

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
Brighton, Massachusetts 02135

REPORT OF INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION

Yurko, Salvesen & Remz, P.C.
One Washington Mall
Boston, Massachusetts 02108
November 20, 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	1
A. Nature and Scope of Investigation	6
B. Sexual Misconduct.....	11
C. 2015 Sexting Incident	19
D. 2015 Bachelor Party.....	22
E. Prevalence of Alcohol.....	29
F. Background of the Formation Process	34
G. Faculty Matters	
Msgr. James Moroney, Rector	43
Fr. Christopher O’Connor, Vice Rector.....	50
Faculty Member 1	54
Faculty Member 2.....	62
H. Cardinal Sean O’Malley	67
I. Board of Trustees	69
J. Recommendations.....	72

Executive Summary

Social media postings¹ in August 2018 from two former seminarians of St. John's Seminary in Brighton alleged that the Seminary tolerated a culture of heavy drinking and illicit sexual behavior among seminarians. Given the importance to the Church and its members of ensuring the proper education and preparation of men to serve as priests, as well as the current challenges of confidence in Church leadership and institutions, the Archdiocese retained us to conduct an independent investigation of the matters raised by the social media postings. The Archdiocese requested that we conduct a broad review not only of the matters discussed in the postings but also of any instances¹ of sexual harassment, intimidation, discrimination, excessive consumption of alcohol, or other activities brought to our attention that would interfere with the proper formation for priesthood.²

Our review was necessarily wide-ranging. We interviewed approximately 80 individuals, including current and former seminarians, current and former faculty members, current and former staff, priests in the Boston diocese as well as a number in other dioceses, Msgr. James Moroney, Cardinal Sean O'Malley, and many others who reached out to us. We were provided unrestricted access to the records maintained by the Seminary. We received the complete cooperation from both the Seminary and the Archdiocese.

Contrary to some of the reporting surrounding the 2018 social media postings, the Seminary is not a den of sexual misconduct fueled by excessive drinking. Instead, our

¹ The social media postings by Mr. John Monaco and the statements issued by Cardinal Sean O'Malley are set out in the Appendix.

² As suggested above, we conducted our review with the standards established for the Seminary and seminarians in mind. This meant that behavior that might be acceptable in other educational settings, such as consensual sexual behavior or occasional excessive drinking, was the subject of our investigation.

investigation disclosed only isolated incidents of sexual conduct and alcohol use that are inappropriate in a seminary setting. However, most of the factual assertions in the social media postings were largely confirmed, including those regarding the expulsion of two seminarians for sexual misconduct in 2014, the receipt by a number of seminarians of lewd and anonymous texts in 2015, a “bachelor party” for one of the staff members, and the Seminary’s acceptance (and frequent encouragement) of social drinking. We also concluded that the Seminary had inadequate (and sometimes absent) leadership and oversight. This contributed to a lack of robust financial controls, a low tolerance for dissenting views, and insufficient attention paid to the seminarians’ “human formation.” Specifically, we have made the following findings and conclusions:

- Sexual Misconduct. Our investigation uncovered no evidence of any sexual activity or any sexual behavior between seminarians and faculty members. There have been some isolated instances of consensual sexual activity between seminarians and occasions when seminarians violated the Seminary’s social media policies. In all of those instances, the Seminary’s administrators addressed the conduct quickly and appropriately.
- 2015 Sexting Incident. The administration of the Seminary could not determine who sent a series of anonymous sexual texts to approximately six seminarians in February 2015. A meeting with all seminarians to address the matter was handled clumsily by the Rector and Vice Rector. Most importantly, whether or not the seminarians’ distress resulting from these texts was appropriate, the Rector and the Vice Rector failed to recognize their impact on the seminarians. The Rector’s absence from much of the life of the Seminary was possibly a contributing factor to his misperception. The Vice Rector’s angry reaction to requests that additional steps be taken to respond to the texts was inappropriate.
- 2015 Bachelor Party. There is a general consensus that while the 2015 “bachelor party” for one of the Seminary’s staff members was not the bacchanalian affair sometimes associated with such events, there was undoubtedly a better way for the seminarians to show their appreciation for the staff member. Our investigation concluded that the party was ill-advised. Furthermore, a number of seminarians had too much to drink and a faculty member, Fr. Chris O’Connor, fell or stumbled from a bar stool. While faculty members are not required to be teetotalers, they are expected to model priestly virtues to the seminarians. On this occasion, Fr. O’Connor did not meet this standard.

- Prevalence of Alcohol. Like many other seminaries across the country, St. John's Seminary is not a "dry house." Presently, it prohibits the use of hard alcohol but allows seminarians to have beer and wine in the Seminary's Common Room. The Seminary also subsidizes the seminarians' beer purchases. While most seminarians drink responsibly, there have been and are seminarians who have an unhealthy relationship with alcohol. Given that the use of alcohol is connected directly or indirectly to most misconduct that takes place at the Seminary, additional steps can and should be taken as part of the seminarians' "human formation" to reduce or eliminate the culture of drinking that does exist so that the seminarians can meet the standards of exemplary conduct expected at the Seminary.
- Faculty Matters. The Seminary's faculty members have an enormous responsibility. They are responsible not only for teaching all of the Catholic faith to the seminarians, but they also assist the seminarians in their formidable task of becoming men of integrity, authentic representatives of Christ, with the personalities necessary for priestly ministry in the Church. As the faculty members are the most immediate source of identification with the priesthood for the seminarians, they should be exemplary priests. Their conduct serves as powerful unspoken sermons to the seminarians on the habits of theological reflection and disciplined thinking that define the priestly office.

Msgr. James Moroney, Rector. Since the Rector of a seminary is the leader of its internal life, as both pastor and priestly model, he must be present and attendant. Msgr. Moroney was pulled away from the Seminary, both by his outside obligations and by his efforts to increase the Seminary's enrollment and its financial standing. Our investigation disclosed that Msgr. Moroney's absences from seminary life had a deleterious effect on the seminarians and faculty. He was also perceived by the seminarians, the faculty, the staff and the Board of Trustees as not sufficiently careful with the Seminary's resources. Because of his overly generous nature, the seminarians bestowed on Msgr. Moroney the nickname of "Diamond Jim."

Fr. Christopher O'Connor, Vice Rector. As the Seminary's Vice Rector, Fr. Christopher O'Connor considers himself to be the Seminary's disciplinarian tasked with ensuring that seminarians adhere to the Seminary's regimented life and that they embrace the ascetic habits of a priestly life. This obligation sometimes places him in conflict with seminarians. A number of persons we interviewed reported that, in his role as Vice Rector, Fr. O'Connor has on occasion come across as bullying or intimidating seminarians and staff. At times, he has trouble controlling his emotions and over-reacts to small matters.

Faculty Member 1. Faculty Member 1 is a world-class theologian and a highly-respected scholar. However, he is unquestionably a "divisive" and a "toxic" presence in the Seminary. His classes on moral theology overwhelmingly focus on sexual morality and include references that some describe as direct and

forthright and others describe as gratuitous and offensive. A number of Hispanic seminarians report that Faculty Member 1 is biased against them and disparages them. Notwithstanding his undeniable academic credentials and his spiritual devotion, most individuals interviewed told us that Faculty Member 1 is not the ideal model for a diocesan priest.

Faculty Member 2. Faculty Member 2 shares a number of interests (physical athletic activities such as hiking or swimming, Premier League soccer matches, cribbage) with a group of seminarians with whom he has uncommonly close relationships. These seminarians, who are referred to by other seminarians as the “Pretty Committee,” all see in Faculty Member 2 a positive model of priestly virtues and their interactions with him are positive for their formation. Fraternalization between Faculty Member 2 and this group of seminarians is not contrary to any of the Seminary’s policies. Nor could we find a basis for finding that Faculty Member 2’s relationships with seminarians was in any way sexual. However, any real or perceived favoritism between a Formation Advisor, like Faculty Member 2, and a select group of seminarians is unhealthy for the Seminary and to be avoided.

- Cardinal Sean O’Malley. Our investigation disclosed that Cardinal O’Malley knew of a number of the matters discussed in this Report, namely Msgr. Moroney’s lack of presence at the Seminary, Msgr. Moroney’s lack of appropriate controls over the Seminary’s financial matters, Fr. O’Connor’s conduct with respect to the 2015 bachelor party, and the culture of drinking at the Seminary. With respect to these matters, Cardinal O’Malley received commitments from Msgr. Moroney to address them. However, Cardinal O’Malley relied too heavily on those assurances from Msgr. Moroney. As a result, there was insufficient follow-up to determine if these commitments were kept.
- Board of Trustees. Although the individuals on the Seminary’s Board of Trustees have impressive and meaningful experience that can benefit the Seminary, they are underutilized. Rather than being an engaged oversight body, the Board was not privy to the on-going problems at the Seminary and, therefore, did not play any real oversight role. This was a missed opportunity.

Based on our findings, our recommendations, which are described more fully at the conclusion of our Report, include the following:

- Establishment of a confidential reporting mechanism, such as a telephone “hotline,” for suspected misconduct, improprieties, or policy violations.
- Training for seminarians and faculty members regarding the indications and the dangers of grooming.

- Promulgation of a detailed written policy articulating the appropriate boundaries that should be maintained between faculty members and seminarians.
- Review of policies concerning the use of alcohol at the Seminary by both seminarians and faculty members.
- Expansion of the Human Formation program or other training at the Seminary to include greater lay involvement.
- Establishment of clear and detailed objectives for the Rector and each faculty member with periodic and meaningful reviews.
- Maintain and enforce the financial controls on Seminary expenditures.
- Improve record-keeping and record retention with respect to seminarians and faculty members.
- Significantly enhance the role of the Board of Trustees in the oversight and governance of the Seminary.

A. Nature and Scope of Investigation

Social Media Postings and Response

In August 2018, the Archdiocese of Boston became aware of social media postings by Mr. John Monaco and Mr. Andrew Solkshinitz, two former seminarians of St. John's Seminary ("Seminary") in Brighton. The postings described activities incompatible with the proper formation of men for the Catholic priesthood.

On August 10, 2018, Cardinal O'Malley requested that Msgr. James Moroney, the Rector of the Seminary, go on a sabbatical leave and appointed Fr. Stephen Salocks as Interim Rector. Cardinal O'Malley also appointed a committee made up of individuals with familiarity with the Seminary to oversee an inquiry into the assertions in the social medial postings, the culture of the Seminary regarding the personal standards expected and required of candidates for the priesthood, and any issues of sexual harassment or other forms of intimidation or discrimination.

The following week, Mr. Monaco posted an open letter to Cardinal O'Malley on a religious blog. In the letter, Mr. Monaco clarified that his "complaints regarding Saint John's Seminary were not specifically about sexual abuse; they were about general misconduct, scandalous behavior by faculty and students, and an overall unhealthy seminary culture." He was also concerned that his previous attempts to report these issues to the Seminary's administration had gone unheard. Mr. Monaco requested that the investigation focus on three major areas: (a) any immoral and unprofessional misconduct by faculty and students; (b) the culture at the Seminary and whether it is unhealthy or "toxic"; and (c) whether the Seminary's administration or others properly address allegations of misconduct or complaints when they arise.

On October 10, 2018, Cardinal O'Malley announced that the review would expand to include Pope St. John XXIII National Seminary in Weston and Redemptoris Mater Seminary in

Chestnut Hill. Additionally, the review of all three seminaries would be undertaken by the Boston law firm of Yurko, Salvesen & Remz, P.C. under the direction of former U.S. Attorney Donald K. Stern. Cardinal O'Malley encouraged individuals who have information relevant to the review to contact Yurko, Salvesen & Remz ("YSR"). Cardinal O'Malley again stated that once the review work is completed, an independent report of the findings would be released addressing any issues arising from the review and identifying steps needed to remediate any identified problems.

Retention by Archdiocese

Following interviews with Cardinal O'Malley and other individuals at the Archdiocese, YSR was formally retained on October 26, 2018. Assisting Mr. Stern were Douglas W. Salvesen and Anthony B. Fioravanti. The Archdiocese requested that we review the specific assertions made in the postings and, in general, the activities at the Seminary over the last six years to bring to light any instances of sexual harassment, intimidation, discrimination, excessive consumption of alcohol, or other activities that would interfere with the proper formation for priesthood. Of course, if any specific incidents of sexual abuse occurred more than six years ago, we were encouraged to investigate these as well.³ The Archdiocese also asked us to identify any policies and protocols currently in place at the Seminary for reporting and responding to inappropriate behavior of any type among seminarians, faculty, and/or administration. Finally, we were asked to offer recommendations to address any issues that we discovered.

³ As a practical matter, the six-year time frame was designed to focus on the more recent culture and problems at the Seminary that were the focus of the reports in August 2018. However, any allegation of sexual abuse at the Seminary, whenever it occurred, would still be investigated and, if necessary, reported.

As part of our review, we toured the Seminary and met with the Interim Rector, Fr. Salocks, the Vice Rector, Fr. Christopher O'Connor, and other staff. In the weeks and months thereafter, we obtained and reviewed thousands of pages of records provided by the Seminary, including (a) the Seminary's paper files maintained on all current and former seminarians going back to 2012 (we did not review, and we did not ask to review, the applications for admission submitted by the seminarians); (b) course evaluation forms completed by seminarians for courses taught by Faculty Member 1 going back to 2012; (c) copies of the monthly statements for the Rector's discretionary checking account and the Seminary's credit card statements going back to 2012, (d) the current handbook provided to seminarians, the *Seminary Way of Life*, and the faculty handbook, which detail applicable policies; (e) the minutes of the Seminary's Board of Trustees since 2015, and (f) the Seminary's files concerning its current faculty members. In December, we requested and were provided access to the e-mail accounts maintained by seven faculty members and four seminarians. We also met with attorneys at Sloane & Walsh, LLP, who had been assisting the commission appointed by Cardinal O'Malley in August 2018 and were provided with documents and emails that the firm had collected.

We interviewed approximately 80 individuals, including Cardinal O'Malley, 35 current or former seminarians (some of whom are now ordained), 14 current or former faculty members, 11 current or former staff members, and a number of priests, bishops, current and former trustees, and many others. We interviewed individuals who had attended the Seminary in the 1970's⁴ and newly admitted seminarians. We spoke with every individual who indicated a desire

⁴ Several individuals we interviewed related various incidents of heterosexual and homosexual activity at the Seminary prior to 2012 that were reported to us as consensual. Two persons told us that there were seminarians who attended the Seminary with them in the 1990's who were active homosexuals and that this created an often turbulent and negative atmosphere. These former seminarians said that they are embittered and discouraged by their experience. We have no

to be interviewed. With the exception of some seminarians from the Worcester diocese, every person we asked to speak with readily agreed to be interviewed.

Interviews were conducted in our Boston offices, at the Seminary, at many rectories at parishes throughout New England, and other locations that were convenient for the individuals being interviewed. In addition, we conducted some interviews by telephone, generally where the individuals were out of the country or out of state. Interviews typically lasted between 1-3 hours. One faculty member, Faculty Member 1, was accompanied by his personal counsel. One former faculty member was accompanied by a canon lawyer. One former seminarian was interviewed in the presence of his uncle, who also happens to be an attorney.

To encourage current seminarians to come forward and to reduce the risk of retaliation against those who did, their interviews were conducted outside of the Seminary. For the same reasons, we decided not to identify in the Report or otherwise any seminarians who spoke with us. For the most part, we also chose to maintain the anonymity of the other non-faculty members we interviewed.

In the Report, there is a discussion concerning two faculty members who are identified as “Faculty Member 1” and “Faculty Member 2.” Although these faculty members were not referenced in any way in the 2018 social media postings, and neither appears to have violated any existing Seminary policy, their interactions with seminarians and others merit further consideration by the Board of Trustees. Although their identities will certainly be known to individuals who are familiar with the Seminary, we decided not to disclose the name of either.

reason to dispute these accounts which were detailed and credible. These individuals faulted the Rector and the faculty for failing to address this misconduct. We did not seek to verify or discredit any of these incidents since we consider them well outside our review and sufficiently divorced from the present-day Seminary. Further, it is our understanding that none of these matters involve individuals who are currently priests.

To associate these two faculty members with some of the initial and sometimes sensationalized media reports⁵ would be unfair. Following the Board’s further consideration of the matters concerning these faculty members, any issues that remain will be more appropriately addressed by the existing procedures in the Seminary’s Faculty Handbook.

With few exceptions, the individuals we interviewed were forthcoming and helpful. Many recounted incidents or information that they had obtained second or third-hand, which was often helpful to our work. However, we did not include in our report rumors, hearsay, incidents that we could not substantiate, or matters that were not within the scope of our review.

⁵ For instance, some media articles stated, inaccurately, that the postings alleged incidents of “sexual deviancy” at the Seminary and also conflated the matters raised in the postings with the clergy sexual abuse scandal.

B. Sexual Misconduct

Consensual sexual activity between adults ordinarily is a matter of privacy and unobjectionable. However, because seminarians are required to live chaste lives and to acquire the habits needed to maintain their chastity, any sexual activity, even consensual sexual activity, by a seminarian is grounds for dismissal from the Seminary.

We did not learn of any sexual conduct between Seminary faculty and seminarians. Although there were isolated incidents of sexual conduct at the Seminary among or by seminarians, our review did not disclose any incidents of sexual activity or conduct that had not been promptly and appropriately addressed by the Rector. To the contrary, it appears that the Seminary is very sensitive to any indications of sexual activity or misconduct and takes prompt steps to address it.

- *2014 Incident of Two Seminarians engaged in Sexual Activity.*

On February 17, 2014, late at night, faculty members discovered two seminarians in various states of undress, and inebriated, in the room of one of the seminarians. It was clear to the faculty members, and acknowledged by the seminarians, that the seminarians had acted inappropriately. Following a meeting with the Rector, both seminarians were promptly removed from formation.

