

AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM

Cardinal Roger Mahony's personal edifice --
Has this Pope failed the people of Los Angeles?



*Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc.
Summer 2004*

Our Mission Statement

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

Our Philosophy

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VIVA CRISTO REY!

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

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

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

Board Members

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

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

Please send your tax-exempt donation today.

RCF does not sell, rent, or exchange our donor mailing list.

Rev. Malachi Martin's 1997 statement regarding RCF, Cardinal Mahony, and the condition of the Church

Page 4

What Have They Got on You, Cardinal McCarrick?
By Chris Ferrara

Page 7

Cardinal Mahony: Master of Cunning and Deceit
By Marian T. Horvat, Ph.D.

Page 8

**CARDINAL SCANDAL:
 LOS ANGELES' ARCHBISHOP
 ROGER MAHONY
 AN ICON FOR ABUSIVE
 AMCHURCH PRELATES**
by Paul Likoudis

Page 13

A Law Unto Himself
By Dr. Thomas Droleskey

Page 44

The Fall of Mike the Bear "Want Sex"
By Dario McDarby

Page 47

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

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

Rev. Malachi Martin's 1997 statement regarding RCF, Cardinal Mahony, and the condition of the Church

Blessings on your endeavors. I will be praying for you all.

These days and months of 1997, there seems to be a long and slow but steady sunset all over the Roman Catholic Church organization of Pope John Paul II. And no matter what he does, no matter how large the crowds at his "mega-Masses", no matter how many prayers are offered day and night by the Saints in the Church: no matter how many authenticated appearances of the Blessed Virgin Mary are granted us (often with manifest miracles): no matter how many seers and visionaries--- stigmatists among them--- bring us warning messages from beyond the created cosmos of man; nothing, but nothing seemingly arrests the oncoming darkness of a night feared by every believing Christian alive today.

We would have to be blind not to see that our human day as Roman Catholics is declining inexorably into that ever-encroaching darkness. Nor is this anything like the welcoming darkness of night beckoning us to enter into a well-earned sleep in preparation for a glorious and still more strenuous tomorrow. Far from it.

Rather, all the reliable signs tell us--and Christ Himself advised us in no uncertain terms to be diligent in reading the "signs of the times"--that this is the sepulchral darkness which will entomb a spent age and its dessicated institutions and organizations. These are the shades of the charnel-house now awaiting us at the end of our Catholic times. It all fits. So dreadfully. So sadly.

Even though we are sure we always will have a Pope of Rome until the end of all human time, it is still a sad scene. And especially so when we realize the horrible nature of that darkness. It is not a question of mere heresy--false teaching--nor of schism as a revolt against authority. This, my friends and fellow Catholics, is the darkness of apostasy: the systematic evacuation of basic Roman Catholic dogmas by those in charge of teaching the Faithful.

On the testimony of competent observers from all over North and South America as well as from Europe and from official Rome itself, the regime of His Eminence, Cardinal Mahony, has been marked by a steady de-Romanization and de-Catholicization of the once flourishing Los Angeles archdiocese.

Many priests, nuns, bishops--under His Eminence's jurisdiction--are not espousing the teaching of the Church. They follow another agenda. Under the guise of the "Spirit of Vatican II" as a catch-all for any whim and caprice, there occur unauthorized liturgical innovations (for example: standing during the Consecration, omission of parts of the Mass, "liturgical" dancing, invalid bread used for Holy Communion, etc, etc.). There are rampant spiritual and canonical abuses (general absolution in place of individual confession, the use of an invalid formula for absolution, First Communion before First Reconciliation for children as the norm, sex education for children that is designed to rob them of their innocence, the pouring of Consecrated Wine down the waste faucets of bathrooms, etc, etc.). Church buildings are renovated on the basis of "Environment and Art in Catholic Worship" But this document was never approved by the National Conferences of Catholic Bishops, and it reflects the personal ideas of certain individuals about whose faith one can have very legitimate doubts.

What observers remark is that an overall plan for radical change is being implemented -- but in small increments, without the overall goal being frankly and candidly stated. Many of these observers will aver that the not so obvious aim of all this change is the establishment of another non-Roman Catholic form of our Faith.

It is, then, a lugubrious fact that, bit by bit, without their knowing it, or realizing it, great sections of the Church in North America headed by their clergy are being led by the nose out of Catholicism and into the darkness of a very comfortable apostasy.

One of the most important statements of the Second Vatican Council emphasizes the new role that the Roman Catholic laity are called upon to play in the life of the Church. We know that more than once in the 2,000 year history of the Church, the laity have been used, as the Council teaches, by the Holy Spirit in order to protect, nourish and preserve the Church.

Lo! and behold! In our day, and precisely when it was most needed, the Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc. (RCF) organization has sprung up in Illinois. When it began in 1996, somebody referred to it as "a little pebble" on the mountainside of a huge Church. But, let me tell you, this little pebble rolling down that mountainside is producing an avalanche of faithful Catholics who will no longer tolerate this apostasy from our Roman Catholic Faith. The RCF has members in all 50 states and abroad in half-a-dozen countries. RCF is dedicated to the defense of Orthodoxy. It is engaged in activities from New York to California, from Illinois to Florida.

The ever-swelling number of members in the RCF will now make sure that His Eminence Cardinal Mahony as well as other bishops, will be reminded by voices from 100,000 throats:

--that he is only one of over 4,000 bishops in the Church, all of whom --like him-- are subject to the infallible teaching of the papacy, past and present;

--that, while by papal permission, he has jurisdiction over the Los Angeles archdiocese, he has no personal jurisdiction over the Church Universal and its dogmas;

--that he, like all us sinners, will have to render to Our Lord Jesus a strict accounting of his Los Angeles stewardship;

--that his chief obligation is to preserve and foment the Faith in that diocese; and any deliberate neglect or infringement of that obligation is punishable with Hellfire.

Let no Catholic shrink from admonishing priests, bishops, or Cardinals, if they act in ways that are irreconcilable with the Faith of our Fathers. This is Papal teaching, this is the teaching of the Church Councils, this is the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas: We have an obligation to do so. The simple but painful fact is that even higher members of the Church's hierarchy are quite capable of treason.

Let us, in our generation, do our duty by Holy Mother Church, so that those who come after us in the generation of the Faithful, will say about us: They were giants in Faith, and they fought the good fight.

† *Malachi B. Martin*

"High Ranking Jesuit Confirms Malachi Martin's Status as Life Long Priest"

(by William H. Kennedy - April 2004"

*"In a stunning reversal of past policy Father Vincent O'Keefe SJ, former Vicar General of the Society of Jesus and a past President of Fordham University, affirmed that Malachi Martin was in fact granted a dispensation from all his vows in the Jesuit order except for chastity. This dispels decades of rumors that Father Martin was defrocked for having had an affair with the wife of a famous journalist. This was the false lie spread by past Jesuits to discredit Father Martin. Martin requested and received a special dispensation by Pope Paul VI to remain a Catholic priest and say Mass in private. Ever since Father Martin's scathing review of his former order *The Jesuits: The Society of Jesus and the Betrayal of the Roman Catholic Church* (1988) rumors were spread by members of this order claiming Martin was defrocked and expelled from the Church of Rome. Martin denied this charge until his death in 1999....."*

Facing Reality — The Destructive and Demoralizing Lack of Leadership From Rome

(After almost 30 years to put his people and policies in place, this Pope has helped create the “New Church”)

By Stephen Brady

“Rome would rather kill 10,000 priests then harm one hair on the head of one bishop.” That statement made by a bishop to a priest who was considering legal action against a homosexual bishop, has been confirmed time and time again.

Since RCF’s founding in 1995 we have been reluctant to share all the information we have gathered with our members. This was done for several reasons, three of which I will share with you now.

1. In the early years much of the information we received from clergy, abuse victims, attorneys, and other sources was just too difficult and painful to believe. We wanted to believe that the hierarchy (the pope) would act if only he, or one of his staff, could receive the facts. It was the late Frs. John Hardon and Alfred Kunz who first convinced me that indeed Rome was the problem. Hardon made it clear it was up to the laity to save the Church (because Rome would do nothing) and Fr. Kunz was adamant that *You could not find justice within the Church today*. Our own investigations have proven that the leadership in Rome is indeed protecting and enabling perverted, faithless bishops to destroy one diocese after another.

2. We always wanted to be sure there was a need to share our information with others. There was always the risk (which we wanted to avoid) of weakening the faith of others if we printed all that we knew. In 1997, five years before the sex abuse scandal broke in the papers, if RCF had told of the sexual perversion going on within the Church most would have thought us crazy.

3. We had to be sure of the facts, not so much because of liability risks but first and foremost for the obvious moral reasons. RCF would never want to harm the innocent, or for that matter the guilty without great need.

Keeping in mind that hope and divine intervention is always a possibility, it has become clear that Rome will not, or does not have the courage nor the faith to take corrective action. In fact, it is the hierarchy in Rome that makes it possible for the likes of Cardinal Mahony to destroy the diocese of Los Angeles in California.

RCF has been receiving information regarding the homosexual activity of clergy of every rank; from Cardinal down to Deacon — from advisor to the bishops’ committee on child abuse and vocations director to parish priest. Priests who have either been convicted or otherwise publicly exposed for their involvement in homosexual activity, child pornography, soliciting for sex in public areas, and masturbation in public, hold key positions within the hierarchy despite their obvious complete lack of moral character. This is to say nothing of those clergy who are open heretics and destroy countless souls with their false teachings. In some parts of this country families with children are being victimized by clergy and their bishops who use the Sacraments as a weapon to force their own anti-Catholic agenda upon these families. And Rome does nothing! **DIRECT YOUR RIGHTEOUS ANGER TOWARD ROME!**

This pope knows! He has the information he needs to act or he knows how to get it. This Pope and his hand-picked staff are a big, if not the biggest, part of the problem. There is no denying that. The ones with authority over bishops are not exercising that authority. **One cannot help but wonder if they are not all cut from the same cloth.**

As the devastation continues, those labeled as schismatic and/or radical look more like Prophets and Saints.

One diocese after another is dying and the faithless bishops are unconcerned. Here in Springfield, Illinois the bishop reports the faith is alive and well yet in his same report he mentions that the Catholic population has decreased. There are fewer priests, fewer Catholic Schools, fewer Religious, fewer baptisms, and every year parishes close. They have no clue.

Here at our local parish, St. Peters in Petersburg, headed by Msgr. Carl Kemme, V.G., Sr. Helen Vahling will

(Continued on page 46)

What Have They Got on You, Cardinal McCarrick?

By Chris Ferrara

When the homosexual priest scandal exploded in the world press after years of concealment by a number of North American bishops, Cardinal Theodore McCarrick quickly revealed himself (along with Cardinal Mahony) as one of the craftiest ecclesiastical spinmeisters.

When, during the so-called "pedophile summit" in Rome in April 2002, I questioned McCarrick on whether he intended to continue admitting known homosexuals to the seminaries under his charge, he bobbed and weaved and never gave a straight answer, while giving every appearance that he *had* answered my question. A very crafty performance indeed.

And now the old fox is bobbing and weaving again. While several American bishops have — finally — found the courage to announce that pro-abortion politicians are no longer to be allowed to receive Holy Communion in their dioceses, McCarrick has conspicuously refrained from following suit.

In a recent interview with *30 Giorni* magazine, reported by Zenit news, McCarrick said that "I think that many bishops among us think that such persons [pro-abortion politicians] should have canonical censures. But I also think that many bishops would not like the possibility of receiving the Eucharist to be a part of these sanctions. Personally, I think it should be a pastoral concern to avoid the Eucharist becoming a point of confrontation."

That is a statement only a calculating politician would utter. As McCarrick surely knows, it is pro-abortion politicians, not the Church, that make the Holy Eucharist "a point of confrontation" when they dare to receive it. And it is they who commit a sacrilege against the very Body and Blood of Christ when they consume the Blessed Sacrament at the same time they make themselves complicit in the mass murder of unborn children.

Why is McCarrick running away from his duty to prevent sacrilege, just as he ran away from his duty to rid the priesthood of homosexual infiltrators? Is it simply that he lacks faith in the Real Presence and has come to regard Holy Communion as a kind of ecclesial perk to which pro-abortion politicians, who call themselves Catholic, are just as entitled as anyone else? Or is there some other reason at work here?

For years it has been rumored that McCarrick was about to be exposed by one major news organ or another for his own involvement in homosexual activity. At one point, I was reliably informed, a major story was about to be broken, but the story was apparently spiked. Indeed, McCarrick's systematic refusal to defend the faith against homosexual infiltrators in the priesthood and pro-abortion politicians at the Communion rail could readily be explained by the presence of some very ugly skeletons in his own closet, which limit his range of action against enemies of the Church.

McCarrick applauds the creation of yet another episcopal commission to discuss what he calls the "complex and delicate question" of whether the political promoters of abortion may receive the Body and Blood of Christ. That commission will, of course, provide political cover for prelates like McCarrick, who for some strange reason will not do their duty before God.

But there is nothing "complex" or "delicate" about whether the promoters of mass murder should receive Holy Communion. On the other hand, it might be a very delicate question indeed — for certain prelates who have things to hide. And so the question arises: What have they got on you, Cardinal McCarrick?

Cardinal Mahony: Master of Cunning and Deceit

By Marian T. Horvat, Ph.D.

Whenever I see Cardinal Roger Mahony's pictures in his archdiocesan newspaper, *The Tidings*, I am reminded of a fox. On his lips, a gleeful smile as he poses with a grand donor, a celebrity, an honor student, a football player, the workers on strike or picket lines, the illegal immigrants clamoring for driver licenses. A man of tremendous energy reputed to be one of the most powerful Bishops in the U.S., he never loses an opportunity to tally points with the people. But his eyes do not smile, they are wary, watchful, seeking the advantage, covering his sides and back.

The medieval bestiaries, which look at the animals God created to find what they figure for man, tells us the fox stands for what is cunning and deceitful. This is because the fox has two natures, it pretends to be harmless and good willed but it will use every scheme and trick to get what he wants. Also, when the fox falls into some danger from which escape seems impossible it will bite off his own foot to get free. "The tricks of this creature," *Physiologus* tells us, "are mindful of the different deceits of treacherous men, and also of the devil." (1)

I don't think this description is a bit too strong to apply to the progressivist quisling, Cardinal Roger Mahony, who served as Bishop of Fresno, CA (1975-80), Stockton, CA (1980), and is Archbishop of Los Angeles since 1985.

After the crisis of clergy sexual abuse of minors exploded in Boston in 2002, it soon became apparent that something similar had been taking place in Los Angeles. Victims of clergy sexual abuse began to surface with claims of being ignored and badly treated; information came to light that pedophile priests were protected or shuffled around when their crimes would come to light; investigations showed the archdiocesan seminary and office teeming with homosexuals. Some wondered if Cardinal Mahony would be the next Prelate to resign. Would the Fox fall into a pit of his own making?

So far, at least, the answer is no. To fool his

flock into thinking he is protecting them, Mahony has used every trick in the bag - even hiring a costly Century City public relations firm to improve his image. He speaks constantly of openness and transparency. He offers apologies to the priests, the religious, the victims, and the people with as great alacrity as JPPII. He boasts that he was among the first to implement the "zero tolerance" policy, and at times assumes a spokesman role at the Bishops' meetings insisting on compliance. All this to create a perceived reality of a leader with some few mistakes of the past that should be overlooked in view of his shining present stance and record.

In fact, his mistakes of the past were not so few, and his present is not so luminous. In February, 2004, the Archdiocese said it had already paid \$10.4 million in settlements since 1985, and still faces a flood of civil cases. More than 500 claims have been made against the Archdiocese since State lawmakers temporarily lifted the statute of limitations last year on child sex abuse lawsuits. (2)

Despite his claims of transparency, Mahony has refused to release accused priests' names and has used legal tricks to keep documents from prosecutors and to dodge depositions. Despite boasts of "zero tolerance," he has shuffled child molester priests from parish to parish even though he knew of their crimes. Despite assertions of complete openness, he has authorized spending millions of dollars to quietly settle sex abuse claims while imposing strict "confidentiality agreements" on victims to buy silence. Despite his call for more lay participation in investigations, it was Mahony who precipitated the resignation of Frank Keating, head of the lay National Review Board, after Keating criticized Mahony's orchestration of a boycott of the California Bishops of its compliance survey.

Let me present some examples illustrating how the Cardinal-Fox works.

The Truth Behind the “Zero-Tolerance” Policy in L.A.

The Cardinal of the nation’s largest diocese boldly brags that the Los Angeles Archdiocese was one of the first to implement the zero-tolerance policy in 1988. He would have it appear as a sign of his far-sighted vigilance over his flock. He repeats this so often that many actually accept this flummery as true. Let me point out what really happened.

The Los Angeles and Orange Dioceses were forced by a judge to formally accept a “zero tolerance” policy as part of a \$5.2 million settlement in the clergy abuse suit of Ryan DiMaria. Along with four other persons, DiMaria accused Msgr. Michael Harris of molesting them when they were teenagers. Diocesan officials apparently knew of allegations against Harris dating back to the 1970s, but did nothing.⁽³⁾ To keep the case from becoming public, Mahony accepted DiMaria’s conditions, including installation of a “zero tolerance” policy.

What is more, it wasn’t until February 2002 that Mahony applied the terms of the policy he had installed to old allegations against eight priests and removed them from ministry. So even with the “zero tolerance” policy he had been forced to adopt in place, it was virtually ignored – except for publicity purposes. Some rigor was applied only when the national clergy sex abuse scandal broke loose and the Catholic public began to demand accountability from Bishops. As investigations began in Los Angeles, many other cases came to light that demonstrated the Cardinal’s complacency with guilty pedophile priests. Was a radical “zero tolerance” policy being applied in L.A., as Mahony so often boasted? Hardly.

A Homosexual-Friendly Archdiocese

As the new Millennium dawned, the Los Angeles Archdiocese was known as one of the most homosexual-friendly in the United States. As early as 1991, Jim Johnson, caregiver to AIDS patients, openly stated that Roger Mahony was “surrounded by homosexual priests” and alluded to several “gay bishops.”⁽⁴⁾ In 1993, the Cardinal helped to fund and produce the video *A Journey for Understanding Gays and Lesbians in the Church*. The video affirmed that there was nothing wrong with any “gay” or lesbian

person whatsoever, that “being gay was a blessing and a gift,” and had “something prophetic toward remodeling the Church.”⁽⁵⁾ In 1996, the L.A. Archdiocese celebrated a Mass for its “lesbian and gay Catholics” during “Gay and Lesbian Pride Week” in West Hollywood, and sponsored a booth at its “Pride Festival.” In 1997, Cardinal Mahony himself said the Mass and delivered the homily for The National Association of Catholic Diocesan Lesbian and Gay Ministries at its annual convention in Long Beach.⁽⁶⁾

Mahony also founded a diocesan office of “ministry to lesbian and gay Catholics” as early as 1986. He headed it up with an openly homosexual priest, Fr. Peter Liuzzi, who had nothing but praise for the Cardinal for never “rebuking those gays and lesbians who are not celibate.” The Archdiocese also sought out an openly pro-homosexual Jesuit psychologist for its priests, Fr. Curtis Bryant.⁽⁷⁾

The same open tolerance for homosexuality prevailed at St. John’s Seminary in Camarillo, where seminarians spend the first four of their seven years of priestly training. A *Newsweek* article (May 20, 2002) reported 30-70 percent of the seminarians at St. John’s were “gay and bisexual.” Seminarians forced to leave for being “too rigid” have described across-the-board tolerance of homosexuality and no teaching on the Church’s proscription of it.⁽⁸⁾ In the sordid atmosphere of a number of post-Vatican II seminaries like this, many sodomites have been ordained priests, protecting and promoting one another in what has been named “the lavender Mafia.”⁽⁹⁾

Has the climate of tolerance for homosexuality changed in the Los Angeles Archdiocese? While it is not so open or visible – the Gay and Lesbian Ministry office was closed in 2002 for financial reasons – there is no indication of any attitude change.

In an April 27, 2002 interview on *Fox News*,⁽¹⁰⁾ Mahony boasted about the warm and wonderful relationship of the Archdiocese with its “very large gay, lesbian community.” He also affirmed that homosexuals should be allowed to be ordained priests, that a homosexual or heterosexual inclination was irrelevant so long as the person was able to commit himself to a lifelong life of celibacy.⁽¹¹⁾

Mahony shields himself behind the progressivist lie that there is “no relationship whatsoever” between homosexuality and pedophilia. How-

ever, even a progressivist expert on the topic, Fr. Donald Cozzens, clearly affirms the opposite. *Id est*, that regarding the clergy, the two vices are profoundly linked since 90 percent of the priest abusers target teenager boys.⁽¹²⁾ If the abused teen is under 16, the priest is termed a pedophile, if he is older, the priest is called a homosexual. It is the same vice divided by a thin line of age difference in the victims.

So while the Cardinal drones “zero tolerance” to the press like a broken record, his unconditional support of homosexuality and his personal acceptance of homosexual priests seems to indicate a strong complicity toward the sexual abuse of teenagers over 16, to say the least.

Cover-ups everywhere

It would fill a book to detail the many cases of cover-up of the L.A. Cardinal regarding pedophile priests. Even so, the work would be incomplete, because it is certain that much remains that is unknown. I will simply set forth several cases for the reader to see the pattern that emerges.

Most notably Cardinal Mahony is accused of assigning Fr. Michael Baker to various parishes for a decade after the priest admitted to the Cardinal in 1986 that he had abused some boys. Baker continued to molest boys until 1999. Then, when two brothers who claimed to be molested by Baker threatened to sue the Archdiocese in 2000, Mahony paid them \$1.3 million to keep the case quiet.⁽¹³⁾ Only in 2002 did Mahony report Baker - along with about ten others - to law enforcement. This was the same Prelate, I remind you, who in 1988 firmly stated that he would “**never** deal with a problem of sexual abuse on the part of priest or deacon by simply moving him to another ministerial assignment.” He made this public statement at the very same time that he was dealing with Baker’s abuses, transferring him to other parishes.

Another volatile case where Mahony admitted his error much too late to protect the innocent is that of Fr. Michael Wempe. Even though Mahony knew Wempe was accused of pedophilia, in 1988 he reassigned Wempe to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center as chaplain without informing officials there of the serious accusations against the priest. Only in March

2002 did Mahony ask Wempe to retire from the active clergy. Obviously, Mahony was aware of the accusations. Later, in September 2003, Fr. Wempe was arrested on suspicion of sexually abusing another child in his chaplain’s office at the hospital from 1990 to 1995.⁽¹⁴⁾ One more innocent child, therefore, was sacrificed because of Mahony’s complicity.

