

Fr. Perozich comments —

The term “organization men” refers to those in an association, political party, commercial company, religion, or other organized endeavor who promote and defend the organization, right or wrong, always and everywhere. They know and speak the company line. They never undermine the authorities over them. They respect the hierarchy of authority.

*Cardinal Müller did not speak so freely when he was ensconced in the “organization” as the head of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. Even now, he does not undermine the Holy Father as a person, but does point out **attacks from within**: organizational waffling, infidelities, ambiguities, confusion, inconsistencies that are present in the organization, in the teaching of “organization men” in the church.*

Cardinal Raymond Burke served faithfully in the Rota before his term expired and he was replaced. Now outside the organizational structure, in the tradition of the church, he presented dubia and continued to plead for answers.

The cardinals maintain respect for the organization, for their superiors, yet they fall back on the person of Jesus Christ, the very Truth which all in the organization called “The Holy Catholic Church” should be promoting always and everywhere.

I myself was censored as a pastor from publishing anything but calendaring events in a church bulletin. Since I no longer serve as a pastor by my own request, I am outside the direct structure of the diocesan organization. These two cardinals give me the example to respect the office of the superior, yet show me the freedom to speak the truth of the Person of Jesus Christ always and everywhere.

Other priests have been censored, removed from office, silenced, defrocked, prohibited from ministering in dioceses for challenging the waffling, inconsistencies, infidelities, ambiguities, and confusion promoted by “organization men”, all the while maintaining fidelity to Jesus Christ, the Way, the Truth, and the Life in Sacred Scripture and Sacred Tradition.

*Our Catholic faith is under **attack from without**. My own Senator from Hawaii, Maize Hirono, says that no one who is a member of the Knights of Columbus is fit to serve in public office because the Knights support Holy Matrimony between a man and a woman, and that they have not supported sexual perversions and identities [my words].*

My Hawaii state representative, Tulsi Gabbard, declared for the presidency. Her father, Hawaii state senator Mike Gabbard, fought for 1 man 1 woman marriage years ago. Tulsi fought along with him. The family lost their restaurant business through protests by sex activists. Tulsi left the Catholic faith. She now identifies as Buddhist. She has apologized to sexual activists for her previous efforts on behalf of marriage.

Senator Mike Gabbard spoke at our Maui Knights of Columbus meeting, urging us to be faithful to Jesus and His teachings in spite of his suffering.

Our Maui county Mayor, Mike Victorino, is a Knight of Columbus and a parishioner of St. Anthony parish in Wailuku.

Both of these men are fit to serve, and are members of the Democrat party. They would not be elected otherwise in this very blue state.

Our March for Life in Washington, D.C. was infiltrated by members of other organizations with other agenda. Insults were hurled at teenagers who wished to Make America Great Again, calling her back to life from conception to natural death. Their path was blocked by a man beating a drum. The media falsely accused them of assaulting a Native American. Their diocese prematurely condemned the situation without the facts.

In the timeless Baltimore Catechism is one of the first questions, "Why did God make me?"

The answer is, "God made me to show forth His goodness, to know, to love, and to serve Him in this world, and to be happy with Him in the next.

Doctrine develops, not deforms. The faith never changes because Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever. Unfortunately, men's hearts do change and warp as says Jeremiah 17:9 "More tortuous than anything is the human heart, beyond remedy; who can understand it?"

Now you know that you, faithful Catholic, are being attacked from inside and from outside the Church. Stay faithful to Jesus. Go to Holy Mass, receive the Sacraments, respect the office of your superiors, go to prayer before the Blessed Sacrament, obey the Bible and Catechism for the truth even when the organization men tell you differently. Take the faith out to the world, knowing you will suffer for it. This is what Jesus did. This is what we faithful do guided by Him and imitating our Redeemer.

Cdl. Müller: Church leaders are exploiting abuse crisis to undermine celibacy

ROME, January 24, 2018 ([LifeSiteNews](#)) – Church leaders who reduce clergy sex abuse to “clericalism,” while failing to acknowledge how active homosexuality has contributed to the crisis, “don’t want to confront the true reasons” why “minors, boys and young men” are abused, Cardinal Gerhard Müller has said.

In a new [interview](#) with the *National Catholic Register* ahead of the February 21-24 Vatican summit on the protection of minors, the prefect emeritus of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, also said he believes these same Church leaders are “against celibacy” and “the sixth commandment,” and are exploiting the sex abuse crisis to push “their own agenda.”

