

## THE CRISIS BEHIND THE HEADLINES<sup>1/</sup>

by Richard Sipe

I appreciate very much being with you. This is the first time I have ever spoken to Call to Action, and I find it a distinct pleasure.

I am going to give some warning before this. I'm going to talk about what's happening behind the headlines. I will try first to put my subject matter into historical context. Second, I will talk about headlines as they refer to, or as they unfold, or as they obstruct our knowledge of what's really happening. I will give you a warning right now: if you do not want to hear sexually explicit material, you can leave now, because we have to deal with this. I am going to deal with:

- The kind of material that is dealt with in grand juries,
- The kind of material that's dealt with in mediations and negotiations,
- The kind of material that with the juries here in cases of abuse by clergy.

It is raw material; it is not pleasant material. But in order to understand the real scope of this problem, I think that more and more people have to hear it.

I have had the advantage of serving as a consultant or as an expert witness now in over 160 cases of sexual abuse of minors by priests in this country and Canada. I have served as a consultant to attorneys-general and to district attorneys. I have served as a witness and consultant to grand juries. And from that, one gets a very different perspective that one can't derive from the media. And, of course, you know that the great revolution that is happening now has been court driven and media driven. There is no question about that; not because they have told the whole truth, but because they have told some of the truth, and they will continue to do so – that, I'm sure

You know, I was brought up as a psychotherapist, besides being a priest; and I was taught that when two people get together for psychotherapy, it is advisable that one of them be in touch with reality – and preferably that that be the therapist. I am not going to say that I am any more in touch with reality because of what's happening, because it's too grand, I think, for anyone to really fathom. But I will be able, I think, to share with you some of the facts that are garnered behind and outside of the press. The dilemmas we face today are daunting. I think they are historical. I think they are epic. And I, first of all, would like to put in an historical content what I think we are dealing with in the sexual abuse crisis in the United States and around the world.

You know, Barbara Tuckman, in her historical accounts has tried to put a mirror up to our century by dealing with other centuries. And she did that in her wonderful book called, "The Distant Mirror." She tried to put a mirror up from the 14<sup>th</sup> century to the 20<sup>th</sup> century. And she said that that time is like our won time, meaning the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It was filled with guilt and passions, with loyalty and treachery, with political assassinations, battles and sieges, fear of the end of the world, corruption in high places, and a yearning for reform. It was a time filled with sorcery and demonology and lust and sadism on the public stage.

You know, there was a church council in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, just as there was in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. And there was also a Pope John XXIII in the 14<sup>th</sup> century. As you know, her was one of the three popes they had after Avignon – and the Council of Constance deposed him. And it is said they deposed him for piracy, murder, rape, sodomy and incest, and even at that, history records that the most slanderous charges, the most scandalous charges, were suppressed. We leave it to al our imaginations what that is.

We do need some help; we do need some glasses to see where we have come from, where we are, and where we are going, if that is possible. We need some historical lens, some very powerful glasses, to help us put ourselves in a perspective of history. Yet, many people do not read our own time in history; but I do think that is important. We need a magnifying glass right now to read and examine the data hidden behind the headlines and the propaganda.

Just today, the Washington Post published the figures that Cardinal McCarrick is putting forward as a review of sexual abuse in the Archdiocese of Washington, D.C. And he says that over 50 years 26 priests were alleged sexual abusers. It is very interesting that we have lay people now, because we have a directory of over 2600 priests who have been alleged abusers. These are validated allegations. And I am eager to get home and look at that directory and compare what Cardinal McCarrick says with the historical facts we have, which lay people have recorded.

The diocese of Anchorage, Alaska just published its report for allegations of sexual abuse by priests in Alaska; and, out of 80 priests in Anchorage, who served there since its founding, I believe, in 1966, out of 80 priests, 17 were found to violate sexual abuse. Seven of those priests were guilty of sex with minors, and five of the abuse incidences took place in Alaska, with two taking place other places.

It is important that these things come out; but even at that, we need a magnifying glass to find what is the real...what are the real figures. Of the dioceses that have revealed a certain number from their records of sexual abusers, they have all ranged over 7%, from 7% to 9% of priests that are acknowledged sexual abusers.

