

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bishop Bevilacqua
FROM: Father Dattilo *nCD*
DATE: September 11, 1985
RE: Bishop Guilfoyle's Request

Bishop Guilfoyle's letter requesting temporary or permanent assignment in the Diocese of Pittsburgh for Fr. John Connor does not indicate the nature of Fr. Connor's problem. We need more information.

I have several concerns and questions about the request.

1) We have no priests assigned to teach high school. Our men in school work are either chaplains or headmasters who may teach an occasional class. Faculties are already set for this school year. We have at least 3 priests who have asked to teach. Bishop Guilfoyle indicates Fr. Connor has taught high school for many years. Does Fr. Connor have any parish experience? Could a parish assignment cause Fr. Connor stress and help him revert to his problem?

2) If the problem is alcohol, there must have been scandal to necessitate an assignment outside the diocese. What happened?

3) Can we trust the evaluation of Southdown i.e. no basic or lasting problem? I seem to remember you telling Fr. Bober and me that you have reservations about Southdown.

4) If the problem is homosexuality or pedophilia we could be accepting a difficulty with which we have had no post-therapeutic experience. We are only now working on a follow-up program.

5) Why was Pittsburgh recommended when there are so many dioceses in dire need of priests? Could it be because the director of Southdown is Fr. Canice Connors, O.F.M. who was stationed in Pittsburgh for several years in the 1970's.

If, after you have talked with Bishop Guilfoyle you believe there is no serious risk in accepting Fr. Connor, we will do everything we can to keep the tradition of bishops helping bishops intact.

I cannot guarantee that there is no serious risk.
AJB
9/17/85

A 1985 memo to Bishop Bevilacqua (then Bishop of Pittsburgh) concerning Fr. John Connor's proposed transfer to the diocese. The Camden, N.J., priest had been arrested for sexually abusing a 14-year-old boy. Bishop Bevilacqua's handwritten notation reads: "I cannot guarantee there is no serious risk. AJB 9/17/85." GJ-988



CAMDEN DIOCESAN CENTER

1845 Haddon Avenue

P.O. Box 709
Camden, N.J. 08101
Phone (609) 756-7900

September 12, 1988

MEMORANDUM

TO: MONSIGNOR BOKUSA
FROM: BISHOP GUILFOYLE
RE: FR. JOHN P. CONNOR

Father Connor has been assigned as Associate Pastor of St. Matthew Church, Conshohocken, Pa., effective October 1, 1988. Archbishop Bevilacqua called to tell me of this last week. Certainly no one knows more than Archbishop Bevilacqua about Father Connor's background over these past several years.

A memo from Camden, N.J.'s Bishop George Guilfoyle, discussing Archbishop Bevilacqua's 1988 appointment of Fr. Connor to St. Matthew parish in Conshohocken. The memo contradicts Cardinal Bevilacqua's testimony that he did not know Fr. Connor's background. GJ-986

D-17

D-31

Section I

Introduction to the Grand Jury Report

This report contains the findings of the Grand Jury: how dozens of priests sexually abused hundreds of children; how Philadelphia Archdiocese officials – including Cardinal Bevilacqua and Cardinal Krol – excused and enabled the abuse; and how the law must be changed so that it doesn't happen again. Some may be tempted to describe these events as tragic. Tragedies such as tidal waves, however, are outside human control. What we found were not acts of God, but of men who acted in His name and defiled it.

But the biggest crime of all is this: it worked. The abuser priests, by choosing children as targets and trafficking on their trust, were able to prevent or delay reports of their sexual assaults, to the point where applicable statutes of limitations expired. And Archdiocese officials, by burying those reports they did receive and covering up the conduct, similarly managed to outlast any statutes of limitation. As a result, these priests and officials will necessarily escape criminal prosecution. We surely would have charged them if we could have done so.

But the consequences are even worse than the avoidance of criminal penalties. Sexually abusive priests were either left quietly in place or “recycled” to unsuspecting new parishes – vastly expanding the number of children who were abused. It didn't have to be this way. Prompt action and a climate of compassion for the child victims could have significantly limited the damage done. But the Archdiocese chose a different path.

psychological abuse that scarred their lives and sapped the faith in which they had been raised.

These are the kinds of things that Archdiocese priests did to children:

- ▶ A girl, **11 years old**, was **raped** by her priest and became **pregnant**. The Father took her in for an **abortion**.
- ▶ A 5th-grader was molested by her priest **inside the confessional booth**.
- ▶ A teenage girl was groped by her priest while she lay **immobilized in traction in a hospital bed**. The priest stopped only when the girl was able to ring for a nurse.
- ▶ A boy was repeatedly molested in his own **school auditorium**, where his priest/teacher **bent the boy over and rubbed** his genitals against the boy until the priest **ejaculated**.
- ▶ A priest, no longer satisfied with mere pederasty, regularly began forcing sex on **two boys at once** in his bed.
- ▶ A boy woke up intoxicated in a priest's bed to find the Father sucking on his penis **while three other priests watched** and masturbated themselves.
- ▶ A priest offered money to boys in exchange for **sadomasochism** – directing them to place him in **bondage**, to “break” him, to make him their “**slave**,” and to defecate so that he could lick excrement from them.
- ▶ A 12-year-old, who was raped and sodomized by his priest, **tried to commit suicide**, and remains **institutionalized in a mental hospital** as an adult.
- ▶ A priest told a 12-year-old boy that his **mother** knew of and **had agreed to the priest's repeated rape** of her son.
- ▶ A boy who told his father about the abuse his younger brother was suffering was **beaten** to the point of unconsciousness. “**Priests don't do that**,” said the father as he punished his son for what he thought was a vicious lie against the clergy.

Section III – Overview of the Cover-up by Archdiocese Officials

The behavior of Archdiocese officials was perhaps not so lurid as that of the individual priest sex abusers. But in its callous, calculating manner, the Archdiocese's "handling" of the abuse scandal was at least as immoral as the abuse itself. The evidence before us established that Archdiocese officials at the highest levels received reports of abuse; that they chose not to conduct any meaningful investigation of those reports; that they left dangerous priests in place or transferred them to different parishes as a means of concealment; that they never alerted parents of the dangers posed by these offenders (who typically went out of their way to be friendly and helpful, especially with children); that they intimidated and retaliated against victims and witnesses who came forward about abuse; that they manipulated "treatment" efforts in order to create a false impression of action; and that they did many of these things in a conscious effort simply to avoid civil liability.

In short, as abuse reports grew, the Archdiocese chose to call in the lawyers rather than confront the abusers. Indeed Cardinal Bevilacqua himself was a lawyer, with degrees from both a canon law school and an American law school. Documents and testimony left us with no doubt that he and Cardinal Krol were personally informed of almost all of the allegations of sexual abuse by priests, and personally decided or approved of how to handle those allegations.

Here are some incidents that exemplify the manner in which the Archdiocese responded to the sexual abuse of its most vulnerable parishioners:

- ▶ The Archdiocese official in charge of abuse investigations described one abusive priest as "**one of the sickest people I ever knew.**" Yet Cardinal Bevilacqua allowed him to continue in ministry, with full access to children – until the priest scandal broke in 2002.

- ▶ One abusive priest was **transferred so many times** that, according to the Archdiocese’s own records, they were **running out of places to send him** where he would not already be known.
- ▶ On at least one occasion Cardinal Bevilacqua agreed to harbor a known abuser from another diocese, giving him a cover story and a neighborhood parish here because the priest’s arrest for child abuse had aroused too much controversy there. Officials referred to this sort of practice as **“bishops helping bishops.”**
- ▶ A **nun who complained** about a priest who was still ministering to children – even after he was convicted of receiving child pornography – **was fired** from her position as director of religious education.
- ▶ A **seminarian** studying for the priesthood **who revealed that he himself had been abused** as an altar boy was accused of homosexuality – and **was dismissed from the diocese**. He was able to become a priest only by relocating to another area.
- ▶ When the Archdiocese did purport to seek psychological evaluation of a priest, the **primary tool for diagnosis was “self reporting”** – in other words, whether the abuser was willing to admit that he was a pedophile. Absent such a “diagnosis,” the Archdiocese declined to treat any priest as a pedophile, no matter how compelling the evidence.
- ▶ Even when admitted, the abuse was excused: an Archdiocese official comforted one sexually abusive priest by **suggesting that the priest had been “seduced” by his 11-year-old victim**.
- ▶ An Archdiocese official explained that the church could not discipline one especially egregious abuser because, as the official put it, he was **not a “pure pedophile”** – that is, he not only abused little boys; he also slept with women.
- ▶ When one priest showed signs of seeking penance from his victims, the church-run “treatment” facility urged Archdiocese officials to move him to another assignment away from the victims – in other words, transfer him before he apologizes again.

Such cynicism toward priest sexual abuse may not have started in Philadelphia; indeed media reports have revealed strikingly similar tactics throughout the country.

Bishops in other dioceses also shuttled abusive priests from parish to parish, until there was no place left to go, ignored repeated reports of abuse, absent a direct confession or

“diagnosis” of pedophilia, and looked to legalisms, at the expense of decency. But these parallels, far from excusing Philadelphia church officials, serve only to underscore that their actions were no accident. They knew what they were doing.

Section IV – Legal Analysis and Recommendations

The notion of prosecuting a priest – let alone a high Church official or even the Archdiocese itself – may seem shocking to some. But our oath required us to explore any criminal statute whose terms might fit the conduct we discovered. By the same token, we were obligated not to recommend criminal charges against priests or church leaders merely because of our moral outrage at what they did, over and over again. What we found was that many offenses applied to the evidence before us, but were barred by statutes of limitation, while many others narrowly failed to apply because of what we believe are unintended or unwise limitations in the law.

With regard to the priest offenders, any number of sexual offenses were readily made out by the evidence: rape, involuntary deviate sexual intercourse, statutory sexual assault, indecent assault, endangering welfare of children, corruption of minors. In every case, however, our information was simply too old. As we learned from experts in the field, it takes many years – often decades – before most victims of child sexual abuse are able to come forward. By then it is simply too late to prosecute, at least under current Pennsylvania law. We are convinced that more recent victims exist, and perhaps in the future they will be able to give testimony. For now we were able to document many assaults, but none still prosecutable.

A. The evidence reveals that child sexual abuse follows regular patterns.

When we gathered, many of the Jurors did not understand the dynamics of clergy members' sexual abuse of minors. We could not understand how children who were so awfully abused could fail to tell anyone or, worse, would return to their abuser again and again. We learned from one of the leading American experts in the field, Kenneth Lanning, formerly of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the answer lies in the twisted relationship that acquaintance molesters initiate with their victims.

Those who prey on children first are careful in selecting their victims. They seek out vulnerable children who are needy for attention, often because of difficulties at home, because vulnerable children are easiest to mold to the abuser's desires. They then achieve power over their victims in a process that the experts call "grooming." Child molesters have enormous patience, identifying and pursuing victims sometimes for months before initiating the abuse. One might take a child to the beach, the cinema, or the local ice cream parlor, showering his prey with toys and treats. He will give his victim what the child believes is benign attention and "love." Abusers also often befriend the families of their victims, visiting their homes, becoming dinner guests, exploiting parishioners' reverence for the priesthood. The parents are pleased and flattered by a priest's attentions to their children.

What surprised the Jurors most in Lanning's lengthy testimony was that so many of these men come across as "nice guys," that they can be so outwardly likeable. Mothers and fathers like them. The children who are their targets often love them. These are not "Stranger Danger" predators who look shady or menacing; they are the pillars of the

Catholic community, respected and admired by all. Meanwhile, many of the targeted children do not understand sex in the first instance, so that when the priest reaches the point where he begins to act out sexually, the victims are utterly defenseless. As the abuse continues, their initial confusion turns to guilt and shame over what they believe they have allowed to happen. Many victims continue to think that priests can do no wrong or feel responsible for making a “good” priest go bad.

For the vulnerable child who craves love and security, and the devout child raised never to question the clergy’s authority, it becomes nearly impossible to break free from the abusive priest, even after the sexual abuse begins. Experts refer to this phenomenon as the “trauma bond.” Even though the abusive relationship is terribly damaging to the victim, he finds it difficult to remove himself from it because of the priest’s power over him and the psychological and emotional bond that has resulted.

1. Sexually abused children rarely report their abuse.

Related to the question of why victims seem unable to break free of their abusers is the question of why it takes some victims decades to report priest sexual abuse. We learned there are many reasons for delayed reporting. Most of the victims are devout and/or come from devout families. Therefore, many of them regard priests as God’s representatives on Earth. The well-educated priests, for their part, know very well the esteem in which trusting children and their parents hold them, and they manipulate that trust to ensure the victims’ silence. Some of the priests whose cases we examined told their victims that God had sanctioned the sexual relationship and would punish them if they revealed it. Others told children that they loved them, and that the sexual abuse

should be their little secret. Still others told their prey that they, the victims, were responsible for the abuse, and that no one would believe them if they told.

Psychological denial is not an unusual response to trauma, confusion, shame, and despair. And there are other, powerful disincentives to report a priest's abuse. Some victims fear damaging the Church's reputation. Others fear their parents' disbelief or anger – not toward the priest, but toward them. Some worry that such a horrific revelation could destroy their parents' sustaining faith in the Church. Many adolescent boys fear that revealing sexual contact with a man would call into question whether they are heterosexual.

2. The lifelong impact extends from isolation to “soul murder.”

The priests' manipulation of their victims, we found, can be as cunning as it is cruel. Often the offenders isolate their victims from others, dominating their time, criticizing their parents and friends, and discouraging activities outside of the church and the priests' presence. The victims come to believe that the abusive relationship is the only one they have. This strategy of isolating victims not only deprives them of someone in whom they might confide; it also serves the priest's purpose – to continue the abusive relationship. Subsequently, the isolation often becomes one of the cruelest consequences of abuse, destroying families and lasting decades.

We saw victims who had been told by their abuser that their parents had sanctioned the priest's actions. In two cases, the victims discovered only recently, as they prepared to testify before the Grand Jury, that what the priest had told them was not true. For 20 years they had been estranged from their parents, sometimes hating them, because

they believed that their parents had knowingly allowed their abuse. If a priest and God could betray them, how could they know that their parents had not as well? Parents, for their part, cannot understand their abused children, who for no apparent reason have turned their backs on school, church, friends, and family. Who suddenly are not fun-loving and happy, but sullen and withdrawn. Who are abusing alcohol and drugs and acting out in other ways. The parents blame their children.

Meanwhile, if other children suspect a boy is being abused, they often ridicule the victim, suggesting he is homosexual. And not just children do this. We heard testimony about a nun, the teacher of one victim, who – after the boy reported his abuse to police – began calling him by a girl’s name in class, eliciting giggles from his fellow students.

Most devastating of all, we saw firsthand what Father Thomas Doyle calls “soul murder.” As Father Doyle, a conscientious Dominican priest who has assisted clergy-abuse victims around the world, points out, these children suffer from the abuse not just physically and psychologically, but spiritually. The faith they need to cope with the tragedies of life is for them forever defiled. In order for a priest to satisfy his sexual impulses, these children lose their innocence, their virginity, their security, and their faith. It is hard to think of a crime more heinous.

3. Priests who abuse minors usually have many victims.

Another thing we learned about sexual abuse of minors is that the offenders typically have numerous victims. We heard from experts that the compulsion that drives some priests to molest or rape children is not curable, that treatment and supervision need to be intense and lifelong, and that the recidivism rate is extremely high. In the files of

them feelings so that you could live every day and not be laying on the couch with a depression problem so bad that, you know, four days later you'd be in the same spot.

The Archdiocese files had the names of 11 boys who had been reported as victims of Fr. Brzyski. Three of his victims who testified before the Grand Jury provided names of still others they knew of. Sean told Jurors that he saw as many as a hundred photographs of boys, ages 13 to 16, many of them nude, which Fr. Brzyski kept in a box in his bedroom. One of the pictures was of Sean.

Father Nicholas Cudemo

A top aide to Cardinal Bevilacqua described Father Nicholas Cudemo to the Grand Jury as “one of sickest people I ever knew.” This priest raped an 11-year-old girl. He molested a 5th grader in the confessional. He invoked God to seduce and shame his victims. He maintained sexually abusive relationships simultaneously with several girls from the Catholic school where he was a teacher. His own family accused him of molesting his younger cousins.

Complaints of Fr. Cudemo's sexual abuse of adolescent girls began in 1966, with a letter to Cardinal Krol describing a three-year “affair” between the priest, then in his first assignment, and a junior at Lansdale Catholic High School. More allegations followed in 1968 and 1977, the latter alerting the Archdiocese to another long-term sexual relationship with a schoolgirl, and her possible pregnancy.