Another scandal flared in April 2002 after Mahony appointed his close friend Fr. Carl Sutphin as an associate pastor at the new Cathedral of Los Angeles, despite his knowledge that Sutphin was accused of sexually assaulting boys in the 1960’s and 70’s. One of his victims, Andrew Cicchillo, stated he had written a letter to Cardinal Mahony in 1991 and had been promised for his silence in the matter that Sutphin would retire and not be allowed to wear a collar. In 1995, however, Sutphin was given a position at St. Bibiana’s Cathedral in downtown Los Angeles. With the new Cathedral appointment, Cicchillo came forward and protested. So, only in February 2002 under public pressure was Mahony forced to permanently remove Sutphin was from his ministry. ⁽¹⁵⁾

In Spring 2002 Mahony was again in the news proclaiming openness and transparency and pledging to do “all that is humanly possible” to prevent sexual abuse in the nation’s largest Archdiocese. The same month Rita Miller came forward and asked Mahony to help her identify which of seven priests who consistently sexually abused her 20 years ago was the father of her daughter. She became pregnant at age 16. She said the Archdiocese tried to cover up the abuse by arranging for her to go to the Philippines where she delivered her baby. She stated Mahony approved regular payment to her chief molester, who allegedly was counseled by the Archdiocese to flee the country to protect himself from law enforcement officers.⁽¹⁶⁾

One of the latest problems for Mahony comes from a case from his past. I refer to the notorious sex abuse trials involving two Stockton-area brothers who had been abused by Fr. Oliver O’Grady from the time they were toddlers until they were in their late teens. The Cardinal, who was Bishop of Stockton during a critical period addressed in the lawsuit, testified at the 1998 civil trial involving the former priest. Mahony had ordered an evaluation after the priest himself admitted to him that he was a molester. Then, even after a negative report, Mahony went on to reassign O’Grady to another parish, where he abused victims

for years to come. The jury awarded \$30 million in damages to the brothers, later reduced to \$13 million.(17)

In 2003 six more child abuse suits against O'Grady were filed, and Cardinal Mahony's testimony is being sought because plaintiffs' lawyers believe he knew O'Grady was a pedophile, but transferred and promoted him anyway. So Mahony has dodged and delayed the deposition with a number of ingenious ploys. In July 2004, a plaintiff's attorney asked a judge to hold Mahony in contempt of court for his delays and stonewalling of justice.(18) The question necessarily arises: Why does Mahony go to such ends to refuse to testify unless he is hiding more information that could be helpful to the plaintiffs in these - and perhaps other - cases?

A national survey report released in February 2004 showed Mahony had also allowed at least 10 priests with civil cases filed against them in 2003 to stay in active ministry, among them Msgr. Richard Loomis, former vicar of the clergy, the one who actually oversaw misconduct allegations against priests. Loomis' parishioners were told he had the Cardinal's "complete confidence." But when another Loomis accuser came forward, the Cardinal finally had to remove his friend, placing the priest on paid leave. How did Mahony wiggle out of this difficult situation? The crafty fox used the opportunity to falsely assert that this case proved his stern policy of protection was working. More accurately, Mary Grant, a director of Survivors Network of Those Abused by Priests, said Mahony's action made a "glaring example" that what he promises and what he does are two different things.(19)

From these cases, we can see the Cardinal routinely failed to report errant priests to authorities until a 1997 California law compelled disclosure. He also habitually reassigned priests with long records of sexual abuse to places with access to children. The "one-strike-and-you're-out" Cardinal himself holds a dismal record of protecting pedophile priests. In other words, his touted policy of "zero tolerance" is a ruse and a lie, and he is complacent with pedophile priests.

Master of Delays

Mahony, backed by his high-powered, high-

cost attorneys, is a master in the tactic of delay. With fox-like cunning, he protests loudly that his first priority is care for the victims. Threatened with a grand jury investigation in May 2002, Mahony vowed to give law enforcement officials all the documents tied to molestations by his priests. "We want every single thing out, open and dealt with, period," he said.(20)

Notwithstanding, to this day, the Archdiocese continues to present legal snags that keep 2,000 pages of documents out of the hands of law enforcement. Even after grand jury subpoenas and stern admonitions from the National Review Board, Mahony refuses to release the documents or disclose the names of 33 accused clerics, including six in active ministry.(21)

Therefore, instead of helping the victims in the more than 400 civil cases the Archdiocese faces, he works to slow the process down and hurt the victims, who were counting on the private documents that Mahony had promised to release. What is happening here, noted Richard Sipe, former Benedictine monk and expert on sexual abuse in the Church, is that Bishops like Mahony who say they want transparency are exposing themselves as liars.(22) They are obviously more interested in child predators and their own careers than the victims and their flocks.

Taking Advantage of the Crisis

When one analyzes the practical consequences of the Cardinal's reaction to the clergy sexual abuse scandals, one can see that the Mahony has actually tried to take advantage of the dismal situation to forward the progressivist agenda. He has exploited the villainous crisis to bring up the question of priestly celibacy, suggesting that this could be the real root of the sexual abuse scandal in the clergy and that a married clergy should be a topic open for discussion.

I would not be surprised if the Cardinal-Fox would go even further and depict this crisis as a good fruit of Vatican II. My suspicions are not ungrounded in fact, since he claimed just such a thing about the tragic vocations crisis the Church has suffered in this post-Vatican II period. In his 2000 pastoral letter, *As I Have Done for You* he made the astounding statement that the vocations crisis in the Church was "one of the

many fruits of Vatican II, a sign of God's deep love for the Church" because, without priests, there is yet more opportunity for the laity to participate in the liturgy.

I would agree with the Cardinal that the vocations crisis is a fruit of Vatican II, but a bad fruit, and not a good one as he says. I would also propose to him that a root cause for the torrent of pedophilia and homosexuality that inundates the Catholic clergy and hierarchy is that same Ecumenical Council. As Atila S. Guimarães points out in his timely work, *Vatican II, Homosexuality and Pedophilia*, this crisis is "without a doubt a consequence of the moral leniency that was established in the Church after Vatican II."

(1) *Physiologus, A Bestiary* by Bishop Theobald (London, John and Edward Bumpus, 1928). The author is believed to have been Abbot of Monte Cassino from 1022-1035.

(2) "LA Churches Details Abuse," *CBSNews.com*, February 17, 2004.

(3) Atila Sinke Guimarães, *Vatican II, Homosexuality & Pedophilia*, (Los Angeles: TIA, 2004), p.185.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 87.

(5) *Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.

(6) *Ibid.*, p. 90.

(7) "The Shocking 22-Year Record of LA's Archbishop," *Los Angeles Lay Catholic Mission*, December 2002.

(8) Robert Kumpel, "They Didn't Think It Was Any Big Deal: Homosexuality and St. John's Seminary," *Los Angeles Lay Catholic Mission*, July/August 2002.

(9) Guimarães, *Vatican II, Homosexuality and Pedophilia*, pp. 117-119.

(10) "Is the Catholic Church Doing Enough?" transcript of April 27 interview of Rita Cosby with Cardinal Mahony, *FOXNews.com*, April 29, 2002.

(11) *Ibid.*

(12) Daniel Cozzens, *The Changing Face of the Priesthood*, pp. 123-4.

(13) Guimarães, *Vatican II, Homosexuality and Pedophilia*, p. 185.

(14) Richard Winton, "Priest Held Again in Alleged Sex Abuse," *Los Angeles Times*, September 11, 2003.

(15) Guimarães, *Vatican II, Homosexuality and Pedophilia*, p. 207.

(16) Ron Russell, "Cardinal Cover-Up," *Los Angeles New Times*, May 2, 2002.

(17) Guimarães, *Vatican II, Homosexuality and Pedophilia*, p. 183.

(18) Jean Guccione, "Mahony's Testimony Is Sought," *Los Angeles Times*, July 1, 2004.

(19) William Lobdell and Larry Stammer, "Mahony Criticized by National Review Board," *Los Angeles Times*, February 28, 2004.

(20) "Mahony Resisting Disclosure," *Los Angeles Times*, March 3, 2003.

(21) William Lobdell and Larry Stammer, "Mahony Criticized by National Review Board," *Los Angeles Times*, February 28, 2004.

(22) *Ibid.*

Send your tax-deductable donations to:

Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc.
PO Box 109, Petersburg, IL 62675
Ph: 217-632-5920 / Fax 217-632-7054
www.rcf.org

For information on destructive sex education within Catholic schools and parishes contact:

MOTHER'S WATCH
PO Box 1029, Frederick, MD 21702-0029
Ph: 410-761-7437 or 540-822-3875
Fax: 410-761-4233 or 540-822-3876
www.motherswatch.org

CARDINAL SCANDAL: LOS ANGELES' ARCHBISHOP ROGER MAHONY AN ICON FOR ABUSIVE AMCHURCH PRELATES

by Paul Likoudis

As scandals go in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, the most recent scandal in late May barely registers on the Amchurch Richter scale for seismic shocks, barely a blip next to the well-documented and, apparently, never ending scandals in clerical sex abuse, ongoing liturgical abuses, heterodox catechesis, cemetery finances, homosexual proselytization and left-wing politics.

But the scandal is emblematic of the egregious misrule of the Cardinal-Archbishop of Los Angeles, Roger Mahony.

Earlier this year, Cardinal Mahony yanked from his pulpit at St. Louise de Marillac Catholic Church in Covina – a parish where a former pastor had abused at least a dozen children over 20 years – a very popular priest who had complained during a priests' meeting with the cardinal that Mahony was not being forthright on the matter of clergy sex abuse.

More than 8,000 parishioners wrote Mahony, asking that he reinstate Fr. Chris Cunningham, a popular, orthodox priest who had brought more than 1,000 youth into the parish, and demanding to know why he abruptly pulled him.

What was Mahony's response? He called Fr. Cunningham "emotionally unstable," recalling the old Soviet dictator Krushchev's dictum that those who oppose communism are "criminally insane."

+ + +

Cardinal Roger Mahony presides over a sprawling archdiocese, perhaps the most multiethnic on earth, with nearly four million Catholics from more than a hundred different ethnic communities.

Since the death of Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, says Mahony loyalist Tom Fox, the dissident publisher of the *National Catholic Reporter*, Cardinal Mahony has become the liberal American Catholic's standard bearer, "carry[ing] on the Bernardin legacy

of articulating a pastoral vision of Church" – which means, in reality, demonizing and marginalizing faithful Catholics, riding roughshod over orthodox priests, professing loyalty to Rome from one side of his mouth while advocating an ambitious agenda to deconstruct traditional Catholicism.

"How refreshing to see such pastoral leadership," wrote Fox.

+ + +

Born February 27, 1936 in Hollywood, Ca., the adopted Mexican-American son of an Irish electrician who later went into the poultry business, Mahony was appointed the Archbishop of Los Angeles by Pope John Paul II in 1985, after serving as Bishop of Stockton, where he had become somewhat of a hero to orthodox Catholics around the country for speaking out against heterodox religious education texts.

From the time of his ordination in 1962, Mahony began building his public persona as California's version of the French "worker priest," working outside his diocese ministering to migrant farm laborers in Fresno and Stockton, befriending and promoting United Farm Workers president Cesar Chavez during the often-violent labor organizer's struggle against local grape growers. He went on to serve former California governor Jerry Brown as the state's first chairman of the Agricultural Labor Relations Board, and worked hard to unionize migrant workers.

By the late 1960s and through the '70s, Mahony's political clout grew, as he forged alliances with Democrat power-brokers in and out of politics, becoming the de-facto voice of the state's burgeoning population of Latinos. But he was equally adept at working with Republican power brokers, as well, as evidenced by his close relationship with Los Angeles Mayor Richard Riordan, one of the region's wealthiest businessmen, to whom Mahony gave communion at his first mayoral inauguration – despite the fact that Riordan was divorced, remarried and had dumped his second wife for a new lady companion, Nancy Daly.

Reportedly, Cardinal Mahony had to divest

himself of a million dollar helicopter ostensibly given him by a group of wealthy businessmen, including Riordan, as a condition for receiving the red hat of a cardinal.

Mahony's political interventions since the 1960s could be the subject of an entire book.

But the "bottom line" of his intertwined secular and ecclesiastic politics has been a disaster for Catholic interests in California.

Under his reign, there has been a dramatic deprioritizing of genuine moral issues, in particular, the most crucial of all, abortion – especially in California where one-fourth of all American abortions are performed. As archbishop of Los Angeles, Mahony allowed the internment of the notorious inventor and promoter of partial-birth abortion – described by former Congressman Bob Dornan as "killing a baby on his birthday" – Dr. James McMahon, to be buried in the Holy Martyrs section of Holy Cross Cemetery, with an ostentatious monument for himself and his surviving wife.

With Los Angeles the abortion capital of the western world, where unscrupulous, often-criminal schlock-doc abortionists prey on hundreds of thousands of poor, young, mostly undocumented Catholic Latinas, the region's Catholic legislators are among the most rabidly pro-abortion, pro-Planned Parenthood in the California state house and U.S. congressional delegations.

To cite one example, among the recent Democrat Catholics in Congress who sent a protest to Washington's Theodore Cardinal McCarrick, saying it was wrong to deny pro-abortion politicians communion, were Los Angeles' rabid pro-abortion and feminist Diane Watson, Hilda Solice, Loretta Sanchez (who won her Orange County seat, replacing pro-life Congressman Bob Dornan, through vote fraud and with the active participation of Catholic Church-based voter registration programs), Loretta's sister Linda Sanchez (making the first "sister act" in the House of Representatives), Joe Bacca, Grace Napolitano, Xavier Baccera and Lucille Roybal Allard.

What has especially aggravated California Catholics, however, has been the cardinal's two-faced approach to the homosexual agenda. While on the surface he has supported the opposition to directly affirming so-called "gay marriage," he has allowed his subordinates, such as Auxiliary Bishops Juan Arzube, Stephen Blair and his on-staff homosexual ac-

tivist Fr. Peter Liuzzi, to constantly warn and caution about denying homosexuals their supposed rights to benefits accorded married heterosexuals based on sodomy relationships.

The Los Angeles archdiocese – which embraces Hollywood and the San Fernando Valley – is the world's center for the production of hard and soft core pornography. When Dr. Dennis Jarrard was employed to work on the pornography issue by the archdiocese, and suggested that the Church should revive its 1930s-style film code, he was abruptly fired by Mahony, and publicly rebuked – apparently at the behest of multi-millionaire media moguls who made major contributions to Mahony and his various projects.

Among the other major political issues facing Catholics in the state – from unionizing nurses in Catholic hospitals to state funded abortion and birth control, sterilization of minorities, homosexual proselytization in public and Catholic schools, border issues involving illegal migration and their exploitation – Mahony has always worked the left to ensure the Church remains a well-funded subcontractor of the welfare state.

+ + +

As Cardinal-Archbishop of Los Angeles, Roger Mahony's meteoric rise up the Church hierarchy was left largely unexamined until the clergy sex abuse scandal erupted across the nation with the Boston *Globe's* revelations of long patters of episcopal cover-up of predator priests in Boston in January 2002.

Though this reporter, among others, had been probing what appeared to be a "catamite syndrome" in the Church for years – particularly while researching the rise of San Francisco Archbishop John Quinn and his close relationship with the late, disgraced, Bishop Joseph Ferrario of Honolulu, the extent of a homosexual buddy-system in the Church where homosexual seminarians were groomed and promoted was never really examined until the groundbreaking investigative work of Californian Ron Russell, first at the *L.A. New Times* and later, at the *S.F. Weekly*.

In "Mahony's Cronies," a masterpiece worthy of a Pulitzer Prize, Ron Russell, in June 2002, when the sex crimes of Los Angeles priests seemed ready to displace those of Boston's, suggested Mahony was disingenuous, to say the least, on his deni-

als pertaining to clerical sex abuse.

Russell, who had been uncovering Mahony's responsibility for the elevation of his close friend G. Patrick Zieman, former bishop of Santa Rosa who was forced to resign after a priest released tapes of Zieman pressuring him for sex, found that Mahony had surrounded himself for years by fellow priests he knew were sex offenders, sometimes for as long as decades, such as his close friend Father Carl Sutphin, with whom Mahony had lived at St. Vibiana's and whom he had just appointed as associate pastor at the soon-to-open Our Lady of the Angels Cathedral.

A week after Mahony cut Sutphin off (as a condition of settling a lawsuit which enabled Mahony to avoid giving testimony), "Mahony was forced to disclose having tossed overboard another longtime friend and child molester, Father Michael Wempe," wrote Russell.

"This, after a reporter began asking questions about Wempe at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, where Mahony had stashed him as a chaplain without bothering to tell hospital officials that he was a known pedophile. Mahony had even been the star guest at a luncheon in Wempe's honor at the hospital as recently as two years ago.

"Shortly after the Wempe mea culpa, a 34-year-old West Hollywood man walked into a sheriff's substation to file a complaint about yet another of Mahony's longtime intimates, Father Michael Baker, who is accused of molesting numerous children during more than a decade after Mahony welcomed him back to the fold in the mid-1980s despite knowing then of his history of pedophilia. As it turns out, Mahony had torpedoed Baker in 1999 and kept it quiet by imposing a 'confidentiality agreement' on the victims' families and their lawyers after paying them more than \$1.3 million in church funds.

"But," continued Russell, "Sutphin, Wempe, Baker and Zieman have more in common than merely their reputations as sexual predators. At one time or another, each cleric has been a member of Mahony's inner circle, part of the same old-boys' network born from years of shared experiences. As with others close to Mahony, a common denominator is St. John's Seminary College in Camarillo, the secluded 92-acre hilltop institution that has stocked the parishes of the Los Angeles Archdiocese and beyond with Roman Catholic priests since it opened in 1939. Sutphin and Wempe were classmates of Mahony's

there. Zieman arrived in 1963, the year after Mahony graduated. But those who know Mahony and Zieman say their paths have interconnected at St. John's and elsewhere since at least the 1960s. After Mahony became archbishop of Los Angeles in 1985, Zieman's stock soared as one of his most promising proteges. Mahony and Baker (St. John's class of '74) became close after Mahony took over the L.A. Archdiocese from the late Cardinal Timothy Manning, another St. John's alumnus....

"Besides cardinals Mahony and Manning, the walls are peppered with bishops and their top lieutenants, past and present, from dioceses all over the country. The photographs also illustrate just how powerful a figure Mahony has become within the hierarchy of the American Church, based on the numerous contemporaries and proteges who've ascended to lofty clerical positions.

"Among his former classmates, to name a few, are William J. Levada, archbishop of San Francisco; George Niederhauer, bishop of Salt Lake City; Justin S. Regali, archbishop of St. Louis [now cardinal in Philadelphia]; Manuel D. Moreno, bishop of Tucson, Arizona; Tod D. Brown, bishop of the Diocese of Orange, and John T. Steinbock, bishop of Fresno...."

+ + +

Russell puts St. John's Seminary somewhere near the level of a homosexual bathhouse, where, for decades, faculty and students and visiting alumni get drunk together, have sex together, protect each other and eject those who don't play along.

In mid-December 2003, a civil lawsuit filed against the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, which names 28 high-ranking priests, including two auxiliary bishops, shed new light on the "catamite syndrome" at work at St. John's Seminary.

(A "catamite" is the beneficiary/victim of an older, powerful, homosexual predator-pederast who is constantly recruiting a succession of adolescents, and showering affection, preferences, professional opportunities and material goods in return for sexual favors.)

The lawsuit filed December 17 in Los Angeles Superior Court by 17 sex abuse victims, only two of whom are women, reveal the vast power of a homosexual underworld in controlling the Archdiocese of Los Angeles' minor seminary and seminary, the

chancery tribunal, religious education, major fund-raising operations – in short, all that has to do with the propagation of faith for future generations.

In its report on the lawsuit, the Los Angeles *Times* quoted Archdiocese spokesman Tod Tamberg calling the claims “over the top and without merit” and said the notion that there was a band of clerical pedophiles in high positions helping each other was preposterous.

Nevertheless, the introduction to the lawsuit (Case No. BC307934) lays out an explanation of how the two bishops and 26 priests utilized their positions of power to gain access to victims and then “funnel the children they molested into seminaries and the priesthood.”

“These 28 priests and likely many others occupied positions such as Auxiliary Bishops, Vicar for Clergy, Vicars General, consultants, Judges, school board members, Director of Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, teachers and deans at local seminaries and recruiters for seminaries. The elevation of child molesters to these positions helps explain why so many child-molesting priests were protected by the Archdiocese, how so many child molesters became priests, and how so many seminarians and priests became child molesters,” states the lawsuit filed by attorneys Raymond Boucher of Beverly Hills and Laurence Drivon of Stockton.

“Child molester priests congregated in three arms of Archdiocesan religious education,” the introduction continues: (1) Administrators; (2) faculty at the Junior Seminary and; (3) members of the Vocations Commission who acted as recruiters for the Junior and Major Seminaries. In these capacities child molester priests had increased opportunities to seek out additional victims who they then steered into the seminary. Once there they were preyed upon and, for too many, inculcated into a perverse lifestyle where the only thing unacceptable about molesting children was being caught by someone that might complain. There can be little doubt that this systematic molestation of children at the seminaries, grade schools and parishes, was known within the community of priests. Fellow priests did nothing to prevent the continuation of abuse because they themselves were molesting, or they feared reprisal from the high-ranking priests who were child molesters.”

The nine causes of action include: child sex abuse, negligence, negligent supervision with failure

to warn, negligent hiring/retention, breach of fiduciary duty, negligent failure to educate, warn or train plaintiff, negligence per se for statutory violations, premises liability and sexual battery.

WHO THEY ARE

The following archdiocesan officials named in the lawsuit are:

* Retired Auxiliary Bishop Juan Arzube. The lawsuit alleges that “Since the 1970s, Father Juan Arzube has been an Auxiliary Bishop...For much if not all of this time the Defendant Archdiocese and the Vatican have been aware of his sexual improprieties with young boys. In his capacity as Auxiliary Bishop, Arzube has exercised extraordinary influence in promoting other pedophiles within the priesthood and in aiding cover-ups and transfers of molesting priests. One such molester that Arzube had a direct hand in promotion was Joseph Pina, who for many years served with Arzube at St. Alphonsus parish in Los Angeles.”

(It is relevant to point out here that Bishop Arzube, long supportive of the homosexual rights movement, was among three California bishops – with former San Francisco Archbishop John Quinn and Oakland’s former Bishop John Cummins – who signed an advertisement opposing passage of California’s Proposition 6, which would have barred homosexual teachers from proselytizing for homosexuality in public school classrooms.)

* Resigned Bishop G. Patrick Ziemann. The lawsuit alleges: “From Ziemann’s earliest assignment as a priest to his last assignment as a Bishop, he has been accused of sexual impropriety by numerous children and adults. Despite or perhaps because of his abuse, Ziemann rose rapidly through the ranks of the Defendant Archdiocese, teaching at Our Lady Queen of the Angels Junior Seminary, becoming an Auxiliary Bishop and Vicar General and eventually becoming Bishop of Santa Rosa. From 1975 to 1987, Ziemann taught at Our Lady Queen of the Angels Junior Seminary, eventually becoming Dean of Studies. Both before he was made a teacher and during the time he taught there Ziemann molested young boys.” The lawsuit also states that Ziemann was appointed to the Priests’ Senate and the Priest Placement Board, before becoming Bishop of Santa Rosa, which he resigned “because of allegations he blackmailed a younger priest into having sex with him.”

* Monsignor Joseph Sharpe. The lawsuit alleges: "Starting in 1960 and running until 1976, Monsignor Joseph Sharpe was the Superintendent of High Schools and Colleges and a member of the School Board...In the mid-1970s, he was appointed an Advocate, Notary and Defender of the Bond for the Synodal and Post-Synodal Tribunal. At least one child that was sexually molested by Sharpe when he was a high-ranking official has come forward.. Sharpe like not less than seven other child-molesting priests was also assigned for a significant time to Santa Clara parish in Oxnard."

