SESSION 3: THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CRISIS: ABUSE, CANON LAW, AND REFORM PROSPECTS

INTRODUCTION

MR. GOOD: Good morning, everyone. Today we are going to be talking about Baltimore and about the Vatican, about the Vigano letter, about canon law, and about what’s currently unfolding in the Catholic Church. I’m sure a number of your read John’s piece yesterday and Fr. Raymond de Souza has a website and blog that I encourage you to follow as well, connected to some of his work with Cardus and elsewhere. Today we have two first-rate scholars who have been closely following what is unfolding in the Catholic Church. I’ll tell you just a little bit about John Allen, first. John is the editor-in-chief of Crux, and he lives in Denver and has staff throughout the world doing work with him at Crux. He’s written 11 books, covering topics ranging from the Vatican to Pope Benedict (two books on Pope Benedict, actually), to Opus Dei. He’s also worked as a journalist for many years, with CNN, the National Catholic Reporter, and other outlets. Fr. Raymond de Souza is a current Catholic priest, in Canada -- so we’re grateful for him making the trip so far south. He’s a chaplain and a pastor both: the Chaplain at Newman House, at Queens University, and pastor at Sacred Heart of Mary Parish on Wolf Island. He’s also a senior fellow with Cardus and writes and teaches on economics and as well. Fr. Raymond will be heading directly from here today to Baltimore to continue to cover what’s happening there, with the Bishops Conference. And as you know, there are a number of journalists who are part of Faith Angle’s broader network who aren’t here today because they are there -- though several of them are following this morning’s conversation as well. So #FaithAngle if you’re up for keeping that Live-conversation going. John Allen is a three-timer which is kind of like a Saturday Night Live hat-tip, here at Faith Angle. For the third time, welcome back to Faith Angle.

JOHN ALLEN

MR. ALLEN: Thank you. I assume there’s like a platinum card I’m gonna get, right, and I get points off my next stay or something like that. All right. I want to also say that in the room with us over there somewhere is Ines San Martin of Crux. She is our Roma bureau chief. And everything you know about the current clerical sexual
abuse scandal in -- and I mean everything -- is because of her reporting so much so to the point that the Chilean press now will not report anything until they get Ines’ planchet on it. So if you want to know anything about the global dimensions of this crisis she could certainly speak with great authority on that. So first of all, I am not a scholar. Let me be 100 percent clear about that. I’m a journo, okay. That’s what I’ve been doing for more than 20 years. I have covered the clerical sexual abuse scandals in Catholicism for all of that time. It has been the single most important story of my professional career. I was there in 2002 when the crisis erupted first in Boston and then rippled across the country. I was in Rome covering that end of it. I was in Dallas when the bishops met and adopted their Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People. And in some ways it feels like I have been covering no other story my entire life. This has sort of been the defining Catholic story of our lifetime. And here we are in 2018 and I wish I could claim that I scripted yesterday and today’s news just to make this more interesting for you, but no. It’s just that we live in a -- in a world in which the clerical sexual abuse scandal periodically will flare up and have another peak moment, then it kind of goes into recess for a while but it never really goes away. And I’m not convinced it ever will to be honest with you. So just to bring you up to speed if you weren’t paying attention what happened yesterday. The U.S. bishops, as Josh mentioned, are currently meeting in Baltimore for what is known as their plenary assembly. It means when all the bishops get together. They have one in the fall and one in the summer. This fall meeting in Baltimore was expected to be the moment when the U.S. bishops really came to terms with what has been called the summer of shame for the Catholic Church on the sex abuse front. This summer began, as you all remember, with the revelations about now Arch Bishop Theodore McCarrick, then Cardinal Theodore McCarrick. It had been well-known for some time that there were concerns about McCarrick’s conduct with adult seminarians, but what emerged in June was an accusation from someone who was a minor at the time that the -- that the abuse occurred. That doc- -- that allegation was upheld by the Independent Way Review Board in the Arch Diocese of New York. McCarrick was removed from ministry. Other accusations surfaced and fairly swiftly in July he was expelled from the College of Cardinals. This, by the way, is an extraordinarily rare move. The only other time in the 20th
Century it happened was in 1912 Cardinal Louie Belo (phonetic) of France, Jesuit Cardinal, who was a big supporter of Action Francaise which was a right-wing monarchist movement that was opposed by the Vatican and so his red hat got yanked. This is the very first time anywhere in the world that a cardinal has lost a red hat due to charges of sexual abuse. Flash forward we get the Pennsylvania grand jury report the extraordinary revelations there. More than 1,000 victims, 300 predator priests over a 60-year arch of time. Footnote, you put that kind of a microscope on any corner of the Catholic Church in America and you will get exactly the same results. And that’s what’s going to happen. There are now 12 states that have announced their own grand jury investigations, more are considering them. You can expect over the next two, three, five years at a rhythm of about every six months to be dealing with a story the magnitude of the Pennsylvania grand jury report. Then, of course, August 25th we get the 11-page public letter from Italian Archbishop Carlo Maria Vigano, former papal ambassador to the United States under both Benedict and Francis alleging that on June 23rd, 2013, Vigano had a conversation in Rome with Pope Francis in which he informed him of sexual misconduct concerns regarding Cardinal Theodore McCarrick and that Francis basically ignored him. Now, of course, the letter came with a lot more than that. There were accusations against no fewer than 32 senior churchman for various forms of misconduct, most of them involving homosexuality. But that accusation against the Pope was the heart of the thing, okay. So all of that shaped the context in which there was an expectation that when the bishops met this November they were going to have to take strong, dramatic reform measures to convince the Catholic public that they get it. Because here’s the thing about the Catholic public in the United States right now as compared to 2002. I would submit to you that the anger today is actually much worse, much more intense than it was in 2002 because in 2002 the anger was about the revelations themselves. How in God’s name could priests do this to kids? Now that anger, that disgust is still there, but added to that is how in God’s name could the church not have figured this out in the intervening 16 years? Why do we still seem to be where we were when this thing first blew up? In some ways that’s a false and unfair perception, but that perception is out there, okay, which makes the anger all the more raw. So the bishops were expected to deal with that. They were expected to
adopt a code of conduct for bishops which would subject them to the same zero tolerance discipline as other clergy in the church. They were expected to adopt accountability measures. They were also expected to get serious about an investigation to reveal what happened with McCarrick. How was that guy able to become a cardinal and maintain a cardinal and expand his power despite decades of rumors and concerns about his conduct? That was all expected to play out this week in Baltimore. Instead yesterday Cardinal Daniel DiNardo of Galveston-Houston who is the president of the conference right now announced that the Vatican, specifically the Vatican’s Congregation for Bishops lead by Canadian Cardinal Mark Ouellette had asked the U.S. bishops to stand down, to not do anything until February because in February, February 21st through the 24th to be precise, Pope Francis has summoned a meeting of the presidents of all the Bishops Conferences in the world to discuss child protection, the sex abuse crisis, okay. So the bishops have been asked to wait for that meeting essentially before they do anything. Now it was proposed yesterday by Cardinal Blasé Cupich of Chicago to some receptivity that the bishops should take non-binding votes anyway just to sort of express where they stand so that DiNardo could carry that information to the summit in Rome in February. We have to see how that’s going to play out. But in any event, a non-binding vote falls well short of a decision and they’ve been asked not to take decisions. You know, if you want later I can impact why I think that happened. The bottom line is that apparently there were serious problems under Canon Law of which is the body of law that governs the Catholic Church. There were serious canonical problems with some of the draft proposals the bishops had come up with which weren’t finalized until -- Cardinal DiNardo acknowledged this yesterday. They weren’t finalized until October 30th. Meaning that the relevant Vatican departments only had about a week to review them. And the scenario would have been had the bishops adopted these things as they stood there was a really good chance that they were going to be shot down in Rome and that was a set of optics that nobody wanted. So this was, in a sense, the Vatican trying to save the bishops from themselves. I mean, there are still very good questions about why the bishops couldn’t simply have amended that document this week rather than being told to wait until February, but okay. Anyway, so that was yesterday’s news. Now there is a predictable dynamic in
the Pope Francis era that if there is a story one day that appears to lurch in one direction all you got to do is wait 24 hours and there will be a countervailing story that lurches in the opposite direction and that’s what we have today. So yesterday was the Vatican telling the bishops not to deal with sex abuse. Today the story is Pope Francis has named Arch Bishop Charles Scicluna of Malta who is basically known as the Elliot Ness of the Catholic Church when it comes to sex abuse. He was Benedict XVI top cop. He’s the guy who brought down Maciel, the founder of the Legionairies of Christ. He’s the guy who earlier this year conducted a very thorough investigation in Chile that lead the Pope to do a 180-degree course change on Chile from complete denial to saying, oh, there’s a grave problem here and he summoned all the bishops. They all resigned, all of them, everyone and he chastised them for a manner of things and is now in a very activist stance when it comes to Chile. And that was because of Scicluna’s investigation. So today Scicluna has been named the new Adjunct Secretary, which is the number three official, at the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith which is the Vatican department that has lead responsibility for dealing with sex abuse cases. Now Scicluna is not gonna move to Roma. He’s gonna stay in Malta. But Malta is a 45-minute flight from Rome. Scicluna is an old Roma hand. He is in constant touch. So all signs are that this is going to be a meaningful appointment. And with Scicluna in that role the forecast would be for a very activist stance from the CDF in terms of cracking down on the sex abuse stuff. That’s my point. You know, if you’re trying to assess where Francis is on this issue, one day the signals look like they trend in this direction, they next day they seem to trend in this direction and it’s almost I would say indecipherable. But in any event, that’s where we are as of today, okay. Now I’m gonna try to offer you three bits of context in thinking about these things that I hope will be helpful and then a smarter guy, Fr. Raymond, will take over and, you know, give you what you actually need to know. But just three bits of context in terms of how the Vatican deals with the sex abuse crisis. Point one, American Catholics account for exactly 6 percent of the global Catholic population. There are roughly 70 million Catholics in the United States, there are 1.3 billion Catholics in the world. Two-thirds of the Catholic population these days is in the Southern hemisphere, it’s in Africa, Latin America, and Asia. That share will be three-quarters by 2050. Americans, quite
frankly in terms of the global situation, are a diminishing minority. And were it not for our burgeoning Latino Catholic population that would be even more the case, okay. What that means is that American experiences, American priorities, American perceptions simply do not, cannot, and will not call the shots in the global church, okay. It’s a much more complicated situation than it often seems from our American perch where, for instance, the absolute priority of the sexual abuse scandals to us seems a no brainer. It’s almost hard for us to understand that the Catholic Church would be talking about anything else or dealing with anything else other than the scandals because to us until the church gets that cleaned up we’re not gonna listen to them about anything else, right. That is not, folks, the global psychology. I mean, if you are, for instance, the cardinal, the newly appointed cardinal of Lahore in Pakistan where your primary issue is the way that blasphemy laws in that country are wielded like a club against its Christian minority where we’ve just seen at long last for the first time somebody convicted for those blasphemy laws acquitted by the country’s supreme court, but she had to go into hiding because there is active -- there is real fear for her life. There is a bounty on her head placed there by the Chief (inaudible) of Pakistan. They’re gonna pay 10,000 rupees for anyone who takes her out which is the equivalent of about three months’ rent in Pakistan.

MALE SPEAKER: 10,000 rupees.

