

**VATICAN II,
HOMOSEXUALITY
AND PEDOPHILIA**

Atila Sinke Guimarães

Edited by

Marian Therese Horvat, Ph.D.

Copyright © 2004 by Atila Sinke Guimarães

ISBN: 0-9726516-2-4

Library of the Congress Number: 2003115933

Printed and bound in the United States of America

Cover by TIA's art desk.

Picture: *Lot leaving Sodom*, by Jaime Huguet, 15th century, Barcelona Cathedral.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means whatsoever, including the Internet, without permission in writing from the author, except that brief selections may be quoted or copied for non-profit use without permission, provided full credit is given.



Tradition in Action, Inc.

P.O. Box 23135

Los Angeles, CA 90023

www.TraditionInAction.org

WORD TO THE READER

The first draft of this book was the appendix on homosexuality to *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*, which is volume one of my collection on Vatican II, published in 1997. It presented homosexuality and pedophilia in the clergy as moral aspects of the broader crisis that Vatican II brought to the Catholic Church. Later the appendix was published separately in a booklet form and was spread widely.

Since that time, the wave of sexual scandals continued to expand around the world. Suddenly in 2002 this wave, presented in the form of clerical sex abuse of children, swelled and flooded the U.S. media, Catholic milieu and public opinion. It has come to constitute the largest moral scandal of North American Catholic history.

In 2002, several friends asked me to update my booklet on the topic to cover the new developments of the crisis. They argued that it was already an efficient tool that provided the principal texts of Catholic doctrine against homosexuality and pedophilia, as well as the main initiatives of post-conciliar religious authorities that opened the dike for the present day flood of homosexuality and pedophilia within the ecclesiastical milieu. It also presented a summary of the major episodes of the crisis, useful to the average Catholic who lacks the time for research. The work just needed to be update, they contended, to report significant data both past and present.

The number of scandals, unfortunately, had increased a great deal since 1995, when my research had ended. The American Catholic Hierarchy with the en-

dorsement of the Vatican had also taken an official position on clerical pedophilia (the Washington document of November 2002) that demanded analysis. These two factors obliged me to update the study, and transformed my booklet into a more complete work.

Today it is presented to the public as a special edition to the Collection *Eli, Eli lamma sabacthani?* (My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?), which analyzes Vatican Council II.

Naturally, this new updated publication overshadows its previous editions, since both only covered events up until 1995. Further editions of *Murky Waters* will no longer carry such an appendix.

ASG

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Word to the Reader | 3 |
| Table of Contents | 5 |
| Introduction | 9 |
| | |
| I - Position of Sacred Scriptures and Catholic Tradition regarding homosexuality | 11 |
| 1. Excerpts from Sacred Scriptures | 11 |
| 2. Tradition of the ecclesiastical Magisterium | 15 |
| A. Popes and Councils..... | 15 |
| B. Saints and Apologists | 22 |
| 3. Tradition of civil legislation | 31 |
| II - A new tolerant conciliar morals | 37 |
| 1. Conciliar principles of adaptation and tolerance... | 38 |
| 2. Post-conciliar Vatican documents on homosexuality .. | 39 |
| Presupposition of the analysis | 40 |
| A. <i>Declaration on questions about sexual ethics</i> .. | 41 |
| Confusion creates tolerance | 45 |
| B. <i>Letter to the Bishops on the pastoral care for homosexual persons</i> | 46 |
| C. <i>Regarding legislative proposals on discrimination of homosexuals</i> | 49 |
| D. The persistent Vatican tolerant approach..... | 52 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| E. Summarizing | 54 |
| 3. Vatican position regarding pedophile priests..... | 56 |
| A. The Dallas meeting and documents..... | 58 |
| B. Vatican refuses approval of the documents ... | 61 |
| C. The Washington documents | 66 |
| a. Definition of sexual abuse | 67 |
| b. The judgment and its reliability | 69 |
| c. Changing the statute of limitations..... | 72 |
| D. A final assessment | 77 |
| III - Homosexuality and the Catholic Church in the US... | 79 |
| 1. Extent of the phenomenon and principal movements... | 79 |
| 2. Support of the Hierarchy for homosexuality..... | 82 |
| 3. The Chicago symposium | 93 |
| 4. Homosexual “religious orders” | 98 |
| 5. Homosexual priests and Bishops | 99 |
| 6. The “McNeill affair” | 102 |
| 7. The “Weakland affair” | 107 |
| 8. Percentage of homosexual priests..... | 109 |
| 9. Homosexuality: the new face of the priesthood ... | 114 |
| 10. The homosexual <i>mafia</i> in the seminaries and the support it receives from the Bishops | 117 |
| 11. Should homosexuals be ordained? | 126 |
| IV - Ecclesiastical homosexuality in other countries ... | 131 |
| Accusations against Paul VI | 157 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| V - The scandal of priestly pedophilia in the US | 165 |
| 1. Definition and terminology | 165 |
| 2. Beginning of the crisis in the U.S. – Overview | 168 |
| 3. The clergy pedophilia scandal explodes..... | 185 |
| The year 2002 | 186 |
| The year 2003 | 232 |
| 4. Figures for pedophile priests in America.... | 250 |
| 5. Financial costs of the crisis | 252 |
| VI - Clerical pedophilia in other countries | 259 |
| Conclusion | 291 |
| Refuting sophisms | 299 |
| Index | 311 |

INTRODUCTION

To evaluate the moral consequences of the Ecumenical Council Vatican II, this book presents an overall view of the sexual scandals against nature that have taken place in the Church since then. The overview focuses particularly on homosexuality and the pedophile sex abuses within the Catholic clergy and Hierarchy.

The data on these two topics are presented as they were published in organs of the press and books worthy of credit. Each quote is followed by the respective source that supports it and stands responsible for what is stated.

I am responsible for my comments, for the ensemble of the picture presented, and for the translations of news items originally published in languages other than English.

I have tried to be honest as far as I could regarding objective information and refrained from exaggerating the moral crisis of the Church, already so grave. For this reason, biased anti-Catholic information, presented by some sectors of the media, was not included in my sources.

The selection criteria adopted were few: preferably to leave aside particular cases in favor of those reflecting general situations; when possible, to summarize numerous data on one incident with the aim of showing the larger picture represented.

A final section, after the Conclusion, attempts to respond to the main sophisms that have been circulating on this scorching topic. It seems to me that such sophisms circumvent finding an honest solution to the moral crisis

shaking the Catholic Church. The sophisms and the refutations are presented as questions and answers.

Chapter I

POSITION OF SACRED SCRIPTURES AND CATHOLIC TRADITION REGARDING HOMOSEXUALITY

1. Excerpts from Sacred Scriptures

In the **Old Testament** Scriptures refer to the vice of homosexuality with special severity:

* “And the Lord said: The cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is multiplied, and their sin is become exceedingly grievous” (Gen 18:20).

* After the angels arrived at Lot’s house, under the appearance of two comely men:

“But before they went to bed, the men of the city beset the house both young and old, all the people together. And they called Lot, and said to him: Where are the men that came in to thee at night? Bring them out hither that we may know them And they pressed very violently upon Lot; and they were even at the point of breaking open the doors. And behold the men put out their hand, and drew in Lot unto them, and shut the door. And them that were without, they struck with blindness from the least to the greatest, so that they could not find the door” (Gen 19:4-11).

* “And they [the angels] said to Lot: ... all that are thine bring them out of this city, for we will destroy this place, because their cry [of their crimes] is grown loud before the Lord, who hath sent us to destroy them (Gen 19:12-13).

* “And they brought him forth, and set him without the city: and there they spoke to him: Save thy life; look not back, neither stay thou in all the country about, but save thyself in the mountain, lest thou be also consumed” (Gen 19:17).

* “And the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of Heaven; and He destroyed these cities, and all the country about, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and all things that spring from the earth. And his wife looking behind her, was turned into a statue of salt. And Abraham got up early in the morning and looked toward Sodom and Gomorrah, and the whole land of that country, and he saw the ashes rise up from the earth as the smoke of a furnace” (Gen 19:24-28).

* “Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with womankind, because it is an abomination” (Lev 18:22).

* “Defile not yourselves with any of these things [illicit unions, child sacrifice, sodomy and bestiality] with which all the nations have been defiled, which I will cast out before you, and with which the land is defiled; the abominations of which I will visit, that it may vomit out its inhabitants Beware then, lest in like manner, it vomit you also out, if you do the like things” (Lev 18:24-28).

“If any one lie with a man as with a woman, both have committed an abomination, let them be put to death; their blood be upon them” (Lev 20:13).

* “A woman shall not be clothed with man’s apparel, neither shall a man use woman’s apparel: for anyone that doeth these things is abominable before God” (Deut 22:5).

* On the punishment that God prepared for the Jews:

“And I shall give children to be their princes, and the effeminate shall rule over them the shew of their countenance hath answered them: and they have proclaimed abroad their sin as Sodom, and they have not hid it; woe to their souls for evils are rendered to them. The Lord standeth to judge the people” (Is 3:4-13).

In the **New Testament**, Saint Paul indignantly castigated the vice against nature:

* “Do you not err: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor the effeminate, nor liars with mankind [sodomites] shall possess the kingdom of God” (1 Cor 6:9-10).

* In the **Epistle to the Romans**, the Apostle of Gentiles threatened perverts with punishments even on this earth:

“Wherefore God gave them up to the desires of their hearts, unto uncleanness, to dishonor their own bodies among themselves, who changed the truth of God into a lie and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed

forever. Amen. For this cause God delivered them up to shameful affections. For their women have changed the natural use into that use which is against nature. And, in like manner, the men also, leaving the natural use of the women, have burned in their lusts one towards another, men with men working that which is filthy, and receiving in themselves the recompense which was due to their error” (Rom 1:24-27).

What would be this “recompense due to the error” of the sin against nature? One cannot help but link the accomplishment of this threat with the AIDS epidemic now ravaging sodomites.

* **Saint Peter** stressed the infamy of the sin of sodomy and the chastisement God reserves for it:

“For if God reducing the cities of the Sodomites, and of the Gomorrahites into ashes, condemned them to be overthrown, making them an example to those that should after act wickedly, and delivered just Lot, oppressed by the injustice and lewd conversation of the wicked... [it is because] the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly from temptation, but to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be tormented” (2 Pt 2:4-9).

* **Saint Jude** was no less severe:

“As Sodom and Gomorrah, and the neighboring cities, in like manner, having given themselves to fornication, and going after other flesh, were made an example, suffering the punishment of eternal fire, in like manner these men also defile the flesh, and

despise dominion [of Christ], and blaspheme majesty.” (Jud 7:8) ¹

2. Tradition of the Ecclesiastical Magisterium

A. Popes and Councils

* The first statement of a Church council on homosexual practices was issued by the **Council of Elvira** (305-306). The decree excluded from communion, even in *articulo mortis* [in the imminence of death], the *stupratores puerorum* [sexual abusers of children].

* The decree of the **Council of Ancyra**, held in Asia Minor in 314, powerfully influenced the Church of the West, and was often cited as an authoritative argument in later declarations against homosexual practices. Canon 17 alluded to those “who have committed iniquity with animals or men.”² For these crimes, the Council of Ancyra

¹ Vague references to sodomites, not of particular interest to this exposition, are found in 1 Tim 1:8-10. Other references to Sodom and Gomorrah that do not expressly mention the vice of homosexuality: Deut 29:23; 32:32; Jer 23:13-14; 49:18; 50:40; Ezech 16:55-56; Matt 10:15; Rom 9:29; Apoc 11:8.

² *Concilium Ancyrense*, 16, 17; cf. C. H. Turner, *Ecclesiae occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima* (Oxford, 1909), vol. 11, p. 19; on the influence of this Council, cf. *Capitulares Aquisgran.*, (789), 48, Joannes Dominicus Mansi, 17b, col. 230; *Capitulare Caroli Magno*, 48, Mansi, 17b, col. 710; *Capitulare Caroli Magno et Ludovic*, 82, Mansi, 17b, col. 839; *Canones Isaac Episcopi Lingonensis*, 4, 11, Mansi, 17b, col. 1259; *Concilium Parisiensi*, (829), 1, 34, Mansi, 14, col. 560, *apud* John McNeill, *La Iglesia ante la homosexualidad* (Barcelona/Buenos Aires/Mexico: Grijalbo, 1979), p. 121, note 81.

established a series of punishments that varied according to the age and state of the infractor:

“Those who have committed such crimes before age 20, after 15 years of penance, will be readmitted to the communion of prayer. Then, after remaining five years in that communion, let them receive the sacraments of oblation. However, let their lives be analyzed to establish how long a period of penance they should undergo in order to obtain mercy. For if they unrestrainedly gave themselves over to these crimes, let them devote more time to doing penance.

“If, however, those aged 20 and over and married fall into these crimes, let them do penance for 25 years and [then] be received in the communion of prayer; and, remaining in it for five years, let them finally receive the sacraments of oblation.

“Further, if those who are married and over 50 years of age commit these crimes, let them receive the grace of communion only at the end of their lives.”³

* The norms issued by **Pope Saint Siricius** (384-399) for admission into the priestly state indirectly apply to homosexuality:

“We deem it advisable to establish that, just as not everyone should have to do a penance reserved for clerics, so also a layman should never be allowed to ascend to the clerical honor after penance and

³ Council of Ancyra, *apud* St. Peter Damian, *Liber gomorrhianus*, in PL 145, cols. 172-3.

reconciliation. Because even though they have been purified of the contagion of all sins, those who were formerly vessels of vice should not receive the instruments to administer the Sacraments.”⁴

* In 693, in the opening speech of the **XVI Council of Toledo**, King Egica of Spain exhorted the clergy to battle against homosexual practices:

“See that you determine to extirpate that obscene crime committed by men who lie with males, whose fearful conduct defiles the decency of honest living and provokes from Heaven the wrath of the Supreme Judge.”⁵

* The most complete set of norms against homosexual practices in the medieval era is found in the canons approved at the **Council of Nablus**, assembled on January 23, 1120 under the direction of Garmund, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and Baldwin, King of the same city.⁶ On that occasion a sermon was preached in which the evils that had befallen the Kingdom of Jerusalem – earthquakes, pests, and attacks by the Saracens – were judged to be a punishment from Heaven for the sins of the people. As a consequence, the Council issued 25 canons against the sins of the flesh, four of which related to homosexual practices. Death at the stake was decreed for those convicted of those specific despicable crimes.

⁴ St. Siricius, *apud ibid.*, cols. 174-5.

⁵ *Concilium Tolitanum*, 16, 3, Mansi, 12, col. 71, *apud* J. McNeill, *La Iglesia ante la homosexualidad*, p. 121.

⁶ *Concilium Neapolitanum* 8, Mansi, 21, cols. 261-264, *apud ibid.*, p. 122.

* In the year 1179, the **Third Lateran Council** established these stern measures:

“Anyone caught in the practice of the sin against nature, for which the wrath of God was unleashed upon the children of disobedience (Eph 5:6), if he is a cleric, let him be despoiled of his state of office and kept in reclusion in a monastery to do penance; if he is a layman, let him be excommunicated and rigorously kept apart from the communion of the faithful.”⁷

Such was the horror that surrounded the sin against nature that, since the late 12th century, sodomy in effect was treated as a secret sin, for which absolution normally could be given only by the Pope or, in some rare cases, by the Bishops.

* Nevertheless, with the Renaissance, the vice of homosexuality again became more prominent. This was a matter of great concern to **Saint Pius V**. As the well-known historian von Pastor narrated:

“In the first year of his pontificate, the Pope had two preponderant concerns: to promote the Inquisition and to fight against ‘this horrendous sin whereby the justice of God caused the cities contaminated by it to be consumed in flames.’ On April 1, 1566, he ordered that sodomites be turned over to the secular arm The various imprisonments of sodomites impressed Rome and in particular frightened influential and prosperous parties, for it

⁷ *Concilium Lateranense can 11*, Mansi, 22, cols. 224-6, *apud* Fabio Bernabei, *Chiesa e omosessualità - La ragioni di un'immutabili condanna* (Rome: Centro Culturale Lepanto, 1995), p. 3.

was known that the Pope wanted his laws enforced even against the powerful. Indeed, to chastise such vices against nature, the torment of the stake was applied throughout the pontificate of Saint Pius V An earlier papal Brief mandated that clerics who were guilty of that crime be stripped of all their posts, dignities, and income, and, after being so disgraced, be handed over to the secular arm.”⁸

The Holy Inquisitor Pius V also promulgated two Constitutions in which he castigated and punished the sin against nature.

In the **Constitution *Cum primum***, of April 1, 1566, the Saint solemnly established:

“Having determined to do away with everything that may in some way offend the Divine Majesty, we resolve to punish, above all and without indulgence, those things which, by the authority of the Sacred Scriptures or by most grievous examples, are more repugnant to God than any others and raise His wrath: that is, negligence in divine worship, ruinous simony, the crime of blasphemy, **and the execrable libidinous vice against nature**. For such faults peoples and nations are scourged by God Who, according to His just condemnation, sends catastrophes, wars, famine, and pestilence

“Let the judges know that if, even after this our Constitution, they are negligent in punishing these crimes, they will not only be guilty of them in the divine judgment but also will incur our indignation

⁸ Ludovico von Pastor, *Historia de los Papas* (Barcelona: Gustavo Gili, 1931), vol. 17, pp. 299-300.

.... If someone commits that nefarious crime against nature that caused divine wrath to be unleashed against the children of iniquity, he will be given over to the secular arm for punishment; and if he is a cleric, he will be subject to the same punishment after having been stripped of all his degrees [of ecclesiastical dignity].”⁹

Saint Pius V was no less rigorous in the **Constitution *Horrendum illud scelus***, of August 30, 1568:

“That horrible crime, on account of which corrupt and obscene cities were destroyed by fire through divine condemnation, causes us most bitter sorrow and shocks our mind, impelling us to repress such a crime with the greatest possible zeal. Quite opportunely the Fifth Lateran Council [1512-1517] made this decree: ‘Let any member of the clergy caught in that vice against nature be removed from the clerical order or forced to do penance in a monastery’ (chap. 4, X, V, 31). So that the contagion of such a grave scourge may not spread with greater audacity by taking advantage of impunity, which is the greatest incitement to sin, and so as to more severely punish those clerics who are guilty of this nefarious crime and who are not frightened by the death of their souls, we determine that they should be handed over to the severity of the secular authority, which enforces civil law.

⁹ St. Pius V, Constitution *Cum primum*, April 1, 1566, in *Bullarium Romanum* (Rome: Typographia Reverendae Camerae Apostolicae, Mainardi, 1738), vol. 4, chap. 2, p. 284, *apud* F. Bernabei, *Chiesa e omosessualità*, p. 14.

“Therefore, wishing to pursue with the greatest rigor that which we have decreed since the beginning of our pontificate, we establish that any priest or member of the clergy, either secular or regular, who commits such an execrable crime, by force of the present law be deprived of every clerical privilege, of every post, dignity, and ecclesiastical benefit; and after having been so disgraced by an ecclesiastical judge, let him be immediately delivered to the secular authority to be put to death, as mandated by law as the fitting punishment for laymen who have sunk into this abyss.”¹⁰

* In the **Code of Canon Law** written under the initiative and encouragement of **Saint Pius X** and published in 1917 by his successor, Pope **Benedict XV**, these punishments were established:

“As far as laymen are concerned, the sin of sodomy is punished *ipso facto* with the pain of infamy and other sanctions to be applied according to the prudent judgment of the Bishop depending on the gravity of each case. (can. 2357)

“As for ecclesiastics and religious, if they are *clerici minoris* [minor clergy, that is, any degree lower than deacon], let them be punished with various measures, proportional to the gravity of the fault, which can even include dismissal from the clerical state; (can. 2358)

“If they are *clerici maiores* [higher clergy, that is, deacons, priests, or Bishops], let them ‘be declared

¹⁰ St. Pius V, Constitution *Horrendum illud scelus*, August 30, 1568, chap. 3, p. 33, *apud ibid.*, pp. 14-5.

infamous and suspended from every post, benefit, dignity, deprived of their possible stipend and, in the gravest cases, let them be deposed.” (can. 2359, § 2) ¹¹

B. Saints and Apologists

* **Tertullian**, the great Church apologist in the second century, strongly condemned the sins against nature:

“We condemn all those who give themselves over to the frenzies of lusts contrary to natural law and sin against both their bodies and their sex. We banish them from the bosom of the Church, for they [such acts] are better called monstrosities than sins.” ¹²

* **Saint Basil of Cesarea**, the fourth century Church Father who wrote the principal rule of the monks of the East, also established severe punishments for this sin:

“The cleric or monk who molests youths or boys, or is caught kissing or committing some depravity with them, let him be whipped in public, deprived of his crown [tonsure] and, after having his head shaved, let his face be covered with spittle and let him be bound in iron chains, condemned to six months in prison, reduced to eating rye bread once a day in the evening three times per week. After

¹¹ Benedict XV, *Code of Canon Law*, *apud ibid.*, p. 16.

¹² Tertullian, *De pudicitia*, 4, *apud*. J. McNeill, *La Iglesia ante la homosexualidad*, p. 134.

these six months of living in a separate cell under the custody of a wise elder advanced in the spiritual life, let him make prayers, vigils and manual work, always under the watch of two spiritual brothers, without being allowed to have any relationship ... with young people.”¹³

* **Saint Augustine** was categorical in the combat of sodomy and similar vices. The great Bishop of Hippo wrote these strong words:

“Sins against nature, therefore, like the sin of Sodom, are abominable and deserve punishment whenever and wherever they are committed. If all nations committed them, all alike would be held guilty of the same charge in God’s law, for our Maker did not prescribe that we should use each other in this way. In fact, the relationship that we ought to have with God is itself violated when our nature, of which he is Author, is desecrated by perverted lust.”

Further on he reiterated the charge that by this sin man corrupts and perverts his own nature:

“Your punishments are for the sins which men commit against themselves, because, although they sin against You, they do wrong in their own souls and their malice is self-betrayed. They corrupt and pervert their own nature, which You made and for which You shaped the rules, either by making wrong use of the things which You allow, or by becoming inflamed with passion ‘to make unnatural

¹³ St. Basil of Cesarea, *apud* St. Peter Damian, *Liber gomorrhianus*, cols. 174-5.

use of things which You do not allow.’ (Rom 1:26)”¹⁴

* **Saint John Chrysostom** denounced homosexual acts as contrary to nature. Commenting on the *Epistle to the Romans* (1:26-27), he said that acts of sodomy are an unpardonable offense against nature. They are doubly destructive because they threaten the species by deviating the sexual act from its primary end of procreation, and they also sow disorder between men and women, who are no longer inclined by physical desire to live together and in peace.¹⁵

The brilliant Patriarch of Constantinople employed most severe words against this unspeakable vice. In fact, Saint John Chrysostom argued that there was no more depraved act than this:

“All passions are dishonorable, for the soul is even more damaged and degraded by sin than the body is by disease. **But the worst of all passions is lust between men.** The sins against nature are more problematic and less satisfying, so much so that one cannot even say that they procure pleasure, since true pleasure is only that which is according to nature. But when God abandons a man, everything is turned on its head! Therefore, not only are such passions [of homosexuals] satanic, but their lives are diabolic So I say to you that they [the homosexuals] are even worse than murderers, and

¹⁴ St. Augustine, *Confessions* (New York: Penguin, 1967) book 3, chap. 8, p. 65.

¹⁵ St. John Chrysostom, *In Epistulam ad Romanos 4*, apud J. McNeill, *La Iglesia ante la homosexualidad*, p. 134.

that it would be better to die than to live in such dishonor. A murderer only separates the soul from the body, whereas these [homosexuals] destroy the soul inside the body. There is nothing, absolutely nothing more absurd or damaging than this perversity.”¹⁶

* **Saint Gregory the Great** delved deeper into the symbolism of the brimstone and fire that God used to punish the sodomites:

“Brimstone calls to mind the foul odors of the flesh, as Sacred Scripture itself confirms when it speaks of the rain of fire and brimstone poured by the Lord onto Sodom. He had decided to punish it for the crimes of the flesh, and the very type of punishment emphasized the shame of those crimes, for brimstone exhales a strong stench and fire burns. It was just, therefore, that the sodomites, burning with perverse desires that originated from the foul odor of flesh, should perish by both fire and brimstone so that by means of this just chastisement, they might realize the evil they perpetrated under the impulse of a perverse desire.”¹⁷

* **Saint Peter Damian’s** *Liber gomorrhianus*, addressed to Pope Leo IX in the year 1051, is considered a principal work against homosexuality.¹⁸ It reiterated the censure of those who do these perverse acts and con-

¹⁶ St. John Chrysostom, *Homilia in Epistula Pauli ad Romanos*, in PG 47, cols. 360-1, *apud* F. Bernabei, *Chiesa e omosessualità*, pp. 7-8.

¹⁷ St. Gregory the Great, *Commento morale a Giobbe*, XIV, 23 (Rome: Città Nuova, 1994), vol. 2, p. 371, *apud idem*, p. 7.

¹⁸ J. McNeill, *La Iglesia ante la homosexualidad*, p. 123.

demned them as unworthy to exercise ecclesiastical functions:

“Just as Saint Basil establishes that those who commit sins [against nature] should be subjected not only to a severe penance, but a public one, and Pope Siricius prohibits penitents from entering clerical orders, one can clearly deduce that he who corrupts himself with a man through the ignominious squalor of such a filthy union does not deserve to exercise ecclesiastical functions. For one who was formerly the vessel of such vices ... is unfit to administer the Sacraments.”¹⁹

* **Saint Albert the Great** gave four reasons why he considered homosexual acts as the most detestable sins:

- they are born from an ardent frenzy;
- they are repulsively foul;
- those who become addicted to such acts are seldom freed from that vice;
- they are as contagious as a disease, passing quickly from one person to others.²⁰

* Writing about sins against nature, **Saint Thomas Aquinas** explained why they are considered unspeakable:

“However, they are called passions of ignominy because they are not worthy of being named, according to that passage in Ephesians 5:12: ‘For the things that are done by them in secret, it is a shame

¹⁹ St. Peter Damian, *Liber gomorrhianus*, cols. 174-5.

²⁰ St. Albert the Great, *In Evangelium Lucae* 17, 29, *apud* J. McNeill, *La Iglesia ante la homosexualidad*, p. 141.

even to speak of.’ For if the sins of the flesh are commonly censurable because they lead man to that which is bestial in him, much more so is the sin against nature, by which man debases himself lower than even his animal nature.”²¹

* In a sermon at the Church of Saint Mary of Porciuncula, **Saint Bonaventure** spoke about the miracles that took place at the very moment of the birth of Our Lord Jesus Christ. The seventh prodigy was this:

“All sodomites, men and women, died all over the earth, as Saint Jerome said commenting on the psalm ‘The light was born for the just.’ This was to make it clear that He was born to reform nature and to promote chastity.”²²

* **Saint Catherine of Siena**, the great 14th century religious mystic, transmitted the words of Our Lord Jesus Christ about the sin against nature, which contaminated some of the clergy in her time. Referring to sacred ministers who committed this sin, He stated to her:

“They not only fail from resisting the weakness [of fallen human nature] but they do even worse, as they commit the cursed sin against nature. Like the blind and stupid, having dimmed the light of their understanding, they do not recognize the disease and misery in which they find themselves. For this not only causes Me nausea, but is disgusting even

²¹ St. Thomas Aquinas, *Super Epistolae Pauli ad Romanos* I, 26, pp. 27-8.

²² St. Bonaventure, *Sermon 21 - In Nativitate Domini, apud Catholicismo* (Campos/São Paulo, December 1987), p. 3; F. Bernabei, *Chiesa e omosessualità*, p. 11.

to the very devils whom these depraved creatures have chosen as their lords.

“For Me this sin against nature is so abominable that for it alone five cities were destroyed, by virtue of the judgment of My Divine Justice, which could no longer bear their iniquity It is disgusting to the devils not because evil displeases them or because they find pleasure in good, but rather because their nature is angelic and flees upon seeing such a repulsive sin being committed. For while certainly it is the devil that first strikes the sinner with the poisoned arrow of concupiscence, nonetheless when a man actually carries out such a sinful act, the devil goes away.”²³

* **Saint Bernardine of Siena**, an illustrious Franciscan preacher of the 15th century, made an acute psychological analysis of the consequences of the homosexual vice:

“No sin has greater power over the soul than the one of cursed sodomy, which was always detested by all those who lived according to God Such passion for untenable practices borders on madness. This vice disturbs the intellect, unbalances an elevated and generous state of soul, drags lofty thoughts down to base ones, makes [men] pusillanimous and irascible, obstinate and hardened, servilely soft and incapable of anything. Furthermore, the will, agitated by the insatiable drive for pleasure, no longer follows reason but the tumult

²³ St. Catherine of Siena, *El diálogo*, in *Obras de Santa Catalina de Siena* (Madrid: BAC, 1991), p. 292.

[of the passions] One who lived practicing the vice of sodomy will suffer more pain in Hell than anyone else, because this is the worst sin that there is.”²⁴

* **Saint Peter Canisius** had this to say about the enslaving practice of sodomy:

“Those who are not ashamed of violating divine and natural law become the slaves of this depravity, which can never be sufficiently execrated.”²⁵

* Speaking about homosexuality in Brazil in an SBT television interview on October 29, 1992, Prof. **Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira** stated that it is a natural sense of self-preservation that makes society reject homosexuality:

“The sexual act exists in the natural order of things for the fecundity of the family and, through the fecundity of the family, for the expansion of mankind. The command of Our Lord Jesus Christ to men is to ‘multiply and fill the earth.’ It is necessary, therefore, to do this, and to thus encourage the fecundity of sexual intercourse, which is legitimately exercised only in matrimony. Now then, for homosexuality there is no matrimony, and above all there can be no fecundity”

“For many centuries successive generations regarded homosexuality with a real revulsion. And this was not just due to some whim but by virtue

²⁴ St. Bernardine of Siena, *Predica 39*, in *Le prediche volgari* (Milan: Rizzoli, 1936), pp. 869-71, 915, *apud* F. Bernabei, *Chiesa e omosessualità*, pp. 11-2.

²⁵ St. Peter Canisius, *Summa doctrinae christianae*, 3, a, b (Colonia: Colenium, 1557), p. 455, *apud ibid.*, p. 12.

of the doctrinal principles I have just enunciated, which are principles of the Roman Catholic and Apostolic doctrine. This rejection [of homosexuality] is a means by which society preserves itself from that which it senses as being opposed to it. Every living being rejects what destroys itself. And thus, by a comparable movement of the instinct of self-preservation, human societies modeled on Catholic doctrine have been profoundly anti-homosexual.”

When asked why homosexuals are discriminated against so strongly in Brazilian society, Prof. Corrêa de Oliveira responded in this way:

“Brazil is a son of Portugal, and Portugal and Spain were always very strong bulwarks of the Catholic Church. From our Portuguese ancestors we received rigidity and consistency in the Catholic Faith. It was this Faith that modeled the customs of colonial Brazil, the Brazilian United Kingdom [Brazil and Portugal], the Brazilian Empire and, until some time ago, the Brazilian Republic. Hence the Catholic aversion for homosexuality impregnated our customs and constituted a tradition.”

3. The Tradition of Civil Legislation

In civil legislation as well as Catholic law, there is a tradition of intolerance for the sin of homosexuality. The following can be pointed out as just a few samples of laws that condemned homosexual acts:

* Law of December 16, 342, of **Emperors Constantius and Constant**:

“When a man marries and is willing to offer himself to men in a feminine way [*quum vir nubit in feminam viris porrecturam*] we order that norms be established so that the law be armed with an avenging sword, and that these infamous persons receive the supreme punishment.”²⁶

* Law of August 6, 390, promulgated by **Emperors Valentinian II, Theodosius, and Arcadius**:

“All persons who have the shameful custom of condemning a man’s body to play the role of a woman, shall expiate their crime in avenging flames before the public.”²⁷

* Law of December 30, 533, of **Emperor Justinian**:

“In cases of penal suits, public prosecution will be guided by various statutes, including the *Lex Julia de Adulteris* which punishes with death not only those who violate the marriages of others, but also

²⁶ *Codex Theodosii* IX; VII, 3; *Codex Justiniani* IX; IX, 31; in *The Theodosian Code* (Princeton University Press, 1952), pp. 231-2., *apud* J. McNeill, *La Iglesia ante la homosexualidad*, p. 117.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, IX, VII, 6, in *The Theodosian Code*, p. 232, *apud ibid.*, pp. 117-8.

those who commit acts of vile concupiscence with other men.”²⁸

* Law of the year 538, of Emperor Justinian:

“Whereas certain men, overcome by diabolical incitement to practice among themselves the most unworthy lewdness and acts against nature, we exhort them to be fearful of God and the coming judgment, and to abstain from such illicit and diabolical practices so that the just wrath of God may not fall upon them on account of these heathen acts, with the result that cities perish with all their inhabitants. For Sacred Scriptures teach us that similar impious acts caused the annihilation of cities with all their inhabitants

“And since such sins are the cause of famine, earthquakes, and plagues, we warn men to abstain from these acts so as not to lose their souls. But if, after this warning of ours, it should be discovered that someone persists in such iniquity, he will render himself unworthy of God’s mercy, and further will be subjected to the punishment established by law.

“Thus, we order the most illustrious Prefect of the Capital to arrest those who persist in the aforesaid illicit and impious acts and to inflict upon them the most severe punishments, so that the city and

²⁸ Justinian, *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, Institutes IV, XVIII, 4, *apud ibid.*, pp. 116-7.

the State do not end by suffering on account of such iniquitous acts.”²⁹

* The influence of the *Justinian Code* was felt for centuries. It can also be noted in Blackstone’s *Comment on the Laws of England* in the 19th century. Blackstone stated that reason as well as nature called for the crime against nature to be punished with death:

“The crime against nature [is one which] the voice of nature and of reason, and the express law of God determined to be punished with the death sentence. Of this we have a special instance, long before the Jewish diaspora, in the destruction of two cities by fire from Heaven; so that this is a universal, not merely a provincial, precept. In the Old Testament the law condemns sodomists (and possibly other homosexual offenders) to death as perpetrators of an abomination against the Lord, while in the New Testament, they are denounced as transgressors of the natural order and are disinherited from the kingdom of God as followers of the vile practices of the heathens.”³⁰

* Jurist **Pietro Agostino d’Avack** compiled a roster of laws that through History protected the State against the vice of homosexuality:

“No less severe and scathingly repressive laws against such sexual aberrations are found in later centuries [after the Roman Empire], and were is-

²⁹ Justinian, *Codex Justiniani*, nov. 77; cf. nov. 141, *apud ibid.*, pp. 118-9.

³⁰ Blackstone, *Comment on the Laws of England* (London, 1826), vol. 4, p. 215, *apud ibid.*, p. 120.

sued by all the civil authorities from the early medieval period all the way to the modern age. Thus, the *Lex visigothica* condemned to castration and jail those [men] ‘who united carnally with men’ and prescribed, if they were married, that their goods should be immediately distributed to their children and heirs. After the *castratio virum* [castration of the man], the law also prescribed capital punishment.

“In turn, in the well-known collection of the *Franc Capitulars* [Frankish Capitularies] of **Ansegisius** and **Benedict Levite** those who had engaged in sexual acts with animals, who were guilty of incest, and who had ‘carried out copulation with men’ were punished with capital punishment; and, if pardoned by some indult, they were obliged to subject themselves to canonical penances imposed by the Church.

“In the later *Capitulars of Ludovicus Pius*, such a crime, invoking Roman legislation, was punishable with execution at the stake; this severe sanction was justified in the name of the ‘salvation of the *rem publicam* [the public good]’ so that ‘on account of such sins we also may not fall with the kingdom, and the glory of the whole realm may not perish.’

....

“For many centuries, this civil legislation remained substantially unaltered and was nearly identical everywhere, be it in Italy or the other European States, as attested to by the *Statutes of Bologna* in 1561, the *Statutes of Ferrara* in 1566, the *Statutes of Milan, Rome*, and the *Marche* [an Italian prov-

ince] in the 17th century, the *Florentian Tires* of 1542, 1558, and 1699, the *Sicilian Pragmatics* of 1504, the *Carolingian Criminal Constitution* of Charles V, the *Theresian Constitution* of Marie Thérèse, the *Royal Portuguese Ordination*, the *New Spanish Recompilation*, etc.

“For their part, the *Florentian Statutes*, ‘condemning the lewdness of the great crime that is the sodomite vice, and wishing to extirpate it,’ approved the institution of eight *officiales honestatis* [officers of decency], who were assigned to six-month terms specifically to repress such a crime.”³¹

* * *

³¹ Pietro Agostino d'Avack, *L'omosessualità nel Diritto Canonico*, in *Ulissee*, Spring of 1953, pp. 682-5, *apud* F. Bernabei, *Chiesa e omosessualità*, pp. 21-2.

Chapter II

A NEW TOLERANT CONCILIAR MORALS

The principles of adaptation of the Church to the modern world approved by the Ecumenical Council Vatican II, as well as a new general acceptance of tolerance and mercy as remedies for evil, had a special application in the case of homosexuality.

Modern psychology is divided and follows various currents with respect to this vice. One current believes that homosexuality results from the influence of various environmental factors – family troubles, an emotional imbalance of the mother, bad example, etc. Another opines that homosexuality is due to innate factors – the simultaneous presence of masculine and feminine genes in the make-up of homosexuals, or a certain number of brain cells that predetermine homosexuality.

For a considerable segment of modern psychologists, homosexuality does not result from a person's concession to an unnatural tendency, nor is it a moral vice, as Catholic doctrine and tradition always taught. On the contrary, they hold that it is something natural, or pathological at most, which should be accepted as normal.

1. Conciliar Principles of Adaptation and Tolerance

Now, in accordance with its general rule of adaptation to the modern world, Vatican Council II adapted to the modern scientific theories. In several texts of the **Constitution *Gaudium et spes*** modern psychology was generically and specifically praised and pointed to as a model. In fact, this Constitution reads:

* “Advances in psychology and the social sciences not only lead man to greater self-awareness, but provide him with the technical means of molding the lives of whole peoples as well.” (5b)

* “Recent psychological advances furnish deeper insights into human behavior.” (54a)

* “Let the faithful incorporate the findings of new sciences and teachings and the understanding of the most recent discoveries with Christian morality and thought, so that their practice of religion and their moral behavior may keep abreast of their acquaintance with science and of the relentless progress of technology.” (62f)

* “In pastoral care, sufficient use should be made, not only of theological principles, but also of the findings of secular sciences, especially psychology and sociology.” (62b)

In the *Opening Speech* of the first session of Vatican II, **Pope John XXIII** stated the Church preferred to show tolerance and mercy for the errors and moral evils afflicting the world:

“The Church has always opposed these errors; many times she even condemned them with the greatest severity. In our days, however, the Spouse of Christ prefers to use more the remedy of mercy than that of severity; she deems it better to satisfy today’s needs by showing the validity of her doctrine rather than by condemning errors Thus, the Catholic Church, raising by means of this Council the torch of religious truth, wishes to show herself the loving mother of all, benign, patient, full of mercy and kindness toward the children separated from her.”³²

Such principles have led to the acceptance of modern psychology’s theories about homosexuality, as well as to the tolerance the Church has manifested since then toward this vice.

2. Post-Conciliar Vatican Documents on Homosexuality

To date there are three basic documents of the Holy See on homosexuality. They are all from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

³² John XXIII, *Opening Speech of Council Vatican II*, October 11, 1962, *apud* Carlos Boaventura Kloppenburg, *Concílio Vaticano II* (Petropolis: Vozes, 1971), vol. 2, p. 310.

Presupposition of the Analysis

In order to analyze and understand these documents well, it seems appropriate to me to make some preliminary observations.

Up until Council Vatican II, the language of Church documents was habitually clear and accessible, continuing the line of coherence of the Magisterium through the centuries. The body of doctrine thus constructed constituted a supremely good, true, and beautiful ensemble, a worthy reflection of Our Lord Jesus Christ, Wisdom Incarnate.

After Vatican II, however, ecclesiastical language often forsook such characteristics. Now more, now less, one finds in it the presence of two opposing currents of thought: one is the traditional doctrine of the Church and the other is Progressivism. For this reason, often a text can lend itself to different and even contradictory interpretations. This is a deplorable but obvious consequence observed by anyone who has any practice reading post-conciliar documents.³³

This fact necessitates establishing a method of analysis that permits one to confidently discern how much progressivist thought is actually present in the text, and the gates it thus opens for error and evil.

The method used in this work is to spotlight what is most tolerant toward evil and contrary to tradition in each

³³ This contradiction as a source of ambiguity and confusion was pointed out in my book *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II* (Metairie, LA: MAETA, 1997), *passim*.

document, and analyze it in order to determine if some progressivist thinking is present in it.

Granted, often there is a possible conservative interpretation for other excerpts of the documents. I leave this aside, for it seems to me more consonant with the spirit of Catholic vigilance to pay greater attention to evil, which invades with its characteristic force of impact, rather than to good, which is often content to survive this invasion, impassive and silent.

Based on these premises, therefore, I go on to analyze the three documents of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

A – Declaration on Certain Questions Concerning Sexual Ethics

Dated December 29, 1975, the **first document** is titled *Declaration on Certain Questions Concerning Sexual Ethics*, signed by **Cardinal Franjo Seper** and approved by **Pope Paul VI**. In my view, as far as homosexuality is concerned, the words of the document transcribed below broke the wall of repulsion and horror that held back the waters of this vice against nature. In the document, Cardinal Seper affirmed a new tolerance and pastoral understanding for homosexuals:

“At the present time there are those who, basing themselves on observations in the psychological order, have begun to judge indulgently, and even to excuse completely, homosexual relations between certain people. This they do in opposition to the

constant teaching of the Magisterium and to the moral sense of the Christian people.

“A distinction is drawn, and it seems with some reason, between homosexuals whose tendency comes from a false education, from a lack of normal sexual development, from habit, from bad example, or from other similar causes, and is transitory or at least not incurable; and homosexuals who are definitively such because of some kind of innate instinct or a pathological constitution judged to be incurable.

“In regard to this second category of subjects, some people conclude that their tendency is so natural that it justifies in their case homosexual relations within a sincere communion of life and love analogous to marriage, in so far as such homosexuals feel incapable of enduring a solitary life.

“In the pastoral field,³⁴ these homosexuals must certainly be treated with understanding and

³⁴ Not without interest are the observations of Fernand Dumont, professor of Sociological Theory at the University of Laval, Canada, on the new conception of Pastoral Theology. According to him, Pastoral Theology will gradually come to replace Dogmatic Theology. This excerpt is especially significant:

“In a Church that wishes to be both missionary and concerned with her own reform, it was inevitable that there should have been great activity in pastoral theology in recent decades. It [pastoral theology] is considered less and less as a heteroclitite ensemble of practices and prescriptions on the fringe of the main body of doctrine and has become, progressively, a comprehensive vision of the Church in its project of perpetual edification. One can even think, as we have suggested elsewhere (Fernand Dumont, *Pour la conversion de la pensée chrétienne*, 1964, pp. 205-7) that pastoral theology will

sustained in the hope of overcoming their personal difficulties and their inability to fit into society. Their culpability will be judged with prudence. But no pastoral method can be employed which would give moral justification to these acts on the grounds that they would be consonant with the condition of such people. For according to the objective moral order, homosexual relations are acts which lack an essential and indispensable finality. In Sacred Scripture they are condemned as a serious depravity and even presented as the sad consequence of rejecting God. **This judgment of Scripture does not, of course, permit us to conclude that all those who suffer from this anomaly are personally responsible for it.”**³⁵

One sees, therefore, that Cardinal Seper distinguished between an objective moral order – which should theoretically be respected – and a subjective moral order that should orient the pastoral action of the Church, which in some cases should accept homosexuality as a *fait ac-*

soon be questioning the deepest foundations of systematic theology
....

“If pastoral theology and theological anthropology continue to develop along the lines indicated thus far, it is unlikely that they will limit themselves to adding new tracts to the *corpus* of theology. They will suggest new, comprehensive perspectives of all of theology, opening to the concrete historical situations of man.” (F. Dumont, “The Sociology of Religion and the Renewal of Theology,” in *Theology of Renewal – Renewal of Religious Thought*, Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1968, vol. 2, pp. 271-2).

³⁵ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Declaration on Certain Questions Concerning Sexual Ethics*, of December 29, 1975 (Washington: United States Catholic Conference, 1976), n. 8, pp. 8-9.

compli. Note that on implicitly assuming erroneous premises of modern psychology to justify Church pastoral action, Cardinal Seper provided a powerful theoretical argument contrary to objective Catholic Morals, which he had sought to defend.

Further on, the Cardinal, enunciating general principles that should govern questions related to homosexuality, pre-matrimonial relations, and masturbation, cautioned against hasty judgment:

“It is true that in sins of sexual order, in view of their kind and their causes, it more easily happens that free consent is not fully given. **This is a fact which calls for caution in all judgment as to the subject’s responsibility [for such sexual faults].**”³⁶

It was this relaxation in principles that, in a certain way, legitimized and gave free rein to homosexuality in the Church. While this vice had already come to surface based on the conciliar *aggiornamento*, only after the publication of this document did it begin to feel comfortable in the light of day.

Ten years went by before the Holy See felt the need to make a new pronouncement, even in face of the veritable homosexual avalanche that had fallen upon the contemporary world. Then, when the topic was dealt with again, the point of reference was the already more relaxed document of 1975.³⁷

³⁶ *Ibid.*, n. 10, p. 12.

³⁷ For example: Congregation for Catholic Education, *Orientamenti educativi sull'amore umano*, of November 1, 1983, Poliglota Vaticana, pp. 32-3, nn. 101-3.

Confusion Helps Create Tolerance for Homosexuality

Here I insert a short observation to aid in the reading of the next document analyzed below.

In it, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger did not seem to be very precise in distinguishing the boundaries between two fundamental concepts: that of homosexual tendency (or inclination or orientation), and that of homosexual behavior.

According to Catholic doctrine, any unruly inclination or tendency, above all toward a vice contrary to nature, cannot have a right of citizenship even in a person's thoughts. If someone makes a concession in his mind to this tendency, he sins. This is why in the *Confiteor* one asks forgiveness for sins of thought, word, and deed. Thus, a homosexual tendency can be a sin even without a homosexual act.

A person also sins when he outwardly expresses a homosexual tendency. Indeed, the previous chapter showed passages from Sacred Scriptures (Deut 22:5; Is 3:4-13) and excerpts from Saint Basil severely condemning those who behave or dress in a homosexual fashion even though they do not practice the act.

Finally, there is the act of sodomy, which constitutes a sin that cries out to Heaven and clamors to God for vengeance.³⁸

³⁸ Gen 19:13; St. Pius X, *Catecismo maior* (São Paulo: Vera Cruz, 1976), p. 174; Francisco Spirago, *Catecismo católico popular* (Lisbon: União Gráfica Ed., 1951), vol. 2, p. 369; F. X. Schouppe, *Curso abreviado de Religião ou verdade e beleza da Religião Cristã* (Porto: Livraria Chardron, 1875), p. 296.

Now then, such clear and precise concepts of the tendency toward homosexuality, the behavior of the homosexual, and the act of sodomy become somewhat shuffled around in Cardinal Ratzinger's document below.

At times the tendency toward homosexuality is presented as only in the individual's thoughts; at other times the tendency manifests itself and is confused with behavior. The concept of behavior is likewise uncertain. At times it is a public manifestation of homosexuality without practicing the act; at other times it includes the act.

Perhaps this confusion can be explained as follows: since the homosexual act is indisputably sinful but the tendency is not categorically so, if someone wanted to morally justify homosexual behavior, the shrewd thing to do would be to unduly emphasize the notion of the tendency.

Having pointed out the imprecisions and the related confusion of language, I will proceed to the analysis of the document.

B - Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Pastoral Care for Homosexual Persons

On October 1, 1986, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith published its **second document** on the topic. Entitled *Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons*, it was signed by **Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger** and approved by **Pope John Paul II**. The document was prepared with the intention of repressing abuses taking place in debates

about homosexuality in Catholic ambiances,³⁹ as well as correcting overly benevolent interpretations that were being given to the prior 1975 document of the Holy See on homosexuals.⁴⁰

Toward this end, Cardinal Ratzinger distinguished between homosexual tendency and behavior:

“Although the particular inclination of the homosexual person is not a sin, it is a more or less strong tendency ordered toward an intrinsic moral evil; and thus the inclination itself must be seen as an objective disorder.” (n. 3)

Ratzinger said that the act is intrinsically evil, and that the inclination is objectively disordered without being a sin properly speaking. This is in accordance with Catholic doctrine.

But the Cardinal went on to soften the doctrine:

“Homosexual activity is not a complementary union able to transmit life; and so it thwarts the call to a life of that form of self-giving which the Gospel says is the essence of Christian living. This does not mean that homosexual persons are not often generous and giving of themselves; but when they engage in homosexual activity they confirm within themselves a disordered sexual inclination which is essentially self-indulgent.” (n. 7)

³⁹ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Lettera ai Vescovi della Chiesa Cattolica sulla cura pastorale delle persone omosessuali,” of October 1, 1986, *L'Osservatore Romano*, October 31, 1986, p. 5, n. 1.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, cfr. n. 3.

In this excerpt, the Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith began to praise homosexuals – they are generous, they give of themselves. This made it appear as if he were seeking legitimacy, a kind of right of citizenship, for them.

This hypothesis was more strongly confirmed in the text below where Ratzinger prohibited any prohibition against homosexuals:

“It is deplorable that homosexual persons have been and are the object of violent malice in speech or in action. Such treatment deserves condemnation from the Church’s Pastors wherever it occurs. It reveals a kind of disregard for others which endangers the most fundamental principles of a healthy society. The intrinsic dignity of each person must always be respected in word, in action, and in law.” (n. 10)

Note that here Cardinal Ratzinger was advocating a legislation that defends homosexuals from lack of respect or discrimination, that is, “malevolent expressions, violent actions,” etc.

Overall, one may say that this instruction of the Holy See on one hand condemns the sexual act as entirely evil from the moral standpoint. On the other hand, however, it defends homosexuals who do not engage in sexual activity.

Indirectly the document also oriented Bishops to support civil laws defending so-called homosexual rights.

C – Some Considerations Concerning the Response to Legislative Proposals on the Non-Discrimination of Homosexual Persons

* On July 24, 1992, *L'Osservatore Romano* published the **third document** of the same Congregation on the subject, entitled *Some Considerations Concerning the Response to Legislative Proposals on the Non-Discrimination of Homosexual Persons*.⁴¹ Addressed to the Bishops of the United States, it is undated and its introductory note stated that the published version is a second draft written after consultation with the Bishops. Quite atypically, it specified that the first version of *Some Considerations* was not intended to be an official instruction, but only a resource for “the conscientious Catholic legislator, voter, or Church authority who is confronted with such issues.”

The second version did not state that it was an official document. Its official character is implicit in the fact it was published in *L'Osservatore Romano*. In short, the final draft is an official document, without the name.

Its objective is to orient the Bishops on what position to take regarding civil laws protecting homosexuals. That is to say, the boldest point made in the earlier document – an implicit call for legal protection of homosexuals – became the presupposition of this document. One can see how rapidly the spirit of benevolence toward homosexual persons gained ground.