* Fr. Gerald Fessard.. The lawsuit alleges: "In 1981, Fessard was appointed the Associate Superintendent of Elementary Schools...He held this post while molesting multiple children and despite being run out of Santa Clara parish in Oxnard because of his sexually graphic talk with students. In February of 1987, Fessard was made Dean of the Vocations Committee who acted as recruiters for the Junior and Major Seminaries...."

* Monsignor Leland Boyer: The lawsuit alleges: "Throughout his reign in the hierarchy of the Archdiocese, Monsignor Leland Boyer utilized his position as a prominent priest to molest children and funnel them into the priesthood. Starting in 1958 and running into the early 1980s, Boyer obtained progressively higher posts of Director of Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (CCD) programs and Consultor in the College of Consultors...The College of Consultors is charged with assisting and counseling the Archbishop on matters of grave seriousness...including allegations of sexual abuse. While in these posts, Leland Boyer was molesting boys and have these boys accompany him at dinners and other functions with fellow priests. He funneled those boys into the Junior and Major Seminaries.

"Like so many other high-ranking child molester priests, Leland Boyer covered-up for fellow molesting priests sheltering them in his parish. In 1983, Lynn Caffoe was transferred to St. Bede the Venerable under Boyer's supervision after Caffoe was seen molesting a child while assigned to Our Lady of Peace in North Hills. At Our Lady of Peace numerous complaints were made about Caffoe's sexual contact with children before he was transferred....."

* Fr. Edward Dober. The lawsuit alleges: "From 1983 to 1990, Dober taught at Our Lady Queen of the Angels Junior Seminary. From 1978 into the early 1980s Dober occupied a post on the Vocations Board...Throughout this time at the Junior Seminary, Dober used his position to molest children, intimidating them into silence and rewarding their acquiescence."

* Fr. Richard Martini: The lawsuit alleges: "From 1989 to 1994, Richard Martini also taught at Our Lady Queen of the Angels Junior Seminary. In the mid-1990s, Martini was placed on the Vocations Board. On the Vocations Board he and the other members of the board recruited children from junior high schools and high schools to attend the seminaries. Throughout the time he was associated with the Junior Seminary Martini molested children that attended the school."

* Fr. John Farris. The lawsuit alleges: "In terms of shaping the make-up and philosophy...of the Archdiocese toward child molestation in the 1950s and into the 1960s, perhaps the most significant child molester faculty member of Our Lady Queen of the Angels Junior Seminary was Fr. John Farris. Father Farris was among the most popular teachers and spiritual advisors at Our Lady Queen of the Angels Junior Seminary in the 1950s and 1960s. While rendering spiritual advisement, Farris sexually molested the young students at the Junior Seminary. During this period of time, not uncoincidentally, the attrition rate of students dropping out of the Junior Seminary was extremely high. During this time many of the present Archbishops and Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in California were students at Our Lady Queen of the Angels Junior Seminary, including Cardinal Roger Mahony, Archbishop William Levada, Bishop John Steinbock, as well as former Bishop of Tucson Manuel Moreno."

* Fr. John Dougherty: The lawsuit alleges Fr. Dougherty was appointed to teach at Our Lady Queen of the Angels Junior Seminary "after he had molested children for several years."

* Fr. Stephen Hernandez. The lawsuit alleges:

“Immediately after his ordination Fr. Stephen Hernandez was assigned to rapid succession of parishes, including Santa Clara in Oxnard, before he was dumped into Our Lady Queen of the Angels Junior Seminary. While there from 1987 through 1990 he molested numerous children who aspired to be priests, lavishing attention and other rewards on his inner circle of boys. Hernandez was eventually removed from the Junior Seminary, and assigned to juvenile detention and related ministries where he continued to molest boys up until 2002 when police began investigating him.”

* Fr. Fidencio Silva. The lawsuit alleges: “In the mid-1970s through the mid-1980s, Fidencio Silva sexually molested scores of children at Our Lady of Guadalupe Parish in Oxnard. During this time numerous complaints were made about his activities with children, leading to increasing restrictions on his contact with children at the parish. Finally, in the mid-1980s, he was transferred...Instead of turning him over to the police...the defendant archdiocese...promoted him to be head of the Hispanic Young Adult Ministry....”

* Fr. Patrick Roemer. The lawsuit alleges: “Roemer became a priest in 1970. Accusations of his sexually molesting children followed him from his earliest assignments at St. Raphael in Goleta and San Roque in Santa Barbara, to his last, St. Pascal Baylon Parish in Thousand Oaks. In 1981 he was finally criminally convicted of molesting boys. Incredibly, in the middle of his rampage...he was assigned to [the Archdiocese’s] Vocations Board from 1975 through 1977....”

* Fr. Richard Loomis. The lawsuit alleges: “Became Vicar for Clergy in the late 1990s through 2002. Before he became a priest he taught at Pater Noster High School and was known as Brother Beckett. While teaching at Pater Noster he routinely molested children. In his capacity as Vicar for Clergy, Loomis had a direct hand in receiving complaints regarding priests and administrative actions from those complaints....”

* Fr. Joseph Pina. The lawsuit alleges that “while at St. Alphonsus church under the tutelage of Bishop

Juan Arzube, Joseph Pina molested children. Also under the guidance of Arzube, Pina began ascending the ranks of the Church hierarchy in the late 1980s when he was made a Deanery Representative and worked on the Personnel Board....”

* Fr. Joseph Alzugaray. The lawsuit alleges: “In the late 1960s, Fr. Joseph Alzugaray, the flamboyant priest at Immaculate Conception in Mornovia, molested numerous prepubescent girls. In the early 1970s, Alzugaray began ascending the ranks of the Church’s hierarchy, becoming an advocate on the Archdiocesan Courts and a recruiter for the Vocations Board. He took on the mantle of directing the Holy Child Pontifical office, the Propagation of the Faith office and the Lay Mission Helpers office, and continued in these posts through the late 1980s...”

He was eventually transferred to a northern California diocese.

* Fr. Clinton Hagenbach. The lawsuit alleges: “Not less than 11 children at several different parishes and hospitals that were molested by Clinton Hagenbach throughout his career have come forward....” Hagenbach served as an Advocate, Notary and Defender of the Bond at the archdiocesan tribunal, and in 1981, elevated to Judge in the Synodal and Pro-Synodal Tribunals.

Other accused molesters who served on the archdiocesan tribunal are Fr. Christian Van Liefde, Fr. Thomas Havel and Fr. Peter Garcia.

Defendant Fr. George Scott, formerly pastor of one of the archdiocese’s largest parishes, alleged to be a member of what the lawsuit calls a “ring of child molesters” was director of the Apostleship of the Sea.

Defendant Fr. David Cousineau was regional director of Catholic Social Services and Director of the Cardinal McIntyre Fund.

Defendant Fr. Theodore Llanos is alleged by the lawsuit to be “known to be one of the most prolific child molesters” in the archdiocese. The lawsuit claims that Llanos was known to be a pedophile before his ordination, and that complaints were made to archdiocesan officials before the ordination. Nevertheless, in the early 1990s he was placed on the Priest Personnel Board.

Defendant Fr. Louis Stallkamp served as a Deanery Representative.

Defendant Fr. Michael Baker is accused of molesting “not less than a dozen children.” In 1993, after returning from the Servants of the Paraclete treatment center in Jemez Springs, New Mexico, he was assigned to the Office of the Vicar for Clergy.

Defendant Fr. Carlos Rodriguez, was transferred from St. Vincent de Paul Parish after molestation claims were made against him, but then was promoted to head of the Office of Family Life in Santa Barbara. While holding that post, the lawsuit alleges, he molested three brothers over a six-year period from 1988 through 1994.

+ + +

The extent of this homosexual “buddy system” in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, extending throughout the western United States, goes far to explain why Mahony founded, in 1986, his archdiocesan Office for Lesbian and Gay Ministry, and his ongoing support for the unabashed homosexualist Fr. Peter Liuzzi, O. Carm.

It also helps explain why Mahony and those around him describe their Catholic critics as “retro-Catholics.”

It also explains why Mahony seems to be on a mission to deconstruct the faith and replace it with a religion more to his liking, exemplified by his long-standing support for homosexuals (and pedophiles), his initiatives in so-called “religious education,” his obsession on liturgy as “theater,” his tirades against traditional Catholics and his close relationships with the Hollywood elite and the glamor set.

THE INFAMOUS APOLOGY

Two years before the clergy sex scandal broke, Cardinal Mahony scandalized many of his flock with an “apology” he offered at the opening of Lent, 2000.

What struck many Catholics, not just in Los Angeles but around the country, as odd was those to whom the apology was offered.

On Mardi Gras, Roger Cardinal Mahony issued what the Los Angeles *Times*’ religion writer Larry Stammer described as “an extraordinary public apology...for the failings of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Los Angeles and of himself.

“Divorced and remarried Catholics, organized labor, victims of sexual abuse by clergy, women and homosexuals were among the specific groups Mahony listed as he declared that confession and repentance must precede forgiveness,” wrote Stammer for the L.A. *Times* March 8 (Ash Wednesday) edition.

Left out of the cardinal’s sweeping apology was any acknowledgment of how his actions and policies have hurt men because of his ridiculous gender-bending policies; to women, for not speaking the truth about how contraception, sterilization and abortion can ruin their lives; to couples whose marriages have been torn apart by his annulment mill; to seminarians, for the fetid atmosphere in his seminary; to pro-lifers who have suffered from his contempt; to catechists for promoting heresy and heterodoxy at his annual religious education congress; to traditionalists for his niggardly attitude toward the Indult Mass; to millions of Mass-goers for having to endure and suffer through liturgical abuses; to the Catholics of Santa Rosa for sending his colleague G. Patrick Ziemann up there to embarrass them and bankrupt their diocese morally and fiscally; to grandparents, suffering the consequences of the horrid education their children received in Catholic schools; to Hispanics, who now comprise 50 percent of the state’s prison population because the Church social structures his predecessors provided to immigrants have become inadequate under his reign as he concentrated on leftist politics.

The litany could go on to include all those not on Hollywood’s list of politically-correct victims.

Ironically, the Archbishop of Hollywood failed entirely to apologize to the world-wide victims of the scandalous and morally corrupting and degenerate entertainment produced under his nose, both by his millionaire Hollywood donors and in the San Fernando Valley, which is the world’s largest production for hard core pornography.

But Mahony’s message, which anticipated Pope John Paul II’s *mea culpa* by several days, was produced in time to be featured on the NBC national news with Tom Brokaw on March 8, in a two-minute six-second news report by Andrea Mitchell on Pope John Paul II’s request for forgiveness for the sins Catholics committed in the past.

“Anticipating the Pope’s call for forgiveness,” said Mitchell, “a public apology came Wednesday [sic] from Cardinal Roger Mahony in Los Angeles. It was directed at some of the most controversial

past targets of Church criticism: divorced and remarried Catholics, victims of sexual abuse by the clergy, women and homosexuals.”

As she spoke, photos of Mahony dressed in his cardinal's regal scarlet vestments appeared on the screen over a neutral set background, giving the impression his orchestrated event was staged for this “virtual” event; his picture was followed by video clips of churches and of children who appeared to be kneeling at a communion rail – which would be quite rare in Los Angeles.

“Christians and the followers of other religions that profess belief in the one God are invited to ask themselves how far they have lived and acted outside the faith they profess,” Mahony said.

One of the most bizarre aspects of his apology was his denunciation of his two predecessors, Cardinals James MacIntyre and Timothy Manning, for hurting the feelings of the rebellious Immaculate Heart of Mary nuns during their bitter struggles with the prelates during the 1960s and '70s as the nuns repudiated their vows and infected thousands of students they taught with modernism.

Mahony apologized for his predecessors' actions for upholding Church teaching and discipline and to those nuns “who felt hurt and rejection by the Church during those years.”

Cardinal Mahony also apologized for his union-busting activities in the late 1980s when his Catholic cemetery workers tried to form a union, but made no apologies to Catholics in his diocese (and others) for putting Catholic cemeteries into unprecedented and exclusive business deals with multinational mortuary businesses who then gouge bereaving Catholics when it comes time to bury loved ones. (More on this below.)

But there was no apology (in advance) for the anti-Catholic insults and jokes he was about to inflict on his own diocesan catechists and religion teachers at the upcoming religious education congress, when “Sister's” *Late Night Catechism* was offered for entertainment.

Mahony also apologized to his priests for making “intemperate” remarks and acknowledged that his “pride and lack of charity” had offended many, and he resolved to “be more humble, generous, kind, considerate, and supportive to all within the archdiocese.”

“There is no saving value in simply naming a group of issues unless we have some real firm purpose of amendment in terms of a real program that seeks to redress the wrong,” he added.

A special focus of the apology, said the *Times*, were gays and lesbians. Mahony “specifically asked the pardon of Catholic homosexuals and lesbians for those times when the Church seemed to be unsupportive and homophobic,” wrote Stammer, who did not mention just how supportive Mahony has been of the homosexual agenda in the Church.

“Mahony,” Stammer continued, “offered a blanket apology to anyone in the archdiocese who has felt like an outsider because of his or her culture, language, ethnic background or immigration status.

“Divorced and remarried Catholics -- presumably those who remarried outside the Church and cannot receive the sacraments -- came in for special mention. Mahony said the Church had once been insensitive to their needs and failed to reach out to them. That is not the case today, he said, although Catholics who have been remarried still are not permitted the sacraments unless their new marriage is recognized by the Church.

One year later, Mahony made another startling apology, when he issued an unprecedented personal, public apology for writing a letter seeking a presidential pardon for a convicted cocaine dealer who ran a multimillion dollar, multi-state cocaine ring.

As Matea Gold and Larry Stammer wrote for the *Los Angeles Times*, February 13, 2001

“Cardinal Roger M. Mahony and former Assembly Speaker Antonio Villaraigosa said Monday that they regretted writing letters in support of a Los Angeles cocaine dealer whose sentence was commuted on President Clinton's last day in office.

“Clinton's commutation of Carlos Vignali's 15-year federal prison sentence for his role in a multi-state cocaine ring was detailed Sunday in the *Times*. On Monday, the *Times* disclosed that Mahony and several local political figures, including two mayoral candidates, had lobbied for the presidential gesture....

“[Mahony] said in a statement. The purpose of the letter was to seek a further review of the facts, the law, and the processes used in his case. I made it clear that I was incapable of making a judgment about

his guilt or innocence.

“‘Regardless of the merits of the case, I made a serious mistake in writing to the president and I broke my decades-long practice of never sending a letter on behalf of any person whom I did not know personally. I apologize for not following my own principles in this matter,’ Mahony said. The archbishop did not say in the statement who approached him. He did not return telephone calls seeking clarification....”

+ + +

MORE SCANDAL

For many Catholics, and even non-Catholics, Cardinal Mahony's decision to abandon St. Vibiana's Cathedral – which would eventually be sold and turned into a theater – and build a new, modernistic cathedral as part of a new downtown “entertainment” center manifested the cardinal's view of himself as a major power not only in Los Angeles, but in the state.

His decision to close St. Vibiana's after minor earthquake damage and his threat to raze it, his bullying of historic preservationists and state legislators in the process, his lies that the church would be too expensive to repair, all played out in public, revealed an arrogant side of the cardinal many had not yet seen.

But by December 2001, months before it was to open, and the price-tag climbed to nearly \$200 million, it was the butt of jokes. People called it “Raj Mahal,” “the Yellow Armadillo,” “Butt-Ugly.”

Mahony himself didn't quite know what a cathedral is for. In October 2001, in what was considered a “major” address at a symposium on church architecture at the University of Notre Dame in Indiana, the cardinal said, “a cathedral is more than a building.... It is a place or space in a city or town, like some great buildings of other religions have been more like oases in the middle of densely inhabited places: Here the people assemble.”

According to a report on his talk, which appeared in the *Los Angeles Lay Mission*, December 2001: “The cardinal said that, in building a cathedral, he had learned a few things. First, a cathedral is a place where ‘there is an exchange of the gifts that have been and are being given by God to the community, the local Church.’ The cathedral is also the place where the ‘Catholic community does what is central

to its faith and life,’ such as celebrate the Eucharist and other sacraments, ‘discuss and debate the theological issues of our day and make pronouncements on matters of faith and morals,’ teach, offer support to the oppressed, etc.

“The cathedral, continued Mahony, is ‘a place of hospitality’ and ‘a place of transformation.’ It is, as well, ‘a place of beauty. You cannot go on starving Catholic people, and people in general, of beauty, of visual art, music, great architecture, glass and light, the good crafting of beautiful materials.’ A cathedral, said Mahony, must be a ‘finely crafted setting for a precious jewel -- the jewel being the Body of Christ in all its diversity.’

“A cathedral, concluded the cardinal, is always incomplete, always in the process of becoming. ‘Over and over again it will be what it is not,’ said Mahony, ‘more than what it is, summoning us to more than what we dreamed we might be. And in this age, an age whose greatest poverty is its service to the literal, to the purely functional, that will have been worth all our effort’.”

Mahony's New Age-edifice blather aside, popular author and architecture critic Michael Rose more honestly captured the sense of Catholic outrage over the \$200 million structure in an op-ed piece in the *Wall Street Journal*, September 13, 2002, when he observed:

“But how does Our Lady of the Angels measure up as a Roman Catholic cathedral? After all, the 11-story edifice is not a government building, a museum or a bank. It is meant to be a sacred structure charged with transmitting the truths of the Catholic faith to current and future generations. It is meant to evangelize, to inspire and to beckon. It is meant, above all, to be a house of God wrought in the fashion of heavenly things.

“Unfortunately, Cardinal Roger Mahony's new center of Catholicism for Los Angeles does little of that.

“Designed by the renowned Spanish architect José Raphael Moneo, the cathedral is decidedly abstract and modernist in its architectural vocabulary. With its hulking shape, sharp-edged profile, asymmetrical layout and unsettling lack of right angles, the building consciously breaks with the historical continuity of two millennia of Catholic church architecture. Instead it pays homage to the past 50 years of

banal and uninspiring utilitarian office structures that have littered the landscape of downtown Los Angeles (and many other American cities).

“A successful Catholic cathedral, measured by architectural theology, is a work of art that acknowledges the greatness of the church’s architectural patrimony: It refers to the past, serves the present and informs the future. It identifies with the life of the church throughout two millennia and manifests the permanence of the faith that it serves. Our Lady of the Angels, however, springs from the fashions of the day and the whims of its designer.

“The cathedral is devoid of any sign of value both in its form and in its details. It signifies nothing beyond itself....”

Again, however, it was the *LA New Times* reporter Ron Russell who discovered there is definitely something “deathly” about the financing of Mahony’s edifice which fits in so well with the Staples Center and the new Disney Center.

“Although insisting that the project is being financed exclusively by private donations, the archdiocese has kept a tight lid on who some of the donors are and about how much they have pledged, including the identities of at least two corporations that have remained anonymous.

“Although little-talked-about publicly, there is speculation that one of the cathedral’s biggest benefactors may be Stewart Enterprises Inc., the world’s third-largest funeral-services company, based in New Orleans. Both the archdiocese and a top Stewart official interviewed by *New Times* dismiss the suggestion. But the denials have scarcely quelled speculation, especially in view of a highly secretive business arrangement Mahony negotiated with the huge death-care conglomerate in 1997 giving it the exclusive right to build commercial mortuaries in archdiocese cemeteries.

“In exchange, Stewart is leasing the ground beneath the mortuaries for 40 years in a deal widely considered to be worth many millions of dollars to the archdiocese. ‘The intriguing aspect,’ says one funeral industry source, ‘is that there’s no outlay involved for the archdiocese. The money [from Stewart] is theirs to spend on anything they see fit’....”

Examining documents from the Securities and Exchange Committee, Russell found that Stewart had poured at least \$22 million into 11-area Catholic

cemeteries, had plans to build four more.

In addition to operating a huge mausoleum in the cathedral’s crypt, with 1,500 burial places and 3,000 niches for cremated remains, Russell named the area’s moguls who helped Mahony build his edifice.

“The donor list,” wrote Russell, “is a who’s who of philanthropists, foundations and prominent Catholic [and non-Catholic, ed.] families. The archdiocese says that the largest contributions remain the combined \$35 million from the cathedral’s two founding donors, the Dan Murphy Foundation and the Thomas and Dorothy Leavey Foundation. Among the many individual donors are Betsy Bloomingdale, whose in-laws founded the department store chain; comedian Bob Hope, who was awarded a papal knighthood in 1998; former Dodgers owner Peter O’Malley; Riordan; and Roy E. Disney and his wife, Patty. Other high-profile donors include the Murdoch family and the Doheny, Hilton and Ahmanson foundations. On the corporate side, the list includes Walt Disney Co., Kaiser Permanente, Edison International, Wells Fargo, Bank of America and the Times Mirror Foundation...Also on the corporate list is Western Sequoia, with headquarters in Inglewood. Unlike Stewart, which operates mortuaries on Church property, Western Sequoia has an exclusive relationship with the archdiocese as a broker of graves, crypts and niches at the Catholic cemeteries....”

Two of the biggest donors, Russell also reported, wished to remain anonymous.

+ + +

THE SCANDAL OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

In April 2004, the *Los Angeles Lay Mission* reported on a recent “Cardinal Mahony Online” Internet session in which the cardinal, just as his annual Religious Education Congress convened, read actor/director Mel Gibson out of the Church.

Mahony said that Gibson “has chosen to live apart from the communion of the Catholic Church.”

According to the *Lay Mission*, Mahony was asked to comment on the growing Traditionalist movement in the Church, and he explained to one participant in the Internet forum:

“[T]here is no such thing as the ‘Catholic traditionalist, modernist, movement.’ Either one is in

full communion with the Catholic Church, in unity with the Successor of Peter, or not. One cannot pick and choose which Pope to follow, especially dead ones, or which teaching to follow -- and then set aside the rest. Such people may be very nice people, but that doesn't make them 'Catholic' in the true sense.

"We must give full assent to the Creed and all that the Church teaches," said the cardinal.

The *Lay Mission* editorialized: "Some might find it odd, though, that for all his defense of the Church and her teachings, Cardinal Mahony should tolerate the speakers he does, year after year, at his Religious Education Congress. This year's Congress once again featured speakers affiliated with Call to Action, a dissident group that calls for the ordination of women to the Catholic priesthood, the acceptance of homosexuality as a valid orientation, a lifting of the 'ban' on artificial contraception, among other issues. One of this year's speakers associated with Call to Action, [Georgetown University professor] Diana Hayes, has questioned the Church's hierarchical nature....Hayes is also affiliated with the Women's Ordination Conference. Other Call to Action speakers present at this year's Religious Education Congress were Father Michael Crosby, Sister Barbara Fiand, Father Patrick Brennan, and Father Richard Rohr" -- the latter of whom earned a rebuke in late 1996 for presiding at the "commitment ceremony" for two lesbians.

For nearly ten years, as news editor for *The Wanderer*, I have meticulously documented the theological, moral and pastoral errors taught at Cardinal Mahony's annual Religious Education Congress.

For the same amount of time, Cardinal Mahony -- who personally okays each speaker -- or his aides have denounced Congress critics, demeaning them as "simple people who have no impact," or by threatening lawsuits.

