The Elephants in God's Living Room
Clergy Sexual Abuse and Institutional Clericalism

Volume One: Theoretical Issues

Ruth Elizabeth Krall, M.S.N., Ph.D.

Enduring Space
© www.ruthkrall.com
March, 2012

The Elephant in God's Living Room
Clergy Sexual Abuse and Institutional Clericalism:
Volume One: Theoretical Issues

Ruth Elizabeth Krall

This manuscript may be downloaded and used for classroom use by undergraduate or graduate students and their faculty. It may also be downloaded and used by congregations, denominations, and other religious institutions in continuing education activities. Finally, it may be downloaded and used by individuals who wish to inform themselves about matters of clergy and religious professional abuse.

In none of the above situations, should this manuscript be sold or traded in any way for economic profit.

The author's intention is to make this information widely available to all individuals who are interested in its content. Therefore, while the material has been copyright protected, it is offered to a wide variety of religious communities for their use in studying clergy sexual abuse and clericalism.

Includes bibliographic references

1) Clergy Sexual Abuse – 20th Century, United States
2) Religious Institution Clericalism – 20th Century, United States
3) Violence Typologies: Public Health, Social Sciences, and Religious Studies
4) Individual, Collective and Transpersonal Consciousness
5) Betrayal Trauma
6) Sexual Victimization Trauma
7) Religious Authoritarianism and the Duty to Obey
8) Forgiveness Models and the Duty to Forgive

Webpage Cover Photograph, Stuart Bassil, South African Elephant Used With Permission

In Memory

Jeevan Paul, MD

This book is dedicated to

Professor John C. Bennett
Professor Howard Clinebell
Professor Dan Rhoades

In the background of this manuscript is my graduate work in theology and personality studies at The Southern California School of Theology in Claremont, CA.

Now deceased, Professor Howard Clinebell's unwavering insistence that religion is called to ministries of healing has deeply informed my personal understanding of a central task for all religious communities. In order for any collective people of God to effectively provide healing ministries, religious organizations and their leaders must manifest a compassionate, trustworthy, holistic, mature spirituality. They need, as well, to demonstrate psycho-social and political-economic wholeness in their organizational structures, policies, and patterns of administration.

In my Christian ethics courses with Professor John C. Bennett (also now deceased) and Professor Dan Rhoades I gained an understanding of God's people as full participants (or co-creators with God) in the liberation of those who are oppressed and disadvantaged by the corrupted social, economic, and political systems which surround them. A preferential option for the wounded, the weak, the violated, and the vulnerable is, in such a theology, the hallmark of a mature, trustworthy, and faithful spiritual community.

With the mentoring encouragement of these faculty mentors, in mid-life I merged skills and interests from my previous clinical education and practice with my interests and emerging skills as a pastoral theologian. This dedication acknowledges my lasting gratitude to each of them for their individual and collective presence in my life.

Table of Contents

Preface

The first flower of unholiness can grow only in the close neighborhood of the Holy. No where do we tempt so successfully as on the very steps of the altar.

Screwtape[1]

This is a book in two volumes. Together, both volumes form a unified whole. The decision to break the book into two distinct volumes was done to help readers (1) navigate complex interdisciplinary theoretical issues from a mix of academic disciplines and (2) apply the materials in a case study format. There is no unifying thesis statement. Nevertheless, some chapters have concepts that might serve as thesis statements.

Volume One deals with a wide variety of theoretical issues that surround individual events of clergy and religious leader sexual abuse of their subordinates. In addition to providing information related to the relationship of sexual abuse predators and their victims, information about current church and religious institution management of abusers is examined.

This first volume functions, therefore, as an interdisciplinary literature review. It attempts to heed the World Health Organization's counsel about the personal and social costs of violence when it reminded the world community that *talking about violence means looking upon complex matters of morality, ideology, and culture* (WHO, 2002b, 1). The sequence of chapters provides readers with information from a variety of academic disciplines and resources: public health, the social sciences, religious studies, ethics, theology, biblical studies, depth psychology, and contemporary studies about the nature of human consciousness.

Because individual academic disciplines have developed their own systems of language, naming and meaning and because these various professional usages of technical language may diverge from ordinary language, I provide definitions for various technical terms as used within a particular theoretical discourse. I also seek to clarify

conceptual distinctions between two cultural realities which may look alike to the casual observer. For example, events of adultery involving two consenting adults are differentiated from sexual abuse between two adults. Since both sets of behavior are commonly labeled sexual misconduct, it is necessary to fine tune our definitions if we are to understand the problem of clergy and religious leader sexual abuse of the laity. To further help the reader who is unfamiliar with sexual violence vocabularies, a glossary is provided in the appendices.