The document, published on the authority of **Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger**, emphasized the rights and per-

⁴¹ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Considerations Concerning the Response to Legislative Proposals on the Non-Discrimination of Homosexual Persons,” *L'Osservatore Romano*, July 24, 1992, p. 4.

sonal dignity of homosexual persons even while it mentions certain limits:

“Homosexual persons, as human persons, have the same rights as all persons, including the right of not being treated in a manner which offends their personal dignity. Among other rights, all persons have the right to work, to housing, etc. Nevertheless, these rights are not absolute. They can be legitimately limited for objectively disorder outward conduct.” (n. 12)

Earlier, the text was more specific:

“There are areas in which it is not unjust discrimination to take sexual orientation into account,⁴² for example, in the placement of children for adoption or foster care, in employment of teachers or athletic coaches, and in military recruitment.” (n. 11)

Further on, the document made a prudential warning against taking homosexuality as a basis for a legal right:

“Including ‘homosexual orientation’ among the considerations on the basis of which it is illegal to discriminate can easily lead to regarding homosexuality as a positive source of human rights The recognition of homosexuality as a factor on which basis it is illegal to discriminate can easily, if not automatically, lead to the legislative protection for, and promotion of homosexuality.” (n. 13)

⁴² The document presented the following definition of *orientation*: “An individual’s sexual orientation is generally not known to others unless he publicly identifies himself as having this orientation, or unless some overt behavior manifests it.” (n. 14)

That is to say, Ratzinger advocated that homosexuals be recognized and acknowledged as having rights on the basis of being human persons with human rights, but not on the basis of homosexuality.

In this document also, there was a certain contradiction in the concept of orientation, which was at times taken to mean an inclination that is not manifested in public, and at times understood as a perceived behavior which may or not be subject to a law.

Finally, in the document there were two notions of discrimination against homosexuals. One it called unjust, because it results from an alleged lack of respect for the rights of homosexuals. Another it called just, but this notion followed an ambiguous criterion since it derives from the imprecise concept of homosexual orientation pointed out in the paragraph above. This just discrimination only became clear in the case of the examples given – the adoption of children, the hiring of teachers or athletic coaches, and recruitment for military service.

These are the three existing post-conciliar Vatican documents that have dealt with homosexuality. They applied to it the general principles of adaptation to modern psychology adopted by Vatican Council II and John XXIII. They all present a new tolerant moral approach toward this anti-natural vice. It is my opinion that they broke the dike that held back homosexuality from inundating the Catholic milieu, clergy, and seminaries.

D – The Persistent Tolerant Approach of the Vatican

A characteristic application of the same ambiguity in the concept of homosexual tendency can be found in the short allocution delivered by **Pope John Paul II** on the occasion of the approval of the “marriage” of homosexuals by the European Parliament. He affirmed the need to defend the person manifesting homosexual tendencies but not the practice of homosexuality:

“Our thought turns toward the recent and well-known resolution approved by the European Parliament. In it, they do not simply limit themselves to the defense of persons with homosexual tendencies, refusing to allow unjust discriminations toward them. On this point, the Church is also in agreement, approves it, and makes it her own, since every human person is worthy of respect. What is morally inadmissible is the juridical approval of homosexual practice.”⁴³

From then on, the Vatican has continued to take essentially the same tolerant position, affirming the need for compassion and respect for the homosexual person, while rejecting protection for his homosexual act.⁴⁴

⁴³ John Paul II, *Angelus Message* of February 20, 1994, published under the title “Con la risoluzione del Parlamento Europeo si è chiesto di legittimare un disordine morale,” *L'Osservatore Romano*, February 21-22, 1994, pp. 1, 5.

⁴⁴ John Paul II, *Angelus Message*, of June 19, 1994; Address to the Plenary Meeting of the Pontifical Council for the Family (March 24, 1999); Pontifical Council for the Family, “Letter to the Presidents of the Bishops’ Conferences of Europe on the Resolution of the European Parliament Regarding Homosexual Couples” (March 25, 1994); “Family, Marriage and “de facto” Unions” (July 26, 2000), n. 23, *apud* Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Considerations

The most recent document was issued June 3, 2003 by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and dealt with the legal recognition of unions between homosexuals. The document was signed by **Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger** and approved by **Pope John Paul II**. This document, which did not present any new doctrine on the topic, simply summarized post-conciliar teachings on the subject. The same moral tolerance already pointed out in previous documents was also apparent in it.

Referring to the strong condemnations Sacred Scripture made of homosexuality, the document concluded that such condemnations should not be applied to persons, since homosexuality can be just an “anomaly,” and not necessarily a moral vice. Assuming the thesis of modern psychology that asserts homosexuality can be only a psychological defect and not a moral vice, the text affirmed:

“This [condemnatory] judgment of Scripture does not, of course, permit us to conclude that all those who suffer from this anomaly are personally responsible for it, but it does attest to the fact that homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered” (n. 4).⁴⁵

Later, the document repeated the same tolerance regarding homosexual tendencies:

Regarding Proposals to Give Legal Recognition to Unions Between Homosexual Persons,” note 1, Vatican website.

⁴⁵ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Considerations Regarding Proposals to Give Legal Recognition to Unions Between Homosexual Persons,” June 3, 2003, Vatican website.

“Men and women with homosexual tendencies must be accepted with respect, compassion and sensitivity. Every sign of unjust discrimination in their regard should be avoided. They are called, like other Christians, to live the virtue of chastity. The homosexual inclination is however objectively disordered and homosexual practices are sins gravely contrary to chastity.” (n. 4)

This has been the Vatican’s constant and invariable tolerant approach to the topic since the end of the Council.

E – Summarizing...

Summarizing the concessions made in the three Vatican documents, one has the following:

* In the *first document*, Cardinal Seper admitted that there seems to be foundation to the theories of modern psychology which claim that homosexuality is part of the person’s psychic make-up or results from external factors beyond the person’s control;

* In the name of pastoral care, he recommended that the Church’s attitude toward homosexuals be one of understanding and support;

* He greatly attenuated the person’s responsibility for sexual sins when he stated that such sins are easily committed without the full consent of the person.

* In the *second document*, Cardinal Ratzinger called for the condemnation of malicious speech or actions against homosexuals. He launched an anathema, based on

human rights, against those who discriminate against homosexuals by words, deeds, or laws.

* In the *third document*, Cardinal Ratzinger instructed Bishops to have legislators approve laws in favor of homosexuals based on human rights, but not on homosexuality as such.

To close this chapter of the exposition on conciliar and post-conciliar doctrine on homosexuality, let me note that alongside the numerous manifestations of tolerance toward this vice, in none of the documents quoted did the Holy See accuse homosexuality of being a vice contrary to nature that cries out to Heaven and clamors to God for vengeance.

On analogous doctrine, published under the responsibility of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, the following documents can be consulted:

- *Principles to Guide Confessors in Questions of Homosexuality* (1973);
- *To Live in Jesus Christ* (1976);
- *Called to Compassion and Responsibility* (1989).
- *Always Our Children; Pastoral Message to Parents of Homosexual Children* (1997).

3. The Vatican Position Regarding Pedophile Priests

One of the sad conclusions that everyone in the United States reached in the aftermath of the scandal on the sexual abuse of children by clergy was that the Catholic Hierarchy had a policy of covering up such abuses. This shameful procedure became manifest in data brought to light about Cardinal Bernard Law's administration of the Boston Archdiocese. For decades a cover-up procedure had been followed for the sake of preserving the Prelate's own reputation, without any special concern for the abused victims and the common good.

Was the Cardinal Law case a unique instance? Unfortunately not. Every day it became clearer that throughout America there were many other Bishops who had adopted the same *modus operandi*.

If the traditional moral precepts had been guiding the Church, the predatory priests would have been dismissed from their sacramental duties and brought before the Civil Law to be punished for their crimes. Today, however, with the conciliar principles of tolerance governing a new moral code, the very opposite has occurred. The predatory priests have been hidden, protected, and often reinstated in other ecclesiastical services, where they easily could commit similar aberrations again.

Facing torrential discredit and pressured by Catholic public opinion to toe the mark and take a firmer stance, the American Bishops gathered in Dallas in June 2002 to draft less tolerant guidelines for disciplining guilty priests. Many of the Bishops at the meeting were pushing for a "zero tolerance" policy, which was never clearly defined

but was generally understood as a policy in which an abusive priest would be immediately removed from his post.

Did the Dallas meeting represent, in fact, a sincere change in policy? Some religious commentators surmised that talk about the “zero tolerance” policy of the Bishops was nothing more than an attempt to sidestep the “zero credibility” they had earned among the faithful. *Id est*, it was first and foremost a strategic maneuver to regain trust rather than an authentic resolution of moral amendment. Genuine or not, it revealed itself as a healthy reaction to the scandal, and a good first step that promised effective measures to punish the guilty and to repair the moral damage done in Catholic rank-and-file.

The first draft that came from this effort, which had two parts, became known as the Dallas documents. Before their corrective measures could be applied by the Bishops in the United States, however, the Dallas documents had to be approved by the Vatican in accordance with the normal protocol of the Church. But the Vatican denied such approval by alleging that the Bishops had been too rigorous in the laws to punish culpable priests. It demanded a more lenient approach toward the guilty. A commission composed of American Bishops and officials of the Holy See was established and met in Rome to adapt the measures of the Dallas documents to meet Vatican demands. After a short time, the final proposal was issued and approved in a plenary meeting of the American Bishops in Washington DC.

What follows is a slow motion report and analysis of the steps of this process, underscoring the Vatican position.

A. The Dallas Meeting and Documents

On June 13-15, 2002, around 250 American Bishops met in Dallas to deal with sexual abuse of children by priests. According to the press, two-thirds of the Prelates had allowed accused priests to continue to work.⁴⁶ At the opening session Bishop Wilton Gregory, president of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, admitted that too often Bishops were more concerned about scandal than preventing abuse and too often had treated victims as “adversaries and not as suffering members of the Church.” Gregory called on all victims of clergy abuse to report crimes committed against them. He also urged abusive priests and Bishops to step forward and confess their crimes. Addressing the profound loss of confidence by the faithful in the Bishops, he said:

“Only by truthful confession, heartfelt contrition and firm purpose of amendment can we hope to receive the generous mercy of God and the forgiveness of our brothers and sisters.”⁴⁷

After many debates, two final documents were approved June 14 by the vote of 239 to 13. The two documents, called the *Charter* and *Norms*, were entitled in full, *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People*, and *Essential Norms for Diocesan Policies Dealing with Allegations of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Priests, Deacons or Other Church Personnel*. After the vote, the documents

⁴⁶ Brooks Egerton and Reese Dunklin, “Two-thirds of Bishops Let Accused Priests Work,” *The Dallas Morning News*, June 12, 2002.

⁴⁷ Teresa Atanabe, “U.S. Bishops Apologize for Scandal,” *Los Angeles Times*, June 14, 2002.

were sent to the Vatican to receive *recognitio*, that is, its approval and authorization to put them into practice.

The Dallas documents were a good beginning since they acknowledged the prior improper policy of the American Bishops who covered for the guilty priests. They expressed intentions to resolve the crisis of pedophilia, to punish the culpable priests by dispensing them of the use of Holy Orders, and to open hitherto closed-book information on the sexual abuse of minors either to the civil authority or lay parties with interests in the cases. The *Norms* also drafted solid measures to punish the guilty “whether the sexual abuse was recent or occurred many years ago.”⁴⁸

All of these good intentions, however, along with the correspondent norms, were essentially rendered fruitless because the definition of pedophile abuse given in the statement was too vague to be of value. This was the hazy definition the document offered:

“Sexual abuse [includes] contacts or interactions between a child and an adult when the child is being used as an object of sexual gratification for the adult. A child is abused whether or not this activity involves explicit force, whether or not it involves genital or physical contact, whether or not it is initiated by the child, and whether or not there is discernible harmful outcome.”⁴⁹

What is the precise meaning of the expression “being used as an object” when it is applied to an adult-child relation? According to modern ecclesiastical lan-

⁴⁸ USCCB, “Norms,” Preamble, *Origins*, June 27, 2002, p. 107.

⁴⁹ “Charter for the Protection of Children,” art. 1, note 1, *Origins*, June 27, 2002, p. 106

guage, “to use someone as an object” means to act egotistically toward that person. Therefore, in this case, would it mean that the adult’s action is reproachable because it is egotistical or self-interested? Then, if the adult would approach the child not as an object, but with a disinterested love, would this count as sexual abuse? Of course, one might reply. But why? The action would no longer fit within the boundaries of the given definition.

The definition also supposes that in pedophile abuse a child is used as an object of sexual gratification for the adult. What does “sexual gratification” means? Would a caress, an embrace, or a kiss that are not strictly sexual acts be included in the concept of “sexual gratification”? If they are not included, would they then be permitted? And if they are included, it would seem inappropriate since the notion of “sexual gratification” does not necessarily apply to these acts? Again, the expression is inadequate to convey the reality. These are just a few points to show how the first sentence is incomplete and imprecise, easy game to shoot down by a competent canonist.

The second sentence of the above-quoted paragraph is still more imprecise. In fact, it is so vague that is difficult even to make a critique.

This definition, notwithstanding, is considered the very core of the two Dallas documents, the criterion to establish someone as either innocent or guilty of the crime of pedophilia. Given the absolute imprecision of the definition, how can the proper authorities uniformly judge ecclesiastics as innocent or guilty of sexual abuse by applying this paragraph? It is not possible. Each Bishop can interpret the definition the way he wants. With the definition being so vague, the proposed punishments lack conditions to be

seriously applied. Even with the disciplinary measures the documents provided, everything still remained in the air. In short, from a juridical point of view, the criteria established by the Bishops at Dallas did not provide remedies to cure the crisis of pedophile abuse.

Many Bishops left Dallas speaking loudly about “zero tolerance.” This expression, however, also lacks a precise definition, and until this is provided it is without any serious juridical base. It seems to be a mere slogan, repeated over and over to impress public opinion.

The Dallas documents were sent to the Vatican for its due approval. That approval did not come. On the contrary the Vatican considered the disciplinary measures against the guilty priests set out by the Dallas documents as too radical, and insisted on a different text, a much more tolerant one.

B. The Vatican Refuses Approval of the Documents

The official Vatican document denying approval and expressing disagreement with the American Bishops was a letter by Cardinal Giovanni Battista Re, Prefect of the Congregation for the Bishops, issued on October 14, 2002. The letter criticized the two documents approved June 2002 in Dallas. Cardinal Re’s letter gave three arguments against the Dallas *Charter* and *Norms*.

* It objected to the vagueness and imprecision of the Bishops’ text and pointed out the need to correct it. On this point, I wholeheartedly agree. A commission composed of Vatican officials and American Bishops was established to present a revised document to a general

meeting of the Bishops that would take place in November 2002.

* It stressed the proportionately small number of guilty priests to lessen the gravity of the crisis, and surprisingly qualified the enormous crime of pedophilia as a “misdeed.” Therefore, it indirectly censured the American documents as too rigorous against the abuser-priests. Here is the text of Cardinal Re’s letter:

“Deeply moved by the suffering of the victims and their families, the Holy See supports the American Bishops in their endeavor to respond firmly to **the sexual misdeeds of the very small number of those who minister or labor in the service of the Church. But such a very small number cannot overshadow ‘the immense spiritual, human and social good that the vast majority of priests and religious in the United States have done and are still doing.’**”⁵⁰

* It implicitly took up the defense of the priests accused and convicted of pedophilia when it stated:

“**The policies adopted at the Plenary Assembly in Dallas can be the source of confusion and ambiguity, because the *Norms* and the *Charter* contain provisions which in some aspects are difficult to reconcile with the universal law of the Church.**”⁵¹

⁵⁰ “Letter of the Prefect of the Congregation for the Bishops, Cardinal Giovanni Battista Re,” October 14, 2002, Vatican website.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

Since I agree with the *first argument* accusing the Dallas statement of being “vague and imprecise,” I will analyze the two subsequent ones.

*

But first, let me present an essential presupposition that the Vatican is skipping over in its position.

In any society that follows Natural Law, the role of the authority and the laws is to uphold the common good. *Salus populi, suprema lex* [the good of the whole society should be the supreme law], says the well-known juridical aphorism that forms the base of any law.

What is the common good with regard to the topic of pedophilia? It is to defend the Catholic Church as a whole against the spreading of this despicable vice that calls to Heaven for vengeance. To defend the Church effectively, the Vatican should have a very rigorous law to punish the guilty, and thus discourage others from following the infamous example of pedophile priests. This would be the normal way to restore the honor and health of the Catholic Church in the United States. It would also preserve the trust and union between the faithful and Prelates, which was seriously damaged by the wave of scandals and complacent position assumed by the Bishops regarding the guilty priests.

Would such a rigorous law be uncharitable? Would it be a lack of goodness? No, absolutely not. It would be a manifestation of charity for the whole Church whose moral principles are threatened. The principal role of the authority is to safeguard the whole of society. To rigorously punish the guilty is the normal way that Catholic authorities, either

religious or civil, have dealt with the anti-natural vices in the past to protect both the religious and civil orders.

Emperor Justinian, for example, in his *Corpus Juris Civilis* [Code of Civil Law] wrote very strong words against the vice of homosexuality that would also apply to the crime of pedophilia. He exhorted such men, who were “overcome by diabolical incitement to practice among themselves the most unworthy lewdness and acts against nature” to fear the private judgment of God falling on them. He further warned that God’s just wrath could likewise fall on whole cities and countries that permit such atrocities. Thus, he established that those who commit these crimes against nature suffer the most severe punishments possible “so that the city and the State do not end by suffering on account of such iniquitous acts.”⁵²

What Justinian set in law was similarly established in the codes of the Catholic Church and innumerable civil societies. It is logical, therefore, that the application of such principles against the guilty priests was what American Catholics not only were expecting from the Dallas meeting of Bishops but also awaiting from the Vatican.

*

The two arguments the Vatican offered in Cardinal Re’s letter do not take into consideration the above-mentioned role of authority and thereby subvert Natural Law. Let me analyze them:

* In the *second argument*, Cardinal Re emphasized that the legal measures against pedophile priests must take

⁵² Justinian, *Corpus Juris Civilis*, Novel 77; see full quote in chap. 2, pp. 32-3.

into consideration that the guilty priests are only a minority of the clergy as a whole. The majority of priests and religious, he asserted, do not have this vice.

This reasoning seems puerile to me. What possible difference should numbers make when the offense is so grave before God and deadly before man? What if a doctor would take this position with a patient? What if he would only begin to give the proper preventive remedies after the number of diseased cells was greater than the number of healthy ones? Normally the disease strikes only a few cells, but these few contain a virus with a tremendous dynamism that can break the general health and eventually cause death.

The same applies to society. Even though the criminals are not numerous, even if they number only a few, they can break the stability of the whole social body. The Vatican seems to have either forgotten or is ignoring this known universal principle about the action of evil and how it spreads and damages a whole society.

Taking this ludicrous argument at its face value, it would appear that the Vatican is waiting for the number of pedophile priests to equal that of the good clergy before it would adopt the proper severe measures to punish the guilty...

* In the *third argument*, Cardinal Re wrote that the supposedly radical measures proposed in Dallas do not comply with the law of the Church. Actually he is referring only to the post-Vatican II ecclesiastical laws, which, contrary to the tradition of the Church, almost always take the side of the guilty.⁵³ In my opinion, this post-conciliar

⁵³ See above items 1 and 2 of this chapter.

Vatican position of supporting the guilty subverts the very role of authority and law in any society governed by Natural Law. This applies most of all to the Catholic Church, source of holiness and moral rectitude.

Today, we have John Paul II, who, instead of safeguarding the ensemble of the Catholic Church against the vice of pedophilia, has restrained himself to a few bewailing lamentations,⁵⁴ without any effective legal measures against the criminals. Even while a healthy public opinion and U.S. Civil Law have demanded the punishment of the criminal-priests, the Vatican has risen up to protect the accused and the convicted priests. In this, there is a fundamental inversion of the role of the authority and the law. The Vatican would appear not to be working to defend the whole of the Church, but to protect those who are destroying her honor and her structure. Hence one can see that in this instance the Vatican would be doing nothing less than working for the self-destruction of the Holy Catholic Church.

C. The Washington Documents

After Cardinal Re's letter was issued, a commission was set up including representatives of the American Bishops and Vatican officials with the aim of changing the Dallas documents. Its final results were presented and

⁵⁴ Some of these futile laments he made in his annual letter to priests (March 21, 2002, see text pp. 192-3); his addressing to American Prelates at the Vatican (April 23, 2002, see text pp. 203-4), and at Toronto, in his speech at World Youth Day (July 28, 2002, see text p. 217).

shortly approved by the ensemble of American Bishops in Washington on November 13, 2002. The two Washington documents retained the same names given to those issued in Dallas, so there is a *Charter* and *Norms*. These laws will be in effect for two years (2002-2004), when they will again be revised. Here are the main alterations introduced by the Vatican:

a. The definition of sexual abuse – The ambiguity present in the Dallas *Charter* definition of sexual abuse was maintained in the Washington *Charter*. It reads:

“Sexual abuse of a minor includes sexual molestation or sexual exploitation of a minor as an object of sexual gratification.”⁵⁵

The same critique made above,⁵⁶ about the vagueness of the concept of “object of sexual gratification” applies also to this text.

The Washington *Charter* continued the definition of sexual abuse:

“Sexual abuse has been defined by different civil authorities in various ways, and these norms do not adopt any particular definition provided in Civil Law. Rather, the transgressions in question relate to obligations arising from divine commands regarding human sexual interactions as conveyed to us by the Sixth Commandment of the Decalogue. Thus, the norms to be considered in assessing an allegation of

⁵⁵ USCCB, “Charter,” art. 1, note, *Origins*, November 28, 2002, pp. 411, 415. The same text was repeated in “Norms,” Preamble, and note 2, *Origins, ibid.*, pp. 416, 418.

⁵⁶ Pp. 59-61.

sexual abuse of a minor is whether conduct or interaction with a minor qualifies as **an external objectively grave violation of the Sixth Commandment**. A canonical offense against the Sixth Commandment of the Decalogue need not be a complete act of intercourse. Nor, to be objectively grave, does an act need to involve force, physical contact or a discernible harmful outcome. Moreover, imputability [moral responsibility] for a canonical offense is presumed upon external violation unless it is otherwise apparent. If there is any doubt about whether a specific act fulfills this definition, the writings of recognized moral theologians should be consulted and the opinion of a recognized expert be obtained. **Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the Diocesan Bishop, with the advice of a qualified review board, to determine the gravity of the alleged act.**⁵⁷

It is noteworthy that this “definition” does not explain the essence of the act of sexual abuse and, therefore, is not a definition. The only element that looks like a definition is the statement that sexual abuse is “an external objective grave violation of the Sixth Commandment,” which is so generic a statement that it is useless. It is a banality. The other elements of this “definition” either are just comments on the issue or are some characteristics of sexual abuse. In brief, the “definition” presented by the Vatican is not a definition because it does not give the necessary ele-

⁵⁷ USCCB, “Charter,” art. 1, note, *Origins*, November 28, 2002, pp. 411, 415. The same text was repeated in “Norms,” Preamble, and note 2, *Origins, ibid.*, pp. 416, 418.

ments to allow a serious and uniform judgment to be made about who is guilty of the crime of pedophilia.

In its pretense to correct the Dallas documents, the Vatican failed to produce an appropriate workable law to punish guilty pedophile priests. Most probably, this was not a lack of competence, but rather the firm deliberation to protect the guilty.

What is clear in the Washington documents is that each Bishop will determine at his own pleasure and convenience what sexual abuse is; who is guilty; and what kind of punishments described in the two documents the culpable priest deserves.

The Vatican thus imposed a law on the American Bishops by which only the Bishop will decide how to apply this vague, ambiguous, and confused definition, as well as to whom it applies. Clearly, it opens a large door for the guilty to escape and for the Bishops to continue the cover-up.

b. The judgment and its reliability – As already noted, the judgment process of who is a sexual abuser of a minor falls to the responsibility of the diocesan Bishop, who, “with the advice of a qualified review board,” will determine “the gravity of the alleged act.”

Explaining this responsibility, the Article 4 of the *Norms* states:

“To assist diocesan Bishops, each Diocese will have **a review board which will function as a confidential consultative body to the Bishop in discharging his responsibilities.** The functions of this board may include: A. Advising the diocesan Bishop in his assessment of allegations of sexual

abuse of minors and his determination of suitability for ministry”⁵⁸

In clearer words, this review board will discharge the Bishop of any juridical responsibility over the decisions regarding pedophile priests. Should the final decision of the Bishop following the advice of his review board be to consider a pedophile priest as innocent or to be moved from one Diocese to another, the Bishop is released from any juridical responsibility. Further juridical charges would have to be made against the review board.

This article strongly protects the Bishop, and *a fortiori* the Vatican and the Pope. It seems to have been written with the ulterior motive of avoiding eventual new cases similar to that of Cardinal Bernard Law, in which he was held responsible for the covering up of guilty priests. Since his post in the Hierarchy of the Church depends on the Vatican and the Pope, his unjust decisions to cover the crimes of his priests constituted a serious threat to the authorities over him. From now on, however, any unjust decision or action can go no further or higher than the Diocese. The blame for a bad judgment will be neatly placed on the review board and die there. The Bishop, the Vatican, and the Pope are left free of juridical charges.

Furthermore, the process of the review board is confidential, that is, it is closed to public inspection so that no one can follow its steps. Its clear purpose is to prevent the “transparency” that the American Bishops in Dallas declared they were aiming for.

⁵⁸ USCCB, “Norms,” art. 4, *Origins*, November 28, 2002, p. 417.

Who will be the members of the review board and what will be their legal liability for the decisions made? The *Norms* continue:

“The review board, established by the diocesan Bishop, will be composed of at least five persons of outstanding integrity and good judgment in full communion with the Church. The majority of the review board members will be laypersons who are not in the employ of the Diocese; but at least one member should be a priest who is an experienced and respected pastor of the Diocese in question, and at least one member should have particular expertise in the treatment of the sexual abuse of minors. The members will be appointed for a term of five years, which can be renewed. It is desirable that the promoter of justice participate in meetings of the review board.”⁵⁹

One can see that the Bishop maintains his power of decision over the board for a variety of reasons: *first*, because he still has the last word in the judgment; *second*, because of the presence of a priest on the board who normally will defend the Bishop’s opinion; *third*, because of his personal influence over the lay members who were all chosen by him for the review board. However, he does not assume legal responsibility for the decisions it issues.

Responsibility is assumed instead by the board members who, except for one priest, are laypersons without any official link to the Diocese, a requirement the article specifically sets out. Here also the *Norms* were careful to free the Diocese of any liability. The Diocese does not

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

want even the indirect link of a diocesan employee associated with the review board. In short, only the priest who is chosen as a board member will be professionally linked to the Diocese.

Therefore, the total responsibility for judgments declaring a clergyman innocent or guilty of sexual abuse, as well as the recommended punishment – transferal to another Diocese, provisory or definitive removal from the ministry, or even dismissal from the clerical state – is a decision for which the lay majority of the review board will be legally responsible.

Why all these many precautions to avoid legal responsibility? Would it be because the Vatican was counseling the American Bishops to be rigorous and mete out exemplary punishments to all the guilty priests? This would not appear to be the case at all. If the Bishops would adopt this course, they would have the strong support of Catholic public opinion and there would be no need for such excessive legal protections. These precautions seem more likely to have been inserted for the juridical and financial protection of the Bishops who might continue to favor guilty priests.

c. Changing the statute of limitations – In his letter refusing approval of the Dallas documents, Cardinal Re affirmed that this was done because

“the *Norms* and the *Charter* contain provisions which in some aspects are difficult to reconcile with the universal law of the Church.”

To resolve this problem, the new Washington texts were supposed to be set in good order. Apparently it was

just a matter of harmonizing the American and the Vatican canonical legislation.

In reality, however, bringing the Dallas documents in line with the new Canon Law would result in favoring guilty priests. In effect, while the Bishops in Dallas declared their good intention to punish those who were guilty of pedophilia “whether the sexual abuse was recent, or occurred many years ago.”⁶⁰ The *Code of Canon Law* promulgated by John Paul II in 1983, however, establishes a limit of only five years after the crime for the victim of pedophilia to accuse the guilty. The Canon 1362 reads:

“§ 1. Prescription⁶¹ extinguishes a criminal action after three years unless it concerns: an action arising from the delicts [crimes] which are mentioned in Canon1395, which have a prescription for five years

“§ 2. Prescription runs from the day on which the delict was committed or, if the delict is continuous or habitual, from the day on which it ceased.”⁶²

Canon 1395, in its turn, reads:

“§ 2. A cleric who in another way committed an offense against the Sixth Commandment of the Decalogue, if the delict [crime] was committed by

⁶⁰ USCCB, “Norms,” Preamble, *Origins*, June 27, 2002, p. 107.

⁶¹ *Prescription* means a juridical prohibition to pursue a criminal action after a certain period of time. In the United States this term is understood as the statute of limitations for presenting charges against an allegedly pedophile priest.

⁶² 1983 *Code of Canon Law*, in Canon Law Society of America, *New Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, (New York: Paulist Press, 2000), p. 1573.

force or threats or publicly or with a minor below the age of sixteen years, is to be punished with just penalties, not excluding dismissal from the clerical state if the case so warrants.”⁶³

The *New Commentary* explains several things about these two canons that appear neither in the Washington documents nor in the *Code of Canon Law*.

First, a modification was introduced in Canon 1395 when applied in the United States. The *New Commentary* explains the exception:

“The age of ‘minors’ here has been temporarily raised to 18 years in the United States due a special Holy See modification of the *Code* for five years beginning in April 25, 1994. On November 30, 1998 John Paul II extended the provision for ten years until April 25, 2009.”⁶⁴

There are several unclear points regarding both the canons and the exception.

- According to their provisions five years after the sexual abuse was committed the criminal would be free, unless judicial charges had been brought against him. Therefore, if the abused child, who can be just a five or six-year-old child, remains silent, which is probable, the limit will expire and the criminal will never have to answer for the crime. This certainly does not seem just.
- The commentaries state that John Paul II made a special exception for the United States by establ-

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 1599.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1599, note 290.

ishing the age of a minor to be “temporarily raised” to 18 years. Why only for the United States? It would be obtuse to hypothesize that children in this country mature slower than children in other countries. It is not clear why the United States was singled out for special treatment. Someone could propose that this is because U.S. law establishes that children are minors until age 18. Then, why is this norm temporarily set for 10 years, and not definitively fixed? Again, it is not clear. It would be clear, however, if the temporary measure would have been established only to silence the angry reaction of American Catholic public opinion. By April 2009, this reaction supposedly would have subsided and the exception could be removed without commotion.

- Apart from this, the limit set for the abused minor in all other countries is age 16, regardless of the age of minors established by Civil Law (16, 18, or 21), and the abused minor has five years after the crime to report it. Past age 16, if someone were to suffer a sexual abuse that was not committed by force or threats or publicly, he or she has only three years to file a legal complaint. If no charges are presented in this period, the criminal will be free.

Both the clear and confused provisions of these canons seem to have been written with the aim of protecting the criminal, and not the victim. The protection of the abused children is not even mentioned. What appears clear and strong is the intent to absolve the guilty cleric as soon as possible.

Second, another special extension of norms was issued by John Paul II to deal in a provisory way with the problem of children who remain silent after being abused because they lack the psychological maturity to face the problem and describe what they suffered to their parents or lawyers. The *New Commentary* describes this provision:

“Another example of the seriousness with which this delict [crime of pedophilia] is viewed in the United States is a change in the statute of limitations (prescription) for initiating a criminal action based on alleged sexual abuse of minors. The aforementioned special April 1994 Holy See norms modified Canon 1362, which normally provides a five-year period after the commission of such a delict. For alleged delicts committed against minors *under 18 years of age between April 25, 1994 and April 24, 1999*, such a criminal action may be initiated until the minor celebrates his/her 28th birthday or one year has elapsed from the denunciation of the delict expedited prior to that 28th birthday. For alleged delicts committed with minors *under 16 years of age before April 25, 1994*, such a criminal action may be initiated until the minor in question celebrates his/her 23rd birthday On November 30, 1998 John Paul II extended the aforementioned norms for ten years until April 25, 2009.”⁶⁵

In this quite confused provision, it seems that in practical terms, what this exception means is that today, since we are still in the specified period between 1994 and

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p.1600, note 296.

2009, no one who is older than age 28 can file complaints about pedophile abuses committed after April 1994. And no one who is older than age 23 can complain about pedophile abuses that took place before April 1994.

According to this provision regarding the statute of limitations, today it would be impossible for the accuser of Cardinal Hans Hermann Gröer to charge him as a pedophile; it would be impossible for most of the accusers of Fr. John Geoghan, who abused more than one 100 children, to charge him for crimes of pedophilia; it would be impossible for most of the accusers of Fr. Paul Shanley to charge him as a pedophile, etc. These shameful ecclesiastics and countless others would be considered innocent because of statutes of limitations, according to the present Canon Law.

After 2009, the situation will be even worse. The special extensions will be lifted, and the text of Canon 1362 will be applied literally. That is, the time limit will expire five years after the crime was committed, if the victim is under age 16. This will encourage the tendency to absolve guilty ecclesiastics.

One can see that the first concern of the Vatican does not seem to be Justice...

D. A Final Assessment

What was the result of the Vatican demand that the Dallas documents be made to harmonize with the universal law of the Church? The result was a situation that did not fulfill the expectations of the Catholic faithful. In its provisions there was no special punishment provided for

the guilty priests and no special protection given to the victims. The principal change was that many measures were taken to evade punishing pedophile priests and favor covering up their crimes, as well as to avoid future legal problems for the Bishops. In short, the Vatican measures favor the continuation of the *status quo* prior to Dallas.

In my opinion, this obstinate defense of pedophile priests is an action that makes a three-fold call for vengeance from Heaven:

- The debased vice of homosexuality itself calls for vengeance from Heaven, and pedophilia, in most cases, is a despicable variant of homosexuality.
- The pedophile priest destroys the innocence of the child, and Our Lord cursed such men: “But he that shall scandalize one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone should be hanged around his neck, and that he should be drowned in the depth of the sea” (Matt 18:10);
- By protecting those who are destroying her honor and structure, the Vatican fails to defend the Church and works for its destruction. To try to destroy the Catholic Church is to directly challenge the Holy Ghost, upon whose protection the Holy Church depends.

Those who are responsible for these actions should keep in mind that while the vengeance of God can be late, it never fails to come.

Chapter III

HOMOSEXUALITY AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES

Regarding the topic of homosexuality, the United States is the country with the most accessible and numerous statistical data. This is due to the welcome that American public opinion usually gives to the publication of statistics. Also, due to the general liberalism that characterized the formation of the United States, it seems that here there are more homosexual organizations and a greater public acceptance of such individuals who “come out” and speak openly on the topic. An innate propensity of Americans to form associations more readily than other peoples could also contribute to the abundance of data. These are some reasons why the United States is analyzed first in this book on the topic of homosexuality.

The overview that follows, therefore, is not intended to classify the United States as any more decadent than other countries. For what is happening here is indicative of what is happening in the whole world.

1. Extent of the Phenomenon and Principal Movements

In his well-documented book *The Homosexual Network*, Fr. Enrique Rueda pointed out the rapid growth and influence of this network throughout the 1960s and

'70s. He quoted a newsletter of the Democratic Party on the 1979 political campaign (December 13, 1979), which stated:

“The gay vote is now so important in national [American] politics that no serious politician can ignore or ridicule it.”⁶⁶

According to this document, there would be 15 million homosexual Americans of voting age, an estimation confirmed by contributors to a political column in *The Washington Star*.⁶⁷

A word should be said about this figure of 15 million. In the beginning of the 1950's, American biologist Alfred Kinsey published the result of a survey of 11,000 people on sex-related matters. He began with the premise that people usually do not tell the truth about themselves when interviewed on sexual matters. So he looked for those who voluntarily wished to discuss the subject, which tended to be primarily persons in marginal groups, in this case, homosexuals and lesbians. The data collected from this study was in general use for some 40 years. Applications of his method projected an estimated 10 % of homosexuals in the population.⁶⁸ Today that would mean about 29 million people.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Enrique Rueda, *The Homosexual Network - Private Lives and Public Policy* (Old Greenwich, CT: Devin Adair Co., 1982), p. 134.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ Philip Elmer-Dewitt, “Now for the Truth about Americans and Sex,” *Time*, October 17, 1994, pp. 44, 46, 50.

⁶⁹ US population from a July 2003 estimate was 290,342,000, according to *The World Factbook* website.

In October 1994, however, a group of three researchers at the University of Chicago and one at New York State University published another study based on 3,500 interviews with selected persons carried out by an authoritative public research institute. *Time* magazine considered the new study “the first really scientific statistics in America.”⁷⁰

The researchers in the 1994 study contested the Kinsey method as unreliable because those interviewed were not chosen randomly, but were drawn from atypical groups, especially self-identified homosexuals. The weak point of their own research, they acknowledged, was that the sexual topic – especially homosexuality – inhibits people. “There is probably much more homosexual activity than people are saying,” one admitted.⁷¹ They estimated the homosexual population in the United States as 2%, or about 5 million people.

On the basis of this smaller percentage, those scholars concluded that the danger of AIDS is not as grave as it was trumped up to be and needs to be fought only in the so-called high-risk groups. This raised indignation in certain public health-related sectors. The former head of the National Commission on AIDS, for example, commenting on the study, protested: “The message is shocking and runs against the whole history of the epidemic.”⁷²

It is clear, therefore, that both surveys are controversial. If one were to draw an average between the two –

⁷⁰ P. Elmer-Dewitt, “Now for the Truth about Americans and Sex,” p. 46.

⁷¹ Statement by Stuart Michaels, *apud ibid.*, p. 48.

⁷² Statement by June Osborn, *apud ibid.*, p. 49

since one claims 29 million and the other 5 million – the result would be 17 million in 2003, not so far from the 15 million mentioned by Fr. Rueda in his 1982 book.

But even the more conservative estimate of five million would suffice to show that homosexuality has become a phenomenon of apocalyptic proportions.

Among the principal organizations of homosexuals in the U.S. are the so-called Catholic movements:

- New Ways Ministry, founded in 1977 by Sr. Jeannine Gramick, SSND, and Fr. Robert Nugent, SDS. In its mission statement it calls itself a “a gay-positive ministry” that “fights personal and structural homophobia” and “promotes the acceptance of gay and lesbian people as full and equal members of church and society.”⁷³
- Dignity, founded by Fr. John McNeill, SJ, in 1969.⁷⁴ It openly states that it works for respect, justice and equal rights for all gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons in the Catholic Church. Dignity has more than 100 chapters in the U.S. and Canada.⁷⁵

2. Support of the Hierarchy for Homosexuality

* The first symposium on “Homosexuality and the Catholic Church” promoted by New Ways Ministry, whose speakers were all in favor of this vice, was held at the Holy Trinity Missionary Seminary of Silver Springs,

⁷³ New Ways Ministry website.

⁷⁴ E. Rueda, *The Homosexual Network*, pp. 362.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

Maryland, from November 20-22, 1981, with the permission of the ecclesiastical authority. Twenty-two religious organizations, nearly all Catholic, supported the organization of the event.⁷⁶

* The National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) has supported on various occasions the homosexual movement. Fr. Robert Nugent, director of New Ways Ministry and one of the leaders of the homosexual movement, served as a consultant to the NCCB. The NCCB's Department of Education published a document titled "Planning for the Single Young Adult Ministry," a work written in part by New Ways Ministry.⁷⁷

* Dignity's efforts to influence the NCCB began in 1977. A key figure of the NCCB's Office of Public Affairs and Information became president of Dignity. This movement's relationships with the NCCB gradually grew more intense with the passing of time. Milestones in this process were: the July 1981 meeting of Dignity president Frank Scheuren with then-Archbishop John Quinn of San Francisco and president of the NCCB; another meeting with Bishop Thomas Kelly, who held the important post of general secretary of the Bishops Conference in the late 1970s; and an exchange of correspondence with the next NCCB president, Archbishop John Roach.⁷⁸

A Dignity newsletter reported the positive support offered at the meeting with Archbishop Quinn:

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 293-4.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 306-10.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 308-9.

“The Archbishop has requested that Dignity submit to him proposals that show how joint cooperation can be accomplished in the day-to-day pastoral ministry of our people. He expressed that this would be the beginning of an ongoing dialogue between the parties.”⁷⁹

* A booklet published by New Ways Ministry, *Time to Speak*, listed 16 Bishops – including Cardinal Krol of Philadelphia and the Cardinal Dearden of Detroit – who in some way had benefited the homosexual movement.⁸⁰ Conspicuous among this support is a letter signed by Raymond Hunthausen, Bishop of Seattle. It encouraged the efforts of the homosexual movement to lobby the House of Representatives of the State of Washington to approve a law granting special privileges to homosexuals. A letter from the Archbishop of Milwaukee, Rembert Weakland, also favored approval of a law to protect the “basic rights” of homosexuals.⁸¹ The booklet *Time to Speak* contains a list of 38 Catholic associations that supported the homosexual movement.⁸²

* Dignity has estimated that 75% of its meetings are held on Church properties.⁸³ Some homosexual parties have also taken place on Catholic premises, such as Dignity’s ball, called a “black and white dress ball,” where people of the same sex danced with each other. That ball

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 323-4.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 316. The full list of Bishops with the support they gave and the dates it was given can be found here.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 319-20.

⁸² *Ibid.*, pp. 326-7.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 321.

took place at Rosary Academy in Sparkhill, New York, on September 12, 1981. Another example was “Cabaret night,” held by the same movement in the auditorium of St. Francis School in New York City on April 7, 1982 – an Ash Wednesday⁸⁴

* Homosexual events hosted by Catholic institutions are becoming increasingly more frequent. At the same time the homosexuals have become more bold and uninhibited. In early 1995 *The Wanderer* published the following report:

“Among those entering the ground floor of San Francisco’s St. Mary’s Cathedral on a Saturday evening, as Mass was being held above, was a tall Asian gentleman wearing a stunning scarlet cocktail dress and long spiked red high heels, arm-in-arm with two shorter men. And as Mass-goers walked out of the cathedral after the 5:30 p.m. Mass, it was hard not to notice affectionate male couples in the cathedral parking lot, hugging and kissing. And a continent and an ocean away, in Vatican offices, fax machines were buzzing as angry San Francisco Catholics informed Rome of the latest sacrilege in their city.

“On February 11, San Francisco’s Catholics cathedral was the site for a major celebration of homosexual power in California. The chief political, religious, and social leaders of the homosexual rights movement in the city, state, and nation mingled with their constituents at a fund-raiser for pro-homosexual causes. The scandal and outrage show

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 329.

to what extent the American Church has bought into the homosexual agenda

“The event at St. Mary’s Cathedral Conference Center was billed as a Saints Alive awards celebration and a celebrity auction to benefit the exclusively homosexual Metropolitan Community Church’s social service programs. The live auction was conducted by two local gay comedians, whose patter was constant, clever, crass, and peppered with jokes about sodomy. Suzy Berger, an improvisational and stand-up comedian, ripped off a barrage of smutty homosexual jokes, bathroom humor, asides about ‘lesbian culture,’ and lurid comments.

“When a painting, *Study with Fruits and Flowers*, seemed not to be getting many bids, he offered to throw in the male model with the deal. The model then turned his backside to the audience, and took a bow. The audience whooped and hollered in excitement. The more outrageous the merchandise, the cruder the MCs were, and the louder the audience.

“When two one-year scholarships to The Child Unique Montessori School did not receive many bids, the auctioneer offered to throw in one, and then two, sperm donations to lesbians who might like to have a child to use the scholarship.”⁸⁵

⁸⁵ “San Francisco Cathedral Is Site for “Gay Power” Bash,” *The Wanderer*, February 23, 1995.

New reports are constantly surfacing of the support given by Bishops and Cardinals for homosexuality, or their explicit or implicit involvement in such. The following list provides a significant example:

* On April 22, 1988, Cardinal Roger Mahony asked the Gay Men's Chorus of Los Angeles to provide the music at his "Liturgy Commissioning Those Called to Minister to Persons with AIDS" at Blessed Sacrament Church in Hollywood. The choir assisted him in the presentation of the award crosses.⁸⁶

* In November 1991, Jim Johnson, a caregiver to AIDS patients, told the press that the Cardinal of Los Angeles, Roger Mahony, and the Archbishop of San Francisco, John Quinn, "were surrounded by homosexual priests." Johnson also made an allusion to "gay Bishops" in the Los Angeles area.⁸⁷

Two years later, Dr. Joe Nicolosi, a psychologist who treated homosexuals, including priests and seminarians, repeated the accusations of Johnson. He told the *San Diego News* (April 1993) that he thought there were "at least two gay Bishops in the Los Angeles Archdiocese."⁸⁸

* In 1993, Cardinal Roger Mahony helped to fund and produce the video *A Journey for Understanding Gays and Lesbians in the Church*. In it Mahony affirmed:

⁸⁶ *Catholic Eye*, June 20, 1988, *apud* Concerned Roman Catholics of America, "The Shocking 22-Year Record of L.A.'s Archbishop," *Los Angeles Mission*, December 2002, n. 12.

⁸⁷ Notes, *San Diego News*, November 1991, *apud ibid.*, n. 17.

⁸⁸ Concerned Roman Catholics of America, "The Shocking 22-Year Record of L.A.'s Archbishop," n. 18.

“There is nothing wrong with any gay or lesbian person whatsoever. They are just as equal as I or anyone else.”⁸⁹

The video called being gay “a blessing and a gift,” and “something prophetic toward remodeling the Church.” Bishop Stephen Blaire, an auxiliary Bishop of Mahony’s Archdiocese, also appeared in the video.⁹⁰

* In 1994, the Archdiocese of Los Angeles joined gay groups to support a memorial in East L.A. for 2,000 Latinos who died of AIDS.⁹¹

* In 1995, Cardinal Mahony opened an Archdiocesan office for Spanish-speaking gays and lesbians.⁹²

* On June 25, 1996, the Los Angeles Archdiocese had a special Mass for lesbian and gay Catholics during “Gay and Lesbian Pride Week” in West Hollywood. It also sponsored a booth at its “Pride Festival.”⁹³

* In 1996, various Catholic Bishops publicly favored proposals of new congressional bills that supported homosexuality.

For example, Bishop Howard Hubbard of Albany publicly backed the “gay rights” agenda and urged support for legislation that would outlaw discrimination based on sexual orientation. The bill, introduced by legislator Julie Dennison, whose constituency includes many homosexuals, was endorsed by Bishop Hubbard, who said that the

⁸⁹ *The Wanderer*, July 29, 1993, *apud ibid.*, n. 32.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ *Los Angeles Times*, January 14, 1994, *apud ibid.*, n. 37.

⁹² *Los Angeles Times*, July 22, 1995, *apud ibid.*, n. 37

⁹³ *The Tidings*, June 14, 1996, *apud ibid.*, n. 40.

Albany Diocese affirmed “the sacred dignity and unique worth of homosexual persons and is adamantly opposed to discrimination against all persons, including those who have a homosexual orientation.”⁹⁴

The proposal was opposed by an Albany branch of the Christian Coalition, a Catholic organization. Spokesman Chuck Benoit pointed out the bill’s true objective:

“There is no use for it. No need for it. The human rights laws that are on the books basically take care of this issue. This is an attempt to legitimize homosexuality.”⁹⁵

Bishop Matthew Clark of Rochester gave an analogous support for the homosexual agenda. One day after the U.S. Senate passed the Defense of Marriage Act, Bishop Clark was quoted in the Rochester *Times Union* as expressing the hope that the Church might some day find a way to bless long-term homosexual relationships. The East Rochester St. Thomas More Church holds an annual “blessing” ceremony for homosexual couples.⁹⁶

* Standing under a “gay pride” flag, Cardinal Roger Mahony of Los Angeles celebrated a Mass for homosexuals at St. Matthew’s Church in Long Beach on February 4, 1996. “To see the Cardinal with the gay pride flag is an incredible thing,” said Vanessa Romain, the president of Long Beach Lesbian and Gay Pride, Inc. “It’s what a lot of Catholics have been waiting for all their lives.”

⁹⁴ “Albany Bishop Backs Homosexual Rights Bill,” *The Wanderer*, January 18, 1996.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

⁹⁶ “Bishop Holds Hope Church Will Bless Homosexual Unions,” *The Wanderer*, October 3, 1996.

Approximately 500 people attended the Mass celebrating the 10th anniversary of the Archdiocese's outreach to homosexuals.⁹⁷

* At the funeral Mass of Cardinal Joseph Bernardin of Chicago in November 1997, one of the groups providing music at his wake was Windy City Gay Men's Chorus. The decision to include the sodomite choir was made by Cardinal Bernardin, who prepared all the funeral arrangements personally before his death.⁹⁸

* The National Association of Catholic Diocesan Lesbian and Gay Ministries held its 1997 convention in Long Beach with Los Angeles Archdiocesan approval. Cardinal Mahony said a Mass, delivered a homily, and distributed Communion to those present, including many members of Dignity.⁹⁹ Also present were Auxiliary Bishops of Los Angeles Stephen Blaire, Joseph Sartoris, and Gabino Zavala.¹⁰⁰ The speaker, Fr. Kenneth Waibel, qualified "gay spirituality" as the only authentic one. He also made this absurd statement:

⁹⁷ "Los Angeles Cardinal Celebrates Mass under 'Gay Pride' Flag," *The Wanderer*, February 29, 1996.

⁹⁸ Tim Unsworth, *I Am Your Brother: Cardinal Bernardin of Chicago* (NY: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1997), *apud* book review by Judith Anne Testa, *Christian Century*, July 1, 1998, online edition; Stephen Brady, "The Beginning of the End: Bernardin's Legacy," *Roman Catholic Faithful Newsletter*, Spring-Summer 2000, p. 9.

⁹⁹ *San Diego News Notes*, October 1997, *apud* Concerned Roman Catholics of America, "The Shocking 22-Year Record of L.A.'s Archbishop," n. 43.

¹⁰⁰ *Los Angeles Times*, August 30, 1997, *apud ibid.* n. 43.

“Jesus wants us to be erotically in love with Him, and that is not possible for homophobes.”¹⁰¹

At one point during the convention Fr. Peter Luizzi, director of the Archdiocesan Ministry for Lesbians and Gays, “pretended to bless attendees with puppy urine, and then simulated a strip show, tossing his clerical collar into the crowd.”¹⁰²

* On June 7, 1998, Cardinal Francis George of Chicago celebrated a Mass for homosexuals at Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church. According to the *Windy City Times*, the Cardinal praised the work of the Archdiocesan Gay and Lesbian Outreach (AGLO). Following the service the Cardinal told the newspaper he was impressed with the congregation: “This was a very prayerful group,” he said. “These are people who are striving to be people of faith.”¹⁰³

* In December 1998, Bishop Anthony Pilla presided at the Cleveland chapter of Dignity’s 25th anniversary prayer service held in the Cathedral of St. John Evangelist. The invitation text for the service read:

“Dignity invites all lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender Catholics, their families and friends to join them. The service is set for Friday, December 4, at 7 p.m. at the Cathedral The prayer service

¹⁰¹ *The Wanderer*, September 18, 1997, *apud ibid.* n. 43.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*

¹⁰³ “Cardinal Officiates at Gay Mass,” *Windy City Times*, June 11, 1998, *apud* Roman Catholic Faithful Newsletter, Fall-Winter 2003, pp. 8-9.

will be followed by a reception with Bishop Pilla.”¹⁰⁴

* In June 1999, Cardinal George permitted his archdiocesan organization for homosexuals to march in the Gay Pride Parade. The Our Lady of Mount Carmel bulletin stated: “Our participation in the gay parade not only represents our community of faith sharers, but also the Catholic Church.”¹⁰⁵

* On January 9, 2002, a news report stated that seven Chicago Catholic churches in Oak Park, River Forest, and Forest Park would be holding two special Sunday evening Masses for homosexuals and lesbians in late January. The Masses were organized by Cardinal Francis George’s AGLO. According to AGLO organizers, the Masses “will be geared toward people who may feel more comfortable sitting next to their same sex partner than at a regular Mass.” The AGLO often schedules Masses in the Chicago Archdiocese.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ *The Gay People’s Chronicle* (Cleveland), November 20, 1998, *apud*, Roman Catholic Faithful Newsletter, Spring-Summer 2000, p. 20.

¹⁰⁵ “Cardinal George Endorses AGLO’s Marching in Gay Pride Parade,” *The Wanderer*, June 17, 1999, *apud ibid.*, p. 9.