Father Cudemo began abusing another girl, “Ruth,” in the late 1960s when she was 9 or 10 years old. When she was 11, he began to rape her. He would then hear her confession. He convinced the child that she could not survive without him, and that only through her confession was she worthy of God's love. When Ruth became pregnant at

age 11 or 12, he took her for an abortion. He abused her until she was 17. She has suffered severely ever since.

Father Cudemo taught at three high schools – Bishop Neumann, Archbishop Kennedy, and Cardinal Dougherty – being transferred each time because of what were recorded in Archdiocese files as “particular friendships” with girls. He was then recycled through five parishes, and twice promoted by Cardinal Bevilacqua to serve as a parish pastor. The Grand Jury heard of at least 16 victims.

Father Gerard Chambers

Father Gerard Chambers was accused of molesting numerous altar boys, and of anally and orally raping at least one, during 40 years as a priest in the Archdiocese. Beginning in 1994, four of his victims came forward to the Archdiocese to talk about their abuse. (The victims were from his 14th and 15th assignments – Saint Gregory, in West Philadelphia; and Seven Dolors, in Wyndmoor.) One victim, “Benjamin,” told the Archdiocese that Fr. Chambers plied him with alcohol and cigarettes and then abused him, “hugging, kissing, masturbating” him and engaging in “mutual fondling of the genitals.” This happened in the church sacristy, at Fr. Chambers’ sister’s house, and in the priest’s car.

Another victim, “Owen,” has tried to commit suicide and has been institutionalized at a state mental hospital. Father Chambers anally and orally raped him when he was 12 years old. Owen was, and continues to be, especially devout. He suffers delusions because he cannot reconcile his faith in the Church with what happened to him. Two of his brothers, “George” and “Francis,” were also victims of Fr. Chambers and are still haunted by their abuse more than 40 years later. They described to the Grand Jury

how the abuse ruined their family – each boy withdrawing and suffering in silence, even though they knew, they said, on some level, that Fr. Chambers was abusing them all. They could not tell their parents, who taught them to be in “awe” of priests. Rather than confide in anyone, George said they just “stuffed it down.” But he began drinking at age 13, and still suffers from serious depression.

The victims named several other boys from Saint Gregory whom the priest had abused. One of the brothers testified that he believed Chambers “sexually abused every altar boy and quite frequently those who weren’t altar boys.”

Father Stanley Gana

Father Stanley Gana also sexually abused countless boys in a succession of parishes. One victim, “John,” who testified before the Grand Jury, had gone to Fr. Gana in 1977 because the then-14-year-old had been sexually abused by a family friend. Father Gana used his position as a counselor and the ruse of therapy to persuade the boy to have physical contact with him. This “therapy” slowly progressed to full-fledged sexual abuse, involving genital touching, masturbation, and oral and anal sodomy. It continued for more than five years. Father Gana abused John in the rectory, at a house at the New Jersey Shore, on trips, and at the priest’s weekend house in the Poconos. Often there were several boys involved in a weekend or on a trip, and Fr. Gana would have them take turns coming into his bed. Sometimes he would have sex with John and another boy, “Timmy,” at the same time.

Father Gana abused Timmy for nearly six years, beginning in 1980, when the boy was 13. The priest ingratiated himself with Timmy’s parents. He was a frequent dinner

Bevilacqua noted in the file of Fr. Connor, an admitted child molester, that the priest could present a “serious risk” if allowed to continue in ministry (which he was). Notes in the file of Fr. Peter Dunne show that Cardinal Bevilacqua also was aware that therapists recommend lifelong supervision and restricted access to children for pedophiles. (Fr. Dunne, a diagnosed pedophile, did not receive such supervision and was permitted to continue in parish ministry.)

Secretary for Clergy William Lynn displayed his understanding of child molestation when he told Fr. Thomas Shea that “the evidence of the medical profession” makes it “very unusual for such instances [of sexual abuse] to be with only one youngster.” Cardinal Bevilacqua and his staff also knew from experience that most victims do not report their abuse until many years later, if at all.

B. Archdiocese leaders employed deliberate strategies to conceal known abuse.

In the face of crimes they knew were being committed by their priests, Church leaders could have reported them to police. They could have removed the child molesters from ministry, and stopped the sexual abuse of minors by Archdiocesan clerics. Instead, they consistently chose to conceal the abuse rather than to end it. They chose to protect themselves from scandal and liability rather than protect children from the priests’ crimes.

For most of Cardinal Krol’s tenure, concealment mainly entailed persuading victims’ parents not to report the priests’ crimes to police, and transferring priests to other parishes if parents demanded it or if “general scandal” seemed imminent. When Cardinal

Bevilacqua took over as Archbishop in February 1988, concern over legal liability had joined fears of scandal. Dioceses across the country were grappling with the implications of a 1984 case in which a Louisiana diocese paid \$4.2 million to nine victims of a pedophile priest.

Cardinal Bevilacqua was trained as an attorney. (He holds degrees in Canon law from Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome, Italy, and in American law from St. Johns' University Law School in Queens, New York.) The Grand Jurors find that, in his handling of priests' sexual abuse, Cardinal Bevilacqua was motivated by an intent to keep the record clear of evidence that would implicate him or the Archdiocese. To this end, he continued many of the practices of his predecessor, Cardinal Krol, aimed at avoiding scandal, while also introducing policies that reflected a growing awareness that dioceses and bishops might be held legally responsible for their negligent and knowing actions that abetted known abusers.

To protect themselves from negative publicity or expensive lawsuits – while keeping abusive priests active – the Cardinals and their aides hid the priests' crimes from parishioners, police, and the general public. They employed a variety of tactics to accomplish this end.

1. Archdiocese leaders conducted non-investigations designed to avoid establishing priests' guilt.

At first, Grand Jurors wondered whether Archdiocese officials, including Cardinal Bevilacqua and his aides, were tragically incompetent at rooting out sexually abusive priests and removing them from ministry. Secretary for Clergy William Lynn suggested,

for example, that accusations made against Fr. Stanley Gana in 1992 – of anal rape, oral sodomy, and years of molestation of adolescent boys – “must have fallen through the cracks,” since Fr. Gana remained a pastor three more years until another allegation surfaced. Soon the Jurors came to realize that sexual abuse cases in the Philadelphia Archdiocese did not fall “through the cracks” by accident or mistake.

The Secretary for Clergy, whom Cardinal Bevilacqua assigned to investigate allegations of sexual abuse by priests, routinely failed to interview even named victims, not to mention rectory staff and colleagues in a position to observe the accused priests. The only “investigation” conducted after a victim reported being abused was to ask the priest if he did what was alleged. If the accused priest, whose very crime is characterized by deceit and secretiveness, denied the allegation, Archdiocese officials considered the allegation unproven. Monsignor Lynn professed to the Grand Jury that he could not determine the credibility of accusations – no matter how detailed the victims’ descriptions, or how many corroborating witnesses there might be, or how many similar accusations had been made against a priest by victims who did not know each other, or how incriminating a priest’s own explanation of the events.

The reason for Msgr. Lynn’s apparent lack of judgment, curiosity, or common sense in refusing to acknowledge the truth of abuse allegations became evident when Cardinal Bevilacqua testified. The Cardinal said that, when assigning and promoting priests, he disregarded anonymous or third-party reports of sexual crimes against children that were contained in many priests’ files. The Cardinal, like his Secretary for Clergy, claimed to be unable to determine whether the reports were true. He told the Grand Jury that he could not know without an investigation. And yet the staff, with his approval,

never truly investigated these reports – no matter how serious, how believable, or how easily verified. This was the case even when victims were named and other priests had witnessed and reported incidents. The Cardinal conceded under questioning that allegations against a priest were generally not labeled “credible” unless the priest happened to confess.

The Grand Jury is convinced that the Archdiocese could have identified scores of child molesters in the priesthood simply by encouraging other clergy to report what they witnessed – for example, incidents in which they saw fellow priests routinely take young boys, alone, into their bedrooms. We heard from many victims that their abuse had been witnessed by other priests. Fellow priests observed Frs. Nicholas Cudemo, Craig Brugger, Richard McLoughlin, Albert Kostelnick, Francis Rogers, James Brzyski, and John Schmeer as they were abusing young victims. None of these witnesses helped the children or reported what they saw. Father Donald Walker confirmed what we came to believe – that the Archdiocese had an unwritten rule discouraging “ratting on fellow priests.”

We were initially incredulous when Cardinal Bevilacqua insisted that Msgr. Lynn was very intelligent and competent. After all, the Secretary for Clergy’s “investigations” did not bother with witnesses, nor did they seek the truth or falsity of allegations, unless the priest happened to confess. But after reviewing files that all contained the same “incompetent” investigation techniques, it became apparent to the Grand Jurors that Msgr. Lynn was handling the cases precisely as his boss wished.

2. The Cardinals transferred known abusers to other parishes where their reputations were not known and parents could not, therefore, protect their children.

a. The decision whether to transfer a known abuser was determined by the threat of scandal or lawsuit, not by the priest's guilt or the danger he posed.

Father Donald Walker was one of three priests in Cardinal Krol's Chancery Office charged with investigating and handling sexual abuse allegations against priests. He explained to the Grand Jury how, during his tenure, the Archdiocese's primary goal in dealing with these cases was to reduce the risk of "scandal" to the Church. The Grand Jurors saw this pattern for ourselves as we reviewed the files of priests accused of molesting minors. Whether an accused molester stayed in his position, was transferred to another parish, or was removed from ministry, the Archdiocese response bore no consistent relationship to the seriousness of his offense or the risk he posed to the children of his parish. Rather, the decision was based entirely on an assessment of the risk of scandal or, under Cardinal Bevilacqua, legal liability.

We saw this vividly illustrated in the case of Fr. John Mulholland. In 1970, Archdiocese managers had reason to believe that Fr. Mulholland was taking parish boys at Saint Anastasia in Newtown Square on vacations and engaging in sadomasochistic behaviors with them. An adviser to the church's youth group, the CYO, had warned the managers and given the names of many of the boys involved. Believing at first that Fr. Mulholland's reputation for "play[ing] around with boys" was widespread, Archdiocese officials decided he would have to be reassigned because of "scandal." Many of the parents of these boys, however, never imagined what was going on and opposed Fr.

Mulholland's transfer. When the Archdiocese officials realized that there was no hue and cry, they decided to let Fr. Mulholland stay in the parish where they had been told he was committing his abuse. The reason for the change of heart was recorded in Church documents: "the amount of scandal given seemed to lie only with a very small minority."

While Archdiocese memos recording abuse allegations often omitted the names of victims or the nature of the priests' offenses, they almost never failed to note the degree of scandal or whether the victim had told anyone else. When scandal threatened, the Archdiocese would take action. During Cardinal Krol's administration, this almost always meant a transfer to another parish and the managers' memos unabashedly recorded the motive. In Fr. Joseph Gausch's file, for example, one of his many transfers was explained this way: "because of the scandal which already has taken place and because of the possible future scandal, we will transfer him in the near future."

Cardinal Bevilacqua's decisions, like his predecessor's, were similarly dictated by an assessment of risk to the Archdiocese. In the case of Fr. Cudemo, multiple victims came forward in 1991, reporting to the Archdiocese that the priest had abused them when they were minors. One he had raped when she was 11 years old, another he had had a sexual relationship with for 14 years, beginning when she was 15. The priest's Secret Archives file contained at least three allegations previously made against the priest. As more and more victims came forward, Cardinal Bevilacqua steadfastly refused to remove Fr. Cudemo as pastor of Saint Callistus parish. Only when some of the victims threatened to sue the Archdiocese and Cardinal Bevilacqua did he finally ask the priest to leave his parish. After the lawsuit was dismissed because the statute of limitations had run, the Cardinal permitted Fr. Cudemo to resume ministering.

b. Parishioners were not told, or were misled about, the reason for the abuser's transfer.

The Archdiocese's purpose in transferring its sexually abusive priests was clear – to remove them from parishes where parents knew of their behavior and to place them among unsuspecting families. The obvious premise of this pattern was the Church officials' understanding that parents would never knowingly allow their children to serve as altar boys, or work in rectories, or be taken to the New Jersey Shore by men they knew had molested other boys. The result of the Archdiocese's purposeful action was to multiply the number of children exposed to these priests while reducing the possibility that their parents could protect them.

Cardinal Bevilacqua had a strict policy, according to his aides, that forbid informing parishioners – either those whose children had recently been exposed to a sexual offender in his old parish or the parents of potential victims in a newly assigned parish – about any problems in a priest's background. The Cardinal, in fact, encouraged that parishioners be misinformed. When Fr. Brennan was removed from an assignment in 1992 because of allegations of improper behavior with several parish boys, one parishioner remembers being told to pray for the Father because he was “being treated for Lyme Disease.” Even the pastors of the new parishes, who might have supervised the abusers if aware of their history, were usually told nothing.

c. Sexual Offenders were transferred to distant parishes where their reputations would not be known.

If a priest was particularly notorious or a former victim was vigilant and vocal, the Archdiocese would transfer the priest to an especially distant parish, in hopes of escaping notice. Thus, after Fr. Leneweaver had abused boys in parishes in Philadelphia,

Delaware, and Chester Counties, Chancellor Francis Statkus lamented that “the latest incident eliminates his usefulness in his ministry in the area of Chester County,” and explained that he was to be transferred next to Bucks County “because it is one of the few remaining areas where his scandalous action may not be known.” A notation in Fr. Leneweaver’s file stated that his reassignment would not be announced, making it unlikely that anyone could forewarn the parents in his new parish.

Cardinal Bevilacqua used a similar strategy in 1992, when considering a reassignment for Fr. Michael McCarthy. The Cardinal just months earlier had received allegations that the priest had regularly taken students from Cardinal O’Hara High School to his beach house, plied them with liquor, slept nude in the same bed with them, and masturbated the boys and himself. The Cardinal had an aide tell the accused priest that, despite the allegations against him, he could be “appointed pastor at another parish after an interval of time has passed.” That new parish, according to the Cardinal’s instructions, “would be distant from St. Kevin Parish so that the profile can be as low as possible and not attract the attention of the complainant.”

If a priest was arrested or convicted and his crimes publicized in the news, more extreme measures were needed to return the abuser to ministry among uninformed parishioners. Thus, when Archbishop Bevilacqua was deciding where to assign Fr. Edward DePaoli after his conviction for possessing child pornography, he wrote: “for the present time it might be more advisable for [Fr. DePaoli] to return to the active ministry in another diocese.” The Archbishop explained that this move would “put a sufficient period between the publicity and reinstatement in the active ministry of the Archdiocese

of Philadelphia.” He arranged for Fr. DePaoli to be assigned to a parish in New Jersey for three years.

d. The Archdiocese harbored abusers transferred from other dioceses.

Cardinal Bevilacqua also reciprocated with other dioceses, as part of what an aide referred to as the “tradition of bishops helping bishops.” For five years, beginning in 1988, Cardinal Bevilacqua secretly harbored a New Jersey priest, Fr. John Connor, at Saint Matthew parish in Conshohocken so that the bishop in Camden could avoid scandal there. Cardinal Bevilacqua, despite an earlier acknowledgement that Fr. Connor could present a “serious risk,” did not inform Saint Matthew’s pastor of the danger. In fact, he told the pastor that Fr. Connor had come to the parish from another diocese because his mother was sick and he wanted to be near her. The pastor never knew, until he read it years later in a newspaper, that Fr. Connor had been arrested in his home diocese of Camden for sexually abusing a 14-year-old. As a result of his ignorance, the pastor did not worry, as he should have, when Fr. Connor showered attention and gifts on a boy in the parish grade school.

3. Archdiocese leaders made concerted efforts to prevent reports of priest abuse to law enforcement.

The hundreds of allegations of sexual abuse by priests that the Archdiocese has received since 1967 have included serious crimes -- among them, the genital fondling and anal, oral, and vaginal rape of children. Sometimes the abuse was ongoing at the time it was reported. The obvious response would have been to report such crimes to law enforcement, to allow police to investigate and to stop the perpetrators. The Archdiocese managers, however, never reported a single instance of sexual abuse – *even when*

admitted by the priests – and did everything in their power to prevent others from reporting it.

Cardinal Bevilacqua was asked repeatedly when he testified before the Grand Jury why he and his aides never reported these crimes to law enforcement. His answer was simply that Pennsylvania law did not require them to. That answer is unacceptable (as well as the result of a strained and narrow interpretation of a law specifically intended to require reporting sexual abuse of children). It reflects a willingness to allow such crimes to continue, as well as an utter indifference to the suffering of the victims. Such thinking is the reason, for example, that Fr. Leneweaver, an admitted abuser of 11- and 12-year-old boys, was able to receive a clean criminal record check and teach Latin at Radnor Middle School last year.