It is widely expected that efforts will be made at the Vatican’s [Pan-Amazonian Synod](#) next October to relax the Latin Rite’s discipline of priestly celibacy, by way of an “exception” that will then open the door to married clergy in other regions of the world.

The right diagnosis

In the Jan. 23 interview, Cardinal Müller said that blaming the sexual abuse crisis on “clericalism” is “very unjust [to] Jesus.”

The Lord “gave spiritual power and authority to the apostles,” he said, adding that such abuse is “not due to the sacrament of holy orders, but to sexual incontinence, a false

understanding of sexuality, [and] not respecting the Sixth Commandment.”

“If you are a priest, you must preach the Decalogue and respect it. Where is it written in the Holy Bible or a book about the priesthood, or the Church Fathers, that because you are a priest, you are outside morality? On the contrary, you must set a good example,” he said.

Asked about his hopes for the February Vatican meeting on “the protection of minors in the Church,” Müller said what’s needed is a “diagnosis of the true reasons of the crisis.”

“You cannot give the right treatment with the wrong diagnosis,” he said. “We must confront reality in the light of the Gospel, the Church’s doctrine and discipline, and the spirituality of the priesthood.”

He said Pope Francis was “absolutely right” when he said in [a recent interview](#) that priests who practice homosexuality should consider leaving the priesthood.

“Practiced homosexuality is against the plan of God,” he said.

“Homosexual practice is not acceptable, not with adults and absolutely not with minors. More than 80% of the victims of sexual abuse are young boys, adolescent male minors, over 14 years. This is a homosexual act,” he added. “The abuse of females is just as terrible.”

The cardinal distinguished between “same-sex attraction” and “homosexual practice,” but noted that “same-sex attraction in no way justifies homosexual contact.”

“We don’t need a new interpretation of this doctrine but, rather, more obedience to the word of God. ‘For God did not call us to impurity, but to holiness ... who [also] gives his Holy Spirit to you’ (1Thessalonians 4,7-8),”

Since the McCarrick scandal broke last June, high-ranking prelates including deceased Bishop Robert Morlino of Madison, Wisconsin, and Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò, have said the sexual abuse crisis will not be solved until the causes are

denounced and measures are taken to eliminate them. And they agree that chief among these causes is a “homosexual subculture” within the hierarchy.

Asked about Chicago Cardinal Blasé Cupich’s downplaying of consensual homosexual acts between clergy, Müller said: “Where is that written in Holy Scripture?” and called his position “secularized.”

“If two men steal something consensually, is this any more acceptable because they’ve consented to do that together? That is a sin in a double sense. In no way does consensuality relativize a sin.”

A consensual homosexual act between a bishop or priest and a seminarian is “more than grave,” he said.

Cardinal Cupich is one of two cardinals whom Pope Francis appointed to organize the Vatican summit on clergy sex abuse in February.

Cupich, who featured prominently in Archbishop Viganò’s initial 11-page [testimony](#), [dismissed](#) the former nuncio’s testimony on the McCarrick abuse cover-up as a mere “[rabbit hole](#)” distracting the Church. He has also [said](#) he believes that homosexuality is not a significant contributing factor in the abuse of minors (despite statistics showing otherwise: watch video [here at 42:33](#)), and [defended](#) the Vatican postponing U.S. bishops from voting at their November assembly on measures to prevent abuse cover-up.

The limited title of the February meeting (“the protection of minors in the Church”), and the Pope’s choice of Cardinal Cupich to organize it, support Cardinal Müller’s position that at least some Church leaders are not facing the elephant in the room.

A theological meltdown

Cardinal Müller’s Jan. 23 interview with the Register also touched on the current crisis in theology.

He said there is a “breakdown” not only of “academic theology” but in the faith from which all true theology flourishes. “We need more qualified theologians” who are grounded in “Scripture, Tradition, and the Magisterium,” he said.

Turning to the Pope’s change to the Catechism on the death penalty, the prefect emeritus of the CDF said that “theoretically” we cannot deny the admissibility of capital punishment, even when we are “against executions” in practice.

“If there are capital crimes, the question is if the secular state has the right to perform an execution. But Jesus was condemned to death, he was innocent, and this belongs to soteriology,” he said, adding that “these questions weren’t reflected on” before the change was made to the Catechism.

“The impression is not good that the Pope, if he wants to do, can simply change the Catechism,” he added. “Where are the limits? The magisterium is not above the word of God, but under it and serves it (*Dei Verbum*, 10),” he said.

Müller noted that the change was “justified” as a “development of dogma,” but he said “the death penalty has nothing directly to do with dogma,” but is rather based in natural law and the “natural ethics of the state.”

