

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY




A  
0  
0  
0  
1  
0  
3  
8  
2  
0  
7

Mergerheim city

3d-  
scale





d

OBSERVATIONS

ON

THE ABUSE AND REFORM

OF THE

MONITORIAL SYSTEM

OF

HARROW SCHOOL,

WITH

LETTERS AND REMARKS

BY THE

EARL OF GALLOWAY.

LONDON:  
THOMAS HATCHARD, 187, PICCADILLY.  
1854.

---

*Price One Shilling.*

y

LONDON:

G. J. PALMER, PRINTER, SAVOY STREET, STRAND.

LETTERS AND REMARKS

RELATIVE TO THE

CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN

THE HONOURABLE BARON PLATT

AND

THE REV. DR. VAUGHAN,

HEAD MASTER OF HARROW SCHOOL.

WITH

OTHER LETTERS

AND

OBSERVATIONS

BY

THE EARL OF GALLOWAY.

2017229

LETTERS AND PAPERS

CORRESPONDENCE

THE HONORABLE JOHN

TOM BRYAN

OTHER MATTERS

OBSERVATIONS

THE EARL OF GARRARD



## PREFACE.

---

MR. BARON PLATT, having sent to Lord Galloway a printed copy of his correspondence with Dr. Vaughan, on the matters affecting their respective sons at Harrow School, was informed by Lord Galloway that some notice would be taken of it in print, and was requested to furnish a list of the parties among whom it had been distributed.

Lord Galloway, having waited several weeks in vain for Mr. Baron Platt's compliance with his request, circulated privately about five hundred copies of the "Letters and Remarks," chiefly among persons who might be supposed to take an interest in the subject of them.

Subsequently, Lord Galloway was apprized by Mr. Baron Platt of his intention to re-commence the distribution of his original pamphlet, together with a printed letter from his son, Mr. H. E. Platt, in reply to these "Letters and Remarks."

Mr. Baron Platt then offered to circulate the "Letters and Remarks," together with his two documents, on the plea that "the two boys might have fair play." But, as Mr. H. E. Platt's letter contained much refutable matter, Lord Galloway could not consider that justice would thereby be done either to his own son, or to the facts of the case, and therefore declined the offer.

However, it was impossible for Mr. Stewart's family to remain satisfied in the circumstances, and to allow these circulars to go forth under the authority of one of the Judges of the land, without remonstrance on their part. So, as the whole affair has obtained greater notoriety, and excited a more general interest, from its bearing on Public School Discipline, than was anticipated, and as contradictory accounts have found their way into some of the newspapers, and inaccurate reports are abroad, attributable in part to the limited circulation of the counter-statement in behalf of Mr. Stewart,—Lord Galloway has consented to the publication of the "Letters and Remarks," with the addition of other letters, and observations thereon, which are intended to convey a correct apprehension of the matters in dispute, and to protect injured parties from misrepresentation.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Extract from Mr. Baron Platt's Letter to Dr. Vaughan, Nov. 29, 1853 . . . . .	2
Letter from Mr. Stewart to his father, Lord Galloway, Nov. 24, 1853 . . . . .	3
Letter from Lord Galloway to Dr. Vaughan, Dec. 1, 1853	6
Extract from Dr. Vaughan's Letter to Lord Galloway, Dec. 3, 1853 . . . . .	9
Extract from Mr. Baron Platt's Letter to Dr. Vaughan, Dec. 1, 1853 . . . . .	9
Certificate of Mr. Hewlett, the Surgeon to Harrow School Remarks . . . . .	10 11
Extract from a Letter from Mr. Platt to Mr. Baron Platt, Nov. 26, 1853 . . . . .	14
Extract from Dr. Vaughan's Letter to Mr. Baron Platt, Nov. 26, 1853 . . . . .	17
Letter from a Harrow Monitor to Lord Galloway, Jan. 17, 1854 . . . . .	19
Letter from Mr. Platt to Lord Galloway, Feb. 8, 1854 .	25
Letter from Mr. Platt to Mr. Stewart, Nov. 23, 1853 .	30
Letter from Mr. Stewart to Mr. Platt . . . . .	32
Observations by Lord Galloway . . . . .	35
Extract from Dr. Vaughan's Letter to Lord Palmerston .	49

N.B.—Wherever, in any of the Letters following, words or sentences are printed in italics, they are so given in the original printed circulars, or were underlined in manuscript letters.

# LETTERS AND REMARKS

RELATIVE TO THE

## CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN

THE HONOURABLE BARON PLATT

AND

THE REV. DR. VAUGHAN,

HEAD MASTER OF HARROW SCHOOL.

---

THE Honourable Baron Platt having considered it expedient to print and circulate his correspondence with Dr. Vaughan, Head Master of Harrow, relative to the removal of his son from the monitorship, and also Mr. Platt's own letter to his father, in which he gives his version of the circumstances under which he had incurred Dr. Vaughan's displeasure (and which is inserted at page 14)—documents calculated to convey a most erroneous and unjust impression of the merits of the question at issue between the various parties concerned—it has been deemed advisable by Mr. Stewart's family to let the Governors of Harrow School, and the parents of Harrow Boys, see Mr. Stewart's account of the disagreement between him and Mr. Platt, as stated in his letter to his father, Lord Galloway,—Lord Galloway's letter to Dr. Vaughan,—extracts from Dr.

Vaughan's reply, bearing testimony to the accuracy of Mr. Stewart's statement, and Mr. Hewlett (the Harrow surgeon's) certificate as to the nature and extent of the injury received.

*Extract from Baron Platt's Letter to Dr. Vaughan,  
date November 29th, 1853.*

“ You say that you have reason to know that my son's conduct was disapproved of by his brother monitors. To this their own conduct on the occasion affords a decisive answer. If there had, in fact, been any excess in the chastisement, and they had so far neglected their duty as to omit to stop it, they would have been equally guilty of the excess, and equally responsible for its consequences. Why did they not interfere and stop the chastisement of which they are now said to have disapproved, at its proper limit? The answer is obvious. Because, until the contumacious boy, smarting with resentment and the mortification of wounded pride, had walked to the doctor, shown him his bruises, and obtained the doctor's formidable prognostication of prolonged injury (which, however, does not seem likely to be realised) they did not consider that in the infliction the proper limit had been exceeded. The facts as they now stand satisfy me that my son's conduct was unexceptionable. May I, therefore, implore you to reconsider the matter, for the sake of my son, for the sake of his family, for the sake of Harrow, and, with sincere respect I add, for the sake of yourself.

We are all liable to err. Even the judges of the land, in their anxious and single-minded pursuit of justice, often err. They are always too happy in such cases to correct their errors. My son has been degraded, I think, unjustly."

*From Mr. Stewart to his Father, Lord Galloway.*

"Harrow-on-the-Hill, Thursday, Nov. 24th, 1853.