- *2014 Allegation of Sexual Grooming by Faculty Member.*

On March 11, 2014, a seminarian accompanied by his formation advisor, Fr. Salocks, met with Msgr. Moroney. The seminarian told Msgr. Moroney that a series of incidents over the last several months had eventually led him to conclude that he was being groomed and sexually harassed by a member of the faculty. While none of the incidents described by the seminarian were overtly sexual or offensive, they had made the seminarian uncomfortable and question the faculty member's intent.

The same day that the seminarian shared this information with Msgr. Moroney, Msgr. Moroney cleared his schedule and met with the seminarian's formation advisor, Fr. Salocks, the Vice Rector, Fr. O'Connor, and the relevant faculty member. Msgr. Moroney concluded that the

faculty member's actions were not instances of grooming but had been misunderstood by the seminarian. Msgr. Moroney met again with the seminarian and suggested a meeting which would include the Rector, the Vice Rector, the seminarian, and the faculty member, to the seminarian could hear the faculty member's explanations for his actions. The seminarian agreed and asked that Fr. Salocks also be present.

At the meeting two days later, the seminarian was not satisfied with the explanations that the faculty member offered of his actions. Msgr. Moroney then decided to submit the entire matter to Cardinal O'Malley. He asked the seminarian, Fr. O'Connor, and the faculty member to each prepare written statements regarding the events. Msgr. Moroney submitted those along with his own summary to Cardinal O'Malley on March 14, 2014.

In the following days, a further investigation was undertaken by Mr. Mark Dunderdale, the Director of the Archdiocesan Office of Professional Standards and Oversight, and Bishop Mark O'Connell. Following interviews of the seminarian, the faculty member, Msgr. Moroney, Fr. O'Connor, and Fr. Salocks, they prepared a five-page memorandum to Cardinal O'Malley in which they outlined their findings.

The investigation concluded that the faculty member had not sexually harassed the seminarian or engaged in sexually inappropriate behavior and that the faculty member's motivations had been misunderstood and/or misinterpreted. It further concluded that while the faculty member's motives were not predatory, he failed to properly appreciate how they could be perceived. The report stated that the faculty member "must learn appropriate strict boundaries for Seminary faculty."

We interviewed both Bishop O'Connell and Mr. Dunderdale regarding their inquiry into the seminarian's contentions. Their investigation seemed thorough and professional. We have no

reason to doubt their conclusions. We understand from Mr. Monaco and others that the seminarian, who withdrew from the Seminary since these events took place, did not want to participate in our review. Neither did we seek to interview the faculty member. It is significant that when the seminarian made these allegations, the Seminary responded quickly and appropriately within a short period of time.

- *2015 Incidents of Improper Sexual Relations Between Professor of Theological Institute and Student.*

In our review, we were made aware that a professor of the Seminary's Theological Institute for the New Evangelization engaged in inappropriate conduct with an adult female student in 2011 and 2012. The Theological Institute prepares laity, deacons and members of religious orders for ministry and service to the various dioceses in New England. Upon learning of the professor's conduct in 2015, the Seminary severed the relationship between the professor and the Theological Institute. Because this incident did not involve either the Seminary or any seminarians, we considered it to be outside the scope of our review. Nevertheless, it appears that once it learned of the behavior, the Seminary acted appropriately.

- *2018 Dismissal of Adjunct Faculty Member for Failure to Report MCAD Complaint.*

On October 18, 2018, Mr. Mark Dunderdale, the Director of the Archdiocese's Office of Professional Standards and Oversight, received a call regarding an adjunct member of the faculty who was also a priest in a parish outside of the Archdiocese of Boston. The caller was a graduate of a college outside of the Boston area. This individual told Mr. Dunderdale that in 2013 his college roommate had filed a claim of sexual harassment against this priest with the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination ("MCAD"). At the time of the alleged incident, the priest was not a member of the Seminary faculty.

In the summer of 2012, the roommate had a college internship at the priest's parish. The internship required the roommate to shadow the priest and assist him in everyday tasks at the parish. When school resumed that fall, the roommate disclosed that over the course of the summer, the priest had made sexual advances toward him, telling the roommate that he wanted to be close to him, rubbing the inside of his leg, kissing his cheek and touching him in a sexual manner. Later that year, the roommate also said that during the summer the priest had asked him to retrieve his iPad and when the priest had opened it the iPad had a tab open to gay pornography. The priest claimed that an unknown third person must have been using the iPad.

In the spring of 2013, the roommate retained an attorney and filed a complaint with the MCAD against the priest, the college, and perhaps others. Although we do not have a copy of the complaint, the caller did provide Mr. Dunderdale with a copy of an affidavit that the caller provided to his roommate's attorney. The caller understood that the attorneys for the Respondents took the position that if there was any sexual contact between the roommate and the priest it was consensual and not unwelcome.

In the ensuing months, the roommate stopped talking about his summer internship and the MCAD claim. More recently, the roommate had come out as gay. The caller believes that the claim was dropped or settled, in part, because it revealed more about the roommate's sexual orientation than he was comfortable disclosing at the time. The caller told Mr. Dunderdale that the priest should be investigated and removed from his positions at his parish and the Seminary.

After Mr. Dunderdale learned of these events, Auxiliary Bishop Peter Uglietto contacted the priest's diocese and confirmed that a MCAD complaint had been filed against the priest by a former college student. Though the salient events had occurred before the priest was hired to teach a course at the Seminary, neither he nor any officials in his local diocese had alerted the

Seminary or Cardinal O'Malley of the claims in the MCAD complaint. On Friday, October 26, 2018, Auxiliary Bishop Uglietto and Fr. Salocks decided that the priest should not continue teaching at the Seminary as an adjunct faculty member and he was dismissed.

- *Two Incidents of Seminarians Using A Dating App.*

On two occasions, the Seminary administration became aware that a seminarian was using a dating app. The first incident occurred in 2016 when the Msgr. Moroney received a letter from someone claiming to be a graduate student at Boston College. The BC student claimed to recognize one of the seminarians from the seminarian's dating profile on the app. The seminarian was confronted with this information and agreed to withdraw from formation.

The second incident occurred in December 2018. Fr. Salocks received a telephone message from Fr. Paul Tomasso, the Vicar General and Diocesan Director of Seminarians for the Diocese of Rochester. Fr. Salocks returned the call. Fr. Tomasso told him that an anonymous letter had been sent to Bishop Matano about one of the seminarians from Rochester. The letter was allegedly written by a Boston College employee whose office was at 129 Lake Street, adjacent to the Seminary. While using a dating app, the BC employee claimed to have received a message and a photograph from someone located within 200 feet of the employee's office. In the following week, the BC employee claimed to recognize the individual as a seminarian. Instead of contacting the Rector or anyone at the Seminary, the BC employee claimed to have found a pictorial directory of seminarians from Rochester, identified the seminarian, and wrote to the Bishop. Fr. Tomasso e-mailed a copy of the letter to Fr. Salocks.

Later that afternoon, Fr. Salocks and the Vice Rector, Fr. O'Connor, and the Dean of Students, Fr. Ed Riley, met with the seminarian. Fr. Salocks told the seminarian that there was evidence that he had used a dating app, which is not permitted. The seminarian admitted to using

the app on three occasions. Following the meeting, Fr. Salocks decided that the seminarian should be dismissed from the Seminary and the seminarian was informed of that decision by the end of the day.

- *Inappropriate Relation/Texting with Female High School Student.*

In 2013, as part of their pastoral assignments, some seminarians were assigned to St. Mary's High School in Lynn where they taught religious education classes. One of the students, a 15-year old girl, became friendly with two of the seminarians. Her mother came to learn that her daughter was exchanging e-mails and texts with the seminarians. While the communications were friendly, the student's mother explained to her daughter, and to the seminarians, that it was not appropriate for them to be communicating in this manner. Subsequently, the student's mother discovered another e-mail. She spoke to the principal of St. Mary's and was told that it was against school policy for seminarians to be texting and e-mailing students. The principal said he would speak with the seminarians.

In the fall of 2014, the student's mother found other texts between one of the seminarians and her daughter that indicated they planned on meeting for lunch. Prior to the lunch, she spoke to the seminarian and reminded him that it was against policy for him to meet privately with female high school students. He agreed and said that he would tell her daughter that he had made a mistake.

At this point, the student's father spoke with Fr. Van De Moortell, a faculty member at the Seminary whom the family knew, about the seminarian's continuing contact with his daughter. Fr. Van De Moortell spoke to the seminarian and the texting and e-mails stopped for a time. Shortly thereafter, the student's mother found additional texts. In these texts, the seminarian encouraged the teenager to discuss her problems with him and was generally

supportive of her. However, those texts occasionally included exchanges of remarks such as “love you,” “I miss you” and the seminarian referred to the student as “sweetie.” While the texts were not prurient, they were inappropriate.

The student’s mother again spoke with Fr. Van De Moortell and told him of the remarks. Fr. Van De Moortell reported the incident fully to both Fr. Riley and to Msgr. Moroney. In response, the seminarian telephoned the student’s mother to assure her that the texts, which he had repeatedly been requested to stop, were harmless. He said that he intended the comments that he “loved” her daughter to be akin to the way that Jesus “loved” mankind. After this telephone call, it appears that the seminarian stopped texting the student.

In our interview of the seminarian, who is now ordained, he reiterated that his intentions were to be helpful and supportive of the teenager. Nevertheless, he agreed that it was misguided to engage the teenager in this manner, particularly after her mother had requested that he not.

- *2018 Incident of Seminarian Sending Inappropriate Texts.*

On September 2, 2018, Fr. Salocks received an e-mail from a woman regarding an unnamed seminarian. In the e-mail, the woman stated that the seminarian had sent her inappropriate text messages that she wanted to discuss with Fr. Salocks. In his September 4 response, Fr. Salocks requested additional information including whether the messages were recent and whether the seminarian was from Boston or another diocese. On September 8, the woman provided the requested information and included some screen shots of the messages. The messages included a request that the woman send the seminarian pictures of herself, a statement that he had been drinking, and that he was “done with seminary.”

Fr. Salocks arranged a meeting at the Seminary on September 16, 2018 with the woman and a second person she brought for support, Fr. O’Connor, and the seminarian’s Vocation

Director. At the meeting, the woman provided additional information regarding her relationship to the seminarian, additional contact between the two, and what she would like to see as a result.

Following the meeting, the seminarian's Vocation Director discussed the matter with his sending bishop, who decided that the seminarian would remain at the Seminary. It was also determined that the seminarian needed to get clarity on his vocation, including embracing his chastity and celibacy, and to address communicating appropriately with women. After a meeting with the seminarian to discuss the text messages and the steps needed for his continued formation, the seminarian decided to leave the Seminary in October.

- *Cuddling Seminarians.*

In his social medial postings, Mr. Monaco stated that on occasion he had observed two seminarians "cuddling" in the Seminary's Common Room. He stated that the seminarians were in positions that he described as not being overtly sexual, but would give people pause, for instance, one seminarian's head resting on another's chest. As far as we could determine, Mr. Monaco is the only person to observe this type of activity. A number of other seminarians and former seminarians who said that they were regularly in the Common Room (even those who had negative things to say about the Seminary) told us that they did not see anything like what Mr. Monaco described.

C. 2015 Sexting Incident

Both Msgr. Moroney and Fr. O'Connor failed to appreciate the impact that the lewd texts had on some of the seminarians who received them. Their conflicting responses to the incident were also distressing to the seminarians and demonstrated an absence of guidance. While reporting the incident to the police may not have resolved it, that step would have demonstrated to the seminarians that their concerns were taken seriously.

The Lewd Texts

Beginning in February 2015, at least six seminarians each received separate anonymous texts from a person claiming to be a woman who had attended college with the seminarian. Initially, the texts were innocuous, asking if the seminarian missed college life and how he was adapting to the Seminary. The texts became more personal and sexual in nature, such as asking about the seminarian's masturbatory practices. The individual sending the lewd texts had knowledge of the seminarians' schedules and did not send texts when they were in class or chapel. This led the seminarians who received the texts to assume that the person sending them was another seminarian or a member of the faculty or staff.

One of the seminarians who had been receiving sexual texts brought them to the attention of Fr. O'Connor. The seminarian had done some research on his own and told Fr. O'Connor that the telephone number associated with the texts was fake and not traceable. Fr. O'Connor found the texts "gross" but did not believe that they were criminal in nature. Nevertheless, he thought that it would be appropriate to contact the Archdiocese to get its guidance. Fr. O'Connor raised the text messages with Msgr. Moroney, who perceived the texts to be an internal matter, not something that required the involvement of the Archdiocese.

After learning that several additional seminarians were receiving lewd texts, Fr. O'Connor went back to Msgr. Moroney and informed him that the problem was more

widespread. Toward the end of March 2015, a house meeting of seminarians was scheduled to address the texting incidents. All seminarians were required to attend.

The House Meeting

By all accounts, the meeting did not go well. Msgr. Moroney and Fr. O'Connor did not present a unified message. Fr. O'Connor demanded that the individual responsible for sending the texts identify himself and immediately withdraw from the Seminary. On the other hand, Msgr. Moroney called on the individual to identify himself privately to the Rector so that appropriate counseling could be provided. Neither Msgr. Moroney nor Fr. O'Connor seemed to have any strategy to address the texts other than encouraging the individual who sent the texts to identify himself.

The seminarians who had received the lewd anonymous texts were frustrated. Neither Msgr. Moroney nor Fr. O'Connor seemed to appreciate the effect that the texts had on the seminarians who received them. While the texts did not necessarily threaten the seminarians with a physical assault, they were a form of predatory behavior. Because the individual knew the seminarians (and were likely living and praying with them) but was anonymous, the texts destroyed any sense of security for the seminarians in the Seminary and interfered with their formation. These seminarians sought a more serious response from Fr. O'Connor and Msgr. Moroney than was provided.

For their part, both Fr. O'Connor and Msgr. Moroney were also frustrated but believed that there was nothing more that they could do. At the house meeting, one of the seminarians confronted Fr. O'Connor and asked what else was going to be done to find the individual responsible for sending the lewd texts. Fr. O'Connor blew up and responded in a loud and angry voice that he would be happy to take the seminarian down to the Brighton police station, if that

was what the seminarian wanted. The seminarian did not perceive this as a genuine invitation and instead perceived it as an attempt to intimidate him into remaining quiet.

In fact, it is not clear if there was anything that either Msgr. Moroney or Fr. O'Connor could have done to identify the individual who sent the lewd texts. The individual was never identified, and no texts were sent after the house meeting. It is clear, however, that Msgr. Moroney, Fr. O'Connor, and other faculty members and vocation directors did not fully appreciate the impact the texts had on the seminarians who received them. For instance, in a social media posting in August 2018, Mr. Andrew Solkshinitz, a former seminarian, stated:

At the end of my first year in seminary I began to receive creepy texts from a strange number, looking to hookup with me. Found out it was a fellow seminarian. When I brought it forward this was the response: "Its not like he sent you pictures of his penis, don't overexaggerate and act like a victim"-vocations director. The response from the vice rector was just as surprising. (He wanted me thrown out for questioning him openly) I never trusted the church again and it put me in a 4 year long state of serious depression. One that I'm finally beginning to get over.

Another faculty member told one seminarian who had received lewd texts that it should not "ruin your Holy Week." A few faculty members and some seminarians believed that seminarians should have the maturity and resilience to deal with issues like receiving an anonymous sexual text. In our view, the failure by the Seminary to take additional steps and to appreciate the emotional impact on seminarians contributed to a cynical attitude shared by a number of seminarians that problems should not be raised and that those who do raise issues will not be treated seriously. It also suggested to some seminarians that involving law enforcement in Seminary matters is to be avoided.

D. 2015 Bachelor Party

Although the faculty member, Fr. Christopher O'Connor, denies that he was "drunk" at Mr. Armand DiLando's bachelor party, he acknowledges that he was sitting on a bar stool in the Common Room, that he pushed back from the bar, lost his balance, and fell to the floor. He also acknowledged that after having the three to four gin martinis that evening he would not have driven a car and that the drinks likely contributed to him losing his balance.

The Student Common Room

The party Mr. Monaco described in his social media postings took place in the Seminary's Student Common Room, a large room located in the Seminary's basement level. The Common Room is used for informal gatherings. It contains a bar, refrigerator, tables, chairs, couches, a pool table, and large screen television. Seminarians can purchase bottled or canned beer at the subsidized price of one or two dollars. The Common Room is intended to provide the seminarians with a comfortable space of their own where they can relax, have a beer, mingle, and watch television. During the academic year, there is a "social" held in the Common Room on most Thursday evenings, which is sometimes referred to as "community night." Seminarians are encouraged, but not required, to attend. While faculty generally do not spend time in the Common Room, faculty are invited to the Thursday night gatherings. However, few faculty members regularly attend.

Each year, two seminarians are designated as Common Room Managers and are responsible for maintaining and stocking the Common Room and for sending a seminary-wide e-mail promoting each weekly social. Toward the end of the 2015 academic year, one of the Common Room Managers announced that the April 30, 2015 social would be a party to celebrate the upcoming September wedding of Mr. Armand DiLando, a staff member of the Seminary.

The Party

Mr. Armand DiLando is the Seminary's Assistant Director of Finance and Operations, and close friends with Fr. Chris O'Connor. They first met years ago when Fr. O'Connor was assigned to St. Mary's in Chelmsford where Mr. DiLando and his first wife (who passed away in 2010) were parishioners. When Fr. O'Connor left St. Mary's, he and Mr. DiLando stayed in touch. In 2013, after his employer was acquired by another company, Mr. DiLando told Fr. O'Connor of his desire to work for his church in some capacity. Fr. O'Connor introduced Mr. DiLando to Msgr. Moroney, and he was hired as Assistant Director in 2013.