MR. ALLEN: An actual poll recently found that 85 percent of Pakistani Muslims said they’d kill her if they had the chance either for the money or just out of conviction. If that’s your world, okay, then the clerical sexual abuse scandals quite frankly do not see like that big a deal. And further, that Cardinal Joseph Coutts would tell you that all the talk about the clerical sexual abuse scandals in the West serves the propaganda interests of his oppressors, okay. Let me give you an illustration of how this plays out. Last month in October there was something called a Synod of Bishops in Rome, that is a gathering of about 300 bishops from all around the world, to consider some topic. In this case the topic was young people, faith, and vocational discernment, okay. Now the sexual abuse stuff came up. It was brought up by American bishops, Australian bishops, Irish bishops,
German bishops, Belgium bishops, places where the sexual abuse crisis has erupted in its full-blown form, okay. And in the draft of the final document of that Synod there was a straightforward, clear apology from the bishops to young people for having failed them when it comes to clerical sexual abuse and there was also a clear reaffirmation of a zero tolerance policy. Both of those elements got scrubbed out of the final document before it was adopted because of strong opposition from bishops from some parts of Latin America, most of Africa, some parts of Asia, and the Italians, okay, because in those parts of the world the sexual abuse crisis as we all know it simply has never happened, they don’t think it’s gonna happen. I think they’re living in a delusion, but they don’t believe that it’s going to happen there. They think this is a regionally confined problem and they think an unrelenting drumbeat of apology and mea culpa weakens the position of the church when they would rather be talking about other things. That’s the global reality, okay. So that’s point one. The Catholic Church is not an American enterprise, okay. It’s a global church and there are competing sensitivities, competing perspectives all the time and you win some and you lose some, okay. Number two, you cannot underestimate the importance of the Italian contribution to all of this. For all of its pretense of being a global reality, okay, the Vatican -- for instance, theoretically the Vatican communicates with the world in seven official languages, okay. You got Italian, French, English, Spanish, Portuguese, Arabic, and German, okay. In reality, okay, the Vatican’s daily news bulletin is issued exclusively in Italian. Virtually every document that is issued by the Vatican is exclusively in Italian. Every meeting you will attend in Rome -- every Vatican meeting that you will attend in Rome is in Italian. And if you look at the management of the Vatican at the level below -- like the prefix are like the cardinals and archbishops who are in charge, it’s a fairly global bunch. The level below, okay, it’s almost exclusively Italian secretaries who actually run all of the departments in the Vatican. But the language, the psychology, the culture is extremely Italian. And so in thinking about how they respond to sex abuse stuff you have to factor in the Italian element. Here’s the Italian element. First, there’s no such thing as the sex abuse crisis in Italy. It never happened, okay. I mean, now I don’t mean to say that there aren’t clerics who have been caught sexually abusing minors, that’s true. But, you know, the crisis isn’t just the behavior
obviously. I mean, the crisis is negative press. The crisis is lawsuits, right. The crisis is public protest. The crisis is loss in credibility, right. It’s financial losses because of the lawsuits, right. None of that has happened in Italy. Does not exist. The press culture in Italy will cover individual cases. They do not cover a kind of broader pattern. Italian corporate law there is no concept of corporate liability. You can’t sue an Italian corporation for the misdeeds of employees the way you can in the States, okay. I mean, that employee can be subject to criminal sanctions, but you cannot hold the company responsible for what he did. So the whole concept of holding the church institutionally accountable for the misdeeds of some of its priests doesn’t exist in Italian jurisprudence. There are no lawsuits. Never have been. And there’s no legal basis for them. And all of that so the Italian church has never experienced the pressure of the sex abuse crisis the way we do. And further there is a psychology among Italian clergy to sort of personalize any discussions of church failure. So they will always interpret that as a kind of malicious attack rather than sort of a well-meaning reform. And that is certainly the way they interpret much of this stuff. I mean, I will tell you in this recently concluded Synod of Bishops, you know, I mean, I said there were -- there was opposition from Latin America and Asia and Africa. There was, but the critical moment was when this got into -- this document for the Synod got into the drafting committee which was a 12-bishop panel, some of the elected from the Synod, some of them appointed by the Pope. And the two guys who were personally responsible for taking out the apology and the zero tolerance thing on sex abuse were Italians. It was Italian Cardinal Lorenzo Baldisseri who runs the Synod and Italian Archbishop Bruno Forte who is considered the best theologian in the Italian hierarchy. Those two guys personally said we don’t need this and, anyway, we shouldn’t preempt the Pope’s hand in February, okay. If you want to know how that language got taken out of the document, it was those two guys. And they were reflecting very standard Italian clerical psychology when it comes to all of this which is that the sex abuse crisis is something that exists in Anglo-Saxon and Germanic cultures because of the nature of the press and the nature of the legal system there. But it’s not ever -- from their point of view it is not ever going to be a reality in -- in their world, in their cultural context and so they’re opposed to the church expending too many resources in trying to deal with it. All right. So, one, remember the
global context. Two, remember the Italian context. Third point I would give you in terms of trying to understand what’s going on in the Vatican these day. Look, there is a very familiar narrative in discussing Catholic stuff, right, where something happens in Rome that we don’t quite understand or that we think is wrong, but we like the Pope. We don’t want to blame it on the Pope, right, because Catholics are just genetically resistant to saying that the Pope is a bad guy. So what we do is we blame it on the blue meanies in the Vatican, right. I mean, this has been the narrative about -- Francis is in so many ways a Teflon guy. I mean, this has been the narrative about him from the very beginning. If anything is going on that you don’t like you say, oh, well, Francis is struggling against, you know, resistance from these troglodyte arch-conservatives in the Vatican who are getting in the way of his, you know, progressive reform agenda. It’s not that there isn’t some truth to that, but let me tell you where we are, okay, more than five years into the Francis papacy, okay. Where we are is that Pope Francis has almost completely neutered -- neutered the traditional power structures in the Vatican. I mean, departments that used to make decisions and have real power simply do not anymore, okay. In terms of how decisions are made by this Pope he’s not consulting the congregations and councils and other entities of what we call the Roman Curia which is the governing bureaucracy in the Vatican, okay. They are on the sidelines. They are on the outside looking in. Typically they learn of papal decisions the way that you and I do, okay. We see them in the Bulletino, we read them in some interview Pope Francis has given, we hear about them from some friend of the Pope, okay. I can guarantee you right now this morning I know more about what is currently going on with the sexual abuse crisis than the Vatican’s official paid spokesperson does. And I know that because I spoke to him yesterday and I was bringing him up to speed, okay. So the official channels of authority, decision making, communications, they’re marginal, okay. The decisions that matter right now in the Vatican are being made one place and one place only which is the Domus Sanctae Marthae. That is the residence on Vatican grounds where Pope Francis chose to live at the beginning of his papacy rather than the papal apartments. He is residing in Room 201 and I can tell you for sure that the real exercise of power in this papacy unfolds in that room. So my point in terms of context is that it is a fool’s errand to think that when it comes to
sex abuse or anything else the story is that Pope Francis is trying to do X, but he is being interfered with by
minions in the Vatican, you know, the old guard who are trying to get in his way. That is false. I mean, there is
an old guard in the Vatican for sure that has a very clear agenda and we’ve seen it playing out in the complete
failure of the Pope’s financial reform, but that’s not because Pope Francis lacks the power or the wherewithal to
get things done. He has shown that when he is determined he will ride roughshod over any opposition if
necessary in order to make his will stick. That’s what he did with the Amoris Laetitia, his document on the
family, which included that controversial provision for Communion, for divorced and civilly remarried Catholics.
There was strong, enormous, intense opposition to that in the Vatican. The Pope just bulldozed it. So thing of it
is as we cover this story at some point depending on how this -- how the sex abuse thing develops we cannot --
we cannot and it would be irresponsible not to address the question of what the Pope’s role personally in all of
this is. It’s not that Pope Francis has one agenda and the system is -- is imposing another, okay. It is Pope
Francis’s agenda that matters right now. And the seeming incoherence of the last two days, right? The
instructions to the U.S. bishops and then the appointment of Scicluna. Those are both personal decisions by
Pope Francis. There is no one else to ascribe them to, okay. So when reporting this out I would say we also have
to be very attentive to the Pope’s own attitudes, his own inclinations, his own instincts in all of this. All right.
That’s what I have. Fr. Raymond?

RAYMOND DE SOUZA
FR. DE SOUZA: Okay. Well, thank you very much. This is not my platinum visit to the Faith Angle Forum. I’m
black level of whatever it is you start off at so it’s my first time.

MR. GOOD: Silver, baby. Silver.

FR. DE SOUZA: Silver? Start off at silver? The other day I -- I fly our accounting staff on United and my boarding
pass very proudly, you know, had Zone 1. They were ready to go. They called global services, they called military
families, they called people who have difficulties boarding. So I thought, okay, 1 has to be after that. Then they
had 1K. Who knew? But I got on. Anyway, it’s good to be here. Just a word about who I am. I think I’m the only
Canadian around the table. So I’ve been -- I’m a priest obviously, Arch Diocese of Kingston. So my main work is
pastoral work, but I’ve been involved in journalism for 20 years or more. When John first came to Rome in the summer of 2000 I was the correspondent for the National Catholic Register which I still write for very often. It used to be every other week, but the news is so heavy it’s every week now which is a reputable Catholic --

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

FR. DE SOUZA: -- paper in the United States of the more conservative side. John at that time was working for the National Catholic Reporter which is a reputable Catholic paper, more on the liberal side. But we became friends during that period. And, of course, John has become more distinguished in the interim and his site Crux is very well followed. I write for the National Post in Canada. That’s really where I started being a columnist which is we have two national newspapers in Canada. And the National Post is probably the lesser known of the two. Globe and Mail probably better known. But I’ve been doing that for 15 years a weekly op-ed column. And I think I’m the only Catholic priest with a regular op-ed column in any North American newspaper, but I don’t know that for a fact. And then I write a fair bit for the Catholic Press, the National Catholic Register, I wrote for a while for Crux, the Catholic Herald in the UK, and I have my own digital magazine called Covivium. So if you’re interested in what I have to say there’s more of it that you could possibly be interested in actually, but Fatherdesouza.com is where everything is kept. And I don’t know if our email addresses are circulated, but if you’d like to reach me feel free to do so. I’ve been -- I’ve really enjoyed the conversations we’ve had at the various breaks and at the meals here. I would echo what John said about Ines here. I got to know her through Crux, but -- and as important issues on Chile, closer to my heart is her reporting on Venezuela where this very prosperous country is being starved literally to death. It’s a tremendous human tragedy, totally unnecessary which involves persecution of the church as well. And in English Ines is the one who tells us what’s going on there. So just a -- I mean, it’s kind of a forgotten story, but this -- this country’s being crucified by its own leadership and Ines has done --

MR. ALLEN: Speaking of that, you should that Ines next week is heading to Nicaragua, is gonna be in Nicaragua
for a couple weeks.

FR. DE SOUZA: Another country on the Vue de la Rosa so it’s -- anyway, just to draw your attention to that. My editors -- I don’t usually go to cover the Bishops Conference meetings and so forth but my editor at the Register said maybe you could go this year because of all the interest. I said, “Well, I’ve been invited to go to Miami and I think it’s an important thing I’d like to do.” And I said, “Well, I’ll go there on Tuesday.” And I said, “Not to worry. Monday is a day of recollection. They’re just gonna open the meeting” --

MR. GOOD: Ha, nothing’ll happen.

FR. DE SOUZA: -- “and pray.” So it’s important, but it’s not really very news worthy. But just like in the era of President Trump you can’t visit a cemetery without generating news in there. Pope Francis is true, you can’t have a prayer day without there being some eruption so -- so here we are. I’d like to start with a story about eight, nine years ago maybe -- no, less, seven years ago a new archbishop from Montreal was appointed, Christian Lepine is his name. But so someone was assigned a story from one of the -- I think the Montreal Gazette and, you know, there’s -- I’m in the Cath- -- in the media in Canada I’d be one of the Catholic -- obvious Catholic voices so she called me up and said, “I want to interview Christian Lepine.” And she knew nothing about anything, but she’d been assigned the story. So the question she eventually got around to asking which was maybe a second or third question was, “So you think the bishops of Quebec and the Archbishop Lepine are gonna have to sort of, you know, change Catholic teaching to accommodate the general ethos of Quebec culture?” I knew what she was asking because it’s the only question we ever really get asked sometimes. And so I said, “Oh, you must be talking about the report from Statistics Canada last week.” And she said, “No. What’s that about?” And I said, “Well, they released the charitable giving figures and Quebecers by far, by far are the least generous in Canada, I mean, compared to all the other provinces.” So she said, “Oh, I -- what do you mean?” I said, “So you were -- you think that it’s time for the bishops of Quebec to stop emphasizing charitable giving, sacrificial giving because people don’t want to do it. They don’t do it so why would you bang on about
that?" Which was not the question she was asking. She was talking about sex which is really in a certain sense all -- in certain sense is a Catholic story -- the religious story is about. Now in this room we've got a group of journalists who are not in that track, but a lot are. It's the old -- the religious story is only really a sex and sexual politics story and therefore the sex abuse scandal fits very well into what journalists who are not often covering this issue, cover. It's about sex. It's not only about that. And therefore that's one reason why the story is dominant. To pick up on what John said that's one reason why other countries where that's not what the Catholic story always is the story's not as prominent. But that's one reason why this story is as big is as it is. Also because it's not a story only about sexual misconduct. It's a story about hypocrisy, it's a story about cover ups, a story about misused -- a story, pardon me, about misused authority, all these kinds of things so it is a very big story. It has been for now at least 16 years. In Canada the story started in the late 1980s, early 1990s so --

MR. ALLEN: Right.

