

Fordham Center on Religion and Culture

Reckoning and Reform: New Horizons on the Clergy Abuse Crisis

The 2019 Russo Family Lecture

Tuesday, March 26, 2019
12th Floor Lounge | Fordham University
113 West 60th Street | New York, N.Y.

Moderator:

Peter Steinfelds

Co-founder, Fordham Center on Religion and Culture

Speakers:

Margaret Leland Smith

Quantitative criminologist, Institute for Criminal Justice Ethics at John Jay College of Criminal Justice; researcher in the areas of the institutional contexts of the sexual abuse of youth and the social and ethical implications of artificial intelligence

Karen Terry

*Professor in the Department of Criminal Justice at John Jay College of Criminal Justice; faculty member in the Criminal Justice Doctoral Program at the Graduate Center, CUNY; author of *Sexual Offenses and Offenders: Theory, Practice, and Policy**

DAVID GIBSON: Good afternoon. Last entrants taking your seats. My name's David Gibson. I'm the Director of the Center on Religion and Culture here at Fordham, and I want to welcome you to this special symposium, our two-part event, Reckoning and Reform: New Horizons on the Clergy Abuse Crisis.

Can everyone hear me okay? Great.

This is the latest in what is an ongoing series of programs at Fordham dedicated to plumbing the depths of the crisis and hopefully pointing toward some constructive paths forward.

As we plan these events we always need to be mindful that the survivors of abuse must be at the center of our concern. They are not just the subjects of our attention but are the very protagonists of this drama, this narrative.

Their views and experience must always be central, and I'd also note that even as they usually refer to themselves as "survivors" rather than "victims," there are far too many who in fact do not survive the abuse. The wounds are so deep and lasting that it claims their lives somewhere down the road. That happens far too often, as we know.

Before we start I'd just like to take a moment of silence to remember them.

[A moment of silence was observed]

Reckoning and Reform. The title of this symposium sets out our plan this evening. In order to begin to resolve the problems we need to first understand them, to reckon with what has happened and why.

The best and most impressive efforts to do that in the Catholic context have been the two reports commissioned initially by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) and conducted by researchers at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, right here around the corner. First was the 2004 report, *The Nature and Scope of the Problem of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests and Deacons in the United States*, and then the followup 2011 report, *The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States*.

We're truly privileged today to have the principal investigator and data analyst on those studies here with us, Karen Terry and Margaret Smith, to give us an overview and update on their research.

Karen Terry is a professor in the Department of Criminal Justice at John Jay College and a faculty member in the Criminal Justice Doctoral Program at the Graduate Center, CUNY. Her research focuses on sexual offenders and victims, specifically the abuse of children in institutional settings. She's the author of *Sexual Offenses and Offenders: Theory, Practice, and Policy*.

Margaret Leland Smith is a quantitative criminologist at the Institute for Criminal Justice Ethics at John Jay, where she teaches courses in statistics and the ethics of information technology. In addition to the continuing work on the institutional contexts of the sexual abuse of youth, her current research focus is on the social and ethical implications of the development of artificial intelligence.

I'd also note among our guests this evening is another expert who worked on the John Jay studies with them, Sister Katarina Schuth, who came in from St. Thomas University in Minnesota to be with us, a terrific expert on seminary education as well, which is a vital link in this whole chain of causes and contexts.

Following their presentation, Peter Steinfelds will lead a discussion with Karen and Maggie, and also during the presentation please write any questions you might have on the note cards under your seats, and we'll collect them afterward to use in our discussions.

Now, on to you, Maggie and Terry. Thank you.

PROFESSOR KAREN TERRY: [Slide] Thank you, David, and it is a pleasure to be here today speaking with all of you. I'm Karen Terry, and Maggie and I are going to be talking today about the studies that we did for the Catholic Church, *The Nature and Scope of the Problem of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests and Deacons in the United States* and *The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States*.

We are also going to talk about some of the updates that have come out since we published our findings in those studies, both in the United States and also worldwide.

I would like to thank Sister Katarina Schuth for coming here as well, who did help us with the *Causes and Context* study, particularly on the issue of formation.

We began this project in 2002, when Kathleen McChesney, who is the Director of the Office of Child and Youth Protection, came to John Jay and asked our then-president Gerald Lynch if he thought that we could help in the investigation of this problem of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church.

In 2002, of course, was kind of the height of this crisis as reports were being made every day in the media and in particular in *The Boston Globe*, *The New York Times*, and *The Los Angeles Times*. In 2002 over 2000 reports were published. There were a number of victims who were coming forward to report the abuse in record numbers in that year.

[Slide] We knew that child sexual abuse has long been a widespread phenomenon, and we wanted to better understand the extent of this problem within the Catholic Church.

What we know today is that there is widespread abuse in a number of institutions where youth interact with adults, particularly in situations where adults have the ability to interact with and mentor and nurture children and adolescents. This includes a number of religious institutions, schools, childcare facilities, sports, and social organizations such as the Boy Scouts of America. Even just this week in *The Atlantic* there was an article published about the extent of abuse in Jehovah's Witnesses and the systematic cover-up of that abuse by the elders.

So what we're going to do is we're going to start by talking about the *Nature and Scope* study and the findings there. I'm going to turn this over to Maggie, who's going to talk to you about the data that we collected there and some of the updated findings for that, and then we'll start to talk about the *Causes and Context*.

PROFESSOR MARGARET LELAND SMITH: [Slide] Greetings. Happy to have a chance to talk about this information.

The challenge of the *Nature and Scope* study was: What happened? When did it happen? How widespread was it? And what is the impact financially on the church?

[Slide] We were initially asked to select a sample of dioceses to study, but it was clear, although we know that sexual abuse of youth is very widespread, we had no idea what its shape would be in the church, so it wasn't possible to make a sample, and we had to ask the USCCB to require all dioceses to submit a survey on each priest or cleric who had been accused and one on each victim who had come forward.

So that's what we did, and in order to do this kind of research as ethical professionals, we are required to protect the confidentiality of all individuals. So the dioceses and staff completed the surveys. They were sent to an independent auditor, who removed all indications of the source, meaning the diocese. There were no individual names, and they came to us with numbers.

This process of anonymization has often been challenged, but I want to say that we would not have been able to do this work if we had not been able to guarantee that that information would not become public about the individual specifics of a victim or a cleric or a diocese.

[Slide] The response was very good; 97 percent of dioceses and 63 percent of religious institutes participated by submitting surveys.

[Slide] What do we know now that we didn't know then? A lot of people then said to us: "Well, how can we believe what the church said? If they paid for your study, how could it

be believable?” That question was asked to us many times.