Asked if he thinks theology and dogma will make a comeback, Müller said that “many liberal Catholics are very content with the relativizing of moral dogma.”

“They always want to be on the side of the majority, the collective, but belonging to Christ is a cross, requiring penitence and change of life, obedience to the commandments, the fellowship of Christ,” he said, adding: “Some want a soft God.”

The Cardinal also noted that “some Church leaders don’t realize the deep crisis the Church is in. But he insisted that we must “learn from the mistakes of history” and “learn from the great reform movements.”

Müller concluded, saying the right understanding of reform is best summed up in the words of St. Paul: “Do not conform

yourselves to this age, but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that you may discern what is the will of God, what is good and pleasing and perfect” (Romans 12:2).

Cardinal Müller: Clergy Sex Abuse Involves Sexual Misconduct, Not Merely Clericalism

Speaking with the Register, the former head of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith says Church leaders must acknowledge the central role homosexuality has played in the abuse crisis.

Edward Pentin

Those who reduce clergy sex abuse to clericalism and never mention the role that homosexuality has played in the crisis “don’t want to confront the true reasons” for the abuse, Cardinal Gerhard Müller has told the Register.

The prefect emeritus of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith also said these groups and individuals who publicly hold these views are against priestly celibacy and are exploiting such abuse crimes “for their own agenda.” Cardinal Müller shared these words in a sit-down interview with the Register in Rome recently, during which he shared his hopes for the Feb. 21-24 meeting of bishops on the “protection of minors” and discussed a range of other topics.

The German cardinal, who has been giving many interviews and talks on the crisis in the Church since Pope Francis asked him to step down as prefect in July 2017, also said he believed academic theology is facing “a breakdown” and that “more qualified theologians” are needed, along with “an appreciation for them.”

“Some Church’s leaders don’t realize the deep crisis the Church is in,” he said. “We must learn from the mistakes of history and learn from the great reform movements.”

Your Eminence, what is your view of the argument that clerical sex abuse is the result of clericalism?

It’s very unjust against Jesus, who gave spiritual power and authority to the apostles and bishops, with their priests. The large majority of such abuses are not due to the sacrament of holy orders, but to sexual incontinence, a false understanding of sexuality, not respecting the Sixth Commandment.

If you are a priest, you must preach the Decalogue and respect it. Where is it written in the Holy Bible or a book about the priesthood, or the Church Fathers, that because you are a priest, you are outside morality? On the contrary, you must set a good example.

Why are some Church leaders pushing the clericalism argument but never mentioning homosexuality?

I think they don’t want to confront the true reasons for sexual abuse of minors, of boys and young men, and want to make their own agenda. They’re against celibacy, against the Sixth Commandment, and therefore they instrumentalize abuse and this terrible situation for their own agenda.

What are your hopes for the February conference?

There has yet to be an analysis or diagnosis of the true reasons of the crisis, and you cannot give the right treatment with the wrong diagnosis. Take, for example, my broken wrist that happened when I fell a few weeks ago. I went to the doctor and told him I have so much pain in this hand, and it’s as if he would have said: “It has nothing to do with a broken hand. It’s because you’re an ivory-tower professor who trips over his own feet; you must go to a psychologist and have your mind changed. Then you’ll have no more pain.” It’s absurd. We must confront reality in the light of the Gospel, the Church’s doctrine and discipline, and the spirituality of the priesthood.

What do you make of the Pope’s recent comments on homosexuality in a recent interview, that homosexual

priests who perform such acts should consider leaving the priesthood?

Practiced homosexuality is against the plan of God, the Creator, and nobody can relativize the Law of God. The Pope was absolutely right. Homosexual practice is not acceptable, not with adults and absolutely not with minors. More than 80% of the victims of sexual abuse are young boys, adolescent male minors, over 14 years. This is a homosexual act. But the abuse of females is just as terrible.

Daniel Mattson's book *Why I Don't Call Myself Gay* is very good on this. I presented the Italian version of it. On the one hand, there's same-sex attraction, and on the other hand is homosexual practice, which is quite different. If you have a normal attraction to women, you're not allowed to have a sexual attraction to every woman, only with your own wife. That's very clear.

Same-sex attraction in no way justifies homosexual contact, as St. Paul said in the first chapter of his Letter to the Romans. We don't need a new interpretation of this doctrine but, rather, more obedience to the word of God. "For God did not call us to impurity, but to holiness ... who [also] gives his Holy Spirit to you" (1 Thessalonians 4,7-8).