"MY DEAREST PAPA,

"I hope you will excuse my touching upon school subjects at a time when you all must be in affliction from the loss which you have sustained in the death of my uncle; but you will, of course, hear of it sooner or later, and so I think the best thing I can do is to make you aware of it myself; and I hope that you will think, when you have read of it all, that though (and I acknowledge it) I may have acted hastily, yet, that having received provocation, I am entitled to some share of exoneration from blame. Last Tuesday I was down at football as usual, and while playing, a boy of the name of Holmes, on the opposite side, was what we call *behind*, that is, he was near our base, and the ball was some way behind him toward his own base, and consequently, according to all rules of fair play, he had no more right to attempt to kick the ball than any one who was not playing. (This rule is very often broken through, but it is customary when a boy is breaking it, for one of the contrary side to call out, 'You are be-

*hind.*’) He was just going to kick the ball, when I exclaimed, ‘*You are behind*, Holmes.’ He immediately, most honourably, let the ball pass, knowing, as well as I did, that he had no right to kick it. But, just after this, a *monitor at that time*, by name Platt, came up to me, and said sharply, ‘He was not behind any more than you were : you are always behind.’ (This speech was, you will see, giving me the lie, and at the same time, though I say it myself, asserting what he knows was a very unjust accusation, as I always make it a rule not to touch the ball when I am behind.) Upon which I answered, and I own that I was irritated at the time, ‘You know nothing about it ; by that remark you show either your total ignorance of the game, or else your desire to cheat.’ (The first part of this was true, as he very rarely comes down to football, and when down it is quite a rarity if he touches the ball.) I thought no more about it then, but on Wednesday morning after breakfast, he sent for me to his room, and told me that he had sent for me to *whop* me for my impertinence yesterday. Upon which I told him that I had not been impertinent, or, at any rate, if I had, the remarks I had made were in consequence of his speaking as he had done to me. He then told me that that had nothing whatever to do with it, and (I copy his remark verbatim) said—‘I may say anything I like on the football ground, and you have no right, whatever it is, to contradict me.’ So I said, ‘If you say what is not true, I shall certainly contradict you ;’ but he cut me short, and told me



to stand out, and so I told him that I should do no such thing; upon which he said, 'I suppose you know that you must either take my whopping or you will be sent away from the school;' so I told him that I would not take it, and I left his room and called at Dr. Vaughan's, who, however, was engaged then, and I was told to call at a few minutes before one. In the meanwhile Platt had been to Dr. Vaughan and had told him about it. When I saw Dr. Vaughan, he was excessively kind, and told me that he was exceedingly sorry that I should have got into a mess with any of the monitors, and that as far as he heard, I was to blame in what I had said, and so he should advise me to take the whopping, as there was no cowardice in taking anything from a legal power. And so I went away with the determination of telling Platt that I would submit, and begging his pardon. He, however, anticipated me, and sent for me to the monitors' library directly after dinner, where he told me what he had said before in the morning, and asked me if I had altered my determination? I told him that I had, and that I would submit. He then gave me *thirty-one cuts* as hard as ever he could across the shoulder blades with a cane more than an inch in circumference, *which he paid 1s. 6d. for*, and with such force that he had to stop almost every cut to bend back the cane, it was so curled with the violence of the blow. I almost fainted during it, but I cannot help being glad that I managed to get out of the room, without making the slightest movement to show him that I felt his

brutality. I was immediately taken to Mr. Hewlett, who told me that he had never in the whole course of his life witnessed such *an unmanly and brutal outrage*. He immediately went to Dr. Vaughan, and the consequence is that Platt has been turned down, his monitorship taken away, and he himself, I hear, obliged to leave at the end of the quarter. Would you believe it? there was a place two inches broad from one arm to the other, as black as ink, as if I had been stained. Mr. Hewlett said that my arm was swollen four inches above its natural size. I shall not be able to go into school again till Sunday; and so I hope to write to-morrow to tell you any little thing I may have forgotten. I will give you my word of honour that I have told you everything impartially. In great haste, I remain,

“ My dearest Papa,

“ Your truly affectionate Son,

“ RANDOLPH.”

*Letter from Lord Galloway to Dr. Vaughan.*

“ Galloway House, Dec. 1st, 1853.

“ MY DEAR SIR,

“ After some reflection, I consider it to be my duty to send you the enclosed letter from my son Randolph, with the request, that, after its perusal, you will return it to me. I believe the narrative of the transaction alluded to, to be substantially, if not literally, correct. The statement could not fail to be harrowing to the feelings of parents generally, as well

as to our own. It must be distressing to yourself : but surely the measure of your disapprobation of what has passed will be estimated by parents, and by the School, by the measure of the punishment awarded to the offender,—and what is it ? It appears to be degradation from his monitorship to being head of the sixth form, and prohibition to return, after the next holidays, to a school, almost the whole course of which he had already passed through, he being of an age, I understand, to leave it naturally.

“The spirit of the times in which we live has, in this country, not only done away with excessive corporal punishment, but in the army and navy it has placed restraints on officers in the exercise of their authority. It appears then to me that, if this kind of monitorial authority be needful for the discipline of a public school, it also ought to be under some guards against the abuse of it by boys of tyrannical disposition. The after punishment of an offending monitor, even when commensurate with the offence, however salutary, is quite insufficient in parents’ eyes for such a case. There ought to be positive prevention, either by limitation or by supervision, or otherwise. The constitution of a delicate boy might, from such treatment, receive a shock from which it would never recover quite in after life : and I believe there are some weakly frames which might sink under it at once : or, in some states of body, inflammation might take place, and mortification ensue. But this punishment, though of course disapproved by you in degree, was approved of in principle. It had your

especial sanction for its infliction on a boy in the upper fifth, and your especial recommendation to him to bear it, whose judgment on the occasion had to be formed under the alternative of submission or expulsion ; so that practically, in your eyes, his refusal to bear it would have been a greater fault than its infliction, and there was no precaution against excess. Submission then was inevitable. I do not desire to defend my son's speech to the monitor, now ex-monitor, but I would respectfully inquire of you, dear Sir, if submission in such cases ought really, as it would appear, to be altogether independent of the circumstances ? If so, and there could be no indulgence, no forbearance, in a case of so great provocation and want of principle on the part of the monitor, I know not, considering the scriptural definition of the human heart, where are the limits to a most cruel despotism, and what sort of security there can be to life and limb among so many youths of high spirit and varied temperament. \* \* \* \* \*

“ My dear Sir, I am an old Harrow man myself, and have had some experience of school life, and have had also three sons at Harrow. \* \* \*

“ I have been at great pains to inculcate on them respect for authority, and I trust not in vain, for I had the gratification last week of receiving an excellent report of my sons, in all respects, to console us under the distress of the subject matter of this letter, no unimportant part of which is the eventual effects on discipline and diligence, and on moral tone in the School, generally and particularly.

But you will say to all this, *Cui bono?* to which, in reply, I would urge on your consideration, as the head of a great establishment, during the ensuing vacation, whether there must not be something faulty in a system under which such enormities can be perpetrated? something requiring your best attention and that of the Governors of the School?

“ Believe me, dear Sir,

“ Yours very faithfully,

“ GALLOWAY.

“ The Rev. Dr. Vaughan,” &c. &c.

*Extract from Dr. Vaughan's Letter to Lord Galloway, date Dec. 3rd, 1853.*

\* \* \* “ The whole case is deeply distressing to me. If I had time to do so, I might perhaps explain some portion of it; but I prefer assuring you that it has received, is receiving, and shall receive, my very best consideration. It is a grave question, and one which needs great wisdom for its just settlement. Your son has behaved *nobly*, and his letter (which I take the liberty of keeping for a few days), does him great credit, and is, so far as I see, a very correct statement of what has occurred.” \* \* \*

*Extract from Baron Platt's Letter to Dr. Vaughan, dated December 1st.*

\* \* \* “ On the opinion of the medical gentle-

man, upon which alone you have relied to establish the excess, Mr. Stewart's resumption of the school duties on Sunday last, when he appeared, as I understand, in chapel in his full health and strength, affords a sufficient commentary. I do not believe the chastisement was excessive."

*Certificate of Mr. Hewlett, the Surgeon to Harrow School.*

"Harrow, Dec. 14, 1853.

"MY LORD,

"I have been requested by Dr. Vaughan to forward to your Lordship my report of the injury lately received by your Lordship's son, Mr. Stewart. This gentleman came to my house, in company with a schoolfellow, on Wednesday, Nov. 23rd, in a state of great suffering, and requested me to look at his back. On throwing off the shirt, I found the whole of the back across the shoulders, from the border of the left armpit to the top of the right shoulder, one entire mass of bruises, the colour varying from a bright red to a deep black. There was one deeply blackened spot over the upper and broad part of the shoulder, covering a space of very nearly four inches square by measurement. The injury he had received was sufficiently severe to render it necessary for Mr. Stewart to go immediately to the sick room,

where he was detained until the following Sunday, under medical treatment,

“ I have the honour to be,

“ My Lord,

“ Your Lordship’s faithful servant,

“ THOMAS HEWLETT.