The seminarians' celebration of Mr. DiLando's wedding has been described in the social media postings and by the participants as a "bachelor party." The description of this gathering as a bachelor party is somewhat misleading. It was much closer to the usual weekly social than an alcohol-fueled night of debauchery – though there was more alcohol present than usual. Perhaps as many as half of all seminarians stopped by the Common Room at some point that evening to congratulate and to toast Mr. DiLando, who was seated at the bar on a stool near Fr. O'Connor for most of the night.

A handful of faculty members stopped by briefly to congratulate Mr. DiLando. Fr. O'Connor, who was a close friend of Mr. DiLando's, was present for the entirety of the party. Msgr. Moroney recalled arriving at the party at its beginning, perhaps around 7:00 p.m., and leaving 30-45 minutes later. During this time, Msgr. Moroney had one drink, a scotch on the rocks. Msgr. Moroney believes that he saw Fr. O'Connor have two martinis during this time. When Msgr. Moroney left the party, he did not believe that Fr. O'Connor was intoxicated.

Fr. Joseph Scorzello was in the Common Room from approximately 9:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m., long enough to drink his orange soda. Fr. Scorzello recalled that there were between 20 to

25 people in the Common Room when he left. According to some seminarians, Fr. Scorzello urged Fr. O'Connor to leave as well. Fr. Scorzello did not recall doing so but did not deny it. Fr. Scorzello said that he may have made the suggestion, as he had on other occasions, but it was not because Fr. O'Connor was inebriated. Rather, more likely, it was because it was getting late and everyone had classes the next day. In fact, Fr. Scorzello did not think that Fr. O'Connor (or any of the others in the Common Room) was inebriated, but he also noted that the faculty were role models for seminarians, and that a priest needs to be very sensitive to the image that he presents, both to seminarians and to lay persons. Because of this, Fr. Scorzello did not think that it was best for Fr. O'Connor to be drinking with seminarians in the first place.

The band⁶ stopped playing by 9:00 p.m. and the crowd gradually began to thin out. A smaller group, including Mr. DiLando and Fr. O'Connor, remained. One seminarian, who left the party between 10:30 p.m. and 11:00 p.m., thought that the party seemed to be escalating and that those who remained were getting drunk. A number of seminarians reported that individuals were doing shots at the bar. Although there are differing descriptions of the amount of drinking as the evening progressed, most of the individuals we spoke to agreed that many who remained past 11:00 p.m., including Fr. O'Connor, over-indulged.⁷ More than one seminarian noted that

⁶ The Seminary jazz band, the "Vatican Three," sometimes played music for the Thursday night gatherings in the Common Room and did so on the night of the celebration for Mr. DiLando.

⁷ Mr. DiLando remembered the party markedly different from everyone else who spoke with us. He described the party as "wholesome, unique and fun." Mr. DiLando said that he did not see anyone drinking liquor or hard alcohol, insisted that no one was drinking shots, and did not observe anyone drinking to excess. Mr. DiLando recalled leaving the party at about 10 p.m., though he allowed that it could have been later. Mr. DiLando told us that one of the seminarians at the party suggested that Mr. DiLando not drive home to Chelmsford but instead stay in a guest room at the Seminary. Even though Mr. DiLando did not have a change of clothes, he decided to stay, not because he was unable to drive home to Chelmsford, but because it was late, and it was a long drive home.

when the seminarians asked Fr. O'Connor to recite the "Night Prayer" he stumbled through a portion of it.⁸ Fr. O'Connor denied have any difficulties reciting the "Night Prayer."

E-Mail at 12:49 a.m. Excusing Seminarians from Morning Mass

Towards midnight, there were still people drinking in the Common Room, including a handful of seminarians, Mr. DiLando, and Fr. O'Connor. Some of the seminarians were plainly inebriated. One asked Fr. O'Connor if he would excuse the seminarians from the requirement to attend morning prayer and mass the following morning at 8:30 a.m. A seminarian told us that Fr. O'Connor agreed to excuse the seven seminarians on the condition that they drink a shot with him.

At 12:34 a.m., a seminarian e-mailed Fr. O'Connor a list of seven seminarians. Fifteen minutes later, Fr. O'Connor forwarded the list to Fr. Riley, the Dean of Men, with the statement that the listed seminarians would celebrate mass with him later in the afternoon. At least one of the seminarians was significantly impaired the following day. Fr. O'Connor told us that it was probably not appropriate for him to have excused these seminarians, but it was not uncommon to

There are reasons to doubt the accuracy of Mr. DiLando's memory. Although Mr. DiLando recalls that he went to the party at 7:00 p.m. and that it ended around 10:00 p.m., others who were at the party until the end, including Fr. O'Connor, agree that it ended after midnight. During the more than five hours that he was in the Common Room, Mr. DiLando stated that he had only one or two glasses of wine, which seems unlikely. Although Mr. DiLando said that he did not see anyone drinking liquor, there are photographs provided to us that show half-filled tumblers of liquor. Fr. O'Connor, who Mr. DiLando said he was sitting next to the entire evening, told us that he was drinking gin martinis and that he may have had a shot of Sambuca. Msgr. Moroney stated that he had a scotch on the rocks. Others acknowledged that they were drinking hard alcohol and/or doing shots. Finally, though Mr DiLando said that his decision to stay in a guest room at the seminary was made at the party, Fr. O'Connor said that it had been arranged beforehand.

⁸ The "Night Prayer" is part of the Liturgy of the Hours, which seminarians are required to participate in each day. It is the final prayer of the day and is said before retiring for the night.

excuse seminarians from such obligations. Fr. O'Connor disputed that he excused the seminarians on the condition that they agree to do a shot with him.

The Fall

At the end of the evening, likely near 1:00 a.m., Fr. O'Connor fell or slipped off a bar stool. Some witnesses stated that when Fr. O'Connor attempted to sit on the stool, it tipped over, and he fell backwards onto the floor. Others, like Mr. DiLando, did not see the chain of events until Fr. O'Connor landed on the floor. Fr. O'Connor's memory was that he was sitting on a stool, he pushed back from the bar, slipped off the stool, lost his balance and fell to the floor. All agree that Fr. O'Connor was on a stool and then he was on the floor.

The individuals who were at the party when Fr. O'Connor fell, including to some degree Fr. O'Connor himself, agree that alcohol was a contributing factor. Some felt strongly that Fr. O'Connor was "loaded" and "drunk." Others noted that Fr. O'Connor is a large man with a seemingly high tolerance for alcohol. Although he has a reputation for drinking, he does not have a reputation for being drunk. In fact, the following morning, Fr. O'Connor played racquetball with a seminarian at 10:00 a.m.

Fr. O'Connor feels very strongly that he was not drunk and that any seminarians who have said that he was drunk are resentful towards Fr. O'Connor because of actions that he has taken against the seminarians as Vice Rector. While there are some seminarians who may hold a grudge against Fr. O'Connor, this would not explain the larger number who expressed concern about his drinking. Even if Fr. O'Connor did not fall because he was drunk, he acknowledges that it would have been unsafe for him to drive that evening and the gin martinis he drank did not help him keep his balance.

The Aftermath

Fr. O'Connor stated that he was "mortified" that he had fallen and went to bed shortly thereafter. The following day, Fr. O'Connor went to see Msgr. Moroney to tell him about the incident. Fr. O'Connor told Msgr. Moroney that he had too many martinis and was embarrassed by what had happened.⁹

Msgr. Moroney told us that he believed that he had witnessed Fr. O'Connor's "fall" though it was clear in our interview that Msgr. Moroney was describing a different incident entirely. Msgr. Moroney described the separate incident that he saw. He told us that shortly before he left the party in the early evening, he saw Fr. O'Connor slip off a bar stool he was sitting on, land on his feet, and grab the side of the bar to maintain his stability. Fr. O'Connor did not fall on the floor and was not drunk at that time.

In their meeting the day after the incident Msgr. Moroney asked Fr. O'Connor if he only had two drinks, and Fr. O'Connor told Msgr. Moroney that his fall was not because he was drunk, which confirmed what Msgr. Moroney told us he had witnessed earlier in the previous evening. Although Fr. O'Connor stated that he had also told Msgr. Moroney that he had excused a number of seminarians from their obligation to attend morning prayer and mass, Msgr. Moroney told us that he was not aware of that.

A day later, when a rumor began spreading that Fr. O'Connor had fallen at the party because he was drunk, Msgr. Moroney decided to speak with Cardinal O'Malley. Msgr. Moroney told Cardinal O'Malley that he had witnessed the incident (when he had actually

⁹ Although Fr. O'Connor says that he was embarrassed, he did not feel so embarrassed to stop drinking with seminarians, including those who witnessed his fall. On Saturday, May 2, 2015, two days after the party, he invited a seminarian to stop by his room for a drink before taking him out to dinner.

witnessed a different incident) and that Fr. O'Connor had not been drunk. Later, after the social media postings in 2018, Msgr. Moroney in an e-mail intended for Cardinal O'Malley in which he again stated that he had been present when Fr. O'Connor fell. In the email, a draft of which Msgr. Moroney shared with Fr. O'Connor before sending on to the Cardinal, Msgr. Moroney assured Cardinal O'Malley that Fr. O'Connor had "simply slipp[ed] on the rung of a high chair" and had not been drunk.

In our interview, Msgr. Moroney told us that he had not lied about being present when Fr. O'Connor fell, and acknowledged that it was likely that the slip that he claims to have witnessed was different from the "fall" that was the subject of the rumors at the time and the social media postings from 2018.

Cardinal O'Malley told us that he heard about the April 30, 2015 party shortly after it occurred. He recalls speaking with Msgr. Moroney about it but does not recall any of the details of that conversation. Instead, Cardinal O'Malley was focused on Fr. O'Connor's welfare. Shortly after the party, Fr. O'Connor told Cardinal O'Malley that he stopped drinking and Cardinal O'Malley has not heard otherwise since.

After the social media postings in August 2018, Fr. O'Connor told us that Cardinal O'Malley telephoned him to ask him about his actions in the bachelor party. Fr. O'Connor explained to Cardinal O'Malley that he had too many martinis and he offered to resign as Vice Rector.

E. Prevalence of Alcohol

Our review disclosed a number of alcohol-related incidents that are inconsistent with the formational goal of “instilling ascetical practices that foster vigilance and self mastery over one’s impulses and drives.” Although Msgr. Moroney was aware of many of these incidents and was counselled to take more aggressive steps to address them, both he and Fr. O’Connor did not think that they were serious issues.

In light of the poor judgment and risky behavior that often accompanies the use of alcohol, the Seminary should reassess its policies to determine whether they are consistent with the goals of formation.

The current policy on the use of alcohol by seminarians set forth in the *Seminary Way of Life* handbook is stated below:

Alcohol and Drugs

It is never appropriate for one preparing for public ministry in the Church to improperly or excessively use alcohol. Only beer and wine will be served in the Basement Common Room. Hard alcohol is prohibited. No opened bottles of alcohol are permitted on the residence floors. The use of drugs other than for medicinal purposes is unacceptable. The use of marijuana is prohibited at all times. If chemical dependency or problematic use of alcohol is observed, this matter will be brought to the attention of the seminarian immediately. After prompt review of each individual case of abuse in these matters, the faculty will determine whether treatment and/or dismissal are an appropriate response for the seminarian in question.

Based on our review of existing policies in other Catholic seminaries, a policy which permits seminarians to use of alcohol but prohibits the improper or excessive use of alcohol is not unusual. Roughly half of the seminaries we reviewed prohibited the use of alcohol or restricted the times when it could be consumed. The other half, like St. John’s Seminary, only prohibited its misuse.

An unusual detail regarding the use of alcohol at the Seminary is the fact that the Seminary stocks the Common Room with beer which the seminarians can purchase for \$1 or \$2, leading one seminarian to comment that the Common Room had the “cheapest beers” in Boston. The rationale for subsidizing the purchase of beer seems well-intentioned. Faculty members

pointed out that “the Seminary is not a monastery” and responsible and moderate drinking is not inconsistent with the vows taken by a diocesan priest. The Seminary believes that since seminarians are likely to drink in any event, if a seminarian is going to make a mistake with alcohol, it is better that it happens at the Seminary rather than at a bar off-campus.

Many seminarians interviewed believe that seminarians too often have abused alcohol and that the Seminary appears to tolerate this behavior and has not taken sufficient steps to correct it. There are others, however, who maintain that the large majority of seminarians drink responsibly and that instances in which a seminarian has had too much to drink are rare.¹⁰ The following incidents were mentioned by more than one person:

- In February 2014, the two seminarians who were dismissed from formation for unchaste behavior were drunk at the time. A few months prior to that incident, one of those two seminarians had entered the Seminary intoxicated after curfew and fell and injured himself climbing the stairs going up to his room. Following these incidents, Msgr. Moroney restricted the hours that the Common Room was open to seminarians.
- In 2015, on the evening of Holy Thursday (Maundy Thursday), which commemorates the Last Supper, a group of seminarians were in the Common Room for the weekly “social,” which included having one or more beers. Holy Thursday is one of the holiest nights of the year for Catholics, especially so for priests, and the seminarians should have spent the evening in prayer. A faculty member who came upon the seminarians explained to them the inappropriateness of their conduct, which was subsequently reinforced by Msgr. Moroney.
- In the spring of 2015, an individual who was considering applying to the Seminary, went to the Seminary for an overnight visit. The individual attended the Thursday night “social” and became very intoxicated. The Seminary telephoned the individual’s local priest who came and took the individual home. The individual subsequently applied to the Seminary and was accepted on the condition that he not consume any alcohol the first year of his formation. However, the faculty members were not made aware of this condition and the individual’s record at the Seminary does not mention it.

¹⁰ It is worth noting that while we were able to identify instances each year in which a handful of seminarians have had too much to drink, the use of alcohol at the Seminary is far less than would be found at a typical American college. See *2017 National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH)*, Tables 6.78A-B, 6.79A-B and 6.80A-B. We point this out not to excuse the conduct at the Seminary but only to place it in the appropriate context.

- During the course of the year, the Seminary hosts festive dinners to celebrate various occasions. These events often, but not always, include “pre-prandials,” i.e., a cocktail hour, and wine with the meal. The one festive dinner that drew the most comments was the annual St. Patrick’s Day dinner, at which Fr. Chris O’Connor serves as the unofficial host. Most described the dinner as a drinking occasion and drinking is very much encouraged. At the dinner, Fr. O’Connor hands out Irish coffees that are “more Irish than coffee” and, as a result, tends to become lively and boisterous. Fr. O’Connor is assisted by a seminarian dressed up as a leprechaun. Fr. O’Connor explained that because there was one year in which seminarians absconded with some of the liquor provided for the evening, he makes sure to lock it away each year since.
- Every year, a large group of seminarians and some faculty travel to Washington, D.C. for the March for Life. One year, Fr. O’Connor hosted seminarians for a party in his residence the night before the trip to Washington. Several seminarians got very drunk and were still drunk the next morning when they had to catch the train for the March. Fr. O’Connor also hosts one or two parties each year in his residence and invites the seminarians who live on his floor or others. Fr. O’Connor sees no issues with serving seminarians alcohol and contends even that it is important for the faculty to assess how the seminarians handle alcohol and should be part of the formation process.
- On the night of Election Day 2016, a number of seminarians and some faculty members gathered in Fr. O’Connor residence to view the election results. The group’s celebration included excessive drinking and one former faculty member had trouble returning to his room.
- Beginning in 2016, the most senior class of seminarians were housed in Cheverus House, a property on Lake Street in Brighton close to the Seminary. The Seminary acquired Cheverus House while a property owned by the Seminary adjacent to Our Lady of Presentation in Brighton was being renovated to become Deacon House, a separate house for these senior seminarians to live. The seminarians living in Cheverus House were provided with a Seminary credit card to be used to purchase snacks and beer, wine, and liquor for the house. A seminarian explained that the alcohol was intended for any faculty members who visited or dined at the House. Not all of the faculty were in favor of the seminarians moving into the Cheverus House and the Rector and Vice Rector encouraged the seminarians to have those faculty members over for meals and to provide them with alcohol. However, the alcohol was more often than not consumed by the seminarians, a few of whom would occasionally drink excessively. The same activity occurred when the seminarians were moved from Cheverus House to Deacon House, the property adjacent to Our Lady of Presentation.

One faculty member reported to Msgr. Moroney that Cheverus House was “referred to as the Seminary Frat House.” And a seminarian complained of the “endless parties” at Cheverus House that are “not conducive to prayer, studies, or rest” and requested to move back into the Seminary. After two years, the seminarians were moved back into the Seminary.

Some seminarians, faculty members, and staff, noted that Msgr. Moroney tolerated the Seminary's drinking culture and tacitly condoned it. For instance, when a group of seminarians proposed a Lenten ban on alcohol in the Common Room, Msgr. Moroney pushed back and challenged the seminarians to try to find a rectory in Boston that did not have alcohol. On another occasion, a priest from the Archdiocese's Priests' Recovery Program made a presentation to the seminarians at which he cautioned against the "pre-prandial" culture in the priesthood. However, on the very next night, Msgr. Moroney had two seminarians in his residential suite for pre-prandial drinks before taking them out to dinner.

A number of individuals commented in their interviews on the "grand" bar in Msgr. Moroney's residential suite where he often entertained seminarians and guests of the Seminary. Those individuals wondered what type of message the bar sent to the seminarians. Msgr. Moroney pointed out that though his bar may have appeared elaborate, it was not. He purchased it at Jordan's Furniture for \$600 and the glassware at Bed, Bath and Beyond. The liquor (Dewar's, Tanqueray) also was not expensive.