¹⁰⁶ Christine des Garennes, “Local Catholic Churches to Offer Gay-Friendly Masses,” *Wednesday Journey*, January 9, 2002, *apud* Stephen Brady, “By Their Fruits You Shall Know Them,” *Roman Catholic Faithful Newsletter*, Winter 2001-2002, pp. 10-11.

3. The Chicago Symposium

The scandal of homosexuality in the Church took on hitherto unheard-of proportions when homosexuals assembled in Chicago on March 27-29, 1992, with the support and presence of various Bishops.

The symposium was sponsored by 91 diocesan offices and religious communities. About 39% of the participants held leadership posts in religious orders, parishes, and other institutions; 63% were priests, nuns, and religious.¹⁰⁷

The *Catholic News Service* distributed a press communiqué on the meeting entitled "Bishops Urge Less Rigid Church Attitude toward Homosexuals." It read:

"Three Catholic Bishops speaking at a forum on 'Lesbian and Gay People and Catholicism' said they hoped pastoral leaders will adopt less rigid attitudes toward homosexual men and women.

"On March 26 Bishop Kenneth E. Untener of Saginaw, Michigan, Bishop William A. Hughes of Covington, Kentucky, and Auxiliary Bishop Thomas J. Gumbleton of Detroit addressed a symposium in Chicago, organized by New Ways Ministry. The organization seeks understanding for and acceptance of gays and lesbians in the Catholic community.

"Bishop Hughes, who chaired the U.S. Bishops' task force that drafted 'The Many Faces of AIDS:

¹⁰⁷ Robert McGlory, "Bishops Buck Criticism, Attend Gay Symposium in Chicago," *National Catholic Reporter*, April 10, 1992.

A Gospel Response,' said that Christians are called to be a people of compassion, aware of the difficulties and struggles people face. He likened the Church's changing pastoral approach to gays and lesbians to its experience in embracing divorcees and survivors of suicide. He said such outreach obviously did not endorse divorce or suicide."¹⁰⁸

In a comprehensive report for the newspaper *The Wanderer*, Eric Bower added other important details:

* Bishop Gumbleton was enthusiastically applauded by the 500 plus participants when he said: "I am proud to

¹⁰⁸ Keith Picher, "Bishops Urge Less Rigid Church Attitude toward Homosexuals," *Catholic News Service*, March 31, 1992.

This news release was published by the Chicago Archdiocesan paper, *The New World*, April 3, 1992, as well as by innumerable other papers such as *The Long Island Catholic*, April 1, 1992; *Mississippi Today*, Jackson, MI, April 3, 1992; *The Messenger*, Belleville, IL, April 3, 1992; *The Catholic Free Press*, Worcester, MA, April 3, 1992; *The Catholic Review*, Baltimore, MD; April 8, 1992; *Catholic Herald*, Milwaukee, WI; April 9, 1992; *Catholic Courier*, Rochester, NY, April 9, 1992; *The Monitor*, Trenton, NJ, April 9, 1992; *The Message*, Evansville, IN, April 10, 1992; *The Catholic Sentinel*, Portland, OR, April 10, 1992; *Catholic Telegraph*, Cincinnati, OH, April 10, 1992; *The Florida Catholic*, Miami, April 10, 1992; *New Catholic Explorer*, Joliet, IL, April 10, 1992; *Catholic East Texas*, Tyler, April 10, 1992; *The Green Bay Catholic Compass*, April 10, 1992; *The Catholic Post*, Peoria, IL, April 12, 1992; *Northwest Indiana Catholic*, Merrillville, April 12, 1992; *The Catholic Virginian*, Richmond, April 13, 1992; *The Catholic Messenger*, Davenport, IA, April 16, 1992; *Twin Circle*, April 19, 1992; *The Providence Visitor*, RI, April 23, 1992; *The Saint Cloud Visitor*, MN, April 23, 1992; *Acadiana Catholic*, Lafayette, LA, May 1992; *Inland Catholic*, San Bernardino - Riverside Counties, CA, May 1992.

be here! Pleased to be here! And honored to be with you!" He also gave this advice to the homosexuals present:

"Be patient and ready to wait until the Bishops and priests show compassion, love, and care for all those in the gay community."¹⁰⁹

* Outside the main conference room, various display tables were set up featuring literature, tapes, and other information on homosexuality. One table sponsored by Dignity also offered literature advertising the services of AGLO (Chicago's Archdiocesan Gay and Lesbian Organization, personally supervised by Cardinal Joseph Bernardin). The same table offered pornographic homosexual literature.

* Bishop William Hughes of Covington, KY, celebrated a strange "mass" for the meeting's participants in the Westin Hotel ballroom. Coffee was served before it began. The makeshift sanctuary consisted of a platform with a stack chair and small table on it. On the table was a punch bowl. No crucifix. The wine for the "mass" was a gallon of Gallo served in chalices. The bread was coarse and falling in crumbs. Participants served themselves unceremoniously. After the "mass," used wine cups, plates, and napkins were left in the ballroom.¹¹⁰

* Richard Freeman, president of the Catholic Action League, described the conference as "perhaps the most blatant and dramatic example we have yet seen of how far gone some of our Bishops are, and how little discipline is being exercised by the Vatican ... Our renegade Bishops

¹⁰⁹ Eric Bower, "Give Lip Service to Rome, Encourage Dissident Homosexuals," *The Wanderer*, April 9, 1992.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

and Cardinals seem to fear nothing and no one, least of all God. We are moving very, very close to a formal break with Rome and a complete disintegration of the structure of the Church in this nation."¹¹¹

Freeman said it was no accident that Chicago was picked for the site of the conference. Under Cardinal Bernardin, he observed, it had become notorious for its inner-Church homosexual activities. According to a well-informed source, Cardinal Bernardin was invited to address the conference. He declined the invitation, perhaps because he was personally embroiled in a priestly pedophilia scandal.¹¹² But he gave it his formal blessing and singled out his three brother Bishops who attended the conference for special praise.¹¹³

¹¹¹ See also the news item in *The Eternal Call*, Park Forest, IL, Pentecost 1992.

¹¹² Cardinal Joseph Bernardin was accused of sexually molesting a seminarian in 1975 ("Processado," *Veja*, November 17, 1993), an event that had worldwide repercussions ("Ricevuto dal Papa cardinale accusato di abusi sessuali," *Corriere della Sera*, January 5, 1994). He was later acquitted for lack of evidence (Kenneth L. Woodward, "Was It Real or Memories?" *Newsweek*, March 14, 1994).

¹¹³ a. The Vatican's reaction to these events in the United States was one of extreme moderation. In July 1992, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith released the document it had sent to the U.S. Bishops justifying certain limitations to the civil rights of homosexuals, as analyzed above (chapter II.2.C). It also reaffirmed principles it had already issued in its letter sent to the full Episcopate in 1986 on the subject (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, "Alcune considerazioni concernenti la risposta a proposte di legge sulla non-discriminazione delle persone omosessuali," 2nd version, July 23, 1992, *L'Osservatore Romano*, July 24, 1992).

These *Considerations* were published with a few alterations (*Ibid.*), along with comments by Vatican spokesman Joaquim Navarro-Valls. He said that the document "was not intended as a public and official

instruction but to help those who have to evaluate projected bills on the matter" ("Chiarezza, non discriminazione," *Avvenire*, July 24, 1992; "Responding to Legislative Proposals on Discriminations against Homosexuals," *Origins*, August 6, 1992, pp. 173-7).

The reaction of the American Bishops to this Vatican document can be gauged by this report in the *San Francisco Chronicle* entitled: "San Francisco Archdiocese Opposes Vatican Letter on Gay Bias Law":

"Local Roman Catholic Church leaders said yesterday that they will continue to oppose laws that discriminate against homosexuals – despite a Vatican missive declaring that gays and lesbians do not have the same civil rights as heterosexuals" (Don Lattin, *San Francisco Chronicle*, July 25, 1992).

The article goes on to say that the Holy See document "contradicts past statements by San Francisco Archbishop John Quinn Quinn was on vacation yesterday ... but Fr. Robert McElroy, the Archbishop's representative on the Archdiocese's Justice and Peace Commission, said, 'There is no change in the Archdiocese's policy

'Aides to several of the Bishops said they doubt the Vatican document will lead to any change in their tolerance policies toward gays.

"'Most of the Bishops would rather just ignore this,' said one priest, a seasoned observer of the American Bishops' Conference" (*Ibid.*).

Archbishop Rembert G. Weakland of Milwaukee, a prominent leader of the Church's liberal wing, "noted that the statement carried no signature and that there was no indication that it had been seen by the Pope" (Peter Steinfels, "Vatican Condones Gay-Rights Limits," *The New York Times*, July 18, 1992).

b. Practical measures that went against the Holy See's orientation were not long in coming. A symptomatic example is the support given by Archbishop John Roach and the Minnesota Catholic Conference (MCC) to a 1993 state law barring discrimination against homosexuals in employment, housing, education, and public accommodations. Not only did the MCC support passage of the bill, it helped to write it. MCC executive director Msgr. James Habiger urged approval of the bill in these words: "The Catholic Church recognizes and affirms the human dignity and worth of gay persons and calls for the protection of their basic human rights" (Argumentation in support of the law preventing discrimination of homosexuals," *apud* Paul Likoudis, "Minnesota Catholic Conference Helps Write and Pass Homosexual Rights Bill," *The Wanderer*, April 1, 1993).

4. Homosexuals' "Religious Orders"

Special mention should be made of a little publicized phenomenon, the foundation of so-called religious orders exclusively for Catholic homosexuals. Such "orders," described in *The Homosexual Network*, still had not been recognized by Church authorities near the end of 1982 when the work was published. Some of the main groups include the following:

Agape Community – a religious extension of Dignity: Its members may, if they so desire, make promises of poverty, chastity, and obedience. The rule states:

"Lovers are welcome with or without their partners While ideally chastity or love commitments are to be encouraged, the community is open to all who seek to be witnesses to Christ."¹¹⁴

Emmaus House – formerly called St. Matthew Community: Its rule says it is an entity made up primarily of Catholic homosexuals who serve the Church in a variety of ministries. Any member who wishes may make private vows of celibacy, obedience, and poverty under the orientation of the organization's spiritual director and with the approval of the Diocesan Bishop.¹¹⁵

Christian Community Association – This order has several levels of spirituality, with the most advanced requiring a monastic lifestyle. Vows of poverty, obedience, and chastity were renamed as sharing, commitment, and charity. A postulant must recite this formula:

¹¹⁴ E. Rueda, *The Homosexual Network*, p. 350.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 351, 581.

“I believe that homosexuality is a gift of God and that we have an obligation to use our gifts in the service of humanity, and that this is one way in which we return our gift to God, through religious community.”¹¹⁶

Other similar organizations: Augustinians of Charity, The Order of Transformation, the Morning Star Community.¹¹⁷

5. Homosexual Priests and Bishops

Setting aside further examples that could still be cited showing the support of American Prelates for the homosexual movement, I will go directly to cases in which members of the Catholic clergy and Hierarchy were publicly revealed as homosexuals.

Nowadays, cases of homosexual priests are so numerous that just to list them along with the most essential data could fill an entire book. It is not my intention to assemble such an extensive list. Here I will describe one expressive case that is indicative of the ensemble. It took place in the Californian Province of the Society of Jesus.

In 1995, the Jesuit University of San Francisco (USF) appointed **ex-Jesuit Dr. Dan McPherson** as coordinator of its Marriage and Family Counseling program in the School of Education for the 1996-1997 academic year. McPherson had left the Order to enter an open homosexual relationship with another ex-Jesuit. Later he and his ex-

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 352.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 351-3.

priest “partner” **Kevin Gogin** adopted a seven-year-old girl.

The two men were ordained in the early 1980s and left the Order in 1987. During Archbishop John Quinn’s tenure, Gogin worked for Catholic Charities and was a guest lecturer at St. Patrick’s Seminary in Menlo Park, California.

Fr. John W. Clark, SJ, was provincial of the Jesuit’s California Province at the time both McPherson and Gogin were ordained and dismissed. He was also provost at USF and vice-president for academic affairs in 1996, when McPherson was given his appointment at the Jesuit university. For a number of years McPherson had been a counselor in the USF Counseling Center advising undergraduates.¹¹⁸

This is a case of two homosexual priests who left the priesthood to live together. It reveals the support and complacency of the Jesuit Provincial who permitted McPherson to hold a prestigious place in a Jesuit university. It also supposes the support of Archbishop Quinn, who allowed Gogin to work for a Catholic organization and lecture in his Archdiocese.

The only difference between the situation of these two priests in the late 1980s and the situation of many homosexual priests in 2004 is that nowadays the latter would not need to leave the priesthood to publicly reveal their homosexuality and live together as “partners.” Today homosexuality has become so frequent within the priesthood that homosexual priests are everywhere, publicly living as

¹¹⁸ Arthur J. Brew, “USF Names Homosexual Ex-Jesuit to Counseling Post,” *The Wanderer*, August 15, 1996.

such either alone or with their “partners” in all kind of ecclesiastical institutions – seminaries, parish rectories, monasteries, universities, schools, hospitals, etc.

But homosexuality can be found further up the ladder of the Catholic hierarchy than priests. American Catholics are facing the shock of finding that there are homosexual Bishops as well.

Beginning January 29, 2000, *The Kansas City Star* published a series of articles on ecclesiastics who have died of AIDS. Among other data it reported that **Bishop Emerson Moore** left the Archdiocese of New York in 1995 and went to Minnesota, where he **died of AIDS** in a hospice.¹¹⁹

In 1999 **Bishop Patrick Ziemann**, of Santa Rosa, CA, resigned after one of his priests, Fr. Jorge Hume Salas, filed a lawsuit charging that Ziemann had blackmailed him in a two-year homosexual affair. The Santa Rosa Diocese agreed to pay Salas \$535,000.

Later in 2002 a former altar boy also sued Bishop Ziemann, accusing him of sex abuse that had lasted nearly 20 years, starting in 1968. This suit also accused the Los Angeles and San Francisco Archdioceses of complicity for recommending to Pope John Paul II that Ziemann be made Bishop of Santa Rosa, even though officials were aware of his past.¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ Judy Thomas, “AIDS in the Priesthood,” part 1: “Catholic Priests Are Dying of AIDS, Often in Silence,” *The Kansas City Star*, January 29, 2000, online edition.

¹²⁰ Concerned Roman Catholics of America, “The Shocking 22-Year Record of L.A.’s Archbishop,” n. 7; Arthur Jones, “A Chronology of

In November 2000, an article in *Catholic World Report* by Fr. Paul Schaughnessy listed four other American Bishops who had been deposed as a consequence of sexual scandals related to either homosexuality or pedophilia. They are **Bishop Eugene Marino of Atlanta, GA; Bishop Robert Sanchez of Santa Fé, NM; Bishop Keith Symons of Palm Beach, FL; and Bishop Daniel Ryan of Springfield, IL.**¹²¹

If Fr. Schaughnessy had written his article in early 2004, he would have included yet several more Prelates: **Archbishop Rembert Weakland of Milwaukee, WI; Bishop Anthony O'Connell of Palm Beach, FL; Bishop J. Kendrick Williams of Lexington, KY; Bishop James Rauch of Phoenix, AZ; and Benedictine Abbot John Eindenschink of Collegeville, MN.** Details of their cases will be given further in this book.

These Prelates appear to be just the tip of the iceberg. How many others Bishops and Archbishops will be revealed as homosexuals in the future? How many Prelates actually are homosexuals and pedophiles and will never be found out?

6. The "McNeill Affair"

Former Jesuit John McNeill, who holds a doctorate from the University of Louvain and is founder of the ho-

Sex Abuse in Southern California," *National Catholic Reporter*, January 31, 2003.

¹²¹ Paul Schaughnessy, "The Gay Priest Problem," *The Catholic World Report*, November 2000, p. 57.

mosexual movement Dignity, wrote a book making a theological defense of this vice against nature.

His work, *The Church and the Homosexual* (1976), has become a historic milestone on the subject of homosexuality. Aside from the audacity shown by a Catholic priest in publishing a book in defense of this vice, the work can be considered a principal base for what has since been termed “homosexual theology.”

On the manifestations of support and criticism that preceded the publishing of his book, McNeill recounted:

“After various delays, a final revised copy of the manuscript was sent to Rome in 1975. A reply was finally received in October. In his reply Fr. Arrupe turned over authority to give ‘permission to public’ to the Provincial of the New York Province of the Society of Jesus. He said he would not object to publication granted that certain suggestions and guidelines be accepted and followed.”¹²²

Soon after Fr. Arrupe made these suggestions, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith published *Declaration on Certain Questions Concerning Sexual Ethics*. McNeill communicated to his superiors that he had adjusted his book in accordance with his interpretation of the *Declaration*. On January 28, 1976, the Jesuit Provincial, Fr. Eamon Taylor, granted his approval for McNeill’s work in a letter that stated:

“In my opinion the adjustments you introduced in your manuscript, as we had agreed in a conversation on November 10, respond to the recommen-

¹²² J. McNeill, *La Iglesia ante la homosexualidad*, pp. 12-3.

datations of the Superior General of September 19 and ... as a result I am pleased to be able to grant you the *imprimi potest*, with today's date." ¹²³

The adjustments made by Fr. Arrupe and referred to by Fr. Taylor were not substantial, as McNeill later recorded:

"I want to assure my readers that at no point was I asked to change or alter my ideas or convictions in any way to be granted official permission for publication." ¹²⁴

¹²³ Eamon Taylor, "Letter responding to Fr. John McNeill," January 28, 1976, *apud ibid.*, p. 14.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p.15.

a. In November 1986 – that is, ten years after the publication of the work – the news broke that Fr. John McNeill had been punished with dismissal from the Society of Jesus because of his preaching in favor of homosexuality (Marjorie Hyer, "Gay-rights Priest Faces Expulsion," *apud The Washington Post*, November 8, 1986; *Jornal do Brasil*, Rio de Janeiro, November 9, 1986).

b. On that accusation the press reported that the Vatican had revoked approval of McNeill's book in 1977, one year after it was published. The measure was an initiative of Cardinal Franjo Seper, then Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, who had also forbidden Fr. McNeill to speak publicly in favor of homosexuality. Nine years passed before the General of the Society of Jesus, Fr. Peter Hans Kolvenbach, acted, giving Fr. McNeill the choice of ceasing his public support for homosexuality or of quitting the ranks of the Society. McNeill preferred to leave the Jesuit Order rather than agree to be silent (*ibid.*).

c. The first order issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith for McNeill to be silent had little practical result. It was ignored by both the priest and his superiors, and the public at large was unaware of it. The priest's book continued to be broadly distributed and sold in English as well as translated into other languages, with the approval of the Jesuit Provincial in New York and the consent of Fr. Arrupe, then Superior General. As for its part, the homosexual

In addition to denying Catholic doctrine on homosexuality, McNeill contended that this vice should play a

movement Dignity, which McNeill founded, was not hindered in its growth and expansion.

d. Undoubtedly, the 1986 punishment dismissing the priest from the Society of Jesus was a moral and disciplinary sanction. Aside from being late in coming, it could also be viewed as a way for the Order to disengage itself politically from McNeill's position on homosexuality. After his dismissal, the priest was free to continue his work and speak at will without compromising the Society of Jesus. No word was ever reported of any threats by the Holy See to pronounce McNeill a heretic or excommunicate him, or even to dismiss him from the priesthood, thus hindering his freedom of movement and expression outside the Order. On the contrary, the record shows only the surprising benevolence of New York Jesuit Provincial, Fr. David Tolan, who called the homosexual priest "an extraordinarily good man" who "tried to stick to the letter of the law established for him" (*ibid.*).

Fr. Tolan added that Fr. McNeill continued to be a priest in good standing. For his situation to be regularized, he would only need a Bishop to accept him in his Diocese.

Given Fr. Tolan's benevolence, one can only ask whether the disciplinary action on the part of the Jesuits was a real punishment? Or did it merely permit McNeill the freedom to continue his preaching without compromising the Society of Jesus?

e. The Society of Jesus, *servatis servandis*, made a similar political procedure in relation to Fr. Urs von Balthasar, who in 1950 was also released from Jesuit obedience to be able to devote himself more fully to the foundation of his Secular Institute, the *Johannesgemeinschaft*. At the time an audacious pioneering initiative, the institute is viewed today as one of the blueprints for the Church of the future. Von Balthasar himself confirmed this new vision: "The split of which I had a premonition took place in fact when I faced my duty to obey a formal order of Saint Ignatius, to abandon – much to my displeasure – my spiritual motherland, the Society of Jesus, in order to achieve a kind of prolongation of his idea in the world" (Hans Urs von Balthasar, "Von Balthasar: la mia opera è abbozzata più che terminata," *L'Osservatore Romano*, June 24, 1984, p. 4).

One cannot but ask if the heads of the Society of Jesus were using the same procedure with McNeill?

social role of balancing a masculine culture and feminist demands.¹²⁵ In this sense, the theologian adopted Jung's thinking on the social "mission" of homosexuals:

"This [homosexuality] gives a great capacity for friendship, which creates bonds of admirable tenderness between men and can even rescue friendship between sexes from the limbo of the impossible. An individual can have a good and aesthetic sensibility fed by the presence of a feminine vein He often possesses great riches of religious sentiments, which helps lead him to practice the *eclesia spiritualis*." ¹²⁶

According to McNeill, homosexuality also would have an important role to play in the quest for peace. Since they lack the aggressive and combative characteristics of men, homosexuals could more easily curb violence. Furthermore, because of his "sweetness" the homosexual would be strongly inclined to serve others, and his "femininity" would allow him to make a contribution to humanity in the appreciation of aesthetic and religious values.¹²⁷ Describing the role of the homosexual in the religious ambit, McNeill pointed to Our Lord Jesus Christ as model.¹²⁸

All these doctrinal and psychological aberrations were implicitly supported by the Jesuit superiors who allowed McNeill to publicly preach them for 10 years, and

¹²⁵ J. McNeill, *La Iglesia ante la homosexualidad*, pp. 191-2, 195-6.

¹²⁶ Carl Gustav Jung, *The Collected Works* (New York: Pantheon, 1959), vol. 9, part 1, pp. 86-7., *apud ibid.*, pp. 194-5.

¹²⁷ J. McNeill, *La Iglesia ante la homosexualidad*, pp.198-204.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 208-9.

then by the religious authorities who did nothing to stop him from continuing to defend his theses after he left the Order.

7. The “Weakland Affair”

As evidence of the invasion of homosexuality in the Catholic Hierarchy, the “Weakland affair” is certainly the most characteristic in the United States.

Archbishop Rembert Weakland of Milwaukee, one of the most important American progressivist leaders, used to have the winds of publicity blowing the sails of almost every point of his platform. Weakland fought for the rights of homosexuals, the ordination of women, women in places of authority in the Church, an end to priestly celibacy, the “liberation” of priests from the authority of the Bishops, and so on. He was also known for his new morals that called for the right of married couples to decide if they should use artificial birth control and that looked complacently at pre-marital sexual experiences. During 2000-2001 he was the center of another polemic over his extravagant modernization of Milwaukee’s historic old Cathedral.

Weakland was appointed Archbishop in 1977. In April 2002, he was 75, retirement age, but was expected to remain for some time longer. This was his situation when the scandal blew up.

The “Weakland affair” can be summarized as follows.

In May 2002, Paul Marcoux, 53, gave an interview to *ABC News* alleging that he had been sexually assaulted

by Archbishop Weakland in October 1979. To prove the existence of a homosexual relationship between the Archbishop and himself, Marcoux produced two strong pieces of evidence. One was an 11-page love letter addressed to him and handwritten by Weakland in August 1980. Another was proof that the Archbishop had made a payment of \$450,000 to buy his silence.

According to Marcoux's account, he had gone to the Archbishop to ask advice about whether he should enter the priesthood when he was a student at Marquette University in 1979. Weakland invited Marcoux to dinner at his apartment and allegedly then tried to force him into sexual acts. Later, the two had a "love affair," which the 1980 letter makes quite obvious.

On May 23, 2002, in a segment on *Good Morning America*, *ABC News* broke the news on the topic.¹²⁹ The rest of the media was quick to follow up.¹³⁰

Weakland denied the sexual assault, but could not deny his handwritten letter and the \$450,000 settlement.

In response to the astonished reaction of many of the Milwaukee Catholic faithful who realized Church funds had probably been used to cover-up a sexual scandal of their Archbishop, Weakland offered an excuse. He insisted

¹²⁹ Brian Ross, "Vow of Silence: Archbishop Signed \$450,000 Agreement," *ABC News*, May 23, 2002, online edition.

¹³⁰ "Pope Accepts Resignation of US Archbishop Accused of Sex Abuse," *France Press*, May 24, 2002, online edition; Melissa McCord, "Archbishop Plans to Make Apology," *Associated Press Online*, May 24, 2002; Geraldine Baum and Eric Slater, "Pope Accepts Resignation of Milwaukee Archbishop," *Los Angeles Times*, May 25, 2002; Eric Slater, "Prelate's Exit Brings Sadness to Milwaukee," *Los Angeles Times*, May 26, 2002.

that he had more than covered the amount with all his lecture and writing fees during his tenure as Bishop.¹³¹ This seems to me a very weak argument that fails to justify his action. Priests and Bishops give up their rights to financial remuneration for their work to the Church when they dedicate their lives to the Church with a solemn promise or vow of poverty. Therefore, they do not have the right to use the fruit of their labor for personal interests.

On May 24, the day after the news exploded, the Vatican accepted Weakland's resignation. The Archbishop alleged he had asked the Pope to accelerate his retirement.¹³²

The balance of the "Weakland affair" is bleak: the revelation of a significant case of homosexuality, blackmail, and the misuse of Church funds by one of the highest and most famous Catholic Prelates in the United States.

8. Percentage of Homosexual Priests

Studies abound on how many American priests are homosexual. Results vary significantly, and since no uniform evaluation on this matter exists, I offer the reader the most serious data I found.

* *Newsweek* magazine stated that in one of the very few studies based on reliable data – 1,500 interviews made between **1960 and 1985** – psychologist Richard Sipe of Maryland, a former priest, concluded that **close to 20 %** of

¹³¹ G. Baum and E. Slater, "Pope Accepts Resignation of Milwaukee Archbishop."

¹³² *Ibid.*

the 57,000 Catholic priests in the United States were homosexual, and half of them were sexually active. According to Sipe, the number of homosexual priests had significantly increased since 1978. Other therapists said they believed the real number in **1987** would be **closer to 40%**.¹³³

* *Time* magazine published these statements by author Fr. Robert Nugent on a network of actively homosexual clergy:

“A U.S. survey by vocation directors in men’s Religious Orders showed that, **from 1981 to 1985, 5% of candidates** accepted for the priesthood **identified themselves** to the Church as **being homosexual** in orientation.”

“Perhaps the most emotional debates are those now occurring within the Roman Catholic Church. Fr. Andrew Greeley, the irrepresible U.S. sociologist and novelist, complained in a recent article that regard for priestly celibacy is being undermined by a ‘national network’ of actively homosexual clergy. ‘In some dioceses, certain rectories have become lavender houses,’ he grumbled. Theologian Fr. Richard McBrien, of the Notre Dame University, contends that homosexuality is so widespread that ‘heterosexual males are deciding in ever larger numbers not even to consider the priesthood.’”¹³⁴

“Another clergyman, who is a regional director of priestly education in one of the larger men’s Orders,

¹³³ “Gays in the Clergy,” *Newsweek*, February 23, 1987.

¹³⁴ Richard Nugent Osting, “The Battle over Gay Clergy - Demands for Toleration Shake Many North American Churches,” *Time*, November 13, 1989, pp. 44-5.

explained to *Time* the justification for his private homosexual life during recent years. ‘We’ll never know what is right or wrong until we open up the issue and look at people’s experiences,’ he said. ‘I don’t see any contradiction between having an intimate relationship and a total commitment to Christ.’ This prominent priest said his superiors have been quietly aware of his long-running, but not live-in, relationship with a fellow gay. They expect him to be judicious, he says, not to change.”¹³⁵

* The number of priests contaminated with AIDS in the U.S. increases by the day. This was disclosed in a documentary made by the Conference of Men Religious, an entity that represents 25,000 of the 27,000 American Catholic priests. Non-official estimates in **1988** reckoned the number of homosexual priests at **about 40%**.¹³⁶

* In the year **2000**, Fr. Donald Cozzens published the book *The Changing Face of the Priesthood* in which he delved deep into the problem of homosexual priests. The work by Cozzens, professor and rector of St. Mary Seminary in Cleveland, is generally regarded as a competent and serious study. In it he stated why the face of the priesthood was changing:

“Some will deny the reality that many observers see as changing the face of the priesthood – that the percentage of homosexual priests and seminarians is significantly higher than it is in society at large.”¹³⁷

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*

¹³⁶ “AIDS-1,” *Folha de São Paulo*, January 15, 1989.

¹³⁷ Donald Cozzens, *The Changing Face of the Priesthood* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2000), p. 97.

Cozzens was more specific:

“The general perceptions are often shaped by various studies and surveys which attempt to measure the percentage of priests who are gay. **An NBC report** on celibacy and the clergy found that ‘anywhere **from 23% to 58%**’ of the Catholic clergy have a homosexual orientation.¹³⁸ **Other studies** find that approximately **half of American priests and seminarians are homosexual oriented. Sociologist James G. Wolf** in his book *Gay Priests* concluded that **48.5% of priests and 55.1% of seminarians were gay.**¹³⁹ **The percentage appears to be highest among priests under 40 years of age. Moreover, the percentage of gay men among religious congregations of priests is believed to be even higher.** (I heard a Religious Order priest with long experience in both formation and leadership state publicly at a conference on AIDS and the mission of the Church that **80% of his large East Coast Order was gay.**)”¹⁴⁰

* In October **2002**, the *Los Angeles Times* published results of a written poll it made of 5,000 Catholic priests in 80 different Dioceses in the U.S. From the priests polled, 1,854 (37%) answered the long set of questions sent to them. Regarding their sexual orientation, 9% iden-

¹³⁸ Timothy Unsworth, *The Last Priest in America* (New York: Crossroad, 1991), p. 248, *apud* D. Cozzens, *The Changing Face of the Priesthood*, p. 98.

¹³⁹ See also Raymond Hedin, *Married to the Church* (Bloomington - Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995), pp. 125-73, *apud ibid.*

¹⁴⁰ D. Cozzens, *The Changing Face of the Priesthood*, p. 99.

tified themselves as homosexual; 6% as “somewhere in between, but more on the homosexual side;” 5% placed themselves “completely in the middle” between heterosexuality and homosexuality. That is, according to the *L.A. Times*, among the priests who responded, **15% admitted to being homosexual. Among younger priests – those ordained for 20 years or less – the figure was 23%.**

Asked if a “homosexual subculture”¹⁴¹ existed in their Diocese or Religious Order, 44% said “definitely” or “probably.”¹⁴²

* Regarding the **percentage of priests who have died of AIDS**, precise figures are even more difficult to find than those on homosexuality in the clergy. Notwithstanding, *The Kansas City Star* published a series of articles on the topic that began in January 2000. The newspaper based its report on a survey sent to 3,013 priests; among these 801 (27%) responded. From this response and from parallel investigations, the *Kansas City Star* projected that **300 priests had died of AIDS since the mid-1980s**. That translates into an annual AIDS-related death rate of **about 4 per 10,000 priests**, which is four times higher than the general population rate. This estimate is considered conservative.

The same report soon elicited higher figures from other sources. Sociologist **Richard Sipe**, a former priest who has spent 30 years studying sexual issues in the Catholic Church, said that he figured **about 750 priests**

¹⁴¹ Defined by the paper as “a definite group of persons that has its own friendships, social gatherings, and vocabulary.”

¹⁴² “15% Identify as Gay or ‘on Homosexual Side,’” *Los Angeles Times*, October 20, 2002.

nationwide had died of AIDS in the same period from the mid-1980s to 1999.

Joseph Barone, a New Jersey psychiatrist and AIDS expert, **estimated the number of U.S. priests who have died at 1,000.** Barone directed an AIDS ministry from 1983 to 1993 at the North American College in Rome.¹⁴³

9. Homosexuality: the New Face of the Priesthood.

Fr. Donald Cozzens, author of the work *The Changing Face of the Priesthood*, was professor of psychology and theology at Ursuline College in Cleveland from 1981 to 1989. In the 1990s he was named vicar and counselor for clergy and religious in the Cleveland Diocese. Later he was appointed rector of Cleveland's Saint Mary Seminary and chairman of its admission committee. He speaks often at conferences dealing with problems in the clergy. Based on his experience and extensive research, he wrote this work.

Although he assumed a Freudian and Jungian approach in the book, with which I don't agree, he indisputably presented sound facts about the moral crisis in the priesthood. He presented his thesis quite straightforwardly:

“At issue at the beginning of the twenty-first century is the growing perception that the priesthood is or is becoming a gay profession.”¹⁴⁴

¹⁴³ J. Thomas, “AIDS in the Priesthood,” part 1.

¹⁴⁴ D. Cozzens, *The Changing Face of the Priesthood*, p. 107.

After analyzing the most probable statistics,¹⁴⁵ he described the social-psychological mechanism that created the homosexual subculture in the priesthood and seminaries:

“The need gay priests have for friendship with other gay men, and their shaping of a social life largely comprised of other homosexually oriented men, has created a gay subculture in most of our seminaries.¹⁴⁶ The growing numbers of gay priests and seminarians impact, of course, the priesthood’s own self-awareness, even if on a subliminal level of consciousness. At the same time, it affects the laity’s perception of their clergy.”¹⁴⁷

Cozzens presented the homosexual network in the priesthood as synonymous with a homosexual culture. He distinguished two kind of gay priests: those who have homosexual tendencies but try to be chaste, and those who have a completely immoral life. He stated:

“The last decades of the twentieth century witnessed the formation of informal and discreet networks of gay priests in most Dioceses from coast to coast Some of these gay networks or subcultures are using the priesthood as cover for their sex-

¹⁴⁵ See item 7, in this chapter.

¹⁴⁶ Andrew Greeley believes that U.S. Bishops, unclear on how to address the issue of expanding numbers of gay priests, have simply resorted to denial. One of the effects of this psychological defense mechanism is the toleration of lavender rectories and seminaries. “Bishops Paralyzed over Heavily Gay Priesthood,” *National Catholic Reporter*, November 10, 1989, *apud* D. Cozzens, *The Changing Face of the Priesthood*, p. 100.

¹⁴⁷ D. Cozzens, *The Changing Face of the Priesthood*, *ibid.*

ual acting out, believing that their only responsibility to the Church is a certain discretion

“As gay priests come out among themselves, religious and diocesan leadership need to distinguish between the celibate, both straight or gay, who is struggling and sometimes failing to be chaste, and the priest or religious who coolly exploits the priesthood or the congregation for his own destructive purposes.”¹⁴⁸

Fr. Cozzens pragmatically commented on the question of whether the priesthood is becoming “a gay profession”:

“And to the point is the question: Does it matter? Does not the question reveal still another form of homophobia? Is it not another manifestation of discrimination and suspicion? Some would say the issue is best left alone, that we would all be better served not to notice the proverbial elephant in the room. Ignoring the phenomenon would certainly be easier than addressing it; yet closing our eyes to the situation only delays the time when our circumstances will demand that it be given attention.”¹⁴⁹

Would Cozzens advocate closing the seminaries to homosexual seminarians? Although he never took a clear position on the topic, at the beginning of the book he stated the need for compassion:

“The question of disproportionate numbers of homosexual priests is clearly a tricky and delicate is-

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 109-10.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

sue Yet the implications of largely gay priesthood must be faced compassionately but candidly.”¹⁵⁰

His likely position would be not to expel the homosexual seminarians, but to ordain them and try to guide them to live chastely. In his book, he made no suggestions that this bad tendency toward homosexuality should be extirpated from the priesthood, with a return to the previous manly priesthood.

Therefore, he accepts the homosexual take-over of the priesthood as a *fait accompli* that one must adapt to “compassionately” and live with “candidly.”

10. The Homosexual *Mafia* in the Seminaries and the Support It Receives from the Bishops

In his book, Fr. Cozzens works with the constant presupposition that the American Catholic seminaries are being filled with homosexuals. He described the gay network present in the seminaries as a subculture that has an increasingly great influence on the mentality of the future priests. That is to say, those who remain in the seminaries either are homosexuals, have tendencies toward the vice, or are tolerant of those who do.¹⁵¹

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

¹⁵¹ See also Michael Rose, *Good Bye, Good Men* (Cincinnati: Aquinas, 2002), chapters 4, 6, 7, 8, 10 *passim*.

Fr. Andrew Greeley termed this network of homosexuals in the seminaries “the lavender *mafia*.”¹⁵²

Such an ambience has an effect on the whole. English journalist Annabel Miller noted that “the resulting [homosexual] *ethos* of the seminaries causes the heterosexuals to leave.”¹⁵³

How did it become possible for seminarians to ostensibly present themselves as homosexuals?

Five degrees of complicity of the clergy and Hierarchy can be pointed to as explanation for the crisis:

- **The teachers of some particular seminary**, either priests or lay people, are homosexuals or sympathetic to such vice.
- **The rector of the seminary** is aware of the situation and supports both homosexual seminarians and homosexual-complacent teachers.
- **The Bishops** are complacent with homosexuality in their seminaries and take no effective measures to stop it.
- **The Vatican** shows complacency toward these Bishops and takes no effective measures to correct the situation. Further, several homosexual priests have been chosen by the Vatican to become Bishops.

¹⁵² Apud M. Rose, “The Roots of the Scandal,” *The Catholic World Report*, June 2002, p. 17.

¹⁵³ Annabel Miller, “This Endangered Species,” *The Tablet*, April 1999, apud D. Cozzens, *The Changing Face of the Priesthood*, p. 102.

- **The Pope** is complacent with the Vatican on this issue. Further, some homosexual Bishops have been personally chosen by the Pope to become Cardinals, and some homosexual Cardinals, revealed to be such after they were chosen, have remained in their positions without being dismissed. Even more, the Pope has chosen some homosexual Prelates to be his close auxiliaries.

Regarding the two first steps, ample documentation can be found either in this book or its quoted sources. No serious observer of present day affairs in the Church will contest the affirmations.

Regarding the complicity of Bishops with homosexuality, there are several proofs. *First*, many Bishops have been denounced as homosexual or pedophiles and, given that the charges were sound, have resigned from their positions.¹⁵⁴ Certainly the Bishops who were denounced were not the only guilty ones in the American Episcopate. This kind of Bishop obviously supports the “lavender mafia” at the seminaries. *Second*, many Bishops, although not homosexual, follow the progressivist agenda and defend homosexuality in the seminaries, priesthood, Episcopate, and so on. *Third*, most of the Bishops who do not agree with homosexuality in the seminaries, do not act for fear of receiving reprisals. Such reprisals can take several forms: some skeleton in his own closet might be revealed, or his ecclesiastical career could be threatened by his peers or superiors. *Id est*, either the Bishop has a past that is not sparkling clean and wants to keep his

¹⁵⁴ Only in the U.S. nine Bishops and one Abbot were publicly pointed out as either homosexual or pedophile, see above pp. 101-2.

wrongdoing quiet, or he lacks the courage to face the pressures he could receive from those around and above him. He prefers to progress in his career than to cure the aberration of homosexuality in his seminary. Therefore it is difficult for this kind of Bishop to not be judged as either a bandit in the past or a coward in the present.

In a sharp critique of the situation, Fr. Charles Fiore wrote about the responsibility of the Bishops to oversee their seminaries and assure that good morals and sound orthodoxy prevail in them:

“Why are men and women who clearly do not understand and apparently do not believe the teachings of the Church allowed to educate, form, and train seminarians who will be entrusted with the souls of the faithful? Whatever can rectors and Bishops who permit the use of alien and alienated professors be thinking? No wonder good faithful pastors are discouraged from sending young men to study for the priesthood, when all [the seminarians] too often are subverted in their faith and perverted in their morals!

“If the Bishops and rectors don’t know that this kind of rot is eating away at the innards of the Church, at its future vitality, that’s misfeasance! If they do know but do nothing to stop it, that’s misfeasance! And the faithful should demand top-to-bottom house cleaning where such situations exist!”¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁵ Charles Fiore, “Seeds, Weeds, Seminaries and Gardeners,” *The Wanderer*, November 14, 1995, *apud* M. Rose, “The Roots of the Scandal.”

As for my accusations of the complicity of the Vatican and the Pope with homosexuality, I will deal with them later in this book,¹⁵⁶ after exposing the homosexual scandal in other countries, the serious accusations of homosexuality against Pope Paul VI,¹⁵⁷ as well the strange lethargy of the Vatican and John Paul II in face of the pedophile crisis in the United States.

Notwithstanding, let me pose and respond here to two objections that could be made defending the Vatican position regarding homosexuality. They are the following:

First objection: The Vatican has satisfactorily exercised its role of vigilance against homosexuality in American seminaries. It appointed an Apostolic Visitor in 1981 to examine such institutions in the United States. Therefore, the accusation of Vatican complicity with homosexuality is baseless.

Answer: In fact, in 1981 the Vatican named Bishop John Marshall of Burlington as its Apostolic Visitor for all seminaries and houses of formation in the United States. As one knows, an Apostolic Visitor is a special investigator in charge of reporting directly to the Holy See the situation of an institution in the Church. Bishop Marshall spent seven years making his investigation with visits to more than 200 seminaries and houses of formation throughout the country. He had the close support of 70 Bishops to carry out his mission, which he concluded with a report sent July 2, 1988 to the Vatican. After the normal

¹⁵⁶ Chapter VI, pp. 287-9.

¹⁵⁷ Chapter IV, pp. 157-163.

delay of protocol, on March 25, 1900 John Paul II praised Marshall's work in an official letter.¹⁵⁸

Although the conclusions of this report remained confidential, one can easily imagine its content regarding homosexuality in the seminaries. If Bishop Marshall would have described the homosexual network that many authors and journalists have depicted in detail in articles and books, it seems probable that the Vatican would have taken some disciplinary measures to correct the problem and alert the authorities to the danger. The Catholic faithful could then have noted the gravity of the crisis by the strength of the remedy. But almost nothing of significance happened. Therefore, either Bishop Marshall did not see (or did not want to see)¹⁵⁹ what was going on in the seminaries and did

¹⁵⁸ Donald Wuerl, "Seminary Visitation," *America*, September 30, 2002.

¹⁵⁹ This opinion is confirmed in a report by Fr. Milan Mikulich, OFM, in the newsletter *Orthodoxy of the Catholic Doctrine*. In it he stated that Bishop Marshall intended to accept at face value the information provided by the Bishops and rectors about their respective seminaries. Fr. Mikulich described what he was told at the time: "At the U.S. Bishops meeting in November, 1981 Bishop Marshall spoke to the Bishops about the task [of investigation on seminaries] he was to undertake. After that meeting, a Bishop, who knew previously that I had taken the first complaint [regarding the bad situation] of some American seminaries to the Holy See, told me: 'Don't expect much from this investigation. Bishop Marshall spoke to all of us Bishops and said that he would need the help of the Bishops and the rectors of the seminaries.' Then the Bishop added: 'Those who are to be investigated are going to be investigators!'

"After this statement of Bishop Marshall to the Bishops at their meeting that he would need the help of the rectors, some professors [who were very concerned about the investigation], according to the seminarians' reports, became jubilant. They were confident of a cover-

not report it, or the Vatican aware of the data of the report, chose not to take effective measures against the homosexual presence in the seminaries.

Since almost nothing was done, what Marshall's investigation actually demonstrates is complicity rather than vigilance and effectiveness.

Second objection: Most of the problems of homosexuality in the seminaries are recent. Bishop Marshall could not have known about them in the 1980s.

Answer: There are many proofs that the problem was present both before 1980 and during the 1980s. I will quote several sources below.

Describing the orientation of some seminaries in the 1980s, author Michael Rose affirmed that homosexuality was widespread:

“Several Detroit-area priests recalled the widespread homosexual promiscuity during the 1980s at St. John's Provincial Seminary in Plymouth, Michigan. They described their seminary as a ‘veritable hothouse’ for gay subculture. Said one of the priests, ‘Everyone there knew what was going on. There were visits at night as gay seminarians cruised from room to room.’ Little effort was made to hide either the sexual orientation or the homosexual activity of the seminarians at St. John's The priest recited a long list of active homosexuals who were ordained

up.” (“Commentary on the Investigation of the American Seminaries,” *Orthodoxy of the Catholic Doctrine*, July-September 1984, pp. 1-2.

“Archbishop Rembert Weakland of Milwaukee also endorsed and permitted, at least since 1980, a four-week series titled ‘Homosexuality and its Impact on the Family.’ This workshop was taught by a Milwaukee priest, Fr. James Arimond, who also served as the chaplain of Dignity, and was a regular columnist for *Wisconsin Light*, a member publication of the Gay and Lesbian Press.”¹⁶⁰

The testimony of Fr. Joseph Wilson, a priest of the Diocese of Brooklyn, New York, speaks for itself. In 2002 he wrote the following in the *Catholic World Report*:

“I was in the seminary 1977-1986. The theologate from which I graduated was the Dallas seminary. The vice-rector in charge of the collegians there left the priesthood a year after I graduated to ‘marry’ the president of the Dallas Gay Alliance. He thoughtfully invited the seminarians to the festivities. He had been our Moral Theology professor in whose class we used Fr. Andre Guidon’s text, *The Sexual Language* [in this work the author defends that ‘gay sex is preferable to straight sex because it is more innovative, expressive, and playful’]

“I actually had the experience, while there, of sitting through a lecture by Fr. Paul Shanley, the Boston priest who was recently arrested in California. The lecture he gave was for the priests of the Dallas Diocese and for the 3rd and 4th year seminarians. I was sitting directly behind the then Bishop of

¹⁶⁰ M. Rose, “The Roots of the Scandal,” *The Catholic World Report*, June 2002, pp. 20-2.

Dallas, Thomas Tschoepe, who laughed and joked his way through a truly vile presentation.”¹⁶¹

The witness of Richard Nugent Hasselbach, a priest in the 1970s, is also significant. He wrote an article for *Commonweal* about homosexuality in the clergy and the pedophile abuses. In it he described his experience with the “gay culture” around him:

“Over my years as a priest I became increasingly aware of the gay culture around me. Many of my clerical colleagues were quite open about it. The reality of the priesthood’s hidden gay culture was brought home when a fellow priest made insistent, aggressive sexual advances toward me over the course of an entire year. Because I rejected my friend’s overtures, I was pushed to the fringes of the only community available to me.

“A look back on these experiences that occurred almost 25 years ago, I realize that the trauma was not a spiritual director [who, before the reported case, also tried a sexual relationship with Hasselbach] or that a friend broke faith with friendship. These men were themselves victims of a system that simultaneously condemned homosexuality and tacitly condoned clandestine homosexual sex.

“While numbers vary about the percentage of gay priests, I would venture to guess that among the clergy under the age of 60 it is well in excess of 50%. The Church condemns the homosexual lifestyle; at the same time she turns a blind eye on

¹⁶¹ Joseph Wilson, “The Enemy Within,” *The Catholic World Report*, June 2002, pp. 28-9.

rampant clerical homosexuality as long as the relationships don't become embarrassing.”¹⁶²

In my opinion, these three testimonies, whose objectivity I do not doubt, are significant enough to answer the objection. They reveal that already in the 1970s, soon after the close of Vatican II, homosexuality was established as a homosexual culture in the clergy, and most probably also in the seminaries.

There is no excuse, therefore, for Bishop John Marshall not to have reported the tragic situation of homosexuality in the American seminaries. Likewise, no justification can be made for why the Vatican did not strongly counter-attack this iniquity.

11. Should Homosexuals Be Ordained?

Intentionally or not, the books *The Changing Face of the Priesthood* and *Good Bye, Good Men* – published in 2000 and 2002 and broadly disseminated – brought to the spotlight the legitimacy of the ordination of homosexuals. The problem intensified with the titanic scandal of sex abuse of boys and adolescents by priests. *Pros* and *cons* on the issue began to appear here and there.

Pro ordination – Favorable to the ordination of homosexuals is, for example, the editorial board of the Jesuit magazine *America*.¹⁶³ This organ published an article

¹⁶² R. Nugent Hasselbach, “Clerical Sexuality,” *Commonweal*, June 14, 2002, pp. 11-2.

¹⁶³ “Ordaining Gay Men,” editorial, *America*, November 11, 2002. The editorial concluded with these words: “Historically, the ministry of gay priests has represented a significant contribution to the Catholic

by Bishop Thomas J. Gumbleton, Auxiliary Bishop of Detroit, that synthesized the arguments in favor of ordination. Here are the faulty reasons he presented:

- The homosexual was created by God as such. Since God is responsible for making a person this way, it is good to be a homosexual; it is a gift.
- God has called many homosexual men to the priesthood and to the Episcopate.
- Through the testimony of their suffering, God has chosen gays and lesbian to reveal something about Him that heterosexuals do not.
- A further gift that homosexual priests bring to the Church is an exceptional ability and courage to proclaim the truth.
- Homosexual priests can also offer a depth of compassion not always shared in a comparable way by heterosexual priests.

Gumbleton concluded:

“For all these reasons, I urge our Church leadership to rejoice in the blessings that come to us by recognizing and supporting gay priests.”¹⁶⁴

Church. Preventing the ordination of gay men would deprive the Church of many productive, hard-working, and dedicated ministers and would, moreover, ignore the promptings of the Holy Spirit, who has called these men to Holy Orders.”

¹⁶⁴ Thomas Gumbleton, “Yes, Gay Men Should Be Ordained,” *America*, September 30, 2002, pp. 10-13.

Contra ordination – On the other hand, Fr. Andrew Baker, an American member of the Roman Congregation for the Bishops in Rome, took a firm *con* position. He affirmed that a Bishop should not ordain a man with predominant homosexual tendencies, also called a man with a “same sex attraction” (S.S.A.). Here are the sound reasons he offered in defense of the good position:

- To classify homosexuality as a “same sexual orientation,” as some have done, can obfuscate the serious disorder that exists and distort the biblical precept that ordered man and woman to tend toward one another. Therefore, this “orientation” in reality is a disorientation.
- Homosexuality may be an inclination, tendency, or condition, but, according to Catholic doctrine, it is fundamentally dis-orienting in that it tends to a corrupt end.
- Homosexual tendencies are aberrations that should be addressed by both the individual and competent experts in order to prevent them.
- The homosexual has a tendency to duplicity and pretension that are not compatible with the priesthood.
- It is healthy for the homosexual to clearly understand that he is in the wrong, otherwise he will have a distorted view of human sexuality.
- For the sake of chastity, it is better to not allow homosexuals in the priesthood, since the presence of other men is an occasion of sin for them.
- The homosexual normally does not have attraction for the other sex or for the life of marriage and

family. Therefore, for him the vow of celibacy and chastity for priests as it was conceived by the Church does not make sense. To avoid sexual relations with other men is an imperative of nature rather than a counsel of perfection. Therefore, there are two different notions of chastity being applied.

- For all these reasons the homosexual is not suitable for ordination.¹⁶⁵

What should the Catholic faithful expect on this important matter? It is simple: that the ordination of active or inactive homosexuals should cease, and that a strong document would be issued from the Vatican forbidding it along with stern measures with teeth to assure compliance. What Catholics desire to see is an action taken soon to begin the healing process that will purify the body of the Catholic Church and rid it of this vice against nature.

¹⁶⁵ Andrew Baker, "Ordination and Same Sex Attraction," *America*, September 30, 2002, pp. 7-9.

Chapter IV

ECCLESIASTICAL HOMOSEXUALITY IN OTHER COUNTRIES

The facts listed in this chapter are exemplificative of how the scandal of homosexual priests and Bishops and the cover-up of authorities is lively and present not only in the United States, but throughout the countries of the world.