One prominent cardinal has tried to distinguish between non-consensual and consensual acts.

Where is that written in Holy Scripture? It's a secularized meaning. If two men steal something consensually, is this any more acceptable because they've consented to do that together? That is a sin in a double sense. In no way does consensuality relativize a sin.

And it is likewise very grave if consensual between, say, a bishop or priest and a seminarian?

More than grave. A sin is a sin, and circumstances can aggravate the sin or diminish the guilt.

The U.S. priest Father George Rutler recently said the Vatican is undergoing "theological Chernobyl." Do you agree with that?

There's a breakdown not only of academic theology but also the basis of all theology, revealed through faith.

We need more qualified theologians and have an appreciation for them. There are certain different forms of theology: The Church Fathers, the scholastics, were inspired by other philosophers, but we have a legitimate plurality of theology on the same basis of the faith. Scotus is a little bit different from St. Thomas Aquinas, and St. Augustine is different from Hieronymus, but it's the same basis, the same content: Scripture, Tradition, magisterium.

For example, some are speaking about the reform of the Curia, but not everybody has an idea what is the theological, ecclesiological position of the Holy Roman Church, with the Pope as its head. What is the College of Cardinals? It's a representation of the Holy Roman Church, a *presbyterium* or synod of the Pope for his universal mission.

What are your views on the Pope's death-penalty comments and his revision of the Catechism to make capital punishment "inadmissible"?

We're against executions, but theoretically we absolutely cannot deny them, if we look at the history of discussion on this subject. If there are capital crimes, the question is if the secular state has the right to perform an execution. But Jesus was condemned to death, he was innocent, and this belongs to soteriology; but these questions weren't reflected on before the new declaration was made. And the impression is not good that the Pope, if he wants to do, can simply change the Catechism. Where are the limits? The magisterium is not above the word of God, but under it and serves it (*Dei Verbum*, 10).

Do you think it sets a bad precedent, such unilateral action?

It was justified as a development of dogma, but the death penalty has nothing directly to do with dogma. This is a natural truth belonging to the natural ethics of the state. It's not material related to God's self-revelation of the truth and the salvation of all. This is the self-revelation of God in Jesus Christ, or the sacraments belonging to the *materia fidei*. But we also have natural truths: The Church fights for human rights, for example, but natural human rights don't belong to supernatural Revelation.

One argument is that Benedict XVI and St. John Paul II laid the path for this. John Paul, for example, called for an international moratorium on the death penalty.

This is another question: There's the theoretical and the practical. The first thing to consider is: Are there crimes that result in loss of life, which take away the life of all, that mean the perpetrator has lost his right to life? The other question is whether and how that should be carried out. Some modern antidemocratic states and dictatorships have no respect for human dignity.

Do you think an absolutist position against the death penalty relates to a wider and deeper problem of a loss of the sense of justice, a problem that some believe stems from a loss of belief in the Final Judgement — the reasoning being that if there's no Final Judgement, this affects our overall perspective of justice in all our relationships?

Generally we need more of a sense of ultimate responsibility, and not feeling just answerable to the reaction of the press, the internet, or only public opinion.

Do you think a major problem is that we have lost a sense of the eternal, the supernatural, so we view everything from the perspective of this life?

I think almost all believe in eternal life but it's only a consolation for death, while others don't think it relevant to their own life, deeds, omissions, sins. In their understanding, God is always bestowing mercy, but it's not the God of the Revelation of Jesus Christ. It's their own projection. "I forgive myself and God is only the mirror in which I see myself, he is my God. God doesn't justify me, but I justify myself and God is only the medium."

Is a turning point coming, do you think? Might some things change and the importance of theology and dogma make a comeback?

Many liberal Catholics are very content with the relativizing of moral dogma.

They always want to be on the side of the majority, the collective, but belonging to Christ is a cross, requiring penitence and change of

life, obedience to the commandments, the fellowship of Christ. Some want a soft God.

Some Church leaders don't realize the deep crisis the Church is in. We must learn from the mistakes of history and learn from the great reform movements.

There we have the right understanding of reform: "Do not conform yourselves to this age, but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that you may discern what is the will of God, what is good and pleasing and perfect" (Romans 12:2).

Edward Pentin is the Register's Rome correspondent.

Silencing Catholic Speech

By David Carlin

FRIDAY, JANUARY 25, 2019

Ideological defenders of homosexuality argue that all disapproval of homosexual conduct arises from "homophobia" and that all speech against homosexuality is, therefore, "hate speech." In the United States, in recent decades, this campaign against homophobic hate speech has been very effective. Almost never nowadays does anybody dare to utter a public word of disapproval against homosexuality.

