

+

Learning From Our Mistakes: Responding Effectively to Child Sexual Abusers

by
Rev. Msgr. Stephen J. Rossetti PhD DMin

Responding effectively to allegations of child sexual abuse is complex and difficult. There is a complicated web of competing demands- pastoral, legal, clinical, and public relations which can confuse, confound and even paralyze. It is publicly well known that, at times, in our responding, we have failed.

We have done so partly because we have not fully understood this crime and its pathology. Systemic features likewise have impeded a rapid and open response. But there are clear signs of progress and hope. While these cases do not make the newspapers, in recent years many Church leaders have responded well. An increasing number of bishops from several countries have intervened decisively and effectively when allegations of child sexual abuse have surfaced.

At this moment, the Catholic Church stands at an important juncture. Catholic leaders on several continents have been going through the same decades-long, painful learning process. Does each country around the world have to go through this same agonizing process? The Church now knows the essential elements of an effective child-safe program. We ought to implement them today, around the world, hence the importance of this symposium.

If the Catholic Church were proactively to implement and strongly enforce such a world-wide child-safe program, it would become what it is called to be: an international leader in promoting the safety and welfare of children.

An important part of this program must include swiftly and effectively dealing with those who abuse. I would like to outline six kinds of mistakes that Church leaders have sometimes made when working with priest-offenders. Then I will suggest some remedies which have been shown to be effective.

1. Not Listening to Victims: Being Manipulated by Offenders. As we have so eloquently heard in the first session, listening to victims must be our first priority. Because the accused offenders have sometimes been our own priests, the Bishops and their vicars naturally have focused their attention on those accused. The Church's organizational structure is skewed in this direction and thus our handling of allegations has likewise been skewed. As one American Bishop said, "Our mistake was that we forgot that the victims are part of our flock too."

Unfortunately, when we focus on perpetrators and not on victims, there are devastating consequences. Perpetrators almost universally minimize, rationalize, project blame and deny the truth about their crimes. It is difficult for them to face the truth about their behavior; a behavior which Pope Benedict, on several occasions, has rightly called, "filth."

First of all, they often lie about their behavior when confronted. In the past, Bishops or their vicars typically have called accused priests into their offices. The Bishop then asks the priest if the allegation is true. And, not uncommonly, the perpetrator will lie. Sadly, the Bishop is often taken in by the man's deception. For those of you who have experienced confronting alcoholics or drug addicts, the patterns of denial by the perpetrators of child sexual abuse are similar, if not more intense.

There are false allegations to be sure. It is critical that we do all that we can to restore a priest's good name once it is determined that the allegations are false. But decades of experience tell us that the vast majority of allegations, over 95 percent, are founded. There is little benefit, and much to be lost, for a person to come forward and to allege that he or she was sexually molested by a priest. It takes courage to do so and a willingness to suffer blame and ridicule.

There are many kinds of minimizing and rationalizing behaviors typically used by offenders. Psychologists call these defense mechanisms. Perpetrators try to convince Church leaders, and themselves, that this was a "one off" event; or that it only happened because he had "too much to drink"; or that "it won't happen again." An offender might say that all this is past; he has gone to confession and it is over. Or, he will blame the victim, saying that the child was "coming on to him," trying to seduce him.

These are attempts by the perpetrator at getting Church leaders to let it go and say that it is over....but it is not over. And if one victim surfaces, it is likely that there are more.¹

Most church leaders are not trained to investigate and respond to allegations of child sexual abuse. In the past they have tried to deal with these complex cases personally and "discreetly," sometimes with poor results. The aid of experienced legal and clinical professionals is needed.

But even mental health professionals can be conned by the rationalizations and denials of perpetrators. Many times bishops relied upon professionals who might have had good credentials in general, but knew little about working with the sexual abusers of children. This is why at the facility where I ministered and where we evaluated hundreds of offenders, we used teams of professionals each with many years of experience in the field. A perpetrator might be able to manipulate one person, but rarely an entire, experienced team.

Listening to offenders and being taken in by their manipulations and rationalizations has caused some church leaders to err in their response. When the Church listens first to victims, as Pope Benedict repeatedly has done, we learn the truth. From victims, we learn about the real pain caused. From them, we learn about the perpetrators' seductions and manipulations. From victims, we learn that the events are far from over and that what is needed now is strong and decisive action.