Brazil – The Brazilian National Conference of Catholic Bishops (BNCB) no longer makes its traditional veto against laws proposing to regularize stable homosexual liaisons. On October 16, 1996, secretary of the organization Bishop Raymundo Damasceno declared that the BNCB would only discuss adding some restrictions to a new law that would admit civil unions for persons of the same sex that had come before the Brazilian Congress for approval.¹⁶⁶

A day earlier, on invitation, a BNCB representative argued before Congress that a minimal age of 25 be set for homosexual unions. Presenting the argument at the BNCB's request was the president of Brazilian Society of Moral Theology, Fr. Leonard Martin.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁶ Hugo Marques, "CNBB propõe restrições, mas já admite lei para a união civil de pessoas do mesmo sexo," *O Globo*, October 17, 1996.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

Thus, instead of vigorously opposing such laws that clash with Catholic doctrine on the topic of homosexuality, the BNCB is promoting them by only requesting certain restrictions in bills that would legalize same-sex unions.

In 1993, a journalist of a Brazilian daily, *O Estado de São Paulo*, revealed that 15 priests had died of AIDS in the São Paulo metropolitan area from 1988 to 1993.¹⁶⁸ Rumor has it that the actual figure is even higher.

It was quite significant that in 1995 the Gay Group of Bahia awarded Cardinal Paulo Evaristo Arns, Archbishop of São Paulo, the “rose triangle trophy” in recognition of his defense of homosexuals’ rights.¹⁶⁹

Canada – In 1996 the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops (CCCB) declined an invitation to speak against a law presented in the Senate that would allow homosexuality to be grounds for discrimination. Instead, CCCB president Cardinal Francis Spencer sent a letter to Prime Minister Jean Chrétien expounding the opinion of the organization on the topic. The letter indirectly supported the law, affirming the Canadian Bishops’ opposition to any kind of discrimination against homosexuals. It also stated that the CCCB was deeply concerned that their defense of Catholic marriage might be interpreted as unjust

¹⁶⁸ Roldão Arruda, “A Aids chega à Igreja,” *O Estado de São Paulo*, October 22, 1993; “D. Angélico nega que Igreja esconda doentes,” *O Estado de São Paulo*, October 23, 1993; “A Igreja Católica se destaca no apoio aos doentes de Aids,” *O Estado de São Paulo*, October 24, 1993.

¹⁶⁹ “Grupo gay da Bahia dá troféu a D. Paulo,” *O Estado de São Paulo*, May, 25, 1995.

discrimination against homosexuals or used as a pretext to condemn homosexuals.”¹⁷⁰ One week later the law was approved.¹⁷¹

Only then did the Canadian Bishops agree to discuss the law before Parliament. The ecclesiastical representatives, however, revealed themselves incapable of defending Catholic doctrine on homosexuality, which was being challenged by Parliament member Svend Robinson.¹⁷²

England – As far as England is concerned, I will limit the discussion to the “Hume affair,” which caused a large scandal in March and April 1995. The case can be viewed cumulatively from two standpoints: the doctrinal and the political-ecclesiastical.

From the doctrinal standpoint: In March of 1995 Cardinal Basil Hume, Archbishop of Westminster and Cardinal Primate of England and Wales, released a document to the press about homosexuality.¹⁷³ Entitled “A Note on the Teaching of the Catholic Church Concerning Homosexual People,” the statement made concessions to homosexuality that on some points went further than those made in the documents of the Holy See and frontally

¹⁷⁰ “Canadian Bishops Decline Invitation,” *The Wanderer*, April 25, 1996

¹⁷¹ “A Scandal of Tragic Proportions...” *The Wanderer*, May 9, 1996.

¹⁷² “Unable to Defend the Church’s Teachings,” *The Wanderer*, May 16, 1996.

¹⁷³ Basil Hume, “A Note on the Teaching of the Catholic Church Concerning Homosexual People,” *Briefing* (London), March 16, 1995, pp. 3-5.

clashed with Catholic doctrine. In his *Note*, Cardinal Hume stated:

“The Church recognizes the dignity of all people and does not define or label them in terms of their sexual orientation.”¹⁷⁴

Further on he spoke about the moral situation of the homosexual person:

“The particular orientation or inclination of the homosexual person is not a moral failing Being a homosexual person is, then, neither morally good nor morally bad; it is homosexual genital acts that are morally wrong.”¹⁷⁵

On issuing such statements, the Cardinal is guilty of equivocation on some points.

First, by reducing moral culpability only to acts, Cardinal Hume appeared to legitimize sinful thoughts and words. However, such concessions incur culpability with regard to the vice of homosexuality like any other vice, as Catholic doctrine has always taught. Thus, this omission by the Cardinal can hardly be said to harmonize well with Church teaching.

Second, by reducing the moral culpability of homosexuals to genital acts, the Cardinal appeared to legitimize a whole series of libidinous acts between these people, which can range from necking, hugging, and kissing, to acts more directly offensive to good customs such as manual or oral contact with private parts, which nonetheless are not explicitly “genital acts.” The Primate of Eng-

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3, n. 4.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 4, n. 7.

land also appeared to legitimize a series of unnatural practices common to a certain type of homosexual, such as mimicking the opposite sex in speaking, dressing, walking, and behaving in public, taking hormones to assume the characteristics of the opposite sex, and even the increasingly common practices of breast implantations or surgical alteration of sex organs. Such things could certainly be interpreted to have been excluded from what the Cardinal called “genital acts,” and therefore to be held as morally indifferent, neither good nor bad. This plainly transgresses both good customs and Catholic doctrine.

Third: Cardinal Hume said that “the particular orientation or inclination of the homosexual person is not a moral failing.” What does he mean here by “particular orientation or inclination,” which can also be called tendency? Above I noted that such an inclination toward homosexuality cannot consist of sinful consent in the realm of thought, word, or deed. Hence, for a tendency of this kind to be admitted as non-condemnable, it would need to be repressed – without any external manifestation and without any right of citizenship even in a person’s thoughts. This moral norm is confirmed by another traditional teaching of the Church, that it is a sin to entertain thoughts of carnal desire for someone of the opposite sex, even though this relationship is according to nature. Therefore, homosexual thoughts and desires are all the more sinful, since this vice is against nature. This airtight concept of what constitutes the homosexual tendency is indispensable for anyone who wants to transmit the authentic thinking of the Catholic Church. If concessions are made, the concept of tendency can be interpreted so broadly as to grant citizenship to the moral vice of homosexuality provided that the sexual act is not directly involved.

In this particular case, a question needs to be asked: *Qui bono?* Who are the ones to profit from the imprecision and ambiguity of the Cardinal Primate of England? The answer is obvious, the homosexuals.

Fourth: Cardinal Hume erred gravely in saying that “the Church does not define or label them [people] in terms of their sexual orientation.” Now, the sin of homosexuality, called the sin against nature, was always considered one of the sins that cry out to Heaven and clamor to God for vengeance. Hence, Church teachings and customs stamp a deservedly infamous note on persons who commit sins pertaining to homosexuality.

Fifth: the Cardinal also said that “the Church recognizes the dignity of all people.” This sentence applied to homosexuals would mean that the latter have dignity insofar as they publicly manifest themselves as such, and in this condition the Church respects them. Here again one finds imprecision and ambiguity in concepts. Just what is this dignity that the Church recognizes in every person? There are three types of dignity that it would be opportune to distinguish.

Ontological dignity. Every being created by God – especially angels and humans – are created to His image and, as such, should be respected. In this sense, the devil himself, in spite of his antagonism toward God, continues to maintain his ontological dignity as an angel; he is an image of God and, for that, deserves respect.

Moral dignity. Superior to ontological dignity is moral dignity, since every being endowed with intellect and will can become similar to God by adhering to good and rejecting evil. Ontological dignity derives simply from being made to the image of God; moral dignity, however, derives

from similarity with God. In this sense, only men who do good have dignity, whereas those who do evil are unworthy and lack dignity.

To this is added yet another characteristic of moral dignity: the interior and exterior practice of good. As far as the interior practice of good and evil is concerned, a person is judged only by God. As for the exterior practice of good and evil, the person is judged by God and also by those who see his actions. Above all, he is judged by the Catholic Church, the custodian of upright morals and good customs. This is why the Church offers the faithful the examples of the Saints. Recognizing in them the highest moral dignity that results from their constant and heroic exterior practice of good, She grants them the highest expression of respect by elevating them to the altars. In the opposite sense, the Church censures public and scandalous sinners, and calls on her children to reject them. Obviously such censure confers upon sinners a note of shame and at times infamy, consequences of their moral loss of dignity.

Social dignity. Social dignity is a concept derived from a given society's collective acceptance of an ensemble of attitudes that characterize someone's social profile. In well-established societies, the concept of social dignity is based on natural law and natural ethics, whence it derives. According to Church doctrine, a person's social dignity is directly related to his moral dignity. That is, the Church strives for the social body to be consonant with her morals. This or that concession to principles different from Catholic ones – for example, living in a polygamous environment in certain African countries – can be admitted only as a lesser evil on a provisional basis, and must cease as soon as possible.

Given such clearly different meanings of dignity, a question comes to the fore: In what sense can one admit Cardinal Hume's statement that "the Church recognizes the dignity of all people"? As I see it, there is only one meaning where the concept reconciles with Catholic doctrine in relation to homosexuals: ontological dignity. With respect to moral dignity, homosexuals who openly declare themselves as such are public, scandalous sinners, whose situation is aggravated further by the fact that the homosexual act is contrary to nature. To admit an equal dignity for self-proclaimed homosexuals would be to relativize the concepts of good and evil and to subvert the natural order. The same can be said in relation to social dignity.

These are, in my opinion, the principal equivocations and imprecisions of Cardinal Hume in the premises he established for his *Note*. One would say that as a whole these errors have a predisposition to grant a comfortable moral and social right of citizenship to one of the worst vices ever known.

Incidentally, the English Cardinal's intent to grant moral and social citizenship to homosexuals also reveals itself in other parts of his document. Some of the more significant texts:

- "Love between two persons, whether of the same sex or of a different sex, is to be treasured and respected." ¹⁷⁶
- "To love another, whether of the same sex or of a different sex, is to have entered the area of the richest human experience." ¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4, n. 9.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4, n. 10.

- “It is a fundamental human right of every person, irrespective of sexual orientation, to be treated by individuals and by society with dignity, respect, and fairness.”¹⁷⁸
- “Nothing in the Church’s teaching can be said to support or sanction, even implicitly, the victimization of homosexual men and women.”¹⁷⁹
- “Furthermore, ‘homophobia’ should have no place among Catholics.”¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 4, n. 12.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 5, n. 15. What does the Cardinal mean by ‘victimization’?

In the preceding paragraph he said: “The Church condemns violence of speech or action against homosexual people” (*ibid.*, p. 5, n. 14).

Regarding violent action, the Church certainly condemns taking justice into one’s own hands, that is, for a private person to take on the role of judge and executioner against homosexuals. To admit such violence would be tantamount to ignoring legitimately established order and plunging society into chaos. Nonetheless, just as the Church supports equitable punishment for voluntary homicide, oppressing widows and orphans, and denying a defenseless person a just salary, so likewise she can and should support just legal measures punishing the vice of homosexuality. One can see, therefore, that Cardinal Hume made an excessive generalization by failing to consider the possibility that a just law could punish homosexuality with violent action.

As for the other type of violence condemned by the Cardinal, the question once again has to be asked: What is “violence of speech”? To say that homosexuality is a vice and a sin that cries out to God for vengeance? To publicly condemn it as a sin? To brand it with a note of infamy? Would efforts that encourage society and the State to reject the acceptance of homosexuals amount to “victimizing” or exerting moral violence against them? If this hypothesis were true, the Cardinal would be condemning Catholic doctrine. If the above sanctions against homosexuality are legitimate, as they are, then what Church was the Cardinal speaking of when he stated that the Church condemns violence of speech against homosexuals?

The advantages procured for homosexuals by the document of Cardinal Hume are so great that one could say his *Note* was nothing less than a charter of citizenship for homosexuality in the moral, social, and legal domains.

From the political-ecclesiastical standpoint, it is noteworthy that the Cardinal was pressured to go public with the *Note* by the homosexual group OutRage. The London *Daily Mail* reported that in January of 1996 Outrage chairman Peter Tatchell sent a “forceful” letter to the Cardinal on the matter. It continued:

“Cardinal Hume had not intended immediate publication, *Catholic Herald* editor Christina Odone claimed, but did so only when Mr. Tatchell contacted media organizations offering the statement as a ‘leaked document.’ Tatchell said the statement was a direct response to OutRage’s demands, adding: ‘When I told them I was going to publish it, they rushed out the statement themselves.’ The Cardinal’s office denied that the statement had been issued in a hurry.”¹⁸¹

To confirm that the Cardinal made the document public from fear that Peter Tatchell and OutRage might publish compromising personal information, I need only present an overall view of the blackmailing game that was being played in Britain by homosexual groups at that time.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 5, n. 15.

¹⁸¹ Anthony Doran and Steve Doughty, “How the Gay Lobby Rail-roaded a Cardinal,” *The Daily Mail* (London), March 8, 1995; Christina Frade, “El sexo de los Obispos,” *El Mundo* (Madrid), March 19, 1995, p. 2.

Moving outside the Catholic arena, one can see that already in November 1994 OutRage had publicly denounced as homosexuals ten Anglican bishops.¹⁸²

On the same March 7, 1995 that the Hume document came to light, the church of Scotland assembled and issued a statement asking for more tolerance and understanding for homosexuality in line with the principles upheld by Cardinal Hume.¹⁸³

In view of these two facts Tim Hopkins, director of another group favoring homosexuality, called on Cardinal Thomas Wining, head of the Catholic Church in Scotland, pressuring him to give public support to Cardinal Hume's *Note*. Wining complied. Through his spokesman, Fr. Tom Connelly, Cardinal Wining declared that Cardinal Hume's viewpoints were "entirely in line with the Church's general moral principles."¹⁸⁴

In a BBC television broadcast the same night, bishop Derk Rawcliffe of the church of Scotland, under pressure from Outrage, "came out," that is, he publicly declared he "had always been a homosexual." At the same

¹⁸² Greg Hadfield, "This Is Just a Start, Say the Activists," *The Daily Mail*, March 8, 1995; Ruth Gledhill, "Churchmen Condemn Move to 'Out' Hope," *The Times*, March 15, 1995; Luca Romano, "Estremisti omosex minacciano di fari I nomi di prelati e deputati," *Il Giornale*, March 15, 1995.

¹⁸³ Ray Clancy, "Church Pleads for Greater Tolerance of Homosexuals," *The Daily Telegraph*, March 8, 1995.

¹⁸⁴ Severin Carrel, "Cardinal Wining Challenged to Back Praise for Gay Love," *The Scotsman*, March 8, 1995.

time he advocated that a blessing be given to relationships between homosexual priests.¹⁸⁵

On March 13, after receiving a letter from the director of OutRage, the Anglican bishop of London, David Hope, published a statement saying he was neither heterosexual nor homosexual, his sexuality residing in an ambiguous “gray area.” He also promised to show tolerance toward homosexuals.¹⁸⁶ Hope condemned OutRage’s “outing” campaign as “profoundly disturbing” and “based almost totally on rumors, unknown sources, and intimidating in nature.”¹⁸⁷ Some people saw his words as a semi-confession.¹⁸⁸

On March 14, Hope’s statement received a letter of support from 34 primates of the Anglican church assembled

¹⁸⁵ G. Hadfield, “This Is Just a Start, Say the Activists”; R. Gledhill, “Churchmen Condemn Move to ‘Out’ Hope”; Allan Massie, “Terror Tactics of the Tatchell Gang,” *The Daily Telegraph*, March 15, 1995.

¹⁸⁶ David Hope, Letter, March 3, 1995, *apud* R. Gledhill, “Churchmen Condemn Move to ‘Out’ Hope.”

¹⁸⁷ L. Romano, “Estremisti omosex minacciano di fari i nomi di prelati e deputati.”

¹⁸⁸ George Carey, Letter, of March 14, 1995, *apud* Dan Conagham, “Archbishops Angry at Hope ‘Intrusion,’” *The Daily Telegraph*, March 15, 1995.

An article by Alessio Alticheri, “Promosso il vescovo gay,” published in the *Corriere della Sera* (April 12, 1995) corroborated Hope’s semi-confession (note 187), and pointed out the new prestige the Anglicans were giving him. According to Alticheri, Hope received a promotion in the Anglican hierarchy with a transfer from the London diocese to that of York, second only to that of the bishop of Canterbury. Hope’s promotion prompted new congratulations and hundreds of letters. “Many came from outside the church, many from homosexuals, some of them really touching,” the second highest Anglican bishop noted.

at Windsor. Speaking in the name of the other bishops present, the Anglican archbishop of Canterbury expressed his solidarity with Hope, “deploring this reprehensible intrusion into his private life” and manifesting “most profound affection” and “prayerful support” for the London bishop.¹⁸⁹ The same day, March 14, the Anglican bishop of Southwark, Robert Williamson, said he “would be happy” to ordain an openly homosexual priest living in a stable relationship with someone of the same sex.¹⁹⁰

On March 15, Anglican archbishop of York John Habgood published an article making concessions toward homosexuality in *The Times*. In it, he stated:

“The common presumption that all physical intimacy must lead to penetrative sex is unjust to those who want to enjoy some warmth of companionship, but wish to draw a line.”¹⁹¹

A document was also released by the 34 Anglican bishops assembled at the international conference at Windsor. It took a like conciliatory tone regarding homosexuality:

“In the internal life of the church there are models of sexuality different than those recalled by tradi-

¹⁸⁹ Robert Williamson, Statement to the press, *apud* R. Gledhill, “Churchmen Condemn Move to ‘Out’ Hope”; A. Massie, “Terror Tactics of the Tatchell Gang.”

¹⁹⁰ John Habgood, “When Sex Ceases To Be Private,” *The Times*, March 15, 1995.

¹⁹¹ 34 Anglican Bishops Collective statement, “I gay? Bravi cristiani,” *Corriere della Sera*, March 17, 1995.

tional Christian morals; nevertheless, these experiences are marked by a genuine Christian seal.”¹⁹²

The *Corriere della Sera* commented that gay rights advocates were triumphant at hearing this statement, proclaiming the success of their outing campaign and pressures:

“‘It was a success!’ exulted organizations for the defense of gay rights. With that phrase the Anglican church admits one can simultaneously be gay and a good Christian.”¹⁹³

Following Cardinal Hume’s orientation, the group Catholic AIDS Link published a 38-page booklet entitled *Positively Called*. It emphasized the unique role homosexual clergy should play in the Church AIDS ministry:

“Many HIV-infected clergy and religious are able not only to maintain their active ministry but are uniquely suited to play a special role in the Church’s pastoral ministry in the HIV-AIDS epidemic.”¹⁹⁴

The document, which had the backing of the English hierarchy, added:

“It is certainly plausible that God could call to religious or priestly life some who are infected with HIV.”¹⁹⁵

¹⁹² *Ibid.*

¹⁹³ Catholic AIDS Link, *Positively Called*, *apud* Piers McGrandle, “Church Needs HIV Clergy, Says Group,” *The Catholic Herald*, March 17, 1995.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

It also called for the Church to accept its HIV-infected clergy:

“*Positively Called*, which was culled from seminars held for those selecting candidates for the priesthood, urges the Church to act in an ‘inclusive’ way towards those ‘who may have acquired HIV through activity not permissible under vows,’ rather than treating them as ‘pedophiles.’”¹⁹⁶

The same *Catholic Herald* article concluded that the booklet *Positively Called* was at least indirectly a consequence of the intense lobbying of the militant homosexual group OutRage.¹⁹⁷ The article pointed directly to the blackmailing work of Tatchell:

“Peter Tatchell claims to have written to four senior Catholic clergy and two more Anglican clergy, urging them to ‘come out.’”¹⁹⁸

A commentator from *Il Giornale* said Tatchell was preparing to “out” another five Anglican bishops.¹⁹⁹ The *Corriere della Sera* reported these insolent words of the homosexual leader:

“We will influence the future policy of the Church of England in a way no one can imagine.”²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁸ Peter Tatchell, Statement, *apud* Mino Vignolo, “Preti e politici gay dovete confessare,” *Corriere della Sera*, March 21, 1995.

¹⁹⁹ L. Romano, “Estremisti omosex minacciano di fari i nomi di prelati e deputati.”

²⁰⁰ P. Tatchell, Statement, *apud* M. Vignolo, “Preti e politici gay dovete confessare.”

Later, Tatchell opened a new front of attack by sending letters to 20 members of Parliament – two of them ministers in John Major’s cabinet – suggesting that they publicly admit their homosexuality. The letters exhorted recipients to “follow the example of two MPs who admitted their homosexuality.”²⁰¹

Clearly, Cardinal Hume’s *Note* on homosexuality can be objectively situated in the context of this great blackmailing effort carried out by homosexual groups against Catholic Prelates, Anglican bishops, the church of Scotland, and English cabinet ministers and parliamentarians. In my opinion, the Cardinal’s document on the whole was by far the strategic piece of greatest importance and usefulness to homosexual interest groups in England.

France – Fr. Jacques Perotti, private secretary of the well-known Abbé Pierre, provided data that permits one to gauge the degree that the vice of homosexuality has been accepted in the French clergy. Perotti openly stated his own homosexuality:

“I am a priest and a homosexual. I belong to a French organization called David and Jonathan, which has existed for 21 years and brings together homosexual men and women Although it is a lay movement, priests and women religious also take part in it In the United States several studies were done, and they considered that be-

²⁰¹ “Grupo gay inglês ameaça revelar lista de políticos homossexuais,” *O Globo*, March 21, 1995; L. Romano, “Estremisti omosex minacciano di fari i nomi di prelati e deputati;” M. Vignolo, “Prete e politici gay dovete confessare.”

tween 20 to 30% of its priests are homosexuals. It must be similar in all the countries of the world.”²⁰²

Perotti told how he stopped exercising his priestly functions because of his homosexuality, and later how he resumed them thanks to the support of his Bishop and Abbé Pierre:

“I lived outside the Church from 1969 to 1981, working in different jobs just like anyone else. It was during this time that I discovered the homosexual world with its miseries, its sufferings, its hopes. Then in 1981, I went to see my Bishop and told him: ‘I return bearing in me a world I will never leave, the world of my homosexual brothers.’ And he accepted me back. Since I did not want to return to a parish, for that would prevent me from appearing publicly as a homosexual, and since I had known Abbé Pierre since 1954, it occurred to me that I might be able to work with him In 1981, I went to see him. Abbé Pierre spoke with my Bishop, and ever since I have been in a ministry with Abbé Pierre, working under him. It is a priestly mission, but I am allowed freedom of expression.”²⁰³

Under the heading “Gays and the Church build bridges in France also,” *Newsweek* magazine added this data about the homosexual group Perotti helped to found:

“Jacques Perotti, a priest who left the Church when he realized it was impossible to reconcile his ho-

²⁰² Jacques Perotti, “Todo amor es sagrado,” interview with Maria Urruzola, *El Pais* (Montevideo), April 4, 1994.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*

mosexuality with his [religious] vocation, helped found a group known as David and Jonathan, which holds study groups, prayer meetings, and debates on the moral dilemmas faced by gays. Although the organization, with 30 centers throughout France and 1,500 members, is not a group officially recognized by the Church, it is in frequent contact with Catholic Bishops, and at times the Church lends its premises for their meetings.”²⁰⁴

Reporting one of the many activities of Bishop Jacques Gaillot, famous for his extreme progressivist agenda, namely for his support of homosexuality, the London *Catholic Herald* published this bit of news: “In the mid-eighties, he [Bishop Jacques Gaillot] admitted he was a homosexual.”²⁰⁵

Germany – Homosexual priests are estimated to make up 20% of the 18,000 ecclesiastics in Germany. Determined to make their voices heard and fight for their citizenship in the Church, the gay priests have organized themselves into twelve different groups. One of the goals of this network is to establish dialogue with the Bishops and smooth the way for the acceptance of homosexual priests.

In 1997 *Der Spiegel* magazine published an interview with three homosexual priests. They spoke about the

²⁰⁴ “Gays in the Clergy,” *Newsweek*, February 23, 1987.

²⁰⁵ “John Paul Meets With Gaillot,” *The Catholic Herald* (London), March 10, 1995. I wrote to the editor of the *Catholic Herald* in 1995 asking for more evidence on this statement, but to date have never received any response.

large number of priests in Germany who have died with AIDS. They stated that also many Bishops are homosexuals, a datum normally concealed by the Hierarchy. The priests explained that at the time [1997] it was difficult to live in Germany as a homosexual ecclesiastic, since if a priest were to be publicly discovered, he would be sent away. The overall problem of pedophile priests, they added, made the situation more difficult for homosexual priests.

The issue of homosexuality in the clergy is one that divides the German Bishops. Leader of the anti-gay crusade, Bishop of Fulda Johannes Dyba has strongly condemned homosexuality as a sin against nature. But on the other side are Bishops like Cardinal Walter Kasper and Cardinal Karl Lehman, who have supported homosexual priests for many years.²⁰⁶

Holland – A 1983 survey showed that a large number of parish priests in that country had turned away from the teaching of the Magisterium of the Church on homosexuality.

Fr. Van der Ploeg pointed out a high percentage supporting the vice:

“In a local paper dated April 15 of last year [1983], we found an article entitled ‘Parish Priests Reject Church Doctrine on Homosexuality.’ The Union of Pastoral Agents carried out a survey of 757 pastors in the Archdiocese of Utrecht to find out their opinion about ‘homosexual behavior by parish

²⁰⁶ “Prete gay allo scoperto,” *Corriere della Sera*, April 27, 1997.

priests.’ Only 350 of the 750 pastors responded to the survey. Experts consider this to be a high percentage, which can be considered representative of the whole. However, it should be noted that a certain number of priests may not have answered perhaps because they viewed the survey as abusive to their privacy.

“Of the 350 parish priests who answered the survey, 86% [that is, 301] are at odds with the Church position on homosexuality. As a consequence, these gentlemen place themselves outside the Church. A fine-looking Archdiocese, where 301 parish priests view the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah as licit and want to bring it inside the Church! Furthermore, 84% of the 350 [i.e., 294], believe that ‘men who are regularly engaged in homosexual relations’ and who are not obligated by vows of celibacy, should be assigned as pastors. And this is not in Sodom and Gomorrah, but in the Archdiocese of Utrecht! How can one trust a ‘parish priest’ in the Archdiocese of Utrecht? In Holland, the Church has become a Church in exile.”²⁰⁷

A 1987 survey revealed data along the same line:

“In Holland, where an open and vigorous debate has long been taking place about some of the most basic principles of Catholic doctrine, a coalition of 90 male religious formed the Workers Group of Catholic Homosexual Priests. Group members have met with a delegation of Bishops to discuss the gay

²⁰⁷ J. van der Ploeg, “Survey Among Utrecht Parish Priests,” *Katholieke Stemmen* (Tiburg), June-July 1983, pp. 275-6.

clergy issue. To all appearances, meetings have produced no substantial change in Church procedure. But the group was encouraged by the recent survey it conducted among 375 priests of the Archdiocese of Utrecht: 84% said they had a positive opinion of homosexuality and 28% admitted to being homosexuals.”²⁰⁸

Spain – Telltale of the situation of the clergy in Spain are the blasphemous and arrogant statements by **Fr. Emili Boils**. At the IX Congress of Theology held in Madrid in September 1989, he shamelessly declared:

“I am homosexual by nature and the grace of God, and as a believer and a religious I am neither ‘corrupt’ nor ‘scum’ nor a ‘shameful son of darkness.’ Nor is my sin ‘nefarious;’ nor does my abnormality ‘cry out to heaven;’ nor am I ‘sick’ or ‘abominable’ I am not a Sodomite. I was not born in such an exotic place [Sodom]; nor was I born more than twenty centuries ago Enough of this [expletive]! I am a priest because I am homosexual.”²⁰⁹

The April 1, 1995 *Adista* bulletin carried this news on a general trend in the Spanish Catholic Hierarchy:

“Spain is now treading the same pathway taken in the United States: the scourge of sexual molestation

²⁰⁸ “Gays in the Clergy,” *Newsweek*, February 23, 1987

²⁰⁹ Emili Boils, “Declaraciones en el IX Congreso de Teología – Iglesia y derechos humanos, Evangelio y liberación,” Madrid, 1990, *apud Covadonga-Inforna* (Madrid), May 1990, p. 8.

by clergy members appears to be spreading like an oil slick. Two Cardinals and five Bishops are said to be guilty of concealing a network for corrupting minors that involves priests. There are reports of rapes and the sexual abuse of women and the insane. The accusation was made by author and journalist Peter Rodriguez, who wrote a book on the topic entitled *La vida sexual del clero* [The Sexual Life of the Clergy]

“The accusation, made at the book launching on March 7 gives first and last names. Accused of supporting the network are Cardinal Emeritus of Barcelona Narcis Jubany, along with his three auxiliaries, Bishop Carlos Soler, Bishop Jaime Traserra, and Bishop Juan-Enric Vives.

“But it does not stop here. Rodrigues also made accusations against Bishop of Caragena Javier Azagra and denounced Bishop of Cuenca José Guerra Campos for covering up cases of sexual abuse perpetrated by a priest who was guilty, among other things, of raping a mentally handicapped person.”²¹⁰

On February 2, 2002, **Fr. José Mantero**, parish priest of Valverde del Camino, Andalusia, gave an interview to the homosexual monthly *Zero*. Mantero defined himself as an active homosexual. In the interview he affirmed:

“I thank God for being gay because it had expanded my capacity to love.”

²¹⁰ “In Spagna due cardinali e cinque vescovi accusati di silenzio sugli abusi di minori e psicotabili,” *Adista*, April 1, 1995.

After this interview the priest was suspended from his ministry. Spaniard theologian Juan José Tamayo, who publicly came to Mantero's defense, affirmed that homosexuality is much more widespread in priestly and religious milieus than one can imagine.

Carlos Alberto Biendicho, president of the group Plataforma Popular Gay, threatened to denounce three Bishops as homosexual if the attacks against Mantero did not cease. Biendicho claimed that he had homosexual relations with the three Bishops when they, along with Biendicho, were seminarians together.

Mantero also stated that he has a "very complete list" of names of homosexual priests, and threatened to reveal them should the persecution not stop.²¹¹

Italy – In a 1995 interview on Italian television, **Fr. Pascal Janin**, a French priest of the Society of African Missions residing in Rome, declared he was homosexual. Supposedly it was the first time that this had happened in Italy. Fr. Janin is also a militant of the Italian association Arcigay-Arcilesbica, a gay-lesbian center known for its criticism of the Vatican's position on homosexuality. In the same interview, Fr. Janin defended homosexual marriages and stated that the Bible did not condemn homosexuality.²¹²

²¹¹ "Sono prete e omosessuale attivo. E allora? Il Vescovo lo sospende," *Adista*, February, 18, 2002; "Parrocchiani ed amici: Don Mantero è prete omosessuale. E allora?," *Adista*, February 18, 2002, pp.4-5.

²¹² "Sono prete e gay, ma casto," *Corriere della Sera*, December 6, 1995; "Padre confessa ser homosexual," *O Globo*, December 7, 1995.

The position that Archbishop Ettore DiFilippo of Campobasso took in face of a local scandal involving a homosexual seems to express a general policy of the Italian Hierarchy regarding homosexuality. In a village near Campobasso, Fr. Luis Arteaga was in charge of St. Martin's parish. A known homosexual in the village, Vincenzo Marinelli, would attend his Mass, blatantly provoking the priest, for example, singing loudly in an exaggerated feminine voice during the ceremony. Fr. Arteaga opposed some of these provocations, and asked Marinelli to stop them. Instead of complying, he boldly went to the Bishop and asked him to transfer the priest. He continued to aggravate the priest during Mass, and finally Fr. Arteaga put his foot down and refused to say Mass when Marinelli was present. After four days without Mass, the case was presented to Archbishop DiFilippo. Instead of supporting Fr. Arteaga, the Archbishop punished the priest. This was his verdict:

“The gravest thing is that Fr. Luis placed his own severity above his duty to say Mass. Next, he was wrong to refuse Communion to a parishioner. Communion must always be given, even to those who do not declare repentance of their sins; therefore, it must be given to those who have not repented of their homosexuality.”²¹³

Fr. Luis Arteaga was sent to Mexico for a period of “rest and meditation.” With this kind of response from the Hierarchy, what priest would feel comfortable in taking a stand against homosexuality?

²¹³ Carlo Vulpio, “La Curia sospende il parroco anti-gay,” *Corriere della Sera*, January 14, 1997.

The murder of Italian designer Gianni Versace in a homosexual-related crime in Miami on July 15, 1997 provided occasion for the homosexual community to profit from media sympathy and publicity. Versace, a known homosexual, was celebrated and eulogized in religious ceremonies in the Catholic Church.

In Miami the funeral Mass was co-celebrated by Auxiliary Bishop Agustin Alejo Roman and eleven priests at St. Patrick's Church. The homily was delivered by Fr. Patrick O'Neill who said Versace was already in paradise and that St. Peter had "put him in charge of redecorating Heaven."

Fr. O'Neill also remembered "with affection, respect and compassion his partner Antonio," Versace's last lover. Spilling over with good will toward Versace's anti-natural relationship, he concluded his eulogy saying, "God is our final lover."²¹⁴

One week later, another solemn funeral Mass for Versace was held in the Cathedral of Milan. The event was attended by 2,000 celebrities and called a gay parade by Catholic critics. Even the president of Azione Omosessuale (Homosexual Action), Gabriele Baroni, accused the Catholic Church of being ambiguous, since the Church officially condemns homosexuality but nonetheless opened

²¹⁴ "Omosessualismo: La fine di Gianni Versace," *Corrispondenza Romana*, July 19, 1997.

Three years after he delivered Versace's eulogy at the Mass in Miami, **Fr. Patrick O'Neill** was himself arrested in a place of male prostitution for offering \$100 for sex to an undercover officer ("Top Priest Caught in Rent Boy Sting," *The Sunday World*, July 21, 2000).

its Cathedral doors wide in Milan for a man who was a known homosexual.

This opening of the Milan's Cathedral for a homage to a homosexual was publicly defended by Cardinal Ersilio Tonini of Ravenna, however. He stated that while the Church cannot approve the "option" Versace had chosen, "this doesn't matter in the face of death." It is interesting to note that Versace's family donated \$580,000 to the Milan Curia for the use of the Cathedral.²¹⁵

The Vatican – Within this context, of news about homosexual clergy and the Episcopate's support for homosexuality, one cannot omit what occurred at the Vatican at the end of 1989 during an International Conference on AIDS promoted by the Holy See. The three-day event brought together 1,400 Bishops, theologians, scientists, and researchers from 85 countries.

Right at the opening session, an Irish priest, Fr. John White, stood up in the Synod Hall and displayed a sign reading: "The Church has AIDS." After being escorted out of the hall, White told the press, "I have AIDS and live with it every day."²¹⁶

Later at the same conference, AIDS sufferer Peter Larking of London engaged in a heated exchange over the incident with conference organizer, Archbishop Fiorenzo Angelini, and was also put out.

²¹⁵ "Missa causa polêmica," *Jornal do Brasil*, July 25, 1997.

²¹⁶ "Aids é debatida no Vaticano," *O Estado de São Paulo*, November 14, 1989.

The following day, however, Archbishop Angelini readmitted Fr. White to the conference with a public embrace.²¹⁷ AIDS victim Larkin was allowed back as well and was granted a brief audience with John Paul II, who greeted him warmly and told him, "I am praying for you."²¹⁸

A peculiar testimony of German reporter Edwin Thomas in *Micromega* magazine stands out for its symbolic aspect. For several weeks in 1995, Thomas stated, he took a stroll every evening in the environs of St. Peter's Basilica. During that period he said he was approached by 64 churchmen who made homosexual propositions to him. The witness said they were ecclesiastics "of all kinds, from seminarians to the secretary of a nunciature."²¹⁹

Accusations Against Paul VI

It is especially painful to report that the moral integrity of one of the Sovereign Pontiffs was marred by serious reports of homosexuality. For Catholics who love and defend the Papacy, the revelation that homosexuality could have penetrated the highest cupola of the Church is particularly sorrowful. Nonetheless, given the credibility of the source and the importance of facing the truth in this grave matter, it seemed a requisite of honesty to offer the

²¹⁷ Rod Norland, "The Church Has AIDS' – Anger Flares at a Vatican Conference," *Newsweek*, November 27, 1989, p. 55.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*

²¹⁹ Edwin Thomas, "Amori gay all'ombra del cupulone. Inchiesta di *Micromega* fra i sacerdoti omosessuali," *Adista*, May 13, 1995, pp. 8-9.

following data to the reader to allow him to form his own judgment.

In April 1976, an important statement regarding Paul VI was made. In an interview with the Italian magazine *Tempo*, French author Roger Peyrefitte, a professed homosexual, commented on a homily (January 1976) in which Paul VI had spoken against homosexuality. The French writer alleged that the Pontiff's words were hypocritical and made this revelation:

“The second sin from which I feel I have been freed, after this grotesque papal speech is my homosexuality In my last book *Hunting Scenes*, and in another *About the French People*, I stated with all the respect due a Pope, especially when he is still alive, that he is homosexual. It is amazing that the papal speech [against homosexuality] was published at the same time as my book. Was Paul VI moved by a guilt complex? But why should he feel guilty? It is known that a boyfriend of Paul VI was a certain movie star, whose name I will not give, although I remember him very well. He was an unknown actor when our friend Paul was Cardinal Montini, Archbishop of Milan.”²²⁰

These grave accusations, which some might consider open to discussion given the scandalous character of Peyrefitte, were confirmed, however, by another author. This one, a serious professor and journalist who had worked at the Vatican in the papal quarters. The details he reported corroborate Peyrefitte's affirmations and seem

²²⁰ Roger Peyrefitte, “Mea culpa? Ma fatemi il santo piacere,” *Tempo*, April 4, 1976.

quite worthy of credit. His name is Franco Bellegrandi, he was *camariero di spada e cappa* (honor chamberlain) of His Holiness from the end of Pius XII's pontificate into Paul VI's reign. He was a member of the Vatican Noble Guard, which was the most distinguished corps of the papal military service. The Noble Guard – done away with by Paul VI – was an elite military honor corps made up of members of the Roman nobility that would assist the Pontiff at ceremonies and solemn acts, as well as at day-to-day diplomatic functions with heads of States or important foreign representatives. With reliable credentials – professor of Modern History at Innsbruck University (Austria), a correspondent for *L'Osservatore Romano*; author of two other books on the Vatican, and decorated with the Golden Cross of Merit of the Austrian Republic – he utilized sources and was sure of his facts. In 1994, when his book *Nichitaroncalli – Controvita di un Papa* (Nikita Krushev and Roncalli – Unknown Aspects of a Pope) was launched in Rome, among those present was Cardinal Silvio Oddi, who came to lend his prestige to the work and to indirectly endorse its contents.

In this book Bellegrandi described the situation in the papal quarters:

“In Rome and throughout Italy the rumor is out that Paul VI is a homosexual When he was Archbishop of Milan, he would have been caught by the police one night wearing civilian clothes and in not so laudable company. Actually, for many years he has been said to have a special friendship with a red-haired actor. This man did not make any secret of his relation with the future Pope. The relation continued and became closer in the years ahead.

[After Montini was elected Pope] an official of the Vatican security forces told me that this favorite of Montini was allowed to come and go freely in the pontifical apartments. And that he had often been seen taking the papal elevator at night.

“The ‘banana skin’ that Paul VI stepped on and that put an end to the confident nature of his weakness was the homily on sexual ethics he delivered in January 1976 dealing with some points on homosexuality. This homily provoked a reaction from the writer Roger Peyrefitte. On April 13, 1976, the weekly *Tempo* published an interview with the author with a reputation for very good documentation who accused the Pope of being a homosexual and denied his right to be a censor on the topic. Paul VI officially acknowledged the blow.

“A ‘day of reparation for the offense received by the Pope’ was called for. All of Italy, however, was laughing about the incident. British TV made an interview with Peyrefitte, who confirmed his accusations and expressed surprise over the publicity he was receiving.

“The first blackmail against Montini, as soon as he mounted the steps of the throne of Peter, was made by Freemasonry, which pressured him to do away with the Church’s condemnation of those who ask to be cremated after death [which he did]. What it threatened was to reveal the secret meetings between the Archbishop of Milan and ‘his’ actor in a hotel in Sion, in the Valais canton in Switzerland. In Paris, sometime later, the story behind this change made by Paul VI surfaced, with the indisputable

evidence patiently amassed by a gendarme [policeman].”²²¹

Some pages further, Bellegrandi described what he had personally witnessed:

“Another change observed by those in that narrow circle who, because of their position in the Hierarchy or their posts, used to pass a large amount of time inside the Apostolic Palace, was the sudden appointment of homosexuals to positions of prestige and responsibility close to the Papacy. This plague infested, transformed, and devastated the Vatican during the time of Paul VI. It had already begun then [in the pontificate of John XXIII], well hidden in the baroque curtain folds of the Pontifical Court, but unfortunately alive and real. But it was the distant hand of the Archbishop of Milan, himself a victim of such weaknesses, that discretely placed one after another on the State chessboard the pieces of his game dear to his heart.

“Those highly situated new personages, who were contaminated by the same ‘sickness,’ naturally brought with them other less highly placed people of the same ilk. Therefore, slowly but continuously, rumors and indiscretions began to flow in the Vatican, and grave facts began to occur as matter of course.

“Because of their functions, these people were often seen by us [the Noble Guard] They also had

²²¹ Franco Bellegrandi, *Nichitaroncalli – Controvita di un Papa* (Rome: Ed. Internazionale di Letteratura e Scienze, 1994), pp. 85-6.

their favorites, who were the effeminate young men wearing elegant uniforms and make-up on their faces to dissimulate their beards. We – the *camarieri di spada e cappa* and noble guards – carefully kept our distance from their smiles and courtesies. We limited ourselves to greeting them at distance with the military salute of the heels.

“‘Favorites’ of the Archbishop of Milan also began to appear at the level of functionary, and both small and large scandals at times would erupt. The *Gendarmeria Pontificia* [the Vatican police] had to steer carefully along those floating mines and keep one eye closed – and sometimes both eyes – to keep reports from leaking and to discourage some sharp journalists Honorable old employees who relied on the *Governatorato* [the administration of the Vatican State] were suddenly fired or removed to other posts, and these newcomers were installed in their empty chairs, all them carrying in their pockets letters of recommendation from Cardinal Montini.”²²²

Along these same lines is the testimony of Spanish author Pepe Rodrigues, who in March 1995 published the book *La vida sexual del clero* [The Sexual Life of the Clergy]. In an interview to the magazine *El Mundo*, he stated:

“In this century we had a great homosexual Pope and many homosexual Bishops They practiced

²²² *Ibid.*, pp. 91-2.

their homosexual option and their superiors did not rent their garments.”²²³

*

The data on homosexuality in the clergy either in the United States (Chapter III) or in other countries (Chapter IV) were taken almost on the whole from written sources. I left aside a quite extensive file on the topic I had collected from internet sources in the last five years. Perhaps in the future I may update this book with more details provided by these reports, as well as any subsequent development on the topic.²²⁴

* * *

²²³ Pepe Rodrigues, “España no es diferente,” *El Mundo*, March 19, 1995, p. 3.

²²⁴ If the reader would like further updates on homosexuality in the clergy, he may visit the website of the valorous movement The Roman Catholic Faithful founded and directed by Mr. Stephen Brady.

Chapter V

THE SCANDAL OF PRIESTLY PEDOPHILIA IN THE UNITED STATES

1. Definition and Terminology

The crime of pedophilia, i.e., the sexual abuse of children, is a moral aberration that includes the infamies of cowardice, cruelty, and in most cases, homosexuality.²²⁵ It has caused devastation in ecclesiastical circles and damaged the prestige of both the Catholic clergy and Hierarchy. News items in magazines and papers have portrayed an explosion of scandals caused by priests who have abused children.

²²⁵ I am considering the fact that the great majority of cases of pedophilia involving the clergy has occurred with boys, and not with girls. As a result, what is being looked at here is the sexual abuse of a male by a male, which would be included in the genre of homosexuality.

In this book I disregard some scholarly theses that try to present pedophilia merely as a psychological sickness, thus lessening the infamy of the guilty. See Paul Morrissey, "Are Gay Priests Living a Lie?" *America*, April 1, 2002; Joseph Guido, "The Importance of the Perspective," *America*, April 1, 2002; Melvin Blanchette and Gerald Coleman, "Priest Pedophiles," *America*, April 22, 2002, pp. 18-21; see also Kevin Luperchio, "Understanding of Pedophilia Remains Incomplete, Psychologists Say," *National Catholic Reporter*, March 15, 2002.

For sake of clarity, it seems useful to distinguish two realities that are often lumped together under the general name of pedophilia: the sexual abuse of children and the sexual abuse of adolescents.

Pedophilia derives from two Greek words, *pedo*, which means child, and *philia*, which means love of. In its common acceptation applied to sexuality, *pedophilia*²²⁶ is sexual attraction of an adult to children.

* Thus, in its *primary sense* and *direct application*, a pedophile is an adult who sexually abuses a child, understood as one with less than 13 years. A person with 13 to 18 years is normally considered an adolescent, based on his psychological and physical development. After age 18, he is legally an adult and responsible for his acts.

In its *secondary sense* and *indirect application*, pedophilia is used by extension to refer to sexual abuse by adults of adolescents from age 13-16, who still have a psychological state of children.

Very rarely can one apply pedophilia to sexual abuse of adolescents of 16 or 17 years. Sexual abuse of this type should be considered homosexual abuse of minors, but not pedophilia.²²⁷

* The same concern for clarity has induced some scholars to recur to the distinction between *pedophilia*, which they consider the abuse of pre-pubescent children

²²⁶ It can be alternatively spelled *paedophilia* or *pædophilia*.

²²⁷ These two senses of *pedophilia* also apply to the abuse of female children or adolescent girls by nuns, since these acts are also homosexual acts. Obviously, the term *pedophilia* in its first application can be properly applied as well to the abuse of girls by priests or to the abuse of boys by nuns, even though they are not homosexual acts.

(up to age 13), and *epehebophilia*, which they use to refer to the abuse of post-pubescent minors (age 13-18).²²⁸

In my opinion, such distinction, although having some medical and juridical utility, does not always match the reality, since *pubescence* (= the growth of body hair in adolescents), does not necessarily mean that there has been an accompanying psychological development and maturity. That is, many times a youth may be physically pubescent, but psychologically still a child. Therefore, this criterion does not offer an appropriate basis to diminish the moral gravity of the crime of pedophilia when the abuse is made against such adolescents.

This terminology, therefore, has clear and unclear components. I prefer to use the direct and indirect applications of the term pedophilia presented above, along with the notion of the abuse of adolescents. If the terms *pedophilia* and *epehebophilia* were used, the following distinctions should be observed in order to be precise:

Pedophilia clearly applies to the sexual abuse of children less than age 13.

Epehebophilia clearly applies to the sexual abuse of 16 or 17 year-old adolescents;

For the ages 13 to 15, which fall between these two categories, either of these terms may apply depending on the psychological maturity of the victim. The religious su-

²²⁸ D. Cozzens, *The Changing Face of the Priesthood*, p. 119; Stephen Rossetti, *A Tragic Grace: The Catholic Church and Child Sexual Abuse* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1996), p. 67; M. Blanchette and G. Coleman, "Priest Pedophiles," *America*, April 22, 2002, pp. 18-21; Richard McBrien, "What Caused the Crisis?" *The Tidings*, September 20, 2002.

perior, legislator, lawyers, and public must analyze each particular case to determine if it is one of pedophilia, the sexual abuse of a child, or ephebophilia, the sexual abuse of a minor. In case of doubt, my opinion is that the more severe course should be taken: the crime should be considered pedophilia.

* Even less precise is the terminology that only distinguishes between sexual abuse of minors and sexual abuse of adults. By putting the different types of abuse of minors altogether in one category, this simplification hides the reality that countless crimes of this nature were committed against children. That is, it dilutes the moral gravity of pedophilia, offering a more comfortable situation for the guilty. This inappropriate generalization is what has been used by the American Episcopate and the Vatican in dealing with the sexual abuse of children and adolescents by priests.

2. Beginning of the Crisis in the U. S. – Overview

Broadly speaking one can say that up until mid 1980s, the public was generally unaware of the problem of pedophilia in the priesthood. When the abscess broke with news reports revealing countless cases of pedophile priests and Bishops, the Catholic public was shocked and indignant to find the moral wound so deep and putrid. It would seem that these extremes were another vicious consequence of the progressivist reforms of Vatican II.

One of the early scandals exploded in the United States in 1985 when **Fr. Gilbert Gauthé** of the Diocese of Lafayette was prosecuted and confessed to having sexually

abused 37 boys.²²⁹ He was accused of 23 counts of rape, pornography, and crimes against nature.²³⁰

Cases of sexual abuse of children tripled in a short time. The next year, 1986, a contributor to the *National Catholic Reporter (NCR)*, wrote:

“Since the *NCR* report on pedophilia cases involving Catholic priests a year ago, the number of priests accused, indicted, or convicted of sexual misconduct with adolescents has more than tripled.

“Fr. Thomas Doyle, a Dominican who worked at the Apostolic Nunciature in Washington, speaking at a meeting of canonists in Morristown, New Jersey, early this month, figured that [from 1985 to 1986] there were from 40 to 50 cases in the U.S. ‘This is the most serious problem the Church has faced in the last few centuries,’ he said.”²³¹

In an attempt to respond to this growing problem, Fr. Doyle teamed with Fr. Michael Peterson and attorney Ray Mouton in 1985 to write a confidential report on the potential ramifications of the pedophilia crisis. The report, sent to all the American Bishops, predicted a staggering array of scandals to come and billions of dollars in legal

²²⁹ “Bishops’ Words and Actions on Sexual Abuse,” *Los Angeles Times*, June 14, 2003.

²³⁰ “Padre americano será julgado por tara sexual,” *Zero Hora* (Porto Alegre, Brazil), October 14, 1985; “Sins of the Fathers,” *Newsweek*, March 4, 2002, p. 49.

²³¹ Thomas Doyle, Statements on pedophilia in the USA, *apud* Jason Berry, “Dioceses React to Deepening Dilemma,” *National Catholic Reporter*, May 30, 1986.

fees. A well-informed priest described what happened to that report:

“The report was shelved by the Bishops. So was Fr. Doyle, who pressed for the report’s acceptance, and was canned.”²³²

Later Fr. Doyle commented on the results of his efforts:

“We advised that the public be dealt with honesty and openly. The Bishops’ Conference rejected the whole report and everything that was in it.”²³³

Similar predictions of trouble ahead and the need for preventive and corrective measures were made by this report in the *National Catholic Reporter*:

“The incendiary and painful experience of Lafayette [the Diocese where Fr. Gauthier served] was a mere first lightning launching a disquieting and at times sinister light on the problem of child abuse in the Catholic Church as a whole in the United States, and findings on a national scale can be devastating. Many dioceses are no longer able to obtain insurance covering sexual infractions of the clergy, and some sources indicate that penal lawsuits for sexual abuse may cost the Church one billion dollars in the next ten years – especially if preventive and corrective measures are not taken.”²³⁴

²³² J. Wilson, “The Enemy Within,” *The Catholic World Report*, June 2002, p. 31; Thomas Fox, “What They Knew in 1985,” *National Catholic Reporter*, May 17, 2002.

²³³ “Sins of the Fathers,” *Newsweek*, March 4, 2002, p. 49.

²³⁴ Tim McCarthy, “Church Still on Trial in Pedophilia Crisis,” *National Catholic Reporter*, May 30, 1986.