In this first volume I include a deliberate pattern of contrasting Christendom's war theologies and praxis with its sexual violence theologies and praxis. This comparison will reappear in various places. The interpenetrations of war's systemic violence against women and children in cultures which accept civilian acquaintance or affinity violence against them seems clear to me. In addition, in the development of the Post-traumatic Stress Disorder diagnosis the post-war symptoms of veterans and the post—sexual violence symptoms of survivors were both utilized by the American Psychiatric Association in the development of its diagnostic manual for clinicians.[2],[3]

Five forms of clerical or religious leader violence appear in this book. Three fit within the WHO category of personal violence. Two fit within the category of social or structural violence as described by R.M. Brown (1987). *First* there is the physical sexual assault from of personal violence. Rape of a child or an adolescent is an example of such violation and violence. *Secondly*, there is the violence and violation of sexual harassment. This may include contact forms of violence such as unwanted grabbing of another's buttocks or genitals. It may include non-contact violations such as sending an obscene electronic message to a colleague or exposing one's genitals to an administrative assistant. *Third,* there is sexual violence which often masquerades as consenting adult intercourse. In this form of violence an individual with power and authority over another individual engages the subordinate person in sexual activity. This may, for example, include a seminary's religious studies professor who sexually propositions and later has intercourse with one or more of his students. The *fourth form* is that of clericalism, an institutional clergy structure and practice that protects the clergy and church

institutions at the expense of the laity. The *final* form is institutional violence against whistle blowers and other witnesses to clergy sexual abuse and clericalism.

Each form of clergy and religious leader abuse contains elements of personal decision-making. Each, however, is also deeply reflective of the institutional cultures in which such violence erupts. Systemic tolerance and protection of individual clergy sexual abusers establishes a hostile culture for victims, onlookers, and victim advocates. An abusive systemic culture permits, excuses and legitimizes unacceptable sexual behavior by individual members of the clergy.

In addition, this volume examines a very common social misperception in the general public that individual religious professionals (in a wide variety of religious institutions) who sexually abuse others are rare *bad apples in the barrel*. Based upon the demographic research that is available, it appears as if 10-12% of Christian clergy engage in one or more forms of sexual misconduct (Labaqcz and Barton, 1991; Rutter, 1989; Sipe, 1996). It is important to note that sexual misconduct of religious professionals or spiritual teachers is not limited to Christian organizations (Kramer and Alstad, 1993; Lesser, July-August, 2010).

Volume Two **(**forthcoming) contains case study materials. Erik Erikson's methodology of psycho-biography or psycho-history informs the case study methodology and construction. In addition, my life status as a clinician-theologian equally informs and shapes the case study materials.

Book Purposes

Both volumes of this book share four purposes: (1) to raise awareness about clergy sexual abuse of the laity; (2) to educate readers about the component behaviors of sexual abuse *and* institutional clericalism; (3) to engage readers in questions and conversations about action on behalf of those victimized by each form of abuse; (4) to assist readers to examine these complex ethical, spiritual and moral issues with compassion.

As the book's author my personal hope is that this book will be utilized in undergraduate classroom courses about sexual violence. I hope, as well, that it will be used in seminary and religious studies graduate classes as part of seminary student's religious or spiritual formation curricula.

In addition, by publishing this on the web, I hope that individuals who are active in church leadership positions will find the book useful as they seek to inform themselves about clergy sexual abuse. I hope, therefore, to indirectly help religious organizational leaders as they seek to manage clergy abusers in such a manner that re-victimizations of the laity or other religious professionals do not occur and re-occur.

The long-term goal of such education efforts is twofold: (1) to help religious organizations more effectively and compassionately manage instances of sexual abuse by religious leaders wherever and whenever these incidents occur and (2) to prevent sexual abuse by religious leaders within religious communities.

A Word about Resources

I have chosen to list many of the resources I consulted rather than limit the bibliography section to materials directly quoted. Since the audience for this book is undergraduate and graduate students I decided to be selectively inclusive rather than exclusive as I created the chapter reference lists. When I merged various chapter lists into the comprehensive resources list, I excluded books and articles which are (1) outdated or (2) confusing and misleading or (3) which cover concepts other authors present more clearly or in greater depth. I have, however, included books where authors disagree with each other about specific issues. These precautionary comments are particularly relevant since I utilized the internet as one resource for information.

While I have, in general, followed the APA publishing guidelines for authors, I have felt free to follow a general principle (avoid plagiarism) rather than obsess about publishing practices designed for scientific

and technical publications. In quoting internet sources a serious effort has been made to keep the URL information current. In the process of learning how to use the web as a resource tool, I discovered that web addresses frequently change. As of January 2, 2012, URL addresses were re-checked and updated wherever possible. Should a particular URL not work, on-line readers are encouraged to use the article's title in a web search process. When we did this on January 2, 2012, we were able to relocate many sources of information that appeared lost.

At the end of each chapter except the final one I have listed supplementary resources which can help readers to deepen their knowledge base about the content of that chapter. These supplementary resources may not be related specifically to religious institutions or situations of clergy misconduct. They do address, however, issues of violence, power, control and other relevant concepts that do apply to sexual violence experiences of individuals and communities. Some of these resources are now classics from the social sciences. Others reflect contemporary research.