What about the Catholic Church? Has the homosexualist campaign against "hate speech" had the effect of silencing the Church, of preventing it from communicating its ancient teaching that homosexual sodomy is sinful?

If my anecdotal information is reliable, it is a rare priest who gets into the pulpit at a weekend Mass and reminds his parishioners that homosexual conduct is seriously sinful. In some cases, probably not many, this silence on the part of priests is the result of their disagreement with Church teaching on the subject.

But in most cases, their silence is likely just a matter of discretion (the kind of "discretion" that is, as Falstaff says, the better part of

valor). Why upset parishioners, many of whom disagree with the Church teaching on homosexuality, and not a few of whom have friends or family members who are gay or lesbian? Let sleeping dogs lie.

“Besides,” the priest can say to himself every time he decides not to preach on this touchy topic, “everybody knows what the Church teaching is. No need for me to remind them.”

This is true to a certain extent. The Catholic Church is famous for its super-strict sexual ethic, according to which the only morally legitimate sex is that which takes place between husband and wife without contraception and within the context of monogamous marriage. If you know that, then you know that the Church condemns homosexual conduct. Leaving aside the fact that some people don’t actually know this (it’s amazing what perfectly obvious things some people don’t know), there is a distinction between believing something in the abstract and actually believing it.

Take, for example, another element of the Catholic sexual ethic: the teaching that marital contraception is a serious sin. “Everybody knows” in an abstract way that this is what the Church teaches, but not many American Catholics think this is what the Church *actually* believes. Why not? Because for a half-century, ever since Pope Paul VI reaffirmed the traditional Church teaching on this topic in his encyclical *Humanae Vitae*, parish priests have pretty much left the topic of contraception alone.



*

The priest knows that the younger married couples in his parish (if he's lucky enough, in many places, to *have* any younger couples) are almost certainly practicing contraception, or are getting ready to practice it as soon as they achieve their desired quota of children; and he knows that many of his older parishioner couples used to practice it when the wife was still young enough to get pregnant.

So it is not a sin that is rare and almost unheard-of among his parishioners, like murder or bank robbery. To sermonize against murder or bank robbery would indeed be a waste of time. But to sermonize against contraception would be to call the attention of parishioners to a sin commonly committed in the parish. Yet for the priest to sermonize against contraception would be to antagonize parishioners and make himself unpopular. Better, then, to remain silent on the topic.

But this silence, when it persists year after year, decade after decade, pastor after pastor, gradually persuades the average person in the pews that the Church isn't truly serious when it says that marital contraception is a serious sin. The Church must think that marital contraception is a minor sin or perhaps not a sin at all.

William Ellery Channing (1780-1842), often called "the father of American Unitarianism," once wrote that Calvinism went into decline in and around Boston, not because Congregational ministers sermonized against Calvinist doctrines, but because they no longer preached in support of these doctrines. The anti-Calvinists didn't preach against the doctrines of predestination, total depravity, the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, etc. They just remained silent about these matters. And then one day the best people in Boston woke up and realized that they were no longer orthodox Christians and had become Unitarians.

Something not very different from this is happening in American Catholicism with regard to homosexual behavior (not to mention other elements of Catholic sexual ethics). Perhaps no priest is preaching *against* the traditional Catholic teaching. But not many are preaching *in support* of it either. As a consequence, the moral disapproval of homosexual conduct that *should* be found and *used to be* found in the hearts and minds of Catholics is withering away.

And so the answer to the question I asked above – "Has the homosexualist effort to silence all criticism of homosexual behavior been effective among American Catholic priests?" – is a definite: YES. The success of this "let's silence the Catholic Church" campaign imposes, it seems to me, a fourfold obligation upon Catholic bishops and priests to preach vigorously against homosexual conduct. This must be done:

- (1) in order that the Catholic moral doctrine regarding homosexuality not fade away;
- (2) in order to say in no uncertain terms to pro-gay ideologues and their anti-Christianity allies, "You will not silence us on this or any other Christian topic";
- (3) in order to give encouragement to faithful Catholics, many of whom sometimes fear that the Church is about to discard or water-down this element and other elements of the Catholic faith. And

(4) it must be done to give encouragement to non-Catholic Christians who, whatever their disagreements with Rome, look to the Catholic Church as Christianity's Rock of Gibraltar.

Catholics and everybody else, both friend and foe, must be assured that the Catholic Church is not about to walk down the path that has been trod by liberal Protestant churches; that is, it is not about to discard one element after another of Christianity, thereby drawing closer and closer to atheism.