Recommendation 1a: *A Victims First policy. Every investigation should begin with listening to the victim. The victim, not the perpetrator, ought to be the first focus of the Church's attention.*

Recommendation 1b: *Church leaders should not handle these cases by themselves. They ought to have a panel of child sexual abuse experts in criminal investigation, law enforcement, canon law and mental health to investigate and advise the Bishop.*

2. *Underestimating the Prevalence of Child Sexual Abuse in One's Diocese.* When the first cases of child sexual abuse surfaced publicly, most assumed they were isolated events. "Yes," some bishops admitted, "Sadly, there is this one case of sexual abuse, but it is a rare event."

Church leaders around the world began by saying, "This is only an American problem." Then, as more cases surfaced in other countries, they said, "This is an English speaking problem." Then, as the circle of abuse cases widened, they expanded it to: "This is a Western problem." The boundaries were pushed back farther and farther. But each time, Church leaders said, in effect, "It doesn't happen here."

A meta-analysis published only ten months ago shows that child sexual abuse occurs in similarly high rates in Africa, Asia, Australia, Europe, South America, and North America.ⁱⁱ The World Health Organization, in its 2002 report on child sexual abuse, wrote, "Child abuse and neglect is a global public health concern. It is a prevailing problem in all generations, socioeconomic strata and societies."

Child sexual abuse has always been a scourge in our society and in our Church. Simply read Canon 71 from the Council of Elvira (c. 306 AD). It says, "Those who sexually abuse boys many not commune even when death approaches." Apparently there was enough sexual abuse of boys in Spain 1,700 years ago to warrant a canon against it. Child sexual abuse is not a new phenomenon.

In his important book, *Light of the World*, our Holy Father spoke candidly about the sexual abuse of minors in the Church. I suspect that his many years of working in the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, where cases are read and processed, helped him to grasp the truth of this tragedy. He is a man who, as they say colloquially, "Gets it." He understands. Even he, when asked why he was not more aggressive in dealing with the problem as Archbishop of Munich, responded, "For me...it was a surprise that abuse also existed on that scale in Germany." Sexual abuse is a horror that remains hidden and it, like all evil, thrives in the dark. Healing only begins when it is exposed to the light.

If there are people in the Church today who are thinking that this is not a problem in their country, I urge them to speak to those who work with children. Contact those who generously run programs for abused children or staff child abuse hotlines. Find out what is being said behind closed doors.

In whatever country children are being sexually abused, some of our own priests will become involved as well. You and I would like our priests to be free of human dysfunction, but they are not. Priests typically manifest the same psychological pathologies as their lay counterparts. It is true that they have a sacred vocation, but they are also human.

Fortunately, the vast majority of priests do not abuse children. They are chaste celibates and generous stewards of the Gospel. This is another reason why we should aggressively prosecute those who do molest children. First, we owe it to the children and to their families. In addition, our priests do not deserve to have their corporate reputation sullied in such a despicable way or being yoked with the suspicion of being a child molester.

Any denial of the frequent sexual molestation of minors around the globe is an echo of the very denial perpetrators use to keep their evil hidden. When we fail to expose this evil to the light of day, it continues secretly to pollute the Church from within.

Recommendation 2: Proactively determine the truth about child sexual abuse in each country. Develop a comprehensive prevention program and implement it now.

3. *Believing that Perpetrators Could Be Cured and Risk-Free.* At one time, there was an excessive optimism among some mental health professionals that the psychological pathology giving rise to the sexual abuse of minors could be “cured.” Perpetrators were sent to treatment and some were given a “clean bill of health.” These bishops were ill-advised by clinicians’ faulty understanding of the pathology of child sexual abuse at the time and, sadly, many of these men were returned to an unrestricted priestly ministry. While most of these men did not reoffend, some did. This not only caused trauma to the victims and the families, Church leaders were accused of shuffling these priests from one assignment to the next without dealing with the problem.

There has never been, nor will there ever be, a psychological treatment regimen for the perpetrators of child sexual abuse, or any pathology for that matter, which is 100% effective. This is not the nature of psychology or the world in which we live. There is always some chance of relapse.

In the clinical program where I worked, of the 339 priests who were treated for sexually molesting minors, (only including those who have been discharged for at least five years), 21 relapsed, that is 6.2%. Those results were so strong because the program had an intensive, long-term treatment, relatively high-functioning clients, an excellent staff, and an extensive multi-year follow-up program that included supervision. But even this program was not 100% effective.

In the wake of highly publicized relapses of offenders, there has lately arisen the equally extreme notion that all perpetrators of child sexual abuse are untreatable. Some believe they are all doomed to reoffend. If we were once in a period of excessive optimism, we are now in danger of falling into a hopeless pessimism. In either extreme, the safety of children is not served.