* In January 1985 **Fr. Carmelo Baltazar** was sentenced to seven years' imprisonment in Idaho for sexual abuse of children.²³⁵

* In July 1985 **Fr. Alvin Campbell** of Morrisonville, IL, pleaded guilty to molesting seven boys when he was pastor at the Morrisonville church, from 1982 to 1985.²³⁶ He was sentenced to 14 years in prison, served almost seven years of his sentence and was released in 1992. Soon afterward he died.²³⁷

* In June 1986 **Fr. William O'Connell** of Providence, RI, was give a year prison sentence. In April 1985 he had been indicted on 22 felony counts of child abuse.²³⁸

* In 1986 **Fr. Robert Peebles** of the Dallas Diocese was arrested for attempted rape of a boy at the Air Force base where he served as chaplain. What ensued follows:

“The Diocese of Dallas prevented his prosecution by arranging for a discharge on condition that he received treatment, as their pastor assured the boy's parents that the priest would get help. Well, he did not; the Diocese broke its promise to the parents of the boy and to the Armed Forces. He was reassigned to St. Augustine Church in Dallas. From there he was arrested for abusing kids.”²³⁹

²³⁵ Philip Jenkins, *Pedophiles and Priests* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 35.

²³⁶ *Ibid.* On Fr. Alvin Campbell see p. 184.

²³⁷ Lisa Kernek, “Abuse Victims Get \$3 Million,” *The State Journal-Register* (Springfield, IL), online edition.

²³⁸ Philip Jenkins, *Pedophiles and Priests*.

²³⁹ J. Wilson, “The Enemy Within,” p. 30.

Later, in a sworn deposition Fr. Peebles admitted that he had sexually abused 7 to 16 boys from 1979 to 1986.²⁴⁰

* In 1989 the United States Catholic Conference assembled for one week in Baltimore. One of the topics addressed was the “pedophilia of some priests and Bishops.”

The Bishops not only sidestepped the issue, but seem to have covered for one of the Episcopate accused of such crimes. A news report made this commentary on the 1989 meeting:

“This topic of pedophilia is a most worrisome one: after all, 300 cases of priests who have sexually abused minors have been denounced to the authorities, and the Church has had to cough up \$50 million in settlements with the victims in order to avoid greater scandals.

“Right at the opening of the meeting, the Catholic movement Open Church, founded in Washington, accused one of the Bishops present of having had sexual relations with a 13-year-old boy seven years earlier. The victim’s mother appeared at a press interview to confirm the accusation. A second denunciation was made by a student just over 20 years of age, who disclosed that when in high school he had sexual relations with a priest (now a Bishop) who paid him for it. The young man claimed the priest gave him money for several trips so they could meet in some other town.

²⁴⁰ Ed Housewright, “Abuse Suits Involving Two Ex-Priests Settled,” *Dallas Morning News*, February 12, 1998.

“The Bishops counter-attacked with a communiqué saying these denunciations had already been examined by the representative of the Pope himself in the United States, Archbishop Pio Laghi, and no solid evidence had been found.”²⁴¹

* In October 1991, **Fr. Thomas Chleboski** was sentenced to eight years for molesting boys in Washington D.C., in addition to a 22-year sentence received in Virginia for an analogous crime.²⁴²

* In September 1992, a Massachusetts grand jury indicted **Fr. James Porter** on 46 counts of assault, battery, sodomy, and unnatural acts after years of complaints by sexual abuse victims.²⁴³ He abused 28 children and was sentenced to 18 to 20 years in prison.²⁴⁴ Further documents released later by the Boston Archdiocese under court order showed that Boston Cardinals Richard Cushing and Humberto Medeiros knew of Porter’s history of sexual abuse of children as early as the mid-1960s and took part in the effort to cover it up. These new documents showed that Porter had been accused of molesting more than 120 children.²⁴⁵

The same documents on Porter showed that more than 30 years ago Vatican officials were aware both of

²⁴¹ José Meirelles Passos, “Acusações de sexo e racismo envolvem Bispos americanos,” *O Globo*, November 7, 1989.

²⁴² P. Jenkins, *Pedophiles and Priests*, p. 42.

²⁴³ “Bishops’ Words and Actions on Sexual Abuse,” *Los Angeles Times*, June 14, 2002.

²⁴⁴ “Sins of the Fathers,” *Newsweek*, p. 49.

²⁴⁵ “Church Leaders Knew of Abuse in 1960s, Documents Show,” *National Catholic Reporter*, May 24, 2002.

sexual abuse of children by American priests and of their Bishops' attempts to hide such abuse by reassigning the guilty priests to new parishes.²⁴⁶

* In October 1992, **Fr. Daniel Calabrese** was found guilty of sexual abuse of children in the State of New York. After pleading guilty to sodomizing a 16-year-old boy he plied with alcohol, Calabrese was sentenced to only 90 days in jail. At the time, he was a priest at St. Mary's Church in Poughkeepsie, NY.²⁴⁷

Later in 1993, the Archdiocese of New York was sued for \$5 million for placing Calabrese in charge of a youth program at St. Mary's Church knowing that at St. Paul's Church in Congers he had been caught drinking with teenage boys and showing them pornography.²⁴⁸

* In 1992 the number of churchmen accused of pedophilia had risen to 400, and Church legal expenditures had reached \$400 million dollars.²⁴⁹

Such figures continued to rise. A *Newsweek* report on child abuse by priests gave this estimate:

“While allegations have been lodged against an estimated 400 priests since 1982, some churchmen

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁷ Philip Jenkins, *Pedophiles and Priests*, p. 42; “Priest Gets 90 Days for Sodomy,” *New York Times*, October 10, 1992.

²⁴⁸ “Archdiocese Hit with \$50 Million Suit,” *New York Post*, February 19, 1993.

²⁴⁹ Data taken from the book of Jason Berry, *Lead Us Not Into Temptation* (Doubleday, 1992), *apud* K. L. Woodward, “The Sins of the Fathers,” *Newsweek*, June 1, 1992, p. 57; Jemez Springs, “Sins of the Fathers,” *The Economist* (London), June 18, 1992, p. 50.

extrapolate that as many as 2,500 priests have molested children or teenagers.”²⁵⁰

Some scholars have claimed the real numbers are even higher:

“Precise data are lacking, but the author of a book titled *Lead Us Not into Temptation* reckoned that from 1983 to this day [1992] 400 priests have been sued in penal or civil courts. Richard Sipe, who after leaving the priesthood works as a psychotherapist at John Hopkins School of Medicine, calculated that 6% [that is, 3,180] of the 53,000 American priests had sexual contacts with minors. He figured that over the last few years the Church paid between 200 to 500 million dollars in legal fees and compensation to families. The price of silence.”²⁵¹

Another survey confirmed these high figures and added a few more details:

“According to a survey recently published in the American press, cases of sexual abuse carried out in American parishes over the last 20 years reportedly involve from 2,000 to 4,000 priests and about 100,000 victims, mostly women and children.”²⁵²

²⁵⁰ Eric Press, “Priests and Abuse,” *Newsweek*, June 16, 1993, p. 40.

²⁵¹ Rodolfo Brancoli, “Linea verde contro preti pedofili,” *Corriere della Sera*, September 24, 1992; Randall Samborn, “Priest Playing Hardball to Battle Abuse Charges,” *The National Law Journal*, July 1994.

²⁵² Orazio la Rocca, “Wojtyla: ‘Piango i preti tentati dai vizi del sesso,’” *La Repubblica*, December 22, 1993; Molestie, mea culpa dei vescovi, *Corriere della Sera*, November 18, 1994.

* In March 1993, **Archbishop Robert Sanchez** of Santa Fé, New Mexico, resigned following allegations that he had molested five teenage girls.²⁵³

* In April 1993, **Fr. Richard Henry** of Los Angeles was sentenced to eight years in prison for the abuse of boys. He admitted to molesting four children in Holy Redeemer Parish from 1985 to 1991. Cardinal Roger Mahony was his first visitor in jail. He put up \$30,000 bail, then did nothing to remove him from the priesthood. Henry was paroled in 1996.²⁵⁴

* **Fr. Toussaint Perron** was sentenced to three years in prison after pleading guilty to abusing a boy, age 14. At the time he was pastor of St. John's Church in Walnut, Illinois. Other allegations for sexual crimes made while he was priest at Immaculate Conception Church in Ohio were introduced in court to support the prison sentence.²⁵⁵

* In February 1993, a jury found **Fr. Juan Bazalar** of St. Peter's Church in Monticello, NY, guilty of six counts of sexual abuse and sodomy involving a 14-year-old altar boy. After the accusation was made in 1991, Msgr. Edward O'Donnell of the Archdiocese of New York advised Bazalar to leave the country. The priest fled to Canada, but was extradited one year later.²⁵⁶

²⁵³ P. Jenkins, *Pedophiles and Priests*, p. 42.

²⁵⁴ *L.A. News Times*, July 4, 2002, *apud* Concerned Roman Catholics of America, "The Shocking 22-Year Record of L.A.'s Archbishop."

²⁵⁵ "Priest Gets Five Years for Molesting Boy," *Chicago Sun Times*, February 20, 1993.

²⁵⁶ "Monticello Priest Convicted, Archdiocese Protected," *New York Post*, February 20, 1993.

* In August 1993, **Fr. Thomas Smith** committed suicide in Maryland following charges that he had abused minors.²⁵⁷

* In 1993, **Fr. David Holley** of Worcester, MA, got 275 years in prison for molesting eight boys in the 1970s.²⁵⁸

* In April 1994, **Fr. Edward Pipala** was sentenced to eight years prison in New York State for the sexual abuse of children.²⁵⁹

* In 1994, a jury in Plymouth County, MA, convicted **Fr. John Hanlon** of raping an altar boy at a summer cottage in Scituate. He was sentenced to life in prison.²⁶⁰

* In 1994, the San Francisco police notified the Archdiocese that **Msgr. Patrick O'Shea** was under investigation for child sexual abuse. In 1996, O'Shea and two other area priests were named in a sexual abuse claim brought by 15 alleged victims against the San Francisco Archdiocese, which was settled for \$2.5 million.

In June 2000, O'Shea was indicted by a San Francisco County grand jury on 224 counts of child molestation. The complaints covered a period from the early 1960s to the late '80s. According to grand jury transcripts, O'Shea allegedly gave boys alcohol, let them drive his sports cars, and gave them other inducements. Victims

²⁵⁷ *L.A. News Times*, July 4, 2002, *apud* Concerned Roman Catholics of America, "The Shocking 22-Year Record of L.A.'s Archbishop."

²⁵⁸ "Sins of the Fathers," *Newsweek*, p. 45.

²⁵⁹ P. Jenkins, *Pedophiles and Priests*, p. 43.

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

testified that the abuses included sodomy and oral copulation.

O'Shea, ordained in 1958, was pastor of St. Cecilia's parish in San Francisco and an adviser to former Archbishop John Quinn. He was also pastor of Holy Name of Jesus Church in San Francisco from 1978 to 1990.

In March 2002, the San Francisco Superior Court Judge dismissed the 224 child molestation charges against the defrocked priest on grounds that the statute of limitations ran out before he was indicted.²⁶¹ Finally, in June 2003 O'Shea walked away a free man after California judges ruled that his case was voided by a recent U.S. Supreme Court decision on the statute of limitations.²⁶²

* In 1995, the Diocese of Santa Rosa, CA, paid \$450,000 to Michael Pavelka to settle his claims of abuse by **Fr. Austin Peter Keegan**. The latter was considered a "notorious molester" of children. He had already been accused of abusing boys in three parishes in the 1960s and '70s. Between 1979 and 1982 he was accused of molesting more than 50 boys. His last known address was in Mexico.²⁶³

* In late 1995, the same Diocese of Santa Rosa has reached a settlement of \$830,000 with nine men who

²⁶¹ Arthur Jones, "National Crisis Draws Attention to Local Cases." *National Catholic Reporter*, March 29, 2002; Michael W. Ryan, "The Second Greatest Scandal in the Church," *New Oxford Review*, September 2003.

²⁶² "Supreme Court Ruling Puts Hundreds of Molestation Cases in Question," *FOX News* online edition, July 1, 2003.

²⁶³ Guion Kovner, "Santa Rosa Priests, Victims Meet," *National Catholic Reporter*, July 5, 2002.

claimed they were molested by **Fr. Gary Timmons** in the late 1970s. The Diocese issued a public statement acknowledging the guilt of the priest. According to Maja Ramsey, attorney for the plaintiffs, a second case against Timmons involving three other victims was still pending.²⁶⁴ Later it was revealed that he had molested 18 youths. He was arrested in Illinois in October 1996 and returned to California to face the charges. He was convicted, served four years in prison, and was released in 2000.²⁶⁵

* In 1995, **Fr. Raymond Laferriere** retired. A priest in the Diocese of Manchester, he was accused of sexually abusing an altar boy in the mid-1960s. The Diocese settled the case for \$25,000 under the condition that the victim remained silent about the circumstances of the abuse.²⁶⁶

* In 1995 it was estimated Church expenditures for victims' compensation in the U.S. had reached \$650 million dollars.²⁶⁷

* In 1996, **Fr. Robert Melancon** was convicted of sexual abuse of an altar boy for four years in the 1980s. The child was eight when the abuse started. Mark Rhodes, prosecutor for the Houma court, LA, told the jury before deliberations began: "This man is less a Catholic priest than

²⁶⁴ Arthur Brew, "Santa Rosa Diocese Settles Sexual Abuse Case," *The Wanderer*, January 4, 1996; "San Francisco Molestation Victims Receive \$ 2.5 Million," *The Wanderer*, April 11, 1996.

²⁶⁵ G. Kovner, "Santa Rosa Priests Victims Meet."

²⁶⁶ "N.H. Diocese Releases 9,000 Pages of Files," *National Catholic Reporter*, March 14, 2003.

²⁶⁷ Alessio Alticheri, "In Irlanda la Chiesa si scusa per pedofilia," *Corriere della Sera*, October 10, 1995.

a pure and simple sexual abuser.” Melancon was sent to jail.²⁶⁸

* In 1996, **Fr. Robert Burns** pleaded guilty to sexually molesting two boys under age 13 in New Hampshire. Sentenced to two consecutive four-to-eight-year terms, he served six years. In 1999, he was defrocked by order of the Vatican.²⁶⁹

Burns sexual abuse record began in Youngstown, OH, where he was a priest from 1975 to 1981. Church officials there determined that he had sexually abused young boys, and in 1981, they sent him to a counseling program for pedophiles in Massachusetts. After a year of therapy, he was assigned on his request to the Boston Archdiocese. More than \$2 million was paid out in secret settlements to protect Burns.²⁷⁰ These revelations were made by Church officials under court order in December 2002.

* In July 1997, the Diocese of Dallas was ordered to pay \$119.6 million to 10 ex-altar-boys and the parents of another who committed suicide. The boys suffered sexual abuse from **Fr. Rudolph Kos** during an 11-year-period from 1981 to 1992. The Diocese was considered guilty of negligence, malice, conspiracy, and fraud for having covered up evidence of the crimes. According to the victims,

²⁶⁸ “Padre é punido por abuso sexual contra coroinha,” *Gazeta do Povo*, June 20, 1996.

²⁶⁹ Elizabeth Mehren and Josh Getlin, “Boston Scandal Grows,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 4, 2002. On Burns see p. 226.

²⁷⁰ Walter Robinson and Stephen Kurkjian, “Records Show a Trail of Secrecy, Deception,” *Boston Globe*, December 4, 2002.

Kos would attract the boys by giving them candy and sweets, and then later alcohol and drugs.²⁷¹

Alleging that such a sum would have forced the Diocese into bankruptcy, Bishop Charles Grahmann of Dallas pressured the victims to accept a reduced settlement of \$23 million. In separate settlements with three others abused by Kos, the Diocese had already agreed to pay \$7.5 million, bringing the total of its damages to \$30.5 million.²⁷²

Some months later, Fr. Rudolph Kos was sentenced to a life term in prison.²⁷³

The complicity of the ecclesiastical establishment in the earliest development of this scandal was duly noted by Fr. Joseph Wilson:

“The case of Fr. Rudolph Kos makes no sense from soup to nuts. Kos had been married in the Catholic Church and divorced, yet someone wanted him in the seminary so badly that a fraudulent annulment was obtained for him – despite the fact that his wife contacted the Diocese to say, ‘He can’t be a priest! I threw him out because he likes boys!’ Someone wanted to keep him so badly that the administration and vicar general ignored the complaints of

²⁷¹ “Igreja Católica vai recorrer de indenização por abuso sexual,” *O Estado de São Paulo*, July 26, 1997; “Wages of sin,” *The Economist*, August 30, 1997.

²⁷² “Bishops’ Words and Actions on Sexual Abuse,” *Los Angeles Times*, June 14, 2002.

²⁷³ “Padre pega perpétua por abuso sexual,” *Jornal da Tarde*, April 3, 1998.

seminarians that Kos, in the seminary, was preying upon the college seminarians."²⁷⁴

According to other sources, the one directly responsible for the annulment of Kos' marriage was Fr. Thomas Kelly, future Archbishop of Louisville. The rector of the seminary at that time was Fr. Michael Sheehan, future Archbishop of Santa Fé.²⁷⁵

* In 1997, charges surfaced against Jesuit **Fr. Jerold Lindner**, ex-teacher at Loyola High School in Los Angeles. Two brothers asserted in a lawsuit that Lindner sodomized them and forced them to perform oral sex years earlier during weekend retreats in the Santa Cruz Mountains. The Jesuits removed the priest from Loyola and negotiated a secret \$625,000 settlement with the brothers.²⁷⁶

* In 1997, the Diocese of Santa Rosa, CA, settled abuse claims by five former altar boys against **Fr. Vincent O'Neill**. The amount of money of the settlement was not disclosed. Fr. O'Neill died in 1998 of a brain tumor.²⁷⁷

* In 1998, **Bishop J. Keith Symons** of Palm Beach resigned after admitting he had molested five altar boys decades earlier.²⁷⁸ Later reports showed that in 1994 one of Symon's victims reported his abuse to Pensacola Bishop

²⁷⁴ J. Wilson, "The Enemy Within," p. 30.

²⁷⁵ Stephen Brady, "Bernardin's Boys," Roman Catholic Faithful Newsletter, Winter 2000-2001, p. 24.

²⁷⁶ Glenn Bunting, "L.A. Priest Blamed for Legacy of Pain," *Los Angeles Times*, December 14, 2002.

²⁷⁷ G. Kovner, "Santa Rosa Priests, Victims Meet."

²⁷⁸ "New Bishop for Scandal-Hit Diocese," *Los Angeles Times*, October 20, 2002.

Kenneth Povish, but no action was taken until the victim became more vocal.²⁷⁹

* In 1998, Cardinal Roger Mahony of Los Angeles was a central figure in one of the most famous sex abuse trials in the Catholic Church. The case involved two Stockton-area brothers who had been abused by a priest from the time they were toddlers until they were in their late teens. During this period, the Stockton Diocese had received numerous complaints against the priest. The San Joaquin County Superior Court ordered the Diocese to pay \$30 million in damages to the two brothers. After negotiations, the amount was reduced to \$13 million. Mahony was the Bishop of Stockton during a critical period in the lawsuit. He had ordered an evaluation after the priest admitted he was a molester, and then reassigned him to another parish, where he abused victims for years to come.²⁸⁰

* On October 19, 1999, **Bishop Daniel Ryan** submitted his resignation as head of the Diocese of Springfield, Illinois. Frank Berger, a former male prostitute, alleged that on May 27, 1999 he had written a letter to Ryan accusing him of paying for Berger's sexual favors for a period that began when he was age 16. Earlier, in January 1999, another male prostitute, Danny Evans, gave a sworn statement describing his alleged sexual relations with Ryan. According to Evans, he was solicited for sexual favors by Ryan for more than 50 occasions from the 1980s through the late '90s.

²⁷⁹ Rod Dreher, "Sins of the Fathers," *National Review*, February 11, 2002; Stephen Brady, "By Their Fruits You Shall Know Them," *Roman Catholic Faithful Newsletter*, Winter 2001-2002, pp. 10-11.

²⁸⁰ A. Jones, "A Chronology of Sex Abuse in Southern California."

Ryan's resigned one week before a lawsuit was filed naming him a co-defendant in the case of late Fr. Alvin Campbell, who was convicted in 1985 for the abuse of seven other children. The 1999 lawsuit was filed in the name of Matthew McCormick, one of the alleged victims of Fr. Campbell. The charge against Ryan read: "Bishop Ryan ignored his oath and obligation of celibacy by virtue of multiple homosexual relationships with male prostitutes and other priests or deacons." Ryan denied the charges.²⁸¹

The Diocese of Springfield reached an out-of-court \$3 million settlement with McCormick and the other 27 alleged victims of Campbell. In 2002 the Diocese referred the allegations involving Ryan and a teen-age boy to the State attorney's office. But prosecutors declined to pursue the matter because the statute of limitations had expired.²⁸²

* In 2000 Eric Patterson, 29, killed himself in the Diocese of Wichita, KS. The family blamed the deep depression of the young man on the sexual abuse that began at age 13 by his parish priest, **Fr. Robert Larson**. Later, the Pattersons learned that the Diocese had been informed

²⁸¹ Facsimiles of both the handwritten alleged letter of Frank Berger and the lawsuit text of Matthew McCormick can be found at the Roman Catholic Faithful website. See also Lisa Kernek, "Abuse Victims Get \$3 Million," *The State Journal-Register* (Springfield, IL), online edition; Toby Westerman, "Sex Scandal Death Knell for the Church?" *WorldNetDaily*, July 17, 2002, online edition. Regarding Danny Evans, see Stephen Brady, "The Doorway to the Corrupt Hierarchy," Roman Catholic Faithful Newsletter, Fall-Winter 2002, p. 16.

On Fr. Alvin Campbell see p. 171.

²⁸² Lisa Kernek, "Abuse Victims Get \$3 Million," *The State Journal-Register*, online edition.

in 1981 – a year and a half before Larson came to the Pat-
tersons’ parish – that Larson had molested a Wichita altar
boy in 1972. Six altar boys who served under Fr. Larson
have committed suicide. He went to jail.²⁸³

* In 2001, the California Dioceses of Los Angeles
and Orange agreed to pay \$5.2 million to Ryan DiMaria,
who with four other persons accused **Msgr. Michael Har-
ris** of molesting them when they were teenagers.²⁸⁴ One of
the conditions DiMaria imposed for settlement was that
both Dioceses should adopt a “zero tolerance” policy to-
ward pedophile priests. Without explaining that his Arch-
diocese had been forced to accept this policy as part of the
DiMaria settlement, Cardinal Mahony looked like the au-
thor and pioneer of the zero-tolerance policy, which was
later adopted by almost all the American Bishops.

3. The Clergy Pedophilia Scandal Explodes

To portray the explosion of pedophile scandals that
has blasted the credibility of the Catholic Church in the
U.S., a chronology of some of the more significant and
easy-to-find cases will be presented. The fuse leading to the
barrel of gunpowder was lit in late 2001.

* November 2001 – Since **Fr. John Geoghan** was
facing 84 separate civil lawsuits and two criminal trials,
Superior Court’s Judge Constance Sweeney ruled that the

²⁸³ J. Wilson, “The Enemy Within,” p. 31.

²⁸⁴ L.A. *New Times*, May 2, 2002, *apud* Concerned Roman Catholics
of America, “The Shocking 22-Year Record of L.A.’s Archbishop,” n.
49; A. Jones, “Sex Abuse Scandal Hits Los Angeles,” *National Catholic
Reporter*, March 15, 2002.

documents surrounding his case should be made public by the Archdiocese of Boston.²⁸⁵ Cardinal Bernard Law and five other Bishops of that Archdiocese were named defendants in many of the pending lawsuits, charged with negligence for not properly supervising Geoghan. Up to that date the Archdiocese had already paid \$10 million to settle around 50 previous lawsuits against Geoghan. Another 89 lawsuits were still pending against him.²⁸⁶

– 2002 –

* January 6, 2002 – The *Boston Globe* published the first article of a series on clergy pedophilia, which triggered the start of the American media's close attention to the topic. The newspaper had received court approval to read and make public the first available documents on the Geoghan case.²⁸⁷ Its report showed that Fr. John Geoghan had been accused of abusing around 130 boys during his six parish assignments in 34 years as a priest. Records revealed, for example, that during his first year in Boston in 1984, Cardinal Bernard Law assigned Geoghan to St. Julia's in Weston, even though he had been removed from his two prior parishes for molesting children. The report demonstrated that the Archdiocese had been warned about Geoghan's predatory behavior at least 15 years before he was removed from the active ministry in January 1993.

²⁸⁵ Philip Lawler, "The Scandal in Boston – And Beyond," *The Catholic World Report*, March 2002, pp. 36, 40.

²⁸⁶ "Sins of the Fathers," *Newsweek*, p. 44.

²⁸⁷ "Chronology of the Cases," *The Catholic World Report*, June 2002, p. 4.

Rather than removing him from the priesthood, the records showed, Church leaders simply placed him in new parishes, where he continued to work with children. Geoghan was only removed from the priesthood in 1998.²⁸⁸

* January 17, 2002 – Massachusetts Attorney General Tom Reilly insisted that the Boston Archdiocese should report all past cases of sexual abuses.²⁸⁹

* January 19, 2002 – Fr. Geoghan was found guilty by the Middlesex Superior Court in Cambridge, MS, in his first criminal trial. He was charged with indecent assault and battery against a 10-year-old boy.²⁹⁰ The official verdict, issued February 21, sentenced him to a nine-year prison term.²⁹¹

* January 26, 2002 – Another Boston priest, **Fr. Ronald Paquin**, admitted to molesting children.²⁹² On May 15, Paquin was indicted on three counts of raping a boy between 1989 and 1992. One of the most serious allegations against him was that in 1981 he molested a 16-year-old boy, James Francis. Later, under the influence of alcohol, Paquin fell asleep while driving, causing a car accident.

²⁸⁸ P. Lawler, "The Scandal in Boston – And Beyond," pp. 36, 40; E. Mehren, "Cardinal Testifies He Knew of Abuse by Priest in '84," *Los Angeles Times*, May 9, 2002; "Boston Cardinal Offers Apology to Sex Abuse Victims," *National Catholic Reporter*, January 18, 2002.

²⁸⁹ P. Lawler, "The Scandal in Boston – And Beyond," p. 40.

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*; E. Mehren, "Cardinal Testifies He Knew of Abuse by Priest in '84"; Chuck Colbert and Gill Donovan, "Former Priest Convicted of Abuse," *National Catholic Reporter*, February 1, 2002.

²⁹¹ Chuck Colbert, "Catholics Grapple With Scandal at Parish Forum," *National Catholic Reporter*, March 1, 2002.

²⁹² P. Lawler, "The Scandal in Boston – And Beyond," p. 40.

The boy, a passenger, was killed.²⁹³ In April 2002 the parents of Francis filed a wrongful death suit against the Archdiocese. They said for years the Diocese had known about the complaints of molestation leveled against Paquin by parishioners at St. Monica's, where he ran youth programs between 1974 and 1980.²⁹⁴ On December 31, Paquin pleaded guilty to three charges of oral rape of a child and received a 12-year prison sentence.²⁹⁵

* January 31, 2002 – The *Boston Globe* stated that the Boston Archdiocese had settled lawsuits involving 70 different pedophile priests.²⁹⁶

* February 25, 2002 – In Marathon County District Court, **Fr. Timothy Svea** from the Institute of Christ the King Sovereign Priest pleaded guilty to sexual abuse of a minor, for actions committed while he was at the Institute's location in Wausau, Wisconsin. He was charged with sexual assault, indecent exposure, false imprisonment, and exhibition of pornography. The offenses date from April 1999 through February 2000. He was sentenced to a 20-year prison term.²⁹⁷

* February 2002 – The *Arizona Daily Star* called for the resignation of Bishop Manuel Moreno of Tucson

²⁹³ "Abusive Priest Reassigned After Settlements," *National Catholic Reporter*, June 7, 2002.

²⁹⁴ O'Ryan Johnson and Jason Tait, "Parents Pursuing Wrongful Death Suit," *Eagle-Tribune*, April 11, 2002.

²⁹⁵ G. Donovan, "Priest Says He Also Was Victim of Clerical Abuse," *National Catholic Reporter*, January 17, 2003.

²⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁹⁷ "Wisconsin Priest Pleads Guilty to Sex Abuse of Minor," *National Catholic Reporter*, March 15, 2002.

after the disclosure that Church officials had quietly paid millions of dollars in restitution to nine former altar boys to settle accusations of priest sexual abuse. The sexual assaults were said to begin in 1967 and span two decades, involving four Arizona priests. One case occurred at St. John's Seminary in Camarillo, CA., where a Tucson priest, Msgr. Robert Trupia,²⁹⁸ hosted "Come and See" weekends for teenagers.²⁹⁹ According to a news report by the *Boston Globe*, Lynne Cadigan, an attorney for the clergy abuse victims, got a settlement of \$14 million for 11 lawsuits against Trupia.³⁰⁰

One year later (March 2003) Pope John Paul II accepted Bishop Moreno's resignation. At the Mass in which he announced his resignation, he apologized to victims of priest abuse.³⁰¹

* In February 2002 Cardinal Law suspended from the active ministry eight priests who were accused of sexual abuse of minors. Seven of them acknowledged the accusations were true. The eighth, Fr. George Spagnolia, publicly denied the charges, arguing that he had had homosexual relations with adults, but he did not abuse minors.³⁰²

²⁹⁸ On Trupia see pp. 220-1.

²⁹⁹ "Sins of the Fathers," *Newsweek*, p. 45; William Lobdell, "Catholic Church to Pay Settlement to Close Abuse Cases," *Los Angeles Times*, January 30, 2002.

³⁰⁰ Michael Rezendes, "Bishop of Tucson Diocese Resigns," *Boston Globe*, March 8, 2003.

³⁰¹ *Ibid.*

³⁰² C. Colbert, "Pressure Over Abuse Cases Mounts," *National Catholic Reporter*, March 15, 2002.

* March 9, 2002 – Cardinal Bernard Law presided over the ninth annual meeting of Church leaders and parish representatives of the Boston Archdiocese. Present were 2,500 Catholics. The subject was the sex abuse scandal. Several representatives asked the Cardinal to step down. One said that the Archdiocese did not just make “tragic mistakes,” but acted with reckless decision. A representative of the Boston North Region noted that the Diocese needed to accept the responsibility for its misdeeds:

“We have somehow made the media out to be a problem, but we wouldn’t be here without the media. Your resignation is warranted and needed.”³⁰³

* March 15, 2002 – *The Boston Pilot*, official newspaper of the Archdiocese, published an editorial titled “Question that must be faced,” written by Msgr. Peter Conley, the paper’s executive director and close confidant of Cardinal Bernard Law. The editorial stated Boston’s child molestation cases involving the Church raised questions about whether there would be fewer scandals if celibacy were optional for priests, and whether the priesthood by its nature attracts an unusually high number of homosexual men. These questions generated intense media commentary.

One week later (March 21) another editorial stated that the first piece had been misinterpreted. The paper said it was only reporting what rank-and-file Catholics were saying about celibacy, and that the piece was not to be construed as a desire “to call for changes in Church poli-

³⁰³ “Cardinal Law Hears Concerns of Boston Catholics,” *America*, April 1, 2002.

cies.”³⁰⁴ Cardinal Law issued a statement saying the editorial had “unfortunately created confusion.” He tried to cover for his Archdiocesan paper’s controversial piece, stating:

“It is one thing to report the question of others, it is quite another thing to make those questions one’s own.”³⁰⁵

* March 19, 2002 – Archbishop Rembert Weakland wrote a letter saying that the pedophile crisis in the Church opened the doors to discuss priestly celibacy.

“Perhaps this will be the moment when the larger issue of priestly ministry in the Church will be faced.”

Another door was opened, he added, when the Pope allowed married Episcopalian priests to become Catholic priests. Such discussion, he wrote, “could be the kind of breakthrough that will force us to move ahead in unexpected ways.”³⁰⁶

* March 20, 2002 – Cardinal Edward Egan of New York faced accusations that he had allowed several priests with multiple charges of sexual abuse to continue working for years.³⁰⁷ The *Hartford Courant*, which published the

³⁰⁴ “Catholic Newspaper Says Editorial Misinterpreted,” *Los Angeles Times*, March 22, 2002; “Editorial Says Questions About Priesthood Must Be Addressed,” *America*, April 1, 2002, p. 5.

³⁰⁵ Larry Stammer, “Scandal Puts New Focus on Celibacy,” *Los Angeles Times*, March 27, 2002; Mark Jurkowitz, “The Media – At Cross-purpose?” *Boston Globe*, April 25, 2002.

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁰⁷ Elizabeth Hamilton and Eric Rich, “Egan Protected Abusive Priests,” *Hartford Courant*, March 17, 2002.

report, relied on data in secret court documents. They showed that three Hartford priests, **Fr. Charles Carr**, **Fr. Raymond Pcolka** and **Fr. Laurence Brett**, though facing multiple charges of abuse, were allowed by Egan to continue their ministries in the Diocese during the time Cardinal Egan was Bishop of Bridgeport, from 1988 to 2000. The documents were supposed to have been under a court-ordered seal following a \$12 million settlement against Diocesan priests made in March 2001. The newspaper has not revealed how it obtained the documents.³⁰⁸

* March 21, 2002 – In his annual letter to the priests, John Paul II addressed the question of pedophilia. It was said that many Bishops had urged the Pope to write on the topic. The Pontiff acknowledged the problem:

“They [the errant priests] have betrayed the grace of ordination in succumbing to the most grievous forms of the *mysterium iniquitatis* [mystery of evil] at work in the world.”

The Pope offered no suggestions on practical measures to resolve the problem, nor did he comment directly on how the Bishops had handled the controversy. He limited his words to some general lines on the topic. He wrote:

“All of us, conscious of human weakness but trusting in the healing power of divine grace, are called to embrace the *mysterium crucis* [mystery of

³⁰⁸ “Documents Provoke Criticism of Cardinal,” *National Catholic Reporter*, March 29, 2002.

the cross] and to commit ourselves more fully to the search for holiness.”³⁰⁹

While the Pope said that the Church “shows her concern for the victims and strives to respond in truth and justice to each of these painful situations,” he stressed the scandal’s impact on the priesthood:

“Grave scandal is caused, with the result that a dark shadow of suspicion is cast over all the other fine priests who perform their ministry with honesty and integrity and often with heroic self-sacrifice.”³¹⁰

He used virtually the same words in 1993 at the Denver World Youth Day, declaring that the sexual abuse of minors had caused “suffering and scandal.” Several experts on the Vatican, reported the *Los Angeles Times*, regarded this letter as evidence that the Vatican has failed to recognize the incendiary nature of the moral and financial crisis confronting the Church.³¹¹

* Fr. Richard McBrien, progressivist professor of Theology at the University of Notre Dame, observed that the Pope’s remarks constituted “a totally inadequate response.” He commented:

“It is some acknowledgment of the crisis. At least it is a fresh start. But if it were to be the only step, it would be totally inadequate. This crisis is far

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*; John Allen, “Vatican Defends Church’s Handling of Sexual Abuse Accusations,” *National Catholic Reporter*, March 29, 2002.

³¹⁰ L. Stammer, “Pontiff Speaks on Sex Abuse,” *Los Angeles Times*, March 22, 2002.

³¹¹ *Ibid.*

more serious than the Pope's advisors in the Vatican think." ³¹²

* March 25, 2002 – Cardinal Mahony celebrated a Mass in Long Beach for around 300 priests of the Archdiocese. In the homily he addressed the question of pedophilia. He stated: "I have never felt so devastated, so sad, and so besieged." He recognized that the truthfulness, honesty, and credibility of the Church had been deeply wounded, and called this a "time of purification" for her.

After the Mass, talking to the press he assumed full responsibility as head of the nation's largest Archdiocese for the sins of the past. "I offer my sincere apologies," he said. Dealing with the question of priestly celibacy, the Cardinal, though recognizing the official Vatican orientation, said the topic remained open to discussion:

"I have never said we can not discuss these things. The Eastern Catholic churches have always had a married priesthood, and it works out fine." ³¹³

He concluded:

"So, I think it should be discussed, very much discussed." ³¹⁴

* March 29, 2002 – *The Cleveland Plain Dealer* reported that a woman, whose feet were washed by Bishop Anthony Pilla on Holy Thursday as a symbol of apology from the Diocese, had been abused by **Fr. Martin Louis**

³¹² *Ibid.*

³¹³ L. Stammer and R. Winton, "Mahony Won't Name Abusers," *Los Angeles Times*, March 26, 2002.

³¹⁴ L. Stammer, "Scandal Puts New Focus on Celibacy," *Los Angeles Times*, March 27, 2002.

when she was eight-years-old. The abuse continued until she was age 11. According to the report, Fr. Louis has admitted having molested over 90 children while a priest in Cleveland. The Diocese has estimated that he abused 12 to 16 victims. Louis was indicted on 14 counts of rape in 1992. He pleaded guilty to one count as part of a plea bargain and was sentenced to 5 to 25 years in prison.³¹⁵

* March 29, 2002 – The shocking case of **Fr. Donald Kimball** came to light. A 38-year-old woman alleged she had been raped in 1977 by the priest behind the altar at Resurrection Church in Santa Rosa, CA, when she was age 14. She claimed that sexual encounters continued and when she became pregnant, Kimball arranged for an abortion. According to the Diocese attorney, \$120,000 had been paid to the woman for counseling.³¹⁶

Later, on June 7, 2002, Fr. Kimball was sentenced to seven years in prison for molesting a 13-year-old girl in 1981. Lawsuits filed by four of Kimball's victims were settled for \$1.6 million in 2000.³¹⁷

* March, 2002 – **Bishop Anthony O'Connell** of Palm Beach, FL, resigned after admitting that he had fondled a boy repeatedly between 1977 and 1980. At the time he was head of a high school seminary in Hannibal, MO.³¹⁸

³¹⁵ G. Donovan, "Forgiveness Marks Holy Thursday Service," *National Catholic Reporter*, April 12, 2002; "Local Priest at Center of Abuse Allegations from 1967," WKYC in alliance with Cleveland.com Internet site, March 28, 2002.

³¹⁶ A. Jones, "National Crisis Draws Attention to Local Abuse Cases."

³¹⁷ G. Kovner, "Santa Rosa Priests, Victims Meet," *National Catholic Reporter*, July 5, 2002.

³¹⁸ "New Bishop for Scandal-Hit Diocese," *Los Angeles Times*, October 20, 2002.

In 1996 the Missouri Diocese paid the youth, Christopher Dixon, a \$125,000 settlement to drop the case against O'Connell and two other diocesan priests.

In an astonishing turn of events, O'Connell was sent from Missouri to Florida in 1999 to take over the Palm Beach Diocese from another abuser, Bishop J. Keith Symons. Symons was the first American Bishop to resign as a result of sex offenses against children.

Revelations of O'Connell's past might not have surfaced if Dixon had remained silent. But he did not. Troubled by the sexual abuse scandal in Boston, Dixon divulged the facts of his abuse by O'Connell and the secret settlement to the *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, which published the story.

Since the resignation of O'Connell as Bishop, three other former seminarians at St. Thomas Aquinas have come forward to accuse O'Connell of sex abuse.³¹⁹

* March, 2002 – The Jesuit magazine *America* published an editorial about the sexual abuse by priests stating that the Hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the U.S. was incapable of investigating itself.³²⁰

* In March 2002, Archbishop John Foley, president of the Pontifical Council for Social Communications, suggested to Pope John Paul II that the Church dedicate three days during Holy Week as a period of prayer and repara-

³¹⁹ Margot Patterson, "Scandal's Fallout Still Settling in Palm Beach," *National Catholic Reporter*, March 14, 2003; Mary Jo Malone, "Forgive Me Father, but It Is You Who Sinned," *St. Petersburg Times*, March 12, 2002.

³²⁰ L. Stammer, "Pontiff Speaks on Sex Abuse," *Los Angeles Times*, March 22, 2002

tion for the “tragic moral flaws” revealed in the lives of some priests.³²¹ A similar proposal was made by American Bishops, with a generic endorsement by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger,³²² but no official action on the suggestion seems to have been taken.

* Regarding the concern that many false accusations of pedophilia have been made against priests, the FBI has found the false accusations to be no more frequent than for other crimes.³²³

Patrick Schlitz, dean of the Law School at the University of St. Thomas in Minnesota, has served as a Church diocesan defending attorney in over 500 cases of sexual abuse. Given his experience, he is often quoted as an authority on the topic. For example, in a *New York Times* report of August 31, 2002, Schlitz stated he believed that in his 500 cases, “fewer than 10 priests” were falsely accused.³²⁴

* April 2, 2002 – A former chancellor of the Chicago Archdiocese under the late Cardinal Joseph Bernardin and former vicar (1995-2000) to Cardinal Francis George was removed from ministry after accusations of sexual abuse. The departures of **Fr. R. Peter Bowman** and

³²¹ “Vatican Official Says Clerical Abuse Offends God, Children,” *America*, April 1, 2002.

³²² J. Allen, “Ratzinger Endorses Day of Penance for Abuse,” *National Catholic Reporter*, May 10, 2002.

³²³ Pegi Taylor, “Beyond Myths and Denial,” *America*, April 1, 2002.

³²⁴ Gill Donovan, “Databases Hold Abusers’ Names,” *National Catholic Reporter*, January 2003.

another priest were requested after the allegations were found credible by the diocesan review board.³²⁵

* April 3, 2002 – The Vatican was named a defendant in two lawsuits filed by attorney Jeffrey Anderson. The *first*, in Pinellas County Circuit Court in St. Petersburg, Florida, accused **Fr. William Burke** of molesting Rick Gomez in 1987 at the Salesian-run Mary Help of Christians School in Tampa, FL. The *second* lawsuit, filed in the District Court in Portland, OR, accused **Fr. Andrew Ronan** of sexually abusing a youth at age 15 in 1965-1966.

Church leaders were charged with protecting priests accused of molesting children by transferring them to other states and countries to avoid prosecution. The plaintiffs' attorney said he had evidence implicating the Vatican in the cover-up. Vatican spokesman Joaquin Navarro-Valls refused to comment on the litigation.³²⁶

* April 4, 2002 – **Fr. Don Rooney**, associate pastor of St. Anthony of Padua Parish in Parma, Ohio, was found dead from a self-inflicted gunshot. Three days earlier he had been accused of having sexually abused a child 22 years ago.³²⁷ Cuyahoga County Police ruled the death a suicide. Cleveland Bishop Anthony Pilla preached at Rooney's funeral Mass. He said:

³²⁵ Mickey Ciokajlo and Monica Davey, "Ex-deputy to George, Bernardin Accused" *Chicago Tribune* online edition, February 7, 2004; "Chronology of Cases," *Chicago Tribune*, *apud The Catholic World Report*, June 2002, p. 4.

³²⁶ "Vatican Named a Defendant in Clergy Sex Abuse Lawsuits," *National Catholic Reporter*, April 19, 2002.

³²⁷ "Chronology of the Cases," p. 4

“The message of Fr. Rooney’s death is hidden from our eyes. Yet we cannot conclude that his life and death had no meaning or were rejected by God.”³²⁸

Twelve U.S. Catholic priests accused of sexually abusing children have killed themselves since 1986, according to an investigation by the Cleveland *Plain Dealer* conducted after Rooney’s suicide.³²⁹

* April 8, 2002 – The Archdiocese of Boston released 1,600 pages of documents on **Fr. Paul Shanley**, forced into the open by a court order. New revelations on moral aberrations of Fr. Paul Shanley came to the public domain: in addition to being a confessed pedophile and advocating love between man and boys at a conference in February 1977, he also defended bestiality and incest.³³⁰

Cardinal Bernard Law wrote a letter to Shanley on his retirement dated February 29, 1993 in which he stated:

“You brought God’s Word and His love to His people and I know that that continues to be your goal despite difficult limitations.”³³¹

The released documents showed that archdiocesan officials knew about sex abuse allegations against Shanley as early as 1967.

³²⁸ “Ohio Priest Accused of Abuse Found Dead,” *National Catholic Reporter*, April 19, 2002; “Priest Suicides Tied to Sex Charges?” *CBSNews* online edition, May 25, 2003.

³²⁹ “Priest Suicides Tied to Sex Charges?” *Ibid.*

³³⁰ E. Mehren, “Judge Orders Access to Priest’s File,” *Los Angeles Times*, May 14, 2002; E. Mehren, “Cardinal Testifies He Knew of Abuse by Priest in ‘84.” On Shanley see pp. 124, 246, 228-9.

³³¹ C. Colbert, “Documents Provoke Fresh Anger,” *National Catholic Reporter*, April 19, 2002.

Attorney Roderick MacLeish, who obtained the veiled documents, called the documents astonishing for what they say about the depth of the Archdiocese's knowledge of Shanley's sexual habits and for the disdain they show for his victims. He said there were 26 known victims to date.³³²

* In the documents released by the Boston Archdiocese, the names of 80 priests who had sexually molested minors over the past 50 years appeared.

The Archdiocese of Philadelphia reported that there were "credible allegations" against 35 priests.

The Archdiocese of Chicago reported 40 priests in analogous cases.³³³

The Diocese of Brooklyn, NY, handed over files on 15 priests accused of sexual misconduct in the past to district attorneys.³³⁴

* April 8, 2002 – **Fr. Roman Ferraro**, a Brooklyn diocesan priest suspended since 1988, was arraigned in a Massachusetts court in charges of rape and indecent assault on a child under age 14 between 1973 and 1980.³³⁵

* April 10, 2002 – **Fr. Bryan Kuchar**, a St. Louis archdiocesan vocations official and associate pastor at a South St. Louis parish, was arrested by police on six

³³² Walter Robinson and Thomas Farragher, "Shanley's Record Long Ignored," *Boston Globe*, April 9, 2002.

³³³ Stephen Rossetti, "The Catholic Church and Child Sexual Abuse," *America*, April 22, 2002, p. 10.

³³⁴ "Concern Rises As Crisis Grows," *National Catholic Reporter*, April 26, 2002.

³³⁵ *Ibid.*

charges of statutory sodomy for alleged sexual assault on a 14-year-old boy in 1995.³³⁶

* April 12, 2002 – **Fr. Paul Desilets** was indicted by a grand jury in Worcester County, MA, on charges of molesting 18 boys while serving at a church in Bellingham between 1978 and 1984.³³⁷ In 1984, he moved back to his native Canada. On January 10, 2003 the Quebec court initiated preliminary measures to extradite him to Massachusetts, where he faces a 32-count indictment for sexual abuse of 18 altar boys.³³⁸

* Around April 13, 2002, Cardinal Law traveled to Rome to confer with the Pope and Vatican officials about his future. He returned to Boston and announced that he would continue as Archbishop as long as God would permit him to serve.³³⁹

* April 22, 2002 – *America*, the U.S. Jesuit organ, reported that since 1985 Church out-of-court payments added to the jury awards in the pedophile clerical scandal could well reach \$1 billion.³⁴⁰

* William Donohue, president and C.E.O. of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, defended most of the recent media coverage of the sex abuse scandal of priests. Although some writers and cartoonists have

³³⁶ *Ibid.*

³³⁷ *Ibid.*

³³⁸ *National Catholic Reporter*, "Lay Group Urges Preservation of Records," January 24, 2003.

³³⁹ Larry Stammer, Beth Schuster, and Richard Boudreaux, "Key U.S. Clerics Plan to Push for Law's Removal," *Los Angeles Times*, April 22, 2002.

³⁴⁰ Editorial, *America*, April 22, 2002, p. 3.

gotten out of control, he stated he was satisfied with the overall reporting:

“The media did not cause this problem. The Catholic Church brought it on herself. Most of the hard-news reporting on TV and in newspapers has been fair, as have the editorials.”³⁴¹

* April 22, 2002 – In face of the escalating sexual abuse scandal, several senior American Cardinals urged the Vatican to ask Cardinal Bernard Law to resign as Archbishop of Boston. The American Bishops are all but unanimous in believing that Law must leave Boston for the good of the Church, said an American Cardinal, who asked to remain anonymous.³⁴²

The Cardinal said he had been commissioned by other Prelates to take their request against Law directly to the Pope John Paul II’s inner circle. He told the *Los Angeles Times*:

“If the Holy See wants to send a strong signal of quality and standards of leadership, Law will have to be replaced. This cannot be a phase out.”

An American Bishop, also requesting anonymity, noted that “many Bishops are of the mind that the healing process really can’t begin until there is a change of leadership in Boston.”³⁴³

* April 23, 2002 – At a preparatory meeting at the Vatican before a session with the Pope, 12 American Car-

³⁴¹ News Briefs, *America*, April 22, 2002, p. 5.

³⁴² L. Stammer, B. Schuster, and R. Boudreaux, “Key U.S. Clerics Plan to Push for Law’s Removal.”

³⁴³ *Ibid.*

dinals and two Bishops discussed the topics of priestly celibacy, homosexuality in the seminaries, and whether homosexuals should be excluded from the priesthood. They did not arrive at any concrete conclusions.

It is worthy of note that there was no more talk about the resignation of Law, who was present at the meeting.

Bishop Wilton Gregory, president of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, present at the Vatican meeting, called for direct engagement:

“We have passed the time for *mea culpa*. We are in the season for action.”

Some American Cardinals were demanding a strong statement from the Pope, according to the *L.A. Times*.³⁴⁴ The newspaper also reported that the Prelates were studying the idea of creating a national layperson’s panel to advise the U.S. Bishops Conference on the issue.³⁴⁵

* April 23, 2002 – John Paul II delivered a speech on the pedophile crisis to the American Prelates. His words were designed to please both Greeks and Trojans, that is, the Catholic laymen indignant over the abuses and cover-ups, as well as the ecclesiastics. To please the American Catholic faithful the Pope stated:

“The abuse which has caused this crisis is by every standard wrong and rightly considered a crime by society; it is an appalling sin in the eyes of God. To the victims and their families, wherever they may

³⁴⁴ L. Stammer and R. Boudreaux, “Priesthood Has ‘No Place’ for Abusers, Pope Declares,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 24, 2002.

³⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

be, I express my profound sense of solidarity and concern.”³⁴⁶

John Paul II also spoke generically against those who abuse minors:

“People need to know that there is no place in the priesthood and religious life for those who would harm the young.”³⁴⁷

On the other hand, to please the ecclesiastics, no punitive legal measures against the guilty abusers were mentioned. Nor did he offer any explicit guidance on whether the Church should remove a guilty priest from his ministry, much less from the priesthood. In fact, he seemed to insinuate the opposite with this affirmation:

“We cannot forget the power of Christian conversion, that radical decision to turn away from sin and back to God, which reaches to the depths of a person’s soul and can work extraordinary change.”³⁴⁸

Commenting on the ambiguity of this passage, the *Los Angeles Times* noted:

“Whether a priest undergoing such a ‘conversion’ would be allowed to remain a priest remained open to question.”³⁴⁹

³⁴⁶ “Abuse an ‘Appalling Sin’ in God’s Eyes, Pope Says,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 24, 2002.

³⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁴⁹ L. Stammer and R. Boudreaux, “Priesthood Has ‘No Place’ for Abusers, Pope Declares.”

According to a *Commonweal* report on the meetings, these were the main measures supported by the Vatican with regard to the sex abuse scandal in the U.S.:

- Bishops should not turn over names of accused priests to civil authorities.
- Bishops are not liable for the criminal acts of priests, unless they have connived in them.
- Bishops should not make civil settlements with victims.
- An accused priest cannot be required to have psychological tests or seek therapy.
- A priest's past record of abuse should not be revealed in a new assignment.³⁵⁰

This “do-nothing” response to the crisis was also summarized in an article in the Jesuit publication *La Civiltà Cattolica* on May 20, 2002 by Fr. Gianfranco Ghirlanda, SJ, a canon lawyer and Vatican adviser, as well as dean of the Canon Law Faculty at Gregorian University.³⁵¹

* April 23, 2002 – Eight Benedictines monks at St. John's Abbey in Collegeville, MN, admitted to having committed sexual abuse of children.³⁵²

* April 24, 2002 – The American Cardinals issued a common statement at the end of their meetings at the Vatican. It expressed general plans and the need for moral reform, but lacked any practical measures against sex

³⁵⁰ “The Do-Nothings,” editorial, *Commonweal*, June 1, 2002, p. 6.

