“And I will give children to be their princes, and the effeminate shall rule over them…”  The Book of the Prophet Isaias, Chapter 3
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Our Mission Statement

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

Our Philosophy

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**VIVA CRISTO REY!**
CORRECTION

In the article “Another Piece of the Puzzle” contained in the last issue of AMDG (Page 16, Spring/Summer 2003) I incorrectly stated that (Msgr.) Dr. Michael Higgins was accused of soliciting sex from a minor while in the confessional when in fact it was an adult who “initially brought the charge,” and “he later recanted the accusation.” Dr. Higgins continues his assertion he was not provided a trial in violation of Canon Law.

I regret the mistake.

Stephen Brady, Editor.

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

Pope St. Gregory the Great
A “doctor” who obtained his degree and license to practice medicine by theft, blackmail and deception is not really a doctor despite the fact that he can legally practice medicine. A Catholic bishop is no different in my opinion. If he reached his position in life with lies, deception, blackmail, and/or sexual favors, he may legally be able to run the diocese but he is not a prince of the Church. We must expose the perverts who parade as bishops. The following statement by St. Alphonsus De Liguori perfectly predicts the very crisis that now exists within the Church.

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

Now from time to time, I do receive a complaint or two regarding my so-called "attacks" on the hierarchy. Some of the statements made to me are; "The Pope doesn't know," "The Pope is kept in the dark," "He is surrounded by bad people," "The Vatican works quietly behind the scenes," and so on. To this I say, if the Pope didn’t know he should have known. If he is surrounded by traitors — he should replace them with people he trusts. He has been Pope for 25 years which, I would think, is plenty of time to implement his plans and put his people into key positions.

If the Church’s existence is about saving souls, then look at the present condition of the Church. If this is a great Pope, what condition would the Church be in if he was a bad Pope? I realize that someone out there might be thinking that “the Church deals in centuries.” But I say to that, a lot of souls will be lost in another century—my family can’t wait that long. Now I realize the Pope is not responsible for educating and raising my children, but he is responsible for appointing good holy bishops to run dioceses and remove them if they are proven to be unfit. If this Pope is a “great Pope,” then we must assume that the people of Albany, Rochester, and Los Angeles (and many other cities) are best served by the likes of Bishops Hubbard, Clark, and Mahony.

Now if I may, let me point out several events that convinced me the problem is in Rome. A few years ago an American bishop provided me with a fax number for Cardinal Ratzinger. He assured me the material sent via this fax would get through to the Cardinal. I know for a fact that the Cardinal did receive RCF’s faxes because he acted on at least one of them.

I faxed to Cardinal Ratzinger comments made by Bishop Reginald Cawcutt of Capetown South Africa on the St. Sebastian's web site regarding Bishop Cawcutt being called to Rome. After his trip to Rome Cawcutt, not realizing RCF was still monitoring his Sebastian e-mails, commented on information I had sent to the Cardinal and the resulting effect. So it was clear to me that the Pope's number two man was aware of scandalous behavior on the part of certain bishops RCF was investigating. The second and most important point is next.

Wednesday, January 14, 1998, Archbishop Francis George of Chicago (The Pope’s retreat master) called me asking that RCF not hold the press conference we had scheduled to expose bishop Daniel Ryan for sodomizing teenage boys.

The Cardinal stated: "If your first priority is to remove Ryan -- do not go public." He said the Vatican would not work through the press. He informed me that by going public we would be stuck with Ryan. I then asked the Cardinal, "You mean if I go public with this information, the Vatican (the Pope) will leave a sexual abuser in power rather then face embarrassment?" He did not answer. He offered me (RCF) "a relationship with the hierarchy" if I (RCF) "remained obedient to the Church." Upon further questioning I realized this meant keeping my
mouth shut.

Ryan was indeed left in power to destroy souls. In fact, 11 months later, Christmas 1998, Ryan had a sexual encounter with one Danny Evans (one of many of Ryan's sex partners RCF interviewed). Evans gave a statement regarding his long sexual relationship with Ryan to Springfield attorneys who later sued Ryan and helped force his removal. All of you can understand the implications of Cardinal George's statement and lack of action. It is heartbreaking to realize how corrupt and perverted the hierarchy has become.

RCF, through Fr. John Hardon and Cardinal George, was in contact with the former Papal Nuncio and Vatican officials whom we offered all the proof they needed to act against Ryan. The Vatican did nothing!

While I am not aware of all the power struggles that are going on within the American hierarchy, I can say that there is no excuse for Rome's inaction against Ryan. It became clear that Cardinal George, the Papal Nuncio, Ratzinger and Vatican Officials had betrayed the faithful. There is not enough memory on my computer to share all the information I have regarding Ryan and Rome.

In my opinion, to not publicly protest and denounce the current Vatican leadership is unacceptable and immoral. They have left known rapists in power to save embarrassment, thereby enabling them to continue to rape and destroy all in the name of respect for higher office. A Vatican official, cardinal, bishop or priest, who willingly and without so much as a word of public warning, knowingly places children (or souls under his care) at such risk is a disgrace.

In this issue of AMDG—We sure have come a long way regarding God’s Law and Church teaching when it comes to homosexual activity (sodomy). Once upon a time, Scripture, Church teaching, and the Saints spoke out, in the strongest possible terms, against the vile, filthy acts of sodomites. Nowadays, in many once-Catholic parishes and dioceses, being inclined to commit sodomy is held up as a “gift” deserving of special status and recognition entitling the homosexual to special treatment, especially if he is a priest or bishop.

I am sure you have heard of or read about a number of cases in which orthodox clergy are punished or persecuted by their bishops for simply defending God’s Law and speaking the truth, while their “feminine” counterparts (bishops & priests) have their immoral behavior overlooked or explained away. It is clear to me that the majority of the current hierarchy, both here and in Rome, are homosexual and/or effeminate in nature. The fact that the American bishops, (led by Bishop Gregory of Belleville, Illinois and Bishop Skylstad of Spokane, Washington) will not address the issue of the infiltration of homosexuals into the priesthood and bishops’ ranks, prove they are not serious about addressing the child abuse crisis, and further shows they have most likely lost their faith. They are blinded by sin and cannot see the elephant in the sanctuary.

If a priest makes known his homosexual inclination, you can be sure he is promoting an agenda contrary to Church teaching. A celibate, orthodox priest, would have absolutely no reason whatsoever to make his sexual inclinations known to anyone. On the other hand, a priest or bishop who is guilty of unrepentant sexual sin would have the motive to (in order to ease his conscience) water down or deny Catholic moral teaching, downplay the need for confession, remove the crucifix, hide the tabernacle, and take liberties with the Mass. All this he will counter with a strong emphasis on so-called social justice.

Let us glance back at scripture, tradition and Church teaching regarding the issue of homosexuality and see just how far our current hierarchy has fallen.

Romans 1: (Douay-Rheims)
18 For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and injustice of those men that detain the truth of God in injustice:…22 For professing themselves to be wise, they became fools… For this cause God delivered them up to shameful affections. For their women have changed the natural use into that use which is against nature. 27 And, in like manner, the men also, leaving the natural use of the women, have burned in their lusts one towards another, men with men working that which is filthy, and receiving in themselves the recompense which was
due to their error.  **Who, having known the justice of God, did not understand that they who do such things, are worthy of death; and not only they that do them, but they also that consent to them that do them**

The Book of the Prophet Isaias, Chapter 3  
4  And I will give children to be their princes, and the effeminate shall rule over them… 8  For Jerusalem is ruined, and Juda is fallen: because their tongue, and their devices are against the Lord, to provoke the eyes of his majesty. 9  The shew of their countenance hath answered them: and they have proclaimed abroad their sin as Sodom, and they have not hid it: woe to their souls, for evils are rendered to them.

The Book of Leviticus, Chapter 20  
13  If any one lie with a man as with a woman, both have committed an abomination, let them be put to death: their blood be upon them.

The 1917 code of canon law—Canon 2359, paragraph 2 states: “If they (clerics) have committed an offense against the sixth commandment with minors under sixteen years of age, or been guilty of adultery, rape, bestiality, sodomy, traffic in vice, or incest with blood-relatives or relations by marriage in the first degree, they shall be suspended, declared infamous, deprived of every office, benefice dignity, or position that they may hold, and in more grievous cases they shall be deposed.”

The Second Vatican Council however, repealed this law with the 1983 Code of Canon Law, which states in Canon 1395, paragraph 2: “A cleric who has offended in other ways against the sixth commandment of the Decalogue, if the crime was committed by force, or by threats, or in public, or with a minor under the age of sixteen years, is to be punished with just penalties (?), not excluding dismissal from the clerical state if the case so warrants.”

This watered-down Canon from the revised 1983 code of Canon Law was a major step toward neutralizing God’s law regarding sodomy. It also gave homosexual bishops the ability to retain child abusing clergy as well as sodomite bishops and priests without directly violating canon law.

In this issue of AMDG we will provide you with a number of examples that, in my opinion, prove the majority of our current “serving” bishops and Vatican hierarchy are either without faith, or blinded by sin, and have no intention of taking the steps necessary to correct the many abuses found within the Church today. Only by cutting off the flow of money into the bishops’ personal coffers will positive change come about. Without their lavish lifestyles the current leadership, with few exceptions, will fade away.

No help from Rome — According to a report that appeared in the July 25, 2003 issue of The Tidings, (the diocesan newspaper for the Archdiocese of Los Angeles), titled “Cardinals concelebrate historic Mass…” Cardinal Francis Arinze (A Vatican official) made it clear that the faithful would receive no help from Rome and that Vatican authorities would not confront or discipline errant bishops; *He “cautioned that, as a Vatican official, neither he nor ‘the Vatican’ can simply step in ‘like a firefighter’ to resolve problems within a particular parish or diocese. ‘For me to lecture the bishops...on what to do about a particular situation is not appropriate.’ ‘It is much better if you yourselves approach your priests and bishops.’”*

An article by Janet Tu titled—**“Bishop attacks media coverage of sex scandal,”** that appeared in the Saturday, September 6, 2003 Seattle Times, proves, in my opinion, that Bishop Wilton Gregory, President of the Bishops’ Conference while, he's not a hit-and-run bishop like O'Brien, he's sure asleep at the wheel.

According to the article, Bishop Gregory, criticized the way the media "obsessively covered" the Church's clergy sexual-abuse scandal and said dioceses across the country are taking significant steps to comply with an abuse-prevention policy passed last year. Gregory, speaking at the Religion Newswriters Association's conference in Seattle, criticized the media for "linking child sexual abuse solely to Catholic clerics" and for not digging into such abuses in other professions and society at large. Crybaby Bishop Gregory responds to the current abuse scandal by stating: **“Well, they did it too!”** Catholics deserve better than this transparent jackass. By the way, Bishop Gregory sees no problem with homosexuals in the seminary. No surprise there.
SCANDAL IN THE CHURCH, BEHIND THE SMOKE AND MIRRORS

After all the verbiage and hand-wringing, a few facts remain starkly clear and undeniable. For many years a large number of bishops of the American Catholic Church have allowed homosexuals into the seminaries and ordained them as priests. When these priests preyed on the innocent, they were protected and even enabled by these “false shepherds”. This evil was actively “covered up” and would be largely unknown today had not huge lawsuits begun to be filed. Then, it was neither love of God nor neighbor or even concern about the destruction of the innocent, but concern about the money that motivated what little action was taken. That action is clearly a concern about “liability” and not the most basic Christian morality. Even now the issue of homosexuality in the priesthood is not being confronted by Church leadership. Lawsuits are being settled out of court and the bishops are in “damage control” mode to ride it out trusting in the shortness of the flocks memory!

Homosexuality and Pedophilia are perversions and the people who practice them are sick. Those leaders who enable this sickness to destroy the bodies and souls of others are not sick, they are evil!

How is it possible that men who claim to stand “in persona Christi” could be so evil and perverted, especially given what Jesus said about the judgment of those who harm “His little ones”? There is only one reasonable answer. They were trained to be Pharisees! They are “churchmen”, not Christians. They are religious but not holy! They put on a fine show but their concern is to appear religious before the world, not holy before God. Like all Pharisees they are beautiful, but “empty tombs filled with corruption.” They control bishop’s conferences and chancery offices and their main concerns are money and appearances. Committees and programs cannot change this tragic state, only when God raises up saints and prophets will the faith truly be renewed. Until then every Roman Catholic must learn the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas on true and false obedience and the lessons of history where we find that an entire national conference of bishops left the Church at one time. (With one exception, the martyr St. John Fisher!). We must accept the fact that we cannot always trust our leadership. Many have proven unworthy of that trust and while they have every right to expect our love, they have no right to demand our trust. Trust must be earned! We have consolation and encouragement in the statements of Vatican II on the primacy of a properly formed conscience, and what properly forms that conscience is the teaching of Jesus Christ and the traditional faith known and taught for centuries! To trust anything else is to risk our eternal salvation on the dubious opinions of dissident theologians and television talk show hosts. All Catholics and especially priests must clearly understand that we “work” for Jesus Christ and not a bishop.

The leadership of the Church seems to lack the humility to repent, but this sad situation gives the true Catholic an opportunity to purify his faith and renew his allegiance to “Christ and Him crucified”. This is not the first time in history Catholics have had to choose between Christ and church leadership, but never between Christ and His true Church! The true Church is always pure and holy! But it has not always been well served by those who claim to speak in its name.

“IT IS BETTER THAT SCANDALS ARISE THAN THE TRUTH BE SUPPRESSED!” – Pope St. Gregory the Great.

Fr. Charles Dahlby
Cardinal Francis George of Chicago who heads one of the largest archdioceses in the United States, responsible for providing a large portion of funds needed to run the Vatican, was found to be sharing his residence with a priest who, before becoming a priest, abused a boy. According to a February 28, 2003 story titled: “George hosting accused priest,” that appeared in the Sun Times:

“Last spring, in the midst of the worst clergy sex abuse scandal ever faced by the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, Chicago’s Cardinal Francis George began receiving an unusual house guest. The Rev. Kenneth J. Martin, 57, a priest from the Wilmington (Del.) Diocese who in 2001 was charged criminally with sexually abusing a high school boy in Maryland in the 1970s, has stayed at the cardinal’s mansion on North State Parkway about one week a month since last May. That was when he began consulting for a publishing house owned by the Chicago Archdiocese.

“Gay Pride” or Celebrating sodomy in Chicago?

Much has been written about Cardinal George in previous issues of AMDG. In the centerfold of this issue you will find pictures from Chicago’s 2001 “Gay Pride Parade.” The Cardinal has promoted this event by allowing one of his parishes, Our Lady of Mt. Carmel (OLMC), and his Archdiocesan “Gay Ministry” AGLO to promote and participate in this filth.

I would now like to provide you with a few facts regarding Cardinal George’s Archdiocesan Gay & Lesbian Outreach (AGLO). Also please check out http://www.depaul.edu/~pride/ a website for homosexuals at this Chicago (Catholic in name only), university. There you will find such things as:

“REMEMBERING STONEWALL - Some of Chicago's best female impersonators will be performing in the Stuart Center - Cafeteria from Noon - 2pm” and do not miss the Drag Ball - Details will be available soon.”

On the cover of the October 12, 2001 issue of “The DePaulia” the newspaper for DePaul University was a picture of a “drag queen” who was part of the entertainment for the “Pride DePaul,” celebration for “Coming Out Week” held at the university.