Since the last year of data that we got in 2002 the dioceses have been asked to report to the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA) the new allegations they received every year between 2004 and 2017. And for those who still feel that that might be not as straightforward as it should be, there are a number of commissions and studies that have taken sources directly from victims and from criminal justice or forensic sources and so are not limited by simply the reports of the Catholic leaders, and that would include the Royal Commission in Australia as well as the recent work produced by the Catholic Conference of German Bishops, and in Poland there is a new work. Also, in the state of Pennsylvania the special report gathered information from multiple sources.

[Slide] The *Nature and Scope* results were that approximately 4 percent of priests in ministry in U.S. dioceses were involved in abuse and that many people thought that this is just an urban problem — this is just San Francisco; this is just Boston; this is just New York.

But that was not the case. Throughout the country, the percentage of priests accused ranged between 3 and 6 percent per diocese, small ones, large ones, urban ones, and not.

We received information on 10,667 victims, and of the diocesan priest percentage in terms of those in service in this period from 1950 to 2002, 4.6 percent of diocesan priests had received an allegation of abuse. In terms of the religious institutes, that percentage is 2.7.

[Slide] What do we know now? If we compare the percentages that are produced by the other work, 7 percent of priests in service in the Catholic Church in Australia. This is based on a similar survey that they carried out within their church hierarchy; in Germany, 4.4 percent; in Poland, we don't have a percentage. The report was just released, 362 priests. So the percentages are not dissimilar.

[Slide] In *Nature and Scope* we found that two-thirds were diocesan priests, mostly pastors or associate pastors. The age range was very wide, from some young priests to some very elderly.

The term “generalist” here, that means that the victims were not always one particular age group or gender, but in fact those priests with more than one victim often had heterogeneous victims, victims with different sex and different age.

Pedophilia was not common. This has now been confirmed by several other studies, but less than 5 percent would have fulfilled the clinical definition of pedophilia.

However, the duration of offending, although approximately half had only one known victim, there were many cases where the abuse went on for years and years, and so the average duration is almost five years for those who had more than one allegation.

[Slide] We know in criminal justice as professionals that many people commit one minor crime or one crime and are arrested, and then a very small number of people commit many, many crimes and are arrested over and over again. This pattern, which has been consistent over time and in forensic research, is replicated here.

In *Nature and Scope* 3.5 percent of priests had ten or more victims, and they were responsible for more than a quarter of the total of the almost 11,000 victims.

It is really a significant problem that this situation that exists in the world of deviance exists in this situation as well, in terms of those who deal with youth. The differences between those we call “serial predators” and others have to do with how long the behavior persisted, diversity of gender and age, more and more deliberate grooming of victims, and the longer delay on the part of victims for disclosure of the abuse.

This is not surprising given the amount of time that a victim had spent in an abusive relationship. I say that term “relationship,” but for those for whom it went on for years it was a form of relationship of abuse.

[Slide] Here is what we knew. This is the distribution of age and gender. What we have represented in the next few graphs are remarkably consistent percentages, and what that says about what we know about the truly unknown dimension of this problem of sexual abuse of youth specifically in the Catholic Church is that we see the same percentages repeated again and again.

What that means is that what we are getting are samples from a problem whose underlying dimensions are unknown but can be regularly represented: 80.9 percent of victims that we knew of in 2002 were male, and almost 60 percent between ten and fourteen.

[Slide] When we look at the victims who disclosed their abuse between 2004 and 2017 we find that the percentages are exactly the same.

I want to reinforce this. These are 8645 victims who came forward after our research was published in the annual reports that are carried out through the USCCB and tallied by CARA. The percentages are exactly the same.

[Slide] What else do we know that’s new? We know that most people, most victims, were not able to come forward immediately but waited for some time to be able to discuss or reveal what had happened to them.

In the John Jay study 10 percent waited one year. In Australia 5 percent reported within one year. The Australia lags in reporting were more pronounced than in the United States, but the pattern is similar.

[Slide] What happened? Well, we anticipated at John Jay that we would receive reports that would be false and that would be obviously untrue or that would be about simply a bad touch or an extreme hug or a flirt or something like that, but that was not the case.

The reports we received were substantially about explicit sexual abuse. That means explicit sexual touch with an erotic component on the part of the abuser. This is echoed in terms of Germany — 80 percent were hands-on offenses — and in Australia as well.

The age group that we found, the adolescent males, this is replicated again in the Pennsylvania dioceses data, in the German data, and in Australia, perhaps a little younger in Australia.

I should comment that the Australian abuse, a substantial amount of it took place in residential schools, which may account somewhat for the younger age. But the patterns are similar. We have vulnerable adolescents, primarily male adolescents, being victimized in their homes or in the homes or residences of the priests whom they trusted.

[Slide] This is a famous slide that we published, and it shows you the total dimension of

the abuse for the period of 1950 to 2002 with a block around what we call the “peak of abuse,” the time period that created the highest level of abuse.

[Slide] What do we know now? The first two slides are equivalent in height, so the first one in blue is what we knew in 2002; the second on the right in blue is what we know after 2002 from the United States. These show that even though the time has gone forward the pattern of abuse remains in the same place.

The Pennsylvania incidents are in purple, and the Australian incidents, these are the events of abuse counted in the years in which they began.

Although we collected data directly from the church and that people thought that perhaps what we had was not accurate, it does look like it has been substantially confirmed by the studies that have been carried out in the intervening period of time.

[Slide] This is when the abuse was revealed. The box at the bottom shows the peak of abuse when it was taking place, between 1974 and 1982, and this spike is in 2002, when 3399 individuals came forward. So this discrepancy is one that often is overlooked when the discussions take place about what was done. It’s a question of what was done based on what was known.

[Slide] Here’s a complicated slide. People still have questions about, and say to us, “Well, as time goes forward more victims will come forward because the events would have happened more recently.”

This is showing the number of allegations that CARA received every three years between 2004 and 2017 and the percentage that began before 1985. So time is going by, but the reports are being brought in for abuse that happened many years ago, and the current abuse, which is the list of abuse after 2000, is rising somewhat but is still very small.

So this question of disclosure and reporting is a major pattern that we discovered, and it’s one that we fear will also be applicable in other environments where youth are connected to adults.

[Slide] In summary, what we found from *Nature and Scope* appears to be stable in terms of when things happened and when they were known. Male adolescents are the primary victims. More than half of priests had a single known victim. This has been replicated in Germany and in Australia as well.

The amount of damage done by persistent offenders remains a significant challenge. And although most incidents of abuse were substantiated in the *Nature and Scope* data, it is becoming more difficult for CARA and for the dioceses to do that substantiation because people are no longer present.

But when I reviewed all the CARA reports a very small fraction have been found to be false, a very small fraction. We think that the current studies that gather data directly from victims and directly from forensic sources do not produce anything that is inconsistent with what the church reported and that we summarized.