Cardinal O'Malley spoke to Msgr. Moroney on multiple occasions regarding concerns about the use of alcohol at the Seminary. In September 2016, Cardinal O'Malley told Msgr. Moroney that there was "too much drinking" among the seminarians and that "not every celebration needs to be marked by drinks." In a letter dated September 25, 2016 memorializing this conversation, Msgr. Moroney noted that he and Cardinal O'Malley had discussed this issue on three previous occasions. There is nothing in Msgr. Moroney's letter to suggest that he intended to make any changes at the Seminary. Instead, he noted that in the prior year he had limited the hours in which alcohol could be served in the Common Room and had spoken to the seminarians about alcohol-related issues in three Rector's Conferences. Msgr. Moroney also

impliedly refuted Cardinal O'Malley's contention in stating that hard alcohol was served at only three celebratory occasions, including St. Patrick's Day and the Alumni Dinner.

At the end of the September 25, 2016 letter, Msgr. Moroney stated that he would report back to Cardinal O'Malley on this issue and the other issues discussed on a regular basis both at the Board of Trustee meetings and in his private meetings with O'Malley. But, since Msgr. Moroney did not commit to any changes with respect to the use of alcohol at the Seminary, it is unclear to us what it was he expected to report on. There do not seem to be any references in the minutes of the Board of Trustee meetings that alcohol use at the Seminary was ever discussed. Nor did any of the members of the Board that we interviewed recall such a discussion.

F. Background of the Formation Process

The following background on the Seminary and brief overview of the “formation” process implemented by Catholic seminaries to train priests is included to provide some minimal context for the subsequent findings and conclusions regarding various faculty members of the Seminary.

Administrative Management of the Seminary

Saint John’s Seminary, located in the Brighton neighborhood, is a Roman Catholic major seminary sponsored by the Archdiocese of Boston and dedicated primarily to the intellectual, cultural, and spiritual preparation of seminarians for the priesthood. In 1883, the Seminary was granted a charter to award degrees in philosophy and divinity and was incorporated under Massachusetts law in 1892. The Seminary is governed by the five Members of the Corporation, the Archbishop of Boston, the Chancellor of the Archdiocese, the Rector of the Seminary, and two other persons appointed by the Archbishop.

There is also a Board of Trustees which consists of the Archbishop of Boston, Members of the Corporation, and other elected Trustees. Strictly speaking, the Board of Trustees is empowered to manage the business and affairs of the Seminary that is not reserved in the By-Laws to the Members of the Corporation. As a practical matter, the Board of Trustees acts almost entirely as an advisory body. Significant decisions regarding the Seminary are made by the Members of the Corporation.

Historical Background

At its founding, the Seminary was staffed by Sulpician priests who established the model of its training for seminarians. The Sulpician model of formation requires seminarians to live in community with the Rector and the faculty and to engage with them in a one-on-one formation.

By living in the Seminary, the faculty members share a common life with the seminarians and train them not only in their theological studies, but also in priestly virtues, more by their own daily examples than by the lessons which they teach.

The Seminary is intentionally organized as a cloistered apostolic community where seminarians, detached from their prior lives, cultivate spiritual and personal disciplines, and wholly devote themselves to formation and discernment. In the Catholic faith, the priesthood is an irreplaceable and indispensable vocation. A priest is the sacramental representation of Jesus Christ and serves as a mediator between God and God's people. A priest occupies "an authoritative role in the Church as [a servant] of the proclamation of the Gospel to every people and of the fullness of Christian life of all the baptized." *Pastores Dabo Vobis: Post-synodal apostolic exhortation*, March 25, 1992, no. 15. Called to embrace a life of holiness, discipleship, and service, he administers the sacraments and preaches the faith by word and example.

Seminarians are trained to be priests in "a community that relives the experience of the group of Twelve who were united to Jesus." *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, no. 61. The Program of Priestly Formation (5th edition), approved by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops in 2005, similarly provides that that:

Seminaries are to be a continuation in the Church of the apostolic community gathered around Jesus. This basic organizing principle means the seminary is first and foremost a learning community of the disciples of Jesus. At the same time, the seminary is a community of charity and friendship, where fraternal bonds are anchored in genuine relationships to the Lord and his Body, the Church. Finally, the seminary is a worshipping and praying community that finds its source and summit in the celebration of the Eucharist.

*The Four Pillars of Priestly Formation*¹¹

In *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, Pope John Paul II described the principal foundations for priestly formation as human, spiritual, intellectual, and pastoral, known as the “Four Pillars” of formation. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops has provided guidelines in the Program of Priestly Formation to be followed by Catholic seminaries for the formation process to prepare a seminarian for life as a priest.

- *The First Pillar of Priestly Formation -- Human Formation*

The goal of Human Formation is to foster the growth of a man of solid moral character with a finely developed moral conscience; a man who demonstrates the human virtues of prudence, fortitude, temperance, justice, humility, constancy, sincerity, patience, good manners, truthfulness, and keeping his word; a man who has real and deep relational capacities, someone who can enter into genuine dialogue and friendship, a man of true empathy who can understand and know other persons, an individual with a settled disposition for the requirements of celibacy; one open to others and available to them with a generosity of spirit; a man of feelings who is not driven by them but freely lives his life enriched by them; a man who relates well with others, free of overt prejudice and willing to work with people of diverse cultural backgrounds; a man capable of wholesome relations with women and men as relatives, friends, colleagues, staff members, and teachers; a good steward of material possessions who is able to live a simple style of life; and a man who can take on the role of a public person.

Pope John Paul II emphasized the importance of human formation in providing seminarians those qualities that are “needed for them to be balanced people, strong and free,

¹¹ The Catholic Church has issued dozens of documents regarding the formation of seminarians for the priesthood. The description of the formation process in this report is not intended to be complete or authoritative but simply to provide context for what follows.

capable of bearing the weight of pastoral responsibilities.” *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, no. 43.

Specifically, seminarians “need to be educated to love the truth, to be loyal, to respect every person, to have a sense of justice, to be true to their word, to be genuinely compassionate, to be men of integrity and, especially, to be balanced in judgment and behavior.” *Id.*

- *The Second Pillar of Priestly Formation -- Spiritual Formation*

The Program of Priestly Formation recognizes that since “spiritual formation is the core that unifies the life of a priest, it stands at the heart of seminary life and is the center around which all other aspects are integrated.” The spiritual formation of a seminarian seeks to help him nourish and cultivate a deep personal relationship with Christ through prayer and virtuous living. This relationship is formed by the seminarian’s daily participation in the celebration of the Eucharist, the Liturgy of the Hours, the daily practice of the *Examen*, the Holy Hour, and his personal meditation. The seminarian also makes regular use of the sacrament of penance and seeks to develop ascetic habits in his daily life. The Seminary provides days of recollection, spiritual conferences, and retreats that contribute to the deepening of the seminarians’ spiritual life. Most importantly, each seminarian is assigned a Spiritual Director and meets with him every two weeks. In spiritual direction, the seminarian examines his prayer life, his personal history, and his relationships so as to integrate his personal and community life, his academic and pastoral experience.

- *The Third Pillar of Priestly Formation -- Intellectual Formation*

The preparation of a seminarian requires an “extremely rigorous intellectual formation” *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, no. 51. The seminarian must master the essential aspects of the Catholic religious tradition and its history, in addition to taking classes on philosophy, scripture, canon law, and homiletics, among other subjects. The seminarian seeks to attain intellectual

competence and study skills, the ability to read and write critically, develop presentation and communication skills, including the ability to speak well and to present ideas clearly. But as Pope Benedict XVI counselled, “the point is not simply to learn evidently useful things, but to understand and appreciate the internal structure of the faith as a whole, so that it can become a response to people’s questions, which on the surface change from one generation to another yet ultimately remain the same” *Pope Benedict XVI, Letter to Seminarians, 18th October 2010, 5*. That knowledge and skill must be integrated into the seminarian’s spiritual life so that he can communicate the faith to his parishioner. Proper intellectual formation thus enables the priest to proclaim the Gospel and to make it credible and intelligible to the legitimate demands of human reason in a world marked by religious indifference.

- *The Fourth Pillar of Priestly Formation -- Pastoral Formation*

Pastoral formation, which is the more practical side of theology, entails the development of those skills and competencies that enable priests to serve as the “bridge” to Christ. It is “the culmination of the entire formation process.” Program of Priestly Formation, no. 236. A pastoral formation program should provide seminarians with a broad exposure to supervised pastoral service, with the primary emphasis on parish ministry, and also train them to function as employers and as stewards of the temporal goods of the Church. It develops those teaching, preaching and administration skills, that allows the seminarian to stand and act in the community and to effectively advance the mission of the Church.

Seminary Faculty

At the Seminary, there are three persons that assist the seminarians in formation: the Rector of the Seminary, the faculty who also serve as Formation Advisors, and the Spiritual Directors. The Program of Priestly Formation states that the Rector is to serve as “the pastor of

the seminary community” and sets the direction and tone of the seminary program. His duties are described more fully below:

- *The Rector*

The Program of Priestly Formation, nos. 318-23 outline the important duties and obligations of a seminary’s Rector. The Rector “serves as the pastor of the seminary community,” “sets the direction and tone of the seminary program,” and is principally responsible for “the implementation of the seminary program.” The “spiritual and personal welfare of faculty and students is a central responsibility of the rector” and he is to be “a model of priestly virtue, able to live himself the qualities he encourages in students.” As the “leader of the internal life of the seminary both as pastor and priestly model” the rector creates “a climate of mutual confidence and trust” necessary to elicit “the full cooperation and involvement of faculty and students.” Given the extent and gravity of these responsibilities, the diocesan bishop “should ensure that the rector not have additional obligations outside the seminary that detract from his primary duties.”

- *Formation Advisors*

According to the Program on Priestly Formation, Formation Advisors should be priests who are exemplary in their dedication to the Church and to the ministerial priesthood. They should be mature and faithful Catholics who possess a background in human development, Catholic spirituality, and related areas. As a rule, Formation Advisors should reside in the seminary.

Formation Advisors observe seminarians and assist them to grow humanly by offering them feedback about their general demeanor, their relational capacities and styles, their maturity, their capacity to assume the role of a public person and leader in a community, and their

appropriation of the human virtues that make them “men of communion.” These same formators may, on occasion, teach the ways of human development and even offer some personal mentoring or, at times, coaching. More generally, they offer encouragement, support, and challenge along the formational path.

Formation Advisors function exclusively in the “external forum,” meaning that their observations and discussions with the seminarians are not confidential. They are not to engage in matters that are reserved for the “internal forum.” This is the role of the seminarian’s Spiritual Director. Of course, discernment requires the seminarian to willingly “self disclose;” it is not simply about psychological facts or states but about the movements of grace and inclinations to sin that the seminarian may encounter and address in the formation process. A reluctance to share such information or to embrace an “us versus them” attitude is contrary to formation.

- *Spiritual Directors*

A seminarian’s Spiritual Director helps him to integrate the spiritual, human, intellectual, and pastoral pillars of formation. He assists the seminarian in acquiring the skills of spiritual discernment, self-reflection, and self-discipline and helps the seminarian determine whether he is called to priesthood or to another vocation in the Church. When engaged in spiritual direction, a Spiritual Director operates in the internal forum, meaning that any information received is held in the strictest confidence and many not be revealed. Spiritual Directors may not participate in the evaluation of those they currently direct or whom they directed in the past.

The Spiritual Director provides a focus and a reminder of the primacy of the spiritual life: the necessity of the Morning and Evening Prayer of the Church, especially the Liturgy of the Hours; the value of particular practices such as retreats, days of renewal, and devotions; the integration of all ministry and life in the Lord’s paschal mystery; the centrality of the word of

God found in the Sacred Scriptures; and the invitation to an ever fuller and deeper participation in the sacramental life of the Church, especially in the Eucharist and the sacrament of reconciliation.

*Annual Evaluation of Seminarians*¹²

Each year, every seminarian is evaluated by the Faculty Advisory Council to determine whether he should advance to the following year of formation. The evaluation process begins with the submission of a self-evaluation by the seminarian discussed with, and approved by, the seminarian's Formation Advisor. Following the meeting of the Faculty Advisory Council, a written evaluation or "composite report" summarizing the views of the Advisory Council is provided to the seminarian. The seminarian discusses the composite report with his Formation Advisor. Although the Formation Advisor is permitted to provide additional details concerning matters discussed in the composite report, he is not permitted to attribute comments or concerns to specific faculty members. The seminarian may also discuss the composite report with his Spiritual Director.

Each seminarian then appears before a Candidacy Review Board to discuss issues relevant to his progress in formation though, again, attribution of concerns or comments to specific faculty members is not permitted. Following the interview, the Board votes on whether to recommend that the seminarian may advance to the next year of formation. If the Board votes

¹² A number of seminarians expressed frustration at an evaluation process they perceive as inscrutable. These seminarians feel that decisions regarding their lifetime vocation are being made by a small group of faculty members, many of whom do not know the seminarians very well. (As discussed below, though Faculty Member 1 was the Formation Advisor to only six seminarians, he could not recall each of their names). These seminarians are concerned that the lack of transparency permits decisions based on favoritism, bias, and misunderstanding. They point out that while a seminarian is expected to enter formation with a spirit of openness and willing self-disclosure, the evaluation process seems inaccessible to them. The faculty members we interviewed disagreed.

not to advance the seminarian, he is invited to appear before the Faculty Advisory Council for questions and a discussion prior to a vote by the Council. The Council's vote and the final decision by the Rector are then communicated to the seminarian by his Formation Advisor.

As a practical matter, when a seminarian becomes aware that he is not likely to advance to the next year of formation, he often decides to withdraw voluntarily from the Seminary, rendering a vote by the Council unnecessary.

G. Faculty Matters

Msgr. James Moroney, Rector

The most important contribution that a Rector can make to his Seminary is to be present as its pastor and priestly model. While Msgr. Moroney undoubtedly has many excellent qualities, his lack of presence at the Seminary too often deprived the Seminary of its pastor and the seminarians of their priestly model. His absence had a significant negative impact both on the seminarians and the faculty. In addition, Msgr. Moroney proved not to be a good steward of the Seminary's resources with little apparent control over its spending.

Installation as Rector

On July 1, 2012, Rev. Msgr. James P. Moroney became the 20th rector of the Seminary, replacing Bishop Arthur L. Kennedy. Although Msgr. Moroney had been a priest in Diocese of Worcester since 1980, he had spent more time outside of Worcester on various assignments than in the diocese. He was a past chairman of the Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions and had served as Executive Director of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops Secretariat for the Liturgy from 1996-2007. Msgr. Moroney is the Executive Secretary and adviser to the Vox Clara Committee, a group of senior bishops from the English-speaking world which advises the Catholic Church on the translation of Latin liturgical texts into English, and a frequent lecturer on liturgical matters. At the time of his appointment as rector, Msgr. Moroney was a professor of Sacred Theology at the Seminary and served as Rector of the Cathedral of St. Paul in Worcester where he resided.

Cardinal O'Malley selected Msgr. Moroney to be Rector of the Seminary because he is a gifted teacher and a well-known figure with established relationships with many bishops. Cardinal O'Malley attributes much of the subsequent increase in the enrollment at the Seminary to Msgr. Moroney's efforts. At the time of his appointment, Msgr. Moroney stated that he had a discussion with Cardinal O'Malley about the challenges the Seminary faced, particularly the major financial challenges and the Seminary's relationship with the Archdiocese of Boston.

Absence From Seminary

Both the Program of Priestly Formation and the Seminary's Faculty Handbook emphasize that the rector is the "pastor" for the seminarians, the faculty, and the staff of the Seminary. He sets the tone and direction of the seminary program and bears responsibility for all aspects of seminary life. Although the rector also has responsibilities that may at times take him away from the Seminary, including obligations for public relations and development, "it is important that the rector serve as leader of the internal life of the seminary both as pastor and priestly model." Program of Priestly Formation, no. 320. The "spiritual and personal welfare of faculty and students is a central responsibility of the rector" and he "should frequently preside at prayer and at the Eucharist." Id., no. 321. The Program of Priestly Formation cautions that the diocesan bishop appointing the rector, here Cardinal O'Malley, "should ensure that the rector not have additional obligations outside the seminary that detract from his primary duties." Id., no. 318.

Overwhelmingly, seminarians, staff, and faculty noted that Msgr. Moroney was not sufficiently present at the Seminary, did not frequently attend chapel exercises, often missed the classes that he was teaching, and was not present at lunch (which is the only meal that the faculty shares with the seminarians). We reviewed e-mails which disclosed that over the course of just one semester, Msgr. Moroney cancelled twelve of his classes. Msgr. Moroney conceded that missing so many classes was "horrible," and he could not provide an explanation for his many absences. Two Vocational Directors also noted that Msgr. Moroney was not at the Seminary on the occasions that they visited.

A significant portion of the seminarian's day is devoted to his spiritual formation. Each weekday begins with Morning Prayer at 7:00 a.m. followed by Mass. The Seminary Way of Life states that participation in the daily Mass, which is expected of the seminarians even when they

are home on vacation, is “the most important element of seminary formation.” At noon, the seminarians and faculty assemble in the chapel to make the Examen, a technique of prayerful reflection, and pray the Angelus, a brief devotional prayer. Before dinner each day, the seminarians again gather in the chapel for Holy Hour and Evening Prayer. To provide a priestly example, and as a source and sign of unity within the seminary program, faculty members are expected to regularly participate in the Seminary liturgies. Program of Priestly Formation, no. 352.

Msgr. Moroney’s absence from the life of the Seminary, and especially from chapel exercises, negatively affected the morale of both seminarians and faculty. One faculty member said that Msgr. Moroney being absent from the Seminary’s liturgical exercises was “like a pastor never being in the church.” The attendance of some other faculty members flagged as well as a result of Msgr. Moroney’s lack of attendance. The absence of Msgr. Moroney and other faculty members from these events sent a “message” to the seminarians, as reported by seminarians and others, that these activities were not important.