Archdiocesan Gay & Lesbian Outreach

AGLO

August, 1995 AGLO gave their “E. Paul Govera” award to the organization Dignity. The recipients of this AGLO award must have “rendered service [to the homosexual community] that is judged outstanding…” According to “The Blaze,” AGLO’s bulletin, AGLO has a “shared purpose and commitment” with Dignity. As many readers are aware, Dignity demands the Church accept sodomy as good.

September 29, 1996 a flyer was passed out at OLMC Parish advertising the 25th Anniversary Celebration for the militant homosexual organization “Dignity.” The flyer passed out at OLMC Parish included “Blessings” for sodomite couples.

In the May 20, 1998 issue of NightLines, a “Quintessentially Queer” weekly, Chicago-based publication for homosexuals, you will find an advertisement for AGLO and OLMC Parish. Along with AGLO’s ad you will also find many xxx-rated ads for live sex shows, adult movies, leather bars, dating services, massages, and more.

The June 11, 1998 issue of the Windy City Times (WCT), Chicago’s homosexual newspaper, contained an article titled “Cardinal Officiates At Gay Mass.” On June 7, 1998 Cardinal Francis George celebrated the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, at OLMC Parish, for homosexuals. According to the article “The Cardinal praised the work of AGLO,
which holds the denomination’s only gay mass.” The article went on to state:

“Following the service he (Cardinal George) told WCT he was impressed with the congregation. ‘This was a very prayerful group,’ he said. ‘These are people who are striving to be people of faith.’”

The August 30th, 1998 OLMC Church bulletin advertised an October 24-25 AGLO retreat titled “AGLOChicago-Passage to Intimacy.” One of the “guides” for this event was “John Balester, former chair of the (Chicago) Mayor Advisory Council on Gay and Lesbian Issues.” Mr. Balester is an inductee into the Gay & Lesbian Hall of Fame (www.glhalloffame.org), who “worked to improve liaison between city government and such organizations as Queer Nation and ACT-UP.” “While Balester chaired ACGLI, a gay and lesbian advisory committee in the Chicago Police Department was formed, and the Chicago Gay and Lesbian Hall of Fame was created. In addition, Balester has been involved as an openly gay man in electoral campaigns including those of Daley and of President Bill Clinton.”

Now, does anyone reading this believe that John Balester, while leading the AGLO retreat “Passage to Intimacy” will promote and or endorse Church teaching regarding the sinfulness of sodomy? What about you, Cardinal George?


“We gay people must risk believing that God is not homophobic, even though the human church is. We must learn to accept our gayness as a gift from God…”

The same bulletin also advertised a retreat titled: “Sons of Earth — A Spirit Day for Gay & Bisexual Men. “AGLO member Bro. Joe Kilikevice guides a journey of integrating spirituality and sexuality…”

November 3, 1998 Bishop Thomas Gumbleton spoke at a forum titled “Homosexuality and the Catholic Church”, which was held at DePaul University. The event was co-sponsored by AGLO & Dignity among others. As many of you know Dignity supports and promotes Church acceptance of sodomy-Gumbleton is a known dissender.

Read the article in December 17th, 1998 issue of The Wanderer titled: “Bible Is Pro-Gay Text; declares Chicago AGLO Newsletter.”

Read the May 27th, 1999 Wanderer article titled, “Is Cardinal George Yielding To Homosexualist Pressure?”

Read June 17th, 1999 Wanderer article titled: “Cardinal George Endorses AGLO’s Marching In Gay Pride Parade.” “Thus our participation in the gay parade not only represents our community of faith— sharers but also the Catholic church.” (OLMC AGLO Church Bulletin) Ed note: Now go look at the centerfold in this issue of AMDG.

In the October 3, 1999 issue of the Catholic New World, the Chicago Archdiocese’s newspaper, appears an article titled “AGLO offers parishes a vision for outreach.” Steve Berg of AGLO was interviewed for the story. What is most offensive is the fact that Cardinal George’s newspaper claims that AGLO is a “working model for success to dioceses across the country.” Once you read our report on AGLO’s activities and view our centerfold on their participation in Chicago’s “Gay Pride Parade,” it becomes clear that this so-called gay ministry could only be considered a model for other dioceses if the purpose of the “ministry” was to undermine Church teaching foster dissent, and promote perversion.

October 10—12, 2002 The Catholic Medical Association (CMA) held their yearly conference at Loyola University in Chicago. Prior to the event on July 23, 2002, CMA sent an open letter to all American bishops titled: “Homosexuality and Hope” a copy of which can be found on RCF’s or CMA’s website.

The open letter supported Church teaching, and stated in part that:

“As the revelations of [clerical sexual] abuse [of children] have become public it has become increasingly clear that almost all the victims are adolescent males, not prepubescent boys. The problem of priests with same-sex attractions molesting adolescents or children must be addressed if future scandals are to be avoided.”

In response AGLO, an official ministry of the Chicago Archdiocese, condemned the CMA’s
statement and blasted Loyola University for allowing the CMA to hold their conference there.

According to news reports that appeared in the October 2, 2002 issue of the Windy City Times, AGLO accused CMA of going “against 27 years of Catholic Teaching on human sexuality about homosexual persons.” Notice that AGLO only references 27 years of Catholic teaching suggesting the teaching they are referring to is relatively new Church teaching. This statement and the fact that AGLO accuses CMA of being anti-Catholic in their beliefs confirms what many orthodox Catholics have long believed; the bishops, in this case Cardinal George, have allowed mixed messages to be presented to the homosexual community in the form of watered-down and/or heretical Church teaching. The Cardinal’s endorsement of AGLO and his deafening silence regarding AGLO’s often scandalous behavior and/or associations suggests the Cardinal is either a coward and/or a homosexual. A true “Prince of the Church” could not—would not, allow this confusion to continue.

Fr. Robert Pawell, OFM is now on the staff at Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish, home of AGLO, Chicago’s Catholic “Gay Ministry.” Fr. Pawell is/was “Director of the Mount Carmel House of Study and Prayer” where, according to his fall 2001 bulletin “NOTATIONS,” promotes the Enneagram and the notorious Fr. Richard Rohr, and Edwina Gately.

Father Pawell is also co-director of Communication Ministry, Inc. (CMI), a group for gay priests, nuns and religious operating out of Chicago. RCF has made this information available to Cardinal George in the past.

CMI’s September 2000 newsletter contains a letter from a “gay priest” on page 7. The priest thanks CMI for its members’ support for him and his male partner of 6 years. This is one example of many regarding CMI’s danger to all concerned. CMI at one time operated out of the Christian Brothers’ property with the help of Franciscans and other religious in Chicago. [CMI has since moved its location—ed. ]

Fr. Pawell is a member of the Sacred Heart Province of the Order of Friars Minor (Franciscans) based in St. Louis. According to CMI’s recent newsletter, the St. Louis-based OFM’s made a financial contribution to CMI as did the Dominican Sisters of Springfield. Springfield is the former See of homosexual bishop Daniel Ryan. Bishop Ryan’s right-hand man, canon lawyer, civil lawyer, Brother Patrick Shea, is also a member of the Sacred Heart Province. Shea is referred to by some diocesan priests as the “KGB agent” because of his role as “enforcer” for Bishop Ryan.

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

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

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

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

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

“he would be reluctant to order a loving [homosexual] couple to end their relationship.” Fr. Seamon went on to say “I am not sure I see the sense in trying to halt a long-term committed relationship…”

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

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

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

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

In an article by Cardinal George that appeared in the May 9, 1999 issue of the New World, Chicago’s official Catholic Newspaper, he stated that: “This ministry (AGLO), of course, remains full of pitfalls for everyone involved. That is, however, no reason not to support it.” Full of pitfalls? Let me ask the reader a few questions;

1. Under any circumstances would you or your children support, endorse, promote, or participate in a public parade where some female participants marched topless and some male participants were clad only in G-strings? Cardinal George would.

2. Under any circumstances would you or your children support, endorse, promote, or participate in a public parade where sexual perversion was celebrated and displayed through various forms of sexual innuendo? Cardinal George does.

3. Would you ever consider sending your children to confession with a priest who was alleged to have promoted homosexual activity while hearing confessions? Cardinal George would.

4. Would you send your children to a religious education program if you knew the head of religious education was a homosexual living with his “lover?” Cardinal George would.

5. Would you endorse, promote, or participate in a “gay Ministry” if you knew the ministry director was a homosexual who publicly proclaimed that the Church was wrong regarding the sinfulness of sodomy? Cardinal George does.

6. Would you promote, endorse, or attend a religious retreat on sexuality if the retreat master was a homosexual who supported “gay marriage” and believed sodomy was a good thing? Cardinal George would.

7. Do you believe a Catholic Church or ministry should advertise in, and thereby support, a publication that advertises and also supports pornography, sex shows, bath houses, sodomy and other types of lewd behavior? Cardinal George does.

These are but a few examples of the filth and perversion Cardinal George has permitted and/or endorsed that causes me to wonder just what he believes. Regrettably we must conclude that His Eminence is not competent, not fit to lead the archdiocese of Chicago.

Please remember, this is the same Cardinal George who, along with the former Papal Nuncio and various Vatican officials, protected and held up as a moral leader, predatory homosexual Bishop Daniel Ryan, thereby enabling him to continue to abuse others and do great harm to the Church.

While holy priests are being cast out for simply speaking the truth, predatory homosexual bishops like Bishop Ryan of Springfield are praised and defended for their “service” to the Church. The Diocese of Springfield purchased a new home in Springfield for Ryan to live in.

Cardinal George is not a faithful Catholic; he is a liar and a coward. He has allowed poisoned food to be set before his flock without so much as a word of caution. His chef he praises and places in a position of authority.
While American priest Father William Auth, OSFS claims to serve the Maya Indians near Merida, Mexico, his organization’s newsletters criticize and deny Church teaching and his e-mails speak of his homosexual sex partners in the U.S., while he mocks Mexicans for their reluctance to have sex with priests. Despite all this and the fact that Fr. Auth has traveled with a twelve year old Mexican boy he refers to as “not my current lover,” Church authorities in both Mexico and the United States refuse to act.

Three years ago RCF exposed a network of homosexual priests operating an internet chat room and web page titled: “St. Sebastian’s Angels.” This group’s activities were reported on in the summer 2000 issue of our newsletter AMDG. One bishop and several priests involved in this group were forced to resign after our report was made public. (You can access this information on our website at: www.rcf.org ). The story of Fr. Auth and the St. Sebastian’s Angels can also be found in the June 2000 issue of Catholic World Report.

Fr. William Auth, OSFS (OBLATES OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES ) was a member of “St. Sebastian’s Angels.” Some of the e-mails Auth posted to this group were so offensive and anti Catholic it is hard to believe he was allowed to remain in the priesthood. Despite the fact that RCF contacted Fr. Auth’s superiors in both Toledo, Ohio and Merida, Mexico, he remains in good standing both in Mexico and with his order, Toledo-Detroit Province of the Oblates of St. Francis De Sales.

According to the Oblates’ web site:

"Oblatus" or "a complete offering to God."

According to Auth’s website: “William G. Auth is the founder, [President, and at times sole employee] of the Maya Indian Missions, Inc. He has developed both a Mexican and an American Board of Directors as well as Tax Exempt Status to help with this work and insure its continuation.”

Fr. Auth’s Corporate address is listed as:
Maya Indian Missions, Inc.
P. O. Box 8195
Toledo, OH 43605-8195

Fr. Auth’s Mission address and residence is listed as:
Fr. William Auth
Apartado 32, Admon #9,
97200, Merida, Yucatan, Mexico

Despite the fact that Auth’s 2000 corporate tax returns claims he receives 0 (zero) income from the corporation and a travel allowance of $1,149.00, he has traveled to Brazil and he spends his summers at his lake vacation home at:

William Auth
12495 N. Crystal Lake Dr.
Cement City, MI 49233
Phone listing: 517-688-4098

In the Summer 2002 Maya Indian Mission newsletter, Fr. Auth begs for donations to help raise $60,000.00 to build a Church in “Noc-ac.” What Auth does not tell his supporters is that he has $1,000,000.00 in cash, stocks, and bonds in the corporations coffers. RCF was able to obtain Auth’s corporation tax forms and financial information, some of which can be downloaded from guidestar.org (search Maya Indian Missions).

While the corporation 990 Tax Form for 2001 shows income of $333,916.00, and program and other expenses for the year at $118,749.00, the corporation has assets (cash and bonds) of over $1 million with
zero liabilities. In my opinion any not-for-profit corporation that accumulates assets of almost ten years’ operating expense is not putting its donated funds to good use. The following quote was taken from guidestar.org;

“An organization’s total assets should generally exceed its total liabilities, or it cannot long survive, but the types of assets and liabilities also must be considered. For instance, an organization’s current assets (cash, receivables, securities, etc.) should be sufficient to cover its current liabilities (payables, deferred revenue, current year loan and note payments). Otherwise, the organization may face solvency problems. **On the other hand, an organization whose cash and equivalents greatly exceed its current liabilities might not be putting its money to best use.**”

Below you will find copies of letters sent to Auth’s superior’s both in the United States and Mexico, along with some of his e-mail transmissions from “St. Sebastian’s Angels.”

According to a parishioner of St. Patrick’s Parish in Sonora, Diocese of Santa Rosa California, the following statement from Bishop Stephen E. Blair was read during Mass or placed in parish bulletins in August 2003.

“It has come to our attention that there appears on the internet disturbing and offensive e-mail transmissions from Father William Auth, OSFS. The transmissions, which occurred between September 26, 1999, and April 6, 2000, have raised serious moral questions. Because of the content of the e-mails, I have determined that it is not appropriate for Father William Auth to exercise any priestly functions in the Diocese of Stockton. People have generously contributed to Father Auth’s Mayan Mission in Mexico.

We have no reason at this time to question the use of the donations given to this work. However, the Diocese of Stockton from this point forward does not endorse any fund raising in this Diocese for the Mayan Mission. Nor can any Parish facilities be used for this purpose. I ask that you continue to pray for our Church and for all who minister in the Church during these diffi-

The following letter was sent to Fr. Auth’s superiors on January 20, 2000;

Oblates of St. Francis de Sales
Very Rev. James F. Cryan
2056 Parkwood Ave.
Toledo, Ohio 43620-1616
Phone: (419) 243-5105

Dear Rev. Cryan;

Several months ago our organization was given information regarding a group of self-described “homosexual Catholic clergy” operating a “chatroom” on the Internet. The group also had a web page where they displayed some of their pictures. At one point the site with pictures contained a video clip of an erect ejaculating penis.

Nude photos of some of the clergy members were passed around via e-mail and some of the comments made, by the clergy, were very offensive.

RCF turned this information over to several U.S. cardinals, one of whom gave RCF some direction on how to deal with this situation.

Rev. Auth was one of the names that appeared on the site. His photo was also displayed and comments attributed to him were also posted to the site. (Copies enclosed).

You can access copies of the above-mentioned material by going to our web site at: http://www.rcf.org. Once on the site go to the box marked scandalous material and click on the word “here” within that box. This will take you to the material.

Sincerely, Stephen Brady, President
Roman Catholic Faithful

Ps: please contact RCF if you have any questions or comments.

August 21, 2002 RCF sent the following letter to Mexican Church officials. As of this date, to the best of our knowledge, neither the U.S. nor Mexican Church hierarchy have taken action against Auth.
Dear Father,

Thank you for your recent response to my inquiry, and for taking the time to speak with me. This letter is being written in accordance with our telephone conversation of three weeks ago. As I mentioned to you previously, I would like to discuss with you some areas of great concern that pertain to Fr. William Auth, OSFS. As you indicated, Fr. Auth has been working in Komchem, Yucatán for twelve years.