Our understanding and treatment of the perpetrators of child sexual abuse has grown greatly in the last thirty years. Many of the field’s early beliefs had to be revised, if not discarded. Some of the best treatments of offenders today incorporate relapse prevention strategies, often using a cognitive-behavioral approach. They are likely to include a variety of treatment goals such as regulating one’s emotions, developing chaste relationships with peers,

taking responsibility for the abuse, developing victim empathy, and managing their abusive sexual fantasies.

The latest treatments may also include some form of what is called “The Good Lives” model. This model suggests that the most effective treatments help offenders achieve primary human goods such as healthy living, a rewarding work life, inner peace, friendship and creativity. Combining both relapse prevention strategies and implementing a good life are a powerful combination in leading a perpetrator away from molesting minors and into a healthier, productive life. The Good Lives model is something that we Christians intuitively grasp. We understand that living a good life is something that increasingly separates us from sin and tends us toward all that is good.

The perpetrators of child sexual abuse have committed a heinous crime. However, the current trends toward ostracizing and demonizing perpetrators is not only unchristian, it actually increases their likelihood of re-offending. It might feel cathartic to focus the whole of one’s hatred and disgust toward the abusers of minors and to force them to live in perpetual shame and banishment. But this societal self-indulgence is likely to reinforce the underlying dynamics of shame and victimization which propels many abusers to abuse in the first place.

This is one area where our Christian values can be of particular help in the current climate. We hate the sin, but we love the sinner. We despise what molesters have done, but we try to rehabilitate offenders, making them productive members of our society whenever possible. We dare to call them our brothers, sinners like ourselves. To do so is Christian. To do so is not only in their best interests, it is also in the best interests of our children. When perpetrators are assisted in living good lives, children are safer.

Recommendation 3a: *To promote the safety of children, and for the good of the offender, those who sexually molest minors should undergo a treatment program informed by modern treatment regimens and designed specifically to address their pathologies. These programs should not only intervene in their offense cycles, but also promote their living a healthy, virtuous life.*

Recommendation 3b: *For the safety of children and the welfare of the offender, the heinous nature of child sexual abuse ought to be widely known, but the offender ought not be demonized.*

4. *Misunderstanding Forgiveness for Perpetrators.* There was a time when Church leaders, often with the cooperation of civil authorities, shielded priests from civil laws. It was thought that the scandal of seeing a priest arrested was not good for society or the Church. Moreover, the Church had its own law and was expected to handle disciplinary matters in-house. In the case of child sexual abuse, such an approach was disastrous.

John Paul II and his successor rightly recognized that the sexual abuse of children is a civil crime in most countries. Catholic priests ought not to be shielded from answering for their crimes, whether it is the stealing of monies from their Churches or the sexual abuse of a minor,

or any violation of civil law for that matter. When a priest has been accused of a civil crime, it is the role of the civil authorities to investigate the crime and to apply just punishments.

I recall speaking with a priest who had just finished a multi-year prison sentence for sexually molesting a minor. I asked him about his experience in jail. He said it was difficult but that it was “a debt” he felt he had to pay. Indeed, priests who commit crimes need to answer to civil authorities, not only for the good of society, but for their own good as well.

After civil adjudication and punishment and then psychological treatment, the difficult question arises, “Where should they go?” Sometimes perpetrators, and others, will say, “If you really forgive me, then you will reassign me as a priest.” However, forgiveness and reassignment are two different issues. We can forgive the priest and not reassign him. For example, while we forgive a man who has a history of robbing banks, it would be imprudent to make him a bank teller. No, we forgive the man but we keep him away from handling other people’s money.

Should priests who have molested children ever return to any kind of priestly ministry, even a restricted one? This is a complex question. The Holy Father has given us a wise guideline in *Light of the World*. He said, “It is therefore necessary for the Church to be vigilant, to punish those who have sinned, and above all to exclude them from further access to children.” He is first saying that priest-perpetrators should answer for their crimes. Second, he is saying that they should have no further access to children for the rest of their lives.

Of course, the latter is difficult to apply since children are everywhere. I suspect that what the Holy Father is saying is that these men should never have any direct responsibility for children or any one-on-one private contact with them. At our clinical program, we expressed this by attaching the following caveat to our recommendations, “No unsupervised contact with minors.”

