannot succeed in the real world they seek solace in an alternative family of undemanding religious believers." This is what seems to have inspired the celebrated defection of Viscount Reidhaven, heir to a £35 million estate in Scotland, when he became a follower of the Naqshbandi sect of Sufism in 1990, taking on the Moslem name Sheik Abdul Qadir and referring to his spiritual guru, Mohammed Ali, as "Master". In one of the more dramatic cult rescues on record, his father, the Earl of Seafield, hired a team of former SAS men to entice him back. They tricked Ali into making a trip to America before hustling the Viscount, James Ogilvie-Grant, to safety on Scotland's remote west coast where he spent three months under guard, including more than a week closeted with two of America's leading practitioners in deprogramming - Dr Louis Jolyon West, of UCLA, and Joseph Szimhart. Last autumn, the Viscount was reported to be back with the sect, saying that he had never given up the faith. "My father has to accept this," he said, claiming that he wanted to regain control of the estate near Inverness left to him by his grandmother. "I have my own life to lead." He derided attempts to win him back as a waste of time and money. Lord Seafield continues to maintain a stoical silence. A family friend said yesterday: "He is very much the concerned father. He finds it distressing." Forcible deprogramming has been widely discredited - the greater the duress, the less the chance of success - and few "exit counsellors" work with cult members against their will. Mr Szimhart's clients are always "free to leave the premises". He says Viscount Reidhaven drove himself and his security guard to the Knoydart peninsula in Inverness-shire - believing the guard was from the cult - where he was counselled. "He was not in a functional state of mind," says Mr Szimhart. "My impression was that he had been manipulated in the extreme. Perhaps because of mind control, he was slow to absorb information compared with other impacted people I have dealt with." The techniques of exit-counselling rely on persuading individuals to accept the true nature of the cult and re-evaluate their lives. "One of the hallmarks," says Mr Szimhart, "is the marathon approach: talk for as long as they are willing. Sometimes for 10 hours. Once you open them up, so much comes out." Mr Szimhart charges up to \$500 a day and has a 60-70 per cent success rate, though others in the field claim there is only a 50-50 chance that a follower will not revert. "I do not guarantee that my work will keep a person from a group for ever," he says. "Where there has been deep emotional contact, there is very little anyone can do, short of physically keeping them away." Catalyst: Graham Baldwin 01777 816631 Fair: 01892 538313 Christian Rescue: Rev John Celia 01536 741 250 Cult Information Centre: Ian Haworth 0181 651 3322 Inform: 0171 955 7654.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

Copyright 1995 Times Newspapers Limited
The Times

March 15, 1995, Wednesday

SECTION: Home news

LENGTH: 76 words

HEADLINE: Man cleared of kidnap bid

BODY:

A man who admitted trying to abduct his former flatmate, whom he believed had been brainwashed while living with the Church of Scientology, was cleared of attempted kidnap at Lewes Crown Court.

Stephen Cooper, 27, tried to snatch Kathleen Wilson from the sect's headquarters in East Grinstead, West Sussex, but was foiled by other scientologists. Mr Cooper, of Saltburn-by-the-Sea, Cleveland, said he believed she had been robbed of her freewill.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 16, 1995

March 14, 1995, Tuesday

SECTION: HOME NEWS

LENGTH: 234 words

HEADLINE: MAN CLEARED OF SCIENTOLOGY KIDNAP BID

BODY:

A shop manager was cleared today of trying to kidnap his former flatmate from the Church of Scientology's castle HQ. Stephen Cooper, 27, of Saltburn-by-the-Sea, Cleveland, was acquitted of the attempted kidnap of Kathleen Wilson, 23, and a separate charge of affray.