Tucson, Arizona: 24 out of 78 priests have been labeled as sexual abusers. San Antonio and El Paso: almost 50% of the priests have been involved in sexual abuse. What you read in the paper, and especially from the Vatican paper, it is less than 1% of priests are sexual abusers. And please, don't get me wrong! This does not smear the priesthood. We're talking about a problem within the priesthood, within the hierarchy, and within the clerical system. We do no good to exaggerate it; and we do not good to minimize it. We do good if we find out what it really is. If it takes a magnifying glass to find out, to read the fine print, of what's happening now, we probably need a microscope, a telescope, and possibly a crystal ball to tell us what's going to happen in the future, or where we're going from now.

I will talk from those sources I told you about in mediations, juries and grand jury investigations as much as I can. And it is really amazing, isn't it, that ... well, I'll talk about this later, what's happened. But let me put this into historical perspective. Today, we know that the expose of this crisis would not be possible without the print media. And there's a very interesting parallel, you know, between now, between us and the 16<sup>th</sup> century - and that was the proliferation of moveable type that helped communication. It just didn't go by rudder or slow train from Wittenberg to Rome; it went very quickly in documents that were handled officially. It didn't just go by word of mouth.

But if there were headlines in a Roman paper in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, there would be little notice in the Roman paper that in 1510, Martin Luther and a few Augustinian monks traveled to Rome to settle some theological disputes. Nobody would have thought that was a big deal – nobody would have taken notice. But in the mind and heart and vision of Martin Luther, this was very big indeed. He went as a young, idealistic monk – yes, somewhat scrupulous, very attentive to detail. But what Martin Luther saw and recorded was scandal, not only the theological scandal, of people making jokes about the Eucharist, a controversy at that time that was very important to theologians, but priests and bishops and popes with mistresses, with sexual companions – openly, and without any regard. You didn't have to read it in the newspapers; you knew it. That kind of thing didn't make headlines. And it disturbed Martin Luther. He felt that this was not what the Church, this is not what Christianity, this is not what the priesthood should be about. And he felt that there was a tremendous discontinuity in what was going on.

Even in 1517, oh there would be a notice that Martin Luther tacks 95 theses on the cathedral of Wittenberg's door. At that time, that act was not nearly as rebellious as a convention of Call to Action. True! It was the way scholars notified the openness to discussion, to the clarification of their ideas and to inviting discussion. But he did discuss some very topical things; and he did discuss some things he thought were abuses. One of the issues that's no longer an issue today was the selling of indulgences. But the selling of indulgences at that time was the poster child for the reformation, for the discontentment of people. The sexual abuse of minors is the poster child for the reformation of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. This reformation will not take place without addressing it; this reformation will not take place until this problem is solved and exposed – and I don't mean superficially. I mean at its very foundation, at the core of it: the very structure of Church teaching on morality.

There would be a third headline. It would kind of be a double headline sometime in 1546; and that would be a headline in Rome that said, "MARTIN LUTHER DIES IN DEFEAT," because at that time the tide had turned against Martin Luther. The peasant revolt came up and had been decided. Martin Luther had been in exile a great deal of his life, but he had his supporters. But from the point of view of Rome, this little uprising was almost over. But there was still an uneasiness theologically and morally about the Church.

But Pope Paul II<sup>2</sup> in 1546 called the Council of Trent. Pope Paul, as a cardinal, was called Cardinal Petticoat. He was called Cardinal Petticoat because his sister was the mistress to the reigning pope at the time. When Paul was elected – no I've got this mixed up in my mind – Paul II and Julius III, or Paul III and Julius II. You go through your history book and figure it out. They're in there. Paul had a mistress, and he had three sons and a daughter. This is the man who summoned the Council of Trent.

The second session of the Council of Trent was called by Julius III<sup>2</sup>, I believe. Julius – this is historical record – Julius had a sexual companion, a 15 year old boy. It was not exactly kosher to have a sexual companion of that age in the Vatican openly. He had his brother adopt him, called him a nephew, and he created him a cardinal.