However, this can become a thorny problem. If priest-perpetrators are dismissed from the clerical state, they are completely out of the Church’s control and so the best we can do is hope that civil society will supervise them. However, most offenders are not successfully prosecuted in civil courts for a variety of reasons. And without a criminal conviction, civil societies cannot supervise offenders.

If the men are not dismissed from the clerical state, some Church leaders in different countries have already implemented, either formally or de facto, a policy whereby the priest can never function publicly as a priest again. The priest is not allowed to present himself in public as a priest and he has no priestly faculties whatsoever. These are often called “zero tolerance” policies. For one offense against minors, the priest loses his privilege of ministering as a priest forever.

In the United States we tried for about a decade to have these priests remain in priestly ministry after treatment and to engage in a limited ministry that had little to no contact with minors. The great majority of these men did not molest minors again. But a few did. In addition to the tragedy of more children being harmed, this solution became publicly intolerable. A large percentage of the people understandably did not want these men back in ministry, even a restricted one. What is slowly spreading around the world is the inescapable reality that once a

priest has sexually molested a minor, he forever loses his privilege of ministering as a priest. This is functionally true in many countries right now. I believe it will eventually become the reality throughout the world.

But the challenge is: if he no longer can minister as a priest then how can we help this man live a “Good Life”? Some can be retrained for a secular job. Others live in special supervised houses for priest-offenders. Others float around in society, becoming idle and without direction. We have not yet solved the challenge of how to remove them completely from priestly ministry and children, and yet assist them in living a productive but supervised life.

For those who are not dismissed from the clerical state but out of ministry, it is clear that what is safest is supervising these men and keeping them away from minors. To accomplish this, Church leaders in some countries are starting to consult with professionals to develop “Safety Plans.” These plans are a written set of guidelines for the priest-offenders to follow, a kind of behavioral contract. Modern clinical practice is fairly adept at identifying offenders who are at high, medium or low risk to re-offend. Based upon this risk level, the plan is more or less strict in controlling the priest’s movements.

I must alert you that there is a small group of high risk offenders who are particularly dangerous men. They have molested scores, perhaps hundreds, of children.ⁱⁱⁱ This type of offender does not normally respond to treatment and will most probably offend again, if given the chance. While the minority, these high risk offenders must be identified and kept under the highest level of supervision.

Of course, for all offenders, there should be no unsupervised contact with minors, forever. Their Safety Plans must be clear and enforced as much as possible, with real adverse consequences if not followed.^{iv} The goal is to keep them safe, and thus to keep children safe.

Recommendation 4a: *From Benedict XVI- “It is therefore necessary for the Church to be vigilant, to punish those who have sinned, and above all to exclude them from further access to children.”*

Recommendation 4b: *In countries with functioning and just criminal justice systems, Church leaders ought to refer all allegations of child sexual abuse to civil authorities.*

Recommendation 4c: *Develop Safety Plans for perpetrators of child sexual abuse that are based upon their level of risk. Supervise these men; keep them away from children; enforce the plans.*

5. *Insufficient Human Formation of Priests, Including Human Sexuality.* In the United States in the late 1970’s and 1980’s, there was a spike up in incidents of child sexual abuse. Why? It is likely there was a combination of factors.

First, perhaps most important, my initial research suggests that there was a cohort of men admitted to the priesthood around that time who had elevated levels of sexual dysfunction.^v

Second, it appears that the general societal conditions contributed. The conditions surrounding potential perpetrators influence the likelihood of their acting out. At that time, there was a limited societal and church response to sexual abuse. It was several years before societal and Church efforts to prevent sexual abuse would take a firm hold. Moreover, the cultural climate of sexual expression of the so-called “sexual revolution” of the 1960’s likely contributed as well.^{vi}

Simply put, we took a group of men with deviant sexual problems and put them in an environment which not only did not sufficiently condemn and punish the sexual abuse of minors, but actually loosely promoted sexual expression. Combining deviant sexuality with a permissive cultural environment is a deadly combination.

Now, American society has strong child protection statutes in place with fairly rigorous enforcement. Also, the Catholic Church in the United States now has one of the strongest and most extensive child protection programs of any institution anywhere. Not surprisingly, the rates of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church in the United States have plummeted. Thank God! This highlights the importance of child safe programs for the Catholic Church everywhere and for society as a whole. Child protection programs work to change the entire culture in which potential perpetrators operate. These programs make a difference.^{vii}

This also highlights the need for better screening and formation of priestly candidates. We recognize that it is impossible to identify and screen out all psychosexual deviations in candidates for the priesthood. Again, the science of psychology will never be 100%. This is coupled with the fact that there are many different types of offenders. Some popular accounts give the impression that all perpetrators of child sexual abuse have the same set of characteristics. They do not.