“ The Earl of Galloway.”

### REMARKS.

It is thought that Baron Platt could not have been brought to express himself as he has done in the extracts given above from his letters to Dr. Vaughan, had he been at the time aware that his son had given the first offence, and how neglectful he had been of those rules of British justice, which it is his own practice to administer. For Mr. Platt, instead of, as was his duty, and as had been enjoined by Dr. Vaughan, “ laying the matter before the monitors,” held no previous conference with them on the subject, and gave Mr. Stewart no opportunity of making his statement for their adjudication, but took the law into his own hands, literally conjoining the heterogeneous offices of plaintiff, judge, and executioner, with convenient omission of all process of trial, and of address and verdict to and from this monitorial jury, consisting of seven sons of English gentlemen (besides Mr. Platt himself), who appear to have enacted on the occasion the part of passive spectators of all this barbarity, but without previous in-

quiry into its cause, and without remonstrance against its operation, although they are since represented to have felt at the time, and to have vented afterwards, the fruitless expression of their abhorrence of the whole scene from first to last.

However Baron Platt, to exculpate his son, may find it consistent with his dignity to make light of the case in question, there is ample evidence to show that Mr. Stewart was nearly fainting with exhaustion and suffering. Moreover, he was unable after it to lie in his bed as usual, and never closed his eyes the first night; and with respect to the *animus* with which the torture was inflicted, as Mr. Platt professes in his letter to have done all against his own feelings, and in zeal alone for the monitorial body, it is needful to remark that there is evidence of his ill-will against Mr. Stewart for some time prior to the occurrence; that while the ordinary price of the instrument with which these monitorial inflictions are effected is about three pence, Mr. Platt must needs have for this occasion a cane of the value of eighteen pence; that, after the first stroke, the boy, not having chosen to show sufficient sense of his suffering to satisfy Mr. Platt, he must needs inquire of him "If he was padded?" when, after having been gratified with an assurance to the contrary, the residue of the process was gone through without Mr. Platt's having been allowed the additional gratification of a single murmur from his poor victim, who was then taken away in the state described by the surgeon. Yet Baron Platt, writing from London,



“ does not believe the punishment to have been excessive.” His son, who inflicted it, was afterwards brought to a different opinion, and addressed a letter to Mr. Stewart to that effect, acknowledging his fault. The document is otherwise anything but satisfactory to Mr. Stewart, or, in the opinion of his friends, in the circumstances, creditable to the writer, who desires it may be burnt as soon as read, and that no one else should see it ; wherefore it is not printed in *extenso* ; but, as Mr. Stewart’s punishment was a public act, and its justification in all its severity has been both defended and published by Mr. Platt’s father and himself, it has been deemed right by Mr. Stewart’s father, that so much of that letter should be made public as appears needful to refute the erroneous and injurious statements and opinions which have been circulated, and to justify the view of the case, as stated by Lord Galloway in his letter to Dr. Vaughan.

*Extract from a Letter from Baron Platt's Son, dated the 26th, and received by Baron Platt in the afternoon of the 28th of November, 1853.*

(As printed by Mr. Baron Platt.)

“ On the afternoon of last Tuesday I was grossly insulted on the Football Field by a fellow in the upper fifth. It will shorten my story if I give you his name, Stewart. The language used was such as at any time or place would have called for severe notice, but the fact of its having been used on the Football Field, where the position of a monitor is held to be peculiarly sacred, and to the head of the game, made it a serious offence. The next morning I sent for Stewart to my room, and eventually told him that I must punish him there for an affront offered to the monitors in my person. He then said that he should refuse to take the punishment unless I forced him to do so. I warned him of the inevitable consequence of persisting in his refusal, that is to say, expulsion from the School; but he still refused, at the same time using insulting language. I then sent him away for the time, and went to Vaughan to ask his advice. He perfectly approved of all I had done, and even refused to see Stewart upon the subject, until I asked him as a favour to me to do so, in order that I might give him every chance of clearing himself. Upon Vaughan's advice

I punished Stewart before the monitors in the afternoon. The punishment I inflicted upon him was not so severe as I have known to be inflicted for slighter offences. Stewart afterwards went to Hewlett, and what passed between them I do not know ; but Hewlett then went to Vaughan and told him that the punishment had been too severe. As to what Hewlett said, Vaughan acknowledged to me afterwards that he did not at all understand the meaning of the terms which Hewlett used, that he knew that he had said that something must be applied, but he did not understand what, but thought it must be something only applied in rather severe cases. Upon the strength of these thoughts, he has put me down eight places, whereby I am no longer a monitor.

“ Immediately after his doing this, I told him that I should write to you, and tell you that I could not stay here after this quarter in a position of degradation. He was most earnest in urging my remaining in the School, and expressed entire satisfaction with the manner in which I had exercised my monitorial authority during this quarter, at the same time leading me to believe that it was his intention to restore me to my place at the beginning of next quarter.

“ Strangely enough, after this he has filled up my place among the monitors, none of whom leave this quarter, and I therefore do not see how he can restore me.

“ It was at his request that I deferred writing to

you until to-day, as he wished me to think over the matter before I did so. My opinion is unaltered ; and the experience of three days of degradation has taught me that, unless in compliance with your express wish, I could not undertake to go through months of it.

“ Although my personal authority may remain the same, my *moral influence* in the school must be impaired by it ; and nothing but restoration to my own place again can remedy the evil.

“ Vaughan acknowledges to me that his reason for punishing me so severely is, not that he thinks that I deserve it, but that he fears what ‘ people will say ’ if he does not. This moral philosophy reminds me of Paley’s infidel doctrine of expediency. He has no doubt told you that I have submitted to the punishment without a murmur as to its severity, feeling that my character is a necessary sacrifice to the welfare of Harrow. I feel that it is undeserved ; and, God knows, the reflection that I had exceeded my duty in causing pain to a fellow-creature, nay, more, to a schoolfellow, with whom I had been and am now on terms of friendship, would have been punishment enough, without having to think that the name of your son may go forth to the world disgraced. It would have been far more in accordance with my wishes to have left Stewart unpunished. It is a part of my duties which I always looked upon as a necessary evil attending upon my position ; and now, for the sake of guarding against paltry scandal, I suffer, and my character suffers, as though I had

done maliciously what I did most unwillingly. But a short time ago, Vaughan expressed an opinion that I was too lenient in the exertion of my authority. He has now deprived me of that authority for too great severity in supporting it. All this happening in the midst of the examination has entirely upset my reading. I before had a position to keep in the result of the examination, and the thoughts of this would have urged me on to endeavour to vindicate it. Now I have none ; and, the reward of years of industry suddenly taken from me, all my spirit has gone with it.

“ I had hoped that my career at Harrow might not terminate without some mark of distinction attending its close ; but six months of the wretchedness, which I have endured for the last three days, would be too high a price for the mere chance of this. Enough of this now—I fear that I shall not be able write again to you before next Friday, but let me hear from you as soon as you have time to write. I should very much like to see Vaughan’s letter to you. There might be some errors in it which I could correct. I think, however, that I am as safe in his hands as in my own, as far as intentional statements are concerned.”

*Extract from Dr. Vaughan’s Letter to Mr. Baron Platt, dated November 26th, 1853.*

“ The blows were excessive in number (about thirty, I understand), in weight, and in being all

directed to one particular part of the back, which is in consequence so much injured as to be (in Mr. Hewlett's opinion) in some danger of prolonged injury.

“ In proportion to my anxiety to uphold the monitors' authority, and to defend it against the numerous attacks directed against it by parents and by the public, must be my resolution to punish with severity any case of cruelty in the administration of their punishments ; and I have found myself on two or three occasions compelled not only to threaten but to inflict most grave retribution upon those who have erred in this respect.

