

Section V

Selected Case Studies

The Grand Jury reviewed hundreds of allegations of sexual abuse committed by priests in the Philadelphia Archdiocese. The Jurors examined “Secret Archives” files for 169 priests (121 Archdiocesan and 48 religious-order priests working in the Archdiocese) and 2 permanent deacons. These files were supplied by the Archdiocese in response to a subpoena asking for all records relating to allegations of sexual abuse of minors by priests that had come to the attention of Church officials since 1967. In addition to these Secret Archives files, the Grand Jury also subpoenaed and reviewed the personnel files of many of these priests.

We have not, in this Report, attempted to summarize all of the evidence we received or to describe the allegations against all 171 clerics. We have chosen instead to focus and report in depth on a representative sampling of these priests. These are not necessarily the worst offenders with the most victims. They were chosen because the evidence from their files and the witnesses who testified about their cases provide the most complete picture of clergy sexual abuse of children in the Archdiocese, the impact on the victims and their families, and the Church leaders’ strategies to conceal the priests’ crimes.

The nature of sexual abuse of minors, including the reluctance of victims to come forward, is such that the official record typically represents only the tip of the iceberg. In this case, we also do not have the full story because of the Archdiocese’s longstanding efforts to suppress the truth about its priests. There are many victims whose names were

never recorded. Church records obscured crimes with euphemisms – an attempted rape, for example, was recorded as “touches.” The Archdiocese’s success in keeping these crimes hidden for so many years has made a full investigation of them at this time nearly impossible. Still, the evidence summarized in this report makes clear the patterns of sexual abuse and the cover-up by Church officials that have haunted and outraged the members of this Grand Jury.

The following case studies of selected priests reflect our findings based on documents from the priests’ Secret Archives and personnel files, and on the testimony of victims, witnesses, and Archdiocesan priests and managers. We found these cases to be representative of the priests whose files we reviewed. We also found that the Archdiocese’s response to the allegations against these priests accurately illustrates how, unfortunately, such cases were routinely handled.

The names of the victims, their families, and parishioners who reported priests’ offenses have been changed.

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.

Father Gana abuses a 13-year-old boy at Our Lady of Calvary.

In 1980, 13-year-old “Timmy” lived with his parents and four siblings in Northeast Philadelphia. His family was deeply religious and invested in activities at Our Lady of Calvary, their parish church. Both of Timmy’s parents and his sister volunteered at the church. From an early age, Timmy knew that his mother’s greatest hope was that one of her children would become a nun or a priest.

Timmy’s family kept a strict home: meals were eaten together, television and telephone use were restricted, and Timmy and his brother and sisters were shielded from anything sexual. The boys did not even undress in front of each other. A quiet and well-behaved child, Timmy was chosen to read at his 8th-grade graduation Mass. Although pleased at his selection, he was insecure. A speech impediment made him fear public speaking. So when Fr. Stanley Gana, the new assistant pastor at Our Lady of Calvary, praised his reading in the sacristy, Timmy was grateful.

That summer, 40-year-old Fr. Gana began injecting himself into the Timmy’s home life, visiting regularly, often bringing gifts, and staying as an honored guest at family meals. Father Gana began to ask young Timmy to do things with him or to help at the rectory. He also invited Timmy to visit his Poconos farm for the weekend. Timmy’s parents welcomed the priest’s interest in their son. Neither they nor Timmy knew that the Archdiocese had been warned about Fr. Gana’s relationships with young boys during a previous assignment.

Flattered by the priest’s friendship and his parents’ resulting pride, city-raised Timmy found Fr. Gana’s farm a new and exciting world. Timmy received more adult attention from Fr. Gana than he did in his own large family. At first, he was not overly worried about the priest’s physical “roughhousing” despite the enormous disparity in their sizes: Fr. Gana, Timmy thought, weighed about 375 pounds, while he was a scrawny 13-year-old. For a sheltered boy from a strict family, there was no reason to suspect the priest’s intentions.

After Timmy’s first trip to the farm, Fr. Gana began calling often for his help with various projects. The priest also found Timmy a job as parish sacristan, a duty that

involved locking the church after Saturday evening Mass and opening it on Sunday morning. Soon Fr. Gana was inviting Timmy to stay for pizza. Then he was asking Timmy's parents if the boy could spend the night, since Timmy had to open the church early on Sundays.

On Saturday night stay-overs, Fr. Gana and Timmy played a favorite card game of Timmy's family – five hundred rummy – on a coffee table in Fr. Gana's living room. One night, complaining that the table was too small, Fr. Gana moved the game to his bedroom. There, he ordered the boy to take his shirt off. The priest then took off his own shirt and Timmy's pants, assuring the boy that what he was doing to him was natural and would feel good. The priest told Timmy how beautiful his undeveloped body was. Then he fondled his penis until the boy ejaculated. Later that night, Fr. Gana had Timmy masturbate him. Timmy, who had never so much as undressed in front of family or friends, thought that Fr. Gana's behavior had to be proper because he was a priest.

After that night, Fr. Gana's sexual abuse of Timmy became unrelenting. Father Gana frequently invited the boy out – for movies, dinner, even visits to the priest's sister's house. Then Fr. Gana called and asked Timmy's parents' permission to keep Timmy out late or overnight. That summer the priest forced the child to perform oral sex and, later, began anally raping him. The obese priest pushed Timmy over the bed so that his face was on the carpet. Sometimes Timmy cried and Fr. Gana stopped, briefly. But then, ignoring the boy's pain, he pushed ahead until he penetrated Timmy's anus. Timmy remembered going to the bathroom afterwards and passing blood and what must have been semen, although at the time he did not know what it was.

The first time Fr. Gana anally sodomized him, Timmy went home and curled up on the floor of the family basement, stunned and terrified by what had happened. Later that summer, Timmy's mother became convinced he was lactose intolerant because of the milky fluid that sometimes emerged when he sat on the toilet. Father Gana told Timmy that anal sodomy was a part of loving someone. He expected the boy to reciprocate.

The priest told Timmy that the sexual activity between them was their secret which could not be shared. There was little risk of that: the frightened boy knew his parents would never believe him even had he dared to tell them. In Timmy's household, priests

were like teachers. They were never wrong; it was always the child who was wrong. The boy felt powerless.

In the fall of 1980, Timmy entered Archbishop Ryan High School in Philadelphia. Father Gana saw him on average three times a week and sexually abused him each time. He also continued to shower the family with gifts. In the summer of 1981, despite the availability of better paying jobs, Timmy's parents insisted that he work at the church.

When Timmy sought to socialize with friends on weekends, his parents discouraged him, saying he should help Fr. Gana instead because "he's so good to you." Even when Timmy took a weeknight job to earn money for college, Fr. Gana called his parents and offered to drive him home. The priest picked up Timmy, took him to the rectory and sexually abused him before dropping him off.

In addition to co-opting the boy's parents and monopolizing his time, Fr. Gana sought to control and isolate Timmy in crueler ways. He played on the boy's insecurities, robbing him of the confidence necessary to connect with other people. Father Gana convinced Timmy that a girl named "Susie" had invited him to her prom only because she felt sorry for him. When Timmy was asked to join the National Honor Society, Fr. Gana told him he was not smart enough and would only embarrass his parents when the Society would likely expel him in a year.

Father Gana showed Timmy nude photos, which he kept in a safe in his bedroom, of other boys whom he had sexually abused. Father Gana singled out one boy, named "Barry," who, he said, "performed" better than Timmy. The priest even ruined the teenager's high school senior week at the shore, when he showed up and demanded that Timmy spend the day with him.

It was not until Timmy left for seminary that he was able to begin breaking away from Fr. Gana. In the fall of 1984, the 17-year-old enrolled in Saint Charles Borromeo Seminary in Overbrook to begin training for the priesthood. The school's rules limited Fr. Gana's access to the teenager, who was allowed out only on Saturdays. Father Gana persisted, arranging with the boy's parents to pick him up and bring him home on weekends, or showing up unannounced at the seminary.

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.

John told Msgr. Lynn that he was 14 years old when, in 1977, he had summoned the courage to tell his mother that a family friend had orally sodomized him for three years. John's mother sought a counselor to help John deal with his resulting depression. She turned to the assistant pastor at Ascension Church in Kensington.

Father Gana recommended that he meet regularly with the boy, in private, to help him recover from the effects of the sexual abuse. Their first meeting took place in a rectory office. Father Gana closed the door and asked John to describe the molestation he had experienced. Then, telling the boy that it would help him overcome his fear of men, Fr. Gana hugged him. After Fr. Gana accustomed John to hugging during a number of counseling sessions, the priest told him, "It's OK to kiss another man." He instructed John to kiss him on the cheek.

When Fr. Gana began to invite John to stay overnight at the rectory, the boy became extremely upset. His mother asked him why he was so nervous. He answered that he was afraid she would think that Fr. Gana was doing the same thing to him that his previous abuser had. His mother dismissed his fear, assuring her son that the priest would never harm him.

Father Gana took his time grooming John. The first few times he made the boy share his bed he did not molest him. After several months, Fr. Gana told the boy that it was okay to show affection to a man while lying in bed. Thereafter, the priest progressed from fondling and kissing to "humping up against" the boy, masturbating him and, eventually, anally raping him. Father Gana also required John to masturbate and sodomize the priest.

At the end of John's freshman year, in 1978, Fr. Gana asked the boy's mother whether John could spend the summer at Fr. Gana's farm in the Poconos. It would be good for him, the priest told her. It would help keep John out of trouble. In all, Fr. Gana invited five boys to the farm: John, his two brothers, Barry, and a teenager named "Dean." That summer, Fr. Gana rotated John, Barry, and Dean through his bed on consecutive nights. He boasted about being in his late thirties yet "bedding three young boys at the same time." He told them that "each friendship needs personal time."

When John returned from the summer at the farm, Fr. Gana arranged for him to transfer to North Catholic High School. Father Gana paid the tuition. The priest continued

to sexually abuse John throughout the boy's high school years, including at weekly "therapy" sessions and summers on the farm. During those years, Fr. Gana abused numerous boys, as older victims left to be replaced by younger boys.

Barry confirmed in a statement given to a detective and read to the Grand Jury that Fr. Gana had made him engage in mutual masturbation with the priest from 1976, when Barry was 15 years old, until 1979. Father Gana, he said, also orally sodomized him.

Father Gana confided in John that he was upset when Barry stopped coming to the farm. But Barry was replaced by another teen, "Sandy," who came to live year-round at the farm during John's junior year. In 1980, when Fr. Gana was transferred to Our Lady of Calvary in Northeast Philadelphia, Fr. Gana started bringing Timmy to the Poconos. Timmy was 13. The priest began taking John and Timmy to bed at the same time.

Father Gana told John about other boys he had sexually abused during the 1970s. He boasted that someone had reported him to the Archdiocese as a possible child molester when he was an assistant pastor, but Fr. Gana had blocked the inquiry. According to John, Fr. Gana said that he had told Church officials that the pastor himself was having an affair with the rectory's housekeeper, showing them women's clothes in the pastor's quarters. Archdiocese managers had called off the investigation.

Father Gana successfully deflected allegations on at least one other occasion. In October 1980, he called Fr. Donald Walker of the Chancery office (then in charge of allegations of clergy sexual misconduct) to report that his brother and nephew-in-law had spread word that he was, among other things, a homosexual and a "deviate." Father Gana blamed these accusations on family disharmony and the alleged physical and emotional problems of his accusers. Archdiocesan managers instructed Fr. Gana to "keep a very low profile for the next few weeks in the area of his farm by not taking his days off spending any time there." They also advised him to hire a lawyer.

Over the years, Fr. Gana showed John pornography and nude photos of boys whom the priest had abused. One picture was of a boy named "Bob," from Fr. Gana's first assignment (from 1970 to 1974) in Feasterville. The boy was lying on a bearskin rug with his buttocks in the air. Father Gana made John pose for pornographic photos as well. Barry told the detective that Fr. Gana also took a nude photograph of him.

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.

John reports his abuse but is frustrated by Church officials' response.

When John met with Msgr. Lynn at Archdiocese headquarters on September 6, 1995, he told Msgr. Lynn he wanted Fr. Gana removed from the priesthood, a newspaper ad seeking other victims, and a letter of apology from the Cardinal, or at least a meeting with him. He gave Msgr. Lynn detailed information about his own abuse, and named people who could corroborate his story. He also identified other victims, including Tim, and offered to produce them.

John said that Msgr. Lynn told him not to contact the other victims. He said that if Archdiocesan managers determined that the abuse had occurred, they would help pay for John's therapy. Monsignor Lynn promised to do "whatever he could" to arrange a meeting with Cardinal Bevilacqua. The meeting never occurred.

By November 1997, more than two years after he had gone to Msgr. Lynn to report his allegations, John still had not received from the Archdiocese an acknowledgment of Fr. Gana's abuses, or an apology, or a meeting with the Cardinal. Monsignor Lynn had told John in July 1996 that Fr. Gana "continues to deny the allegations," even though Msgr. Lynn knew by then that the priest had admitted the abuse to therapists. Meanwhile, John's marriage had broken up and he had lost his nursing job. Frustrated and angry, he returned to Archdiocese headquarters on November 18, 1997, demanding again to meet with the Cardinal and asking for financial assistance. Monsignor Lynn agreed only to give John a referral to Catholic Social Services.

Cardinal Bevilacqua's Assistant Vicar for Administration, Msgr. Joseph Cistone, wrote in a subsequent memo that the Cardinal was not inclined to meet with John, lest it set "a precedent, i.e. for the Cardinal to meet with such individuals." The memo recorded the Cardinal cautioning that "there must be other means of letting [John] know that His Eminence was informed, other than for His Eminence to meet with him personally."

(Appendix D-1)

John's meeting with Sister Pat Kelly, the site supervisor for Catholic Social Services, did not have happy results. He had hoped she might assist him with job training and placement and, in the meantime, help him pay his bills. Instead, according to John, Kelly grilled him with questions, lectured him, and asked why he blamed the Archdiocese

rather than himself. She expressed disbelief that he had been in therapy for two and a half years, sarcastically exclaiming, “Really that long?” She criticized John for his focus on material compensation, assuring him it would not make him happy. She asked John whether he had received sexual satisfaction from Fr. Gana’s abuse. (Appendix D-2)

Yet, because John threatened to make his allegations public if it failed to respond, doing nothing was no longer an option for the Archdiocese. On September 6, 1995, the same day that John first appeared at headquarters, Msgr. Lynn and his assistant, Msgr. Michael McCulken, met with Fr. Gana.

As he had done when he was questioned in 1992 about abusing Tim, Fr. Gana “denied” John’s allegations but incriminated himself in doing so. Father Gana admitted making a substantial financial settlement with John. He admitted sleeping in the same bed with John when he was a young boy, while denying that he touched him sexually. He not only admitted to the Disney World trip but conceded that other guests would corroborate the “sleeping” rotation of boys in his bed. He discounted the likelihood that Tim and John were colluding against him.

Father Gana assured Msgr. Lynn that if anyone went to court or the media with allegations against him, he would resign his priesthood. But Msgr. Lynn, as he wrote later, did not know “what action [John] might take if it appears to him that the Church is not doing anything about his allegations.”

Father Gana is evaluated and treated, but he and Archdiocese officials manipulate the process to obtain the diagnosis they desire.

John’s September 1995 complaint against Fr. Gana triggered what had come to be the Archdiocese’s routine procedure for dealing with priests accused of sexual abuse of minors. Monsignor Lynn scheduled an evaluation for Fr. Gana at the Anodos Center of St. John Vianney Hospital, in Downingtown, a church-affiliated facility with which the Archdiocese and its law firm, Stradley Ronon, had a longstanding relationship. Father

Gana obtained a two-month delay to hire a canonical lawyer, during which he continued as pastor of Our Mother of Sorrows.

Monsignor Lynn provided the Anodos Center with background information on Fr. Gana and a summary of Tim's and John's allegations. Monsignor Lynn asked center officials to determine whether Fr. Gana had, in fact, engaged in sexual activity with teenage males, and whether he should be engaged in priestly ministry that involved adolescents. The treatment center, however, was ill suited for this task: it could not check evidence or question witnesses or victims.

Monsignor Lynn noted under "Living Situation" on the center's form: "Father is stationed alone. He mentioned he does have students from Slovakia living with him." Monsignor Lynn did not think it important to investigate the situation of these foreign students living at the rectory with Fr. Gana.

Monsignor Lynn also wrote that other named victims would be questioned – implying that if there were anything to their claims, Msgr. Lynn would provide the information to the evaluation center. Hearing nothing back, center staff might assume that there were no other victims, or that other allegations had been explored and found not credible. In fact, the Archdiocese did not question other named victims.

Even with the incomplete and inaccurate information that Msgr. Lynn provided, the Anodos Center concluded that returning Fr. Gana to ministry presented a risk. Its report found that Fr. Gana "demonstrates significantly impaired professional conduct such that he is at risk for further inappropriate and dangerous behavior." It recommended treatment at a residential facility.

Cardinal Bevilacqua received a copy of the hospital's summary statement. He also received a memo from Joseph Cistone, the assistant to the Vicar for Administration, Edward P. Cullen, which reflected the priorities governing Archdiocese deliberations. "Bishop Cullen and I both feel," the memo warned, "that this has the potential of becoming a PR concern." At the Cardinal's urging, Fr. Gana resigned as pastor of Our Mother of Sorrows, effective December 15, 1995.

Yet Fr. Gana's career as a priest did not end. Pursuant to Archdiocesan procedure, he was permitted to select his own residential treatment program. And so long as he could

emerge from such a facility without being diagnosed a “pedophile” or “ephebophile,” he could hope to return to active ministry.

Father Gana chose to begin treatment, on February 4, 1996, at another church-affiliated facility, Southdown, near Toronto, Canada. Before Fr. Gana checked in, Msgr. Lynn spelled out for him exactly what diagnosis he had to avoid in order to remain an active priest. At least twice, Msgr. Lynn warned Fr. Gana that a diagnosis of pedophilia or ephebophilia would mean the end of his career. This was also a finding that the Archdiocese would want to avoid if it sought to keep a priest in ministry while avoiding liability for the criminal abuse of church members.

On February 23, 1996, two weeks after Fr. Gana arrived at Southdown, Msgr. Lynn received a call from the Executive Director and psychologist Sister Donna Markham. She stated that Fr. Gana had been “very open and honest with her.”

During this call, Sister Markham described Fr. Gana as “heavily addicted to drugs and alcohol and very involved in substance abuse, and that causes sexual acting out.” Monsignor Lynn’s notes offer no evidence that he questioned this explanation of pedophilic acts, much less the report that Fr. Gana was a substance abuser. Yet in all the years he had dealt with Fr. Gana, Msgr. Lynn admitted he had never heard of any substance abuse problems. John, whose father was an alcoholic, stated that Fr. Gana had not consumed alcohol before or during sex. In fact, while Fr. Gana was abusing Tim, he sought a papal dispensation not to drink wine during Mass. The doctor’s note accompanying Fr. Gana’s 1983 petition explicitly stated that the request was made because of a medical condition and not any problem with alcohol abuse. Less than three weeks into Fr. Gana’s scheduled four-to-six-month treatment program, Sister Markham reassured Msgr. Lynn that Fr. Gana “would not be diagnosed a pedophile or an ephebophile, but rather a person who acted under the influence of drugs and alcohol.”

Father Gana, however, apparently felt less confident about his prospects. On March 4, 1996, Fr. Gana abruptly cut short his treatment. He took a taxi to the airport and within a week was in Florida.

New concerns about the priest quickly surfaced. On March 13, 1996, Sister Lucy Vazquez of the Diocese of Orlando called Msgr. McCulken in Philadelphia. She told him

that parishioners from her diocese had reported that a number of young males from Slovakia were living with Fr. Gana in a house he owned in Orlando. The parishioners, said Vazquez, expressed “concerns about what might be happening at the house,” with these males, some of whom looked to be in their teens. (Appendix D-3)

Rather than contact Sister Vazquez, Msgr. Lynn called Fr. Gana. According to Msgr. Lynn’s notes of the March 19, 1996, telephone call, Fr. Gana talked about his confusion and disillusionment, his fears, his love of the priesthood, and his self-healing. There is no indication that Msgr. Lynn told Fr. Gana to remove the young males from his house or to return to Southdown or Pennsylvania. Monsignor Lynn never investigated the situation in Orlando. Meanwhile, the Philadelphia Archdiocese continued to pay Fr. Gana his regular monthly stipend.

It was four months before Msgr. Lynn contacted Fr. Gana again. On July 19, 1996, he sent a letter urging the priest to contact him and to return to Southdown. This was two weeks after Msgr. Lynn had told John, falsely, that Fr. Gana was in treatment, neglecting to mention that Fr. Gana had fled the treatment center and was now living in Florida. Father Gana responded by letter on August 18 – from Slovakia.