He claimed the former shoe shop worker had been brainwashed by the controversial sect. His counsel argued that it had deprived her of her free will and that Mr Cooper sought to rescue her. The jury at Lewes Crown Court was told Cooper tried to snatch her back as she walked through the grounds of the sect's Saint Hill Manor castle, in East Grinstead, West Sussex. But his bid was foiled when other Scientologists came to her aid and bundled her on to a staff bus. After the verdicts, Mr Cooper said: "I am so relieved that this is all over. In my eyes British justice has won. "My advice to other people is, 'Don't get involved in Scientology'." On the courtroom steps, Miss Wilson said: "Instead of judging Stephen, this trial judged me. I feel insulted by the verdict. "I know what I want to do and what I don't want to do. I told him I wanted to stay at Saint Hill and I meant it." Church of Scientology spokeswoman Margaret Reese said: "Kathleen and her religious beliefs were attacked as a 'defence' with insulting and demeaning inferences that she was 'brainwashed' or 'hypnotised'. "This is an outrage."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

March 11, 1995, Saturday

SECTION: Pg. 8

LENGTH: 505 words

HEADLINE: 'Rescuer' believed sect woman was brainwashed

BYLINE: By John Steele Courts Correspondent

BODY:

A SHOP manager accused of trying to abduct a friend from the Church of Scientology told police after the incident that he believed the sect "brainwashed" its members. Stephen Cooper, 27, also told officers that no jury would convict him if he was prosecuted for attempting to remove her against her will. He chose not to enter the witness box at Lewes Crown Court but a recording of his interview with police in November 1992, two weeks after the alleged abduction attempt, was played to the jury. The court heard that Cooper was a friend of sect member Miss Kathleen Wilson and that his girlfriend, Miss Lorna Bowden, was a former best friend of Miss Wilson. Cooper said that Miss Wilson's mother had "asked us to go and get her. . . because she was scared and worried and upset." He said he had been told people went to the sect "under false pretences. . . they pick on people who are quite vulnerable and shy and lure them into a sense of, like, security". He conceded that Miss Wilson, 23, never directly said she wanted to leave. But he maintained that if she was abducted it would be "probably against her will because she's been brainwashed and she'll be on drugs." Citing sources of his information as taxi drivers, a local newspaper journalist, others involved in the "rescue" of members of religious cults, as well as his own investigations, Cooper said: "I know I would be liable to criminal prosecution now but no jury in the country. . . would see me guilty.

Because I'm not guilty, I'm innocent." He said that he could give evidence that he was not wrong and "East Grinstead Castle" - a reference to the sect's British HQ at Saint Hill Castle in the Sussex town - "was wrong by the way they hold them and everything." He told an interviewing officer that people went to the sect of their own free will "but then they're held", adding that adherents underwent what he termed "electric treatment". He said that after Miss Wilson - whom he had known for about two years - went to the sect, she received an £8 a week allowance and was given all her clothes and food and wore a uniform. Describing Miss Wilson, Mr Cooper said: "She'd got no interest in anything she used to have an interest in. She's got no interest in art, no interest in animals or anything." He added: "In fact, to be quite honest, she's imprisoned." Though she'd never said she wanted to leave, he believed some of her letters were "cries for help". Mr Cooper said Miss Wilson's letters started off in her own hand and then went into somebody else's saying "I'm OK - it's a lovely place." He said Miss Wilson's mother, Mrs Margaret Wilson, 63, of Cleveland, who is separated from her husband, showed the letters to a solicitor who concluded that she was being held in the sect. He dismissed as "rubbish" a suggestion by a Church of a Scientology "security guard" that he had wielded a knife or had cut the face of another sect member. Cooper, of Saltburn, Cleveland, denies attempted abduction and affray. The trial was adjourned until Monday.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 11, 1995

March 16, 1995

SECTION: Pg. 16

LENGTH: 1187 words

HEADLINE: SAD MOTHER WHO WAITS FOR HER LOST DAUGHTER;
Heartbreaking postscript to trial of man who snatched girl from Church of Scientology

BYLINE: Roger Scott

BODY:

HER heart broken, Margaret Wilson knelt in church and offered two prayers as a man stood trial for snatching her daughter from a sinister religious cult. One was for Stephen Cooper to be cleared of trying to kidnap 23-year-old Kathleen from the East Sussex HQ of the Church of Scientology.

The other was for her daughter to escape the cult's influence and come home.

Her first prayer was answered on Tuesday when a jury at Lewes Crown Court acquitted Mr Cooper, 27, of trying to rescue his former flatmate.

The second, however, was still unheeded yesterday.

As Mrs Wilson, 63, sat alone by the fireside in her bungalow she prayed once again for victory over the people she accuses of turning her 'lost daughter' against her family.