“ I am bound to show the school and their parents that I do not deliver over any boy to the cane of a schoolfellow without appeal or redress in case of injustice or cruelty. It is thus only that I can maintain for a day the exercise of that monitorial power, which is always unpopular enough, and which yet I consider so essential to the well-being of a public school.

“ I have, therefore, *most reluctantly*, and with much sorrow and vexation on my own part, been constrained to put down your son from the monitorship.”

*Letter from a Harrow Monitor to Lord Galloway.*

“ Harrow, January 17th.

“ MY LORD,

“ After the painful matter of the excessive punishment inflicted on your son has so long occupied your attention, and the publication of your own sentiments with regard to it, it might appear idle, if not impertinent, to address to you any further remarks on the subject ; but as one of the points in the treatment of your son, which you especially blame, is his having been sentenced without being heard, you will, I am sure, not be offended at my offering a few observations in self-defence. Baron Platt has attempted the total vindication of his son from the charge of cruelty ; and you have been naturally unwilling that Mr. Stewart should figure as ‘ the contumacious boy smarting with resentment,’ &c. Dr. Vaughan, attacked at once for doing too much and doing too little, has justified his conduct in his correspondence with both sides.

“ There remains a fourth party, whose conduct has been severely censured by you and Baron Platt ; by Baron Platt, indeed, only hypothetically, as he declares the punishment, in his belief, not to have been excessive, and therefore acquits the spectators. But you, my Lord considering (I fear with much more reason) that the pain inflicted exceeded all proper limits of punishment, throw no small share of blame upon those who passively witnessed its infliction. Widely different though the views are, in most respects, which you and Baron Platt take of this affair, in one

thing you both seem to agree, that those who were present, and did not interfere, are in the same case as the actual inflictor of the punishment.

“ Your Lordship will pardon a few remarks in apology for, if not in justification of, their conduct. Whether the system of this School is wise or not (and it has just received a defence, to my mind most satisfactory), while it exists, it is our duty to carry it out, and its existence should at least be taken into consideration in discussing a case like the present. Your Lordship treats it as a ‘ difference ’ between two boys ; but in the eye of our system it is an insult offered to a superior, and (omitting for a while all mention of excess) a punishment naturally consequent upon resistance to constituted authority. The powers of a monitor closely resemble those of a master, of whom, in matters of school discipline, your Lordship would not complain that he ‘ conjoined the heterogeneous offices of plaintiff, judge, and executioner.’ And since the individual monitor has the right of punishing at his own discretion, and an appeal to the monitors collectively in arrest of judgment, though allowed in theory, has never yet been made in any case, and certainly was not in the present one, it is unfair to consider us as an unfaithful jury which found a verdict of guilty without enquiring into facts, or hearing the case for the defendant. The practice has been this :—if any boy refuses to submit to a sixth form, he is punished by the head of the school before the monitors, after they have heard the statement of the sixth form boy in question, and I suppose, if it was offered, any plea in



extenuation from the offender. The presence of the monitors both is, and is intended to be, an aggravation of the punishment, by giving it a partial publicity, greater than when inflicted by a sixth form boy in his own room ; less than when (as is done in extreme cases), inflicted before the whole school. I hope it will not be presuming unwarrantably upon your Lordship's patience, if I venture briefly to relate what passed before the monitors during the ten minutes from their first assembling, to the termination of Mr. Stewart's punishment. It was, it appears, Dr. Vaughan's intention that the whole matter should be examined by us.—I do not know how the mistake arose, but such was not the impression conveyed to us by Platt's statement of their interview. The matter was in fact brought before us as prejudged : for having related what had passed between him and Mr. Stewart, both on the Football Field and in his room, he concluded by saying, that all he had done (including his resolution to inflict punishment) had met with Dr. Vaughan's approval. But at the same time, no monitor, I am sure, (for the question was expressly put to us) did not agree with Platt, after hearing his account, that Mr. Stewart had merited punishment, and it is not correct to represent any one of those present as expressing afterwards his abhorrence of the *whole* scene from *first to last*. That Dr. Vaughan really is of opinion, that the punishment was not undeserved, appears from his first letter to Baron Platt, where he says of his son, 'I do not blame him for the act itself.' I think then that we were not to blame for investigating no fur-

ther into the case ; nevertheless, had Mr. Stewart, thinking as he seems to have done, the punishment undeserved, offered to make any explanation to us, we should of course have willingly listened to him, though I do not believe that his statement would have altered our view of the case, any more than it did that of Dr. Vaughan.

“ I hope I have shown, to your Lordship’s satisfaction, that our position, as we understood it, was not that of a “ jury ” to try the case, and that we did know and had approved the cause of the punishment. Let me now endeavour to explain why we did not put a stop to it in the course of its infliction, at the proper limit, and also some of those circumstances which you mention as an aggravation. The price paid for the cane was not known to me, nor, I believe, to any of us, at the time. The facts as I have since heard them are, that sixpence was the price paid at the shop by the original purchaser, who had refused to part with it to Platt, except for eighteenpence. This, I am aware, does in no degree weaken the case against Platt, but I wish to show that the instrument was not in appearance, or to our knowledge, different from those ordinarily employed. The inquiry, ‘ if he was padded, ’ did not, as you suppose, result from Mr. Stewart’s not having chosen to show sufficient sense of suffering, but is a question often put, no doubt in consequence of the frequency of the practice. At a ‘ whopping ’ before the whole school, about a year ago, the head boy not only asked the question, but insisted on satisfying himself by actual inspection. From the injury that resulted the blows

must have been excessive in violence as well as in number. At the time I certainly thought otherwise ; the firm endurance of the sufferer, I am afraid, conduced to the delusion. If the thirty blows had occupied as long in the infliction as I have in the description (instead of only three or four minutes), we should, I doubt not, have made up our minds to interfere, and, disregarding the breach of discipline, and the scene that would probably have ensued upon so bold and unprecedented a step, have prevented the far greater evil of excessive punishment. Could we have known, before it commenced, the extent to which it would be carried, or during its infliction, the pain and injury that was being caused, is it conceivable that we should have remained the passive spectators that we were ? The reason of our non-interference was that we did not know, and could not have imagined, either the one or the other. With full knowledge of the results, looking back upon our position, and not considering that those results, the number of blows ultimately inflicted, and the injury they caused, were then of course unknown to us, our conduct naturally appears highly culpable, and it may even be necessary to mention that our fathers, at least, were ‘English gentlemen.’ How each of us now, I doubt not, wishes that he had got up in the middle of the punishment, had stopped Platt, and said, ‘I do not suspect you of cruelty, the blow I have arrested was, I dare say, the last you intended to give, but I think, and you and the others must agree with me, that enough has already been done, and if I were to let blow follow blow, still expecting

of your humanity that each would be the last, serious injury might ensue, traceable in part, to my non-interference.' Knowing much now that we did not know then, this is the course we (for I think I may fairly answer for the others in this matter) wish we had pursued ; this is the course which you, my Lord, also, looking back, would require of us. Its difficulties have, I am happy to say, been appreciated by Dr. Vaughan, who does not blame us, and I trust, that you too, taking all into consideration—the short time occupied—each blow after the first few expected to be the last—the difficulties and evils of interference—a trust in the humanity of Platt, an ignorance of the severity of the blows, or that each was falling on the same place—and also a little, perhaps the fact of what was every body's business, being no one's business—will, if you cannot wholly acquit us, at least not believe that our non-interference arose from a love of cruelty ; or represent us also, even mentally, as waiting in vain for the additional gratification of a single murmur from our poor victim. I must, in conclusion, again apologize to your Lordship for troubling you with so long a letter on a subject which must be painful to you : my only motive has been to give you a clearer view of what must have appeared well nigh inexplicable—the conduct of the monitors on that occasion. It would add nothing to the force of my letter to affix my name, and it might look like putting myself forward. It will be sufficient to vouch for the facts that I have stated, if I subscribe myself,

“ Your Lordship's humble, obedient servant,

“ A HARROW MONITOR.”