Over the next several months the two priests exchanged a series of letters and telephone calls in which Fr. Gana sought, and Msgr. Lynn gave, assurances that the priest would likely be allowed to return to active ministry. Monsignor Lynn gave him such assurances in the absence of an official diagnosis by the treatment center and despite the fact that, since Fr. Gana had taken unauthorized leave from his treatment, he had lived with teenage youths in his Orlando house. Father Gana finally returned to Southdown on February 10, 1997.

For the next four months Fr. Gana was treated at the Church-affiliated facility by a psychologist, Samuel Mikail. As Msgr. Lynn predicted, Mikail concluded that Fr. Gana was neither a pedophile nor an ephhebophile, and that his risk of future sexual misconduct was minimal. This conclusion was based on an understanding that Fr. Gana had only three victims who were minors – the three mentioned in the summary of the accusations provided by Msgr. Lynn to the treatment facility.

Monsignor Lynn in fact knew about other minors. John had told Msgr. Lynn that he knew of four other boys and one adult having sex with Fr. Gana during John's junior year alone. Monsignor Lynn knew about a Slovak student who had complained about Fr. Gana sometime after 1992. Monsignor Lynn also knew about the reports of suspected involvement with seminarians. Monsignor Lynn did nothing to correct Mikail's mistaken belief that, in 1997, Fr. Gana had been chaste for 10 years, nor did he contradict Mikail's impression that Fr. Gana had spent the past year "soul-searching," when in fact the priest had spent the year in Orlando in a house full of teenagers. Monsignor Lynn let Mikail's report pass, knowing it would have a significant impact on Fr. Gana's return to ministry and the access this afforded to new victims.

Monsignor Lynn's April 17, 1997, memo to Cardinal Bevilacqua about the Fr. Gana case warned that John and Tim might go public with their allegations. It suggested that having Fr. Gana active as a priest in Philadelphia might exacerbate the situation. It recommended that, if Fr. Gana sought ministry outside Philadelphia, the Archdiocese should not stand in his way.

On June 23, 1997, Cardinal Bevilacqua received Mikail's final report, which declared Fr. Gana "not a pedophile" but confirmed his sexual abuse of at least three diocese children. The accompanying memo recommended that "[b]ecause of the possibility of the matter becoming public, [Fr. Gana's] service should be limited" to serving as a chaplain for a religious community.

The Cardinal authorized Fr. Gana's return to ministry.

The Archdiocese nominally restricts Father Gana's ministry but allows him to continue to act as a priest – except where it might provoke scandal.

In August 1997 Cardinal Bevilacqua approved Fr. Gana's becoming chaplain for a Carmelite Monastery, in order, as an Archdiocese memo put it, to "minimize the

possibility of unwanted publicity.” Father Gana was sent to live at Immaculate Conception Rectory, along with other priests who were recovering from alcoholism and other problems. He became Chaplain of the Monastery of the Discalced Carmelite Nuns on September 16, 1997.

Three weeks later, on October 6, Msgr. Lynn and Fr. William Dombrow, the pastor of Immaculate Conception, met with Fr. Gana to discuss the limitations on his ministry. In memos for official Archdiocese records, Msgr. Lynn reported instructing Fr. Gana that he had “permission to exercise his ministry only at Immaculate Conception Parish and as Chaplain to Carmelite Monastery.” Any other assignments required Msgr. Lynn’s permission. To Fr. Gana, Msgr. Lynn emphasized the need to act “low key” in the diocese.

Although he was now ostensibly responsible for the priest, Fr. Dombrow said he was never told that Fr. Gana had sexually abused minors. Fr. Dombrow admitted to the Grand Jury that he did not feel qualified to supervise a sexual offender, and would have refused to take Fr. Gana in had he known his condition. He was certain he would not have been so lax in his supervision.

Not knowing the danger that Fr. Gana posed to children, Fr. Dombrow asked Msgr. Lynn whether Fr. Gana could fill in when parishes called in need of a priest to celebrate Mass. Monsignor Lynn said that he could, while advising him to avoid Fr. Gana’s old parishes in Northeast Philadelphia.

Yet, by November 3, 1997, less than a month later, Fr. Gana was seen celebrating Mass, assisted by altar boys, at Ascension Parish in Kensington where he had first met John and Barry. Learning of this from his sister, Tim wrote that day to Cardinal Bevilacqua expressing concern that Fr. Gana was still in active ministry and warning that he presented a danger to the boys of the Archdiocese.

The Cardinal handed the letter to Msgr. Lynn with instructions to respond over Msgr. Lynn’s, not the Cardinal’s, signature. Monsignor Lynn invited Tim to come talk the next time he was in town from Connecticut, where Tim had gone to become a priest after his excommunication from Philadelphia.

Monsignor Lynn belatedly apologizes to a victim, but tries to justify the Archdiocese's treatment of Father Gana.

At their April 1998 meeting, Msgr. Lynn apologized for the manner in which he and Msgr. Molloy had handled Tim's case in 1992. According to Tim, the Secretary for Clergy finally acknowledged that the Archdiocesan managers believed that Fr. Gana abused Tim. Monsignor Lynn noted that others had accused the priest of committing sexual abuse after Church officials had heard, and ignored, Tim's reports about Fr. Gana. One accuser, Msgr. Lynn said, was a Slovak student whom Fr. Gana sponsored to study in the United States. According to Msgr. Lynn, Fr. Gana had revoked the student's funding upon discovering that the boy had a girlfriend, which made Fr. Gana jealous. Monsignor Lynn also spoke of another of Fr. Gana's victims who would "never be right" as a result of his abuse. "He can't function. He has threatened to take his own life."

Monsignor Lynn called Fr. Gana's repeated celebration of Mass at Ascension parish a "mistake" – but not because of how traumatic the priest's presence could be to his victims. Rather, Msgr. Lynn said: "We tell him to keep a low profile because there are people out to get him."

Monsignor Lynn reassured Tim that Fr. Gana's ministry was limited, and that he was being monitored. But Tim remained unconvinced, noting that Fr. Gana's new ministry at the Carmelite Monastery took only about 35 minutes a day, that he had a car, and that no one was watching him.

Tim testified that Msgr. Lynn related to him the cockeyed logic of the Archdiocese, according to which Fr. Gana had not been diagnosed as a "pedophile" (attracted to prepubescent children) or "ephebophile" (attracted to post-pubescent minors) because he was alcoholic and also had sexual encounters with women and adult males. Had Fr. Gana been diagnosed a pedophile, Msgr. Lynn explained to Tim (who had been compelled to have oral and anal sex beginning when he was 13 years old), the Archdiocese would have taken steps to remove him from the priesthood.

By December 1998, Fr. Gana was asking Msgr. Lynn's permission to hear confessions at parish penance services. Monsignor Lynn refused, noting that it was

impossible to supervise confession. As Msgr. Lynn phrased it in a memo, this was a problem because “any of [Fr. Gana’s] victims from the past, seeing him hear confession, could claim the church is being negligent.”

Father Gana continued, however, to minister in inappropriate situations. Tim’s sister reported seeing him, surrounded by altar boys, celebrating Easter Mass at the Carmelite Monastery. Later, Fr. Dombrow reported that Fr. Gana, who often spent time at his mountain house, was overly involved with a young man he met in one of Fr. Dombrow’s twelve-step meetings. Monsignor Lynn questioned Fr. Gana on December 5, 2000, and reported that Fr. Gana “mentioned one other person, but by the end of the conversation, he had mentioned two more.”

Father Gana is removed from ministry only after the sex-abuse scandal among Boston clergy brings national attention to the issue.

On February 13, 2002, Msgr. Lynn wrote to Fr. Gana, notifying him that the Archdiocese was “unable to provide and sustain an adequate level of supervision” of many sexually abusive priests it kept in limited ministry. Father Gana, along with some others, was relieved of his assignment.

Father Gana was removed from the priesthood one month after the sex-abuse scandal among Boston clergy had surfaced – and more than 25 years after he had begun preying on children in his parishes. Tim told the Grand Jury he was disappointed that the pain of victims had not been enough to prompt earlier action by the Philadelphia Archdiocese.

On October 11, 2004, faced with the possibility of involuntary laicization, Fr. Gana agreed to live “a supervised life of prayer and penance.” Father Gana 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 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 admits to reported sexual abuse and the Archdiocese permits him to remain a high school teacher.

In June 1964, Fr. Raymond Leneweaver was assigned to live in the rectory at Our Lady Help of Christians Church in Philadelphia and to teach at Roman Catholic High School. It was during these assignments, which lasted until the summer of 1966, that Fr. Leneweaver began sexually molesting a minor, “Jeffrey.” The Archdiocese received a report of Fr. Leneweaver’s criminal behavior in June 1968 from Fr. Anthony Massimini of Saint Charles Borromeo Seminary. A June 3, 1968, memo to the file by Chancellor Terrence F. Monihan recorded that Fr. Massimini had informed him that Jeffrey had come forward six months after his own two years of sexual abuse had ended, because he suspected that Fr. Leneweaver was still abusing two other boys.

Monsignor Monihan recorded the complaint, but made no effort to contact Jeffrey or the boys that Jeffrey sought to protect. When Msgr. Monihan asked Fr. Leneweaver about Jeffrey’s allegation, the priest immediately confessed, as recorded in the June 3, 1968, memo: “I know; I admit it; I am deeply ashamed.”

Father Leneweaver claimed, however, that he was not abusing other boys. He suggested that Jeffrey was merely “jealous” because the priest had found new “friends” at Sacred Heart in Clifton Heights, where he had moved after leaving Our Lady Help of Christians. Had the Archdiocese looked into these “friends” in 1968, it likely would have found “Stuart,” among other of Fr. Leneweaver’s victims. Handwritten notes of a March 22, 2002, telephone call recorded that Stuart called Archdiocese authorities 35 years later to inform them that Fr. Leneweaver had abused him when he was an altar boy at Sacred Heart Parish in 1968.

Even after Fr. Leneweaver’s admission to sexual abuse, Archdiocese managers did not speak to Jeffrey or probe his allegations about other boys. Father Leneweaver, then a teacher at Cardinal O’Hara High School as a result of his reassignment in 1966, claimed that his molestation of Jeffrey for more than two years had been a temporary lapse. He blamed depression following his first assignment, where he had lived with an alcoholic priest and had had to minister to “the Negroes.” Father Leneweaver also claimed that his

parents had died shortly before he began molesting Jeffrey. The priest often used his parents – who, in fact, were not dead in 1968 – to explain the “difficulties” in his life.

Despite Fr. Leneweaver’s admitted acts of pedophilia, Archdiocese managers allowed him to continue to teach at Cardinal O’Hara High School. The Archdiocese gave no notice of Fr. Leneweaver’s problem to the school principal, much less to parents. The priest remained at the school until 1971, when a litany of complaints, including some about serving alcohol to minors, prompted the Archdiocese to transfer him to a parish assignment.

Although the new chancellor, Msgr. Francis J. Statkus, noted in a memo, dated August 4, 1971, that he knew of Fr. Leneweaver’s history as a child abuser, Cardinal Krol assigned the priest to Saint Monica’s, a South Philadelphia parish with an elementary school.

While at Saint Monica’s parish, Father Leneweaver sexually abuses several more boys; after his admission to these crimes, the Archdiocese transfers him.

At Saint Monica’s parish, Fr. Leneweaver formed a group out of the boys he abused. He named them the “Philadelphia Rovers.” The priest had T-shirts made up for them. He took them on outings – swimming at the seminary, ice skating, tobogganing. When he got them alone, he molested them. He put his hands down the front of their pants, or pulled down their pants. He fondled their genitals and rubbed his own erect penis against their buttocks until he ejaculated.

In a certified, confidential letter dated June 26, 2002, an attorney, Neil Murray, wrote to Cardinal Bevilacqua and provided the following account from “A.,” a former altar boy and Rover. On at least five occasions when A. was in 8th grade, Fr. Leneweaver came into the boy’s classroom and took him out of class. The priest took him to the school auditorium, where he forced the boy to bend over a table and rubbed against him until the priest had an orgasm. In the rectory bedroom, the lawyer wrote, “Leneweaver pulled [A.’s] pants down, poured a lubricant on [A.’s] buttocks, and thrust his penis against [A.’s] buttocks until Leneweaver had an orgasm on [A.]”

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

allegations to Msgr. Statkus at the Chancery Office, who noted in a May 7, 1975, memo to Cardinal Krol that this was not Fr. Leneweaver's first "unnatural involvement."

When Msgr. Statkus questioned Fr. Leneweaver, the priest admitted, according to the Chancellor's notes, "that for almost a year he has engaged in homosexual activity" with the boys at Saint Monica's parish school whose parents had registered the complaints. A May 12, 1975, memo to the file by Msgr. Statkus recorded that the priest later told the Chancellor that he was "seriously" involved with other boys from the parish as well. In addition, he confided to Msgr. Statkus during their meeting that there were "several others" with whom he was involved "in an incidental fashion, as swimming trips to the seminary, etc. . . ." The Chancellor asked Fr. Leneweaver to provide the names of other boys with whom he was involved. In a May 13, 1975, letter, Fr. Leneweaver provided Msgr. Statkus with three names: "Kenneth" (8th grade), "Christopher" (7th grade), and "Gary" (8th grade).

Archdiocese files reflect no action taken to warn the parents of Kenneth, Christopher, or Gary, so that those boys might be saved from the abuse they were suffering. Instead, Msgr. Statkus wrote a memo to Cardinal Krol informing him about Fr. Leneweaver's admitted crimes but assuring him that "general scandal" was not imminent. The Cardinal was willing to honor Fr. Leneweaver's request to stay in his position two more weeks so that he could participate in a scheduled class reunion. Only when Edward's mother made it very clear that this would not be acceptable, was Fr. Leneweaver asked to leave.

Archdiocese officials did not report Fr. Leneweaver's criminal abuse of multiple minors to the police. Nor did they initiate proceedings to remove Fr. Leneweaver from the priesthood. Instead, on May 7, 1975, Cardinal Krol granted Fr. Leneweaver leave to take care of his still-alive parents in Florida and to seek treatment there. Three and a half months later, the Cardinal assigned Fr. Leneweaver to serve as a priest in Saint Agnes parish in West Chester. A September 4, 1975, Chancery office memo noted that the assignment would not be announced.

Father Leneweaver's victims suffer lifelong damage.

While Fr. Leneweaver moved on, the abused boys and their families were left to deal with their damaged lives. No one from the Archdiocese ever contacted the victims or their families. Edward's father told a detective from the District Attorney's Office that, when he happened to see Cardinal Krol at their church one day, he asked what was being done about Fr. Leneweaver. The Cardinal, knowing that his questioner was the father of a victim, answered: "What do you want, a public confession?" The Cardinal expressed no sympathy, compassion, or remorse.

Edward continued to suffer physically and psychologically. In his early teens, he had 18 inches of his bowel removed due to a perforation. He was afflicted with a stress-related stomach condition. Mentally, his brother testified, Edward shut down. According to Daniel, Edward "drank his way through his late teens and early twenties." He acted out sexually, Daniel believed, in order to reassure himself that he was not homosexual. As an adult, Edward told his psychologist brother that he had trouble sleeping because flashbacks continued to torment him.

Edward's father was too sick with cancer to testify before the Grand Jury. He told his story to the detective from the District Attorney's Office, but some parts were too painful for him to recount. According to the detective's testimony before the Grand Jury, the victim's father cried during the interview; it appeared to the detective that he was crying because he knew he could, and should, have done something more to protect his son.

Russell, another of the "Rovers" at Saint Monica's, also suffered long after Fr. Leneweaver left his parish. He told the Grand Jury that, as with Edward, his abuse began when he was 11 years old, in 1973, and continued until his parents reported Fr. Leneweaver to Fr. Farrell in May 1975. Russell's abuse, like Edward's, included a forceful, brutal attack. Russell told of an instance in the priest's bedroom when Fr. Leneweaver pinned his face down on the floor, fondling his genitals and "humping on him from behind." The boy tried to bang on the floor, to be heard by the priest downstairs, but Fr. Leneweaver restrained him. The assault lasted nearly twenty minutes. When it was over, Fr. Leneweaver gave Russell a few dollars and told him not to tell anyone.

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

treatment was begun and within a few weeks of the time Fr. Leneweaver had been sexually abusing several young boys simultaneously.

The report made no mention of Fr. Leneweaver's sexual behavior with boys or anyone else. Indeed, there is nothing in the report to suggest that Dr. Afield even knew of Fr. Leneweaver's deviant sexual history or problems. Rather, Dr. Afield addressed problems arising from Fr. Leneweaver's dealings with his aging parents and "some difficulty with his career in terms of his relationship with authority." Dr. Afield concluded that Fr. Leneweaver needed more therapy but could work in any setting where he would be most useful. The doctor stressed that it was "most important" that Fr. Leneweaver's next therapist be Catholic. He did not explain why.

The Archdiocese did not receive Dr. Afield's report until September 3, 1975, several days after Cardinal Krol had already assigned Fr. Leneweaver to Saint Agnes Parish in West Chester. Although too late to influence the Cardinal's decision about Fr. Leneweaver's placement, the report proved useful two months later, when Edward's mother complained because Fr. Leneweaver had been reassigned as a priest and was visiting his old parishioners at Saint Monica's as well. Monsignor Statkus wrote in a November 10, 1975, memo that he "assured her that truly Father Leneweaver was appointed in accord with medical advice, and that he [had] undergone therapy and medical attention." Monsignor Statkus gave these assurances and brushed off the mother's concerns even as he noted in the same memo that Fr. Leneweaver was not pursuing the recommended follow-up therapy and was having serious problems with authority in his new assignment. In a June 23, 1976, memo, Msgr. Statkus wrote that Fr. Leneweaver was "not close to a favorable resolution of his problems. . . . It seems to me that if he remains in the priesthood, he will constantly need the help of a professional."

Father Leneweaver saw a psychiatrist, Anthony Panzetta, nine times in seven months after he returned from Florida. However, as Msgr. Statkus noted in his June 23, 1976, memo to the file, when Dr. Panzetta referred Fr. Leneweaver to another doctor, Alan Goldstein, Msgr. Statkus became concerned about Fr. Leneweaver's therapy. He warned the priest to "be alert in his consultations with Dr. Goldstein – that Dr. Goldstein's care, advice and directives would not run counter to the ideals of the priesthood and his

membership in the Church.” When Fr. Leneweaver failed to pursue treatment with Dr. Goldstein, the Archdiocese did not object. Within months, Fr. Leneweaver was abusing Andy.

Four years later, in June 1980, when Andy’s father threatened to report Fr. Leneweaver’s criminal abuse to the police, Cardinal Krol ordered Fr. Leneweaver to undergo psychological testing at the church-owned hospital, Villa Saint John Vianney, in Downingtown. The Cardinal did this, Msgr. Statkus noted in a July 18, 1980, memo to the file, so that “the faithful of West Chester” would be reassured “that the case of Father Leneweaver is being carefully studied and that he was not being reassigned routinely.”

On July 18, 1980, Fr. Leneweaver entered Villa Saint John for evaluation. In a letter dated July 31, 1980, Msgr. Kelly, the pastor of Saint Agnes, wrote to Msgr. Statkus to inform him that even though Fr. Leneweaver was at Villa Saint John, he seemed “to have freedom to continue his sick ways.” Monsignor Kelly told Msgr. Statkus that Fr. Leneweaver was visiting parishioners’ homes, including that of the “Donnelly” family, where Fr. Leneweaver was “friendly” with two of the teenage sons. The pastor had received this information from a young man named “Lamar” who had known Fr. Leneweaver at Saint Monica’s and had received a letter from the priest suggesting a get-together while the priest was at Villa Saint John. Lamar warned Msgr. Kelly that “Father Leneweaver should never again be assigned where he would come into contact with boys.” Monsignor Kelly relayed this information to Msgr. Statkus, along with his own opinion that Lamar had come forward because he was sincerely concerned that boys were “in danger of being hurt.” He viewed Fr. Leneweaver “as taking advantage of his priesthood to get what he wants out of boys.”

Monsignor Kelly also recounted to the Chancellor a phone call he had received following Fr. Leneweaver’s departure from Saint Agnes from a parishioner inquiring about the priest’s health and praising his work with the youth. The pastor then boasted: “We have been able, certainly with your help, to keep suspicion from entering people’s minds.”

In accordance with the Archdiocese’s practice of keeping parishioners in the dark, Msgr. Statkus did not contact the Donnellys to warn them that an admitted sexual offender was visiting their sons. On August 13, 1980, while Fr. Leneweaver was still living at Villa

Saint John, it was Mrs. Donnelly who reported to Msgr. Statkus her suspicions that Fr. Leneweaver had been molesting her sons. One son had told her about his sexual advances; the other, a 15-year-old, had admitted only to “wrestling.” She also told Msgr. Statkus, who recorded his meeting with Mrs. Donnelly in an August 18, 1980, handwritten memo, that Fr. Leneweaver had invited the 15-year-old to play racquetball during the priest’s “stay” at Villa Saint John Vianney Hospital.