In October 2012, only four months after Msgr. Moroney’s appointment as rector, Fr. Derek Borek, the Seminary’s Spiritual Director, raised the issue of Msgr. Moroney’s “frequent absences” in an e-mail to Msgr. Moroney, who was then in Rome. Fr. Borek observed that over a recent time period, Msgr. Moroney had attended chapel exercises less than half the time. He urged Msgr. Moroney to “get yourself into the chapel and let these [seminarians] see you praying, celebrating Mass and setting a good example for them.”

In his responsive e-mail, Msgr. Moroney did not dispute that he was frequently absent from seminary life. He pointed out that there were many “conflicting demands” on his time. Msgr. Moroney dismissed Fr. Borek’s concerns and saw no reason to alter his practice or increase his presence at the Seminary. In the e-mail, Msgr. Moroney asserted that he had spoken

to Cardinal O'Malley and to rectors at other seminaries and that they all agreed that there was no reason for Msgr. Moroney to increase his presence in the Seminary.

Certainly, there are many demands on a rector's schedule. Msgr. Moroney noted that in 2012 and 2013 he had to spend time away from the Seminary to tend to his aged parents. Given the financial difficulties facing the Seminary, Msgr. Moroney also spent time away from the Seminary for fundraising activities. For many of the same reasons, Msgr. Moroney worked very hard to maintain and increase the enrollment at the Seminary. That required Msgr. Moroney to maintain and cultivate relationships with the various dioceses served by the Seminary. In addition, Msgr. Moroney maintained his responsibilities as Executive Director of the Vox Clara Committee which occasionally required his presence in Rome. Finally, like other faculty members, Msgr. Moroney was entitled to vacation time in the summer, a week in the winter, and he sometimes took long weekends away from the Seminary.

At a faculty meeting in May 2013, the issue of Msgr. Moroney's lack of presence at the Seminary came up again. The faculty meeting occurred shortly after the Boston Marathon bombing when the Seminary had been placed on lockdown. At the faculty meeting, Msgr. Moroney asked what he could have done better in the days following the bombing. Fr. Borek criticized Msgr. Moroney for being absent from chapel exercises and not visible in the building during this time and stated, "You could have been present." In response, Msgr. Moroney brought the meeting to an abrupt end.

At the end of May 2013, Msgr. Moroney and Fr. Borek met to discuss the faculty meeting. Msgr. Moroney did not feel that Fr. Borek was being supportive, that he seemed to disagree with everything that Msgr. Moroney did, and that he was trying to tell Msgr. Moroney how to do his job.

For his part, Fr. Borek felt that Msgr. Moroney was easily wounded by criticism, though he acknowledged that he did disagree with many of the actions taken by Msgr. Moroney. Fr. Borek noted that the Rector's absence and his lack of involvement in the seminarians' lives seriously interfered with their formation as priests. Fr. Borek also asserted that Msgr. Moroney's residential suite in the Seminary was too lavish and did not display the appropriate simplicity of life expected of a priest; Msgr. Moroney regularly overscheduled himself and did not make the seminarians a priority; Msgr. Moroney's decision to have Spiritual Directors attend formation sessions of the faculty council was a serious error and risked violations of the internal forum; and issues regarding the use of alcohol in the Seminary were not taken seriously. Fr. Borek believed that he was not trying to tell Msgr. Moroney how to do his job but was only "reminding him of how the bishops have told him to do it," which seems not much different.

A few months later, Msgr. Moroney requested that Cardinal O'Malley reassign Fr. Borek. Msgr. Moroney did not feel that Fr. Borek was supportive of him and was critical of Msgr. Moroney in front of students. Cardinal O'Malley met with Fr. Borek. Fr. Borek explained his various frustrations with Msgr. Moroney, including the Rector's lack of presence at the Seminary. Cardinal O'Malley determined that Msgr. Moroney and Fr. Borek could not work together at the Seminary, and he reassigned Fr. Borek.

Whatever the wisdom of reassigning Fr. Borek, one thing is clear: it sent an unmistakable message that faculty dissent, even if presented fervently and directly, was not welcome. It reinforced to other faculty members and seminarians that it was best not to make waves. As at least one person told us, the name Borek became a verb, as in, "Don't speak up, or you will be Boreked."

That is not to suggest that Cardinal O'Malley ignored the substance of Fr. Borek's concerns. The issue of Msgr. Moroney's absences from the Seminary was explicitly the subject of a meeting between Msgr. Moroney and Cardinal O'Malley in September 2016. On September 26, 2016, Msgr. Moroney wrote a letter to Cardinal O'Malley in which he summarized their conversation. The letter includes the following paragraph:

Presence

Your Eminence spoke of the importance of Father O'Connor and I being regularly present for liturgical services at the Seminary, a subject which you and I have spoken about on three prior occasions. As you will recall, I instituted the policy earlier this year of the Rector preaching and presiding at every Monday mass when the Seminary is in session. I am always present for the vast majority of the other liturgical services and will continue to follow this practice.

Msgr. Moroney's September 26 letter indicates that he believes that he was appropriately present at the Seminary. Msgr. Moroney's statement that he was "always present for the vast majority of the other liturgical services" is not supported by any other person.

"Diamond Jim"

Msgr. Moroney's tenure as Rector was notable for his ambitious plans to grow the enrollment and the reputation of the Seminary. The Seminary acquired Our Lady of Presentation in Brighton from the Archdiocese, renovated it, and turned the main building into a lecture hall and the rectory into additional residential space for seminarians ("Deacon House"). The Seminary also purchased a one-family house on Lake Street, Cheverus House, which it intended to use first to house seminarians and, once Deacon House was completed, guests of the Seminary. Though some privately questioned the wisdom of these expenditures in light of the Seminary's finances, which have grown less secure, they were approved by the Board of Trustees.

We learned from our interview with seminarians, faculty, and staff that Msgr. Moroney has a reputation of not sufficiently controlling the Seminary's operational costs. The renovation costs of Our Lady of Presentation in Brighton were large and contracts for the renovation were awarded without competitive bids. Msgr. Moroney routinely approved purchase requests submitted to him. For instance, when seminarians living at the Cheverus House decided that it might be nice to have an outdoor grill for cooking, Msgr. Moroney told them to send him the bill, and they purchased a grill that reportedly cost more than \$800. When a faculty member's laptop needed to be replaced, Msgr. Moroney told him to buy one and send him the bill, and the faculty member purchased a top of the line Apple laptop rather than an equally useful laptop that was less expensive. When one seminarian said he could not live in the Deacon House because he would have difficulty getting to classes at the Seminary, Msgr. Moroney offered to purchase a car for him. Many took advantage of Msgr. Moroney's generosity and his willingness to spend the Seminary's money. Among the seminarians, Msgr. Moroney's nickname was "Diamond Jim."

At some point, the Board of Trustees put some financial controls in place. The Board enacted a policy that any purchase over \$1500 had to be preapproved by the Chair of the Finance Committee. That rule was routinely ignored by Msgr. Moroney who continued to make such purchases without obtaining the appropriate authorization. It was not until shortly before Msgr. Moroney's leave from the Seminary and after the Seminary hired a new Director of Finance that the proper procedures have been followed.

Fr. Christopher O'Connor, Vice-Rector.

Notwithstanding Fr. O'Connor's significant abilities as a diocesan priest, it is problematic for him (or any faculty member) to be the Seminary's "lead partier." Fr. O'Connor admits that he is an emotive individual, though others contend that he too often lets these emotions get the better of him. Where Formation Advisors, like Fr. O'Connor, are to train the seminarians in the priestly virtues by modeling those virtues, the Seminary might choose to reconsider Fr. O'Connor's role.

Role as Vice Rector

Fr. Christopher O'Connor is the Vice Rector of the Seminary. According to the Seminary's Faculty Handbook, the Vice Rector assists the Rector in areas of seminary life assigned to him and replaces the Rector when he is absent. A Vice Rector should "show strong pedagogical gifts, a joyful love of the service he renders and a spirit of collaboration." Vatican Congregation for Catholic Education, Directives Concerning the Preparation of Seminary Educators, Vol. 23, No. 32 (Jan. 27, 1994) at p. 565.

As a practical matter, Fr. O'Connor works closely with the Rector to achieve the Rector's objectives, supervises the maintenance and security functions in the Seminary, and oversees the discipline of the student body. In addition, Fr. O'Connor has teaching responsibilities, serves as a Formation Advisor for a number of seminarians, and was the President of the Theological Institute for The New Evangelization.

In 2013, one year after Msgr. Moroney became Rector, Fr. O'Connor was frustrated in his role and asked for the Cardinal to reassign him. He explained to Bishop Deeley, then the Vicar General, that he found Msgr. Moroney's management style to be "chaotic." Additionally, Fr. O'Connor thought that Msgr. Moroney's desire to be liked resulted in a willingness to skirt the truth at times and tell people whatever they wanted to hear to make them happy. According to Fr. O'Connor, Bishop Deeley reasoned that these were justifications to have Fr. O'Connor remain as Vice Rector, rather than justifications for his reassignment.

Drinking

The majority of seminarians interviewed mentioned that Fr. O'Connor is an outgoing, gregarious individual with a reputation for enjoying his alcohol. They would expect to find him, and generally do find him, at the center of any party. It is noteworthy that most of the incidents at the Seminary involving groups of seminarians drinking, sometimes to excess, such as the bachelor party, the annual St. Patrick Day dinners, the gathering on Election Night 2016, the party the night before the March for Life, all revolve around Fr. O'Connor.

As stated above, Fr. O'Connor believes it is appropriate to provide seminarians who visit his residential quarters in the Seminary with alcohol. His "personal rule" is that he can provide alcohol to seminarians, but not more than two drinks. His justification for this practice -- that there is no rule in place at the Seminary that would prohibit a faculty member from providing alcohol to a seminarian and that it permits him to determine whether the seminarian can handle his alcohol -- is weak. We have not seen any indication that the Seminary provides meaningful assistance to any seminarian believed to have a dependency on alcohol or who abuses alcohol.

Bullying, Intimidation and Retaliation

Many individuals we spoke to agreed that Fr. O'Connor often has trouble controlling his emotions and occasionally overreacts. Fr. O'Connor can quickly get "very angry" and "blow up" at seminarians, faculty, and staff in a way that is "scary." Small matters that should be dealt with calmly too frequently end with shouting and slammed doors. The instance that most seminarians cited was Fr. O'Connor's conduct at the March 2015 house meeting called to discuss the sexting incident, described above at pages 19-21. At that meeting, one of the seminarians who had received the inappropriate texts confronted Fr. O'Connor on whether sufficient steps were being taken. In response, Fr. O'Connor "lost it" and wound up yelling and screaming at the seminarian.

That was far from the only time that Fr. O'Connor lost his temper. On another occasion, Fr. O'Connor was conducting a disciplinary hearing in connection with a seminarian who had submitted a plagiarized paper. The seminarian was a non-native English student who had great difficulty writing academic papers and had been caught and sanctioned for an earlier incident of plagiarism. At the disciplinary board hearing, instead of acknowledging his misconduct, the seminarian tried to evade responsibility and told an obvious lie involving two other seminarians. Frustrated by the seminarian's dishonesty, Fr. O'Connor let his emotions get the better of him. He immediately marched out of the hearing, abruptly pulled the two seminarians from their classes, lined them up in the hearing, banged the table with his fist, and loudly demanded to know "who was lying."

Fr. O'Connor noted that he is an emotive person and can be excitable, though he denied being a bully or having any temperament issues. Fr. O'Connor believes that these assertions against him should be discounted to the extent that they are being spread by seminarians, some who are now priests, who were the subjects of his disciplinary actions.

Fr. O'Connor's angry and "unpredictable" outbursts were not directed only at the seminarians. Instances of Fr. O'Connor losing his patience and yelling at staff, other faculty members, and even the food service staff in the refectory, were described in our interviews. One staff member portrayed Fr. O'Connor as an "exquisite bully," the kind who would learn a person's weaknesses and then exploit them.

Among those staff and faculty who acknowledged that Fr. O'Connor was not always in control of his emotions, some defended his outbursts. One staff member told us that while she had certainly seen Fr. O'Connor get angry, "his bark is bigger than his bite." A faculty member, who has heard Fr. O'Connor yelling at a seminarian through the walls of his office, said that

being “very direct” with the seminarian, i.e., yelling at him, is helpful to the seminarian’s formation. Other faculty members noted that when Fr. O’Connor was required to impose some disciplinary measure, there were seminarians who probably deserved to receive a hard time from him.

Faculty Member 1¹³

Although Faculty Member 1's gratuitous sexual references in his moral theology classes seem unusual, a graduate school professor, especially one of Faculty Member 1's renown, should be allowed significant latitude in how to present his course work. However, Faculty Member 1's "divisive" and "toxic" presence in the Seminary outside of his class, his perceived bias against Hispanic seminarians, and his weakness as a Formation Advisor, suggest that the Seminary may want to revisit his role there.

Background

Faculty Member 1 was ordained in 1971 and, other than being a priest-in-charge between 1976-1979 in Bern, Switzerland, he has been a faculty member of a Catholic seminary. He has been a professor at the Seminary since 1995 where he teaches classes on Catholic moral theology and pastoral moral issues. He is a world-renown specialist in Thomist theology and an author or editor of dozens of scholarly articles and books. The seminarians and others that we interviewed all recognized that Faculty Member 1 is a "brilliant" and highly-respected scholar, that his publications are "masterpieces of the moral corpus," and that his classes were among the "best" offered at the Seminary.

Gratuitous References to Sex and Sexual Acts

Many individuals complained that Faculty Member 1's repeated references in his classes to sexual acts and practices, often involving homosexual sex or masturbation, to be "way over the top," "gratuitous," and something of a "fixation." Faculty Member 1's lectures on morals usually involve accounts of sexual gratifications provided by "Fifi La Rue" or "Streetwalker

¹³ Faculty Member 1 was only current faculty member we interviewed who was accompanied by an attorney. One former faculty member was accompanied by a canon lawyer and a former seminarian was accompanied by his uncle, who happens to be an attorney.

Sally,” two women of loose morals.¹⁴ Faculty Member 1’s imagery is consistently sexual but strikes many as weird or quirky instead of salacious. For instance, when explaining that individuals will engage in immoral acts, even when the acts are harmful to themselves, because they derive pleasure from the acts, Faculty Member 1 encourages the seminarians to visualize someone “masturbating with sandpaper.” To impress upon seminarians that homosexuality is disordered, Faculty Member 1 points his two index fingers (which represent penises) at one another while saying “this does not work.” Seminarians report that Faculty Member 1 seems to work a reference to a sexual act into almost every class. For instance, a class on the Trinity somehow included a reference to sodomy. Indeed, many seminarians recounted that about half of Faculty Member 1’s class on moral theology seems focused sexual morality, and specifically on the Sixth Commandment (“thou shall not commit adultery”) and the Ninth Commandment (“thou shall not covet thy neighbor’s wife”).

Faculty Member 1’s unusual sexual references have unusual consequences. Msgr. Moroney told us that he had received a telephone call from a diocese about a newly ordained priest recently graduated from the Seminary. The priest had been counselling a young couple preparing for marriage. The priest advised the couple that under the Church’s teachings they should not expect to use anal sex as an alternative form of birth control. The priest said he learned that lesson in one of Faculty Member 1’s classes.

Fr. Salocks told us about a seminarian, now deceased, who objected to an assignment in Faculty Member 1’s class. The material was very descriptive of homosexuality and the

¹⁴ One former seminarian, now a priest, was particularly offended by the “moaning” or “sighing” timbre of Faculty Member 1’s voicings of these accounts, though no others made that complaint.

seminarian felt it was inappropriate. Faculty Member 1 changed the assignment for the seminarian.¹⁵

Faculty Member 1's disconcerting sexual references are not restricted to his classroom. Seminarians reported that on the occasions where Faculty Member 1 has joined them for lunch in the Seminary's refectory, it was not unusual for him to turn the conversation to some unusual sexual practice that he has come across in his research. One of Faculty Member 1's advisees recounted that Faculty Member 1 spent the majority of one formation meeting telling him about a sexual commune in Oneida, New York, in the 1800's in which the residents practiced *coitus interruptus*. The seminarian also noted that Faculty Member 1 asked the seminarian if he had ever "tried it." Another individual, not a seminarian, who went out to dinner with Faculty Member 1 reported that when they sat down at the table Faculty Member 1 said to him, "I hope no one here thinks that you are my catamite."¹⁶ On another occasion when Faculty Member 1 was wearing his clerical collar eating dinner at a restaurant where the tables were particularly close together, he could easily be overheard discussing oral sex to the consternation of his table mates.

While many seminarians find Faculty Member 1's habitual references to sexual acts and practices to be unnecessary, puerile, and offensive, others defend him. They point out that, as a moral theologian, Faculty Member 1 is required to discuss the morality of human actions. Since many moral issues in modern society concern sexuality, homosexuality, abortion, birth control,

¹⁵ It is noteworthy, however, that while many seminarians and former seminarians objected to the proliferation of sexual references in Faculty Member 1's classes, there is virtually no mention of it in the student course evaluations we reviewed. In fact, the overwhelming majority of the course evaluations that have been provided to us are very positive.

¹⁶ In ancient Greece and Rome, a catamite was a boy or youth who was in a sexual relationship with a man.

reproductive issues and similar topics, one would expect that Faculty Member 1's references would reflect those issues. In their estimation, seminarians who are offended by references to and discussions of coitus, ejaculation, autoeroticism, sodomy, fellatio, or cunnilingus, are simply too sensitive. One seminarian noted that the Program of Priestly Formation, the guideline for training seminarians, provides that discussions of human sexuality and human action should not use ambiguous terms or euphemisms and he applauded Faculty Member 1 for discussing sex and sexual practices directly. He and other seminarians were not offended and suggested that the unusual references were hyperbole and sometimes funny. Finally, a number of seminarians maintained that Faculty Member 1 was justified in lecturing so much on "immoral" or "deviant" sexual practices because as priests they will be required to discuss such sins in the confessional.