Our organization became aware of Fr. Auth when we discovered his activities in an internet-based organization run by and for homosexual priests. The group proclaimed themselves as “St. Sebastian’s Angels,” and they circulated a number of illicit and immoral communications to one another, including pornographic photographs of other men (and on occasion, even themselves). Our organization monitored their activities for some time and, after exhausting all reasonable attempts to have the priests corrected and disciplined by their superiors, we exposed the group to the national press. While the website became inactivated in early 2000, continued exposure by our organization through the press has resulted in the removal of a number of priests and a South African bishop from active ministry.

You can see some examples of this website by going to the following hyperlink on the Internet:
http://www.rcf.org/investigatessa/index.htm

If you have not yet seen this material, you should be warned that it is often quite offensive.

I am writing to you because Fr. Auth was an active participant in this organization. You can see a number of his e-mails by reading the enclosed or going to the following link on the Internet:
http://www.rcf.org/auth/

In particular, I would like to share with you the following excerpts from Fr. Auth’s statements to the group:

“i too long (still) for that special person and still believe he is there - so i don't give up trying - but the Yucatan is so catholic they just go into sever guilt when they even think of doing it with a priest - so I watch myself here and look forward (sic) to two or three relationships I have in the states - some sexual some not - where I can be myself and share my life fully…”

Elsewhere, Fr. Auth states:

we went to Ek Balan a new "dig"not too far form Merida today so I am sending these along----the little guy with me is not my current lover
(Photograph modified by RCF)

We brought this information, and a great deal more, to Fr. Auth’s superior. No action whatsoever was taken against Fr. Auth for his activities. To this day, he continues to practice disobedience to the teachings of the Church. In a public newsletter (April, 2002), which can be found on the Internet at the www.guidestar.com, Fr. Auth speaks out against nearly every substantial teaching of Holy Mother Church. Auth states:

“For years we have avoided truth and reality. It is a disgrace that some clergy have abused children and it is even a worse sin that their leaders have covered this up. But this is not the
only issue of skeletons in our church, or cover-up and we all know it. We pretend that everyone is or ought to be heterosexual. We insist that all clergy be celibate. We will do anything to avoid ordaining married clergy or bringing back those who have left. We refuse to admit the values of birth control or second marriages. We talk about women’s rights but keep them from the altar.”

I am respectfully, therefore, bringing these concerns to you and to your bishop. I ask that you investigate these matters for yourselves. Is this the kind of priest that the Mexican people deserve? Is this the kind of priest who should be continually around young, impressionable boys? Do the faithful Catholics in Mexico not deserve much more than the agenda harbored by this dissident, openly homosexual priest?

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions or are in need of clarification of any of the points I have brought to your attention. I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely, Stephen G. Brady, President
Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc.

PS: RCF had hoped that, by contacting Fr. Auth’s religious superiors in the U.S.A. two years ago, this situation would have been addressed and Auth removed. Since it appears that no action was taken, we felt an obligation to contact your office. It is unfortunate that Father’s superiors did not advise you of the situation. They have, in my opinion, failed to act responsibly. The Mexican people have a history of strong Catholic Faith and they deserve better from the American Catholic neighbors.

The following are copies of e-mails sent by Father Auth to the St. Sebastian’s Angels group. (More stories on the Angels can be found in our summer 2000 newsletter and the June 13, 2002 Washington Times.)

E-mail Transmissions
on the St. Sebastian's Email List
By Fr. William Auth, OSFS

From: "william g. auth"<wga@diario1.sureste.com>

“norm you tell the story that is most of ur lives - and thanks for that - as i reach 57 and continue to enjoy my work immensely I struggle with a leadership (religious order) which is homophobic and in denial - I was in leadership a few years ago and know exactly what most of them now there were doing - but that is another story...i too long (still) for that special person and still believe he is there - so i don't give up trying - but the Yucatan is so catholic they just go into sever guilt when they even think of doing it with a priest - so I watch myself here and look forward to two or three relationships I have in the states - some sexual some not - where I can be myself and share my life fully...paz y amor. Bill”

########################################################################

From: william auth
To: saintsebastian@onelist.com
Sent: Sunday, September 26, 1999 3:10 PM

"hi reg - you continue to be great - and we don't want to loose you- so as far as i'm concerned when you get the letter to sign - cross your fingers and sing it - the mexicans have the custom of feeling free to lie about anything when the person that asks really doesn't have the right to do the asking - i.e. invade your personal space - i'm en favor of that custom ! paz bill”

########################################################################

From: william auth
To: saintsebastian@onelist.com
Sent: Sunday, September 26, 1999 5:20 PM

“boy this is great - now i have to get you a better pic - but not with a speedo - by the way what about starting some video conferencing - i've got a cam video - trying to figure out how to get it to go - but that is a possibility - possible norm could help us figure it all out?paz”

########################################################################
To: <saintsebastian@onelist.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 10, 1999 3:49 PM
Subject: RE: [saintsebastian] the leather thing

From: "william auth" <wga@diario1.sureste.com>

“well i’ve been reading with angst these missives about leather and just couldn’t connect until nick said he wasn’t into seeing guys in leather but in their underwear - now that i can connect with - i don't know why -0 maybe lack of experience or somthing - but the leather thing never attracted me and i agree it's just oo expensive - i prefer the gentle cuddling type, but a little more agressive as well - paz y amor. maybe one of you will have to introduce me to the leather scene...paz bill”

############################################################################

From: william auth <wga@diario1.sureste.com>
To: <saintsebastian@onelist.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 1999

"Hi Andy thanks for your note- I'm Bill in mexico and in michigan in summer too hot here and I don't mean sexually)....but it’s good to hae you in the list and I hope you enjoy our discussions and reflections...if you ( or anyone reading this ) needs a winter break - you are welcome here in Merida - I guarantee it will be hot - we live only 4 hours form Cancun, but are quite close to the gulf coast - jsut today I went to the beach fdor my day off and discovered an incredible hotel only one half hour a way - on the beach - very private etc. etc...so cum soon amigos. Paz y amor. Bill”

############################################################################

From: william auth <wga@diario1.sureste.com>
To: <saintsebastian@onelist.com>
Sent: Monday, November 01, 1999 6:53 AM
Subject: RE: Mr Mickey Mouse et al....

“hi guys...just checking to see if we could get some more communication via video - does anyone else have a cam and connect to a program? I'll bet some do and are keepin it hidden - oh you lusers !!! anyway another way of getting to knwo and see one another - of course we might not have all the regalia of a vested certain mnseignor form S. Africa- but then , there might be some other regalia showing...paz y amor. Bill”

From: william auth <wga@diario1.sureste.com>
To: <saintsebastian@onelist.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 1999 6:54 AM
Subject: RE: welcome, closets, risking

“hi rich- i always appreciate your comments and contributions -Mexico ismuch like Africa because the church just denies any problems especially with sexuality - hey was that a request for more "still fotos"which I detected in your last note- if so .lets'respond guys! Paz y amor. Bill”

############################################################################

From: william auth <wga@diario1.sureste.com>
To: <saintsebastian@onelist.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 1999 6:49 AM
Subject: RE: [saintsebastian] ordination

"Hola amigos -well one of the old gang will weigh in at Sept 6, 69 there are a lot of sixes and ninces in that number , but of course it has nothing to do with the real me!) - to be honest , I am not big on celebrating anniversaries of ordination, etc....especially this talk of being "superior"because one is ordained longer - bothers me - a lot more than the pronography to be honest! It 's not that I don't like being a priest - I thorougouhly enjoy it , but i have been surrounded for years by people who use their status of being clerics and have never understood the call t service - that we are meant to follow.....so much so that last week i began my homily by asking how theythought a priest shold be laid out in his ataud ( casket) and they of course all said in his vestments - giving me the perfect opportunity to say - well i have left orders that i am not to be in vestments at all, i prefer being nude but so as not to asustar surprise) the poor peple, they can putme in jeans and a t shirt....i mean what difference does it really make that we are priests in the end judgement? cum on !

"oops im getting a bit carried away.....anyway about the pornography .. i realy appreciate this site because of the opinions that have been expressed on all subjects and on that one as well. For a long time I thought that my body was not something to be appreciated , that i didn'tlook as good as others, and then i discovered that was a crock of shit !
One way I appreciate myself is to look at others and myself naked...yeh it also leads to getting off at times, but I do appreciate the me all the more...I think that's why I like icu! - I mean there are no Rickie Martins on that channel, but real people with real bodies, just like mine - and we appreciate one another - so I agree with those who say, just make it an attachment and don't be hesitant - nice thing about my computer now is that it shows the attachments immediately!!! Paz y amor. Bill”

“I appreciate the concerns of some about someone turning us in, but, and I don't know why, I have learned to live without this fear...I am not out to many, not as many as I wish I could be to, but I just am not about to let others control my life, and I have decided from the beginning that I will be open here and leave the rest to whatever happens. I think we have to be careful and I also believe that someday our names will be turned in to someone - well let that be and then we will deal with it....paz Bill”

“in reference to labels - I don't usually like them either - but how about this for your favorite Ratz: SOB!!!”

“Hi guys...these people are spreading the word...I got another email from a very conservative organization in Ann Arbor asking for an interview too - don't worry I won't respond...but that means the word is getting out of the list with our names on it....not to my liking....Paz y amor. Bill”

“thanks to John Harris for this info on Jesus forskin - I'm uncut but have had my share of nicks - now I got the best of both worlds..paz Bill”

“Im staying too...and thanks for all the work you guys are doing...I am going to try to act as if that group did not exist and write the way I have always written in the past.. paz y amor. Bill”
From: william auth <wga@sureste.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2000 3:17 PM

“well guys our good friend [Roman Catholic Faithful] continues to do us a lot of damage..i just got a message from some people who did a web site for me, and somehow he got his message to them and got associate with them...what is happening? can he get onto all the sites , like Reg's without anyone even knowing it? Thsi goy must be getting his jollies on doing damage , i sure hope he has lots of ice with him in hell! Paz y amor. Bill"

You can read more of the e-mails from St. Sebastian’s Angels on our web site at www.rcf.org

The fact that the Oblates of St. Francis de Sales (OSFS) allow active homosexual priests who mock/deny Church teaching to continue to “minister to Catholics” suggests the leadership of this religious order may be infested with homosexuals. On that note, Fr. Roland Calvert, OSFS, we are told, serves as chaplain of the Toledo, Ohio chapter of Dignity. In June 2002, the Gay and Lesbian Union of Greater Toledo presented Fr. Calvert with their man of the year award for twenty five years of faithful service to “gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered community of Greater Toledo.”

An update on Fr. John Harris of St. Sebastian’s Angels fame. According to a September 4, 2003 report titled “Priest faces misconduct allegations” by JOHN RICHARDSON, Portland Press Herald Writer;

“A Roman Catholic priest who led a parish in Rangeley until last month could be expelled, following a church investigation into reports that he was seen nude while swimming, boating and sitting in a hot tub with youths at a private camp 20 years ago.

The Rev. John Harris is the fourth Maine priest who was active in a parish to publicly face misconduct allegations since the sexual abuse scandal hit the Catholic Church last year.”

“...Harris was removed from his previous parish, in Sabattus, in early 2000 because of his role as creator and manager of a Web site for gay clerics that contained sexual content...”

Vatican Promotes Child Abuser Priest

According to an article titled, “Vatican promoted priest despite warnings of sex abuse, records show” by Reese Dunklin that appeared Sat, Aug. 30, 2003 in The Dallas Morning News:

“The Vatican promoted a U.S. priest through its international diplomatic corps despite high-level warnings in the 1990s that he had [repeatedly] sexually abused a girl...” “The case is believed to be the first in which the Vatican has been found harboring an abuser in its ranks.”

According to the news report the priest in question is one Monsignor Daniel Pater who was the subject of a lawsuit that ended in 1995 with a confidential payment to his accuser.

Msgr. Pater served as the Vatican’s number two diplomat in India until his resignation shortly before the Dallas Morning News story broke. Msgr. Pater is from the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, Ohio “where he abused a young parishioner before joining the Vatican's foreign service in the early 1980s.”

According to the article;

“Archdiocesan spokeswoman Tricia Hempel said Pater acknowledged the abuse when first confronted about a decade ago. ‘The Vatican knew the status of the case,’ she said.”

Fifty year old Msgr. Daniel Pater, “remains a priest in good standing, even though U.S. bishops passed a one-strike-and-you're-out policy last year in Dallas.”

So much for the Vatican’s credibility.
Many earnest Catholics believe the so-called sexual abuse crisis in the Church is about over. They feel the perpetrators have been caught, punished, and the sordid past put behind the Church. They say it’s time to move on and stop all this talk about abuse.

The problem with this Pollyannaish scenario is that it is wrong.

In many dioceses in the US, the pederast’s network still flourishes and its infernal grip continues to destroy the faithful by undermining of the Church with its glorification of perversion and destruction of dogma.

Over the past 40 or so years enemies of the faith have accelerated the deconstruction of the Church and Her dogma and doctrine. They’ve sedulously plotted Her downfall, a continuation of an ancient attack against God Almighty. A bitter fruit of this current attempted deicide has been the infiltration of the priestly ranks by men of perdition, pederasts whose god is sodomy and who worship a lifestyle of sin and destruction of innocence. They are homosexuals, ephebophiles, and pedophiles.

However, the continuing expose of these satanic foot soldiers has led to much soul searching, hand-wringing, and apology from the hierarchy. Many priests have been removed, defrocked, or imprisoned for their heinous crimes of sexual abuse, actually rape as it should rightly be called. Many Catholics, battered by this unworldly assault from men who worship the perversions of the world, have had their faith weakened or destroyed.

The horror is that some of the predators or their enablers still prowl, with ecclesial support. These evil men, more homunculus than man, hope the fluttering minds of the majority of churchgoers will be led astray by the latest fad, the most current innovation, the myth that sodomites have been exposed and eliminated. The sexual scandal was yesterday’s news; it’s “time to move on” the consensus builders say.

A curse of the modern mind is its thinness of memory. Things that need to be remembered are misplaced in the siren call for change and innovation.

The memory of the recent pederast evil may soon be forgotten, or, at least, recast to placate the Church’s enemies.

After the continuous theater of catharsis is exhausted, the reality of the network of sodomites in the Church and society will still remain to threaten children. And if you think that the ‘sex abuse scandal’ in the Church is behind us, you’ve been deluded by those who still want to prey upon the bodies and souls of the young and innocent. The sodomite’s network still thrives in the shadows of the Church, protected, it seems, by many of the men who are called to defend the Faith.

Chicago Cardinal Francis George seemed not to care that his house guest was one of those who helped plunge the Church into its worst crisis since Vatican II. Card. George hosted Rev. Kenneth J. Martin from the Wilmington, Delaware diocese. Fr. Martin faced criminal charges in 2001 for sexually abusing a high school boy in the 1970s. The predator also began consulting for a publishing house owned by the Chicago Archdiocese, according to the Chicago Sun-Times.

Fr. Martin told the paper’s reporter that he had been placed on “pre-judgment probation” since his case was adjudicated in June 2001. Card. George admitted he didn’t know all the details. He said, “If he’s a priest in good standing, I don’t think his bishop thinks he’s a threat, and his bishop is a responsible man, in my experience with him.” Card. George added that Fr. Martin has no contact with children even though St. Mary of the Angels elementary school is next door to the publishing house.

Sr. Mary Ann Walsh, a spokesman for the US Conference of Catholic Bishops familiar with the Martin case, said that the new clergy sex abuse policy approved by the Vatican in 2002 did not pertain to allegations or offenses that took place before the men were priests. Walsh added that “canon law makes it very clear that a bishop can remove someone from the ministry if he feels the person is unsuitable for ministry.” Apparently, Fr. Martin’s bishop feels he is suitable and Card. George concurs.

