



## *Our Mission Statement*

Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc. (RCF) is a lay organization, with many religious members, dedicated to promoting orthodox Catholic teaching and fighting heterodoxy and corruption within the Catholic hierarchy.

## *Our Philosophy*

While we accept the authority of the Holy Father and all bishops in union with him, we will not sit idly by, nor blindly follow, while many in the hierarchy allow the Holy Catholic Church to be torn apart and assaulted by the forces of Modernism, Syncretism, Heresy, and the gross immorality of some of its clergy. As parents and teachers, we will not allow our Catholic youth to be robbed of their faith or have their innocence destroyed in the name of “tolerance”, “ecumenism”, “diversity” or any other politically correct ideology of the day.

We object to individuals or groups of individuals being given access to Catholic schools, churches, and Church property to promote any belief, teaching, or idea contrary to Catholic teaching as defined by two thousand years of Tradition and Church teaching. We expect every Catholic priest to follow the disciplines of the Catholic Church as he promised. We expect every bishop to do all he can to safeguard the souls of our children by exercising his authority to ensure proper teaching within Catholic schools and parish religion programs. We insist that Catholic colleges and universities either teach the True Faith or cease calling themselves Catholic.

We object to any priest treating the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass as his personal possession by adding, changing, or removing any part of the Mass on his own authority. Furthermore, we assert that the right of every Catholic priest to celebrate the Traditional Latin Mass must be recognized, and we consider it a grave scandal that such a right is not recognized while at the same time countless liturgical and theological novelties are promoted by many in the hierarchy.

We will do everything within our power to undo the last thirty-plus years of watered-down Catholicism that has been foisted upon us. We will not separate ourselves from the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church; we will stand and fight and demand what is rightfully ours. In that regard, we insist at this time in history that those in positions of authority in the Church proclaim loudly the infallibly defined dogma that “outside the Church there is no salvation”, as that dogma has been taught and explained by the Church for centuries.

We insist that the Catholic media, especially diocesan newspapers, present authentically Catholic perspectives on social issues and current events and cease being used as forums for heresy and blasphemy.

We express our love for the clergy, and refuse to be silent while holy priests and nuns are persecuted by the modernist establishment holding power within the layers of bureaucracy existing in chancery offices throughout much of the world. At the same time, we refuse to be blind to the fact that a pattern of gross immorality exists among many religious, and that among their victims have been children, and that the hierarchy has for years covered up and enabled these predators to attack God’s children. For this we cry out to heaven for justice, and pledge to our last breath to seek out and expose these predators.

We acknowledge Jesus Christ as our Lord and King, and will fight for His social reign in society. We adopt as our slogan the words of Blessed Miguel Pro just before his murder by the Masonic revolutionaries of his land:

**VIVA CRISTO REY!**

AMDG is the newsletter of Roman Catholic Faithful and is sent out to our supporters free of charge. Your contributions make RCF's work possible.

Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc.  
P.O. Box 109, Petersburg, IL 62675-0109

Phone: (217) 632-5920 / Fax: (217) 632-7054  
Web site: <http://www.rcf.org>

**Board Members**

Stephen Brady, President, James Bendell, Esq.  
J. Brady, P. Bultmann, M. McGrath

We need your financial help to continue our work.  
Please send a generous contribution.

**Please send your tax-exempt donation today.**



***Inside this issue:***

Morally Bankrupt Bishops	4
Are They Catholic?	9
Doorway to Corrupt Hierarchy	15
A Medicinal Solution: by Michael Chapman	20
RCF receives foundation grant	31
Homosexual Priests Poison Diocese of Arlington By Michael Chapman	32
Speaking out on the Scandal By Paul Likoudis	40

**Cover:** *Left, above:* Bishops attending episcopal consecration, March 19, 2002 at the Cathedral of St. Raymond, Joliet, Illinois.

*Right:* Francis Cardinal George. *Inset, below left:* Bishop Daniel Ryan. At the time Ryan made the statement (cover) he was, according to testimony, an alcoholic and predatory homosexual.

*Photos by Stephen G. Brady*

Heavenly Father, we ask Your blessing on our efforts. Show us the way to spread the Truth of the Catholic faith in the midst of error and infidelity. Fill our hearts with authentic love for our priests, bishops, pope and all the clergy, a love that moves us to unceasing prayer for their souls and to constant exhortation to faithfully fulfill their sacred task of preaching the whole truth of the Catholic Faith without compromise.

Grant us wisdom in our deliberations, courage in exposing error and corruption, and humility and charity in all the things we do. Bless our Holy Father with the wisdom and holiness to discern and carry out Your Will, and the loyalty and fidelity of bishops, priests and all religious in helping him carry out this task. May Thy will be done in all things.


We ask this through the intercession of our Holy Mother Mary.

**“It is better that scandals arise than the truth be suppressed.”**

*Pope St. Gregory the Great*



Below is a copy of an invitation sent out by the Joliet Chancery. Despite the fact the Bishop Daniel L. Ryan was publicly known as a predatory homosexual, Bishop Joseph Imesch held him up as a moral leader by allowing him to act as co-consecrator at the episcopal ordination of the new auxiliary bishop of Joliet.



The Church of Joliet  
joyfully invites you to  
The Episcopal Ordination of  
The Most Reverend James E. Fitzgerald  
Titular Bishop of Walla Walla  
and  
Auxiliary Bishop of Joliet

The Most Reverend Joseph L. Imesch  
Bishop of Joliet  
Principal Consecrator

The Most Reverend Roger L. Kaffer  
Auxiliary Bishop of Joliet

and  
The Most Reverend Daniel E. Ryan  
Retired Bishop of Springfield  
Co-Consecrators

In the presence of  
His Eminence Cardinal Francis George  
Archbishop of Chicago

Tuesday, March 19, 2002  
2:30 p.m. CST  
Cathedral of St. Raymond  
610 North Raynor Avenue  
Joliet, Illinois

The above photographs, as well as those on the following three pages, were taken March 19, 2002 at St. Raymond Cathedral in Joliet, Illinois.

The occasion being celebrated was the episcopal ordination of Auxiliary Bishop James E. Fitzgerald of Joliet.

RCF members were present  
To protest at the event.



During RCF's protest, a Catholic Layman approached RCF President, Stephen Brady, screaming profanities and demanding that RCF members leave. A Joliet police captain had one of his officers take pictures of RCF members and their signs and claimed it was for our own (RCF's) protection.

As soon as we RCF members arrived at St. Raymond's Cathedral, RCF president Stephen Brady took one protest sign and went over to where the Joliet police were placing cones to prevent people from parking in front of the Cathedral. Chancery staff members were present. One man from the diocese instructed a police officer to arrest Brady. The officer apparently informed him that Brady was within his rights to be there. Shortly thereafter several more police cars arrived, as did four Joliet area Catholics who helped carry our signs.

At one point during our protest, a priest from the Cathedral approached us and called us a "bunch of hillbillies". He then stated: "You are no better than the Hindus and Moslems." Brady asked Father for his name so he could quote him in RCF's newsletter. Brady told the priest his name at which point Father became very angry and said: "YOU'RE THAT GUY!" Father said something about Hell and stormed off.





Notice the angry look on the bishops' faces. They are looking at Stephen Brady as he takes their pictures.



RCF has mailed every U.S. bishop information regarding Bishop Daniel Ryan's predatory homosexual activity, yet all the bishops pictured, by their presence at this ordination, confirmed Ryan's good-standing within the Church.



What does Ryan know about his fellow bishops? What kind of power does he have over them? Or, perhaps, do these bishops see no contradiction with a homosexual predator ordaining bishops? You cannot believe in Jesus and do such things.

Would any of you associate with such a person?

RCF is looking for the answers to these questions.

The faithful must realize that unless they stand up and oppose the corruption that exists (as told to the late Fr. John Hardon by his Vatican superiors), **“one diocese after another will be lost.”**



Homosexual Bishop Daniel Ryan (far left) made the following statement in 1984 at his installation as bishop in Springfield, Illinois:

*“The bishop stands with his brother bishops... as a teacher of the Catholic faith, whose purity and integrity are guaranteed by the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church”* [Say what?! Ed.]

*“Christ’s promise by guaranteeing the authority of the bishops’ teaching and imposing on the faithful the obligation of obedience, makes it crystal clear why the individual bishop has to be a sign of fidelity to the doctrine of the Church.”*

*“The choice of bishops, successors of the apostles, is as important today for the church as was the choice of the twelve for Jesus. The recommendation and selection of every new bishop deserved the greatest prayerful reflection on the part of all those associated with the process of the selection of candidates. In this regard the bishops themselves have a special role in proposing those whom they judge the most suitable, with God’s help, to be living signs of Jesus Christ—priests who have already proven themselves as teachers of the faith...”<sup>1</sup>*



<sup>1</sup>Bishop Daniel Ryan at his installation service in Springfield, Illinois January 18, 1984. Special Installation Issue – “Time and Eternity” newspaper of the Diocese of Springfield in Illinois 01/29/84

At the time Ryan made the above statements he was known as an active predatory homosexual according to testimony of a Joliet priest in good standing, as well as several former teenage male prostitutes. At the time these pictures were taken, at least 4 Catholic priests and 4 laymen had come forward to give first-hand testimony regarding Ryan’s sexual advances toward them – yet Cardinal Francis George of Chicago (left) held up Bishop Ryan as a moral leader worthy to ordain other bishops.



# ARE THEY CATHOLIC?

## Time to call a spade a spade.

By Stephen Brady

*(Cardinal George is no more Catholic than Judas was a friend to Jesus. Judas paid lip service to Jesus while betraying Him with his actions. Cardinal George pays lip service to the Church while betraying Her with his actions (or lack thereof). Cardinal George is not a faithful Catholic; he is a liar and a coward. He has allowed poisoned food to be set before his flock without so much as a word of caution. Its chef he praises and places in a position of authority.)*

Every Catholic assumes that when they deal with their bishops regarding matters of faith, morals and justice, they will be dealing with individuals who act in good faith. We presume, rightly so, that when one presents a bishop with evidence that shows problems exist within a diocese, the bishop will automatically take care of those problems. But that's not always the case. In fact, in many instances just the opposite occurs.

When we approach our bishop with one problem or another, we find that the bishop, in many cases, denies the truth. For example, when homosexual activist and ex-priest, David Schimmel, gave a talk at the Joliet pastoral center last year, RCF presented the bishop with evidence that the speaker was promoting homosexual activity and books that denied Church teaching. We had tapes of this talk. We had handouts that Schimmel distributed at the meeting. Yet when Bishop Imesch was confronted with the facts, he simply denied them and took no corrective action. In cases such as these, it is fair to assume the bishop has an agenda that is not Catholic; and it begs the question: What is Bishop Imesch's sexual "orientation" – and is he sexually active? Considering his support of homosexual Bishop Daniel Ryan, human nature and common sense may have already answered those questions. It is fair to assume that a Catholic bishop who repeatedly acts in such a fashion is indeed an imposter who has found his way to the See by theft and deception (possibly in collusion with other members of the hierarchy). It is time for faithful Catholics to point this out. Many bishops' lives are a contradiction to the Catholic faith. *It is time to pull our heads out of the sand!* The bishops' failure to take corrective action regarding the many abuses taking place within the Church is proof enough that they have lost their faith or never had any faith. It is time to stop making excuses for their inaction and negligence.

Bishops who fail to responsibly exercise the authority of their office, and who are not acting in good faith, have caused monumental damage. Many of these bishops use our orthodoxy against us. They hold us hostage by denying the sacraments to our children if we fail to enroll them in heretical diocesan programs. In many cases, we are subjected to a Mass filled with abuses and novelties with no recourse to justice. This is evil personified. The very person who claims to represent Christ uses His Church to enslave the faithful. For those whom he cannot control by excusing their sexual sins with ambiguous moral teaching and double-talk, he attempts to destroy with the power of his office. I suggest bishop Imesch may very well fall into this category. You cannot explain away his lies, abuse of authority, and endorsement of homosexual bishop Daniel Ryan. Until Catholics stop second-guessing themselves and confront their bishops, nothing will change.

Let's look, however, at another aspect of this situation and the actions of a number of other bishops regarding abortion and sexual abuse. Most of us realize that with position in life comes greater benefits, respect, prestige and, most importantly, greater responsibility. While a higher position in life provides one with the opportunity to do greater good, it also enables one to perpetrate a greater evil upon others. This is indeed the case regarding abortion as well as other problems that we find in the Church today. As scripture tells us, to those who are given more, more is expected.

As an example, let's look at the abortion laws. While the mother has the opportunity to kill her child, she has the opportunity to kill only her child. On the other hand, the doctor whom the mother pays to kill her child has a state license to kill as many children as he has opportunity and time.

Next come the lawmakers, the senators, the representatives, the Catholic-in-name-only Ted Kennedys and Dick Durbins of this world. They make the laws that allow hundreds, even thousands of doctors to kill millions of unborn

children. Dick Durbin, Ted Kennedy and many other like-minded “Catholic” politicians have an even greater responsibility than those non-Catholic politicians, who do not claim to be Catholic, do not have the truth before them, do not necessarily belong to the One True Church. If abortion is murder as the Church teaches, then the blood of the innocent unborn is dripping from the hands of Durbin, Kennedy, and many others.

Let’s carry this argument one step further. The Supreme Court justices who “interpret” the constitution to favor the legality of abortion are responsible for all of the abortions we have today. How many of these individuals have been honored, in life or death, by Catholic Bishops?

*Yet even more responsible than the mothers, the doctors, the lawmakers, and the justices are the priests and bishops. The majority of bishops only pay lip-service to the Church’s teaching on the abortion issue while in fact, they have done more to promote abortion on demand than nearly anyone else. Allow me to provide the reader with one example.*

According to a news article that appeared in the February 9, 1998 Chicago *Daily Herald* titled “Political issues with religious ties tricky for Durbin” by Robert C. Herguth, “Sen. Dick Durbin, an Illinois Democrat and practicing Catholic who said he is personally opposed to abortion, but would not outlaw it” met with Cardinal Francis George of Chicago to discuss Durbin’s 100% pro-choice voting record and other issues. George also met with then-senator Carol Moseley-Braun, another pro-death “Catholic-in-name-only” political leader. According to the *Herald* article, Cardinal George said of senator Dick Durbin:

“**I respect** what he is, and does, as a public servant,” – “But there are some things on which we’re **probably** not going to agree.” [emphasis RCF]

How on earth can a “Catholic” Cardinal say “**I respect** what he is, and does, as a public servant,” when that “public servant” has so much blood on his hands? Of course, that statement would be just fine if George did not accept Church teaching regarding abortion. This may be the case, considering the rest of his statement in which he stated that he (George) “probably” would not agree with Durbin on some issues. **Just “probably”?** The fact that he used this qualifier speaks volumes. After all, Judas did not kill Jesus – he just made it possible for someone else to kill Him. Jesus said of Judas: “It would have been better for him had he never been born.” While Springfield Catholic Senator Dick Durbin never directly killed a child, he just made it possible for others to kill them. While Cardinal George never killed a child – he just respected the man who made it possible for others to kill children. What lesson have we learned here?

*Cardinal George is no more Catholic than Judas was a friend to Jesus. Judas paid lip service to Jesus while betraying Him with his actions. George pays lip service to the Church while betraying Her with his actions. Cardinal George is not a faithful Catholic; he is a liar and a coward. RCF has presented proof of this in past issues of AMDG and will revisit some of those facts at the end of this article.*

George’s behavior betrays a clear double standard. Only after the press exposed the bishops’ involvement in the child abuse scandal did the bishops act. *Zero Tolerance* was their slogan. But Cardinal George shows his, and the other bishops’, hypocrisy. The bishops presently declare that a priest who abuses a child must repent and be stripped of his collar. Yet, according to Cardinal George, a Catholic politician who promotes, and makes possible, the death of millions of unborn children can remain a “Catholic in good standing” and be respected by the Cardinal. Why hasn’t the press called the bishops on this one? The bishops have given Catholic pro-death politicians a free pass and the politicians have given the hierarchy a free pass.

Pro-death Catholic-in-name-only Senator Dick Durbin lives within the boundaries of the Springfield, Illinois diocese; yet neither Bishop George Lucas of Springfield (who this writer heard praise Durbin at Lucas’ installation service as the Bishop of Springfield) nor Cardinal Francis George of Chicago have made any public statement condemning Durbin by name for his part in the murder of the unborn. As far as is known, Dick Durbin is still considered a Catholic in good standing who has the respect and admiration of both bishops. Is it any wonder so many Catholics vote “pro-choice”?

Is Dick Durbin a Pontius Pilot to the unborn? While he claims to be against abortion, he makes it possible by his pro-death votes in the Senate. Are his hands clean?

Is Francis Cardinal George of Chicago a Judas to the unborn? Did Christ not say that “what you do for them you do for [to] Me? “

Have the bishops been dealing in good faith? It is impossible to imagine the human costs due to the negligence of our bishops. Here is another example.

Monday, September 30, 2002, the Associated Press published the story “Priest Admits Sexual Relationship” By J.M. Hirsch. According to the story, parishioners at St. Patrick’s parish in Jaffrey, NH were outraged when they found that Bishop John B. McCormack had assigned the Rev. Roland Cote to their parish – despite the fact that the bishop knew the priest had sodomized a teenage boy, with whom the pastor claimed he was “in a relationship” for 5 years beginning in 1985. Cote claimed the boy was 18, but the teenager claims he was only 16 when he became “involved” with the priest.

Bishop McCormack excused his appointment of the sodomite priest by stating that although “Cote's actions were wrong, they did not violate the Diocese of Manchester's policies on sex abuse” because the teenager was 18 at the time. “The diocese defines a minor as anyone under 18, and its policy is to remove any priest from active ministry in New Hampshire if he is the subject of credible allegations of sexual misconduct with a minor.” “Cote said he is now committed to a life of celibacy.” *Well, isn't that nice.* What about the five or six years Fr. Cote celebrated a sacrilegious (and possibly invalid) Mass and administered the sacraments while sodomizing this young man? If the bishops believe such a person is worthy to represent Christ, then I suggest Bishop McCormack needs to be asked a few questions regarding his sexual orientation and beliefs.