Not only did Church officials not report the crimes; they went even further, by persuading parents not to involve law enforcement — promising that the Archdiocese would take appropriate action itself. When the father of a 14-year-old boy reported to Cardinal Krol's Chancellor in 1982 that Fr. Trauger had molested his son and that he had told someone in the Morals Division of the Police Department (the father was himself a detective), the Chancellor succeeded in fending off prosecution. Chancellor Statkus informed the Cardinal: "Convinced of our sincere resolve to take the necessary action regarding Fr. T., [the victim's father] does not plan to press any charges, police or otherwise." (What Cardinal Krol did upon receiving this information was what he had done a year before, when Fr. Trauger had attempted to anally rape a 12-year-old boy from his previous parish: the Cardinal merely transferred the priest to another parish, where his crimes would not be known.)

Once in a while priests engaged so publicly in abusive acts that their crimes could not be concealed – such as when police in Rockville, Maryland stopped Fr. Thomas Durkin – a Philadelphia priest who was visiting the area – in the middle of the night. At the time of the police encounter, the priest was chasing a half-dressed 16-year-old boy through the streets. The teenager had run from their shared bedroom to escape Fr. Durkin’s sexual advances. In that case, the Archdiocese had to rely on the local diocese to intervene to keep the police from taking action. Having successfully hidden its priest’s crime and prevented the prosecution of it, the Archdiocese then permitted Fr. Durkin to continue in ministry despite his admission that he had abused other boys as well.

4. Church leaders carefully avoided actions that would incriminate themselves or the priests.

Some of the Archdiocese leaders’ actions or inactions, which initially might have seemed merely callous or reckless, we soon came to realize were part of a deliberate and all-encompassing strategy to avoid revealing their knowledge of crimes. Church officials understood that knowing about the abuse, while taking steps that helped perpetuate it, made them responsible for endangering children.

Many victims, for example, told the Grand Jurors that they were treated badly by the Secretary for Clergy when they reported their abuse. After recounting their nightmarish experiences to the Archdiocese managers, the victims were surprised at the lack of outrage toward the priest or compassion toward the victim. They had wanted desperately to be believed and hoped for an apology. They expected that the Archdiocese, once informed, would make sure the offenders would never again hurt the children of their parishes. Instead, the Church official charged with assisting the victims often

questioned their credibility and motives. When victims needing reassurance that the abuse had not been their fault asked Msgr. Lynn whether their abuser had other victims, the Secretary for Clergy refused to tell them – or lied and said they were the only one. Cardinal Bevilacqua’s highest aide, Vicar for Administration Edward Cullen, instructed his assistant, James Molloy (who at times displayed glimpses of compassion for victims), never to tell victims that he believed them. Doing so would have made evident the Church officials’ knowledge of other criminal acts and made later denials difficult.

Archdiocese leaders even left children in dangerous situations with known abusers rather than reveal their culpable knowledge by intervening to protect a child. Thus, when Archdiocese managers learned, on two separate occasions, that parish boys were on camping trips with Frs. Francis Trauger and John Mulholland – priests they had just been told were abusers – they did nothing to interrupt the camping trips. Nor did they do anything afterwards to keep the priests away from the boys or to warn their parents.

Cardinal Krol’s Assistant Chancellor, Vincent Walsh, sat silently while parents from Saint Anastasia in Newtown Square voiced support for Fr. Mulholland, asking that the Archdiocese reconsider its decision to transfer the priest to another parish. These parents vouched for Fr. Mulholland’s interest in their sons: one was grateful that the priest had taken his child on vacation without asking for money from the parents, another that the priest had helped his son gain entry to a sought-after school. At the time of the meeting, Fr. Walsh knew what the parents did not: that these teens had been reported as possible victims of Fr. Mulholland’s sadomasochistic behavior. The Assistant Chancellor said nothing to warn the unsuspecting parents, and Cardinal Krol left Fr. Mulholland in their parish.

In another case, when a school psychologist learned from a third party that Fr. Brzyski had sexually abused a student, he informed the Archdiocese that it was important to the boy's mental health to talk to him about the abuse. Archdiocese officials, at that time, had already received numerous reports of Fr. Brzyski's assaults on altar boys, and the priest had admitted having sexual relations with this particular victim. Still, the Archdiocese managers refused to allow the psychologist to help the boy. Rather than acknowledge the abuse they were pretending not to know about, they chose to let the boy suffer.

When Msgr. Lynn learned that a priest and a teacher at Saint Matthew's parish were concerned in 1994 because Fr. Connor was still visiting a young boy in the parish after the priest was mysteriously transferred back to Camden, the Secretary for Clergy informed the Archdiocese's lawyer, but not the boy's mother. Similarly in 2002, Msgr. Lynn, knowing Fr. Sicoli's long history of inappropriate relations with adolescent boys, left two teenage brothers living with the child molester in his rectory rather taking action that might have alerted the boys' mother to the danger.

5. Archdiocese officials tried to keep their files devoid of incriminating evidence.

Even in their internal files, Archdiocese officials tried to limit evidence of priests' crimes and their own guilty knowledge of them. Under Canon law, the Archdiocese was required to maintain special files – in “Secret Archives,” kept in a locked room accessible only to the Archbishop, the Secretary for Clergy, and their aides — that recorded complaints against priests such as those involving sexual abuse of minors. Church officials could not, therefore, simply conceal priests' crimes by never recording them.

The managers did, however, record information in ways that often masked the nature of the reported abuse and the actions taken in response. Written records of allegations often left out the names of potential victims, while euphemisms obscured the actual nature of offenses. An attempted anal rape of a 12-year-old boy, for example, was recorded in Archdiocese files as “touches.” The Grand Jury often could not tell from memos reporting “boundary violations” and “unnatural involvements” exactly what the Church officials had been told.

In addition, many of the communications discussing priest sexual abuse were oral. Under Cardinal Bevilacqua’s policy, aides would inform him immediately when abuse allegations came into the Archdiocese, but not in writing. His initial response and instructions were not recorded.

6. Church leaders manipulated abusive priests’ psychological evaluations to keep them in ministry.

a. Officials used therapy and evaluation to give false reassurances.

When confronted with allegations that they could not easily ignore, Church officials sometimes sent priests for psychological evaluations. A true determination of a priest’s fitness to minister was not, however, their main purpose. Cardinal Krol’s use of these evaluations for public-relations purposes was blatant. He often transferred child molesters to new parishes *before* evaluations finding them mentally fit – usually with no convincing evidence – were completed or received by the Archdiocese. We saw this in the cases of Frs. Trauger and Leneweaver.

Father Leneweaver was transferred to his last assignment even when the evaluation did not declare him fit. Cardinal Krol found the evaluation useful nonetheless,

as his Chancellor explained in a memo, so that “the faithful of West Chester,” the priest’s old parish, would be reassured “that the case of Father Leneweaver is being carefully studied and that he was not being reassigned routinely.” On another occasion, when the mother of one of Fr. Leneweaver’s victims complained that her son’s molester had merely been recycled to a new parish, Chancellor Statkus wrote that he “assured her that truly Father Leneweaver was appointed in accord with medical advice, and that he [had] undergone therapy and medical attention.”

b. Cardinal Bevilacqua instituted a test that falsely purported to exclude pedophiles.

By the time Cardinal Bevilacqua became Archbishop in Philadelphia, it was no longer possible to tell victims’ parents that an abusive priest had been treated and was now fit for a parish assignment. The Cardinal was aware of the nature of pedophilia – that it cannot be cured, that sexual abusers of children often have hundreds of victims, that the abusers need lifelong treatment and supervision, and that they need to be kept away from children. In 1985, he had been given a copy of a report, the Doyle-Mouton-Peterson “Manual,” and had discussed it with one of the authors, Fr. Thomas Doyle, who testified before the Grand Jury. The report contained several medical articles on sexual disorders, as well as legal and pastoral analyses. The authors were hoping to alert the U.S. bishops to the problems presented by pedophilia among priests and to help bishops know how to handle cases as they arose.

Cardinal Bevilacqua, however, used this knowledge about pedophilia not to protect children, but to shield the Archdiocese from liability. Central to his scheme was a policy designed to sound tough: Based on what was known about sexual abusers, he would not give an assignment to any priest who was diagnosed as a pedophile (someone with an

enduring sexual attraction to prepubescent children) or an ephobophile (someone with an enduring sexual attraction to adolescents). But then he and his aides made a mockery of evaluation and therapy to avoid reaching these diagnoses. In the absence of a formal designation of pedophilia or ephobophilia, Archdiocese officials perverted logic to reach the converse of the Cardinal's "rule" – if a priest was not diagnosed a pedophile, he *would* be given an assignment. Never mind the Church leaders' full knowledge that the priest had abused children.

In fact, a failure to diagnose a priest as a pedophile is not the same thing as determining that he is *not* a pedophile. We repeatedly saw situations where treatment facilities found evidence to suggest pedophilia, but did not have sufficient information to make a conclusive diagnosis. This was especially problematic when the "treatment facility" did not use up-to-date tests and technology in making its diagnoses, and instead relied primarily on self-reports of the priests. The Archdiocese-owned Saint John Vianney Hospital was such a facility. In other words, to determine if a priest was a pedophile, the "treatment" facility often simply asked the priest. Not surprisingly, the priest often said no.

In addition, Church-affiliated centers would often fail to diagnose priests as pedophiles if they claimed to be acting under the influence of drugs or alcohol, or had sex with adults. According to one of Fr. Gana's victims, who had been forced to have oral and anal sex with the priest beginning when he was 13 years old, Secretary for Clergy Lynn asked him to understand that the Archdiocese would have taken steps to remove Fr. Gana from the priesthood had he been diagnosed as a pedophile. But Fr. Gana was not only having sex with children and teenage minors, Msgr. Lynn explained; he had also slept

with women, abused alcohol, and stolen money from parish churches. That is why he remained, with Cardinal Bevilacqua's blessing, a priest in active ministry. "You see . . ." said Msgr. Lynn, "he's not a pure pedophile."

As a result of these policies, as the Cardinal himself acknowledged, "it was very rare that a priest would diagnose as such [a pedophile]." And yet, the Philadelphia-area priesthood harbored numerous serial child molesters. The Cardinal's litmus test was, on its face, grossly inadequate to protect children. It did, however, serve the Cardinal's purpose. He was able to say that he had a policy of not assigning pedophiles to the ministry.

c. Church officials interfered with evaluations.

Cardinal Bevilacqua's policy afforded easy opportunities for Archdiocese managers to manipulate treatment and diagnoses to keep abusive priests in the ministry. Secretary for Clergy Lynn often failed to provide incriminating information to therapists about priests he sent for evaluation. No Church-affiliated therapists spoke to victims or witnesses. The Cardinal allowed priests to shop for diagnoses, granting requests for second opinions when the priest was dissatisfied with the first.

The Grand Jurors find it significant that, according to the records we reviewed, the Archdiocese stopped using Saint Luke Institute in Suitland, Maryland, a facility it had used often in the past that does use up-to-date evaluation tools. The relationship with Saint Luke ended in 1993 after it diagnosed Fr. McCarthy as an ephebophile. (The priest had admitted to therapists that he was sexually attracted to adolescent males.) Thereafter, Church officials began referring sexual offenders almost exclusively to the Archdiocese's

own Saint John Vianney Hospital for evaluation – a facility under Cardinal Bevilacqua’s purview and supervision and more attuned to his priorities.

d. The Cardinal attempted to evade personal liability for retaining abusers by claiming to rely on therapists’ recommendations.

When asked by the Grand Jury why he placed obviously dangerous men in positions where they could abuse children, Cardinal Bevilacqua repeatedly testified that he relied on the advice of therapists. Those therapists, however, more often than not worked for him. That they understood their role as protecting the Archdiocese from legal liability was evident in many of the files we reviewed.

The therapists at Saint John Vianney, for example, warned in their “psychological evaluation” that returning Fr. John Gillespie to his parish, where he had abused two current parishioners, could present a risk. The risk, however, was not that the priest might further harm the victims – it was that he might apologize to them. Archdiocesan therapists warned: “If he pursues making amends with others, he could bring forth . . . legal jeopardy.” In a similar vein, Msgr. Lynn asked the therapists “evaluating” Fr. Brennan at Saint John Vianney: “Should Father remain in his present assignment since there seems to be much gossip throughout the parish about his behavior?”

Even when therapists did recommend meaningful action, moreover, the Cardinal did not always follow their advice – especially when it conflicted with that of the Archdiocese’s lawyers. We saw this in the case of Fr. Dunne (one of the few diagnosed pedophiles), who remained in ministry for seven and a half years after the Archdiocese learned he had abused several boys. Cardinal Bevilacqua first had Chancellor Samuel Shoemaker pressure a Saint John Vianney therapist to make an “accommodation” in the

After making this show of concern in order to fend off legal action, Cardinal Bevilacqua allowed Msgr. Walls to remain unmonitored in a parish residence in Bryn Mawr – with no formal assignment, few obligations, and limitless unsupervised time in which to procure new victims. For 14 years after learning of the priest’s admitted sexual offenses against minors, Cardinal Bevilacqua permitted him to live in the parish rectory, to celebrate Mass with altar boys, to hear confessions, and to counsel parishioners and others through Catholic Human Services.

8. Archdiocese officials used investigation and intimidation to fend off lawsuits and silence victims and witnesses.

The treatment of victims who reported abuse to the Archdiocese offered yet more evidence of the Cardinals’ preoccupations and priorities. Secretary for Clergy Lynn, often taking direction from the Archdiocese’s attorneys, treated victims as potential plaintiffs. Not only did they not receive apologies acknowledging their abuse, but many were bullied, intimidated, lied to, even investigated themselves.

The victim of Fr. Gana’s, who was barred from Saint Charles Borromeo Seminary and forced to seek ordination outside the diocese after accusing his abuser, is one example of a victim subjected to investigation and intimidation. Proving that their “investigations” of accused priests were purposefully incompetent, Archdiocese leaders conducted an extremely thorough probe of Fr. Gana’s victim. They aggressively scrutinized second- and third-hand reports (the kind Cardinal Bevilacqua found unworthy of further investigation when leveled against priests accused of serious sexual abuse of children) of homosexual contact (possibly hugging and kissing) between the victim and a

fellow seminarian. Monsignors Lynn and Molloy spent several weeks interviewing students, teachers, and administrators at the seminary. Despite this investigation, they could not substantiate the rumors. They succeeded, however, in humiliating and silencing the victim. Cardinal Bevilacqua, who had complete power over the seminarian's future in the priesthood, punished the victim by refusing to allow him to become a priest in the Archdiocese.

In another case, an investigator hired by the Archdiocese's law firm accused a victim of Fr. Furmanski's of being motivated by money. He suggested to the victim's wife that if her husband persisted with his allegation, the wife's employer would find out about a criminal conviction in the victim's past. The investigator told her it could affect her employment.

Monsignor Lynn's questioning of victims often seemed more like cross-examination than a compassionate, or even dispassionate, interview. With coaching from the Archdiocese's legal counsel (recorded in a memo of a conversation between Msgr. Lynn and the attorney), the Secretary for Clergy questioned and re-questioned one of Fr. Schmeer's victims in accordance with the lawyer's instructions to "get details – even unimportant." (The investigator hired by the Archdiocese's law firm also investigated this victim, collecting records of taxes, relatives, and two divorces.) Monsignor Lynn asked a victim of Fr. Gausch's whether it was possible he had "misinterpreted" the priest's actions of putting his hands on the then-12-year-old boy's penis. The Secretary for Clergy asked this, knowing that Fr. Gausch had a thick Secret Archives file of prior allegations of abuse dating back to 1948, which included letters he had written about boys whom he was sexually abusing or desired.

When Msgr. Lynn met with Fr. Gausch in 1994, he assured the priest that “the Archdiocese supported him and that he would investigate a little more the background of [the victim].” Probing victims and their families was a common practice. Records show Msgr. Lynn, as late as the summer of 2004, suggesting that some of Fr. Schmeer’s victims be investigated.

The Secretary for Clergy also suggested possible defenses – even to admitted child molesters – that might embarrass or discourage a victim from pressing an allegation. Interviewing Fr. Thomas Shea, who had previously confessed to sexually abusing at least two boys, Msgr. Lynn suggested that perhaps the priest “was seduced into it” by his 5th- or 6th-grade altar boy victim.