The Wolves Still Prowl Among the Flock
By Dario McDarby
David Clohessy, national president for Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests, said that Fr. Martin’s presence in the Chicago archdiocese and at Card. George’s home, was “such a powerful statement and such a depressing statement (that) you can molest a child and still be considered a Priest in good standing and enjoy the favor of one of the Church’s most high princes.”

In the Baltimore Archdiocese, between 1969 and 1986, Fr. Michael Spillane sought boys for his unholy gratification. The Washington Post reported in June 2002 that in 1991, Fr. Spillane, who is executive director of the Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions, acknowledged assaulting six youths after one victim came forward. The archdiocese immediately revoked his faculties and informed the federation of its sanctions. However the federation did nothing, now claiming it was unaware of Fr. Spillane’s admission and the archdiocese’s sanctions. Somebody apparently lied.

Fr. Spillane underwent therapy for his perversion. Fr. John Burton, chairman of the Federation, told the Post that if he had known earlier about Spillane’s past he would not necessarily have asked him to resign. “When a man has tried to right the wrong and has fixed his life, I’d be very careful about zero tolerance,” Fr. Burton added. Unfortunately, the victims of Fr. Spillane can never right their lives or fix the immeasurable harm done to them. Sadly, Fr. Burton has offered no comfort to Fr. Spillane’s victims.

Spokesman Walsh of the Bishops’ Conference said, in the case of Fr. Spillane, “We were not aware of the accusations until three days ago.” Either she is covering up for the Bishops’ Conference or else the archdiocese lied. Were the charges and sanctions against Spillane sent on to the Federation, an agency of the Conference, or weren’t they? The Catholic faithful may never know, given the continued duplicity and secrecy of those who are prone to cover-ups and lies.

THREE THINGS TO KNOW ABOUT ABUSE AND PEDERASTS

Frederick S. Berlin, M.D., Ph.D., Director of the National Institute for the Study, Prevention and Treatment of Sexual Trauma, said in an interview:

“In Priests, we rarely see the physical or assaultive kinds of behavior. It’s very rare to see rape other than statutory. The most common thing we see with Priests is that they enjoy the company of youngsters, like the companionship, want to do good for them, and then, unfortunately, as a bond develops emotionally, begin to feel sexually tempted and persuade the youngster to go along with sexual activity. That’s the most common scenario that we see in a Priest. Of course the youngster, in respecting the priest and in feeling that the Priest is not going to lead him astray, is at a tremendous disadvantage.”

Dr. Berlin’s irresponsible comments seem consistent with the assertions of pedophile groups that their sexual involvement with children is not abusive. They claim to be too persuasive, too dominant, or too much an authority figure and the ignorant kids simply go along with their own abuse. As one bishop has stupidly remarked, the kids need to be held responsible too because some of them are seductive of the pedophile Priests!

The fact is that sexual abuse of minors is assault; it is rape; it is violent. Unless society tells youngsters exactly that, they’ll continue doubting whether or not they were to blame. Worse, children may develop gender problems that lead to a life of homosexuality and the emotional, physical, and spiritual dead end that life brings.

We need to know three important things about these recent scandals. One, the assault of minor children and young adult by those in authority is RAPE. In recent times the deconstruction of this horrid act has left the victims doubly violated. “Sexual abuse” is trendy; “rape” is vile. What child predators share in common is the RAPE of children. We need to reclaim the proper terminology to instill in us again the absolute horror of this vile act. Children and young adults were not “sexually abused;” they were raped. Also, we need to remember that their rapists are not amenable to therapy; they are not cured, fixed, or made whole again. They remain, until their death, threats to children.

Two, we need to understand an important distinction in the mind of the pederast. He does not believe he has “abused” his victim. No, for the molester, his mind is enraptured with “love.” Just ask the fellows in the major pedophile organization, the North American Man Boy LOVE Association. No rape, no assault, no abuse. They only have feelings of ‘love’
for their victims. This curious duplicity of mind is a vitally important point for outsiders to understand. It explains how active pedophiles can become involved in professions that appear to care for children. It also explains how a pedophile can oppose the so-called sexual abuse of children and continue in his sordid lifestyle.

Three is the apparent fewness of victims. Why are men convicted or charged on only one or two cases? That doesn’t mean there were no more victims. The number of allegations has no bearing on the actual number of victims. The sexual career of a pedophile is remarkable for the number of victims. The pedophile can victimize more than a thousand children. Most often the numbers are in the hundreds. One of the reasons a pedophile remains at large is because he is an influential or high status man; or else, he moves frequently. Also, few children are willing to come forward because, having been seduced, they are enamored of him, relishing gifts and attention; or they are frightened, having been told that nobody will believe them, that they or their parent will be killed. Worse, their lives have been shattered and they believe they’re no good. Dr. Alice Miller, a psychologist, has called this heinous act, “soul murder.” For prosecution, only one credible victim is necessary to make a case. For the investigation, it’s too time consuming to plod through all leads and uncover more victims.

**THE BISHOPS’ RESPONSE**

As the abuse scandal exploded in the media, the American Bishops met in Dallas, Texas. The result, after two days in 2002, was an eight-page document titled, “Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People.” The document outlined 17 Articles that the bishops hoped would persuade the public, and the Catholic faithful, that they were serious about “the sexual abuse of minors.”

No doubt many bishops were serious. But the document they wrote just didn’t seem to fit the crimes and their genesis. The bishops wrote earnestly against the “sexual abuse of minors.” Not once did they mention pederasty, pedophilia, ephebophilia, homosexuality, or, the very appropriate, sodomy, the quintessence of all these evils that God hates. Nor did they condemn the culture of pederasty in the Church, under the protection of bishops and “progressives” who believe that perverse lifestyles are as valid and normal as the God ordained sacrament of marriage and His gift of parenthood. Over the past forty years they have become the gatekeepers for the destruction of the Faith.

For a casual observer, the bishops’ intent seemed plausible. For anyone who has investigated these crimes, the bishops’ plan fell short of the necessary goal of expunging the perverts from the priesthood, seminaries, and chanceries and to eliminate the modernists under whose influence these evils flourished.

The bishops, according to the first article, wanted to “reach out to victims/survivors and the families and demonstrate a sincere commitment to their spiritual and emotional well-being.” The bishops chose this because they feel “the first obligation of the Church with regard to the victims is to healing and reconciliation.” Curiously, for them the first obligation was not the elimination of all pederasts and the culture of pederasty in the seminaries and dioceses, the only way of destroying the vile culture and its network of those who murder innocence. Instead, they chose to be reactive.

The second article of the 2002 Dallas Charter appears to be proactive. The bishops called for “mechanisms in place to respond promptly to any allegation where there is reason to believe that sexual abuse of a minor has occurred.”

The mechanisms, however, are already in place. They were put there by state law, following federal legislation. If they want mechanisms, they can adhere to current law. Responding to the requirements of law doesn’t necessarily include the breach of the Confessional seal. They seem to be proactive, but decades too late.

The bishops added that a review board would be a nice addition to show diocesan compassion. Tell that to the two victims who served on the Orange diocese review board. After a diocese employee discovered child pornography on a priest’s computer, the diocese continued allowing him to serve as priest in the diocese.

According to Steven Greenhut, senior editorial writer for the Orange County Register, the bishop refuses to tell where the priest is and if he is in contact with children. The reason for the apparent cover? The diocese maintains that the mere presence of child porn on a priest’s computer does not violate the diocese’s “zero tolerance” policy.

The first board victim resigned in an e-mail. Writing to the review board’s chairman, the victim had
“expressed significant frustration and concern over the diocese’s failure to take decisive and appropriate action with respect to certain cases reviewed by the board.” The victim said the appointment to the board was touted as a voice for victims. “I feel that voice is being ignored,” the victim wrote.

The second victim appointee wrote in the Register that the diocese was using the self-policing board as a means to cover up abuses. Bishop Tod Brown responded with an attack on her veracity. He said he ordered “files…searched and thorough background checks…conducted to determine whether there ever was a credible accusation made against a priest, religious, or lay person ministering in our diocese.” The bishop failed to say who conducted this thorough checking. Apparently the existence of child porn on a priest’s computer lacks credibility.

So, review boards, touted by the bishops, are not fail-safe mechanisms, and actually can be used to further cover up the pederast culture. As the bishops wrote, the review board members would, “assist the… bishop in assessing allegations and fitness for ministry…” The events in the Orange diocese show that good intentions are easily subverted.

The bishops also railed against “confidentiality agreements” that prevent the truth from finding the light of day. These agreements insulate pedophiles and their perverted ilk against public disclosure that could ruin their careers as serial rapists of children. This was the tactic of choice of former bishop Thomas J. O’Brien of the Phoenix diocese. As bishop, O’Brien was notorious for covering up crimes, moving predatory priests, and forcing confidentiality statements on victims in settlements of claims against the diocese and its several sex crazed priests. He prevented the exposure and prosecution of many predators. He owes victims much that can never be repaid. Money, no matter how much, will never be a balm to heal wounds and amend the destruction of life caused by men who care only for their genitals.

National attention focused on the Phoenix diocese after former Bishop O’Brien was arrested and released following the investigation of a hit and run accident that took the life of a jaywalking pedestrian in June of this year. Shortly thereafter, O’Brien resigned as head of the diocese.

Archbishop Michael J. Sheehan currently administers the diocese. He is aided by Msgr. Richard Moyer and Msgr. Dale Fushek, who has had his trouble with an allegation of sexual impropriety toward an adult male. The case was settled with a confidential agreement and payment of $45,000 to the man. Fushek claimed it was cheaper just to pay the man than to fight it in court. He kindly wanted to save the diocese significant court costs.

Msgr. Fushek helped establish Life Teen, a marginally Catholic service that is intended to get the teens involved and keep them from being bored by the Faith. Teens, often in salacious or grubby clothing, gather round the altar, hold hands, and hug each other. Many course through the aisles hugging and waving to friends amid the din of a low noise that betrays solemnity that the presence of Christ our Lord demands. But for Fushek and his modernist ilk, it’s all about teens anyway.

A “zero tolerance” policy would not apply to the monsignor because his alleged victim, to whom he agreed to pay $45,000, was an adult male. To the folks in the monsignor’s parish, he is heroic. They applauded his return as if he were the victim.

Is there more to Msgr. Fushek than was hidden in the confidentiality agreement entered into with his victim? Perhaps clerics like Fushek, if facing any allegation or having submitted to charges, should be investigated by the new national Office for Child and Youth Protection. Clerics under any form of cloud should be given the opportunity to completely restore their good name. While the presumption of innocence protects suspects, the nature of pederasty, its highly influential network, and the implicit dangers to children demand that these allegations and the fitness of priests under suspicion be thoroughly investigated.

OFFICE FOR CHILD AND YOUTH PROTECTION

It seemed that the bishops had done something right in Dallas. They established a national Office for Child and Youth Protection. Perhaps a mechanism for investigation would come from within the Church to expose and remove pederasts. But the bishops soon dashed those hopes.

Article Eight of the Charter called for the OCYP to: “(1) assist… individual dioceses/eparchies in the implementation of the ‘safe environment’ programs…(2) assist… provinces and regions in the development of appropriate mechanisms to audit adherence to policies, and (3) produce… an annual public
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report on the progress made in implementing the standards in this Charter.” No mention was made whatsoever of investigation, exposing pederasts, uncovering the culture of sodomy in the Church, and elimination of that culture which for over the past forty years has led to the destruction of thousands of Catholic youth and the loss of Faith for an untold number of Catholics.

From the beginning, the OCYP appeared star crossed. A number of pro-pederast bishops threw up obstacles in front of the newly formed office. Former Oklahoma governor, Frank Keating, a Catholic, challenged the bishops. He admonished Cardinal Mahony of Los Angeles for "listening too much to his lawyer and not enough to his heart." Writing for History News Network, C.E. Richard, wrote in “Frank Keating's Brave Reprimand to the Bishops," that Keating was “frustrated by a few unrepentant prelates.” Keating publicly resigned from the board earlier this year after the frustration led him to compare the secrecy and obstinacy of these pro-pederasts with a criminal organization.

Keating wrote in a letter to Bishop Wilton Gregory, president of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, "To resist grand jury subpoenas, to suppress the names of offending clerics, to deny, to obfuscate, to explain away; that is the model of a criminal organization, not my church." While Keating’s explosion may offend some Catholics, Richard, in his article, wrote: “Besides a lesson in humility, His Eminence could use a refresher course in church history. Mahoney might recall that, in his scathing letters and invective, Keating is in fact keeping company with the saints.” Specifically he mentioned the great St. Catherine of Siena. She admonished Pope Gregory XI: "You are in charge of the garden of the holy Church. So uproot from the garden the stinking weeds full of impurity and avarice and bloated with pride. I mean the evil pastors and administrators who poison and corrupt the garden. . . . Use your authority, you who are in charge of us!” Keating continued the noble tradition of lay defense of Catholicism against the timid bishops who fail to act and the criminal syndicate that has caused much ruin.

THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SEXUAL ABUSE

Article Ten calls for the reconstitution of the Ad Hoc Committee on Sexual Abuse to reflect representation from all episcopal regions of the country.


He wrote: “Since the mid-1980s, when public attention became intensely focused on pedophilia, we bishops began to educate ourselves about the problem of sexual abuse with the help of experts.” The excuse of ignorance was used frequently by many bishops in response to news investigations of priestly rape in their dioceses. The bishops knew in the 1980s that these men were dangers to children. They did nothing, other than study and meet in ineffective groups.

Bishop Kinney continued that, “In many ways, 1992 was a watershed year in this learning process. It was then that the case of James Porter received a great deal of public attention. He had abused numerous children and continued to abuse after he had received treatment, left the priesthood, and married. By then, he faced charges in three states.” As allegations came forth the bishops continued their nearly decade long study of pedophilia.

Bishop Kinney claimed the bishops’ conference acted: “It was also in 1992 that the president of the bishops' conference announced the actions which we considered basic to shaping our independent diocesan policies.” He said the policies were “to suspend a priest from his duties immediately and investigate, when there is a well-founded allegation of abuse; to extend pastoral care to the victim and the victim's family; to cooperate with any investigations by civil authorities that might arise; and to deal with the matter as openly as possible, given the circumstances.” Perhaps a few responded in this way, too many did not.

Ten years later the bishops were in Dallas, apologizing for the actions of the pederasts in the Church. They even admitted that they had been “addressing the evil of sexual abuse of minors” since 1992. But it wasn’t the bishops who exposed the crimes. It was the media informed by Catholic laity who rose to the defense of the Church and victims of pederastic rape. While the bishops studied, formed ad hoc committees, and developed policies, pederasts tore the Church apart and were exposed by the media. The bishops reacted only at the continual prodding of reporters and laity demanding results.

When will it end? Bishop Kinney wrote: “In
priestly “misconduct.”

Fr. Ingels even served on the task force that revised the “zero tolerance” policy of the bishops in Dallas. Zero tolerance for the bishops meant that a man would be removed from ministry for committing “even a single act of sexual abuse of a minor- past, present, and future.” Pope John Paul II objected. Five months later, Ingels and others revised the policy to protect the rights of victims and accused priests.

He probably never thought that he’d be found out, as a hypocrite and a pederast.