# A LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT HON. EARL OF GALLOWAY.

BY H. E. PLATT,

FEB. 8, 1854.

---

MY LORD,

AFTER reading a pamphlet which has lately been published under your Lordship's sanction, containing not only imputations injurious to me, but also many assertions made entirely without foundation with regard to recent events at Harrow, I am compelled to contradict those assertions with some degree of publicity, lest my silence should be construed into acquiescence ; although, while I wish the facts of the case to be known to all those who are really interested in them, I do not intend publishing this letter for the satisfaction of vulgar curiosity. I shall not recapitulate the account which appears in my letter to my father of the 26th of November of the transaction in question, which, as far as it goes, is strictly true, but con-

fine my remarks to the contents of the pamphlet which calls forth this answer.

The first document contained in it which demands my notice is Mr. Stewart's letter. As to the fairness of Mr. Holmes' kick, which caused Mr. Stewart's interference, my decision at the time was not unsupported. As to the *tone* in which I gave my opinion on the occasion, which he characterises as "sharp," I may remind your Lordship that my position on the football field at the time was that of head of the game, and the arbitration of any dispute was part of my duty. I spoke to Mr. Stewart calmly, as became that position, and merely used the words, "He was not behind." According to Mr. Stewart, arbitration in any case must be "giving the lie" to one side or the other. Mr. Stewart could not have been ignorant of the regularity of my attendance at football, for up to that day I had only absented myself four days since the beginning of the quarter. Upon his refusal to submit in my room, I warned him of the consequences, and would not accept the decision to which he had come until I had offered him more time to consider of it. This offer he refused. As to the size of the cane, its circumference was never measured by Mr. Stewart or myself, and I shall therefore confine myself to stating that it was of the size commonly used on such occasions. It would be almost beneath me to contradict the positively ridiculous assertion as to the price of the cane but for the importance attached to it by Mr. Stewart's friends; *I never paid, nor ever intended to pay, one farthing for*

*the cane.* It never was mine, but belonged, in fact, to a friend, although it had been in my possession for about a month. Mr. Stewart says that he was "taken" to the surgeon. He walked there ; with a companion, it is true, but unsupported, and with no visible difference from his usual step. Again, he informs you that he heard I was "obliged to leave at the end of the quarter ;" his friends have published, without remark or correction, the part of your Lordship's letter to Dr. Vaughan which reiterates that assertion, after they had read the correspondence between my father and Dr. Vaughan, where they must have seen that my father removed me from Harrow in consequence of my own wish expressed to him not to remain there in a position of irretrievable degradation, and of his opinion that that degradation was undeserved.

Upon your Lordship's letter to Dr. Vaughan I have little to say. Whatever you or others may think of the Monitorial System at Harrow, I was part of it, and it was my duty to uphold it. But I have no intention of offering an opinion upon a subject which is now receiving the consideration of those better qualified than I am to do so ; neither do I feel myself called upon to notice Dr. Vaughan's share in the transaction ; and the more especially so, as I do not consider it necessary to offer any comment upon a few lines of a letter the remainder of which is withheld. As to Mr. Hewlett's letter, I wish to say nothing, more than that the opinion of a more eminent practitioner than Mr. Hewlett would not stand in the face of facts.

I now come to the last, though not least important, portion of this publication ; and I can only regard it as equally discreditable to the writer, and to those, if any, who furnished him with the misrepresentations contained in it. It is asserted that I held no consultation with the monitors. Now, I must acquit Mr. Stewart of a share in the concoction of this portion of the Pamphlet, for there are many assertions in it which he must know to be untrue—this among others ; but I think that he ought in candour to have removed the doubt on the subject which the account given in his letter was calculated to produce. On the afternoon of the occurrence in the Football Field, I consulted those of the monitors whose opinions I had reason to respect ; and the next morning one of my seniors, who had been my chief adviser on the occasion, had been with me for an hour before I sent for Mr. Stewart, and was with me during the time that Mr. Stewart was in my room. Upon his refusal to submit, Dr. Vaughan agreed with me in thinking that the monitorial character of the punishment ought to be more distinctly asserted ; and it was upon this that I assembled the monitors in the School Library, and, although they all knew the particulars before, (the greater part of them, I believe, having been on the Football Field at the time), I recapitulated the whole story, and eventually put these questions : “ Do *all* of you think that I ought to whop Mr. Stewart ? Is there one of you who thinks that I ought *not* ? ” There was not one dissentient voice ; each answered for himself that I ought to do so.



This is enough to contradict what has been written on this part of the subject.

In the next place, the writer thinks it "needful to remark that there is evidence of my ill-will against Mr. Stewart for some time prior to this occurrence." It does not seem to occur to him that, even had Mr. Stewart entertained any wish to act so as to provoke ill-will on my part, the difference in our positions at Harrow would have put it out of his 'power. I do not mean for an instant to insinuate that he had any such wish, for our intercourse at Harrow, as far as it went, was invariably that of friends ; indeed, his own answer to my letter which follows is enough to corroborate this ; and had I been in the habit of showing ill-will towards him, he would scarcely have "hoped that we might be on the same terms as we were before." There now remains little to be said.

In referring to the letter which I wrote to Mr. Stewart, common honesty would have prompted the mention of the *time* at which it was written. That letter was written within three hours after Mr. Hewlett had made his representation to Dr. Vaughan, when I had no reason, beyond the utter incomprehensibility of such a result ensuing from such a cause, to doubt the truth of his statement, and after Dr. Vaughan, acting on that representation, had degraded me. Under those circumstances, I thought, and I feel now that I was right in so thinking, that, apart from any regret which I might feel myself, it was my duty to offer some acknowledgment of the injury which I believed that I had unwittingly inflicted.

on Mr. Stewart. His written answer to me will enable you to judge whether that letter was satisfactory to him at the time. My reason for requesting that it might be burnt was this : I believed that it was the wish of all concerned, as I know that it was of Dr. Vaughan and myself, that for the sake of Harrow the whole matter should not gain more publicity than was inevitable. In breach of that confidence which I thought I could safely repose in him, Mr. Stewart appears to have sent the letter the round of his friends, and they have contented themselves with giving a description of it which the readers of these pages will decide whether it deserves. I did not keep a copy of it ; but knowing that on the 23rd of November, the time of writing that letter, I had been led to believe that Mr. Stewart had received serious injury from the caning, and conscious of the impossibility of my having written anything inconsistent with that belief and my own feelings at the time, I did myself the honour of requesting your Lordship to furnish me with a copy, and have to thank you for your ready compliance with my request, although the copy did not reach me until Saturday last, in consequence of my letter having been addressed to Scotland. The following is a copy of my letter to Mr. Stewart, written on the 23rd of November :—

“ MY DEAR STEWART,

“ Circumstances have placed us relatively in different positions to those which we occupied a few hours ago. I might, perhaps with reason, be occu-

pied too much now with the consideration of the consequences which the events of to-day have brought upon myself, to think much upon any other subject, did I not feel that some acknowledgment was due on my part of an excess of punishment *unwittingly* inflicted.

“You cannot but believe me when I tell you that any such effects as that punishment has produced upon you never had a place in my mind. I firmly believed at the time that I inflicted it, and afterwards, that it was certainly severe, but not in any way excessive. As to my punishing you, in your calmer moments you must see, I think, that I had no other course. The result shows that the *amount* of punishment was too great. You will, I am sure, believe in my sincere sorrow for this, and not attribute it to any *personal* feeling on my part. I never looked upon the matter as an affront to *me*, but to a monitor; and thus I dealt with it.

“After the degradation which this has brought upon me, Harrow is not the place in which I would choose to spend more time than I am obliged. Any feeling of resentment on your part, then, may be removed by knowing that this will probably bring to a sudden close that part of my life which I have hitherto wished to prolong to its utmost, and will form no small alloy to my remembrances of Harrow.