Victims were not the only ones bullied by Archdiocese leaders intent on suppressing the truth. Witnesses were, too. A nun in Saint Gabriel, Sister Joan Scary, expressed concerns about the safety of children in her parish who were exposed to a priest convicted of possessing child pornography. After she tried to pressure the Archdiocese officials to act and began talking to parents, she was fired as director of religious education.

9. The Cardinals shielded themselves from direct contact with victims.

We are aware of no case in which Cardinal Krol met with an abuse victim or his or her family. Cardinal Bevilacqua also shielded himself from contact with victims. He was the head of the Philadelphia Archdiocese 14 years before he would meet with a victim, and even then it was a non-Archdiocesan victim (who could not, therefore, sue

him), whom he met during a meeting of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops in 2002.

One of Fr. Gana's victims asked to meet with Cardinal Bevilacqua in 1995. He requested the meeting because he found it inconceivable that the man who anally and orally sodomized him when he was 14 years old would still be a priest if the Cardinal had been informed. Monsignor Lynn's suggestion that such a meeting might be possible was flatly rejected by the Cardinal, who had another aide inform the Secretary for Clergy that it "would be setting a precedent, i.e. for the Cardinal to meet with such individuals. His Eminence [the Cardinal] cautioned about such a recommendation and noted that there must be other means of letting [the victim] know that his Eminence was informed, other than for his Eminence to meet with him personally."

10. Even in 2002, Cardinal Bevilacqua continued to mislead the public and give false assurances.

Cardinal Bevilacqua continued to try to hide all he knew about sexual abuse committed by his priests even in 2002, after the scandal in Boston drew attention to the problem nationally. He had his spokeswoman tell the Philadelphia media in February 2002 that there have been only 35 priests in the Archdiocese credibly accused of abuse over the last 50 years – when in fact the Archdiocese knew there were many more. (We were able to substantiate allegations against at least 63 abusers, and reviewed many more reports that on their face seemed credible, but could not be fully verified after so many years). The Cardinal misled the public when he announced in April 2002 that no Philadelphia priest with accusations against him was still active in ministry – when in fact

several still were. He certainly was not credible when he claimed before this Grand Jury that protecting children was his highest priority – when in fact his only priority was to cover up sexual abuse against children.

Before the Grand Jury, Cardinal Bevilacqua continued to mislead about his knowledge of and participation in the cover-up.

In his testimony before the Grand Jury, Cardinal Bevilacqua was still attempting to evade responsibility for placing known sexual offenders in parishes where they had easy access to hundreds of children brought up to honor, trust, and obey priests. He often suggested that he might not have known all the facts and that he delegated the handling of these matters to his Secretary for Clergy. He repeatedly claimed to have no memory of incidents and priests that we will never forget.

He repeatedly was not forthright with the Grand Jury. For example, in the cases of Fr. Connor and Msgr. Walls, documents clearly established that Cardinal Bevilacqua knew that the priests had admitted abusing minors. They also established that he alone was responsible for subsequently placing or leaving the priests in parishes where they would present a severe danger to children. In both cases, when there was no plausible deniability, Cardinal Bevilacqua took the unsatisfying position that he did not know that the victims of the priests were minors. He declined to reconsider this claim even when confronted with a memo he had written about his concern that the *parents* of Msgr. Walls' victims might sue the Archdiocese – thus obviously indicating knowledge that the victims themselves were not adults.

and the “breach of official duty” provision applies only to public officials, not private parties such as the church leaders.

We also considered the crime of hindering apprehension or prosecution. This offense, however, primarily applies to harboring or concealing a fugitive for whom the police are looking. Because sexual assaults by priests almost never came to the attention of law enforcement, there was no occasion for such hindering.

The story is similar for the crime of tampering with or fabricating physical evidence. Tampering requires the belief that an official proceeding or investigation is pending or about to be instituted. Archdiocese officials knew, however, that reports of priest sexual abuse had been contained, and that there were no official proceedings to tamper with.

Another related offense is intimidation of witnesses or victims. Certainly Archdiocese leaders did not want witnesses or victims to complain to law enforcement authorities. Generally, however, church officials were able to employ more indirect means of achieving this goal. Even without actual intimidation, abusive priests were almost never reported to police – because they were spirited away when suspicions arose, because they enjoyed a special status as emissaries of God, and because their victims in any case were young and scared.

Thus Archdiocese officials typically did not have to commit obstruction offenses in order to effect a cover-up – but even if they had, they would have been protected, as with other possible crimes, by the passage of time. The statute of limitations for these offenses during the 1990’s and before was only two years. By the time the true scope of the scandal came to light, the church leaders were already immune.

Father Stanley Gana

Father Stanley Gana, ordained in 1970, sexually abused countless boys in a succession of Philadelphia Archdiocese parishes. He was known to kiss, fondle, anally sodomize, and impose oral sex on his victims. He took advantage of altar boys, their trusting families, and vulnerable teenagers with emotional problems. He brought groups of adolescent male parishioners on overnights and would rotate them through his bed. He collected nude pornographic photos of his victims. He molested boys on a farm, in vacation houses, in the church rectory. Some minors he abused for years.

Archdiocese officials were aware of the priest's criminality. At least two victims came forward in the 1990s to describe specifics of their abuse and provided names of other victims. They begged the Archdiocese to take away Fr. Gana's cover as a priest in good standing, to stop facilitating his exploitation of minors. Instead, the Archdiocese managers tried to silence the victims and conceal the crimes.

When Cardinal Bevilacqua and his aides heard that one of Fr. Gana's victims, "Tim," was telling fellow seminarians about his sexual abuse and might sue the Archdiocese, the Cardinal initiated a top-level investigation – against Tim. Based on unsubstantiated charges, he was expelled from seminary and forced to seek ordination outside the diocese. Meanwhile, Church officials limited their probe of Fr. Gana to a single interview with the priest himself. They never sought to contact named victims brought to their attention.

With no further inquiry, and the seminarian out of the way, Cardinal Bevilacqua permitted Fr. Gana to remain a pastor at Our Lady of Sorrows in Bridgeport for three more years – until another victim, who refused to be silent, came forward. When the threat of scandal forced them to act, Archdiocese managers pursued "treatment" for the priest, but this seemed clearly designed to protect the church from liability rather than victims from his assaults. Church officials purported, on paper, to limit Fr. Gana's ministry while doing little in practice. Instead of reporting his crimes to police, they advised the priest to keep a "low profile."

In 1998, the former seminarian who had been forced out of the Archdiocese spoke with Cardinal Bevilacqua's aide, Secretary for Clergy William J. Lynn. Msgr. Lynn asked the victim, who had been forced to have oral and anal sex beginning when he was 13 years old, to understand that the Archdiocese would have taken steps to remove Fr. Gana from the priesthood had he been diagnosed as a pedophile. But Fr. Gana was not only having sex with children and teenage minors, Msgr. Lynn explained; he had also slept with women, abused alcohol, and stolen money from parish churches. That is why he remained, with Cardinal Bevilacqua's blessing, a priest in active ministry. "You see, [Tim]," said Msgr. Lynn, "he's not a pure pedophile."

The Cardinal removed Fr. Gana from ministry in 2002, only after the national scandal arising from sexual abuses by Boston's clergy had made it more difficult for the Archdiocese to continue to protect Fr. Gana and other sexually abusive priests.

But, away from the priest's overbearing presence, Timmy – now Tim – tried to cope with his internal turmoil and shame. He lay on his bed in his seminary room, feeling overwhelmed and trapped, not knowing how to save himself. He determined either to get help or to kill himself.

Eventually, Tim asked the dean of the college, Msgr. William J. Lynn, for a referral to a therapist. Monsignor Lynn commented: “Yes, fine, but that therapist is going to think we're all crazy over here because you're the third person I'm sending to him in a month's time.”

Monsignor Lynn did not ask Tim his reasons for needing therapy, but he was not entirely ignorant of the student's relationship with Fr. Gana. Monsignor Lynn had noticed Fr. Gana's frequent visits to Tim's dorm room, and had instructed the seminarian to tell Fr. Gana that he needed to check in with the dean before going upstairs. It was an unusual request: priests generally had free access throughout the seminary.

Tim began therapy during his sophomore year. He found it helpful. He came to understand that he was not to blame for what had happened to him. This realization allowed him to begin opening up with others. He discussed Fr. Gana's abuse with two priests who were his mentors. Neither advised him to report these crimes to police or to the Archdiocese. Tim subsequently confided in a few friends.

One day during his second year at the seminary, Tim told Fr. Gana that he realized what the priest had done to him was wrong, and that he was getting counseling. Father Gana became enraged. He screamed at the teenager. He accused him of ingratitude. In a wild state, Fr. Gana dumped Tim's belongings from the rectory onto his family's lawn, then drove away.

The Archdiocese responds to a report of abuse by investigating the victim.

Cardinal Anthony Bevilacqua and other top Archdiocese managers first learned of Fr. Gana's abuse of Tim in November 1991, when the victim was in his eighth and final year of seminary. Tim had not reported Fr. Gana's criminal acts because his spiritual director at the seminary, Fr. Thomas Mullin, had urged him to wait until after his ordination so that he would not jeopardize his chances of being made a priest.

The seminary rector, Msgr. Daniel A. Murray, however, learned of Tim's victimization and notified Archdiocese managers. He informed them, too, that Tim had told other seminarians about Fr. Gana's abuses, and that gossip about Fr. Gana was spreading among the parishes. Archdiocese managers acted quickly – but not against Fr. Gana.

In December 1991, the Archdiocese made Tim the target of a full-scale “investigation” into second- and third-hand rumors of homosexual contacts with another seminarian. The probe, Archdiocese managers said, would decide whether Tim would be allowed to continue at seminary and on to ordination.

Cardinal Bevilacqua himself initiated the inquiry, choosing to ignore the child-molestation charges against one of his priests. Archdiocese managers did not even speak to Fr. Gana for another six months. The investigation of Tim, meanwhile, was conducted by the third-highest official of the Archdiocese, Assistant Vicar for Administration James Molloy, and his new aide, Msgr. William Lynn — the same Lynn who had served as Tim's seminary dean.

The true purpose of this investigation, the Grand Jury finds, was not to get at the truth about Tim, but to suppress the truth about Fr. Gana by controlling and silencing the seminarian. Archdiocese managers barred Tim from the seminary and his deaconate assignment. Monsignor Murray, the rector, threatened his friends with dismissal if they associated with him. Those who came to his defense were themselves punished.

According to Archdiocese records, Msgr. Murray told Msgrs. Molloy and Lynn that Tim was “damaged goods,” that he was “fragile and sensitive.” Monsignor Murray warned Archdiocese managers that the seminarian “might sue the diocese for pedophilia.”

During the investigation, Msgr. Molloy conveyed to Tim that the Cardinal's decision on the ordination of a sexual-abuse victim might depend on whether the victim “tried to address the matter responsibly through a therapeutic process” – a process that (perhaps coincidentally, perhaps not) might have the effect of keeping the victim's disclosures confidential. In the meantime, Archdiocese managers hung over Tim's head the fate of his future as a priest. For eight months, in isolation, shame, and fear, he awaited the Cardinal's decision.

Tim's training for the priesthood had been, for both Tim and his family, a dream come true. His mother had cried with happiness and pride when he told her he would embark on the eight-year course of study to become a priest. Now, after seven and a half years, already an ordained deacon, with a record unmarred by any type of disciplinary problems, and in excellent academic standing, Tim found himself cast out of seminary and the subject of an Archdiocese investigation. His good reputation was ruined. Rumors of homosexuality had disgraced his family and shamed him to the core. In spite of all this, he continued to cling to his lifelong hope of becoming a priest.

On July 28, 1992, Cardinal Bevilacqua received the Archdiocese report summarizing the investigation of Tim. The report's conclusion: "no finding could be made except to state that evidence to substantiate the allegations was inconclusive." Despite this finding, and despite numerous previous assurances to Tim that he would be afforded due process, Cardinal Bevilacqua chose to "resolve the doubt in favor of the church." The Cardinal announced that Tim would not be permitted either to complete seminary or to be ordained in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

Even though Msgr. Molloy's recommendation to the Cardinal envisioned that Tim might be an acceptable candidate for priesthood after undergoing therapy, Cardinal Bevilacqua ordered that laicization proceedings be initiated against the seminarian – stripping him of his clerical status – unless he applied for excommunication to go to another diocese.

Cardinal Bevilacqua ended Tim's dream of becoming a Philadelphia priest and ejected him from the Archdiocese. Tim later was ordained as a priest in Connecticut. He told the Grand Jury that a Trappist monk later summed up accurately what had happened to him, when he said: "As a child, that priest murdered your soul, and as a priest, the Church has broken your heart."

Archdiocese officials pretend to investigate Father Gana.

Father Gana, meanwhile, remained a priest in good standing. In April 1992, when Msgrs. Lynn and Molloy interviewed Tim as part of their investigation of the seminarian,

he described in detail how Fr. Gana had sexually abused him for more than five years, beginning when he was 13 years old. Tim told them about going to Fr. Gana's house in the country, and of anal rape in the rectory. He told them how Fr. Gana's abuse had hurt him. He provided the names of two other boys, John and Barry, whom Fr. Gana had also molested.

Monsignor Lynn testified before the first grand jury, swearing on a Bible, that he suspected Tim might have made up the whole story about Fr. Gana to extricate himself from his troubles at the seminary. The Grand Jury, however, finds that Msgr. Lynn's claim that he distrusted Tim's reports was not credible. First, Tim had begun confiding in others about Fr. Gana's abuse as early as 1985, six years before the investigation of his alleged misconduct. Second, and most importantly, Msgr. Molloy told the Grand Jury that both he and Msgr. Lynn in 1992 had found Tim credible.

Third, Church officials also knew of other corroborating evidence, which did not originate with Tim. The Archdiocese had been hearing allegations about Fr. Gana's sexual misconduct since the early 1970s. A seminarian had described Fr. Gana to Msgrs. Lynn and Molloy as "like a sugar daddy, always supplying money and vacations and use of a beach house." A parish priest in Media had expressed concern to the Archdiocese about Fr. Gana's inviting other seminarians to his rectory at Our Mother of Sorrows in Bridgeport, where he had become pastor in 1986.

Fourth, Msgr. Lynn's own behavior, while a dean at the seminary, not only added corroborating evidence of Fr. Gana's guilt, but also convinced the Grand Jury that Msgr. Lynn himself had believed that Fr. Gana was guilty. In the mid-1980s, it was Msgr. Lynn who noticed Fr. Gana's frequent visits to Tim's bedroom, disapproved of them, and tried to restrict them. Indeed, in December 1991, Msgr. Murray had informed Archdiocese managers that he was "convinced it is a fact that [Tim] was abused by Stanley Gana."

And yet, in stark contrast with the aggressive, top-level investigation of the troubled seminarian – in which several witnesses were interviewed over a number of months while Tim was barred from completing his seminary studies – Archdiocese managers saw fit to limit their probe of Fr. Gana's abuses to just one conversation: *with Fr. Gana himself.*

On May 26, 1992, Msgrs. Lynn (soon to be named Secretary for Clergy) and Molloy asked Fr. Gana about the allegations against him. Unlike the interviews with seminarians in the Tim probe, all of which had been neatly typed, signed, and witnessed, Msgr. Lynn's nearly illegible notes of the Fr. Gana interview were never typed or signed. Monsignor Lynn later insisted that Fr. Gana denied the accusations of sexual misconduct, but any objective reader of his notes would find the priest's evasions every bit as incriminating as an admission. The record gave further evidence, too, that Fr. Gana had abused not only Tim but also many other young boys.

According to Msgr. Lynn's scrawled notes, when Fr. Gana was asked about the allegations, he said there were "a lot of close calls. Could have went either way. Can't deny that." Father Gana claimed that Tim "[c]ould have misconstrued things of affection." He described Barry, whose name Tim had provided, as "Friendly. Sometimes get affectionate. Don't know why gave his name. Pure jealousy." Father Gana claimed that John (another name supplied by Tim) had been involved in a "sex ring. Very involved in perverse sexual activity. Incest." He stated that two years earlier, John had threatened him. Fr. Gana also admitted he had paid John a monetary settlement, which he described as "outright blackmail." At the conclusion of the interview, Msgr. Molloy warned Fr. Gana to stay away from Tim because "what he's describing is a criminal offense."

Monsignor Molloy noted at the time that "a major cause for concern right now is any current or future victims." He told the Grand Jury that it was a "prudent assumption" that Fr. Gana was abusing boys at Our Mother of Sorrows in Bridgeport, where he continued to minister for three years after Tim's allegations surfaced and were ignored. Monsignor Lynn acknowledged to the Grand Jury that Msgr. Molloy's concerns were valid.