For his part, Faculty Member 1 does not dispute that a significant part of his moral theology course concerns sex and sexual practices, though he maintains that his references are not graphic or gratuitous. Faculty Member 1 suggests that seminarians who complained may be "uncomfortable with moral truth" or may not have recognized that instruction about sexual intimacy is part of a priest's duties. The examples Faculty Member 1 uses of "Fifi La Rue" and such are derived from *Ethica Thomistica*, a widely recognized text on St. Thomas Aquinas. Faculty Member 1 points out that the terminology he uses most in class in discussing disordered homosexual acts -- fellatio, sodomy, cunnilingus and anilingus -- can all be found in the *Oxford Dictionary*, and he would be remiss not to discuss them. According to Faculty Member 1, he prepares seminarians to discuss these and other issues in the "three p's" -- the pulpit, the parlor and penance. With respect to the priest who counseled a couple before marriage that anal sex is not a permissible birth control practice, Faculty Member 1 said he cannot be held responsible for misuse of his instruction.

Although Faculty Member 1 did not recall using the term “catamite” to refer to a dinner companion, he notes that it is a perfectly legitimate word. He also may very well have talked about oral sex in a restaurant. Faculty Member 1 rejects the notion that priests should avoid conversations regarding sex or other matters that the culture extols that are contrary to the teachings of the Church. Such discussions help seminarians and others resist the enormous pressures of culture and are not to be avoided.

Personal Interactions

While nearly all of the other faculty members at the Seminary are described positively or at least innocuously, Faculty Member 1 is described as a “jerk,” “culturally insensitive,” “rude,” seeking to “humiliate” and “belittle” seminarians, “arrogant,” “abrasive,” “intimidating,” “uncharitable,” the “worst person at the Seminary,” “discourteous,” “egotistical,” “childish,” “vain,” “elitist,” “condescending,” a “toxic presence,” and “a poisonous influence” on the Seminary. There were many accounts of Faculty Member 1 acting in a small and uncharitable manner, especially to seminarians who feel intimidated by Faculty Member 1 or unsure of themselves. Msgr. Moroney stated that Faculty Member 1 was a divisive force among the faculty and seminarians and “anything but a diocesan priest.”

There were numerous instances of Faculty Member 1’s inappropriate behavior, including the following:

- One seminarian who was serving at Holy Hour for the first time was nervous and spoke with another seminarian before the service to ask a question. As a psychological response to his extreme nervousness, the seminarian smiled. Faculty Member 1 came over to reprimand the seminarian and tell him to be more contemplative and serious before entering the chapel. Faced with this confrontation, which greatly increased his anxiety level, the seminarian again reacted by smiling. The resulting dressing down he received from Faculty Member 1, for *smiling*, was heard by individuals in the chapel.

- Like many seminarians and faculty members, Faculty Member 1 generally sits in the same location in the chapel. Unlike everyone else, Faculty Member 1 refuses to sit elsewhere. If an individual happens to be sitting in “his seat,” Faculty Member 1 taps them on the shoulder and requires that they move. Faculty members largely agreed that if a seminarian behaved in this way it would be treated as a formation issue to be resolved before ordination.
- A lay faculty member related to us that because of a personal choice the faculty member made, which Faculty Member 1 disagreed with, Faculty Member 1 refused to speak with him and would not look at him for two years. When Faculty Member 1 approached the faculty member in the hall he literally would turn his head away.
- Some years ago, faculty members were too often cancelling classes and rescheduling them for a time that was more convenient for the faculty member. Because this practice played havoc with the seminarians’ schedules, a rule was enacted that prevented faculty members from rescheduling classes without the approval of the Academic Dean. Faculty Member 1 regularly violated that rule, which upset the Dean. One day there was a confrontation. The Dean became aware that Faculty Member 1 was about to start a class that he had rescheduled without permission. The Dean went down to the classroom to dismiss the class before it began. Faculty Member 1 got angry. He refused to speak to the Dean for six years.¹⁷

One individual sought to explain Faculty Member 1’s dismissive behavior on the grounds that he was a Dominican priest and the Dominican order is based on a hierarchical structure. A seminarian agreed that Faculty Member 1 can be dismissive towards people, but felt it was not because of the hierarchical structure of the Dominican order, it is simply that Faculty Member 1 cannot stand those people. On the other hand, a number of faculty members pointed out that, more than any other faculty member, Faculty Member 1 is asked by newly ordained priests to preach at their first Mass. At least one priest we interviewed, who referred to Faculty Member 1 as a “jerk,” also acknowledged that he had asked Faculty Member 1 to preach at his first Mass.

¹⁷ One of the other faculty members disputed this and stated that Faculty Member 1 refused to speak to the dean for only one year – as if that somehow made his behavior acceptable.

Perception of Discriminatory Treatment of Hispanic Seminarians

The Hispanic seminarians we spoke with perceive that Faculty Member 1 is biased against them. For instance, on one occasion when a Hispanic student was having troubling coming up with an answer to a question, Faculty Member 1 pointedly asked him, “Come on, come on, do you want to be a priest or an American citizen?” Similarly, at a Candidacy Review Board, Faculty Member 1 asked a Brazilian seminarian from Springfield why he, Faculty Member 1, should not believe that the seminarian was “like other people from Latin America who just come to the states looking for a green card.” In one of Faculty Member 1’s classes, he asked the Spanish-speaking seminarians for a certain Spanish term. Rejecting each of their responses, Faculty Member 1 asked the entire class if there were any “real” Spanish speaking individuals in the class. One Hispanic seminarian who was serving as one of four Sacristans waited in the sacristy to confer with Faculty Member 1 about which of the texts in the sacristy Faculty Member 1 would be using. It seemed to the seminarian that when Faculty Member 1 saw this particular seminarian in the sacristy he chose not to enter, but instead found one of the other Sacristans, who was not Hispanic, and requested that he retrieve the text instead.

Faculty Member 1 denied that he had treated any seminarian discriminately. When we discussed these issues with Msgr. Moroney, he told us that whenever Faculty Member 1 had some issue or difficulty with a seminarian, the seminarian was invariably a non-Caucasian student.

Role as Formation Advisor

In addition to being a member of the faculty with significant teaching obligations, Faculty Member 1 is also a Formation Advisor. A Formation Advisor plays a critical part in helping the seminarian to integrate the various dimensions of priestly formation. Seminarians are required to

meet at least monthly with their Formation Advisors where they should examine and discuss their progress in each of the formative areas. The role of a Formation Advisor is not passive. He is to accompany and assist the seminarian on his journey towards ordination. Each year, the Formation Advisor provides the other faculty with his personal evaluation of the seminarian and his progress.

Msgr. Moroney told us that Faculty Member 1 was not a particularly good Formation Advisor and limited the number of seminarians assigned to him. For instance, Faculty Member 1 bluntly told one of his advisees that he was “fat” and needed to lose weight which, though it may have been Faculty Member 1’s honest opinion, hardly seems supportive. In our interview, Faculty Member 1 could not recall the names of all six of his advisees or details regarding their backgrounds and experiences at the Seminary. Faculty Member 1’s approach to formation is passive. He explained that he spends 45 minutes with each of his advisees once each month. During their meetings, they go through passages of the *Pastores Dabo Vobis* that he has assigned in advance of the meeting and discuss any questions the seminarian may have. Other than these monthly meetings, Faculty Member 1 does not develop a plan to address formation issues that particular advisees may have. Faculty Member 1 contends that this is what he should be doing as a Formation Advisor.

In our interviews with some Formation Advisors, priests, and bishops outside the Archdiocese of Boston, it came to our attention that the presence of Faculty Member 1 on the Seminary’s faculty was a reason, sometimes one of a number of reasons, why that diocese had chosen not to send their seminarians to the Seminary. We also understand that there are other sending bishops who trust Faculty Member 1 to correctly teach the tenets of moral theology and his presence at the Seminary is an important factor in their decision to send seminarians there.

Faculty Member 2

A number of seminarians expressed uneasiness with perceived favoritism that a faculty member, Faculty Member 2, shows towards certain seminarians. Although Faculty Member 2's motivation is likely admirable, and there is no evidence of any sexual abuse or contact, his closer relationship with a small number of seminarians has unintended and deleterious consequences for others. Additionally, some of the particular details of his interactions, such as inviting seminarians into his residence, providing alcohol to them, going on vacations with some, are to be avoided. The Seminary should revise its Faculty Handbook to provide clearer guidelines regarding fraternization between faculty and seminarians.

Background

Faculty Member 2 is the Director of Human Formation and teaches a course of Systematic Theology. Faculty Member 2 is a popular instructor at the Seminary. After graduating from Holy Cross, Faculty Member 2 attended Boston College Law School and graduated from Harvard Law School. After law school, Faculty Member 2 worked for one year as an attorney at a large Boston law firm before he decided to enter the seminary at the North American College in Rome. Ordained in 2001, Faculty Member 2 has never been a parish priest. After spending a year as Chaplain at Bishop Strang High School, Faculty Member 2 became the Priest Secretary for the Bishop of Fall River, Bishop Coleman. In 2008, Faculty Member 2 was assigned to the Seminary.

When he became a member of the Seminary's faculty, Faculty Member 2 was provided no training to teach seminarians or guidance as to how to be a Formation Advisor. The assumption was that since he was a priest, he had the skills to counsel seminarians. Since then, Faculty Member 2 has attended summer programs on formation for formators and workshops.

Interaction with Seminarians

In contrast to nearly every other member of the faculty, Faculty Member 2 seeks out opportunities to associate and form friendships with seminarians in activities outside of the

classroom. In general, the activities outside the Seminary are physical or athletic activities that Faculty Member 2 enjoys. For instance, he has planned trips with seminarians to go hiking in the White Mountains or up Mount Monadnock. He has gone skiing with seminarians in Maine and has played tennis with them on courts at the Boston College campus. Faculty Member 2 has taken some seminarians swimming at Walden Pond and invited others to a pool party at the home of a local family who are friends of Faculty Member 2. Each fall, Faculty Member 2 invites seminarians to go to Berlin Orchards, which is owned by one of his friends, to spend the day doing volunteer manual labor, usually picking up the dropped apples that can be sold to make apple sauce or cider. On occasion, but not always, another faculty member may also accompany the group on any of these trips.

Faculty Member 2 also invites seminarians to his residence at the Seminary for various social activities. For instance, he has had seminarians over to watch a movie, play cards, play board games, play cribbage, pray the rosary, and watch a soccer game or other sporting event. Faculty Member 2 often provides beer to the seminarians for these activities.

A number of seminarians noted that Faculty Member 2 has an uncommon relationship with one particular seminarian and his family. When this seminarian entered the Seminary, he accepted Faculty Member 2's invitations to play cribbage (which was new to the seminarian), to watch televised games of the English premiere soccer league (also new), to watch movies, go on hikes, to Walden Pond, out to dinner, and other activities. These activities and the time spent with Faculty Member 2 were positive for the seminarian, gave him a deeper appreciation for the priesthood, and greatly enhanced his experience at the Seminary.

Twice, the seminarian has travelled to England on a vacation with his father. Each time, they arranged to meet up with Faculty Member 2, who was also travelling in England, to see a

couple of soccer matches and to spend some time with him. On one trip, they were joined by another seminarian who was studying at the North American College in Rome. In 2016, Faculty Member 2 arranged for the seminarian and his father to be included in a group along with Faculty Member 2 and Supreme Court Justice Scalia's son that received a private tour of the Supreme Court. They also got to meet with Justice Thomas in his chambers, spending almost two hours with the Justice.

Because the seminarians who participate in Faculty Member 2's outdoor activities are usually athletically-inclined and physically fit, other seminarians have dubbed them the "Pretty Committee." While most seminarians acknowledge that Faculty Member 2's actions are motivated by his sincere desire to get to know the seminarians outside of the classroom, they point out that these relationships cause resentment. One seminarian asked, "How fair is it that this guy [the seminarian mentioned above] goes on vacation with someone who votes on him?" Moreover, in our interviews, it was also clear that these activities also open Faculty Member 2 and the members of the Pretty Committee to false and malicious rumors. While we have found no evidence of wrongdoing, the appearance of favoritism inevitably caused resentment and speculation.

On one occasion, a Vocational Director was very concerned upon learning that one of the diocese's seminarians had gone on a swimming outing alone with Faculty Member 2. The proper relationship that must exist between a seminarian and a faculty member precludes a seminarian from becoming "pals" or "friends" with a faculty member. They are not equals. In order for the faculty member to serve as a model and an effective guide for a seminarian, he must remain strictly objective. The faculty member's proper role precludes him from having any type of a personal or exclusive relationship with one seminarian or a group of seminarians. Concerned that

Faculty Member 2 was not sufficiently sensitized to these boundary issues, the Vocational Director contacted the Seminary. He was told that Faculty Member 2 had intended to take a group of seminarians to Walden Pond and, at the last minute, the other seminarians had cancelled.

The majority of individuals we spoke with, including a well-respected authority on the governance of seminaries, agrees that it is important to establish and maintain boundaries between faculty and seminarians. Any favoritism or partiality that a faculty member shows towards a seminarian has the very real potential to undermine the relationship of trust between faculty and students, engender and excite jealousies, cause divisiveness, and disrupt the seminary community. Favoritism is harmful even when it is based on objective criteria. It invites comparison and ranking. Even though it is part of human nature to be closer to some individual over others, it is to be resisted. Seminarians who are not shown such favor may understandably feel that there are barriers created to their ordination.

Faculty Member 2 believes that the time he spends with seminarians outside of class has formational value. These shared activities provide Faculty Member 2 additional insight into the character and spirit of the seminarians. They also encourage seminarians to see priests, and their future selves, as “normal” people and not elevated above or apart from the laity. Others suggest that Faculty Member 2’s motives are less formational and more likely simply reflect his desire to have companions for his activities. They note that the seminarians who make up the “Pretty Committee” are socially well-adjusted, popular with the faculty, and in little need of additional attention or formation from the faculty.

Faculty Member 2 explained that neither the Rector nor the Vice Rector advised him not to take seminarians on trips outside of the Seminary and that neither had spoken to him about the

Vocational Director's inquiry concerning the seminarian he had taken to Waldon Pond. He also pointed out that there was no policy prohibiting faculty members from entertaining seminarians in their residences or providing them with beer and that both Msgr. Moroney and Fr. O'Connor did so. Faculty Member 2 maintained that he tries to be inclusive when inviting seminarians to events, though he concedes that most of his activities are generally with the more athletic and popular seminarians. Prior to our interview, Faculty Member 2 did not know that these seminarians were known as the "Pretty Committee." He also acknowledged that he was always cognizant of his formational role and believes that he maintained appropriate boundaries.

H. Cardinal Sean O'Malley

Cardinal O'Malley believed that he had addressed the issues that were brought to his attention regarding Msgr. Moroney's lack of presence at the Seminary, the lack of appropriate financial controls over the Seminary's finances, Fr. O'Connor's conduct at the 2015 bachelor party, and the drinking culture at the Seminary. In light of Cardinal O'Malley's large number of responsibilities inside and outside the diocese, it is appropriate for him to rely on others and expect that they will comply with their commitments made to him. It would be useful and a proper role for the Board of Trustees to ensure that commitments made to Cardinal O'Malley with respect to the Seminary are honored.

The Program of Priestly Formation, no. 293, specifies that Cardinal O'Malley has oversight responsibility for the formation of seminarians at the Seminary and must ensure that the activities at the Seminary correspond to canon law. In addition to this responsibility, Cardinal O'Malley has oversight responsibilities for two other seminaries in the Archdiocese, Pope Saint John XXIII National Seminary and Redemptoris Mater House of Formation, as well as responsibility for all of the priests in the diocese, over 300 parishes and their staff, and more than 60 "related" organizations (including various parochial schools, social service entities, insurance companies, investments trusts, foundations, retirement plans). Beyond that, Cardinal O'Malley has extensive responsibilities outside the Archdiocese. He is a member of Pope Francis's Council of Cardinal Advisers, the President of Pontifical Commission for the Protection of Minors, and a member of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

The fact that Cardinal O'Malley has such extensive responsibilities is not to absolve him of any of those responsibilities. But, as a practical matter, Cardinal O'Malley must rely on the Rector and the Seminary's faculty for the proper administration of the Seminary and it is appropriate that he do so. However, as we discuss later, Cardinal O'Malley should in the future also rely on an engaged Board of Trustees.

Our investigation disclosed that Cardinal O'Malley was aware of Msgr. Moroney's lack of presence at the Seminary, Msgr. Moroney's lack of appropriate controls over the Seminary's

financial matters, Fr. O'Connor's conduct with respect to the 2015 bachelor party, and the culture of drinking at the Seminary. When he learned of each, Cardinal O'Malley addressed them promptly and responsibly. Msgr. Moroney told Cardinal O'Malley that he would take steps to remedy each of the matters and Cardinal O'Malley was justified in believing that they had been resolved. However, there does not appear to have been sufficient follow-up by Cardinal O'Malley or his designee, especially with respect to Msgr. Moroney's lack of presence at the Seminary and to the Seminary's drinking culture, to ensure that they had, in fact, been addressed.

I. Board of Trustees

Although the individuals on the Seminary's Board of Trustees have impressive and meaningful experience that can benefit the Seminary, they are underutilized.

Since becoming Rector in 2012, Msgr. Moroney has worked very hard at improving the composition of the Board of Trustees and its depth of experience. Each of the members that we interviewed were impressive and dedicated to their responsibilities.