However, it is true that there are some commonalities among offenders. For example, most perpetrators have a limited ability to relate to their peers. Many suffer from poor emotional regulation. A significant percentage themselves were sexually abused as minors, although most were not.

Nevertheless, there are many different kinds of offenders. Some are highly narcissistic and use people to gratify their own needs. Others are hyper-sexual and will be sexually involved with many different kinds of people. Some are classic pedophiles who sexually prefer pre-pubescent children. Others rape children thinking it will cure their HIV/AIDS. Others are adults who find the post-pubescent child emotionally congruous with their own stunted emotional development. There are more types as well.

A hotly contested issue today is the relationship of child sexual abuse and homosexuality. There are two positions on either end of the spectrum: one end says that child sexual abuse is primarily a problem of homosexuality; the other end says the two are not related at all. Research has only begun to address this question. But there are some things we do know. First, most child abusers in the world are not homosexual and most homosexuals do not molest minors. However, there is a subgroup of men who identify themselves as homosexual who are at high risk. In two sets of data on priest-perpetrators in North America, the largest group of victims was post-

pubescent boys. When the perpetrators were asked to identify their sexual orientation, homosexuals or bisexuals were disproportionately represented compared to heterosexuals.^{viii} Dr. Martin Kafka concluded that while homosexuality is not a cause, it is a “likely risk factor” for abusing young males.^{ix} The relationship between homosexuality and child sexual abuse is complicated and not fully understood.

There are no tests to completely screen out all potential perpetrators from the priesthood, but some can be identified. What I and my colleagues have found to be most useful and appropriate is a thorough psychosexual history. This history is conducted in an interview in a confidential setting with a licensed expert clinician. The clinician looks for the candidate having achieved normal psychosexual milestones as well as the presence of any signs of psychosocial or psychosexual deviancy. These clinicians have already saved the Church from many potentially disastrous situations. Some candidates with deviant sexual interests can be identified and dismissed, although not all.

In a similar vein, once candidates have been accepted into formation, it is critical that a strong program in human formation follows. In his landmark work on priestly formation, *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, John Paul II spoke of human formation as the “necessary foundation” of all priestly formation. This includes a positive formation in living a healthy, chaste life as a priest. It ought to include managing one’s emotions and developing healthy, chaste relationships with peers. If a man has good solid friendships with people his own age, he is unlikely to seek out minors in deviant ways.

Recommendation 5a: *Develop strong child-safe education programs that will create a climate that helps deter potential abusers.*

Recommendation 5b: *Provide psychosexual screening of candidates for the priesthood to include a comprehensive psychosexual history in a confidential, clinical interview by an experienced clinician.*

Recommendation 5c: *Provide extensive formation and on-going formation in healthy chaste psychosocial and psychosexual living for candidates to the priesthood and for priests. These programs ought to include effective emotional regulation, chaste management of one’s sexuality, and the formation of life-giving chaste friendships with peers.*

6. *Missing the Red Flags.* The last mistake I would like to mention is our missing the “Red Flags,” clear signs of impending child sexual abuse. Not only have we sometimes dealt ineffectively with allegations, we have sometimes overlooked signs of at-risk behavior until it was too late.

Before the physical act of sexual abuse occurs, a perpetrator typically engages in a “grooming period.” He may give lavish gifts to the child, take suggestive photographs, spend increasing time alone with the child, and engage in touching the child in increasingly intrusive

ways. He may tell the child that he or she is special and that this is their secret. If other adults see some of what is happening, they may feel uncomfortable with the relationship and/or become suspicious. In the past, we sometimes ignored such inappropriate relationships until it was too late. These are obvious danger signs and are abusive in themselves.

For example, recently a priest was found to have taken hundreds of pictures of children, spent excessive amounts of time with them, had children sitting in his lap and reaching into his pockets, and even had little girl's underwear in his apartment. But when the diocese received a formal complaint, it responded slowly and ineffectively. Eventually the priest was arrested for possession of child pornography. All the signs were present that this man likely had deviant sexual interests and that minors were at risk or were being abused. People formally complained and yet Church leaders were slow to respond.

We are responsible for protecting children. This not only includes dealing with allegations of child sexual abuse swiftly and effectively, but also recognizing the warning signs, the red flags. Time and again we have failed to heed these warning signs and intervene.