People have said, and I hear it all the time, "Well, wait 'til we get a new pope. The pope will make the difference." The pope is not going to make the difference. Will he make a difference? Certainly! He's not going to make the difference; he never has! It is the people who reform. You cannot have a reformation without people demanding both of themselves and of others transparency and accountability. Corruption comes from the top down; reform comes from the bottom up! If you look at history, I think you will find it's so, and I think this is why you are a part of history.

Well, we look into the mirror and we feel we are so small, so impowerful, so old, things must be passing us by. What kind of influence can we have? The only influence we could have is to be honest with ourselves, to demand of ourselves accountability and integrity, the same as we demand of others. If we do this, we will eventually elicit the help of those above. But it would not be those above who will essentially and first elicit our help. I would say that, by the way, if all the bishops and cardinals who have blackballed me already were sitting here, because I believe it. But it would give some substance to what they're – why they're blackballing me.

We are in an historical time, and we are part of history. That's hard for me to believe, that's always been hard for me to believe, but as I have been blessed with experience and burden, with some of the work I have been burdened with, I have come to this conclusion: We are small, but if we have the truth, if we have the facts, we are very strong.

As you know, the Boston Globe, on January 6, 2002, started publishing a series that ended up with more than 1,000 articles on the sexual abuse of priests, a sexual abuse of minors by priests in the United States. It took a great deal of courage for this group to do that. Several months before they put the stories together, they went with my wife and I – my wife is a psychiatrist, had been in religious life and had treated many religious – and we sat down with the whole staff: the editor of the Globe and the five core people who made up the spotlight team and said, "What can we expect?" And I said, "From the research I have done, this is what you are going to discover. You are going to go from individual perpetrators to group perpetrators. And whenever you find groups of perpetrators – clusters, you're going to find someone in authority who has either given permission, who has given permission for that, either by easy forgiveness or by involvement themselves." And we can talk about the sexual genealogy of sexual abuse, and I will in a little bit. It comes from the top down.

How many of the priest abusers have themselves been abused by priests, either as young boys, in the seminary, or early in the priesthood? And they – some of them – go on to reform; some of them go on to have an appropriate sex life, if you can talk about that in a celibate community, or at least without any coercion with a fully consenting sexual partner – that’s a whole problem in itself – but some of them will revert to having sex with youngsters of the priest’s own psycho-sexual development, which is about 13 years old. You ask why this happens? This has been the story is not new. This has been told to the Church for 50 years, and to the hierarchy: “You’re turning out psycho-sexual adolescents.” My mentor talked, Bishop Krol – I mean Cardinal Krol – several other bishops, he was a consultant to, he talked about this all the time.

The bishops themselves in the late 60s set up a commission on sociology and psychology and history, and in that, Kennedy and Heckler said that 66% of the priests were psycho-sexually underdeveloped, 8% were developed, and 8% were mal-developed, and the others were developing. What does this mean if you’re psycho-sexually underdeveloped? This means that your psycho-sexuality is going to be in a mode that is under – that’s psycho-sexually underdeveloped. This means that there is going to be a great deal of sexual impropriety, of sexual adolescent mish=chief like these, and it’s going to mean that there are going to be some priests who seduce and sexually abuse minors. And that minority is not an insignificant minority.

Since that time, 11 grand juries investigating the Catholic Church have been impaneled in this United States. Of those, 4 are finished. The rest are still going. We have reports from 3 of them. Have you read these reports? They’re devastating!

- ❑ Suffolk County: the grand jury says: “The Catholic Church is not capable of managing the sexual activity of its priests.” It is not capable of it.
- ❑ New Hampshire says that the Church is not only incapable of this, but that we will make a deal with your bishop, Bishop McCormick, that he will not be indicted, he will not be tried and threatened with prison, if he signs an agreement that all of the sexual abuse activity, or all the delegations, everything having to do with sexual abuse by priests, will be monitored by the state – not by the Church but by the state – because the Church is incapable of doing it.
- ❑ The grand jury in Phoenix, Arizona had enough evidence to prosecute Bishop O’Brien, and they agreed that if he agreed also to monitoring outside of his jurisdiction, that they would not press those charges.