[Slide] Then we engaged some consultants, Professor James Kelly, Emeritus from Fordham, Sister Katarina Schuth from St. Thomas, and other graduate students to help us work on the reasons for what would explain the peak in behavior.

The most profound question: Why was the harm of the abuse not understood? Why was

it not understood in 1985? Why was it not understood in 1995? And are there risk factors or individual characteristics that would allow the dioceses or others to identify people who would be potential sex offenders? How has seminary education changed? And what role did the church leadership play? Finally, how do we understand the situations in which this abuse arose?

[Slide] We gathered a very substantial amount of information using: analyses of society; analyses of seminary education; surveys with priests who had abused and those who had not; we coded the original data from Eugene Kennedy's archival data from his 1991 study; surveys of survivors and victim assistance coordinators; and clinical files.

We were granted access to the clinical data in a very complicated way that guaranteed the review of the files would be done by the employees of the clinics, but they would then fill out the surveys and give them to us. This allowed us to have a glimpse at much more expanded information about the men who were sent to treatment by their diocese.

Finally, we carried out conversations and surveys with bishops and other diocesan leaders and with victim advocates.

[Slide] So what is the reason for the rise in incidents and the peak between 1978 and 1982? This is also the peak of massive resignation from the ministry. Why? Because there was a change in society that led people to expect more individual freedom in sexuality.

These are what we call social indicators, aspects that can be measured in society, that indicate underlying changes in attitude. Birth to single mothers increases, divorce increases, crime, drug use, and disorder all increase during this period of time.

It was once thought that what goes on in the Catholic Church is different than what goes on in the society, but we did not find that to be the case.

[Slide] This is a complicated slide I added. The red line at the bottom is the count of individuals who were diagnosed with pedophilia. You'll see that it doesn't change. When individuals have psychological disposition to abuse it is not something that's affected in the changes in society over time. That's a straight line.

We worked with Professor Cimboric. He hypothesized that there was something called ephrophilia, which was a specific attraction to adolescent males of a certain age. The green line shows the cases that would have fulfilled that categorization, an exclusive attraction to males of a certain pubescent age.

The blue line is those who had one single accusation of abuse.

The most significant curve at the top is what we call the generalists or the multiples. These are individuals who had abuse incidents with males and females or with younger children and older children, with adolescents, and with seventeen-year-olds.

So it looks to us as though the behaviors that are most affected by society are the ones that are least categorizable by psychological disposition.

[Slide] So why did it go down in the 1980s? What happened so that the incidents dropped?

In many ways this is a reaction to the changes between the 1960s and the 1970s. We have

the recognition of familial abuse, the recognition for the first time that it is unlawful to strike your wife, it is unlawful to strike your child. You forget that these things were not against the law in major parts of the United States in the 1960s.

We had major changes, moving from a single statute for rape to a much wider framework for understanding sexual abuse.

And, beginning in 1985 with the notorious case of Gilbert Gauthé, there was recognition of the problem within the church. There was advocacy by former victims, some of whom were priests, Father Doyle, and internal discussions initiated by the USCCB that began in the 1990s and explain in part the wider recognition of the harm within the widespread Catholic Church and also the increase in reporting at that time.

[Slide] The people who were ordained in earlier years are still offending many years later, but the people who are ordained later, in the 1970s and 1980s, are offending much more quickly. We take this to be another indication of the impact of social influence. It's important to recognize these were distinct differences in the behavior.

[Slide] Sister Katarina guided us through the work on seminary education, but seminaries expanded after the war. Opportunities for young Catholics were not as widespread as they are today. We found that there was a suspicion that those who went to minor seminaries would be more represented in abuse. We didn't find that to be the case and that as seminary education changed, we saw a change in development in teaching of human formation.

[Slide] What did the clinical data tell us? It told us what all the criminologists who work in this field understand, that you cannot predict abusive sexual behavior. We found in one study that those who had been sexually victimized themselves as children were slightly more likely to abuse, but in general there were not factors that would allow potential abusers to be identified in advance.

[Slide] One of the most striking studies is that the clinical data revealed that 80 percent of the men who had abused minors had also generally subsequently been involved with adult females. This is something that has not gotten widespread recognition, but it does show that what we have here is a response perhaps to loneliness, to a need for intimacy, a lack of ability to respect boundaries, but it was not widespread pedophilia.

Those who had sexual experience before coming to the seminary were more likely to have sexual experience after the seminary or after ordination but with adults.

There was discussion of the fact that there was written documentation by scholars that the conversation about homosexuality was present in seminaries in the 1980s, but that is when the incidence of abuse declined. Actually, some of our respondents said that it was great to have the conversation, even if it was prompted by those who defined themselves as homosexual.

So you have behavior when you have no discussion, and then when you have conversation and the ability to talk about human sexuality you have a decrease, a rapid decline in the incidence of abuse following that period of time. The abuse of those educated in the seminary who were ordained in the 1980s drops precipitously.

[Slide] Karen's going to come back to talk about the response within the church to the allegations of abuse and then move on to the wider dimensions of this problem in the society we live in.

PROFESSOR KAREN TERRY: What do we know about the responses by the church leadership to these allegations of abuse? What we do know is that they were largely inadequate, but we also know that the types of responses changed over time.

Maggie talked about 1985 as a pivotal year. One of the things that we looked at in the *Causes and Context* study is if the leaders' responses to allegations of abuse changed before and after that time period.

We know that 840 cases of abuse had been reported to the dioceses prior to 1985, even though we know now that much of the abuse that had taken place had already happened by that time. These were just reported much later.

We know that prior to 1985 the primary focus by leaders was on helping the priests, not the victims, and often this meant sending them for either spiritual or psychological treatment.

We also know that many were reprimanded and returned to ministry at that time. In fact, 35 percent of priests with allegations of abuse between 1950 and 1979 were reprimanded and returned to ministry, but only 4 percent were reprimanded and returned to ministry by the year 2000. So again, this is a shift in the type of responses over time.

By 1985 we know that there were widespread discussions about sexual abuse of minors amongst a body of bishops. We know that there had been sexual abuse cases reported in at least half of the dioceses by that time.

There was an ad hoc committee on sexual abuse that was created. The bishops published *The Cardinal's Commission on Clerical Sexual Misconduct with Minors* in 1992 that was led by Cardinal Bernardin that said some of the recommendations that were made by others, such as Father Doyle and victim advocates, were largely ignored even at that time.

[Slide] Because of the church's lack of response on an institutional level to victims of abuse, a number of advocacy groups began to form, such as the Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests (SNAP), which was founded in 1988 and held their first conference in 1991. Later we see the creation of Voice of the Faithful. I believe they formed in the year 2000. But this is also in response to the lack of response on an institutional level to victims of abuse.