***Image:** *Acedia* (i.e. *sloth*) by Hieronymus Bosch, c. 1500-10 [Museo del Prado, Madrid]. This is a detail from *The Seven Deadly Sins and the Four Last Things* (below).



© 2019 *The Catholic Thing*. All rights reserved. For reprint rights, write to: info@frinstitute.org

The Catholic Thing is a forum for intelligent Catholic commentary. Opinions expressed by writers are solely their own.



David Carlin

David Carlin is a professor of sociology and philosophy at the Community College of Rhode Island, and the author of *The Decline and Fall of the Catholic Church in America*.

AN OUTCAST AMONG ORGANIZATION MEN

FEW CHURCHMEN SPEAK ABOUT THE ROOT CAUSE OF THE ABUSE CRISIS

By Pieter Vree | **December 2018**
Pieter Vree is Editor of the NOR.

Today's bishops are a frustrating bunch. Sure, a few are courageous and even holy, but these seem to be buffeted by fools, cowards, and Organization Men — a term coined in 1956 by William Whyte that has come to

denote those whose personal values and judgments are dominated by the organizations for which they work. Corporate conformists, you might call them. They feel obligated to fit in, to serve and protect The Organization. In a hierarchy so populated, few are the churchmen who are willing to speak publicly about the core problem facing the Church today — more so the higher up the ecclesial ladder they ascend. Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò is one of those few. He is an outlier, even an outcast. His is like the voice of one crying out in the ecclesial wilderness.

Archbishop Viganò recently released his third salvo in the ongoing matter of who knew of Theodore Cardinal McCarrick's habitual sexual predations and when. Initially Viganò testified (Aug. 22) that Pope Francis himself was aware that the former cardinal archbishop of Washington, D.C., was a serial abuser of seminarians and minors, yet the Holy Father nevertheless provided cover for McCarrick and even made him his "trusted advisor" (see "At Last, a Reckoning?" New Oxford Notebook, Oct.).

Viganò concluded his second missive (Sept. 27) with a direct appeal to Marc Cardinal Ouellet, prefect of the Congregation for Bishops. "Your Eminence," he wrote, "you were the one who told me of Pope Benedict's sanctions on McCarrick. You have at your complete disposal key documents incriminating McCarrick and many in the curia for their cover-ups. Your Eminence, I urge you to bear witness to the truth."

That, naturally, didn't elicit a favorable reply. Instead, to Viganò's undoubted dismay, Cardinal Ouellet stepped smoothly into the role of Organization Man. He issued his

own communiqué (Oct. 7) in which he calls Viganò's claims "sarcastic, even blasphemous" and says emphatically that they "cannot come from the Spirit of God." If not from God, then they must come from the spirit of Satan. What better way to render Viganò an unperson than to claim that he has thwarted the values that undergird The Organization? In this, Ouellet has echoed Francis's subtle suggestion that Viganò is in league with the Devil (see "Ecce Papa Franciscus!" New Oxford Notebook, Nov.) — a smear tactic suited more to Soviet apparatchiks of yesteryear than to today's enlightened ecclesiastics.

Ouellet writes that a review of his office's archives revealed "no documents signed by either Pope" regarding sanctions against McCarrick and "no audience notes" from Ouellet's predecessor "imposing on the retired Archbishop the obligation to lead a quiet and private life with the weight normally reserved to canonical penalties." It is "false," therefore, for Viganò to call these measures "sanctions formally imposed by Pope Benedict XVI and then invalidated by Pope Francis."

But Viganò never once mentioned canonical penalties or formal proceedings against McCarrick. Rather, he wrote (Sept. 22) that both he and his predecessor in the apostolic nunciature had informed McCarrick face to face — i.e., verbally — of Pope Benedict XVI's sanctions, but McCarrick openly defied the orders. And Ouellet, despite himself, confirms this. He divulges that "it had been requested" of McCarrick "not to travel or to make public appearances, in order to avoid new rumors about him."

Nota bene: To avoid new rumors, not to avoid supplying McCarrick with new victims. Appearances and reputations must be maintained, lest scandal break out. That, friends, is the clericalist mindset, the mindset typical of Organization Men.

Ouellet contradicts himself further. He admits that he had given Viganò “written instructions” when he assumed the role of apostolic nuncio to the U.S. about “certain conditions and restrictions that [McCarrick] had to follow on account of some rumors about his past conduct” — conditions that, he says, addressing Viganò, “I mentioned to you verbally.” Clearly, no thought was given to canonical proceedings; rather, the Vatican used an informal chain of communication to relay Benedict’s sanctions to McCarrick. It’s not difficult to see through Ouellet’s thin sophism.