This is a unique time in America. This isn’t a little bleep. There are more grand juries to come - I will guarantee you at that. 435 priests have been dismissed – 435 priests currently serving have been dismissed by the bishops themselves, because of validated accusations of sexual abuse of minors. This doesn’t take in sexual abuse of women, of nuns, of adult men. Is there some of that? Yes, there is! I will tell you that. I will tell you that it is recorded in very significant proportions.

Did all of these stories get told in the Globe? No! But you got some good headlines; you got some accurate headlines; you got some movement; you got Justice Constance Sweeney ruling against this. You’ve changed the climate of the judiciary in the United States. I know this.

I spent all day Wednesday – I didn’t get home ‘til midnight - in mediation of a number of cases of Orange Diocese. Naturally, all those negotiations are private at the time; but we all know that there are over 50 cases against the diocese. There are over 500 cases against the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. And I’ll talk a little more about this.

You say, “Well, some of those allegations – those aren’t – are they real? The paper says, ‘Oh, he got touched. What’s a sexual touch? We’ve all had a sexual touch; we’ve all done a sexual touch. What’s the big deal?’”

Well, I am going to go into the second point of my headline, behind the headline, that the great headline in the Globe was: "**GLOBE PROVES COVER-UP**." Globe proves cover-up! And so I was saying before, I told – Mary Ann and I said, "Look! If you want to go to that, you are going to a coterie. Then, what you're going to find – you're going to find priests and others who are involved, not necessarily with minors, but with women, with men, and so on. And then you're going to go into it higher. What is going to come out is the sexual activity of bishops and of other priests, of seminary directors and of spiritual directors. It's all there. And it's all going to come out." You can no longer hold this out.

And, of course, there are some very significant cases coming up. One is the case of Paul Shandley. I'm an expert on some of these cases against him. The attorney general in Massachusetts, because I helped him out there in grand jury investigations, sent me the whole stack of documents on him. I've read all of them. There are some things in there that are very important and, when they come out, they're not just going to be about little boys, they're not just going to be about other priests. I think you know, and it's already been published, that in his correspondence, he wrote and he said: "I've kept my part of the deal. I have not revealed about my sexual abuse by a priest in the parish, or my sexual activity with a seminary professor, or a priest in the parishes, nor Cardinal, my involvement with one of your predecessors." That's there! That's a matter of record already. Let's see what will happen in the criminal investigation. That will all come out. I'll talk about that later when I talk about the dynamics of this.

That headline: "**GLOBE PROVES COVER-UP**" is one of the most significant headlines that has been written in the last 50 years. And I include in the headlines around Watergate, in terms of the influence, in terms of the effect, that that headline has had, and will continue to have, on the Catholic Church, on the judiciary, and on the Church, I believe, universally.

Let me take another actual headline – not the fictitious headlines from Rome about Luther, but an actual headline: "**TUCSON VICTIMS PAID 14 MILLION DOLLARS**." This was actually a headline that came before the Globe. I'm using the Globe as the central headline around which all the activity that now is happening:

- The formation of The Voice of the Faithful,
- The bishops' meeting in Dallas,
- The bishops being called to Rome.

All that is centered around that.

But before that, there was a headline: "**TUCSON PAYS 14 MILLION**." You think: "Oh boy! Now that's a nice generous settlement for plaintiffs; and they ought to be happy....and so on." In the paper it says: "The boys were touched." Well, I interviewed these boys – these men. I'm going to tell you how they were touched. And I'm going to go through three categories of sexual contact of priests with youngsters, and with others also:

- One is in counseling.
- Two is in the confessional.
- Three is at Mass.
- 

Counseling: Priests are counselors. Teachers are too, but priests are kind of special counselors. A wife becomes a widow, and she has 4 or 5 children; and the children are variously disturbed – naturally. But the oldest is especially disturbed and distraught and at a loss. And she says to him, "Go and talk to Father" – a perfectly normal thing for a Catholic family to do. Father talks to the boy. He says, "Oh yes, you're in trouble, and look, let me come over and I will comfort your family." He comes over, and something very typical, he ingratiates himself with the family. He's not some distant guy. Lurking in a dark corner, in some kind of an overcoat, exposing himself to kids. Oh no! He's the thief in the house. He's invited in. He's fed. He's thanked. He's made comfortable. He's one of them. And he feels so good. Why? - Because he's a damned underdeveloped kid with a very big responsibility on his shoulders.