The following is reprinted from a past issue of AMDG.

### **Chicago’s Archdiocesan Gay and Lesbian Outreach (AGLO)**

#### ***Francis Cardinal George betrays his flock. Is he fit to serve?***

In the September 20, 2000 issue of the Chicago *Sun-Times* there appeared an article titled “STEPPING INTO THE LIGHT – Group for gay Catholics expands to south suburbs”, by Cathleen Falsani, Suburban Reporter. In the article, the *Sun Times* announced:

The Archdiocese of Chicago's ministry to gay and lesbian Catholics is expanding to the suburbs. Cardinal Francis George has given the go-ahead for the Archdiocesan Gay and Lesbian Outreach program – known as AGLO – to set up its first suburban outpost at St. Emeric's Church in Country Club Hills.

The *Times* went on to speak of Gary Pate, co-director of the Cardinal’s AGLO ministry:

Gary Pate remembers the first time he attended an AGLO mass, six years ago. ‘I know when I first went, there was a sense of coming home, a sense of belonging,’ said Pate, a social worker who once studied for the priesthood. While he disagrees with some church teaching about homosexuality and other issues, at AGLO Pate said he has been able to wrestle with questions of faith, sexuality and church teaching without being pressured to change. ‘AGLO is an outreach ministry,’ said Pate, who is now an AGLO board member and co-director of the ministry. ‘Let them get settled, feel at home and then begin to struggle with whatever they need to struggle with.’

***Cardinal George is not a faithful Catholic; he is a liar and a coward. He has allowed poisoned food to be set before his flock without so much as a word of caution. Its chef he praises and places in a position of authority.***

There is more. An article in the December 4, 2000 issue of *Daily Southtown* (by Allison Hantschel) reported on the “gay” Mass held at St. Emeric’s Catholic Church. Fr. Seaman, pastor of St. Emeric’s, was reported to have said, according to the paper:

he would be reluctant to order a loving [homosexual] couple to end their relationship. ‘I am not sure I see the sense in trying to halt a long-term committed relationship...’

So we have the co-director of the Archdiocese’s ministry to homosexuals publicly stating he does not accept Church teaching regarding homosexuality and that **AGLO** does not pressure anyone to change. And the pastor, Fr. Seaman, sees no sense in attempting to pull a homosexual couple out of their sinful lifestyle. *What a scandal.* Father

refers to a homosexual relationship as “loving”. Is Father a Catholic priest? Is it *love* to sodomize someone? To allow this to go unanswered is cruel to the homosexual and shows a complete lack of charity. No misinterpretation is possible. But there is more regarding AGLO and the danger it represents to the spiritual well-being of the homosexual as well as the general public under Cardinal George’s care.

On July 11, 1999 RCF issued a press release regarding an obituary that appeared in the August 8, 1998 *Tribune* that listed Robert Boyle as the “*Life Partner*” of the deceased. At the time of the press release Mr. Robert Boyle was the “Education Commissioner” at **Our Lady of Mt. Carmel**, home to **AGLO**.

In addition, on July 27, 1999 RCF interviewed a “recovering” homosexual who had been part of the AGLO community at OLMC parish. He told us of homosexual activity being promoted in the confessional. He also told us of a priest he knew personally who hung out with the AGLO crowd and was a very active homosexual. **AGLO** [in the past–ed.] advertises its “ministry” on a gay web site called QCOMMUNITY (<http://www.qcommunity.com/local/illinois/042601il.htm>). On the same page as AGLO’s mission statement is an advertisement for “*buyitgay.com*” where a Catholic shopper can buy anything from sex toys to gay porno.

Now let’s address **Communication Ministry, Inc.** (CMI), a group for gay priests, nuns and religious operating out of Chicago in violation of Illinois law. RCF has made this information available to the Cardinal George in the past. **CMI**’s September 2000 newsletter contains a letter from a “gay priest” on page 7. The priest thanks **CMI** for its members’ support for him and his male partner of 6 years. This is one example of many regarding **CMI**’s danger to all concerned. **CMI** operates out of the **Christian Brothers**’ property with the help of **Franciscans** and other religious in Chicago. [CMI has since moved its location– ed. ]

These are but a few examples of the administrative actions Cardinal George has permitted that lead RCF to wonder just what he believes. Regrettably we must conclude that His Eminence is not competent to lead the archdiocese of Chicago.

The following exchange with Cardinal George is also being reprinted from an earlier issue of AMDG.

**On February 26, 2001 this writer sent the following to Cardinal George of Chicago.**

*Your Eminence,*

*I recently received a letter from a Mr. Matt Abbott regarding his Feb. 24, 2001 conversation with you at St. Rita High School during Parish Leadership Day. According to Mr. Abbott:*

*‘.he [Cardinal George] doesn’t like the fact that you make accusations with no evidence to back them up. He used the [Bishop] Ryan case as an example: He claims that there as no evidence of wrongdoing, other than Ryan’s “imprudent” association with certain individuals’*

*Surely Mr. Abbott misunderstood your comments, to assume otherwise would suggest you are a liar who has some reason to protect a pervert bishop.*

*The lawsuit filed against Bishop Ryan one week after his resignation mentions Ryan’s homosexual activity with clergy and male prostitutes. Are you suggesting the attorneys who filed the lawsuit had no affidavits to back up their statements? Are you calling them liars as well? How about the statement from the ex-wife of Ryan’s former lover? What about the statements from 3 priests and 2 former male prostitutes?*

*It seems everybody is lying except you and bishop Ryan – and General Absolution doesn’t happen in Chicago and there has never been a child sexually abused by a Catholic priest.*

*Maybe RCF’s work in Springfield is not complete. In an effort to defend RCF’s reputation and my good name, we might need to present to the public all the evidence including the size and shape of Bishop Ryan’s penis along with statements and copies of cancelled checks. One wonders what bishop Ryan must know that would cause other bishops to lie for him. Maybe we should take a closer look at others who protect the wolf. RCF has credibility and speaks the truth Cardinal – you do not.*

*Sincerely,*

*Stephen Brady, President  
Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc.*

**On March 1, 2001 the Cardinal answered RCF's letter.**

*Dear Mr. Brady:*

*This is in response to your faxed letter of February 26. I'll attempt to clarify the report which Matt Abbott gave you of our short conversation in the corridor of St. Rita High School. I had not realized that, in speaking with him, I was speaking with you; but it is good to take the occasion to raise with you the distinction between an accusation and an accusation accompanied by proof.*

*Let me use a fictitious example. Suppose that, last week, a woman who has been in prison for drug dealing off and on over the years came to me and told me you had committed adultery with her four times last year. She gave me the times and places, describing your physical characteristics in some detail. She also showed me copies of checks you had written to her. Is any of this evidence that you are an adulterer? Since I have no knowledge of your physical characteristics and the checks didn't say "payment in service for sexual favors", am I free to assume she has verified her story? Am I morally justified in concluding that her story is true? Am I then free to write and tell anyone willing to listen that Stephen Brady is an adulterer?*

*The answer, of course, is no. You have a right to your good public reputation which, like anyone's, can be easily destroyed. In talking to Matt, I did not say that you or anyone else is lying. I said there has been no conclusive evidence given to prove the accusations you've made against Bishop Ryan, who also has a right to his good reputation without conclusive proof against him. I had assumed that the lawsuit filed against the diocese might clarify some of the accusations, but I have not heard anything about the case since it was filed. Filing a suit isn't proof of anything, except of the intent of the one who files. Filing an affidavit isn't proof of anything until it is contested and adjudicated. I have not seen any the "evidence" you have accumulated. Interviews by Mr. Lago with some of the parties concerned left the accusations unresolved. Bishop Ryan befriended some individuals whom, he explains, he was trying to help. At this point, I am in no position to say anything more; nor have you given me any proof which would justify saying anything more.*

*You know that your remark about a child never having been sexually abused by a Catholic priest is merely sarcasm, the kind of sarcasm often used by enemies of the Catholic faith who hate bishops and priests. What does it say when you and Call to Action adopt the same tone? In the Archdiocese of Chicago, at least, every accusation by someone who claims to be a victim of sexual abuse by a priest is carefully investigated. Not every accusation is true, but some are. If there is something I need to know about sexual abuse of a child by one of the priests of the Archdiocese, I ask you to have the victim contact me. You know, as well, that priests have been permanently removed from ministry and their victims helped, to the extent possible, to overcome the effects of such terrible sin committed against them. Also, you may or may not know that the practice of giving general absolution, an abuse which began years ago in the Archdiocese of Chicago, has begun to be addressed.*

*Finally, I am sorry that you believe you have to make personal innuendoes and threats to get attention, even for causes you believe in sincerely. This is Lent, a time when Christ, through the Church, calls us all to conversion. You are in my prayers; please keep me in yours.*

*Yours in Christ,*

*Francis Cardinal George, OMI  
Archbishop of Chicago*

## On March 6, 2001 Roman Catholic Faithful responded to the Cardinal's letter

*Francis Cardinal George  
Archdiocese of Chicago  
Office of the Archbishop  
Post Office Box 1979  
Chicago, Illinois 60690*

*Your Eminence,*

*Let me begin my response to your March 1 letter by first commenting upon your remark that the practice of your diocesan priests giving general absolution has begun to be addressed. In this remark, your cowardice and insincerity are laid bare. You have been bishop of Chicago since May 7, 1997, a total of more than three years. At any time you could have ordered this practice stopped by simply commanding your priests to obey, under penalty of discipline. The expression "has begun to be addressed," is more appropriate for problems like termite control or poor grades in children's math scores. Such subtle problems are often not subject to readily recognizable remedies. You like to give examples. Let me give you an example. Suppose these priests practicing general absolution were instead handing out pamphlets stating black people do not have souls and cannot go to heaven. Do you have any doubt that you would instantly order this practice ceased? Do you think you would wait four years before "beginning to address" the problem? Of course not. General absolution places the eternal souls of your flock in eternal jeopardy. Your failure to come to their rescue is a disgrace and a betrayal of your office.*

*With regard to Bishop Ryan, you know fully well that Fr. Hardon flew to Rome with statements from priests and personally vouched for the accuracy of the charges. This is in addition to the sworn statements that I referred to previously. To respond to your analogy, if in addition to the sworn statements from these drug addicts, Fr. Hardon flew to Rome with two women who claimed to have committed adultery with me, and he vouched for their accuracy, I would consider this a sufficient basis in which to conclude that the adultery had occurred. When combining this information with the affidavits filed with a civil lawsuit, for which attorneys can be disbarred for unfounded allegations, any possible doubt would be removed from my mind.*

*It therefore appears that the only way you would acknowledge that a priest or bishop was engaged in sexual misconduct is if we sent you photos of the priest performing these acts. However, when we attempted to provide you with photos of clergy misconduct last year in connection with the St. Sebastian Website, you faxed me a letter in which you said that you would not look at these homosexual photos because they could be a near occasion of sin for you. You have thus built a wall around yourself which guarantees plausible deniability on your part for any sexual misconduct on the part of your clergy. Although this is shameful and cowardly, we must at least congratulate you on the genius of this scheme.*

*Yes, Cardinal George, we will continue to pray for you. It is clear we have not been praying hard enough.*

*In Jesus' Name, The Way, The Truth, and the Life,*

*Stephen Brady*

If you have any information regarding Clergy misconduct, abuse of authority or heretical teaching—please mail it to Roman Catholic Faithful. Your name can be kept confidential if requested. Also, please include photographs of your bishop, priest and parish.

**Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc., P.O. Box 109, Petersburg, Illinois 62675**  
**www.rcf.org / 217-632-5920 phone / 217-632-7054 fax / sbrady@rcf.org**

# The doorway to the corrupt hierarchy

By Stephen Brady

It has been five years since RCF first called for the resignation of Bishop Daniel Ryan, of Springfield Illinois, because of his homosexual activity and abuse of authority. It has been three years since he resigned in disgrace. Yet for the past three years Ryan has been supported and paraded around as a moral leader by the likes of Cardinal George of Chicago, Bishop Imesch of Joliet, Bishop Lucas of Springfield, and others. That may all be coming to an end as the diocese and the Church may now be forced answer some questions regarding Ryan's past. I am convinced that had it not been for the media coverage of sex abuse scandals and the determination of a few attorneys, the hierarchy would still be protecting the likes of homosexual abuser Bishop Daniel Ryan.

"Newly public allegations that retired Catholic Bishop Daniel Ryan solicited sex from a 15-year-old boy in 1984 have prompted the Springfield Diocese to refer the case to the Sangamon County state's attorney and to an independent review board of laypeople."<sup>1</sup>

The latest Ryan victim to come forward is Frank Thomas Anthony Sigretto, 33, of Springfield, Illinois. According to Sigretto, he was picked up by Ryan in August 1984, (at the age of 15) "while walking near South Grand Avenue when Ryan approached him in a gold car and offered him a ride." "...[Ryan] took him to the rectory at the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception. There, the teenager said, Ryan allegedly offered Sigretto \$50 to take off his clothes and let Ryan massage him with baby oil. During the massage, Sigretto said, he successfully resisted Ryan's attempts to have sex with him."<sup>2</sup> Sigretto passed a lie-detector test.

Also listed in court documents and news reports were Fr. John Reeves, Danny Evans, and Frank Bergen. While all three men had been interviewed by RCF in the past, Frank Bergen was the only one whose name was known to the public. All three men provided statements for a lawsuit filed in Springfield on Thursday, October 28, 1999. The suit against Fr. Alvin J. Campbell, former pastor of St. Maurice Church in Morrisonville, Illinois, also named recently retired Bishop Daniel Ryan of Springfield. The suit by Matthew McCormick charges that these parties were involved in an extensive cover-up of Campbell's pedophilic activities; moreover, that:

"BISHOP RYAN ignored his oath and obligation of celibacy by virtue of multiple homosexual relationships with then, now former, male prostitutes and other priests or deacons to wit: John Doe X, John Doe Y, and Reverend Father John Doe Z (the identities of whom are known to the Defendants) among others, during his tenure as Bishop to such an extent that an atmosphere of tolerance to the sexual abuse of minors was thereby created, facilitated, and perpetuated by DEFENDANT RYAN."

According to news reports and my interview of Fr. Reeves, Bishop Ryan made his first sexual advances toward Reeves in 1984 when Reeves was an acolyte. "In a seven-page statement written in the first person and filed with the court, Reeves said he and Ryan had traveled and dined together, shared motel rooms, visited bathhouses and taken vacations to the Cayman Islands and Puerto Rico. In his statement, Reeves portrayed Ryan as a sexual harasser and said he was afraid to reject Ryan's advances for fear he would not be ordained a priest. Reeves said he continued to travel with the bishop even after he was ordained."<sup>3</sup>

I had lunch with Father Reeves Tuesday, November 5, 1996 in Jacksonville, Illinois. According to Fr. Reeves, he had approached Fr. Thomas Holinga, former Vicar General and Director of Clergy Personnel, for help in ending Ryan's sexual demands upon him. Reeves stated that Holinga called him a liar and laughed at him. Fr. Reeves led RCF to two other priests he knew had also received sexual advances from Ryan. Both priests confirmed Reeves' situation and Ryan's advances toward them. Both priests are in good standing with the diocese – another indication that Lucas, George and Imesch had been covering for Ryan. This information and much more was made available to Cardinal George of Chicago, the former papal nuncio in Washington, D.C. as well as Archbishop Hoyos in Rome, yet no action was taken. [Reeves left the Catholic Church in 1995. It is difficult to blame him.] Fr. John Hardon (RIP) delivered the material to Rome himself, accompanied by another Springfield priest who was also abused by Ryan and interviewed by RCF. This same Springfield priest told RCF of a Ryan Christmas party held at the Cathedral rectory at which a drunk Bishop Daniel Ryan was caressing the bare feet of a Joliet priest/boyfriend. More than twenty

years ago, then-Joliet Auxiliary Bishop Daniel Ryan's predatory homosexual lifestyle was made known to Bishop Joseph Imesch. Imesch took no action and saw to it that Ryan was made Bishop of Springfield, Illinois in 1984.

"...a long-time Joliet Diocese priest who asked that his name not be used, told The Herald News that Ryan made a sexual advance toward him about 20 years ago. The priest accompanied the auxiliary bishop on an overnight stay to help confirm youngsters at remote parishes in the diocese and spent a night in a motel. ... The priest reported the incident to then-Auxiliary Bishop Raymond James Vonesh, he said. 'Bishop Vonesh did not seem surprised, but he told me to inform Bishop Imesch. When I did, I was so shamed by (Imesch). After leaving, I felt like I had done something wrong. I will not soon forget that conversation, but I did not know where to go with what had happened,' the priest said." <sup>4</sup>

RCF is now looking into reports that Ryan had invited other clergy to vacation with him at a remote Caribbean island accessible only by plane, where visitors wore no clothing. One wonders how many hard-earned dollars donated by the faithful were used to fund lavish sex-filled sodomite vacations.

On December 12, 1997 I received a call from one Sandra Elraghy 34, of Springfield, Illinois. Sandra, who was sexually abused as a child and spent some of her teenage years on the streets, had some first-hand information regarding Bishop Ryan. At the time of her call, Sandra was taking classes at Springfield College. She was angered by the fact that the Springfield Diocese had repeatedly denied allegations made against Ryan that she knew to be true. I met with Sandra that evening and recorded her statement. Sandra, because of her life on the streets of Springfield, had come to know several teenage boys who had, on occasion, sold their bodies to Ryan in order to survive on the street. Frank Bergen was one of those individuals. Sandra gave us several other names. While individuals like Sandra, Frank, and Danny were looked down upon by many, I found them to be more honest and sincere than any of the above-mentioned bishops.