“What I have written, I of course write to you in strict confidence. Let *no one* but yourself see it. To any one with a particle of spirit, it needs no small

effort to acknowledge a fault as I have to you now. In return, *burn this immediately you have read it.*

“Believe me, sincerely yours,

“H. E. PLATT.”

To which this answer was returned on the following day :—

“Thursday Morning.

“MY DEAR PLATT,

“The expressions of regret in your letter to me yesterday have certainly, to a great degree, allayed the feelings which arose in my mind in consequence of your conduct to me. I can perfectly understand that my refusal to submit in the morning must have served greatly to make you forget the mercy which was due to a fellow-creature, much more to a school-fellow, however great his fault might have been, but which in this case (on reflection, and considering the exasperation which a gentleman must feel on hearing himself, though not in words, yet in fact, called a *liar* at a time when he knew he was in the right), you must acknowledge to have been trivial. You must be aware that I called at Dr. Vaughan’s in the morning, who quite convinced me that I was wrong, both in my conduct the day before, and also in my refusal to submit to your authority yesterday morning. Upon my leaving his house at ten minutes past one, I determined to go directly after dinner to your room, and tell you that I would submit to anything you chose to do ; and, when it was finished, to

have begged your pardon for my conduct, and hoped that we might be on the same terms as we were before. This, however, I was unable to do, as you sent for me to the Library first ; and, I am not ashamed to confess it, I did not like to perform the latter part of my resolution before the other monitors. Hoping you will excuse the liberty I have taken in speaking so freely, and, moreover, that we may again be friends,

“ I remain, yours sincerely,

“ RANDOLPH HENRY STEWART.”

And now, my Lord, a word upon this answer. It was written on the same day as his letter to you. Let those who read them both judge which expresses the true feelings of the writer towards me at the time. One or the other *may*, *both* certainly *cannot*. Mr. Stewart, before he decided upon not apologising to me before the other monitors, should have considered that the insult was a public one, and offered to the other monitors in my person. I should have considered an apology made before them as sufficient reparation, though my acceptance of it must have depended, as the punishment did, upon their agreement as to its sufficiency ; and it would have been better for all parties had he offered such an apology. A private apology I should have refused. I may here add that the liberty of addressing the monitors in a case such as that of Mr. Stewart is invariably conceded as a matter of course, and therefore I cannot think that he would not have availed himself of

this had he felt disposed to do so. It was at my request that Dr. Vaughan heard Mr. Stewart's account of what had occurred on the Football Field, instead of forming his opinion from mine alone, and therefore few will believe that I would have refused him the same privilege before the monitors.

I have only now to add that I trust that there may be no necessity for my writing more on this subject. I feel that the more the real truth is known the more I am freed from reproach ; but, at the same time, I feel myself called upon to contradict any misrepresentations which may be published.

I have the honour to be, my Lord,

Your Lordship's obedient servant,

H. E. PLATT.

59, Portland Place, Feb. 8, 1854.

## OBSERVATIONS BY LORD GALLOWAY.

THIS Letter of Mr. H. E. Platt suggests the following Observations :—

The pamphlet (reprinted at page 1), of which Mr. H. E. Platt complains, was called forth by his own proceedings. If he had not misled his father by misrepresenting the occurrences which had occasioned his degradation from the monitorship, and if Mr. Baron Platt had abstained from reflecting on Mr. Stewart's character and conduct, and from the endeavour to exalt his own son at the expense of his injured schoolfellow, no counter-statement on behalf of Mr. Stewart would have been required. Lord Galloway would have remained satisfied with the assurances contained in Dr. Vaughan's letter to him of the 3rd of December, and all the painful details of the transaction would have been known only to a comparatively small number of persons, immediately connected with Harrow School. As it is, the consequences of publicity are chargeable on Mr. Baron Platt and his son alone.

Mr. Platt would now mystify the origin of his disagreement with Mr. Stewart, and desires to make it appear that, acting the part of a high functionary on the Football Field, he had been called upon to

arbitrate judicially on a disputed point between Holmes and Stewart, and that he had delivered his judgment before all the field with the calmness befitting his office on such an occasion. Now all this the whole field know to have no foundation in fact. There was no arbitration, and no occasion for arbitration. Neither the boy Holmes, nor any of his schoolfellows, objected to Stewart's warning to the former, but only Mr. Platt, whose interlocution, therefore, was in truth as uncalled for, as it was offensively expressed. Moreover, though, accidentally, as the senior boy present, Mr. Platt became head of the game nominally, it is notorious that such matters, constantly recurring, are not necessarily referred to the technical head of the game (who, as in this case, might have little experience of field-sports), but, either to some boy having influence with his schoolfellows on the playground, or to general consent, as on the present occasion.

The assertion of Mr. Platt, who seems to measure his words by the same standard as his blows, that he "spoke to Mr. Stewart calmly as became his position, and merely used the words 'He was not behind,'" is incorrect. The words he actually used can be proved to have been, as stated in page 3, "He was not behind any more than you were. You are always behind."

And here it may not be inopportune to remark, that Mr. Stewart's refusal to take the whopping from Mr. Platt in his own room, when first ordered by him to "stand out," did not arise from the spirit of re-



sistance to lawful authority, but from the distinction formed in his mind between monitorial authority and monitorial tyranny—from the impression that, as Mr. Platt had given the first offence by a dereliction of principle and abuse of his position, the punishment, by Mr. Platt's own hand, of the subsequent offence, which arose from the former, had become unlawful. There is ample corroboration of this in Mr. Stewart's ready appeal to Dr. Vaughan, and compliance with what he deemed to be Dr. Vaughan's requirements on the occasion, namely, that he should submit to the award of the monitors, which he certainly hoped might be favourable to him. He intended to apologize to Mr. Platt, but had no opportunity of doing so, as Mr. Platt sent for him to the monitor's library, and without preface at once asked him before the monitors, "If he would then submit," to which he replied in the affirmative; and he felt "that he could not then apologize, for fear it should be thought that he did so to escape the whopping." He stated in his letter to Mr. Platt why he did not make an apology *after* the whopping, from which obligation in the circumstances he was perhaps morally exonerated, if not physically incapacitated.

Mr. Platt disputes the accuracy of the "Remarks" about the cane, saying, "I never paid, nor ever intended to pay, one farthing for the cane." Mr. Stewart's friends are willing to concede this point on Mr. Platt's representation; but they do not see how Mr. Platt's case is improved thereby, as, if the cane was only of the ordinary size, it must have been ap-

plied with extraordinary and vindictive force and frequency, to have produced effects notoriously so unusual, and which at times are still felt, two months after the infliction.

Then what becomes of Mr. Platt's "calmness" and absence of personal animosity? Will the public give him credit for having acted under these feelings, especially when informed that the results of his conduct on this occasion have been the limitation of monitorial punishment at Harrow for the future, even in *extreme cases*, to *one-third* of the stripes inflicted by Mr. Platt, and the inhibition of a monitor punishing a schoolfellow for an offence committed against himself, or punishing an upper fifth form boy at all, notwithstanding Mr. Platt's estimate of the great difference of position between the parties. (See page 29.)

Mr. Platt disclaims having entertained feelings of ill-will against Mr. Stewart before the occurrence in question, and appeals to the terms of Mr. Stewart's reply to his apology. Concerning this last, a few words will be said presently. In the meanwhile, it is distinctly asserted by Mr. Stewart, that, however friendly their intercourse had been previously, for several weeks before the affair on the Football Ground, he had been subjected to a series of petty annoyances on the part of Mr. Platt—a fact perfectly well known to his schoolfellows, and of which, if proof were otherwise wanting, the notice put up by Mr. Platt in the Harrow Philathletic Club Room, and taken down by him immediately after the whopping, is sufficient evidence.

By the expression in the "Remarks," that Mr. Stewart, after his whopping, "was then taken away in the state described by the surgeon," it was never intended to convey the idea, as Mr. Platt would imply, that he had been carried out on a litter ; which would have been at variance with Mr. Stewart's own account in his letter home. (See page 3.)