So he goes in and ingratiates himself. Mother trusts him. Everybody in the church trusts him. This young kid goes to Mass on Sunday, and he sees the priest preaching, and he sees how attentive the people are. This priest is a good man! And, if you're in a small southwestern town, the priest is who? He's God! That happens in other places too. But in a small midwestern<sup>3/</sup> town, where your heritage is very deep in Spanish, and centered on the Church; and the whole social life is centered in the Church. So what happens? So he has the confidence, this global confidence, this prestige. And he says to the boy, "I love you so much. God has sent me to you, and I have this special mission. I'm going to be your spiritual father." So the boy tells him everything that's going on in his head and everything in his world. Little by little, the priest puts his hand on his leg, and he says, "You know, young man, you're just too tense. Let me rub your shoulder." Hum! "Let me relax you, because it's important – to be holy, you have to be relaxed." He has all the support of new age on that. So then he goes on. He builds this up over a period of time. And he says, "You know!" And they go out and do social things together, and so on. They go swimming together, and he says, "You come on and take a shower with me," and so on. And then he says, "You come on and take a shower with me," and so on. And then he says, "Lay down on my bed. There's nothing wrong! Your mother knows you're here; your mother sent you to me. You wouldn't be here if God didn't want you here. And this is very special." So, he caresses the boy, as a young man would to a young woman if they were going together at the appropriate age and development. He hugs him and he kisses him. He rubs his back, and then, he masturbates him. He says, "I'm going to teach you how to do this." He asks the boy to masturbate him; and then, he says, "You know, we can get closer;" and he kisses the boy there and sucks his genitals. He encourages him to suck his genitals. Sometimes this goes further; sometimes that's it.

Now people: if you read the headlines, you say, "Well, that's because so many priests are homosexual." It's not so. Don't get confused by that. There are some very good people writing, and there's a very smart guy by the name of Jenkins whom I disagree with entirely, because he analyzes the headlines of newspapers. He's never interviewed on victim. He's never interviewed one perpetrator. And he says, "Well, it's proof that priests are homosexuals, because all of their victims are adolescents." Not true! I've had case, after case, after case, after case, where the initiation of sexuality, or the courting and the sexual activity begins at 8 or 9 years old, and goes on to 16. What do you call it? Do you call it pedophilia or do you call it aphebophilia? Or do you call it a crime and you call it a sin? We can argue about the other stuff, but it's plain wrong. Think about your own children who are 8 years old, or your grandchildren. Do you want a priest involving himself in this way in their life and development, let alone anybody else?

You have a young woman at 13; you don't say, "Oh! Those damn, dirty heterosexuals. There they are again." Heterosexuality and sexual activity with a minor is just as separate as homosexuality and sexual activity with a minor. Please get that straight. We do a disservice to everybody and to truth by not keeping that clear.

I will tell you about another situation: a priest, small Mexican parish (Spanish-American parish), now naturally, a lot of small kids, a lot of poor families. So he takes a liking to an 18<sup>4/</sup> year old young boy. He gives him work to do – he gives him work to do- and little by little... This kid has never had any sexual experience before; he hadn't even come into puberty yet, but the priest courts him. And he tells him what sex is all about. And if you learn it in that context, what else are you suppose to think? When this young man was 16, the priest came home, and on his pillow was the young man's garden shears, and they were covered with blood. It was the first indication that this priest had had that perhaps he wasn't doing a favor to these young boys – or this young boy.

If you talk to priests who have been involved with this kind of thing: "I was doing it to help them. You know, young kids have sex and I wanted to put it into the right context." Of course, no admission at all that they were doing that partly for themselves for their own gratification. Oh no! "I'm doing this as part of my good work; and more than that, it's part of my good spiritual work."