Despite this intensive work by individuals and advocacy groups, there was little change over a decade from that period of 1985 to 1993. What we did see is the publication in 1993 of *Restoring Trust*, which published the five principles.

[Slide] These resulted from a lot of that work that was done by some of those church leaders at that time, such as Cardinal Bernardin.

What are the five principles?

- (1) To respond promptly to these allegations of abuse;
- (2) To remove the offender when there is sufficient evidence;
- (3) To comply with all of the obligations of civil law;
- (4) To reach out to victims and their families and communicate with them; and
- (5) To deal as openly as possible about the abuse with members of the community.

[Slide] Unfortunately, despite the good intentions of these five principles, they were not

implemented consistently across dioceses, and by 2002 many of the bishops that we spoke to did not even know what these principles were.

So what happened after this time, between 1993 and 2002? Many of the things that we saw prior to 1985. We still saw a lack of follow-up on reports of abuse. Many priests were still being returned to ministry, often after treatment and without supervision.

There was still very little communication with civil authorities or with the Vatican. The only times canonical procedures were initiated were in the most severe cases of repeated abuse.

There were some leaders, including cardinals, who even denied knowledge of sexual abuse within their dioceses under oath, even though we know now that allegations of abuse had been reported at that time.

[Slide] What happened post-2002? Well, we know that meaningful change did happen, but it was slow and inconsistent. There are a number of policies that resulted from the Charter, in particular safe environment training and external audits to ensure that there is compliance by all of the dioceses with the various types of safe environment training for the protection of children and young people.

We also know that there are 181 dioceses today that have released names of all the credibly accused priests. That is about 92 percent of dioceses in the United States, and those are all online, so those are accessible lists of credibly accused priests from almost all of the dioceses in the United States.

We also see that there are now criminal and canonical investigations of very high-level bishops and cardinals who were accused of abuse themselves or thought to be covering up allegations of abuse.

There are also many civil investigations into abuse in a number of states in the United States today.

[Slide] What's our focus in 2019? It's accountability of leaders. The focus has shifted from the abuse itself, the abusers themselves, to those who covered up or allegedly covered up the allegations of abuse, tried to prevent disclosure, and really their responsibility for failure of supervision.

Again, looking at very specific examples of failure of leadership we have McCarrick, Cardinal Wuerl's resignation as examples of what we've seen just in the last year, and we know that there are currently thirteen states and the District of Columbia looking into investigations of abuse and the cover-up.

[Slide] What are the recommendations and policies at this time?

[Slide] Throughout the 2000s the abuse by Catholic priests was viewed almost exclusively as an American problem in the United States. This is despite the fact that there were patterns evident in the Canadian Catholic Church that had come out before that, but it had not received the same level of media attention as it did in the United States.

But by 2010 we began to see reports emerging in South America, Europe, and Australia about widespread abuse in the Catholic Church. There were a number of commissions that were formed; there were a number of reports made; and a number of researchers began to study this problem worldwide.

Here's an example of some of the reports that have been issued as a result of that work.

[Slide] In the Australian Royal Commission report that Maggie mentioned earlier on the role of organizational culture on child sexual abuse, the author, Palmer and his colleagues, described an organizational culture as the “assumptions, values, beliefs, and norms that are associated with organizations.”

One of the cultural factors that scholars have associated with the organizational response to abuse is a hierarchical structure within the church and the priests' and bishops' power and authority within the church so each diocese is basically its own entity, and the bishops have much discretion in how they responded to individual problems within those dioceses. They had the power to make nearly unilateral decisions that were rarely questioned.

Even the most serious cases were handled through internal mechanisms within the church. They were not handled by external civil authorities. This is particularly true prior to the 1980s. The leadership's use of these internal mechanisms and lack of transparency about the responses they were taking was one of the most critical flaws in the church's response to abuse at this time.

Again, most importantly, little attention was given to the harm that was caused to victims, so several reports called the sexual abuse crisis in the Catholic Church a “moral failure,” not just because of the harm to the thousands of youths but because the priest abusers and others who knew about or suspected that this abuse was taking place failed to live up to the most basic of their pastoral commitments, which is the care of the most vulnerable in their community.

[Slide] Palmer in his report for the Royal Commission identified five factors that he believes inhibit the response to abuse victims from an organization, and one he described as “motivated blindness.” He said this is the unconscious drive to ignore information that would require them to take actions. For example, maybe they're not accurately identifying some of the grooming behaviors that they saw or some of the abuse that they might have seen occurring.

Second, he noted the cognitive dissonance, which is this uncomfortable feeling you have that is a disconnection between the good person that you know that you're hearing about committing these bad acts and that disconnect.

Third, he said that people tend to support those with whom they interact and those within the organization.

They also have an in-group bias where members consider themselves better or different than nonmembers, and they have a sense of moral superiority, are prone to groupthink, or discount outsiders' criticisms.

Finally, the more power the perpetrator has, the less effective the institutional response is going to be to the victims, and this is something that's really critical that we've seen in a variety of different types of organizations, and not just in the Catholic Church.

[Slide] So what did these commissions recommend? They issued largely consistent recommendations. All of those commissions and reports from all of those different countries over a period of time had similar recommendations.

They said that you need to respond quickly and fully to allegations of abuse. Those actions have to be transparent, and you really have to focus on the wellbeing of the victim, develop this restorative process for those who were abused. And in order to prevent abuse from happening in the future, you need to improve formation and ensure consistent implementation of safeguarding policies.

[Slide] The Catholic Church implemented a number of abuse-prevention policies that were based upon those recommendations. A lot of these policies focused on micro-level or individual people. So, background checks of people who were applying to come into the priesthood, psychological screening, education and training of individuals within the church. They also implemented a number of these situational crime-prevention policies.

[Slide] Why is that situational context so important? Well, situational factors play a critical role because abuse often occurs in private, and as Maggie noted the most common place for abuse to occur that we found within the *Nature and Scope* study — and it was replicated in other studies — is in the home of the priest or also in the home of the victim.

Diocesan priests tend to live alone in the parish residence. There is very little supervision, if any, and they have high levels of isolation, very little external oversight, and we found that at times they were bringing youths back to the parish residence where they were abusing them as there was very little supervision.

Opportunity can also help to explain the large number of male victims within the Catholic Church. We know that there is a lot of opportunity for priests to interact with adolescent males. They served as altar boys; they went on retreats and spent time overnight with the priests in various situations. This often did not happen with girls.

Something that's particularly interesting to note is that when girls were able to serve as altar servers for the first time in 1983 we started to see a shift in the gender of victims, so that by the mid-1990s the gender of victims was almost equal between boys and girls. So again, you see that major shift at that time when there was more access suddenly to females.