In May of this year, the San Francisco Chronicle reported that Fr. Ingels was charged with “molesting” a boy more than 30 years ago, a couple of years before his ordination. Police charged him under a controversial California law that allows certain sex crimes to be prosecuted beyond the usual statute of limitations. The law is facing court challenge.

Police taped Fr. Ingels, now 60, during the investigation. He told the victim who is now in his forties, but who was 15 at the time of the rape, “What I did to you was terrible.” He added, “I did this to you… it was an authority issue.”

While no other victims have come forward, the idea of one victim per pederast is unusual, especially since Ingels was teaching at Marin Catholic High School and had easy access to young boys and showed his audacity by engaging in oral sex with the boy during a family gathering at the beach.

This isn’t the first time the San Francisco Archdiocese has heard the charge. In 1996 the diocese investigated but Fr. Ingels continued his ministry. Maurice Healy, spokesman for the archdiocese, said, “Every allegation is unique.” He added that “It may have been handled differently if there had been more than one allegation.”

As of May, Fr. Ingels continued to work on cases for the tribunal and to celebrate Mass at St. Bartholomew Church in San Mateo, the Chronicle reported.

THE STRANGE CASE OF FR. GREGORY INGELS, CANON LAWYER

Fr. Gregory Ingels was a highly regarded canon law authority. As mentioned above, he iterated the right of bishops to use investigative teams to investigate
of authority. They must get serious. Remove the pederasts and restore the One True Faith. The battle is spiritual and temporal. And with God, we will be victorious against the devil’s darkness and perversion.

SIDEBAR

A critique of the bishops’ document on “sexual abuse”

The bishops’ attempt to address the pederasty crisis in the Church is not impressive. The 17 articles of the 2002 Charter offer words when serious action is required.

Before any healing can begin, any reconciliation initiated, any movement made forward, the bishops need to tell the faithful that the pederasty network will be broken and the vile perverts eliminated. They must tell the perverts that no prisoners will be taken; the network will be smashed once and for all. The bishops, contrary to their apparent nature, cannot equivocate. The enemy they face is the ancient one named Satan. His spoor pollutes the Church and needs to be eliminated now.

This can only be done with the intercession of heaven through fervent prayer and sacrifice and the unending action of man. God will not help us unless we help ourselves.

I recommend to the bishops that the Office for Child and Youth Protection be reconstituted to investigate and expose pulpit pederasts and their companions in the chanceries of the nation. I urge this as a former “expert” on child sexual abuse and one who has been trained in conjoint investigations of this vile phenomenon.

I have several citations for my work and proudly was a member of the Louisville Crimes Against Children Unit, the premier child abuse investigation unit in the nation. While with the unit, I investigated many sexual abuse complaints, factitious medical abuse, and other serious crimes where my expertise was welcomed by the detectives. I helped send many criminals to prison. I am proud of my work in the unit and for the cause of real child abuse.

The bishops should approve a division within the OCYP modeled after Louisville’s excellent Crimes Against Children Unit, a joint effort of police detectives and CPS investigators working closely with prosecutors, physicians, and therapists to offer a strongly united offensive against a well entrenched and highly protected perversion that finds among its practitioners men of high status, wealth, and authority. They’ll find many men and women with the necessary skills who want to help the Church extirpate the pederast presence. Battling the pedophile network means uncovering disturbing truths and exposing highly regarded public people who have fooled us in order to preserve their sexual perversions. The bishops must vow to eliminate the perverts and end their insidious compromise of the faith.

There remains a network within the Catholic Church dedicated to the seduction and sexual use of children for the gratification of adult men and a few women. To believe the “sex abuse” problem is over is to deny the reality of the problem. The pederasts found comfort in the church that was deformed by the perversiveness of Vatican II, a pastoral council the excesses of which Pope Paul VI fretted had loosed the smoke of Satan in the sanctuary. Dogma was denied, change for its own sake was made, liturgy was tampered with until it became an absurd psychodrama, homosexuals and other pederasts sponsored by feminists and progressives were admitted to seminaries, bishops were coerced into accepting all kinds of innovation and in their submission to the modernist darkness became pawns of Satan. In fact, the beast tended to convince most modern clergy and progressive theologians that he did not exist. Through the madness and the gloom of the satanic darkness that poured through the Church’s open windows, the innocence of children was destroyed. Pederasts fed on the lambs of the Lamb and nobody in the hierarchy seemed to care.

It can be ended now. The bishops have an opportunity to stop the reign of darkness that has polluted the One True Church. They seem to be akin to the fool, who handling a pistol, shoots himself in the foot to see if it’s loaded. He then shoots himself in the other foot to see if the last shot emptied the chamber. The bishops have shot themselves in one foot with their secrecy and obstinacy in the debacle over Frank Keating. Will they shoot the other foot? Eminences, the pistol is still loaded!

By Dario McDarby
A Matter of Common Sense / Gay Pride Parade Features Catholic Parish/Priest
By Phil Sevilla

For the past 33 years, "gay" pride parades have distinguished San Francisco as the epicenter of the homosexual movement in America. On June 29, I was present to videotape and document with a small group of Catholic and pro-family journalists the parade and events at the Civic Center rotunda. I witnessed frontal nudity, lewd conduct, simulated acts of sodomy, and even profane slogans and caricatures mocking the pope and bishops. I filmed at least one Catholic priest, Father Edward Phelan, and members of his parish in the parade, advertising their affiliation with Most Holy Redeemer Catholic Church (San Francisco.) A 15-year-old student at Mercy Catholic High School in Burlingame, Marina Gatto, daughter of a lesbian couple, trumpeted her pride in participating in the parade as a grand marshal.

The sisters of perpetual indulgence drove by on a float with the sign, "Weapons of Ass Destruction", with characters dressed as the pope and a cardinal. The character dressed up as the pope was enclosed in a cage. Beside them was a missile named "Cheney" (for Vice-President Cheney) made up as a phallic symbol with a character with a Bush mask riding the missile. One transvestite paraded a sign that said, "Sodomize me. It's legal." Another sign read, "I had sodomy for lunch!" It was curious to see representatives of the Church marching between leather-bound, bare-bottomed advocates of sodomy, sex toy shops (good vibes.com), and black-winged, bare-chested devils in leathers, dancing on a float decorated with hell fire.

I contacted the archdiocese of San Francisco to inquire about the participation of a Catholic parish and pastor in his clerics in a gay pride parade. Although no one returned my call, I corresponded by e-mail with the director of communications, Maurice Healy to ask if the Catholic Church in San Francisco was giving, at least, tacit approval to the San Francisco Gay pride parade by allowing Father Phelan to participate in it.

Mr. Healy responded on July 2 saying the archbishop was out of town but that my message would be forwarded to him when he returned. In part he wrote: "As a matter of common sense, I think it would be wrong for you to assume that all marchers agree with or approve of the raunchy examples you cite." In response, I wrote that the spectacle in San Francisco was not only raunchy but pornographic and the parade conveyed a serious, political message with hundreds of identical signs proclaiming, "Support AB205 Domestic Partner Rights" (a reference to the "gay" marriage bill winding its way through Sacramento) and "We All Deserve Freedom to Marry." These signs were placed all along the parade route.

I asked Healy, "can there be any justification for a Catholic priest and his parish to participate in a blatantly pornographic public display? Would German Catholic bishops and priests have marched with the National Socialists and saluted Hitler in 1939, or Lot and his family cavort with the perverted and decadent people of Sodom?" I received no response.

September 2003 San Francisco Faith
A direct violation of the seal of confession? Does anyone care?

It has been almost four months since various members of the hierarchy were notified regarding a possible direct violation of the seal of confession. Despite the fact that the alleged victims provided signed, notarized statements—neither their bishop nor any Vatican official has taken action or even acknowledged an investigation is underway.

Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc
September 16, 2003

The Congregation for Divine Worship and
The Discipline of the Sacraments
Prefect: His Eminence Francis Cardinal Arinze
Piazza Pio XII 10, 00193 Rome, Italy

RE: Violation of the seal of confession

Your Eminence,

I am writing you regarding an alleged direct violation of the seal of confession by Father Adrian Vorderlandwehr (pastor at St. Wenceslaus in Prague, Oklahoma), and Bishop Eusebius J. Beltran’s (Archdiocese of Oklahoma City USA) apparent failure to take appropriate action. We are also requesting that the victim, Mr. Mitch Hutchens, be provided due process.

Fr. Adrian Vorderlandwehr, OSB was the seventh Abbot of St. Gregory’s Abbey in Shawnee, Oklahoma elected March 14, 1979. He retired as Abbot October 15, 1988.

Our organization was contacted by Mr. and Mrs. Mitch Hutchens because they felt Bishop Beltran had not taken appropriate action against Fr. Vorderlandwehr for his revealing the contents of Mitch’s confession to his wife and a third party one Sandra Moore. Signed and notarized statements of both Barbara and Mitch Hutchens are enclosed.

According to Mrs. Barbara Hutchens, on or about December 19, 2001 her husband, Mitch, went to confession to Fr. Vorderlandwehr. A short time later (after the holidays) Father approached Mrs. Hutchens and revealed the contents of her husband’s confession. According to Mrs. Hutchens, Father also revealed the contents of Mitch’s confession to a Mike and Sandra Moore. Mr. Mitch Hutchens confirmed this. The Hutchens brought this matter to the attention of their bishop with no result.

Upon further investigation and a search of public records we found that Father Adrian at times lives with one Mr. Georges Franchelin (also known as Christian) whom he refers to as his “cook.” Public court records reveal that Father and Mr. Franchelin own property (real estate) jointly (Copy of court record enclosed). This fact suggests their relationship is more then just an employer-employee relationship especially since, as Charles Buckley of St Gregory’s confirmed to me in an e-mail, according to the rule of St. Benedict “Implicit in this is that I [Fr. Vorderlandwehr] do not possess [have ownership] anything individually but that we hold all things in common.”

Also, according to information our office received from a Mr. James Brooks of Sparks, OK., In February of 2003 he approached Father Vorderlandwehr regarding what appeared to be Father’s inappropriate relationship and living arrangement with Georges Franchelin (Christian) at which point Mr. Franchelin moved out of Father’s residence and provided a letter to be given to all parishioners (copy enclosed). It has been reported to RCF that Mr. Franchelin is now back at the parish.

It is our request that you take immediate action in this case. Also, considering the fact that Canon Law states (Can. 1388) that a violation of the seal of confession incurs an automatic (latae sententiae) excommunication, can Fr. Adrian’s celebration of the Mass be considered valid and is he allowed to continue to administer the Sacraments?

Sincerely, Stephen G. Brady, President
Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc

cc. Apostolic Nuncio to the United States,
His Excellency Gabriel Montalvo, J.C.D.,
3339 Massachusetts Ave., NW,
Washington, DC 20008-3687
Phone: 202-333-7121 / Fax: 202-337-4036

Most Rev. Eusebius J. Beltran,
Archdiocese of Oklahoma City, USA,
7501 Northwest Expwy., PO Box 32180,
Oklahoma City, OK 73123
Phone: 405-721-5651 / Fax: 405-721-5210
Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc.

March 31, 2003

Most Rev. William Skylstad
Vice President, U. S. Conference of Catholic Bishops
Catholic Pastoral Center
W. 1023 Riverside Ave., PO Box 1453
Spokane, WA 99210-1453

Your Excellency:

I am writing to you on behalf of Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc., a lay organization dedicated to fighting heterodoxy and corruption in the hierarchy. We demand that you resign your position as Vice President of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, a position which normally leads to the presidency of that organization. Our reasons are as follows:

1. When you were bishop of Yakima, you knew that Fr. Dale Calhoun was a child molester. Instead of removing him from the priesthood, you made a deal with Archbishop Hunthausen of Seattle to take Calhoun off your hands and place him in the Seattle Archdiocese. Hunthausen gave Calhoun an administrative position and allowed him to reside at St. Anne’s parish – a parish with a grade school. In fact, Calhoun’s residence looked out on a school yard. Further details on Fr. Calhoun are detailed in the Supreme Court case C.J.C. v. Catholic Bishop of Yakima, 985 P.2d 262 (Wash. 1999), although I suspect you have read that case by now.

2. Your negligence in failing to protect children was further brought to light by comments from Bellevue attorney Tim Kosnoff in the September 21, 2002 issue of The Olympian, wherein Kosnoff was quoted as stating “He knew children were being abused and he said nothing.” Your quoted reply also included these remarks:

“We judge things 20 years ago by what we know now. The presumption is we knew a lot more than we actually did.”

“Unfortunately society demonizes abusers………….”

3. In your present diocese of Spokane, you have placed Fr. Adrian Parcher in a position of trust and responsibility as Pastor of St. Thomas More parish. Fr. Parcher was formerly Abbot of St. Martin’s monastery in Lacey, Washington. There, he abused his position of authority by entering into homosexual liaisons with other monks and with novices. After someone attempted to blackmail Parcher, he paid that person off using monastery funds. He was removed after his unauthorized use of monastery funds was discovered. Fr. Parcher’s reputation was notorious at the monastery. He had his abbot’s crozier custom-made with diamonds; his nickname at the monastery was ‘Fr. Nancy.’

4. On February 27, 2003 your diocesan column The Bishop Writes contains statements that further disqualify you from leading the nation’s bishops.

You stated, “research does not indicate whether or not pedophilia has anything to do with whether one is heterosexual or homosexual. Some of the priests who abused teen boys were, however, likely to have been homosexual in orientation, which contributed to the confusion.” This is the usual purposeful misdirection that we have come to expect from our bishops. In point of fact, pedophilia technically refers only to sexual abuse directed at those age 12 and under. Most of the children abused by priests have been between the ages of 13 and 17. The vast majority of children molested were boys who were molested by homosexual priests. As reported in The Washington Times (6/12/02):

The Family Research Council has now connected the dots to show the evidence of a direct correlation between homosexuality and child sexual abuse — one that existed long before the priest scandals. In a paper titled “Homosexuality and Child Sexual Abuse,” author Dr. Timothy J. Dailey has documented three key facts:

• The vast majority of child molesters are male (the Journal of Sex Research says that “pedophilia does not exist, or is extremely rare, in women”).

• The percentage of the male population that is homosexual is quite small (only 2.5 percent of males, according to one estimate in the journal Demography).

• Since almost all molesters are men and the vast majority of men are heterosexual, one would expect that nearly all of the children molested would be girls. However, this is not the case. In fact, a significant percentage of the victims of child sexual abuse are boys (a study in the Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy found that 36 per-
percent of male sex offenders had victimized male children).

Thus, it appears that less than 3 percent of the total male population (namely, men who are homosexual) are committing more than 30 percent of the total child sexual abuse (namely, that which is committed by men against boys). Logic thus suggests that in proportion to their numbers, homosexual men are far more likely to be child molesters than are heterosexual men.

The three legs of this argument (most molesters are men; very few men are homosexual; but a third of sex abuse cases involve men molesting boys) are essentially uncontested. So how do homosexual activists avoid the logical conclusion? Only by asserting that men who molest boys are not “homosexuals.”

They support this claim with two arguments. One is that “pedophilia” is somehow a separate sexual orientation unto itself, unrelated to a “homosexual” identity. Yet a study of convicted child molesters, published in the Archives of Sexual Behavior, found that “86 percent of offenders against males described themselves as homosexual or bisexual.”

The second argument is that any offender who has ever engaged in heterosexual activity cannot be classified as “homosexual.” But this overlooks the wide range of sexual behavior in which many homosexuals have engaged. Ironically, when they find it in their interest, homosexual activists will use a much broader definition of “gay” — for example, counting as “gay parents” even some people who are still in heterosexual marriages.