FR. DE SOUZA: -- it’s been around for my entire priesthood and certainly -- I was ordained in 2002 so this was the background. All the stories about myself and my classmates who were being ordained was against the backdrop of this. So one of the things that might be -- I think that I might just put out for your consideration one is that as journalists why is this story -- why does it come -- keep coming back, coming back, and coming back? One of it I think -- one reason is because it’s an easy story to report. If you go back to the Boston Globe stories of 2002 and very well represented I think in the movie about it, Spotlight, actually what the Boston Globe reporters did was they had a -- they had sort of a courageous desire to follow the story, but really that story was about unsealed documents from a trial and then they printed what was unsealed in the trial. With the Catholic Church records are kept and authority is centralized so you can, for example, ask the diocese of Harrisburg what happened in 1951 with Fr. de Souza at St. Bartholomew’s and you will get some kind of answer. I mean, records are not always perfectly kept. But whereas if you went to -- I don’t know, to the Air Force Academy and asked what happened with, you know, Lieutenant General such and such in his class in 1951, you may not get an answer. Not because it’s being obstructed. The answer might not even be there. Also the power that bishops
have for which their misgovernance has earned them a lot of criticism is also one that allows them to do things that very few other superiors can do. If the Archbishop of Kingston wanted to release my personnel file this afternoon, there’s nothing to stop him from doing it --

MR. ALLEN: Right.

FR. DE SOUZA: -- at all. Now if I’m upset about it I might write an appeal to the Congregation for Clergy in Rome and say that he really shouldn’t have done that and maybe six months from now he would be told he shouldn’t have done it. But if I was a teacher at Kingston General High School -- Federal High School and the principal wanted to release my personnel file, he would be stopped because my union would say you can’t do that even if I was convicted of a crime. So there are certain dynamics to this story which make it relatively easy to report. Right now in the United States dioceses are publishing the names of historic allegations. So if someone was accused in 1962, died in 1978, allegation was never resolved, his name is now published usually on the website. Not every diocese, but they’re getting towards that stage. Very few other institutions can do that. Now you may -- some people think it’s a bad idea to do it, other people think it’s a necessary idea, but the Catholic Church -- the way it operates makes it very easy to find out. The Pennsylvania grand jury was not a sort of a -- it was time consuming because the records were voluminous, but it wasn’t a sort of an exercise in, you know, crack police work. It was the Pennsylvania attorney general asking the diocese give us all your files and then they went through them. So other places in society that don’t have that centralization and authority -- or centralized recordkeeping and authority to release it’s a harder story to cover. And especially today when as we all know that resources for reporting as opposed to commentary in the media are shrinking this is a story that no journalist is gonna cover or can’t. Carl was telling me about his work in the 1980s. I didn’t realize he was the one who did the Night Ritter (phonetic) stories in the 1980s where you cover, what, 25 dioceses? How many months did you work on it?

MR. CANNON: Three.

FR. DE SOUZA: Three months. How many stories today do -- reporters can work on for three months? I mean,
not -- not that it never happens, but it’s that kind of reporting. So that’s gonna be a -- it’s gonna be a continuing story, it’s an important story. It’s possible, it’s possible --- what happens in Hollywood and news media and so forth with the Me Too I don’t know exactly what’ll have -- how that will go, but it’s possible within a few years that this will be the only sex abuse story that’s regularly reported simply because regularly, as John points out, the church is going to disclose or legal proceedings will be disclosed that will give the story over the past however many years. So it’s a story that’s gonna be with us. I’ve detected, you know, in some places an attempt to try and get at this story in other parts of society. I just don’t think the reporting resources are there. And the people accused if they work for a prison, if they work for a school, if they work in the government they have protections against disclosure that would make it more difficult to assemble this information. One of the dynamics of this story in the United States which relates directly to the lawsuit business very -- the legal system makes a big difference. For example, the Province of Quebec dioceses do not own the properties of the parishes. They’re owned by individual corporations and there have been almost no lawsuits because there’s no money. So to say that the problem only exists -- where the problem is better known is where the legal system makes it easier to sue than the documents become part of a court record which can be released. It doesn’t mean that where it’s not happening it’s not happening, it’s just that the legal system doesn’t favor it.

**MR. ALLEN:** Grant.

**FR. DE SOUZA:** In several states there has been an attempt to what’s called -- sometimes it’s been called look back or window laws which basically say that for a period of time, one year or two years, the statute of limitations on civil suits is suspended. Where that’s done it causes bankruptcies -- so the most recent one I think was Minnesota -- because then you get this avalanche of civil suits from 30 or 40 years back. The only -- where this law has been proposed usually meets with a general sense of fairness. People should be able to sue, you know, for things in the past. Where it’s been defeated, which I think is in Colorado and Pennsylvania and New York, it’s because the church has made the argument -- and Georgia I believe -- very strongly that this is anti-Catholic if you don’t apply it to public schools. And no state is going anywhere near applying civil
suspension of statute of limitations on public schools. It’s just not -- it’s never gonna happen because the cost would be prohibitive for the state. So that’s -- probably in places like in New York and Pennsylvania maybe now with these grand jury reports there will be these civil suspension of statute of limitations. In the State of New York in order to say we’re gonna do something for victims, but we don’t want that statute suspended, the limitations, the institute their own voluntary compensation program which is how Cardinal McCarrick’s accuser came forward. So there is a very practical public policy dimension to this that we’ll sort of go through most -- many states on the issue of whether the civil statute of limitations should be suspended. And there where, generally speaking, the church has invited now -- not 30 years about, but now -- district attorneys and review boards to look at records and so forth, has been very accommodating one might say on that. On that issue the suspension of civil statute of limitations there’s been really vigorous opposition if it’s not applied to public schools, which it never will be. The story as a whole I think has shifted from 2002 to 2018. In 2002 there was a lot of focus on the law, compliance with the law, procedures for removing priests who were guilty of abuse, protocols, and above which is the biggest data impact in Catholic life in the United States, safe environment training. So every parish in the United States, also in Canada, has protocols for volunteers depending on what you’re doing, police checks, all of that. The figures are astonishing when you look. There’s something like, you know, 60 million people have been screened or something like that since 2002. That was the focus then. Today in 2018 the focus is actually I’d say a little bit more internal. Meaning, what is the culture that has permitted this? What is sort of the internal life of the church that has to change not so much whether there’s a new protocol? We’re talking about things that were very difficult to talk about and weren’t talked about much before, say, a year ago. The culture of the clergy is it a culture of complacency, is it a culture of correction when you see things that are not being done? I’m not talking only about sexual misconduct. Any number of things, Liturgical Doctrinal, so on. Is it a culture which tolerates, you know, good appearances over, you know, looking hard at what might be awry? It is a culture of mendacity? Do we tolerate sort of, you know, untruths for the sake of, you know, smoothing things over? That’s -- in my own view as a priest -- not so much a journalist, but as
a priest I think that that could be a very important -- it is a very important aspect of the church’s life in terms of reform that was hard to talk about. But now a crisis has arrived that forces us to speak about it. Now that culture -- what parts of the clerical culture need to be reformed -- that’s not a matter of unanimous agreement. So, for example, Pope Francis, those who are if you want to say more allied with him, speak very clearly and insistently about a culture of clericalism. What exactly clericalism is it’s hard to define, but generally you’d say you’d be using the clerical office state as a privilege rather than a service. A club rather than a, you know -- to be a member of a club rather than to be a service of the people. Others will talk about doctrinal, liturgical, sexual lack of discipline to put their attention to homosexuality. But what unites those two emphases would be an attention to the internal culture of the church and that was not the same as in 2002. Which is why in 2018 in the large mainstream secular if you want to say media coverage of the church there’s much less hate than there is actually in the Catholic press this time around compared to 2002 because it’s touching on the -- the internal life of the church more essentially. Okay. So where we are -- what kinds of things might we look at cover the next little while? Well, about Pope Francis I would add just to what John’s remarks are the centralized intendancy. Very interesting. Santae Marthae, the house where he lives, it’s the Vatican guest house, and what does that word mean in the Catholic press in 2018 as opposed to 2013? Now if I might gently chide my friend John here, I think before 2013 what was Santae Marthae usually described as?

MR. ALLEN: The luxury -- $25 million luxury hotel built by John Paul II.

FR. DE SOUZA: Right.

MR. ALLEN: And the place where cardinals stayed during the time.

FR. DE SOUZA: Right. So it’s quite a big building. It’s actually not -- it’s not as luxurious as our rooms here, for example. It’s like the Holiday Inn maybe without a TV.

MR. ALLEN: It’s an Embassy Suites.

FR. DE SOUZA: Yeah. Oh, but without the televisions.

MR. ALLEN: There’s no TV in his room. What are you talking about?
FR. DE SOUZA: The Pope -- I’ve never been in the Pope’s room.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

FR. DE SOUZA: In the rooms that normal people stay in there are no TVs, but he might have it.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah, I know that. There’s a TV there that he watches --

FR. DE SOUZA: He doesn’t watch TV. Okay. Okay.

MR. ALLEN: If you’re the Pope you can have a TV, right. That’s how it works. Al though he denies watching TV.

FR. DE SOUZA: Yes.

MR. ALLEN: By the way, he claims to have not watched television for like the last 40 years which everybody knows to be completely ridiculous.

FR. DE SOUZA: Well, I didn’t know about that part of it. Okay. Interesting. But there’s an example. So when the Pope decided to live there as opposed to live in the Vatican apartments, apostolic apartments where his predecessors lived, immediately overnight every news story which always -- which had all -- always described the Sanctae Marthae erroneously as a luxury hotel overnight was now described as the humble Vatican guesthouse --

MR. ALLEN: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

FR. DE SOUZA: -- where the Pope stays.

MR. ALLEN: Like it’s a monastic cell, right.

FR. DE SOUZA: The building had not been renovated when the Pope moved in there. They didn’t rip everything out.

MR. ALLEN: It’s the same.

FR. DE SOUZA: But that was the dominant thing. Pope Francis is a simple guy, he’s a humble guy, so therefore he doesn’t live in a hotel. He lives in a simple, humble guesthouse, right. You can look at the -- do your searches.

What’s that?

FEMALE SPEAKER: There was a manger?
FR. DE SOUZA: No man- -- no. He’s living in a manger. Very good. The -- today when people say Sanctae Marthae there’s that element obviously he lives in -- that’s where he lives, but it now refers to the fact that had he been over in the apostolic apartments where the us- -- where Popes usually lived and the usual officials come and see him, now he lives over in Sanctae Marthae where his inner circle, which is not made up as John correctly mentions of the heads of the departments, they gather and he makes decisions in that little circle. So that’s just interesting. Sanctae -- the actual term Sanctae Marthae which used to be only positive now has a slightly different meaning inside the Catholic press. Teflon --

MR. ALLEN: It’s like calling it -- it’s like tin downing (phonetic), right.

FR. DE SOUZA: Right.

MR. ALLEN: I mean, it’s a shorthand for where the center of power is.

FR. DE SOUZA: Correct. But my point was back in 2013 it wasn’t thought about as a power place.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. Yeah.