But Mr. Platt's criticism makes it necessary to state that, though Mr. Stewart did "manage to get out of the room," he was met by the Custos on the staircase, who expressed his horror at what he had overheard, and was supported by him in an exhausted state into the school-room, where he rested for a while and recovered himself, before going on to the surgeon. If Mr. Platt had heard that a friend, having had his arm shattered by accident or in action, his legs being uninjured, had walked to the surgeon to have it dressed, would he have thought it incredible ?

Mr. Baron Platt indeed wrote to Dr. Vaughan, "On the opinion of the medical gentleman, upon which alone you have relied to establish the excess, Mr. Stewart's resumption of the school duties on Sunday last, when he appeared, as I understand, in chapel in his full health and strength, affords a sufficient commentary. I do not believe the chastisement was excessive." Now assuredly this judgment, though pronounced by one of Her Majesty's Judges, whose liability to err he admits in his letter to Dr. Vaughan (see page 3), is supported by no proof which can affect the medical certificate. Mr. Baron Platt

had neither witnessed the event, nor received the account of it from a disinterested party, nor can he be considered disinterested himself in a matter so nearly concerning his own son. Whereas ample corroborative evidence in support of the medical certificate might have been adduced, had it been thought needful. Indeed, Dr. Vaughan himself wrote to Mr. Baron Platt on the 1st of December, "that the immediate effect of the punishment was frightfully severe, I have the testimony, not of Mr. Hewlett alone, but of others also." Moreover, when Mr. Baron Platt infers from Mr. Stewart's appearance in chapel on the fourth day after the occurrence, that he cannot have been *excessively* hurt, he ignores the fact that the severest chastisement inflicted on a boy by the master for the gravest offence, does not occasion his absence from "school duties" for a single hour, nor necessitate any medical attendance whatever. But, in truth, though Mr. Stewart was from various considerations allowed to leave his room on the fourth day, being Sunday, this course was felt to be hazardous, and was not adopted without hesitation, and for a considerable time he had to take precautions against further injury.

Allusion is made, in the concluding sentence of the "Remarks," to the admission by Mr. Platt, in his letter to Mr. Stewart, of the punishment having been "excessive." To this Mr. Platt takes exception, observing that "common honesty would have prompted the mention of the *time* at which it was written." Does Mr. Platt really conceive that he

was aggrieved herein? and that his case would have been more favourably stated, if the reader had been informed that the apology to Mr. Stewart—the so-called “acknowledgment”—bore the date of 23rd of November, the day of the event; whereas Mr. Platt’s letter to his father was written three days later, while Mr. Stewart was actually yet confined to his room through Mr. Platt’s cruelty, and contains the following statements, alike inconsistent with truth, “Upon Vaughan’s advice, I punished Stewart before the monitors in the afternoon. The punishment inflicted on him was not so severe as I have known to be inflicted for slighter offences,” &c.; adding (with what sincerity let facts decide), “it would have been far more in accordance with my wishes to have left Stewart unpunished.” And this letter to Mr. Baron Platt was printed and circulated, while the letter of “acknowledgment” to Mr. Stewart was to be seen by no one, and to be “burnt as soon as read!” In fact, notwithstanding Mr. Platt’s assertion that “Mr. Stewart appears to have sent the letter the round of his friends,” the letter was seen only by his brother and a schoolfellow, to whom, being in the room, it had been read out on the moment of its receipt, before arriving at its concluding sentence, forbidding its promulgation. It was afterwards shown to an old Harrovian, who had been for a long time head of the school, and subsequently to Lord Galloway, but only to him after the receipt of Baron Platt’s pamphlet; and Lord Galloway thought it his duty in the circumstances to transmit it to Dr. Vaughan.

Lord Galloway, notwithstanding his perfect right in equity and common sense so to do, would not have made the allusion to this letter in the "Remarks," had not Baron Platt and his son put themselves out of court, and deprived themselves of all imaginable claim on the forbearance of Mr. Stewart and his friends, by their gratuitous representations in print, essentially at variance with the previous "acknowledgment" to Mr. Stewart; and yet Mr. Platt now affirms that he wished that document to be burnt *only* that, "for the sake of Harrow, the *whole matter* should not gain *more publicity* than was inevitable!" If that was indeed his reason, with what justice can he complain that, having himself given it that publicity, all his proceedings should be made known?

Mr. Platt has now thought fit to print his letter to Mr. Stewart in *extenso*. His reason for so doing, in respect of any benefit which may accrue therefrom to his own cause, is equally as inexplicable as the reason which may have induced him to pen it in the first instance, *in such terms*, to his injured school-fellow, containing, as it does, an apology, so qualified as to partake almost of the nature of additional insult, and valuable only from its admission of a fact, which has been denied since it has become known, but utterly valueless, as long as "there was no one but yourself to see it."

There is in it self-gratulation on his magnanimity in dwelling, at such a moment, on Mr. Stewart's punishment, rather than on his own; there is self-justification, and the profession of much which is not sup-

ported by internal and circumstantial evidence ; and there is the saving clause—" burn this immediately you have read it !"

In the same letter, Mr. Platt says to Mr. Stewart, " To any one with a particle of spirit, it needs no small effort to acknowledge a fault as I have to you now ;" but, in his letter to Mr. Stewart's father, he complains of the document having been represented in the " Remarks" as unsatisfactory,—though it contains no apology for, nor even allusion to, his own injustice and gratuitous insult to Mr. Stewart in the first instance, which were the origin of the whole affair, and of the offensive retort ; no self-condemnation for having outstepped his authority both at first and at last, for having manœuvred to get Mr. Stewart expelled or beaten for his own wrong, for having neglected " to lay the case, as enjoined by Dr. Vaughan, before the monitors," and for having determined to revenge, with his own hand, a personal offence provoked by himself !

But Mr. Platt has also ventured to print Mr. Stewart's reply in print, for which act Mr. Stewart's friends are certainly under obligations to him, whatever he may think to the contrary.

Mr. Platt contrasts this reply with Mr. Stewart's letter to his father of November 24th, and says, " Let those who read them both, judge which expresses the true feelings of the writer towards me at the time. One or the other *may*, *both* certainly *cannot*."

The reader will remember that one of these letters was the letter of a youth to his parent, detailing, as

was his duty, the origin, progress, and issue of the whole affair, but admitting, in respect of his retort upon the monitor, "that he was irritated at the time." And no wonder! But has Mr. Platt made any such admissions? On the contrary, he says in his letter what is at variance with the fact, that he spoke to Mr. Stewart "calmly," and altogether omits the insulting words which roused Mr. Stewart's indignation, and led to his rebuke.

The other letter was that of the victim of Mr. Platt's outrage to the perpetrator of that outrage, on receiving from him a very shabby apology, on which Mr. Stewart was willing to put the most favourable interpretation. But though Mr. Stewart charitably makes allowance for Mr. Platt having "forgotten the mercy which was due to a fellow-creature," and apologizes to Mr. Platt constructively, while he explains the cause of his not having done so actually; he, at the same time, evinces his sense of the indignity, injustice, and cruelty which he had suffered, and of which Mr. Platt's letter to him was a very unsuitable acknowledgment.

And now a few words with regard to the apology required of Mr. Stewart by Mr. Platt. (See page 33.)

It has been already shown that no one word of regret had been expressed by Mr. Platt to Mr. Stewart for the speech made to him in the Football Field, which led to the offence, and which, though now characterized as a *public* offence, Mr. Platt desired and endeavoured to punish *privately* in his own room; and yet Mr. Platt writes, "I should have considered



an apology made before the monitors as a sufficient reparation, though my acceptance of it must have depended, *as the punishment did*, upon their agreement as to its sufficiency." And yet, in the monitor's letter, it is expressly declared they did not know what amount of punishment Mr. Platt intended to inflict. How then could they judge of its sufficiency? Or, if Mr. Stewart had offered a public apology for a private affair, in which he himself was the party most aggrieved (which proceeding the whole of Mr. Platt's conduct had been calculated to prevent), would the reference for judgment on its "sufficiency," as with regard to the case itself, have been restricted to "those of the monitors whose opinion Mr. Platt had reason to respect?" For he adds, "a private apology I should have refused," though his own subsequent apology to Mr. Stewart was so private, that no one but Mr. Stewart was to see it.

