

**HEARING PANEL OF THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS**

THE EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS	}
	}
v	}
	}
THE REVEREND DOUGLAS E. ANDERSON	}
	}
RESPONDENT	}

**RESPONSE OF THE RESPONDENT
THE REVEREND DOUGLAS E. ANDERSON
TO THE STATEMENT OF ALLEGED OFFENSES**

In accordance with the provisions of Canon IV.13.2.(c), the Respondent, The Reverend Douglas E. Anderson, hereby responds to the Written Statement of Alleged Offenses prepared by the Church Attorney, which is undated but emailed to the Respondent by The Rev. Nancy E. Gossling, President of the Hearing Panel on November 30, 2022.

**OBJECTION TO FORM OF THE CHURCH ATTORNEY'S
WRITTEN STATEMENT OF ALLEGED OFFENSES**

Canon IV.12.1 provides in pertinent part that the Church Attorney shall prepare a written statement, "describing each alleged Offense separately, with reasonable particularity sufficient to apprise the Respondent of the acts, omissions or conditions which are the subject of the proceedings."

Canon IV.13.2 provides in pertinent part that "within 10 days of a referral for Hearing Panel proceedings, the Church Attorney shall provide to the Hearing Panel the statement of the alleged offenses, updated as needed."

The Church Attorney's "Written Statement of Alleged Offenses" does not comply with the provisions of Canon IV.12.1 and Canon IV.13.2 in that neither "describ[es]

each alleged Offense *separately*, nor does either "describe with *reasonable particularity* sufficient to apprise the Respondent of the acts, omissions or conditions which are the subject of the proceedings." (Emphasis Added)

AS TO THE FIRST CHARGE
Alleging Violation of Canon IV.4.1(h) (1)

Respondent denies that he engaged in any act of Sexual Misconduct and therefore denies any violation of Canon IV.4.1(h) (1).

AS TO THE SECOND CHARGE
Alleging Violation of Canon IV.4.1(h) (6)

Respondent denies that he engaged in any act conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation and therefore denies any violation of Canon IV.4.1(h) (6).

AS TO THE THIRD CHARGE
Alleging Conduct Unbecoming a Member of
the Clergy, in Violation of Canon IV.4.1(h)(9)

Respondent denies that he engaged in any Conduct Unbecoming a Member of the Clergy, and therefore denies any violation of Canon IV.4.1(h)(9).

**RESPONSE OF THE RESPONDENT
TO THE STATEMENT OF ALLEGED
OFFENSES (IMPROPERLY TITLED
“CHURCH ATTORNEY STATEMENT”)**

The Church Attorney drafted a “Summary of the Acts, Omissions or Conditions Supporting the Offenses” which does not comply with the Canons. In that Summary the Church Attorney improperly makes a lot of statements as if he is testifying or has first-hand knowledge of information that he has no way of knowing. He does not provide the sources for the half-truths, lies and misinformation mixed with sprinklings of fact. He has twisted

information to present a picture of the Respondent to fit the narrative that he created to pursue this Title IV action against the Respondent.

Respondent denies that he ever engaged in any sexual behavior with the Complainant. Furthermore, Respondent denies that he engaged in any behavior with the Complainant that fits the definition of Sexual Misconduct as defined in Canon IV.4.1.(h) (1).

Respondent did not engage in sexual behavior with the Complainant.

Complainant was not at any time “an employee, volunteer, student or counselee of the Member of the Clergy, or a person with whom the member of the Clergy has a pastoral relationship.”

There is no legal connection between [REDACTED] and St James’ Church. [REDACTED] is its own 501(c) nonprofit, with its own officers, Board, By Laws, budget and functioning. Respondent, just like any member of the Board, was nominated and elected to the Board not in an *ex officio* capacity as a member of the clergy, but in the same manner as any other member of the public. Over his 15 years in Texarkana, there were periods of time when Respondent did not serve on the Board.

At no time did Respondent have a pastoral relationship with the Complainant. The Complainant was neither a parishioner of St. James’ nor an Episcopalian. In fact, the Complainant is not even Christian.

The Church Attorney falsely wrote in his statement, “Shortly after Ms. [REDACTED] arrival at the [REDACTED], Rev. Anderson began coming to her office, calling her, texting her and confiding in her.” To the contrary, soon after the Complainant arrived at the [REDACTED], the Respondent left for Spain with family members for several weeks.