There is a great tendency within the Catholic Church theologically now to sexualize theology, to sexualize sacrament. This is part of the movement of the corruption in the Church. But let me talk: There's a boy who came in with counseling – he was counseling himself. The thing is that often times, these priests don't have one sexual partner, they have a group of kids.

Confession: What about confession? Confession is a very interesting sacrament. It really only became a private enterprise in the middle ages. In the Vatican council in 1215 – there was a Lateran Council of 1215 – that regulated that, for the first time, people had to make an annual confession – to make their Easter duty, so to speak. Before that it was public: you know, you're a sinner, I'm a sinner; we get together and pray and confess our sins, and we go on. But some very holy men developed, men who were especially designed to help people with their spiritual life. It's an absolute myth that every priest can be a spiritual director. It's not true! It's not true! There were special people who were holy enough, and spiritual enough, that they had control, who could love in this way, forgive in this way.

Well, you know, one of the big things in the council, or the reformation – Charles Borromeo, I think, was the one who introduced this: you know, the wood division between where the kneeler on one side and the priest who had to sit on the other side – that's an invention, that was a reformation invention. Why? Because priests could not keep their hands off people by talking to them intimately about sex. It's not a new thing! People - you know – one of the greatest admissions of the Second Vatican Council is that they did not talk about sex; they did not talk about celibacy. Do you realize that? It has been, and what we are about now, is a remedy for that. We cannot have a Church that we cannot talk about sex realistically, and that we cannot deal with celibacy realistically – and I mean honestly and direct.

But what about the priest invading confession? And this is very, very common with young girls, and by the way, very common with women. I could talk for a whole hour on cases of women being seduced in spiritual direction and in confession. You become very trusting of the priest, and the priest – I will just give it shorthand; some of these things are in the book that I have written, some not – but that again, you relax: it's important, And you play some music, and you'll think about God. "And we'll lay on the floor here, and we'll think about God, and relax. And because God created us, without any clothes, because that's our natural state, we should present ourselves in this holy way without clothes.

Now, you know, we sit in a room like this here, and it sounds kind of silly. Who would be stupid enough to suggest that; and who would be stupid enough to go along with that? And I tell ya, don't cast a stone on anybody else. Because, when one is in a very asking relationship, spiritual relationship, from someone who represents God and good and morality, there's an awful lot of trust that can be invested in that person, and awful lot of trust. "It couldn't be wrong, because he's a priest. He couldn't be wrong, because I see him in his robes with the bishop. He couldn't be wrong, because I hear him preach, and I hear wonderful things he says." Can you imagine: if adults – if we as adults can get roped in – what about children? And fashion is an entrée many, many times.

I listen to victims, "Well, how did this happen?"

"Well, I went to confession. I told Father I was concerned about sexuality, and I was concerned about my masturbation, and I was concerned about my thoughts. And so, you know, he took me" – and this and that. It goes on and on and on.

I'll give you one case, just briefly, about this, because the priest got into some trouble and was summarily dismissed from the parish. He called up this boy at 8 o'clock at night, and he said, "I'm really having a terrible time and I have to come over." He needed a boy to console him – a 13 year old boy to console him. And although the priest had touched him before, and although the priests had experimented with him sexually before, this night, he had sexual anal intercourse with this boy – with this 13 year old boy. And when he was done, he gave the boy \$80.00, not only perverting confession to sex, to sin, but to prostitution. Does this young man have something to work through?

And in the paper you will read that Father So and So "touched" so and so. "Touched" doesn't say it! "Rape" says it, in all that it means.

Mass: The other way is at Mass, and I'll give you two small examples. These are from the files where I have interviewed these men. This priest had the habit of not wearing his cassock when he said Mass. He just wore his alb, and so on. And Afterwards, he would – again boys he had cultivated and won their confidence, and so on – he would have them falate him – kneel in front of him and falate him – because he said, “This is very special between you and me; this is very special between you and God, because I've just said Mass and I have Jesus in me, flowing through my veins. And you, having taken part of the seeds of my life, you now have God inside you, flowing through your veins.” He then put his thumb in his own semen and made the sign of the cross on the young man's forehead. The Mass and sexual abuse!