Mr. Stewart's own acceptance, afterwards, of his castigator's apology, was certainly not made to depend on "sufficient reparation;" and the hope expressed by him, "that they might be on the same terms as before," however distorted by Mr. Platt into an acquittal of previous ill-will on his part against Mr. Stewart, will be understood by others, as referring to the period antecedent to that at which Mr. Platt began to manifest his inimical feeling, and as evidence that Mr. Stewart had no ill-will to Mr. Platt; and that, instead of being, what Baron Platt calls him, "the contumacious boy, smarting with resentment and the mortification of injured pride," he

was a generous boy "smarting," indeed, but not "with resentment," and "wounded," indeed (though short of "mortification"), but not with "pride."

Mr. Platt complains that he is charged with "having held no consultation with the monitors," and in reply states that, "in the afternoon of the occurrence in the Football Field, he consulted those of the monitors whose opinion he had reason to respect." (See page 28.)

But did Mr. Platt, in the monitor's library, honestly fulfil Dr. Vaughan's injunctions to "lay the case before the monitors?" Did he there invite Mr. Stewart to apologise? Did he offer him any *locus penitentiae*? Did he even relate the words he had himself used at the outset?

In the sequel, did Mr. Platt disclaim to his brother monitors the propriety of his acting personally on the occasion? or, did he so contrive that they could scarcely propose to supersede him without seeming to run counter to Dr. Vaughan's intentions, or, at least, to covet the performance of what should be considered an unenviable operation? The monitor's letter to Lord Galloway answers these inquiries.

Lord Galloway desires to avail himself of this opportunity to offer his acknowledgments for the letter of "A Harrow Monitor," in which the writer has made the best of a bad case, while Mr. Platt, by his advocacy, has made a bad case worse. If the monitors have been incorrectly represented as afterwards expressing "their abhorrence of the whole scene from first to last," though Dr. Vaughan wrote to Mr.

Baron Platt on the 28th of November, that "he had reason to know that his son's conduct was disapproved by his brother monitors, the persons who would naturally be most anxious for the maintenance (by due means) of their joint authority,"—it appears, at any rate, from the letter above, *inter alia*, that the case which Dr. Vaughan had instructed Mr. Platt to lay before the monitors for their examination and adjudication, was represented to them by him "as prejudged"—that the presence of the monitors both was, and was intended to be, an aggravation of the punishment, rather than a security for the administration of justice—that an appeal against prejudice existed rather "in theory" than in practice, and that, however true in its extenuating statements, it would have availed nothing against the decision of the complaining monitor in his own cause—that, as the case had not been considered, so also the amount of the punishment had not been predetermined, by the monitors—and that, inasmuch as their "trust in Platt's humanity," as "blow followed blow," having proved vain, they "wish they had stopped him in the *middle* of the punishment," "*enough having already been done,*" the punishment actually inflicted by him was *double* what was fitting, and was therefore "excessive." Do not then these admissions accord with the tenor of the "Remarks?"

All the documents connected with the case in question are now placed before the reader, and the letters of Mr. Platt and Mr. Stewart in juxtaposition.

Lord Galloway believes a dispassionate review of

the points in dispute, and beyond dispute, must lead to the following conclusion :—That Mr. Platt gave the first offence, abusing his position in addressing Mr. Stewart as he did ; and that, however wrong in Mr. Stewart to reply as he did, there was an ungenerous and improper exercise of the monitorial power on the part of Mr. Platt, notwithstanding the overweening confidence with which he affirms at the end of his letter, that the more the real truth is known, the more he must be freed from reproach.

In the same sentence, Mr. Platt expresses the desire that there may be no necessity for his writing more on this subject.

Until now, two printed statements had been circulated on his behalf for the one on behalf of Mr. Stewart ; and for the reasons mentioned in the preface, Lord Galloway has found himself obliged to issue this publication in defence of his son and of himself.

If Mr. Baron Platt and his son should feel themselves impelled to take any further step, Lord Galloway hopes it may be to acknowledge that they have both done his son wrong, in which case, Lord Galloway's family would be sincerely happy to bury the whole affair in oblivion.

The Harrow Monitor has endeavoured to shield the conduct of the monitorial body in some respects under the authority of Dr. Vaughan. But Lord Galloway desires to record his conviction that, if Dr. Vaughan has erred in the course of the affair, in his effort to reconcile its difficulties with a

system which he approved, and felt himself bound to maintain,—he did so under the influence of the purest motives, and in the endeavour to secure justice, in the first instance, and eventually to allay the irritation of wounded feelings, and to promote peace among all the parties concerned, for the best interests of the School.

Dr. Vaughan, in his published letter, in reply to Lord Palmerston, at the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first pages of that able defence of the monitorial system of Harrow School, says :—

“ But, on the other hand, it is no less necessary, for the sake alike of the monitors and of the school, that such *checks* shall be imposed upon the exercise of this power as shall make its abuse either absolutely impossible, or, at least, a very rare exception.

“ With this view, it is one rule of the system, that any boy has a right of appeal from the individual monitor (however high his station), to the assembled body, who are bound to enter into the merits of the case, and come to a formal decision upon it. My experience thus far has led me to believe that ten young men, acting under such responsibilities, are not likely either to come to an unjust decision, or to execute their sentence with undue severity.

“ But if, after all, this hope is in any case disappointed ; if (which in such an event is the most probable supposition) an individual monitor has outrun his powers, by not allowing this appeal to the collective body, or by not waiting for its result, or by executing punishment himself in undue excitement

or passion, then the duty is cast upon me of interposing my authority to redress the injustice, by the degradation of the offending monitor, or by a measure of punishment yet more severe.

“This, happily, is a case of rare, most rare, occurrence. The general testimony, alike of boys and of their parents, will rather be this: that, while the School has enjoyed, on the whole, under the monitorial system, a very real exemption from the miseries of that tyranny of brute force which it is designed more especially to preclude, it is perfectly easy, on the other hand, for a boy to pass through his Harrow life without once incurring the risk of monitorial punishment, while the salutary dread of it has done much to keep him orderly and tractable, and to save him, in no slight degree, from the sight and hearing of evil.”

When Lord Galloway addressed Dr. Vaughan on the 1st of December, on the ill-treatment which his son had experienced, he did so under the impression that, however defensible, the system, as existing at Harrow, needed reform. It is presumed that the generality of the readers of these pages will think so too, and that Dr. Vaughan was mistaken as to the actual working of his own system, if not blind to its defects, when writing to Lord Palmerston, “that it is perfectly easy for any boy to pass through his Harrow life without once incurring the *risk* of monitorial punishment,” and when resting the security of the boys against monitorial tyranny on the “right of appeal.”

But, in deference to public opinion, Dr. Vaughan has since instituted a more rigid inquiry into the details of the system, the principle of which he has so forcibly defended, and he has re-modelled it in a way which, it is trusted, will obviate the evils complained of, restore the confidence of parents, and be greatly conducive to the welfare of the School. It will be some consolation to Lord Galloway, that such good should result from the cruelty perpetrated on his son, and he sincerely hopes that, by the fostering care of so gifted a master and so excellent a man as Dr. Vaughan, whose character and admirable qualifications have raised Harrow so high in general estimation, that valuable establishment will derive fresh vigour from recent ameliorations, the good effects of which are already perceptible, and, with the increasing confidence of the community, continue, as a Public School, to confer increasing benefits on the country.









UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



**A** 000 103 820 7