FR. DE SOUZA: Teflon. When the current Vatican spokesman was appointed some years back I think in one of the interviews he gave he may have used that same expression, he’ll -- Pope, Holy Father, is Teflon. Nothing sticks to him. That’s changed. And that’s probably the biggest change of 2018 is that whereas in some of the controversies that John mentioned which in the Catholic world did expose divisions between certain parts of the flock and the Pope on doctrinal matters and others, but in the mainstream press if you want to call it that nothing stuck, that’s changed in 2018. And the Pope ends the year 2018 in a much weaker position going into what I think is gonna be a very weak position in 2019 which concerns me greatly. From a news point of view it’s very newsworthy, as a priest that’s not something I’m looking forward to. Let me explain what I mean by that. Because the church is not the United States and because sex abuse is not an American only story the most important thing in 2018 was Chile. It’s a complicated tale, but basically for three years the Pope had stood by an appointment he had made attacking in the most intemperate and severe language his critics on this which amounted to it turned out the bishops of Chile who asked him not to do it, but he didn’t say that. Anyway, he
went to Chile in January. The most catastrophic trip, a papal trip, in recent memory. The report that John mentioned was commissioned after that. He turned around and in order to sort of save his credibility in Chile, which he had over three years really bungled, this most severe remedy was employed because the resignation of all the bishops in Chile. Now he hasn’t accepted all. They offered them all. He’ll decide what to do. So he basically took over the church in Chile to run it himself. Throughout the Catholic world of bishops it’s not -- it’s impossible to imagine a worse scenario. I mean, that you get -- you compromise for a generation or two the entire credibility of the church. So the leadership for the church for this generation and the next and maybe the one after that totally compromised. It is a fiasco of -- it’s impossible to describe it in accurate terms. That’s the big story of 2018. And that story, unlike some of these disputes about Cardinal McCarrick, is from beginning to end a Sanctae Marthae story. It comes out of the -- not the history, but the way that it was managed the last three years. So there are people around Pope Francis in very senior positions -- they may not be consulted as they were before -- whose confidence in the Holy Father has been shaken which is why when the accusations of Archbishop Vigano were made in the summer what was most astonishing was the lack of response. Very few of the senior Vatican officials came to the Pope’s defense. There was one after he was attacked came very vigorously. So the Pope --

**MR. ALLEN:** Sorry. I just -- since we were talking Chile I just wanted to see if Ines wanted to jump in with anything.

**MS. SAN MARTIN:** (Speaking off mic; inaudible.)

**MR. GOOD:** Maybe a microphone would be better, yeah.

**MR. ALLEN:** Just join us at the table, Ines.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Yeah. Kick Alan out. I don’t even know what he’s doing here anyway.

**MR. GOOD:** And we’ve got about nine of you in the queue so this is good stuff. We’re about to turn the corner, please.

**MS. SAN MARTIN:** Okay. Again, I completely agree with Fr. de Souza on the fact that Pope Francis completely
mishandled the situation for the past three years and he was very good adding that it was because he got wrong information and never told us who he got the wrong information from and never acknowledged his role in the wrong information which is the fact that he personally tapped Jesuit Fran from Spain to try to get the story right. But I’d also caution on blaming it all on Francis because we’re talking about 35 bishops who are currently active in Chile. Seven of whom had their resignation accepted, eight of whom have been subpoenaed. Those eight did not --

**MR. ALLEN:** You mean subpoenaed by local prosecutors, civil prosecutors?

**MS. SAN MARTIN:** Yes. Sorry. By the civil authorities including the president of the Bishops Conference who’s still active in duty and Cardinal Ezzati who is the Archbishop of Santiago. And we have the Pope on the record saying that he doesn’t know who to replace him with. Not that he doesn’t want to, simply that he doesn’t know who to replace him with. Most of the bishops have been accused of not only covering up, but also of sexually abusing either minors or seminarians themselves including, for instance, Bishop (inaudible), of -- who’s -- sorry - - who had his resignation accepted at the age of 75 with no explanation given by the Vatican. So this is a huge, huge crisis and we cannot blame it all on Pope Francis. There’s currently been a lot of wrongdoing in the appointing of these bishops and that goes back to John Paul II and goes back to Benedict XVI and that goes back, I would dare name one name, to the former papal representation in Chile Arch -- Cardinal Sodano who is -- well, let’s just put it, not a nice person in the Catholic Church. A lot of the appointments that we -- we see today in Chile that are -- the Pope has to walk down were personally made by Sodano who chose a lot of personal friends, some of them very conservative, some of them actually very liberal. And that’s one of the many things that make the situation in Chile even more complicated that it’s extremely ideological and was in the fact that the Pope in a history-making move decided to defrock two bishops on the same day. By the way, none of those two -- none of those two bishops is one of the eight or the seven so it’s just another number to add. One of them from the left and one from the right, both of them accused of sexually abusing minors. One is 50, one is 85. So the problem, again, goes way back to Francis even if I agree on the fact that he mishandled it in the past
three years.

FR. DE SOUZA: I would -- I -- Ines is correct. My point was not that the underlying malfeasance was his fault, but the way that it resolved itself shook the confidence of people around him --

MS. SAN MARTIN: Yeah.

FR. DE SOUZA: -- that --

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

FR. DE SOUZA: And this is his neighboring country. He’s from Argentina.

MR. ALLEN: Fair enough.

FR. DE SOUZA: I would say just a few final points on that is that the -- Francis’s pontificate has been divisive. And so like in a family when there’s some external shock -- you know, a son gets arrested, unemployment, an illness, or whatever -- if the families are united it’s a blow to the family, but it -- it can survive. If the family’s already divided and one of these things comes along it can be very destructive. And that’s the environment that we’re in. The consequence what happened yesterday in Baltimore is severe that the American bishops as a whole, even those who are more favorably inclined towards him, feel blindsided or maybe even stronger than that. And what’s happening is now the fact that -- I have a column in the Catholic Herald earlier this week arguing that Pope Francis decided he will be the responder. He will handle Chile, he will handle America, he will hand- -- there’s some of the examples. Which I think is very bad because you don’t want everything to land on the Pope’s desk, but that’s how he’s chosen to do it. And above all today’s news, which was -- I mean, I almost laughed out loud when I read it -- Archbishop Scicluna has been made senior official to the Congregation of Doctrine of the Faith which last was announced three years ago when he was announced to be the head of a special tribunal for these cases. So this is the third time that the same man has been given a special task which shows that instead of using the existing offices to get at institutional reform you have these -- this personal intervention. Very interesting, this summer there’s an article in the Guardian written by Catherine, I think, Propinster or Pepinster --
MR. ALLEN: Pepinster.

FR. DE SOUZA: -- former editor of the Tablet. Very distinguished, long-time Catholic journalist. The Tablet’s more on the left and so is the Guardian. Writing about the isolation of Pope Francis that he was alone. Yes, he’s -- and then you have in -- also in the summer (inaudible) the prominent German magazine which is also more on the progressive side with a cover story attacking the Holy Father for his role in Argentina. So I think over the next year at the level of the Vatican -- at the level of the United States we know what’s gonna happen largely. These grand jury reports and so forth. At the level of the Vatican I think we’re going -- we’re in for a very, very rough year. 2018 was a rough year because the Pope has taken a decision that he, himself, and only himself is going to address this in an ad hoc way as necessary. Which means if something goes wrong -- which Ines just in two minutes gave you the complexity of Chile -- that’s gonna land on the Holy Father’s desk. And it’s not good for the church to have, you know, have that dynamic unleashed in a divided church. So I think we’re in for a very rough year. Now I would say -- people ask me all the time, you know, how is -- how are you? I say, well, you know, journalistically there’s too much news to cover. So it’s gonna be a very interesting story, but as a pastor I’m not as sanguine.

MR. GOOD: Thank you, gentlemen, very... (Off the record.)

Q&A
QUESTION 1
MALE SPEAKER: I’m sure that both of you (inaudible) say about this, but, John, you mentioned that one of the reasons perhaps that the Vatican asked the U.S. bishops to hold off is that there were serious problems under Canon Law with some of the draft proposals. I’m wondering -- I’m really curious about what Canon Law has to do with all of this. The protection -- the apparent emphasis on protecting church institutions, the emphasis on secrecy over transparency, the emphasis on therapy over punishment for -- for priests, a lot of those have to do with specific Canons that, for example, are referenced to paternal correction in Canon 1341. So I’m curious whether, you know -- on the one hand whether Canon Law has been undermined -- whether the authority of
Canon Law has been undermined by this crisis or could you also -- could you alternatively say that Canon Law has complicated this crisis?

**MR. ALLEN:** Well, look, I’m not a Canonist, but I speak to Canonists on a regular basis because Canon Law has been a feature of this story from the very beginning. You know, I mean, let’s face the basic facts first. The Catholic Church -- the Vatican one should say, the Holy Sea, is a sovereign state and so therefore it is natural that it has its own body of law. And that body of law has been carefully articulated over the centuries. The most recent systematic revision of it was 1983 under John Paul II, although it’s updated by Popes on a regular basis through what is known as a Motu Proprio, an exercise of their own authority to amend the code. You know, what Canonists will tell you when you ask does Canon Law complicate getting on top of the clerical sexual abuse stuff they will tell you it is exactly the opposite. That well before this crisis erupted the code had all the tools a bishop needed to discipline a wayward priest. There is an -- Section 7 of the code is the penal section about clerical misconduct. So what they will tell you is the problem here has never been Canon Law. The problem has been the will to apply it, right. It’s the politics of the situation. I mean, we have -- we have -- we have had an ecclesiastical culture for a long time that preferred to deal with clerical misconduct quietly and informally, right. Senza cavalla rumore as the Italians would say, without making noise, right. And so bishops instead of subjecting priests to a formal Canonical trial, you know, would try, as you see, the therapeutic route, right. They would say, all right, you know, this guys is struggling. You know, let me maybe send him off for treatment some place and, you know, we’ll get an evaluation. And if things look promising then, you know, we’ll put him back into the field. That was always considered more pastoral, more generous, more merciful, right, than the -- than the instruments of a formal trial. In terms of whether the code gets in the way, I mean, you know, you mentioned secrecy. Well, I mean, it is true that the code imposes secrecy, for instance, on Canonical legal proceedings the same way any other legal proceeding anywhere in the world often is surrounded by requirements of secrecy. I mean, in Australia right now -- show of hands. Does anybody actually know what happened in Cardinal George Pell’s first trial? Why don’t you know? Because Australia has an absolute gag order, okay. I mean, reporters can
go to jail for reporting stuff like that, you know. So, look, yes, there are requirements of secrecy under the code, but you have to remember the code governs the internal life of the Catholic Church, right. It doesn’t govern what a bishop may elect to do in terms of cooperation with civil investigations. There’s no requirement in the code that would tell you you can’t share information with a civil investigation, okay. They’re parallel procedures. So in that sense I don’t think the code is the problem. I really think -- and it would be a lot easier if it were, okay. If it were just a matter of changing a Canon, you know, in the code that would be simple, you know, if you could flip a switch and wrong, right, and we're living in a different world. But I think this is one of those cases where the problem is cultural, it’s not legal. I mean, look, you know, I grew up in rural western Kansas. Went to Catholic schools all the way through high school, okay. High school was operated by the Capuchin Franciscans. My boys to this day. I love them with my whole heart. Caps are great. By the way, they’re taking care of Ted McCarrick right now out in the seminary that I used to attend on weekends, you know. St. Fidelis Seminary in Victoria, Kansas. It’s ten miles from where I grew up. I’m making a road trip next weekend. Because actually a friend of mine, his uncle is a Capuchin priest who’s in residence at St. Fidelis so we’re gonna drop in on Father Gilmary and see if we can see Uncle Ted while we’re there. But -- but anyway, freshman year part of standard orientation the older kids would tell us don’t get into the pool or on the wrestling mat with Father Julian because he likes to -- he likes to grope you up, okay. So we just all knew that. Everybody knew it. Now, you know, flash forward ten years later Father Julian is no longer Father Julian. He was laicized because he faced as it turns out an avalanche of abuse accusations. Now is it the church’s failure for not disciplining Father Julian earlier? Sure. Should have acted. There were -- there were legitimate grounds for concern. But all of us were complicit in it too. I never said anything. Nobody I know ever said anything and we all knew. I mean, we didn’t know about the actual abuse, but we certainly know there was something hinky about the guy, right. And that unfortunately is not a legal problem. It’s a cultural problem, right. And I think we are slowly getting over it. I think the code has been adapted really since John Paul II, progressively adapted through a series of Motu Proprio to make it more adaptable and feasible in terms of trying to come to grips with this. But I don’t think the
code -- honestly from the beginning I don’t think that was the problem.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Well, what was the -- what -- do you know of any problems in the -- I mean, you said last night you didn’t know what the recommendations of the bishops were going to be so maybe you can’t answer this. But you did say that you thought that there was some implications for Canon Law with some --

**MR. ALLEN:** Yeah. I mean, you know, the code, of course, is very clear that a bishop’s superior is the Pope and the Pope alone. It is also very clear that a -- as things stand -- now Pope Francis has made some noise about changing this, but it hasn’t actually happened in terms of the code yet -- the -- a Bishops Conference has no authority of governance over individual bishops, right. So if this -- and, again, we don’t yet have this proposed checklist that the bishops were looking at. But we are given to understand that a couple of the provisions were something like, you know, bishops must do X and the conference will review it and if they’re found to be unsatisfactory then these consequences will ensue which as stated would be Canonically a no fly zone, right. So, yes, I mean, I take your point that part of the stall that’s going on in Baltimore right now is the problem of reconciling what the bishops want to do with the code, but I just want to get to the heart of it. You know, the heart of it there -- there is -- I mean, we tend to make Canon Law often the bad guy in these stories, right, as if it’s the brick wall standing in the way of reform. Well, I mean, the truth of it is as I say there was always Book 7 of the code there. If a priest committed a crime -- and sexual abuse, okay, it’s only been made explicit as a crime in Canon Law since John Paul, but implicitly it was always there, you know. There are crimes against -- crimes against morals, right, in Book 7. A bishop could have used that code to discipline a priest at any time he wanted to, right. So there certainly undoubtedly will have to be some tweaking of the code going forward. I just don’t want us to be under any illusion that that’s the real problem here and that tweaking the code is magically going to solve things. It needs to be done, but more fundamental than that is getting at the cultural problem. And the cultural problem is both in the clerical world and in the lay world taking care of Father has long been far more important than any other perceived good.