The good news is that an increasing number of Church leaders are now becoming more sensitized to these "Red Flags." I know a number of recent cases where Church leaders have intervened in such situations before any abuse occurred. Many children were thus spared. The climate of prevention and a culture of child protection are currently taking hold in increasing areas of the Church.

Recommendation 6: *Church leaders should be educated on the "Red Flags" that someone might become, or already is, a perpetrator of child sexual abuse. When significant "Red Flags" or boundary violations surface, interventions should restore proper boundaries and assess and intervene as appropriate.*

I have offered these six general areas of mistakes that we have made and the attached twelve recommendations so that others may not make the same mistakes. I have witnessed the agony and the shame of victims, perpetrators and the entire people of God who have been scarred by this terrible tragedy. I earnestly hope that others will now be able to learn more quickly and respond more effectively.

It is time to proactively and aggressively root out this evil from our society. You and I must begin this task by exorcising it from our own midst. It has been with us for centuries and continues to this day. Child molesters must know that they have no safe sanctuary in our Church.

The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has begun this process worldwide by asking every Bishops' conference to submit policies on child sexual abuse within the year. You and I both know that policies are useless unless there is a will and commitment behind them.

Child sexual abuse can be stopped. The plunging rates of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church in the United States and elsewhere, after decades of increasingly aggressive efforts, are clear proof that child protection programs do work.

The process begins with education. I heartily thank the Gregorian University for their courage and intellectual integrity in hosting this workshop. It carries the strong approbation from the highest levels of the Church.

In recent years, I have witnessed the tremendous strides that the Church has made, with the strong support from our Holy Father, in combatting this evil. I know that this growing consciousness will, and must, spread throughout the world.

Our calling is to become the voice of millions of abused children. We must stand in the corner of those who are hurt and suffering. One day victims of child sexual abuse will look upon us, not as their foe, but as their advocates and their friends. That day is not yet fully here and so we are not yet fully the Church we are called to be.

The Catholic Church is a large, international body with a 2,000 year history. It is slow to change. But when it finally gathers its intellectual strength and moral conviction, and focuses on that which is right, the power of its voice is unstoppable. Peter has already spoken to us about this terrible evil, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

ⁱ In a 2011 unpublished study by Saint Luke Institute of 91 priests who have sexually molested minors, only 14% or 13 offenders reported having only one victim. 47% reported having five victims or more. The modal number of victims for this sample was four.

ⁱⁱ Stoltenborgh, Marije et al., "A Global Perspective on Child Sexual Abuse: Meta-Analysis of Prevalence Around the World," *Child Maltreatment* 16(2), 2011, p. 87.

ⁱⁱⁱ In the previously cited study of 91 offenders at Saint Luke Institute, 10% (9 out of 91) reported having 30 victims or more. One reported 500 victims; two reported 100 victims, one reported 50, one reported 40, **one reported 35 and 3 reported 35 victims.**

^{iv} A negative consequence for not living up to the Safety Plan could be complete dismissal from the clerical state.

^v Stephen J. Rossetti, *Why Priests are Happy: A Study of the Psychological and Spiritual Health of Priests* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Ave Maria Press, 2011), pp. 48-52.

^{vi} John Jay College of Criminal Justice, *The Causes and Context of the Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950-2010* (Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011), p. 36.

^{vii} Finkelhor, David et al., "Updated Trends in Child Maltreatment, 2008," Crimes Against Children Research Center. Durham, New Hampshire, University of New Hampshire. See <http://www.unh.edu/ccrc/Trends/index.html>.

^{viii} McGlone G., Viglione D.J., Geary B.: *Data from one treatment center in USA (n=150 catholic clergy) who have sexually offended*. Presented at the Annual Research and Treatment Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers (Montreal, Ontario: CN, October, 2002). With a sample of 158 priests treated at Saint Luke Institute, of those who molested pre-pubescent children, 54% identified themselves as heterosexual; 32% self-identified as homosexual; and 14% claimed to be bisexual. Of those priests who had abused post-pubescent minors, 46% said they were homosexual; 35% said they were heterosexual and 19% identified as bisexual. See also Ukeritis, Miriam D. and Dodgson, Christine, "Clergy Who Violate Boundaries," *Seminary Journal*, Winter 2007, 13(3), pp. 7-19.

^{ix} Kafka, Martin P. "Sexual Molesters of Adolescents, Ephebophilia and Catholic Clergy: A Review and Synthesis," in *Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: Scientific and Legal Perspectives*, ed. by R. Karl Hanson et al. (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2004), p. 54.