'The prayer has not been answered yet, but it will, won't it?' she said, wringing her hands.

'She is all I have now and if I don't get her back I might as well be dead.'

Mrs Wilson is seeking legal advice on how to win her only child back from the cult, which she joined more than two years ago after quitting her job in a shoeshop.

Last week, the pensioner travelled from her home in Boosbeck, Cleveland, to attend the closing stages of the trial and to make contact with the 23-year-old daughter she had not seen in all that time.

'I glanced across at Kathleen in the public gallery and she just sort of smiled,' Mrs Wilson said.

'I waited until I could speak to her outside but she would hardly look at me. She kept glancing back at people from the cult.

'Then she was surrounded by them and she seemed as if she daren't answer me properly.'

Mrs Wilson confronted cult members and asked them why they would not allow her daughter to visit her.

'They said she daren't come home because she was frightened she would be put in an institution - as if I would do such a thing to my only child.

'Besides, she is already in an institution, as far as I'm concerned - being brainwashed.'

Although Mrs Wilson was given phone numbers to arrange a meeting with Kathleen, when she got through she could only leave a message on an answering machine.

After Kathleen failed to make the rendezvous, the cult insisted there had been a mix-up over the time.

'It's all part of what they do,' said Mrs Wilson. 'They tell you lies then make you out to be the liar.'

'I don't want to possess her. She is their slave, not mine. I just want to see her back here with me and happy again.'

'I would like to take them to court, but on a pension how could I afford it?'

This week's verdict was a severe blow to the cult, which has worked hard to repair its image since it was described in the High Court in 1984 as 'immoral, socially obnoxious, corrupt, sinister and dangerous'.

Mr Cooper's lawyer told the jury that Kathleen had been 'suppressed and enslaved' by the cult in their headquarters at Saint Hill Castle, East Grinstead.

When he tried to rescue her his aim had been to 'put her in a position where she could make her own free choice'.

But his bid was foiled when he was overpowered by cult members.

Mrs Wilson, who is divorced from Kathleen's father, can take some comfort from the case.

'I have had to live a lie, not telling the neighbours the truth when they asked why she was not coming home any more,' she said.

'Now everyone will know and I'm glad. People should know the terrible effect it has when your loved one falls in with these people.'

GRAPHIC: Brief reunion: Margaret Wilson with her daughter Kathleen outside Lewes Crown Court, where Stephen Cooper (left) was cleared of attempted kidnap. 'Kathleen is all I have now,' said Mrs Wilson. 'If I don't get her back I might as well be dead.'

LOAD-DATE: March 17, 1995

Copyright 1995 Times Newspapers Limited
The Times

March 16, 1995, Thursday

SECTION: Home news

LENGTH: 134 words

HEADLINE: Member of cult to sue friend for damages

BYLINE: Andrew Pierce

BODY:

A WOMAN cult member, who was the victim of an attempted abduction by a friend who had believed she had been brainwashed, is to sue him for the trauma she suffered.

Stephen Cooper, 27, was cleared by a jury at Lewes Crown Court on Tuesday of attempting to kidnap his former flatmate, Kathleen Wilson, 23, from the Church of Scientology's headquarters in East Sussex.

Scientologists were outraged by the decision, because Mr Cooper had confessed to the abduction attempt but pleaded in his defence that Miss Wilson had been robbed of her freewill by the cult. Yesterday the Church of Scientology said Miss Wilson was issuing a writ.

A spokesman for the cult said the action would be pursued vigorously. "She suffered a gross affront to her dignity. She is entitled to exemplary damages."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 17, 1995

Copyright 1995 Telegraph Group Limited
The Daily Telegraph

March 15, 1995, Wednesday
Correction Appended

SECTION: Pg. 3

LENGTH: 601 words

HEADLINE: Friend cleared of Scientology kidnapping

BYLINE: Reports by John Steele Courts Correspondent

BODY:

A MAN who tried to remove a woman from the Church of Scientology was cleared of attempted kidnap yesterday after arguing that "brainwashing" by the cult had turned her into a robot without the ability to decide whether she consented or not to leaving. Stephen Cooper's "victim", 23-year-old former shoe shop worker Miss Kathleen Wilson, told the jury that she was happy to be at the cult's headquarters at Saint Hill Castle in East Grinstead, East Sussex, and did not consent to being removed. The court also heard he had admitted to police he intended to "snatch her" against her will. But Cooper, 27, who runs a newsagent's shop, was cleared at Lewes Crown Court of the charge by a jury which retired at 12.53pm, began their lunch at 1pm and returned with unanimous verdicts at 2pm. His counsel, Mr John Tanzer, argued that, even though she claimed in court she did not consent to removal, it was possible her free will had been removed by the processes she had undergone in the cult and she did not have "sufficient intelligence and understanding" to decide if she consented. After the verdict, a delighted Cooper said: "I wasn't confident. I thought the evidence was against me but the jury was fantastic. In my eyes, British justice has won today." Scientology officials took a different view, warning the verdict would act as a "green light" to those who wanted to remove members from sects.

Miss Wilson, a former flatmate of Cooper, said: "I am outraged. "I feel insulted by the verdict. Instead of judging Stephen, they judged me. I said I wanted to stay at Saint Hill and I meant it. I was not brainwashed." Mr Justice Hidden told the jury that Scientology was not on trial and that they did not have to decide if it was a cult or a religion. The issue was Stephen Cooper's acts and intentions when he went to Saint Hill with another man on the night of Nov 6, 1992. To prove attempted kidnap, the Crown had to establish four elements - an attempt to remove her, that it was by force, that it was without lawful excuse and that she did not consent. The first two elements were not challenged - Mr Cooper admitted to police he went to snatch her, "probably against her will", after being contacted by her mother - and the judge ruled he could not offer a defence of lawful excuse because that would require a belief that she faced physical danger. But the judge ruled that there could be a possible defence on the grounds of consent, even though Miss Wilson testified that she did not consent. This enabled Mr Tanzer to tell the jury some of the evidence suggested a regime in which she was effectively enslaved and robbed of her free will. "Kathleen Wilson was a victim. She was deprived of her own free will and Stephen Cooper sought to rescue her. She never said she wanted to be rescued but we say, simply, that is because she couldn't. "If a member of our society is turned into a robot, turned into a slave, is that person consenting? A robot is programmed as to what to say. The person underneath has been suppressed and enslaved." Cooper, he said, was not a "malign kidnapper using unwarranted force to take away a damsel manifestly not in distress". Rather, he wanted to "put her in a position" to make her own free choice. Outside court, Cooper, from Saltburn, Cleveland, said the last two years had been a nightmare. He planned to marry Miss Lorna Bowden, 23, the one-time close friend of Miss Wilson. "I was only interested in the welfare of Kathleen. We felt she had changed after joining them. Lorna said she was always easily-led and that she had to look after her at school."

CORRECTION-DATE: April 6, 1995

CORRECTION: Our report of 15 March, concerning the trial of Stephen Cooper for allegedly attempting to kidnap Kathleen Wilson, was headed "I feel insulted, says woman as jury decides that she was brainwashed". We wish to make clear that the jury made no formal finding of fact in reaching their verdict.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 15, 1995

March 15, 1995

SECTION: Pg. 24

LENGTH: 827 words

HEADLINE: Friend who tried to rescue girl from cult is cleared of kidnap

BODY:

A SHOP manager was cleared yesterday of trying to kidnap a 'brainwashed' member of the controversial Church of Scientology.

Stephen Cooper, 27, claimed he tried to rescue his former flatmate Kathleen Wilson because the sect had changed her personality.

He also said her elderly mother Margaret was worried about Miss Wilson, who was intending to go to Los Angeles for 'further training'.

John Tanzer, defending, compared Mr Cooper's actions at the sect's Saint Hill Manor headquarters in East Grinstead, Sussex, to saving a woman as she tried to jump off a ten-storey building.

He said: 'Our case is simply that Kathleen Wilson was a victim, that she was deprived of her own free will and that Mr Cooper sought to rescue her.'

After a jury at Lewes Crown Court cleared Mr Cooper of attempted kidnap and affray, 23-year-old Miss Wilson said: 'I feel insulted.'

'They are saying that I am brainwashed but I have a mind of my own.'

'Other people don't understand what Scientology is about. I am really upset.'