God chose what is foolish in the world to shame the wise, God chose what is weak in the world to shame the strong, God chose what is low and despised in the world even things that are not, to bring to nothing things that are, so that no human being might boast in the presence of God.  
*1 Cor 1:26-31 Revised Standard Version*

Danny Evans was a long-time Ryan sex-companion. RCF first learned of the existence of Evans through a 1997 anonymous letter that was also sent to the Springfield State Journal-Register. We eventually identified and interviewed the author of the letter, who turned out to be a prominent Springfield-area businessman and political figure. He would provide Danny with work from time to time in an attempt to help him. This informant provided RCF with details regarding Ryan's homosexual relationship with Evans. On occasion, Evans would use our informant's phone to contact Ryan and on several occasions Ryan would pick Danny up outside our informant's residence. In fact, he contacted RCF Thursday, July 30, 1998 informing us that the bishop had picked up Evans at 5:30 that evening for a night "out on the town."

Prior to attempting to make contact with Evans, RCF interviewed one of his ex-wives. The former Mrs. Evans provided RCF with documents, including copies of cancelled checks, proving the bishop had been paying some of Danny's bills. Mrs. Evans became suspicious when Ryan started showing up at her home (sometimes on a weekly basis) claiming to need her husband for a short time to help with some "odd jobs." According to Mrs. Evans, once Ryan learned that RCF had obtained the documents, the bishop showed up at her doorstep (on or about July 10, 1998) and threatened to "damage" her if she helped RCF. Ryan suggested she go to the State's Attorney to force Stephen Brady to stay away from her.

In June of 1998, RCF found that Danny had rented an apartment at 1110 North Seventh Street in Springfield. We then contacted the landlord, Mrs. Jean Stites, only to learn that Bishop Daniel Ryan had paid the rent for Danny's apartment. I had my first meeting with Danny Evans on Thursday, January 14, 1999 after which I drove him to the office of Attorney Fred Nessler, whom he provided with a sworn statement regarding his sexual relationship with Bishop Ryan. "A 14-page transcript of the interview with Nessler is among the documents filed with the court in July [2002]. Evans, now 36, said he went to motels with Ryan on more than 50 occasions from the 1980s through the late 1990s, where he would let the bishop massage him for \$50 or more per encounter. Evans also said that Ryan took him on trips to Indiana, Ohio, Chicago and Wisconsin, with some trips as recent as 1998..." <sup>5</sup>

Frank Bergen first encountered Bishop Ryan ("the Bish") as a teenage runaway living on the streets of Springfield in the 1980's. According to Frank, it was common knowledge on the street that "if you needed



money you could sell your body to the Bish.” Frank first ran away from his adopted home at 15 and became addicted to hard drugs. Selling himself to Ryan made it possible for Frank to survive on the street and feed his drug habit. Frank provided RCF with a detailed description of the bishop’s anatomy as well as a description of the inside of the bishop’s living quarters. Frank’s statement can be found on RCF’s web site at [www.rcf.org](http://www.rcf.org). RCF first interviewed Frank at a prison in Jacksonville, Illinois. Shortly after Frank’s interview, we interviewed another young man incarcerated at another Illinois prison. Both of their accounts of their sexual relationship with Ryan matched. Since both individuals were incarcerated in different Illinois prisons at the same time (Illinois inmates are forbidden to communicate with each other) we were confident they were being honest with us.

It is next to impossible to estimate the human/spiritual cost of Ryan’s homosexual lifestyle. The street kids, the very individuals who were most vulnerable, most in need of a moral guidepost, an example of holiness, someone to whom a Christian helping hand should have been extended, were the ones who suffered most. The street kids and those others frowned upon and looked down on by society knew better than most of the hypocrisy that existed within the Springfield diocese. They knew that the individual held up by society and Catholics of the Springfield diocese as the representative of Christ was in fact the most wicked of them all. To make matters worse, many others who held positions as “moral leaders” help to defend and protect Ryan.

Daniel Leo Ryan was born September 28, 1930. He was ordained a priest by Bishop Martin McNamara on May 3, 1956 for the Joliet Diocese. Ryan served as both Chancellor and Vicar General for the diocese. Bishop Imesch took over the Joliet Diocese in 1979 and made Ryan his auxiliary bishop.

While working in the Joliet Chancery “Ryan shepherded the ordination of the Rev. Lawrence Gibbs, a man criticized as ‘immature’ and a ‘possible source of scandal,’ a man who later would become the Chicago area’s most notorious example of the sex abuse scandal in the American Catholic Church.”<sup>6</sup> “When parishioners and priests [from the Joliet Diocese] reported concerns about the behavior of the Rev. Lawrence M. Gibbs in the 1970s, the man responsible for investigating the complaints was the Catholic Diocese of Joliet’s then-chancellor, Rev. Daniel Ryan. Allegations contained in court documents claim Ryan covered up reports of wayward priests accused of sexually abusing

minors because Ryan himself engaged in homosexual relationships with young men.”<sup>7</sup> It was Ryan who saw to the ordination of Gibbs despite the warnings. “At least two diocesan priests told the seminary board in 1971 that they had doubts about Gibbs’ ability to function as a priest. ... Court pleadings from the 1993 civil lawsuits note that the seminary board voted 9-0-1 against ordaining Gibbs and recommended he serve as a layman or continue as a deacon indefinitely.”<sup>8</sup> Bishop Joseph Imesch himself defended Gibbs when parents complained about his (Gibbs’) sexual contact with their children.

So far this year more than 10 priests have already been removed from active ministry in the Joliet diocese because of sexual abuse allegations. Joliet attorney Keith Aeschliman has recently filed the “first of at least a dozen civil lawsuits alleging sexual abuse by 11 different Joliet Diocese priests over the years. An examination of abuses at St. Ray’s [Cathedral school] – the hub of the seven-county, 50-year-old Roman Catholic Diocese of Joliet – sheds light on how widespread misconduct by diocesan priests went undetected for so long. Court records and interviews with abuse survivors, diocesan insiders and others indicate that priests lacked oversight and had free reign to do as they pleased.”<sup>9</sup> Much of this abuse took place under the chancery leadership of Daniel Ryan and/or Imesch.

When Ryan became Bishop of Springfield the diocese had 189,000 Catholics, 153 active diocesan priests, 91 Religious priests, 38 seminarians, and 938 sisters. After Ryan’s tenure, the number of Catholics dropped by 32,000; the number of active diocesan priests dropped by 35% to 100; the number of Religious priests plummeted by 35% to 59; the seminary is now closed, and the count of women Religious is now at 661, a reduction of 30%. “By their fruits you shall know them.”

#### **Some notable accomplishments and moments during the Ryan reign:**

1. Ryan had to undergo treatment for alcoholism
2. The Diocesan Office for Youth offered a T-shirt for sale with the words “Council of Trent-Been there–done that–moved on” printed on it.
3. A woman Religious offered a retreat at the Dominican renewal center which included discussions on whether or not Christ was a woman.
4. Several Catholic ladies from Sacred Heart Parish in Springfield were forced to follow a gar-

bage truck to the landfill to retrieve religious items thrown into a dumpster by their pastor Father Laughery.

5. Father Laughery gave a “glowing” recommendation for a former diocesan priest to enable him to get a job at a Florida school. Laughery neglected to inform the school that the ex-priest was a convicted felon who had raped several teenage boys.
6. Sister Helen Vahling teaches a required class for teacher certification for the diocese. Vahling promotes birth control, women priests, and masturbation to relieve tension.
7. A local priest admitted paying for his girlfriend’s abortion.
8. Fr. G. Neal Dee of Springfield, who admitted to sexually abusing children in Springfield, was transferred to the diocese of Amarillo, Texas where he served as pastor in Groom. The parents at the Texas parish were not told of Dee’s past.
9. On February 11, 1999, a Lesbian/Gay Ministry Workshop was presented by Jeannine Gramick, SSND and Robert Nugent, SDS, and held at the Dominican Renewal Center.

Not only has Bishop Imesch lied to protect his sodomite friend, Daniel Ryan, many within the Joliet and Springfield chanceries have either lied or refused to accept the facts in an effort to protect him as well as to save their own jobs. *Many of the children who were sexually abused while living throughout the Joliet and Springfield Dioceses might have been spared had someone cared enough to act.* While RCF was the first to publicly expose Ryan in 1996, an abundance of additional evidence has since been made public through news reports, by attorneys, and through court documents. Cardinal George, Bishop Lucas, Bishop Imesch, and some of their staff should hang their heads in shame for the part they played in the betrayal of the innocent. Judas has nothing on them!

A complete report on Imesch and the Joliet Diocese was published by RCF in the Spring of 2001. The report can be downloaded from RCF’s web site at [www.rcf.org](http://www.rcf.org), or a copy can be requested by contacting RCF.

Bishop Joseph Imesch is a liar who has placed children at risk by covering for homosexual predators. While helping to promote the homosexual agenda in his own diocese, he has also placed countless souls at risk. He is a disgrace to the Catholic Church and is not fit to serve. Anyone who would support him is likewise unfit.

The following is a short list of statements made by or about Imesch that provide clear evidence of his moral bankruptcy. Also listed are various statements made by others in defense of, or regarding, Ryan:

1. “Imesch, Dearden [and] Gumbleton – All of them lied under oath. Dearden and Gumbleton were professional [and] respectful; Imesch was sarcastic and nasty.”<sup>10</sup>
2. “I believe that Father Gibbs is an excellent priest and has served the people of your parish community extremely well,” Imesch wrote to a parishioner at Christ the King Church in Lombard. “Despite what has occurred I believe that, given the necessary professional help, he can be an effective minister.”<sup>11</sup> The bishop acknowledged in letters written during the summer of 1980 that both he and law enforcement officials had reviewed the allegations of sexual abuse against Gibbs.
3. “...while I do not condone what has occurred, [the sexual abuse of children] I also do not find it serious enough to withhold an assignment from Father Gibbs.”<sup>12</sup> The latter response was to a parishioner whose two sons reportedly spent time alone with Gibbs at his cabin in Lake County. The three lawsuits filed against Gibbs alleged that he took young boys up to his cabin, got them drunk and molested them.
4. “We’ve alleged all along this has been a pattern of cover-up by Ryan, and that Ryan was compromised,” said Springfield attorney Fred Nessler....<sup>13</sup>
5. “We have never had a credible witness come forward [regarding Bishop Ryan’s homosexual activity]. There may be something I don’t know about,” [Kathy] Sass said. Sass is the spokesman for the Springfield Diocese.<sup>14</sup> This is an incredible statement by Sass, considering the number of victims who have come forward. It is an indication of just how badly the victims were treated.
6. “...during an interview earlier this week, Imesch blasted Roman Catholic Faithful and

said the claims about Ryan were untrue. "How can you believe anything they say?" Imesch asked.<sup>15</sup>

7. "Sass said, however, the diocese had no credible allegations against Ryan until Nessler provided an affidavit earlier this summer from a man who had not previously come forward. In March, current Bishop George J. Lucas assured his flock there were no credible complaints against any active priests in the Springfield Diocese."<sup>16</sup>
8. "When asked why priests removed from public ministries were never charged with crimes, Imesch said, 'I have no idea.' ... Imesch insists that he informed bishops in St. Louis and Santa Rosa, Calif., about claims of misconduct by Joliet priests who transferred to those dioceses, despite those dioceses' claims that they were not aware of a priest's past. ... Imesch said he did not know how many people have said they were sexually abused by priests in his diocese... The bishop said he did not know how much the diocese has paid to settle claims of sexual abuse and in legal fees, or to provide counseling for victims."<sup>17</sup>
9. "Imesch shook off complaints about sexually aggressive priests from worried parents, writing one concerned family that he knew of several instances where sexual abuse did no permanent damage to victims."<sup>18</sup>

To reference RCF's report on Bishop Imesch in its periodic publication, *Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam*, visit RCF's website and link to

[http://www.rcf.org/pdfs/amdg\\_imesch.pdf](http://www.rcf.org/pdfs/amdg_imesch.pdf).

(Adobe Acrobat Reader is required.)

In closing, Bishop Daniel Leo Ryan's life is an indictment against the Catholic hierarchy in the U.S. It would have been impossible for Ryan to have climbed up through the ranks had it not been for the help he received from many Cardinals, bishops, and priests who were cut from the same cloth. As painful as it may be for many of us to admit, the Holy Father himself must share in the blame. He has led this Church for more than twenty years, and only he has the authority to appoint or remove a bishop.

This issue of AMDG is part one of a four-part series. The next three issues will deal with updates on previ-

ous RCF investigations regarding the St. Sebastian's Angels and the Dioceses of Winona, Chicago, San Diego, and Arlington and more.

- 
1. "Former bishop investigated Church panel reviews charge he solicited sex from teen" by Lisa Kernek 08/15/02 *State Journal-Register*, Springfield, Illinois
  2. *Ibid*
  3. *Ibid*
  4. "Cloak of secrecy" by Ted Slowik, Joliet *Herald News* 08/11/02
  5. "Former bishop investigated Church panel reviews charge he solicited sex from teen" by Lisa Kernek, 08/15/02 *State Journal-Register*, Springfield, Illinois
  6. Chicago area *Southtown*, "Ordained by God, accused by boys As Joliet's chancellor, Daniel Ryan helped a dubious young man become a priest. Years later, both men would face accusations of sexual misconduct", *Sunday, August 11, 2002*, by Allison Hantschel, Staff writer
  7. "Critics: Church official was compromised, Diocese's former chancellor allegedly covered up reports of wayward priests", (Originally published June 22, 2002) by Ted Slowik
  8. "Gibbs prompted red flags, Documents reveal doubts about priest who later was accused" (Originally published June 22, 2002), by Charles B. Pelkie, *Joliet Herald*
  9. *Joliet Herald News*, "Cloak of secrecy, Men alleging they were abused by Joliet diocese priests step forward with their stories", (Originally published August 11, 2002) by Ted Slowik
  10. Attorney Mark Bello in a statement to RCF.
  11. *Joliet Herald*, "Gibbs prompted red flags, Documents reveal doubts about priest who later was accused" (Originally published June 22, 2002) by Charles B. Pelkie
  12. *Ibid*
  13. *Joliet Herald*, "Critics: Church official was compromised, Diocese's former chancellor allegedly covered up reports of wayward priests", (Originally published June 22, 2002), by Ted Slowik ,
  14. *Ibid*
  15. *Ibid*
  16. *Herald & Review*. Online at <http://www.herald-review.com> "Catholics react with sadness to latest accusations against former Bishop Ryan" by Theresa Churchill, H&R Senior Editor Saturday, August 17, 2002
  17. Joliet Herald, June 19, 2002 / Imesch defends decisions by Ted Slowik
  18. *Southtown* article by Allison Hantschel, 04/21/02 "Grace under Fire"

## A MEDICINAL SOLUTION: REMOVE THE HOMOSEXUALS FROM THE CLERGY

Counsel and Compensate the Victims, Send Predator Priests to Reparative Therapy

by Michael Chapman

*Author's note: The sexual abuse scandal in the Church shows that Satan is doing a good job of using some bad priests and bishops to help destroy the Faith and the moral authority of the Church. Criticism of certain clerics in this article is not intended to pass judgment on them as persons or to propose any "reform" that is not in line with tradition and orthodoxy. As Catholics, it is our duty to pray for the victims of this diabolical scandal and pray for the perpetrators, even though their sins are as red as scarlet.*

To say that homosexuality is not relevant to the sexual abuse scandal in the Catholic Church is like saying that homosexuality is not relevant to the spread of AIDS. Yet while the major media and some Catholics spin the current scandal as pedophilia or the result of celibacy, the facts do not support such views. The majority of abuse cases involve older priests molesting adolescents and teenagers: It's a matter of homosexual men preying on young men. And despite the calls from "reformers" for married priests and female priests, the prudent solution is to remove the risk. Pope John XXIII ordered that homosexuals be barred from the priesthood. It's time to listen to that liberal Pope.

"Like it or not, a great deal of this is homosexuals who are misusing adolescent boys," said Bishop Fabian Bruskewitz of Lincoln, Nebraska, at the bishops' meeting in Dallas in June. "I think men who are homosexual are not suitable for the priesthood." Fr. Stephen Rossetti, a psychologist who has advised the U.S. bishops and is the author of "A Tragic Grace: The Catholic Church and Child Sexual Abuse," says, "most perpetrators of child sexual abuse are not pedophiles. ... The majority of perpetrators are involved with post-pubescent children." I.e., teenagers. The Catechism of the Catholic Church says that, "Basing itself on Sacred Scripture, which presents homosexual acts as acts of grave depravity, tradition has always declared that 'homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered.' They are contrary to the natural law. ... Under no circumstances can they be approved." (2357) And the spokesman for the Pope, Joaquin Navarro-Valls, has said: "People with these inclinations just cannot be ordained."

There are about 46,000 priests in the United States – 30,429 diocesan, 15,244 religious. They serve more than 65 million Catholics in 207 dioceses. The majority of priests do not engage in homosexuality. They live their vocation, which includes celibacy and obedience to the Church's teaching on morality. They work hard to serve God and save souls. The current homosexual scandal in the Church involves a minority of priests (and bishops). While some estimates on the number of homosexual priests in the United States go as high as 30%, most of the data available show that around 15% of priests are involved in homosexuality and around 6% engage in homosexual abuse of teenagers. That translates into about 2,800 homosexual abusers.

However, such numbers are sketchy because 75% of abuse victims never come forward. Dr. Richard Sipe – a former priest who apparently supports a married clergy and whose opinions must therefore be viewed with caution – reports the following: "Generally, 30 percent of U.S. priests (estimates established from all sources) are either involved in homosexual relationships, have a conflict about periodic sexual activity, feel compelled toward homosexual involvements, identify themselves as homosexual, or at least have serious questions about their sexual orientation or differentiation. Approximately half of these men act out sexually with others. The reporting of homosexual behaviors has increased significantly, and the reliable estimates of percentage almost doubled from 1960 to 1994." If Sipe is right, then about 13,800 U.S. priests are homosexual or have such inclinations, and about 6,900 of those priests act out sexually with others.

That minority of homosexual abusers – between 2,800 and 6,900 – has caused incalculable damage to thousands of people and to the Church. As Arthur Austin, abused for years by Fr. Paul Shanley, said: "You [Cardinal Law] and your Church have taken 34 years of my life from me. My anguish does not end, ever. Like an incubus, Paul Shanley still haunts my dreams. And you Bernard, my Cardinal, my prince of the Church, my shepherd, my father in Christ, how long have I hungered at your indifferent

door, for a crumb of compassion, justice or mercy? – or even a crumb of simple honesty? You are a liar. Your own documents condemn you. You are a criminal. ... You degrade the office you hold in the Church.”