After the 2001 Congress, in anticipation of a special cardinals' Synod in Rome, meeting on the crucial subject of "episcopal collegiality," i.e. the notion that bishops are to be united among themselves and around the Holy Father, *The Wanderer* provided a dossier to officials of the Holy See on some of the lowlights of Mahony's annual congress.

At the Spring 2001 Congress, here is what some of the speakers said:

*** "If you can't fantasize Mary and Joseph**

having sex -- even if you wanted to say -- okay, the Church says, 'ever-virgin' -- okay, I leave that in place. I'm not going to change that. Church says, obviously for Jesus Mary was still a virgin -- because it's like a miraculous conception -- okay, where did all those brothers and sisters come from? They're cousins. Where did all those brothers and sisters come from? Joseph had children from a previous marriage. Okay. But if somebody says, 'Do you think Joseph ever wanted to jump on Mary's bones? Do you think Joseph ever thought, 'God, why can't we consummate this thing?'

"By the way, in terms of Canon Law we could annul this marriage just like this" -- and he snapped his fingers. "We can annul it. Joseph can get himself another wife.

"Now, all I'm saying is -- even if they didn't have sex, did they ever neck, or did they maybe cuddle and snuggle. Did he ever sorta fondle his wife? Did she ever kinda fondle him?"

"Hey! -- you're saying, 'don't say that about Joseph and Mary.' My purpose is not to solve Joseph and Mary's life. They're dead and gone. My purpose is to say that if that sounds dirty or bad, then it probably says you've got some hangups about your own embodiment and sexuality if you can't even let the Holy Family come near that stuff." -- Fr. Richard Sparks, CSP, one of the U.S. Bishops' top "experts" on sex education.

*** "What happens after death is what you're looking at right here." Christians believe, "that we died in baptism. So this is what the after-life looks like." -- Fr. Richard Fragomeni, Chicago Theological Union.**

*** "It is not necessary to participate in the Christian liturgy in order to participate in the liturgy of the world....Cardinal Mahony's wonderful letter on the Sunday Eucharist is all about that. He uses the visionary -- visionary parish -- but this is what it's meant to be. He's talking about Christian liturgy acting out the liturgy of the world. So Christian liturgy is not separate, not apart, not surrounded by boundaries, lines and borders. Christian liturgy has no borders. Christian liturgy is meant to be co-extensive with all of life -- the same thing as the life of the world was meant to be...." -- Fr. John Gallen, SJ**

*** "When God came, He didn't come as a catechism. God did not come as a moral code or a**

doctrinal system or theology school. He came as a person. God is love....This love is messy – not an easy love. Following the law – law has boundaries that are very clear. Who's in, who's out? Who's allowed to come to communion, who's not? Who's a practicing Catholic, who's not? Love is not....When you love someone, you don't ask, 'are you a good Catholic?' Love transcends that. Theology is precise, love is not. Love is ragged around the edges. Doctrine can be collected in a book, love cannot. Love is beyond the boundaries of that. Love transcends it all. When we give a dinner party at our home, we don't ask, 'are you in a valid marriage?'" – *Catechist Bill Huebsch*

* "So you and I extend salvation to one another if we extend hospitality to one another. We save other people not by getting them to keep the rules perfectly, but by eating with them, by bringing them to the table, by opening wide the doors to Christ. That is what salvation is all about. And that's what the hospitality of the heart – or the hospitality of God – affects. It nourishes relationships. It sustains life and the most surprising and most subversive and most dangerous part of all is that everybody has a placecard at the table with their name on it. Everybody who wants to be there gets invited.

"That's dangerous, isn't it? That's subversive, isn't it?" – *Sr. Fran Ferder*

* "A religion of transformation is much more concerned about the now. The power is in the now. The saints called it the grace of the present moment or the practice of the presence of God. Brothers and sisters, how you do anything is actually how you do everything. Really. The key is to watch how you're doing right now. This is it! This is it! It's heaven all the way to heaven. It's hell all the way to hell – ha, ha. And if you're fighting and contentious and argumentative and needing to win and needing to be right and needing to control and needing to fix and needing to change before you can be happy – in fact, if you need to change anything before you can be happy, then you're not happy. It has nothing to do with changing anything because happiness is an inside job.

"That's transformed people who can talk that way...It's a different notion of religion. It happens now. That allows you to see everything belonging, everything connecting. That it's all right here, right now. How I do anything is how I do

everything. – *Fr. Richard Rohr, OFM*

* "So our vocation is to cultivate, to nurture, to keep it going, to sustain relationships that are rooted in equality, mutuality and interdependence. Men aren't up there and women down here; blacks up there -- white's are -- blacks up -- whites down -- however you want to construe it. Any kinds of relationships that are built on ordination or super-ordination, superiority, inferiority, blind obedience and so on and so forth, this I would suggest calls into question the degree to which we are mirroring the divine life." – *Dr. Michael Downey, Cardinal Roger Mahony's theologian*

The Congress' 2001 featured speakers, the refined distillate of three decades of the dysfunctional Amchurch educational and pastoral center office bureaucracies, addressed an estimated 23,000 Catholic school teachers and catechists from California, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, Arizona and New Mexico.

Of these 23,000, close to 75 percent were Hispanic, and if they were learning what Cardinal Roger Mahony wants them to learn, it is that the Catholic Church is at the pinnacle of its numbers, wealth, success, influence and political power, and its educational leaders – while appearing a bit eccentric at times – must be given full credibility and obedience.

And yet: the majority of the presenters at the conference, were, in fact, deeply disturbed victims-turned-victimizers of a cruel and heartless Amchurch machinery of elites, determined to snuff out any vestiges of true Catholicism, in liturgy, belief and practice through ridicule, mockery, lies, distortions and misrepresentations.

Exemplifying the vicious assault on foundational Catholic morality and human nature itself was the workshop led by Father Peter Liuzzi, O. Carm., Cardinal Mahony's personal homosexual activist leader.

Liuzzi's workshop, titled "My Spouse is Gay," featured four individuals who all were once married, but either were abandoned by a spouse who "discovered" his or her homosexuality, or "discovered" their own homosexuality and engaged in homosexual behavior.

Each of the four, who spoke after Liuzzi set the framework, emphasized that their problems were caused by the Church, which forced them into a mar-

riage which would never have occurred if the homosexually-behaving spouse had had homosexual behavior affirmed and encouraged and mentored from their earliest years.

Each of the personal tragedies recounted clearly involved a marriage that was not inspired and sustained by Church teaching at the beginning, and as time passed. But Liuzzi manipulated the remains of these shattered lives into believing they could find happiness by shilling for the homosexual message and agenda – a homosexual catechism, if you will, with its own dogma and lifestyle.

Fr. Peter Liuzzi, O. Carm., 62, began his workshop by telling his audience of about 200 people that he has devoted 20 years of his priesthood to ministry to gay and lesbian people. “It’s a personal response to my baptismal vows,” he said.

He also mentioned that he was ordained in 1965. “I think that’s very significant because those were days after the council and I belonged to a new breed. We were supposed to rip up the old pea patch and totally renew the Church – I don’t think we quite did that....”

He then presented the format for his workshop: he would present Church teaching on homosexuality, which he described as “theory – up there in an ivory tower,” that there would be four speakers telling their stories, and there would be an opportunity for members of the audience to raise questions or “come out” if they were so inclined.

When he was ordained, he said, the term “mixed marriage” applied to Catholics who married non-Catholics. Today, however, the term applies to those situations where a “straight spouse is married to a gay spouse....Twenty years ago, we never imagined we could talk about that.”

According to Dr. Amity Pierce Buxton, author of “The Other Side of the Closet,” there are an estimated two million lesbians and gays involved in a traditional marriage. “Who are those folks, that invisible but significant minority?” Liuzzi wondered. The answer: They’re the neighbor who never dared to tell his wife, the friend who gets caught and arrested for lewd conduct, the friend who lives a secret relationship with his partner, afraid to tell his wife and children, etc.

One such person, he said, was a 72-year old man who lived a secret life “all these years; he told

only his confessor, then he told me, and he cried, because he could never tell the people he loved.”

“If we could see them, what would our reactions be?” he asked

Liuzzi then complained that “our society pushes people into marriage,” and he expressed his disgust as those “right wing ads” which promote reparative therapy and bear the testimonies of homosexuals who have overcome their “orientation” and married.

For gays and lesbians who abandon a “traditional marriage,” he continued, the gay spouse finds new friends and a strong support group. But the abandoned spouse, “goes into a closet,” and all types of dilemmas arise, especially if there are, as is often the case, children. “In the beginning,” he said, “the straight spouse is supportive, but as that person [i.e. the gay spouse] becomes healthy, then the straight spouse begins to ask, ‘what about me?’ The straight spouse no longer knows what is true or false.’ Questions of moral judgments arise. How comfortable can the straight spouse be with the ex-spouse’s lifestyle? Should the straight spouse allow the “ex” to be involved with children? And then, the straight spouse “experiences meaninglessness, worthlessness, hopelessness, depression, suicidal tendencies,” etc., and “the trauma has to be lived through.”

Liuzzi then gave a “quick summary” of Church teaching on homosexuality. He said the Church teaches that “homosexuality is not sin,” that “it is not chosen but discovered,” “that it is so deep-seated that it is beyond change,” “that no document says homosexuals have to change,” that the Church takes no position on the origins of homosexuality, that the Church “does not identify sexual orientation with genital acts,” that “lesbians and gays have a role to play in the Church,” that “the issue has to be treated in our schools, because kids are discovering their sexuality and we have to help them.”

He also said that experience has taught him that straight spouses abandoned by a gay spouse need three-to-six years to work with their anger, the feeling they were deceived, and that often the straight spouse will become homophobic. He said the rejected straight spouse has to have time to grieve and mourn, and has to understand that the gay spouse will not return.

When a gay spouse leaves a marriage, “the children also ‘suffer hurt’ because of anti-gay attitudes in school and the parish.

“This is forcing us to deal with the issue,” he said. As an example, he cited the case in one Catholic school where a teacher was giving the bare bones of Church teaching on marriage, and one of the students, who lived with her lesbian mother and her partner, became very upset; so Liuzzi had to go to the school to give a workshop to teachers to tell them how to handle the delicate subject.

In concluding, he appealed to his audience: “I make a strong, strong plea. I call it prevention. We need to do something to prevent that tragedy [of pressuring homosexuals into marriage]. I think the way we do that is we question our own prejudices, fears – we need to do everything we can to understand that this is a reality in peoples’ lives – it’s not going to go away.

“We need to support in the best way we can to deal with this as a reality and not a strange phenomenon. I think we need to be particularly careful in our own Church, with people on the religious right – extreme positions – whether political or religious – I think that indicates zero tolerance – it’s not doctrine – it’s zero tolerance of homosexuals which would stop us from dealing with it.

“Finally, I think a key directive or motivational force is that we as a Christian community need to be very cautious – very suspicious – about excluding. The Old Testament and New Testament are all about embracing the outsider.”

TESTIMONIALS

Liuzzi’s first shill was Lucille, who was making her fifth appearance at the religious education congress. “I am a lesbian,” she announced. “I am still a mother, I have a new daughter-in-law, a second grandchild, and now God has blessed me with a wonderful woman to share my life with.”

Lucille told how she was divorced in 1980, and that she and her husband “reconciled” in time for their daughter’s wedding, and, at the wedding, Lucille and her ex-husband and his new wife sat in the front row of the Church “with their heads held high.”

She explained that when she married, she had mistaken her feelings for her husband as love, but that she knew in her heart that “marriage to a man would

never work out for me.”

And through the ministry of lesbian and gay Catholics, she said, “I have become very comfortable with myself.”

The next shill was DeeDee, now 50, whose 26 years of marriage produced two children, a daughter 22 and a son now 18. She and her former husband, who both attended Catholic high schools, began dating at 15 and 16 respectively, and married at 22 and 23 years of age. After 25 years of marriage, her husband announced he thought he was bisexual, and six months later, announced he was gay and wanted a divorce.

In the upheaval, she continued, she found a gay therapist who “helped me understand.” Similarly, both her son, who worries he might turn out gay, and her daughter, who “felt abandoned,” received counseling, and now both accept their gay father and his partner.

Her tragic marriage, she continued, is the result of a person not being honest with himself, so she asked, “What can the Church do?” Her answers: Stop saying homosexuality is disordered and stop laying guilt on homosexuals. “My husband was afraid of his homosexuality because of the guilt the Church taught him,” she said.

DeeDee was followed by Bill, who became aware at age 7 that he was different from others, and knew by adolescence “what was different about me.” He fought off his homosexual inclinations by hard work and prayer, by rediscovering his Catholic faith, and by marriage to a wonderful woman named Mary.

He married Mary at age 23 in 1977, and worked hard at being the “perfect husband.” Their first and only child, a daughter, was born six years later, and they were viewed by their friends as the “perfect couple” and “perfect parents.”

But after 14 years of marriage, “everything crashed” when the homosexual feelings he had suppressed for so many years “intensified to the point I lost concentration.” Desperate to save his marriage, he and his wife began an intense two-year counseling project with a “fundamentalist Catholic couple” in an effort to “exorcize the demon of homosexuality.”

But these years of counseling, he said, “were a living hell,” because he was desperate “to understand this feeling. I needed to find out about myself.”

He abandoned his wife and daughter – though his daughter now lives with him.

“My prayer,” he concluded, “is that the eyes of the Church will learn to be open, honest, sensitive so that young men and women can feel good about themselves when these issues arise, so these terrible mistakes do not happen because they cause so much pain and suffering. My prayer is that the Church becomes the vanguard of this healing ministry so the lives of many like Matthew Shephard can be spared. My God does not give me a cross to bear – that cross comes from my brothers and sisters. I only needed to learn to love this part of me. My prayers are being answered.

The fourth skill was Anna Lee, the ex-spouse of a gay man, married 25 years until that day in 1988 when her husband announced he was leaving her for another man. The marriage produced two sons, now 32 and 34, one of whom is himself now in the “process of coming out” as a homosexual.

Anna Lee explained that nothing in her 13 years of Catholic education in St. Paul, Minnesota prepared her for what she has endured.

“God in her wisdom did not divulge that I would be here to reveal – to share feelings of pain, fear, ostracism, betrayal, sexual rejection, deception, confusion, powerlessness, grief and anger, shock, blame and questioning of my own sexuality when one hears ‘I am gay’ from a spouse.”

A year after her 1964 marriage, her husband was arrested by a plainclothes cop for soliciting a male for sex. He vowed it would never happen again. In 1986, on the eve of their anniversary, she returned from work to hear he was in jail for soliciting sex from a male cop. Two years later, he announced he was gay and leaving her. She concluded her talk by addressing the need for the Church to support the remaining spouse.

FASCINATED BY DEATH

Fr. Richard Fragomeni is an entertaining exhibitionist. He opened his presentation by informing the audience that his presence at the conference is sponsored by Silver Burdett Ginn, for whom he serves as a consultant for its religious publications, and that he is the author of the “Blessed Are We” catechetical text, a part of the “Gifts of A Lifetime” series, which has already been approved by the U.S. bishops.

He opened his talk, “What Happens After Death,” by singing a couple verses of the popular hymn “I Will Raise You Up,” and then launched into his theme.

“I’ve always been fascinated with what happens at death,” he blurted out. When he was four or five years old, he confessed, his neighbor, the grandfatherly Sylvester died, and was waked in his home. Young Richard “wanted to poke his dead body,” but his parents wouldn’t allow him to go to the wake; so he snuck in, and “poked his body, and it was hard, and cold, and he didn’t want to move.

“But he looked better dead than he did alive,” Fragomeni cracked to waves of laughter.

He told some more death stories, and then revealed that “I actually went to a hypnotist to see if I could get regressed. It was very strange. I discovered that the hypnotist could bring me back to my birth moment. I found myself in 14th century France.

“I trust you – you won’t report this to the Holy Office in Rome. I’ll deny it if you do.

“So I did get regressed. The first thing you need to know is that I got ordained a priest so I could be a bishop. In France, I was in love with a girl who wanted to be a nun. So I decided to become a priest. And I became a bishop, and I was preaching at Chartres or some other cathedral, and my opponent appeared. He was from the Inquisition and I got boiled in oil. Now, when friends say do you want to be a bishop, I say, ‘been there, done that.’

“We all got these kinds of stories.”

“So what is the afterlife like?”, he asked.

He told his audience that there are three major images the Church offers. The first, he said, is that “we fall asleep.”

“This is the most ancient understanding,” he said. “We fall asleep in Christ. Falling asleep happens when it happens. Sleep as death – death as sleep awaiting to be wakened up. No memory, no consciousness, and when you wake up, it’s like you’ve never been asleep. That’s what the early Church talked about, a deep, deep sleep until the final trumpet blows....Like Dorothy in the poppies....sleep, deep, deep sleep. That’s what St. Paul says.

“I like this one because I like to sleep. Death is nothing more than sleep, like Snow White, sleep till

the Prince comes with his kiss.”

The Church’s view of the afterlife changed with the Greek influence in the early centuries, when Church fathers taught,” he said, “there is a separation of body and soul and the soul gets a particular judgment and the body is put together molecule by molecule for the Final Judgment. This splits body and soul. If you split body and soul, you are no longer a person....

“I kinda like this one,” Framomeni said, “because it gives you something to do instead of sleep, but there is an anthropological problem with it: a person is a body and soul and they have to stay together.”

A third view comes from the Funeral Liturgy, in which “the heart of what is told is that ‘life has changed, not ended’ and it links us to the promise of the Resurrection of Jesus. If you pay attention to the prayer, it simply says, ‘life has changed, not ended, and on that day we will become like God’ – And then it puts a big fat period there. Don’t even speculate how that happens.”

At this point, Fragomeni blurts out: “I’ll have a better place in heaven than you, after all, I’m a priest. I sitting up here and you’re sitting down there.”

Fragomeni explained what he found deficient about each of these images, and blurted out another confession: “I’ve given my whole life to this Catholic Church, but if there ain’t anything after I can count on what the hell am I doing up here?”

He told how back in his seminary days the seminarians used to sing, “Arise, come to your God, sing Him your songs of rejoicing,” which he had altered to: “Surprise, There may be no God, you left your girlfriend for nothing.

“Y’all know what I mean?”

Seventy-five minutes into his talk, Framomeni then told his audience that, the older he gets, the less and less he thinks about the afterlife. “Let me give you the reason why: I think it is an insult to the life we share to keep on expecting more and more from God. Think about this carefully: When I try to image what happens after death and fill it up with expectations of wanting more and better, I think it is insulting to God who gives life in abundance now. Whatever happens is God’s decision, God’s gift –

even if it is nothing.”

Megan McKenna, a popular speaker at religious education confabs around the country, was introduced as a “world traveler” who has spoken in Europe, Latin America and Asia and the author of three new books. She began her presentation with a Navajo story, “How the Stars Fell Into the Sky,” which she described as “one of the beginning stories, an exploration of how the world got to be the way it is now.”

“Remember,” she said, “that all stories are true, all stories are about you, and all stories are about transforming your life.”

This story, as she related it over the first 30 minutes of her 90-minute talk, is about First Man and First Woman, and they are having a dialog about where to write the laws that will bring the world peace and justice. After First Woman failed several times to interest First Man in her work to write laws with stars, the woman began to “write laws for all human beings to see so that there would be no violence, no confusion,” by laying out all her jewels in front of her and carefully setting them in the sky.

The task was laborious and time-consuming, and First Man quickly lost interest in helping her. As First Woman worked alone, a coyote watched silently from behind some bushes, and then came out to help her. Well into her work, she had to leave her blanket, all covered with the jewels that would become stars, when the coyote took two corners of the blanket, shook it hard, and scattered the stars willy-nilly into the universe. And ever since then the world has lacked peace and justice.

McKenna then engaged her audience in a dialog, first asking participants to turn to their neighbor and discuss “wuddas da story make ya feel.” After a few minutes, she began barking out to the audience, “wudda da story do ta ya?” “wuddas it make ya feel?” “Wats goin’ on in da story?”

As members of the audience shouted out their various feelings in one or two words, McKenna elaborated on their feelings, expressing such thoughts as this in response to the answer, “It tells us ancient wisdom”: “First woman wrote the laws....Again, matriarchal cultures –you know – they’re the ones who have real laws...they’re the ones in touch, they’re the ones who can articulate...all major native writers are women...women articulate the basic core of the ground we stand on....”

McKenna's talk might be described as "stream of unconsciousness," for it consisted mostly of fragmented sentences, incoherent utterances, random thoughts and emotions all tied together with her distracting commands, "waddas it make ya feel?" But her cleverness consists in her ability to use the Gospel as a magician uses a scarf to amuse the audience, to impose her ideology and dogmatic beliefs on an unsuspecting and gullible audience.

Sr. Mary Boys, who teaches theology at the Protestant Union Theological Seminary and the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York (and who was recently a leader in the campaign against Mel Gibson's *The Passion of the Christ*, asserting it was anti-Semitic and non-Scriptural), began her talk by praising Cardinal Mahony's religious education congress as "the best organized conference I've ever attended," and said it is such a wonderful event "because we get a feel for ourselves as a Church in renewal...."

Sister's 90-minute talk, like McKenna's, was largely stream of unconsciousness, blather about how feminist theologians and liberation theologians are discovering new insights that allow us to imagine Jesus in new ways so he is no longer a "pale Galilean," but can be seen as black or a woman.

Despite their contributions, which emphasize Jesus' inclusivity, there is a problem in this work because it is separating Jesus from his Jewishness.

Understanding Jesus' Jewishness is important, she said, because it "gives us a way of locating Jesus in time and space," it "gives us a context for what he taught, said and did," and this "reflection stimulates us to rethink our relationship with Judaism and deal with the legacy of anti-Judaism."

"The problem with the Church today," she said, "is that we never got past the [Baltimore] Catechism" – which states that Christianity completes Judaism.

Jesus' significance, she continued, is that he "shattered" all of Judaism's purity regulations and "gave us the law of love and freedom," that he was "contemptuous of the system of the Temple and the corrupt priesthood," and that he was all inclusive.

According to Boys, the richness of the Jewish tradition at Jesus' time was that it was like a great debating society. For Jews living far from the Temple, most of the Torah's rules and regulations were irrelevant. In the temple, there was great freedom to

discuss the Torah's norms and how they should be interpreted.

"What we see in the New Testament," she said, "is Jesus debating about how to keep the Torah. Jesus is always contending with the Pharisees, and he always wins and the Pharisees come out as hypocrites.

"When Jesus engages in debates, that's a sign of the community being alive, and the debates we have in the Church today are a sign it's alive...."

She encouraged her listeners to "think of the scribes and Pharisees and Sadducees and priests as individuals who debated in a lively way the meaning of the Torah," and warned them that Catholics "have an inaccurate picture of the Pharisees in the Gospels."

The Pharisees, she said, "thought the rules of the Temple applied to the home – family based catechesis. The Pharisees were the kind of people who would, on a nice day, listen to a talk about religion."

So who is Jesus? Sister Boys summarized her view in a succinct conclusion:

"The Jewish Jesus was a Galilean Jew living up north, who came to Jerusalem. He observed Shabbat, prayed *tefelin*, offered sacrifice in the Temple, kept the purity laws, emphasized the love of enemies, caring for the oppressed and excluded, service to others. Jesus preached the nearness to God's reign and by so doing he relativized all institutions including the Temple.