**FR. DE SOUZA:** I would add to that that the -- it’s very hard to believe that Canonical problems would have
bothered Pope Francis. They are real, but he’s not --

MR. ALLEN: That’s a good point.

FR. DE SOUZA: -- he’s not bothered about them in the least bit. So this -- whatever happened in Baltimore was not because the Pope didn’t like the Canonical structures. Because the Pope, in my view, didn’t want other people running this part of the operation. But it goes back to the culture because on things far removed from sexual abuse there are Canons that govern what the church considers most important for liturgical life, for life of worshiper sacraments. And you would be hard pressed to find any bishop in Canada or the United States in the last 40 years who has really used effectively the code of Canon Law to discipline there -- it’s just a whole culture of legal discipline was abandoned on everything and this is the one that becomes most -- that’s what I’m talking about the internal culture change. I would say that the most remarkable thing about Cardinal McCarrick, John’s point about only -- only the Pope can judge a bishop, only -- cardinals answer to only the Pope -- Cardinal McCarrick’s case with the cooperation of the archbishop or the initiative of the Archbishop of New York Cardinal Dolan and the agreement of Pope Francis was judged entirely from start to finish by laypeople.

MR. ALLEN: Absolutely right.

FR. DE SOUZA: Anyway, there’s all the issues that they had there. So and that, you know -- so it shows there’s a kind of -- when there’s -- where there’s a will the Canons don’t get in the way. Had there been a culture of Canonical discipline across the board say from the 19-say-50s onwards many of these problems, not all, would have been better addressed. Anyway, that’s --

MR. ALLEN: But you mentioned McCarrick and why what happened in Baltimore happened. Let me just try to lay out my reading because I think Fr. Raymond is right. I am quite sure that Cardinal Ouellet and his team at the Congregation for Bishops reviewed this draft by the U.S. bishops, found serious Canonical problems, and brought them to the Pope. Bear in mind, Cardinal Ouellet was received in audience by Pope Francis on Saturday and this decision was communicated to the bishops on Sunday so there’s a natural sequence there. I agree 100 percent with Fr. Raymond that in Pope Francis’s own mind those Canonical problems were not the issue
because he’s absolutely right, Pope Francis has demonstrated that he is either willing simply to ignore the code or to amend it on an ad hoc basis to serve his purposes. So I don’t think that was the real issue here. What I actually think is at issue -- bear in mind the context here, okay. Last week the Catholic bishops of France issued their own aggressive, new anti-abuse standards which includes the creation of a strong, independent lay board. Precisely one of the things that the U.S. bishops were looking at. So France got the green light from the Vatican. The Italian bishops right now are working on their own new updated anti-abuse guidelines. They’ve gotten the green light from the Vatican to do that. Why were the American bishops asked to slow down? Why are they being asked to wait for February? My theory about that is because in addition to everything else the American bishops want a serious investigation in the McCarrick scandals. They -- they want to know who facilitated his rise to power, who protected him because that’s the only thing the American public right now will settle for is getting answers to those questions. And that is an extraordinarily sensitive thing for the Vatican to deal with because it would involve opening records about who knew what when that might end up indicting not merely this papacy, but other papacies, right. I mean, there is a real fear that if you dig hard about who facilitated McCarrick’s rise to power, one answer you’re going to get is Cardinal Stanislaw Dziwisz who is the personal secretary of St. John Paul II because of McCarrick’s prowess in the 90s as a fundraiser on behalf of solidarity in Poland. And then you end up indicting -- in a sense you end up indicting the papacy of John Paul II. And so I think it is the politics of this situation rather than the principle of it actually. My suspicion is most of the proposed measures the U.S. bishops are looking at will eventually be adopted in one way, shape, or form. I think that the politically sensitive thing right now is the McCarrick piece trying to figure out how they could go forward in terms of addressing that in a way that does not put anyone and particularly Pope Francis in the position of looking like he’s throwing other Popes under the bus.

**FR. DE SOUZA:** Uh-huh.

**MR. ALLEN:** Not that Francis wouldn’t have his own culpability here, but there is also the issue of the role of John Paul in particular. Benedict is a different story because we know under Benedict these accusations were
taken seriously, there were informal sanctions on McCarrick that were imposed which essentially lapsed at the end of Benedict’s papacy. But I think that’s the real fear, okay. Yeah, Ines?

MR. GOOD: And let me just name for our -- for our cue make sure we get you in. We’ve got Andy Ferguson, next we’ve got Tina, Amy, Wajahat, Jon Ward, Carl Cannon, and Adelle Banks. So please weigh in and then let’s keep it moving rapid fire.

MS. SAN MARTIN: I just want to update that’s come in from the U.S. (inaudible) meeting right now which is that the bishops have voted in favor of adding into the agenda a discussion and resolution encouraging Pope Francis to release documentation on McCarrick.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MS. SAN MARTIN: So really that is the center of it all.

MR. ALLEN: That’s the center of it all. We’ll see if it happens.

MR. GOOD: Andy Ferguson?

QUESTION 2

MR. FERGUSON: One of the things that struck me as odd this summer with the Pennsylvania report was -- at least if I read it right. And maybe I’m wrong about this -- that the outrage was so intense about events that in almost every case, a couple of exceptions, happened before the reforms and the --

MR. ALLEN: Yes.


MR. ALLEN: Yes.

MR. FERGUSON: And so it seemed kind of weirdly out of proportion, I mean, as horrifying that this -- the details of the story of course are -- is what got people so disgusted. But how can that be guarded against, as you say, there’s gonna be one report after another, from state after another every six months and I assume will show sort of the same pattern --

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MR. FERGUSON: -- 50s, 60s, 70s, 80s, 90s terrible.
MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MR. FERGUSON: 2002 happens, everybody institutes these reforms 60 million background checks and so on. How do you kind of keep that -- that from -- that outrage from just getting out of proportion every six months?

MR. ALLEN: Well, the other element of Pennsylvania you've leaving out of the picture is the fact that we were able to indict a cardinal, right. You had Don Wuerl in Pittsburg in his record in Pittsburg. And most of that was also going on pre-2002, by the way. But because of who Wuerl was, right, that could create a scenario in which he was under fire and then ultimately, as you know, I mean, you know, had to step down so there was a kind of celebrity value to it all, right. Now not all of these grand jury reports are going to indict the service record of a sitting cardinal, right. But, look, I mean, your point is well taken, okay. I mean, it -- as you say, in virtually every case -- I think there were maybe two exceptions, okay, in the Pittsburg report -- were talking pre-Dallas, okay. I think, you know, from the way this has to be covered, certainly the way we're going to cover it, you know, we will take the -- we will try to pitch these reports as x-rays of why the sex abuse crisis happened rather than status reports about where it stands today. Because, you know, the untold story here is, look, yeah, okay, the Catholic Church in so many ways has just bungled the situation and as Ines is reporting from Chile it indicates in so many ways continues to bundle it in mind blowing ways, okay. But on the other hand, you know, there has been -- there have been so many titanic reform measures adopted over the course of the last decade. I mean, in -- I attended a conference at the Gregorian University which is the Jesuit University in Rome a couple years ago on keeping children safe in the digital world and I interviewed the head of European Interpol, right. Non-Catholic, totally secular, okay, law enforcement type. And I asked her in your view which institution in Europe today has the best record on child protection and she said by far the Catholic Church. You know, if only we could get, say, you know, the public education sector to adopt some of the measures that the Catholic Church has taken. So, you know, to me this story is always a mix of shadows and light, I mean, because there are some real heroes in the Catholic Church who have spent their lives for the last decade and a half doing nothing else trying to get this right, you know. I think of a Jesuit priest by the name of Hans Zollner who runs the Center for
Child Protection at the Greg in Rome, I think of Monsignor Stephen Rossetti here in the States, Teresa Kettelkamp who ran the Bishop’s Office for Child Protection and then went over to work in Rome for basically no salary for the Commission for Child Protection because she wanted to contribute. I mean, there is an enormous success story here to tell about the way that the Catholic Church has tried to get this right. Unfortunately it is almost impossible to tell that story because of the episodic tone deafness and, you know, obtuseness of people who make decisions about this kind of thing. I mean, you want to be the one who pitches your editor an A1 story this week on the Catholic Church’s success story after the Vatican told the bishops to stand down? Are you gonna do that? It doesn’t make that story wrong, but is this the environment for it? No. Right? And that’s the story of the way the Catholic Church has kind of blundered its way through this for the last decade and a half.

**MR. GOOD:** Raymond, you want --

**FR. DE SOUZA:** I would say on the issue of the grand jury reports that dynamic is gonna continue, but something will change. The -- there were I think three of the six diocese or at least two in Pennsylvania wanted to release their records and the attorney general asked them not to so as to not to compromise the grand jury. They feel very betrayed by what they think was a political manipulation by the attorney general. That’s not gonna happen again in other states. So when grand juries review in other states all the information that they will have in their grand jury report or most of it will already be in the public domain on the websites of most diocese. I mean, just last week there were four or five that did it. So that’s -- there’ll be -- there’ll be part of what you’re asking about that continuing dynamic, but it’s gonna be -- that’s gonna change a little bit in the States going forward is that these disclosures -- now some of the details like, you know, the actual stories and so forth which made the Pennsylvania grand jury report very gripping, but also very disturbing reading that will continue I suppose. But in terms of when -- you know, I don’t know when the State of Missouri reviews the diocese in Missouri will already have revealed the names and so forth. So that will be a slightly different dynamic after Pennsylvania than before.
MR. GOOD: I think that given the intensity and substance that we’re hearing that I might suggest that we actually make this adult learning. If you need to grab a coffee or use the restroom go for it. But let’s keep going and plow right through. Amy Sullivan, you’re up next.

QUESTION 3
MS. SULLIVAN: Thanks.

MR. ALLEN: So no smoke break?

FR. DE SOUZA: No.

MR. GOOD: It comes later. It comes later.

MR. ALLEN: All right.

MS. SULLIVAN: I have two questions. One is I’m very interested to hear from either both of you what explains the Pope’s tone deafness or poor instincts in dealing with sex abuse cases in Chile or of the past week where you have back to back kind of seemingly incoherence in -- in the strategy? And the other is I have appreciated and acknowledge the context in terms of, you know, the U.S. being a small and increasingly smaller piece of the global church. That said, it seems to me that the examples of the U.S. and to a larger extent Ireland should be really chastening to folks in the Vatican in that in both of those cases it doesn’t really matter to the victims that the church has done some good things --

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MS. SULLIVAN: -- or that there are other institutions that were maybe as bad or worse. What matters to them is that their church did this --

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MS. SULLIVAN: -- and that the leadership didn’t deal with it. Is -- is that chastening to anyone?