In the face of all the evidence that had been conveyed to them, in light of Msgr. Murray's conclusion that Fr. Gana had in fact abused Tim, and in light of Msgr. Molloy's recollection that both he and Msgr. Lynn had found Tim credible, what the officials did next was disgraceful. They did nothing.

The surest route to the truth would have been to report the allegations to the police and let those trained to investigate criminal acts do their job. But Archdiocese managers

did not do that. The list of things they did *not* do demonstrates that their intent was not to establish the truth of the accusations, help the victims, or prevent further abuses:

- They did not attempt to speak to Barry or John to confirm or deny Tim’s assertions, or to offer therapy or other assistance.
- They did not try to talk to any seminarians regarding their visits with Fr. Gana, about which a parish priest had raised concerns.
- They did not question priests who had lived with Fr. Gana.
- They did not attempt to determine whether Fr. Gana had sexually abused boys in the 1970s while he served as a chaplain for both the Boy Scouts of America and Archbishop Wood High School.
- They did not warn Fr. Gana’s current parishioners about the allegations.
- They did not begin to supervise Fr. Gana’s behavior or limit in any way his freedoms, duties, or access to minors.
- They did not even send Fr. Gana for a psychological evaluation – a procedure that Msgr. Lynn claimed was standard whenever an allegation of sexual abuse arose against a priest.

This “investigation” of Fr. Gana ended with the single interview with the priest. In February 1993, after a disgraced Tim had left the state, Cardinal Bevilacqua reviewed his case and decided “no additional action is required at this time.” Father Gana remained pastor of Our Mother of Sorrows, even as Archdiocese managers professed concern for potential victims. It took another three years and another threat of scandal, this one a threat less manageable than Tim’s, to provoke even minimal action against Fr. Gana.

Father Gana abuses John and many other boys.

When John showed up at Archdiocese headquarters on September 6, 1995, he was still struggling with the impact of Fr. Gana’s prolonged abuse. John, then 32, wanted Cardinal Bevilacqua to know about the suffering he had endured nearly 20 years before. He met with Msgr. Lynn, the Secretary for Clergy, and the official responsible for investigating priests’ sexual misconduct.

Father Gana took several boys at a time with him on trips. During John's freshman or sophomore year, the priest brought John, Barry, Dean and another boy to a conference at Notre Dame University. Father Gana rented one bedroom for all five to share. He had sex with one boy at a time while making the others wait outside. On a trip to Disney World during John's sophomore year, seven guests shared one room while Fr. Gana had the other to himself, rotating the boys into his bedroom for sex. The next year, Fr. Gana took John, Larry, and Timmy to Niagara Falls.

Much as he did with Timmy, Fr. Gana controlled and manipulated John psychologically. He bullied the boy into not socializing with friends or going to dances. When John attended a Christmas party, Fr. Gana made him check in every hour. Terrified of the priest, John did everything Fr. Gana wanted, including giving up his senior week at the shore.

To further isolate the teenager, Fr. Gana turned him against his parents. He encouraged John to disobey them, telling him: "You're a man now. You don't have to deal with this shit from them." At the same time Fr. Gana counseled John's parents: "He's really a messed up kid, and I need more time with him." The priest's tactics convinced John that his parents were the enemy, thus preventing him from confiding in them.

More than three years into his abuse of John, Fr. Gana began forcing the boy to perform oral sex, which was particularly foul for John because his first abuser had also forced it on him. Father Gana demanded and received fellatio at the rectory and at a beach house belonging to a friend of Fr. Gana's, Fr. Mike Bransfield.

Only as a 19-year-old was John finally able to break Fr. Gana's hold on him, and it was not until he was 32 that he reported Fr. Gana's abuse to the Archdiocese. It took him that long to come forward, he said, because he had spent most of the intervening years abusing alcohol and drugs to escape facing his feelings. John attended nursing school. He married. However, as he struggled to gain sobriety, the emotions that he tried to bury constantly overwhelmed him. He finally found a therapist who helped him quit drugs. The therapist suggested it might help to report the abuse, have his hurt acknowledged, and help prevent harm to others.

Father Raymond O. Leneweaver

The abusive history of Father Raymond O. Leneweaver is remarkable for the number of victims who brought allegations of molestation and rape to Archdiocese managers while they were still being abused by the priest, or shortly thereafter. It is also remarkable because, even with these prompt reports and Fr. Leneweaver's repeated admissions of guilt, Cardinal John Krol allowed him to continue as a teacher and a priest, transferring him from parish to parish, thereby providing him unrestrained access to ever more unsuspecting victims.

Father Leneweaver told the Grand Jury in January 2005 that, for the past year, he had taught Latin at Radnor Middle School. In fact, Cardinal Bevilacqua and his aides had known since 1997 that the admitted child molester was teaching in suburban public schools. The Grand Jury finds that Fr. Leneweaver's large number of victims and his continued access to young boys are directly attributable to the Archdiocese's practice of not reporting a priest's crimes even after he confessed them, of persuading victims' parents not to go to the police, and of then transferring the offender to parishes where his reputation was not known and parents were unaware of the need to protect their sons from their priest.

Ordained in 1962, Fr. Leneweaver began admitting his sexual abuse of boys to Archdiocese officials in the late 1960s. In response to specific complaints made in 1975 to the Archdiocese by victims or their families, he admitted that he had "seriously" abused at least seven young boys. These sexual assaults began when the children were as young as 11 years old, usually lasted a few years, and included fondling, anal rape, and attempted oral sex. In addition to these "serious" involvements, Fr. Leneweaver told Archdiocese officials that he molested other boys "in an incidental fashion," for example, in the swimming pool at Saint Charles Borromeo Seminary. Still more victims, about whom Fr. Leneweaver was not questioned, came to the Archdiocese's attention during his 18-year tenure in active ministry. Given the typical reluctance of young sexual-abuse victims to come forward, these boys, though considerable in number, were most likely a tiny portion of the total. Over the years additional victims of Fr. Leneweaver, now adults, reported their childhood abuse by this priest.

Despite the Archdiocese's knowledge that Fr. Leneweaver was a chronic sexual offender, each time angry parents confronted Church officials with new complaints, Cardinal Krol merely transferred him to another assignment, where the priest remained in active ministry. By the time Fr. Leneweaver was transferred for the fourth time, the Archdiocese Chancellor, Francis J. Statkus, noted in a September 1980 letter that "he was appointed to this area of the diocese because it is one of the few remaining areas where his scandalous action may not be known."

Father Leneweaver forcibly raped another of the Rover boys, overcoming his resistance to penetrate him anally. He gave the boys money or gifts afterwards. He assaulted the boys in the seminary swimming pool, in the ocean, in his rectory bedroom, at the church's summer camp, and in the church itself, in the sacristy behind the altar. Several, if not all, of the Rovers were altar boys.

One of the Rovers, "Russell," testified before the Grand Jury. He named four others – "Edward," "Stephen," "Thomas," and "Angelo." Of those, the District Attorney's office was able to locate Edward, but he refused to get involved, saying that he had put those years behind him. His father and brother, however, told their family's painful story.

Edward's older brother, "Daniel" (who, as an adult became a psychologist operating a treatment program for juvenile sex offenders), knew and remembered the most about Edward's abuse. He became aware of it when Fr. Leneweaver visited the family's rented beach apartment in the summer of 1974. Edward was 11 or 12 years old and had spent the previous year as an altar boy at Saint Monica's. Daniel, who was 14 at the time, knew that Edward and other altar boys spent a lot of time with Fr. Leneweaver either at the rectory or swimming at the seminary. Edward told Daniel that Fr. Leneweaver taught him "wrestling moves" in the priest's bedroom. At the beach that summer, Daniel discovered the true nature of Fr. Leneweaver's relationship with his brother.

Daniel watched from the shore with his youngest brother, "Dirk," as Fr. Leneweaver took Edward into the ocean. Daniel described seeing the two, "sort of plastered together," bobbing up and down, with the priest's front against Edward's back. Later that evening, Fr. Leneweaver singled out Daniel and separated him from his brothers. After taking the three boys to a movie, Fr. Leneweaver returned with them to the beach. He sent Edward and Dirk on a mission to find seashells, then asked Daniel to climb into the lifeguard stand with him. There, the priest started to rub his erect penis against Daniel's backside as he reached down the front of the 14-year-old's pants. Daniel testified that he broke away from the priest's grasp and called for his brothers. The priest told the boys not to mention their walk on the beach to their mother when he dropped them off.

Daniel did tell his mother, but he tried to be vague at first. He told her that he did not think Edward should spend time with Fr. Leneweaver. When his mother accused him

of being jealous of the priest's attention, Daniel became more explicit. He told his mother that he thought Fr. Leneweaver was a pervert and that the priest had tried to "push into" Daniel from behind. At that, his mother called Daniel a pervert and slapped him. She told her son that "priests don't do that."

When Daniel and Edward's father came home, their mother recounted what Daniel had told her. The father's response was to beat his oldest son with a belt, repeating, "priests don't do that." Upset that his father did not believe him, Daniel persisted, telling him, as he told the Grand Jury, what the "priest was fucking doing with my fucking brother." Daniel could not remember what happened after that. He heard the rest from his brother Dirk, who was hiding with Edward in the closet. Their father, according to Dirk, "went nuts," beating his oldest son until he was unconscious. Daniel did not bring up the subject again, and Edward continued to spend time alone with Fr. Leneweaver.

In the first week of May 1975, Fr. Leneweaver brutally raped Edward, anally, on a Saturday morning when he was helping to clean a church nursery. After this attack, the young boy no longer could hide his distress from his family. He went home, showered, and refused to return to the nursery to work that afternoon. His father later found him curled up in a fetal position on his parents' bed, crying. His father also found a pair of bloodstained underpants. Edward told his father that Fr. Leneweaver had "messed with him." Daniel told the Grand Jury that Edward admitted being penetrated anally to their father. In addition to the anal rape, the boy told his father that the priest had wanted to perform oral sex on him and have the boy do the same in return. Eventually Edward had been able to escape and run away.

This time, the horrified father believed his son. He picked up a baseball bat and went looking for the priest, but another priest interceded to prevent any violence.

The next day, Edward told his father about three other boys Fr. Leneweaver was abusing. Together with the parents of two of those boys, Edward's mother and father went to their parish pastor, Fr. Aloysius Farrell, and reported Fr. Leneweaver's behavior. According to Daniel, Fr. Farrell persuaded the parents not to go to the police by telling them that it would not be good for Edward or the others, or for the parish. He promised them that the Church would take care of the situation. Father Farrell then passed on the

Father Leneweaver never relented when Russell asked the priest to stop touching him in the pool, the rectory, or the sacristy. Father Leneweaver forced himself on the boy, saying it was “just wrestling.” Russell felt ashamed and scared. As word was getting out about Fr. Leneweaver, the priest dragged Russell out of class one day and, while crushing the boy’s hand, threatened to kill him if he told. Russell believed the priest.

Russell’s grades dropped when Fr. Leneweaver’s abuse began. He developed a nervous twitch that caused him to shake his head constantly and blink. His father could not stand the twitch and took Russell to another priest who tried to hypnotize the boy to get rid of it. The twitch lasted nearly 10 years, into Russell’s twenties. Like other victims, when they got older, Russell began to drink heavily. At age 41, he cannot get the abuse out of his mind. His wife has threatened to leave him because of his drinking. He is in counseling and on medication to help him with his anxiety. He said he still distrusts priests and cannot take his children to church – he cannot bear to see altar boys.

At Saint Agnes, Father Leneweaver sexually assaults more children and admits to it; the Archdiocese responds by moving him again.

On August 28, 1975, despite seven admitted instances of long-term sexual abuse of children and several admitted “incidental” encounters, Fr. Leneweaver was named assistant pastor of Saint Agnes parish in West Chester, another parish with a grammar school. A year later, Fr. Leneweaver was sexually abusing “Andy,” an 8th grader at Saint Agnes School. In July 1980, when Andy was a senior in high school, his parents learned from an anonymous letter that Fr. Leneweaver had been abusing their son for nearly four years. The parents immediately notified their pastor, Msgr. Lawrence F. Kelly.

In a letter to Msgr. Statkus, dated July 15, 1980, Msgr. Kelly summarized Fr. Leneweaver’s abuse of Andy. In the beginning, Fr. Leneweaver regularly approached the child in the schoolyard at Saint Agnes School, instructed him to get excused from his next class, and then abused him, usually in the rectory. Father Leneweaver also molested Andy on camping trips and in his home where Fr. Leneweaver was often a dinner guest. The abuse happened against Andy’s objections, but afterwards Fr. Leneweaver lavished the boy with gifts.

Monsignor Kelly confessed to knowing that other boys, in addition to Andy, were frequent visitors to Fr. Leneweaver's bedroom. Monsignor Kelly warned Msgr. Statkus that Andy's father had "not ruled out [going to the police] unless action [was] taken by church authorities." Monsignor Kelly related that the father "did not want to see him again at the Altar, or hear him preach." The father wanted him "away from here." Once again, Fr. Leneweaver admitted to the Archdiocese that the allegations were true.

In response to a threat to contact police, Father Leneweaver was immediately removed from the parish and sent to Villa Saint John. Yet, within two months, the Cardinal had reassigned him to another active ministry. During those two months, two more allegations of recent or ongoing sexual abuse of boys from Saint Agnes became known to the Archdiocese. Cardinal Krol's response was to transfer Fr. Leneweaver to a new parish, Saint Joseph the Worker Church, in Fallsington. As Msgr. Statkus explained: "He was appointed to this area of the diocese because it is one of the few remaining areas where his scandalous action may not be known."

Father Leneweaver's evaluations and treatment gloss over his problems, and the Archdiocese ignores them.

Between each of his last three assignments, Fr. Leneweaver underwent some type of psychological evaluation or therapy. But the actual diagnosis or treatment had no discernible effect on the priest's subsequent assignments. The Grand Jury finds that Archdiocese officials used Fr. Leneweaver's "treatment" solely for public-relations purposes, that is, so they could justify to parishioners who might question them why a serial child molester and rapist kept being reassigned to new parishes.

Father Leneweaver's first treatment followed his departure from Saint Monica's parish in 1975. While in Florida for three months allegedly assisting his aging parents, Fr. Leneweaver met twice weekly with a psychiatrist, Walter E. Afield. Following Fr. Leneweaver's return to Philadelphia, Dr. Afield sent a report to the Archdiocese, which noted that tests performed when Fr. Leneweaver first arrived in Florida showed "no signs of psychosis or serious mental disorder." This conclusion was reached before any

Father Joseph Gausch

Father Joseph Gausch began serving as a priest in the Philadelphia Archdiocese in December 1945 and, based on the Secret Archives file provided, he started to abuse young boys almost immediately thereafter. The abuse included fondling, masturbation, oral sex, and attempted anal rape. It occurred in sacristies, rectories, and on outings. On one occasion in 1974, after Fr. Gausch admitted to Archdiocese officials that allegations of child molestation were true, Chancellor Francis J. Statkus wrote in a memo that, "because of the scandal which already has taken place and because of the possible future scandal, we will transfer him in the near future."

There is every reason to believe that Fr. Gausch continued his reign of terror throughout his 54 years of service in the Archdiocese. Yet, because of the manner in which complaints of abuse were handled, neither the Grand Jury nor anyone else will be able to determine just how many victims this priest left in his wake.

The Archdiocese discovers letters that Father Gausch wrote detailing his sexual abuse of boys, sends him to do "penance," and returns him to ministry.

In 1948, Fr. Joseph Gausch was sent to Alexian Brothers Hospital in Oshkosh, Wisconsin, to do "penance" for "perversion and homosexuality." He was ordered to the hospital after letters that he had written to another priest, Fr. Charles L.G. Knapp, were discovered by the assistant pastor at St. Alphonsus, the parish where Fr. Gausch was assigned. The letters describe Fr. Gausch's abuse of several teenage boys beginning as early as 1946:

- In one letter, written in 1946 when he was assigned to St. Joseph's parish, Fr. Gausch wrote that he was going to watch a high school football game and that the "trick will be to appear interested in the game and not the players – there are some wows among them." He continued that "the latest obstacle to my spiritual advancement is a 14 year old 7th grader – not stupid but does not study, wretched home conditions, not a bad kid, attractive as anyone could ask – and sex has already made itself a nice place in his life --- you can see the set up. I was going over town last Friday just as school was dismissing --- his home is over there. He volunteered to walk over with me – a mile and a half. Something to remember Chunk for."

present writing. That is why it would be so convenient if we had our own place. Not too much more to say so I'll double back here. Been hoping for months now to make a masterpiece of this year's vacation, with something like the above in mind ... rounding up a few of the desirables and making off somewhere. After your recent escapades, you may be an invaluable help...". (Appendix D-6)

Upon discovery of these letters, Cardinal Dennis Dougherty suspended Fr. Gausch and sent him to the hospital to do "penance." Father Gausch remained at the hospital from July 21, 1948, until March 1949. There is no indication that any attempts were made to identify or contact the teenage boys that were the subject of the letters.