The Respondent supported Complainant because she was a friend and the [REDACTED] needed

stability. Over the past ten years the [REDACTED] had several [REDACTED] who all left for various reasons none having to do with the Respondent. In fact, Respondent (as Chairman) would regularly advocate on behalf of the Complainant when concerns about her performance were raised by other members of the Board. Even after Respondent departed Texarkana in January 2020 and thus ceased serving on the Board, the Complainant regularly consulted with the Respondent about how to handle concerns raised by members of the Board.

The Respondent admits that he and the Complainant were friends. However, the Complainant is one of many friends that the Respondent met through [REDACTED]

The Church Attorney falsely wrote in his statement, “Rev. Anderson told [the Complainant] that his wife was going to Canada for close to a month to visit relatives. During the period his wife was away, Rev. Anderson, on several occasions, invited Ms. [REDACTED] to dinner at his home. On one such occasion, Rev. Anderson engaged in oral sex with Ms. [REDACTED]. Thereafter, Rev. Anderson repeatedly asked [REDACTED] if she would consider a romantic relationship with him.”

It was common knowledge that Respondent’s family would return to Canada during the Summer to visit relatives. The Respondent has invited lots of friends and acquaintances for dinner at his home. The Respondent never engaged in oral sex or any sexual contact with the Complainant or anyone else to whom he was not married. The Respondent has been married to his wife since 1995. The Respondent never asked for or sought a romantic relationship with the Complainant.

The Respondent is surprised that the Church Attorney asserts that the Complainant considered the Respondent to be her boss. At the time of the Complainant’s tenure at [REDACTED], the

Respondent served as Chairman (or President—the terms were used interchangeably) of the Board. In and of itself, the Chairman has no additional authority than any other member of the Board, except when the Chairman acted as a member of the Executive Committee (all officers) acting in concert. The Chairman has no authority to hire, fire, discipline, determine compensation for the [REDACTED] except as a member of the Executive Committee or the wider Board. This is abundantly clear in the [REDACTED] By Laws, of which any [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] would have been very familiar.

Terms of the [REDACTED] employment were governed by the organization By Laws and her Letter of Agreement with the Board, signed by the Chairman “for the Board.” Indeed, when the Letter of Agreement was being negotiated, the Complainant asked for compensation in excess of that being offered by the Board. As Chairman, Respondent advised that he was unable on his own authority to increase compensation, and that any increase would need to be approved by the Board at a subsequent meeting.

The Church Attorney falsely wrote in his statement, “In late 2019, Rev. Anderson told [REDACTED] that he had been approached about a position at Church of the Advent in Boston, that he was in love with her and that if she would not reciprocate, he was going to accept the position in Boston. [REDACTED] told Rev. Anderson that she did not think the two of them had a future together. In January 2020 Rev. Anderson moved to Boston. Right before his departure he asked Ms. [REDACTED] to get a hotel room together with him. He told her that she owed it to him to do so. She refused.” Respondent denies everything in this entire paragraph except to admit that in late 2019 he told several people, including the Complainant, that he had been approached about a position in Boston.

The Church Attorney wrote in his statement, “In February 2020, Rev. Anderson sent Ms.

██████████ a book, a letter, and tickets to fly from Texarkana to Boston to visit him on Valentine's Day while his wife was away.” The Respondent denies everything in this paragraph except to admit that at some point he gave the Complainant a book. The Respondent has given many friends books over the years.

The Church Attorney wrote in his statement, “In his interview with the Investigator in March 2022, Rev. Anderson intentionally misrepresented his behavior toward Ms. ██████████. He falsely denied having oral sex with her and falsely denied sending her a love letter and airline tickets to visit with him in Boston on Valentine's Day.” Respondent denies this paragraph entirely.

The “Investigator” that Donald J. Allison, the Church Attorney refers to in his statement is Michael A. McHale, Esq. Mr. McHale is the law partner of Mr. Allison in a firm called Allison & McHale, LLP. In violation of Canon IV.2, Bishop Gates informed the Respondent on May 13, 2022, that, “The Church Attorney for the Diocese of Massachusetts, Donald J. Allison assigned Michael A. McHale, attorney at law, as the Investigator.”

After the Respondent left Texarkana, the Complainant continued to reach out to the Respondent. In one instance, in the Spring of 2020, the Complainant asked advice about a potential real estate purchase in Texarkana, and the Respondent arranged for her to speak to a real estate attorney that he knew.

Respondent denies committing any of the Canonical violations set forth in the Church Attorney’s Written Statement.

Faithfully submitted,


The Reverend Douglas Anderson

Dated: December 30, 2022