Monsignor Statkus told Mrs. Donnelly that Fr. Leneweaver “had undergone full-time psychiatric counseling and rehabilitation before being assigned to Saint Agnes; that he was declared fit for assignment, and that he was counseled to seek part time counseling while on assignment.” Monsignor Statkus neglected to tell her that “full-time psychiatric counseling” meant twice a week with a doctor whose declaration of fitness did not address the priest’s sexual issues; that Fr. Leneweaver had received no follow-up counseling for four years; and, that the chancellor had known for years that Fr. Leneweaver was “not close to a favorable resolution of his problems.”

Dr. Anthony L. Zanni at Villa Saint John diagnosed Fr. Leneweaver as afflicted with a “personality disorder – psychosexual immaturity.” He concluded that the priest was suffering from the very mental conditions – anxiety, depression, and frustration – that caused him to molest boys. Although Dr. Zanni suggested that Fr. Leneweaver’s prognosis might be favorable with “long term psychotherapy,” he did not conclude that Fr. Leneweaver was fit for an assignment at that time.

In an extremely frank memo to Cardinal Krol, dated September 11, 1980, following Fr. Leneweaver’s stay at Villa Saint John Vianney, Msgr. Statkus outlined Fr. Leneweaver’s long history of sexually abusing boys in several parishes. He recounted the repeated transfers made “in the hope of avoiding scandal,” and he lamented that “the latest incident eliminates his usefulness in his ministry in the area of Chester County.” The Chancellor pointed out that Fr. Leneweaver’s misbehavior was so widespread that there were only two areas of the diocese where he could still be assigned. He questioned the validity of psychological testing that repeatedly proved to be wrong. He reported that Fr. Leneweaver continued his contact with at least one victim even while at Villa Saint John Vianney. (Appendix D-4)

This was when Cardinal Krol assigned Fr. Leneweaver, once again, to a new parish at the opposite end of the Archdiocese – Saint Joseph the Worker, in Fallsington, Bucks County.

With the Archdiocese unwilling to remove him, Father Leneweaver removes himself from ministry, but the danger that he poses remains unknown to the community.

As it happened, Fr. Leneweaver's departure from the priesthood was at his own instigation, not the Archdiocese's. In December 1980, he asked for a permanent leave of absence. In a notation to a memo approving Fr. Leneweaver's leave, Cardinal Krol wrote:

His problem is not occupational or geographical & will follow him wherever he goes. He should be convinced that his orientation is an acquired preference for a particular method of satisfying a normal human appetite. – An appetite which is totally incompatible with vow of chastity + commitment to celibacy.

Otherwise phrased, Cardinal Krol believed that Fr. Leneweaver was an incurable pedophile. Thereafter, the Archdiocese loosed the sexual offender on children outside the church.

Over the next 20 years the Archdiocese denied various requests from Fr. Leneweaver to become active as a priest again – always, as one memo put it, because of “the risks for the diocese, for the bishop, for himself and the legal repercussions” While protecting themselves, however, the Archdiocese managers abdicated their responsibility to the community.

Cardinal Bevilacqua learns of Father Leneweaver's past crimes and his continued work with children, but takes no action.

In 1997, Fr. Leneweaver wrote directly to Cardinal Bevilacqua, expressing his interest in resuming active ministry. He sent the Cardinal what Vicar for Administration Joseph Cistone referred to as “a rather large packet of materials.” It contained the priest's resumé; several letters of reference for teaching positions, at least one written by an Archdiocese employee; a letter thanking the priest for his volunteer work at a homeless

shelter for youth; and a clean criminal history record obtained by Fr. Leneweaver when he applied for a teaching position in New Jersey in 1993. His resume showed that immediately after leaving active ministry in 1980, he had worked for 10 years as a “Residential Counselor and Instructor” for a Jesuit Program for Living and Learning. The resumé listed a job teaching Latin for a year and a half in the Millville, New Jersey, school district. (Appendix D-5)

According to notes from a December 15, 1997, issues meeting, the Cardinal “presented” the letter and asked that his Secretary for Clergy, Msgr. William Lynn, meet with Fr. Leneweaver to discuss his request. The Cardinal also asked that Msgr. Lynn inform him “under what circumstances Mr. Leneweaver left the active ministry.”

On February 16, 1998, after meeting with Fr. Leneweaver and reading through his Secret Archives file, Msgr. Lynn sent a memo answering the Cardinal’s question to Msgr. Cistone. The Secretary for Clergy attached a chronology of Fr. Leneweaver’s career, including his repeated admissions that, as a priest, he had sexually abused boys in his parishes. Monsignor Lynn wrote:

You will note that he has a history of acts of pedophilia/ephebophilia and I imagine by today’s standards, would be diagnosed as such. He really does not understand the climate of the times, nor the risks to himself or the church, should he be given ministry.

The Secretary for Clergy recommended that the Archdiocese write Fr. Leneweaver and explain that “for his own welfare and the welfare of the Church,” his request to return to ministry could not be granted. As usual, no mention was made of protecting children.

Monsignor Cistone forwarded Msgr. Lynn’s memo and chronology to Cardinal Bevilacqua, who approved the recommendation that Fr. Leneweaver not be given an assignment in the Archdiocese. But the Cardinal did nothing more. Despite knowing that Fr. Leneweaver had admitted sexually abusing many boys during his priesthood, that Msgr. Lynn considered the man a pedophile, and that he was still teaching boys, thanks to a clean criminal history resulting from the Archdiocese’s concealment of those crimes, Cardinal Bevilacqua did absolutely nothing to reduce the risk that Fr. Leneweaver posed to his students and other children.

Even though Cardinal Krol's earlier decisions not to report the priest's crimes inhibited prosecution of the offender in 1998, Cardinal Bevilacqua could have taken other actions. He could have reported the priest's crimes to law enforcement – as the Archdiocese now does – even though the statute of limitations might be deemed to have run. He could have used his authority to tell the priest that he should not be teaching children. The Cardinal could have protected many children simply by formalizing and publicizing the priest's removal from ministry and the reason for the decision. In December 2003, Cardinal Bevilacqua announced the removal of four priests due to allegations of sexual abuse of minors and provided their names to the public. Had he done the same with Fr. Leneweaver, it is unlikely the admitted child molester would have found employment in Philadelphia's suburban public schools.

On January 29, 2002, Msgrs. Lynn and Cistone were informed by memo that Fr. Leneweaver had been teaching Latin and History full-time for three years in the Philadelphia suburbs – in the North Penn and Central Bucks School Districts. Again they took no action. And so, on January 5, 2005, Fr. Leneweaver told this Grand Jury that, just last year, he was teaching Latin at Radnor Middle School in Montgomery County.

The Grand Jury finds that Cardinal Bevilacqua could have protected hundreds of students had he chosen to shield them instead of the Archdiocese and this sexually abusive priest.

Father Leneweaver was called to testify before the Grand Jury. He answered questions about his employment since leaving the Archdiocese, but when given the opportunity to answer the allegations against him, he chose not to do so.

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.”

- In a second letter to fellow priest Fr. Knapp, Fr. Gausch wrote: “Your ‘work’ among the adolescents sounds interesting INDEED. I only hope it is less dangerous than my own escapades with male teenagers. I sometimes feel it is just a question of when I am going to reach out and snatch. I’ve come THAT close so often...” (emphasis in original).
- In a third letter, Fr. Gausch talked about a student at St. Joseph’s and described how “it happened again. We’ve gotten through the wildfire stage and the thing has settled down into solid, wholesome friendship. He needs no idealizing... he’s got the goods... “Teddy” has a grandma who though not sick is housebound and delights in my visits --- you know the rest of the story. That’s the last place on today’s list --- Teddy will be home from school by then. That, pal, is zeal ... who cares for *what*” (emphasis in original).
- Finally, in a May 25, 1948, letter to Fr. Knapp, Fr. Gausch wrote: “This afternoon ... Sister asked me if I would take some of the 8th grade boys to camp today. They are finished their exams and they are a job to keep in tow. I said yes ... we always do, you know ... She told me to take my pick ... decision was based on anything but their qualities of soul, naturally. Kept the crowd small ... purposefully. We worked for a while then lounged ... that’s one name for it ... for at least two solid hours ... result: one more ,e,ory [sic] with a capital ‘M’. It is the closest approximation to an old fashioned roll that I have had in years ... and the subject was oh so satisfactory and (this is what makes the story) willin’ ... “Larry” (the hero of the above piece) plans to go to the lake on the annual trip, told me that in the middle of everything this afternoon. Have since been thinking of something. There are so many signed up and it is so difficult to get a place big enough to hold the mob. Sooooo, I am [sic] thinking, why not make two expeditions out of it. First the official JHN jaunt, and the second I could use as one of my vacation weeks --- just take the “overflow” the second week ... a cozy five or six. Take a small cottage ... and of course, the overflow being handpicked ... with Larry heading the list at

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

Archdiocese supported him and that he would investigate a little bit more the background of [Ross].”

Monsignor Lynn did just that: he conducted an investigation not into Fr. Gausch, whose abuse of children went back to 1946, but into the personal history of the victim and his family. Monsignor Lynn tracked down the principal of Good Shepherd’s parish school and a priest who was assigned there from 1976-1980. He also spoke with a nun who taught at St. Clements at the time of Ross’s abuse. Monsignor Lynn learned from these people that Ross was absent from school several times, that the family was known in the community in “unflattering” terms, and that Ross was a poor student.

By contrast, Msgr. Lynn conducted *no* investigation of Ross’s claims, other than to speak with Fr. Gausch. Most notably, he made no effort to speak to the other altar boy who was identified as also being abused. On March 4, 1994, Msgr. Lynn wrote a memo to Cardinal Bevilacqua informing him of the allegations and suggesting that both he and his aide, Fr. James Beisel were “very suspicious” of Ross’s allegations. He also wrote that “it is our suspicion that he is motivated by the hope of a cash settlement with the Archdiocese.” Monsignor Lynn noted this “suspicion” even though Ross at no point made a request for a cash settlement. Monsignor Lynn never recommended that Fr. Gausch be evaluated, nor did he recommend that the other named victim be contacted to determine whether he had in fact been abused.

Cardinal Bevilacqua did nothing except to order that “every sensitive allegation, including those involving incidents to have occurred in excess of five years ago, are to be brought to the attention of the Archbishop on the same day that they are received in the office of the Vicar for Administration.” Father Gausch died on May 30, 1999.

Following Father Gausch’s death other victims come forward.

- **“David”**

On August 11, 2000, David wrote a letter to the Cardinal stating that he had been sexually abused by Fr. Gausch on several occasions when he worked at the Good Shepherd

rectory in the early 1980s. He also stated that Fr. Gausch was “unprofessionally friendly with some of the male children who either worked in the rectory or attended the school.”

Cardinal Bevilacqua forwarded the letter to Msgr. Lynn. The Secretary for Clergy spoke by telephone with David, who said that the only thing he wanted done was to make the Cardinal aware of Fr. Gausch’s behavior. Apparently at no point in the conversation did Msgr. Lynn ask for names of additional victims.

- **“Patrick”**

On March 25, 2002, Patrick informed Msgr. Lynn that Fr. Gausch, while assigned at Saint Stanislaus Church (from 1956 to 1961), had sexually assaulted him when he was 18 years old. Patrick said that it was very difficult for him to cope and that he spent many years not speaking to anyone about what happened. He said that he drank excessively to numb the pain. Monsignor Lynn told him Fr. Gausch was dead and offered counseling assistance.

- **“Sammy”**

On March 27, 2002, Sammy informed Msgr. Lynn that Fr. Gausch had abused him in 1963-64 when he was an altar boy at Our Lady of Peace Church in Milmont. Sammy said that he had told his father about what had happened and his father had confronted the pastor, Fr. Noll, as well as Fr. Gausch, who was transferred in August 1964 to St. Bridget’s. Sammy expressed his disgust at the fact that the Church had transferred Fr. Gausch to other parishes where he was able to abuse other children.

Sammy also talked about how he had heard Cardinal Bevilacqua publicly state that there were only 35 victims of sexual abuse in 50 years in the Archdiocese. (Sammy was confused on the numbers – the Cardinal had said there were 35 priests and 50 victims. The point, however, remains that the Cardinal grossly underestimated the number of victims.) Sammy said that he felt even more victimized by that statement because he felt more isolated than he had before. He thought, “I can’t be only one of 35 people this ever happened to. Am I that big a freak.” Sammy said that during a meeting with Msgr. Lynn and his aide, they did not give any information except that Fr. Gausch was dead. They would not confirm that he was transferred based on this incident, nor would they say

whether he had any psychiatric treatment. They only stated that “situations back then were handled differently.”

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.

Cudemo lived at Saint Helena in Center Square. He continued to teach at Archbishop Kennedy for another four years after this allegation.

Three victims from Father Cudemo's tenure at Kennedy report abuse in 1991.

Although they did not surface until many years later, in 1991, subsequent allegations show that during his time as a teacher at Kennedy High School, Fr. Cudemo molested at least three other girls. Two of the girls were related to him: one, Irene, who later became a nun, was his second cousin; the other, Ruth, was her cousin, but unrelated to Fr. Cudemo by blood. (Fr. Cudemo had earlier molested Irene's sister, Donna, while he was still at Saint Stanislaus in the 1960s.)

- **Sister Irene**

Sister Irene testified before the Grand Jury that Fr. Cudemo started visiting her home frequently when she was in 6th or 7th grade and her sister Donna, who was five years older, was in high school. When Irene entered high school in 1969, Fr. Cudemo began taking Irene to baseball and basketball games at Kennedy and at Saint Joseph's University.

On one occasion, after a game at Kennedy, Fr. Cudemo stopped his car on route to Irene's house and started kissing her, as she described it, "kind of all over me." She said she was uncomfortable with the way he was touching her body and told him she wanted to go home. At the time, Irene was 15.

From then on she tried to avoid being alone with him, but he managed to abuse her another time while driving a car full of young people. As Irene sat in the front center, next to him, Fr. Cudemo took her hand, put it on his penis, and held it there. Frozen in fear, and not wanting to draw attention, she said she let it happen, becoming numb and pretending she wasn't in her body.

Sister Irene testified that embarrassment kept her from telling anyone about these incidents, and that it never occurred to her he might be doing the same thing to other people. She did not learn of Fr. Cudemo's severe sexual abuse of her young cousin Ruth until 1991.

- **Ruth**

Father Cudemo became acquainted with Ruth through Donna and Irene's family. Ruth was between 8 and 10 years old in the late 1960s when Fr. Cudemo ingratiated himself with her family and her older brother, who was a football player. Ruth's father was also a sports fan, so they would go to games with Fr. Cudemo or have him over to watch sports on television. Ruth told the Grand Jury that her parents felt privileged to have a priest spending time with their family. Fr. Cudemo would often say Mass in their living room and stay for dinner. Her parents felt he was a good influence.

Initially, Fr. Cudemo's interactions with Ruth seemed innocent. He took her for ice cream or to visit his mother. She said she felt special and almost like she "was the only person in the world that mattered...."

Ruth estimated she was around 10 or 11 years old when Fr. Cudemo began sexually abusing her (but she also recalled sexual activity with Fr. Cudemo at the Saints Cosmas and Damian rectory which he left in 1969, when she was still 9). The first sexual incidents happened in his car. He would say, "Well, I really better drive you right home, because if I don't, I'm going to kiss you."

Ruth explained to the Grand Jury how this approach of Fr. Cudemo's made her feel responsible for what happened:

And you know, kind of like I didn't say anything, and then, you know, he would pull over and kiss me; and then each time it was something else, but he would always warn me first, which I didn't know at the time, but it was sort of like his way of making me feel responsible, because if I had a choice, you know, to say no, you know, if he — you know like, I'm warning you, so if you don't say anything, I'm going to do this. But I was, you know, a kid, and I was just like really paralyzed and really — I don't know, didn't really feel like I had a choice.

Fr. Cudemo's actions progressed from kissing, to touching — her breasts, then vagina — then to oral sex. He would call the child on the telephone and instruct her to do sexual things to herself. She said she did not fully understand what was happening at the time.

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

priest who abused minors. They said that they were not surprised, but felt guilty for not speaking up sooner. The two women had been friends during their junior and senior years at Cardinal Dougherty High School from 1972 to 1974. Both were accosted by Cudemo when they were 17 years old and in their senior year of high school.

Patricia testified that Cudemo constantly touched and hugged her and that it was routine when accompanying him in his car, even with others present, for him to take her hand and put it between his legs. She told of three incidents which went far beyond this touching, in one case terrifying the teenager. The first incident, she said, took place as she cleaned in the chapel after school one day. She said that Fr. Cudemo entered the chapel, came over behind the altar where she was working, and began "chitchatting." The next thing she knew, she was pinned against the wall and he was kissing and touching her body. Before anything else happened, the principal of the school, Father James Howard, entered the chapel and saw them. She said that Fr. Cudemo immediately stepped away from her and left the chapel without a word. Patricia testified that she could not remember the principal's exact words, but that his message to her was clear -- if she said anything about the incident, she would be expelled. She said that he asked her no questions about the incident or her welfare.

She continued to see Fr. Cudemo around school and on outings in his car with other students. She said that she felt safe when with a group, but twice Fr. Cudemo dropped the other teens home before her. Both times, when he had her alone, he sexually abused her. The incident which scared her most, happened when the priest pulled his car to the side of a dark and deserted road "in the middle of nowhere." She testified that after stopping, Fr. Cudemo pulled her toward him and began to kiss her. She said that she pled with him: "Please don't do that." When she began crying and asked what he was doing, she said, he unfastened his pants and pulled down the zipper. She said that he got angry and the more she cried, the angrier he got. She said that he kept pulling her hand over to try to make her touch his exposed penis. He told her he couldn't believe she "didn't want to do this." She said that she was terrified by his anger and truly thought she was in danger of physical harm. She said she did not know how long the activity lasted, but eventually she took her hand away and he drove her home. This was one of the last times she saw Fr. Cudemo.

Patricia's friend, Stacy, testified that she came to know Cudemo because she was the president of the school's community service organization and he was a moderator for the group. She described how she was in class one day when a hall monitor entered with a note for her teacher. The teacher then announced that Fr. Cudemo wanted to see Stacy in the sacristy. She said that when she entered, Fr. Cudemo approached her, hugged her longer than she thought normal, and then began to kiss her. She said that she pushed him away and asked why he had wanted to see her. He answered that he "loved being close to her" and "just wanted to be with" her.

Stacy said that she continued to have a relationship with Fr. Cudemo in which he aggressively tried to persuade her to become a nun. She did not describe other sexual incidents. She testified that she lost touch with Fr. Cudemo after she turned 18, except for one time, four years later, when he stopped by her mother's house unannounced. She said he was accompanied by two young Dougherty girls.

Then, in March 2003, Fr. Cudemo called Stacy to wish her a happy 47th birthday. He said that he had been in trouble with the Archdiocese in the 1990s, telling her: "They're calling me a pedophile, but I don't like little boys." He said that he had been accused of hurting girls and he wanted to know if he had hurt her. She told him how inappropriate she thought his behavior had been. Finally, he told her that he was living in Orlando. He explained that he was able to minister and say Mass because the Philadelphia Archdiocese had given him a letter stating that he was a priest in good standing.

The Archdiocese is told of Emily's abuse in 1977.

The Archdiocese learned of one victim from this time, Emily, shortly after she graduated from Cardinal Dougherty, and while she was still being abused by Cudemo. In July 1977, Emily's best friend, "Denise," and Denise's mother came to see then-Chancellor Francis J. Statkus. They informed him that Emily (they declined to give her last name) had told Denise that Fr. Cudemo had been having sex with Emily since June 1975, the end of the girls' sophomore year of high school. The relationship had continued through high school and was ongoing in July 1977 after they had graduated. Denise told Msgr. Statkus that she was coming forward because she felt the situation was wrong and

she feared “tragedy might ensue.” She explained that she and Emily had started teachers college at Bloomsburg State following graduation, but that Emily had dropped out following a visit from Fr. Cudemo. Denise said that, while at Bloomsburg, Emily had confided that she feared she might be pregnant. Monsignor Statkus noted that in late July “however, that condition does not exist from the latest information.”

After dropping out of teachers college, Emily accompanied Fr. Cudemo and a niece of his to Florida for 13 days. Another trip was planned to California in August. According to Denise, Emily suspected that Fr. Cudemo “associated with” other girls from school.

Monsignor Statkus interviewed Fr. Cudemo on July 27, 1977, having found out Emily’s full name. He told the priest of the accusations. Monsignor Statkus wrote in a memo that Fr. Cudemo “admitted to all the statements of Denise concerning his association with [Emily]” — except that he insisted there were no “sexual overtones” in this association.