Since the scandal broke in January in Cardinal Law’s Boston Archdiocese, more than 250 priests have been removed from active ministry. Four bishops have resigned. (From the mid-1980s through 2001, more than 800 priests were removed from ministry for sexual abuse allegations.) It has been discovered that some homosexual priests have abused hundreds of victims. Former priest James Porter, for instance, reportedly molested up to 200 people. Former priest James Geoghan was convicted of molesting 86 people, and has been accused of molesting at least 130 people. Former priest Rudy Kos was accused of molesting hundreds of boys. The liberal priest Andrew Greeley reported in 1993 that, using Chicago as a statistical baseline, some 2,500 U.S. priests had sexually abused 100,000 children over the last generation (see “*Lead Us Not Into Temptation*,” by Jason Berry, p. x.).

It’s also been documented that some bishops have shuffled predator priests from one parish to the next and used diocesan lawyers to intimidate victims or pay them off with “hush money.” Cardinal Law and other Church officials in Boston apparently knew, for instance, of Fr. Paul Shanley’s homosexual abuse of boys and his public support for the North American Man-Boy Love Association. Yet they reportedly did nothing for years, except reassign Shanley and write recommendation letters for him.

The Church has paid more than \$1 billion to settle abuse cases since the 1980s. There are more than 1,400 insurance claims on the books. And the current spate of litigation is expected to cost several more billions of dollars. Further, it’s known that not a few priests are dying from AIDS at a rate four times greater than that of the general population. As *Catholic World Report* noted: “When more of your priests die by sodomy than by martyrdom, you know you’ve got a problem; when the man you bring in for the fix comes down with AIDS, you know you’ve got a crisis; and when the Pope first gets the facts thanks to ‘60 Minutes,’ you know you’re corrupt.”

Some seminaries, such as St. Francis in San Diego, St. Mary’s in Baltimore (“Pink Palace”), and Notre Dame in New Orleans reportedly are havens for

homosexuals. Some homosexual Church officials actively recruit other homosexuals into the priesthood. “Blatantly active homosexual priests are appointed, transferred and promoted,” Fr. Andrew Greeley told the *National Catholic Reporter* in 1989. “Lavender rectories and seminaries are tolerated. National networks of active homosexual priests (many of them church administrators) are tolerated. Pedophiles are reassigned (despite the legal risks) and sometimes subjected to compulsory treatment with drugs to control their passions. If a heterosexual priest engaged in a blatant love affair with a woman, he would be suspended as quickly as a phone call could be made to the chancery.”

Another liberal priest, Fr. Richard McBrien, has said of the troubled seminaries: “If the bishops honestly confronted the seminary crisis, they’d have to close them down. They’re fraught with gays. Celibacy provides a cover for lots of homosexuals who are running away from sexuality. It also discourages healthy heterosexual males who would be terrific priests.”

A “lavender mafia” reportedly controls the Chicago Archdiocese. Homosexual priests in Virginia reportedly protect each other through a network called the “fruit loop.” Some priests – and South African Aux. Bishop Reginald Cawcutt (recently resigned) – participate in homosexual pornographic Web sites. And, it’s reported that some priests and at least one cardinal – the late Joseph Bernardin of Chicago – engaged in satanic pedophilia.

On another level, the Church continues to decline in the United States. For instance, in 1960 there were 41,129 seminarians. Today there are 4,587. Infant and adult baptisms, First Communion, Confirmations, and Catholic marriages are down, as are the number of religious sisters and the number of parishes. Furthermore, surveys show that slightly more than 50% of Catholics support abortion and some 73% regularly use artificial birth control. About 71% of all U.S. Catholics believe they can disobey the Church’s teaching on birth control and still be “good Catholics.”

Despite the dark news, the good news is that enrollment in traditional/conservative seminaries and religious orders is on the rise. Faithful Catholic couples are having large families. And not a few brave priests and bishops – Msgr. Eugene Clark (NY) and Bishop Anthony Bevilacqua (Penn.), for instance –

speaking out about the homosexual problem in the Catholic Church.

### **See, Hear, and Speak No Sodomy**

Meanwhile, however, the major media and some bishops and priests are saying that homosexuality is not the problem. A typical example is found in the *Washington Post*. In her Aug. 4 column, anti-Catholic columnist Mary McGrory writes about the “the pedophile scandal rocking the church,” the “pedophile priests,” and the “notorious pedophiles.” Not once does McGrory mention the homosexual scandal or the homosexual priests. She goes on to quote the president of a “reform” group who equates the current sex scandal with the Crusades and the Inquisition.

Marilyn Elias of *USA Today* tells us (7/16/02) that the “child sexual abuse crisis” is about “pedophiles” and that homosexuality isn’t the real problem. It’s a problem of priests attracted to teenagers that may result from the Church’s enforced celibacy rules, Elias skillfully spins. She ends her article by quoting a psychiatrist, Frederick Berlin, who tells us: “[Y]ou’re going to see the least risk of all to children from female priests.” In other stories, the *Washington Post* repeatedly relies on the pedophilia label and the “sexual abuse of children.” In another typical *Post* spin, the sub-headline reads: “Why does the Church Protect Pedophiles and Not Their Victims?” And in a recent piece (8/4/02) in the *Post*’s popular Style section one reads when a lawyer “Took On a Pedophile Priest as a Client....”

No doubt, some of the abuse cases involve pedophilia, a sexual attraction for children – a condition that most doctors agree is incurable. However, the overwhelming majority of sexual abuse cases in the Catholic Church – about 90% – involve homosexual priests preying on teenage boys. The major media and the U.S. culture at large want to deny or spin the homosexual factor out of the scandal. They and militant homosexuals have invested decades – and billions of dollars in media and cultural propaganda – to portray homosexuality as just another lifestyle, a sexual practice on the same moral level as heterosexuality. Homosexuals are just like everybody else, we’re told. They fall in love, they get “married,” they have families, careers, homes, car payments – all the same joys and foibles of heterosexuals. To say that homosexuality in the priesthood is in any way at fault for the sexual abuse of teen boys is, well, homophobic,

narrow-minded, bigoted – not the sort of thing that progressive minds think.

Clearly, some bishops and other Church officials think the same way because they did not allow (or invite) conservative and traditionalist Catholics to speak at the July meeting in Dallas. Some clerics don’t want the homosexual issue raised because they apparently support homosexuality or they themselves may be exposed and scandalized. In addition, some of those bishops know that the U.S. media will not press them on the issue, so they avoid it. Knowledge of the homosexual problem, as the *National Review* put it, implies an obligation to act. And that is something some clerics do not want to do.

### **Homosexuals are the Problem**

Despite the media and cultural spin on the issue, the facts show that most of the cases involve adult male priests abusing teenage, post-pubescent boys. The following list is a sample of some – not all – of the cases that have been reported since 1999-2000. (A few cases from the early 1990s are also mentioned.) This list is meant to be a reference for readers (and researchers) to use if challenged about the homosexual problem in the Church. This list is not meant to be a rogue’s gallery of condemned priests. Nor should it be used as such. Some of the people discussed here have denied the allegations against them. Some charges are, undoubtedly, false – the priests are innocent. And some fallen priests have sought reparative therapy to get out of the homosexual trap and lead holy lives. We should remember all of the accused, the guilty, and, most especially their victims, in our prayers.

- Bishop Daniel Ryan (Springfield, Ill.) resigned in October 1999 after his homosexual liaisons with several priests and male teenage prostitutes were publicly revealed by Roman Catholic Faithful.

- Archbishop Rembert Weakland (Milwaukee, Wisc.) rushed his resignation through Vatican channels in May 2002 just prior to the public revelation that he had engaged in a homosexual affair and that his “lover” had been paid a reported \$450,000 to keep the affair quiet.

- Bishop Kendrick Williams resigned in June 2002 after two lawsuits were filed against him charging sexual abuse. Kendrick denied the allegations.

- Auxiliary Bishop Reginald Cawcutt (Cape Town, South Africa) was compelled to resign in July 2002 only after Roman Catholic Faithful had docu-

mented (and the Washington Times had reported on) his participation in a homosexual pornographic Web site that, among other things, posted messages calling for the death of Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger and Pope John Paul II.

- Bishop Joseph Keith Symons (Palm Beach, Fla.) resigned after admitting that he had sexually abused five teenage boys in three churches while a priest. In one case, the homosexual abuse occurred over several years.

- Fr. Rocco Charles D'Angelo, accused of molesting five altar boys, was accepted into the St. Petersburg diocese when Fr. Joseph Keith Symons served as chancellor there. Symons reportedly knew D'Angelo's history. The Church settled a lawsuit against D'Angelo involving eight men who accused him of abuse when they were teenagers.

- Bishop G. Patrick Ziemann (Santa Rosa, Calif.) resigned after admitting to a two-year affair with a priest from Costa Rica who had threatened him with a lawsuit. Fr. Jorge Hume Salas says that Ziemann forced him into having sex after discovering that Salas had stolen \$1200 in Church money. In July 2002, a former altar boy filed a lawsuit against Ziemann, claiming that the former bishop sexually abused him for 20 years, starting in 1968.

- Cardinal Joseph Bernardin (now deceased) reportedly engaged in at least two instances of homosexual abuse of young men: 1) a former seminarian who received a cash settlement to keep quiet; and 2) former seminarian Steven Cook, who dropped his lawsuit after reportedly receiving a payment but who never retracted his allegations against Bernardin.

- Steven Cook also accused Fr. Ellis Harsham of forced sexual acts against him while at St. Gregory seminary in Cincinnati. Cook claimed that Harsham then would deliver him to Bernardin, then the Archbishop of Cincinnati, for homosexual acts. The Harsham suit was settled out of court. Cook died of AIDS.

- Several seminarians in Winona, Minn., accused Cardinal Joseph Bernardin and three other bishops of participating in sexual/satanic rituals. The seminarians stated that Steven Cook accompanied Bernardin in those activities. Bernardin's lawyers settled the case, but details were leaked to Roman Catholic Faithful by a bishop who received a copy of the settlement terms.

- Msgr. Frederick Hopwood (Charleston Diocese) was accused of homosexually molesting hundreds of boys from the 1950s through the 1980s. Hopwood was friends with Bernardin and had resided with him at the Cathedral of St. John the Baptist in

Charleston. Hopwood also reportedly engaged in satanic rituals involving animals in the woods where he abused some of his victims.

- Fr. Paul Steitz, another friend of Bernardin's, was accused of sexual abuse in 1994.

- Fr. Eugene Condon, another Bernardin friend, was investigated in 1996 on charges that he had sexually abused teenage boys and exposed them to pornography and alcohol.

- Fr. Justin Goodwin, another Bernardin friend, was charged in 1995 with the sexual abuse of teenage boys.

- Sime Braio filed a lawsuit in July 2002, claiming that Auxiliary Bishop George Rueger (Worcester, Mass.) sexually molested him when he was 13. Rueger denies the charges.

- Msgr. Rudolph Galindo (San Diego Diocese) reportedly molested a teenage Vietnamese boy; the diocese paid the boy's family \$75,000 to drop a civil lawsuit against Galindo.

- Msgr. William Spain reportedly was a cocaine addict who had a homosexual affair with another addict. Spain moved to Hawaii after his San Diego parish refused to accept him.

- Msgr. William Kraft (San Diego Diocese) was accused of molesting an altar boy in the 1960s.

- Louis Copestake, editor of the San Diego diocesan newspaper, was assaulted by a man apparently because of Copestake's homosexual advances. The man passed a polygraph and Copestake did not press charges, reported Jason Berry in his book, *"Lead Us Not Into Temptation."*

- Former priest Richard Buongrino (Diocese of Norwich, Conn.) reportedly abused an altar boy at St. Matthias Church in East Lyme, Conn. between the time the boy was nine and 16 years old. Before becoming a priest, Buongrino admits that he abused another boy at St. Thomas More School for three years, starting when the boy was 16. As a priest, Buongrino was reassigned twice, and each time he was discovered with a teenage boy in his room.

- Fr. Paul Lavin (Archdiocese of Washington, D.C.) has been accused of molesting three men when they were teenagers. Lavin denies the allegations (July 2002) and has been placed on leave as the investigation continues.

- Rev. Richard Connors (Manchester Diocese) was found dead of a heart attack at the home of two men in November 1999. Connors was partially clothed and had a black leather device tied around his genitals. According to Fr. James McCormack, a search of Connors residence turned up

hundreds of pornographic homosexual videotapes and pictures of men having sex with boys. The material was loaded into a car and destroyed by church officials, according to a police report. Fr. MacCormack says his superior, Bishop John McCormack, has waged a campaign to keep him silent and, in doing so, reportedly has even accused Fr. MacCormack of mental instability. Bishop McCormack was a former aide to Boston Cardinal Bernard Law.

- An Augustinian priest in Cebu, Philippines, has been accused of sexually abusing four teenage boys between 1998 and 2000. The priest's brother, Fr. Mario Mejorado, told reporters that the Augustinian community paid the boys \$7,157.00 to keep quiet. (In the last 20 years, some 200 Filipino priests were either defrocked or rehabilitated for sexual offenses.)

- Rev. William Giblin and Rev. Eugene Heyndricks (New Jersey) were arrested in July 2002 in Montreal, Canada, for patronizing a homosexual prostitution ring that offered the services of teenage boys.

- A priest in Mainz, Germany, is under investigation (July 2002) for allegedly sexually abusing a 14-year-old boy. The priest denies the charges but admits that he had a "homosexual relationship" with another young man.

- In April 2002, a priest in Bavaria turned himself into police after abusing a boy. The diocese defrocked the priest and informed Rome about the case.

- Fr. Paul Shanley sexually abused Arthur Astin and dozens of other boys in the Archdiocese of Boston starting in the 1970s. Shanley is an open supporter of the North American Man-Boy Love Association and Dignity, a pro-homosexual group of Catholics. Homosexual congressman Barney Frank (D-Mass.) attended legislative meetings with Shanley. Shanley currently is facing charges that he repeatedly raped Paul Busa, sometimes in a church confessional. The abuse apparently did not end until Busa was 12 years old.

- Two former seminarians of St. Patrick's College in Maynooth, Ireland, dubbed the "Pink Palace," claimed in June 2002 that fellow seminarians there paid for sex with strangers in homosexual saunas, befriended ("cultured") new seminarians to have sex with them, and engaged in a drinking binge that mirrored scenes from a "wild gay bar." The two seminarians claim that a gay clique called "The Circle" at the college preys on young seminarians.

- Rev. Edmund Borycz reportedly abused a 13-year-old boy at SS. Peter and Paul rectory in Detroit. In 1987, he reportedly homosexually abused a 19-year-old boy at St. Cyril of Jerusalem parish in Taylor, Mich. Other complaints have come forward as

Borycz took in "troubled youth" over the years as the chaplain for the Taylor Police Department.

- Rev. Donald Peters reportedly sexually fondled and took nude photos of a 16-year-old boy in Fond du Lac, Mich. He also took nude photos of two other boys. Peters served at St. Clements Church in Sheboygan, and he also "worked" with the Boy Scouts.

- Fr. Mark Haight, diocese of Albany, reportedly sexually abused a boy starting at age 12 for six years, often plying the boy with drugs and alcohol. The diocese settled the case for \$997,500.

- Fr. Jerold Linder reportedly sodomized and forced an 11-year-old boy to perform oral copulation on him. Linder denies the charges.

- Four priests reportedly sexually abused a boy starting at 16 until he was 19, when he worked in the rectory of St. Simon Stock Church in New York City, between 1996 and 1999. The case involved group masturbation, money for sex, jealous tantrums among the priests, and physical threats that forced the teenage boy to move to Miami.

- Reportedly, Fr. Peter Kiare, a missionary priest with the Holy Ghost Fathers, sexually abused a 12-year-old boy this year, after meeting him through his parents at St. Mary's Church in Woodside, Queens, NY.

- Rev. Mark Roberts allegedly fondled and photographed several teenage boys at his parish in Nevada, and engaged in child abuse and gross lewdness.

- Rev. James T. Hanley, formerly with the diocese of Paterson, NJ, sexually molested at least six young boys.

- Rev. Louis Miller, Archdiocese of Louisville, sexually molested at least 59 people, reportedly all boys, over the last 40 years. (Former Lexington Bishop J. Kendrick Williams has been accused of sexual abuse when he was a Louisville priest; Williams denies the allegation.)

- Four priests in the Diocese of Tucson, Ariz., sexually abused at least 10 boys. The priests are: Msgr. Robert Trupia, Rev. Michael Teta, Rev. Lucien Munier and Rev. William Byrne. Eleven other Tucson priests have "credible" allegations of child sexual abuse against them. (Also, allegations of homosexual activity and abuse by "high Church officials," reportedly including former Phoenix Bishop James Rausch, second general secretary of the NCCB and close friend of Joseph Cardinal Bernardin.)

- Msgr. John Oliver reportedly sexually molested a 14-year-old boy in 1967 (Diocese of Tucson) and yet was subsequently promoted.



· Fr. Robert Trupia, supervised by Msgr. Oliver (above), became known as a “notorious and serial abuser” of boys in Yuma, Ariz. Trupia, for example, fondled several boys at St. Francis of Assisi Catholic School in Yuma. He also reportedly committed oral sodomy on altar boys, followed by anal sodomy.

· Msgr. William A. Kraft sexually abused a 15-year-old California boy who held a church maintenance job at a parish in San Diego in the 1970s.

· While bishop of Duluth, Minn., Robert Brom reportedly coerced a seminarian into having homosexual sex. The dioceses of Duluth and Winona paid the alleged victim a settlement. Brom is now the bishop of San Diego.

· Former priest Michael Campanalunga, Archdiocese of Newark, was sued in 1999 for allegedly sexually abusing two brothers, Thomas and Michael Corsie, between 1966 and 1972.