"What I think Jesus does – besides – is frees us to join the Jewish people in being partners waiting the redemption of the world."

Another speaker was Father John Gallen, SJ, one of Amchurch's pre-eminent liturgists and one-time chief liturgist for the Diocese of Phoenix, recently accused of molesting young boys while he was visiting Toledo back in the 1980. (In 1994, Cardinal Mahony had to disinvite Buffalo priest Fr. John Aurelio, a pioneer in "children's liturgies," after it was revealed he was a longtime sex abuser of young men.)

Gallen told Catholic educators at the Los Angeles Archdiocese's annual Religious Education Congress that Cardinal Roger Mahony's pastoral letter on liturgy, *Gather Faithfully Together*, is a "visionary" document that incorporates Jesuit theologian Karl Rahner's theory that the Christian liturgy "should act

out the liturgy of the world.”

At one point in his talk, Gallen even asked, “What has Sunday Mass got to do with quanta zooming around the cosmos?”

Though he worried he might be “scaring” his audience by telling them that “it is not necessary to participate in the Christian liturgy in order to participate in the liturgy of the world,” Gallen assured his audience that the Christian liturgy does have a place if it “brings people together to act out what God is doing in the world.”

Gallen’s talk, along with those of Archbishop Rembert Weakland, Fr. Tom Sweetser, SJ, and the priest-nun team of sexual therapists, Sister Fran Ferder and Fr. John Heagle are joined by a common thread: embittered attitudes against the present teaching and discipline of the Catholic Church.

Weakland’s keynote address at the Feb. 15-18 event on “leadership” was, if anything, a confession of personal failure and frustration disguised in psychobabble and his trademark whinings; but the others expressed a revolutionary contempt for a Church they declare to be exclusivist, pharisaical, lacking in compassion for “outcasts,” and unfaithful to the Gospel as they understand it. Their Christ, it appears, is not the Christ of Catholicism, but a New Age theosophical construct whose greatest achievement was explaining to Jews the necessity of becoming “inclusive,” welcoming and hospitable.

Two-thirds of Fr. Gallen’s presentation consisted of “new-agey” psychobabble employed to explain the title of his talk, “Liturgy Without Borders,” which, he said, “was meant to provoke” and ask the question: “Does liturgy have borders built around it that keep it from the dynamics of daily experience? Does it have anything to do with your health, your tears, your laughter, your joy, your depression, your career, your imagination, your sexuality, your hopes, your fears? Has it got anything to do with that? What do we mean by liturgy?....”

“The reason we are having a liturgical renewal,” Fr. Gallen continued, about 60 minutes into his talk, “is because in our frailty Mass can stop being the fulness of what it was meant to be and so we call ourselves together and say, ‘heh!’ so let’s get cracking on what Mass is meant to be because that’s what we are all about, what we are meant to be, and that’s all about the Divine Lover who’s making us this way.

“Is that an okay summary of the liturgical renewal?”

“Cardinal Mahony’s wonderful letter on the Sunday Eucharist is all about that. He uses the visionary – visionary parish – but this is what it’s meant to be. He’s talking about Christian liturgy acting out the liturgy of the world. So Christian liturgy is not separate, not apart, not surrounded by boundaries, lines and borders. Christian liturgy has no borders. Christian liturgy is meant to be co-extensive with all of life – the same thing as the life of the world was meant to be....

“The Christian liturgy must, therefore, exhibit a profound humility in the embracing of the holy call to participate in the liturgy of the world, to participate in what God is doing in the world....

“We have a problem with that, don’t we?” Gallen suggested.

As he deconstructed the Catholic Mass, Gallen continued:

“Now, of course, the bread and the cup have a place – just as the book has a place. But we have to be careful. But we have to keep that alive in the context of events. The reason there is so much fuss about the tabernacle is not so much – there’s an underlying thing going on there – is the tabernacle is constantly being used. Huh? If it weren’t being used all the time, no one would be asking the question where should we put it [laughter]. Huh? Right. All the Roman documents say again and again and again that you shouldn’t be using bread at Mass – except the ones made holy at this Mass. We ignore that. No bishop is getting in the way of that, saying, stop that, stop using tabernacle for communion. Do you hear any bishop saying that?

“Now, Cardinal Mahony’s letter pushes in the opposite direction: make the breads holy at this Mass. And they’re the ones being used. But since we keep using the fridge [laughter] we don’t – I mean no disrespect – we don’t want it to be far away. And that’s why it’s an active question all the time. If we would follow what Eucharist is about and use the breads made holy in the Mass, we wouldn’t be asking, where’s the tabernacle. You wouldn’t need it. That make sense?

“So we made a regulation. Only the priest can touch the bread. Remember? Are we moving back in that direction? Yes. And what will keep us

from that? Getting more and more deeply into our holy and sacred tradition. We don't need to make up Eucharist. We got it. Our job is to dig more and more deeply into the gift we have been given.

"Well," Gallen concluded, "that's what I have to say about the liturgy of the world and Christian liturgy."

THE ARCHBISHOP

Archbishop Rembert Weakland, OSB, revealed in 2002 to have paid \$450,000 to a man he sexually assaulted, was introduced as "a man of great sensitivity and great joy," who was elected Primate Abbot of the Benedictine Order in 1967 and Archbishop of Milwaukee in 1977, where he "has served with great sensitivity, joy and courage....He is a great man of our Church."

Humbly, he said he came to Los Angeles to speak on "Leadership and Ministry," "with trepidation," observing it was like "carrying coals to Newcastle" in light of the "wonderful letter of Cardinal Mahony" on ministry. A few moments later, looking out into the crowd, he enthused: "Look at all these leaders! The Church is so alive and vital."

Several times in his talks, he made reference to the nasty people in the parish who make life and work difficult for the leader, but he encouraged the leaders in his audience to be good listeners.

TRAINING THE TRAINERS

Two of the most prominent leaders in Amchurch today, regulars at the Los Angeles Religious Education Congress, are Sister Fran Ferder and Fr. John Heagle, co-directors of Therapy And Renewal Associates, associate professors at the Seattle University School of Theology, and co-authors of a book on sexuality.

Ferder, as a seminarian screener for former Seattle Archbishop Raymond Hunthausen and Archbishop Thomas Murphy, was responsible for psychologically screening candidates for the priesthood. During one deposition, it was revealed that Ferder not only counseled a pedophile priest, but was also paid handsomely by the archdiocese to counsel the pedophile's victims. She and Heagle, until recently, were independent contractors for the archdiocese, and at the time of the depositions five years ago, were receiving \$8,000 per month-plus for their counseling and therapy services. In her deposition in the

case concerning convicted pedophile Fr. Paul Conn, Ferder testified under oath that she dissents from the *Catechism of the Catholic Church's* teaching on homosexuality.

Ferder's and Heagle's address, in a word, was a revolutionary attack on the foundations of Christianity. In their world, the traditional teachings of the Catholic Church pertaining to Christ's salvific mission to overcome the original and personal sins of human beings, and the Church's role in carrying out that mission to individuals and societies through history have all been rejected in favor of a humanistic, psychological, sociological spin in which Christ becomes a pseudo-model for their idiosyncratic ideas.

Jesus is reduced to a model for hospitality, compassion and inclusiveness, and his horrible suffering and death on the Cross was merely a punishment by the religious and civil authorities because he did not exclude anyone from his meals. This bizarre deconstruction of Christ's mission and the truth of the human condition is, however, merely a ploy to agitate for an amoral, dogma-free libertine Church.

In their talk, "Jesus, Healer of Relationships," the pair spoke alternately, in soft, gentle, hypnotic sing-song tones. Heagle began with a story and a question: "Is there enough love in the world to hold it together?"

We "radically entrust" ourselves to the belief that there is, he said, but quickly added there are "forces of fragmentation and experiences that divide us." Jesus, he said, is a healer of relationships, but he warned his audience of Catholic educators that "we need to recognize that we can too easily domesticate Jesus into a nice person," referencing his view to that of liberation theologian Johannes Metz, who "speaks of what he calls the dangerous and subversive memories of Jesus."

Jesus, continued Heagle, "revolutionizes the values of our own time and challenges those obstacles and blocks that keep us from being an inclusive person."

Heagle commented that he has seen many Catholic churches in the past Jubilee Year with banners proclaiming, "Open Wide the Doors to Christ," and asked:

"What does it mean to 'open wide the doors?' Who gets in? Who belongs? Who's excluded? Who is not? And so we are talking about relationships that

can be very fragile. What is it about Jesus and his times that speaks to us and our experience of our times?"

With that question and cue, Fran Ferder intoned: "Is there enough love in the world to hold it together?"

She observed that the popular TV show *Survivors* is so popular precisely because it is a "metaphor for our times....We are in a world where strategic exclusion is a way of life; trust no one but pretend you do; don't be so loyal to someone that it gets in your way. We live in a world where people's hearts are broken not so much because someone has died but because of the forces of fragmentation and exclusion surround us."

Speaking of "exclusion," she complained of "structures that eliminate the weak, structures that divide us into us and them. That world is alive and well in our Church, but it's the same world that Jesus was born into, where might makes right, women and children and the infirm, the elderly, the foreigner and strangers were excluded because they weighed the society down...."

"What was Jesus' response?"

Heagle answered her question. "Jesus would have been a devout Jew," he said, as he launched into an explanation of the Old Testament "purity laws" described in Leviticus 19. These purity laws, he said, gave the Jewish people their identity, a sense of belonging and community, "but they also excluded many people based on heredity, class, physical well-being, gender and ethnic backgrounds."

"If you were not a member of the Jewish people," he claimed, "you could not be holy. If you were not physically whole, were blind, lame, struggling with menstruation, a leper, or physically, emotionally or mentally at the margins of society, you could not be holy."

Jesus, he continued, "believed in holiness," and he became a dangerous, subversive and revolutionary person because he linked holiness to compassion.

"The ethos of compassion," he explained, "implies it is not just an individual virtue, not just something I am supposed to be. For Jesus, it was a social and religious paradigm. It was to revolutionize not only people's hearts but structures in society and

attitudes and structures within the religious community....Jesus said there is a deeper law and a deeper rule. The law of compassion has to go beyond the ethos of purity to break the boundaries of exclusivity and reach out to the other. There is a deeper need here. We cannot begin to understand how confrontational this is unless we understand that what Jesus did – that he did not go to his death because of a mistake – an accident of history – of benevolence. He died because he believed in compassion as a paradigm of living, and it's a model of relationships so he not only stirred up the ire and wrath of imperial Greco-Roman society and dominant culture, he also stirred up the wrath of the institutional religious experience of his time and it was ultimately that that alienated and became a source of Jesus and that his memory became subversive and dangerous.

"What is the mobilizing metaphor we have for this ethos of compassion and its implications?" he asked, and answered:

"The mobilizing metaphor of Jesus' life and ministry was the festive table – the table in which everyone was invited, where everyone was welcome. We cannot understand the Last Supper unless we understand all the other meals in Jesus' ministry."

Jesus' meals – his dining with sinners, his feeding of the multitudes, etc. – according to Heagle, were "political demonstrations. He's engaging in hand-to-hand emotional and social combat with those things that exclude, with the powers that keep other people away....All of the meals – therefore Eucharist – was of its nature an inclusive experience."

"So you and I," Ferder continued, "extend salvation to one another if we extend hospitality to one another. We save other people not by getting them to keep the rules perfectly, but by eating with them, by bringing them to the table, by opening wide the doors to Christ. That is what salvation is all about...."

DECONSTRUCTING THE PARISH

Jesuit Father Thomas Sweetser developed his business, the "Parish Evaluation Project" 28 years ago, in an effort to create a new form of parish to replace the hierarchically-ordered parish with a priest as its head.

Or, in his words, his business was designed to answer the question: "how do you make the parish alive?"

Armed with a doctorate from the Chicago Theological Seminary in a combined field of sociology, theology and group dynamics, Sweetser, who told Congress participants this was his sixth or seventh appearance at the event, explained how he and his co-workers are trying to reconfigure the parish “from a single to a dual focus.”

In his rambling discourse, a disjointed jumble of words, sentence fragments, questions, asides and jokes, Sweetser revealed that he is a consultant to the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, where he is regularly and routinely visiting parishes “to affirm a lot of the things they are doing.”

Just last week, he exclaimed, he had visited each of the regions of the L.A. archdiocese and met with priests to instruct them on how to create “effective ministry.”

This Amchurch “parish expert” disclosed that after studying hundreds of parishes over nearly three decades, he “junked everything we did” in order to start a new parish assessment and renewal program.

His new program, “The Parish’s Covenant,” he explained, “looks at the new look of the parish.”

In one of the interactive exercises, Sweetser asked his workshop participants to create a diagram of their parish, showing where they fit in. As participants diagramed, Sweetser joked that the “hierarchical model” of the parish has become very rare; but now most parishes are based on the “crowd model,” where a lot of different people are doing different things, and where the priest – if he is a leader at all – is a “co-leader” – usually with a woman.

One of the best models of the emerging parish structures, he said, can be found in the Diocese of Saginaw, where the pastoral associates – usually women -- are allowed to wear albs when they lead the Sunday services without a priest, where the women pastoral associates give “reflections” rather than homilies, and where ‘everyone knows that Sister Jenny is the pastor of the parish, and the priest is nothing more than a sacramental minister.’”

“If we are to think of a parish without an individual in the center – canonically, we know the pastor is in charge of everything – but the way it really operates – it’s coming where the pastor cannot do everything – right pastors? – thank you, thank you, thank you – this is tricky – a pastor – not in charge of staff – ohhhh heresy – how can that be? – how could that

operate? – what does that mean? – What comes into your head?” he blabbered, as someone from the audience shouted, “He must be a Protestant!”

“Very good,” said Sweetser acknowledging the response. “Very good. That’s marvelous.”

THE BLASPHEMOUS SEX EDUCATOR

“If you can’t fantasize Mary, the Mother of God, and Joseph, “having sex,” or if you deny that they didn’t have sexual desires, didn’t fondle, cuddle and snuggle with each other, that Jesus wasn’t sexually attracted to Mary Magdalene “it probably means you’ve got some hangups about your own embodiment and sexuality,” said Fr. Richard Sparks, CSP, one of the U.S. bishops top sex experts for more than a decade.

He offered the advice above in a long and rambling discourse on the U.S. bishops 1990 document *Human Sexuality: A Catholic Perspective for Education and Life-Long Learning*, and his role in the production of the text, which called for cradle-to-grave sex education for Catholics in the United States.

Sparks exposed himself as a verbal exhibitionist pre-occupied with sexual obsessions, a man whose mind is cluttered with impure thoughts and compelled to pass them on to others, a priest who cannot speak of the Holy Family without blasphemy and sacrilege.

The following are direct quotations from his address:

“He [Jesus] is God and human – fully both. What that means is hard to explain. But if you thought of it as God inside a body, going, ‘I’ll have to goo-goo now. Well, I suppose I’ll have to let go with the bowels – though, of course, as God, I have perfect bowel control [laughter]. Well, I suppose I’ll have to pretend I don’t know Aramaic – though I created all the languages’ – No! No! – a baby who didn’t have bowel control, he goo-gooed because that was all he could do. He had to learn Aramaic and he had to trust his parents to teach him that.

“He had to go through puberty. He had to decide should I get married. He might have even had a prom date with Mary Magdalen. They might have even necked a little in the back seat of a car. He’s like us in all things but sin – necking isn’t necessarily a sin. He might have even petted her once or twice –

it's like – oh – wait, wait, wait, yes – now.

“Touch, including sex, in the right setting, is holy, sacramental, a wonderful gift.”

Sparks then expressed his indebtedness to “progressive” Protestant theologian Jim Nelson, who, Sparks explained, taught him that “if we are to take Jesus with utter seriousness, and yet uneasily retreat from Jesus’ sexuality, or even recoil [from it] with repugnance, it is likely we shall either deny much of our own sexuality or else find considerable difficulty integrating our christological beliefs into the reality of our lives and body selves.

“What he’s saying is – when I suggested that Jesus might have had a wet dream – or that Jesus may have had some passion for Mary Magdalen or that Jesus might have dreamed about getting married, if you go – ‘don’t say that about Our Lord’ – then you are saying, thinking those kind of thoughts is not what holy and good people do – then that says married people are all second-class citizens – then it says that those of us who are celibate are better people – because anybody that deals with sex and sexuality is disgusting.

“If you can’t fantasize Mary and Joseph having sex – even if you wanted to say – okay, the Church says, ‘ever-virgin’ – okay, I leave that in place. I’m not going to change that. Church says, obviously for Jesus Mary was still a virgin – because it’s like a miraculous conception – okay, where did all those brothers and sisters come from? They’re cousins. Where did all those brothers and sisters come from? Joseph had children from a previous marriage. Okay. But if somebody says, ‘Do you think Joseph ever wanted to jump on Mary’s bones? Do you think Joseph ever thought, ‘God, why can’t we consummate this thing?’

“By the way, in terms of Canon Law we could annul this marriage just like this” – and he snapped his fingers. “We can annul it. Joseph can get himself another wife.

“Now,” Sparks continued, “All I’m saying is – even if they didn’t have sex, did they ever neck, or did they maybe cuddle and snuggle. Did he ever sorta fondle his wife? Did she ever kinda fondle him?

“Hey! – you’re saying, ‘don’t say that about Joseph and Mary.’

“My purpose is not to solve Joseph and

Mary’s life. They’re dead and gone. My purpose is to say that if that sounds dirty or bad, then it probably says you’ve got some hang-ups about your own embodiment and sexuality if you can’t even let the Holy Family come near that stuff.

“The Catholic bishops of the United States phrased it this way: human sexuality is a wonderful gift and therefore an awesome responsibility. So some said, ‘Oh, wonderful gift and lots of potential mortal sin’ – and their ghostwriters said, ‘no, no, you said you wanted to make this positive. Anything that’s a wonderful gift potentially can be used for great things or for bad things. Nuclear energy is a wonderful gift. Friendship is a wonderful gift....There are lots of wonderful gifts....”

Sparks opened his talk, “Catholic Sexual Morality: More Than ‘Thou Shalt Nots,’” by telling his audience that he wanted to talk about the need for “intimacy education” and “relationship education,” and a “smaller subset of that, sexuality.”

He provided some background on the bishops’ sex education document, and the commitment of the team of 24 who prepared it to avoid saying anything negative and to accentuate the positive.

He explained that the bishops tried to present the various components of sexuality education, that it is premised on a “relational anthropology,” and on the notion of “embodiment,” i.e. that sex and sexuality is good, and part of God’s plan from the beginning.

“So I get frustrated when people come to me in confession and say, ‘I had dirty thoughts,’ and I say, ‘were you thinking of whips and chains or sex with animals?’ ‘No, I was thinking of my girlfriend who I hope to marry some day....

“So being sexual is good....Those feelings say we’re alive.”

Sparks then offered this confession to his listeners:

“So I confess that I, Dick Sparks, live celibately. Whether I always did is none of your business....

“I wanna be a handsome, hunky guy – and I am. It’s a little bigger than Mel Gibson’s, but the bigger the better I say.

“Now, I am not planning on having sex today and I’m not planning on being on the make and I’m

not planning on seducing anyone and I am not planning on leaving the priesthood and I don't have a mistress or a beloved but I still care about how I dress and I still care how my hair looks, which cologne I pick. I still care when I shave under here....

"That's who I am....

"When I went through puberty, I found you – Cynthia – more exciting than you, Jim. But I didn't choose that. When I went through puberty that was a discovery. Why I notices breasts or thighs or behinds or crotches and whether they were male or female was something I discovered.

"For a percentage of the population – somewhere under ten percent but way higher than one – some will say five-to-six percent for women, a little higher – seven percent – for men discover the opposite. They notice their own gender more.

"But whatever one's primary sexual orientation, we usually notice the opposite of that is not unattractive. So I can notice Mel Gibson's behind. When Tom Selleck used to take his shirt off every episode of *Magnum PI*, I didn't hide my face that it was hairy and disgusting. When I'm in a locker room I notice. I'm not that interested, but I notice...."

THE SAD NEW AGER

Fr. Richard Rohr, introduced as a man uniquely "in touch with a vision of the new millenium" and a "prophet for our times," began his lecture by informing the audience his first appearance at the Congress was in 1975, when Cardinal James McIntyre was still at the helm of the archdiocese.

Then, with humility, he said, "I can never promise you, obviously, that what I am saying is perfect, true or right, but I hope you join me in this quest." The title of his talk, "Religion as Membership vs. Religion as Transformation," he explained "is a little bit abstract," and yet he encouraged his audience to listen carefully "to see if it all names our experiences."

To fully appreciate Rohr's address, as reported here, one must imagine his manner of speaking, its New Age pauses, emphases, the *ooing* and *ahhing*, the professorial *hmmms*, and the uncontrollable outbursts of giggling and laughter whenever he pronounces a distinctly "Catholic" word.

There is also a strong sense of sadness in his voice. Over and over again he acknowledged that he

has been peddling a product -- Church renewal -- for more than 30 years that doesn't work -- and yet, he has people, such as Cardinal Roger Mahony, who keep paying him to peddle it.

What other system would allow such hucksterism?

Rohr's first acknowledgment of failure came early, when referring to the New Jerusalem community he founded in Cincinnati in 1971. The community's first members, he said, were all committed to changing their lives, and "changing the definitions of what life means." But now, 30 years later, "instead of changing lives, we're emphasizing different things." The community, he said, has become paralyzed by "group boundary issues," such as "are you in or are you out," "membership requirements," "questions like annulments," "rules for communion/intercommunion," "questions of access to God."

"That's not what the Gospels are saying," he lamented, as he launched into his critique of what he calls "belonging systems."

"Belonging systems" -- such as the Catholic Church, which he subsequently compares to an incompetent but tyrannical dating service -- "do not lead to transformation, and in fact they often become an inoculation to transformation or even a substitute for it," he said.

"We confuse the dating service with the date -- all right? [laughter] -- I just thought of this this morning -- everything about the dating service. Does the dating service like me? Do I pass the rules? Did I fill out the forms of the dating service correctly? And I think that's a fairly good analogy for the Church: a dating service. But we think because we passed the test of the dating service and they said, 'well you are compatible' we think we've really gone on the date. And I think a lot of our people haven't. I don't think they've gone on the date at all. I don't think they're in love yet. I don't think they've fallen into the hands of the living God. Hmmm. In other words, what it appears is that a lot of it is religion -- about being a good Catholic -- which I'm all for -- but not necessarily being transformed into the mystery of God...."

"Belonging systems give us a false sense of having arrived -- no one is calling me a heretic or a sinner so I guess I've met God...."

He went on:

“The more requirements for membership in a group have to do with following the rules of the group – which, by the way – don’t hear me ‘either/or’ – these are good rules – all right – we need them for social order; we need them to maintain the ideal; we need them to keep some sense of being together on a journey – but don’t ever make the jump that that of itself means accessibility to God. That that means availability to God because the great, great news is that, in fact, we come to God not by doing it right but ironically, shockingly, unbelievably, by doing it wrong.

DEAL WITH THAT!