The 41-year-old priest admitted having the girl visit him at his rectory when she was in high school, talking to her frequently on the phone, visiting her at her house, taking her on trips, and driving her around in his car. He admitted that he had visited her at Bloomsburg State earlier that summer and that he had brought her home because, he said, she did not want to continue. He admitted to being attracted to younger girls, “but in no offensive way.”

Monsignor Statkus recorded that Fr. Cudemo offered, “since this was the third occasion that he has been approached by the Chancery on the same subject, namely particular friendships with girls, that he is prepared to face or meet any action which may be directed to him, even being deprived of his faculties.” Despite this offer to remove himself from a situation where he could continue to abuse the diocese’s girls, no one in the Archdiocese asked him to forgo his faculties. Rather, he was told by Msgr. Statkus: “we would consider changing him from the teaching apostolate, since he has already been changed twice previously to other high schools and yet the particular friendships have continued.”

The Archdiocese then reassigned Fr. Cudemo to a parish, Saint Mary Magdelan De Pazzi in Philadelphia – with a school attached to it – despite evidence in his Secret

Archives file, from 1966 and 1969, suggesting that he was quite capable of procuring victims in a parish setting.

Father Cudemo begins to abuse Marion and continues to abuse Ruth.

A year before he was reassigned from Cardinal Dougherty, and while continuing his sexual relationship with Emily, Fr. Cudemo began to abuse another, younger Dougherty student — Marion. A 15-year-old sophomore when the priest began molesting her, she would continue to have a sexual relationship with him for 16 years before informing the Archdiocese in 1991.

Father Cudemo also continued abusing Ruth, whom he had started molesting when she was about 10 years old. She testified that once she entered Cardinal Dougherty High School, Fr. Cudemo started “bringing in other priests” to rape her. She said that the circumstances of sexual abuse by other priests varied, but she testified about one such incident.

She described a time she was at Fr. Cudemo’s rectory and he left her in his bedroom, saying he was going to a wedding rehearsal. He told her he’d be back and asked her to wait. Shortly after Fr. Cudemo left, an unfamiliar priest came into the bedroom and gave the teenager some alcohol. He then raped her and left. When Fr. Cudemo returned, he asked Ruth what she’d been doing. Afraid to tell the truth, she said she had been watching T.V. Father Cudemo then cursed her, called her a liar, and said, “I ran into Father John, and he told me that you seduced him.” She later came to suspect that such incidents were designed by Fr. Cudemo. She said he was “really big into ...punishment.”

Ruth recalled instances where priests she did not know would rape her while Fr. Cudemo was present. She became very upset as she recalled these events, and had to take a break from testifying. Ruth told the Grand Jury that Fr. Cudemo would often insert a Host, the Eucharist, into her vagina and tell her she had “fucked God” or “fucked Jesus.” He told her she was a “walking desecration,” that she was “unworthy of God’s love.” He made her feel ashamed, and then would hear her confession.

Father Cudemo told her she had seduced him and that she was evil. He said that he was celibate before he met her, but that her body made him break his vow. She testified

that she now knows that what he did was just “really sick,” but, as a child, she believed it was her fault. She said she grew up hating herself and her body.

Throughout his tenure at Dougherty High School, Fr. Cudemo took advantage of Ruth’s family’s hospitality, spending several nights a week at their house and eating most meals there. The priest dropped his “friendship” with Ruth and her family when he was transferred out of Dougherty in 1977.

Saint Mary Magdalan De Pazzi (9/77-12/81): Abuse of Marion Continues.

No new victims came forward during Fr. Cudemo’s assignment as assistant pastor at Saint Mary Magdalan de Pazzi parish. His abuse of Marion, who was then a high school senior, continued. She testified that she was often in his room at the rectory. She said other priests saw her at the rectory, but no one seemed to care.

Saint Irenaeus (1/82-6/87): Father Cudemo abuses at least two more girls, but no contemporaneous reports are recorded.

Father Cudemo was appointed assistant pastor at Saint Irenaeus Parish in January 1982. In a memo to Cardinal Krol, his pastor there described him as “popular with the youngsters, serving as director of the CYO Sports and Cultural activities. He was very exacting with the Altar Boys. He visited the school to give religious instructions....” With three allegations of sexual abuse of minors in his file, this news might have been received as cause for inquiry. There is no evidence it was.

In January 2001, the Archdiocese learned from Philadelphia Police Officer Denise Holmes, that Fr. Cudemo had been accused of molesting a student from Saint Irenaeus grade school during his tenure there. The victim, Theresa, came forward nearly 20 years later and reported being molested in the confessional by Fr. Cudemo when she was in 5th, 6th, and 7th grades. In February 2001, she repeated her allegations to Msgr. Lynn’s assistant, Fr. Vincent Welsh. His notes of a telephone conversation with the victim record that Fr. Cudemo touched her genitals, had her touch his, and that he “attempted intercourse.” She said that she had been in counseling for years as a result of what Fr. Cudemo did to her. According to a letter Theresa wrote to the Archdiocese in October

2004, she “specifically asked members of the Archdiocese hierarchy if they knew if Father Cudemo abused other children, and . . . was told definitively NO.”

The victim was not the only one lied to by Archdiocese managers. When Officer Holmes was investigating Theresa’s allegations in January 2001, she pointedly asked Msgr. Lynn if there had been other allegations from Saint Irenaeus. Monsignor Lynn’s own memo recording his meeting with Officer Holmes records: “I stated none of which I was aware.” When the officer persisted and asked why Fr. Cudemo was retired, Msgr. Lynn told her that the situation “all had to do with allegations made by his family.” Both of these statements were false.

Monsignor Lynn had learned of another teen victimized by Fr. Cudemo at Saint Irenaeus from the priest himself. Monsignors Lynn and Molloy had called Fr. Cudemo in after Sister Margaret had been to see them on October 23, 1991. They mentioned to him that they had a complaint, but before telling him who that person was, he began to talk unbidden about another woman, “Isabelle,” who had angrily confronted him at his church just days before.

He told the officials that he’d gotten to know Isabelle and her sister when Isabelle was a freshman or sophomore in high school and Fr. Cudemo was at Saint Irenaeus. He said that her parents would leave her at home alone, not allowing her to have guests or go out. They did, however, trust Fr. Cudemo to be alone with her. He denied “overt sexual activity” with her, but mentioned an occasion when he reminded her that she had “said she would prostitute herself to get money” and then gave her five dollars.

Father Cudemo told the Archdiocese officials that, Isabelle, now 24 years old, had recently confronted him, telling him: “You messed up my life sexually. I have a totally messed up life because of you. . . . You said such things like you would marry me.” The priest said she talked about sexual encounters in his car and about his putting her head in his lap while he was driving.

All the while, as associate pastor of Saint Irenaeus, Fr. Cudemo was maintaining his now 7- or 8-year-old relationship with Marion.

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.

King of Peace (6/89-6/91): Cardinal Bevilacqua promotes Father Cudemo to pastor with multiple uninvestigated allegations in his file.

At the time Cardinal Bevilacqua elevated Fr. Cudemo to pastor of King of Peace parish, the priest's Secret Archives file contained allegations going back to 1966 (a three-year "affair" with a girl from the Lansdale parish), 1969 (Fr. DeSimone's report of two witnessed incidents with girls), and 1977 (details of his two-year sexual abuse of Dougherty student Emily). Father Cudemo was 13 years into his sexual relationship with Marion, whom he had started abusing when she was 15, and he had just purchased a house with her in Florida. In addition, Cardinal Bevilacqua's number-two man, Vicar for Administration Monsignor Cullen, had longstanding personal knowledge of Fr. Cudemo, having spent seven years with him at Saint Charles Borromeo Seminary.

Despite all of this, Fr. Cudemo became the new pastor at King of Peace in June 1989. He remained there for two years. During that time he, again, befriended at least one parish family with a teenage girl. In 1991, the Archdiocese was told of allegations that Fr. Cudemo was, at that time, very close to the mother, "Rita," and was also molesting the 13-year-old, "Claire." According to Donna, Fr. Cudemo's cousin and former victim, Claire's great-grandmother said, as she was dying, that she had seen Fr. Cudemo fondling Claire. She pleaded with the girl's family to keep Fr. Cudemo away from the girl.

Claire's mother, however, believed in Fr. Cudemo. He was Rita's pastor, and no one from the Archdiocese had ever informed the parishioners of his unrelenting abuse of girls in his former schools and parishes. She had gotten to know him while helping out at King of Peace. She soon became inseparable from him. Marion told Archdiocese officials in November 1991 that 13-year-old Claire was seen alone with Fr. Cudemo in his car when she and her mother accompanied him to Florida the previous summer. Monsignor Lynn noted that Marion "said she can not say anything happened but when young people are around, Fr. Cudemo always has his hands all over them."

Rita, on the other hand, was unaware of the litany of complaints of improprieties and sexual abuse of young girls in Fr. Cudemo's background. In an interview with Msgrs. Molloy and Lynn in December 1991, it was apparent she thought that the only abuse allegations came from Fr. Cudemo's family. Having heard only his side of the story, she

said she thought his relationship with Marion was platonic. She apparently believed Fr. Cudemo that Ruth was just psychologically sick.

She had no way of knowing about the girl from Lansdale, or Sister Margaret, or Emily, or Isabelle, or Michelle from Epiphany, or Sister “Nancy,” or Sister Catherine, or a girl named “Laura.” The Archdiocese officials knew of allegations relating to all these girls and women, but they weren’t sharing the allegations with Fr. Cudemo’s parishioners who needed to know to keep their children safe. Monsignors Molloy and Lynn declined an offer by Rita to speak with her daughter Claire.

When Fr. Cudemo was reassigned to Saint Callistus in June 1991, Rita went with him as his secretary.

Saint Callistus parish (6/91-5/96): Cardinal Bevilacqua installs Father Cudemo as pastor after learning of Marion and leaves him in place as the Archdiocese receives numerous allegations.

The Archdiocese learns about Marion then installs Father Cudemo in a new pastorate.

Father Cudemo was installed as pastor at Saint Callistus parish on June 23, 1991. In the priest’s Secret Archives file at the time of the appointment were the same allegations of abuse of girls that were in the file in 1989 when Fr. Cudemo was promoted to pastor of King of Peace parish. In addition, just weeks before his installation, Marion came to the Archdiocese with the story of her abusive relationship with Fr. Cudemo, beginning when she was 15 years old. She told Msgr. John J. Jagodzinski, Cardinal Bevilacqua’s first Secretary for Clergy, that she believed Fr. Cudemo was emotionally unfit to take on a new pastorate.

Marion met with Msgr. Jagodzinski on June 6, 1991. She was 31 years old at the time. She told him that Fr. Cudemo had initiated an inappropriate “relationship” with her when she was a sophomore at Cardinal Dougherty and he was a teacher there. She told of the house in Florida that she and Fr. Cudemo bought in May 1989 and still co-owned. She also said the priest was “in a very poor emotional condition,” that he needed to be forced to face himself, and that he should be kept away from other people. Monsignor Jagodzinski

wrote a memo to Msgr. Molloy on June 7, 1991, describing his meeting with Marion and recommending that Fr. Cudemo not be made pastor at Saint Callistus.

Monsignor Jagodzinski's memo expressed his belief that Fr. Cudemo had done what he was accused of: "I cannot help but give some personal reaction to what has been communicated to me, in view of my long association with Nick (high school classmates)" The memo concluded:

[Marion's] story is, in my estimation, largely believable. Her assessment of Father Cudemo's present emotional state, I believe, is fairly accurate. . . . I think that if Father Cudemo were confronted with [Marion's] story (she gave full approval to her being identified as the source) he would not dispute it. In that event, it seems to me very inadvisable that he assume his new pastorate. Perhaps he could be referred to the Anodos Center for evaluation and be given time to reflect on his present and future ministry. Perhaps some time at Villa Saint John Vianney Hospital is in order, if Father Cudemo admits to what has been told.

Monsignor Cullen testified that, although he had no specific recollection, a memo such as this would normally come to him and he would take it immediately to the Cardinal.

With all this information, and against the recommendation of his Secretary for Clergy, Cardinal Bevilacqua installed Fr. Cudemo at Saint Callistus on June 23, 1991. Almost immediately other complaints against the priest began to pile in.

Archdiocese officials learn about Ruth, Donna, and Irene, yet leave Father Cudemo in his pastorate.

On September 25, 1991, Fr. Cudemo's cousins Donna and Sister Irene, I.H.M., and their cousin Ruth, brought their allegations to the Archdiocese. They were accompanied by Ruth's husband, "Will," and Donna and Irene's sister, "Peggy." They spoke to the Cardinal's delegates, Msgrs. Molloy and Lynn.

Donna told of a time Fr. Cudemo was spending the night at her family's house when she was 15. The priest called her into his bedroom and asked her to sit on his bed. He was dressed only in undershorts. After talking to her briefly, he began to touch and kiss her. He told her that it was all right for cousins to be close. After that incident she stayed

away from him. She said it helped that her father thought Fr. Cudemo should not be hanging around so much with young girls, and did not really welcome him in their house.

Sister Irene told of two experiences with Fr. Cudemo's sexual advances when she was a high school sophomore and he was a teacher at Archbishop Kennedy. She also provided the names of two others from her convent whom she suspected had been abused by Fr. Cudemo – Sister Catherine, I.H.M., and a girl named Laura who had left the convent.

Ruth told many but not all of the details of her abuse. She had been 10 years old when Fr. Cudemo started sexually abusing her. She told them that he was manipulative and threatening, that he had a violent temper, and she was afraid of him.

When Monsignor Molloy asked about physical contact, he noted she became "visibly shaken." Eventually, Ruth was able to tell them that Fr. Cudemo would masturbate with her present and tell her to masturbate. He would lie on top of her nude and "ejaculate all over her." He put his penis in her mouth and ejaculated. He would use his finger and mouth on her vagina. He was forceful and would hold her down. She told them this all happened when she was in grade school and high school.

The family members all told of the enormous impact that Fr. Cudemo's abuse had had on Ruth's life. She had attempted suicide several times. She had seizures. She entered terrible relationships. Her husband told how she still slept "in a position of fear with her arm covering her head."

Monsignor Lynn wrote: "[Ruth] stated she just wants to be normal again. She said her life has been ruined. This has had an impact on every part of her life." told the Church officials that it was "hard to accept" the Archdiocese's inaction, knowing that if steps had been taken when Fr. Cudemo was first accused, none of this might have happened. She said that she came to speak to the Archdiocese at this point for the sake of other people. Donna, Irene, and Peggy all said that Fr. Cudemo should be removed from his parish and that he should not be near families with children.

Not knowing that Marion had already made a report to the Archdiocese, Ruth informed Msgrs. Molloy and Lynn that she believed Marion was Fr. Cudemo's next victim.

The family members were all extremely anxious to have Fr. Cudemo confronted and to know what he said. Sister Irene told the church officials she would be willing to confront him if he denied the allegations. Ruth's husband Will said he felt Fr. Cudemo should have to face the civil justice system.

Monsignor Lynn recorded that Msgr. Molloy responded to this threat of legal action by offering a "middle ground." The victims would allow Fr. Cudemo to voluntarily seek treatment; if he refused or there was a recurrence, Msgr. Molloy suggested, the victims could still resort to "whatever legal action is available."

Monsignor Molloy assured Sister Irene that the Cardinal would receive the information from the meeting.

Father Cudemo was interviewed twice in response to his family's allegations, on October 2 and 3, 1991. Father Cudemo gave a rambling mixture of admissions and denials – stating he "possibly" lay nude on top of an undressed girl; had been confronted by a girl about touching her and performing sexual acts on her, but didn't remember doing those things and "I remember everything"; that he had "known lots of women and that it always takes two to do these things;" that if sexual activities did occur, they must have happened 20 years ago; that all the girls were willing, and that "nothing close to sexual happened with these girls." When told his accusers were family, he immediately said their names and talked about having "incidents" with them.

Monsignor Lynn noted that Fr. Cudemo offered to do "anything we ask." He said he would leave the priesthood and give up his parish if asked to. Monsignor Molloy assured Fr. Cudemo, however, that the Cardinal was not asking him to resign from the parish. Monsignor Molloy merely asked whether the priest would be willing to have an evaluation done. When Fr. Cudemo commented that Msgr. Molloy had offered him such an evaluation the year before, as well, Molloy stated, "that in this case it would be good to have because the allegations were very specific." Father Cudemo agreed to an evaluation. Monsignor Lynn's notes do not explain why Msgr. Molloy had offered Fr. Cudemo an evaluation the year before.

Father Cudemo also wanted Msgrs. Molloy and Lynn to know that people had come to him with sexual abuse complaints against other priests, but Fr. Cudemo had never

sent those people “downtown” to report to authorities. No one, apparently, asked who those priests might be.

The Archdiocese officials asked nothing about Fr. Cudemo’s relationship with Marion, even though he mentioned her name repeatedly.

The Archdiocese learns about Claire and leaves Father Cudemo in his parish.

On October 17, 1991, three weeks after they told Msgrs. Molloy and Lynn about their abuse, Ruth and her family members returned to the Archdiocese. They were concerned because, despite all they had told the Archdiocese managers, Fr. Cudemo was still at Saint Callistus. They learned that the Cardinal intended to leave Fr. Cudemo in place until his evaluation, scheduled for December 1, 1991. They were further angered because they had learned that Marion had told the Archdiocese in June 1991, before Fr. Cudemo was reassigned, about her experiences with the priest from the time she was a teen-ager until 1990. The relatives were baffled that, with all these allegations against Fr. Cudemo, the Cardinal insisted that the priest be evaluated before removing him, even temporarily. The relatives were not aware that Fr. Cudemo had volunteered to give up his parish, but that the Cardinal had chosen to leave him in place.

During their second meeting, Msgr. Molloy repeatedly told the victims that Fr. Cudemo denied not only their allegations, but those of Marion as well. There is, however, no record of Fr. Cudemo denying his relationship with Marion. Moreover, anyone hearing the victims’ allegations, coupled with Fr. Cudemo’s explanations, could not reasonably doubt that he had sexually molested many girls.

The victims told Msgr. Molloy that they knew there had been complaints about Fr. Cudemo for years, dating back to Lansdale. Yet Msgr. Molloy, with allegations in Fr. Cudemo’s Secret Archives file from 1966, 1969, and 1977 — two relating to Lansdale — told the victims: “There is nothing in the file that would prevent Father Cudemo from being a pastor.” When he made this statement to the victims, Msgr. Molloy also knew that Msgr. Jagodzinski believed Marion’s report about her abuse.

Even after Donna told Msgr. Molloy about the 13-year-old girl, Claire, currently spending time with Fr. Cudemo (the one whose fondling by the priest had been witnessed

by her great-grandmother), Msgr. Molloy said “there is no compelling evidence at this time to remove him.” Monsignor Molloy assured the victims that he reported such “matters” directly to the Archbishop, but still Fr. Cudemo was left in place.

Monsignor Molloy was not as reticent in suggesting wrongdoing by Fr. Cudemo’s accusers. On October 25, 1991, Fr. Cudemo told Msgr. Molloy that Sister Irene had warned the principal at Saint Callistus elementary school to protect her students from the priest. As recorded by Msgr. Lynn, “Molloy [then] stated that he wanted to ask a rhetorical question. He asked Father Cudemo if he had considered that such behavior might be the basis for Father Cudemo to speak to Sister or any others about defamation of character.”

Archdiocese officials learn of Margaret, Isabelle, and Sisters Catherine and Nancy and still refuse to remove Father Cudemo from the parish.

Less than a week after the second meeting with Ruth and her family, on October 23, 1991, Sister Margaret, I.H.M., came to see Msgrs. Molloy and Lynn. She told of her two years (1971-1973) of molestation by Fr. Cudemo when she was a high school student. She mentioned two other nuns, Sisters Catherine and Nancy, who, she said, were also “friendly” with Fr. Cudemo. She said that one had had a nervous breakdown. Sister Margaret offered, as had the other victims, to confront Fr. Cudemo if he denied the allegations. The Archdiocese managers put her off, but assured the victim that they would “inform the Cardinal again.”

Monsignors Molloy and Lynn questioned Fr. Cudemo again two days later. He admitted his relationship with Marion was sexual. It was also during this interview that Fr. Cudemo, when told there was a new allegation, first guessed it was Isabelle, whom he had abused years before. When told it was an Immaculate Heart nun, he mused that it could have been “Sister Nancy” or “Sister Catherine.”

Once informed that the allegations came from Sister Margaret, Fr. Cudemo admitted kissing, embracing, touching her breast, possibly lying on top of her, and sleeping in the same bed with her and another girl at the same time. He then assured the Archdiocese managers there was no “sexual involvement.”

Monsignor Lynn pointed out to Fr. Cudemo that, despite how the priest might view his actions, what he admitted to was a crime. Despite Fr. Cudemo's admissions to sexual behavior with minors and his simultaneous refusal to acknowledge the behavior as sexual, Msgr. Molloy ended the interview by asking the priest "if he could assure the Archbishop that there is no overt sexual behavior going on now." Monsignor Lynn dutifully recorded that Fr. Cudemo "stated that there is not."