The situational crime-prevention model focuses on preventing opportunities for abuse to occur, and that is particularly important because it's not possible to screen out all potential offenders.

Janet Warren — a professor of psychiatry and neurobehavioral sciences who evaluated the Boy Scouts files — stated that: “It must be recognized that no mental health professional, scientific researcher, law enforcement agency, or youth-serving organization has ever created a scientifically valid profile of a probable child sex offender. It's an unfortunate reality that child sex offenders until they act are indistinguishable from other members of society. No one has yet designed a reliable checklist or similar document to flag persons who will someday go on to abuse children.”

So the situational crime-prevention model works to reduce the vulnerability of potential targets largely by educating them, educating children, educating the families, and educating the community about abuse and what it is and how to respond. The policies also enhance guardianship of potential victims through policies such as two-deep leadership, meaning that individual children and adolescents are not allowed to be alone with a single individual adult and that there have to be at least two adults with a child at any given time.

[Slide] And so while situational factors can help explain how the priests had or created

opportunities to abuse, it's really these cultural factors that can help explain how the abuse was able to persist over a long period of time and why it was not recognized or reported.

Palmer referred to this as an "organizational culture," which refers to the assumptions, values, beliefs, and norms that are associated with the organization. He called the church an "institutionalized" organization, where members take on the identity of the organization, protect it from criticism, and overlook negative issues within to protect that external reputation, and threats to the organization's image are perceived as issues that need to be managed really to minimize their negative effect.

So we look at some of these macro-level factors, like the change in culture, and these are very challenging issues to change. It requires a change in the culture of all the people who are involved in that community, but there is variability in buy-in. That is what we have seen in the church throughout the United States and in other countries as well.

And it's particularly challenging when you have oversight that is externally imposed, for instance, from the courts, from insurance companies, or even from the audits, where they're being told what to do, but the change has not necessarily developed from within.

[Slide] We know that change in institutions can happen, but institutional change is slow, and there has to be a commitment to reform by the organizational leaders. But the Catholic Church faces similar challenges to other institutions.

We know that prevention of abuse is a critical factor in all youth-serving organizations again that we've looked at over the past decade. As Palmer said, there are no comprehensive large-scale studies on the frequency of child sexual abuse across the full range of organizations delivering services to children and young people.

So one of the questions that we've been asked is: What does the problem in the Catholic Church look like compared to other institutions? And the answer is, it's very hard to say because we do not have comparable data in any other institution other than the Catholic Church.

What we do know is that there's a recognition of problematic behavior that often results from high-profile cases or court cases and that many of these organizations do experience similar problems and have similar institutional responses to what we witnessed in the Catholic Church.

[Slide] For context, I'm going to talk a bit about what has happened within the Boy Scouts.

Since the 1920s the Boy Scouts has kept files on individuals that they deem ineligible to join the Boy Scouts as volunteers, and these are called their "Ineligible Volunteer" files or IV files.

There have been more than fifty significant lawsuits against the Boy Scouts of America (BSA) for allegations of sexual abuse, and a number of these IV files were required to be released by the courts as a result of these cases, and in particular in 2012 the Oregon Supreme Court ordered the release of files held by the BSA from 1965 to 1985. These had been submitted as evidence in a case in 2010.

Based on the release of those files as well as a few others that had been released from other court cases, John Jay now has a total of 2440 of these IV files that were released as

a result of civil suits, and these cases span the years 1965 to 1991.

[Slide] What we know is that most of those who had allegations of abuse within the Boy Scouts were scoutmasters or other volunteers. They had mostly male victims. Much of the abuse occurred in the same places as we found in the Catholic Church, in the home of the abusers, on retreats, or during other activities that had been planned by the abusers, and the abusers used emotional manipulation much in the same way that they did in the church.

We also know that about half of the abusers had one victim, again very similar to that 55 percent that we saw in the Catholic Church, and 3.5 percent had ten or more victims, where we saw again in the Catholic Church that 3.2 percent had ten or more victims. So again, you're looking at a small number of individuals who are responsible for a large amount of the abuse that happened in that organization as well.

What we know is that the files that we have cover the peak period of abuse, but we don't have files prior to 1965, and we don't have files after 1991 that might show some of the changes that resulted from the Boy Scouts. So we can't compare it completely to the information that we have from the Catholic Church, but we do know that like the Catholic Church it is an institutionalized organization or has been called an institutionalized organization.

We also know that just like the church there is a focus on the offenders instead of the victims. Many of those offenders left, went through treatment, and were later allowed to join again. Much of the information was not shared with victims or the families of victims, and again there is a concern about lack of transparency and trust.

[Slide] I also would like to use as an example the case of allegations in sports.

There is a significant problem of child sexual abuse and abuse of adolescents in sports, from club levels to the Olympic level, from team sports to individual sports, and there have been a number of high-profile cases that have come out in the media.

So, awareness. There is not a lot of mass data that is available within sports. A lot of our attention is drawn to this through individual cases that come out in the media, such as the case of Larry Nassar.

I'm sure many of you are familiar with the case of Larry Nassar, but this is a particularly egregious case of an individual who had over 300 allegations of abuse from 1992 over a period of decades where he abused a number of athletes at Michigan State University as well as Olympic-level gymnasts. This was largely unreported and unnoticed, and when it was reported it was not acted upon.

As a result of this case there are a number of experiences that have happened with both Michigan State University, where the president had to resign and was later also indicted, as well as USA Gymnastics, the entire board had to resign, including the CEO, Steve Penny, who was later charged with allegations of covering up the crime. So again, very poor response on an organizational level across multiple organizations in this case.

We know that the perpetrators in sports are often leaders in their sports. They're often the best coaches, the most powerful, and they have a lot of opportunities to abuse with this one-on-one mentorship, even in team sports.

Many of the victims have a fear of reporting for concerns about retaliation and inability to

be able to continue within their sport and proceed to the highest levels of that sport.

For organizations what we find is that their priority is often athletic performance, winning, and gold medals. That's what we saw in the case of USA Gymnastics, and it's the protection of their reputation.

[Slide] What have been the responses to abuse in sport? The U.S. Olympic Committee implemented a SafeSport program in 2012. It's the Olympic Committee's response to recognize, reduce, and respond to misconduct in sport, and it requires all the national governing bodies to create athlete safety programs that include what type of conduct is prohibited. It requires them to have criminal background checks for anyone who is going to work with youth. It requires education and training of everyone within a sport who is a member of the organization. It requires them to provide guidelines for reporting and some method of enforcement of reporting.