Other defensive statements, like “most child molesters are not homosexual” or “most homosexuals are not child molesters,” may be true, but are irrelevant. The shocking figure is the relative rate of molestation by homosexuals, not the absolute numbers.

In addition to behavioral studies like those above, the writings of homosexual authors demonstrate a strong undercurrent of fascination with what is euphemistically called “intergenerational love.” Gay activist David Thorstad says, “Boy-lovers were involved in the gay movement from the beginning.” Leading anthologies of “gay literature” prominently feature stories about “the love of older men for young boys.” Paula Martinac, a lesbian writer for the Washington Blade, recently acknowledged that among some gay men, “adult-youth sex is viewed as an important aspect of gay culture.”

Saddest of all is the evidence that homosexual child abuse is a vicious circle, increasing the chances that its victims will become homosexual themselves — and that they will victimize others. One expert reports that “boys victimized by older men were over four times more likely to be currently engaged in homosexual activity.” Another study found that 59 percent of male sex offenders against children reported being a “victim of contact sexual abuse as a child.”

The evidence is in — homosexuality is a clear risk factor for child sexual abuse. This fact should impact our decisions not only on qualifications for the priesthood, but also on homosexual adoption, “gay-friendly” policies in schools, and “gay rights” laws that force schools, day care centers and youth camps to hire homosexuals.

The “exclusionary” policy of the Boy Scouts is looking better all the time.

In your column you also wrote: “Also surprising were the strong feelings expressed by a very small minority who seemed to believe that anyone even inclined toward a homosexual orientation could not possibly be a good priest, forgetting that all priests make a promise of celibacy, regardless of orientation. Those who speak with such certitude on this issue should review the Gospels, where our Lord speaks of the importance of loving one’s neighbors and not being judgmental. No one was excluded from his exhortation.”

Sorry, bishop, your beef should not be with those persons who wrote to you, but with the Vatican. The Vatican’s 1961 Document, “Careful Selection and Training of Candidates for the States of Perfection and Sacred Orders” states:

Advancement to religious vows and ordination should be barred to those who are afflicted with evil tendencies to homosexuality or pederasty, since for them the common life and the priestly ministry would constitute serious dangers.

More recently, a May 16, 2002 letter from Cardinal Jorge Medina Estevez, former prefect of the Vatican’s Congregation for Divine Worship stated:

Ordination to the deaconate or priesthood of persons with homosexual tendencies is absolutely unadvisable and imprudent, and from a pastoral point of view, extremely risky.

In conclusion, by your actions you have demonstrated that you are unfit for a leadership position among bishops.

Sincerely, Stephen G. Brady, President
Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc.
cc: His Eminence, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger
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Polygraph examination of Joseph Paul Kellenyi, carried out at 1 Robert Street, London WC2 on 21st October 2002. A total of 19 questions was asked - relevant questions were numbered as be Mr. Kellenyi's responses are shown in **Bold** type.

5. Did you write a document entitled “Final report to the committee for the American College of Louvain” dated March 2001?  
   **Yes**

6. Did you, in March 2001, mail a copy of this final report to each of the 20 recipients listed in the report?  
   **Yes**

7. Did you later cause this document to be published on the world wide web?  
   **Yes**

8. Is everything you wrote in this “final report” the truth?  
   **Yes**

10. Is the person referred to in the final report as “student X” or “seminarian X” a man called Patrick van Durme?  
    **Yes**

11. In April 2000, following your allegations of sexual misconduct, did you participate in a “mediation meeting” with David Windsor, Patrick van Durme and Kevin Codd?  
    **Yes**

12. At that meeting did Patrick van Durme loudly exclaim “I am very comfortable with David”?  
    **Yes**

13. Did he then repeat the words “very comfortable” four time more at an increasing volume each time?  
    **Yes**

14. Did David Windsor reprimand Patrick van Durme in any way?  
    **No**

16. Have you and I both signed a document entitled “Questions about the August 1999 conversation between Joe Kellenyi and Rev John Canary, Rector of Mundelein Seminary”?  
    **Yes**

17. Did you write that document?  
    **Yes**

18. Are the contents of that document the truth?  
    **Yes**

Having carefully analysed the charts produced by the Polygraph instrument whilst Mr. Kellenyi was connected to it, and whilst I asked the agreed questions and he responded to them, I can state quite categorically that all his replies were truthful.

NB The document referred to in question 16 is attached to this exhibit.
Questions about the August 1999 conversation between Joe Kellenyi and Rev. John Canary, Rector of Mundelein Seminary:

Rev. Canary began by telling me that there was an “issue” with me (although it is not found in my written evaluation- for obvious reasons). He said certain priests on the faculty felt that I was not “transparent” enough to them. Also, one feminist nun had a problem with me. While I do not remember my exact words, I politely but firmly told him, essentially to “cut the bullshit.” I told him that while I had no formation issues, the real issue was that the priests in question belonged to the “alternative lifestyle” clique, and that “people like that don’t like people like me.” Rev. Canary confirmed this was the case. Then he said I was welcome to return, after all I had no “issues.” However, he said that without the support of these priests, and their friend the nun, I would lack the votes to be “endorsed” at the end of the following year. He stated that I had a good personality, and that if I wanted to, I would be able to get these (gay) priests and the nun to like me. I agreed.

Then I told Rev. Canary that I had some problems with the Chicago Diocese. I told him that I perceived that while Cardinal Bernardin had probably lived a celibate life, and may not have abused Steven Cook, that he also was flamingly gay.1 I said that I perceived that under Bernardin’s regime, Chicago had become like Santa Rosa under Bishop Zieman. I said that in Santa Rosa, those priests and seminarians not in the bishop’s gay clique were treated unjustly, and that the same was true of Chicago under Bernardin. I said that I perceived that Bernardin fostered and promoted a network of gay priests and bishops, and that they protected each other, covered up each other’s “mistakes”, and promoted one another to positions of responsibility in Chicago and the church at large. I alluded to the fact that Bernardin had appointed Rev. Canary, and that he in turn had appointed the formation faculty.

Rev. Canary’s response was “Your perception is accurate. The question is what are you going to do about it.”

1 I cannot recall if the exact word I used was “flaming”, but I used words to that effect.

[Signature]

[Date: 7/10/02]
AN AFFIDAVIT

I, Jeremy Barrett, of One Heights Close, London SW20 0TH, MAKE OATH and say as follows:-

1. I am the Managing Director of a company called Polygraph Security Services which provides a Polygraph (or lie detection) service. I was trained in the science of Polygraphy by the Zonn Corporation, in Miami, Florida, USA, in 1982. Polygraph Security Services was incorporated on 30th June 1983. I have carried out many hundreds of Polygraph Examinations in the United Kingdom, Europe, Middle East and Asia.

Clients are referred to me by organisations such as the Law Society, the Register of Expert Witnesses, Legal Experts and many previous clients. These clients include several Foreign Governments, National Security Agencies, Police Forces, International Corporations, Banks, Airlines, Shipping companies and Hotels - a wide variety of businesses, large and small, in addition to many private individuals with specific problems.

The Polygraph Instrument which I use is a Lafayette Ambassador model, which is acknowledged, and widely accepted, to be a highly accurate piece of equipment.

2. On Monday 21st October 2002 I met Joseph Paul Kellenyi, by arrangement, in central London. He had travelled from Belgium in order for me to give him a Polygraph examination in connection with a variety of matters relating to his experiences. I identified Mr Kellenyi by means of his American passport number 0245354085USA6005188M0303077. Mr Kellenyi had provided me with an internet website address www.americancollegescandal.com to give me some background to his situation and he had also prepared a list of potential questions for my possible use. In addition, Mr Kellenyi submitted to my lengthy interview with a full and frank attitude.

3. Having been given such a detailed account of events and occurrences which have lead up to the current situation, I was able to prepare a series of questions which I proposed to ask Mr Kellenyi whilst he was connected to the Polygraph instrument. As is established practice, each question was discussed in detail to ensure that Mr Kellenyi was able to answer it with a definitive “Yes” or “No” response. I then connected Mr Kellenyi to the instrument and prepared to conduct the agreed test.

4. My training and experience in the science of Polygraphy enabled me to analyse the charts produced by the Polygraph instrument whilst I asked the questions as shown, and recorded the answers as shown, in order to establish whether Mr Kellenyi responded truthfully.

There is no doubt that Mr Kellenyi was truthful in all his responses.

5. There is now produced a copy of the relevant questions which I asked Mr Kellenyi. His answer to each question is printed in bold type at the conclusion of that question. The relevant questions and answers are set out in exhibit JB/1.
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This twenty third day of October 2002

Before me [Signature]

PEACOCK

DX 35055

WIMBLED:

PEACOCK & CO.

DX 35055

WIMBLEDON VILLAGE

Faye Lygo, Solicitor

Pearcock & Co, 94 High Street, Wimbledon Village, London SW19 5EV

Page 33
Readers of this article may recall my name from Michael S. Rose’s book, *Goodbye, Good Men*. Having read my polygraph results in this issue of AMDG, one will of course realize that all the information attributed to me in Mr. Rose’s book is true. But this polygraph result has far greater significance than that. The polygraph results show that I discovered in 1999 that Cardinal Bernardin had fostered a network of gay priests and bishops who were covering up one another’s sexual indiscretions. The rector of Mundelein Seminary confirmed this fact.

The most widely known and respected polygraph firm in England administered this test. The accuracy of the results was 100% and the polygraph administrator swore to this before a British magistrate.

I have given RCF permission to make public the original copy of the above polygraph results because I did not want to go to my grave with my knowledge of the late Cardinal Bernardin’s homosexuality. Bernardin’s perverse sexuality has long been common knowledge among well-informed Catholics and often alluded to publicly. However, this polygraph result constitutes, in my opinion, the long sought ‘smoking gun’ that establishes for posterity the fact that the late Cardinal was in fact homosexual.

In my own life, I have twice suffered from the consequences of Joe Bernardin’s homosexuality. When I was a seminarian at Mundelein, Bernardin had appointed the rectors (one of whom at least was certainly homosexual) who appointed the overwhelmingly gay formation faculty that discriminated against me because I was heterosexual. When I discovered a homosexual scandal at the American College of Louvain, the bishop responsible tried to cover it up. He is a homosexual with ties to Bernardin. (It is nearly certain that Bernardin played a role in this priest becoming a bishop).

In addition, anyone who reads this polygraph result will realize that it helps prove, not just that Bernardin was homosexual, but it helps prove the existence of an organized network of homosexual priests and bishops, centered in Chicago with tentacles throughout the American hierarchy. Even before the Boston clerical scandals exploded, I discovered the fact that some bishops and priests mentored by Bernardin were covering up for one another’s ‘mistakes’ and promoted each other’s ecclesiastical careers.

This polygraph result helps prove that the Bernardin network of priests and bishops actively discriminated against heterosexual seminarians and priests.

The man who corroborated these facts is Rev. John Canary, rector of Mundelein Seminary. He was in a unique position to know. He was appointed by Bernardin to his current position, and (according to the *New York Times*) was chosen by Bernardin to handle the archdiocese’s response to the priestly sex abuse scandals that hit Chicago in the 1980’s. Rev. Canary belonged socially and professionally to Bernardin’s inner circle of friends.

At this point, I should state emphatically that I have no animosity towards Rev. Canary, and that we have mutual (non-priest) friends. Moreover, in his dealings with the seminarians, Rev. Canary was always professional and above reproach. In other words, there was nothing in Rev. Canary’s personal behavior that would have made me think he was homosexual. But the reader must look closely at the polygraph results. Rev. Canary admitted that he had hired a formation faculty that was predominantly homosexual, and he admitted that these people were biased against heterosexual people. He admitted that he had given the gay clique (whom he hired) veto power over Chicago seminarians. Moreover, he socialized and vacationed with these gay priests. Does the reader really believe that any heterosexual priest would have purposefully hired a group of gay men and homosexualist nuns and allowed them to discriminate against heterosexual seminarians?

Now, one could argue that Rev. Canary might be heterosexual, and that he promoted a homosexual agenda simply in order to please his then boss, Cardinal Bernardin. Yet how would one explain away the fact that Canary was still pursuing this agenda after Bernardin’s death, and under Cardinal George’s nose?

Rev. Canary’s admission to me that his formation faculty was homosexual, and the fact that he hired them, does raise a character issue. I say this because after the publication of *Goodbye, Good Men*, he issued a tepid statement that he was unaware of any homosexual problem at Mundelein, and that everything was just fine.

This presumably chaste homosexual/homosexualist priest used his authority to promote a homosexual agenda and to treat heterosexual seminarians and priests unjustly.

Now, let us imagine for the moment that Joe
Bernardin lived a celibate and chaste life as a priest. How then would Rev. Canary know that Bernardin was a homosexual? The point is that you do not need to catch a priest or bishop in an act of sodomy to be able to say that the man is homosexual. The fact is that I never saw any of Bernardin’s friends engage in sexual acts. But I saw many of Bernardin’s appointees and friends say and do things that no heterosexual man would ever say or do. For example, I have publicly suggested that Bishop Ed Braxton (a former Chicago priest under Bernardin) is homosexual, and I informed Archbishop Dolan that I am convinced that I could prove, in an ecclesiastical or civil court, that Braxton is homosexual. In a letter to Archbishop Dolan (August 19, 2003), I offered to cooperate with a formal inquiry into Rev. David Windsor’s history of homosexual misconduct. In that letter, I informed Archbishop Dolan that:

You should also know that in more than one published article, I have sharply criticized the bishop responsible for the Louvain seminary (Ed Braxton) for his attempts to protect Rev. Windsor. An article in Crisis magazine pointed out that I have publicly suggested that Bishop Braxton is homosexual. I have in fact done so. However, my credibility is surely enhanced by the fact that I stand by my remarks. As part of an inquiry into Rev. Windsor’s sexual misconduct, I am prepared to present to any tribunal, civil or ecclesiastical, evidence that strongly indicates that Ed Braxton is homosexual. The evidence establishes beyond any doubt that he is at the very least a homosexualist of dubious moral character, and that he has lied to his fellow bishops about matters related to Windsor.

His (Braxton) association with Bernardin, and my personal impression of him, lead me to suspect that he was homosexual. The public record of his behavior, and things he has said and written, confirmed my impression and allow me to state quite confidently that he could not possibly be heterosexual. Moreover, Archbishop Dolan’s refusal to allow an inquiry into Rev. Windsor’s homosexual misconduct may reasonably be interpreted as an implicit acknowledgement that he (Dolan) is well aware of Bishop Braxton’s homosexuality. Further, I have met Braxton personally, and others have confirmed my (admittedly subjective) impression that he is “prissy” and feminine.

Another question arises. After barely nine months as a seminarian, I was willing to confront my rector with my perception that the late Cardinal Bernardin was not just homosexual, but a flagrant homosexual, and have this confirmed. I would urge the reader to search the New York Times archives for an article entitled “Can this Man Save the Catholic Church?” The article is about Wilton Gregory, and in it he describes in detail how Bernardin mentored and handpicked him, grooming him from early on for a leadership position. Now, am I so much smarter than Bishop Gregory that it took me less than nine months of observation to discover that Bernardin was gay, yet Gregory never figured it out after a lifetime of close collaboration with Bernardin? At the very least, one can reasonably presume that Bishop Gregory is well aware of the fact that he is where he is today because a gay Cardinal took a special interest in him at a young age. Bishop Gregory has benefited directly from the combination of homosexuality and power in the Church. This alone would explain his waffling over the gay priest problem.