So assured, the Cardinal still did not remove Fr. Cudemo as pastor at Saint Callistus.

The Archdiocese is threatened with a lawsuit, then removes Father Cudemo from his parish.

Totally frustrated, Ruth, Sister Irene, Donna, and their family, wrote to Cardinal Bevilacqua on Nov. 5, 1991 (Appendix D-7). They criticized Msgr. Jagodzinski, the Secretary for Clergy, because nothing was done in response to Marion's information. They apparently did not know that Msgr. Jagodzinski had, in fact, recommended that Fr. Cudemo not be given his new pastorate. They told the Cardinal that they thought Marion's allegation alone should have been sufficient to suspend Fr. Cudemo. They told the Cardinal that their complaints, which Msgr. Molloy told them he believed, were surely sufficient evidence against Fr. Cudemo for the Archdiocese to remove him.

When they wrote their letter, they did not even know that the Archdiocese had recently also learned of Sister Margaret's abuse. Or that the Archdiocese had learned from Fr. Cudemo himself about Isabelle, Sister Nancy, and Sister Catherine. Even so, the victims had come to realize that lack of credible allegations was not the problem. They told the Cardinal that priests they had consulted "uniformly tell us that any substantial change will come only in response to a lawsuit." And so, the victims in their letter threatened to name the Archdiocese and the Cardinal in a lawsuit.

A week later, on Nov. 11, 1991, the Cardinal asked that Fr. Cudemo "withdraw from the parish" until his evaluation was conducted. In making this request, the Cardinal asked Fr. Cudemo "to consider two things: 1) what is good for Fr. Cudemo; 2) what is good for the Church." The priest complied, saying he would do whatever he was asked.

Following an evaluation, Father Cudemo refuses recommended treatment and continues to minister.

Father Cudemo was first evaluated beginning December 1, 1991, at Saint Luke Institute in Suitland, Maryland. Unhappy with the results, and not wanting to begin treatment before Christmas, Fr. Cudemo asked for a second opinion. Cardinal Bevilacqua gave his approval, and Msgr. Molloy agreed to schedule an evaluation at Saint John Vianney Hospital around a trip Fr. Cudemo had planned for Jan. 19-29, 1992. He was informed he could not perform his duties as pastor of Saint Callistus. With no other limitations placed on his faculties, Fr. Cudemo was still free to minister in other parishes, live in their rectories, or visit with their parishioners. Following the second evaluation, the Cardinal directed on February 11, 1992, that Fr. Cudemo be hospitalized immediately. Father Cudemo told Msgr. Molloy that he would not comply. Moreover, aware that the Archdiocese was concerned about a possible lawsuit, Fr. Cudemo told Msgrs. Molloy and Lynn that he would rather go to court, and risk jail, than do as the Cardinal ordered.

Over the next few years, the Archdiocese several times repeated its order that Fr. Cudemo enter treatment, and each time he repeated his refusal. On June 22, 1992, Msgr. Molloy spoke to Ruth. The Church official had earlier suggested to the victims that they forego their lawsuit until they gave Fr. Cudemo a chance to voluntarily get treatment. Monsignor Molloy told them that if he refused, “they would still have an opportunity for legal action.” But when Ruth asked Msgr. Molloy what was happening with Fr. Cudemo, the Cardinal’s delegate did not tell her that the priest had repeatedly announced he would not enter treatment. Instead, Msgr. Molloy told her “it was not yet clear what response he was going to make concerning what is being asked of him.”

Ruth and her husband waited four more months for the Archdiocese to respond. Finally, on Oct. 13, 1992, they filed a civil suit against the Archdiocese and Fr. Cudemo. A review of the files indicates that for the next eight months, Church officials took no action. Father Cudemo was permitted unfettered exercise of full faculties to minister anywhere in the Archdiocese except Saint Callistus.

On June 8, 1993, Msgr. Molloy was notified that Fr. Cudemo had scheduled a Mass in the house of a Saint Callistus parishioner — one of the only things he was prohibited

from doing. Upon further investigation, it was learned that he had been living and celebrating Mass at Annunciation parish. On June 17, 1993, Cardinal Bevilacqua restricted Fr. Cudemo's faculties to saying private Mass. This was two years after Marion had alerted the Archdiocese to Fr. Cudemo's behavior.

Despite the supposed restrictions, Archdiocese files reveal that a year later, Fr. Cudemo was still acting as a priest, still visiting parishes, and still asking to say Mass. Without notification to pastors of any restrictions, they were predictably impossible to enforce. From time to time the Archdiocese was alerted, for example, that Fr. Cudemo was once again "a frequent visitor to [Annunciation] parish and to parishioners," or that he was looking to say Mass.

Although Fr. Cudemo was able to keep himself busy in the parishes of the Archdiocese by flouting his restrictions, he wanted his faculties to be reinstated officially so he could minister in Florida, where he also spent a lot of time. On January 30, 1995, Msgr. Lynn in response wrote that Fr. Cudemo's faculties had been "restricted for the good of the Church and the avoidance of scandal" and would remain so "at least until the resolution of civil litigation."

That litigation was resolved on August 21, 1995, when it was discontinued because the statute of limitations had expired. Father Cudemo remained on the books as pastor of Saint Callistus, but being relieved of his duties there, was free to spend his time visiting parishes and parishioners all over the Archdiocese.

On October 18, 1995, the parochial vicar at Saint Jude Church in Chalfont notified the Archdiocese that Fr. Cudemo had been accused of sexual harassment by a woman doing community service at the church. Father Michael Gerlach asked Msgr. Lynn if Fr. Cudemo should be spending so much time at the parish. The Secretary for Clergy said that decision was up to the pastor. There is no indication that he informed the pastor of Fr. Cudemo's history, of any restrictions on his faculties, or of the danger he posed to young women and girls.

Cardinal Bevilacqua removes Father Cudemo from his pastorate, but then restores his full faculties.

Although the Archdiocese seemed unconcerned by news that Fr. Cudemo was involved in several parishes, Cardinal Bevilacqua was interested in moving him from his official and published assignment as pastor to a less visible status. Because Fr. Cudemo was not being cooperative, the Cardinal, on January 15, 1996, initiated an administrative process to remove him under canon law.

As part of this process, two Archdiocesan pastors, Msgr. Robert T. McManus, Pastor, Saint Joseph Parish, Downingtown, and Fr. Thomas P. Flanigan, Pastor, Corpus Christi Parish, Lansdale, reviewed the allegations against Fr. Cudemo dating back to 1966. Among their findings was that, based on the documents the Archdiocese had in its files, “it is impossible not to see the turpitude that is present and documented in the Acts.” They commented that “the accusations and the scandal will not simply go away and if Father Cudemo was reinstated to the parish there would be great harm to the Church.” They also noted that “there is the grave possibility of civil legal action.” They pointed out that there had been a complaint about harassing a woman from Saint Jude’s just a few months earlier. The pastors recommended that Cardinal Bevilacqua remove Fr. Cudemo as pastor.

But rather than proceed with the removal process, the Cardinal accepted Fr. Cudemo’s resignation on June 28, 1996. In doing so, he bestowed on Fr. Cudemo the status of retired priest, and gave him permission to fully exercise his priestly faculties throughout the Archdiocese. On Jan. 21, 1997, Monsignor Lynn issued an open-ended certificate of “good standing” to assist Fr. Cudemo in his efforts to minister in Florida parishes as well.

Once retired, Fr. Cudemo split his time between Philadelphia and Florida. On February 12, 1999, he wrote the Vicar of Priests in Orlando, who had been reluctant to allow the priest to minister in that diocese. In his letter, which attached his certificate of good standing, Fr. Cudemo described the extensive ministering he was doing in Philadelphia and elsewhere. He listed six parishes where he was involved: Immaculate Conception, B.V.M., Jenkintown; St. Matthew, Conshohocken; St. Thomas Aquinas,

Croydon; Our Lady of Mt. Carmel, Bridgeport; Annunciation B.V.M., Philadelphia; and All Saints Rectory in Manassas, Virginia.

According to Fr. Cudemo, he filled in for pastors for weeks at a time at these parishes, led retreats for teen-agers and children preparing for confirmation, worked with children in CCD (the religious education program), and performed baptisms, confessions, marriage preparation, marriages, and grade-school and high school liturgies. He said he was at Immaculate Conception every Sunday he was not in Florida or serving in another parish in Philadelphia. He estimated he served the equivalent of two months a year at Saint Matthew in Conshohocken — the parish in which Ruth lived. The pastor at Saint Matthew, Father James W. Donlon, testified that the Archdiocese never informed him about Fr. Cudemo's past.

In his letter, Fr. Cudemo questioned the Orlando diocese's reluctance to let him minister, despite Msgr. Lynn's letter of good standing, when the Philadelphia Archdiocese was being so permissive:

P.S. Father, there is something that puzzles me. I have served for 2½ years since being reinstated and continue to serve in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia (and in some cases in the very area where my accusers reside) with full faculties, in youth work and all kinds of ministries, and I am not able to serve in a far away diocese such as yours.

Monsignor Lynn acknowledged receiving a copy of this letter, which shows Fr. Cudemo bragging about ministering two months of the year in Ruth's neighborhood. Although Msgr. Lynn had heard graphically how traumatized Ruth was by Fr. Cudemo, he did nothing to stop the priest from ministering in her parish. Only after Ruth's husband called Msgr. Lynn, on November 22, 2000, to report what the Secretary for Clergy already knew and to say how upset his wife was, did the Archdiocese do anything. Monsignor Lynn's response was merely to tell the Saint Matthew pastor, Father Donlon, that it "would be best" not to have Fr. Cudemo helping out there. He did nothing to prevent such situations in the numerous other parishes where Fr. Cudemo was active and where his many other victims might worship.

On March 1, 2002, apparently under pressure from the exploding priest-abuse scandal in Boston, Msgr. Lynn informed Fr. Cudemo that his faculties were restricted.

There is no indication on file, however, that Fr. Cudemo's "celebret," vouching for his "good standing," and asking other dioceses to allow him to celebrate Mass, was ever revoked.

In March 2003, Fr. Cudemo told one of his former victims, Stacy, that he was, indeed, ministering and saying Mass in Orlando. He explained that he was able to do so because the Archdiocese of Philadelphia had certified that he was a priest in "good standing."

Cardinal Bevilacqua explains the Archdiocese's handling of Father Cudemo.

Cardinal Bevilacqua testified before the Grand Jury that it was his policy that no priest with a history of sexual abuse of minors was to be recommended to him for assignment. He said that his Secretaries for Clergy — first Msgr. Jagodzinski; later, Msgr. Lynn — knew this policy. They also knew, according to the Cardinal, that before making a recommendation, they were to review the priest's Secret Archives file. Cardinal Bevilacqua told the Grand Jury he did not know of a situation where that policy was ever not followed.

Even knowing all the recorded allegations on file at the time Fr. Cudemo first became a pastor — the complaints about multiple victims from 1966, 1969, and 1977 — the Cardinal refused to say that Fr. Cudemo's appointment was a mistake or a breakdown in policy. The Cardinal's testimony clarified how his "policy," properly carried out, had resulted in the appointment of a notorious child abuser, with serious allegations spanning decades, as a pastor in 1991. When shown the allegations that were in Fr. Cudemo's Secret Archives file in 1989 and still in 1991, the Archbishop shared with the Grand Jury the rationales he would use to discount each one:

Q: If this information had been brought to your attention, would you have made him pastor at King of Peace?

A: I . . . when I look at this, these three documents here, I see one is anonymous. ["Saint Stanislaus Parishioner" reports three-year affair known among the parishioners] It has no value at all to me. The second one [Fr. DeSimone reports two witnessed encounters with girls], there's no admission. I

don't see anything in the second document here of any kind of admission of guilt. We're talking civilly and legally now.

Q: Ok. Go ahead. Continue. We'll talk about them later.

A: The third document [Denise and mother reporting two-year sexual relationship with best friend — Emily], we're looking at secondhand information. We have someone here who won't give the last name of the person, and I don't see that the original so-called alleged victim has brought any kind of allegation against him.

The Cardinal claimed that the first allegation had “no value in it unless you investigate it.” The third allegation, from a victim's friend and her mother, he described as “secondhand” and, thus, of lesser credibility than if the victim had been interviewed. Yet, according to Msgr. Lynn, it was Archdiocese policy not to seek out known victims reported by third parties, thus avoiding acquisition of first-hand information. Emily's last name was learned within a month, but Archdiocese officials never chose to question her.

Even where two priests reported seeing two suspicious encounters between Fr. Cudemo and young girls – where one of those reports corroborated the 1966 allegation, and where Fr. Cudemo admitted his behavior was “imprudent, if not scandalous” – Cardinal Bevilacqua discounted the information because there was no “admission of guilt.” He expressed no displeasure, surprise, or remorse, that this allegation was disregarded in the process of evaluating a potential pastor.

Monsignor Cullen, the Vicar for Administration, confirmed that what the Cardinal claimed was a policy – strictly forbidding the Secretary for Clergy from recommending for assignment any priest with a background of abuse of minors – was, in practice, something quite different. He explained that the Secretary for Clergy could, in fact, recommend priests as suitable for assignment if: (1) there was no definitive proof by Archdiocese standards (for example, an explicit admission or a conviction) or (2) the priest was “rehabilitated” (again by Archdiocese standards – for example, if he had a letter saying “not a pedophile” on file) or, sometimes, (3) if the allegation was old enough. Thus, Msgr. Cullen, like Cardinal Bevilacqua, was able to dismiss the reports from 1966, 1969, and 1977 of abuse by Fr. Cudemo as mere allegations.

Cardinal Bevilacqua, with his attorney's help, took care to distinguish between accusations or allegations and what he called "credible" allegations. When asked to explain what would be required to consider an allegation credible, the Cardinal answered that it would "practically" require an admission by the priest. "Most of the time," he explained, "when we did have allegations, and we said that that person could not be reassigned, it was because the priest admitted it."

Cardinal Bevilacqua grudgingly acknowledged that "possibly" a large number of allegations could be a factor in determining credibility. He added, however, that: "there have been cases where there have been several and turned out to be they're all false." When asked what case that was, he said, "[I]t had nothing to do with this."

Monsignor Molloy testified that he was reprimanded by Msgr. Cullen for telling Ruth and her family that he found their allegations credible. Monsignor Molloy explained that he knew how important it was to victims to be believed and, so, he tried to give them this bit of consolation. He was told, however, not to do that. Monsignor Molloy surmised that he was so instructed in order not to compromise any subsequent legal action.

After Ruth's family's lawsuit was dismissed without judging the evidence (because the statute of limitations was deemed to have lapsed), Cardinal Bevilacqua reinstated Fr. Cudemo's faculties, as Msgr. Lynn had suggested he might. At that point, the Cardinal knew of two psychological evaluations — from Saint Luke and Saint John Vianney — that were negative enough for the Cardinal to have directed the priest to be hospitalized immediately for treatment.

Father Cudemo never went for treatment as directed. Instead, he presented a two-paragraph letter from Hugh H. Carberry, a psychologist he chose, stating that he was not a pedophile. No explanation was provided for the basis of the opinion. Nor was an alternative explanation offered for Fr. Cudemo's long history of sexually abusing young girls. From the letter it is unclear whether the psychologist was aware of the history of allegations against Fr. Cudemo or the admissions he had made about some of the molestations of which he was accused.

Cardinal Bevilacqua's own panel of pastors, which recommended removing Fr. Cudemo, had rejected an earlier opinion of the priest's personal therapist, saying "Doctor

Carberry had not reviewed any of this material, yet he makes statements which are at odds with two other confidential psychological reports and without performing any psychological testing of his own.” That panel concluded on February 7, 1996, that Fr. Cudemo was at risk of acting out — at least until treated. On June 28, 1996, Cardinal Bevilacqua reinstated the priest’s faculties anyway.

Father Cudemo testifies before the Grand Jury.

Father Cudemo testified before the Grand Jury and was given an opportunity to respond to the allegations against him. He acknowledged knowing the girls who accused him of sexual abuse, but declined to answer when asked if their accusations were true. He told the Grand Jury that Cardinal Bevilacqua restricted his faculties from June 1993 until June 1996 (which covered the time period when the victims’ lawsuit was pending and during which the canonical process to remove Fr. Cudemo was ongoing). As soon as these matters were resolved, Cardinal Bevilacqua fully restored Fr. Cudemo’s faculties and he once again freely ministered within the Archdiocese. He remained completely unsupervised or restricted for six years. He testified that during that time, he would sometimes take altar servers, including girls, in his car and out to breakfast after Mass.

Father Cudemo told the Grand Jury that some restrictions were put on his faculties in February 2002, but that he was “not clear” what they were. According to the testimony of Stacy, Fr. Cudemo told her in March 2003 that he was still permitted to minister, at least in Florida, and was doing so. Father Cudemo testified that it was not until June or July 2004 that he was finally told he could not wear a collar and present himself as a priest. This was 12 years after Marion, followed by Ruth and many others, told the Archdiocese of their abuse and the danger Father Cudemo posed to young girls.

After it was determined, in August 2004, that the allegations of sexual abuse of minors lodged against Fr. Cudemo were credible, his case was referred to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in Rome, with a request that the priest be involuntarily laicized. Father Cudemo has retained canonical counsel to contest that action.

The Archdiocese’s determined maintenance of willful ignorance in the case of Fr. Cudemo succeeded in fending off, until it was too late, legal action that might have

stopped the priest's sexual abuses. Cardinal Bevilacqua's policies permitted the Archdiocese to discount or dismiss numerous allegations while Church officials systematically refused to follow up on accusations or even to seek out known victims. They allowed the Archdiocese to avoid scandal or accountability while the Cardinal continued to assign and even promote Fr. Cudemo to positions ideally suited for preying on young girls.

Father Peter J. Dunne

Father Peter J. Dunne, ordained in 1954, served the Philadelphia Archdiocese as a teacher, pastor, administrator of a school for delinquent boys, and assistant director of the Archdiocese scouting program for 40 years. He remained a parish priest for seven and a half years after Archdiocese officials learned, in 1986, that he had sexually abused an altar boy who had been in the priest's Boy Scout troop. During those seven and a half years, Father Dunne was diagnosed as an untreatable pedophile. He personally paid \$40,000 to silence a victim. The Archdiocese was warned repeatedly that he had many victims, that he was most likely continuing to commit sexual offenses, that he should not be in a parish setting, and that he should not be around children or adolescents.

Yet, not until a former victim threatened a lawsuit did Cardinal Bevilacqua in 1994 finally remove Father Dunne from his assignment at Visitation B.V.M. in Norristown.

In an effort to escape legal liability, the Cardinal chose not to place Father Dunne in a supervised living situation as his therapists strongly urged. A committee of Cardinal Bevilacqua's advisers concluded that "overwhelming evidence of pedophilia is here!" But, rather than take action to protect present and future victims, the Cardinal responded to concerns that the Archdiocese might risk being held liable for the priest's crimes if it tried to supervise him. Cardinal Bevilacqua permitted Father Dunne to retire to his rural cabin where he was known to take boys for sleepovers.

The Archdiocese is informed in 1986 that Father Dunne has abused "Gordon" and several other boys; the priest attempts to buy the silence of one of his victims.

In April 1986, the Archdiocese was told that Fr. Peter Dunne, then pastor of Sacred Heart in Oxford, had sexually abused a boy for several years, beginning in the late 1950s when the boy was 13 years old. In an April 1986 letter, the pastor of the now-grown victim in Eugene, Oregon, Fr. Joseph Wood, informed Philadelphia's Chancellor, Msgr. Samuel E. Shoemaker, of the "detrimental effects" the priest's actions still had on his parishioner – a doctor, referred to in this Report as "Gordon." Father Wood asked the Philadelphia Chancellor to "look into the priest's activities to ascertain that he is not hurting other young people." Msgr. Shoemaker wrote back to Fr. Wood, asking that the victim put the specifics of his allegations in writing.

The victim, Gordon, asked his therapist, Dr. David A. Myers, and a lawyer he retained, R. G. Stephenson, to relate his story. Their letters told the Archdiocese that Fr. Dunne's sexual abuse of Gordon started after the boy told the priest in the confessional that

he was attracted to other boys his age. Shortly thereafter, Fr. Dunne began to take Gordon camping and to a cabin that the priest owned in Bucks County. The priest first had the boy sleep in the same sleeping bag or bed and the priest was naked. Soon he was asking the boy to remove his underwear.

Gordon was 13 years old when Fr. Dunne made the boy handle the priest's genitals. Before long the priest was demanding "sexual contact," including "ejaculation and other deviant sexual behavior," whenever they slept together. This behavior continued until the boy was 17 and picked up again when Gordon was an adult.