[Slide] I have personally had an opportunity to work with one of the sports that has helped to implement one of these SafeSport programs, and I have worked with the sport of U.S. Figure Skating to help create those guidelines, and I've been able to experience and see firsthand what some of the successes and some of the challenges are. Not surprisingly, what we see is a lot of similarities again between this, sports, and other types of organizations.

Because of the intensive education and training that it has provided its members what we do see is a shift in the culture. So SafeSport is now part of the common language within sports. Every single person who is a member of any sport is required to participate in some kind of training.

There is much increased awareness and reporting of various types of behaviors, including boundary-violating behaviors.

However, there are a lot of challenges that they face. In particular, this desire to win often outweighs the safety risks. And parents are the ones who are often placing their athletes in harmful situations.

Just in the last week or so we had some parents who called the U.S. Figure Skating organization and asked is there a way in which they could have their children continue to take lessons from an individual who had been arrested for child sexual abuse of a young girl. He was arrested at the ice rink while he was teaching a lesson and has a court date pending, and still these parents said, "But he's our coach, and he is a national-level coach, and we want to still take lessons from him."

So you see how parents are putting their children at risk, even when it is known. That happened last week.

Also, what we find is there is a lack of enforcement on a local level. We can implement policies, but we don't know, for instance, if the local club is enforcing the locker room policy. It's very difficult to know how much this is being enforced on the ground.

We also know that abuse is still significantly, significantly underreported for all of those reasons that we mentioned. We also know in terms of the U.S. Olympic Committee generally the implementation by sport varies, much like the implementation by diocese varies.

[Slide] What can we take away? Importantly, our understanding of child sexual abuse

changed over time, and many of the abuse incidents occurred decades ago. We tend to view these through a lens of what we know now about child sexual abuse, including the devastating harm that can be caused to victims. This is not to reduce the level of responsibility of youth-serving organizations that they had to protect children from harm but to better understand why the abuse might not have been recognized at that time and reported as it might be today.

When abuse was recognized it was often considered an individual rather than an institutional problem. So the abuser was considered a bad apple and not the product of the organizational environment in which the abuse took place. As such, a lot of the institutions responded on a case-by-case basis.

And organizational cultures provide these opportunities for abuse to occur, and there are many barriers to identifying, responding to, and reporting abuse. And not only were there low levels of reporting abuse, but when it was reported it often led to this cognitive dissonance amongst the organizational leaders. Many of the abusers were among the most prolific in the organization, whether it be the church or other organizations, and many of the leaders did what they could to protect the organization from outsiders or from ruining the reputation of the organization or what they perceived to be the single bad apple.

We know that organizational cultures are very difficult to change and require more than just the idea of a policy as we can see from the uneven implementation of the five principles in the Catholic Church that led to no significant improvements really in child protection. It was only after the scandal was fully recognized a decade later that the bishops as a body made significant efforts to change their culture and focus on the protection of children from harm.

[Slide] We know that for real change to happen the welfare of children and adolescents must be the top priority of any organization, and it can't just be on winning in sports or protecting the organization from lawsuits or protecting their reputation; it has to be on the best interests of the children and their health.

Instituting these prevention programs that train staff is essential to curtail any of these organizational behaviors that enable the abuse to happen. Training must be about more than just procedures; it has to reflect an organizational culture in which everyone expects abuse to be reported and allegations to be properly investigated.

Accountability of the organizational leaders and transparency of their actions is critical for change to happen. We have to do more than just enact policies. The full implementation of the policies, supported by leaders of the organization and with buy-in from constituents signifies that there is a change in the culture and that the organization as a whole deems sexual misconduct unacceptable.

As O'Hare stated in *America* magazine in 2004, "Policies and procedures will only be effective if bishops maintain a commitment to meaningful reform and vigilant enforcement that outlasts the immediate crisis and becomes ingrained in the character of the church itself."

Thank you

DAVID GIBSON: Thank you very much, Karen and Margaret, for a terrific presentation of the facts as we know them and the context and the data.

Now we're going to welcome Peter Steinfels to lead a discussion with Karen and Maggie. This should be short. Peter Steinfels needs no introduction, but I need a reason to exist, so here we go.

Peter co-founded the Center on Religion and Culture back in 2004 along with his wife, Margaret O'Brien Steinfels. He's a longtime Catholic journalist who not only edited *Commonweal* magazine but was for years the Religion writer at *The New York Times*, where he covered the clergy sexual abuse scandal long before there was a Spotlight investigation by *The Boston Globe*. Peter has been at this for a long time and knows the terrain, as he also demonstrated in his recent magnum opus on the Pennsylvania grand jury report in *Commonweal* magazine.

Peter?

PETER STEINFELS: Thank you very much, and thank you, our John Jay scholars, for not only their presentation now but the years of research and work that lies beneath it. It has been a tremendous service.

It's very hard to absorb in short order some of the things that you've been telling us. I have a question that is oriented a little bit about perhaps some of the controversial aspects of your work, and my first question is: Among — I don't know whether you want to deputize one or the other of you to answer it, or both have different views — all the findings that you have produced, what in your view seems to have encountered the most resistance, either among the Catholic faithful in general or the public?

PROFESSOR MARGARET LELAND SMITH: I think the thing that I get the most questions about is this issue of whether it is an ongoing problem or whether it's a problem that existed primarily in the peak years between the late 1960s and the early 1980s. We had skepticism among those we worked with at John Jay as to whether this was the case, and we continually get questions that say, "But people just haven't come forward yet."

But I'm a quant, and I can't look at the numbers any other way than to say that every year when the new reports of abuse come forward they are concentrated in that period of time before 1985, and so I think this is the one thing that I have had the most resistance to.

It's partly because I think it is not normal that we think of ourselves as shaped by public views. We don't really think about the impact of social attitudes on our individual lives. We may think about them on the lives of others. It's hard to internalize, but the data is pretty clear that the majority of the abuse did happen in the past, at least as far as the United States and Australia is concerned. Other countries haven't released the distribution yet, but it would not surprise me to see if it were confirmed as well.

PROFESSOR KAREN TERRY: I would second that. I have also received a number of questions saying exactly the same thing, "But more people are going to come forward."

I would also add that for the *Causes and Context* study we worked with a mathematician who did three different types of estimation modeling to look at the data we had and also found that that peak was stable. So we were confident when we released the report in that finding, but again that is something that is questioned by many people.

I would also add that I think there are a lot of people who look at some of the findings and say, "But this is a homosexual problem; you're wrong," or, "This is a problem of celibacy; you're wrong." Those are I would say the other two aspects that people have challenged us on.

PROFESSOR MARGARET LELAND SMITH: One of the things that I would say is that it's also really difficult for us to accept the extent of unwanted sexual approach from adults that adolescents experience. When surveys began to ask these questions in the 1960s the percentage of women who said that they had unwelcome sexual approach from adults was over 30 percent; it was 40 percent. People couldn't believe the results. When female graduate students were surveyed, a majority had experienced unwelcome sexual approach from adults.