· Fr. Morgan Kuhl of Staten Island was arrested in 1999 for allegedly trying to have sex with a 15-year-old boy, who was actually an undercover FBI agent. Police found condoms and other incriminating items in the priest’s car.

· Former priest Franklin Richards confessed to molesting at least 25 altar boys and students in Tennessee. (Richards sought treatment and left the priesthood in 1989.)

· In 1999, Fr. Laurence Brett was accused of sexually assaulting a teenage boy on three occasions between 1961 and 1964.

· Fr. Edward Lawrence Ball was arrested in Illinois in 1999 as a fugitive from justice on 26 charges of abusing boys in the 1980s. In the early 1990s, Ball had pleaded guilty to fondling two altar boys in San Bernardino, Calif.

· In connection with St. Sebastian’s Angels, a pornographic Web site for homosexual priests, the bishop of Portland, Maine ordered Fr. John Harris to shut down the site in 2000. At least 55 gay priests and Catholic clergy from around the world posted messages on Harris’s site – a Web site that the bishop’s spokesman described as “in some cases obscene.”

· In Massachusetts, brothers William and Paul Oberle alleged in 2000 that Fr. Paul Mahan had exhibited explicit sexual behavior in front of them in 1969, when they were 12 and 7. Mahan allegedly fondled the boys and gave them pornographic materials. (Mahan may have been laicized in the 1990s.)

· While a priest in 1987, Michael Santillo allegedly molested a 13-year-old boy. Santillo, from Schenectady, NY, was sentenced in 1999 to 10 years in prison for the offense.

· Three former students (males) of St. Cecilia’s School in Brooklyn, NY, claim that Fr. Patrick Sexton molested them in the early 1980s, when Sexton served as the school’s superintendent and supervisor of altar boys. One man claimed the priest took nude photos of him when he was 12; another man, Daniel Dugo, claimed that the priest fondled him when he was 8. When Dugo approached the Brooklyn Diocese, it reportedly offered him \$15,000 to keep quiet about the incident.

· Former Tennessee priest Edward McKeown confessed to molesting at least 20 boys and was sentenced to 25 years in prison in 1999. McKeown was forced from the priesthood after he gave a boy a condom as a Christmas gift in 1989.

· Fr. Carl Schipper, Archdiocese of San Francisco, academic dean of a seminary, was arrested in 2000 on child pornography and sexual abuse charges. Schipper allegedly used the Internet to solicit sex from boys.

· While a Jesuit seminarian for seven years, John Bollard says that at least 12 priests made homosexual advances toward him while at the California seminary.

· Fr. John Furdek, Chicago, was arrested in 2000 for allegedly arranging a sexual rendezvous with a 14-year-old boy.

· Fr. Hurtado-Badillo, Chicago, was convicted of indecent exposure in 1998. In 2000, he faced charges of fondling a 21-year-old seminary student.

· Catholic youth worker and Boy Scout volunteer Christopher Reardon (Massachusetts), was accused in 2000 of raping and assaulting three boys. A computer in Reardon’s bedroom contained the names of 250 boys between the ages of 5 and 14. A videotape showed Reardon with a boy about 11 years old engaging in acts of mutual masturbation. A hidden camera was also found in the Church rectory.

· Former priest James Porter pleaded guilty to 41 counts of raping and molesting 28 children, all of them reportedly boys. Porter is accused, however, of molesting at least 200 young boys.

· Fr. Frank Capellupo, New York, was charged with sodomy and sexual abuse against a 14-year-old boy in June 2000. The boy had moved into the rectory on 1999 to escape family problems. Capellupo denied the allegations.

· In May 2000, Fr. Andrew Millar was arrested for sodomy against a 15-year-old boy. The boy, who is “learning disabled,” was allegedly sodomized in the bathroom of a beach pavilion.

· Former Cincinnati priest George Cooley pleaded guilty in 1991 to molesting four boys. An-

other man, who claimed he also was abused by Cooley, filed suit against the Archdiocese in Cincinnati in 1999. The Archdiocese settled the suit in 2000. Archbishop Daniel Pilarczyk possibly was warned of Cooley's "psychological problems" as early as 1971. Cooley was imprisoned in 1994 for violating his parole: he stalked one of his former victims. Then in 1996 Cooley was arrested for soliciting oral sex from a 19-year-old undercover cop.

- In Oregon in 2000, the Church settled a \$44 million lawsuit filed by 22 men who said they had been sexually abused, most as altar boys, by Fr. Maurice Grammond, between 1950 and 1974. Fr. Alexander Ong Verzosa was arrested in 1999 for allegedly engaging in a six-year sexual relationship with one of his altar boys in California.

- Joh and James Howard reportedly were sexually molested by Fr. Oliver O'Grady from the time they were children. The Diocese of Stockton settled the case for \$7.5 million in 1999. O'Grady was suspended from ministry but not removed from the priesthood.

- The Diocese of Venice, Florida, acknowledged in 1999 that Fr. Ed McLoughlin and former choir director Richard Trepinski sexually molested an altar boy starting in 1991, when the boy was 13 years old. Trepinski molested the boy first and then when the boy went to Fr. McLoughlin for help, the priest said he needed to be punished and spanked him. McLoughlin then started molesting the boy, abuse that lasted for 2½ years.

- Fr. Marshall Gourley, formerly of Denver, was accused by John Ayon of sexually molesting him nearly 100 times when Ayon was a teenager seeking counseling from Gourley in the 1980s. The priest denied the allegations but the diocese relieved him of his duties.

- Franciscan Fr. John Rudy was charged in 1998 with groping an 18-year-old boy at a church friary, and had been accused of improperly touching another boy as many as 10 times while the two were swimming.

- 13 former altar boys are suing Msgr. Norman Goodman (Diocese of Peoria) for allegedly abusing them. Goodman denies the charges. He abruptly retired in October 2001, informing parishioners through a notice in the church bulletin. Three of the former altar boys claim that Goodman struck them with a Bible for sexual gratification.

- Fr. Ronald McKeirnan, former deputy director of Catholic Education for Brisbane (Australia), was sentenced in 1998 to three years in jail for molesting nine boys who were 14 years and older.

- Fr. John Gerard (London, England) was convicted in 1998 of sexually assaulting 16 young males between 1959 and 1981.

- Rev. John Thompson (Queens, NY) allegedly spent more than \$14,000 in church and school funds on his 19-year-old homosexual lover, Jonathan, who he had moved into the rectory, as reported in June 2002. Thompson also allegedly used money taken from the St. Elizabeth Elementary School to go to gay resorts in Florida and barhop at homosexual bars in Greenwich Village with other priests, including two unnamed Monsignors.

- Suspended priest Rudolph "Rudy" Kos (Dallas, Tex.), a supporter of the homosexual group Dignity, was sentenced to life in prison for sexually assaulting altar boys in hundreds of attacks. Four victims said Kos molested them about 1,350 times over five years. One former altar boy and victim, Jay Lernberger, committed suicide at the age of 20. Kos's victims were teenage boys.

- Fr. Thomas G. Rainforth (Clifton, NJ) was placed on leave in July 2002 following allegations that he abused a young boy in 1975 at St. Joseph's Church.

- Robert Tatu was sexually molested by a priest when he was 11 years old. "I didn't know what was happening," Tatu told reporters. "I was thinking: 'Here is a man of God. He is three steps away from God. There are priests, bishops, the pope and God.'" The abuse led to a downward spiral, sexual identity problems, and Tatu's sodomizing of two other boys.

- Former priest Patrick O'Shea reportedly molested nine altar boys between the ages of 10 and 18, and was charged with 224 counts of molestation.

- Fr. James Aylward (San Francisco Archdiocese) was caught "wrestling" with a 16-year-old former altar boy, who subsequently accused the priest of physical and mental abuse. The archdiocese settled out of court.

- Former altar boy Frank Martinelli claims that he was sexually abused by Fr. Lawrence Brett three times between 1962 and 1964 at St. Cecilia Church in Stamford, Conn. The Bridgeport Diocese settled the case in April 2000.

- Fr. Patrick O'Neill (Miami Archdiocese) was arrested in July 2000 for soliciting homosexual sex from an undercover police officer. O'Neill is a former president of Miami's St. Thomas University, and former president of the South Florida Center for Theological Studies, the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the New Hope Charities

Foundation.

· Fr. Rene Bissey (Normandy, France) was sentenced to 18 years in prison in October 2000 for raping and molesting 11 children and teenagers. On a related note: In France, 30 priests have been convicted of sexually abusing minors in the last 7 years. In Britain, 21 such convictions were handed down in 1995 and 1999, And in Germany, 13 priests have been convicted since 1994.

· Fr. Eugene Greene (Dublin, Ireland) was sentenced to 12 years in prison in April 2000 after he had admitted to more than 40 charges of indecent assault, sodomy, and gross indecency. Most of his 26 victims were altar boys.

· Fr. James Murphy (London, England) went to jail in July 2000 after admitting to 11 charges of indecent assault, including one incident in which he groped an 11-year-old boy after a funeral Mass.

· Former priest John Geoghan was accused of molesting at least 130 people, most of them young boys. He has been convicted in numerous cases and is now in jail. In one case, Geoghan reportedly molested a 12-year-old boy in his bedroom following the wake of the boy's brother, who had drowned.

· In January 2001, three men accused Fr. Robert Burns (Charlestown, Mass.) of sexually assaulting them in the late 1980s at St. Mary's rectory and on field trips.

· Fr. Michael Fugee was arrested in March 2001 and charged with criminal sexual conduct for allegedly fondling a 13-year-old boy on several occasions in 1999.

· Fr. Edward Ball (San Bernardino, Calif.) was sent to jail in 1998 for three years after he pleaded guilty to fondling two brothers who had served as altar boys. In 2000, he pleaded "no contest" to 31 other felony counts.

· Fr. Bernard Dabbene (San Francisco) pleaded guilty in 2001 to child molestation, which involved his sexually fondling a 17-year-old boy.

· Timothy Brody, former music director at St. John the Evangelist Church in Florida, went to jail in 2001 for his sexual abuse of two 15-year-old boys. In one instance, Brody reportedly used alcohol to lure one of the boys to his house in 1999, showed him pornographic movies and then masturbated in front of the boy.

· Former priest Robert Larson (Kansas) went to prison in March 2001 for his sexual abuse of altar boys. Nearly two dozen young men accused Larson of abuse. Two alleged victims, Gilbert Tafolla and Paul Tafolla, committed suicide as a result of the abuse. Larson's lawyer said that his client "was full of

denial about his sexual orientation and about the [homosexual] urgings he had."

· Six religious at Los Gatos Jesuit Center were accused of sexually abusing two retarded men in their employ for nearly 30 years. According to court records, one of the accused, "Mariano," had also been arrested in 1998 for having sex with a 17-year-old boy. "Mariano arranged to meet two teenagers by posing as a 25-year-old woman on an Internet chat room. He wore lipstick and rouge when he met the boys," reported George Neumayr in the American Prowler. Today, Mariano reportedly lives with Fr. Thomas Smolich, the head of the California Province of Jesuits. When asked about Mariano, Smolich said: "This is anonymous sex. This doesn't involve people at the parish. It wasn't a priest thing. He wasn't dressed in a collar." Smolich did not inform police about the alleged abuse of the retarded workers because the men weren't minors. The lawyer for the Jesuits told the *Los Angeles Times*: "The Jesuits have no obligation under California law to disclose the information."

· The Archdiocese of Dubuque, Iowa, is being sued by a man who claims he was sexually abused by Fr. John Brickley (now deceased) from 1966 to 1971 in churches, a rectory, and on church-sponsored outings.

· Fr. Maurice Blackwell (Baltimore, Md.) was put on leave in 1998 after it was discovered he had had a homosexual affair with a teenager about 20 years ago. In 1993, Blackwell had been removed from his parish for allegedly touching a teenage male parishioner inappropriately.

· Fr. Daniel Herek (Omaha, Neb.) went to prison in 1999 after being convicted of sexually assaulting a 14-year-old boy at a church between 1992 and 1997. Officials say that Herek also manufactured and possessed child pornography.

· Fr. Roger Fortier (Dover, NH) was sentenced to prison in 1998 on 10 counts of sexual assault. Police had arrested Fortier after receiving reports from a 14-year-old boy that the priest sexually molested him.

· Fr. Robert Malloy (Albuquerque, NM) was arrested in 1998 for allegedly promoting homosexual prostitution of minors. In the 11 counts of sexual exploitation, Malloy was charged with hiring or offering to hire seven boys between 13 and 16 years old to engage in sex. Malloy was also accused of allegedly paying or trying to pay the boys for oral sex and/or masturbation.

· Fr. Michael LaMountain (Providence, RI) pleaded guilty in 1999 to sexually assaulting five teenage boys at a cottage and at a church rectory.

· Fr. Clifford Gardner was removed as assistant pastor of St. Pius X Catholic Church in July 2002 and barred indefinitely from functioning as a priest after it was revealed by Roman Catholic Faithful, through the *Washington Times* newspaper, that he had participated in the pornographic homosexual Web site St. Sebastian's Angels. In some of his Internet messages, Fr. Garner said: "Although I'm no 'chicken hawk' [A man who seeks out boys or young men as his sexual partners], there are some really cute guys around the country. I do have a very special place in my heart for those Latin blooded ones." Although RCF revealed Garner's activity more than two years ago, Bishop Joseph Galante protected the priest until the *Times* ran its story and the general public learned the facts. Garner also reportedly preached from the pulpit against the Church's teaching on homosexuality.

· Fr. Dennis Peterson, who served as director of Special Youth Services under Bishop Joseph Fiorenza, a former president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, allegedly repeatedly abused a teenage boy who, himself, had already been molested by a homosexual leader in the Boy Scouts. Peterson apparently abused the boy after giving him drugs and/or alcohol. Following the sexual abuse, Peterson heard the boy's confession and then absolved him of any sins involving the abuse.

· Twenty-seven people filed a lawsuit in 1999 claiming that they had been molested by priests from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Diocese, and that diocesan officials knew of the abuse and yet covered it up by transferring the priests to different parishes. The diocese settled the case in 2001. One of the accused priests, Fr. Raymond Peolka, said in a deposition that he did not believe that having a homosexual relationship violated Church rules on celibacy.

In nearly all the cases cited here, homosexual priests abused boys between the ages of 11 and 18. That's not pedophilia. As the National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality stated in its June letter to the bishops meeting in Dallas: "As the revelations of abuse have become public it has become increasingly clear that almost all the victims are adolescent males, not prepubescent boys." And as Fr. Rosetti reported: "The majority of perpetrators are involved with post-pubescent children." And the list goes on and on – somewhere between 2,500 and 6,500 priests and an estimated 100,000 victims. Who knows for sure? The total numbers will likely never be known because about 75% of sexual abuse victims never come forward. They never reveal what happened to them. Many are ashamed. Many feel guilty.

Sexual abuse can scar people for life. They don't talk about it. If you're a young man abused by a homosexual, you definitely don't want to talk about it. And that's what the homosexual predators are banking on: shame, fear, silence. And that's also why, in part, homosexuals should not become priests – the risk is too great.

### **Are the U.S. Bishops Corrupt?**

"We feel that a person who is homosexually oriented is not a suitable candidate for the priesthood, even if he did not commit an act [of homosexual sex]," said Cardinal Anthony Bevilacqua in April this year. "There is a difference between heterosexual candidates and homosexual candidates. A heterosexual is taking on a good thing, becoming a priest, and giving up a very good thing, the desire to have a family. [A homosexual], by his orientation, is not giving up family and marriage. He is giving up what the Church considers an abomination. ... It is possible we have homosexuals who are very chaste [as priests]. But the risk is much higher that he will fail on celibacy. The risk is higher, that's all were saying." The list of cases cited above would seem to confirm Cardinal Bevilacqua's views.

And he's not alone. Msgr. Eugene Clark (Archdiocese of New York) in his homily at St. Patrick's Cathedral on April 21 spoke about the Church's teaching on homosexuality and the ongoing sex scandal. "The tendency to homosexuality is a disorder, not a sin," Msgr. Clark told the congregation. "But the practice of homosexuality is truly sinful." He also said that a homosexual disorder "should prevent a person from being ordained a priest." Unfortunately, America promotes and protects homosexuality, Clark suggested. "Homosexuality became in the American exchange of views a protected area," he said. "And unfortunately ... homosexual students were allowed to pass through seminaries." That was a "grave mistake," he said, "not because homosexuals in anyway tend to criminality, but because it is a disorder." Msgr. Clark also criticized "the campaign of liberal America against celibacy."

Msgr. Clark said nothing contrary to Church teaching. Yet the media attacked his message and even his own Archdiocese distanced itself from him. Joe Zwilling, spokesman for the Archdiocese, told the public that Msgr. Clark "was speaking for himself." Zwilling also apparently sought to cover for Cardinal Edward Egan by saying that he did not know whether

Egan knew what Clark planned on talking about in his homily. Rev. Tom Reese, editor in chief of the Jesuit magazine "America" said: "It's clear that Monsignor Clark is speaking for himself and is expressing the views of very conservative Catholics." As noted, however, the Catechism of the Catholic Church describes homosexual acts as a "grave depravity," which are "intrinsically disordered."

Nonetheless, even some of the U.S. bishops apparently don't want to preach the truth about homosexuality. For instance, Bishop Wilton Gregory, president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and the man who oversaw the bishops' meeting in Dallas on sexual abuse, told the public after the scandal broke that, "It's most importantly a struggle to make sure that the Catholic priesthood is not dominated by homosexual men." But when asked about the homosexual problem on "Meet the Press" on June 16, Bishop Gregory said: "One of the things that I think that this moment calls for is that the Church must look carefully at the caliber of priests that serve us, and the caliber of candidates who seek to enter the priesthood. It's a call for holiness and integrity of life. And that statement [about homosexual clergy] was made in that context, that this is a moment of purification and introspection. We need healthy, holy priests, who live the promises that they make with integrity." So much for a straight answer on a simple moral issue.