Father Gausch abuses boys at Our Lady of Peace and Saint Bridget parishes.

After he completed his "penance," Fr. Gausch was assigned to St. Anthony of Padua parish in Easton. He thereafter was transferred as an assistant pastor to several parishes until, in May 1961, he arrived at Our Lady of Peace in Milmont, where he remained until August 1964. His transfer from Our Lady of Peace followed an incident involving molestation of yet another boy.

An April 17, 1974, memo in the file authored by Chancellor Francis J. Statkus revealed that, in 1964, Fr. Gausch had taken a boy from a swimming pool to the rectory at Our Lady of Peace and molested him. No other details were given except to note that Fr. Gausch was immediately transferred to St. Bridget in North Philadelphia.

Father Gausch became assistant pastor at Saint Bridget in August 1964. There he came in contact with "Brian," a 12-year-old altar boy. Father Gausch began by fondling young Brian but quickly escalated to masturbation, oral sex, and attempted anal rape. Brian told the Grand Jury that he came from an extremely religious family whose pride in his being selected as an altar boy was unwavering. This fact played a large part in his inability to speak to anyone about what was happening. Additionally, Fr. Gausch manipulated him by saying that if he were to reveal the abuse, he would not be believed because nobody would believe a "colored" boy. Instead, they would think he was trying to start trouble.

Young Brian never doubted the truth of what Fr. Gausch was telling him. At the time the abuse was going on, he said, there were only about 10 black families in the parish.

Brian told the Grand Jury that the abuse usually occurred after the 7:30 morning Mass, either in the sacristy or the hallway between the church and the rectory. Father Gausch tried to make Brian believe that it was happening because he was “special” and that God was “ok” with it. Father Gausch also told Brian that what was happening made him feel good, and since priests spend all their time making other people feel better sometimes they need someone to make them feel good as well. Brian believed it – Fr. Gausch was a priest, so he had to be telling the truth.

Brian told the Grand Jury that the abuse affected every aspect of his life. When he finally mustered the courage to come forward and set up a meeting with the Secretary for Clergy, William J. Lynn, he wrote out an agenda for the meeting because he wanted to make sure that he remembered all he wanted to say. He wanted to convey that “the abuse had affected his life and his faith and that it had left a scar and that it was now time to uncover the wound and try to diminish the scars and promote some healing.” During the meeting, Msgr. Lynn informed Brian that Fr. Gausch had died and, although he provided no specifics, he also told him that the priest had abused other boys.

At Queen of the Universe, Father Gausch abuses another boy, and nothing is done; he retires in 1992.

In 1973, Fr. Gausch was transferred to Queen of the Universe in Levittown. Thereafter the Chancery was informed that Fr. Gausch was abusing the son of a parishioner, and that a nun with the Sisters of Saint Joseph had commented several times about “Father’s familiar advances toward the boys in the school.”

When confronted with this information by Chancellor Statkus, Fr. Gausch admitted that the allegations against him were true. Monsignor Statkus noted in a memo that, in light of the priest’s conduct and admission to it, “because of the scandal which already has taken place and because of the possible future scandal, we will transfer him in the near future.” Monsignor Statkus also told Fr. Gausch that if “he needs, in his estimation, psychiatric consultation, that he should seek it.” According to the memo, Fr. Gausch was not directed

to this consultation but rather was told that if there was another “lapse,” then he would be directed to it – perhaps on a full-time basis. Monsignor Statkus also informed Fr. Gausch that if, in the future, he did not provide cause for apprehension or suspicion, he would be considered for a pastoral appointment. At no point in the memo or in any subsequent documents was the well-being of the victims considered. Avoidance of scandal was the only consideration.

As the Chancellor had suggested, Fr. Gausch was again transferred, this time to St. Aloysius in Pottstown. And in April 1980, he was elevated to pastor, at Good Shepherd in Philadelphia. When Cardinal Bevilacqua was installed as Archbishop of Philadelphia in February 1988, he retained Fr. Gausch as pastor with no restrictions. In June 1992, Fr. Gausch retired and was named Pastor Emeritus at Good Shepherd.

After Father Gausch’s retirement, “Ross” comes forward to report prior abuse; the Archdiocese investigates the victim and dismisses his report.

On January 13, 1994, a 27-year-old male named Ross contacted the Secretary for Clergy, Msgr. Lynn, to report that he had been sexually abused by Fr. Gausch while serving as an altar boy at Good Shepherd parish in 1980-81. Ross was 12 or 13 years old at the time. Ross told Msgr. Lynn that there was another altar boy who was also abused, and he provided his name.

Ross related that both he and the other boy had been fondled by Fr. Gausch in the sacristy. Monsignor Lynn, having access to the extremely long history of Fr. Gausch in the Archdiocese files, asked Ross whether it was possible that he “misinterpreted” Fr. Gausch’s actions of putting his hand on the boy’s penis. Ross stated that no, he had not misinterpreted the actions. Ross told Msgr. Lynn that all he wanted was to confront Fr. Gausch.

Father Gausch was interviewed on February 15, 1994, and denied the allegations. He said that Ross’s family was “problematic” and that Ross “had a terrible home life.” Father Gausch discussed his own problems of the past but stated that he had overcome them. He refused to meet with Ross. Monsignor Lynn told Fr. Gausch that “the

Father Nicholas V. Cudemo

Father Nicholas V. Cudemo, ordained in 1963, was described to the Grand Jury as “one of sickest people I ever knew” by Monsignor James E. Molloy, Cardinal Bevilacqua’s Vicar for Administration. Father Cudemo raped an 11-year-old girl, molested a fifth grader in the confessional, invoked God to seduce and shame his victims, and maintained sexually abusive relationships simultaneously with several girls from the Catholic school where he was a teacher. His own family sued him for molesting a cousin.

Yet, with serious allegations against the priest on record, Cardinal Bevilacqua twice promoted him to serve as pastor of Philadelphia parishes. Only after victims threatened to name the Cardinal and the Archdiocese in a lawsuit was Fr. Cudemo removed from his pastorate.

Even so, in January 1997, after the victims withdrew their lawsuit, the Cardinal’s Secretary for Clergy, Monsignor William Lynn, presented Fr. Cudemo with a certificate declaring him “a retired priest in good standing in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia,” and asking that he be permitted to function as a priest in any other diocese in the country. Monsignor Lynn issued this certificate one year after a panel of pastors had recommended Fr. Cudemo’s removal as pastor due to “several grave causes” and despite the Archdiocese’s knowledge of at least 10 separate allegations against the priest involving sexual abuse of girls. In March 2003, Fr. Cudemo told one of his former victims that the certificate was allowing him to minister in Orlando, Florida, where he now lives part-time.

Perhaps most disturbing, and revealing, about the Archdiocese’s handling of Fr. Cudemo’s abuse of children is that Church officials have never admitted or acknowledged their misplaced priorities. In 2003, long after the priest’s many abuses were well known to the Archdiocese, Cardinal Bevilacqua continued in his Grand Jury testimony to defend the Church’s handling of Fr. Cudemo’s case. He did so in the face of overwhelming evidence – that Archdiocese managers had ignored or failed to follow up reports of abuse; that they had concealed information from and lied to parishioners; that they had allowed Fr. Cudemo to remain in place long after his abuse was well known, even after he refused treatment; and, finally, that they had permitted Fr. Cudemo to retire early and continue acting as a priest rather than remove him from ministry.

A list of some of the victims identified in evidence before the Grand Jury makes clear both Fr. Cudemo’s unrelenting depravity and the extent of Church leaders’ knowledge when they kept reassigning the priest. This list includes only those girls who were the subject of formal complaints made to Archdiocesan managers. It does not include the names of girls that the Archdiocese learned of either secondhand from the victims who came forward or from the priest himself.

<u>Date Abuse Began</u>	<u>Victim</u>	<u>Date Abuse Reported</u>
1964	“Donna”	1991
1966	Anonymous Letter	1966
1969	Hysterical Girl	1969

1969	Girl in Fr. Cudemo's Room	1969
1969	"Sister Irene"	1991
1969	"Ruth"	1991
1971	"Sister Margaret"	1991
1973	"Patricia"	2004
1973	"Stacy"	2004
1975	"Emily"	1977
1976	"Marion"	1991
1982	"Theresa"	2001

Saint Stanislaus (1963-1968): The Archdiocese ignores report of Father Cudemo's three year "love affair" with a high school junior.

Father Nicholas Cudemo began his first assignment, as assistant pastor at Saint Stanislaus parish in Lansdale, in June 1963. In April 1966, Cardinal Krol received a letter from an anonymous parishioner informing him that Fr. Cudemo had carried on an "affair" for the entire three years he had lived in the parish with a girl identified as a junior at Lansdale Catholic High School.

Father Cudemo denied the allegation, and church files reflect no further investigation or action. No effort was made to talk to the victim. Father Cudemo remained in place for two more years, during which time he also sexually molested a cousin of his, Donna.

Bishop Neumann High School (6/68-2/69): Father Cudemo is transferred five months after school starts because of "particular friendships" with students.

In 1968, Fr. Cudemo was assigned to teach at St. John Neumann High School. Archdiocese records turned over to the Grand Jury include no new allegations from his stint at Neumann, yet Fr. Cudemo was transferred out after only five months of school. His place of residence, as well as his teaching assignment, changed abruptly on February 10, 1969. Reports from his next assignment indicate that he continued to sexually abuse a girl from Lansdale.

Although the Grand Jury received no records from 1968 which might explain Fr. Cudemo's sudden transfer, a later memo, written by Chancellor Francis Statkus in 1977, made reference to the reason. The Chancellor recorded that he told Fr. Cudemo, who was again accused of sexually abusing a girl in 1977, that he might have to be moved from teaching to parish ministry "since he has already been changed twice previously to other high schools" because of "particular friendships" with female students.

Archbishop Kennedy High School (2/69-6/73): Father Cudemo sexually abuses many girls and is permitted to teach for four years after two incidents are reported to the Archdiocese.

In August 1969 two current incidents are reported to the Archdiocese.

In February 1969, Fr. Cudemo took up a new teaching assignment at Archbishop Kennedy High School and a new residence at Saints Cosmas and Damian in Conshohocken. Six months after he arrived, the pastor of his rectory reported to the Archdiocese two instances of inappropriate behavior with girls.

On August 20, 1969, Fr. Louis DeSimone told then-Chancellor Terrence F. Monihan that, a few months before, the pastor had interrupted an encounter between Fr. Cudemo and a girl from his earlier assignment in Lansdale. Father DeSimone reported that he heard "some commotion" coming from one of the church offices on a Sunday afternoon. When he entered to investigate, he found Fr. Cudemo trying to "calm an hysterical girl." The pastor asked the girl to leave, which she did — shouting as she went that she loved Fr. Cudemo. The priest told Fr. DeSimone that the girl had a crush on him but that he was not involved with her in any way. He promised the pastor that he would be extremely careful in his behavior with girls in the future.

A month later, Fr. DeSimone learned from two witnesses — his housekeeper and a priest living at the rectory — that, while the pastor was on vacation, Fr. Cudemo had taken another girl into his bedroom for half an hour with the door shut.

Chancellor Monihan informed Fr. Cudemo that his residence would have to change. Once again Fr. Cudemo promised he "would be extremely careful of the way he conducted himself with girls in the future." From September 1969 to November 1971, Fr.

Ruth testified that Fr. Cudemo began raping her when she was 11 years old, which would be in 1971. After raping her, he would hear her confession. He would tell the 11-year-old that the only way for her to connect with God was through him. Only after confessing was she “worthy of God’s love.” He convinced the child it was really a “life or death situation,” that she couldn’t survive without the priest.

Ruth told the Grand Jury that Fr. Cudemo took her for an abortion of a fetus she conceived from his rapes sometime before she started high school in 1973. She remembered it was not long after she started menstruating, when she was 11 years old. Father Cudemo blamed the young girl and questioned how she could be so stupid as to become pregnant. She said he was mad because he was “very pro-life.” She said she was terrified, but Fr. Cudemo did not stay with her at the abortion clinic.

Father Cudemo transferred from Kennedy to Cardinal Dougherty High School in June 1973. Ruth began Dougherty as a freshman in September 1973.

- **Sister Margaret, I.H.M.**

Margaret, who later became a nun, was a high school junior when she met Fr. Cudemo. She informed Archdiocese officials that Fr. Cudemo molested her for two years until she graduated in 1973.

In October 1991, Sister Margaret told Msgr. Lynn, the Cardinal’s Secretary for Clergy, and Msgr. Molloy that her first encounter with Fr. Cudemo occurred when he took her and a boy to a wedding in New York. When they stayed overnight, Fr. Cudemo put the boy in one bedroom and had Margaret sleep in the priest’s room. In the morning, he got into her bed wearing only boxer shorts. He told her he had wanted to sleep with her the night before.

She said that Fr. Cudemo never had intercourse with her, but that he hugged, kissed, touched, and fondled her many times over the two years. He would lie on top of her and then go into the bathroom. She told of a train trip to Florida with Fr. Cudemo during which he took her hand, as she sat beside him, put it on his penis, and said, “hold me.”

Sister Margaret described the shame she felt as a result of what Fr. Cudemo had done to her. She told how he would come to her convent years later to lead retreats and hear confession and how that was torture for her.

When Sister Margaret came forward 18 years after Fr. Cudemo's abuse had ceased, she was still angry. According to Msgr. Lynn's notes of their conversation, she could not understand why Fr. Cudemo was still in a parish when she knew "this isn't the first we've heard about this" She told Msgrs. Molloy and Lynn of another nun, "Catherine," who she knew had been friendly with Fr. Cudemo and thought might have been victimized. Sister Catherine had a nervous breakdown and said she "hated" the priest.

Father Cudemo was transferred from Archbishop Kennedy High School to Cardinal Dougherty High School in June 1973. Although the Archdiocese provided the Grand Jury with no records from 1973 to explain the transfer, a girl named Marion, who was involved with Fr. Cudemo for many years, told the Grand Jury she believed it was because of "problems with females." Sister Margaret also remembered Fr. Cudemo telling her in 1973 that he had been "called downtown" by the Vice Chancellor because of his behavior with girls. A 1977 memo by Chancellor Statkus confirmed that Fr. Cudemo was transferred from Kennedy because of his "particular friendships" with girls. It was the priest's second transfer from a high school – a fact later noted by the Chancellor to explain why Fr. Cudemo might have to be changed from teaching to parish ministry in 1977. In 1973, however, the Archdiocese responded to the priest's sexual impropriety by giving him his third teaching assignment.

Cardinal Dougherty High School (6/73-9/77): Father Cudemo abuses at least five students; when the Archdiocese learns of one of these victims in 1977, it transfers Father Cudemo to an unsuspecting parish.

At Cardinal Dougherty, Fr. Cudemo added at least four new young victims to the ones he was already abusing. According to the Archdiocese's own records, there was a period in 1976 and 1977, lasting almost a year, during which Fr. Cudemo was reportedly abusing at least three of his students regularly.

Patricia and Stacy tell the Grand Jury of their abuse while students at Cardinal Dougherty

Two victims of Fr. Cudemo's, Patricia and Stacy, came forward to testify before the Grand Jury after reading a July 25, 2004, newspaper article, naming Fr. Cudemo as a

Epiphany Parish (6/87-6/89): Father Cudemo abuses a girl named “Michelle” while continuing his sexual relationship with Marion.

Father Cudemo continued having a sexual relationship with Marion throughout his assignment as assistant pastor at Epiphany Parish in South Philadelphia. Although she was no longer a minor, the abusive and controlling nature of the relationship, begun when she was young and vulnerable, kept Marion from escaping it.

Marion told the Grand Jury that by the time she was an adult, she felt trapped and totally dependent on Fr. Cudemo emotionally. She described the relationship as an addiction and him as a security blanket. She said she couldn't talk to anyone else because she felt “[g]uilty, embarrassed, scared, anxious. All of those negative feelings.” She explained that he had alienated her from her parents, siblings, and friends. He used his position as priest to claim he knew what she was “called to do.” In an interview on November 16, 1991, Marion told Msgrs. Molloy and Lynn that she did everything Fr. Cudemo told her to. She explained that he “uses God” to influence people and “keeps God in the midst of the relationship.”