Mr Cooper, of Saltburn-on-Sea, Cleveland, said: 'All I was interested in was the welfare of Kathleen Wilson.'

'I hope that one day she will get out of the sect.'

'I am so relieved that it is all over. The jury were absolutely fantastic and in my eyes British justice has won.'

Mrs Wilson, 63, who was reunited with her daughter during the trial after two years' separation, said that when she visited the church's HQ 'they all had the same smile on their faces'.

She added: 'The cult has changed and altered her mind. It is heartbreaking to think that I may never see her again.'

'I cry myself to sleep at night.'

But Greg Ryerson, director of special affairs for the Church of Scientology, said: 'The verdict is an insult. It is outrageous.'

'There is no evidence as to brainwashing.'

'The defence has taken bigotry, thrown it against the wall and then seen what sticks.'

Margaret Reese, a press officer for the Church, claimed: 'Once again the British justice system has penalised the victim and let the assailant go free.' During the trial, the jury heard how Scientologists work at the castle headquarters for £33-a-week and sign a billion-year contract to the Church.

Recruits undergo counselling, called 'auditing', until they rise to level eight. They then become an 'Operating Thetan' and reveal their innermost secrets - called 'withholds' - in auditing sessions while holding on to tin cans which are connected to an E-meter, a primitive lie detector.

LOAD-DATE: March 16, 1995

March 15, 1995, Wednesday

SECTION: HOME; Page 4

LENGTH: 457 words

HEADLINE: Cult rescue bid was no kidnap, jury decides

BODY:

The Church of Scientology was dealt a blow yesterday when Stephen Cooper, a shop manager, was cleared by a jury of trying to kidnap a "brainwashed" cult member. Scientologists were outraged by the verdict because Mr Cooper had confessed to the attempt, but pleaded in his defence that his former flatmate had been robbed of her free will by the cult.

Mr Cooper, 27, said he had tried to rescue Kathleen Wilson back from the sect because the church had changed her personality and brainwashed her. He also said her elderly mother was worried about Miss Wilson, who was intending to go to Los Angeles for "further training" with the church.

His defence counsel, John Tanzer, had compared his actions to dragging a woman back as she tried to jump off a 10-storey building. Mr Tanzer had said: "Our case is simply Kathleen Wilson was a victim. That she was deprived of her own free will and that Mr Cooper sought to rescue her."

The snatch attempt, in the grounds of the sect's headquarters at Saint Hill Manor in East Grinstead, West Sussex, was foiled when other scientologists came to Miss Wilson's aid. The jury at Lewes Crown Court cleared Mr Cooper, of Saltburn-by-the-Sea, Cleveland, of attempted kidnap and affray.

After the case, Miss Wilson, 23, a former shoe-shop worker, who attended every day of the week-long trial, said: "I am really angry because they have put me on trial.

"I feel insulted by the verdict. They are saying that I am brainwashed, but I have a mind of my own. Other people don't understand what Scientology is about. I am really upset."

After the verdict Mr Cooper said: "All I was interested in was the welfare of Kathleen Wilson. This case has been two and a half years of pure nightmare. Now hopefully I can put it behind me. I am so relieved that it is all over. The jury were absolutely fantastic. In my eyes, British justice has won."

During the trial the jury was told how recruits to the church undergo counselling, called "auditing" and reveal their innermost secrets, called "withholds" while holding tin cans attached to an "E-meter".

Greg Ryerson, director of special affairs for the church, said: "The verdict is an insult. It is outrageous. There is no evidence as to brainwashing. The defence has taken bigotry, thrown it against the wall and then seen what sticks."

During the trial Miss Wilson had an emotional reunion with her mother, Margaret, 63; they had not seen each other since the incident more than two years ago. Although they embraced, they argued about the effects of Scientology.