When asked about the statement by the Pope's spokesman that homosexuals cannot be ordained, Bishop Gregory said: "I believe that that statement was perhaps more expansive than the tradition of the Church. ... I've never – I asked people about the question of validity of orders. That does not seem to be a part of our tradition." The validity of a sacrament – in this case, Holy Orders – is an issue for the Church, however, as are the validity of other sacraments: baptism, confirmation, confession, and the Eucharist. Much of the Catechism is about the validity of sacraments.

Finally, reporter Tim Russert asked the following: "But the fact that 90% of the abused children in the Church were teenage boys, does that trouble you that there may be a disproportionate level of behavior by homosexual men towards teenage boys?" Bishop Gregory, the man overseeing the U.S. bishops and their handling of the problem, said: "It certainly troubles me, but that – the fact that any of our kids are harmed troubles me. The percentages are startling,

but the total issue is a cause for great sorrow."

Bishop Gregory ducked the issue. It is a "total issue" now apparently, which means everything and, hence, nothing.

At the June meeting in Dallas, Bishop Gregory was asked if he and the bishops would address the homosexual problem. He said: "That is not our focus. Dallas is about the protection of children." Bishop Joseph Galante, who had shielded Fr. Garner and his participation in a homosexual Web site, said at the meeting: "Sexual orientation is not a factor in abuse." Also, Dr. Fred Berlin, who reportedly supports a female clergy, was asked to speak to the bishops in Dallas. He told them, "There is no evidence that a homosexual is more likely to engage in sex with a boy than a heterosexual is to engage in sex with a girl." Experts from conservative and traditional Catholic organizations were not allowed to speak before the bishops. As Phil Lawler, editor of *Catholic World Report*, said: "Who on the agenda, anywhere on the agenda, is known as a stalwart defender of Catholic teaching on sexual morality?" However, the bishops did invite two liberal Catholic intellectuals to speak: R. Scott Appleby of Notre Dame and Margaret O'Brien Steinfels, editor of *Commonweal*, a "Catholic" magazine that writes in favor of a married clergy and female priests. They, in general, blamed Church governance – not homosexual priests – for the homosexual abuse of teenagers.

When Bishop Fabian Bruskewitz called for a study of how dissent and homosexuality may be contributing to the abuse problem, the other bishops shot it down. As Fr. Paul Shaughnessy has written in *Catholic World Report*: "I define as corrupt ... an institution that is unable to uncover and expel its own miscreants. It is in this sense that the principal reason why the action necessary to solve the gay problem won't be taken is that the episcopacy in the United States is corrupt, and the same is true of the majority of religious orders. ... [A]s an agency, the episcopacy has lost the capacity to do its own housecleaning, especially, but not exclusively, in the arena of sexual turpitude." Fr. Shaughnessy also notes that the U.S. bishops have not acted on credible, overwhelming evidence of homosexual abuse by some priests until the "mainstream" media exposed the facts. Traditional Catholic groups, such as Roman Catholic Faithful and others, have been documenting, writing, faxing, publishing, and lobbying the bishops for years. In almost every case RCF was ignored or rebuffed by

the episcopacy. Not until the traditional Catholics went public did the bishops act – and then it seems they only did so to save face and spin the story to protect their reputations and the coffers of their dioceses.

### **Sodomy Poisons Church and State**

As the major media have spun the scandal away from homosexuality, the bishops seem to have done the same thing. And Church “reformers” are reading from the same page as well. When the Pope’s spokesman questioned the ordination of homosexuals, for instance, the head of the gay Catholic group Dignity/USA, Mary Louise Cervone, said that Navarro-Valls was trying to shift the blame. “This is about violence against children and abuse of power,” said Cervone. “It has nothing to do with sexual orientation.” A spokesman for the heretical group Call to Action, Linda Pieczynski, said: “I think this is an attack on gays. It satisfies the right wing and does absolutely nothing to cure the problem.” Needless to say, if homosexuals had not been ordained, about 90% of the reported abuse cases would not have happened. Tens of thousands of teenage boys would not have been molested. That apparently doesn’t concern the reformers.

“Anyone who is a thinking Catholic knows you cannot equate abusers of children with anyone who has a healthy, mature sexuality, be it straight or gay,” said Marianne Duddy, executive director of Dignity. But the facts show that it is largely not “children” who are being abused by homosexuals. Further, homosexuality is not healthy or mature. Homosexual acts are contrary to the “natural law,” says the Catechism. “They close the sexual act to the gift of life. They do not proceed from a genuine affective and sexual complementarity. Under no circumstances can they be approved.” Homosexuality is, in fact, curable in many cases through reparative therapy, a practice the Church and traditional Catholic organizations provide. Duddy, however, whose views represent those of many dissenters, some clergy, and many Americans, says, “We believe gay and lesbian folks can have sexual relationships that are consistent with Christian values that are life-affirming and holy.”

That, of course, is the party line repeated daily in American culture, through the major media, Hollywood, the public schools, many churches, the workplace, and the halls of government. It seems there is no aspect of American life that has not been stained, in some way, by homosexuality. But while

society may continue to suffer from the abominable effects of homosexuality, the Church can take steps to cleanse itself and, in the long run, help purify the culture and, of course, save souls. The first step is: Obey the Pope and Church tradition.

In 1961, Pope John XXIII – the liberal who called for the Second Vatican Council – signed a document that had been promulgated by the Vatican’s Sacred Congregation for Religious: “Careful Selection and Training of Candidates for the States of Perfection and Sacred Orders.” Concerning homosexuals and the priesthood, the document says: “Advancement to religious vows and ordination should be barred to those who are afflicted with evil tendencies to homosexuality or pedaresty, since for them the common life and the priestly ministry would constitute serious dangers.” Serious dangers. That is obvious today. So many priests, bishops, and cardinals did not abide by that very clear and simple instruction, as so many have not abided by other basic teachings of the Church. And, to date, it does not look like many of the U.S. bishops want to read Pope John’s order, let alone obey it.

When Roman Catholic Faithful attorney James Bendell wrote to the Papal Nuncio Archbishop Gabriel Montalvo for a copy of the 1961 instruction, he was told: “Kindly be advised that the document, which you request, was reserved for use of the bishops. Thus I regret that I am unable to help you in this matter.” That was false.

As Catholic apologist John Vennari reported, the document reads: “Although this instruction was not published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* or any other public form but was privately circulated, it is nevertheless referred to the Sacred Congregation of Religious itself as ‘a matter of public law.’”

So while the Papal Nuncio and perhaps other Church officials may not want to inform the public about the Church’s own order against allowing homosexuals in the priesthood, the public, and especially Catholics, have a right to know. And they have a right to demand that their clerical leaders obey Church teaching. After all, Catholic men and women are required, under penalty of sin, excommunication, and possible damnation, to obey the teaching of the Church on Faith and morality. Furthermore, as Pope John Paul II has said many times, the laity have a moral duty to defend the Faith, the laws, and the traditions of the Church. Thus, a first step: Remove the

homosexuals from the clergy and the seminaries, and provide them with the opportunity to seek reparative therapy for their disorder. At the same time, counsel the victims of clergy abuse and compensate them and their families.

It is not a difficult task. There are an estimated 13,000 homosexual priests in the United States, of which around 5,000 are engaged in sexual abuse. If the Church removes the known abusers and gradually works on scouring the seminaries and filling them with honest, normal men, the homosexual abuse will end. The Church will flourish. And thousands of young men will grow up looking proudly at their priests, the real men in black, the princes of the Catholic Church.

###

Michael Chapman is a writer for Roman Catholic Faithful.

#### Upcoming Issues of AMDG

1. Bishop Cawcutt of Cape Town South Africa resigns after the Washington Times covers RCF's work regarding Saint Sebastian's Angels, a network of homosexual clergy operating on the internet.
2. Follow-up on several other members of St. Sebastian's Angels.
3. Another allegation of sexual misconduct against the late Cardinal Bernardin. This time there was a cash settlement according to one bishop.
4. More on the Winona Diocese and payments to seminarians.
5. Reports on the Albany, Rochester and Arlington Dioceses.
6. A detailed report on Bishop Imesch and the Joliet Diocese. Heretical teaching, promotion of homosexual activity, protection of abusive priests and much much more. Why won't Rome act?

## Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc. Receives Foundation Grant

The leader of an international Catholic watchdog group today announced that his organization had received a \$10,000 grant from The Do Right Foundation. The grant recipient, Illinois-based Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc., (RCF) is a lay organization, with many religious members, dedicated to promoting orthodox Catholic teaching and fighting heterodoxy and corruption within the Catholic hierarchy.

"I would like to express my deep appreciation to the Do Right Foundation for this generous gift," said Stephen G. Brady, RCF president. "This endowment is an affirmation of our efforts to restore the authentic Catholic faith and practices to its believers," Brady continued.

The Do Right Foundation's web page at [www.doright.org](http://www.doright.org) states that the foundation aids organizations that "show respect for God and all His creations," and promote "family unity, limited and honest government; private property; free enterprise and the rule of law."

RCF plans to use the award to assist a U.S. diocese by educating Catholics of the departure from Church teaching in that diocese and threats to the family and to children.

Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc.  
P.O. Box 109  
Petersburg, Illinois 62675-0109

217-632-5920 phone  
217-632-5205 phone  
217-632-7054 fax

[www.rcf.org](http://www.rcf.org)  
[Sbrady@rcf.org](mailto:Sbrady@rcf.org)

# HOMOSEXUAL PRIESTS POISON DIOCESE OF ARLINGTON

Bishop Loverde Suspends Whistleblower

By Michael Chapman

The Diocese of Arlington, Va., is infected by a network of homosexual priests, some of whom are reportedly stealing from the collection plate to pay for trips to Las Vegas, gay cruises, pornography, and homosexual parties with priests linked to the National Shrine in Washington, D.C. Yet Bishop Paul S. Loverde apparently is doing little to clean house – except when pressured by major media exposure – and has instead suspended a priest who gathered evidence about the matter and presented it to him. It seems that Bishop Loverde is as adept at handling the gay priest problem in his diocese as Cardinal Bernard Law was at handling the gay priest problem in the Archdiocese of Boston.

Indeed, the evidence suggests that Bishop Loverde tried to smear the reputation of the whistleblower-priest, give the gay and criminal priests every benefit of the doubt, hide the facts, and keep parishioners in the dark. To this day, in fact, priests reportedly tied to the homosexual network hold influential positions in the diocese and with Bishop Loverde. The rector of St. Thomas More Cathedral, for instance, has been named in a deposition as defending homosexual relations among priests. That same rector recently refused Communion to a man because he was kneeling and then publicly criticized the man, calling him a “conservative idiot.” Loverde has said nothing in public about the scandal. Nor has he clarified for parishioners that Church law permits Catholics to kneel for Communion and requires bishops to enforce that law.

This is the same bishop who publicly supports altar girls, and has supported legislation that would allow homosexuals to adopt children or serve as foster “parents.” This is also the same bishop who apparently sees nothing wrong with homosexual priests despite the scandals of the last two years and that the Vatican is working on a new rule to bar homosexuals from the priesthood. (Note: The Vatican under Pope John XXIII issued a ruling in 1961 to keep sodomites out of the priesthood – a rule that most U.S. bishops have ignored.)

Bishop Loverde’s actions in relation to the ho-

mosexual priest problem in the Arlington Diocese are curious, to say the least. And his handling of the priest who blew the whistle on the issue is not surprising – Loverde suspended the guy who was trying to do the right thing. It also sends a message to the other priests in the diocese: Keep quiet or you’ll be gone too. To better understand some of what’s happening in the Arlington Diocese – one of the most “conservative” dioceses in the nation – however, one needs to go back to 1998 and look at the “relationship” between Nancy Lambert and Fr. James Verrecchia.

Here’s the basic story:

Arlington Catholic priest counsels a married mother of four.

The two are attracted to each other and they fall into a sexual relationship.

Just about everybody in the parish knows what’s going on.

Another priest, appalled by the scandal, tells the bishop.

The fornicating priest finds out and claims that the other priest is on drugs and suffers from depression.

The bishop then tells the good-guy priest that he’s not sure who’s telling the truth (despite the witnesses at the parish and the husband of the adulteress).

So, the good-guy priest – who had been offered a pastor-ship – gathers evidence that proves the bad-guy priest is fooling around and gives the evidence to the bishop.

Then the adulteress complains to the diocese about the good-guy priest; she says his inquiries about her affair with the bad-guy priest are harming her reputation.

The bishop smells a potential lawsuit and advises the bad-guy priest to stop sleeping with the woman. He doesn’t.



The bishop also reneges on the pastor-ship deal for the good-guy priest.

The woman eventually gets pregnant.

She leaves her husband.

She and the bad-guy priest get married and move, with her other four children, to another state.

When their “love child” is baptized, another Arlington priest (who was the woman’s confessor) serves as the godfather.

The woman’s husband has a heart attack.

He then sues the diocese for failing to stop the bad-guy priest from ruining his marriage.

The good-guy priest gives the bishop further evidence about homosexual priests and priests stealing from the collection basket in the Arlington Diocese.

The bishop asks the good-guy priest to resign. He refuses.

The bishop suspends the good-guy priest.

The husband loses the lawsuit.

The good-guy priest appeals to the head of the National Council of Catholic Bishops for help.

No word yet from the NCCB chief.

That’s the story in a nutshell. But the Devil is always in the details. And while it’s not possible to discuss all the details in this space, it is possible to provide some details – enough to show that Lucifer has not a few devoted helpers in the Diocese of Arlington.

### **A Mole in the Chancery?**

Fr. Verrecchia was considered the “Golden Boy” of the Arlington Diocese. In 1998, Verrecchia was the youngest pastor of the largest parish in Virginia: All Saints in Manassas. He had served on the boards of Catholic Charities and St. Mary’s Seminary. He was a judge on the Diocesan Tribunal, a columnist for the Arlington Catholic Herald, and an instructor in the permanent Deaconate program. He also had a fondness for homosexual pornography.

As Fr. James Haley, who served as associate

pastor at All Saints during Verrecchia’s tenure there, explained in a July 2002 deposition: “And as I started to look through all of the [computer] files, came across his Netscape history file and further shocked by a collection of homosexual material and sites that he had visited, which he tried to carefully delete, but had not completely done that. ... A lot of young males sexually excited .... [And in emails and letters] references to Father [Daniel] Gee. And Fr. Verrecchia struggles with Father Gee and that he was obviously very attracted to him. ... There were rendezvous at beaches and pictures that he was writing to other men to hide and, ‘Boy, if this came out I’d be ruined.’ ... I spent a week gathering it all together in a notebook, which I gave to Bishop Loverde on June 22nd [1999].”

Loverde, however, told Haley that he didn’t have time to look over the material as he was going on vacation for a few weeks. “[B]ut you have two priests coming in,” Haley told the bishop. “I said he [Verrecchia] should be immediately suspended. I said the material should be given to an outside [party] of the diocese [for] psychological evaluation because this is very serious stuff.” It’s standard procedure to remove a priest for evaluation if there is evidence of potential immoral or criminal behavior. Loverde, however, who may have known about Verrecchia’s problem, apparently didn’t want to deal with it then.

In addition to the gay pornography that Verrecchia perused on a computer – bought and paid for by the diocese – was a stream of email that showed that the priest was having a sexual affair with a married woman at the parish: Nancy Lambert, a mother of four. The immoral relationship between Verrecchia and Lambert was talked about at the parish, and the couple’s behavior had scandalized several parishioners. Things got so bad that some parents removed their children from the parish school. The kids were asking questions such as, “Is that lady Mrs. Verrecchia?” Nancy Lambert’s husband, Jim, also was asking questions. And he demanded that the diocese intervene and stop Verrecchia from preying on his wife and family.

“They saw all the indications that this guy needed help, and they still kept him in his position of power,” Jim Lambert told the Washington Post. “They refused to deal with it. They could have saved my marriage.” (Verrecchia continued to serve as pastor of All Saints a full 15 months after Jim Lambert had first complained to the diocese.)

In his deposition, Haley said: "I found letters, email on the parish computer. In fact, the whole collection. Some two years, two and a half years of email that he had written. He had been using the parish computer as his personal outlet for his emails in actual violation of parish policy – diocesan policy. ... There was so much information that it was boggling to me. ... I was stunned at how much was there and how conclusively it proved of an adulterous relationship ...."

Bishop Loverde, nonetheless, had to go on vacation. The next day, June 23, 1999, Fr. Verrecchia started to erase his own computer files. As Fr. Haley explained: "The next day Father Verrecchia was deleting his computer system. ... And I saw him in there, he checked the files on the network and he was erasing all of the email. ... I called the bishop and I said what's going on here? ... I called the bishop and said there's been a breach here, someone in the chancery has told Father Verrecchia and he is now trying to destroy the evidence." Bishop Loverde reportedly told Fr. Haley that he hadn't tipped off Fr. Verrecchia." He just repeated, 'I didn't tell him,'" said Haley. "And at that point I realized that something was very afoul."

Indeed. Something clearly went askew because at that point, Fr. Haley – not Fr. Verrecchia – apparently became the target of the chancery. (Loverde, incidentally, had been installed as bishop in March 1999, three months before Fr. Haley gave him the emails and related materials; Loverde had also offered Haley the pastor-ship of Our Lady of Hope in May 1999.) What went wrong apparently was Nancy Lambert's threats to sue the diocese for allowing Fr. Haley to supposedly harm her reputation. She, of course, was the one fornicating with Fr. Verrecchia. Fr. Haley was in trouble apparently for asking someone whether Mrs. Lambert was doing what she was, in fact, doing. As Haley explained: "It seemed that if there was the possibility of any kind of legal or public scandal towards the diocese, prompt action would be taken, but not necessarily if there was a scandal of the parishioners. What seemed to motivate a bishop's action was the threat of a legal action or a lawsuit from an offended party." Loverde and the chancery apparently were more concerned about a lawsuit against them than the immoral relations between Mrs. Lambert and Fr. Verrecchia. Thus the turn against Haley.