When I confronted Rev. Canary about Bernardin’s gay clique, Rev. Canary did not ask me for a list of names. If he had, I was willing to name twenty-plus priests and bishops. When I approached Rev. Canary with my concerns, I had observed that, almost without exception, every priest and bishop that I knew had been mentored, befriended, favored, or promoted in any way by Bernardin was homosexual. I am going to name some of these men, but the reader will have to take my word about who was on my list when I confronted Rev. Canary. However, since the polygraph proves I am telling the truth about the existence of the clique, why would I lie about who I thought was in it? In any case, the reader is free to believe, or not, that when I confronted Rev. Canary, these were some of the men I was referring to.

At the top of my list was Rev. Ken Velo, whom Bernardin appointed to head the Catholic Extension Society. Bernardin has publicly referred to Velo as his closest friend, and they were housemates. But there is a dark side to this friendship. Bernardin appointed Velo to handle the priestly sexual abuse crisis that Chicago faced in the 1980’s. I would refer the reader to Jason Berry’s book Lead us Not into Temptation for an account of how Ken Velo treated the victims of sexual abuse by Chicago priests. In other words, Bernardin appointed a gay man, who himself knew Bernardin was gay, to handle a homosexual priest scandal in the diocese. That is an unacceptable conflict of interest, and clouds the results of any and all investigations done by Velo. What questions were not asked, what leads were not followed? Even worse, Bernardin tried to make Velo a bishop, and the Extension Society job is viewed by some as a
‘stepping stone’ to the episcopate.

But there are others. When I confronted Rev. Canary about these gay bishops, most emphatically I had in mind Gerry Kicanas (currently bishop in Tucson). Kicanas was Canary’s predecessor as rector of Mundelein (appointed by Bernardin). During Kicanas’ term as rector, the homosexual lifestyle flourished at Mundelein even more than under Canary. So, the gay seminary rector, who hired a predominantly gay faculty and (at the very least) tolerated a homosexual seminary culture, gets made an auxiliary bishop by the gay Cardinal. That is how the “Lavender Mafia” works. But it gets worse. Scandalous bishops have plagued the Tucson diocese. The last bishop resigned in disgrace because he let his homosexual priests run amok. His predecessor was an active, predatory homosexual. And now they are given another gay bishop! That is just as bad as what happened in Palm Beach. If Cardinal George had anything to do with that appointment, he owes an apology and explanation to the people of Tucson.

Kicanas was not the only gay bishop appointed by Bernardin. When I confronted Canary, I was also referring to a former Chicago priest, now Bishop Vlazny. Since then others have commented on Vlazny’s behavior. I also knew about Imesch in Joliet. I do not know if Bernardin played a role in Imesch’s appointment, but Imesch was certainly in the clique with Bernardin’s pals. I noticed the Chicago priest assigned (by Bernardin) to the staff of the US bishop’s conference was gay.

Part of my polygraph results deal with my perception that the Bernardin clique treated both heterosexual seminarians and priests unjustly. I was quite specific about this, not just in reference to myself. I had observed that, shortly before his death, Bernardin had appointed homosexual priests to a number of prominent positions within the diocese. Heterosexual priests were notably lacking among those appointments. I was well aware that Bernardin had placed Ken Velo in a position to determine where Chicago priests were assigned. I saw that Rev. Canary was trying to purge the seminary faculty of certain heterosexual priests who were opposed to the gay lifestyle. The priests told me this themselves.

The polygraph results also prove the existence at Mundelein of a phenomenon I described in Michael Rose’s book, Goodbye, Good Men. I did not use the phrase “fag hag”, but many readers I spoke to recognized the insinuation. Simply put, the militant feminist nuns on the faculty preferred the company of gay men. And some heterosexual priests on the faculty did share my observations about the power the ‘fag hag’ nuns had at the seminary.

Lastly, part of my polygraph deals with the homosexual scandal at the American College of Louvain, described in detail at www.americancollegescandal.com. As the reader can see in the polygraph results, the seminarian Rev. David Windsor (then rector) was involved with, shouted to me, in the presence of Windsor and a witness, and I quote:


In his own words, that was how the seminarian that sexually harassed me described his relationship with our rector (David). The rector did not contradict the seminarian. This fits in nicely with the things that David and the seminarian put in writing, which revealed that each was homosexual and involved with the other, but that the seminarian was the dominant partner. Moreover, the polygraph results, in my opinion, proved the truth of all the information contained in The Final Report to the Bishop’s Committee for the American College of Louvain: On the Issue of Sexual Misconduct in regards to the Rector, Rev. David Windsor.

These polygraph results pose some other serious questions. Were Steven Cook’s lawyers aware that Bernardin was homosexual? Or did the Archdiocese withhold that information? Was Bernardin asked about his sexual orientation during the Steven Cook affair? Will people finally admit that Bernardin’s “Common Ground” initiative is tainted by his homosexuality? Will the people in Tucson be told who knew that their new bishop is gay, and who was responsible for his appointment? Will Wilton Gregory deny knowing that Bernardin was gay? Andrew Greeley has insinuated that Bernardin was gay. Will he now come out and simply admit that he knew it all along?

Shortly after my conversation with Rev. Canary, I left the Chicago diocese and my new bishop sent me to Belgium to study. At that time I had never even heard of RCF. I was completely unaware of the things they knew about Bernardin, Imesch, Vlazny and others. I only became aware of RCF after meeting with Michael S. Rose in 2002. RCF has spent years and thousands of dollars exposing the homosexual network around Bernardin, and has published many of their findings in detail. I discovered, independently, the broad outlines of what they have discovered about the “Bernardin Boys”.

Joe Kellenyi
November 13, 2003, the Springfield Diocese, under the direction of Bishop George Lucas, released its report on “past sexual abuse of minors.”

According to the “Catholic Times,” (the official paper of the Diocese)

“Since 1950, the Catholic Diocese of Springfield in Illinois has received 43 credible allegations of sexual abuse of a minor against 14 diocesan priests…”

“The results of the national study, covering U.S. Catholic dioceses during the period between 1950 and 2003, are scheduled for release in the second week of February 2004.”

While the abuse report, as covered in the Diocesan newspaper, made no mention of homosexual predator Bishop Daniel Ryan, Ryan was mentioned in a follow-up story which ran in the November 15, 2003 issue of the Springfield State Journal-Register (SJR). The article by Abbey Brown was titled “14 from diocese accused of abuse in last 53 years.”

According to Miss Kathie Sass, Diocesan spokesman, as reported in the article, “allegations against Ryan are among those submitted in the report.” This is the first time that I am aware of, that anyone from the Diocese admitted Ryan was indeed an abuser. But it was not the most disturbing statement made by Sass. According to the article Sass stated that “An allegation is deemed credible until it is disproved.” “When someone cares enough to report it, (sexual abuse) it generally has really happened,” she said. “Very rarely are allegations not credible.”

That unbelievable statements contradicts the diocese’s actions since Roman Catholic Faithful (RCF) first contacted Diocesan and Church authorities with allegations accusing Ryan of abuse in 1996. The Church hierarchy went to great lengths to cover-up Ryan’s abuse and attempted to destroy my credibility as well as that of RCF and all the victims. In short– The Diocese and various Church authorities lied until public pressure and exposure forced them to come clean.

As most of you are aware, in March of this year, RCF attorney, James Bendell, and I were interviewed by Bob Bennett of the Bishops’ Review Board regarding the Ryan Case, at which time we submitted hundreds of pages of documents to back up our claims. The introduction to the Bennett report follows.

Introduction to the Bennett Report, submitted by Stephen G. Brady, President,

Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc (RCF)
207 South 7th Street, Petersburg, Illinois 62675
Phone: (217) 632-5920 / Fax: (217) 632-7054 / www.rcf.org / sbrady@rcf.org
March 14, 2003

Wednesday, January 14, 1998
Archbishop George called me (Stephen Brady) tonight asking that RCF not hold the press conference. The Cardinal stated: "If your first priority is to remove Ryan do not go public," He said the Vatican would not work through the Press. He informed me that by going public we would be stuck with Ryan. I then asked the Cardinal; “You mean if I go public with this information the Vatican will leave a sexual abuser in power rather then face embarrassment?” He did not answer. He offered me (RCF) “a relationship with the hierarchy” if I (RCF) “remained obedient to the Church.” Upon further questioning I realized this meant keeping my mouth shut. AB George Fax xxx-xxx-xxxx phone 312-751-xxxx (Rectory)

I am here today to present you with the results of our more than five-year investigation of Bishop Daniel Ryan, the former bishop of Springfield, Illinois. We believe the information we have will prove beyond any doubt that while Bishop Ryan was engaged in homosexual activity with priests, teenage boys, and laymen, certain members of the hierarchy, including Cardinal Francis George of Chicago, Bishop George Lucas of Springfield, Bishop Joseph Imesch of Joliet, former Papal Nuncio
Augustino Cacciavillan and others, worked together to protect Ryan and allow him to continue to sexually abuse individuals, in an effort to protect their own credibility and save themselves embarrassment. We have reason to believe that one or more of these bishops who have involved themselves in the protection of Ryan were themselves compromised because of their own homosexual activity.

Our investigation of Bishop Daniel Ryan began in 1996, with a letter to Cardinal Bernardin of Chicago who was still alive at the time, asking him for help in correcting the situations occurring within the Springfield Diocese. Included in the copies of the documents we are providing you with today, is a letter we received from Cardinal Bernardin’s chief of staff, informing us he did not want to become involved in any situation outside his own diocese. The reason this is so peculiar and unheard of is that Cardinal Bernardin, as the Metropolitan and Archbishop in Chicago, Illinois, did have an obligation to pass on to the Holy See any information that was detrimental to the Faith, concerning the bishops under his jurisdiction, which would have included Bishop Ryan and the other dioceses in Illinois.

In October of 1996, our first interviews and first-hand account of Ryan’s homosexual activity came from Father John Reeves, who at the time was living in Jacksonville, Illinois. While the details will be provided in the documentation, I will give you a brief summary of each individual’s testimony regarding Bishop Ryan’s activities. Father Reeves explained to us how Ryan’s persistent and continuous predatory homosexual advances towards him made his life a living hell, taking him on confirmation trips with him, demanding sex, as a new priest taking him with him on trips to Joliet, Illinois, staying at a place called Charley’s in Palatine, etc. Father Reeves was continually propositioned by Ryan and on numerous occasions Father Reeves admitted to engaging in sexual activity with Bishop Ryan.

Father Peter Mascari, now deceased, of Athens and Sherman, Illinois, gave me first-hand testimony to the fact that he, himself, had notified Bishop Ryan’s Chancery staff shortly before Father Reeves was ordained, that Father Reeves was indeed an active homosexual.

He gave them an example of a situation that existed with the Franciscans, where Father Reeves was a Brother prior to his ordination by Bishop Daniel Ryan as a diocesan priest for Springfield. Despite this warning from Father Mascari, Father John Reeves was ordained by Bishop Ryan and subsequently used as Bishop Ryan’s sexual play toy.

The next individual we interviewed was a Father xxxxxx, .... I think it is important to note here that Father xxxxx gave us first-hand testimony to Ryan’s sexual advances towards him on numerous occasions. Cardinal George (new to Chicago), the Papal Nuncio and Vatican officials were all made aware of both Father Reeves’ and Father xxxxx testimony. At no time during this was Father xxxxx relieved of his priestly faculties indicating the hierarchy felt he was lying. In fact, Bishop George Lucas (Ryan’s replacement) gave him permission to act as a Chaplain in another state, as Father xxx wanted nothing to do with a diocese where retired Bishop Daniel Ryan was still active. They all knew xxxxx had given us first-hand testimony...

We also interviewed a Father Lichtenberger, who at the time had left the active priesthood, but was technically still a priest and working for the Illinois State Police. Father Lichtenberger gave us very little information. He did tell us that while he was living at the Cathedral rectory he knew for a fact that male prostitutes came to the rectory to see Ryan.

Next was Father y, an active priest within the diocese of Springfield. Again, Father y’s testimony was made known to Jimmy Lago, Cardinal George’s investigator, and Cardinal George. Bishop Lucas also had that information available, as did the Papal Nuncio. Father y told of Bishop Ryan’s sexual advances towards him, kissing him on the lips, etc., and basically explained that he suffered the same homosexual advances as did Father John Reeves.

During this whole time we did go to the Papal Nuncio with the facts, and subsequently to Cardinal George when he was installed as Archbishop of Chicago, providing them with the details of this information. Yet no one was interested in taking any action or conducting an investigation. We solicited the help of a Father John Hardon from Detroit, now deceased. Father Hardon had worked for the Vatican for some thirty years. His superior, according to Father Hardon, was Cardinal Gagnon. Father Hardon took Father xxxxx under his wing, even made a trip to Rome to visit with Archbishop Hoyos, the Prefect of the Congregation of the Clergy, to try to get some action taken regarding Bishop Daniel Ryan. Father Hardon made it clear to me that the hierarchy had known of Bishop Ryan’s problem for some time. He did not get much more specific than that, but made it very clear that the members of the hierarchy were
aware of Ryan’s homosexual activity. At one point he informed me that at least twelve other bishops were backing Bishop Ryan, in defense of his remaining an active bishop within the Springfield diocese. When Father Hardon made his trip to Rome, to the Vatican, he took along with him a Dr. Richard Fitzgibbons from Pennsylvania. I have provided his information to you contained within this packet of documents. Dr. Fitzgibbons is a Catholic psychiatrist who worked with, among other things, reparative therapy for homosexuals. It is my understanding that Dr. Fitzgibbons (and I was told that by one of his doctor associates) gave Father xxxxx a clean bill of health, stating basically that he believed Father xxxx was telling the truth. Dr. Fitzgibbons went along with Father Hardon and Father xxxxx to Rome, to explain to Archbishop Hoyos the methods being used by the bishops to punish priests whom they felt were a threat. This can all be verified (if he is not bound by confidentiality) by Dr. Richard Fitzgibbons, who is a member of the Catholic Medical Association.

Dr. (name withheld by RCF) of Chicago is also aware of this information, as he contacted me on one occasion asking for certain facts, because he, along with the Catholic Medical Association, wanted to present this information to Cardinal George, attempting to convince him to take action against Bishop Daniel Ryan.

After no one within the hierarchy would agree to investigate Ryan or take any action against him, we held a public press conference in Springfield, Illinois thereby exposing Bishop Daniel Ryan. Now you must understand that I personally faced legal action, a lawsuit against me for making this information known publicly. I had absolutely nothing to gain, but as a Catholic I felt an obligation to do so because of the damage that was being done within the Diocese of Springfield, because of Ryan’s own perversion. We looked at this from strictly a Catholic perspective. Shortly after the press conference still no one within the hierarchy was interested in helping us with the Bishop Ryan situation. In February of 1997 we received a copy of an anonymous letter that was sent to the State Journal Register. The letter named a number of individuals, specifically one Danny Evans, who were involved in sexual activity with Bishop Ryan on a regular basis. The letter also named other individuals known to be involved with Bishop Ryan and gave some sordid details of Ryan’s sexual activities.

At some point after receiving the letter, (copy enclosed) we hired a private investigator to check out some of these names and to verify that these individuals may indeed be either male prostitutes, or teenage runaways. The information is enclosed in our packet. Some of these individuals were confirmed to be teenage runaways and/or male prostitutes. At that point we began our search for Danny Evans and some of these other individuals who were listed. During this whole process we were getting some negative press from the State Journal Register as well as the diocesan newspaper. One article in particular caught the attention of one Sandra Elraghy. When I finally got the phone call from Sandra, she explained to me that she had been following this situation for some time and was outraged that the diocese kept lying and denying that Bishop Ryan was an active homosexual, who had engaged in sexual contact with teenage boys, male prostitutes and priests, because she claimed she knew for a fact that he was involved in sexual relations with these individuals. I met with Sandra, and the transcript of her interview and other documents are provided in the packet of information. Sandra gave me a list of names of individuals she knew to have been involved with Daniel Ryan, including her former husband, Darrell Wilson (known as O.D. Wilson, I believe). This information is also contained in the packet.