“And if you’re gonna call me a heretic, you better throw out the story of the Prodigal Son, better throw out the story of the Publican and the Pharisee, you better throw out the story of the Weeds and the Wheat. You’ll always have one who does it right and gets it totally wrong and one who always does it wrong and gets it totally right.

“Deal with that!

“Why did Jesus tell stupid stories like that? Why? He was not a good founder of a religion.... Where we want clear black and whites, clear reward and punishment systems about who’s in and who’s out. That’s the nature of the group. That’s what you have to have to create belonging systems. And it’s not bad.. But you can see why the Rabbis and the Scribes and Chief Priests were not too comfortable with Jesus. Because he didn’t put the belonging system first. He put the transformation first. And then you have this gathering together of the transformed people, then you have a belonging system that is not self-serving, that is not self-maintaining, that is not always pointing to itself but like John the Baptist, always pointing beyond itself, fingers pointing to the moon. Pointing to the mystery....”

The big mistake the Catholic Church has made, Rohr continued, is that it has placed too much emphasis on the “belonging system,” and now its efforts have backfired, as statistics related to the high attrition rate of Catholic school-educated young people from the Church demonstrate.

WAR ON THE HOLY TRINITY

In the attempt to overhaul Catholicism in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, no doctrine is left unabused, and abuse of the Catholic Church’s doctrine of the Holy Trinity and formulating a new lan-

guage to demystify the Trinity was part of the agenda at the L.A. religious education congress that year.

The clearest manifestation of this reworking of Trinitarian doctrine came in two talks delivered by two very prominent theologians: Dr. Thomas Groome, an ex-priest and dissenter, and senior professor of theology and religious education at Boston College; and Dr. Michael Downey, professor of theology at St. John’s Seminary in Camarillo (Archdiocese of Los Angeles), who was introduced as “the cardinal’s [Mahony’s] theologian.”

In his address, “Communion in One Love: Trinity and Spirituality” – his 16th consecutive address at Cardinal Roger Mahony’s Religious Education Congress – Downey proposed that the Church’s doctrine of the Trinity – properly understood as explained by him – can be used to promote a radical egalitarianism which completely precludes any idea of a priesthood, hierarchy, Magisterium, papacy or any concept of absolute truth.

Moreover, the Trinity need not be considered such a “lofty mystery” if Catholics will only stop using “all that language that seems so chilly and abstract,” and look at the “little, teeny words” found in the Church’s propositional language.

When a Catholic is baptized, Downey continued, he enters into relationship with the Trinity, and so he posed his next question: “How do we share in that communion?”

“Our call,” he answered, “is to image the Divine Life. How do we do that? We image divine life by nurturing, cultivating and sustaining all those relationships that are rooted in and foster equality, mutuality and interdependence. On what grounds? That ‘all in Christ are one’....

“So our vocation,” he continued, getting to the meat of his message, “is to cultivate, to nurture, to keep it going, to sustain relationships that are rooted in equality, mutuality and interdependence. Men aren’t up there and women down here; blacks up there -- white’s are -- blacks up -- whites down -- however you want to construe it.

“Any kinds of relationships that are built on ordination or super-ordination, superiority, inferiority, blind obedience and so on and so forth, this I would suggest calls into question the degree to which we are mirroring the divine life,” he declared.

Thomas Groome, the proud father of new baby boy, explored the subject: "What does it mean the God we worship is constituted of a trinity of loving relationships?"

Like Downey, he ridiculed the fact that the Church has taught for 2,000 years that the Trinity is an unfathomable mystery; rather, Groome believes the Trinity is "the symbol that says it all."

"Is it something we believe in, or is it the clue to it all?"

Groome mentioned all the names of God found in Psalm 18 – "my rock," "my bastion," "my shield," "my horn," "my salvation," "my stronghold," etc. – and then observed that the Koran has 999 names for God. There are 4,000 references to God as male in the Old Testament, he observed, pointing out that 3,000 of them are not specifically male in the original Hebrew. For example, the Hebrew El Shadai, he said, which has been translated as Almighty, literally means "big breasted, overflowing with milk."

"Wouldn't it be funny if the priest got up on Sunday and addressed God at Mass, 'Oh God, of the big breasts'?"

When we pray, he suggested, "Why not address God as "Our Mother," "Our Grandmother," "Our Coach," "Our Friend."

CARDINAL MAHONY'S NEW AGE LITURGY

In June 1997, *The Wanderer's* Los Angeles-based correspondent Teresa Cepeda disclosed that Cardinal Mahony was privately circulating a draft document on the liturgy under the headline,

"Cardinal Mahony Wants Liturgy Purged of All European Elements."

"In a desperate attempt to bring some vibrancy to the anemic liturgies common in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, its archbishop, Roger Cardinal Mahony, is preparing a pastoral letter on the liturgy which calls for the complete de-Europeanization of the Mass and the institutionalization of a thoroughly Americanized liturgy," Cepeda reported.

In the 54-page document, then in its second draft, Mahony complained constantly about the poor quality of liturgies in Los Angeles, berates priests and people alike for failing to achieve the vision of the "liturgical renewal" of Vatican II, and provides a "vision" of his ideal liturgy which represents a dra-

matic break with Catholic tradition.

Among the "Mahonyisms" in the pastoral:

"In all honesty, we have hardly begun to give the basic shape of the eucharist the sounds and movements and gestures and arts of our many cultures," he wrote.

"Imagine Sunday liturgies where all acclaim in rhythms known from household and community.

"A warning label ought to be attached to 'full' participation: It can wear you out even as it lifts you up because it isn't just your mind or your voice or your heart or your feet or your money that is involved. It is full. So it is good when you need to nap a bit after the Sunday liturgy."

To his priests, in the second part of the letter, Mahony says: "We will focus on the liturgy and will do so very concretely with goals and even deadlines for implementation of good practice."

"You must know that the goal of this letter is not the mechanical implementation of some of the things that will follow here. Yes, those must be done."

"A good presider is thoroughly attentive to the liturgy.... This is an attitude, a way of being and conducting oneself. It can only happen when we have left behind all magical notions of liturgy and priesthood."

"At Sunday eucharist, there is no reverence for the body of Christ when we have not sought bread that is bread to all the senses, when we have not the habit of enough wine for the cup to be shared by every communicant...."

"The assembly is to be gathered round, if possible, right around the altar, for what occurs here involves not only the bread and wine, but those standing around. We too are consecrated, changed, shared."

Many of the practices called for in the document are clearly contrary to liturgical regulations – moreso even now, as the Holy See tries to reintroduce discipline to the Roman Rite, most importantly in the upcoming 2005 Synod on the Eucharist in Rome.

Many other of his proposals could be questioned on theological grounds. By the year 2000, says the cardinal, every parish in the archdiocese must in-

stitute the following “reforms”:

Members of the “assembly” will gather around the altar, led by the “presider” in the eucharistic prayer of “thanksgiving” (possibly one written by the mandatory parish liturgy director or committee). All must remain standing until Communion is finished, then sit for quiet reflection. Priests’ functions will be limited to leading the opening prayer and the eucharistic prayer. The team of parish “homilists” will meet weekly to plan the following week’s sermon and critique the previous week’s. Instead of hosts, parishes must use “bread that is bread to all the senses, and Communion must always be distributed under both Species.”

The letter also calls for feminist images for God: “Further, let us be at least as rich and broad as scripture when in homily or song we employ images for God. God is not male. But our exclusive use of male imagery risks a kind of idolatry.”

Traditional Catholic terminology is avoided in favor of everyday terms like “cup,” “plate,” “bread,” and “wine” (or, occasionally, “consecrated bread” and “consecrated wine”). We will have an authentic liturgy, said Mahony, “only when we have left behind all magical notions of liturgy and priesthood.”

“Without waiting for further Roman or American liturgical legislation, we can do most of what needs to be done,” said Mahony.

The 12,000 word “pastoral letter on ministry,” called for a “major reorientation” “to meet the needs of an ever-changing Church” one that is becoming aware that it is “inclusive,” “richly multicultural,” “diverse,” “collaborative,” “vibrant,” “gifted,” “talented.”

Mahony opened his pastoral with a black and white, yellowed, portrait of St. Leo’s parish in Los Angeles in 1955, a parish with a pastor, two full-time assistant priests and some clerical helpers from a local religious order who came over to celebrate the five Sunday Masses, in Latin, of course.

Weekday Masses at St. Leo’s, the cardinal continues, “were at 6:30 a.m. and 8 a.m., and a Mass for school children was celebrated every Thursday morning at 9 a.m. During Lent, school children went to confession on the Thursdays before First Fridays. On Fridays in Lent, the children made the Stations of the Cross immediately after Mass....

“Confessions were heard every Saturday from 4 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. and from 7:30 p.m. to 9 p.m.. Since most parishioners went to Confession before receiving Communion, the lines to get into the confessional were quite long. Confessions were often heard during Sunday Mass as well....”

Mahony continues with his little descriptions of the rich social, catechetical and devotional life of the parish, the schedule for novenas and Benediction, the catechism classes, the training of altar boys, the schedule of visits to the sick, the marriage preparation classes, and concludes:

“The spiritual needs of the parishioners were fairly routine. They attended Sunday Mass faithfully and came to Confession at least once a month....

“Since all of the Masses were celebrated in Latin, the ethnic makeup of the parish did not make much difference...The priest assumed everyone in the parish spoke English sufficiently. On the other hand, the priest’s sermon was, for all intents and purposes, the only English spoken during the Mass. It often took the form of moral exhortation, peppered with reminders of one’s duties in Church and civil life. Rarely was the sermon directly related to the Epistle, the Gospel, or to the explanation of the Scriptures, which received little attention in comparison to the heart and soul of the Mass – the moment of consecration.”

In sharp contrast to this staid, predictable, routine way of living the Catholic life, St. Leo’s in 2005 “a vibrant Catholic community of faith, impelled by the Spirit to evangelize and, in word and deed, become a light to the nations.”

“Steeped in the riches of Catholic tradition, the people of St. Leo’s are aware that there is no returning to the days prior to the Second Vatican Council when there were huge numbers of priests, Sisters and Brothers, and when the role of the laity in ministry seemed unnecessary and was inadequately recognized.”

Saint Leo’s is now a totally multicultural parish of 5,000 Catholic households -- though the older white folks are complaining that they never get a Mass in English and are threatening to leave.

“Saint Leo’s is now served by a pastor, a lay pastoral associate who is a married lay woman with two young children, a permanent deacon, and a large staff of lay people, some of whom are full-time, some

part-time, and others volunteer....” The deacon preaches the Gospel; the liturgy director is a woman, there is only one morning Mass, three times per week; the deacon does weddings; and funeral Masses are held during one of the three weekday Masses.

The director of religious education is a woman, and her job “takes her away from home most evenings.” Married couples lead the marriage preparation classes; a youth group meets once a week to decide where they’ll have dinner and what movie they’ll see; there are Cursillo and charismatic groups that meet.

As for the pastor, “he is aware of the need for ongoing formation for himself and for all members of his staff, and is seeking creative ways to make this possible. As pastor, he understands that it is his duty to take advantage of the many opportunities within the archdiocese to develop his skills as a minister of Christ and his Church, and to encourage others on his staff, and within the parish, to do so as well.”

The pastor and all his paid staff take turns being present at the various meetings the parish holds, and the pastor is always sure to attend the weekly Scripture study group, so he can “profit from the wisdom of the community” and bring that wisdom “to bear upon the preparation of the Sunday homily.”

At St. Leo’s in 2005, there’s no mention of Confession, presumably because all the baptized have become saints.

In issuing this pastoral, which, in part, results from a workshop on inclusive ministry Sister Fran Ferder gave the priests of the archdiocese at the invitation of Cardinal Mahony, Mahony is showing his commitment to the lay-run church envisioned more than 25 years ago by Bishop Howard Hubbard of Albany, who published a pastoral in 1978, *We Are God’s Priestly People* – one of the first episcopal calls for a lay-run church.

Since then, lay ministry has proliferated, and in 1997, the Vatican issued a major document, *Instruction on Certain Questions Regarding the Collaboration of the Nonordained Faithful in the Sacred Ministry of Priests*, signed by the Holy Father and eight curial heads, attempting to put the brakes on a development which is exalting the laity while diminishing the priesthood.

At the time it was released, in November 1997, during the annual U.S. bishops’ meeting, re-

tired Baltimore Archbishop William Borders denounced it, arguing the document “eliminates everything we’ve been doing” for 30 years. Rockville Center Auxiliary Bishop Emil Wcela griped that it would appear “like a great criticism of lay ministry in the Church.”

Mahony’s thrust on behalf of lay ministry also separates him from some of the more thoughtful members of the U.S. hierarchy, who spoke out last year against a proposed NCCB document on lay ministry, such as Philadelphia Auxiliary Bishop Joseph Martino, who feared the bishops’ promotion of lay ministry would “foment confusion,” and other bishops who warned of “clericalizing the laity.”

An anonymous Jesuit in California analyzed Mahony’s pastoral for Jim Hollman, publisher of a group of independent Catholic newspapers. Besides branding the document heretical, he also found it condescending.

On specific points, the Jesuit found Mahony’s derogatory comments about the “routine” spiritual needs of the parish “condescending in the extreme... but almost certainly more indicative of the pastoral obtuseness of its authors than the actual spirituality of the parishioners.

“This perspective not only demeans the dignity of the faithful but implies that the authors view a change in pastoral practice as primarily a change in filters -- filters that screen out all spiritual and moral needs except those the authors are prepared to hear.”

Mahony’s argument that “Saint Leo’s 2005 understands itself as a vibrant Catholic community of faith impelled by the Spirit to evangelize and...become a light to the nations” was characterized by the Jesuit as “rubbish” -- “the language of the manifesto or mission statement, a pious hope and not a matter-of-fact statement of current reality such as was used to depict Saint Leo’s 1955.This kind of rhetorical excess casts doubt on the seriousness with which we are meant to understand the rest of the document.”

Mahony’s assertion: “Steeped in the riches of the Catholic tradition, the people of Saint Leo’s are aware that there is no returning to the days prior to the Second Vatican Council...” is simply “fatuous.”

“The people of Saint Leo’s will have only the most fragmentary and fugitive grasp of the Catholic tradition,” the Jesuit correctly observed. “Most will

be unaware that such a tradition exists....The polemical and tendentious rhetoric of 'there's no going back' is itself divisive and destructive of amity and good will....Moreover, this sloganeering is blatantly partisan, echoing as it does a battle-cry in current ecclesiological controversy. It does not serve to clarify the issues but to alienate and marginalize one group of the disputants."

Mahony's line that, "week by week, the people of St. Leo's gather for Word and Sacrament," said the Jesuit, "is frankly ludicrous. This is the European theological cant of 30 years past, and it belongs in a museum gallery with Snoopy posters and Metri-Cal. It is in fact not even English, being simply a calque translation of the German *Wort und Sakrament*, expressing by hendiadys the neo-Lutherite understanding of Eucharistic worship in vogue among heterodox theologians and their workshop disciples of the early 1970s.

"To suggest, even indirectly, that first-generation Mexican and Vietnamese Catholics of 2005 will be calling out of their indigenous spiritual experience for *Wort und Sakrament* argues that the authors of this document are laughably out of touch with the reality they purport to describe and to which, God help us, they are currently pretending to minister."

As Mahony's Jesuit critic observed: "Vatican II was interpreted by groups of a clerical academic elite in a manner contrary to the face-value meaning of the documents, such that (in their view) massive changes in pastoral practices and seminary and religious training were required in order to revitalize the Church.

"Such changes -- almost always instituted and perpetuated in the face of lay resistance -- proved catastrophic according to every objective measure of vitality. Not only are the places that went furthest in institutionalization of the new changes the most moribund in terms of vocations and Catholic practice (Holland, France, Switzerland) but such flashes of vitality as are still seen in places like LA are due to the disproportionate number of Catholics newly arrived from regions in which the post-Conciliar innovations were least violent (Mexico, Vietnam, Korea, the Philippines).

"The situation we are now faced with is this: are we going to let the architects of the Dutch Solution claim victory, and continue to impose the Hol-

land model of Catholic life on the Vietnamese, etc., under the pretense that they are responding to the Holy Spirit in so doing?"

Mahony's boast that "What some refer to as a 'vocations crisis' is, rather, one of the many fruits of the Second Vatican Council, a sign of God's deep love for the Church, and an invitation to a more effective ordering of gifts and energy in the Body of Christ" is, observed the Jesuit, "blasphemy redeemed by stupidity.

"Even if native intelligence did not suffice, the fact that the Holy Father as well as nearly every abbot, provincial and prior urges us to pray for an increase in priests and sisters should alert us to the fact that there is indeed a crisis, and that it makes little sense to pray that we be spared further signs of God's deep love for the Church. Moreover, even the most superficial survey of the causes of the decrease in vocations (bishops dead of AIDS, pedophile priests borne off to prison in handcuffs and leg-irons, massive and diffuse doctrinal dissent, scandalous abandonment of religious vows and promises) should make one slow to attribute the new situation to the work of the Holy Spirit without further qualification."

E-MAILS REVEAL CARDINAL'S STAFF

Since the eruption of the clergy sex scandals in January 2002, Californians have learned that some of the priests closest to the cardinal -- his top aides -- were homosexual predators, including his longtime friends, Monsignor Richard Loomis, Father Michael Wempe, Father Carl Sutphin, Fr. Michael Baker and Fr. Michael Harris.

The Baker case, in particular, has all the elements of every other major homosexual pedophile scandal: He abused kindergarten and elementary-school age children; he was given parishes which had elementary schools, even after Mahony knew he was a pedophile; his specialty was youth ministry; he lived an extravagant lifestyle; archdiocesan officials paid out money to avoid lawsuits; and archdiocesan officials, including the cardinal, today suffer selective amnesia, claiming they have no memory of crucial meetings, conversations or documents.

For Mahony, *The Los Angeles Times'* disclosures about Baker follow on the racketeering lawsuit filed against him for his negligence as Bishop of Stockton in the case involving Fr. Oliver O'Grady.

The current scandal involving Baker also

raises troubling questions about the episcopal appointment process, which seems to mirror the problem of moving abusive priests from parish to parish, or diocese to diocese. Negligent, or even abusive clerics or bishops, are elevated to bishoprics, or moved from one diocese to another. The classic case is that of disgraced Santa Rosa Bishop G. Patrick Ziemann, one of Mahony's former auxiliaries.

One of the first casualties of Mahony's troubles is the sudden dampening of talk of Mahony's *papabilia*.

Sacramento political commentator, Leroy Chatfield, a former Christian Brother and longtime Mahony booster since Mahony's early days with Cesar Chavez and Mahony's first high-profile appointment by Governor Jerry "Moonbeam" Brown to the state's Farm Labor Board, has not recently commented on Mahony becoming the first American-born Pope. Chatfield, the ultimate insider in liberal political circles, seemed to have an uncanny ability to predict Mahony's rise, step by step, from Alinskyite organizer during the Grape Strike, to auxiliary bishop of Fresno, bishop of Stockton and then archbishop of Los Angeles.

According to the *Times*' report, Baker, ordained in 1974, told Mahony he molested young boys in 1986, and "that in one meeting, an archdiocese lawyer suggested calling the police but that Mahony said no."

"The cardinal said in an interview that he could not recall the discussion with Baker," reported Bunting.

DEEPLY TROUBLED

"The case is emerging as a pivotal one for Mahony and archdiocese leaders as they continue to grapple with the sexual abuse scandal that has hit the Roman Catholic Church. In one interview, Mahony called the Baker case the one 'that troubles me the most.'

"The cardinal has sought to portray himself as a defender of young victims and an advocate of cooperating with criminal investigations. At Pope John Paul II's historic meeting with American cardinals in Rome in April 2002, Mahony backed a 'zero tolerance' policy for sexually abusive priests.

"But leaked e-mail correspondence between top archdiocese officials reveals that Mahony was

reluctant to turn over Baker's name to police as recently as late March [2002]....

"In his [May 14] letter to priests, Mahony did not disclose his failure to notify police when he learned about Baker's alleged abuses against minors in 1986 and again in 2000. But he wrote, 'If I had known in those years what I discovered in early 2000, I would have dismissed him from all ministry and requested his dismissal from the priesthood in the late 1980s.'

"Of all the cases involving archdiocese priests facing claims of sexual abuse, Mahony said, Baker's is most troubling because he allegedly molested a number of children in the 1970s, '80s and '90s and continues to live in the area unsupervised."

In his May 14 letter, faxed to all priests in the archdiocese, Mahony wrote:

"As your archbishop, I assume full responsibility for allowing Baker to remain in any type of ministry during the 1990s. I offer my sincere, personal apologies for my failure to take firm and decisive action much earlier."

Mahony alerted the priests to an upcoming May 16 *Times*' expose, informing them the paper "has been preparing an article about the priest. You need to be aware that such a story could come anytime now, and you need to be aware of the seriousness of this case."

Fr. Baker, Bunting's report continued, "was known for his active involvement in youth groups and teen clubs. He frequently took altar boys to the movies and on overnight trips.

"The first incident of alleged abuse that has come to light took place in 1976 when Baker invited a 9-year-old altar boy to spend the night at St. Paul's rectory after a church-sponsored New Year's Eve party....The man recalled in an interview with *The Times* that Baker took him on trips to Palm Springs, Newport Beach, Reno and Chicago. He said the abuse escalated to oral sex and that Baker occasionally whispered to him, 'You're the son of God'....

"Eight other people have alleged that they were molested by Baker in the late 1970s and '80s, according to interviews with them and their lawyers. Two brothers say Baker began abusing them at St. Hilary in 1984 when they were 5 and 7 years old."

AMNESIACS

The Times disclosed that within a year of being named archbishop of Los Angeles, Mahony met with all his priests, and asked any who had a problem with sexual abuse to inform him, and that Baker told *The Times* "he admitted in a private meeting with Mahony in December 1986 that he had engaged in sexual abuse of minors.

"I told Mahony I had a problem," Baker said in one of a series of interviews with *The Times*. Mahony did not ask for specifics and appeared willing to let him remain in the priesthood, Baker said. "He was very solicitous and understanding. I was glad I brought it up."

"That evening, Baker said, he received a call from Msgr. Thomas Curry, the vicar for clergy who oversaw all priests. Curry directed Baker to return to archdiocese headquarters the next day.

"When he arrived, Baker said, Curry was joined by Mahony and John P. McNicholas, the archdiocese attorney. At the meeting, which lasted about 30 minutes, Baker said he was asked the extent of his problem. Baker said he disclosed that 'two or three' victims were involved and vowed not to engage in any future sexual misconduct.

"I don't recall them pressing me for details, and I didn't give them any," he said.

"At one point, Baker said, he became startled when McNicholas blurted, 'Should we call the police now?' Baker said he recalled Mahony's response: 'No, no, no....'

"The cardinal has provided conflicting accounts of his discussions with Baker," reported Bunting.

"Initially, he said last month that he had no recollection of the priest speaking to him about abusing boys. Mahony acknowledged that he would probably remember such a meeting if it had occurred.

"Later, the cardinal said he thought Baker had approached Curry. Curry, now bishop of Santa Barbara, said he could not recall the Baker meeting either. 'I just don't remember,' he said."

Among the other facts Bunting marshaled for is story:

* Mahony failed to inform priests or parents in the

parishes where he assigned Baker of the priest's problems.