While Fr. Haley was gathering evidence for Bishop Loverde, the latter often had one of his top

staffers, Fr. Rippy, around to make copies of documents and ask questions. Rippy reportedly was a good friend of Verrecchia. Fr. Haley told Bishop Loverde that he didn't trust Fr. Rippy and that the latter was "not dependable" and "one of the greater gossips of the diocese." This apparently is well known in the diocese, and Fr. Haley says that Rippy and Frs. Daniel Sychala and William Erbacher are all friends who "seemed to know everything that happened in the chancery before anybody else did." Nonetheless, Loverde – who had been bishop for only three months – told Haley in June 1999 that he needed to trust his staff, i.e., Rippy.

Bishop Loverde took the material Fr. Haley had collected and promised to look at it when he returned from vacation. Haley was disappointed. "That's all he said, but my expectations of the meeting were absolutely shattering," said Haley. "I thought that he would be shocked at what I showed him. I thought that he would be appreciative of the incredible amount of work I had done to get this. There was no sign of 'Thank you very much. Boy, this must have taken a tremendous amount of work to get.'"

### **Crucify the Messenger**

Bishop Loverde returned from vacation in late July. On July 26, Nancy Lambert sent a letter to the chancery complaining about Fr. Haley. That same day Fr. Haley was transferred to a different parish: St. Lawrence. (He had been informed of the transfer on July 7.) In August, Fr. Haley was cc'd on a letter from Fr. Rippy to Mrs. Lambert in which Rippy wrote: "If you know of any inappropriate action that Father Haley is doing, if you know of any further investigation, please contact me right away." He also states, "We apologize for the pain, embarrassment, and humiliation you've experienced as the result of any inquiries by Father Haley."

Mrs. Lambert was the one engaged in an adulterous and mortally sinful affair-in the objective order –with James Verrecchia, the apparently sexually confused pastor of the largest parish in Virginia. Yet Fr. Haley was the one being tracked. "I found myself the victim," said Haley. "I found myself being somehow incriminated in this when they at that point had full knowledge of Fr. Verrecchia." Then Loverde and Rippy moved forcefully against Haley.

In late October 1999, Bishop Loverde met with Fr. Haley. Fr. Rippy was present. This was the first

meeting about the Verrecchia-Lambert issue since June 22, the day before Loverde left for vacation. Instead of leveling with Haley, however, Loverde and Rippy started to challenge his credibility. “Fr. Rippy and the bishop asked me many questions about the email and how it had been obtained,” said Haley in his deposition. “And there [were] suggestions that I had first written all of the email. And I said, ‘Are you serious that I could write 287 pages of material in one week and that it would have references to friends who I have never met and credit card numbers and addresses and sister and personal information.’” According to Haley, the bishop told him, “Well, I’m not assured that you haven’t doctored it. ... It became very clear at that point that they were trying to discredit the information, discredit the giver of the information, finding some way out of this. It was in anticipation of that kind of a threat that I had done such a thorough job.”

Loverde is still spinning the “doctored email” line to the major media. When the Washington Post ran an investigative piece about the Verrecchia-Lambert scandal, Loverde said: “I don’t know whether these [emails] were recording the truth or not. ... I’m always left with a certain question about those emails, about whether they were authentic and true.”

What Loverde doesn’t dwell on, however, is the fact that he never asked Verrecchia if the emails were accurate. He never asked the one person who knew the truth. The shepherd who oversees the Arlington flock has a stack of notes showing that one of his most favored priests is engaged in a grossly immoral affair with a married mom, and he doesn’t ask the priest if he wrote the love notes. In the real world, that’s likely negligence.

Loverde says he never asked Verrecchia for he thought it was inappropriate “because of the respect we had for each of the parties.” Yet Loverde had no qualms about asking Fr. Haley if he had made up the emails. And Loverde apparently had no reservations about dangling that question before the major media. It’s a cheap but clever way to raise doubts about Haley’s veracity.

In a Sept. 14, 2002 letter, which he ordered all diocesan priests to read to their parishioners, Bishop Loverde says that when allegations of wrongdoing involving a priest surface, the situation is “dealt with in appropriate and proper ways.” The letter also says that parishioners should read another of his letters,

published Sept. 12 in the *Arlington Catholic Herald*. That letter says, “I try to determine if the information or allegation is credible. In other words, does it have readily ascertainable facts that make it at least reasonable to pursue?” The bishop apparently ignored that rule in the case of the Verrecchia emails.

### **Loverde ‘Talks Freely’ – If You Sign Legal Release Form**

Further, despite the eyewitnesses – including the secretaries at All Saints parish – and the emails, and gay pornography, Bishop Loverde did not remove Fr. Verrecchia from his post in the summer of 1999. Nor did Loverde assign anyone to keep an eye on Verrecchia. “[T]here were no allegations of sexual misconduct,” Loverde told the *Washington Post*, adding that he felt he really didn’t have enough to remove him.” There were those nagging emails, however, not to mention the homosexual pornography and the scandalized parishioners. And other priests had been removed for evaluation and counseling for far less, according to Fr. Haley.

He cited the case of a Fr. Berghout, who had indiscreetly touched a woman’s thighs. “She complained and he was investigated by Father Verrecchia and Father Steve Leva who were best friends, and the result was that within a week Father Berghout was in inpatient therapy,” said Haley. (Fr. Leva, by the way, was Nancy Lambert’s confessor and the godfather of the “love child” produced by her fornication with Fr. Verrecchia. Leva has testified that Verrecchia is a “man of good character,” a “very caring man and someone who has a lot of love for people.”) In late November 1999 there were fresh reports coming in from eyewitnesses attesting to the on-going relationship between Verrecchia and Lambert. Within two months, Lambert would be pregnant with Verrecchia’s child.

By that point, the bishop had run out of excuses. If he had acted on the evidence gathered by Fr. Haley and the reports of eyewitnesses in mid-1999, he might have stopped the scurrilous affair. As bishop, he could have sent Verrecchia away. But he didn’t. And Jim Lambert lost his wife and children, and the “Golden Boy” of the Arlington Diocese lost his vocation.

“I am always saddened when a marriage fails or when a priest leaves the priesthood,” Loverde said in a written statement about the case. He also said that the diocese “took Mr. Lambert’s concerns seriously,

looked into this matter appropriately and is convinced that it acted both honorably and properly.” Well, of course. What Is Loverde going to say? “We acted dishonorably and improperly?” No, bishops concerned about saving face instead of saving souls are often less than candid. As Mr. Lambert’s attorney, Gregory Murphy said, the diocese took the position that “you can’t rely on what your bishop tells you, and even if we lie to you, you should know better than to believe us.”

Loverde’s lack of candor and fair play is clear in related instances. For instance, Mr. Lambert asked to speak with Bishop Loverde early on to ask him to keep Fr. Verrecchia away from his wife and family. Loverde agreed to meet with Mr. Lambert, but only if he would sign a legal document that supposedly would allow the two men to “talk freely.” Lambert refused. The chancery also asked Mr. Lambert to write a letter that, it seems, would have exonerated the diocese of any legal wrongdoing. Lambert again refused. Such “layering” by Loverde seems atypical for a bishop who describes himself as following a “proactive style of shepherding.”

Further, Loverde says, “As a bishop, I have an ecclesiastical responsibility to uphold confidentiality in such matters [i.e., priest scandals].” When it came to Fr. Haley’s confidentiality, however, Loverde apparently looked the other way. As a result of Nancy Lambert’s lawsuit against the diocese, Fr. Haley’s personnel records were subpoenaed in June 2000. Neither the chancery nor the bishop apparently lifted a finger to help Haley.

As Fr. Haley explained: “I immediately called Father Mealy and asked him what the diocese’s policy was on this, whether they were going to fight this subpoena. And he said no, we won’t. And I said you’re going to give my personnel records out in this case? And he said we would not fight it. ...You’re not going to defend one of your priests?” And he said we will not fight the subpoena. And I said, well, can I see my records? And for the multiple time again it was denied. This was a conversation that later that Father Mealy completely lied about ....” (In all subsequent meetings between Bishop Loverde and Fr. Haley, Fr. Mealy was present.)

In the Arlington Diocese, as the Haley case shows, you better be on the politically correct side. Otherwise, the bishop likely will cut you off at the knees. For while the chancery was willing to release Haley’s records to a hostile party, it doesn’t like to

release the records of diocesan priests engaged in homosexuality, theft, and gay parties.

### **The ‘Big Boys’ Network: Priests, Bishops, and Cardinals**

In his July 22 deposition, Fr. Haley provided details about a network of homosexual priests in the Arlington Diocese. He named names and provided graphic information. Fr. Haley said that while at St. Ann’s parish in 1995, for instance, he “had become aware of some homosexual activity between the priests, between the pastor and another pastor.” He further noted that he and Bishop Keating had discussed the homosexual priest problem from time to time – Keating had agreed to meet with Haley every two weeks in the mid-1990s to talk about priestly matters.

“[I]n some of those conversations he had indicated a problem that existed even among the bishops and cardinals, naming some that surprised me, so I was becoming a lot more aware of how significant the problem was and how guarded it was,” said Fr. Haley in his deposition.

Needless to say, Bishop Loverde and the chancery tried, first, to stop Haley’s July 2002 deposition and then, second, to have it sealed by a judge. Lawyers for the diocese hemmed and hawed and tried to delay the issue, but they failed. Haley spoke under oath, and the deposition became public in late August.

It’s no surprise why Bishop Loverde tried to keep the deposition from the public. If even one tenth of what Haley says is accurate, it shows that the diocese has been poisoned – morally, legally, and spiritually – by a gang of priests infected by a psychological and sexual disorder. Further, that gang apparently has an undue influence over the diocese and the bishop.

In his Sept. 14 letter to parishioners, Bishop Loverde said “no one is punished, priest or lay person, for bringing their concerns to me.” Loverde didn’t mention Fr. Haley. For, in fact, Haley went to Loverde with his concerns about a priest who was apparently hooked on homosexual pornography. As it happened, in October 2001 while assigned to St. Mary’s parish in Fredericksburg, headed by Rev. Daniel Hamilton, Haley showed Loverde “a slide show of the pictures of [Hamilton’s] incredible collection” of gay pornography. Some of the obscene materials, which depicted bisexuality and sado-masochism, had been mailed to the parish rectory. A week later, Loverde suspended ... Fr. Haley.

Other priests in the diocese – including the (now-resigned) Fr. William Erbacher – also had extensive homosexual pornography collections and gay sex toys, according to Fr. Haley. Yet Bishop Loverde apparently has ignored Haley’s complaints about the problem.

In addition to suspending Haley’s ministry, Bishop Loverde has ordered Haley not to speak to anyone about the homosexual priest problem in the Arlington Diocese. Furthermore, when the Erbacher case broke in July 2001 – which included allegations of stealing from the collections – the bishop and the chancery told the public that Erbacher had been suspended for alleged financial wrongdoing. Loverde did not tell the people of the diocese that Erbacher had a massive collection of homosexual porn and some gay sex toys.

When Fr. Hamilton resigned in August 2002, the bishop did not disclose Hamilton’s homosexual porn problem. Further, the diocese refused to allow Hamilton or Erbacher to speak to the media. And, as evidence indicates, Loverde did not act against Erbacher until the major media planned to publish a story on the scandal. “[T]here was no investigation, there [were] no interviews, there was no inquiry,” said Haley. “And seven, eight weeks later information was apparently sent to the bishop and to the media sources and it became immediately public. And only after that two months and only after that public attention was Father Erbacher removed, immediately evaluated and immediately there was a financial audit at the parish, but only after it had become public.”

Fr. Haley had worked under Fr. Erbacher at St. Lawrence parish. While there, Haley discovered that Erbacher had a “homosexual pornography collection of basically young boys, very similar to what Father Verrecchia had been looking at, but much more extensive. Gay guides, he took frequent trips to Mexico and Indonesia and he had, you know, ‘The Gay Mexican Guide’ to the best gay beaches. And so I had gone to Bishop Loverde and told him he had a significant problem at Saint Lawrence. That there was immoral and criminal activity occurring and that it was very obvious and that he needed to go and see it. And he wanted documentation.”

Fr. Haley continued: “So I gave him the key to the rectory and told him to see for himself and he refused, claiming that documents by me would be better. (It’s also safer if someone else does the “dirty work”; if they screw up, the bishop can claim he

knew nothing about it.) And I said what could be more better than your own eyewitness testimony, then when Father Erbacher says who told you this, you can slam your fist on the table and say I saw it and it makes me sick. And I said it does make you sick, doesn’t it?”

“And it began a whole series of conversations with Bishop Loverde about his stance toward homosexuality. What he was willing to do if he knew that priests were homosexual? Whether he was going to make any precautions toward the assigning of two homosexual priests together in a rectory unsupervised, whether he was going to inform clergy of fellow priests who might be homosexuals so that prudence or safeguards might be up.

“I told Bishop Loverde, I said you forced me to live with a gay man and you didn’t tell me. He said he didn’t know. ... He said he never asks. And I said what do you mean you never ask? How can you assign two men to live together and not know or ask if one of them is gay? He said I have no right to ask. And I said you have a responsibility. If you’re going to place them in a living situation, which can be an incredible temptation to them.”

Haley says that he repeatedly asked Loverde “whether there was anything wrong with homosexual priests, and he kept saying that there was nothing wrong, and I was floored by that.” How a U.S. bishop could claim there is nothing wrong with gay priests given the homosexual abuse scandals of the last year is dumbfounding. The facts show that around 90 percent of the abuse cases involve homosexual priests preying on teenage boys. It is a gay priest problem. The U.S. bishops, some of whom are also homosexual, apparently don’t want to address the problem in a medicinal and charitable way. They apparently would rather see gay priests continue as slaves to their sexual addictions and compulsions rather than be cured through therapy and the sacraments.

The Arlington Diocese needs such a cure, as details from Fr. Haley’s deposition reveal. For instance, in speaking with Bishop Keating about the problem, Haley said: “[In] my first assignment [at St. Louis parish].... A man came to the back door asking for Billy. And I thought he meant somebody at the AA meeting.... And he said no, I want Billy. And I said I don’t know whom you’re talking about. And he said Bill Shart, who was the associate [pastor] there.

"I went upstairs, knocked on the door, and he opened the door and he was stark naked. And he was surprised to see me, but he was not surprised the door – that somebody had knocked at the door. ... And I said there's somebody down here who wants to see 'Billy.' To which he responded, 'Send him up.'

"... And I said and then I was at Saint Louis and my pastor, Father Irace [now-rector of St. Thomas More Cathedral], used to have an extraordinarily gay-looking masseuse come and give him personal massages in his bedroom. And there were dinner conversations that would indicate that there was a rupture in these priests' life.

"For example, he [Fr. Irace] said celibacy and chastity are separate. Just because you're celibate doesn't mean you have to be chaste. And if you're gay, you know, you could be attracted and even involved sexually with other men and you haven't broken your vow of celibacy." Irace is the rector of Bishop Loverde's cathedral who recently chastised a parishioner for kneeling for Communion. He also yelled at the parishioner, Del. Richard Black, calling him a "liar" and a "conservative idiot."

Fr. Haley goes on to say that he didn't learn the extent and interconnectedness of the homosexual priest network until he started talking to Fr. William Erbacher. The latter was/is good friends with the diocesan chancellor, Fr. Rippy, and Fr. Daniel Sychala, said Haley. In speaking with Erbacher, Fr. Haley said: "He knowingly pointed out members of the clergy in Arlington who were gay and gave evidence of that, associations. For example, he had gone through the picture book of Saint Lawrence and showed me the boys of the previous pastor, Father McAfee."

According to Haley, Fr. McAfee used to pay teenage boys \$500 to \$1000 to continue as altar boys long into their teenage years. And, according to Erbacher, Fr. McAfee would take those boys to his beach home, said Haley. Fr. Fasano apparently did the same thing: took teenage boys to his beach home.

"I was becoming aware through other means that other pastors and priests had problems," said Haley. "And certainly one of my classmates had gone into the bishop several times with incidents that would shock anyone. Came home and saw his pastor at Saint Mary's anally raping or having intercourse with the black maintenance man in the living room or going to a parish where the priest had an 18-year rela-

tionship with a gay man.

"... Other priests who came to me said that they had been molested by priests of our diocese, that they had been fondled and approached. It was just becoming much, much more apparent to me how significant the problem was and how secret it was.

"... Father Rippy and Father Erbacher had traveled together to Las Vegas several times. There were conversations that Father Erbacher had been trained by certain priests of the diocese on how to handle and obtain money. ... [I]f you were going to take cash from the collection, you had to be consistent, you know." In later testimony, Fr. Haley said that a Msgr. Brown had taught Fr. Erbacher and Fr. Sychala how to commit tax fraud by using a personal credit card.

Haley continued: "... I became aware that even Father Erbacher, himself, was engaged in stealing funds and in homosexual activity, a large collection of homosexual material."

Fr. Haley then disclosed that in conversations with Fr. Erbacher the latter disclosed the "full history" of Bishop Loverde and his assignment and friendship with Archbishop Cronin. According to Haley, Erbacher indicated "Incredible discretions of Archbishop Cronin with other men." Erbacher also reportedly claimed that Cronin was instrumental in getting Loverde appointed as bishop.

When asked by an attorney whether there was any inference by Erbacher of a homosexual relationship between Loverde and Cronin, Fr. Haley said: "No. But certainly there was about Bishop Loverde and his – and a Brother David Eddie who lives with him and has lived with him for more than 15 years, 18 years or something." Br. Eddie, an Xavierian religious, has been with Bishop Loverde for many years, moving with him from assignment to assignment. Br. Eddie reportedly is Bishop Loverde's assistant. Such a relationship between a bishop and a religious brother is extraordinary, said one priest in the Arlington Diocese, who asked not to be identified. This priest further disclosed that, despite appearances, there is much opposition to Bishop Loverde from conservative priests in the Arlington Diocese – and Loverde knows it. That's why Loverde has yet to allow altar girls, for example.