Margaret Wilson said: "The cult has changed and altered her mind. It is heartbreaking to think I may never see her again. I cry myself to sleep at night."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 15, 1995

March 10, 1995, Friday

SECTION: Pg. 8

LENGTH: 657 words

HEADLINE: Scientology woman signed contract with sect for a billion years Recruits made to undergo processing in which inner-most secrets are revealed, court told

BYLINE: By John Steele Courts Correspondent

BODY:

A YOUNG woman alleged to be the victim of an attempted abduction from the Church of Scientology yesterday admitted that some members of the sect signed a "contract for a billion years". Kathleen Wilson, 23, a former shoe shop worker who joined the sect, conceded at Lewes Crown Court that recruits went through sessions of "auditing" or "processing" in which they were asked to divulge their inner secrets and were subject to "ethic penalties" and internal discipline. Miss Wilson was giving evidence in the trial of a friend, Stephen Cooper, 27, from Saltburn, Cleveland, who is accused of trying to kidnap her. She denied she was a prisoner in the sect and told the jury that, though she did not want to leave, she would be free to leave at any time. Cooper admitted to police that he went to the sect's headquarters at Saint Hill Castle in East Grinstead, East Sussex, in November, 1992, with the intention of abducting Miss Wilson because, having been contacted by her mother, he believed she had been hypnotised and had "no mind of her own". He denies attempted kidnap and affray. Miss Wilson said she became a member of the sect after moving to the Chichester area from Cleveland and went to work at Saint Hill Castle, graduating from gardening to filing and clerical work. She worked from 9am to 10pm for an allowance of £33 a week, "with everything else thrown in," and was allowed Saturday mornings and sometimes whole Saturdays off.

Mr John Tanzer, for Cooper, asked her about the sessions of auditing or processing in what he termed "this cult". She said it was "a type of counselling" - with various levels of audit - and she had undergone it in the past. Miss Wilson agreed one level was called "Clear" and a higher one "Operating Thetan" - a "spirit" referred to in the writings of L Ron Hubbard, founder of the sect. Her level was "pre-Clear". She said auditing featured the use of a machine called an "E-Meter", with sect members holding two items like soup cans in their hands "to pick up any reactions you may have to things that are troubling or stressing you". Mr Tanzer said: "During that session, is what is being done to you to put you into what really amounts to a light trance?" She replied: "No, you are totally awake." He continued: "You are hypnotised during this session?" She denied that but agreed that one of the aims of the session was for sect members to divulge what were known as "withholds" - information about matters worrying the members which, she was told, would be kept "secret and confidential". Miss Wilson agreed that the sect regarded people who did or said anything against the Church as "suppressive persons" who had committed "suppressive acts" and had a policy of "disconnection" from such people. She agreed the sect had a system of "ethics penalties" for people committing "harmful acts" - such as drug-taking - and a "rehabilitation project force" dealing with internal discipline. Miss Wilson also said she was a member of an internal sect group known as "Sea-Org", whose members wore blue uniforms and signed the billion-year contracts. Mr Tanzer said: "A billion years? The whole teaching is that once you are in, you are in and that's it?" She replied: "No, lots of people leave." He added: "For that contract, you promise to obey?" She said this was not true. Mr Tanzer asked her about a meeting at East Grinstead on the evening of Nov 6, 1992, the night of the attempted kidnap, in which Cooper and Miss Lorna Bowden, a one-time close friend of Miss Wilson, visited her. He suggested Miss Wilson was quiet at the meeting, letting senior sect members do the talking, because she would have been in breach of the one billion year contract if she told her friends she wanted to leave. Miss Wilson again stressed that she had not wanted to leave. In questioning by Mr Richard Cherrill, for the Crown, Miss Wilson denied she was "a robot". The trial was adjourned until today.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 10, 1995

March 10, 1995, Friday

SECTION: HOME; Page 4

LENGTH: 737 words

HEADLINE: Cult member denies her mind was controlled; Court gets rare and detailed insight into world of Scientology

BYLINE: TIM KELSEY

BODY:

A young cult member whose best friend and former flatmate allegedly tried to "rescue" her from the sect told a court yesterday that she had signed a "billion-year" contract to Scientology.

Kathleen Wilson, a 23-year-old former shoe shop worker who left her job to live near the sect's headquarters, said that in the contract she agreed to decrease the "power of the enemy" and increase the religion's strength.

She also gave a detailed and rare insight into the working of one of the world's largest and most controversial cult religions.

Miss Wilson said she had undergone "auditing", a type of counselling in which members reveal their inner problems - called "withholds" - while holding on to tin cans which are connected to a machine called an E-meter.

The court has heard how her former flatmate, Stephen Cooper, 27, feared she was being brainwashed. He told detectives after his arrest that her mother was worried she had been imprisoned.