Now that the same question is being asked of boys in surveys there is a lot of variability, but the results come in between 15 and 40 percent. This is a very widespread behavior. It is clear that adolescent males and females are found to be attractive by adults in a very widespread way and that people find it difficult to conform their behavior and make excuses for abusive behavior.

But the dimensions of this are such that it should put to rest any questions about celibacy.

PETER STEINFELS: Related to that, you may have already spoken to this sufficiently, so just brush me off. It seems to me the question of looking at this issue in terms of the Catholic Church specifically or the Catholic Church in relationship to the larger social and cultural setting, and I have the impression that the resistance that I've observed among Catholics is to the latter approach, that they want to deal with issues like destabilization of Vatican II or teachings on sexual morality or homosexuality, or questions recently posed about the church leaders having double lives and therefore being reluctant to take disciplinary action against suspected abusers.

That's one approach, and then both of you have spoken about the crucial character to your studies of the larger approach, and I don't know whether you want to add anything to that, but that's what I —

PROFESSOR MARGARET LELAND SMITH: John Jay has experienced a sexual abuse crisis of some magnitude, and I can tell you that we feel pretty strongly about it, so it doesn't surprise me that Catholics feel strongly about the characteristics of the abuse happening within the faith community that they're a part of.

I guess the answer for me is that our work did not enable us to answer that question in the way that you're posing it. We are trained as social scientists, and we think about things in terms of what's going on in the society and are not really equipped to answer the questions for within the church.

PETER STEINFELS: The second question I'd like to pose to you is probably more relevant to your work on where we're going forward, but it's also relevant to the data that you presented is essentially the globalization of the sex abuse crisis. It's now seen in multiple places. Pope Francis's missteps in regard to Chile seem to have posed that, and now reports from every continent, Latin America, Poland, France, whatever, are all blurred together in a way. How do you see this as analysts and scholars, as posing a problem for your work?

PROFESSOR KAREN TERRY: One thing I would say is I think there is a problem of sexual misconduct within the Catholic Church, and I think that it has been responded to in inappropriate ways in many cases. And it's not just in the United States; it is globally. They've had inadequate responses in nearly every country. That's to say that that is similar to what we are finding as responses in other organizations.

One thing that does make the Catholic Church unique, again from a social scientist perspective or from the perspective of someone who's looking at this problem within a single institution, is that it is the only institution worldwide that has data like this, where they are able to look back for decades, for fifty or sixty or seventy years, to find out what those problems are and what the responses were to that problem.

So I don't know what the responses are to the problem of sexual abuse in schools for the last seventy years; I don't know what the problems are within other types of social organizations in these various countries over the last seventy or eighty years because we don't have any of that data.

That's one of the reasons why again we can't compare the Catholic Church directly to any other institution because we do not have any comparable data in any other institution.

I think one thing that's also important to realize is that even in cases where we do know about sexual abuse problems it's often just what has been reported to the police or that has resulted in some type of criminal arrest or sentence.

What we have in the Catholic Church is a vast amount of data of abuse that happened years and years ago that has not gone through the criminal justice system. This is not a forensic example of information. So again, we can't compare it to any other sample of data that we have in any other type of institution.

So it's hard for us to say how other institutions have responded. And again, there are no other institutions that I can think of that have a leader in one place who kind of oversees what has happened globally in all these various institutions worldwide. Again, it's such a unique institution in that sense that it's very challenging to evaluate it in comparison to other types of responses.

PROFESSOR MARGARET LELAND SMITH: We know that many other institutions have investigated this problem. We know that the New York school system investigates itself. We know that hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of teachers sit in a room and can't teach because they have allegations of sexual abuse that are not sufficiently documented to enable them to be fired, but they are just in limbo. This is wide knowledge in New York.

We know that other organizations have conducted studies within, as the Jehovah's Witnesses, but that they didn't release it or they fought the results.

But — Karen pointed this out earlier — we are perhaps moving into a new situation where victims and survivors can count on a more affirmative response and fellowship and recognition and ameliorative response, restoration. I think this is perhaps a beginning of a new direction, and we'll see what comes from this, if this enables us to recognize this harm, the harm of actions against weaker people, and enable those youth and others to resist and to understand the harm and to speak it out as harm and expect to get an affirmative response, which has not been the case in the past.

PROFESSOR KAREN TERRY: Let me just add one thing. It has been very telling, the work I've done with the Olympic sports. Once the widespread education and training of members of the organizations took place, one thing that we started to see was a vast amount of reporting.

I think it's important to think about that in the context of the church as well. As we have increased a lot of these safeguarding policies and implemented a lot of this safe

environment training and we're starting to educate people about what is abuse and in what situations does abuse occur that people are starting to be more vocal about that, not just about what's being done to them but about what they are seeing, and so I do think this is a slightly different era than we have had before in the church.

PETER STEINFELS: Regarding globalization, different countries and different regions are not in sync with the United States in terms of this problem coming to the fore and being widely examined and so on. Likewise, with the reports on which you depended, could you say a little bit more about are they really parallel or comparable, or do they themselves need to be examined? Are they beyond criticism? They are gathered in very different ways.

PROFESSOR KAREN TERRY: Very different ways, absolutely.

First of all, one thing that we find is that many of the commissions that I mentioned and ad hoc committees that came together were created based on a high-profile case. That's also really what happened here. In 2002 we had *The Boston Globe* reporting. We also had the high-profile case of John Geoghan at that time, who was a very prolific abuser. As his actions came to the forefront we started to get more attention about abuse in the Catholic Church in the United States at that time.

So there was a confluence of factors that led to our knowledge about abuse in the United States in that year 2002, and that's when we saw that being a really critical moment.

What we see in Europe and South America is really from 2010 onward, when we started to see again a number of these high-profile incidents that were occurring that led to a lot of the investigations that we started to see from that point on.

Some of the reports that I mentioned again were not systematically collecting data in the way that we did for the *Nature and Scope* study or the *Causes and Context* study. These are commissions who often spoke to some of the individuals involved, who looked into the institutions, looked at some records, but again not any systematic way in which research scholars necessarily do.

So those commissions that made those recommendations and issued those findings had different types of methods for evaluating the problem in the church in their country at that time, but remarkably they came to a lot of the same conclusions. Again, that's where we're starting to see a lot of that organizational culture that was playing a role in allowing the abuse to persist.

PROFESSOR MARGARET LELAND SMITH: I want to comment on that because I actually think that when we refused to create a sample of dioceses and required everyone to turn in surveys it was because we didn't know anything about the social phenomenon, the unknown shape.