In a memo written after the meeting, Msgr. Molloy noted: “She had suffered severe psychological harm as a result of the relationship.” Marion suffered two “nervous breakdowns” and “had been suicidal on several occasions as a result of this harm.”

Although he would never talk to her about them, Marion knew of Fr. Cudemo's abuse of other young girls. One of them, she told Msgrs. Molloy and Lynn, “ended up in a mental institution.” Marion told the Archdiocese officials about another girl, named Michelle, who had been the daughter of parishioners at Epiphany when Fr. Cudemo was assistant pastor. According to Marion, the priest had befriended the family and persuaded them to start coming to church. She noted that Michelle's family fit the priest's predatory pattern: “all the friends he spent time with had young girls in the family.” Michelle came to see Marion in Florida in the summer of 1990. She told her she was in counseling because of Fr. Cudemo.

In 1989 Fr. Cudemo left Epiphany when he was promoted to serve as pastor at King of Peace parish in South Philadelphia.

Father James J. Brzyski

Father James Brzyski was one of the Archdiocese's most brutal abusers – emotionally as well as physically. The 6'5" 220-pound priest convinced a 12-year-old devout boy whom, beginning in 1983, he repeatedly anally raped, that the boy's mother had sanctioned the acts. Father Brzyski's words were lies, but it took the boy 20 years to learn that; alienated from his mother all that time because of this lie, the victim only recently began repairing a two-decades old estrangement. Another victim testified that Fr. Brzyski told him too as a 7th-grader that his parents had made "a deal" with Fr. Brzyski to allow the priest to sexually abuse him. He said the lie had isolated him from all that he loved and had destroyed his life.

By one estimate, Fr. Brzyski, who was ordained in 1977, sexually abused a hundred young victims during just seven years he spent in two parishes of the Philadelphia Archdiocese. The victims were, as described by another priest, "shy, docile, bright, and intelligent." The ones who testified before the Grand Jury could remember a time when they were happy, loving, and deeply religious. That all changed when Fr. Brzyski chose them as altar boys and began his unrelenting abuse, including fondling, oral sex, and anal rape. Father Brzyski abused some of his victims over a seven- or eight-year period.

Had they cared, Archdiocesan managers could have acted to stop Fr. Brzyski from ruining the lives of innumerable children. In 1984, Fr. Brzyski admitted to a Church official that he was a child molester. Archdiocese leaders knew the names of many of his victims, and could have known the identities of many more had they simply followed up on reports they received. A concerned counselor at Bishop Egan High School, a non-diocesan priest named Fr. James Gigliotti, T.O.R., persistently reported victims' names to Church officials and sought help for the victims, in the face of Archdiocesan managers' indifference and even hostility. He informed them that Fr. Brzyski was still involved with many of the boys and their families. He told them that the parents of some of the boys had come to him concerned about changes in their children's personalities and behavior. The high school counselor and a school psychiatrist told Archdiocese officials that it was therapeutically important to inform the parents about their sons' abuse and counsel the victims.

Archdiocese managers, however, chose to turn their backs on Fr. Brzyski's victims and their families. They directed the school psychiatrist not to initiate counseling for the boys about their abuse. Rather than encourage Fr. Gigliotti to inform the victims' parents about the source of their children's troubled behavior, they advised the counselor of the need for "confidentiality." Although Fr. Brzyski admitted "several acts of sexual misconduct" involving minors, Archdiocese officials chose not to end their priest's criminal rampage by reporting his offenses to the police.

This was not a neglectful lapse but a calculated decision, a reflection of Archdiocese policy. Parents even of known victims — including those whose abuse may have been continuing — were not to be informed. And, as a 1986 memo by Vice Chancellor Donald F. Walker spelled out, "we could not actively seek further names of persons who may have been involved with Father Brzyski." The policy shielded the Church from scandal and legal liability. It also consigned Fr. Brzyski's victims to continued abuse.

Billy said that other priests at Saint Cecilia, as well as other boys, knew of Fr. Brzyski's constant sexual predations upon the parish youth. One, Fr. William Joseph (who has himself been accused of sexually abusing boys), walked into the sacristy on one occasion and saw Fr. Brzyski fondling the boy's naked genitals as the boy sat on the priest's lap. Father Joseph, according to Billy, did not appear surprised by what he saw, and certainly did nothing to help the boy. Another priest, Fr. Robert E. Brennan (not the Fr. Robert L. Brennan discussed elsewhere in this report), also knew what Fr. Brzyski was doing to Billy. The victim said Fr. Brennan never told the boy's parents, who considered Fr. Brennan a close friend.

Among the altar boys, Billy testified, Fr. Brzyski "became known for this and feared for this." While Billy estimated that Fr. Brzyski had "nearly a hundred" victims at Saint Cecilia, the boy considered himself particularly unfortunate because he seemed to be a "favorite molestee." Father Brzyski pulled him out of classes and took him to the rectory and on outings – always with the same sexual purpose. His abuse continued from 5th grade through 8th, when the priest suddenly disappeared and parishioners were told he had had a nervous breakdown.

The psychological damage to Billy long outlasted the physical abuse. Billy told the Grand Jury that he was devastated by his helplessness in the face of the constant and repeated humiliation of being dragged out of class, having his pants pulled down, being placed on Fr. Brzyski's lap, and having his genitals fondled. The effect of the abuse was to take from Billy everything he loved in his life. He said he felt like he lost God and his belief in Heaven, and that was "the scariest thing you want to go through being a kid . . ."

Worse still was what happened when the boy finally decided he would not put up with the abuse anymore and he announced to the priest that he was going to tell his parents. Billy told the Grand Jury that upon hearing this, Fr. Brzyski "looked and laughed at me and said, '[Billy].' He said, 'If you don't know,' you know, 'your parents know what goes on. We have a deal.' You know, 'Don't think that they don't know.'" Billy told the Grand Jury, "After that, I walked back to the classroom devastated, like scared to death to even go home or – never look at my parents again . . ."

Billy began to wonder whether his parents needed money so badly that they had accepted money from Fr. Brzyski in exchange for permission to abuse their son. His fears, he said, were confirmed in his mind one day when he begged his mother not to make him go with Fr. Brzyski to the Mummers parade. He recalled his mother yelling at him, telling him he had no choice – he was going. On the way to the parade, in the front seat of Fr. Brzyski’s car, the priest fondled the boy’s genitals. In the back seat were two of Billy’s brothers.

For nearly 20 years, Billy believed that his parents were complicit in his abuse. Doubly wounded by Fr. Brzyski’s sexual molestation and by the belief, fostered in him by Fr. Brzyski, that his parents had abandoned him to this abuse, Billy fell into drinking and drug abuse. He lost all respect for the things he once loved – his parents, his church, his God. His mother could not understand why he turned against everything she had brought him up to believe in. Even when he finally told his mother, in 2001, about his abuse, he could not bring himself to tell her the lie that Fr. Brzyski had told him. Billy explained to the Grand Jury, “I didn’t want her heart broken thinking that I believed this for all those years.”

Billy also felt as though he had lost himself – or the person he used to be – as a result of Fr. Brzyski’s abuse. He described what the priest had done as “turn[ing] this good kid into this monster.” He began to think of himself as two different people. He told the Jurors:

I had no God to turn to, no family, and it just went from having one person in me to having two people inside me.

This nice [Billy] that used to live, and then this evil, this darkness [Billy] that had to have no morals and no conscience in order to get by day by day and, you know, not to care about anything or have no feelings and to bury them feelings so that you could live every day and not be laying on the couch with a depression problem so bad that, you know, four days later you’d be in the same spot.

Though he considered Christmas the “most wonderful time of the year,” Billy spent four consecutive Christmases unable to get out of bed. All the things he had loved most –

“going to church as a family and stuff like that” – were ruined for him, he said, by Fr. Brzyski.

The priest ruined even Billy’s “most precious spot as a kid” – his grandmother’s fishing shack in Forked River on the New Jersey Shore. There, as a youngster, he had spent time with her fishing, hanging out, and cooking crabs. The site was ruined for him when he learned that Fr. Brzyski and another priest owned a house a couple of blocks away. According to Billy, on weekends Fr. Brzyski and priest friends brought anywhere from five to ten boys to the house. Billy saw Kirk and Wesley at the house and several other boys whose names he could not remember. Seeing, as he put it, “this psycho’s down there just killed me and I didn’t even want to go down there no more.”

- **Sean**

Sean was Billy’s cousin and best friend. He, too, was an altar boy at Saint Cecilia. He was 12 years old and weighed just over 80 pounds when Fr. Brzyski – 6’5” and 220 pounds – anally raped him in the rectory. His abuse had started at an even younger age – when he was 10 or 11 – in the corner of the sacristy, where Fr. Brzyski forcibly fondled his genitals and rubbed up against the boy.

Sean testified that he was scared, but he was devout. He believed that to say anything bad about a priest was a mortal sin and that he would go to Hell if he told. So he said nothing at first, and continued to suffer the abuse even as its severity increased. He went on to be named “altar boy of the year” by the Archdiocese, and he was chosen to serve Mass with Pope John Paul II.

Sean tried to take his altar boy uniform home with him, and changed his clothes in the church parking lot to avoid Fr. Brzyski’s attacks. He tried to serve Masses only when other priests were on duty. But Fr. Brzyski still found ways to abuse the boy. The priest became a regular at his family’s dinners. He invited the parents to dine at the rectory – a special honor complete with fancy china and crystal. He invited Sean to dinner and movies. The boy’s parents expressed pleasure that he was spending time with the priest.

Because of episodes like these, he sought psychiatric help in 1997, more than 15 years after his abuse. While acknowledging that he might still appear quite disturbed, he told the Grand Jurors that he was, actually, much better since having finally talked to someone about what Fr. Brzyski had done to him. Like Fr. Brzyski's other victims, Ryan had felt he had no one in whom he could confide. It was clear from his testimony that it never even occurred to him that he could tell anyone. Believing as he did that "priests were the direct link to God," Ryan explained, "this was God . . . there's nobody to tell."

"What I did," Ryan told the Grand Jury, "was I found a way for twenty years to carry this around without telling it, and what you have to do is you have to learn to put it away." So, to save himself "from going nuts," he had to walk away from "everything that I had been brought up in."

Ryan could not care about school, when all he could think about was his abuse by Fr. Brzyski in that same building. The boy who once thought he had a vocation as a priest had to sit in the back of the church at weddings because he could not bear even seeing one. His whole life had revolved around Saint Cecilia, and Fr. Brzyski had taken that from him.

As an adult, he found he had to avoid intimate and caring relationships as well. He described his unsuccessful attempts to be close to someone:

I couldn't have sex without crying afterwards. I would go to bed with my girlfriends and wake up in the middle of the night and like think that they were dead regularly, and . . . if, God forbid, one of them should reach from behind me and like put their hand on my waist.

I used to tear rooms apart . . . and then to think about that, you know, having someone in your life that you love, who didn't sign on to have a boyfriend who's a complete basket case on any given moment, who can't go to bed with you without turning into some kind of lunatic.

So Ryan had to walk away from love, too. He stopped getting involved, assuming that "as soon as we get in bed, I'm going to end up scaring the shit out of this person." He decided, "I'm not going down that road It was awful."

It was apparent from his testimony that there were some details of Ryan's abuse that were still "put away." But he did refer to the priest's assaults as, at times, "intense" and "violent." One incident, he said, he recalled "kind of up until the point that I was on

even though the Secretary for Clergy had been told by Fr. Sicoli's co-workers that they could not work with him. Indeed, Fr. Sicoli's file contained numerous references, from several sets of co-workers at various locations, to Fr. Sicoli's inability to get along with fellow priests. Nevertheless, Msgr. Lynn informed the Archdiocese-owned treatment facility that the hope was to have Fr. Sicoli continue in his present assignment.

Given the information with which the treatment facility was provided, it was unsurprising that, at the conclusion of his evaluation, Fr. Sicoli announced (according to Father Bozeman) that the diagnosis was that he fixated on problems and that he needed more exercise. He assured the staff that everything was fine now.

Following the evaluation, Msgr. Lynn was informed repeatedly that Fr. Sicoli's relationship with Ben was continuing. Father Hennelly, one of the priests living in the rectory, informed him one week after Fr. Sicoli returned from his evaluation announcing that everything was fine. Charles Devlin, Vicar for North Philadelphia, informed him in January 1994, when he forwarded to the Secretary for Clergy a letter from Fr. Murphy (another priest living in the rectory) to Fr. Sicoli, explicitly criticizing his continuing "unhealthy and destructive relationship with [Ben]." In February 1994, Msgr. Lynn recorded Fr. Hennelly reporting that he was still "suspicious of his pastor [Sicoli] and the pastor's relationship with the young men of the parish." On April 5, 1994, Msgr. Lynn met with Fr. Judge, the third priest living at the rectory, and recorded being told: "Father Sicoli's relationship with the young man named Ben who works at the rectory has not changed."

On April 15, 1994, Cardinal Bevilacqua received a six-page letter from Diane and her husband detailing the story of Fr. Sicoli's intense and violent relationship with Adrian at Our Lady of the Holy Souls. They also alerted the Cardinal that Fr. Sicoli was now obsessively involved with another boy, referring to Ben.

Cardinal Bevilacqua responds to complaints against Father Sicoli by transferring him to another parish, where he attaches to a new boy.

Cardinal Bevilacqua's response to the overwhelming opinion of the staff from Fr. Sicoli's last two assignments – that Fr. Sicoli had sick and improper relationships with

adolescent boys – was to offer the priest another pastorate in a different part of town. On May 7, 1994, Fr. Sicoli wrote to Msgr. Lynn:

I have given much thought to the options that you and Msgr. Devlin discussed with me at our May 6th meeting concerning my next assignment.

I wish to accept Cardinal Bevilacqua's offer to be named Pastor of Saint Anthony's parish.

There is no indication in Archdiocese files how Cardinal Bevilacqua reached his decision to offer Fr. Sicoli another pastorate. At least three members of the Priest Personnel Board – the Cardinal, Msgr. Lynn, and the North Philadelphia Vicar, Charles Devlin – were quite familiar with Fr. Sicoli's problem with adolescent boys.

Now-Bishop Joseph Cistone told the Grand Jury that because Fr. Sicoli was the only priest assigned to Saint Anthony, a South Philadelphia parish, this meant that, by necessity, Fr. Sicoli be in charge of any youth programs and altar boys. It also meant there were no assistant priests to observe and report any improper relationships or behavior.

Father Sicoli's behavior had become so notorious among priests and Catholic lay staff, however, that Bozeman soon had people asking and informing him about Fr. Sicoli's actions. He told the Grand Jury that Linda Love, the Director of the Office of Black Catholics, approached him and told him that she had heard stories about what had happened at Our Lady of Hope and was concerned because she knew he was involved with youth again at Saint Anthony. She told Bozeman that Fr. Sicoli had started a chastity program at his new parish, similar to one he ran at Our Lady of Hope. She said that Ben was now a part of this group at Saint Anthony. Love also told Bozeman that Fr. Sicoli had "picked up another kid" at Saint Anthony, a boy named "Allen," and that Allen's mother was worried about the situation. Linda Love told Bozeman that she intended to report Fr. Sicoli's continued involvement with teens to "the proper authorities." If Love did complain to the Office for Clergy, there is no record of it and no action resulted.

Father Francis P. Rogers

The Grand Jury will never be able to determine how many boys Father Francis P. Rogers raped and sexually abused in his more than 50 years as a priest. Nor, probably, will we or anyone else be able to calculate the number of boys the Archdiocese could have saved from sexual abuse had it investigated potential victims rather than protecting itself from scandal and shielding this sexually abusive priest. We have learned of at least three victims who we believe would not have been abused had the Archdiocese taken decisive action when it learned of Fr. Rogers' "familiarity" with boys. We find that the Archdiocese received a litany of verifiable reports beginning shortly after Fr. Rogers' 1946 ordination and continuing for decades about his serious misconduct with, and abuse of, boys.

One of his victims described waking up intoxicated in the priest's bed, opening his eyes to see Fr. Rogers, three other priests, and a seminarian surrounding him. Two of the priests ejaculated on him while Fr. Rogers masturbated himself. Then Fr. Rogers sucked on the victim's penis, pinched his nipples, kissed him, and rubbed his stubbly beard all over him. The former altar boy, whom Fr. Rogers began abusing when he was about 12 years old, remains haunted by memories of the abuse more than 35 years later.