However, yesterday Miss Wilson denied being a "robot" who had been hypnotised and imprisoned by the sect, and said she was happy working at the Saint Hill Castle HQ, in East Grinstead, West Sussex.

Mr Cooper is alleged to have tried to snatch her back just days before she was due to fly out to Los Angeles to undergo further training.

Scientology was founded in 1959 by L Ron Hubbard, an American science fiction writer who believed that it was possible for individuals to reach a state of immortality by following a detailed system of mental examination and therapy which he called Dianetics.

Miss Wilson told Lewes Crown Court, in East Sussex, that she joined the cult after being given a leaflet and then taking a number of courses.

The jury heard that Scientologists wear a navy blue uniform and work at the cult's castle from 9am to 10pm for pounds 33 per week. Miss Wilson also disclosed that the castle grounds are patrolled by security guards who have walkie-talkies and high-powered torches.

She said that new recruits undergo counselling until, after many years, they reach the state of spiritual ecstasy which is known within the cult as level 8. At this point, they become an "Operating Thetan".

The cult has an internal disciplinary organisation called the Rehabilitation Progress Force. She disclosed that acts against the religion are called suppressive acts and people who commit them can be "disconnected" from the church - the equivalent of excommunication.

Miss Wilson said that during auditing "you are asked questions. When you have problems it is to help you. There is an E-meter which is a device to pick up any reaction you have to a certain thing that is giving you trouble, like distress or something like that. The meter is round and has a dial on the front and a knob on the side".

John Tanzer, for the defence, asked Miss Wilson: "Are you being put into a light trance in these sessions?"

She replied: "No, nothing happened."

Mr Tanzer said: "Were you ever hypnotised during these sessions?"

"No," she said. "You go in as you are and come out as you are."

She admitted signing the billion-year contract to the church but said she was free to go if she wanted, adding that although she agreed to "uphold the standards of the religion" it did not make her a robot.

The prosecution alleges that Mr Cooper helped to try to snatch Miss Wilson back when he jumped out at her as she walked through the castle's gardens. But the attack was foiled when other Scientologists came to her rescue and bundled her on to a staff bus.

The alleged kidnap attempt came just hours after Miss Wilson met her former best friend, Lorna Bowden, and Mr Cooper for a meeting in the castle's pavilion. Miss Bowden and Mr Cooper, her boyfriend, who had both shared a flat with Miss Wilson, in Bognor Regis, West Sussex, had gone to the church to talk to her about the training trip to America.

Miss Wilson was accompanied at the meeting by two senior church members and the discussion was stopped when she said she had to attend a staff meeting.

After his arrest, Mr Cooper said that Miss Wilson "no longer had a mind of her own" and was being hypnotised by the sect. Mr Cooper, a shop manager, of Saltburn-by-the-Sea in Cleveland, denies attempted kidnap and affray.

The case continues. attempt on Kathleen Wilson (top) by Stephen Cooper (below), her former flatmate, was foiled

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 13, 1995

Copyright 1995 Telegraph Group Limited
The Daily Telegraph

March 9, 1995, Thursday

SECTION: Pg. 3

LENGTH: 306 words

HEADLINE: Sect member 'thwarted kidnapper'

BYLINE: By John Steele Courts Correspondent

BODY:

A MAN tried to abduct a young woman from the headquarters of the Church of Scientology in Britain because he believed she had been hypnotised into staying in the sect, a court heard yesterday. Stephen Cooper, 27, admitted to police that he went to the sect's base at Saint Hill Castle in East Grinstead, East Sussex, with the intention of abducting Miss Kathleen Wilson, 23, Lewes Crown Court heard. The jury heard the abduction attempt was thwarted by a Scientologist who suffered a minor knife wound in the struggle with Cooper and another man. Cooper told police, according to Mr Richard Cherrill, prosecuting, that Miss Wilson, who was 21 at the time, "had no mind of her own and had been the subject of hypnosis". "He said he had been contacted by Miss Wilson's mother, who had expressed concern that her daughter was off to the US for further training." Cooper, of Saltburn, Cleveland, denies attempted kidnap and affray. Mr Cherrill said kidnap involved trying to remove someone by force and without lawful excuse. He told the jury to beware of letting anything they had heard or read about the Church of Scientology distract them. He added: "This lady was there because she wanted to be there and the defendant attempted against her will to remove her." Miss Wilson told the jury: "I liked being there. I liked doing the work." The jury heard she had been a member of the sect for about 14 months by November 1992, living in the village of West Hoathley, three miles from its base.