Another priest was cultivation a young woman – had an affair with this young woman – and she would come to Mass; and the indication that he would meet her after Mass to have sex was that he took part of his host, when he gave her in her hand his host, she knew that she was to meet him in the appointed place so that they could have sex.

And the priests often times construct their sexual activity with a minor in spiritual terms, in sacramental terms. It is, in my estimation, a tremendous perversion, one that you don't read about in the paper, but that you have to pay attention to, because this is what it is all about: perverting the sacraments and sexualizing them.

I will give you one more. I will move to the systemic. This is not an individual problem of individual priests, nor is it a problem that just goes up. It's a systemic problem. I will try and hurry through this because I'm going to end up with a great mystery of Cardinal Bernardin, because one of the great headlines of great difficulty and a great mystery has been, “**CARDINAL BERNARDINE FALSELY ACCUSED**,” A headline from 1993. That headline was the manufacture of the media. Cardinal Bernardin's accuser never recanted. He never said ‘til the day he died that Cardinal Bernardin did not have sex with him. What he said was that, “I cannot trust my memory.” And the reason he said that was, he brought a law suit, and the law suit was based on recovered memory. And the first story of his recovered memory was that he had told no one, but he didn't even think about it until just recently it came up, when in fact, he had spoken several years before to a therapist. And this then was discovered, and, no, he could not utilize that defense. And that case was dropped on that basis, not the basis that Cardinal Bernardin was falsely accused.

I am sure that Cardinal Bernardin was a man certainly of far more scholarship and holiness that I will attain. That does not mean that he cannot be capable of this. Before this came out in the press, five people had come to me and told me that they had either had sex with Cardinal Bernardin. Or that they had observed it. I can only say that that's the fact that I know. The Archdiocese of Chicago has never revealed any documents about this. No depositions were taken. There was a settlement that was made, and my understanding; it was a settlement for \$3 million dollars. I don't know where the money came from, or where it went.

I do know there was another complication. There was a priest by the name of Harsham. Harsham was accused at the time of sexual abuse by the same man. And that case – there is a new case coming up – the Harsham case was settled. And if the Harsham case had not been settled, Cardinal Bernardin would have been called as a witness in that case. This is very complicated. I'm not making any allegations. I'm telling the facts I know. I do know that the Hershman case is coming up, and that we will find out more of the details at that time.

The thing that is important in the whole history of sexual abuse in the United States is that that one headline set back the victims' movement by a good 10 years. No newspaper would touch these things; they wouldn't deal with these. Why? Because, “Oh God, we're not going to be caught like the Chicago papers did.” The point is that that is a Church mystery to be resolved by bishops.



Bishop Rausch – Bishop Jim Rausch – who’s a friend – maybe some in the room knew Jim Rausch – brought up around St. Cloud, a little town, I think St. Rosa – we knew as a young priest. I was in a priest group with him. Bishop Rausch was the bishop in Phoenix. He was Cardinal Bernardin’s successor as the secretary to the National Conference of Catholic Bishops before Bishop Kelley of Kentucky. Bishop Rausch, dressed in his civilian clothes, his big car, drove through Tucson, Arizona. And he saw a young man, and the young man was just 17 years old, and he called him over and made him a proposition with him; you know, “Could I suck you, \$50.00?” The guy said, “Naw! Naw!” He went on and down the street and the bishop pursued him in the car. He said his name was Bob and he said he was the head of a corporation. This young man, who had never had an adult sexual relationship with a man before, started a sexual relationship with a man he called “bob.” And after several weeks, several months, with regular sexual contact, this “Bob” was in buying cigarettes. On the seat was a black book. And he opened the black book, and it said “James Rausch, Bishop of Phoenix.” This kid, who was not brought up – he was a farm kid from the Midwest – not brought up as a Catholic, who didn’t have any particular bias against homosexual activity, he says: “Hey Jimmy, how’s it going?” Of course, the bishop broke down, because he had not told him his true identity. And they went to the hotel room, and they couldn’t have sex that night, but they did subsequently. Bishop Rausch set up a special place. At time he would come to the hotel in Phoenix, the room all ready. It was under an assumed name.