Dr. Myers explained to the Archdiocese the devastating impact that Fr. Dunne's abuse had, not only on Gordon, but also on his wife, his children, his patients, and his medical practice. The therapist wrote that Gordon first came to him for help in September 1985, because Gordon's wife, "Bonnie," had discovered he had "sexual inclinations toward their son," who was 11 or 12 years old. It came out later that Gordon himself had begun abusing 12- and 13-year-old boys on camping trips when Gordon was an 18-year-old Eagle Scout. Gordon followed in Fr. Dunne's path (Fr. Dunne had been a Scout leader for years), becoming a Boy Scout leader and preying on his young scouts. In 1991 he lost his medical license for molesting boy patients.

In a September 1986 letter to Msgr. Shoemaker, Dr. Myers described how Gordon's thinking and his pattern of living stemmed from his early interactions with Fr. Dunne – especially the priest's habit of initiating sexual encounters and then condemning them afterwards.

This pattern could be characterized as follows: on a public level he strives for perfection. He is a Boy Scout leader, active in his parish, the most popular physician in his clinic, a compulsive worker around the house, preoccupied with physical fitness, and an articulate, persuasive individual. Privately, he searches continuously for possible prey to his homosexual inclinations. He has become fixated on the preadolescent and adolescent sexual arousal memories.

Dr. Myers concluded that, "clearly, his relationship with Fr. Dunne has caused both malignant thinking patterns as well as very abnormal emotional functioning."

In later communications, Gordon provided the Archdiocese with the names of three other victims of Fr. Dunne of whom he was aware: “Elliot,” “Mason,” and “Gil.” Elliot was a student at the school for troubled boys that Fr. Dunne headed from 1974 to 1983. Mason was a student at Saint Charles Borromeo Seminary with whom both Fr. Dunne and Gordon had a sexual relationship. Gordon also told of many more boys whom Fr. Dunne seemed to be grooming for sexual relations.

Gordon’s lawyer, in an August 1986 letter to Msgr. Shoemaker, informed the Archdiocese that his client had “become aware of information which causes him to believe that Fr. Dunne is sexually abusing young boys to the present days.” Gordon’s lawyer indicated that his client was asking for some compensation for the damage caused to him and his family by Fr. Dunne’s actions. Equally important, the lawyer told the Archdiocese, was that Fr. Dunne “no longer [be] given the opportunity to ruin other lives for his sexual gratification.”

On September 4, 1986, upon receipt of the therapist’s and lawyer’s letters, Msgr. Shoemaker, along with the Assistant Chancellor, John W. Graf, interviewed Fr. Dunne. Informed of the accusation against him but not the name of his accuser, the priest named two altar boys from Saint Bartholomew, where he had lived while teaching at Cardinal Dougherty High School. The two names were Gordon and “Shane.” He admitted to swimming nude with an unstated number of boys, as well as sleeping nude with them in the same sleeping bag. He said that of “all the boys, [Gordon] was the most frequent camper.”

Monsignor Shoemaker’s notes of the 1986 interview state that at the time, Fr. Dunne had two “young men,” who, he said, were twenty and twenty-one years old, living with him at his rectory in Oxford. According to Fr. Dunne, the young males were from Saint Francis Vocational School, the school for troubled boys where the priest had been administrator before becoming pastor in Oxford in 1983.

Having learned of the devastating consequences of Fr. Dunne’s behavior on Gordon and his family, the Archdiocese responded on October 14, 1986. The response – a veiled threat to expose the victim’s history if he revealed Fr. Dunne’s crimes – came from the Archdiocese’s lawyer, John P. O’Dea of Stradley, Ronon, Stevens & Young. He wrote

to Gordon's attorney that "litigation would undoubtedly cause [Gordon] considerable discomfort in light of his activity since obtaining maturity." There was no offer to help the victim or his family with counseling. Perhaps most importantly, Fr. Dunne was not removed from his pastorate.

As it turned out, one of the victims Gordon named, Elliot, was one of the two males still living with Fr. Dunne at the Oxford rectory when Gordon came forward in 1986. The Archdiocese knew by September 4, 1986, that Elliot and another male from Saint Francis Vocational School were living in the rectory, and Msgr. Shoemaker ordered that they leave. Father Dunne admitted to sleeping in the same bed with them and "fondling" Elliot, but denied other overt sexual relations.

Despite these facts, which should have caused Archdiocese officials great concern, there is no evidence that they even interviewed either of the two young men at that time. It was not until December 1986, after attorney O'Dea learned that Gordon knew of Fr. Dunne's involvement with Elliot, that Elliot was questioned about his relationship with the priest. Even then, he was interviewed not by Archdiocese officials, but by O'Dea, their attorney.

What Elliot told O'Dea during the December 2, 1986, interview is not recorded in Archdiocese files. After talking to Elliot, however, O'Dea called Msgr. Shoemaker, "requesting an immediate meeting." O'Dea met with Msgr. Shoemaker and Fr. Dunne later that day. Monsignor Shoemaker's notes of the session recorded that it had become apparent at the meeting between O'Dea and Elliot that "Fr. D. had lied to me about his sexual relationship with [Elliot]."

Father Dunne told Msgr. Shoemaker at the December 2 meeting that, when Elliot was approximately 15 years old and a student at Fr. Dunne's school, the priest had taken him to Boys Town in Nebraska, a program that provided housing for troubled boys. The priest told the boy to contact Gordon, who lived nearby in Iowa, if he needed any assistance.

Meanwhile, according to a December 30, 1986, letter by Gordon's lawyer, O'Dea asked about a "settlement figure." Father Dunne resigned his pastorate on December 5, 1986, and was admitted to Saint John Vianney Hospital. Monsignor Shoemaker's notes of

November 1986 recorded that Fr. Dunne indicated to the Archdiocese that he might make a “personal payment of monies to save the church embarrassment.” According to Msgr. Shoemaker’s notes from the December 2, 1986, meeting, Fr. Dunne no longer denied having sex with minors but claimed “he didn’t remember any such happenings -- maybe, he stated, he has a mental block.”

Father Dunne remained at Saint John Vianney for nine months. His therapist there recommended that, upon release, he may need to be assigned to a specialized ministry “which would control his contact with children and adolescents, and [a residence with] someone who will assume responsibility for his whereabouts on a twenty-four hour per day basis.” Despite this advice, in September 1987 Cardinal Krol assigned Fr. Dunne as assistant pastor at Nativity parish in Warminster.

Memos by Msgr. Shoemaker in October 1987 reflect that the Archdiocese appears to have left it to Fr. Dunne to inform his new pastor of his history. In November 1987, more than a month after Fr. Dunne had started his assignment, Msgr. Shoemaker noted that the priest had not fully informed his pastor, Fr. William O’Donnell. Nowhere does it appear that the Archdiocese instructed Fr. O’Donnell to supervise Fr. Dunne.

On November 24, 1987, Gordon and Bonnie signed a “Full and Final Release and Confidentiality Agreement” with Fr. Dunne, purporting to release not only the priest, but also the Archdiocese, from any liability relating to Fr. Dunne’s abuse of Gordon, in return for \$40,000. With this agreement, the abuser also tried to purchase Gordon’s silence. Father Dunne negotiated the agreement with the assistance of Fr. Daniel J. Menneti, an attorney and priest with restricted ministry in the Harrisburg diocese. No one signed the agreement on behalf of the Archdiocese, and its attorney, O’Dea, claimed no knowledge of the agreement until after April 25, 1988.

Despite warnings and recommendations, Cardinal Bevilacqua retains and reassigns Father Dunne to parish ministry.

At the time that Anthony J. Bevilacqua took over as Archbishop in Philadelphia, the Archdiocese knew that Gordon had made a serious and unresolved allegation against Fr. Dunne. Father Dunne had, on his own, paid \$40,000 to silence his accuser. Monsignor

Shoemaker, Philadelphia's Chancellor, had learned, in the course of looking into the allegation, that Fr. Dunne admitted to sleeping and swimming in the nude with boys, and had two former students living with him in his rectory in Oxford. Gordon had identified one of these males, Elliot, as one of Fr. Dunne's young victims, not knowing that Elliot was still living with the priest in Oxford. After the Archdiocese's lawyer had spoken with Elliot, Msgr. Shoemaker had concluded that Fr. Dunne had lied when he denied overt sexual activity beyond fondling. Father Dunne's therapist, after nine months of trying to treat him, had suggested to the Archdiocese that the priest might need 24-hour supervision and should be in a specialized ministry, kept away from children and adolescents. Despite all this, Fr. Dunne remained an assistant pastor of Nativity parish, with no recorded restrictions on his faculties.

Archbishop Bevilacqua took over the Archdiocese of Philadelphia in February 1988. On June 16, 1988, Msgr. Shoemaker sent the Archbishop a four-page report updating him on the "very complicated case" of Fr. Dunne. The Chancellor also alerted Archbishop Bevilacqua that Fr. Dunne had "held very sensitive assignments in the Archdiocese," serving as a teacher for 13 years, the administrator of Saint Francis Vocational School for court-assigned boys, and assistant director of the Archdiocese's scouting program. Monsignor Shoemaker pointed out that Fr. Dunne's settlement with Gordon had to cast doubt on his claims of innocence. Finally, the Chancellor wrote to Archbishop Bevilacqua that Fr. Dunne had requested to meet with him. The Archbishop responded, thanking Msgr. Shoemaker for a "good report," but suggesting no action or response to Fr. Dunne's request for a meeting.

During Archbishop Bevilacqua's first months in office, the Archdiocese also received repeated warnings from Fr. Dunne's therapist, Dr. Thomas J. Tyrrell. In letters addressed or copied to Msgr. Shoemaker in April and June 1988, Dr. Tyrrell informed the Archdiocese that Fr. Dunne's aftercare program was not being adhered to, that Fr. Dunne was not attending his therapy sessions, and that he was "temperamentally unsuitable as a candidate for treatment." His aftercare program, as a result, called for removing Fr. Dunne from parish ministry and placing him in "supervised living which provides twenty-four

hour accountability.” Father Dunne, however, remained in the parish ministry, living in the parish rectory.

In early September 1988, apparently having received no direction from the Archbishop concerning Fr. Dunne, Msgr. Shoemaker wrote again. He reminded the Archbishop of the June 16 report, updating him on Dr. Tyrrell’s continued warnings (most recently on August 19, 1988), and telling the Archbishop that Fr. Dunne had been heard publicly bragging: “I have beaten the system.”

On September 20, 1988, Archbishop Bevilacqua met with Fr. Dunne, his priest/lawyer Fr. Menneti, and Msgr. Shoemaker. The group reviewed the recommendations of Dr. Tyrrell and Saint John Vianney. Archbishop Bevilacqua displayed his knowledge of aftercare theory by noting, according to minutes of the meeting, “that the directions of Dr. Tyrrell are formulated against the model used in Minneapolis.” The Archbishop told Fr. Dunne that aftercare was “indispensable for him,” and that if he violated the aftercare program he would be removed from ministry. Bevilacqua announced that, as Archbishop, he had to be concerned first with scandal, second with the good of the Church, and third with Fr. Dunne.

Further notes, which appear to record a conversation between Msgr. Shoemaker and Archbishop Bevilacqua after the others had left, related that “Dunne admits one incident,” that the “incident--is a crime,” and that there was a discussion of the “statute of limitations”--“2 yrs.” and “5 yrs.” Msgr. Shoemaker wrote: “directions of Villa Saint John Vianney--being question[ed] (???)” Specifically, he recorded the Archbishop asking: “Why (therapy) for the rest of the man’s life?--(Minneapolis).”

Monsignor Shoemaker later recorded that, in accord with Archbishop Bevilacqua’s instructions, he met on November 13, 1988, with Fr. Dunne and Dr. Tyrrell to “surface,” as Archbishop Bevilacqua put it, “if any accommodation can be made in the proposed aftercare model for Fr. Dunne.” As a result of this meeting, Dr. Tyrrell made several “accommodations” to Fr. Dunne’s aftercare program. These “accommodations” – in response to warnings that Fr. Dunne was violating Saint John Vianney’s and Dr. Tyrrell’s aftercare program, thereby putting parish boys at risk – in effect ended the aftercare program.

Dr. Tyrrell wrote to Fr. Dunne on November 25, 1988, releasing him from group therapy; individual therapy had already been discontinued as unsuccessful. The therapist backed off his demand that Fr. Dunne be removed from parish ministry and from his recommendation of a living situation with 24-hour supervision and accountability. The letter stated that Fr. Dunne was to be evaluated January 15-20, 1989, at Southdown Institute in Canada, and was to abide by its recommendations upon his return. Father Dunne continued in his parish ministry, now with no ongoing therapy, for another two months.

On January 20, 1989, Assistant Chancellor John W. Graf met with Fr. Dunne and his counselor at Southdown. In a memo dated January 24, 1989, Msgr. Graf recorded the findings and recommendations of the Southdown staff. Significant findings included: Fr. Dunne was homosexual, extremely intelligent and narcissistic, with a tendency toward manipulation. Monsignor Graf noted: "The counselor stated that Father's lifestyle shows evidence that the situations of inappropriate behavior could be beyond what we already know of Father's conduct." The Assistant Chancellor also recorded Southdown's recommendation that Fr. Dunne continue outpatient therapy with Dr. Tyrrell, that he procure a very strong spiritual director, and that he "never" work with young people.

In the face of all of these warnings and recommendations, Cardinal Bevilacqua nevertheless left Fr. Dunne as an assistant pastor, in two different parishes with easy access to children, for four more years. He did so despite:

- Dr. Tyrrell's warning, recorded by Msgr. Graf in a March 7, 1989, memo, that "he fe[lt] very strongly that Fr. Dunne [was] involved in other illicit relationships, ranging from youngsters to adults" and that he "recommended strongly that we remove Fr. Dunne from active ministry totally."
- Dr. Tyrrell's notice to the Archdiocese, by letter of March 8, 1989, that Fr. Dunne was not complying with his treatment plan.
- Dr. Tyrrell's stated opinion, recorded by Msgr. Graf in a February 1989 memo, that Fr. Dunne was a pedophile and his "intuition" that Fr. Dunne had been involved in "a myriad number of sexual misconduct cases." (Appendix D-8)

- A memo, dated March 16, 1989, from Assistant Chancellor Graf declaring: “It appears at this time that we have come to the point of decision concerning the ministry of Father Peter Dunne.” In the memo, Msgr. Graf reported Dr. Tyrrell’s opinion that the Archdiocese was sitting on a “powder keg,” that Fr. Dunne was a “very sick man,” and should “be relieved of active ministry.” (Appendix D-9)
- Notice on May 31, 1989, that the therapist responsible for Fr. Dunne’s group therapy, Dr. Eric Griffin-Shelley, had “never heard from Fr. Dunne.” The therapist went on to admit “wondering if the Archdiocese is not putting itself at risk with someone so uncooperative on the loose.” Dr. Griffin-Shelley told the Archdiocese: “I believe that he is quite likely acting out sexually and needs to have firm limits set on his behavior.”
- Another letter, dated August 8, 1989, from Dr. Griffin-Shelley telling the Archdiocese he had heard nothing further from Fr. Dunne and was still concerned.
- A letter, dated September 14, 1989, from Fr. O’Donnell, Fr. Dunne’s pastor at Nativity parish, to Secretary for Clergy John J. Jagodzinski, informing the Archdiocese that Fr. Dunne had spent three weeks camping with adolescent boys and their fathers. Father O’Donnell also said that he had discovered Fr. Dunne was counseling a 16-year-old boy without the pastor’s knowledge. This counseling, according to the pastor, was conducted in the priest’s car.
- A memo to Cardinal Bevilacqua from his Secretary for Clergy, on September 15, 1989, updating him in anticipation of a pastoral visit to Nativity parish. In the memo, Msgr. Jagodzinski wrote that four therapists had reached the conclusion that “there is much potential for a recurrence of sexual abuse by Father Dunne.” Father Dunne was about to begin anew with another therapist and was asking for a new assignment. The Cardinal, in response, wrote on the memo: “Be very cautious. I think he is trying to manipulate so that we act according to his agenda. AJB 9/19/89.” (Appendix D-10)
- A long letter to Assistant Chancellor Graf, dated August 18, 1989, from Dr. Tyrrell. In writing about Fr. Dunne, he described the characteristics of pedophiles and how they function. He explained “grooming,” denial, and resistance to change. He

showed how Fr. Dunne fit all the criteria and how his continued activities with adolescents – including camping and counseling – presented a continuing danger. The therapist, once again, recommended removing Fr. Dunne from ministry and sending him to an institution for resistive child abusers. So long as Fr. Dunne stayed in active ministry, the therapist said, the Archdiocese and potential victims remained at risk.

- A report from Fr. Dunne’s next therapist, Dr. Eric Griffin-Shelley, dated April 1, 1990, agreeing that the Archdiocese should remove Fr. Dunne from his parish assignment. Dr. Griffin-Shelley stated that it was generally agreed that “a parish assignment is out of the question for a pedophile.” Without providing a firm diagnosis, the therapist wrote, “there cannot at this time be a satisfactory resolution to the ongoing concern about his potential to sexually act out, especially with youth.” The therapist said it was “an untenable position for the Archdiocese” to leave Fr. Dunne in his parish assignment. “In his current assignment,” the therapist suggested, “it might appear to some that the Archdiocese is not acting with sufficient caution to protect possible victims of sexual abuse.”
- A “very urgent plea” to the Archdiocese from Fr. Dunne’s pastor at Nativity, “that specific arrangements be made to provide Father Dunne with the kind of help he needs but refuses to accept” In a letter written April 10, 1990, Fr. O’Donnell went on to complain that Cardinal Bevilacqua’s administration had allowed Fr. Dunne to avoid both supervision and therapy. He explained how monthly meetings between Fr. Dunne, the pastor, therapists, and Chancellor Shoemaker, required under Cardinal Krol’s administration, had been discontinued when Archbishop Bevilacqua took over. He requested that Fr. Dunne be removed from his parish and suggested that, wherever he go, a supervision team be reinstated.

Cardinal Bevilacqua finally reassigns Father Dunne, but ignores the advice of therapists to take him out of parish ministry.

In June 1990, Cardinal Bevilacqua did reassign Fr. Dunne, as both the priest himself and his pastor had requested. However, the Cardinal ignored the unanimous advice

of Fr. Dunne's therapists to take him out of parish ministry. He also ignored the entreaties of Fr. Dunne's pastor, Fr. O'Donnell, to provide for better supervision. Despite acknowledging Fr. Dunne's manipulative nature, and warning Msgr. Jagodzinski to "be cautious," the Cardinal acceded to a request by Fr. Dunne and assigned him as parochial vicar to Visitation B.V.M. (Appendix D-11)

Father Dunne's pastor at Visitation, B.V.M. was Msgr. Frank Clemins. A September 1989 letter from Fr. O'Donnell to Msgr. Jagodzinski reflects that the Archdiocese knew that Fr. Dunne had previously chosen Msgr. Clemins as his spiritual director and confessor. No supervision team was established, and no therapy was required of Fr. Dunne. Msgr. Clemins, as Fr. Dunne's spiritual director, was constrained in what he could share if he ever learned of misconduct by his parochial vicar.

Cardinal Bevilacqua left Fr. Dunne in this position for several years, insulated from any meaningful oversight. Every few months the priest reported to the Secretary for Clergy, Msgr. Jagodzinski, that all was well. In one such meeting, Fr. Dunne informed Msgr. Jagodzinski that he was spending an "overnight" each week at his cabin in Bucks County, the same cabin where he had abused Gordon. Monsignor Jagodzinski reported that the priest found this opportunity "most helpful."

An October 1990 memo by Msgr. Jagodzinski recorded that Fr. Dunne had told him that he thought therapy was not "necessary at this time," so the priest was not in therapy. After a November 1991 meeting, Msgr. Jagodzinski noted in a memo Fr. Dunne's refusal to undergo a recommended evaluation, but no consequence followed.

On May 6, 1992, Fr. Dunne informed the Archdiocese that he was conducting children's liturgies and delivering report cards to the children in the parish's grade school. In a memo reporting this meeting, Msgr. Jagodzinski recommended leaving Fr. Dunne as parochial vicar.

Had it not been for the persistence of Gordon, his mother, and his wife – and the threat of lawsuit and scandal that they posed to the Archdiocese – Cardinal Bevilacqua might have kept Fr. Dunne in his parish ministry indefinitely.

A victim of Father Dunne again seeks reparations from the Archdiocese.

On October 9, 1992, Gordon's mother wrote the Cardinal pleading for financial assistance for her son. She attached her son's resume, his description of what Fr. Dunne had done to him as a child, and his story of the devastation that the priest's abuse had caused in his own life.

Gordon had a wife and five children, but in 1991 had lost his medical license because he had sexually molested young boys who were his patients. In his attached communication to the Cardinal, he alluded to medical and psychological expenses he had incurred since 1985 and to \$130,000 in legal expenses. He was asking the Archdiocese for \$30,000 so he could enroll in a treatment program in hopes of getting his medical license back.