On the night of Nov 6 1992 she was walking in the 55-acre grounds of the castle with two other Scientologists when, she said, a man ran up and grabbed her. One of her friends, Mr Austin Lenniston, also held her and tried to fight the man off. Cooper, the jury heard, gave himself up two weeks later. The trial was adjourned until today.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 1995

March 9, 1995, Thursday

SECTION: HOME; Page 5

LENGTH: 367 words

HEADLINE: Man accused of kidnap attempt at cult's castle

BYLINE: TIM KELSEY

BODY:

Stephen Cooper, a shop manager, tried to kidnap a 21-year-old woman from the headquarters of a religious sect after fears that she was being brainwashed, a court was told yesterday. He said he had been contacted by the woman's mother who feared she had been imprisoned.

A member of the Church of Scientology, Kathleen Wilson, claimed that she was the victim of a kidnap attempt as she walked in the grounds of the cult's castle headquarters in East Grinstead, West Sussex, in November 1992.

Despite being threatened with a knife and a rottweiler dog, other Scientologists clung on to Ms Wilson and pulled her away from the potential abductors, it was alleged at Lewes Crown Court, East Sussex.

When arrested after the incident, Mr Cooper, 27, of Saltburn-by-the-Sea, Cleveland, told police that Ms Wilson had been subjected to hypnosis by the sect and no longer had a mind of her own. He denies attempted kidnap and affray.

Ms Wilson, 23, of West Hoathly, East Sussex, told the court: "When I first got into the Church of Scientology I found it was good and helped me and other people. I decided to go to East Grinstead to work in the castle because it was helping others . . . I enjoyed doing the work."

Richard Cherrill, for the prosecution, said: "Some of you may know something of the Church of Scientology and some of you may have read about it. It may please some people, it may not please others. That is by the by. She was there because she wanted to be there and the defendant attempted against her will to remove her. If he had strong feelings against the church it is neither here nor there."

Mr Cherrill said that Mr Cooper and two other people tried to persuade Ms Wilson to leave the sect after arranging a meeting with her but Ms Wilson cut the discussion short. Then, three hours later as she went for a walk through the castle grounds, a group jumped out at her shouting "Get her" and "Grab her".

Mr Cherrill said that Ms Wilson was 21 at the time of the incident "and had been a member of the church for about 14 months. She said she was in no way consenting. She was quite happy where she was and had not wanted to leave."

The case continues.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 09, 1995

Copyright 1995 Times Newspapers Limited
The Times

March 9, 1995, Thursday

SECTION: Home news

LENGTH: 216 words

HEADLINE: 'Rescuer' denies sect kidnapping

BYLINE: Michael Horsnell

BODY:

A MAN who tried to "rescue" a woman from the headquarters of the Church of Scientology amid fears that she was being brainwashed went on trial yesterday accused of attempted kidnap and affray.

Kathleen Wilson, 23, a church member, claims she was the victim of an attempted abduction by Stephen Cooper, a shop manager and an acquaintance of her mother, as she walked through the grounds of Saint Hill Castle at East Grinstead, Sussex, in 1992.

Lewes Crown Court was told that despite being threatened with a knife and a rottweiler dog, Scientologist friends pulled her away from her abductors and bundled her on to a staff bus.

When he was arrested, Mr Cooper, 27, from Saltburn, Cleveland, told police that Miss Wilson had been subjected to hypnosis by the sect and no longer had a mind of her own.

Richard Cherrill, for the prosecution, told the court: "He said he believed that she was imprisoned. He said he had been contacted by Miss Wilson's mother who had expressed concern that her daughter was going to the US for further training. He agreed that Miss Wilson never said she wanted to be removed."

Mr Cherrill said that Mr Cooper, who denies the charges, and two other people jumped on Miss Wilson shouting "Get Her" and "Grab Her".

The trial continues.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 10, 1995