³⁵¹ *Ibid.*

³⁵² “Chronicle of the Cases,” *Insight Magazine*, *apud The Catholic World Report*, June 2002, p. 8.

abuser priests.³⁵³ Barbara Blaine, founder of Survivors Network of Those Abused by Priests, summarized the document's lack of teeth:

“Historically, there has been, and there remains a huge gap between what Bishops say and what Bishops do. Their promises sound good, but their performance is lacking.”³⁵⁴

An editorial in *Commonweal* magazine interpreted the visit of the American Prelates to the Vatican as a symptom of disagreement about the issue:

“The unprecedented meeting of the U.S. Cardinals at the Vatican revealed significant disagreement on how to respond to the sex abuse crisis in the United States. Were the differences among the American Cardinals or between the American and curial officials? Or did the disagreements cut across curial-episcopal lines? Hard to know.”³⁵⁵

* In an interview with Italian magazine *Il Regno*, Cardinal Godfried Danneels of Brussels criticized the American meetings at the Vatican. According to Danneels, the American Bishops should not have gone to the Vatican to ask for help, since each Bishops Conference should be able to handle its own problems. Therefore, the American

³⁵³ “U.S. Cardinals See Need to Reaffirm Moral Lessons,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 25, 2002.

³⁵⁴ L. Stammer and R. Boudreaux, “Cardinals Call for Policy to Defrock Abusive Priests,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 25, 2002.

³⁵⁵ “The Do-Nothings,” *Commonweal*, June 1, 2002, p. 6.

Bishops did not handle the sex abuse scandal well. “I believe panic played a large role,” he said.³⁵⁶

* April 29, 2002 – **Fr. Carl Sutphin**, assigned to the new Cathedral of Los Angeles, was reported to the police and forced to retire by Cardinal Mahony because of accusations he had sexually abused four boys in the 1960s and ‘70s.

One of the alleged victims, Andrew Cicchillo, said he told Church officials in 1989 that he and his brother were molested when the priest was at St. Rose of Lima parish in Maywood. In 1991 he wrote a letter to Cardinal Mahony making the same allegations. “They promised me he would retire and not be allowed to wear a collar,” said Cicchillo.³⁵⁷

In 1995, however, Sutphin was given a position at St. Bibiana’s Cathedral in downtown Los Angeles. In 2001 he was named associate pastor at the new Cathedral of Our Lady of the Angels. In a 2002 interview, Cicchillo said he broke his silence when he heard that Sutphin was working in Church institutions with opportunities to interact with children.

In February 2002 Sutphin was permanently removed from his ministry. On April 4, 2003 he was arrested and sent to jail by Ventura County authorities, with reports he would be arraigned in Ventura County Superior Court.³⁵⁸

³⁵⁶ “Danneels: U.S. Bishops Could Have Handled Scandal,” *America*, July 29, 2002, p. 5.

³⁵⁷ A. Jones, “A Chronology of Sex Abuse in Southern California.”

³⁵⁸ Jennifer Ragland and Steve Chawkins, “Retired Priest Is Held in ‘70s Sex Abuse,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 5, 2003.

* April 30, 2002 – Civil suits were filed on behalf of two sets of brothers that accused Cardinal Mahony of running a criminal enterprise. He was sued in Los Angeles Superior Court under a federal racketeering law (RICO) typically used to dismantle organized crime operations. The lawsuits allege that Mahony protected abusive priests as head of the Archdiocese, a pattern of behavior that constitutes a criminal enterprise.³⁵⁹

* According to a survey conducted by *ABC News*, the *Washington Post* and *BeliefNet*, 71% of Catholics in the U.S. said that the sex abuse issue is “a major problem that demands immediate attention.” Also 71% termed the ongoing scandal a “crisis” for the Church. In the poll 70% said they were either angry or dissatisfied with how the Church was handling the situation.³⁶⁰

* May 7, 2002 – A woman has asked Mahony to help to identify the priest who is the father of her daughter. Rita Milla said she became pregnant at age 16 by one of the seven priests who had sex with her 20 years ago. She said the Diocese tried to cover-up the abuse by arranging for her trip to the Philippines to keep her pregnancy a secret. She delivered the baby at the Ilocos Norte Provincial Hospital. One of the priests who abused Milla was **Fr. Santiago Tamayo**, who apologized to her in 1991.³⁶¹

* May 8, 2002 – Cardinal Bernard Law was obliged by Superior Court Judge Constance Sweeney to be present at a Boston tribunal to testify in the Fr. John Geoghan case.

³⁵⁹ A. Jones, “A Chronology of Sex Abuse in Southern California.”

³⁶⁰ “Catholics See Abuse as Major Problem for Church,” *America*, April 22, 2002, p. 4.

³⁶¹ A. Jones, “A Chronology of Sex Abuse in Southern California.”

The main accusation lawyer, Mitchell Garabedian, representing 86 alleged victims, questioned the Cardinal to verify whether he knew that Geoghan was a pedophile in 1984 and covered up for him.³⁶² Law affirmed he knew about the priest's transfers from one parish to another, but denied knowing the reason for that. He claimed only his subordinates would have known that Geoghan was a pedophile.³⁶³

* May 10 and 14, 2002 – The second and third days of testimony by Cardinal Law took place in the Archdiocesan chancellery. Again, he said he knew nothing and that he relied on subordinates to keep track of a priest suspected of child molestation.³⁶⁴

* May 13, 2002 – **Fr. Maurice Blackwell** a priest of the Baltimore Archdiocese on leave of absence from the priesthood, was shot several times in front of his home by a man who alleged he was sexually abused by the priest in 1993. Blackwell was taken to the hospital in serious but stable condition. The suspect, Dontee Stokes, handed himself over to the police. Police said Stokes wanted an apology from Blackwell and did not receive it.

Blackwell was cleared of the abuse charge at the time, but was later suspended as pastor of a West Baltimore parish in another incident involving accusations of sexual misconduct with a minor. Later, a review panel appointed by Cardinal William Keeler faulted the Archdio-

³⁶² E. Mehren, "Cardinal Testifies He Knew of Abuse by Priest in '84."

³⁶³ E. Mehren, "Subordinates Were Relied on to Stem Abuse, Prelate Says," *Los Angeles Times*, May 11, 2002.

³⁶⁴ *Ibid.*; E. Mehren, "Judge Orders Access to Priest's File."

cese's handling of Stokes' charges, finding them consistent and credible.³⁶⁵

* May 13, 2002 – 177 priests have resigned or been removed from the ministry from January to May 2002, according to *America* magazine.³⁶⁶

* May 14, 2002 – On the eve of the release of a public report by the *Los Angeles Times* on the case of pedophile **Fr. Michael Baker**, Cardinal Mahony faxed a letter to about 1,200 priests of the Archdiocese, presenting his version of the events. The letter has two contradictory affirmations. The Cardinal stated:

“Sometime in late 1986, Baker disclosed to me that he had problems in the past of acting out sexually with two minors.”

Two paragraphs later, he wrote:

“If I had known in those years [during which he transferred Baker from parish to parish] what I discovered in early 2000, I would have dismissed him from the ministry and requested his dismissal from the priesthood in the late 1980s.”³⁶⁷

These statements are contradictory.

The *L.A. Times* report, published on May 16, 2002, gave details furnished by Baker himself on the two meet-

³⁶⁵ “Suspended Priest Shot Over Abuse Allegations,” *National Catholic Reporter*, May 24, 2002; Francis Clines, “Man Is Held in Shooting of Priest He Accused of Abuse,” *New York Times*, May 15, 2002.

³⁶⁶ “177 Priests Resigned or Removed From Ministry Since January,” *America*, May 13, 2002, p. 4.

³⁶⁷ Roger Mahony, “An Apology to My Brother Priests,” *Los Angeles Times*, May 16, 2002.

ings he had with Mahony in 1986, the latter in the presence of two witnesses. At both meetings Baker confessed he was a pedophile. This would also contradict Mahony's second statement and question his honesty on the matter.

Regarding the Cardinal's veracity, it is interesting to consider that April 2002 he denied that Baker had spoken to him about sexual abuse of boys; in May 2002, under media pressure, he changed his story and admitted it.

Further, Baker had continued to molest boys from 1976 until 1999. When two of them wrote a letter to the Archdiocese complaining about Baker's abuse and threatening to file a suit, the Archdiocese rushed to settle, agreeing to give \$1.3 million to the two men with the condition that the case be kept quiet. Mahony did not mention that settlement in his letter.³⁶⁸

* May 27, 2002 – Fr. Andrew Greeley, professor at the Chicago University, made this strong critique about Bishops reassigning abusive priest:

“That Bishops could reassign abusive priests after the early '90s was sinful. There were three sins. *First*, they besmirched the office of Bishop and seriously weakened its credibility. *Second*, they scandalized the Catholic laity, perhaps the worst scandal in the history of this Republic. But [*third*] their gravest sin was to not consider the victims and their families, to blind themselves to the terrible wreckage that sexual abuse causes for human lives.

³⁶⁸ G. Bunting, “Cardinal Mahony Kept Cleric's Abuse Secret for 16 Years,” *Los Angeles Times*, May 16, 2002.

“When I argue that many of our leaders have sinned, I am not judging the state of their conscience. ... I am merely saying that by cooperating with sexual abuse of children and young boys they were objectively sinning They were in fact, according to the strict canons of the old Moral Theology, necessary cooperators in evil and objectively as responsible for the evil as those who actually did it.”³⁶⁹

* May 2002 – To date Archdiocese officials in Boston had turned over the names of close to 100 priests suspected of sexual misconduct.³⁷⁰

* Lawyers for Cardinal Anthony Bevilacqua of Philadelphia argued that the parents of victims are legally responsible for not warning their children of the dangers of sexual abuse. This statement was qualified as “a knavish imbecility” by Fr. Andrew Greeley, Professor at the University of Chicago and the University of Arizona.³⁷¹

* **Fr. Brian Cox** was arrested by police and charged with child abuse. In 1995, his priestly faculties were removed. According to the Archdiocese of Baltimore, Cox admitted to sexual misconduct with minors from 1979 to 1985. He served in different capacities at St. John’s parish from 1978 to 1995.³⁷²

* Forty persons from four Catholic parishes have joined in a lawsuit against the Boston Archdiocese, alleging

³⁶⁹ Andrew Greeley, “Why?” *America*, May 27, 2002, p. 13.

³⁷⁰ E. Mehren, “Judge Orders Access to Priest’s File.”

³⁷¹ A. Greeley, “Why?” *America*, May 27, 2002, p. 12.

³⁷² Joe Feuerherd, “Baltimore Officials Defend Release of Abusers’ Names,” *National Catholic Reporter*, October 18, 2002.

that they were sexually abused as children by **Fr. Joseph Birmingham**, now deceased.

According to the *Boston Globe*, Thomas Blanchette, one of the victims, approached Law at Birmingham's funeral and told Law about the abuse.

Blanchette told the *Globe*:

“And then he [Law] said this: ‘I bind you by the power of the confessional never to speak about this to anyone else.’”

Birmingham has been accused of molesting over 50 minors in a period of more than 30 years.³⁷³

* June 7, 2002 – Two priests at St. John's Abbey in Collegeville, MN, were accused of abusing minors. According to a report in the *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, two men alleged they were abused by **Fr. Dustan Moorse** and **Fr. Allen Tarlton** when they were minors studying at St. John's Prep School near the Abbey. According to Abbot John Klassen, the two priests are among 13 monks who have had “credible accusations” lodged against them.³⁷⁴

Two months later in August, a settlement was reached between the Abbey and 12 to 15 people victimized by Abbey monks in the 1960s, '70s, and '80s. In addition, similar suits of an undisclosed number of other persons

³⁷³ Della Gallagher, “Storm Over Rome,” *Inside the Vatican*, May 2002, p. 16; C. Colbert, “More Allegations Arise in Boston,” *National Catholic Reporter*, April 5, 2002.

³⁷⁴ “Sex Abuse Suit Filed Against St. John's Monks,” *National Catholic Reporter*, June 21, 2002.

were settled. The amount of the agreement was not revealed.³⁷⁵

It later came to light that Abbot Klassen had convoked a mandatory meeting of all monks of St. John's Abbey on April 15. At it he disclosed that former **Abbot John Eindenschink** had sexually abused a monk during his tenure as head of the Benedictine community (1971-79), and another at an earlier date. Eindenschink had admitted the abuse when confronted by Klassen.

The names of two other Benedictine monks under accusation of sexual abuse of children were also disclosed. They were **Fr. Cosmas Dahlheimer** and **Fr. Richard Eckroth**. Fr. Dahlheimer has never admitted wrongdoing but Abbot Klassen affirmed there was "compelling evidence" corroborating his abuse of two children in the '70s.

Fr. Eckroth, who took scores of area youngsters to a St. John's-owned cabin near Bemidji, MN, between 1971 and 1976 and allegedly molested a number of them there, has also denied the accusations. There are numerous victims, however, who have described being fondled, assaulted, raped, and sodomized by Eckroth. He was also suspected of murdering two girls who were stabbed to death in 1974.³⁷⁶ Two different men filed personal injury lawsuits against Richard Eckroth in 1993 accusing him of sexually abusing them when they were age six. Psychologists at St. Luke's Institute in Suitland, MD, who examined

³⁷⁵ "Bishops Form Task Group on Charter," *National Catholic Reporter*, October 18, 2002.

³⁷⁶ Patricia Lefevere, "Scandal," *National Catholic Reporter*, December 13, 2002.

Eckroth, said that there was “substantial evidence that Eckroth has been sexually inappropriate with minors.”³⁷⁷

* June 11, 2002 – The Pope accepted the resignation of **Bishop J. Kendrick Williams** of Lexington, Kentucky. He is facing two allegations of abuse of minors and one allegation of abuse of an 18-year-old male.³⁷⁸

* June 13 to 15, 2002 – At the Dallas meeting of the American Bishops³⁷⁹ much data came to light. Among them were these significant figures:

- Around 250 priests had resigned or been suspended in the last six months.
- Four Bishops had resigned after being accused of pedophilia;
- Two priests had committed suicide after being accused of abuse; one priest had been shot.³⁸⁰

* The result of a poll conducted by *NBC News* with Catholics about their lack of trust in Bishops was released on the same day the Dallas meeting opened. A drastic drop in the confidence of the Catholic faithful in their leaders was apparent. A lay Catholic journalist, Peggy Steinfelds, expressed what many thought:

“Whatever the causes of the scandal, the fact is that the dam has broken. A reservoir of trust among

³⁷⁷ P. Lefereve, “Father is Lion at the Gate Pressing Case Against Priest,” *National Catholic Reporter*, December 27, 2002.

³⁷⁸ “Two Bishops Resign Following Sex Scandals,” *National Catholic Reporter*, June 21, 2002.

³⁷⁹ See Chapter II, 3.

³⁸⁰ Teresa Watanabe, “U.S. Bishops Adopt Policy on Sex Abuse,” *Los Angeles Times*, June 15, 2002.

Catholics has run dry. This scandal has brought home to lay people how essentially powerless they are to affect the outcome.”³⁸¹

* June 23, 2002 – In a letter read in the 287 churches of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, Cardinal Roger Mahony apologized for his past conduct regarding sexual abuse of children:

“I ask for your forgiveness for not understanding earlier the extent of the problem, and for not taking swifter action to remove from the ministry anyone who had abused a minor in the past.”³⁸²

* June 26, 2002 – The website *Beliefnet* conducted a search using public documents, newspapers reports, interviews with victim’s groups, lawyers, and leading Catholic thinkers to see who would be considered “America’s Worst Bishops.” Under this title the site published the following hierarchy of bad Prelates beginning with the worst:

Cardinal Bernard Law, Boston
 Bishop Thomas J. O’Brien, Phoenix
 Bishop Charles Grahmann, Dallas
 Bishop William Murphy, Rockville Centre, NY
 Bishop John B. McCormack, Manchester, NH
 Bishop Manuel D. Moreno, Tucson, AZ
 Cardinal Roger Mahony, Los Angeles
 Archbishop Elden Curtiss, Omaha
 Bishop Gerald Gettelfinger, Evansville, IN.

³⁸¹ E.J. Dionne, “Bishop’s Apology Not Enough to Heal Church’s Wounds,” *Pasadena Star News*, June 19, 2002.

³⁸² R. Winton, “Mahony Asks Forgiveness for Handling of Scandal,” *Los Angeles Times*, June 24, 2002.

* The result of a survey by *Associated Press* issued mid-July stated that around 300 priests had been relieved of their duties in the year 2002 due to sexual abuse allegations.³⁸³

* July 28, 2002 – In his speech at the World Youth Day of Toronto, John Paul II in passing mentioned the sexual crisis in the U.S. The more significant excerpts are these:

- “The harm done to the young and vulnerable fills us with a deep sense of sadness and shame.”
- “Do not be discouraged by the sins of some of her members”
- “Think of the vast majority of dedicated and generous priests whose only wish is to serve and do good.”³⁸⁴

Regarding sexual abuse, nothing of significance can be found in this speech. The argument implicit in his talk – that the majority of priests are good and so the crisis is not as momentous as American Catholics say – was repeated and developed by Cardinal Giovanni Battista Re, President of the Congregation for the Bishops, in a letter to the American Bishops in October 2002. This argument has already been duly analyzed in a previous chapter.³⁸⁵

³⁸³ W. Lobdell, “Pope Speaks Out on Scandal,” *Los Angeles Times*, July 29, 2002.

³⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁸⁵ See Chapter II, 3.

* August 9, 2002 – **Fr. John Blankenship** was removed from his post as prison chaplain and ordered to no longer identify himself as a priest. He was indicted on August 20 on four counts of sexually abusing a 14-year-old boy while serving as a diocesan pastor in 1982.³⁸⁶

* August 18, 2002 – The *Los Angeles Times* reported that in the 17 years Cardinal Roger Mahony has been at the head of the Los Angeles Archdiocese, at least 33 priests had allegedly committed sexual abuse against minors.

The list of the more significant and heretofore unmentioned cases includes the following priests:

- **Fr. Richard Henry**, 49, was convicted in 1993 and sentenced to eight years in prison. He pleaded no contest to sex acts with four children in one family.
- **Fr. John Anthony Salazar**, 53, was convicted in 1988 and sentenced to six years in prison. He admitted abusing two boys.
- **Fr. Gerald Fessard**, 56, pleaded no contest in 1967 to soliciting lewd acts; he served 36 months probation.
- **Fr. Tilak Jayawardene**, 58, fled to Sri Lanka. Police are seeking his extradition on charges of oral copulation with a boy.
- **Fr. Nicolas Aguilar Rivera**, 60, fled to Mexico following allegations that he sexually abused altar boys.

³⁸⁶ "Ousting Bishops Not Board's Task, Members Say," *National Catholic Reporter*, August 30, 2002.

- **Fr. Theodore Llanos** in 1995 was charged in 38 counts of sexual abuse of minors. The charges were dismissed in 1996 due to the statute of limitation. He committed suicide in 1997.

The following three priests who denied the accusations made against them fled to other countries to avoid investigations:

- Fr. John Santillan, 63, fled to Bolivia; he was accused of sexually abusing an altar boy in the 1970s.
- Fr. Fidencio Silva, 54, accused of sexual abuse of boys, now resides in Mexico.³⁸⁷
- Fr. Carl Tresler, 37, accused of sexually abusing a 15-year-old boy, went to Peru.

The *Los Angeles Times* report was punctuated by accounts of Mahony failing to dismiss or take other action against accused priests. It also stated that the Archdiocese had “routinely failed to report errant priests to authorities.”³⁸⁸

* August 20, 2002 – Citing sealed court documents to which it had access and interviews with the alleged victims, *The Boston Globe* reported that in 1979 the late **Bishop James Rausch** of Phoenix sexually abused Brian O’Connor in Tucson, AZ, over a period of several months starting when O’Connor was 17. He then referred the young man for drug counseling to two Tucson priests, who also abused him.

³⁸⁷ On Fr. Fidencio Silva see p. 239.

³⁸⁸ A. Jones, “Abuse Revelations Hit Los Angeles Church,” *National Catholic Reporter*, August 30, 2002.

These documents had been under court seal since January 29 when the Tucson Diocese settled 11 sexual abuse lawsuits filed by 16 plaintiffs for some \$14 million.³⁸⁹

One of the priests accused of abusing O'Connor was the late **Fr. William Byrne**, named in a number of lawsuits against the Tucson Diocese. Another was **Msgr. Robert Trupia**, also accused of abusing multiple minors.³⁹⁰ Trupia admitted being a pedophile in an interview in 1992 with Bishop Manuel Moreno of Tucson.³⁹¹

When in 1992 Bishop Moreno ordered his suspension, Trupia blackmailed him demanding that he be retired as a priest in good standing or he would reveal Rausch's sexual history. He then appealed his suspension to the Vatican and received a favorable decision from Cardinal Dario Castillon Hoyos, head of the Congregation for the Clergy. According to the *Boston Globe*, Hoyos sided with Trupia and ordered Moreno to reevaluate Trupia's suspension and pay his legal fees. In March 2003 Trupia was living in Maryland and receiving a monthly stipend and insurance benefits from the Church.³⁹²

Regarding the accusation against Bishop Rausch, on August 2002 Phoenix Bishop Thomas O'Brien issued this evasive comment:

³⁸⁹ "Ousting Bishops Not Board's Task, Members Say," *National Catholic Reporter*, August 30, 2002.

³⁹⁰ On Trupia see p. 189.

³⁹¹ "Ousting Bishops Not Board's Task, Members Say."

³⁹² Michael Rezendes, "Bishop of Tucson Diocese Resigns," *Boston Globe*, March 8, 2003.

“Since Bishop Rausch died 21 years ago, I cannot provide any informed comments nor can I confirm or deny these charges of sexual misconduct.”³⁹³

* September 4, 2002 – The Jesuits agreed to a \$ 7.6 million settlement in the cases of two mentally retarded adult men who were allegedly molested repeatedly by four Jesuits at Sacred Heart Jesuit Center in northern California over a 30-year period. The two worked as dishwashers at the center. One of the offenders, **Fr. Edward Burke**, 81, is currently serving a two-year prison term for molesting one of the men.³⁹⁴

* September 9, 2002 –Bishop Robert Mulvee of Providence, RI, called a press conference to announce that the Diocese has reached a \$13.5 million settlement covering 36 of the 38 sexual abuse lawsuits it was facing. Some of the suits were initiated 10 years ago.³⁹⁵

* September 25, 2002 – Cardinal William Keeler of Baltimore released the names of more than 50 priests and religious brothers accused of child sex abuse in the Archdiocese. He revealed that the Archdiocese had paid more than \$4 million in the last two decades to settle abuse-related suits against the Church.³⁹⁶

* October 14, 2002 – Cardinal Giovanni Battista Re, President of the Congregation for the Bishops, issued an official letter criticizing the two Dallas documents of the

³⁹³ “Ousting Bishops Not Board’s Task, Members Say.”

³⁹⁴ “Multimillion-dollar Settlements Top Sexual Abuse News,” *The Tidings* (Los Angeles), September 20, 2002.

³⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁹⁶ Joe Feuerherd, “Reaction Mixed to Cardinal’s Internet Posting of Names of Abusers,” *National Catholic Reporter*, October 11, 2002.

American Bishops. With this letter the Vatican denied its approval, and called for a joint commission of American and Vatican experts to rewrite the documents.³⁹⁷

* October 18, 2002 – Regarding the Vatican rejection of the Dallas documents, Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, auxiliary Bishop of Detroit, voiced a general opinion:

“I think what will happen is most Bishops are going to hold up now and not do very much other than what they have done.”³⁹⁸

* October 18, 2002 – In Lawrence, KS, **Fr. Edward Schmitz**, a priest of the Kansas City Archdiocese, was sentenced to 32 months in prison for assaulting a 15-year-old boy in 1998. He had pleaded guilty in September to one count of indecent liberties with an adolescent between 14 and 16-years-old.³⁹⁹

* October 20, 2002 – The *Los Angeles Times* published the results of a written survey sent to 5,000 Catholic priests in 80 different Dioceses in the United States, that is to say, 10% of the 45,382 priests in the U.S. at that date. From the 5,000 that received the questions, 1,854 or 37%, answered them.

Two-thirds agreed that the sex abuse crisis shaking the Catholic Church in America is the worst crisis she had experienced in the last 100 years.

Comments by priests include the following:

³⁹⁷ See Chapter II. 3. B.

³⁹⁸ L. Stammer and D. Holley, “Bishops to Retain Policy on Abuse,” *Los Angeles Times*, October 19, 2002.

³⁹⁹ “Voice of the Faithful Asks Bishops for Input,” *National Catholic Reporter*, November 15, 2002.

- “They [the abusers] should be removed from the priesthood.”
- “They must know that nobody is above the law. It is their fault.”
- “Heads have to roll in the Episcopate before people are going to be satisfied.”
- “I can’t wait for a Bishop or a Cardinal to go to jail.”
- “In the end the Bishops have absolved themselves and will walk away unscathed.”⁴⁰⁰

* November 11, 2002 – At the onset of the Washington meetings of Bishops, USCCB president Bishop Wilton Gregory made a declamatory speech. He sustained that all the negative reaction to the sex abuse scandal was caused by some “extremists” inside the Church. He was referring to the progressivists who want to do away with the hierarchical structure of the Church and priestly celibacy. Although these groups exist and pursue such goals, it was a disproportionate exaggeration to attribute only to them all of the indignant reaction of the faithful against pedophile priests and their cover-up by the Bishops.⁴⁰¹ Gregory’s effort to find a scapegoat did not work. Some days later it became clear that his speech was an attempt to prepare the public for the new lenient measures the Bishops had approved.

⁴⁰⁰ “Priests Voice Anger at Bishops,” *Los Angeles Times*, October 20, 2002.

⁴⁰¹ L. Stammer, “Bishops Change Tone on Abuse,” *Los Angeles Times*, November 12, 2002.

* November 13, 2002 – The American Bishops accepted by a vote of 246 to 7 the new *Charter and Norms* imposed by the Vatican to replace their Dallas documents. The Vatican demanded juridical protection be provided for the accused and guilty clerics.⁴⁰² The provisions of these new documents will be in place until November 2004, when they will again be revised.⁴⁰³

* November 17, 2002 – Although Catholic Bishops were trying to turn a corner and hastily put behind them the debilitating scandal of sexual abuse, many of the lay faithful were not moving that fast. Some reactions from them after learning the results of the Washington meeting:

- “I don’t think the Church is past the worst of the scandal.”
- “The rooting out of the problem and the healing of the betrayal of trust will take many years.”
- “Broken trust doesn’t get fixed with a few Band-Aids.”
- “Serious work has to be done. Credibility will have to be earned.”⁴⁰⁴

* November 26, 2002 – The Diocese of Manchester, NH, announced a \$5 million settlement with 62 persons who said they were sexually abused by priests of the Diocese. The settlement involves accusations against 28

⁴⁰² See comments in Chapter II. 3. C.

⁴⁰³ L. Stammer, “Bishops Ratify Policy on Abuse,” *Los Angeles Times*, November 14, 2002

⁴⁰⁴ Teresa Watanabe, “Bishops’ Response Received Warily,” *Los Angeles Times*, November 18, 2002.

priests and one member of a religious institute.⁴⁰⁵ Further information put the number higher. According to attorney Peter Hutchins, the settlement rose to \$6 million for 68 alleged clerical abuse victims in New Hampshire.⁴⁰⁶

* December 2, 2002 – In California a state law was approved suspending the statute of limitations in cases of sexual abuse of children for a one-year period. The law was scheduled to become active January 1, 2003. Under the old law, victims of childhood sexual abuse could sue only up to their 26th birthday or within three years of discovering that their emotional problems were linked to molestations. The new law gives the victims the right to sue any institution for retaining in its employment a known molester.

All the California Bishops and several Church officials objected, calling it an unfair law since it forces the Church to defend herself against allegations that could go back decades. On the other hand, victims' rights advocates say the new law will help victims who went to the Church for help and were strung along in counseling paid for by the Church until the statute of limitations ran out.⁴⁰⁷

Around 200 lawsuits are prepared to be filed early January 2003.

⁴⁰⁵ "Catholic Lay Reform Group, Boston Cardinal Meet," *Los Angeles Times*, November. 27, 2002.

⁴⁰⁶ E. Mehren, "A Requiem for a Loss of Innocence," *Los Angeles Times*, January 27, 2003.

⁴⁰⁷ W. Lobdell, "Bishops to Warn of More Lawsuits," *Los Angeles Times*, December 3, 2002; "Catholic Church Set to Battle New Law," *Los Angeles Times*, December 8, 2002.

Donald Hoard, the father of a victim of sexual abuse who had received a financial court award, welcomed the law:

“They [the Bishops] did nothing until they were faced with civil lawsuits. This [new law] will force them to do what they should have been doing.”⁴⁰⁸

* December 4, 2002 – Obeying a mandate from the Supreme Court Judge, the Archdiocese of Boston released another set of 2,000 pages of documents regarding sexual abuse of minors by priests. More unknown cases of abuse came to light, including the following:

- **Fr. Richard Buntel** was reported to be an alcoholic, a drug distributor among youth, and a pedophile/homosexual who performed oral sex with males ages 15 to 21.
- **Fr. Robert Meffan** had allegedly abused teenage girls preparing to become nuns. According to the records, Meffan would tell the girls that he was Christ and that he would teach them to be “brides of Christ.”
- More data on the pedophile record of Fr. Robert Burns, some already reported above,⁴⁰⁹ were given.
- Other abuses were reported, such as a priest who beat a housekeeper and another priest who had two children with a woman and was found naked in her room when she died from a drug overdose.

⁴⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰⁹ On Robert Burns see, p. 180.

- Besides individual cases, the most important fact that appeared in the documents was the constant cover-up of Church authorities for the pedophile or scandalous priests.⁴¹⁰

These revelations raised new ire among the Catholic faithful, whose protests grew louder, especially in Boston.

* December 9, 2002 – A letter was signed by 58 priests from the Boston Archdiocese asking for Cardinal Bernard Law’s resignation. The letter was delivered to the Cardinal personally late that day. It stated:

“The priests and people of Boston have lost confidence in you as their spiritual leader.”⁴¹¹

* December 10, 2002 – Bishop John McCormack of Manchester, NH, announced that a settlement had been reached with state law officials. He said the Diocese accepted responsibility for the sexual abuse of children by its priests:

“The Church in New Hampshire fully acknowledges and accepts responsibility for failures in our system that contributed to the endangerment of children.”

New Hampshire attorney general Phillip McLaughlin said the Manchester Diocese agreed to allow state prosecutors to audit its handling of sexual abuse cases over the next five years. McLaughlin said that his inquiry

⁴¹⁰ E. Mehren and J. Getlin, “Boston Clerical Abuse Grows,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 4, 2002; G. Donovan, “Records Further Damage Boston Church’s Credibility,” *National Catholic Reporter*, December 13, 2002.

⁴¹¹ E. Mehren, “58 Priests Ask Boston Cardinal to Step Down in Abuse Scandal,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 11, 2002.

had confirmed reports of molestation involving more than 40 priests.⁴¹²

Further information showed that Bishop McCormack had acted under threat of criminal prosecution. The agreement he came to with the State included the order to release former confidential records to the state attorney general.⁴¹³ If Bishop McCormack had refused to accept these terms, the Manchester Diocese would have become the first to be so prosecuted. It would have been for the way the Diocese handled sex abuse cases over a period of 40 years.⁴¹⁴

* December 11, 2002 – **Fr. John Banko** of New Jersey was charged criminally in a sex abuse case. After less than two days of deliberations, jurors convicted Banko of aggravated sexual assault and child endangerment in the abuse of an altar boy, now age 20.⁴¹⁵

* December 11, 2002 – Fr. Paul Shanley walked out of jail in Cambridge when “friends and family” posted a \$300,000 bond. Shanley spent seven months behind bars on 10 counts of child rape and six counts of indecent assault and battery. As early as 1979, Vatican officials had been informed of statements Shanley had made endorsing sexual relations between men and boys. Shanley was present at a 1979 conference in Boston that led to the formation of

⁴¹² *Ibid.*

⁴¹³ E. Mehren, “A Requiem for a Loss of Innocence.”

⁴¹⁴ “Diocese Reaches Agreement to Avoid Prosecution,” *National Catholic Reporter*, December 20, 2002.

⁴¹⁵ “Priest Convicted of Molesting Altar Boy,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 12, 2002.

NAMBLA, the North American Man-Boy Love Association.

In a sworn deposition this year, Bishop Thomas Daily of Brooklyn, NY – who served as auxiliary Bishop and vicar general in Boston – said Church leaders knew Shanley had advocated sex between men and boys when they appointed him pastor of St. Jean’s Parish in Newton in 1983.

In 1990, Shanley was transferred to St. Ann’s parish in San Bernardino, CA. In a letter written by Cardinal Law’s top official, Bishop Robert Banks, the Boston Archdiocese assured the San Bernardino Diocese that Shanley was “a priest in good standing” and had no problems in his past.”⁴¹⁶ Banks stated blankly:

“I can assure you that Fr. Shanley has no problem that would be a concern to your Diocese.”⁴¹⁷

* December 13, 2002 – The resignation of Cardinal Bernard Law was accepted by Pope John Paul II. In a written statement Law apologized and begged forgiveness from “all those who have suffered from my shortcomings and mistakes.”⁴¹⁸

Attorney Mitchell Garabedian, who represented more than 100 alleged victims of clergy abuse, expressed reserve:

⁴¹⁶ E. Mehren, “Catholic Reform Group Calls on Boston Cardinal to Step Down in Abuse Scandal,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 11, 2002.

⁴¹⁷ “Boston Priest Advocated Sex with Boys,” *America*, April 22, 2002. On Shanley, see pp. 124, 199-200, 246.

⁴¹⁸ J. Getlin and G. Baum, “Cardinal Law Steps Down, Apologizes for Mistakes,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 14, 2002.

“This will turn out to be only a cosmetic change unless substantive changes are made in Church communities throughout the nation.”⁴¹⁹

Former Oklahoma Governor Frank Keating, who headed the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops’ review panel on sexual abuse, said he hoped other such actions would be forthcoming:

“I think doubtless other resignations will be appropriate to get a clean state.”⁴²⁰

* December 31, 2002 – Church officials and attorneys for victims of sexual abuse by priests in Los Angeles and Orange counties agreed to negotiate more than 100 claims rather than engage in lawsuits under a controversial state law that took effect this day in California. The new law lifts the statute of limitations on molestation lawsuits for one year.

The mediation discussions could lead to a single proceeding for the hundreds of claims in Los Angeles and Orange counties. A Los Angeles Superior Court spokesman confirmed the broad outlines of the mediation effort for cases that would be covered under the new state law.

During this “stand-still” period no new case would be filed and no action would be taken on cases already pending, according to Allan Parachini, spokesman for the Los Angeles County Superior Court. A single consolidated settlement would help the Church in California to avoid the humiliation Boston ecclesiastic officials faced when court

⁴¹⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴²⁰ L. Stammer, “After Cardinal, Others in Focus,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 14, 2002.

files were opened, revealing internal memos that showed a consistent long-term practice of protecting the priest abusers more than the abused victims.

It is said that the two Dioceses have \$150 million available from insurance companies to settle the claims.⁴²¹

* December 2002 – Fr. John Conley denounced a case of sexual abuse of a priest to the police, for which he allegedly suffered retaliation from the Archdiocese of San Francisco. In November 1997, Fr. Conley witnessed what he termed a “wrestling match” between **Fr. James Aylward** and a teenage rectory worker. He reported it to the police. The Archdiocese placed him on administrative leave due to “unrelated behavior problems.” Fr. Conley sued the Archdiocese claiming the mandate was retaliatory. The suit was settled out of court.

Later, according to the *San Francisco Chronicle*, Fr. James Aylward admitted touching boys for sexual pleasure, and the Archdiocese paid one youth \$750,000.⁴²²

* The Archdiocese of Chicago stated that it had found 55 credible allegations against 36 priests. According to the report, none of the incidents took place after 1991. Archbishop George cautioned that this did not mean that there had been no incidents since then, only that they had not been reported.⁴²³

⁴²¹ L. Stammer, Scott Martelle, and Jean Guccione, “Church to Negotiate Abuse Suits,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 31, 2002.

⁴²² A. Jones, “Archdiocese Settles Suit Claiming Retaliation,” *National Catholic Reporter*, December 13, 2002.

⁴²³ Michele Martin, “Chicago Archdiocese Gives Accounting of Sex Abuse Costs,” *National Catholic Reporter*, February 7, 2003.

* The body of **Fr. Richard Lower** was found in a woods near Enfield, NH, three days after the priest was informed that he had been accused of molesting a boy in 1973. Police investigations could not immediately determine the cause of his death, but Church officials did not exclude the possibility of suicide. In 1989, the priest had been charged with inappropriate advances on an adult male.

If his death is determined to be a suicide, Fr. Lower would be the third American priest to kill himself in 2002 after being accused of child abuse.⁴²⁴

– 2003 –

* January 2, 2003 – A Nevada priest, **Fr. Mark Roberts** of Henderson, pleaded guilty to five charges of lewdness and abuse of five teenage boys. Two felony charges were dropped as part of a plea bargain where he agreed to be registered as a sex offender.⁴²⁵

* January 3, 2003 – According to a *Newsday* report, **Fr. Michael Hands** has agreed to cooperate with prosecutors in an effort to obtain a lighter jail sentence. In March 2002, Fr. Hands pleaded guilty to sodomizing a 13-year-old boy. Recently, in a 138-page sworn statement, he claimed that he had also been sexually abused as a teenager by a monsignor, and that the Diocese of Rockville Centre, NY, had pressured him to remain silent.

⁴²⁴ "Suicide Suspected in Priest's Death," *The Catholic World Report*, February 2003, p. 21.

⁴²⁵ "Lay Group Urges Preservation of Records," *National Catholic Reporter*, January 24, 2003.

In September 2001, when Bishop William Murphy of Rockville Centre learned of Hands' allegation that **Msgr. Charles Ribaldo** had abused him when he was a high school student, Murphy removed Ribaldo as pastor of St. Dominic Parish in Oyster Bay, NY. Afterwards, Msgr. Francis Caldwell, diocesan director of priest personnel, asked for Hands' silence because "we wanted to reinstate him [Ribaldo] back in the parish." In return Caldwell let Hands understand that the Diocese would pay for his health insurance, psychiatric therapy, and other financial help after he voluntarily left the priesthood. Hands agreed, and Ribaldo was returned to St. Dominic's.

The allegation against Msgr. Ribaldo was reported by *Newsday* on April 5, 2002. The article affirmed that Ribaldo resigned from ministry on March 12 and that he was "stripped of his priestly powers" on March 27.⁴²⁶

Hand's 138-page statement provided many details about how the Long Island Diocese has handled the cases of priests accused of abusing minors. Some abusers were shipped out of State, especially to Florida, in what Hands said was called "the Florida solution."⁴²⁷

* January 6, 2003 – Bishop Thomas Dupre of Springfield, MA, petitioned Rome for the expedited forced laicization by the Pope of notorious child abuser **Fr. Richard Lavigne**. The priest was removed from ministry in 1991 after he was arrested on charges of rape and sexual

⁴²⁶ G. Donovan, "Priest Says He Also Was Victim of Clerical Abuse," *National Catholic Reporter*, January 17, 2003.

⁴²⁷ Rita Ciolli, "Priest: Abuse Hidden," *Newsday.com*, January 26, 2003.

abuse of children.⁴²⁸ In 1992, Lavigne pleaded guilty to molesting two altar boys at his Shelburne Falls parish. In 1994, the Diocese settled a lawsuit for \$1.4 million with 17 alleged victims of Lavigne. He remains under investigation as the prime suspect for the murder of a 13-year-old Springfield boy.⁴²⁹

* January 7, 2003 – In Stroudsburg, PA, Augustinian **Fr. Richard Cochrane** pleaded no contest to charges he sexually assaulted a 14-year-old student at a cabin in the Pocono Mountains in 1991. The plea is recorded as a conviction for which he can face up to 10 years in prison.⁴³⁰

* January 10, 2003 – The *Boston Globe* reported that 15 men will receive a total of \$5.8 million in a sex abuse settlement with the Jesuits of New England and two of their schools, Boston College High School and Cheverus High School in Portland, Maine. Fourteen of the men filed claims against Jesuit **Fr. James Talbot**, who taught at both schools and who was indicted last September on rape charges for alleged assaults between 1972 and 1980. The 15th man accused Jesuit **Fr. Francis McManus** of abusing him in the early 1980s at the Boston School.⁴³¹

* January 26, 2003 – In Manchester, NH, several hundred Catholic faithful protested against clerical sexual

⁴²⁸ "Lay Group Urges Preservation of Records," *National Catholic Reporter*, January 24, 2003.

⁴²⁹ Kevin Cullen, "Danny's Story: Death of an Altar Boy," *Boston Globe*, December 14, 2003.

⁴³⁰ "Lay Group Urges Preservation of Records," *National Catholic Reporter*, January 24, 2003.

⁴³¹ *Ibid.*

abuse in 22° weather outside St. Joseph Cathedral. The protesters, carrying placards with the photos of 84 alleged victims, gathered outside the building to describe briefly each of the cases. This description alone took more than an hour. The demonstration was held to protest against the cover-up policy of Bishop John McCormack, head of the Diocese of Manchester and a longtime associate of Cardinal Bernard Law.⁴³²

* January 29, 2003 – The same day that Bishop Richard Lemon, Apostolic Administrator replacing Cardinal Law as head of the Boston Archdiocese, was giving a series of interviews to Boston reporters, 70 new sex abuse lawsuits were filed against 40 priests and a former Church worker of the Archdiocese. The number includes 16 priests not previously named. On January 31, attorney Roderick MacLeish said new records produced by the Archdiocese revealed 24 more priests who had been accused of sexually abusing minors.⁴³³

* January 2003 – The St. Louis Archdiocese announced that **Fr. Robert Johnson** had resigned as pastor in Grantwood, MO, following his admission of sexual misconduct with a minor. The victim, abused over a one-year period in the late 1970s, recently brought the allegation to the Archdiocese.⁴³⁴

⁴³² E. Mehren, "A Requiem for a Loss of Innocence," *Los Angeles Times*, January 27, 2003.

⁴³³ "Bishops Asked to Reveal Costs in Sex Abuse Cases," *National Catholic Reporter*, February 14, 2003.

⁴³⁴ "Lay Group Urges Preservation of Records," *National Catholic Reporter*, January 24, 2003.

* February 10, 2003 – A grand jury investigation report charged the Diocese of Rockville Centre, NY, with protecting 58 abusive priests. Most of these accounts of abuse occurred during the tenure of Bishop John McGann, who led the Diocese from 1976 to 1999. Bishop James McHug followed him and was replaced by Bishop William Murphy in 2001. In its conclusion the report read:

“The history of the Diocese of Rockville Centre demonstrates that as an institution they are incapable of properly handling issues relating to the sexual abuse of children by priests.”⁴³⁵

February 2003 – According to *Newsday*, a Long Island paper that examined some 40,000 pages of Church documents made available by Massachusetts Superior Court Judge Constance Sweeney in the last year, **Fr. Melvin Surette** was accused of sexually abusing a 16-year-old boy. Surette’s accuser eventually settled a civil suit with the Archdiocese of Boston for \$50,000.⁴³⁶

* March 3, 2003 – The New Hampshire Attorney General’s office released 9,000 pages of Manchester diocesan personnel files. It received the documents from the Diocese as part of an agreement that gave the state attorney general’s office oversight of the Church’s continued handling of abuse allegations. The 9,000 pages of files gave details of alleged abuse of minors in New Hampshire by 36

⁴³⁵ G. Donovan, “Grand Jury Reports Long Island Diocese Protected 58 Abusive Priests,” *National Catholic Reporter*, February 21, 2003.

⁴³⁶ G. Donovan, “Records Reveal Bishop’s Role in Boston Scandal,” *National Catholic Reporter*, March 7, 2003.

priests of Manchester, 19 priests of Massachusetts, and five priests of Religious Orders.⁴³⁷

* March 12, 2003 – It was revealed that the new California law suspending the statute of limitations for sexual abusers of children in the clergy had a deadline that was not announced by the press. The date for filing criminal charges will expire the first week of April, 2003. Many alleged victims were counting on private documents regarding the priests that Cardinal Mahony had promised to release. But Church attorneys and officials have delayed releasing these documents with the argument that they are private and written under the pledge of secrecy between priests and their Bishops and priests and their doctors. They argue it is a constitutional right of the accused to keep such information secret. This procedure will supposedly keep 12 priests from being accused.⁴³⁸

Attorney Roderick MacLeish, specialist in sex abuse cases, commented on the delay maneuver:

“I hope this is seen for what it is: an attempt to slow the process down and hurt the victims.”

Lee Bashfort, who allegedly was molested for nearly a decade by a now retired priest, said the maneuver was intended to cover-up the guilty:

“It is pretty clear that the Archdiocese is trying to run the clock on the criminal side. This is standard Mahony operating procedure. They don’t really

⁴³⁷ “N.H. Diocese Releases 9,000 Pages of Files,” *National Catholic Reporter*, March 14, 2003.

⁴³⁸ W. Lobdell and R. Winton, “Later Deadline for Priests Cases Sought,” *Los Angeles Times*, March 13, 2003.

care if they have serial child predators roaming the streets.”⁴³⁹

* March 13, 2003 – **John Lenihan**, former Catholic priest who allegedly impregnated a teenage parishioner and paid for her abortion 21 years ago, was arrested in Newbury Park by Orange County police and charged with 10 counts of felony sexual assault on a minor.

The Los Angeles and Orange Dioceses paid \$1.2 million to a woman last April to settle a civil suit containing molestation allegations against Lenihan. As for the settlement, Lenihan agreed to be removed from the priesthood, which he did in a March 2002 letter to John Paul II asking to dispense him from his vows.

Another testimony was from Mary Grant, whom Lenihan admitted molesting for five years in the late 1970s, starting when she was age 13. Grant said she told Church officials about the abuse by Lenihan in 1979 but was ignored. In 1991 she received \$25,000 from the Orange Diocese. Lenihan was allowed to continue his ministry and was transferred in good standing to St. Edward parish in Dana Point.⁴⁴⁰

* April 1, 2003 – As the first courtroom testimony regarding criminal investigations of local priests by the Los Angeles County district was opened, the State Assembly unanimously passed a bill to prevent the clock from running out on the criminal prosecution of priests accused of sexual

⁴³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴⁰ W. Lobdell, “Ex-Priest’s Letter Is Key to His Arrest,” *Los Angeles Times*, March 14, 2003.

abuse.⁴⁴¹ The law was rushed through as an April 8 deadline approached for handing down indictments against the accused priests. The bill was approved on April 2 by the State Senate and signed April 3 by the Governor.⁴⁴²

* April 24, 2003 – Attorney Timothy Hale filed an amended complaint of child sexual abuse on behalf of a client against the Santa Barbara Franciscan friars in California. The plaintiff alleged that as a 10-year-old he was sexually abused by some of the friars, including in the shower, and that the friars took nude photographs of him. The lawsuit charged that the Franciscan Province, the Los Angeles Archdiocese, and the Santa Barbara Boys Choir knew the accused friars were “pedophilic clergy.”⁴⁴³

* April 2003 – Multiple charges of sex abuse of children were filed against **Fr. Fidencio Silva**,⁴⁴⁴ a missionary of the Holy Spirit who served in Oxnard, CA, from 1979 to 1986 in the parish of Our Lady of Guadalupe. Sixteen former altar boys are ready to give evidences of abuses made by Silva. The general office of the Ventura County district attorney has filed 25 child molestation felony counts against Silva, whose last known residence was in Mexico in 2002.⁴⁴⁵

⁴⁴¹ W. Lobdell and R. Winton, “L.A. Archdiocese Seeks to Withhold Files in Sex Cases,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 2, 2003.

⁴⁴² On Fr. Fidencio Silva see p. 219.

⁴⁴³ “Malpractice Verdict May Affect Abuse Cases in Boston,” *National Catholic Reporter*, May 16, 2003.

⁴⁴⁴ “California Freezes Clock on Clergy Abuse Investigation,” *National Catholic Reporter*, April 18, 2003.

⁴⁴⁵ A. Jones, “Police Officer Holds Holy Week Fast for Release of Records,” *National Catholic Reporter*, April 25, 2003.

* Sexual abuse suits against Southern California Dioceses continued to mount at the end of April. The plaintiffs in one case are the parents of a 36-year-old man who hanged himself in 2002 after years of attempting to deal with abuse that occurred when he was between the ages of 11 and 15. According to the *Los Angeles Times*, when the abuse began Richard Lukasiewicz was a student at John Bosco Technical Institute in Rosemead, CA. The institute was run by the Salesians.⁴⁴⁶

The San Diego Diocese also faces three separate suits over alleged sexual molestations that occurred over a period of 26 years by the late **Msgr. William Kraft**, who died in 2001.

In the San Bernardino Diocese, **Msgr. Peter Hernandez Luque**, former pastor in Corona, CA, faces up to eight years in prison if found guilty of abusing boys between 1963 and 1969.⁴⁴⁷

* May 2003 – **Fr. Siegfried Widera**, a former southern California priest wanted on 42 molestation charges, is now the subject of a “manhunt” in Texas after fleeing law enforcement. An El Paso county sheriff’s office spokesman said Widera “may be trying to conduct himself as a member of the clergy in smaller northern Mexico villages.”⁴⁴⁸

* June 2, 2003 – Bishop Thomas O’Brien of Phoenix, Arizona signed a controversial accord with Maricopa

⁴⁴⁶ “Abuse Suit by Parents of Man Who Committed Suicide,” *National Catholic Reporter*, May 2, 2003

⁴⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴⁸ “Malpractice Verdict May Affect Abuse Cases in Boston,” *National Catholic Reporter*.

County attorney Rick Romley in which he appeared to have abdicated the responsibilities of a Bishop. According to the agreement, the Phoenix Diocese is required by the civil authority:

- To establish a moderator to deal with issues that arise relating to the revision, enforcement, and application of the diocesan sexual misconduct guidelines;
- To set up a youth protection advocate who will report allegations of sexual abuse by diocesan personnel to law enforcement officials independently and not subject to the consent of the Bishop or any other diocesan personnel. This advocate is to be assisted by a counsel whose advice also will not be subject to approval by anyone within the Diocese, including the Bishop.

Maricopa attorney Rick Romley said that, without the agreement, he probably would have criminally charged Bishop O'Brien with obstruction of justice for his role in assigning priests known to have abused minors to parishes in the Diocese. Romley's office indicted six priests on sexual abuse charges the day the accord was released.⁴⁴⁹

By a curious coincidence, June 14, only 11 days after the agreement came to light, Bishop Thomas O'Brien was arrested on a felony charge for leaving the scene of a car accident. The Bishop, who was driving, ran over pe-

⁴⁴⁹ Joe Feuerherd, "Did Phoenix Bishop Go Too Far?" *National Catholic Reporter*, June 20, 2002; "Phoenix Bishop Cuts a Deal," *Our Sunday Visitor*, June 15, 2003.

destrian Jim Reed, 43, and killed him. On June 18, the Vatican accepted Bishop O'Brien's resignation.⁴⁵⁰

* June 9, 2003 – **Fr. Louis Miller**, a priest of Louisville Archdiocese in Kentucky, pled guilty to 14 counts of indecent or immoral practices. He was already serving a 20-year prison sentence after pleading guilty last May to 50 felony sexual abuse counts in Jefferson County.⁴⁵¹

* June 10, 2003 – In 243 lawsuits settled between the Archdiocese of Louisville and 240 plaintiffs, 35 priests and six others associated with the Archdiocese were named. Among the accused were two priests indicted on criminal charges who have not been mentioned yet: **Fr. Daniel Clark** and **Fr. James Hargadon**.⁴⁵²

* June 11, 2003 – Frank Keating, ex-Governor of Oklahoma and head of the National Review Board, accused the California Bishops of acting like members of *La Cosa Nostra*, an insiders name for the *Mafia* organization. The review panel directed by Keating is the official organ of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops created in June 2002 to deal with the abuse of children by priests and oversee the terms of the *Charter of Protection of the Children*, approved November 2002.