MR. ALLEN: Well, okay. So what explains Pope Francis’s instincts on this, first of all, I would say that, you know, Pope Francis very much understands himself as a reforming Pope, wants to root out corruption. I think in general he does want to get this right. However, you’ve got to understand that he brings the instincts of a kind of Latin American pastor to all of this from a country -- I mean, Argentina has never had a clerical sexual abuse
crisis in the sense that we know it. There are individual cases of course, but in the sense of a full-blown crisis it just doesn’t exist. So he doesn’t have the same kind of gut level sensitivity to it that say an Irish bishop, an American bishop, a German bishop, now a Chilean bishop would have. You know, he doesn’t know how to speak the language in a way. And it’s not, you know, in terms of his perceived priorities, you know. If you were to ask him, you know, Holy Father, what are you thinking about when you get out of bed in the morning this is not gonna be on the list, you know. I mean, he’s thinking about poverty and he’s thinking about a third world war in pieces, you know, that he’s concerned about, he’s thinking about the peripheries in all of that. And, you know, now if you said to him is it important, Holy Father, to get this right he would say of course. But if he’s ticking off his priorities this is not gonna be on the list. So there’s all of that. And then I would add to that there is also the fact -- curious phenomena. You know, Francis is the first Pope from the developing world and in some ways symbolizes the globality, the internationalization of the Vatican, right, you know, catching up with the realities of the 21st Century. And yet internally I would submit to you that -- that the Italian stranglehold on power in the Vatican has not been as strong as it is under this Pope since probably the 1950s, era of Pius XII. We’d have to go back that far. Pope Francis’s -- I mean, yes, he’s got advisers from Argentina, Archbishop Victor Fernandez, for instance. But the people he really relies on to get things done, the people he trusts, the people around him they’re almost exclusively Italian. And so they will bring an Italian sensibility to this. Let me give you the difference between Italy and, say, the United States when it comes to the clerical sexual abuse stuff, okay. Right now the archbishop of Milan, a guy by the name of Mario Delphini, has been accused of when he was the Vicar General of Milan knowing about a sexually abusive priest and just transferring him from parish to parish. You know, it’s the standard story, right, just transferring him rather than dealing with it, okay. So the victims in this case sued and so there was -- there was a trail. And Delphini was deposed for this trial and they -- instead of making him come to the courthouse they went to his office in the -- you know, the archbishop’s palace, right, and did the deposition there. And he was asked question one, were you aware -- well, they -- it was a matter of record by that point that Delphini had been informed, right. So the question was: When you were informed
about father so and so’s -- the allegation against father so and so what did you do? His answer, direct quote from the deposition, “I decided to move him to another parish.” Follow-up question: Did you inform the people of that parish of the accusations against him? Answer, “Of course not.” Follow-up question: Were you aware that in his new position father so and so was actually responsible for youth ministry? And Delphini’s direct answer was, “Of course I was.” Just like flat out, okay. Now if this were any American bishop caught in those circumstances you know the language they would use, right. I can’t recall, you know, I don’t have an active memory of that conversation, I’m not aware of what -- you know, blah, blah, right. But it’s the brazenness of it, right, that just takes your breath away. And it’s because the crisis -- again, I say it, the crisis as we understand it simply has never reached Italy and many Italians are convinced it never will. And my point is that I think Pope Francis often is reliant, well certainly in the secretive state he is reliant on a number of Italians who advise on these things and who bring those same instincts. Okay. That’s the Francis piece.

FR. DE SOUZA: On Francis I would disagree I think on that because John Paul and Benedict also were not -- they came from countries where this had not been at that stage. The single most important --

MR. ALLEN: That’s not true of Benedict.

FR. DE SOUZA: But when he was in the 1990s. The most important four --

MR. ALLEN: First sex abuse scandal in Germany was 1992.

FR. DE SOUZA: Okay. So the most important reform from the Vatican on sex abuse was in 2001 where they changed all the rules about when an allegation came where it was reported and so forth. That was the process of almost ten years of John Paul and Ratzinger, his chief leftenant at the time, hearing about these bubbling up and saying something had to be done about it. I think the problem under Pope Francis is that he doesn’t govern or has chosen not to govern with the existing structure. So what he actually knows, who actually speaks to him it’s a very tiny group. It’s --

MR. ALLEN: Mostly Italian.

FR. DE SOUZA: What’s that?
MR. ALLEN: Mostly Italian.

FR. DE SOUZA: Could be Italians or friends of Latin America. So on the Chilean stuff the fact that the entire country was kind of in an uproar about it I don’t know if that registered there. So I think that would explain -- it’s a governing style. That’s why I said in my initial remarks I think it’s very worrisome because now when he -- when he had the confidence of a lot of people, but now he has less. And I think this decision not to make institutional responses, but to make ad hoc personal responses is very, very high risk.

MR. ALLEN: And then to come to your question about the chastening, you know, is anybody in the Vatican chastened about the -- yes, absolutely. I mean, look, I can tell you that when I covered the abuse scandals from Rome in 2002, okay, there was a very clear division in Rome between what you would call the deniers, those who simply denied that this was really a problem, and reformers. And the deniers were the absolute majority, okay. They ran the secretary of state under Cardinal Sadona, they ran the Congregation for Bishops under Cardinal Rey, they ran the Congregation for Clergy, okay, under Cardinal --

FR. DE SOUZA: Castrillon.

MR. ALLEN: -- Castrillon -- thanks -- et cetera, et cetera. The lone beachhead for reform back then as Fr. Raymond accurately said was the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith -- of the Faith under Cardinal Ratzinger. And that is because, as you said, with the reform of 2001. But it really pre-dated that because prior to 2001 -- what 2001 did is it required bishops to send their case files to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, but prior to that many of them elected to do it, okay. So those files were reaching the CDF and Ratzinger was -- whatever else you want to say about him -- very punctilious about doing the paperwork. He read all those files so he was reading --

FR. DE SOUZA: In fact, he would --

MR. ALLEN: -- victim testimony from all over the world.

FR. DE SOUZA: He used to read -- he took it as a penance.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.
FR. DE SOUZA: He would read on --

MR. ALLEN: And Scicluna who --

FR. DE SOUZA: He’d read them on Fridays.

MR. ALLEN: -- was working for him back then will talk about walking into Ratzinger’s office and finding him weeping because he’s reading through all of this garbage, you know, and trying to absorb what it all means. So, I mean, I think there was almost a sort of -- I don’t want to overdramatize it, but almost a conversion, you know, in Ratzinger where he came to take this extraordinarily seriously. And that was the place in Rome -- if you had any hope in 2002 as a American bishop of getting a positive response to something that’s where you went. Okay. Now that was 2002. Today I can tell you that those deniers are out of power. There isn’t a single department in Rome today that I would say is run by an out and out denier, somebody who would say, oh, this is just the media attacking us or, you know, it’s just greedy lawyers wanting to get into our deep pockets and stuff like that, okay. That mentality still exists, but it has been driven underground, okay. So today the divide isn’t over substance, it’s over urgency, okay. What you would have is some people in the Vatican who would say, yeah, this was terrible. I mean, my God, this was -- this was a colossal failure. But it is mostly in the past and we have largely done our penance and it’s time for other priorities to have their day in the sun, you know, versus those who would say, well, no. You know, this remains an urgent priority. You know, it needs to be at the top of the checklist and we need to be much more aggressive about, for instance, creating a meaningful system of accountability for bishops who cover up, right. So the good news here is we are no longer having a debate over whether there is such a thing as a sexual abuse crisis, okay. That’s acknowledged, understood. What we’re having a debate over today in Rome -- and you saw it as the Synod last month -- is over how urgent responding to that crisis needs to be vis-à-vis other perceived priorities.

MR. GOOD: Let’s go to Tina.

QUESTION 4

MS. NGUYEN: Going back to Benedict XVI he still lives in the -- he still lives on the Vatican grounds.

MR. ALLEN: Yep.
MS. NGUYEN: He has -- he clearly has this history of responding strongly to sexual abuse allegations and I have read much -- many, many juicy stories about him having continued influence within the Vatican. They’re very juicy. What is -- what’s your read on his current role in dealing with sexual abuse? Is he -- is he exerting some influence behind the scenes, is he -- is he remaining quiet, is he trying to let Francis burden the responsibility for this? I just wanted to see what your sense is on his...

MR. ALLEN: Well, I would say both on sex abuse and on absolutely everything else the answer basically is that Benedict XVI does not exercise any direct influence on decision making or the exercise of power in the Vatican today. Now he is -- you know, he’s certainly there as a moral pointe of reference for a lot of people, right, so people will often cite his example. But, you know, when Benedict announced his resignation, you know -- I remember when he was on the balcony of Castel Gandolfo as the hours were winding down, right, the tour. It’s 8 p.m. local February 28 when his papacy ended. And he said from the balcony that from that point forward (inaudible), “I will be hidden from the world,” by which he meant that he was not going to have any active role in governance. And Benedict is very much a man of his word. I personally think any speculation that he is somehow pulling strings or orchestrating things, that he was somehow, for instance, behind the Dubi Amoris Laetitia or any of that it’s just false. Benedict being the man of integrity that he is simply would not -- he honors the fact that he is no longer the Pope, right. Now, you know, that said, on the sex abuse stuff I do think there is a kind of influence by example from Benedict because we have the eight years in the Benedict papacy where the approach to particularly imposing discipline for clerical sexual misconduct was extremely stringent. I mean, there were -- I don’t even know. I lost track -- but more than 1,000 priests laicized during Benedict’s papacy. I mean, it is a permanent example of a papacy that took this cancer seriously and tried to use the tools of the church to come to terms with it imperfectly, incompletely because he never got around to dealing with accountability for bishops. That’s still the huge lacuna, you know in all of this. But nevertheless, I think people would look to -- so it’s not that Benedict is pulling any strings or anything, but I think people would look to his example and say that’s a papacy that tried to get this right.
MR. GOOD: Fr. Raymond, go ahead.

FR. DE SOUZA: He looms large amongst those who are the more conservative side who find are frustrated under Pope Francis. I don’t think he’s involved directly. But there is this -- because of the unprecedented situation this tension between the two. Most -- there are two incidents of this past year. One was that the senior official -- the Vatican senior communication official in March tried to make it seem like Pope Benedict had written a letter --

MR. ALLEN: Letter gate.

FR. DE SOUZA: -- endorsing the theological sophistication of Pope Francis, which on its face was a stretch because I don’t think Pope Benedict regards Pope Francis a very theologically sophisticated. But it was manipulation and it poisoned the relations between the two because what Pope Benedict actually wrote they -- they altered it and said -- you can read the story. It was really quite appalling. In the Vigano attack on the Pope, Francis that is, if there was no substance to the charge that there was something done about McCarrick and Francis had somehow resolved it or relieved it Pope Benedict could have, as he does make his views known from time to time, he could have killed that immediately, which he didn’t which was why most people thought there must be something to it which now we know that there was. That’s about all I would say that, you know, there is some friction -- I don’t know. I’ve not been to see Pope Benedict. But there seems to be some friction between the camps. If things unravel, which I suggest maybe in 2019 there is an unraveling, then, you know, if Pope Benedict appears and walks, you know, counterclockwise for his daily walk as opposed to clockwise that will be interpreted in some fashion or the other against Pope Francis. Which is why I think that we’re in for some rough waters there.

MR. ALLEN: By the way, one of the great parlor games in Rome that -- in the press corps we get into is speculating about how does this papacy end, right. Does it end death or resignation? My favorite scenario is one in which Pope Francis resigns while Benedict is still around so then we can have the Pope retirement home, right. They can like organize Canasta tournaments in the evening and like have bands that come take them to
matinees and they can hang out in the mall, you know, and putter around. So that’s one option.

FR. DE SOUZA: It is a fact that, you know, the Popes only got their summer residence Castel Gandolfo in the 1920s, 30s. So for most of the 20th Century there were two papal residences, one in Rome, one in the hills. So you’d have thought that when we had a Pope -- a retired Pope we would be well situated because we had two residences, two residents. And as things work out in the Catholic Church both residences are vacant.

MR. GOOD: All right. We’ve got Wajahat, Jon Ward, Carl Cannon, and Adelle Banks. If you want to get in, please say the word. Wajahat?

QUESTION 5

MR. ALI: Thank you both, John and Father, for that sobering analysis. I’ve said this before, but I’m a product of an all-boys Jesuit Catholic High School, Bellarmine in San Jose, where I was the token Muslim who got the highest grade every semester. I just want to say that.

MR. ALLEN: Wow.