Bishop Rausch passed this young man onto two priests in Tucson. One was Father Bern. Father Bern encouraged this guy’s addiction – his drug addiction. At one time he threw up in the rectory. And Father Bern threw him out of the house. Because he was half-high, he was laying on the ground, and Father Bern urinated in his mouth.

Well this young man had had enough of that, and subsequently, the second priest that Bishop Rausch referred him to, contacted this young man. He didn’t want anything – this young man didn’t want anything. But this priest did some very good things for him; he got him off drugs. He got him off drugs and sincerely got him off drugs, and took him as his lover, and had a man-to-man relationship as this man moved from 17½ to 19 years old. And he was hired by the diocese to work in the chancery office.

Now this priest, who was a monsignor, Monsignor Trupia, was being investigated. An so, when the bishop knew that he was being investigated, because Bishop Moreno knew of the sexual relationship between Trupia and the young man, Brian, and he made him make a vow not to tell anybody – don’t tell anybody. And he didn’t. But they sent him off and gave him 6 months paid vacation, while the authorities investigated this – investigated this monsignor for sexual activity. This young man didn’t know that Monsignor Trupia had violated at least 30 young men. And he was the one who had raped this other young man some years before. The bishop knew! And who else knew? His predecessor, Bishop Green, knew.

In the files of that case, I found what I was looking for for years. For years I have said, because of interviewing people, there is a system of blackmail that goes on, and goes very high in the Church – in the hierarchy. They know what each others have done! And they hold it against each other. In letters from Bishop Moreno to the Vatican is: “Monsignor Trupia is blackmailing us; that if we do anything to him, he will reveal the sexual activity of a prelate in Arizona, and cause problems.” Monsignor was exonerated by the Vatican, after \$14 million in damages have been paid out, after 30 people, at least, have come forward – in fact there are two new cases in Arizona against Monsignor Trupia. He lives in Washington, D.C. and he drives a Mercedes. He gets \$12,000 – he gets \$1200 a month in compensation; he get his health insurance and his car insurance paid for – and has since 1988, and continues. And because they say this is canon law, we have to have this.

What is unraveling is the system of blackmail. I will guarantee you that within the next 6 months, you will see in headlines bishops exposed who have had or are having affairs with women; and probably some who have had or are having sexual affairs with men. You will probably hear about the sexual affairs of a cardinal or two – an American cardinal or two.

This is coming! You can't stop this. Certainly, the Church is trying to do things, but they're trying to plug holes. The core of this problem is a sexual problem, and it is the sexual teaching of the Church. The sexual teaching of the Church is that every sexual thought, desire and action outside marriage is mortally sinful; and every sexual act within marriage not open to conception is also mortally sinful. And there is no paucity of manner. This is not reasonable! This is pre-Copernican! People do not live this way!

I have always wondered were the people to stand up and say: "I cannot live this way! I do not live this way! I will not teach my children this! – that there has to be another moral norm." This is a norm that is a celibate norm. Whether lived or not, it is a celibate norm. It is not the norm for the normal, average person. This is the core, the whole celibate sexual agenda of the Church, is the core of the reformation.

There are other issues. They are grand issues: communication with bishops, and collegiality, and all that; but, the core is – has to do with sexuality, has to do with sex before marriage, sex after death, separation or divorce, contraception, abortion, homosexuality, masturbation, the ordination of women, the authority of women, the marriage of priests – they're all sexual issues. And this reformation we are involved in, whether we want to be or not, this is bigger than all of us together. It's bigger than any pope, whether he's a saint or a sinner.

This is part of history. And it's happening!

I thank you very much.

Transcribed by

*Tom Kyle*

20031129

- 1/ Delivered at the CTA Convention in Milwaukee on November 8, 2003
- 2/ The correct identity is Paul II and Julius II.
- 3/ I believe he meant "southwestern."
- 4/ I believe he meant 16 or less, perhaps 12 or 13.