

seem that, while the decision itself was wrong, it was based on an expectation that having Father Pearce in the community would allow for better supervision. The Abbot has admitted that this was poor judgment on his part. Given the clear establishment of a Safeguarding officer in the monastic community, we can be confident that Safeguarding matters are not only better understood but that appropriate procedures are being implemented and followed.

As mentioned above, it would seem that the Abbot is not responding adequately to the needs of individual victims or to the sense of pain suffered by the parish community. I believe that it would be very beneficial to institute some liturgical response for the benefit of the parish and to provide some apparatus by which the victims might be heard and assisted in some appropriate way.

We were also concerned about the quality of the monastic life in the Abbey. While this is outside the scope of this Apostolic Visitation, I believe that a renewal of the monastic life is a precondition for the revival of the monastery.

I would recommend that there be ongoing mentoring of the Abbot by the Abbot President and that a further canonical Visitation be required before June 2013. If these recommendations are accepted, then there would seem to be no benefit in recommending the removal of the Abbot.

I conclude by making some recommendations:

(1): The Abbot should not be removed from office. He should be encouraged to be more attentive to those who have been abused and the need for healing within the parish. In particular, I recommend that there should be a liturgy of reconciliation.

(2): The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith should accept the relevant recommendations made in the Carlile Report.

(3): The English Benedictine Congregation should make a further canonical Visitation of Ealing Abbey before June 2013, and should send a report on this to the Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life.