The individual she knew the most about was one Frank Bergen, and an individual nicknamed Peanut - she was not sure of Peanut’s real name. We later learned that “Peanut” was one John R. whom I later interviewed. John was a 15 year old runaway when he first had sex with Ryan. Sandra did know of Frank Bergen’s sexual involvement with Bishop Ryan, affectionately referred to by the male prostitutes as “The Bish” She wasn’t sure where Frank was, thought he might have AIDS, and that he might be incarcerated at that time. As it turned out, Frank was 16 when he first had sex with Ryan.

We located Frank Bergen. During this same time frame we also located the individual named Peanut, who was John R. Frank Bergen was in the prison at Jacksonville, Illinois. Peanut, or John Rxxx was located in the prison near Taylorville. All this can be verified by the records of the Illinois Department of Corrections, as I visited both individuals on numerous occasions. The beauty of this was that, while both men were incarcerated at the same time, they were forbidden by Illinois law to communicate with one another. I knew that the
testimony given by both men, if it matched, was truthful. Both were reluctant to discuss the situations. With an introduction by Sandra, I was able to visit Frank Bergen. He gave me details of his sexual contact with Ryan, beginning at age sixteen. He described how to get up into the apartment, the alcohol Ryan liked to drink, some description of the Bishop’s penis size and shape, interior of the Bishop’s living quarters - tile design, etc. He also gave me names of other individuals, street kids he knew to have gone to Bishop Ryan to get money through sexual favors, to feed their own drug or alcohol habits. He was the one who gave me John Rxxx name. Frank went into such detail, I was convinced he was being truthful with me.

Then a short time later I visited John Rxxx at the prison near Taylorville, Illinois. John had known I had been to see Frank Bergen. Although the two individuals were not close and at times were enemies, if you will, they gave identical stories. I knew then that they were being truthful. John gave a description of how to get into the Bishop’s apartment, and was repulsed and sickened thinking back about his engaging in sexual activity, servicing Ryan. Both Bergen and Rxxx are heterosexual, both had girlfriends at one time. Rxxx even had a child he asked me to help locate. His girlfriend was the daughter of a Springfield doctor who had committed suicide. Rxxx gave details of his few encounters with Bishop Daniel Ryan, making it clear that he ended the relationship when he no longer needed money and just became sickened by the situation.

We were still looking for Danny Evans at the time. Sandra’s boyfriend at the time, Darrell (“O.D”) Wilson, had refused to give us any testimony. We eventually located the author of the anonymous letter. It turned out to be Dxxx xxxx, a Democratic precinct committeeman and apartment owner in Springfield. Father Reeves had mentioned a family member who knew of a gentleman on the south side of Springfield who owned an apartment with a pool. This gentleman had first-hand information regarding Bishop Ryan coming there, either to pick up young boys or to engage in sexual activity. During this whole time we were trying to locate the individual who fit the description, and owned property in that area. That turned out to be Dxxx xxxx, the same individual who sent the anonymous letter to the State Journal Register in February of 1997. Dxxx agreed to meet with me, although he asked me not to make his name public because of his standing in the community. He provided us with a videotape of a news program from the local TV station in which they highlighted his apartment complex, low-rent apartments he made available to underprivileged individuals.

One of the individuals who was working for him and at times living in his apartments was Danny Evans. He claimed he knew Evans was someone involved with Ryan. He claimed Ryan would pick up Danny at his apartment on numerous occasions and take Danny with him on various trips. He also stated Danny would come back and brag about the trips he went on with Bishop Ryan, the hotel where they stayed, the pornography they viewed, etc. In 1999 after a series of events, we were able to make contact with Danny Evans, and I will explain that in a bit. So we now had four priests, three male prostitutes, a Democratic precinct committeeman and apartment owner who knew of sexual activity between Ryan and teenage boys, clergy, and laymen. We then notified the Papal Nuncio in Washington, D.C. that we were going to hold another press conference, with additional information regarding Bishop Daniel Ryan's homosexual activity. And one must understand, because of Ryan’ homosexual activity he was compromised to the point they could not take action against any other priest he knew to be engaged in any type of sexual misconduct within the diocese.

For example, Father z (name withheld by RCF) was having a sexual relationship with a woman who came to him for counseling. She obviously was unstable. We have a booklet that was produced and published by her therapist. The family members of this woman even came to Bishop Ryan at one time, begging him to stop the relationship. We learned, through the testimony of another priest, Father z knew of Frank Bergen, and at one point made a comment to a fellow priest, “if you ever want to scare the bishop, mention the name Frank Robert Bergen.” There was also Father John Eck, priest at St. Patrick’s Parish in Springfield, who was apparently picking up young men and boys around the train station in Springfield. We eventually interviewed an Eric Coulter who was located at a prison north of Havana, Illinois. He presented a scenario, told me he was sexually involved with a priest, mutual masturbation for money, as a young man when he was living on the street. I presented him some photographs and he identified Father Eck. The reason I presented him with several photos including one of Father Eck was that he told me the individual priest he was servicing sexually, was also in charge of a high school up north. That and his physical description fit the profile of Fa-
ther Eck. He identified Father Eck, and gave us some statements. Frank Bergen also knew of the situation with Father Eck. We contacted Father Eck’s superiors - he was a Viatorian priest - and Father Eck was removed from his position by his religious superiors. We also knew of a Father Stanley Milewski, who was also paying for the services of Frank Bergen.

Despite our continual public exposure of Ryan’s predatory homosexual activity no action was taken by the hierarchy. We even mass produced (30,000) postcards accusing Ryan of having sex with boys and priests, and mailed them to public offices and media outlets. A Postal Inspector from Springfield, Illinois did threaten me with “criminal prosecution” if I mailed out any more postcards. In response to this unfounded threat our attorney threatened legal action against the post office and I mailed the postcard to every member of Congress at their Washington DC offices.

Ryan did resign in October of 1999 and one week later a lawsuit was filed (copy enclosed) naming Ryan as an active homosexual stating: “BISHOP RYAN ignored his oath and obligation of celibacy by virtue of multiple homosexual relationships with then, now former, male prostitutes and other priests or deacons to wit: John Doe X, John Doe Y, and Reverend Father John Doe Z (the identities of whom are known to the Defendants) among others, during his tenure as Bishop to such an extent that an atmosphere of tolerance to the sexual abuse of minors was thereby created, facilitated, and perpetuated by DEFENDANT RYAN.”

Lawsuit filed in Springfield: On Thursday, October 28, 1999 attorneys for a 30-year old former altar boy filed a lawsuit against a priest, two former bishops, and the diocese of Springfield in Illinois. The law offices of Frederic W. Nessler of Springfield and Ross & Rubino of Margate City, New Jersey filed multiple allegations on behalf of 30-year-old Matthew McCormick, a former altar boy in the Springfield diocese who alleges that, over a three-year period in the early 1980s, he was sexually assaulted, battered, and psychologically abused by Rev. Alvin J. Campbell, former pastor of St. Maurice Church in Morrisonville, Illinois. Also named in the lawsuit were Former Springfield Bishop Joseph A. McNicholas (deceased), the Diocese of Springfield, and recently retired Bishop Daniel Ryan of Springfield. McCormick charges that these three parties were involved in an extensive cover-up of Campbell's pedophilic activities; moreover, that:

Bishop George Lucas was installed as the new bishop of Springfield December 14, 1999 at which time Cardinal George praised Ryan for his service to the diocese. In following months Ryan continued to celebrate Mass, confirm children in Springfield and Joliet Dioceses, led priests’ retreats and in March of 2002 Ryan was co-consecrator at an ordination of a new auxiliary bishop in the Joliet Diocese. Cardinal George was present at the event.

Several months later Ryan was accused, yet again, though the office of Attorney Fred Nessler, of attempted sexual assault on a teenage boy some 15 years earlier. At this point Ryan was stripped of his “Public Ministry”. I am convinced that had it not been for the current public climate, regarding sexual abuse by clergy, brought on by the media coverage starting in Boston in 2002, no action would have been taken against Ryan. In fact, during the dioceses so-called investigation of this latest charge against Ryan, RCF was never contacted by the diocese.” END

The following letter was sent to Mr. Bennett two months after our interview.

“May 8, 2003

Mr. Robert S. Bennett, Attorney
Chair, Research Committee
National Review Board for the Protection of Children and Young People

Dear Mr. Bennett,

I am writing you regarding Father John Renken’s position as canon Lawyer and consultant to the Catholic Bishops’ “Ad Hoc Committee on Sexual Abuse.” Fr. Renken is notorious here within the Diocese of Springfield, in Illinois.

In a June 10, 2002 “United States Conference of Catholic Bishops” (USCCB) press release titled: “Media Briefings by Sexual Abuse Experts Part of Dallas Meeting,” (copy enclosed) you will find the name of Father John Renken listed as a “consultant”.

Renken served as Vicar General to former Bishop, and predatory homosexual, Daniel Ryan. Renken currently serves as Vicar General to Bishop George Lucas. He also holds other key positions within the hierarchy. As stated in our March 15, 2003 report to you, Bishop Ryan was removed from
ministry in 2003 after yet another young man came forward claiming to have been sexually abused by Ryan while a minor. Renken was instrumental in protecting Ryan for the six years (1996 through 2002) that our organization tried to bring about his removal from “ministry.” RCF received first-hand testimony from two priests who complained to Fr. Renken about Ryan’s predatory homosexual advance towards them. Renken did nothing to help the clergy. It was common knowledge among some clergy that Ryan was using the sexual services of teenage boys who were living on the Street. Because of Renken’s negligence as well as the negligence of other chancery staff, namely Fathers Eugene Costa and Thomas Holinga, Ryan was able to continue his abusive lifestyle. The fact that Renken serves as a consultant to the Bishops’ Ad Hoc Committee proves to me that the Bishops are not serious about the protection of children.

After George Lucas was installed as Springfield’s new bishop, he went so far as to reward Renken, Holinga, Costa, and others who protected Ryan, by giving them the title of Monsignor. There is more.

For the past 10 years Fr. Renken has been living at the same small parish in Riverton, Illinois with one Father Kenneth Steffen. While the diocese declares that parishes will have to be closed because of the priest shortage, this couple remains together at this small parish. Fr. Steffen, like Renken, holds key positions within the hierarchy. I have raised this issue with Bishop Lucas.

In yet another unusual (possibly scandalous) situation, Fathers Renken and Steffen are listed as “co-pastors” in both the diocesan directory and parish bulletin. There is no such position for a Catholic priest such as co-pastor. The use of this word as well as their living arrangement, suggests something more. According to the testimony of a priest who was stationed at the Cathedral rectory with Renken prior to 1989, Fr. Steffen was given a key to the Cathedral rectory at the request of Renken despite objections from clergy.

Mr. Bennett, I do hope that you will raise this issue with the Bishops’ committee and request that Renken not be allowed to hold any position regarding policy on child abuse or abuse by bishops. Fr. Renken as well as Bishop Lucas must be held accountable. I would be happy to testify before any committee members as well as the bishops themselves.

Thank you in advance for you attention to this issue.

Sincerely,  Stephen G. Brady, President
Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc.

cc. Bishops’ Conference, Kathleen McChesney

“Pope picks friend Rigali to be cardinal”
St. Louis Post Dispatch 09/29/03

Cardinal Justin Rigali, reported to be a close friend of the pope, is also a close friend of the notorious Cardinal Roger Mahony of Los Angeles. Rigali placed a full page ad in Mahony’s diocesan newspaper congratulating Mahony on his new Hollywood Cathedral.

Rigali gave Springfield, Bishop George Lucas, his former VG, who held his installation party at the Masonic Temple, rewarded clergy who protected former predatory homosexual Bishop Daniel Ryan, and honored, at the Springfield Cathedral, pro-death, Planned Parenthood clergy advisor, and public promoter of abortion, Rabbi Barry Marks.

Rigali also gave Milwaukee his former aux bishop, Bishop Timothy Dolan. Dolan believes that a man who masturbates in a public park in front of a crowd, is fit to serve as a priest.

Send Donations to:
Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc
P.O. Box 109
Petersburg, Illinois 62675-0109
217-632-5920 / Fax 217-632-7054
www.rcf.org / sbrady@rcf.org

Be sure to order a copy of Mothers’ Watch newsletter.

Issue Volume 8, Number 1, Fall 2003 titled: “HOW DARE YOU, BISHOPS!”

Mothers’ Watch
PO Box 1029
Frederick, MD 21702-0029
Ph: 410-761-7437 / Fax: 410-761-4233
Or
Ph: 540-822-3875 / Fax: 540-822-3876
www.motherswatch.org
CLEAR INDICATIONS THE CURRENT HIERARCHY IS MORALLY BANKRUPT

“Pope won’t intervene in sexual-abuse scandal.” Story by Melinda Henneberger of the New York Times/ April 14, 2002 Santa Cruz Sentinel. (The same bishops that created the problem through negligence, cover-up, and in some cases direct involvement in abuse, will have nothing to fear from this Pope.)


Msgr. John Renken, a Canon Lawyer from Springfield, Illinois, who once served as president of the Canon Law Society, is a consultant for the U.S. Bishops Ad Hoc Committee on Sexual Abuse. Renken, as a chancery official in Springfield, helped protect predatory homosexual child abuser and priest chaser, Bishop Daniel Ryan. Ryan has been suspended from all public ministry yet the people who protected him for years, now hold key positions within the hierarchy.

On July 23, 2003 Massachusetts Attorney General Thomas F. Reilly issued a 76 page report regarding the “massive and prolonged mistreatment of children by priests assigned to the,” Archdiocese of Boston. The report stated in part: “The Archdiocese placed children at risk by transferring abusive priests to other” “parishes” and “dioceses;” “The Archdiocese did not notify law enforcement authorities of clergy sexual abuse allegations.” And most shocking: “The investigation did produce evidence that the widespread abuse of children was due to an institutional acceptance of abuse and a massive and pervasive failure of leadership.”

“Vatican promoted priest despite warnings of sex abuse, records show.” Story by Reese Dunklin, August 30, 2003 / The Dallas Morning News. Msgr. Daniel Pater was promoted by the Vatican through its international diplomatic corps “despite high-level warnings” that he “sexually abused a girl.”

“Archdiocese Fined in Abuse Cover-up.” By Alan Cooperman / November 21, 2003 / Washington Post. The Cincinnati Archdiocese pleaded no contest to five counts of failing to report sexual abuse of children and was fined $10,000.00, the maximum fine allowed.

“Catholic bishop supports benefits for gay couples.” Boston Ch. 6, AP Story “The Catholic Church in Massachusetts may be open to extending some benefits to gay couples. That was the message of Worcester Bishop Daniel Reilly…” (Ed. Note: Any priest or bishop who supports, promotes, or otherwise endorses special benefits based on one’s sexual deviancy, disordered desires, or sinfulness, is indeed supporting a disorder and a sinful lifestyle. The Bishop may have tipped us off to his own sexual desires.)
THE PRIESTHOOD

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

St. Alphonsus De Liguori

“we went to Ek Balan a new "dig"not too far form Merida today so I am sending these along----the little guy with me is not my current lover”

(Fr. Auth’s email transmission to St. Sebastian’s Angels.)