MR. ALI: But it was a -- it was -- you know, it was an amazing education. And the motto was “Meant for Others” and it was service. And so I just -- you know, want to -- I just remember that as the positive experience in my interaction with the Catholic Church. But this always loomed large even back then and I have to give a shout out to Carl Cannon who 30 years ago -- I want to quote him -- said, “This is a time bomb waiting to detonate.” I think that was 1987. That was Carl Cannon. You said something, John, in particular in the beginning -- and I want both of you to respond to this if you don’t mind -- that this is gonna be inevitable that this scandal every six months is gonna erupt especially as there’s more investigations. My question, then, is the inevitability based upon the structure of how the church is organized right now and their preference to, as you mentioned, kind of always protecting the fathers? And also is it because of the fathers themselves because the stereotype is it’s these individuals who choose to hide in the church? And you’ve spent your whole life and, Father, you know, obviously you’ve lived this. I’m just very curious why is this inevitable, number one. And the second question I have is if this is indeed inevitable -- going back to what Alan was saying yesterday with the poll numbers. And American Catholics this is like the main thing for the American cycle, right, this story. Based on the numbers it
seems like people leave the church or the mosque or the synagogue if it’s not reforming. They become “nones.” And so what’s gonna be the impact then on the American Catholic space if this is inevitable?

**MR. ALLEN:** All right. Well, the reason I said this is inevitable it’s -- first of all, it’s inevitable in the United States because of the grand juries. I mean, there’s just gonna be a cycle of these reports going forward for the next decade at least. I also think it’s inevitable globally because the plain fact of the matter is that the sexual abuse crisis has not arrived in most of the world. I mean, you know, one of the things that reformers, these heroes that I talked about, that they will spend their time sitting around trying to think through is where is the next place this is gonna erupt, right? Right now a lot of them think the Philippines will be the next place. I mean, you’re talking about the third largest Catholic culture in the world, you know, 80, 90 million Catholics. You know, where the church is just absolutely dominant in every sector of society. Philippines is basically a much bigger Ireland, right. I mean, think about what happened in Ireland. You know, a lot of people the same thing on a much more massive scale could play out there. You know, a lot of these people also think Italy is the next place where a bomb -- and certainly there’s the raw material for it, right, and on and on, right. So my point is I think -- and sadly the lesson up to this point is that rather than getting ahead of it -- in other words, detonating the -- I mean, diffusing the bomb before it goes off -- you know, the pattern in many local cultures has simply been to wait for it to erupt and deal with it then, right. So I think for those two reasons this story is not going anywhere any time soon, right. Now hopefully there will be -- you know, the arch of the narrative will be more and more in the direction of reform, right. But I think the story will be with us for a while. The other thing about, you know, whether there is something intrinsic to the priesthood I guess was your point?

**MR. ALI:** Yeah. It was an assumption. I mean, people say that, but I don’t know.

**MR. ALLEN:** I’m gonna let Fr. Raymond handle it for the most part, but I will tell you I don’t buy it. I mean, look, okay, I’m not gonna bore you with all the statistics about the prevalence of sexual abuse in other institutions in other walks of life. But, you know, my basic read would be what all the data tell us where we have been able to quantify these things which is principally the United States, Ireland, Germany, but it’s a consistent finding, okay,
is that if you take a 50-year arch of time you’re gonna find about 4 to 5 percent of the Catholic priests who were active at some point during that span who have credible allegations of abuse against them. Which means 95 percent of Catholic priests never abused anybody, right? And that’s -- I would su- -- I would -- my gut tells me you would find a similar average in pretty much any other walk of life. So I don’t buy the theory. I mean, I know some people -- and this is one of the dangers of the sex abuse thing that it can get weaponized ideologically by either left or right to try to grind their axes. I mean, that goes on a lot on the right with the issue of homosexuality, you know. They want to say this is all about homosexuality. And it goes on on the left when they want to say this is all the fault of celibacy, right. You know, if only priests were allowed to express themselves in sexually appropriate ways, you know, we wouldn’t have this crisis. Well, that’s just ridiculous. I mean, all the statistics tell us that in terms of raw numbers, you know, abuse that goes on in families that is committed by sexually active males, you know, is hands down more common than anything by a celibate priest. So, look, I don’t -- I don’t buy the gay explanation for this and I don’t buy the celibacy explanation for this. Basically I think the heart of all of this is an ecclesiastical culture that formed over centuries that did not want to confront ways in which clergy fell short of their moral ideals whether it was sexually, financially, personally, you know. It was a corporate and cultural unwillingness, you know, to confront that reality. A reality, by the way, that exists not just in the priesthood, but everybody else -- everywhere else.

MALE SPEAKER: (Speaking off mic; inaudible.)

MR. ALLEN: Yes. I mean, it’s an aspect of clericalism, okay. I mean, clericalism also includes pretense of superiority, you know, moral, intellectual, right. It includes a note of power, right, and privilege. I mean, all of that is part of the clericalism package, but certainly the unwillingness to publicly confront the idea that father has failed, right, that’s part of the picture too, sure.

FR. DE SOUZA: On the statistics and figures John is correct with one amendment is that if you look over, say, 70 years from now back to the 1940s that figure of around 4 percent is more or less repeated in different places. But the period within that 70 years is not consistent. So from basically 1965 to 1985, 1990 you had a higher
incidence and then lower --

MR. ALLEN: Right.

FR. DE SOUZA: -- lower before and after.

MR. ALLEN: Right.

FR. DE SOUZA: We don’t really know compared to other professions because the research isn’t all that well done. Is it inevitable? I think that there’s -- yes, there are these further investigations. I do think, though, that the news worthiness and the impact of Pennsylvania will be one off because it’s not gonna happen again in that way because people -- dioceses will reveal. What’s interesting about this it’s situated in a very particular thing, then a very general thing. The particular thing is that those places of the church that are very vibrant so a lot of university chaplains use, for example, a lot of parishes mostly in the suburbs, new movements and so forth. Their vibrancy has not been compromised by this over 20 years. They’re growing. Those parts of the church which are anemic have been sometimes just sacrificed and others have been closed and so forth. So what’s happening in general is accelerated by the crisis which is to say that the church will be -- to use a phrase of Pope Benedict long before he became elected -- “will be smaller and more vibrant.” Because to make a commitment to it -- my students on campus if you want to be a practicing Catholic you can’t drift along to that anymore. That’s a decision you have to make and therefore they’re more -- much more impressive than my generation was. So that’s -- this internal reform I would say that I think what’s new about 2018 is that you don’t hear anymore bishops and priests as you did in 2002 saying, well, you know, look, we’re better than that or this is a -- you know, we’re being unfairly maligned here. You can defend, you can do an apologetic for it, but it’s mostly, look, this is a sign that our culture needs to be reformed. So I think it’s actually much more hopeful than in 2002. And they’re not situated really which is the challenge for the church. The church is -- has to understand herself in historical Biblical terms. And what is the historical and Biblical story of ancient Israel and the early church is that there is persecution, difficulty, adversity, fidelity, then there are periods of if you want to say growth, stability, complacency, and corruption, right? And we see that right through the Old Testament several.
And in the times of corruption there’s a purification that comes. And, in fact, the time of Jesus why was he always arguing with the Pharisees and the temple priesthood and so forth was because of a corruption that grew in there. So what I think is new in 2018 as opposed to 2002, 2002 almost all of the energy and the commentary was reforms, practical reforms, you know. How do we run a safe environment program? What do we do when an allegation comes in? How do we set up a lay review board? All that kind of stuff. Today I’m hearing much more is, okay, the church as a whole, the priests in particular, needs a purification. And in some ways, to Amy’s point earlier, the Holy Father is kind of tone deaf, to use her word, on sexual abuse. But in other ways on clerical culture he’s very incisive and that need for reform and there’s a possibility of a kind of, you know, congruency there. So the church will be -- independent of sex abuse the church in terms of the figures we saw from the presentation yesterday is gonna be smaller, I think more vibrant. But there’s gonna be a purification which will be partly painful from outside which is happening and then this internal renewal. And that’s -- that’s the story of the people of God, right, from Abraham onwards. And I think we’re more attentive to that. Very interesting, yesterday in Baltimore the bishops chose to begin their meeting with this day of prayer and reflection about what -- who are we as pastors, where -- what is our call to conversation. They didn’t do that in 2002. Now I don’t doubt that the bishops in 2002 were acting in piety, but you see there’s a difference in -- and they’re doing a whole retreat at the invitation at Pope Francis in January.

**MR. ALLEN:** The only thing -- and I think Fr. Raymond is right in everything he said. The only thing I would add is that we also have to remember that this story plays out very differently in Latino Catholic communities than it does in white Catholic communities. You know, in white Catholic communities this is the unquestion (sic) narrative about the Catholic Church in our time. And, you know, it’s a top priority, you know, et cetera, et cetera. You know, it’s not that Latino Catholics are indifferent or in denial about this, but they have a different reality, right, and therefore often a different perceived set of priorities so that the fight against clerical abuse -- clerical sexual abuse, sure, needs to be there and needs to be part of the mix. But, you know, you would often hear them say that things like, you know, promoting immigration reform, right, would be extraordinarily
important to them, taking care of the newcomer, right, sort of issues of economic and social justice would be just as important. And also because Latino Catholicism today is growing like gangbusters in this country there’s also a vibrancy and a dynamism much more upbeat vibe. You don’t -- you don’t get much of the hand ringing, you know, about what’s gone wrong as you often do in settings -- in different settings. Ines, you still here?

MS. SAN MARTIN: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: Ines covered the in quinero, what was that, June?

MS. SAN MARTIN: No, September.

MR. ALLEN: September. Whatever, they all run together for me. But it’s sort of this big summit, you know, of Hispanic Catholics around America. What is it, three day, four day thing in Dallas?

MS. SAN MARTIN: It’s three days.

MR. ALLEN: Was there much talk about the sexual abuse stuff there?

MS. SAN MARTIN: (Speaking off mic). Very little. I mean, every one of the speakers spoke about it, but actually those in attendance there was a different -- whole different mood (inaudible). Last year in Orlando -- I mean, it’s very interesting. And it’s something (inaudible) than like non-Hispanic Catholics do.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. So just keep that in mind too. That’s part of the picture.

MR. GOOD: That’s good. Jon Ward?

QUESTION 6
MR. WARD: One quick question for Fr. de Souza and then one for both of you. To Fr. de Souza I would just I’m -- maybe you have indicated this, but I am curious whether you agree with John’s assessment that if you looked -- well, that what happened in Pennsylvania has basically happened everywhere. And I think, John, you meant that globally, not just in America.

MR. ALLEN: Correct.

MR. WARD: So I’m curious about your assessment of that statement. And then to both of you I’m really interested in this concept of recordkeeping that Fr. de Souza mentioned. I’m curious what drives that, what set of values or principles drives that and I’m curious what’s to stop parishes or dioceses from scrubbing records
and getting rid of parts of the record to cover stuff up.

FR. DE SOUZA: Right. I would -- I would guess where the cultural and demographic factors are the same as, you know, an Irish, German church in Pennsylvania, other parts of the United States would probably be the same. I think that malfeasance of the clergy, as I just was saying, you know, we have Biblical examples of it. So I don’t imagine that there (inaudible) around the world which are totally immune from this. So to the greater lesser degree I think if you look you’ll find it. To the same extent, I’m not sure. I would say this is where there’s a culture of discipline not just on sexual abuse, but other things there may be less -- fewer incidents. We don’t know that, but that might be. I’ll usually use one example one of the most prominent cardinals in the church, Cardinal Robert Sarah. He’s an African. Had a very heroic life fighting the Communists. He was on a death list and so forth. In his biography he tells a story of shutting down the seminary because there was political activism which resulted in an arson and no one would admit it. So he closed it down. He said any community that cannot confront this evil doesn’t deserve to be called a seminary. It’s impossible to imagine in other parts of the world --

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

FR. DE SOUZA: -- that a bishop would have done that. Now if that’s widespread in Guinea or other places, there might be less of it. But I do think where you go looking for it you will -- you will find it. On recordkeeping what’s the culture? Well, the culture is that the most important thing in Catholic life is the sacraments. And we can -- we record Baptisms and we -- we’re very clear about the integrity of those records and their confirmation and their marriages and so forth of which that’s then part of the culture. So we do keep records. There are archives, there are diocese in archives. They’re not usually kept to say, you know, what will someone ask for 25 years ago, but, you know, for parish histories, diocese histories. So it’s a culture of recordkeeping because it has a central authority. And the central authority always wants to know, okay, if I’m being asked to decide something about that, what’s the history of this? I’m not aware of any Canonical requirement that would insist of the keeping of records for 70 or 80 years. There are requirements that are less than that so I don’t -- I’ve have to look into it.
There are requirements of what has to be kept in the archives. Certainly things to do with parishes, when was it erected, when was the altar dedicated, so forth and other things like that. But whether you have to keep personal rec- -- personnel records from the 1950s I don’t think that’s a Canonical requirement. I think it’s just it was done. You’ve got archives, you put things in there. To my knowledge in Canada and the United States, which is the only place I’m familiar with, there have not been claims by attorneys general or investigators that they went to a diocese and found that, you know, everything before 1965 was burned. But I don’t think that that was prohibited. I just think that that’s not done. Certainly since 2002 and earlier in Canada there’s a sensitivity that if you did destroy records even for housekeeping reasons it would be interpreted as a way to try to avoid justice. So I think the fault mode would be not to destroy personnel -- personnel records today. But I don’t know there’s a Canonical requirement.