Viganò had written (Aug. 22) that Francis and McCarrick enjoyed a “long friendship.” Ouellet counters: “I strongly doubt that McCarrick interested him [Francis] as much as you would like people to think.” That’s weak sauce, sir. The public record overwhelms Ouellet’s wishful rejoinder. Consider this from the National Catholic Reporter (June 21, 2014), a year into Francis’s papacy:

McCarrick is one of a number of senior churchmen who were more or less put out to pasture during the eight-year pontificate of Pope Benedict XVI. But now Francis is pope, and prelates like Cardinal Walter Kasper (another old friend of McCarrick’s) and McCarrick himself are back in the mix and busier than ever. McCarrick in particular has been on a tear in the past year, traveling to the Philippines to console typhoon victims and visiting

geopolitical pivot points such as China and Iran for sensitive talks on religious freedom and nuclear proliferation....

McCarrick loves the action, of course, and he is well-suited to his roving ambassador role. He speaks several languages fluently and he seems to know everybody — and everybody knows him....

Francis, who has put the Vatican back on the geopolitical stage, knows that when he needs a savvy back-channel operator, he can turn to McCarrick.... [McCarrick] was sort of spinning his wheels under Benedict. Then Francis was elected, and everything changed.

Sorry, cardinal, but Francis, by all indications, was very much interested in McCarrick. And clearly, whatever “conditions and restrictions” Ouellet had communicated to Viganò, including McCarrick’s “not traveling or making public appearances,” were removed when Francis rose to power — gee, by whom? — or were blatantly disregarded by both McCarrick and his old buddy, Pope Francis.

Yes, buddy. The Reporter’s glowing profile of the newly paroled, globe-hopping cardinal contains some curious anecdotes about his and Francis’s friendship. One mentions McCarrick’s heart problems in 2013, which resulted in his getting a pacemaker. While he was convalescing at — where else? — the U.S. seminary in Rome, McCarrick received a phone call:

It was Francis. The two men had known each other for years, back when the Argentine pope was Cardinal Jorge Bergoglio, archbishop of Buenos Aires. McCarrick assured Francis that he was doing fine. “I guess the Lord isn’t done

with me yet,” he told the pope. “Or the devil doesn’t have your accommodations ready!” Francis shot back with a laugh.

Hilarity! Just a couple of old pals joshing around. Or was there more to it? The Reporter mentions another similar episode:

McCarrick travels regularly to the Middle East and was in the Holy Land for Francis’ visit in May. “The bad ones, they never die!” the pope teased McCarrick again when he saw him.

These supposedly friendly jabs take on a dark undertone in light of recent revelations. We all know now — and perhaps Francis knew then — that McCarrick is indeed a “bad one.” And the Devil very well may be preparing his “accommodations.” The truth, they say, is often spoken in jest.

Despite all this, Ouellet sees fit to chastise Viganò. He finds Viganò’s “attitude” to be “incomprehensible” and says it is “abhorrent” for him to use the “clamorous” sex-abuse crisis to “inflict an unmerited and unheard of blow to the moral authority of your superior, the Supreme Pontiff.”

“I can only conclude,” Ouellet writes, that “this monstrous and unsubstantiated accusation” is a “political plot that lacks any real basis that could incriminate the Pope and that profoundly harms the communion of the Church.” Ouellet urges Viganò to “repent of your revolt and return to better feelings towards the Holy Father.... You cannot end your priestly life in this way, in an open and scandalous rebellion.” Ouellet wants to make crystal

clear that Viganò has broken communion with The Organization.

And that's what prompted Viganò's third letter.

In it Viganò denies responsibility for “creating confusion and division in the Church.” Such a claim, he writes, can only be plausible to those “who believe such confusion and division were negligible prior to August 2018.” Impartial observers, he says, will have noted “a longstanding excess of both.”

Viganò writes that he was “fully aware” that his testimony would “bring alarm and dismay to many eminent persons,” including his colleagues and fellow bishops, some of whom would assail him and his motives — as indeed both Francis and Ouellet, among others, have done. Yet he felt compelled to witness to the truth — a truth that many in the Church would prefer to explain away or ignore entirely. Though it was a “painful decision” to have to expose “corruption in the hierarchy,” Viganò is at peace knowing that he can present himself before the Seat of Judgment with a clear conscience. “I invoked God as my witness to the truth of my claims,” he writes, “and none has been shown false.”