This board sent a questionnaire to the 195 American Dioceses in an attempt to calculate the number of sex abusers. To date the available number – 432 priests – relies

⁴⁵⁰ "Hit-and-run Victim Mourned," *National Catholic Reporter*, July 4, 2003.

⁴⁵¹ "Church in Crisis," *National Catholic Reporter*, June 20, 2003.

⁴⁵² Glenn Rutherford, "Archdiocese Settles 243 Sexual Abuse Lawsuits for \$25.7 million," *National Catholic Reporter*, June 20, 2003.

only upon media estimates. Around 60 Dioceses had not yet replied to those questions at this date. Included among these were all the California Bishops, who formally refused to participate in the survey.

In April, Cardinal Mahony wrote to all U.S. Cardinals and Archbishops calling for the review board to terminate the study, alleging that the company hired to conduct it could leak information to the press and would not arrive at a full picture of the reality.⁴⁵³

Keating called the clear resistance of the California Bishops to answer his survey questions “stunning, startling,” and added these words:

“I have seen an underside that I never knew existed. I have not had my faith questioned, but I certainly have concluded that a number of serious officials in my faith have very clay feet. That is disappointing and educational, but it is a fact. To act like *La Cosa Nostra* and hide and suppress, I think, is very unhealthy.”

Keating added,

“I think that there are a number of Bishops – and I put Cardinal Mahony in that category – who listen too much to his lawyers and not enough to his heart.”⁴⁵⁴

Asked about the privilege of secrecy the Los Angeles Archdiocese is calling on in order to avoid handing over requested documents on pedophile priests, Keating –

⁴⁵³ Larry Stammer, “Mahony Resisted Abuse Inquiry, Panelist Says,” *Los Angeles Times*, June 12, 2003.

⁴⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

a former federal prosecutor and defense attorney – said he had never heard of such a privilege.⁴⁵⁵

* June 12, 2003 – In an interview one day after Keating compared the California Bishops to *La Cosa Nostra*, Cardinal Mahony called his statements “off the wall.” Mahony counter-attacked with these words:

“All I can say is, from the Bishops I’ve listened to – and several called me this morning – this is the last straw. To make statements such as these, I don’t know how he can continue to have the support of the Bishops. I don’t know how you back up from this.”

Mahony said he intended to raise the issue of Keating’s job performance next week in St. Louis, when the U.S. Bishops hold their semi-annual meeting.⁴⁵⁶

A spokesman for Keating said that he stood by his comments.⁴⁵⁷

In short, Cardinal Mahony did not address the real issue, which was the refusal of the California Bishops to answer questions about the number of pedophile priests. It would seem he simply tried to divert general attention from the issue by engaging in a personal fight with Keating.

It would also seem that one of the other goals of the National Review Board directed by Keating was not achieved. In effect, the board was created to help restore the credibility of the Bishops damaged by the pedophile scandal. However, the refusal of the California Bishops to

⁴⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵⁶ L. Stammer, “Catholic Rift over Panel Widens,” *Los Angeles Times*, June 13, 2003.

⁴⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

collaborate with board efforts, along with the consequent criticism of Keating, seemed to have sunk the prestige of the Bishops to a new low.

* June 14, 2003 – Frank Keating announced his intention to resign as head of the National Review Board of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. This decision came after the public censure he received from Cardinal Mahony and after a majority of members of the oversight panel privately asked him to quit. Some Church officials remarked that his leaving office would threaten to revive questions among many Catholics about whether the Bishops were willing to accept independent outside oversight of their work.

A spokesman said that Keating continued to stand behind his affirmations:

“He tells the truth, and apparently some people don’t want to hear the truth.”⁴⁵⁸

* June 16, 2003 – In a letter addressed to Bishop Wilton Gregory, USCCB head, Frank Keating officially resigned as chairman of the sexual abuse review board. The resignation was accepted immediately by Bishop Gregory, who sent a personal letter to Keating praising his efforts. In his letter to Gregory, Keating affirmed:

“My remarks, which some Bishops found offensive, were deadly accurate.”

He also wrote:

“I make no apology. To resist grand jury subpoenas, to suppress the names of offending clerics, to

⁴⁵⁸ L. Stammer, “Clergy Abuse Panel’s Chief to Step Down,” *Los Angeles Times*, June 15, 2003.

deny, to obfuscate, to explain away – that is the model of a criminal organization, not my Church.”⁴⁵⁹

* July 21, 2003 – More than 300 pages of allegations against Fr. Paul Shanley were filed by attorneys representing Gregory Ford, 23, and his parents in a civil lawsuit against Cardinal Bernard Law and the Archdiocese of Boston.⁴⁶⁰ The Fords contended that Church officials failed to stop Shanley from abusing children, including their son Gregory.

The documents were filed hours after the state attorney general confirmed that no criminal charges would be brought against Law. The documents name 25 priests in addition to Shanley who worked in the Boston Archdiocese and are also accused of molesting children. Among other allegations the documents assert that Shanley sometimes paid for sex with teenagers.⁴⁶¹

* July 23, 2003 – State attorney general Tom Reilly issued a 76-page report on the clerical abuse of children and consequent cover-up by the ecclesiastical authorities. The report, based on documents released by the Boston Archdiocese, is the conclusion of a 16-month investigation and considered the most exhaustive inquiry undertaken by any public authority into the Boston priestly abuse scandal.

It was reported that the number of victims of sexual abuse by clergy and other Church workers “likely exceeds 1,000” and involves more than 250 offenders.

⁴⁵⁹ L. Stammer, “Abuse Panel Chief Critical to End,” *Los Angeles Times*, June 17, 2003.

⁴⁶⁰ On Shanley see pp. 124, 199-200, 228-9.

⁴⁶¹ E. Mehren, “New Allegations in Clerical Abuse Case.”

Reilly concluded that Church records show that for decades the Archdiocese offered financial settlements to hundreds of abuse victims who reported their complaints to Church officials. “But a culture of secrecy and an institutional acceptance” of clerical sexual abuse prevailed, he said. Church authorities failed to report the abuse to law enforcement or child protection authorities.⁴⁶²

* September 15, 2003 – Archbishop Timothy Dolan of Milwaukee sent his parishes a report detailing the impact of the clergy sex abuse crisis on the Church of southeast Wisconsin. The report said that as of September 1, allegations of sexual abuse of minors had been made against 55 archdiocesan priests and three deacons. Allegations had not been substantiated against 10 of the priests. For the 45 others, 15 died and six left active ministry. Dolan is seeking administrative laicization from the Vatican for seven of the priests, and five are seeking voluntary laicization.⁴⁶³

* September 2003 – Two men have sued **Fr. Donald McGuire**, a past spiritual director of Mother Teresa of Calcutta and her Missionaries of Charity, accusing him of abusing them in the late 1960s when he taught at Loyola Academy in the Chicago area. He has been removed from active ministry.⁴⁶⁴

* October 7, 2003 – Jesuit **Fr. Bernard Knoth** resigned as president of Loyola University in New Orleans

⁴⁶² E. Mehren, “Report Details Decades of Clerical Abuse.”

⁴⁶³ Maryangela Layman Román, “Archdiocese Releases Abuse Response Accountability Report,” *Catholic Herald*, September 18, 2003.

⁴⁶⁴ “Two Jesuits Sued for Abuse,” *National Catholic Reporter*, October 17, 2003.

because of allegations of sexual misconduct stemming from incidents in the 1980s. A statement from the Chicago Province said it received a complaint of sex abuse against Knoth from his time at Brebeuf Jesuit Preparatory School in Indianapolis. The Province's review board found the allegations credible and recommended Knoth be removed from active ministry. In a statement announcing his resignation Knoth denied "any inappropriate conduct."⁴⁶⁵

* November 2, 2003 – The Archdiocese of Cincinnati accepted responsibility for charges of failing to report sexual abuse involving priests and minors. Archbishop Daniel Pilarczyk agreed to enter a plea of "no contest" to five misdemeanor counts in a Hamilton County courtroom ending a nearly two-year investigation by county prosecutor Michael Allen. The Archdiocese of Cincinnati has become the first in American history to be convicted on criminal charges. The agreement was hastily closed when the Archdiocese was being threatened by even more severe criminal procedures.⁴⁶⁶

The violations in Cincinnati occurred from 1978 to 1982, a time when Joseph Bernardin headed the Archdiocese.

The no-contest plea, which ended any criminal investigation by the prosecutor's office, did not affect other civil suits pending against the Archdiocese and former or

⁴⁶⁵ "Loyola President Resigns Over Alleged Sex Abuse in 1980s," *National Catholic Reporter*, October 17, 2003.

⁴⁶⁶ "US Diocese Convicted," *The Tablet*, November 29, 2003, p. 25.

retired priests for alleged sexual abuse. There were already nearly 70 individuals involved in such lawsuits.⁴⁶⁷

* January 1, 2004 – With the end of the one-year-suspension for the statute of limitations regarding sex abuse of children in the State of California, the number of the lawsuits filed in 2003 became public. According to the *Los Angeles Times*, as many as 800 lawsuits were filed during the year against the Catholic Church in California. An estimated 500 were in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, 150 in the other southern Dioceses of Orange, San Diego, and San Bernardino, and 150 in the northern Dioceses of San Francisco, Oakland, Sacramento and Santa Rosa.

Lawyers and advocates for victims predict that Los Angeles will surpass other U.S. dioceses in both the number of priests involved in the sex abuse scandal and the amount arrived at for settlements.⁴⁶⁸

Author Richard Sipe, an expert on pedophilia in the clergy who acts as a consultant to plaintiff attorneys, agreed with this prediction:

“If Boston was the beginning and the cornerstone of the [pedophile] scandal, California is going to be the capstone of the crisis.”⁴⁶⁹

4. Figures for Pedophile Priests in the American Clergy

⁴⁶⁷ “Cincinnati Archdiocese Pleads No Contest on Failure to Report,” *America*, December 8, 2003.

⁴⁶⁸ J. Guccione and W. Lobdell, “Law Spurred Flood of Sex Abuse Suits,” *Los Angeles Times*, January 1, 2004.

⁴⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

Regarding pedophile priests the broadest and most expressive figures I found are the following:

In **1993**, *Newsweek* commented that according to some churchmen, “as many as **2,500** priests have molested children or teenagers.”⁴⁷⁰

In his book *Lead Us Not Into Temptation*, Richard Sipe calculated that **6% [that is, 3,180] of the 53,000 American priests** have had sexual contacts with minors.⁴⁷¹

Italian newspapers *La Repubblica* (1993) and *Corriere della Sera* (1994) stated that according to surveys published in the U.S. press, cases of sexual abuse carried out in American parishes over the last 20 years reportedly involve **from 2,000 to 4,000 priests** and about **100,000 victims**, mostly women and children.”⁴⁷²

On January 10, 2003, two different studies on the number of pedophile priests came to light. They were based on news published by the media and data from victims' groups. Each list contains the names of some **2,000 priests accused of pedophilia since 1993**.

The *first list* is being prepared by the Dallas law firm Demarest, Smith, Giunta & Howell. All the 2,000 names recorded on it have been reported in the U.S. media. The *second list* is being prepared by Paul Baier, founder of

⁴⁷⁰ Eric Press, “Priests and Abuse,” *Newsweek*, June 16, 1993, p. 40.

⁴⁷¹ *Apud* R. Brancoli, “Linea verde contro preti pedofili,” *Corriere della Sera*, September 24, 1992; See also Randall Samborn, “Priest Playing Hardball to Battle Abuse Charges,” *The National Law Journal*, July 1994.

⁴⁷² Orazio la Rocca, “Wojtyla: ‘Piango i preti tentati dai vizi del sesso’,” *La Repubblica*, December 22, 1993; cf. “Molestie, mea culpa dei Vescovi,” *Corriere della Sera*, November 18, 1994.

victims' right group Survivors First. Only about 500 of the accused priests on his list were found through media reports. The other 1,500 names came from other victims' advocates groups⁴⁷³

Also in January, the *New York Times* published a *third list* estimating that a total of **1,205 priests have been accused of sexual abuse of more than 4,000 minors during the last six decades** in the Latin-rite Catholic Dioceses of the United States. Such data were taken from newspaper clippings, court records, Church documents and statements.⁴⁷⁴ According to the *Times* report, most of the abuses occurred during the 1970s and 1980s, with accusations dropping sharply by the 1990s. The paper also reported that some experts have argued that the drop in accusations in the 1990s was due less to the efforts of the Church than to the reluctance of victims to come forward immediately.⁴⁷⁵

Regarding percentages, different criteria have been used to arrive at varied numbers. The Catholic Hierarchy habitually compares the number of pedophile priests with the total of priests in the last 40 or 50 years, which pushes the percentages very low. They normally claim the figure of 1% or less.

Journalists and authors normally compare the number of living pedophile priests with the total of priests living today. The percentages according to this more objective criterion normally are between 2% and 6%.

⁴⁷³ G. Donovan, "Databases Hold Abusers' Names."

⁴⁷⁴ "Times Survey Compiles Thousands of Abuse Cases," *National Catholic Reporter*, January 24, 2003.

⁴⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

The variation of 4% in these statistics occurs because the lowest calculation in the majority of cases only takes into account the known accused pedophile priests – the ones who were denounced in lawsuits by the victims. Higher calculations project an estimate that for each denounced priest there are one or more other priests who are pedophile but have not been accused.

5. Financial Costs of the Crisis

General diocesan expenses acknowledged by ecclesiastical authorities or credibly estimated in media reports include the following:

* In a comprehensive December 2002 report of the last decade, the Archdiocese of Chicago said the costs of clerical sexual abuse totaled \$16.8 million. Most of the money – \$15 million – came from a fund set up for that purpose, using proceeds from the sales of undeveloped property.⁴⁷⁶

* In a January 2003 news conference, Bishop Gerald Kicanas of Tucson, AZ, released the fact that bankruptcy was “one of the options” the Diocese had to consider in dealing with the debts it had incurred last year to settle 11 lawsuits. Local newspapers estimated the undisclosed amount of the settlements to be about \$15 million.⁴⁷⁷

⁴⁷⁶ Michelle Martin, “Chicago Archdiocese Gives Accounting of Sex Abuse Costs,” *National Catholic Reporter*, February 7, 2003.

⁴⁷⁷ “Ousting Bishops Not Board’s Task, Members Say,” *National Catholic Reporter*, August 30, 2002; M. Martin, “Chicago Archdiocese Gives Accounting of Sex Abuse Costs,” *ibid.*

* Bishop Wilton Gregory released an accounting report stating that sexual abuse of minors by priests had cost the Diocese of Belleville, Illinois, \$2.8 million from 1993 to 2001. A new report updated the costs of the scandal. With these figures added in, the expenses incurred by the Belleville Diocese rose to \$3.3 million in the last 11 years.⁴⁷⁸

* In a similar report, the Manchester Diocese in New Hampshire said it has spent \$7.7 million to settle cases of sexual abuse of minors by priests since 1987.⁴⁷⁹

* The Diocese of Burlington in Vermont reported spending \$2.5 million on such cases since 1990.⁴⁸⁰

* The annual 2002 financial report of the Diocese of Providence, Rhode Island, showed that it paid \$14 million to plaintiffs of sexual abuse of children by priests, who accepted a mediated agreement. An additional \$750,000 covers the projected cost of one last unmediated claim and other mediation expenditures.⁴⁸¹ *America* gave this detail: the expenses just in a settlement with 37 victims in 2002 were \$14.25 million⁴⁸²

⁴⁷⁸ Dennis Coday, "Costs of Abuse Scandal Becoming Clearer," *National Catholic Reporter*, October 3, 2003.

⁴⁷⁹ M. Martin, "Chicago Archdiocese Gives Accounting of Sex Abuse Costs," *ibid.*

⁴⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸¹ "Rhode Island Diocese Faces \$17.5 Million Loss in Assets," *National Catholic Reporter*, December 27, 2002.

⁴⁸² Agostino Bono, "Dealing with the Pain," *America*, November 17, 2002, p. 14.

* As part of its 2002 annual financial report, the Diocese of Worcester in Massachusetts included a special accounting of funds paid out over the last 50 years to settle sexual abuse lawsuits. It said the amount paid was \$2.15 million.⁴⁸³

* A similar accounting was made by the Diocese of Joliet in Illinois. It announced that since 1983, sexual misconduct by priests had cost the Diocese \$2.63 million.⁴⁸⁴

* The Baltimore Archdiocese reported it had spent over \$5.6 million in 15 years on sex abuse cases.⁴⁸⁵

* The Louisville Archdiocese in Kentucky agreed on June 2003 to settle 243 sexual abuse lawsuits brought by 240 plaintiffs for \$25.7 million. The Franciscan Province of Our Lady of Consolation, with headquarters in southern Indiana, was named co-defendant in 19 of the settled suits and was ordered to share the costs for those cases. Eight cases are still pending for plaintiffs who did not take part in the settlement negotiations. Before the June 10 settlement, six other cases had been settled separately.⁴⁸⁶

* On September 7, 2003 the new head of the Archdiocese of Boston, Archbishop Sean O'Malley, settled with

⁴⁸³ "Lay Group Urges Preservation of Records," *National Catholic Reporter*, January 24, 2003.

⁴⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸⁵ "Bishops Asked to Reveal Costs in Sex Abuse Cases," *National Catholic Reporter*, February 14, 2003.

⁴⁸⁶ Glenn Rutherford, "Archdiocese Settles 243 Sexual Abuse Lawsuits for \$25.7 million," *National Catholic Reporter*, June 20, 2003; "Archdiocese Tries to Recover from \$25.7 Million Sex Abuse Settlement," *National Catholic Reporter*, September 5, 2002.

552 plaintiffs for the amount of \$85 million. The figure is on top of a reported \$25 million that the Archdiocese has paid out in other settlements since 1990.⁴⁸⁷ How much more than this \$110 million did the Boston Archdiocese spend in other unreported settlements before 1990? How much has it paid out in court fees, lawyer expenses, and clinical treatment provided for pedophile priests? These answers are difficult to find.

* The Seattle Archdiocese settled 15 clergy sexual abuse lawsuits for \$7.87 million, and is still facing several others.⁴⁸⁸

* The Winona Diocese in Minnesota reported that since 1950 it had received 48 allegations of sexual abuse involving 13 priests, with no new allegations since 1984. Three of the allegations were shown to be false. It said legal costs and settlements over the last 15 years totaled \$4.9 million.⁴⁸⁹

The reported expenses of these 13 Dioceses reach \$216.27 million, a total that represents an average of \$16.63 million per Diocese. If one takes such figures as expressive of the ensemble, for the 192 American Dio-

⁴⁸⁷ William Bole, "Boston Pays the Toll on Turnpike to Redemption," *Our Sunday Visitor*, September 28, 2003; "New Developments on Stories Featured in CWR," *The Catholic World Report*, October 2003, pp. 24-5

⁴⁸⁸ D. Coday, "Costs of Abuse Scandal Becoming Clearer," *National Catholic Reporter*, October 3, 2003.

⁴⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

ceses⁴⁹⁰ one could project the figure of **\$3.19 billion** as the present day cost of the scandal of pedophile priests and Bishops for the Catholic Church in the United States.

Even though this amount is colossal, it does not appear to be exaggerated when one considers that some of the reported data are incomplete.

For example, the figures given for the Archdiocese of Louisville (\$25.7 million) did not pretend to be the total cost. The same can be said for the figures of the Archdiocese of Seattle (\$7.87 million) and for the data from the Diocese of Providence (\$14.75 million). Also incomplete are the quoted numbers given by the Archdiocese of Boston (\$110 million).

According to the press, the Diocese of Manchester officially reported at the beginning of 2003 that since 1987 it had spent \$7.7 million. But additional media reports have disclosed that only in 2002 it settled 176 claims for \$15.45 million.⁴⁹¹ How can such a huge mistake in the official financial report be explained? Was it a mistake of the press? Was it a cover-up by the Diocese of the funds expended on pedophile priests? If the media account is correct, as it appears to be, it can cast general suspicion over all the official diocesan reports.

Likewise, a suspicion arises over some other reported data. How is it possible that the small Diocese of

⁴⁹⁰ The official Vatican annual report in the *Annuario Pontificio* gives for the United States a total figure of 192 Dioceses and Eparchies: 185 Dioceses plus 7 Catholic Eastern rites Eparchies [Greek-Melchite, Syrian, Maronite (2), Rumanian, Chaldean and Armenian] (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2001), pp. 953-4.

⁴⁹¹ "News Briefs," *America*, June 9, 2003, p. 6.

Tucson would have spent around \$15 million to settle cases of pedophile priests while the gigantic Archdiocese of Chicago, one of the largest in the country, would have spent proportionally only \$16.8 million? This comparison leads one to wonder about the figures provided by the Chicago archdiocesan offices. If figures were falsified, another question necessarily arises: Would the reported Chicago total be the only fallacious one?

From this, it becomes clear that the projected total figure of \$3.19 billion for expenses paid out by the American Episcopate for the sexual abuse of priests does not seem exaggerated. The total amount of expenses could be even larger.

* * *

Chapter VI

CLERICAL PEDOPHILIA IN OTHER COUNTRIES

As American Catholics reel under constant new reports of pedophile crimes committed by the clergy and cover-ups by Church authorities, the impression could be that what we are witnessing is an appalling phenomenon occurring primarily, or even strictly, in the United States. But this is not the case.

In the wake of the U.S. crisis, it was soon apparent that the same crisis was shaking the Church in other countries. As in the United States, victims of clergy sexual abuse surfaced with charges that the Church authorities in their respective countries simply shuffled the abusers around when their crimes would come to light. As in the United States, there is growing public awareness, legal actions, and probing media.

The incidents occurring in the various countries reported below do not intend to be comprehensive. They aim simply to present a sample of the broad expansion of the pedophilia vice now undermining the confidence of the faithful in the Catholic Church. It is another consequence unfolding in the wake of Vatican II.

Argentina – On October 1, 2002, Pope John Paul II accepted the resignation of **Archbishop Edgardo Gabriel Storni** of Santa Fé following accusations that he

sexually abused seminarians. In a brief statement, the Vatican said the Pope accepted his resignation in accordance with a Church law provision that allows a Prelate to resign for "ill health or another serious reason." No specific reason was pointed out. Argentine officials announced September 25 that Storni had submitted his resignation to appease the national furor raised by the sex abuse allegations. The Archbishop denied the charges.

The Archbishop's resignation was accepted soon after the release in August of journalist Olga Wornat's book *Nuestra Santa Madre* [Our Holy Mother]. It claimed that Storni, 66, sexually abused at least 47 men, including minors, at his archdiocesan seminary since he became Archbishop of Santa Fé in 1984. Argentine civil authorities have opened a criminal investigation into the allegations.⁴⁹²

Wornat pointed out that the Vatican had investigated Storni in 1994 after almost a decade of rumors of sexual abuse, which began shortly after his appointment in 1984. In fact, the Vatican ordered Archbishop José Arancibia of Mendoza in May 1994 to look into the multiple accusations of sexual abuse against Storni. Arancibia interviewed around 50 youths, seminarians, and laypersons, who gave details about what they knew regarding the alleged abuses of Storni. He closed his investigation in December 1994 and sent his conclusions in a dossier to the Vatican. It remained there, producing no punitive measures against Storni until Wornat – who had access to this

⁴⁹² "Bishops Form Task Group on Charter," *National Catholic Reporter*.

dossier – published her book, expounding analogous evidence.⁴⁹³

October 24, 2002, **Fr. Julio Grassi** of the Moron Diocese, a suburb of the capital Buenos Aires, turned himself in to the police a day after a TV news program aired abuse accusations against him. The priest claimed he was innocent. Argentine prosecutors affirmed they had enough evidence to hold him on aggravated corruption of minors' charges.⁴⁹⁴

Australia – In 1993, **Fr. Gerald Ridsdale** was convicted of 46 sexual offenses against 21 children dating back to 1961 and was sentenced to a minimum 15-year prison term. David Ridsdale, the priest's nephew and one of his victims, came forward in June 2002, accusing Archbishop George Pell of Sidney of trying to buy his silence when he telephoned him to ask for help in early 1993. Pell denied the charges.⁴⁹⁵

The Catholic faithful in Australia were increasingly alarmed by the many cases of pedophilia that were coming to light. Only in 1996, one hundred priests were dismissed because of the sexual abuse of minors.⁴⁹⁶

⁴⁹³ "Mons. Storni, argentino, reo di abusi sessuali. Il Vaticano lo sapeva da otto anni," *Adista*, September 30, 2002, pp. 11-2; "Archbishop Accused of Abuse Resigns," *The Tablet*, October 5, 2002.

⁴⁹⁴ "Voice of the Faithful Asks Bishops for Input," *National Catholic Reporter*, November 15, 2002

⁴⁹⁵ Michael Gilchrist, "Crucifixion Time Down Under," *The Catholic World Report*, July 2002, p. 44.

⁴⁹⁶ "Pedofilia abala Igreja da Austrália," *Jornal da Tarde*, August 27, 1997

In July 2001, figures obtained by *The Sun-Herald* in Sydney show that, over the past five years, 81 priests and 78 brothers in New South Wales and Australian capital territory were accused of sexual abuse. Of the 230 complaints, a majority – 190 – were substantiated. Half involved the sexual abuse of children, adolescents, and young adults.⁴⁹⁷

In June 2002, Archbishop George Pell admitted that he had offered \$28,000 to buy a family's silence about the alleged sexual abuse of its two girls by a local priest for six years. The youngest girl was five at the time the abuse began, the family said.

Pell had initially denied on national television that he had offered money to the parents. But after being shown a letter from the archdiocesan lawyer giving the money as compensation for the alleged abuse, he confessed he had offered the sum.⁴⁹⁸

The same month, the Catholic Church in Australia admitted publicly that some victims of sex abuse had been silenced in exchange for financial compensations. A lawyer speaking on behalf of Archbishop George Pell acknowledged secret clauses of agreements with sexual abuse victims in which they accepted money for silence. The admission came days after the Archbishops of Melbourne and Sydney, Australia's two largest Catholic Dioceses, took out advertisements in weekend newspapers around the country to apologize for past sexual abuse by members

⁴⁹⁷ "Newspaper Publishes Statistics on Complaints Against Clergy," apud *The Sun Herald*, July 8, 2002.

⁴⁹⁸ "Aussie Archbishop Admits Abuse Offer," *The Kansas City Star*, June 2, 2002.

of the clergy. The ad went on to state “compensation payments are not an attempt to buy silence.”⁴⁹⁹

In August 2002, Archbishop George Pell was accused of molesting a 12-year-old boy in 1961 when he was a seminarian in Melbourne. Facing these accusations Pell took the initiative to step aside temporarily from his position as head of the Sydney Archdiocese. He offered to answer all inquires from an independent tribunal regarding charges of sexual abuse placed against him.

This independent tribunal, the Australian Bishops National Committee for Professional Standards, is an organization created by Pell in 1996 shortly after he was named Archbishop of Sydney. A judge retained by this tribunal investigated the allegations. He absolved Archbishop Pell of all charges.⁵⁰⁰

In 2003, Pope John Paul II granted Pell the Cardinal’s hat.

Austria – In Austria, the “Gröer affair” was a highly publicized scandal. A brief overview of the case follows.

On March 26, 1995, *Profil*, a Vienna weekly, published the accusations of agronomic engineer Josef Hartmann, a former seminarian who had been in Hollabrunn

⁴⁹⁹ “Church Admits Abuse Victims Silenced, *CNN* online edition, June 10, 2002.

⁵⁰⁰ “É Accusato di Pedofilia. L’Arcevescovo di Sidney si Autosospende,” *Adista*, September 16, 2002, p. 14; “Assolto dall’Accusa di pedofilia il Vescovo Australiano George Pell,” *Adista*, November 18, 2002, p.13; “Dr. Pell Steps Aside While Allegations Are Investigated,” *The Catholic Weekly* (Sydney), September 1, 2002.

during the time **Hans Hermann Gröer**, then a priest, was a professor there. Hartmann accused Gröer of the crime of pedophilia between 1972 and 1976.⁵⁰¹ The text of the interview was said to have been sent to Cardinal Gröer three days before it was published. The Cardinal reportedly failed to respond.⁵⁰²

By April 3, the number of ex-alumni who were accusing the Cardinal of pedophilia had risen to nine. A Benedictine priest, Fr. Udo Fischer, said that in 1971 Cardinal Gröer had tried to seduce him, a fact he had reported to proper authorities in 1985. Nonetheless, 11 months later, Gröer was named Archbishop of Vienna.⁵⁰³

In April of 1995 another newspaper, *Bild*, recounted – with details lacking decorum and decency – the accusations of five witnesses against the Cardinal.⁵⁰⁴ On April 5, 1995, Cardinal Gröer was re-elected president of the Austrian Bishops Conference. One day later, he resigned the post. A public opinion poll showed that 62% of Austrians believed the Cardinal should relinquish all official duties,⁵⁰⁵ and a growing number of personages were suggesting that he retire.⁵⁰⁶

⁵⁰¹ "Ero seminarista, l'arcivescovo abusò di me," *Corriere della Sera*, March 27, 1995.

⁵⁰² Francesco Strazzari, "Di caso in caso," *Il Regno* (Bologna), May 1995, p. 264.

⁵⁰³ Vivianne Schnitzer, "Más denuncias de homosexualidad contra el cardenal Gröer," *El País*, April 3, 1995.

⁵⁰⁴ "Neuen Zeugen im Sex-Skandal," *Bild*, April 5, 1995.

⁵⁰⁵ "Vienna, il Cardinale cede," *Corriere della Sera*, April 7, 1995.

⁵⁰⁶ F. Strazzari, "Di caso in caso," *Il Regno*, May 1995, p. 265.

On April 13 the Vatican named Bishop Christoph von Schönborn as *coadjutor*, or assistant with the right to succeed Cardinal Gröer.⁵⁰⁷

On April 22 the news broke that some women were also accusing the Cardinal of Vienna of having molested them as children. The women claimed that he had taken them to his home on the pretext of giving spiritual direction. Theologian Adolph Holl told *Der Spiegel* that the news caused no surprise among the churchmen of Vienna, who were already aware of “Gröer’s weakness for adolescents.” A public opinion survey showed that 81% of Austrians wanted Cardinal Gröer to be removed from office.⁵⁰⁸

At the beginning of July 1995, the news broke that a petition drive sponsored by the progressivist group We Are Church had gathered as many as 400,000 signatures from among the Austrian population. The cause for this general indignation was the “Gröer scandal.” Profoundly shocked by the charges of sexual crimes and homosexuality made against the supposedly “conservative” Cardinal, the petition drive originally aimed at calling for an end to a situation that permitted such abuses. Nonetheless, We Are Church directors took advantage of this healthy reaction in order to make various progressivist radical demands to reform the Church. Some requests in the petition included the abolition of priestly celibacy, the ordination of women and the possibility to veto Vatican choices for Bishops *via*

⁵⁰⁷ Celso Itiberê, “Escândalos sexuais que envolvem padres põem Vaticano na defensiva,” *O Globo*, April 14, 1995; R. N. Osting, “An Unholy Holy Week,” *Time*, April 24, 1995.

⁵⁰⁸ Alfredo Venturi, “Vienna ora ripudia il Cardinale Gröer,” *Corriere della Sera*, April 22, 1995.

plebiscite.⁵⁰⁹ The petition ended several days later with 505,000 signatures, including those of 1,000 Austrian priests.⁵¹⁰

On August 1, 1995 an article in the *Corriere della Sera* reported that a spokesman for the Austrian homosexual movement *Hosi*, Kurt Krickler, said that one-fourth of all the Prelates in the country's Bishops Conference practiced the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah. One of the accused was Cardinal Christoph Schönborn, whom the Pope had assigned to replace Cardinal Gröer. Krickler said:

“I hope to disclose it tomorrow. In a press conference we will announce five names, but I still don't know which ones. The list is very long; we will publish names picked at random at the last moment.”⁵¹¹

Referring to the suit against Cardinal Joseph Louis Bernardin of Chicago, who was absolved of charges of pedophilia because his accuser recanted, the homosexual spokesman contended his group would not experience the same results:

“We are not satisfied with gossip-mongers. We have carefully gathered documentation and infor-

⁵⁰⁹ Vivianne Schinitzer, “Amenaza de cisma en la Iglesia Católica austriaca tras el “caso Gröer,” *El Pais*, (Madrid), July 4, 1995.

⁵¹⁰ Tito Sansa, “Rivoluzione in Chiesa’ – Referendum choc tra gli austriaci,” *La Stampa* (Turin), July 6, 1995; Atila Sinke Guimarães, *We Are Church: Radical Aims, Dangerous Errors* (Los Angeles: Tradition In Action, Inc., 2002), pp. 4-7.

⁵¹¹ Kurt Krickler, Statement, *apud* Riccardo Chiaberne, “Vienna, ricatto gay alla Chiesa,” *Corriere della Sera*, August 11, 1995.

mation from various sources. We are very sure of what we are saying.”

The denunciations were allegedly made with the aim of making Austrian law more tolerant of homosexuals. Although the law permitted persons over age 16 to have homosexual and lesbian relationships, homosexuals nonetheless contended they were discriminated against. Homosexual advocate groups took as a model an Italian law that established age 14 as the threshold age to enter any kind of sexual relationship.⁵¹²

In fact, the next day Krickler carried out his promise and disclosed the names of five Bishops he claimed were homosexuals. Heading the list was Cardinal Christoph Schönborn, auxiliary Bishop of Vienna with right of succession, followed by Bishop Egon Kapelari of Klagenfurt, Bishop Andreas Laun of Salzburg, Bishop Klaus Küng of Feldkirch and the deceased Bishop Leopold Ungar. Krickler claimed that he could produce three witnesses to testify against each of the Bishops, but failed to give their names. The four Prelates stated the accusations were groundless and announced legal proceedings against Krickler.⁵¹³

On September 14, 1995, Cardinal Gröer left his post at the head of the Vienna Archdiocese. In August, the Vatican had officially accepted his resignation. He sub-

⁵¹² *Ibid.*

⁵¹³ Alfredo Venturi, “Austria, vescovi alla gogna,” *Corriere della Sera*, August 2, 1995; *La Vanguardia* (Barcelona), “Un líder gay afirma que cuatro obispos austriacos son homosexuales,” August 2, 1995; *ABC*, “El Papa acepta la renuncia del Cardinal austriaco Gröer, que se retira a un convento,” August 16, 1995.

mitted it a year before on October 13, 1994 when he reached age 75. But the Vatican kept him at the post. After the media scandal, however, the Vatican changed its mind and accepted the resignation.⁵¹⁴ He was succeeded by the future Cardinal Schönborn.

In February 1998 fresh accusations against the retired Cardinal were made. In response, four Austrian Bishops – Cardinal Schönborn, Archbishop Georg Eder of Salzburg, Bishop Johann Weber of Graz, and Bishop Egon Kapellari of Klagenfurt – stated they had the “moral certainty” that the allegations of sexual misconduct against Gröer were “in essence correct.”

The Prelates suggested that Gröer should “publicly and unequivocally declare that he was innocent, or publicly ask for forgiveness.” Another investigation took place. Soon afterward Gröer issued the following equivocal written declaration:

“If I have sinned, I beg God and all the people for forgiveness.”⁵¹⁵

Such is the overview of the “Gröer affair.”

The position of the Vatican regarding the case seemed quite complacent afterward.

During a trip to Germany in 1998, John Paul II took the initiative to go and visit Gröer personally.⁵¹⁶

⁵¹⁴ *ABC*, (Madrid), “El Papa acepta la renuncia del Cardinal austriaco Gröer, que se retira a un convento,” August 16, 1995.

⁵¹⁵ *The Tablet*, “Death of Cardinal Groer,” March 29, 2003, pp. 27-8.

⁵¹⁶ *Adista*, “L’eterna rimozione. sui trascorsi del Card. Gröer il Vaticano nasconde la realta,” April 5, 2003, p. 14.

When Cardinal Gröer died in March 2003, as if nothing were amiss, John Paul II sent to Cardinal Schönborn the following telegram, published in *L'Osservatore Romano*:

“With sadness I receive the news of the passing away of your predecessor in the role of Archbishop of Vienna, the Most Reverend Cardinal Hans Hermann Gröer, OSB. With great love for Christ and His Church, he guided the Archdiocese of Vienna from 1986 to 1995 under the motto “*In Verbo autem tuo*,” [“But at thy word” (Lk 5:5)] and for several years was the head of the Austrian Bishops’ Conference. In his last years, which he spent in retreat, he was taken by an illness. I assure you that I join in the prayers that the Archdiocese of Vienna offers in tribute to its former Pastor, and I recommend him to the Lord, to Whom he had dedicated his life. May he receive the eternal reward the Lord promised to His faithful servants”⁵¹⁷

In Gröer’s official biography that *L'Osservatore Romano* published (March 24-25, 2003), no mention was made of the profound wound inflicted by him on the Catholic Church.

Belgium – In April 1998 **Fr. André Vander Lijn** was sentenced to six years in prison for sexual abuse of 10 minors between ages 10 and 16. Lijn confessed to the crimes. According to the victims, Lijn, at the time a pastor of Saint-Gilles parish in Brussels, was drunk at the time of all the abuses. The case came to light in 1996 when the

⁵¹⁷ *Ibid.*

parents of one boy denounced the sexual abuse of their son by the priest. After two years of investigation, Lijn was judged guilty.

Cardinal Primate of Belgium Godfried Danneels, Archbishop of Brussels, was ordered to pay a fine for negligence and complicity in the crimes. Auxiliary Bishop of Brussels Paul Lanneau, under whose authority Fr. Lijn had served, had to pay a similar fine.⁵¹⁸

Brazil – In March 1993, sectors of the Brazilian public were indignant and dismayed over the scandal of **Fr. Frederico Cunha**, convicted of homosexuality and accused of homicide in the Island of Madeira, **Portugal**. After trying to seduce a 15-year-old adolescent, he threw him off a cliff, killing him. The priest alleged that at the time of the crime, he was with another adolescent, age 19, his godson and a homosexual partner. Cunha was condemned to 12 years in prison for homicide and another 18 months for homosexual attempt on a minor.⁵¹⁹

In December 1995, Brazilian priest **Fr. Boniface Buzzi** was sentenced by a Santa Barbara court in the State of Minas Gerais to a 13-year prison term for sexually abusing two pupils in the school where he was teaching.

⁵¹⁸ "Padre belga é condenado por abuso sexual," *O Globo*, April 10, 1998.

⁵¹⁹ Cristina Duran, "Padre brasileiro é condenado em Portugal," *O Estado de São Paulo*, March 11, 1993; "Padre brasileiro deve recorrer da sentence, *Estado de São Paulo*, March 22, 1993; Mario Prata, "Senhor Cunha ou Fred do caniçal?" *ibid.*; "Pecados na sacristia," *Veja*, March 17, 1993, p. 83.

The boys were ages 6 and 11.⁵²⁰ After serving several years, he was released, only to be re-arrested a short time later in April 2002 on a new charge of the abuse of a nine-year-old boy. The boy's parents filed a suit asking punitive damages against the priest and his superior, Archbishop Luciano Mendes de Almeida of Mariana.⁵²¹

In December 1996, the rector of the diocesan seminary of Maceió, **Msgr. Edvar Moraes**, was caught in flagrant sexual relations with a 14-year-old girl. Police were making a routine check of a motel in the city's red light district when they surprised the monsignor with the girl. He was charged with the corruption of a minor and sent to jail. Msgr. Moraes was a well-known ecclesiastic considered a probable candidate to replace the Archbishop of Maceió, Evaldo Amaral. The latter publicly asked pardon for the priest's behavior. He also stated he was trying to convince Moraes not to leave the priesthood.⁵²²

Canada – In 1985, **Fr. Denis Vadeboncoeur**, pastor of St. Benedict Parish in Sainte-Foy, was accused of molesting four adolescents with charges of gross inde-

⁵²⁰ "Padre é condenado por abuso sexual," *O Estado de São Paulo*, December 20, 1995.

⁵²¹ "Voice of the Faithful Asks Bishops for Input," *National Catholic Reporter*.

⁵²² "Juizado flagra padre em motel de Maceió tranzando com uma jovem de 14 anos," *O Globo*, December 3, 1996; "Monsignore a letto con un ragazzina: arrestato," *Corriere della Sera*, December 4, 1996.

gency, sexual aggression, and sodomy. The priest admitted his guilt.⁵²³

In April 1996, the Canadian Broadcasting Company (CBC) aired a television program *No Chance to Heal*, which revealed how Catholic Church leaders in Ottawa and Toronto “paid the bill” for 580 cases of sexual abuses involving the Christian Brothers Congregation.

Some days later, the Archbishop of Ottawa Marcel Gervais and Archbishop of Toronto Aloysius Ambrozic publicly asked forgiveness of the almost 1,100 victims of sexual abuse in schools run by the Christian Brothers. The abuses took place in St. Joseph's and St. John's Training School for Boys in Uxbridge, whose residents included orphans, truants, juvenile delinquents, the handicapped, and children from broken or poor homes.⁵²⁴

In February 2002, it was reported that a Catholic priest, **Fr. James Kneale**, who was convicted of sexually assaulting a teenage boy in Ontario, was working again as a parish priest in Calgary.

Kneale pleaded guilty in 1999 to sexually assaulting John Caruso in the 1980s. Caruso has filed a multimillion-dollar lawsuit against the priest. In a bizarre twist, Fr. Kneale has sued Caruso's parents, claiming they were at fault for allowing their son to spend time with him.

Fr. Bill Trienekens, vicar general for the Calgary Diocese, said the priest's hiring was approved by Bishop

⁵²³ Louise Lemiex, “Selon un psychiatre – Le père Vadeboncoeur victime d'un ‘déravage’ émotionnel,” *Le Soleil* (Quebec), August 23, 1985.

⁵²⁴ “A Scandal of Tragic Proportions,” *The Wanderer*, May 9, 1996.

Fred Henry, who was aware of Kneale's past. Trienekens said that Kneale had paid for his crime and deserved another chance.⁵²⁵

In April 2002, abuse suits forced the Oblates of Mary Immaculate in Manitoba to file for bankruptcy protection.⁵²⁶

In June 2002, the British Columbia Supreme Court allowed the Christian Brothers Congregation to sell two schools for the amount of \$20 million in order to pay more than 90 males who were victims of sexual abuse at the orphanage that the institution ran in Newfoundland. The schools sold were the Vancouver College and St. Thomas More Collegiate. Together the two schools had around 1,700 students.⁵²⁷

Victims of sexual abuse in Canada have complained that no one knows the extent of the problem because Church records are not public. Also cloaked in secrecy is information about the number of lawsuits against priests and dioceses. The Church routinely imposes a gag order on settlements.⁵²⁸

⁵²⁵ Gay Abbate, "Catholic Church in Canada Faces Scrutiny over Abuse," *The Globe*, May 13, 2002; "Priest Posted at Calgary Parish Despite Sex Assault Conviction," Survivors Network of Those Abused by Priests [SNAP] *snapnetwork.org*, February 2002.

⁵²⁶ "Chronology of the Cases," *The Catholic World Report*, p. 6.

⁵²⁷ "Court Allow Schools to be Sold in Abuse Settlement," *National Catholic Reporter*, June 21, 2002.

⁵²⁸ G. Abbate, "Catholic Church in Canada Faces Scrutiny Over Abuse."

England – In November 2000, Archbishop Cormac Murphy-O'Connor of Westminster apologized to victims of clergy child abuse and for the Church's response to the problem. He told the BBC's *Today* program:

“I am very sorry about mistakes that were made in the past. I apologize very sincerely from my heart for any suffering that has been caused by child abuse by a priest or religious or Church worker.”

The Archbishop was speaking prior to the official launching of new measures to deal with priests who abuse children in England and Wales.⁵²⁹

Earlier in 2000, Archbishop Murphy-O'Connor faced calls for his resignation when it emerged that he had been responsible for allowing pedophile **Fr. Michael Hill** to continue working as a chaplain despite warnings he would re-offend.⁵³⁰

In November 2002, the British police involved the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) along with the BBC in an investigation of Cardinal Cormac Murphy-O'Connor of Westminster. The allegations dated from 1985, when he was Bishop of Arundel and Brighton, and concerned his admission that he had failed to report allegations of child abuse against Fr. Michael Hill. Instead, Bishop Murphy-O'Connor moved Hill to the chaplaincy at Gatwick Airport, where he said he believed that Hill would not be a danger to children.⁵³¹

⁵²⁹ “Apology to Victims,” *The Catholic World Report*, November 2000, pp. 11-2.

⁵³⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵³¹ “Cardinal Investigated for Cover-up,” *The Catholic World Report*, November 2002.

The BBC found 25 letters circulated by the Cardinal, the priest, and health professionals dealing with the topic. The spokesman for the Archdiocese of Westminster promised cooperation with the police.⁵³²

In April 2002, **ex-priest David Murphy** from Edinburgh was condemned to six years in prison. He admitted to eight charges of indecent assault against boys and girls at St. Mary's Home in Gravesend in the early 1970s. Some of his victims were as young as age five. He was sentenced at Maidstone Crown Court.⁵³³

In the same month **ex-priest Michael McConville** was also convicted of sexually abusing children at his home in the early 1970s.⁵³⁴

France – In March 1997, **Fr. Lucas** [no last name was disclosed] was jailed in Fontenay-le-Comte under the accusation of abuse of minors. Fr. Lucas held various titles and posts: professor at the Nantes seminary, an authority in Holy Scriptures, a member of the Priests' Council, and a close collaborator of Bishop François Garnier of Nantes.

This case of pedophilia provoked a violent reaction among the faithful from that part of Catholic Vendée where Lucas had been stationed. The charges against Lucas were made by 10 victims who claimed they had been violated as boys and teenagers between 1990 and 1993. According to them, Lucas had repeatedly abused them sexually during

⁵³² *Ibid.*

⁵³³ "Former Priests Convicted of Abuse," *The Tablet*, May 3, 2003, p. 29.

⁵³⁴ *Ibid.*

that period. The Roche-sur-Yon judge decided the priest should await court process in prison.⁵³⁵

On February 9, 2001, the court of Haut-Rhin in Alsace sentenced **Fr. Jean-Luc Heckner** to a 16-year prison term. He was found guilty of the sexual abuse of seven young boys.⁵³⁶

In June 2001, the French court of Caen convicted **Bishop Pierre Pican** of Lisieux and Bayeux for covering up for a pedophile priest in his Diocese. The Bishop was sentenced to three months in prison.⁵³⁷

The verdict against Bishop Pican marked the first time in modern French history that a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic had been convicted for failing to disclose the sexual abuse and mistreatment of minors by a member of the clergy.

During a two-day trial, the Bishop admitted to concealing the pedophile activities of **Fr. René Bissey** for two years before the priest was arrested in 1998. Bissey was sentenced to 18 years in prison in October 2000 on 11 counts of sexual abuse of children. After learning of his crimes, Pican had sent Bissey to a clinic for psychiatric treatment, and then allowed him to reassume parish work.⁵³⁸

⁵³⁵ Dominique Hervouet, "Le demon de l'Abbé Lucas," *Le Figaro*, March 8-9, 1997.

⁵³⁶ *L'Ephéméride* online edition, February 2, 2001.

⁵³⁷ "Centralisation renforcée," *Actualité des Religions*, February 2002, p. 34.

⁵³⁸ "Sexual Abuse Cases Rock Catholic Clergy," *IAfrica.com World News* online edition, September 5, 2001.

Germany – In October 2002, the German Bishops issued guidelines dealing with clergy sexual abuse of children and admitted mishandling cases in the past. According to the communiqué, 47 cases of abuse of children had been documented in the last 30 years.⁵³⁹

Ireland – On June 14, 1995, **Fr. Danny Curran** was sentenced to seven years in prison for having abused 13 boys between 1990 and 1994. According to the victims Curran used to give them beer before the abuse.⁵⁴⁰

Cardinal Primate of Ireland Cohan Daly went public to “present the humble excuses” of the Catholic Church for a long series of sexual abuse by priests against boys. Daly acknowledged that “these terrible violations of sacred trust” caused “huge wounds in many boys and in their families.” After a three-day meeting with the 34 Catholic Bishops of Ireland, he promised that from then on new cases would be reported to the police, as provided by law.

Italian newspaper *Corriere della Sera* commented on the Irish Bishop’s public apology:

“This is the most authoritative admission of the drama now undermining the confidence of the faithful in the Catholic Church, the historic mainstay of Irish society

⁵³⁹ “Bishops Form Task Group on Charter,” *National Catholic Reporter*.

⁵⁴⁰ “Padre é condenado por pedofilia,” *Jornal da Tarde* (Brazil), June 15, 1995.

“According to the Bishops, the proportion of the clergy investigated for sexual abuse is 1.5 %; sixty priests are alleged to be involved (or 100, if priests from Religious Orders are included). The question, however, is not one of statistics, but of morals. And even of politics, if one takes into account the resignation of Prime Minister Albert Reynolds.”⁵⁴¹

Reynolds is said to have ignored the extradition order for pedophile priest Fr. Brendan Smyth, who was wanted in Northern Ireland on charges of sexually abusing 17 young children. Smyth was hiding out in a monastery in the Irish Republic refusing to return to Northern Ireland to answer for his crimes. Many in Ireland thought it inconceivable that the State would collude in protecting a pedophile priest and demanded Reynolds’ resignation.⁵⁴²

In 1997, the same **Fr. Brendan Smyth** pleaded guilty to 74 counts of sexual abuse related to 20 different boys during a period of 36 years. He was sentenced to a 12-year prison term.⁵⁴³

Addressing the National Conference of Priests in 1996, Bishop Willie Walsh of Killaloe admitted that the sexual scandals involving clergy and religious had “shattered” the Church in Ireland and that there was a “perception that we, as Bishops, and other religious authorities

⁵⁴¹ A. Alaticheri, “In Irlanda la Chiesa si scusa per pedofilia.”

⁵⁴² Robert Savage and James Smith, “Sexual Abuse and the Irish Church: Crisis and Responses,” Boston College - The Church in the 21st Century: Occasional Paper 8, www.bc.edu.

⁵⁴³ “Igreja Católica vai recorrer de indenização por abuso sexual,” *O Estado de São Paulo*, July 26, 1997.

involved ourselves in a web of secrecy which was designed to protect the abuser rather than the abused.”⁵⁴⁴

In February 2002, the Catholic Church in Ireland agreed to a record \$110-million payment to victims abused by pedophile priests over decades.⁵⁴⁵ In April the Roman bulletin *Adista* reported the amount had risen to \$128-million, which was confirmed by the November 2003 issue of *The Catholic World Report*.⁵⁴⁶ The *National Catholic Reporter*, however, pointed out that the agreement was to pay 128 million euros, which changes the figure to 150 million US dollars.⁵⁴⁷

Revelations of sexual abuse of children also came to light in various church-run homes and institutions. The Christian Brothers, the Mercy Sisters, and Conference of Religious of Ireland (CORI) have offered public apologies to the survivors of physical and sexual abuse by members of their Orders.⁵⁴⁸ Sr. Elizabeth Maxwell, secretary-general of CORI, stated:

“We accept that some children in residential institutions managed by our members suffered deprivation, physical and sexual abuse.”⁵⁴⁹

⁵⁴⁴ R. Savage and J. Smith, “Sexual Abuse and the Irish Church.”

⁵⁴⁵ L. Stammer, “Pontiff Speaks on Sex Abuse.”