Father Rogers' file demonstrates that the Archdiocese responded to reports of his crimes with a shameful half-century of transfers, excuses, and finger-wagging threats that did nothing to deter the priest from indulging his self-acknowledged "weakness" and that exposed every boy in his path to the very real and horrible possibility of sexual abuse.

Father Rogers sexually abuses "Russell."

In approximately 1962 or 1963, during his first year as an assistant pastor at Saint Joachim's parish in Philadelphia, Fr. Francis Rogers began molesting Russell, having selected him as an altar boy. The priest was 43 or 44; Russell was around 12. Father Rogers sexually abused Russell every week until sometime after Russell turned 16. In a statement he provided to the Grand Jury, discussions with the Archdiocese, a letter he wrote to a detective, and a follow-up interview with the detective, Russell described an escalating sequence of abuse that began when he was an altar boy working on setting up a manger. On that first occasion, Fr. Rogers put his hand inside Russell's underwear and slid his finger into the cleft between Russell's buttocks. Russell was baffled; he knew that what Fr. Rogers had done was a bad thing, but Fr. Rogers was smiling and, moreover, he was a priest and as Russell had been taught, priests were "chosen by God and could do no wrong."

Father Francis X. Trauger

One night in a Poconos motel in the spring of 1981, Fr. Francis X. Trauger repeatedly tried to anally penetrate a 12-year-old altar boy and for hours manually manipulated his penis. After the 5th-grader's parents reported the abuse through their parish pastor, the Archdiocese recorded the event this way: "They shared the same bed and there were touches."

The pastor passed on other allegations against the priest, involving another boy. The Archdiocese report stated: "same bed: touches." A few days later, Fr. Trauger himself told an Archdiocese official that "two similar events" occurred that spring with still two other boys. Subsequent years saw Church officials record other reports of "touches" and "camping."

The Archdiocese's use of such delicate euphemisms had the effect of concealing the true nature of Fr. Trauger's crimes. Whether the result of intentional obfuscation or a refusal to interview victims directly, the Archdiocese's responses to abuse allegations effectively shielded the priest from legal or criminal action and facilitated decades of sexual predation.

Ordained in 1972, Fr. Trauger was transferred eight times during his long career, each time to a parish with a school attached, each time without a warning to parish parents about the priest's predilections. Six of the transfers occurred after 1981, when the Archdiocese began recording abuse allegations.

Father Trauger is transferred following 1981 abuse reports.

The first recorded accusation against Fr. Francis Trauger reached the Chancellor of the Archdiocese, Monsignor Francis J. Statkus, on August 6, 1981. Two families had reported to Fr. Anthony McGuire, the pastor of Saint Titus Church in Norristown, that Fr. Trauger had molested their young sons. One of the boys, "Evan," was 12 years old; the other, "Carl," was 13. Both had been taken by the assistant pastor, on separate occasions, overnight to the Poconos, where the priest had the boys sleep in his bed.

Monsignor Statkus recorded the barest description of the abuse itself. He wrote only that the boys shared a bed with the priest and there were "touches." He added, regarding the abuse of Evan: "reportedly, according to Msgr. McG, no sodomy." He did not record whether there was sodomy with Carl.

Monsignor Statkus wrote extensively, however, about the character of the two boys' families, apparently with an eye toward whether either would make the assaults

Dennis Donnelly, Fr. Trauger himself reported the results to Assistant Chancellor Walker. According to Fr. Walker's notes, Fr. Trauger told him that Dr. Donnelly had "found no evidence of homosexual problems on the part of Father T but there was a gross error in judgment." Father Trauger promised that a written evaluation would follow, but none was found in the priest's file.

Following a 1982 abuse report, Father Trauger is transferred again.

A year later, on August 2, 1982, Fr. Trauger again was accused of making sexual advances toward a student at his parish school. According to Chancellor Statkus's notes, on July 22, 1982, Fr. Trauger took 14-year-old "Marty" to his Pocono mountain house, ostensibly so that the boy could help mow the grass. Marty's father told Msgr. Statkus that Fr. Trauger made the boy sleep with him in a small tent, under one blanket, although there were two bedrooms in the priest's house. Marty told his father that, throughout the night, Fr. Trauger touched and rubbed up against the boy even though he kept telling the priest to stay on his own side. The next morning, the priest drove Marty home, but while they waited for his parents, who were out, Fr. Trauger tried to tickle and "wrestle" with the boy. When his parents arrived home, they found Marty outside their property, upset and crying.

When his father asked what was wrong, Marty related the above account, though his father suspected there was more that Marty did not tell him. Marty also told his father that he did not want to accompany Fr. Trauger on a planned two-week camping trip to South Dakota.

Marty's father was a detective in the Philadelphia police department. He reported Fr. Trauger's actions to the morals division of the police department on the morning of August 2, 1982. After hearing his complaint, an unnamed morals division officer contacted David McKenzie at the Catholic Youth Organization office. McKenzie, in turn, contacted Msgr. Statkus, who arranged to meet with the father on the afternoon of August 2.

Monsignor Statkus wrote after his meeting with Marty's father, the detective: "The [parents] have not discussed this with anyone outside the family and an officer of the Morals Division. The priests of Saint Matthew were not contacted by him or by Chancery. I suggest that no mention be made to the priests. . . ." Monsignor Statkus also noted that he

had successfully diverted Marty's father from pursuing the matter with the police or otherwise: "Convinced of our sincere resolve to take the necessary action regarding Fr. T., Mr. [...] does not plan to press any charges, police or otherwise."

When Msgr. Statkus tried to contact Fr. Trauger on August 2, 1982, the priest was in South Dakota camping with two boys from Saint Matthew's School. The Chancellor immediately asked his assistant, Fr. Walker, to contact Dr. Donnelly for reassurance that Fr. Trauger was "not of a homosexual orientation." And Cardinal Krol, who had routinely reassigned Fr. Trauger to a new parish after four similar incidents the year before, declared the case "very serious."

While Archdiocese officials quickly took steps necessary to keep Marty's father from pursuing charges criminally, their records show no action taken with regard to the two boys camping with Fr. Trauger in South Dakota. Despite the "very serious" nature of this case, there is no evidence that the Archdiocese contacted the parents. According to notes of an August 8, 1982, meeting with Fr. Trauger, Msgr. Statkus questioned the priest about Marty, but asked nothing about the other two boys, including their identity. Monsignor Statkus recorded that Fr. Trauger told him of about eight camping trips he had taken with young boys during the preceding year. Again, there was no mention of an inquiry into who these boys were or what happened on the camping trips.

At Cardinal Krol's direction, Msgr. Statkus informed Fr. Trauger that his assignment at Saint Matthew was terminated, that his faculties were suspended pending evaluation, and that he was to report to Villa Saint John Vianney Hospital, the church-affiliated treatment center in Downingtown. Fr. Trauger underwent an evaluation there on August 11, 1982. His evaluating psychologist, Phillip J. Miraglia, recommended inpatient treatment followed by an "intensive retreat" and outpatient therapy.

Dr. Miraglia found "frustration regarding sexual expression and some confusion regarding sexual object choice." However, the psychologist thought the "quality of the responses . . . benign." The therapist understated the seriousness of the charges against Fr. Trauger in his final report of September 24, 1982, in which he commended Fr. Trauger's acceptance of "the fact that he demonstrated poor judgment in planning a camping trip with a young student." No mention was made that Fr. Trauger had, in fact, inappropriately

touched at least five boys in the previous 18 months and gone “camping” with innumerable others. The weakness of the report may not be the fault of Dr. Miraglia, who may not have been made aware of any behavior other than “physical contact” with one boy while camping.

The Cardinal’s response to this “very serious case” was, once again, to transfer Fr. Trauger to a different parish. On October 1, 1982, Cardinal Krol assigned Fr. Trauger to Saint Francis DeSales in West Philadelphia, a parish with a grammar school. Monsignor Statkus again instructed the priest not to take trips with boys, but he encouraged Fr. Trauger to participate in the parish’s youth activities including, “visiting the school, moderating the altar boys . . . as well as the CYO.”

Monsignor Statkus further told Fr. Trauger “that his most recent indiscretion was viewed as a very serious matter and was filled with extremely dire circumstances which could have led to greater scandal.” Although the obfuscations and vagueness of documents make it difficult to establish exactly how the Archdiocese saw Fr. Trauger’s “recent indiscretion” compared to his previous ones, one important difference, and one that clearly got the attention of the Archdiocese, was that the father of the victim of the most recent indiscretion was a police detective who had made a police report.

With serious allegations against him, Father Trauger is reassigned to four more parishes.

Father Trauger was transferred four more times in his career. He went as parochial vicar to Saint Matthew, Conshohocken, in June 1985 and left in September 1988. From there he went to Annunciation B.V.M., in South Philadelphia, staying less than a year. In June 1989 he was transferred to Saint Joseph, in Aston, Delaware County, where he remained until June 1993, when Cardinal Bevilacqua appointed him parochial vicar of Saint Michael the Archangel in Levittown.

Cardinal Bevilacqua, having become Archbishop in February 1988, was responsible for three of the reassignments. With allegations described by Cardinal Krol as “extremely serious” from three named victims on file, along with several other admissions

of suspicious but unexplored “events,” “touches,” and “camping,” Archbishop Bevilacqua named Fr. Trauger Parochial Vicar of three parishes with grade schools.

There is nothing on record to indicate that the priest’s activities with youth were restricted in any way or that anyone in the new parishes, including the pastors, was ever informed of the reasons why Fr. Trauger had left past assignments.

The Archdiocese in 1991 receives a report that Father Trauger is stalking a boy.

Archbishop Bevilacqua’s last transfer of Fr. Trauger – to Saint Michael the Archangel in 1993 – followed a report that in April 1991, while Parochial Vicar at Saint Joseph’s, Fr. Trauger had stalked a student at Saint John Neumann High School after encountering the boy in a center city bookstore. Even the less-than-rigorous “investigation” conducted by Archbishop Bevilacqua’s staff revealed that Fr. Trauger used his standing as a priest to track down personal information about this student. First, he ascertained the boy’s name from Fr. Ronald Rossi, vice principal at his high school. Then he obtained the boy’s phone number, address, and family information from Fr. Dominic Chiaravalle, the boy’s pastor at Epiphany in South Philadelphia. The next day, Fr. Trauger used his priestly status to remove the boy from class, take him to a room, and presume to “counsel” the boy for an hour and a half about the homosexual pornography he had been perusing in the bookstore.

The boy’s mother called the school, concerned when her son did not return home as scheduled. She called school officials again, very upset, when she learned the content of her son’s conversation with the unfamiliar priest. She did not know that the priest had made sexual advances during their “conversation.” Nor, it appears from records, did Archdiocese officials, because they did not question the student about the incident. (According to a February 9, 2004, recommendation by the Archdiocesan Review Board, prepared after the boy was finally interviewed in 2003, he reported that, in addition to talking about sex, Fr. Trauger felt the boy’s knee and upper thigh.)

School officials reported the incident to the Archdiocese on April 12, 1991. Secretary for Clergy John J. Jagodzinski recorded the report – though not the name of the student involved – and forwarded it to Msgr. Molloy. Monsignor Molloy interviewed Fr.

Trauger on April 15. The priest admitted approaching the boy in the bookstore; introducing himself as a priest; telling the boy, who was wearing a Neumann High School jacket, that the priest knew the principal, vice principal, and several teachers at the boy's school; questioning the boy about pornography; and asking the boy's name (which the boy refused to give). The priest admitted to tracking the boy down, removing him from class, meeting alone in a small room with the boy for an hour and a half, and questioning whether the boy thought he was gay.

In a four-page memo recording his interview with Fr. Trauger, Msgr. Molloy still did not mention the boy's name. Finally, after Fr. Rossi, the vice principal, called for a second time about the incident, Msgr. Molloy recorded the boy's last name – "Logue."

Monsignor Molloy testified that even though he knew of Fr. Trauger's history of abuse when he was dealing with the incident in 1991, Archdiocese officials never interviewed the boy. Monsignor Molloy attempted to justify the failure to remove Fr. Trauger from his parish or restrict his access to schools and children, claiming that the Archdiocese lacked "hard evidence" against the priest. Knowing that Fr. Trauger was in a position to stalk, harass and abuse Archdiocese children, Church officials allowed him to continue in his position as Parochial Vicar at Saint Joseph's. Two years later he was transferred to Saint Michael the Archangel in Levittown.

Cardinal Bevilacqua assigns Father Trauger to another parish with a school.

When Archbishop Bevilacqua appointed Fr. Trauger as Parochial Vicar of Saint Michael in 1993, Archdiocese officials knew of accusations against the priest by four named boys (Evan, Carl, Marty, and the Logue boy). They knew of two other boys whom Fr. Trauger had admitted touching inappropriately. And they knew of many more who had gone "camping" with the priest.

Yet in these 10 years of accusations, Archdiocese officials never sought to question a single victim directly to find out what Fr. Trauger had done. Nor did they seek out the families of known victims so they could stop the continuing abuse of their children. Instead, they recorded hearsay accusations and determined that they lacked "hard

evidence.” Then the Archbishop would reassign the priest, or not, apparently depending on whether it was necessary to prevent exposure or scandal.

In his testimony before the Grand Jury, Msgr. Edward Cullen, the Vicar General, admitted that the Archdiocese’s investigation into the 1991 stalking of the Logue boy was not handled correctly and that the boy and his family should have been interviewed. He explained that Fr. Trauger was not endorsed for a high school chaplaincy in 1991 because it would “make sense to not put that person in a high school.” In light of that recognition of the risk Fr. Trauger posed, Msgr. Cullen was at a loss to explain why Cardinal Bevilacqua appointed Fr. Trauger as Parochial Vicar at Saint Michael, which he described as having a large school.

On December 18, 2003, after Fr. Trauger’s files were subpoenaed by this Grand Jury, the Archdiocese announced that it was removing him from the ministry, finding the allegations against him “credible.” Father Trauger had admitted on December 12 to Secretary for Clergy Lynn that he had sexually abused the three boys who had made allegations against him.

Father Trauger appeared before the Grand Jury and was given an opportunity to answer questions concerning the allegations against him. He chose not to do so.

Father Thomas J. Wisniewski

In July 1992, Cardinal Bevilacqua's newly appointed Secretary for Clergy, William J. Lynn, documented allegations that Fr. Thomas J. Wisniewski had abused a 15-year-old boy in Nativity B.V.M. parish for three years, beginning in 1984, engaging in "everything sexually two men can do."

The documents in Fr. Wisniewski's file shed light on Cardinal Bevilacqua's policies and practices in dealing with priests accused of sexual crimes. According to these procedures, the Cardinal was made knowledgeable of the case from the start. The procedures emphasized consideration of legal liability and scandal over public safety. They sought to conceal information and avoid law enforcement. They failed to heed recommendations for supervising and monitoring the priest. The procedures enabled Fr. Wisniewski, ordained in 1974, to continue acting as a priest for six years after he admitted sexually abusing a minor.

Monsignor Lynn's memos about Fr. Wisniewski describe a process whereby sexual abuse allegations were to be immediately reported, verbally, to Cardinal Bevilacqua and his Vicar for Administration. The Cardinal wanted his Secretary for Clergy to "act quickly" to remove any admitted molester from his assignment and to have the priest evaluated at the Archdiocese's hospital, Saint John Vianney. But the purpose of acting quickly, Msgr. Lynn noted, was to minimize "legal ramifications." Known victims who did not themselves come forward were not to be sought out or interviewed. The Archdiocesan Personnel Board charged with recommending priests' assignments was not to be informed of "such matters" as sexual abuse allegations and admissions.

Also in Fr. Wisniewski's file was a description by Saint John Vianney therapists of the aftercare and supervision that the Archdiocese would need to put in place if it was to consider permitting abusers to continue in what Cardinal Bevilacqua termed "limited ministry." These recommendations called for, among other things, a resident supervisor who kept a daily log of the priest's comings and goings. In Fr. Wisniewski's case, as in others, the ministry was permitted, but the supervision and aftercare were lacking.

In 1992, Father Wisniewski admits to abusing "Kenneth."

On July 7, 1992, "Susan" reported to Archdiocese managers that her ex-boyfriend, Kenneth, had been abused for three years by Fr. Thomas Wisniewski, beginning in 1984 when the priest was an assistant pastor at Nativity B.V.M. in Media. Father Paul Dougherty, who also knew from Kenneth of his abuse, accompanied Susan to the Archdiocese headquarters, where they met with Cardinal Bevilacqua's Assistant Vicar for Administration, James E. Molloy, and his newly assigned Secretary for Clergy, William J. Lynn.