It is here that Viganò hits on the central cause of the clerical sex-abuse scandal that erupted in early 2002 and, over a decade and a half later, is still racking the Church. “In the public remonstrances directed at me,” he writes, “I have noted two omissions, two dramatic silences. The first silence regards the plight of the victims. The second regards the underlying reason why there are so many

victims, namely, the corrupting influence of homosexuality in the priesthood and in the hierarchy.” Bingo!

As documented by the John Jay Report (2004) commissioned by the U.S. bishops, 81 percent of clerical sex-abuse cases involved male victims, with 78 percent of those victims being postpubescent males. To call the scandal one of pedophilia is misleading; to blame clericalism is dishonest. The problem, at its core, is, and always has been, one of homosexuality. And McCarrick is the poster-boy of homosexual predator priests: He preyed on seminarians primarily and, in one exceptional case, began raping a boy when he was 11 years old, continuing that sexually abusive relationship for 20 years. (For details, see our final New Oxford Note, “Uncle Ted’ McCarrick: Queen Pin of the Lavender Mafia,” Sept.)

The sex-abuse crisis “cannot be properly addressed and resolved unless and until we call things by their true names,” Viganò writes. What he says deserves to be considered at length:

This is a crisis due to the scourge of homosexuality, in its agents, in its motives, in its resistance to reform. It is no exaggeration to say that homosexuality has become a plague in the clergy.... It is an enormous hypocrisy to condemn the abusers, claim to weep for the victims, and yet refuse to denounce the root cause of so much sexual abuse: homosexuality. It is hypocrisy to refuse to...take the steps necessary to remedy it.... The evidence for homosexual collusion [in the priesthood], with its deep roots that are so difficult to eradicate, is overwhelming. It

is well established that homosexual predators exploit clerical privilege to their advantage.

Finally! A high-ranking prelate has acknowledged the nefarious existence of the Lavender Mafia. It is real.

Viganò knows full well that he is committing career suicide by outing the homosexual subculture in the priesthood. But he also knows that he is already isolated within the hierarchical structure, a persona non grata in Francis's Vatican, and so he is not deterred. Nor will he be intimidated into silence. Instead, he issues a clarion call that each one of us would do well to ponder:

To my brother bishops and priests who know that my statements are true and who can so testify, or who have access to documents that can put the matter beyond doubt: You too are faced with a choice. You can choose to withdraw from the battle, to prop up the conspiracy of silence and avert your eyes from the spreading of corruption. You can make excuses, compromises and justification that put off the day of reckoning. You can console yourselves with the falsehood and the delusion that it will be easier to tell the truth tomorrow, and then the following day, and so on.

On the other hand, you can choose to speak. You can trust Him who told us, "the truth will set you free." I do not say it will be easy to decide between silence and speaking. I urge you to consider which choice — on your deathbed, and then before the just Judge — you will not regret having made.

The gravest danger to the Church isn't scandal — we've had plenty of that. The gravest danger is silence —

silence about the root cause of the sex-abuse crisis: the scourge of homosexuality in the priesthood. Silence shields a refusal to address that cause, an eagerness to preserve the status quo. Just as the Lavender Mafia is no mirage, the risk is real that the system of sexual abuse and cover-up will be perpetuated by the conspiracy of silence in the Church.

Archbishop Viganò has thrown down the gauntlet, and each one of us must answer the challenge, not least those in positions of power: Do I stand for truth or falsehood? Will I speak out or hold my tongue? In the wise words in Ecclesiastes, “For everything there is a season, and a time for every matter under heaven.... A time to keep silence, and a time to speak” (3:1, 7). Now is the time to speak.

©2018 New Oxford Review. All Rights Reserved.

From Viganò’s Third Letter

“Denouncing homosexual corruption and the moral cowardice that allows it to flourish does not meet with congratulation in our times, not even in the highest spheres of the Church. I am not surprised that in calling attention to these plagues I am charged with disloyalty to the Holy Father and with fomenting an open and scandalous rebellion. Yet rebellion would entail urging others to topple the papacy. I am urging no such thing. I pray every day for Pope Francis — more than I have ever done for the other popes. I am asking, indeed earnestly begging, the Holy Father to face up to the commitments he

himself made in assuming his office as successor of Peter. He took upon himself the mission of confirming his brothers and guiding all souls in following Christ, in the spiritual combat, along the way of the cross. Let him admit his errors, repent, show his willingness to follow the mandate given to Peter and, once converted, let him confirm his brothers (Lk 22:32).”