Although the eleven-member Board of Trustees is intended to provide oversight and to work in collaboration with the Members of the Corporation, in practice the Board acts only in an advisory capacity, and only with respect to decisions regarding the Seminary's finances and real estate matters. The Board's collective advice on these matters is considered seriously by Cardinal O'Malley and the other Members of the Corporation, but the Board's role is otherwise limited.

For instance, Msgr. Moroney related that when he became Rector, he did not meet with the Board of Trustees and does not believe that Cardinal O'Malley consulted with anyone on the Board.¹⁸ The Board members were somewhat dismayed that they were not consulted on the decision to place Msgr. Moroney on sabbatical leave, to appoint Fr. Salocks as interim Rector, to appoint a Commission to review the allegations in the social media postings, or to abandon the Commission and retain an independent law firm for the investigation.

Board members have had very limited exposure to the faculty. They were not consulted or involved in any way in the hiring of any faculty and were entirely unaware of any dismissals.¹⁹ Similarly, the Board has had no meaningful interaction with any seminarians, other

¹⁸ Msgr. Moroney now believes both he and the Seminary would have been better served if the Board of Trustees was a "collaborative partner" in the appointment of the Rector.

¹⁹ Though the Board members did not necessarily expect to be consulted in specific hiring decisions, some expressed a desire to be involved in the larger and related issue regarding what courses could be offered by the Seminary.

than very brief and trivial conversation at certain social events. Each Board member we spoke with enthusiastically welcomed the possibility of having greater interaction with the faculty and the seminarians, but especially the seminarians.

Providing the Board of Trustees with increased exposure to the seminarians might be particularly useful. Because of factors unique to a seminary, there are hurdles that may prevent seminarians from reporting abusive or inappropriate conduct.²⁰ While a seminarian can always bring misconduct to the attention of his Spiritual Director, the Spiritual Director operates in the “internal forum” and is precluded from disclosing to any other person his discussions with the seminarian. A seminarian can also bring the misconduct to the attention of his Formation Advisor who is permitted to disclose the seminarian’s concerns with third parties. However, a number of seminarians said that they would be reluctant to discuss any controversy with their Formation Advisor, especially if the controversy involves a faculty member. The reason is that each faculty member has a vote every year on whether the seminarian will proceed towards ordination. The seminarians are concerned that if they antagonize *any* faculty member, or become labelled as a nuisance, or worse yet a “cynic,” their prospects for ordination will be unfairly undermined. One possibility for providing seminarians with an avenue for reporting misconduct without jeopardizing his vocation may be to engage the Board of Trustees for this purpose.

Apart from episodic matters concerning misconduct that might arise in the future, the Board should be engaged to undertake a periodic, probably annual process, of meeting with

²⁰ In our interview of Dr. Vincent Lynch, the Seminary’s MAM/MTS Psychosocial Assessment/Seminary Human Formation Consultant, told us that he sometimes thinks of the seminarians as a “vulnerable population” because of this reduced capacity that they have to protect their own interests, the extreme power imbalance, and their susceptibility to physical, psychological, and emotional harm from other seminarians and faculty members.

members of the staff, the faculty, the seminarians, and Vocational Directors, to get receive information regarding the performance of the Rector. Significantly, these discussions with third parties should take place outside the Rector's presence. Following these discussions, the Board can meet with the Rector for his performance review and suggestions for continuing improvement. Also, the Board should take steps to gain further information and insight into issues related to Human Formation. Like any board of an educational institution, the Board should be in position to address any cultural issues that impede the Seminary's important mission.

J. Recommendations

Based on our investigation and the above findings, we recommend that St. John's Seminary consider taking the following steps:

1. Establishment of Reporting Mechanism

We recommend that St. John's Seminary establish a "hotline," both telephonic and on-line, by which seminarians and others can report suspected misconduct, improprieties, or policy violations through a confidential and anonymous channel without the fear of retribution.

Our investigation demonstrated that, as a practical matter, seminarians do not have a means of reporting suspected misconduct without subjecting themselves to possible retaliation. Although seminarians can share their concerns with their Spiritual Directors, the Spiritual Directors are prevented from disclosing the content of those discussions with anyone. Many seminarians stated that they would be wary about discussing such matters with their Formation Advisor or any other Formation Advisors for fear of being labelled quarrelsome or a troublemaker. The establishment of an anonymous procedure to facilitate such reports, perhaps to the Board of Trustees and to the Archdiocese's Director of the Office of Professional Standards and Oversight, would help ensure that any misconduct was identified quickly and resolved.

We also note that though the Seminary has designated a staff member to be its Title IX Coordinator, the staff member was identified as the Title IX Coordinator because "someone had to be listed." Neither the Coordinator nor anyone else at the Seminary has any understanding of what is required under Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972, which should be

addressed by the Seminary. The Seminary should also review its existing Sexual Harassment Policy to ensure that it complies with Title IX.

2. Training for Seminarians as Potential Targets of Grooming.

We recommend that St. John’s Seminary educate its seminarians and faculty members regarding the indications and the dangers of grooming.

Although we found insufficient evidence of sexual grooming at the Seminary, our investigation indicated that there was an inadequate understanding by the seminarians and faculty members as to what activities could be described as “grooming” and as to the concerns inherent in affiliations where there is a power differential. The better practice is to educate both the seminarians and faculty members on such matters before any problems arise.

3. Establishment of a Fraternization Policy.

We recommend that St. John’s Seminary establish a detailed written policy articulating the appropriate boundaries that should be maintained between faculty members and seminarians.

Our investigation revealed that seminarians and faculty members were unclear regarding what level and types of interaction were permitted between them, including whether faculty members should or should not meet with seminarians in their living quarters,²¹ whether or not faculty members may give gifts to seminarians, whether there should or should not be more interaction between seminarians and faculty members outside of the classroom, and what interactions outside of the Seminary is appropriate. The absence of clear lines encourages gossip,

²¹ While a number of individuals we interviewed categorically told us that faculty members should not meet with seminarians in their living quarters, we note that seminarians ordinarily do meet privately with their Spiritual Directors in their living quarters and that these interactions do not seem to be cause for any concern. All the more reason, in our view, to establish clear policies and guidelines.

dissatisfaction, and low morale among many of the seminarians. While there plainly should be boundaries between the seminarians and faculty, any guidelines and rules will have to take account of the desirability of still permitting the Human Formation process to include informal contact in the Seminary. If informal gatherings in faculty quarters is deemed inadvisable, the Seminary should consider how this informal contact can be achieved.

4. Revisit the Alcohol Policy for Seminarians and Faculty.

We recommend that St. John’s Seminary revisit its policies concerning the use of alcohol at the Seminary by both seminarians and faculty members.

Our investigation disclosed a number of alcohol-related incidents that occurred as a result of the poor judgment and risky behavior that often accompanies the use of alcohol. In light of the many social ills that are caused by the abuse of alcohol, it would seem appropriate to significantly restrict its consumption at the Seminary. For many of the same reasons, the Seminary should reassess whether it is appropriate to subsidize the purchase of beer in the Common Room.

5. Invigoration of the Human Formation Program.

We recommend that St. John’s Seminary restructure and significantly expand its Human Formation program.

Pope John Paul II observed that the development as a healthy human individual is the most important element of priestly education. *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, no. 79. According to the Program of Priestly Formation, no. 85, a successful Human Formation program instills a seminarian with the qualities of freedom, openness, honesty and flexibility, joy and inner peace, generosity and justice, personal maturity, interpersonal skills, common sense, aptitude for ministry, and growth in moral sensibility and character.

Our investigation disclosed that while the Seminary does not disregard this part of a seminarian's formation, it is much more focused on the Intellectual and Spiritual Formation.²² We also found that many of the issues identified in this Report, such as the culture of drinking, the inappropriate use of dating apps, and the formation of cliques among seminarians, are directly related to Human Formation.

The Human Formation training should focus on creating solid parish priests, as opposed to Ph.D. candidates, and include a variety of instructional forms, such as "best practice" sessions, experiential learning, simulated work-based methods, etc. The seminarians would benefit greatly from being trained to relate to individuals of differing social, demographic, and cultural backgrounds; to draw out the talents and support of parishioners; to have adult interactions with women; to deal with the difficulties of living a chaste and celibate life; the realities of living, not in the communal environment of the Seminary, but in the often-lonely setting of a rectory; and to overcome the challenges of leading a group of parishioners and dealing with their criticisms; among other necessary skills. Dr. Vincent Lynch, the Seminary's MAM/MTS Psychosocial Assessment/ Seminary Human Formation Consultant, has given these matters a great deal of thought and has number of innovative ideas too numerous to be described here. Dr. Lynch could

²² With respect to our suggestion that the Seminary consider revising its Human Formation program, a couple of faculty members pointed out that seminary is not vocational training and that the *Pastores Dabo Vobis* provides that Human Formation, and indeed all formation, is "ultimately a self formation." *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, no. 69. Whether or not the Seminary faculty considers such matters outside of their responsibilities, the seminarians need significant additional training to prepare them for the day-to-day responsibilities and challenges they will face as priests. If the faculty at the Seminary are unwilling to provide that training as part of the Human Formation program, the faculty might consider providing such training in addition to the existing formation programs so that the parishioners in the dioceses served by the Seminary are properly supported.

help the Seminary design a more comprehensive Human Formation program consistent with the Program of Priestly Formation.

It is important that care be taken in the choice of priests to serve as Formation Advisors to assure that they have “either significant pastoral experience or a strong and developed pastoral sense and intuition.” Letter from AUSCP Working Group on Priestly Formation to USCCB Committee on Clergy, Consecrated Life and Vocations dated January 25, 2018. In fact, priests who may be hesitant to leave parish life because they find pastoral work rewarding, fruitful, and life-giving are likely the most appropriate candidates to serve in this role. These priests’ experience of investing in their parishioners bodes well for their capacity to invest in the lives of the seminarians as father and mentor.

As a practical matter, since the Seminary faculty are fully occupied with their current responsibilities, and because there are limits as to what even excellent Formation Advisors can do, the Seminary should consider assigning Catholic lay persons a much greater role in the seminarians’ Human Formation, or in their formation generally. Because Catholic lay persons have the most at stake from the formation process, giving them a larger role seems appropriate. Moreover, unlike the Intellectual Formation and Spiritual Formation aspects of a seminarian’s preparation, there is nothing of Human Formation that necessitates the involvement of a clergy member. There are many Catholic women and men who live exemplary lives who would be wonderful role models for Human Formation purposes.

6. Periodic and Meaningful Performance Reviews of Rector and Faculty.

We recommend that Cardinal O’Malley and the Board of Trustees of St. John’s Seminary establish clear and detailed objectives for the Rector and each faculty member and, thereafter, provide them with periodic and meaningful reviews of their performances.

Our investigation indicated there was too often a lack of communication and understanding between and among the various members of the Seminary community. For instance, Msgr. Moroney appears to have been unaware as to how the seminarians perceived him and were affected by his lack of presence at the Seminary. Many of the faculty members likewise were not aware of the consequences of their conduct. Few members of the Board of Trustees knew any of the faculty members other than the Rector and the Vice Rector and had virtually no contact with seminarians.

To be effective and useful, performance reviews must be done in a thoughtful and intelligent manner. Where they are done correctly, performance reviews establish a formal process that increases constructive communication between various members of the Seminary community. Forms, such as the course evaluation forms completed by seminarians at the end of each semester or the written form evaluations by the Academic Dean, have limited usefulness. To be meaningful, any review process should be broad-based, seek to obtain useful information from seminarians, faculty, staff, the Board of Trustees, vocation directors, and other relevant stakeholders. It is also important that the results of such reviews be shared widely enough to ensure some measure of accountability. For instance, in Cardinal O'Malley's periodic discussions with Msgr. Moroney regarding his performance, two of the main concerns of our Report, Msgr. Moroney's lack of presence at the Seminary and the culture of drinking, were identified. However, because the Board of Trustees was not made aware of these matters, and there was insufficient follow-up, these issues were not sufficiently addressed.

7. Meaningful Financial Controls.

We recommend that the Board of Trustees of St. John's Seminary maintain and enforce the financial controls on expenditures at the Seminary recently put in place.

Although in our investigation we did not delve deeply into the Seminary's financial standing, a significant number of seminarians and faculty members told us that they were distressed by certain wasteful spending and diminishment of the Seminary's limited resources. Obviously, in order to accomplish its important mission, the Seminary must remain financially healthy. It is the Board of Trustees' role to ensure that the Seminary's resources are spent wisely. Although the financial controls established by the Board of Trustees were initially not heeded, there appears to be compliance at this time, and it would be incumbent on the Board of Trustees to continue to closely monitor the Seminary's spending.

8. Improved Record Keeping.

We recommend that the administration of St. John's Seminary improve its record-keeping with respect to seminarians and faculty members.

While files maintained on current and former seminarians were largely complete, the documentation concerning disciplinary actions or withdrawals from the Seminary were sometimes not included in those files or mildly sanitized. The files regarding the faculty members, which we expected to be similar to personnel records maintained in accordance with G.L. c. 149, § 52C, included only the faculty member's curriculum vitae and perhaps a letter from his bishop consenting to his appointment at the Seminary. The importance of accurate and complete record-keeping for both the institution and the individuals is plain. We note that the current administration of the Seminary recognizes the need to create and maintain accurate records and appears to take that obligation seriously.

9. Increase the Role of the Board of Trustees.

We recommend that the role of the Board of Trustees of St. John's Seminary be significantly expanded.

We found that the Board of Trustees is a strong group of dedicated and knowledgeable individuals who share a deep commitment to the Seminary. Without exception, each member of the Board of Trustees we spoke with was eager to become more involved in the operation and oversight of the Seminary and to take on greater responsibility. All welcomed the opportunity to establish personal relationships with individual seminarians. Moreover, as a practical matter, given the extraordinary demands on the Cardinal's time, any increased level of oversight of or involvement in the Seminary's activities will require the increased engagement of the Board of Trustees. Also, the Board of Trustees should be provided with additional information regarding the operation of the Seminary, including any dismissals of seminarians, faculty members, or staff and the reasons therefore.

Appendix - August 3, 2018 Social Media Posting By Mr. John Monaco

Ever since I was a child, I wanted to become a priest. My mother, a devout Catholic, was the one who taught me about the faith, the sacraments, and the Church. She brought me to daily Mass since I was an infant, and my earliest memories are of being held in her arms as she knelt on the communion rail to worthily receive the Eucharist. The image of the priest at prayer, offering the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, hearing confessions, visiting the sick, preaching from the pulpit, proclaiming the Gospel – I admired the priesthood and prayed to God that He would call me to serve Him as a priest.

My family was close with various priests in our home city. All of them knew I had a desire within me to become a priest. Given my solid Catholic upbringing, my participation in our parish life, and my zeal to bring others closer to God, it was a natural conclusion – after high school, I would enter seminary.

I entered when I was 17. At the time, there were only a few programs nationwide that had minor seminaries. I went to a pretty conservative one, one known for its “orthodoxy” and rigor. We were allowed to leave the seminary property only once a week – on Saturdays. Around the seminary walls was a spiked fence, which seemed odd, considering that the seminary was located in one of the most affluent ZIP codes in the country. A mix of the tough conservatism, the fortress mentality, and the distance from my home resulted in my feeling homesick and miserable. It was obvious to everyone. I did not make friends easily, and I often kept to myself.

One night, I was visited by a seminarian who was one year ahead of me. He asked to come into my room – he too seemed downcast. I let him in, had him sit in my comfortable chair, and we talked. He asked me how my adjustment to seminary life was going, and I frankly told him I was not enjoying it at all. He told me that “it takes time” and told me he was struggling as well.

Then the conversation began to turn creepy.

“Do you ever masturbate?”

My eyes flew open. “...what?”

He told me he struggled with masturbation. I understood the nature and struggle of the sin, but it seemed a bit too...forward. Still, I listened to him speak about his struggles. Then he asked me once again, “Do you do it?” I told him I did not. (It was true – I did not have an issue with chastity at the seminary, mostly because I felt too sad and trapped to even feel any affective emotions – ordered or disordered.) He apparently did not understand me, because then he asked me how I did it, what techniques I used to do it, and if I watched pornography. I felt beyond uncomfortable, and asked him to leave my room. He pretended he didn’t hear me, and he slouched in my chair, most likely trying to show off his erect

penis. “Get out!” I yelled. He quickly got up, apologized, and left. This seminarian was later reported by three other seminarians for the same thing, except with others, his advances became clearer. Together, we told the dean of men, and he was expelled.

On President’s Day weekend, we had a rare weekend off. I had the opportunity to go home, but I decided to take up another opportunity: I was invited, by a seminarian close to ordination, to go to his house with other seminarians for a party. I remember getting ready, excited to experience my first college “party,” which, ironically, happened to be at a seminarian’s house.

Upon arrival, I was greeted with a disturbing command: “Drink this.” It is disturbing to hear the words of Our Lord, words spoken that we may have life, used to get a person intoxicated – a rejection of life. He pushed a drink into my hands. It was in a small shot glass, it was green, and it did not seem inviting. “That’s your starter,” he said. I refused. I did not want to drink. He kept pressuring me to drink, saying I was being rude to him, who graciously allowed me to stay at his house for the weekend, and suggested that if I don’t drink, I would have to leave. Pressured by him, I drank. Immediately, I felt a burning sensation down my throat.

“Whoa!” he yelled. “Sip, don’t gulp!” It was too late. My throat burning, I asked for water. The next thing I remember was me stumbling through the house. I came across one seminarian – one of the more “conservative” ones in our seminary – vomiting, head in the toilet. As I continued to stumble down the hallway, looking for somewhere to rest, I encountered two seminarians fondling each other. I went outside for fresh air to call my mother.

While I was on the phone with her, a seminarian came from behind me and groped me. I yelled at him and told him to get away from me. My mother told me, “I’ll just talk to you later,” thinking I was roughhousing with the guys, and hung up. I never felt so alone and abandoned.