At an issues meeting on October 22, 1992, Cardinal Bevilacqua directed the Secretary for Clergy to "pursue the possibility of obtaining documentation to indicate that the Archdiocese of Philadelphia was released from legal liability in the matter concerning [her son, Gordon]." In other words, the Cardinal wanted a copy of the release and confidentiality agreement that Fr. Dunne had negotiated privately with Gordon.

Monsignor William Lynn, who had become Secretary for Clergy the previous summer, was able to procure from Fr. Dunne a copy of the November 24, 1987, agreement. He forwarded it to the Assistant Vicar for Administration, James Molloy. After reviewing the agreement, the Archdiocese agreed to pay \$10,000 toward Gordon's anticipated inpatient treatment. A November 17, 1992, letter from Msgr. Lynn to Gordon made no mention of other costs, totaling \$577,000, which Gordon had attributed to his abuse. Within a week of receiving the Archdiocese's offer of \$10,000, Gordon's wife, Bonnie, wrote again to Msgr. Lynn. This time she detailed \$120,000 of debts she said were "a direct result of [Gordon's] victimization."

In a follow-up letter dated January 18, 1993, Gordon provided more revelations and asked Msgr. Lynn to share his letter with the Cardinal. Gordon wrote of a time in the late 1970s and early 1980s when he was living in Iowa as a young unmarried doctor, and Fr. Dunne was administrator of Saint Francis, the vocational school for troubled boys. Father Dunne brought boys in his charge out to Boys Town in Omaha, Nebraska. According to

Gordon, Fr. Dunne sometimes asked Gordon to house the boys. Gordon told Msgr. Lynn and Cardinal Bevilacqua:

As late as 1981 I was informed by a young man from Saint Francis group home that their history was much like mine. I had been introduced to a number of them by father. I was prepared to restart the predatory cycle myself. On one occasion one of the young men was sent to me in Iowa. Father wanted me to help and shelter them. I picked him up at Boys Town in Omaha. He coyly seduced me while I was driving my car. I asked why he was doing this and he boyishly said, “father does this all the time; I bet he did it to you.”

Gordon’s account suggested the possibility that as head of an Archdiocese school for troubled boys, Fr. Dunne had not only abused the students himself, but had farmed them out to his former victim who also then abused them. After raising that possibility, Gordon again outlined expenses he attributed to his abuse and announced he was thinking of going “forward publicly with the reasons for my horrible reversal.” On January 21, 1993, Msgr. Lynn wrote Gordon informing him that the Archdiocese would cover the entire cost of his inpatient treatment after all.

Threatened with publicity and legal action, the Archdiocese seeks another psychological evaluation; it finds Father Dunne a danger and recommends that he be kept from children and adolescents.

On August 31, 1993, Msgr. Lynn learned that Gordon had a new lawyer who was threatening to file a lawsuit against the Archdiocese for non-therapy expenses attributed to Gordon’s abuse. A letter from the lawyer, Stephen Rubino, to Msgr. Lynn dated September 1, 1993, as well as memos by Msgr. Lynn to Cardinal Bevilacqua on September 9 and 13, show that – four days after informing the Cardinal – Msgr. Lynn for the first time since becoming Secretary for Clergy showed an interest in finding out about Fr. Dunne’s current status.

Monsignor Lynn consulted Dr. Tyrrell at Saint John Vianney. The therapist told Msgr. Lynn what he had been telling the Archdiocese for years – that he thought Fr. Dunne was a “time bomb” and a pedophile. He recommended a complete evaluation and assessment. Although nothing had changed in years with regard to Fr. Dunne, except the

imminence of a lawsuit, Msgr. Lynn, in a September 13, 1993, memo to Cardinal Bevilacqua, recommended that Fr. Dunne submit to an outpatient evaluation and assessment by Saint John Vianney. The Cardinal agreed.

Prior to Fr. Dunne's October 18-21, 1993, assessment, Saint John Vianney asked Msgr. Lynn to complete an "Assessment Referral Information" form. The information the Secretary for Clergy provided Saint John Vianney was replete with inaccuracies – often related more to defending the Archdiocese's actions than to Fr. Dunne himself. For example, under "reasons for referral," Msgr. Lynn stated, "came to the attention of the present Secretary for Clergy and subsequently to the Archbishop that Fr. Dunne was no longer in counseling." Monsignor Lynn went on to explain that in April 1990, Dr. Eric Griffin-Shelley had recommended continuing therapy. "The present administration," Msgr. Lynn declared in October 1993, "is not comfortable with this failure to follow through with professional recommendations."

Monsignor Lynn's suggestion on the form that he and the Cardinal had only recently learned that Fr. Dunne was not in counseling, and that they found this unacceptable, is misleading at best. A year earlier, on October 19, 1992, Msgr. Lynn had written a memo to the Cardinal's Assistant Vicar for Administration, Msgr. Molloy, informing him that "the files do not indicate any on-going therapy program since the evaluation by [Dr.] Eric Griffin-Shelley of 1990. On one occasion, Msgr. Jagodzinski raised the idea of a re-evaluation to Father Dunne. The file indicates Fr. Dunne was not receptive to this."

In his October 1992 memo to Msgr. Molloy, which was later forwarded to the Cardinal, Msgr. Lynn also had made reference to a memo, dated May 6, 1992, from Msgr. Jagodzinski to the file. That memo recorded Fr. Dunne's own report that, as part of his ministry at Visitation B.V.M., he conducted children's liturgies and delivered report cards to grade school children.

Nevertheless, Msgr. Lynn told Saint John Vianney, "[H]e is supervised and avoids work with children." The Secretary for Clergy declared that Fr. Dunne's work and ministry history had "always been good; seen as a hard worker," while an April 1990 letter from Fr.

O'Donnell to Msgr. Jagodzinski and memos from Fr. Graf to the file in March 1989 and to Msgr. Jagodzinski in April 1989 indicated just the opposite.

On November 22, 1993, after Fr. Dunne had undergone the four-day outpatient assessment at Saint John Vianney, Msgr. Lynn sent Cardinal Bevilacqua a memo, along with the hospital's findings, captioned "Diagnostic Impressions and Recommendations," by Dr. Richard Koenig. As before, the priest was diagnosed with pedophilia and narcissistic personality disorder. The psychologist told the Archdiocese, once again, "Father should not be involved with children or adolescents." He recommended, given the rules of confidentiality governing confession, what should have been obvious without a psychological evaluation: "Father's confessor should not be involved in ministry supervision." Finally, the report addressed "Father Dunne's wish to retire to a secluded, unstructured living situation," stating emphatically that such a living arrangement was "highly counter-indicated."

In his memo to Cardinal Bevilacqua, coming on the heels of a threatened lawsuit, Msgr. Lynn recommended that Fr. Dunne be placed on administrative leave, that his faculties be restricted to saying private Mass, and that he be encouraged to seek laicization.

Cardinal Bevilacqua rejects the therapist's advice and convenes a committee that recommends a course of conduct that protects only the Archdiocese.

On November 23, 1993, after receiving the recommendations from Saint John Vianney, Cardinal Bevilacqua directed his aide, Msgr. James E. Molloy, to have Msgr. Lynn convey the Cardinal's wishes to Fr. Dunne. According to Msgr. Lynn's notes and his November 30, 1993, memo to Cardinal Bevilacqua, Msgr. Molloy instructed the Secretary for Clergy to meet with Fr. Dunne and "strongly exhort" Fr. Dunne to voluntarily seek laicization.

Monsignor Lynn was also to inform Fr. Dunne that, in the meantime, he was to be on "administrative leave," but "not in [the] strict canonical sense." Monsignor Lynn was to make it clear that the Cardinal was "not removing his priestly faculties." Rather, Fr. Dunne was being asked to voluntarily refrain from ministering, other than for private Mass. He could appeal this restriction on a case-by-case basis.

Despite Saint John Vianney's clear statement that living alone in an unstructured situation was "highly counter-indicated," the Cardinal wanted Msgr. Lynn to instruct Fr. Dunne to do precisely that – to live on his own. Monsignor Lynn's notes indicate that he was aware of the therapist's warning, but that the Archdiocese's lawyer, John O'Dea, had advised for "civil law liability" reasons that the Archdiocese should take "every step we can to distance self."

On November 30, 1993, Msgr. Lynn sent Cardinal Bevilacqua a memo disagreeing with the Cardinal's instructions that Fr. Dunne should "live on his own." Monsignor Lynn quoted for the Cardinal the entire recommendation from Saint John Vianney: "At this time, Fr. Dunne's wish to retire to a secluded, unstructured living situation is highly counter-indicated by both his past history as well as his present ability and/or willingness to give a clear and coherent self-presentation in this interview." Monsignor Lynn recommended that Fr. Dunne "be assigned to a residence until the laicization process is complete."

Knowing that Fr. Dunne had already expressed his wish to retire and live alone, Cardinal Bevilacqua responded to Msgr. Lynn's recommendation of a supervised residence with the equivalent of a rejection: "If he requests to go." In ignoring Msgr. Lynn's advice, the Cardinal chose to reject the therapist's recommendation designed to protect future victims in favor of a lawyer's recommendation designed to protect the Archdiocese from civil liability.

A January 17, 1994, memo to the file reflects that when Msgr. Lynn met with Fr. Dunne on January 1, 1994, the priest announced he would "go to his cabin to live." He said it would be virtually impossible to contact him by phone.

In another memo to the file, Msgr. Lynn noted that on February 23, 1994, he was notified by Fr. Dunne's spiritual director, Msgr. Clemins, that Fr. Dunne "continues to keep up a good spiritual life, celebrating Mass publicly." On May 2, 1994, Fr. Dunne informed Msgr. Lynn that he would not seek laicization.

At a May 17, 1994, meeting, Cardinal Bevilacqua, faced with this refusal, directed that an ad hoc committee be established to study Fr. Dunne's case. The next day Msgr. Molloy spelled out in a memo to Msgr. Lynn the mission of this committee: "to evaluate this case and to recommend what can be done to minimize bonds of liability." The

committee members were Msgrs. Lynn, Stephen J. Harris (a canon lawyer), Robert McGinnis, and the Archdiocese's lawyer, John O'Dea. They met on June 28, 1994.

Handwritten notes from the meeting indicate that the group determined that Fr. Dunne's current status – that is, on administrative leave, with faculties (although requested to voluntarily refrain from exercising them) – was undesirable from a liability standpoint. The group was advised that under “case law,” a “priest is always on business of Bishop.” “If status quo remains,” the notes say, “some legal liability remains” and Fr. Dunne “would need to be highly supervised.” The notes from the meeting reflect the Archdiocese's knowledge that Fr. Dunne was at that time completely without supervision: “PD now – lives by self – he's totally free, he's seen around – we don't know what's what w/him.”

Several alternatives were outlined for the Cardinal's consideration. (It is not clear whether Cardinal Bevilacqua was present at the meeting. His initials, AB, appear on the fourth page of notes next to comments and questions as if he is being quoted.) While laicization was considered most desirable, it would involve – without Fr. Dunne's cooperation – a judicial process with “witnesses, publicity probably.” In addition, while his sexual behavior could have been grounds for laicization at the time the Archdiocese learned of his crimes, canon law provided that the conduct underlying a penal laicization action had to have occurred within the past five years. Monsignor Lynn noted that the last-known incident was in 1986, and involved “young men living in rect @ Oxford.”

Another alternative proposed by Msgr. Harris was to use an administrative process to declare “an impediment to exercise of Orders.” This would have the effect of suspending Fr. Dunne's faculties, but would not involve a penal process. An “impediment” could be based on his diagnosis as a pedophile. It was noted that “overwhelming evidence of pedophilia is here!” The risk involved in this option, according to the notes of the committee discussion, was that there would still be “civil liability for PD conduct because he's still priest of Archdiocese.” Still, it was noted, “Each step to remove PD – from Archdiocese – good.” A third alternative outlined at the strategy meeting was simply to assign Fr. Dunne, in essence, “to incarceration” as a “permanent resident @ Darby without getting out,” referring to a residential facility the Archdiocese runs for priests in Darby – Villa Saint Joseph.

The group discussed the hospital's warning that Fr. Dunne "shouldn't live by self." Notes record O'Dea opining: "Left as is right now – not good enough for civil law." The next note is: "What's he doing all day – PD – ??" However, rather than advising greater supervision, which might have protected potential victims, O'Dea advised the opposite. He said he didn't "see it as practical, taking responsibility for PD."

The group decided to recommend the second alternative – an administratively imposed "impediment to the exercise of Orders." This choice did nothing to change Fr. Dunne's actual situation or the risk he posed to children. He was still living completely unsupervised. He was still a priest and could wear a collar. He was already, supposedly, refraining from ministering publicly. What the decision accomplished, according to the meeting's notes, was: "civilly . . . takes away authority by Ch [the church] . . . [Fr. Dunne] doesn't represent Ch . . . in no position to act in name of Ch."

The recommendation by the Cardinal's advisers served only one purpose: the one they were charged with, "to minimize the bonds of liability." As an August 1994 memorandum by Msgr. Cullen stated, the Cardinal approved.

Father Dunne retires with no public censure.

The Archdiocese received the diagnosis of Fr. Dunne and the recommendations from Saint John Vianney in November 1993. Its own ad-hoc committee made its recommendations in July 1994. Nevertheless, by January 1995, the Cardinal had not suspended Fr. Dunne's faculties based on a declared "impediment." It was then, in a letter to the Cardinal dated January 10, 1995, that Fr. Dunne requested he be permitted to retire. His request was reviewed by O'Dea, and, on September 14, 1995, approved by Cardinal Bevilacqua. Father Dunne remained a priest, but was still asked to restrict his ministry to private Mass.

Through the spring and summer of 1994, Gordon and his wife continued to call and write the Archdiocese, requesting assistance for their damaged family. The Archdiocese provided the family with money for counseling for years, but their life never much improved. The damage begun with the abuse of one 13-year-old had multiplied, devastating the lives of the victim's parents, his wife, his children, and his own young

victims. Monsignor Lynn eventually notified Gordon and Bonnie by letter, on July 22, 1994, that he would no longer take their phone calls.

Thus, despite nine years of allegations of sexual abuse, Fr. Dunne retired from ministry, as would have any other priest, with full benefits, no public censure and no official recognition by the Archdiocese of the damage he had caused. As for Gordon and his family, as well as the other victims of Fr. Dunne's who have not come forward, they found themselves unable simply to "retire" from the effects of years of sexual abuse.

On October 21, 2004, faced with the possibility of involuntary laicization, Fr. Dunne agreed to live "a supervised life of prayer and penance" at Villa Saint Joseph, a retirement home for priests.

Father Dunne 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 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.

Father Brzyski preys on many children while assigned to Saint Cecilia from 1981 to 1984.

Father James Brzyski spent only seven years in two assignments with the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. In that short time, he had possibly over a hundred victims. The young priest was in his second assignment – as an associate pastor at Saint Cecilia Church, in Fox Chase – when the Archdiocese first recorded knowing that he had sexually abused boys in his previous assignment. At Saint Cecilia, one of his victims estimated, Fr. Brzyski sexually abused nearly a hundred children. Three of those victims described to the Grand Jury their years of abuse – beginning when they were 10 or 11 years old – and the broken lives they have lived ever since.

- **“Billy”**

Billy told the Grand Jury that his deepest wish was to return to who he was before Fr. Brzyski began sticking his hands inside Billy’s pants when he was an 11-year-old altar boy. He wanted God back, and his parents, and the joy of celebrating Easter and Christmas. He wanted to believe in Heaven and morality. He wanted to be able to get out of bed – to live every day. He wanted to believe in God, in part, so he could get past the first steps of his twelve-step program to end his addictions to drugs and alcohol.

Billy told the Grand Jury that, when he became acquainted with Fr. Brzyski in 1981, he was in 5th grade at Saint Cecilia’s parish school. He was the second oldest in a family of five boys and one girl. His parents were extremely devout, and each of their boys served as an altar boy at Saint Cecilia’s. When the new assistant pastor befriended the family – stopping by for coffee and meals -- Billy’s mother was honored. She encouraged Billy to spend time with the priest.

Billy described how Fr. Brzyski began molesting him in 5th grade in the sacristy as the 11-year-old altar boy dressed for Mass. The priest cornered the boy in a secluded corner of the dressing room, slid his hands inside the boy’s pants and fondled his genitals. Billy told the Grand Jury that the priest did this even while other altar boys were dressing in the same room. He named three other altar boys he believed had had the same experience with Fr. Brzyski – “Kirk,” “Wesley,” and “Sean.”

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.

Sean estimated for the Grand Jury that Fr. Brzyski molested him “a couple of hundred times.” The abuse progressed from fondling, to the priest fondling his own genitals, to performing oral sex on the boy, to anal rape.

The first time Fr. Brzyski raped the boy was in his rectory bedroom after giving the 11-year-old an alcoholic drink. Sean testified that he passed out. When he awoke, he was on the priest’s bed. His pants and underpants were pulled down around his knees. Father Brzyski, sitting in a chair in the bedroom, asked him, “How are you doing, Boy?” Sean said he knew immediately that something had happened. He got up, pulled his pants up and ran home. He said he hurt all over and had trouble walking.

When he got home, Sean said, he showered a long time. Sore everywhere, he was bleeding from his rectum. But, more than the blood, it was the “nasty dirty feeling” he was trying, unsuccessfully, to shower away.

Sean told the Grand Jury that he did try once to tell his father what Fr. Brzyski was doing to him. The result was disbelief and physical abuse: “I got back-handed across the room, and I got told how dare I make up a lie about a priest And so that was the first and last time I ever opened my mouth about it.”

As he had done to Billy, Fr. Brzyski told Sean that his mother knew what was going on, so it would do no good to tell her. As for the boy’s father – actually his stepfather – Fr. Brzyski told Sean that the man he had always considered his father could never love the boy because he wasn’t his “real” son. And, like Billy, Sean believed Fr. Brzyski. The priest’s cruel strategy to isolate and control the boy for his own sexual purposes again destroyed a family and permanently damaged an innocent life – a devastation abetted by Archdiocese officials’ strategy of looking the other way.

Having no one to turn to for help, Sean resigned himself to his situation. He dealt with his despair by abusing drugs and alcohol. In order to get through Masses where he served with Fr. Brzyski, Sean got high. He used marijuana and cocaine so he “didn’t have to think about it.” Although Fr. Brzyski left the priesthood in 1985, he continued to abuse Sean – including anally raping him – for four more years, until the victim was 18 years old.

When he appeared before the first Grand Jury in October 2002, Sean was 31. Three days earlier, he had talked for the first time about his abuse to his mother, from whom he had long been estranged. He told the Jurors:

I've harbored this feeling towards my mom for going on twenty years and to come to find out the other night that it's not – you know, it was – it wasn't true. She had no idea. She had absolutely no idea.

So you know, I've been dealing with this. I've been hating her for twenty years for no reason whatsoever, and that's not right. That's my mom.

Like his cousin, Billy, Sean spent Christmases, Easters, Thanksgivings alone. He has been alienated from his family. He cannot maintain a stable, intimate relationship. Both men have fathered children whom they are incapable of supporting emotionally. They have battled alcohol and drugs and have beaten themselves up for not being able to live up to their potential.

Like Billy, Sean witnessed Fr. Brzyski abusing other altar boys. He had sometimes tried to come to their rescue. 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. Sean said that the priest had a photograph of him, and that he recognized several of the other boys.

- **“Ryan”**

Ryan did not use drugs and alcohol to block out what Fr. Brzyski did to him when he was 11, 12, and 13 years old. At age 32, he told the Grand Jury that he still thinks about what happened every day. At times, he said, it seemed as if he had lost his mind.

Ryan told the Grand Jury that he had episodes – every Sunday in one period, he said – during which he believed he was in Hell. He said it was strange because he had always thought, as a child, that Hell – or Heaven – was a place you went after you died. But during these episodes he believed he had ended up in Hell by making all the wrong decisions, each time he was given a choice to do the right thing in his life. He said it seemed as if his soul had died and he had somehow ended up in eternal damnation. These episodes could be so real that, when around other people, he would see them as demons and would run from the room.

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

the floor with this guy on top of me, and then I was half way to my house, you know, and that's when I remember; and if . . . if there's something further, I'm not certain that I care to know what happened."

Ryan stopped showing up for Mass after that incident, and was fired as an altar boy. He continued to believe it had been God's will to make him suffer Fr. Brzyski's violent abuse. He probably never suspected that he continued to suffer the consequences of that abuse in silence because of a willful decision by the Archdiocese.

Between 1984 and 1986, the Archdiocese learns of 11 victims.

