

GAY ROLE IN CLERGY ABUSE STILL DENIED

This is the article that appeared in the July/August 2023 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

We live in a postmodern world where people make up their own idea of truth. It's delusional. People are entitled to their own opinion, but there is only one truth. And in Bill Donohue's book, *The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse: Clarifying the Facts and the Causes*, he amassed over 800 footnote citations telling the truth about how the scandal unfolded. The role of homosexuals was central.

But living in a state of denial about this verity is commonplace, and not simply among secularists. High-ranking officials in the Catholic Church are just as guilty.

The *National Catholic Reporter*, which contributed to the scandal by giving succor to dissident and twisted seminarians and priests, published an article on this subject, trotting out all the old canards. It begins by quoting Cardinal Pietro Parolin.

Parolin, who is not a social scientist, said to link homosexuality to clergy sexual abuse is a "serious and scientifically untenable association." He said, "Homosexual orientation cannot be considered as either cause or aspect of the person." He's wrong.

There is a reason why the Catholic Catechism teaches that homosexual inclinations are "intrinsically disordered." It does not say that about heterosexual inclinations, and that's because men and women are naturally ordered toward each other. It is this attraction of people of the opposite sex that

allows for procreation.

Does a homosexual inclination, or orientation, cause the sexual abuse of minors? Not directly. But then again mono-causality is an anomaly. Is there a link between a homosexual orientation and the sexual abuse of minors? Of course. How else to explain why homosexuals are more likely to abuse minors than heterosexuals, in and out of the priesthood?

We know that 81 percent of the molestation of minors has been the result of priests hitting on adolescent boys (pedophilia is rare). The John Jay College of Criminal Justice, which did two big studies on this issue, provided the data. The *Reporter* says that the researchers “found no correlation between homosexual identity and the sexual abuse of minors.” That’s correct. But that finding is next to meaningless.

Notice the key word “identity.” Now ask yourself, “If an adult man has sex with a postpubescent male—that is defined as homosexuality—why would it matter if he does not consider himself to be a homosexual?” His perception does not change objective reality.

To put it differently, if most of the priests who had sex with a male adolescent considered themselves to be straight, would that mean that the clergy sexual abuse scandal was driven by heterosexual priests? Only a fool would conclude as such.

Maltese Archbishop Charles Scicluna, who is also living in denial, is quoted as saying, “We don’t have categories of people. I would never dare to indicate a category as a category that has a tendency to sin.” This is nonsense.

Most street crime is committed by young men from fatherless homes. Fatherless homes are a category of people; not to discuss their role in accounting for violent crimes would be delinquent. Similarly, since homosexual priests commit most of the sexual abuse of minors, it would be delinquent not to discuss their role.

It was not very helpful of the *Reporter* to cite Pope Francis as being in their corner. Not quite.

If Pope Francis did not believe there was a link between a homosexual orientation and sexual molestation, why did he second the position of Pope Benedict XVI in barring men with “deeply-seated homosexual tendencies” from the priesthood? It’s because they are the problem, that’s why.

The pope has also spoken about the “gay mentality.” He doesn’t talk about the “heterosexual mentality.” He has repeatedly warned about the “gay movement” and the “gay lobby.” Every honest person knows why.

Similarly, when a bishop told the Holy Father that it was no big deal that several priests in his diocese were homosexuals—it was just an “expression of affection”—he strongly disagreed. “In the consecrated life and in the priestly life, there is no place for that kind of affection.” Well said.

If there is no direct cause between being a homosexual and molesting minors, why are homosexuals overrepresented in committing these crimes? Between the independent variable, being a homosexual, and the dependent variable, the molestation, there is an intermediate variable that explains the relationship: emotional and sexual immaturity.

We’ve known, at least since Freud, that many homosexual men are psychosexually stunted—they tap out in their adolescence—and it is this immaturity that attracts them to adolescents. Some, though not most, homosexual men express their immaturity by molesting minors. It is this that accounts for their role in the sexual abuse of minors.

We will never cure this curse in the Catholic Church unless we come to grips with the disastrous role that immature homosexual priests have played in generating the scandal. As Catholics, we are called to pursue the truth. It’s time more

did so.