The party went on, but at some point in the early hours of the morning, I fell asleep in a chair. Hours later, as dawn broke, I woke up in the living room and saw more seminarians cuddling with each other. I ended up rushing out of the house, calling a cab, and spent the rest of the weekend in my room back at the seminary, alone.

A few weeks later, I went to see my formation adviser – the priest in charge of presenting me as a worthy candidate in front of the faculty. When I told him about the party, he told me I needed to be more charitable and understanding with my brother seminarians. He noted that the faculty saw that I was a “loner” and that I should build “fraternity” with my fellow seminarians. I began to cry. The priest then asked if he could “pray over me,” and I told him no. By this time, I knew that I was completely done with this seminary, and I planned on telling the vocations

director that I was leaving. The priest ended up “praying over me” anyhow and suggested that my “resistance” to his prayer was from the “Evil One.”

Thankfully, I left that seminary after my first year, and I continued my studies at a Catholic college while living at a rectory, a sort of “pastoral year.” I studied philosophy and had a great time with the regular lay students, my pastor supervisor, and the various parishioners I interacted with on a daily basis.

In 2012, a number of seminarians were kicked out of our diocese when it was revealed that they were frequenting gay bars, had pornography on their computers and in their room, and had sexual relations with each other within seminary walls. These events corresponded with additional scandal at the same seminary. While I was spared this, I realized I needed time away for myself. I left formation and dated, played lacrosse, made friends, all while continuing my philosophy studies. These were the best years of my life.

Still, I felt a deep desire to serve God as a priest, and so, following graduation, I re-applied to the diocese to enter major seminary and was accepted.

I spent two years in yet another “conservative” major seminary before leaving. During my time in this seminary, I saw more misconduct and abuse. Some priests on the faculty would get drunk with a select group of seminarians and invite them into their rooms late at night. One night, a priest on the formation faculty got so drunk during a seminary party that he fell out of his chair. While during the day, this particular priest was a hardliner regarding the Church’s teachings, his nighttime behavior revealed that such “orthodoxy” was a mask hiding his perversions. When I brought this up to other seminarians, I was criticized for being “uncharitable” and “gossiping.”

Though the seminary was no longer a purple palace where homosexual activity was front and center, sexual deviancy and improper conduct remained – only this time, it was behind the scenes. One of the seminarians ahead of me laughed and told me that the year before I entered, my room belonged to a guy who was kicked out for committing sodomy with a member of a religious order who took classes at the seminary. They were discovered after their moaning was heard by a seminarian across the hall, who notified a faculty member. Both seminarians were promptly expelled. Sometimes, I would come downstairs to the common room late at night and find seminarians cuddling with each other – drunk, of course. Alcohol abuse was prevalent, and no one took action against it.

I kept to myself during those two years, but rumors of seminarians hooking up with each other and faculty members grooming homosexual seminarians with lavish gifts abounded. I became more and more isolated. I stopped attending daily Mass and the recitation of the Divine Office, preferring to stay in my room and try to sleep my way through the day. Thankfully, the rector of the seminary took note of my depressed state, met with me, and arranged for me to see a therapist –

which he kindly paid for. After speaking with the therapist, as well as my Spiritual Director, I knew what I had to do. In spring of 2016, I left.

It wasn't until a month ago that I told my mother about what happened to me in the seminary. After reading about "Uncle Ted" McCarrick and hearing about the atrocities he committed, I was disgusted – though not surprised.

*While seminaries may be better today than in decades past, decadence is still there. In his provocative book, *Goodbye! Good Men*, Michael S. Rose notes that, following the Second Vatican Council, seminaries became liberal forts for deep-seatedly homosexual men. His claim is that the homosexual cabal would screen and kick out any "orthodox" men. While this may be true in some instances, Rose misses a crucial point: sexual abuse, especially in seminaries, is not solely committed by "liberals" who publicly dissent from Catholic teaching. As a former priest points out, even the Diocese of Lincoln – the bastion of conservatism and "orthodoxy" following Vatican II – was susceptible to abuse and subsequent denial.*

If the stories from "Uncle Ted's" victims tell us anything, it is that there is a deep rot within our Church that spans generations. If you are a Catholic man considering priesthood, my advice is this: have a very honest, open, and clear discussion with your vocations director. Ask him about the culture of the seminaries used by your diocese. Maintain communication with him and others about your experiences. If you see something, say something. Do not fear the repercussions. The silence in the face of clerical abuse has done nothing to eradicate it – it simply perpetuates it.

Lastly, we cannot forget the importance of prayer and fasting, especially in the face of such evil. We need to pray for those entrusted with forming the future priests of the Church. Pray for the hierarchy to be courageous in their handling of sexual abuse by clergy and misconduct. And most of all, pray for the victims of abuse. Their pain is real, and they need support.

Appendix - August 10, 2018 Statement From Cardinal O'Malley

Earlier this week I was informed that two former seminarians of St. John's Seminary in the Archdiocese of Boston had posted allegations on social media sites including the Archdiocese's Facebook page that during their time at the seminary they witnessed and experienced activities which are directly contrary to the moral standards and requirements of formation for the Catholic priesthood.

At this time I am not able to verify or disprove these allegations. As Archbishop of Boston, with responsibility for the integrity of the seminary and its compliance with the Church's Program for Priestly Formation, I am committed to immediate action to address these serious matters and have made the following decisions regarding St. John's Seminary.

First, I have asked Msgr. James P. Moroney, Rector of St. John's, to go on sabbatical leave for the Fall Semester, beginning immediately, in order that there can be a fully independent inquiry regarding these matters.

Second, I have appointed Rev. Stephen E. Salocks, Professor of Sacred Scripture, to serve as Interim Rector at St. John's.

Third, I have appointed the Most Rev. Mark O'Connell, Auxiliary Bishop of Boston, Dr. Francesco Cesareo, President of Assumption College and President of the USCCB National Review Board, which advises the USCCB on matters of child and youth protection policies and practices, and Ms. Kimberly Jones, CEO of Athena Legal Strategies Group to oversee an inquiry into the allegations made this week, the culture of the seminary regarding the personal standards expected and required of candidates for the priesthood, and any seminary issues of sexual harassment or other forms of intimidation or discrimination. The inquiry will be staffed by Mark Dunderdale, Esq., Director of the Archdiocesan Office of Professional Standards and Oversight.

I have directed this group to proceed with due seriousness of their assignment and as soon as possible to submit to me the findings of the inquiry and a set of recommendations to assure appropriate standards of professional behavior in compliance with Church teaching at all levels of seminary life. The faculty, staff and students at the seminary will be advised of my expectation that they will fully cooperate with the inquiry.

The allegations made this week are a source of serious concern to me as Archbishop of Boston. The ministry of the Catholic priesthood requires a foundation of trust with the people of the Church and the wider community in which our priests serve. I am determined that all our seminaries meet that standard of trust and provide the formation necessary for priests to live a demanding vocation of service in our contemporary society.

Appendix - August 17, 2018 “Open Letter” From Mr. John Monaco To Cardinal O’Malley

Your Eminence, Cardinal Seán Patrick O’Malley,

It is with a spirit of faith, hope, and love that I write this letter to you, the shepherd of all Roman Catholics in the Archdiocese of Boston. During his apostolic journey to the United States, our Holy Father Pope Francis exhorted you and all of the U.S. bishops in attendance to be “close to people,” becoming “pastors who are neighbors and servants.” Citing the Parable of the Good Samaritan, the Holy Father asked that you and your brother bishops be men of pastoral sensitivity, examples to the priests under your care, so that they too may “be ready to stop, care for, soothe, lift up and assist those who, ‘by chance’ find themselves stripped of all they thought they had” (Lk. 10:29-37).

As a victim of sexual abuse and misconduct, I, like the man in the parable who was attacked by robbers, found myself stripped of all I thought I had. I thought I had security and safety within the walls of an institution dedicated to forming men after the Heart of Jesus. I thought I had trust in those in power to promptly address issues of misconduct, especially seeing how past failures in this area damaged Catholics worldwide. Lastly, I thought I had a priestly vocation – something I have now given up in exchange for a prophetic one.

As you know, news of the abusive “Uncle Ted” McCarrick caused a firestorm among the Catholic faithful in this country. Many of us faithful Catholics find ourselves baffled at how the public face of the Catholic Church in America could have gone on to enjoy a successful episcopal career despite common knowledge among the Church and media that he was a predator. Reflecting upon the way McCarrick and other clerics with power were allowed to commit abuses and cover them up, I realized that silence was what allowed additional violence to be committed against more and more victims. So I decided to write about my experiences of wrongdoing, first published here by One Peter Five.

Out of courtesy, I declined to disclose the names of these seminaries I attended and faculty members guilty of misconduct, preferring to focus on the troubling issues themselves. However, as my story spread across social media, former seminarians spoke out publicly and confirmed that I was telling the truth – and went so far as to give the name of the seminary itself. It is now public knowledge that my tragic experiences took place at St. Charles Borromeo Seminary from 2010 to 2011 and at Saint John’s Seminary from 2014 to 2016, the latter of which is directly under your care.

Please allow me to make a few important distinctions that can hopefully help the investigation. First, my complaints regarding Saint John’s Seminary were not specifically about sexual abuse; they were about general misconduct, scandalous behavior by faculty and students, and an overall unhealthy seminary culture. Such misconduct includes former seminarians engaging in sodomy and a “sexting”

scandal that disturbed many of us in the house. However, should the investigation focus exclusively on the issue of sex and sex abuse, it will be a relatively easy case to dismiss. On the one hand, the two seminarians were rightly expelled – but on the other hand, the sexting scandal was improperly addressed by priests on the faculty and outside the faculty alike. These two instances are not enough to address the many issues plaguing Saint John’s. Sexual misconduct is not the main problem – it is symptomatic of larger issues regarding immorality and accountability.

Secondly, as I have consistently stated, my motivation for speaking out was out of a sincere love for the Catholic Church. I am not a “disgruntled seminarian,” nor am I a seminary “failure.” I received a positive vote to advance in major seminary both years; it was my free and honest decision to leave the toxic environment. I, along with others, have seen the way silence has allowed sin to spread more pervasively. I have heard whispers that my story was “slandorous” and “dishonest.” Let it be known that I have corrected multiple news outlets in their erroneous reporting of important details of this investigation, which should testify to my claim that I care only about truth and justice, not sensationalism and embellishment. Should anyone doubt my honesty, I urge you to note how part of my testimony has already been confirmed through Pennsylvania’s recent grand jury report. Moreover, I have proof and witnesses of the misconduct at Saint John’s.

In speaking the truth, I sacrificed everything – my name, my reputation, my family, my friends, potential future jobs, connections, and more. I now understand what Our Lord meant when He said, “Whoever wishes to save his life will lose it; but whoever loses his life for My sake will find it” (Mt. 16:25).

Thirdly, this investigation must address the disturbing reality that these allegations were brought to the public eye precisely because they were previously ignored. As I mentioned in my story, I went through the proper channels in my attempt to address the misconduct. I brought my concerns to my formation adviser and my vocation director multiple times. There are only two options with regard to my allegations about the culture at Saint John’s Seminary – either the seminary faculty were so obtuse that these complaints went unnoticed, or worse, those in power are lying about their ignorance of my allegations. Either of these options is damning; in either scenario, those entrusted with proper leadership failed in their duty to uphold (in your words) the “moral standards and requirements of formation for the Catholic priesthood,” whether by sins of commission or sins of omission.

I hereby request that the investigation focuses on three major areas:

1. Immoral and unprofessional misconduct by faculty and students alike, including, but not limited to:

- *“Private parties” where certain faculty members would invite an exclusive clique of seminarians into their room late at night.*
- *Widespread alcohol abuse, including a bachelor party hosted at the seminary in which a faculty member, drinking with seminarians until 2 A.M., fell out of his chair.*
- *Allegations of grooming and its subsequent cover-up.*
- *A mismanagement of seminary finances.*

2. *A toxic culture of fear, intimidation, and discrimination at Saint John’s Seminary:*

- *Bullying by certain faculty members.*
- *Threats of a lawsuit against those exposing the misconduct.*
- *Certain faculty members seen as “untouchable” and who survived over a decade of credible allegations.*
- *Fear from seminarians, priests, and laity of speaking out.*

3. *Subsequent cover-up of such misconduct and unhealthy culture by leadership:*

- *The fact that my complaints – and others’ – went ignored and mishandled.*
- *The insistent denial by leadership regarding the basis of these allegations.*

Since this is an open letter, I sincerely hope that anyone who is reading this who has experienced, witnessed, or heard of misconduct in regards to Saint John’s Seminary will come forward – publicly or anonymously – so that additional light may shine on the darkness that has been hidden. Since coming forward, I have received dozens of messages from seminarians, former seminarians, and Catholic laity across the country. Some of these messages include their own experiences of abuse and misconduct at the hands of the Catholic Church; others include their own suspicions about Saint John’s Seminary, which my testimony confirmed. Many, including priests, are afraid to speak publicly because they are afraid of the repercussions. Such is the culture of our Church today – those who speak truth to ecclesial power find themselves ostracized and hated.

Your Eminence, it is my sincere hope that you continue to take seriously these allegations and guide the investigation accordingly. Admittedly, I am perturbed that you appointed a former member of the seminary faculty (who was on the faculty during my time at SJS) to lead this investigation. The Catholic faithful have seen how bishops policing themselves and conducting internal investigations can jeopardize the objectivity so desperately needed for the pursuit of justice. That stated, I trust in your judgment, as I know that Bishop Mark O’Connell is a true shepherd and a man of integrity.

I witnessed and experienced improper behavior by those entrusted with forming men to the Catholic priesthood, and I pray that others may not have a similar experience. You have my utmost support and prayers during the days ahead. May this investigation result in the light of truth and the freedom that only Truth Himself can give.

In the Sacred Heart,

John A. Monaco

Appendix - October 11, 2018 Statement From Cardinal O'Malley

This past August, I assembled a committee of men and women with the highest integrity and expertise to conduct a review at St. John's Seminary in the Archdiocese of Boston. This review is in response to postings on the Archdiocesan Facebook page by two former seminarians stating that during their time at the seminary, they witnessed and experienced activities that are directly contrary to the moral standards and requirements of formation for the Catholic priesthood. Within days of these Facebook postings, the committee was appointed, announced publicly and preparations begun to review the culture of the St John Seminary regarding the personal standards expected and required of candidates for the priesthood, including any seminary issues of sexual harassment or other forms of intimidation or discrimination. I also committed to make available whatever resources the committee felt necessary to undertake this review.

In the weeks that have followed, I have consulted with many men and women who care deeply about the Church and our seminaries. The consultations have included recognition that the Archdiocese is the sponsor for three seminaries: St. John Seminary in Brighton, Pope St. John XXIII National Seminary in Weston and Redemptoris Mater Seminary in Chestnut Hill. While the initial review was specific to St. John's, I have concluded that to meet the generally expected levels of transparency and accountability, it is best to expand the review to include all three seminaries. I want to reassure the seminary communities and the wider public that these are institutions committed to the highest standards of integrity, respect and safety for our seminarians, faculty and staff.

I am confident that the committee that was appointed for the review of St. John's Seminary was fully capable of conducting an objective and thorough study. These women and men are individuals with impeccable integrity and are distinguished in their fields. However, with the determination to expand the review to all Archdiocesan seminaries it would not be reasonable to ask them to take on a project of that scope. Also, I recognize that each member of the original committee has connections or ties to St. John's Seminary and that given the current challenges of confidence in Church leadership and institutions, the people of the Church and our civic community there may have been concerns regarding the objectivity and completeness of the committee's findings. For these several reasons I have decided to engage Yurko, Salvesen and Remz to conduct the review of the Archdiocesan seminaries. The review will be led by former U.S. Attorney Donald K. Stern, with the assistance of Doug Salvesen and others at the firm. Yurko, Salvesen & Remz has significant experience with the process of review that we seek and does not have an existing relationship with any of the seminaries or the Archdiocese of Boston. Individuals who have information relevant to the review are encouraged to contact the firm directly, either by email to dsalvesen@bizlit.com or by calling (617) 723-6900. Individuals who have already provided information relevant to the inquiry, please know that this will be directly transmitted to Yurko, Salvesen and Remz.

Once the review work is completed I am committed to releasing an independent report that addresses any issues arising from the review and identify steps that we will

take to remediate any identified problems. Yurko, Salvesen and Remz will determine the timetable for completion of the review.

It is important to recognize that this review is being conducted in a manner that will be thorough and respectful of all participants but also with as little disruption as possible to the academic year now underway at the seminaries. I want to assure all participants of the integrity of this process and my confidence that truth and full disclosure will ultimately unify us all.

The Archdiocese of Boston is blessed to have three nationally recognized seminaries that are among the finest in the United States. This past May I ordained seven men to the priesthood at Our Lady of Perpetual Help Church in Boston, MA, as the Cathedral of the Holy Cross is undergoing renovations. It was a beautiful and holy celebration, focused on the commitment of the new priests and the future of our Archdiocese. In my homily I shared that the Church exists to evangelize, and all our priests must be missionary disciples, constantly inviting others to be part of Jesus' family, to embrace his Gospel and his mission. I urged the newly ordained to embrace the principles of love, and mercy, which are vital elements of that mission, and that mercy must be a principal theme of their ministry. A seminarian begins the journey of discernment long before entering seminary, where they enter into a formal program of spiritual, academic and human formation. In May 2019 I look forward to ordaining the largest number of new priests in more than two decades in the Archdiocese of Boston.

I often share that Evangelization and the encouragement of vocations are the work of all people of the Church, our parishioners, our priests, deacons and the religious women and men whose presence is a great assistance for our ministry. In times such as we are experiencing it is of ever greater importance that we embrace the dedication, commitment and experience of the laity if we are to provide the path for our future priests to serve as witnesses of the love and mercy of Jesus.