* Even after his problems became known to Mahony, and he was "in treatment," he was assigned to nine different parishes, six of which had schools.

* The Tucson attorney who represented two brothers abused by Baker over a 13-year period told *The Times* about the \$1.3 million hush-money payment they received from the archdiocese: "I have never had a case in my 19 years of handling sex abuse claims that settled this quickly for this kind of money." The archdiocese wanted to avoid a lawsuit, she said. Officials knew "the allegations against Baker were true, there would be more victims, and they didn't want any publicity. What they were buying was silence."

* Mahony's difficulty in determining how to handle the Baker problem was revealed in the leaked, confidential e-mail messages broadcast by KFI radio station in April 2002. "Baker was among the final three names Mahony had not provided to law enforcement," reported *The Times*. In a March 27 e-mail to his top advisors titled 'Our Big Mistake,' Mahony scolded the archdiocesan lawyer, Sister Judy Murphy, for resisting his suggestion that she 'consult' with the Los Angeles Police Department about the three names.

"If we don't, today, 'consult' with the [LAPD] about those three names, I can guarantee you that I will get hauled into a Grand Jury proceeding and I will be forced to give all the names, etc.,' Mahony wrote. 'There is no middle ground on this; we are losing the battle because we are somehow "hiding" those three.'

"On March 30, Murphy reminded members of the cardinal's inner circle that Mahony was the one who resisted giving up Baker to police until the day before his 'Big Mistake' memo...."

"But bringing a criminal case against Mahony might be as hard as turning water into wine," reported Jeffrey Anderson for the *L.A. Weekly*. "Prosecutors must either pry open Church files or crack the code of silence in the Catholic hierarchy. And, police are still rounding up errant priests; some have fled the country."

Los Angeles County Deputy District Attorney William Hodgman described his ongoing investigation of Mahony as "like Watergate unfolding."

"But Mahony faces threats outside the D.A.'s Office as well," continued Anderson. "Civil proceedings before a Los Angeles Superior Court judge could dislodge similar smoking gun documents that led to Boston-based Cardinal Bernard Law's resignation. Such disclosures could devastate Mahony's moral standing as the most powerful prelate in the United States.

"Mahony's lawyers are negotiating hundreds of civil sex abuse claims in a feverish attempt to avoid court orders to release documents. Civil attorneys and prosecutors are convinced the Church's primary focus is to protect Mahony from being called before a grand jury..."

SHOULD HE RESIGN

Responding to a claim made by Roger Cardinal Mahony, in a May 2004 interview with the *National Catholic Reporter's* Rome correspondent John Allen, that "until a month ago, I had never heard of this person" – a reference to the plaintiff in a sex abuse lawsuit against former priest Oliver O'Grady – plaintiff's lawyer John Manly wrote *NCR*: "...I wonder if [Allen] conducted his inquiry of Cardinal Mahony on one knee.

"The most offensive part is his questions about the deposition where he asked him, 'What was behind the effort to depose you?' I am somewhat interested in that issue because I am the attorney who noticed the cardinal's deposition on behalf of my client. In his answer Mahony said in part, 'No one in Stockton had ever heard of this person.' That's funny because my client who was abused from 1973 until his perpetrator, Father Oliver O'Grady, left the parish, was the son of a Diocesan employee who taught for the Diocese of Stockton for nearly 10 years. This gross misstatement was not only disrespectful to my client who was raped hundreds of times but also to his family who are well known in Stockton. I wonder if Mr. Allen can imagine his own child being raped by his parish priest hundreds of times while he worked for the Diocese in question and then read his Bishop stating in a Catholic newspaper, 'No one has ever heard of this person.'

"Furthermore, Cardinal Mahony fails to mention that the deposition was not only for my client's case but also four other cases that range from 1973 to the mid-90's. Cardinal Mahony was bishop in Stockton from 1980 to 1986. He was made aware repeatedly that Oliver O'Grady was raping children. He

not only did nothing, he moved him into three separate parishes and in fact in his last assignment he promoted him to pastor. He also saw fit to name O'Grady to several Diocesan leadership positions including Director of the Family Life Bureau, Director of the Legion of Mary and head of the Spanish Language Outreach. In every one of his positions he had unfettered and unsupervised access to hundreds of children under the Diocese's care. It is beyond comprehension that His Eminence could have placed this predator in positions where he was morally certain to molest kids. It's odd that all this information is in the public domain and yet Mr. Allen never asked the Cardinal about it...."

In the May 13 *NCR* interview, conducted with Mahony while the prelate was in Rome for his *ad limina*, Allen also asked Mahony questions about bishops' accountability and whether or not bishops should resign if found guilty of "egregious misconduct" in tolerating and protecting sexually abusive priests.

Mahony responded: "It's true, there must be some bishops who knowingly took someone who abused a minor and put them back into a parish and didn't tell anybody, and when they abused more minors, maybe moved them somewhere else. There's no question there are some cases like that. I don't know where they are, I don't know what those situations are....But let's assume a clear case of culpability. Should that bishop resign? I don't think so, necessarily. I think you have to look at the whole context. I think there has to be some kind of process to evaluate that, and to put it on a scale from zero to 10. Some decisions have to be made on when it happened, what was known, what was best practices, what he did or didn't do. That's the only way to proceed...."

###

Write a story exposing your pastor or bishop. Or send all the documentation to RCF and we can cover it.

Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc.
PO Box 109, Petersburg, IL 62675-0109
Phone: 217-632-5920 / Fax: 217-632-7054
www.rcf.org
Send RCF you tax-deductible donation!

A Law Unto Himself

By Dr. Thomas Droleskey

The incredibly bold appointment by Pope John Paul II of the disgraced Bernard Cardinal Law, the Archbishop of Boston from March of 1984 until December of 2002, as the Archpriest of the Basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome says so much about the current occupant of the Throne of Saint Peter. Indeed, not much time needs to be spent to belabor points that are really rather obvious even at a cursory glance of the situation.

Many who continue to defend the novelties promoted by Pope John Paul II and who defend his lack of governance of the Church contradict themselves over and over again when attempting to do what I had done for far too long: defend the indefensible. Pope John Paul II believes that he is a law unto himself, that there are no limits to the powers he has as the Successor of Saint Peter to disparage defined teachings of the Church by ignoring them altogether or by deconstructing them of the meaning they have had until the beginning of the conciliarist era with the pontificate of Pope John XXIII in 1958. This has been the subject of numerous commentaries by many scholarly commentators. One of the best is, as I have mentioned repeatedly in recent articles, *The Great Facade*, by Christopher Ferrara and Thomas E. Woods, Jr. Pope John Paul II does not believe he is bound by solemn papal pronouncements or by the pronouncements and decisions of dogmatic councils. He has dared to go where not even Pope Paul VI went insofar as defining almost everything in terms of the conciliarist religion. One manifestation of this is the continued rejection of all but a handful of preconciliar sources as references for the official pronouncements of Vatican dicasteries and/or Papal encyclical letters and allocutions. The fact that the novelties of the new religion continue to lead inevitably to a constant string of contradictory statements and inconsistencies is lost on the Pope's reflexive defenders, believing that they must continue to praise the emperor's new clothes when they know that the emperor is naked and that his reign has been a series of unmitigated disasters for the life of the Catholic Church and thus for the good of the world, which must be subordinated in all things to the Social Reign of Christ the King and of Mary our Immaculate Queen. This was all the subject of "More Than a Matter of Govern-

ance," which was posted on this website recently.

What I would like to point out at this juncture, therefore, is that those who defend everything the Pope or some Vatican functionary says and does, including the sacrilege that took place in the Chapel of the Apparitions in the Shrine of Our Lady of Fatima in Portugal on May 5, 2004, insist quite solemnly that the Pope cannot discipline or remove wayward bishops as this would be "too divisive" for the Church. The Pope's defenders say also that the Pope cannot micromanage the Church and that it would be terribly divisive for him to create an Apostolic Administration to afford the Traditional Latin Mass the recognition in contemporary canon law that is its due as a result of Pope Saint Pius V's *Quo Primum*. Indeed, Vatican officials have fallen all over themselves to provide contradictory reasons why such an Apostolic Administration cannot be created, although a common thread is that such an entity would be "divisive" in that it would be a *de facto* admission that there are two different rites in the Roman Rite of the Catholic Church. Thus, we have heard some utter the nonsensical view that there is only one Roman Rite, but one that has two forms. Where does that leave the "Anglican Use" form of the Roman Rite? A third but forgotten form of the one Roman Rite? It is good to recognize positivism for what it is and thus not try to make any sense of the statements made by revolutionaries who know that logic and history and tradition are simply lined up against them quite solidly and cannot be rebutted with anything other than smoke and mirrors.

How very interesting that the Pope who does not want to "divide" the Church is willing to incur the wrath of Catholics who have been disaffected and abused as a result of the systematic cover-up of the scandals caused by the perverted behavior of sodomite priests in the Archdiocese of Boston under the episcopate of Bernard Cardinal Law by rewarding him with a prominent Roman post. Law, who succeeded the late Humberto Cardinal Medeiros on March 25, 1984, began his career in Boston by caving into the demands of feminists to have nuns administer Holy Communion at his Mass of Installation in Holy Cross Cathedral even though there were scores of cardinals and bishops and priests, the ordinary minis-

ters of Holy Communion, present and able to do so. He protected and reassigned sodomite perverts within the priesthood, even going so far as to write a letter of recommendation for Father Paul Shanley, the co-founder of the North American Man-Boy Love Association, even after Father Shanley's public support for this sickest of all perversities had become known to him. Cardinal Law and his chancery staff in Boston, which included the current Bishop of Rockville Centre, New York, the Most Reverend William Murphy, and the retired Bishop of Brooklyn, New York, the Most Reverend Thomas Daily, betrayed the trust of the victims of perverted priests over and over again. The tangled legal mess created by Cardinal Law has cost the Archdiocese of Boston millions of dollars and has scandalized countless numbers of souls in Boston and elsewhere across the United States of America. Yes, how very interesting that the Pope is willing to divide and demoralize Catholics by showing that he can reward a disgraced prelate when he should have removed his red hat and denied him a vote in the next conclave for his reprehensible defense of sodomites in Our Lord's Holy Priesthood.

Pope John Paul II is all too willing to flex his governing muscle and to incur the wrath of those who will oppose him on decisions he wants to make because he wants to make them. This should put the lie once and for all to the indefensible claim made by the Pope's defenders that the Holy Father is paralyzed by forces beyond his control. The appointment of Bernard Cardinal Law as the Archpriest of one of the four major Roman basilicas shows that the Holy Father's angst over the scandals that came to light in the secular media (but had been reported for the better part of fifteen years in *The Wanderer* and *The Remnant* and had been documented to Roman authorities by Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc.) was so much public relations. No man who understood the depth of the alienation that was caused so needlessly by the blithe treatment of sodomites in the priesthood and the callous treatment of their victims by bishops and their chancery factotums would choose so visible and identifiable a symbol as Bernard Cardinal Law to be the archpriest of any church. Cardinal Law should have had the humility to refuse the appointment and to have spent the rest of his life in humble prayer in a monastery, having voluntarily turned in his cardinal's red hat in disgrace. That the Holy Father still trusts Cardinal Law and that the latter does not have the sense of shame that he should, demonstrates that both men are laws unto themselves who do not care what their actions signify to the faithful who have been so

bewildered by the doctrinal and liturgical revolutions of the past forty years and who are scandalized when their shepherds protect sodomites who have demeaned the priesthood instituted by the God-Man for their sanctification and salvation.

Make no mistake about it. Bernard Cardinal Law has many friends in Rome apart from the Holy Father himself. These curial officials sit around in the Borgia, the little community of shops and bistros that surround the Vatican, eating their bowls full of pasta and drinking the choicest of wines while they belittle the scandals caused by sodomite priests and their bishop-protectors as having been blown out of proportion by an anti-Catholic secular media. To them, you see, Cardinal Law is a victim of circumstances. These curial officials care not one whit for the good of anything other than their own clerical careers and the creature comforts afforded them by the perquisites of their Vatican passports and access to the corridors of power in and around Vatican Hill and the offices located on the Via della Conciliazione and in the Trastevere district. So what if Bishop Matthew Clark of Rochester, New York, said in the mid-1990s that the Church had to find a way to "bless homosexual unions"? So what if Bishop Howard Hubbard of Albany, New York, looked the other way as Catholic Charities officials under his direct control pioneered the adoption of children by a lesbian "couple"? So what if Roger Cardinal Mahony spends \$200 million on a monstrosity that is an affront to everything Catholic and opens his arms to those who want to demonstrate solidarity with practicing homosexuals and lesbians? So what if one bishop after another either supports or does nothing when confronted with the reality of sex instruction programs that undermine the innocence and purity of the young or the simple fact that most of those who teach in Catholic "educational" institutions do not believe in the Deposit of Faith and actually dissent quite actively from the Ten Commandments as explicated by the Church herself from time immemorial? So what if traditional Catholics are deemed to be schismatic and heretical and divisive for demanding their rights under *Quo Primum* for both the honor and glory of God and the good of the Church herself? Oh, no, if everything is fine with the pasta and the wine in the Borgia, all is well in the Church at large. These are the sort of men who enable the enabler of sodomites named Cardinal Law, who is also beloved of the priests and the laity of *Opus Dei*.

We must remember that the Church is di-

vinely founded. She was brought to birth on Pentecost Sunday by the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles and our dear Blessed Mother. She will last until the end of time despite all of the bad example and scandals and sins of her members, including each one of us. Indeed, scandals such as the appointment of Cardinal Law as the Archpriest of the Basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore only prove the divine foundations of the Church: nothing merely humanly organized could survive for nearly two millennia in the face of such outrages. The Church must be of God. It is God's true Church, outside of which there is no salvation. Nevertheless, this particular scandal and outrage should show to dispassionate observers that Pope John Paul II is not unwilling to divide the Church when he is of a mind to use his incontestably strong, strong will to make a particular point. How sad it is for those who have come to realize the importance of restoring the patrimony of the Church's tradition, including the Traditional Latin Mass, that the Holy Father is unwilling to restore our Tradition but all too willing to further alienate already disaffected Catholics by defending a man who has been, much like himself, a law unto himself.

Our Lady, Spouse of the Holy Ghost, pray for us.

Continued from page 6.

be coming to inform/educate the parents regarding the new religion program that will be presented to their children. The last time I heard Vahling speak on behalf of the diocese she promoted women priests, birth control, and masturbation. I informed the diocese and made the information public, yet Msgr. Kemme entrusts the souls of his parishioners' children to this heretic.

My family attends a Springfield parish in order to fulfill our Sunday obligation. We are unable to allow our children to be involved in parish life because their souls would clearly be in danger. But, unfortunately, this parish is the best we can reach within our time and driving limitations. How can we expect our children, who may have never participated in Mass or been involved in a parish where a true priest with strong faith was present, to keep the faith themselves? These priests expose themselves as the hypocrites they are and our children can see it. So many compromises are made at the parish that the Catholic

Faith seems unimportant. How could anyone believe in the Real Presence at this parish when you witness all the talking that goes on before and after Mass in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament. One of the biggest offenders before Mass is an usher. No priest protests. The list goes on and you all know the rest of this story. If the Society of St. Pius X (SSPX) was in Petersburg my family would be there. My children need to witness the actions and hear the preaching of a believing priest, a real man with courage.

These bishops have an agenda and it is not Catholic. They are self destructing. If they had faith they would have vocations. If they preached the truth, people would come. If their actions matched their words, they would have credibility. Cut off the money. Cut off the money. Cut off the money. Take away their lavish lifestyles and these effeminate, spineless, lying bishops would slither away.

Despite all this there is hope. A remnant is alive but unfortunately not in all areas of the country.

Lately RCF has received letters from Catholics who demand that we (RCF) investigate and remove their priest or their bishop. Yet they offer no help, no information, no money to cover expenses. I realize that RCF is the only game in town but we cannot act without facts, documentation, and financial help. Patience is a virtue and we are being tested here at RCF by the cases of Cardinal Mahony, Bishop Hubbard and others. We must destroy their credibility with the truth and pray those with information will have the courage and faith to come forward. In God's time. Meanwhile we keep praying, keep digging, and keep the Faith. Start sending your angry letters to Rome. Tell the Pope and his staff to act by exercising their authority. We don't need another "pastoral letter" or "papal document." We need faith in action. We need a leader.

(Please read the story regarding Fr. Mike Lastiri from Merced, CA. found in the back of this issue. It was a few of his parishioners who identified a problem, investigated, and defended the faith by exposing this sick priest. Follow their example. They are to be applauded.)

Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc.
PO Box 109, Petersburg, IL 62675-0109
Ph: 217-632-5920 / Fax: 217-632-7054
www.rcf.org

"[T]hose shameful acts against nature, such as were committed in Sodom, ought everywhere and always to be detested and punished." St. Augustine, *Confessions* 3:8:15 [A.D. 400]

"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. 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." Romans 1:26-27

"All of these affections [in Rom. 1:26-27] . . . were vile, but chiefly the mad lust after males; for the soul is more the sufferer in sins, and more dishonored than the body in diseases." St John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Romans* 4 [A.D. 391]

"[Christians] abhor all unlawful mixtures, and that which is practiced by some contrary to nature, as wicked and impious." *Apostolic Constitutions* 6:11 [A.D. 400]

The Fall of Mike the Bear "Want Sex"

By Dario McDarby

Mike wanted sex. He said so to other men in an e-personal ad on April 28, 2004. Mike was on his way to Italy.... Let's let him tell the rest of the story:

"I am visiting Rome from May 9th to May 14th...looking for friendly bears and chasers during my visit there." Mike's note was posted at Bear411.com, under the topic of "Want Sex." Bear411.com is a homosexual site for heavy and hairy men looking for others like themselves to fornicate. Mike, also known as *TopCAbear* and *Basqueoso*, is "Father" Jean-Michael Lastiri of the Merced, California parishes of Our Lady of Mercy/St. Patrick's Church, a parish, according to the diocese website, that was established in 1867 and has 2,565 registered parishioners.

Why was Fr. Lastiri going to Rome? Fresno Bishop John T. Steinbock invited him to attend the bishop's *ad limina apostolorum* ("to the threshold of the Apostles.") According to *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, an *ad limina apostolorum* is "an ecclesiastical term meaning a pilgrimage to the sepulchres of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome, i.e., to the Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles and to the Basilica of St. Paul 'outside the walls'." According to the *New Catholic Dictionary*, the pilgrimage is canonically required of bishops every three to 10 years.

While in Rome, Fr. Lastiri did not attend a luncheon with the bishop for diocese members who

were to Rome coincidentally with the *ad limina* pilgrimage. The Rogationists were attending the canonization of their founder. Rogationists are members of a priestly and lay order that prays for the increase in priestly and holy vocations and for the care and promotion of the human and spiritual welfare of orphans, needy children and the poor. The growing Fresno area scandals of homosexual and pedophile priests and a Bishop with a questionable history of caring for and promoting the spiritual welfare of children and the poor, made the Rogationist presence from the Fresno diocese even more ironic.

For Fr. Mike the pilgrimage was, if his email was any indication, to the various fleshpots of the Eternal City. Perhaps he wanted to refresh his soul in fornication not faith, in homosexuality not holiness, in perversion not prayer.

But this wasn't the first time he "want(ed) sex."

"Priests Just Want to Have Fu-un"

The pop singer Cyndi Lauper sang "Girls Just Want to Have Fun" years ago. It became a hit because it spoke to the mindless desires of young girls and some women, who wanted endless fun over troublesome duty. Father Mike could cut a rendition, titled "Priests Just Want to Have Fun." It seems, from a couple of disturbing emails from earlier in this year, that the priest desired play in travels to those sacred

lands of Las Vegas, Nevada and Huntington Beach, California. But it was more than play. He wanted sex. He said this prior to the 17 vacation trips, paid by loving parishioners, between 2001 and 2004 before which he had posted messages seeking sex with other heavy, hairy men.

Fr. Mike wrote on January 10, 2004, at 11:37 am: "Big hairy bear visiting Vegas for a couple days of R&R, staying at the Venetian...Jan21-23...looking to play with other nice bears while in town...TopCAbear@aol.com....or basqueroso@bear411.com" This message, as all others, appeared under the category "Want Sex." There was no disputing his desire "to play." It meant, in crude terms, he wanted to have sexual relations with other men while in Las Vegas.

On February 16, 2004 at 8:40 am, Lastiri wrote, while at his hotel, it seems: "here from feb 15 to feb 19 at local hotel...am basqueroso on bear411...looking for some local fun..."

Fr. Mike planned to return to Las Vegas. On April 5th, 2004 at 3:00 pm, he alerted interested others that he was "Visiting Las Vegas from April 12 to April 15... looking for some fun and frolic with locals or other visiting bears... or cubs/chasers."

And on July 7, 2004, just four days before his removal, he solicited "playmates" during a trip back east. He wrote: ".....looking for bears/admirers to play with...staying at New York New York Hotel....leave email if interested....my pic here is on Basqueroso@bear411.com. ..."

On his AOL.com profile site, "Mike" failed to mention he was a priest, though he said he was "spiritual oriented and love(s) theology." He also mentioned that one of his favorite places on AOL was "Love@AOL," a site specifically set up for people interested in meeting others for more than casual friendship. Given the nature of his sexual appetite, as he showed in his email for sexual encounters with other "bears" and "cubs," it seems that Fr. Mike was looking for love, that 'special friend.'

A Special Friend

Mike had a special friend a long time ago, about 1989 or 1990. Unfortunately, this friend was sent away... by the State of California for the molestation of a six year boy from the parish Fr. Lastiri previously served in Visalia.

In 1989, when he was pastor at Holy Family Church in Visalia, California, Fr. Lastiri found a job at the parish for Joe Herrera Banuelos. Banuelos, about 30 at the time, worked in an unpaid position at Holy Family, but lived at the much smaller parish of St. Thomas the Apostle, in Goshen, California.

Two Banuelos family members, in an interview with Mr. Thomas H. Walsh, a retired FBI agent and currently a private investigator, said that Joe and Fr. Mike were lovers. One relative said they had met at a homosexual night club. Another relative said he had seen the two together on a number of occasions. The relatives added that they confronted Banuelos about the sinful nature of his relationship with Lastiri. He told them that it wasn't wrong, that Lastiri was a priest and anything done with a priest was not sinful.

However, Joe was a dangerous homosexual pedophile. His twin brother died of AIDS. Banuelos believed he, too, was infected with AIDS. Joe and his brother, Gilbert, had been adopted as children by Joe and Lucy Banuelos. Lucy had been deaf since she was a young woman. Joe, the adopted father, was an alcoholic.

Susan Jacquez, cousin of Joe the homosexual, told Walsh in an interview on March 5, 2004 that life for the two boys as children was difficult. They were emotionally neglected, seeking friendship and affection in other places. A neighbor befriended the two, then after a time began sexually molesting them, perverting the boys and causing a lifetime of homosexual and pedophilic debauchery, which caused the death of Gilbert from AIDS and the imprisonment of Joe for sex crimes against a child.