But now we have that information, and so the sampling and survey sampling done in Australia and in Germany — Germany and Australia both used multiple sources; the German study, clinical work, interviews with victims, outreach to victims, surveys of dioceses, and interviews with bishops. I think both of those national studies seem strong, and I do think that having a baseline of knowledge allows for work that is not as comprehensive in the sense that not every diocese was maybe forced to fill it out still allows for comparable work or still is an authentically reliable way to get a picture of the abuse in that particular country.

PROFESSOR KAREN TERRY: I just want to say that I agree with Maggie's comment. Generally, when we look at the scope of studies that have been conducted or reports that have been released, it is the study in Germany and the Royal Commission's report and the John Jay reports that have done the most extensive evaluation of the problem within a particular country.

PETER STEINFELS: As I guess a fairly lonely critic of the Pennsylvania grand jury report, I'm interested in your views of some fourteen or fifteen other state investigations and at least one federal investigation that we're looking toward, which may occupy us over the next who knows how many years.

What would you recommend as people who have tried to establish the truth about this, which presumably is also the goal of judicial bodies like investigative grand juries? What would you like to see them do or not do that would help?

PROFESSOR MARGARET LELAND SMITH: As long as they make the data public, then researchers can turn to it and reanalyze it and identify problems. We're working on the Pennsylvania data now to see what we can discern and learn that we have not known before.

PROFESSOR KAREN TERRY: I would just say that you have to, again as a scholar, look through a lot of the language that is used in the reports and find that data so that we can take that and compare it to what is known, and that's what we are doing with the Pennsylvania report.

What we've found so far is that based on the information in the Pennsylvania report it follows that same distribution that we found in the *Nature and Scope* study. So even though they're talking about a large number of individuals who have made allegations of abuse against a large number of priests, what we've found is it still fits that exact same distribution that we had in the *Nature and Scope* study.

PROFESSOR MARGARET LELAND SMITH: It's criminal justice; it's not research. In research we have ethical protocols that we follow. It's criminal justice; it's bound by statute. It's a different thing.

PETER STEINFELS: One of the statutes being the statute regarding the secrecy of grand jury proceedings, and I'm very interested in your comment on that because the grand jury in the Pennsylvania report claimed to have subpoenaed and examined 500,000 documents, and yet it's impossible even to find out how many times the grand jury met or what the process might have possibly been and who did it about examining half a million documents.

PROFESSOR MARGARET LELAND SMITH: That's a good question, Peter. I didn't know. We'll have to do further research on that one. I'm sorry.

DAVID GIBSON: Peter, could I just throw out a couple of questions in these last few minutes, just summarizing some of the concerns in the audience questions?

One, which comes up a lot for reporters and researchers: What defines a "credible" or "substantiated" accusation? These terms seem to have different meanings in different contexts, and how does that help or hinder your work?

PROFESSOR MARGARET LELAND SMITH: I try not to use the term "credible" because the question of substantiation happens in the diocese. It isn't me that's making

that determination.

The surveys that we received in *Nature and Scope* had a series of questions: Did an investigation take place after this report was received? Was the report substantiated, not substantiated, found to be not true?

Similarly, in the CARA results that are done every year, every new report has to be identified as to whether it was investigated, whether it was substantiated. An increasing number in the recent years are found “not to be able to be substantiated because the person is no longer with us or the records don’t exist.”

But that is a diocesan process of investigation. I don’t know that there would be a typical answer to that. Certainly it would be whether there was evidence that this took place.

PROFESSOR KAREN TERRY: I would just add one thing, though, to that. In our discussions with individuals within the diocese very few allegations were excluded because they were deemed to be not credible, so very few were excluded.

DAVID GIBSON: Last thing. Two points that always come up in terms of the Catholic clergy abuse crisis, homosexuality and celibacy. Could you summarize your findings on those two issues? Is homosexuality a factor or why not, and is celibacy a factor or why not?

PROFESSOR KAREN TERRY: I would just say that our data do not indicate that homosexuality causes someone to abuse a child, and this is supported by nearly every study that I have read in the social science literature. What we found is that individuals who had had a homosexual relationship prior to going into seminary were more likely to have one after seminary but with an adult, not a minor, and that people who identified as a homosexual orientation were no more likely to abuse a minor than someone who had a heterosexual orientation.

The only question that came up in our study was with those who had a confused sexual identity or didn’t know how they would identify themselves, and that was largely from a group of individuals who were ordained in the 1940s and 1950s. But what our study showed was that individuals with a homosexual orientation were no more likely to abuse a minor than those who did not have one.

PROFESSOR MARGARET LELAND SMITH: I would like to say that the homosexual identity that someone feels for herself or himself is different from homosexual activity. We know from a lot of different sources that human beings are capable of having sexual behavior with males and females, and this is something that is distinct from an identity as a homosexual individual.

So, the behavior was homosexual; the persons not necessarily. Very often the behavior was homosexual and heterosexual or included both or was homosexual with a male adolescent and then heterosexual with a female adult five years later. This does not indicate that homosexuality as an identity is an indicator for abuse.

Half of the Boy Scouts offenders are married. Much of the abuse of males comes from heterosexual stepfathers. Everything that we know as social scientists indicates that human beings abuse others, but the nature of a sexual orientation is not a factor. Humans are capable of abusing others, and they do so regularly.

DAVID GIBSON: A grim note but reality. Maggie, one thing that struck me when you

were talking about the history of the timeline was how in the 1980s in seminaries they were beginning to talk about sex, sexual identity, and sexuality, and that correlated and hopefully was a causation of the decline.

PROFESSOR MARGARET LELAND SMITH: Well, that's what our interviewee said, and when we looked at the Eugene Kennedy data carried out in the 1970s it asked how many people were thinking about sex a lot, and most of those priests were thinking about sex a lot. If there's no way to explore what intimacy means, if there's no way to help yourself develop an intentional lifestyle as a celibate, these things are the domain of the seminaries.

It isn't as though the United States doesn't have any celibate individuals. The surveys tell us that a third of people don't have any sex. That is what people say. Many people don't have sex. It's not simply priests who are celibate.

I think that these terms become labels and they become easier answers than the more profound question of how it is that we allow those with power and prestige to abuse those with less power and prestige.

DAVID GIBSON: Thank you. And again, the talking about it indicates a healthier environment, and the talking about it here is a necessary and healthy thing I would submit to you all.

Please join me in thanking our panelists for a terrific presentation. Thank you, Peter.

Thank you all, and again this time we're going to take about a thirty- or forty-minute break. We have cocktails; we have hors d'oeuvres. I hope you will all dig in, take advantage, get to know each other in our community here at the CRC. We'll reconvene to hear from Father Hans Zollner in about half an hour. Thank you.