The Archdiocese began recording reports about Fr. Brzyski's abuses in 1984, when he was at Saint Cecilia. Within a year and a half, officials had learned from a fellow priest the names of at least 11 victims from the priest's previous assignment, at Saint John the Evangelist parish, in Lower Makefield. Their abuse began when Fr. Brzyski was the parish's assistant pastor, from June 1977 to August 1981, and continued, in some cases, for many years after he was transferred to Saint Cecilia.

It was a counselor at Bishop Egan High School, Fr. James J. Gigliotti, T.O.R., who brought the allegations to Assistant Chancellor John W. Graf, beginning on June 25, 1984. Father Gigliotti called Fr. Graf because the parents of one boy – "Mark," then a student at Bishop Egan – had reported to the counselor that their son had been molested by Fr. Brzyski during the student's 5th- and 6th-grade years at Saint Cecilia's grade school.

In a June 27, 1984, interview, Mark's mother and father detailed for Fr. Graf not only their son's abuse, which included Fr. Brzyski's fondling the boy's genitals and trying to make the boy do the same in return, but also the priest's involvement with many other boys. Father Graf's memo recording his meeting with Mark's parents described the pattern of Fr. Brzyski's behavior: "Father would take up with a particular boy and then drop this boy and move on to other friendships." Father Graf noted these "particular friendships" included "rather young boys, 10, 11 and 12 years old."

Mark's parents told Fr. Graf how embarrassed their son was by his encounters with Fr. Brzyski. They said he had suffered from nightmares and emotional stress and that they had taken him for professional counseling.

Mark's parents provided the names of five other boys – “Richard,” “Anthony,” “Steve,” “Darryl,” and “Philip,” who were, in the language of the Archdiocese, also “involved in these friendships” with Fr. Brzyski. All of these boys, according to the parents, were having “family problems when Father befriended them.”

On June 28, 1984, Fr. Gigliotti provided Fr. Graf with the names of two more boys whom he had heard were being abused – “Raymond” and “Paul.” He confirmed the names given by Mark's parents, and he told Fr. Graf that all of these boys were “shy, docile, bright and intelligent and that they were all physically attractive.” He told Fr. Graf that the parents of two of these boys – Raymond and Steve – had come to him for counseling “concerning unusual anger and withdrawal in both their sons.”

Confronted with allegations, Father Brzyski offers to resign, but Archdiocese officials persuade him not to.

Father Graf informed Cardinal Krol of the allegations in a memo dated July 10, 1984. That memo provides an insight into the way the Chancery Office handled sexual abuse allegations. Despite a detailed account by parents of their own son's molestation, and clear indications that many other boys were being abused as well, Fr. Graf was unclear whether he should investigate further because, he said, the information was “indirect.” Thus, he asked the Cardinal: “Should Father Brzyski be confronted with this information even though the information is indirect, thus affording Father Brzyski the possibility of denial?” This language suggests that if Fr. Brzyski denied the allegation, the normal procedure would be to do nothing more. Father Graf went on to advise the Cardinal, however, that doing nothing might be unwise in this case where “scandal” seemed likely. He wrote: “On the other hand, it becomes evident that scandal could easily arise in this case if action is not taken.”

In response, Cardinal Krol instructed the Assistant Chancellor to confront Fr. Brzyski and to “impress on him the gravity of the situation in the words of Jesus about those who scandalize the young.” Cardinal Krol wrote in the margin of Fr. Graf's memo: “His alleged conduct suggests a wolf in sheep's clothing – who serves as Satan's agent for

perdition and not Christ's alter ego for salvation." This depiction did not prevent the Cardinal's aides from later trying to persuade Fr. Brzyski to remain in ministry.

When confronted, the priest was, according to Fr. Graf's notes, "confused as to the details" concerning Mark. But he readily admitted to "several acts of sexual misconduct." He named only two of the boys he had molested – Darryl, who, according to Fr. Brzyski, would have been in 10th grade at the time of the abuse, and Richard, who would have been in 7th grade. The priest admitted that on "several occasions he had sexual contact with [Richard]." He announced he wanted to quit the priesthood.

Archdiocese officials instead persuaded Fr. Brzyski to go to Saint Luke Institute in Suitland, Maryland, for an evaluation. According to a memo by Vice Chancellor Donald F. Walker dated July 27, 1984, the director of Saint Luke, Fr. Michael Peterson, reported that Fr. Brzyski demonstrated "a repressed personality with chronic immaturity manifested in . . . pedophilia." Father Peterson warned that "there is a definite concern for possible legal liability." He recommended that Fr. Brzyski remain at Saint Luke for treatment and that he not be permitted to return to Philadelphia even to pick up clothes. Characteristically, the Archdiocese's response centered on its own interest, not children's: on July 30, 1984, Fr. Walker wrote to Cardinal Krol that "Father Peterson is of the opinion that our criminal liability is minimized by the fact that Father would be admitted to an intensive program."

Father Brzyski continues to be a danger and refuses to participate in therapy.

By August 27, 1984, Archdiocese managers knew for sure that Fr. Brzyski was still a danger to his young victims. In a memo of that date, Fr. Graf recorded being told by Fr. Gigliotti that Fr. Brzyski had called several of his victims, including Richard, and invited them down to Suitland.

Father Brzyski remained at Saint Luke Institute until January 17, 1985, leaving on that date supposedly to visit Philadelphia and the New Jersey Shore, after agreeing to return to Saint Luke by February 11, 1985, to resume outpatient therapy. He never returned. The institute's director made it clear that the priest could not be considered cured.

Father Peterson reported being “very disheartened” by Fr. Brzyski’s immaturity and said the priest was acting “like an eighteen year old.”

Archdiocese officials tried to persuade Fr. Brzyski to remain in therapy. They also tried to persuade him to remain in ministry. Fr. Brzyski decided not to continue either.

Despite Father Brzyski’s continuing threat to parishioners, the Archdiocese is concerned only with its liability.

Over the next two years, the Chancery Office received reports that Fr. Brzyski was still visiting victims from his previous parish in Lower Makefield, and that he had taken a high school teaching job in the Archdiocese of Metuchen, New Jersey. Father Gigliotti provided the names of at least three more victims – “Matthew,” “Mike,” and a boy with the last name of “Gibbs.”

Vice Chancellor Walker wrote on January 8, 1986: “Father Gigliotti has a grave concern that more names will surface and that the influence of Father Brzyski was more extensive than first imagined or known.” Father Gigliotti told Fr. Walker that Fr. Brzyski still visited Lower Makefield often.

Archdiocese officials showed no concern, however, that Fr. Brzyski was almost certainly continuing to sexually abuse boys from his parish assignments. Instead, they worried about the Church’s liability. In a February 7, 1986, memo to Cardinal Krol, Fr. Graf reported Saint Luke Director Peterson’s opinion that “unilateral withdrawal from the ministry or even suspension does not insure the Archdiocese that it is no longer responsible for the actions of one of its priests.” Father Graf went on to suggest: “In light of the possibility that there are more instances of misconduct which may, for all I know, be continuing at the present time, I wonder if it would not be wise for us to review this entire case once again with legal counsel.”

Cardinal Krol directed Fr. Graf to try to persuade Fr. Brzyski to voluntarily seek laicization, a step designed to absolve the Archdiocese of liability. Father Graf also notified the high school in Metuchen of the situation and Fr. Brzyski’s employment was terminated. Nothing, however, was done to protect the known victims who, Fr. Graf

conceded, might still be suffering abuse. No families were informed or warned. No pastoral care was offered to those already damaged.

In order to evade responsibility, Archdiocese officials choose not to help or find additional victims.

Archdiocesan managers apparently never considered contacting law enforcement authorities. Still, because Fr. Gigliotti was pressing the Archdiocese about known victims who needed help, Church leaders had no choice but to make a decision. They could grant permission to professionals to help the victims and their families, which would require revealing what they knew about Fr. Brzyski's abuses, or they could conceal that knowledge and block the counselors from providing assistance. In the case of unknown victims, Archdiocese officials could try to find them to offer counseling and prevent further abuse, which would show that they knew about Fr. Brzyski's criminality, or they could avoid learning about any new victims in an attempt to evade responsibility. In both cases, Church leaders chose not to help or protect the victims.

Some of the boys from Saint John the Evangelist parish harmed by the Archdiocese's policy of neglect were Richard, Matthew, Mike, Raymond, and Steve. Also harmed were all the victims from Saint Cecilia parish whose names the Church officials made an effort not to learn.

- **Richard**

On June 27, 1984, Mark's parents told Assistant Chancellor Graf that, a few years before, Fr. Brzyski had taken their son, Mark, and several other 12- and 13-year-old boys to a shore house that the priest owned in Forked River, New Jersey. There, Mark had observed Fr. Brzyski in bed with one of the boys, Richard. Mark would not describe what he saw, but he and the other boys characterized the priest's relationship with Richard as "extreme."

Richard was one of the boys Fr. Brzyski confessed to abusing when questioned on July 18, 1984. The priest told Fr. Graf that on "several occasions he had sexual contact with [Richard]." He said the boy would have been in 7th grade at the time of the abuse. He told Fr. Graf that he was still friendly with the family.

In handwritten notes of his June 27, 1984, meeting with Mark's parents, Fr. Graf wrote that Fr. Brzyski still visited Richard and his family, three years after his 1981 transfer to Saint Cecilia. Father Graf did not include this information in his typed report. Father Peterson, the director of Saint Luke, told Fr. Graf on July 27, 1984, that Fr. Brzyski's abuse of Richard was more serious than first thought and that it involved "many episodes."

On August 27 of that year, Fr. Gigliotti told Fr. Graf that Fr. Brzyski had called Richard's house and invited the boy down to Suitland, Maryland, where he had gone for treatment. Father Graf claimed in an official memo that he had contacted Fr. Gigliotti to ask the counselor to watch for signs of "any peculiar psychological change in [Richard] and to let us know so that we could be of help to [Richard] and his family if necessary." However, when Fr. Gigliotti agreed that the Archdiocese should help Richard and his family, and proceeded to tell Fr. Graf that Richard's mother had already noticed strange behavior and had asked the school counselor for advice and help, none was given.

Richard's mother had come to Fr. Gigliotti because she could not understand her son's angry reaction when Fr. Brzyski invited him down to Saint Luke. According to Fr. Brzyski's testimony before the Grand Jury, the priest had become close to Richard's family when another of their sons had been tragically killed. Father Brzyski testified that Richard's brother, the family's second son, had also been an altar boy at Saint Cecilia, and that "after leaving an altar boy rehearsal for Easter, [he] crossed the street and got run over by a tow truck and he was killed." (It is possible that Fr. Brzyski confused Richard with Mike – another victim. Father Gigliotti told Fr. Graf that it was Mike's family that Fr. Brzyski became close to when one of their sons died. In either case, Fr. Brzyski recalled involving himself with a family when an altar boy died after leaving a church rehearsal.)

When Richard's mother contacted Fr. Gigliotti, Archdiocese officials knew that Fr. Brzyski had sexually abused her son and was still pursuing him – even from Saint Luke. The mother, confused, was asking for help. She received none.

Father Graf wrote on August 27, 1984:

The mother did not understand her son's reaction and went to Father Gigliotti for advice. Father Gigliotti did not tell her

the possible reason for the boy's reaction. He wanted us to be aware of the situation.

On October 25, 1985, Fr. Gigliotti tried again to get help for the troubled boy. This time he consulted a psychiatrist, Dr. Thomas Daniels, who had been hired by the Catholic School system to provide counseling in the high schools. Father Gigliotti told Dr. Daniels about Richard's situation. The psychiatrist, according to a memo from Fr. Graf to Cardinal Krol, told Fr. Gigliotti "that it is important in matters of abuse, physical or sexual, that the victims be confronted openly and that they be allowed to ventilate their fears and feelings." Father Graf added: "The doctor only wanted us to consider that possibility and offered his assistance." The Assistant Chancellor went on to inform Cardinal Krol: "I expressed to the doctor that we were grateful for his concern, however, because of the sensitivity of the situation, we would ask him to do nothing until we get back to him and we hoped he would respect our wishes, especially in regard to the confidentiality of the issue." (Appendix D-12)

Father Graf wrote to the Cardinal that he next consulted with Fr. Peterson at Saint Luke Institute. While Fr. Peterson agreed that confronting a victim could be beneficial, Fr. Graf wrote that Fr. Peterson "made a perhaps more important suggestion for us to consider." Father Peterson's actual suggestion was redacted from the copy of the memo provided to the Grand Jury, suggesting that it must have been some sort of legal, rather than psychological, advice. Whatever it was, it appears to have disinclined the Archdiocesan managers from behaving with humanity. According to their own records, they did not permit either Fr. Gigliotti or Dr. Daniels to offer counsel to Richard or even to inform his mother that Fr. Brzyski had admitted sexually abusing him. It would be difficult to imagine greater heartlessness.

- **Matthew**

Another victim whom Fr. Gigliotti tried to help was Matthew, the son of friends. In addition to being a friend of the parents', Fr. Gigliotti served as the father's spiritual director as he prepared to become a deacon of the church. Both the parents and son had approached Fr. Gigliotti for help. The parents asked for the priest's advice because their

son's behavior had become disruptive, he was using drugs, and his personality seemed to have changed. The boy, now 19 years old, told Fr. Gigliotti that he had a serious problem, but then was unable to discuss it.

Father Gigliotti told Vice Chancellor Walker that he knew from a third party, unrelated to Matthew's family, that the boy had been molested by Fr. Brzyski from the age of 12 until he was 14 years old. Father Walker wrote in a memo dated January 8, 1986, that Fr. Gigliotti felt it was "very important for the therapeutic process" that he share his knowledge of the boy's abuse with both Matthew and his parents.

Father Gigliotti presented his "quandary" to Fr. Walker. The Vice Chancellor wrote that he then discussed the matter with Chancellor Samuel Shoemaker and that "it was decided" that Fr. Gigliotti should not reveal what he knew. He could continue to counsel the boy about current problems, but could not initiate a discussion of the boy's relationship with Fr. Brzyski. Father Walker noted: "This approach is taken in order to avail [Matthew] of some pastoral assistance *while still maintaining the position taken by the Chancery Office that we could not actively seek further names of persons who may have been involved with Father Brzyski*" (emphasis supplied).

In simple terms, then, the Archdiocesan managers decided that in order to lessen the Archdiocese's possible exposure to civil suit, they would withhold information crucial to the psychological healing of a boy sexually abused by an Archdiocesan priest. The further decision not to seek out other parishioners injured by this same priest was also made to minimize the Archdiocese's possible exposure to lawsuits. The Archdiocese weighed the harm that "scandal" would do to it against the health and well-being of parishioners injured by one of its priests – parishioners injured because they had been placed in particularly vulnerable positions due to the unique role and power of the priest.

- **Mike**

On January 10, 1986, a year and a half after Fr. Brzyski had admitted to abusing at least two boys, Fr. Gigliotti told Vice Chancellor Walker that another boy said to be a victim of Fr. Brzyski's was Mike. The priest was long known to have visited his house. In July 1980, the pastor at Saint John in Lower Makefield had reported to the Archdiocese

that Fr. Brzyski was seen visiting Mike's house as often as two to three times a day. Six years later Fr. Walker wrote of Mike:

The family lives in Lower Makefield Parish and Father Brzyski still visits the family on a regular basis. Father Gigliotti stated that it is common knowledge that Father Brzyski still seeks the company of this young man who may now be nineteen or twenty years of age.

Even though the Archdiocese was well aware of Fr. Brzyski's admitted abuse, and even though the attention Fr. Brzyski was giving to Mike was extraordinary, there is no indication that the Archdiocese took any steps to determine whether Fr. Brzyski was still abusing the boy or to intervene in any way in the situation.

- **Raymond and Steve**

In June 1984, Fr. Gigliotti told Fr. Graf of reports of two more victims of Fr. Brzyski from Lower Makefield – Raymond and Steve. Father Gigliotti also informed the Assistant Chancellor that the mother of Raymond and the father of Steve had consulted him, in his capacity as a counselor at Bishop Egan High School. The parents had sought advice “concerning unusual anger and withdrawal in both their sons.”

Rather than advise the counselor to do his job and help these parents protect their children from a sexual offender or mitigate the damage already done, the Assistant Chancellor noted in a memo that Fr. Gigliotti understood the “confidentiality of this matter and is willing to assist us in any way.” By invoking the protection of the abuser's confidentiality as an excuse not to inform parents that their children were being sexually abused, the Archdiocese aided Fr. Brzyski in his crimes. A year and a half later, on January 10, 1986, Fr. Gigliotti told Vice Chancellor Walker that “Father Brzyski is still a frequent visitor to [Steve's family's] home.”

Archdiocese leaders explicitly decide not to seek out victims from Saint Cecilia parish.

Given what they knew about how many boys Fr. Brzyski had preyed upon and molested in serial fashion at Saint John the Evangelist, Archdiocese officials had excellent

reason to believe he would have many additional victims from Saint Cecilia, where he was assigned from August 1981 until August 1984. The victims from Saint Cecilia who testified before the Grand Jury said his abusive behavior there was blatant and notorious. Billy and Sean both said they were sure the other priests at Saint Cecilia knew. Yet, rather than try to find these victims and help them, the Chancery office established a policy, cited by Vice Chancellor Donald Walker in a 1986 memo, “that we could not actively seek further names of persons who may have been involved with Father Brzyski.”

Father Brzyski’s crimes continue after Bevilacqua becomes Archbishop of Philadelphia.

When Anthony J. Bevilacqua became Archbishop of Philadelphia in February 1988, Fr. Brzyski was still a priest in the Archdiocese, though he had chosen to withdraw from active ministry. Cardinal Krol had decided not to seek an involuntary laicization of the priest. Such a procedure could have required the Archdiocese to document what it knew of Fr. Brzyski’s criminal behavior and present it to a tribunal as true. It might also have required testimony from victims – victims whom the Archdiocese had not acknowledged.

Cardinal Krol chose to keep Fr. Brzyski as a priest even though Archdiocese records clearly indicated his criminal sexual abuse of boys and included warnings in 1986 and 1987 that this serial abuse could be ongoing. Archbishop Bevilacqua, possessing the same information, followed the same course – allowing Fr. Brzyski to remain a priest in the Archdiocese throughout his tenure as Archbishop.

Archbishop Bevilacqua, who presumably would have asked or been told why one of his younger priests was without an assignment, did nothing to protect the Philadelphia community or past parishioners from this dangerous, untreated, and unsupervised sexual offender. Anyone who gave even a cursory look at Fr. Brzyski’s Secret Archives file would know he was extremely dangerous to young boys. They would know that there were many known and named victims who needed psychological or pastoral care. They would know that the priest was likely still involved with known victims and their unsuspecting families. They would know that there had to be a multitude of victims from Saint Cecilia

who were unknown to the Archdiocese only because there was no Father Gigliotti there to care about those children.

Archbishop Bevilacqua's initial Chancellor, Samuel Shoemaker, was well acquainted with Fr. Brzyski's history and the Archdiocese's policy of trying to avoid knowing about the priest's victims. As a result of this policy, Fr. Brzyski's victims from Saint Cecilia went undiscovered, or at least unrecorded, despite the priest's blatant behavior and his notoriety.

During Archbishop Bevilacqua's early years, Sean was 16, then 17 years old, and still being anally raped by Fr. Brzyski. Father Brzyski was also still associating with another former altar boy from Saint Cecilia, "Wayne." According to "Julian," a witness who testified before the Grand Jury, Fr. Brzyski described to him in "graphic detail" his sexual relations with Wayne, beginning when the priest was still at Saint Cecilia and continuing at least until the late 1980s. Julian, who was a friend of Fr. Brzyski's in the late 1980s and early 1990s, named other minors, who had not been parishioners, whom Fr. Brzyski sexually assaulted after leaving active ministry.

In addition to the victims who continued to suffer actual abuse, there were others who suffered a world of torment because their abuse remained secret and they were left to cope with its devastating consequences alone. Victims such as Billy and Ryan, and the boys Fr. Gigliotti was prevented from helping, have led broken lives filled with despair and unfulfilled potential. Children had been estranged from mothers and fathers for decades because no one ever told them that their parents had not made deals with their tormenter.

Because law enforcement was denied a chance to apprehend or deter Fr. Brzyski, there may have been new victims – such as a boy Fr. Brzyski was accused of molesting in May 2002, in his new hometown of Chesapeake, Virginia. There will likely be future victims of this serial molester and child rapist, who remains a priest, albeit without active ministry, free and unsupervised thanks to the Archdiocese's concealment of his crime spree under its auspices.

The Archdiocese seeks forced laicization 20 years after Father Brzyski admitted sexually abusing altar boys.

On February 11, 2004, after allegations made by at least five victims against Fr. Brzyski were found credible, the Archdiocese referred the case to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in Rome, requesting that the priest be forcibly laicized.

Father Brzyski appeared before the Grand Jury and was given an opportunity to answer questions concerning the allegations against him. He chose not to do so, although he did answer questions relating to various residences and jobs.