Investigator Walsh wrote in a report sent to RCF:

"Mrs. Jacquez stated that about 1989 or 1990 it was known to her that Fr. Mike, as (Lastiri) was known, was a homosexual. Joseph told her, and other family members, that he was Fr. Mike's sex partner. Joseph often spoke of his sexual relationship, even to his mother, who Joseph visited with Fr. Mike. Joseph told Mrs. Jacquez that when he first met Fr. Mike he did not know he was a Catholic Priest, because he was dressed in regular clothes and did not wear a collar.

"Before long Joseph moved in with Fr.

Mike at the church, where Joseph advised her he had a room. Some time after this Joseph moved to Goshen, CA (at St. Thomas the Apostle Church). Mrs. Jacquez stated it was no secret among Catholics around town, about the association between Fr. Mike and Joseph. Joseph was observed driving Fr. Mike's Volvo car all around the town with Fr. Mike. She recalled one particular conversation she had with Joseph, regarding his sexual relationship with Fr. Mike. She recalled telling him that what he was doing was a sin. Joseph's response was that 'it could not be a sin because Fr. Mike was a Catholic Priest, he knew the Bible and because Fr. Mike was a Priest, what they did was OK.'"

Fr. Mike, as Banuelos' lover, undoubtedly saw the strange contents of Joe's room. From the police report after the search warrant, Banuelos had an assortment of women's garments and under garments, sexually explicit photos and films, children's toys, and framed photos and a card from Fr. Mike to Joe. Did Fr. Mike know his boyfriend was a dangerous pedophile? If not, should he have known, given the disordered life of his violent homosexual lover?

Walsh interviewed another Banuelos relative, Mrs. Albert Herrera, on March 8, 2004. She, too, believed that Fr. Mike and Joe were lovers. She told everyone in her family and nobody disputed the claims. Neither Joe nor Fr. Mike attempted to conceal the continuing sexual relationship. Walsh wrote, "In her opinion Fr. Mike and Joseph flaunted their relationship since Joseph and his brother Gilbert were well-known homosexuals."

On one notable occasion, Mrs. Herrera recalled to Walsh, "Fr. Mike and Joseph visited her home, Joseph was driving Fr. Mike's car. When asked where they were going, Joseph replied that 'he and Fr. Mike were on their way to Bakersfield, CA where they would be treated like *Queens*.' Mrs. Herrera said she knew the term 'Queens' to be a homosexual term."

Walsh continued: "Mrs. Herrera stated further that she did not contact Bishop Joseph Madera, the Bishop at the time, because she felt that going to him regarding Fr. Mike would be futile, as he must have known what was going on, everyone else in the parish knew." Mrs. Herrera also divulged the nature

of the relationship to investigators after the 1991 arrest of Banuelos for child molestation.

After, Joe's arrest, his calls to Fr. Mike went unreturned. Lastiri had left for Spain immediately after the arrest, which raises the question whether he had been interviewed by the police. When Joe attempted to call Lastiri on several other occasions, Fr. Mike never called, wrote, or offered any assistance to his 'special friend.'

The Heinous Crime

On January 14, 1991, Anna Macias enrolled in college classes. She had her six-year-old son with her. Joe, whom she knew from Holy Family Church, had given them a ride to the school. Ms. Macias registered for classes leaving her son in the information office. She also asked Joe to wait for her.

After registering, she noticed her son eating chocolates and walking with Joe from his car in the parking lot. Ms. Macias asked Joe if he would drive her and her son to a child care center in Goshen. He agreed to wait for her, but he left with her child. He told her he had to pick up some mail. Ms. Macias called for her son but Joe sped away.

Joe didn't return with the boy. So Ms. Macias sought help from the director of the child care center who drove her home. When she arrived home, a friend asked her why she left her child with Joe. Ms. Macias said, "I didn't leave him. He took him."

According to court records, Ms. Macias and her friend, while looking for the child, saw "Mike," a friend of Joe, in front of the rectory of the Holy Family Church. The "Mike" in the report is Fr. Lastiri. "Mike" said Joe left the boy, who was still sleepy at the time he was found. The court report did not mention whether the chocolates contained drugs, but the child's drowsiness seemed to suggest the candies had been drugged.

The child complained of a sore penis and told what had happened to him. Joe Banuelos was arrested and charged with kidnapping for child molesting, two counts of committing a lewd act upon a child (Banuelos performed oral sex on the boy), and attempted sodomy of a child under 14. The state dropped the kidnapping charge and Joe was convicted. He served his time and was released. Later police rearrested him during a "domestic dispute" with a new homosexual lover. Joe assaulted the police during the incident and is now incarcerated in the

California State Prison psychiatric hospital at Atascadero.

Both Ms. Macias and her son, now about 19, converted to Mormonism. She still lives in fear of Banuelos, according to a source who spoke to Roman Catholic Faithful. Her brother, the associate pastor of the Church at the time, has been promoted to pastor of another parish, possibly the reward for his silence in the crime against his nephew, the same source added.

While the assault on the Macias child happened prior to Bp. Steinbock's installation as administrator of the diocese, he failed to exercise prudent judgment and follow up the questions of (1) why was Joe Banuelos allowed to live at St. Thomas the Apostle, (2) what was the nature of the relationship between the two men, and (3) why had Fr. Mike failed to warn others of Banuelos' danger to kids? Most parishioners knew of the vile love affair between the two men. Lastiri surely saw the children's items and pornography in Joe's room. If Steinbock had merely asked about the relationship of the two men from the Banuelos family, he would have found a strong reason to remove the active homosexual priest. But, the crime did not happen on his watch, so it didn't seem to matter given the Bishop's history of indifference and secrecy.

Perhaps the reason for his lack of concern was in a statement the bishop made concerning marriage and homosexual 'unions.' He said, "A same sex union is a personal and private relationship only." Such a cavalier attitude toward the vile nature of homosexuality, especially among priests, explains why he failed to act, not once, but again and again.

Bishop Steinbock vs. Sister Kenneth

Something's strange about Fresno bishop John T. Steinbock. He snatched the Good News Center apostolate to the poor from its beloved founder, Sr. Kenneth Quinn. The elderly nun and others from the Daughters of Charity brought hope and help to the impoverished in Visalia. Beginning in 1981, the Center moved to its current location in 1987 and expanded its services to Visalia and Tulare County's needy.

The Center, according to a writer for the *Visalia Times-Delta*, "provides food, housing, medical care and other services to the poor." The *Los Angeles Times* described the Center as a "one-stop mall for the afflicted."

The *LA Times* reported, "The former bishop, Joseph Madera, had no qualms about handing over control to Sister Kenneth...Catholic Charities in Fresno likewise extended its organizational umbrella to the center--- no strings attached."

Then, in July 2003, Bishop Steinbock reversed years of precedent and blessing from the diocese, and ordered that the Center surrender decision making control over the budget to him, and to the local Catholic Charities. According to the *Times*, Sr. Kenneth, following years of autonomous operation by the Daughters of Charity apostolate, found his order demeaning.

She packed up and left the Center.

A number of staff and volunteers followed her, though she urged them not to. The walk-out cast doubt on the operation's future in the Visalia area. The *Times* article quoted Pete Moreno, the center's maintenance man and driver. "This whole thing is about politics and the sister has no patience for politics," he said. "We had a good thing and, like they say, 'If it isn't broke, why fix it?'"

The *Visalia Times-Delta* reported on August 2, 2003, that the sisters had been permanently banned from working anywhere in the diocese by the Bishop a day earlier. He said in a statement: "(Sr. Quinn) showed no willingness, in a meeting with her superior on July 22 (2003), to recant her position of not being accountable to Catholic Charities. To avoid unfounded expectations, neither Sister Kenneth nor any of the Daughters of Charity will be returning to the diocese." Though the DOC offered to buy the property from the diocese and increase funding for services to the poor the petulant bishop adamantly refused to sell it.

The Center, because of its Christian service to the poor and helpless, is a magnet for funding and financial support, more so than the top heavy and bureaucratic Catholic Charities. Since the homosexual scandals rocked the Church, parishioners across the US have been reluctant to donate for fear their money would be used to pay off victims of predatory priests and bishops. As a way of voting no confidence in the current herd of failed bishops, Catholics have tightened their purse strings, giving directly to those apostolates close to their hearts. Bringing the Center under the umbrella of Catholic Charities would strengthen the latter organization's financial bottom line. The point was not lost on the

Bishop.

In his attack against the Center and its operation, Steinbock was decisive and divisive. But curiously this decisiveness has never transferred to the homosexual and pedophile priests in the dioceses he has administered. He apparently is unaware of his hypocrisy.

The Santa Rosa Diocese Scandals

"The floor of hell is paved with the skulls of bishops!"- St. John Chrysostom

On January 27, 1987, Pope John Paul II appointed Bishop John T. Steinbock, an Auxiliary Bishop of the Diocese of Orange, as Third Bishop of Santa Rosa, a sprawling diocese that stretches to the Oregon border. He succeeded second Bishop Mark J. Hurley, who served from 1970-1987. Hurley died in 1991.

With Hurley's administration the diocese began to suffer sex scandals, sexual abuse of children, cover ups, and pay offs that continued through Bishop Steinbock and the fourth bishop, G. Patrick Ziemann, who served the diocese from 1992 to 1999.

Ziemann resigned as bishop in 1999, after admitting to having a homosexual relationship with another priest. He now lives in a Benedictine monastery outside of Tombstone, Arizona, where he reportedly offers marriage counseling to couples, presumably heterosexual couples.

In 1991, Steinbock received his appointment to the Fresno diocese.

The Santa Rosa scandals resulted in two priests sentenced in prison and a third dead by his own hand. Former bishop Zeimann, an admitted homosexual, removed three priests accused of sexual misconduct and loaned one \$40,000 for his legal defense. One victim died from chronic drug abuse. The diocese spent more than \$7 million to settle the claims of its sexual abuse victims.

Court records noted that bishops Hurley and Steinbock notoriously failed to act while priests committed crimes against children in the diocese. Hurley, in a 1995 deposition, said: "I have never gone to the police. I think there's a danger in that and therefore, I never reported anything on anybody to the police." He also admitted to tearing up confidential personnel

records prior to leaving his chancery.

Bishop Steinbock continued the lackadaisical attitude toward abusers and their victims. His greatest shame, at least in the public record, was a man named Don Kimball, the priest who trolled for teenaged victims through a nationally-known radio ministry for youth. Steinbock tried to move Kimball quietly into a hospital or jail ministry, which the latter refused. Asked under oath why he tried to reassign the molester, Steinbock answered, "You try to save a person's priesthood if possible." Steinbock, though trying to "save the priesthood" of this sexual predator, eventually suspended Kimball when he admitted to sexual contact with six young girls. Steinbock acted three years after he was warned of Kimball's molestations. He thought Kimball molested only two teenaged girls. He seemed angered that the priest molested at least six, as if two were appropriate and six were too many, a curious standard definitely not approved by Rome.

In 2002, a jury sentenced Kimball to seven years in prison for molesting a 13-year-old girl in 1981. However, in a 1999 deposition, Steinbock admitted that he had not tried to locate all of Kimball's victims. He said, "I don't know, do we have them all identified or not yet?"

"There are no homosexual priests in the Fresno Diocese."

In October, 2002, the Vatican issued a document consistent with historical Church teaching on the perversion of homosexuality. The Vatican reiterated that homosexuality is "objectively disordered" and that homosexuals should not be admitted to seminaries or ordained. In September of 2002, Pope John Paul II said, "It would be lamentable if, out of a misunderstood tolerance, they ordained young men who are immature or have obvious signs of affective deviations that, as is sadly known, could cause serious anomalies in the consciences of the faithful, with evident damage for the whole Church." In short: no homosexual because they are at best immature, at worst dangerous.

Without a doubt, the Catholic Church, the real one and not the evil doppelganger cobbled together by corrupt American bishops and their fruity international brethren, has no tolerance for homosexual priests, religious, and seminarians.

The February 1961 document from the Vatican, *Careful Selection and Training of Candidates for the States of Perfection and Sacred Orders*, stated:

“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.”

However, Steinbock believes, “There are no homosexual priests in the Fresno Diocese.” Tom Walsh begs to differ. Walsh has been investigating the presence of active homosexual priests serving in the diocese since 2002 when the local paper, the *Fresno Bee*, interviewed an active homosexual given the alias “Fr. Henry.” Walsh’s tenacious investigation since then has uncovered homosexuals and pedophiles. He has engendered outrage for his good works.

“Recently I have been described as a ‘crazy old man,’” Walsh wrote. “Well better to be old and crazy than a suspected sexually active homosexual priest.” The Bishop and homo-pederast underground disagrees.

In an October 2003 letter, he told the Bishop of at least six homosexuals uncovered in the diocese. He added, in a recent interview, that the Bishop didn’t seem to care.

As a lay Catholic, Mr. Walsh did what Bp. Steinbock and too many other bishops and diocesan administrators have failed to do, to the grave detriment of our beloved Church. Mr. Walsh found and exposed active homosexuals and pederasts in the priesthood. Now the bishop must remove them in defense of the Faith and of souls.

For his heroic efforts, Walsh was told by the Bishop, in a letter on October 27, 2003, that his information, even though it came from facts found in court records, “represents rumor relating to the priest, not fact.” The bishop added, “You are taking gossip of 12 years ago to damage the reputation of a good, dedicated priest.” A priest, he failed to add, that sought sex in homosexual chat rooms and, as the bishop knows, had child pornography on his computer. The “gossip” was the facts documented in the court records.

The Removal of Fr. Mike

Until July 14, Fr. Mike lived a private double life of priest and pervert. A few parishioners knew Lastiri’s sordid secrets. They worked hard to bring his illicit activities to the Bishop’s attention. They persevered, too, to uncover an apparent cover up of financial mis-

deeds and problems within Fr. Mike’s parish.

Bishop Steinbock also knew of Lastiri’s problems before the 14th, but he chose not to intervene. His reluctance continued to endanger Fr. Mike’s soul, continuing his slide toward damnation.

He knew of the priest’s problems at the latest in early October 2003 when he was sent a letter and court documents by Walsh. Instead he insulted the whistle blower. He chose not to act, even to inform himself of potential problems in the diocese. Could he truly care about “sav(ing) a person’s priesthood if possible,” as he stated in the Kimball case in Santa Rosa?

Bp. Steinbock finally acted when continued cover up was impossible. On July 14, the Bishop said in a statement, “information came to me regarding a Web page and chat room of Rev. Jean-Michael Lastiri that was totally inappropriate.” He added that on July 15, he discussed the matter with Lastiri who denied anything more than “entertaining fantasies” on the Web.

“Realizing that this was a compulsive and addictive behavior, I am removing Father Lastiri from St. Patrick’s parish and sending him to St. Luke’s Institute for appropriate psychological and spiritual counseling and appropriate therapy to help him with this problem.” Lastiri was ordered to enter St. Luke’s treatment on August 8.

Lastiri left the parish on July 21 for a previously planned vacation to Orlando, Florida. On July 13, 2004 at 11:08 am, *TopCABear@aol.com*, under the category “Want Sex” wrote: “CA bear visiting Orlando on friday, 7/23....looking for fun in other bears/admirers.....basqueoso on bear411.com..” He listed his website as, <http://basqueoso@bear411.com>. Attempts to connect to the website failed. Only a cryptic statement, “Sorry this profile doesn’t exist,” greets the viewed. Basqueoso’s profile was removed, because the jig was up for Fr. Lastiri.

Less than a year earlier, Bp. Steinbock accused Mr. Walsh of serious sin and warned that he “can cause grave scandal both in the Christian and greater community.” On July 15 Walsh and others were vindicated and Lastiri was removed. Mr. Walsh has yet to receive an apology from the bishop. Others involved in publicizing the Lastiri scandal also have not received apologies.

Lastiri’s Farewell

In his final farewell statement to his adoring though deceived parishioners, Lastiri gave a Clintonesque performance. Nearly 2000 admirers had signed a petition in support of the homosexual priest. Many doubted the allegations against the man and felt he had been wrongly accused. Understandably, they didn't want to believe what came to light, a sordid tale of a homosexual priest trolling for lovers and who has had at least one lover in the past, most likely another, who died of AIDS. Roman Catholic Faithful is developing more information on this other lover and will report the findings soon.

Instead of repenting his individual sins publicly he identified himself with the parishioners. "I stand before you, a sinner, along with every member of the Church, in need of God's redeeming love and mercy." In this common ground of sin, he hoped they would forgive him without knowing the filthy details.

He said, "I am truly sorry and seek your forgiveness for what I have done to cause this turmoil and cause this terrible rift." Here, Lastiri does not overtly apologize for his homosexual sins and his behavior that led to Catholics leaving the Church and endangering their souls, but only what he had done to cause this turmoil, a slight but significant change in the meaning of his apology.

Instead, he was sorry he got caught; he should have hidden his perversion better. He has not accepted ownership of his perversion, or in the words of Bp. Steinbock, his "addiction." Until that time, he, like every other "addict" in denial, will not allow himself to be helped. His trolling for sex on July 13, prior to his removal, and the following, more disturbing, 'smoking gun' raises serious questions about the future of this man as a priest in the Catholic Church.

Smoke of Satan in the Fresno Diocese

Bp. Steinbock had many opportunities to pursue the allegations that Fr. Lastiri as well as other priests were active homosexuals in his diocese. He chose not to act, calling criticism of the homosexual priests "gossip, innuendo and rumor." He wrote that Fr. Lastiri was "a good and dedicated priest...living a chaste and faithful life."

Even a prudent man would have pursued a cursory investigation (a) to shut the critics up and (b) to at least show that the diocese was serious about pursuing all allegations of possible homosexuality or even pederasty. He did neither and chose defamation of the critics of Lastiri and other active homosexual

and pederast priests in the diocese, who will soon be exposed. While he has bent over backwards to whitewash the perversions of his active homosexual priest, he has not yet apologized to the good Catholic men and women who risked calumny and even threats of violence to defend the Faith from those who suffer the "evil tendencies to homosexuality or pederasty."

On July 16, a day after Bp. Steinbock removed Fr. Lastiri from his parish a man named "Mike from the Catholic Church" contacted a Merced College instructor to permanently erase files from his computer's hard drive. Earlier in the year another technician found disturbing pornographic files on the priest's computer. He sent them, using Lastiri's AOL account, to Bp. Steinbock.

An initial investigation was made by the district attorney's office and area police. No complaint was issued because there was not sufficient probable cause to seek a search warrant, according to DA Gordon Spencer. He wrote in an email response to questions from RCF: "The legal standard for issuance of a search warrant is probable cause. Both the detective, the chief of police and I agreed that the legal standard of probable cause was not met. If there had been probable cause I can assure you that a search warrant would have been sought."

As Fr. Lastiri overcomes his "addiction" at St. Luke's treatment center in Maryland, faithful Catholics in the Diocese of Fresno vow to continue their various investigations until the homosexuals are exposed and removed, all pedophiles are exposed and arrested, and all subsequent wrongdoings by priests are brought before the authorities.

Bishop Steinbock was not available for comment for this article. He was on vacation. However, the allegations surrounding this and other active homosexual priests and his documented past failure to respond to children sexually abused by clergy should have compelled him to seek answers over these many years, even if the claims seemed to have been innuendo, gossip, or rumor. In the light of the US Conference of Catholic Bishops pledge to end sexual abuse of children and remove offenders he could do no less. But he did.

Dietrich von Hildebrand will have the last word here. In *The Devastated Vineyard*, he wrote: "This failure of the bishops to make use of their God-given authority is perhaps, in practical consequences, the worst confusion in the Church today. For this fail-

ure not only does not arrest spiritual diseases, heresies, and the blatant as well as the insidious (and this is much worse) devastation of the vineyard of the Lord: it even gives free rein to these evils. The failure to use holy authority to protect the holy Faith leads necessarily to the disintegration of the Church."

The writer would like to thank Brian Kravec, Randy Starkweather, Dr. Robert Butler, Robert Kumpel, and Thomas Walsh for their indispensable help in bringing this story to light. These Fresno area devout Catholics love their faith and defend the Church against the growing evil that still surrounds Her, threatening the souls of all, laity and clergy, who believe in the Catholic Faith. Thank you all.

Dario McDarby

-30

Send RCF the names and mailing addresses of Catholics in your area who would like to read our newsletter. If you have a parish mailing list—send it. RCF will soon have a data base containing the mailing address for every parish in the country. We are constantly sending out mailings to clergy around the country seeking information. It takes time and it takes money.

If you can stomach it; get yourself a job at your local liberal parish. Or get on the parish council. Better yet—get a chancery position. Go to work in the bishop's office.

Roman Catholic Faithful, Inc
PO Box 109, Petersburg, IL 62675-0109

Phone: 217-632-5920 / Fax: 217-632-7054
www.rcf.org

www.novusordowatch.org/story081004.htm

"... In 2003, former FBI consultant Paul L. Williams, author of the recently-released *Osama's Revenge*, published a book called *The Vatican Exposed: Money, Murder, and the Mafia* (Prometheus Books). Although the book deals with alleged Vatican corruption in terms of money and power and has a decidedly liberal flavor, Williams also--almost as a side-note--includes some straightforward, objective information on the papal conclave of 1958... Williams, who is not a Catholic traditionalist, asserts:

In 1954 Count Della Torre, editor of the Vatican newspaper *L'Osservatore Romano*, warned [Pope] Pius XII of [Cardinal Angelo] Roncalli's Communist sympathies. Other members of the "Black Nobility" expressed similar concerns.[5]

Nor did Roncalli [later known as "Pope John XXIII"] escape the attention of the FBI and CIA. The agencies began to accumulate thick files on him and the questionable activities of other "progressives" within the Vatican, including Monsignor Giovanni Battista Montini (the future Paul VI).[...]

Pius XII had appointed Cardinal Giuseppe Siri as his desired successor.[7] Siri was rabidly anti-Communist, an intransigent traditionalist in matters of church doctrine, and a skilled bureaucrat. . . .

In 1958 [on October 26], when the cardinals were locked away in the Sistine Chapel to elect a new pope, mysterious events began to unfold. On the third ballot, Siri, according to FBI sources, obtained the necessary votes and was elected as Pope Gregory XVII.[8] White smoke poured from the chimney of the chapel to inform the faithful that a new pope had been chosen. The news was announced with joy at 6 P.M. on Vatican radio. The announcer said, "The smoke is white. . . . There is absolutely no doubt. A pope has been elected." [9] . . .

But the new pope failed to appear... To quell doubts, Monsignor Santaro, secretary of the Conclave of Cardinals, informed the press that the smoke, indeed, had been white and that a new pope had been elected... By evening Vatican radio announced that the results remained uncertain. On October 27, 1958, the *Houston Post* headlined: "Cardinals Fail to elect pope in 4 Ballots: Mix-Up in Smoke Signals Cause False Reports." [10]

But the reports had been valid. On the fourth ballot, according to FBI sources, Siri again obtained the necessary votes and was elected supreme pontiff. But the French cardinals annulled the results...

Finally, on the third day of balloting, Roncalli received the necessary support to become Pope John XXIII. . . . --Paul L. Williams, *The Vatican Exposed* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2003), pp. 90-92.

The inside of the Los Angeles, California Cathedral.
The inside of the faith of Christ crucified.
The inside of the four last things - death, Judgement, Heaven & Hell -
The only thing missing is the fear.
If he did, he would tremble in fear.
cannot believe in the fear.