MR. ALLEN: The only thing I would add to that is that what records exist and are kept varies widely globally, okay. I mean, Fr. Raymond is describing the situation in the developed first world where you actually have records dating back to the 1950s that are maintained and indexed and you can find them, okay. In much of the Catholic world that just doesn’t happen. I mean, I was just in Nigeria recently, right, and I’m sitting in the Archbishop of Abuja’s residence. It’s in the afternoon. We’re having beers. His -- I don’t know, his like nephew who works at the local bank comes in and says, “Hey, uncle, we have this bond that’s coming out. This would be a really good investment for the church.” And he says, “You sure?” And he’s like, “Yeah. It would be great.” So he goes up and opens this cigar box, you know, full of cash and handles -- hands a kind of wad of cash to his nephew to go out and make this investment. No receipt, no paper trail, no record, no nothing, okay. So what kind of records exist and your ability to get at them, of course, will depend on the culture we’re talking about.

QUESTION 7
MR. GOOD: Carl Cannon? Now you’ve written on this subject, please.

MR. CANNON: (Speaking off mic). Yeah. (Inaudible). But I have a -- I have a question for each of the panelists. John (inaudible) you said at the very outset you made an interesting point. So there’s 70 million American Catholics. I think you said 1.3 million --
MR. ALLEN: Correct.

MR. CANNON: -- worldwide. So --

MR. ALLEN: 6 percent.

MR. CANNON: -- (inaudible).

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MR. CANNON: Okay. So -- I’m sorry. But what’s the -- I don’t want to be crass about it, but what’s --

MR. ALLEN: Money?

MR. CANNON: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MR. CANNON: Yeah. What’s the monetary -- how much -- I mean, is there pressure from the American side on the Vatican because American Catholics raise a lot of money for the world -- for the world mission, for all the other --

MR. ALLEN: Sure.

MR. CANNON: What’s the ratio there?

MR. ALLEN: Well, I mean, first of all, you know, I mean, I know what’s -- if what’s behind that question is can the Americans use their financial influence to drive this up the to do list --

MR. CANNON: Right.

MR. ALLEN: -- right? Alas I have to tell you the answer to that question is basically no.

MR. CANNON: Huh.

MR. ALLEN: You know, I mean, here’s -- I mean, you are right, okay. Every year the Americans and the Germans are by far the two largest contributors to the Vatican’s annual operating budget, okay, by some order of magnitude. Basically speaking, they each would kick in about 15 to 20 percent by themselves, okay, and then everybody else (inaudible). In the Catholic system there is a code in Canon law that diocese are obligated to send money to the Vatican every year for support of the Vatican which -- and how much is determined by how
many people you have, but also how large a budget you have. And in the U.S., like in Germany, it’s the Bishops
Conference that collects all that and then transfers it to Rome. And I always like to say, by the way, our dollars
morally are worth more because in Germany they have a church tax. That’s why they have all that money, you
know, whereas here these are voluntary contributions, right. However, you know, the Vatican’s annual
operating expenses are relatively modest, you know.

FR. DE SOUZA: Well, wait, John. But don’t be so literal about the Vatican’s budget because American Catholics
support all these other --

MR. ALLEN: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

FR. DE SOUZA: -- worldwide --

MR. ALLEN: You’re absolutely right.

FR. DE SOUZA: -- colleges all over the world.

MR. ALLEN: Because in addition to the Vatican’s budget then you have -- like right now the Nineveh Plains
reconstruction project. This heroic effort to rebuild the homes of Christians who were chased out the Nineveh
Plains by ISIS to make it possible for Christianity to survive there, okay. It’s like the Dunkirk’s -- it’s the Catholic
Dunkirk. It’s an incredible story, right. All of that is being financed by American money. It’s Knights of Columbus,
right, and Aid of the Church in Need in the U.S., right, et cetera, et cetera. So, yeah, I mean, the United States is
-- and, look, I mean, we are considered the money bags of the Catholic Church. There’s no question about it,
right. Why did all those American bishops get -- get invited down to Haiti, right, after the hurricane? Because
they were expected to bring cash, right. Why did we even get invited to Puerto Rico? Why do they want us to go
to the Middle East, everywhere, okay? It’s just like the default thing, right. And so, yeah, that certainly does buy
some influence, man, no question about it and some gratitude. But it’s a double-edged sword, Carl, because for
every Catholic around the world -- let’s say Catholic bishops. Let’s talk about the leadership class. For every
Catholic bishop around the world who is grateful for American (inaudible) there’s another one who resents
American arrogance who thinks that we believe that because we have the money we ought to get our way all of
the time, right. It just makes them -- gets their backs up even more. I mean, something nobody here has asked but it’s a fascinating question to pursue is Pope Francis’s attitude towards the United States, not just the sex abuse crisis, but just towards the United States, period, right. And I would submit he is one of these churchman who feels that ambivalence. On the one hand he admires the generosity of the United States wherever -- whenever there is a tragedy or a calamity someplace. On the other hand he also I think believes that Americans are a bit arrogant and a bit insular, a bit accustomed to getting their own way. And if you asked occasionally why is Pope Francis not willing to do the obvious thing in the United States, you know, that might maybe turn a pastoral corner, whatever, I think that’s part of the picture.

MR. CANNON: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: And the same point applies to the money, right? I mean, a lot of these guys would say, yeah, we desperately need the United States and its financial contributions, but on the other hand we got to make it clear to those guys that that doesn’t mean that they’re gonna run the show.

MR. CANNON: All right. Fr. Raymond, I have an even tougher question for you.

FR. DE SOUZA: Okay. All right.

MR. CANNON: You know, you said at the -- you mentioned that the church goes through times it needs purification. On this issue I have a slightly different perspective. I’m not Catholic, but I wrote about this. In 2002 what was so shocking to me personally -- and not just me, Jason Berry who John knows, there was a group called SNAPS, survivors of --

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MR. CANNON: -- priest abuse. What shocked them in 2002 was that this was still going on. We -- this was 15 year -- this seems to happen in 15-year increments like the San Andreas Fault or something. And in 1987 and 1980 the bishops had a meeting. In 1987 the head of the Catholic bishops (inaudible) said he was instituting reforms. All these things were already supposed to happen. One of the reason this story went away is people thought it was dealt with. MR ALLEN: Yeah.
MR. CANNON: And, you know, Thomas Doyle did a report for the church warning them. He was a chaplain at the Air Force. And these stories were not obscure (inaudible) 39 newspapers, New York Times wrote stories about our stories. I was on the Phil Donohue Show, me and Jason Berry were.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MR. CANNON: Georg-- I got an award at the Correspondent’s Association, George--

MR. ALLEN: Did you go--

MR. CANNON: -- Bush handed it to me.

MR. ALLEN: -- on with him on Oprah?

MR. CANNON: No. She wasn’t a think yet. It was Phil Donohue. He was the -- he was the Oprah.

FR. DE SOUZA: That’s how long ago it was.

MR. ALLEN: Well, Jason later did Oprah because he did this famous essay about --

MR. CANNON: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: -- life beyond Oprah.

MR. CANNON: Right. So, you know, so this -- I’m not saying this to -- the Boston Globe wrote about it then, so did the Times. So I’m saying -- I’m wondering if it’s not a story that keeps coming up, but it’s a scandal that keeps coming up. And that are you -- are you guys -- are you sure the root problem has really been dealt with? These reforms are what they are, but, you know, as a -- what’s -- despite what John said about the ratio, is -- have been -- has the root problem been dealt with? Why are we -- are priests still being produced to do this kind of thing, are the seminars still the way they were? Because as a Protestant my mind goes not just to reforms of reporting, but to married priests, women priests, that sort of that’s what comes up. I didn’t write about that at the time. I stayed clear of it, but I’m wondering now if that’s where the conversation needs to go so this won’t happen again what’s 15 years from now? 15 years from now.

FR. DE SOUZA: Right. It is a more difficult question. I think that -- this is gonna be the last response here so what has animated many of John’s responses that I would echo is that what’s being looked at in 2018 is a culture --
the culture of the priesthood, not so much the institutional reforms that occupied most of the attention before. I’ll use a simple example. When the Pennsylvania report came out and the McCarrick business came out Cardinal Wuerl went to Rome, he met with the Pope and he said, “What should I do?” Pope said, “Go back and ask your priests do you have their confidence.” So he went back, he talked to his priests and priests to his face said, “On this issue we don’t believe you’re telling us the truth.” I don’t think that’s ever happened before, I mean, not in that kind of formal setting and it led to his resignation. That aspect truth telling, transparency, a willingness not to look away when there’s something difficult to look at, that’s not -- that -- the institutional reforms are the procedures that were put in place whenever in Canada in 1992, 2002 the Dallas Charter. They didn’t get at that. What we do know is that as best as we can tell the number of incidents has dropped. So are there priests today going through who at the same rate seem to offend? That does not seem to be the case since 2002. That’s what people who look at this tell us. But what’s got people angry and where I think the potential for good reform is now is on there’s cultural issues which I don’t mean the culture being Latino versus Irish or whatever. What I mean is what’s the internal culture of the priesthood and do we correct whether it’s on sexual misconduct or financial misconduct? I’ll give you a concrete example from my own life. Some young priests that I know, I’m kind of a mentor to them, took a holiday. They went to some all-inclusive resort. Nothing happened of an immoral nature. But I just thought that’s not really, really a priestly place to be. You can do other things for recreation. It’s kind of an indulgent environment. And I correct them on that. That -- we need more of that. And would I have done it ten years ago? Probably not. I think there’s gonna be more of that. And that’s what will lead to a holier priesthood. As to the other issues the celibacy of priests, male priesthood, those issues they’re not as prevalent now as they were in the 1990s in terms of just discussion. They will be returned whenever you discuss the priesthood. But I think that the -- you know, whether the sex abuse crisis will be solved by that generally seems not to be thought to be that married priests don’t have these problems or the churches that have them. But I think that’s where the -- that’s where the reform is gonna be. And I think -- I don’t know, but I think I can -- I know and the world (inaudible) there are things that we can speak about in the
priesthood today that we just never did, you know, privately or in collectively where we challenge each other on, you know, truth telling and upright living and so forth and including doctrinal liturgical coherence. Now that’s -- that’s my hope. It’s always possible that when something’s bad it could get worse and it’s always possible that an evil thing could not be a spiritual reform, but just destructive. So I can’t guarantee that this path that I’m indicating will be followed. But that, I think, is what’s open to us now. In 2002 what really all the energy went into procedural and administrative responses. There’s gonna be a bit of that, but the fact that yesterday’s agenda in Baltimore -- this week’s agenda in Baltimore was partly administrative procedural and partly pastoral conversion I think shows the difference.

MR. GOOD: That’s a very I think helpful --

MR. ALLEN: Just one very quick note, Carl. There is one bit of structural reform. You asked has the job been done to make sure this doesn’t happen again. The one bit of structural reform that has not happened for 20 years now is a meaningful system of accountability for the cover up of the abuse, not just the crime. And until there is a transparent, effective procedure for holding superiors accountable it is folly to pretend that this -- that the job has been done.

MR. GOOD: There’s clearly a thickness and a heaviness and I think an excellence in expertise represented in the presentations that you guys have each shared. We are grateful for that.