Fr. Erbacher, as noted, told Fr. Haley about some of the gay priests in the Arlington Diocese and their twisted exploits. When asked by an attorney under oath who those gay priests were that Erbacher

discussed, Haley said: “Certainly it seemed that the chancellor, Father Rippy and Bill Saunders and Danny Spsychala and Bill Erbacher were all gay and had a very strong bond and were very supportive and defensive of each other. There [were] conversations about Father Verrecchia and some of his relationships with some of the gays in the diocese, including his replacement as MC [Master of Ceremonies for the bishop].”

Richard Mullins replaced Verrecchia as MC. “Richard Mullins and, you know, in conversations [with Erbacher] that were just phenomenal,” said Haley. “[Mullins is] always over there with Monsignor Bransfield, you know. And I said who’s Monsignor Bransfield? He said he’s the – he runs the National Shrine, you know, the Immaculate Conception. And I said, what are you telling me? He said he’s one of the boys. He’s got a big boy’s club. They have big parties over there. Just phenomenal stories.”

“Q: Now when you say ‘boys,’ this is parties with young boys?”

“A: No, fellow gay priests.”

The National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C., is the largest Catholic Church in the United States. It is dedicated to Mary, the Mother of God, and particularly honors the fact that God preserved her from the stain of Original Sin from the moment of her conception. When Mary appeared to St. Bernadette in Lourdes, France, she said: “I am the Immaculate Conception.” If homosexual priests associated with the shrine are engaging in gay parties there, or nearby, it reflects a perverse – diabolical –state of affairs in the Church.

Fr. Haley says that Fr. Irace, the rector of Bishop Loverde’s cathedral – St. Thomas More in Arlington – defends homosexual relations among priests. Fr. Haley says that the chancellor for the diocese, Fr. Rippy, is a homosexual in a tightly knit network. It’s worth noting that a former chancellor for the diocese, Msgr. William Reinecke, committed suicide in 1992 after a man accused him of molesting him 25 years earlier. Another diocesan priest was arrested for making homosexual advances and masturbating in a car. And Fr. Keith Ramey, former pastor of Queen of Apostles parish, was known as a flamboyant homosexual – in 1995 he was found dead in a bathtub with a bag over his head. Now, according to Haley in his deposition, there also is Fr. Spsychala, Fr. Saunders, Fr. Erbacher, Fr. Hamilton, Fr. Mullins,

Msgr. Bransfield, Archbishop Cronin, and other cardinals and bishops named by Bishop Keating. There undoubtedly are more.

Of course, Bishop Loverde says there is nothing wrong with homosexual priests. And he has supported a law that allows gays to adopt children. One cannot help but wonder if the Nancy Lambert lawsuit wasn’t the real reason for Loverde’s action against Fr. Haley. Perhaps there were other, more disturbing forces at work.

# # #  
Michael Chapman is a freelance writer.

### What Now?

Each week RCF receives letters or calls from individuals who have had their world shattered because of the actions of some heartless, gutless effeminate priest or bishop. Just today I received a heart-felt letter from an 82 year old life-long Catholic woman who wants nothing more than to be able to live out her days working by helping others and serving our lord as all are called to do. Unfortunately a parish priest has other ideas.

In a recent bulletin Father informed her and the other parishioners that kneeling or genuflecting before receiving our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament was not permitted. Of course Father blamed it on the Vatican, new Church law, and liturgical law. While this situation took place in the Joliet diocese it is played out in almost every other diocese in the country. While this one example of abuse may seem trivial to many, added to all the other abuses it can be devastating to those older Catholics, who are isolated and whose only sanctuary is their local parish. The priests who play such games with the lives of believing Catholics– these priests who proclaim social justice more important than “rules”-are in fact cold and calculated as they go about destroying lives. They pollute and dilute the faith in an attempt to ease their own conscience.

**NOT ONE MORE PENNY!**

# Speaking Out On "The Scandal"

by Paul Likoudis

"AMCHURCH COMES OUT" - Paul Likoudis' important book, is easily ordered at [www.rcf.org](http://www.rcf.org).

Nine months after The *Boston Globe* pushed to the fore the issue of homosexual pedophilia among Catholic clergy and the decades-long episcopal cover-up, with the subsequent nationwide exposure of some of the U.S. Church's deepest and most expensively guarded secrets, it is time to assess "The Scandal" in view of correcting mistakes and ending habits of episcopal abuse. Those mistakes extend far beyond the relatively limited area of the physical sexual abuse of minors.

The editors of *The Wanderer* can speak with some authority on the matter. In the nearly 20 years we have reported on sex scandals, cover-ups, and the abusive exercise of episcopal authority, we have been sued, threatened with lawsuits, slandered, maligned, and blacklisted by the U.S. bishops, who even spent time in the executive session at one of their November plenary meetings discussing how to put *The Wanderer* out of business after we exposed a bishop for buying his office.

Unfortunately, for an episcopacy that puts its trust in Band-Aid solutions and PR firms, the solution to the current sexual abuse problem and the larger crisis of the loss of bishops' credibility will require a genuine *mea culpa*, and a repudiation of past "pastoral" programs and policies.

As the evidence mounts that a homosexual network came to power in the U.S. Church, it is more than a little disconcerting that the U.S. bishops still cannot admit their two most serious problems: the infestation of the clergy and seminaries with homosexual predators, and the issue of sex education, including homosexual proselytization (i.e. "fighting homophobia") both of which are the engines driving the sexual revolution, especially in the Church.

Consider: Since the scandals broke earlier this year, the late Bishop James Rausch of Phoenix, the second general secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops who oversaw the Call to Action conference in 1976 – which institutionalized dissent in the U.S. Church – has been exposed as a homosexual predator; newspapers in Illinois are demanding a full investigation of the alleged homosexual predations of Bishop

Daniel Ryan of Springfield, Ill., years after those same newspapers criticized Stephen Brady of Roman Catholic Faithful for making the charges; Bishop Anthony O'Connell of Palm Beach, Fla., resigned amidst allegations he abused males at a minor seminary; and new lawsuits against disgraced Santa Rosa Bishop G. Patrick Ziemann allege he began sexually abusing young men at least as soon as he was ordained a priest – and the lawsuits allege Roger Cardinal Mahony of Los Angeles, Ziemann's mentor, paid out \$5 million so Ziemann would not have to testify about what he knew about sexual misconduct at the archdiocesan seminary.

And what can one say of the revelations that Archbishop Rembert Weakland of Milwaukee was involved in a homosexual relationship? As one of the most influential prelates in the U.S. Church over the past two decades, Weakland's particular avocation seemed to be the deconstruction of Catholic worship, and indications are he empowered kindred people in his pet cause of "liturgical renewal."

In recent months as well, local and national press reports have revealed the extent of the homosexual infiltration of the U.S. bishops' most important agencies or offices. The recent allegations against Fr. John Huels, one of the bishops' top experts in matters of liturgy and canon law, came on the heels of revelations about a number of other alleged molesters working in the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy (assistant director Fr. Kenneth Martin, last year) and the executive director of the Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions, Fr. Michael Spillane, this summer.

Catholics, and non-Catholics as well, have learned that the treatment centers where the U.S. bishops sent offending priests were often set up and staffed by dissident and pro-homosexual priests, who were in some instances pederasts themselves. As time goes by, Catholics will inevitably learn how many of the bishops' top catechists, theologians, Scripture scholars, and spirituality experts, the ones on the "religious education circuit," were also abusers. We're only at the beginning.



But the bishops are not explaining how so many sexual revolutionaries came to power. Instead, they are resorting to a number of high-profile gimmicks: hiring public relations firms to “get the real message out,” instituting background checks on priests, lay volunteers, catechists, and even the men who turn the spits at the parish chicken barbecue, dredging up decades-old records of aged or deceased clergy and turning them over to local prosecutors, establishing hotlines and lay-review boards made up of local experts and dissident Catholics.

The most egregious misstep the U.S. bishops’ leadership made was selecting such professionals to staff their new National Review Board as pro-abortion Leon Panetta, former chief of staff and apologist for the libidinous President Bill Clinton, and Dr. Paul McHugh, who is associated with Johns Hopkins University and Dr. Fred Berlin and John Money (see *The Wanderer*, May 30, 2002, p. 1, Reflections on . . . The Homosexual Network and the 1985 Clergy Sex Abuse Report”).

As “The Scandal” deepens daily, a claim I make in *Am-church Comes Out: The U.S. Bishops, Pedophile Scandals, and the Homosexual Agenda* resonates more and more: “[M]ost Catholics are completely oblivious to the fact that the public outing of clerical sexual perverts – and one hastens to add, the public exposure of episcopal malfeasance, abuse, incompetence, and cover-ups – serves a very valuable function for the sexual revolutionaries in the Church: They demoralize faithful Catholics and deconstruct the traditional understanding and practice of the faith.”

That is precisely what is happening across America: Catholics are becoming demoralized, desensitized, and suspicious. And despite the shedding of episcopal tears in Dallas this summer, there seem to be no regrets, no reparations, no firm resolve to amend their “pastoral practices.” If anything, the modernists’ agenda for a priestless Church seems closer to reality, and some of the most notorious of the pro-homosexualist bishops in the country, such as Rochester’s Matthew Clark and Albany’s Howard Hubbard, are using the scandal to p u s h their vision of the “lay-run church.”

As the U.S. bishops prepare for their November meeting, some subjects are clearly off the table, and some facts are simply unmentionable, especially those relating to the bishops’ commitment to classroom sex education.

One ignored fact is that some of the most vicious lay

and clerical pederasts and pedophiles believed that the sexual abuse they inflicted was justified as therapeutic sex education. Boston-area youth minister Christopher Reardon, who abused nearly 250 young boys, some as young as five, told a judge at his sentencing he was merely providing sex education. In Tucson, Msgr. Robert Trupia was given the responsibility of teaching sex education to Catholic school children after diocesan officials knew he was sexually abusing young boys. The Tucson Diocese, I charge in great detail in the book, virtually sold every child in the Catholic school system as guinea pigs to radical sex researchers at the University of Arizona – without parental knowledge or consent, which violated federal, state, and university laws and policies on at least five counts.

With so many priests, laity, and youth ministers in the news recently for the individual sexual attention they provided young people since the U.S. bishops put their imprimatur on classroom sex ed in their 1968 pastoral letter, *Human Life in Our Day*, maybe the bishops should seriously examine their consciences on this matter.

Instead, however, we are seeing an accelerated campaign to promote, fully support, and implement homosexual proselytization programs for Catholic elementary and high school students under the guise of “sexual catechesis” or “safe school” programs. And parents who object are subject to humiliating, degrading put-downs, such as those chancery officials in Boston gave parents who reported the predatory activities of Fathers John Geoghan and Paul Shanley.

Bernard Cardinal Law took a beating in the press following the broadcasting of depositions he gave in June which showed his contempt for ordinary lay people. But Law’s abuse of a few individuals pales in comparison to the abuse bishops meted out to millions of Catholic parents from Boston to Los Angeles who have objected to 35 years of vile, intrusive “sexual catechesis,” now morphing into intense pro-homosexual propaganda in programs such as Fr. Richard Sparks’ *Growing in Love*, which carries the imprimatur of Archbishop Jerome Hanus, O.S.B., of Dubuque.

Typical of the abuse Catholic parents and their children must suffer is exemplified by the “safe schools” project in the Archdiocese of St. Paul-Minneapolis, documented in the August 15 issue of *The Wanderer*. There, parents of students at one of the archdiocese’s top schools, Cretin-Derham Hall, are essentially told

that if they do not accept the homosexual proselytization of their children, they are dissenters and out of sync with the Church.

It is strange beyond words that while the U.S. Church is caught in the grip of a deepening sexual abuse scandal, no Church leaders will acknowledge the fact that their own sex education programs are abusive in themselves and render children vulnerable to sexual abuse and misconduct. Even more bizarre, according to the most recent news reports, the bishops will accelerate their sex education of children and parents under the aegis of teaching them about sexual abuse! And who will be doing the sex education, in many instances? The same dissidents who occupy Church structures – chanceries, schools, and parishes – and who attend the national meetings of New Ways Ministry, the National Association of Catholic Diocesan Lesbian & Gay Ministries (NACDLGM), the National Catholic AIDS Network (the agendas and actions of which are comprehensively detailed and documented in my book), and other homosexual advocacy groups, many of which exist with the blessing of individual bishops and the national conference of bishops.

More appalling yet in this multi-seasonal storm of sexual abuse scandals is the fact that the Archdiocese of Cincinnati will host later this month the annual NACDLGM conference, with Archbishop Daniel Pilarczyk celebrating Mass for this gathering of pro-homosexual activists, and with his auxiliary, Bishop Carl Moeddel, speaking. This year's conference is directed to the parents and families of homosexuals, and to their conversion to accepting the homosexual movement.

### **An Appeal**

As this debacle continues, it is time for all concerned Catholics to become active.

First, I invite Catholics - and concerned non-Catholics – to learn the dynamics of the sexual revolution in the Catholic Church, and how homosexuals use scandal to advance their agenda, which I explain and illustrate in *Amchurch*. This book is the product of more than ten years of intense study, observation, listening to victims, outraged parents, and writing on this infiltration and sabotage of the American Catholic Church and its educational and catechetical functions.

Second, I would like all concerned Catholics, if they

are able, to provide local media – newspapers, radio, and television – and pastors with *Amchurch Comes Out* to help them understand the real problem of homosexual proselytization in the Church under the guise of sex education or “safe schools” and “tolerance” and the refusal of bishops to address this grave matter.

Third, I would like Catholics to provide their bishop with a copy of the book, with an appeal that he consider its contents and offer a response. If bishops cannot or will not deny the thesis and the facts, they must reach the obvious conclusion that the 40-year experiment in sexual indoctrination and desensitization be mercifully terminated and replaced with solid moral catechesis.

Perhaps the Catholic laity can generate some interest by encouraging libraries to order the book, by writing letters to the editor or op-ed essays for the local newspapers and newsletters and even the diocesan newspaper, calling radio and television talk shows, explaining that this book provides a different perspective on the scandal than the conventional reporting provided by the pro-homosexualist mainstream media.

For more than 30 years, scores of bishops have stonewalled, deceived, lied to, and ignored parents who have seen their children victimized and led into moral chaos by sex educators and sex education programs, and have covered up the enormously tragic consequences of their sex education agenda, which has enervated Catholic family life and marriage.

If readers can make this point to friends, neighbors, fellow parishioners, and can create some kind of popular pressure that places this fact before the public at large, perhaps the bishops will be forced, at least, to acknowledge the problem, if not begin the obvious solution of purging these programs and their advocates from their dioceses and parishes.

*(Paul Likoudis is news editor for The Wanderer, the oldest, independent national Catholic weekly newspaper in the United States, and author of the recently published Amchurch Comes Out: the U.S. Bishops, Pedophile Scandals and the Homosexual Agenda (Roman Catholic Faithful). The previous editorial appeared, in slightly different form, in the September 19, 2002 issue of The Wanderer.)*

# The Bishop's Basement

*"The floor of Hell is paved with the skulls of bishops"*

Saint John Chrysostom

"Jesus sent me here to love you," declared homosexual **Bishop Daniel Ryan** (Springfield, IL) as male prostitutes collected their pay. Later, **Ryan** blessed one of the men as he heard his confession. "Go and sin no more," he admonished, then added with a wink, "see you later." (*Taken from a statement made by one of the boy prostitutes*)

"The bishops will certainly apologize – will that be enough?" said **Francis Cardinal George** as he made his way to the June, 2002 conference to set a policy on child abuse by priests. (*Chicago Sun Times, June 11, 2002*)

The Church must regain the laity's trust, said **Cardinal George** in a homily celebrating the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary Mass at **St. Juliana's Catholic Church** in Chicago in June, 2002. "What do you want?" later demanded the Cardinal of **Michael J. Tario**, a member of the *ad hoc* committee for the prevention of clergy sexual abuse. Tario, a Chicago banker, had just issued a press release outlining needed changes for abuse prevention and asked for an audience with His Eminence.

*Move over, Joe Namath!* Eighth grade male students making a spiritual retreat at **St. Mary Immaculate Church** in **Plainfield, Illinois**, were greeted by an unusual request. As part of a "team-building" exercise, they were instructed by a youth minister present to don women's panty hose over their clothes and pose for pictures. The embarrassed youngsters complied and subsequently complained to their parents. The parents took the case to the pastor, **Fr. Anthony Nugent**. When they received no response from Nugent,

they took the matter to the police. The aftermath: **Mrs. Annalisa Gianna** was told that her family was no longer welcome in the parish and her two sons were expelled from the school. Parish officials explained that Gianna violated a "parental code of conduct" by filing a police report. **Plainfield** is in the **Joliet Diocese**, led by **Bishop Joseph Imesch**. Imesch is standing by the pastor's decision. (*Joliet Herald News, October 12, 2002*)

**Bishop Joseph Galante**, while at the **Dallas Bishops' Conference**, stated in June, 2002: "**Fr. Cliff Garner** is undergoing counseling. As long as his behavior is appropriate, he will be alright." (*Garner has admitted to a fondness for young Hispanic males and was a member of St. Sebastian's Angels, a group of homosexual priests who shared pictures of nude males with one another. The group's website featured a video loop of an ejaculating penis.*)

*Is your bishop or priest doing something that you believe is wrong? Take them to task! Send your information to "My Story" in care of RCF. First-hand or verifiable accounts only, please. Unsigned reports will not be published, but your name can be withheld upon request. Your photographs are welcome and will be returned on request.*

**Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc., PO Box 109, Petersburg, Illinois 62675 / [www.rcf.org](http://www.rcf.org) / 217-632-5920**

## ***THE PRIESTHOOD***

*“But how, I ask, does it happen that the saints, who live only for God, resist their ordination through a sense of their unworthiness, and that some run blindly to the priesthood, and rest not until they attain it by lawful or unlawful means? Ah. Unhappy men! Says St. Bernard, to be registered among the priests of God shall be for them the same as to be enrolled on the catalogue of the damned. And why? Because such persons are generally called to the priesthood, not by God, but by relatives, by interest, or ambition. Thus they enter the house of God, not through the motive a priest should have, but through worldly motives. Behold why the faithful are abandoned, the Church dishonored, so many souls perish, and with them such priests are also damned.”*

*St. Alphonsus De Liguori*