⁵⁴⁶ “Contro la Pedofilia Non Ha Fatto Abbastanza. Se Dimette Anche un Vescovo Irlandese,” *Adista*, April 15, 2002, p. 7; “\$1.2 Billion in Claims,” *The Catholic World Report*, November 2003, p. 14.

⁵⁴⁷ “Ireland Places Billion-Dollar Price Tag on Sex Abuse Scandal,” *National Catholic Reporter*, October 17, 2003

⁵⁴⁸ R. Savage and J. Smith, “Sexual Abuse and the Irish Church.”

⁵⁴⁹ “Religious to Pay \$110 Million to Settle Sex Abuse Claims,” *National Catholic Reporter*, February 15, 2002.

Since 2000, a judicial commission has been inquiring into charges of child abuse in care institutions. Such State-funded institutes were normally run by staff from Religious Orders. In most cases, the accused have been members of those Orders. More than 3,000 persons have come forward to present evidence to the commission.

The first lawsuit in the case was filed more than 10 years ago. At least 20 priests, brothers, and nuns had already been convicted of abusing children by early 2002.⁵⁵⁰

On April 1, 2002, **Bishop Brendan Comiskey** of Ferns resigned following furor over his mishandling of years of complaints against pedophile priest **Fr. Sean Fortune**. Fortune committed suicide in 1999 shortly after standing trial on 66 charges of sexual abuse of young boys. The criticism of the Bishop was sparked by a BBC-TV documentary titled "Primetime: Cardinal Secrets."⁵⁵¹

The past life of Bishop Comiskey has also come under suspicion. In 1995, he took a five-month term of absence to treat his alcoholism in the United States. The Irish press linked a secret apartment he bought in Dublin to pedophile acts. He was also accused of traveling to Bangkok, Thailand, to take part in the sexual entertainments of that city. The Vatican did not specify which article of Canon Law it was applying when it accepted the resignation of Comiskey.⁵⁵²

⁵⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵¹ "Bishop Resigns Over Handling of Abusive Priest," *National Catholic Reporter*, April 12, 2002; "Archbishop Diamund Martin," *Ibid.*, May 30, 2003.

⁵⁵² "Contro la Pedofilia Non Ha Fatto Abbastanza. Se Dimette Anche un Vescovo Irlandese," *Adista*, April 15, 2002, p. 7.

In October 2002 Dublin Cardinal Desmond Connell was heckled at a Mass where he reiterated an apology for his failure to deal effectively with priests who abused children. The apology had been released earlier to victims of sexual abuse by clergy. As Connell attempted to speak, a number of the faithful booed and shouted, “It’s too late.”⁵⁵³

A documentary on Irish State television recently revealed that the Dublin Archdiocese was facing more than 450 legal actions as a result of child sexual abuse by clergy.⁵⁵⁴

Italy – In June 1996, **Fr. Giuseppe Rassello** was sentenced, upon appeal, by a Naples court to two years in prison for having abused a minor in 1989, only 25 months after he was ordained a priest.⁵⁵⁵

On April 26, 2002, in an article in *La Repubblica*, journalist Silvana Mazzochi investigated the problem of pedophilia in Italy. She pointed out several cases – usually withholding the complete names of the accused – in which the Church had protected the guilty. They were the following:

- The parish priest of San Giuliano in Milan was given a four-and-half year prison sentence for pedophile crimes. Notwithstanding, after serving time,

⁵⁵³ “Voice of the Faithful Asks Bishops for Input,” *National Catholic Reporter*.

⁵⁵⁴ “Addenda – Archbishop Diarmuid Martin,” *National Catholic Reporter*, May 30, 2003.

⁵⁵⁵ “Stuprò ragazzo 25 mesi a prete,” *Corriere della Sera*, June 17, 1996.

the priest was returned to his ministry at the same parish.

- Fr. Marco, a pastor at Val di Susa, was suspended from his ministry only after photos were found in his house where he appeared in obscene poses with two boys. He also received a four-and-half year sentence.
- In Sicily **Fr. Margarito Reyes Marchena** was sent by his religious superiors to Mexico after he was accused of sexual abuse of four boys.
- The 65-year-old priest of a parish in the small county of Chianti remained in his post even after he was accused of abusing a handicapped boy. This priest had already been accused of pedophilia in the past. Church authorities had transferred him from parish to parish without warning the faithful.
- Authorities were silent about the report of a priest in Calabria who was accused of having abused his 12-year-old niece. The girl tried to commit suicide, cutting her wrist.
- **Fr. Pino**, ex-parish-priest of Santa Margherita in Liguria, was accused of indecent acts toward a 14-year-old girl. A petition supporting the priest and accusing the victim and her family of slander was drawn up and gathered 1000 signatures. At first the girl refused to confirm the accusation brought forth by her family. Afterwards, however, questioned in court, she acknowledged the abuse and described a scar below the priest's navel. She stated he exposed himself to her after taking her to the rectory to "hear her confession." The priest was ordered to

pay a fee, which he never did, and the girl entered a convent.⁵⁵⁶

In May 2002, one week after the American Cardinals met at the Vatican with John Paul II, the Italian magazine *Famiglia Cristiana* [Christian Family] reported that at least seven Italian priests had been imprisoned for sexual abuse of minors. The magazine did not disclose names or details.⁵⁵⁷

On September 14, 2002, under an Interpol court order, **Fr. Edgar Gaudencio Hidalgo Dominguez** was arrested in Mexico. While serving as a priest in the parish of San Castrese, north of Naples, Hidalgo was accused of many counts of sexual abuse of children, “some of them in orgies.” In November 1999, after an Italian judge ordered a prison sentence, he fled the country. He was captured in Mexico, where he awaited extradition to face charges in Italy.

Regarding the charges against this Italian priest, the Archdiocese of Mexico City issued a communiqué affirming that there was “irrefutable and exhaustive proof” of Hidalgo’s guilt and asking that civil justice be carried out “without any favors or privileges.”⁵⁵⁸

New Zealand – In July 2002, the Catholic Bishops of New Zealand issued a public apology to victims of sex

⁵⁵⁶ “Prete pedofili in Italia: solo la punta dell’iceberg,” *Adista*, May 6, 2002, pp. 9-10.

⁵⁵⁷ “*Famiglia Cristiana* Magazine Reports on Clergy Sex Abuse,” *National Catholic Reporter*, May 10, 2002.

⁵⁵⁸ “Estradato in Italia prete messicano accusato di abusi su bambini di Napoli,” *Adista*, February 15, 2003, pp. 10-1.

abuse by priests or religious. In late June, the Catholic Church in New Zealand revealed that it had confirmed 38 cases of sexual abuse by priests, brothers, and lay Church employees in the past 50 years. In their letter, the Bishops deplored “past mistakes” and the way the Church had handled abuse complaints.⁵⁵⁹

Poland – Archbishop Juliusz Paetz of Poznan was accused of molesting students at his diocesan seminary. Paetz worked at the Vatican from 1967 to 1976 in the Bishops’ Synod, and from 1976 to 1982 as a member of the household staff of John Paul II. In 1982, he was named Bishop of Lomza, Poland. The Pope made him Archbishop of Poznan in 1996.

The charges of sexual molestation against Paetz came to public attention after a February 23, 2002 report in the Polish newspaper *Rzeczpospolita*. The rector of the Poznan seminary, according to the report, barred Paetz from visiting the school.

Four seminarians were said to have given formal statements describing instances in which Paetz allegedly tried to pressure them into sexual contacts. Forty-three Polish intellectuals in Krakow and Warsaw signed a letter asking Paetz to step down until the situation had been clarified.

The *Rzeczpospolita* report stated that letters describing the charges against Paetz were directed in early 2000 to the Pope’s private secretary, Polish Bishop

⁵⁵⁹ “Bishop Proposes Registry of Guilty Priests,” *National Catholic Reporter*, July 19, 2002; Greg Ward, “Catholic Priests Sorry for NZ Abuses,” *BBC News World Edition* online, July 1, 2002.

Stanislaw Dziwisz, as well as to Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, head of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, and Cardinal Angelo Sodano, Vatican Secretary of State.

According to *Rzeczpospolita*, at the end of 2001 a special Vatican commission was sent to Poznan to carry out an investigation. Two clergymen, members of a Church tribunal, questioned more than 40 witnesses in all; according to unofficial sources, most of them confirmed the accusations.

Commenting on the accusation of pedophilia against Paetz, *National Catholic Reporter* wrote:

“It could raise potentially explosive doubts about John Paul’s judgment in promoting him to the Episcopacy, and then promoting him again.”⁵⁶⁰

In April 2002, Pope John Paul II accepted the resignation of the Archbishop of Poznan, although Archbishop Paetz continued to deny the allegations.⁵⁶¹

Spain – This news item headlined “Spain Follows Along After the United States” appeared in an *Adista* bulletin of April 1995:

“The scourge of sexual abuse by members of the clergy appears to be spreading like an oil slick. Two Cardinals and five Bishops are said to be guilty of concealing a network for corrupting minors involving priests, as well as the rape and sexual abuse of women and psychopaths. The denunciation

⁵⁶⁰ J. Allen, “Polish Prelate Accused of Sexual Abuse,” *National Catholic Reporter*, March 15, 2002.

⁵⁶¹ News Briefs, *America*, April 22, 2002, p. 5.

comes from writer and journalist Pepe Rodriguez, author of the book, *La vida sexual del clero* [The sexual life of the Clergy] The accusations, made at the book's launching on March 7, include first and last names: Cardinal Emeritus Narcis Jubany of Barcelona, the present Archbishop of Barcelona Cardinal Ricardo Maria Carles, along with his three Auxiliary Bishops, Carlos Soler, Jaime Traserra, and Juan-Enric Vives, stand accused of supporting the network.

“But it does not stop here. Rodriguez also launched his missiles against Bishop Javier Azagra of Cartagenaand denounced Bishop José Guerra Campos of Cuenca for covering up cases of sexual abuse perpetrated by a priest who was guilty, among other things, of raping a mentally handicapped person.”⁵⁶²

Given the data presented in Chapters V and VI on pedophilia,⁵⁶³ one can conclude that both the present-day higher and lower Clergy act in a way that reveals a general policy of covering up pedophile abusers. This general policy can be deduced from the following positions:

⁵⁶² “In Spagna due cardinale e cinque vescovi accusati di silenzio sugli abusi di minori e psicolabili,” *Adista*, April 1, 1995.

⁵⁶³ What I stated at the end of chapter IV dealing with sources used on homosexuality in the clergy applies also to information on pedophilia in the clergy. The great majority of sources used in chapters V and VI were from written material. The large file on pedophilia collected in the last five years from internet sites may be used for a further update of this work.

Regarding priests:

- A priest never takes the initiative of seeking the civil authority or the family of his victim to confess his pedophile or homosexual crime. He always waits to be accused. That is, he does not act in an honest and straightforward way.
- When accused, he generally denies his sexual abuse, only confessing it after he is prosecuted and without any other exit or is trying to obtain some legal advantage to diminish his sentence. Therefore, such a confession does not reveal repentance, but self-interest.

Regarding Bishops:

- A Bishop never takes the initiative of delivering a guilty priest to the civil law to be punished, as traditional Catholic doctrine instructs.⁵⁶⁴ That is, he disregards the ethics of the civil order.
- Even when he knows that an accused priest is guilty of pedophilia or homosexuality, the Bishop rarely seeks out the families of the victims to warn them of the dangerous priest. What he does instead is to hide the crime and protect the priest. Therefore, in practice he is an accomplice to the crime, and closes his eyes to the damage caused to the victims and their families.
- When a crime of sexual abuse of children is denounced only to the ecclesiastical authority, instead of seeing that justice is applied swiftly and impartially, the Bishop attempts to keep the crime secret

⁵⁶⁴ See Chapter I. 2.

by all means possible – counsels, threats, lies, bribes, settlements, etc.

- If the victim does not initiate a civil suit against a pedophile priest, in its counsel to the victim and the family, the Diocese frequently tries to delay any such decisive action against the priest in order to gain time and let the statute of limitations expire. With this, the Diocese exempts itself from paying for settlements in the case or defending the accused. Therefore, it takes a perfidious rather than upright attitude.
- The Bishop usually alleges that he covers up the pedophile or homosexual priest and takes the above-mentioned actions for the love of the Church, to protect her reputation and save her prestige. But this is not true, because within the very bosom of the Church he harbors a criminal who dishonors her, who can commit yet other sexual abuses, and who gives bad example to the other priests. That is, when he hides the priest, he collaborates in the crimes committed.

Regarding the Vatican:

- The Vatican never takes the initiative of dismissing a Bishop for being an accomplice of pedophilia or homosexuality either indirectly – by protecting the guilty priest – or in a direct way – by being a pedophile/homosexual himself. It only takes such a disciplinary action when it is under pressure from an indignant Catholic public. That is, in practice it makes no effort to eradicate this vice and shows a

general complicity or indifference toward these despicable sins against nature.

- Often the Vatican elevates pedophile or homosexual priests to the dignity of Bishops. It is hard to imagine that it could be unaware of such actions in the pasts of these priests. That is, by raising such priests to Bishops, in practice the Vatican promotes the vice of pedophilia/homosexuality.
- The case of a pedophile/homosexual Bishop serving as a member of the household staff of the Pope suggests that John Paul II has lacked vigilance regarding such vices.

As a matter of fact, regarding pedophilia or homosexuality in the clergy, the general panorama clearly shows this general pattern repeating itself over and over:

- the guilty priests have only admitted their crimes or offered apologies when denounced by the victims or a public authority;
- the Bishops only act when pressured by public opinion;
- the Vatican almost never acts, even when it is pressured by the Bishops.

The Conciliar Church would indeed seem to be rotten from head to toe. And the time for divine intervention would seem to have arrived.

CONCLUSION

The torrent of homosexuality and pedophilia that inundates the Catholic clergy and Hierarchy is without a doubt a consequence of the moral leniency that was established in the Church after Vatican Council II.

Under the pretext of *aggiornamento* – adaptation to the modern world – a new morals established itself in the Church. The concept of principles valid for everyone and applied at all times and places, as existed before the Council, was condemned as old-fashioned and behind the times. It was replaced by a new morals that would be continuously changing and adapting itself to the different concrete situations.⁵⁶⁵

⁵⁶⁵ The evidence presented in this book would seem sufficient to demonstrate this thesis. It is vividly confirmed, however, by this testimony of Archbishop Sean O' Malley in an interview for *America* magazine:

"Most of the incidents [of pedophilia in the clergy] took place during a time of great turmoil. We moved from the pre-Vatican II Church into a new world, and the turmoil existed not only in the Church but in society. Growing up [before Vatican II], we never heard of priests leaving the religious life. Then, in those days after the Council, priests and religious were leaving in droves. So many changes were taking place in such a short period of time. ... When things were more placid and tranquil, there were more supports for religious life, for asceticism, for virtue. And all of those supports were taken away. So some people started to act out at that point" (*apud* James Martin, "To Love and to Pray," *America*, October 27, 2003, p. 9).

Some of the key guidelines of the modern world regarding human behavior were taken from the Freudian understanding of man. According to this false conception, which for a while was believed to be objective and scientific, the whole of human behavior would rely primarily on the sexual drive and urges.

According to this fantastic theory, the child loves the mother because he incestuously imagines himself having sexual relations with her. He fears and respects the father because he sees in him a stronger competitor who sexually conquered the mother. As a consequence of these familiar relations, the social behavior of any person also would be guided primarily by sexual acts or fantasies. In short, the Freudian theory is nothing but an obscene and irreverent sexual obsession that completely clashes with Catholic Morals.

Parallel to this theory, any kind of discipline that aims at taming or correcting the disordered tendencies of human nature is bad, since it curbs the instincts and represses spontaneity. Such a thesis obviously denies original sin and the Catholic view of a corrupted human nature. Therefore, it leads to a utopian and anarchic vision of humankind. Notwithstanding, the Freudian theory became one of the principal points of reference of the new conciliar morals.

No wonder, then, when this new morals was introduced among the Clergy – seminarians, priests, and Bishops – it produced a complete revolution in it. Purity, in its two variances, virginity and chastity, came to be considered an obsolete behavior, detrimental to man since repressing the instincts could only result in anxiety and angst. License

and liberty were introduced into ecclesiastical mores. Discipline and ascetic life in pursuit of supernatural perfection were set aside, and the sexual “emancipation” of religious men and women took its place.

The concept of authority also changed under the influence of this new morals. The superior should no longer correct the subordinate in order to insure wellbeing in the institution. Discipline should be replaced with tolerance, even toward sinful or criminal behavior.

The results were not long in coming. Every Catholic has witnessed the moral excesses of the post-conciliar clergy and religious – men and women – carried out under the blind or complacent eyes of their superiors. The crisis of homosexuality and pedophilia in the Church is no more than a consequence of a broader moral crisis. This moral crisis, in its turn, is but one aspect of the larger phenomenon of Progressivism that strikes also at ecclesiastical institutions, laws, teachings, and Catholic dogma itself.

The root cause of this change is a titanic event, simple to identify, although only a few have the courage to see it for what it is and point to it. It is Vatican Council II.

*

Nothing appeared more fitting to close this overall view of homosexuality and pedophilia than an excerpt from *Liber Gomorrhianus* [Book of Gomorrah] of St. Peter Damian (1007-1072). This work by a Saint was offered to another Saint, Pope Leo IX (1048-1054) as a tool to help reform customs in the clergy, a pressing issue at the time. The movement was known as the Gregorian reform, since

to a large extent it was inspired by the Monk Hildebrand, later Pope St. Gregory VII.

First, St. Leo IX praised Saint Peter Damian⁵⁶⁶ and his work in the most glowing of terms:

“Leo, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to the beloved son in Christ, Peter the hermit, the joy of eternal blessing.

“This book, beloved son, which with noble style and even nobler intention you have published shows with clear documents that by applying your intelligence you have attained, through pious effort, the apex of a refined purity. For you, who have thus raised the arm of the spirit against the depravity of lust, have overcome the disorders of the flesh, that execrable vice which removes persons far from the Author of all virtue Who, being all pure, admits nothing impure near Him. And His inheritance will not belong to those who indulge in sordid pleasures

“Most dear son, I rejoice in untold manner that you preach, by the example of your behavior, all that you have taught through the gift of oratory. Indeed, it is holier to preach through works than words. For this reason, by doing the work of God, you will obtain the palm of victory and, with God [the Fa-

⁵⁶⁶ For those wishing to know more about the death of St. Leo IX as a result of the wars he personally led against the Normans who invaded papal territories, see Emile Amann, “Papes imperiaux et Papes romains,” in *Histoire de l’Eglise depuis les origines jusqu’à nos jours*, ed. by Augustin Fliche and Victor Martin (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1940), vol. 7, pp. 105-7.

ther] and the Son of the Virgin, you will rejoice in the eternal mansion with rewards as numerous as the persons you wrenched from the snares of the devil, who will serve in your retinue and, in a certain way, will be your crown.”⁵⁶⁷

Saint Peter Damian’s words lambasting the vice of sodomy follow:

“In fact, this vice cannot in any way be compared to any others, because its enormity supercedes them all. Indeed, this vice causes the death of bodies and the destruction of souls. It pollutes the flesh, extinguishes the light of reason, and expels the Holy Ghost from His temple in the heart of man, introducing in His stead the devil who is the instigator of lust. It steers the soul into error, banishes all truth from the deceived soul, sets traps for those who fall into it, and then caps the well to prevent those who fall in from getting out. It opens the gates of Hell and closes the doors of Heaven to them, turns a former citizen of the heavenly Jerusalem into an heir of the infernal Babylon, transforming him from a heavenly star into a straw for the eternal fire. It wrenches a member from the Church and plunges him into the voracious flames of the fiery Gehenna.

“This vice strives to tear down the walls of the heavenly motherland and rebuild those of the ruined Sodom. Indeed, it violates temperance, kills purity, stifles chastity, and cuts the head of virginity –

⁵⁶⁷ St. Leo IX, *Epistula super Librum gomorrhianum*, in PL 145, cols. 159-160.

which is irrecoverable – with the sword of a most infamous union. It infects everything, stains everything, pollutes everything; leaving nothing pure, nothing but filth, nothing clean. ‘All things are clean to the clean,’ as the Apostle says, ‘but to them that are defiled, and to unbelievers, nothing is clean; but both their mind and their conscience are defiled (Tit 1:15).

“This vice expels one from the choir of the ecclesiastical host and forces one to join the ranks of the possessed and those who work in league with the devil. It separates the soul from God and links it with the devils. This most pestiferous Sodomite queen makes those who obey her tyrannical laws repugnant to men and hateful to God, forcing them into a nefarious war against God and obliging them to enlist in the ranks of the perverse spirit. It [this sin] separates him from the company of angels and deprives the soul of its nobility, imposing on the unfortunate soul the yoke of its own domination. It tears its henchmen from the arms of virtues and leaves them exposed as prey to the arrows of all the vices. It leaves one to be humiliated in the Church, condemned at court, defiled in secret, and dishonored in public. It gnaws at the person’s conscience like a worm and burns his flesh like fire...

“The miserable flesh burns with the fire of lust, the cold intelligence trembles under the rancor of misgivings, and the unfortunate man’s heart is overwhelmed by hellish chaos, subjecting him to countless pains of conscience as he is tortured in punishment. Yes, as soon as this most venomous

serpent plunges its fangs into the unfortunate soul, it is immediately deprived of its senses and memory, the edge of the intelligence is dulled, he forgets God and even himself.

“Indeed, this scourge destroys the foundations of the faith, weakens the forces of hope, dissolves the bonds of charity, annihilates all justice, undermines fortitude, eliminates hope, and dulls the edge of prudence.

“And what else shall I say? For it [this sin] expels all the forces of virtue from the temple of the human heart, and, as if pulling the door from its hinges, allows the entrance of every barbarity of vice

“In effect, the one whom this most atrocious beast has swallowed down its bloody throat is prevented, by the weight of its chains, from practicing any good work, and is precipitated into the abysses of his uttermost iniquity.

“Thus, as soon as someone has fallen into this abyss of extreme perdition, he is exiled from the heavenly motherland, separated from the Body of Christ, censured by the authority of the whole Church, condemned by the judgment of all the Holy Fathers, despised by men on earth and rebuked by the society of heavenly citizens. He creates for himself an earth of iron and a sky of bronze; on the one hand, laden with the weight of his crime, he is unable to rise; on the other hand, he is no longer able to conceal his evil in the refuge of ignorance. He cannot be happy while he lives nor have hope when he dies, because here and now he is obliged to

suffer the ignominy of men's derision and, later, the torment of eternal condemnation.”⁵⁶⁸

* * *

⁵⁶⁸ St. Peter Damian, *Liber gomorrhianus*, cols. 175-7.

REFUTING SOPHISMS

After completion of this book, I thought it convenient to expound and refute some of the most common sophisms that surround the two-fold crisis of homosexuality and pedophilia that scourges the Catholic Church.

Sophism 1 – The responsibility for the cover-up of pedophile priests by Bishops actually lies in the ecclesiastical system as it was established before Vatican II. According to the pre-conciliar model, the Church is divine and cannot coexist with impurity. This was the image the Bishops were trying to preserve when they covered up the guilty priests. Such image, however, is unrealistic and utopist, as is the system, which requires fraud and deception for it to work. Therefore, it must change.

Answer – In her two-thousand-year History the Catholic Church has known all kinds of moral problems. She faced them and conquered them. Those continuous obstacles and battles against them did not change her immutable essence. The Church's essence, similar to the essence of Our Lord Jesus Christ, is simultaneously divine and human. Because of her divine nature, she is immaculate and will be such until the end of time. Because of her human nature, she can receive wounds from her members, as Our Lord received physical and moral offenses during His Passion. Such affronts make the Church suffer, but do not change her immaculate essence.

It is the duty of her members to face and combat these moral outrages and eliminate their causes. Countless saints in the past fought against the moral vices that had

infiltrated the Church. Perhaps the greatest of these combatants was St. Gregory VII, whose reform included the fight to eradicate two so-called moral heresies that contaminated the Church: Nicholaism and Simony. The first consisted of clergy living with woman, and the second, the sale of spiritual goods by ecclesiastics. He smashed those heresies and restored the Church to health. Therefore, both the vices and the cure proceeded from members of the Church and did not alter her divine and immaculate essence.

This is the proper way to deal with crises in the Church. Since her essence does not change, it is absurd to change her teaching about what she is. Also, this teaching does not rely on fraud or deception in order to be maintained in its purity. The remedies, therefore, are vigilance and militancy in face of error. They were present in the Church before Vatican II and maintained her health.

Granted, the American Bishops were fraudulent in hiding the pedophile and homosexual priests. But the primary cause for such action was not their intent to save a certain image of the Church or follow traditional morals. Rather, it was their application of the new tolerant norms of Vatican II.

Sophism 2 – Given the laxity of the Bishops in their stance regarding pedophile and homosexual priests, lay participation should be a normal part of the government of the Church from now on.

Answer – Since the post-conciliar ecclesiastical establishment seems to be institutionally unable to correct or

heal itself, no one really knows what God will do to save the Catholic Church.

One possibility among many is that He can make the healing process begin by an initiative of the lay people. Perhaps this process has already begun with some of the different actions American lay Catholics took in 2002 and 2003 pressuring the Hierarchy to be rigorous in dealing with pedophile and homosexual priests.

Certainly, the role of diocesan lay boards with a voice in Bishops' decisions regarding pedophile priests is a measure that *per se* inhibits the practice of complicity in the ecclesiastic milieu. Therefore, they seem useful for the moment.

Nonetheless, even though lay participation in some episcopal decisions could help to restore morals, it does not necessarily mean that lay people should henceforth make up part of the government of the Church.

In the fourth century the Catholic Church experienced a severe crisis in which the totality of the Bishops less two (St. Athanasius and St. Hilary of Poitiers) signed a semi-Arian formula of faith infected with heresies. At that time orthodoxy was sustained by the lay faithful, and not by the Hierarchy. Therefore, the lay people played a major role in maintaining the continuity of the Catholic Faith. This did not mean, however, that lay people would have the final word in the teaching of the Church from then on. Analogously, if the morals of the Church today were to rely on lay people, this would not mean that they should be part of the government of the Church from now on.

One thing is a provisory medicine taken to cure a specific disease, another thing is to assume that the medi-

cine should be taken forever, even after the sickness is over.

Therefore, it is not necessary to change the essential structure of the Church to include lay people as part of her government from now on.

Sophism 3 – A priest should be judged only by an ecclesiastic authority. To judge a priest in a civil court violates the sovereignty of the ecclesiastical sphere and constitutes an aggression against it.

Answer – Both spheres – ecclesiastic and civil – are sovereign, and each has the means to maintain and govern itself separately. Normally each is capable of meting out justice to its respective members.

Now, it happens that the totality of the members of one sphere, the Catholic Church, are also members of the other, the State. These members have duties with regard to both spheres. This is the case, for example, of civil governors and officials who should govern fairly and be faithful to Catholic doctrine. If they fail to do so, they can be judged by the religious authority. Reciprocally, Church members have the duty to observe the civil law. Should a member of the Church violate such a law, he should be judged by the civil authority. For this reason a priest who commits a pedophile crime, which damages and threatens the civil order, should be judged by authorities of this sphere.

Furthermore, in the case of pedophile or homosexual priests the ecclesiastical sphere was revealed incapable of healing itself. It has happened in History that God has called representatives of the civil sphere to decisively assist

the Church, such as Charlemagne, St. Louis of France, St. Ferdinand of Castile, St. Henry of Germany and many others. Reciprocally and more frequently Divine Providence has called the Church's representatives to help heal the wounds of the civil order. So, there is a principle of mutual aid between the two spheres, by which one sustains the other when one reveals itself unable to cure itself. The same principle may apply to the present day situation.

Therefore, by judging pedophile or homosexual priests, the civil authority carries out its duty to the temporal sphere and does not violate the sovereignty of the ecclesiastical sphere. On the contrary, it helps to heal the latter.

Sophism 4 – Homosexuality in the seminaries and clergy has nothing to do with the pedophile crimes of priests. It is unscientific and unsubstantiated to pretend that both have the same root.

Answer – This contention, which sprang from progressivist and leftist environs, has been spread in order to prevent the public furor against pedophilia from striking at homosexuality.

Some liberal scholars are producing elaborate studies trying to establish pedophilia as nothing more than a psychological illness.⁵⁶⁹ According to one of these suspect interpretations, the pedophile priest would be nothing but an immature heterosexual who should not be considered

⁵⁶⁹ Irving Bieber, M.D., "On Arriving at the American Psychiatric Association Decision on Homosexuality," *NARTH Bulletin*, April 1999, online edition.

infamous or incur the general horror of society for his behavior.

However, regarding pedophilia in the Catholic clergy the facts speak in an opposite sense. Here I quote the words of Fr. Donald Cozzens, university professor, seminary rector, and experienced counselor of priests and religious. Describing what is happening in the clergy, he wrote:

“When vicars of priests met to learn from one another how we might better minister to the victims of clergy sexual misconduct, we discovered a factor that put priest offenders at variance with the general population of child abusers. As a group, abusers tend to be married men who prey on girls, although many pedophiles abuse both girls and boys. Our respective diocesan experience revealed that roughly 90% of priest abusers target teenage boys as their victims. Most priest abusers, we concluded, were not pedophiles in the strict sense of the term. They tend to be *epebophiles*, adults whose sexual interest focused on post-pubescent teenagers. Relatively little attention has been paid to this phenomenon by Church authorities. Perhaps it is feared that it will call attention to the disproportionate number of gay priests.”⁵⁷⁰

Such facts prove that homosexuality and pedophilia in the clergy are deeply linked.

⁵⁷⁰ D. Cozzens, *The Changing Face of the Priesthood*, , pp. 123-4.

Sophism 5 – The numbers of homosexuals and pedophiles in the clergy show that the Church has not resolved the problem of sexuality of priests. If priests were allowed to marry, most of these deviations would be corrected. Therefore, it is necessary to allow them to marry, and priestly celibacy must end.

Answer – This is to compare apples and oranges. Homosexual seminarians and priests do not want or need to be married because they are not sexually attracted to women. The sacrifice of not being married simply does not apply to the case. Therefore, the argument is void.

Sophism 6 – There should be no problem in accepting homosexuals in seminaries. As long as they are chaste, they are able to fulfill their vocation.

Answer – Even if homosexual acts are not practiced, homosexuality *per se* is an aberration both in its tendency – the attraction of a man to another man, and in its end – the sin of sodomy. It cannot be tolerated in any degree or in any place, most especially in a place destined to form the future directors of Catholic souls and members of the Hierarchy.

Furthermore, the Church has always taught that a person must avoid the close occasion of sin, a rule to be carefully observed by all Catholic institutions. Now then, homosexual seminarians are attracted by men and not by women. Therefore, to live in the midst of other men constitutes for them a close occasion of sin, and should be avoided. It is as absurd to allow homosexual seminarians to live in quarters with other young men as it would be to allow heterosexual seminarians to room together with

novices – young women – in a convent. Such a situation would be a serious error on the part of the religious authority, an occasion of sin for the seminarian, and a scandal to the faithful.

Therefore, the seminaries must categorically forbid the entrance of homosexuals.

Sophism 7 – The homosexual priest who is chaste is not a problem and can even be a great assistance to the Church.

Answer – The priesthood is a calling for men who aspire to a higher degree of perfection and bind themselves to practice the three evangelical counsels: perpetual chastity, voluntary poverty, and perfect obedience. They dedicate themselves to the service of the Church. The vow of chastity consists of abstaining from marriage and maintaining sexual continence. Since the homosexual does not have attraction to women, the vow to abstain from marriage is of small import to him and does not constitute a sacrifice. For him to be chaste – to not sin with another man – is not a prerogative that comes from a counsel of perfection, but an imperative of nature. No one ever has the right to practice homosexuality. So, for a homosexual the vow of chastity and celibacy have an entirely different meaning than the one always understood by the priesthood.

Further, the homosexual priest has an androgynous *tonus* that alienates normal people and does not inspire trust. For the great battles of the Catholic Faith and Morals, the faithful seek manly leaders who are experienced fighters. Proponents of homosexual priests claim they can be models of kindness and compassion, but such homo-

sexual priests lack the steel temper needed to conduct those battles.

Priests are the future Bishops who should command the fights against the enemies of the Church. What kind of man will follow an effeminate commander conducting a campaign? The homosexual cannot earn the trust and maintain the morale needed to govern and defend the Church.

Therefore, priests cannot be homosexuals.

Sophism 8 – The scandal of pedophile priests was caused by an anti-Catholic conspiracy and biased media.

Answer – This rumor was circulated in certain ecclesiastic milieus.⁵⁷¹ Its purpose was to stop the wave of righteous indignation that rose up in the Catholic faithful against the American Hierarchy for the cover-up of pedophile priests. It failed. Only a few obstinate or subservient persons are still singing this tune to an almost empty hall. The majority of Catholics realized that the media reports were useful and necessary to inform them about what was really going on. The media action in fact helped to initiate a healthy reaction among the faithful that can be the beginning of the healing process.

Many reputable witnesses, both ecclesiastic and lay, could be brought to the scene denying the content of this rumor. As an example, these are the words of Fr. Cozzens on the topic:

⁵⁷¹ See pp. 223-4.

“It still remains a strategic mistake to insist the media is a major factor in the scandal [of pedophilia] under discussion. Nor do I see some anti-Catholic conspiracy at work here. While the [anti-Catholic] bias still holds in many quarters of the nation, and the crisis is surely being exploited by those who look with suspicion and fear upon the Church, the root of the problem remains in our own history.”⁵⁷²

William Donohue, president of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, founded his organization with the aim of combating anti-Catholic bias in American society and media. Although he admitted some writers and cartoonists had gotten out of control, he admitted general satisfaction with the media reports on the topic:

“The media did not cause this problem [the sex abuse scandal]. The Catholic Church brought it on herself. Most of the hard-news reporting on TV and in newspapers has been fair, as have the editorials.”⁵⁷³

Many other witnesses could be quoted denying this groundless argument.

Sophism 9 – Even if the media reports were objective, too much attention is being placed on this scandal. After all, there are many good priests and Bishops, and just a proportionately small number of homosexual and pedophile ones. Wouldn't it be better to leave aside these few bad

⁵⁷² D. Cozzens, *The Changing Face of the Priesthood*, p. 122.

⁵⁷³ News Briefs, *America*, April 22, 2002.

apples and concentrate on the good to strengthen the Church and encourage our upright clergy?

Answer – The natural reaction of any living body – be it the body of an individual, a group, or an entire society – is to note and react against anything that harms it. This is the normal response of the instinct of self-preservation, and would apply to the case of pedophile and homosexual priests.

The body of the Catholic faithful was serene trusting that priests and Bishops were leading them along a good spiritual path. However, with the revelations of pedophile and homosexual priests and Bishops and the related cover-ups, the body of the faithful realized that it was being seriously harmed by this unexpected danger. Its instinct of self-preservation reacted immediately. That is, the faithful became indignant and defended themselves by criticizing the situation, which is absolutely normal. This reaction will only cease when they are secure that corrective measures have efficiently been taken.

Besides being a natural reaction, this is also a wise process. When there are criminals in a society, the proper thing to do is not to make rhetorical eulogies of the good citizens, but to take stern measures to efficiently eliminate the criminals. Even if they are much less numerous than the good citizens, they can disturb the entire society. The same applies to the homosexual and pedophile priests. If they are not combated and eliminated, they easily will putrefy the entire priesthood. Therefore, it is both proper and wise to criticize them and the Bishops, who are accomplices to their crimes, until a serious guarantee of change in this behavior will be given to the faithful.

INDEX

- Agape, 98
AIDS, 14, 81, 87, 88, 93, 101,
111, 112, 113-114, 144, 149,
156-157
Albert the Great, St., 26
Aggiornamento, 291; *see* *Morals*
Ambrozic, Aloysius, 272
Angelini, Fiorenzo, 157
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 26
Arimond, James, 124
Arns, Paulo Evaristo, 132
Arrupe, 103, 104 (note 124.c)
Athanasius, St., 301
Augustine, St., 23
Aylward, James, 231
Azagra, Javier, 152
- Baker, Andrew, 128
Baker, Michael, 210-211
Balthasar, Carmelo, 171
Banko, John, 228
Banks, Robert, 229
Barone, Joseph, 313
Basil, St., 22, 26, 45
Bazalar, Juan, 176
Beliefnet list of worst bishops,
216
Bellegrandi, Franco, 159-162
Bernardin, Joseph, 90, 95, 96
(note 112), 197, 248, 266
Bernardine of Siena, St., 28
Bevilacqua, Anthony, 212
Birmingham, Joseph, 213
Bissey, René, 276
Blackwell, Maurice, 209
Blair, Stephen, 88, 90
Blankenship, John, 218
- Boils, Emili, 131
Bonaventure, St., 27
Bowman, R. Peter, 197
Brady, Stephen, 163, note 224;
Brett, Laurence, 192
Buntel, Richard, 226
Burke, Edward, 221
Burke, William, 198
Burns, Robert, 180, 226
Buzzi, Boniface, 270
Byrne, William, 220
- Calabrese, Daniel, 174
Campbell, Alvin, 171, 184
Carr, Charles, 192
Catherine of Siena, St., 27
Catholic AIDS Link, *see* *Posi-
tively Called*
Catholic League, *see* Donahue
Cause of crisis, 291-293, 299-
300, 307-308
Changing Face of the Priesthood,
see Cozzens, Donald
Chicago Symposium (Chicago,
1992), 93-97
Chleboski, Thomas, 173
Christian Community Assn., 98
Chrysostom, St. John, 24
Church and Homosexuality, The,
103-106, *see* McNeill
Church Legislation: *see* Councils,
Vatican Documents
Civil Legislation: Blackstone's
Comment, 33-35; compilation
of Pietro Agostino d'Avack, 33-
34; laws of Constantius and
Constant, 31; of Justinian, 31-

- 33, 64; of Valentinian II, of Theodosius and Arcadius, 31; *Recent*: California, 225-226, 230-231, 237-238, 238-239, 249; Minnesota, 97 (note 113,b.)
- Clark, Daniel, 242
- Clark, John W., 100
- Clark, Matthew, 89
- Cochrane, Richard, 234
- Code of Canon Law, of 1917*, 21; *of 1983*, 73-74; *Commentary on*, 74-76
- Comiskey, Brendan, 280-281
- Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 39, 41, 46, 48, 49, 53, 96 (note 112), 103, 104 (note 124,b,c)
- Connell, Desmond, 281
- Corrêa de Oliveira, Plinio, 29-30
- Councils: Ancyra, 15-16; Elvira, 15; Nablus, 17; Third Lateran, 18; Toledo, 17
- Courts, civil or Church, 302-303
- Cox, Brian, 212
- Cozzens, Donald: *The Changing Face of the Priesthood*, 111-117, 126, 304, 307-308
- Cum primum*, Constitution, 19
- Cunha, Frederico, 270
- Curran, Danny, 277
- Cushing, Richard, 173
- Dahlheimer, Cosmas, 214
- Dallas Meeting of American Bishops, 56, 57, 58-61, 215-216; *Charter and Norms*, 58-61, Vatican reaction to, 61-63, 221-222
- Daly, Cohal, 277-278
- Damian, St. Peter, 25-26; 293-298
- Daneels, Godfried, 206-207, 270
- Desilets, Paul, 201
- DiFilippo, Ettore, 154
- Dignity, definition of -
ontological, moral and social, 136-138
- Dignity, group, 82, 83, 84, 93, 94, 97, 103, 124
- Dolan, Timothy, 247
- Dominguez, Edgar Hidalgo, 283
- Donahue, William, 201-202, 308
- Doyle, Thomas, 169-170
- Dumont, Fernand, see pastoral theology
- Dyba, Johannes, 149
- Dziwisz, Stanislaw, 285
- Eckroth, Richard, 214-215
- Egan Edward, 191-192,
- Eindenschink, John, 102, 214
- Emmaus House, 98
- Ephophobia, 167, 304
- Ferraro, Romano, 200
- Fessard, Gerald, 218
- Fortune, Sean, 280
- Freudian psychology, see *Morals Gaudium et spes*, Constitution, 38
- Gaillet, Jacques, 148
- Gauthe, Gilbert, 168
- Gay Men's Chorus of Los Angeles, 87
- Geoghan, John, 77, 185-187, 209
- George, Francis, 91, 92, 197, 231
- Gervais, Marcel, 272
- Gogin, Kevin, 100
- Good Bye, Good Men*, see Rose
- Grahmann, Charles, 181
- Gramick, Jeannine, 82
- Grassi, Julio, 261
- Greeley, Andrew, 110, 115 (note 146), 118, 211, 212, 212
- Gregory the Great, St., 25

- Gregory, William, 203, 223, 245, 253
- Gröer, Hans Hermann, 77, 263-269
- Guerra Campos, José, 152
- Guidon, Andre, 124
- Gumbleton, Thomas, 93, 94, 127, 222
- Habiger, James, 97 (note 113)
- Hands, Michael, 232-233
- Hanlon, John, 177
- Hapgood, John, 143
- Hargadon, James, 242
- Harris, Michael, 185
- Hasselbach, Richard Nugent, 125
- Heckner, Jean-Luc, 276
- Henry, Fred, 273
- Henry, Richard, 176, 218
- Hilary of Poitiers, St., 301
- Hill, Michael, 274-275
- Holley, David, 177
- Holley, David, 177
- (The) Homosexual Network*, see Rueda
- Homosexuality and the Catholic Church: *in U.S.*: 79-162; conciliar doctrine of tolerance, 37-55; events at Catholic institutions, 85-92; extent of, 79-82; % of priests, 109-114; priests and bishops, 98-101; religious orders, 96-98; seminaries, 117-118, 122-123 (note 159), 123-126; support and complicity of hierarchy, 82-95, 117-126; see Chicago symposium, McNeill, tolerance of, Weakland; *in other countries*, Brazil, 131-132; England, 133-146; France, 146-148; Germany, 148-149; Holland, 149-151; Italy, 153-156, Spain, 151-153, The Vatican, 156-157
- Homosexuality, relation to pedophilia, 303-304
- Hope, David, 142-143
- Horrendum illud scelus*, Constitution, 20
- Hoyos, Dario Castrillon, 220
- Hubbard, Howard, 88
- Hughes, William, 93, 95
- Hume, Basil, 133-140, 146
- Hunthausen, Raymond, 84
- Janin, Pascal, 153-154
- Jayawardene, Tilak, 218
- John XXIII, 38, 51
- John Paul II, Pope, 46, 52, 53, 66, 73, 74-76, 77, 101, 119, 121, 122, 189, 192-193, 197, 203-205, 217, 229, 238, 263, 268-269, 283, 284-285, 289
- Johnson, Robert, 235
- Jubany, Narcis, 152
- Kapelari, Egon, 267
- Kaspar, Walter, 149
- Keating, Frank, 230, 242-246
- Keegan, Austin Peter, 178
- Keeler, William, 221
- Kelly, Thomas, 83, 182
- Kicanas, Gerald, 252
- Kimball, Donald, 195
- Kinsey, Alfred, 80, 81
- Kneale, James, 272
- Knuth, Bernard, 248
- Kolvenbach, Peter Hans, 104 (note 124,b)
- Kos, Rudolph, 180-183
- Kraft, William, 240
- Kuchar, Bryan, 200
- Küng, Klaus, 267
- Lafarriere, Raymond, 179

- Lanneau, Paul, 270
 Larking, Peter, 157
 Larson, Robert, 184-185
 Laun, Andreas, 267
 Lavigne, Richard, 233-234
 Law, Bernard, 56, 70, 186, 189, 190-191, 199, 201, 202-203, 208-209, 227, 229, 235, 246
 Laws, see Civil Legislation
 Lay review boards, role of, 300-302
 Lehman, Karl, 149
 Lenihan, John, 238
 Leo IX, Pope, 16, 293-294, 294 (note 566)
 Lesbian and Gay Ministries, 82, 90, 91, 92, 95
 Lijn, André Vander, 269-270
 Lindner, Jerold, 182
 Llanos, Theodore, 219
 Louis, Martin, 194
 Lower, Richard, 232
 Lucas, Fr., 275-276
 Luizzi, Peter, 91
 Luque, Peter Hernandez, 240

 Mahony, Roger, 87, 88, 89, 90, 176, 183, 185, 194, 207, 208, 210-211, 216, 237, 242-245
 Mantero, José, 152-153
 Marcheno, Margarito Reyes, 282
 Marcoux, Paul, 107-108
 Marino, Eugene, 102
 Marshall, John: 1981 Apostolic visitation to US, 121-123, 126
 Maxwell, Elizabeth, 279-280
 McBrien, Richard, 110, 193
 McConville, Michael, 275
 McCormack, John, 227-228, 235
 McElroy, Robert, 97 (note 113)
 McGann, John, 236
 McGuire, Donald, 247
 McHug, James, 236

 McNeill, John, 82; "McNeill affair," 102-107. see (*The Church and Homosexuality*)
 McManus, Francis, 234
 McPherson, Dan, 99-100
 Medeiros, Humberto, 173
 Meffan, Robert, 226
 Melancon, Robert, 179
 Miller, Annabel, 118
 Miller, Louis, 242
 Moore, Emerson, 101
 Moorse, Dustan, 213
 Moraes, Edvar, 271
 Morals, Freudian vs. Catholic, 292-293
 Moreno, Manuel, 189, 220
 Mulvey, Robert, 221
 Murphy, David, 275
 Murphy, William, 233, 236
 Murphy-O'Connor, 274-275

 Natural law, role of, 63-64
 Navarro-Valls, Joaquim, 96 (note 113)
 New Ways Ministry, 82, 83, 84, 93
 Nicolosi, Joe, 87
 Nugent, Robert, 82, 83, 109

 O'Brien, Thomas, 220-221, 240-242
 O'Connell, Anthony, 102, 195-196
 O'Connell, William, 171
 O'Malley, Sean, 255, 291 (note 565)
 O'Neill, Vincent, 182
 Ordination of Homosexuals: *pro*, 126-127; *con*, 128-129.; 305-307
 O'Shea, Patrick, 177-178
 OutRage, group, 140-145

- Paetz, Juliusz, 284-285
- Paquin, Ronald, 187
- Pastoral theology, 42-43 (note 34)
- Paul VI, Pope, 41; accusations against, 120, 157-163
- Pcolka, Raymond, 192
- Pedophilia and the Catholic Church: *in U.S.* definition, 165-168, figures for, 250-252; financial costs, 252-257; general policy, 287-290; overview up to year 2001, 168-186; 2002, 186-232; 2003-2004, 232-249; Vatican position on pedophile priests, 56-57; 64-66, 77-78; *in other countries*: Argentina, 259-261; Australia, 261-263; Austria, 263-269; Belgium, 269-270; Brazil, 270-271; Canada, 271-273; England, 274-275; France, 275-276; Germany, 277; Ireland, 277-281; Italy, 281-284; New Zealand, 284; Poland, 284-289; Spain, 286-289; Regarding the Vatican, 289-290
- Peebles, Robert, 171-172
- Pell, George, 262-263
- Perotti, Jacques, 146-148
- Perron, Toussaint, 176
- Peter Canisius, St., 29
- Peter Damian, St. see Damian
- Peyrefitte, Roger, 158-159
- Pican, Pierre, 276
- Pierre, Abbé, 146-147
- Pilarczyk, Daniel, 248
- Pilla, Anthony, 91-92, 194, 198
- Pius V, St., 18, 19, 20, 21; See also *Cum primum, Horrendum illud scelus*
- Porter, James, 173
- Positively Called*, booklet, 144-146
- Povish, Kenneth, 183
- Quinn, John, 83, 87, 97 (note 113), 100, 178
- Rassello, Giuseppe, 281
- Ratzinger, Joseph, 45, 46-48, 50-51, 53, 54-55, 285
- Rausch, James, 102, 219-221
- Rawcliffe, Derk, 141
- Re, Giovanni Battista, 61-62, 64-65, 66, 72, 217, 221-222
- Ribaud, Charles, 233
- Ridsdale, Gerald, 261
- Rivera, Nicolas Aguilar, 218
- Roach, John, 83, 97 (note 113)
- Roberts, Mark, 232
- Rodrigues, Pepe, 162-163, accusations against Spanish bishops, 286
- Roman Catholic Faithful, see Brady, Stephen
- Romain, Vanessa, 89
- Ronan, Andrew, 198
- Rooney, Don, 198
- Rose, Michael, 123, 126, 133
- Rueda, Enrique: 79-80, 82, 98
- Ryan, Daniel, 102, 183-184
- Saints and apologists, on homosexuality, 22-30; see Damian, St. Peter
- Salazar, John Anthony, 214
- Sanchez, Robert, 102, 176
- Sartoris, Joseph, 90
- Scheuren, Frank, 83
- Schmitz, Edward, 222
- Schönborn, Christoph von, 265, 267, 268
- Scriptures and homosexuality: 53, *Old Testament*, 11-13; *New Testament*, 13-15, 45, 78

- Seminaries, see Homosexuality in U.S.
- Seper, Franjo, 41, 43, 44, 54, 104 (note 124,b)
- Shanley, Paul, 77, 124, 199-200, 228-229, 246
- Sheehan, Michael, 182
- Smyth, Brendan, 278
- Silva, Fidencio, 219, 239
- Sipe, Richard, 109, 113, 175, 249
- Siricius, Pope, 16
- Smith, Thomas, 177
- Society of Jesus, 99-100, 104-105 (note 124), see McNeill
- Sodano, Angelo, 285
- Soler, Carlos, 152
- Spencer, Francis, 132
- Statute of limitations, changing, 72-77
- Storni, Edgardo, 259-261
- Surette, Melvin, 236
- Sutphin, Carl, 207
- Svea, Timothy, 188
- Symons, Keith, 102, 182, 196
- Talbot, James, 234
- Tamayo, Santiago, 208
- Tarlton, Allen, 213
- Tatchell, Peter, 140, 145-146
- Taylor, Eamon, 103
- Tertullian, 22
- Timmons, Gary, 179
- Tolerance toward homosexuality, 37-41, 52-55, 79-82, 116-125, 129; see Homosexuality in U.S. and in other countries, Vatican documents
- Tolerance toward pedophilia, 56-78, 117-118, 120-122, 168, 289-290; see Pedophilia in U.S. and in other countries
- Tolin, David, 105 (note 124, d)
- Tradition, Catholic, regarding homosexuality, 11-30
- Traserra, Jaime, 152
- Trupia, Robert, 189, 220
- Tschoepe, Thomas, 125
- Ungar, Leopold, 267
- Untener, Kenneth, 93
- Urs von Balthasar, Hans 105 (note 124,e)
- Vadeboncoeur, Denis, 271
- Vatican Council II: *Gaudium et spes*, 38; Opening speech of John XXIII, 38; tolerance toward homosexuality, 37-39, 40-41, 51, 95-96; 96-97 (note 113), 291-293
- Vatican Documents (post-conciliar) on Homosexuality: 39-55; *Declaration on Certain Questions Concerning Sexual Ethics*, 41-44; *Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Pastoral Care for Homosexual Persons*, 46-48; *Some Considerations on the Response to Legislative Proposals on the Non-Discrimination of Homosexual Persons*, 49-51; Other documents, 55, 96-97, note 113
- Versace funeral, 155-156
- Vives, Juan-Enric, 152
- Waibel, Kenneth, 90
- Walsh, Willie, 278
- Washington documents, 66-77, 224
- We Are Church, see Gröer
- Weakland, Rembert, 84, 97 (note 113), 102, 124, 191; "Weakland affair" 107-109

- White, John, 156-157
Widera, Siegfried, 240
Williams, J. Kendrick, 102, 215
Williamson, Robert, 143
Wilson, Joseph, 123
Windy City Gay Men's Chorus,
90
Wining, Thomas, 141
- Wormat, Olga, 260
- Zavala, Gabino, 90
Ziemann, Patrick, 101
Zero tolerance, maneuver, 57, 61,
185