Using This Book in the Classroom or Church Study Groups

Volume One assumes a semester schedule for classroom use. Chapters one and two can be combined as background for a classroom discussion of various types of violence. Chapters three and four can be combined for a discussion of individual consciousness and motivations in violence perpetrators. Chapters five, six, seven and eight can be combined for discussions of issues that surface in the relationships of obedience, authority and power issues to situations of clergy sexual violence. Chapters nine, ten and eleven can be combined to gain an understanding of the behaviors of sexual abuse by clergy. Chapter twelve deals with issues of institutional clericalism and it can be studied in light of chapter thirteen (the Biblical parable of the Good Samaritan). Chapters fourteen and fifteen can be used as background reading to guide classroom discussions about healing and forgiveness.

In addition, at the end of each chapter there are several study and discussion questions. These questions have been designed to help

readers focus upon what they already know and believe about a variety of topics that relate to clergy sexual abuse and institutional clericalism. The questions can be modified or supplemented by a classroom teacher. Students and readers are encouraged to keep a notebook in which they answer each question throughout the course of a semester. This will help readers to track their own learning process and to identify their own questions of each chapter. In addition to a personal notebook, students can be guided by teachers to a process of sharing their answers with others utilizing classroom methodologies such as the electronic blackboard and class discussions.

As is always the case with such a wide-ranging and interdisciplinary literature review, readers may uncover more interesting questions to be pondered and researched. Individuals are, therefore, encouraged to write their own questions in their notebook or on their classroom's electronic blackboard and to follow the lead of their own questions by means of independent study. All of the authors quoted in this book can provide students and other readers with a way to deepen their own awareness of sexual violence inside religious institutions. Many can help readers and students to understand pathological and dysfunctional institutional management practices in situations of clergy sexual abuse.

As the author of this web-published textbook I hope it makes a contribution to a wide variety of denominations and religious communities. I hope it helps individuals and communities to develop awareness of the need to prevent clergy sexual abuse events from happening in the first place. While it is likely that instances of such abuse will continue to happen, what is needed, therefore, is for religious individuals and spiritual teachers to create and implement policies of management in which these episodes of sexual violence become more and more infrequent. This means that religious and educational institutions and the individuals who belong to them need to be informed about clergy sexual abuse and clericalism.

While my personal religious heritage is the historical Anabaptist-Mennonite community, this book looks specifically at issues which have emerged since 1984 in the Roman Catholic communion of faith and praxis. I am an outsider to that community. However, the depth

of analysis that continues to inform and instruct Roman Catholics about the problems of sexual abuse can and does, I believe, provide a model for other faith communities in their efforts to understand and to alter the prevalence of clergy sexual misconduct in many different religious traditions.

Australian Roman Catholic bishop, Geoffrey Robinson (2008), comments that profound changes must happen within the Christian church in order for it to respond appropriately to victims of clergy sexual abuse. For these changes to occur, Christians (or members of other religious groups) must begin to study the phenomena of clergy abuse and the unhealthy institutional environments in which it occurs. In talking about his own responses as a bishop to incidents of sexual abuse Robinson comments, *I start…from the fact of abuse. I argue that, in order to eradicate it, we must investigate it thoroughly and, in doing this, we must be free to follow the argument wherever it leads. If it causes us to question various teachings, laws or attitudes, we must be free to do so. Without this freedom, we would be attempting to respond to abuse while blindfolded and handcuffed..*[4] While Robinson is addressing his comments to Roman Catholic laity and members of the priesthood and religious orders, I agree with him and believe his comments can be adapted and applied to any religious organization or spiritual teaching community.

A Word of Caution

As some early readers of this manuscript have suggested, readers who are very familiar with professional literature regarding clergy and religious leader sexual abuse of children, adolescents and adults may be inclined to skip some of the theory chapters. All readers need to be aware, therefore, that the case study material, in the forthcoming second volume, presumes a working knowledge of the theoretical content in this first volume.

When the first volume has been read and its various questions answered to the best of a student's or reader's ability, then a wide variety of published first hand victim accounts of violation and specific instances of sexual violence and clericalism can be studied and dissected in order to better understand the relevance of these more

abstract and theoretical materials to real life situations. As readers apply this more theoretical content to specific abuse case study situations, they will gain practical experience that they can then apply to real-life situations which they encounter.

Footnotes

[1] C. S. Lewis, (1987). Screwtape Proposes a Toast, *The Screwtape Letters.* New York, NY: Harpers, 209.

[2] American Psychiatric Association, (1994), *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (4th ed.), Washington, DC: APA.

[3] Judith L Herman, (1997). *Trauma and Recovery: the Aftermath of Violence from Domestic Abuse to Political Terror,* New York, NY: Basic Books.

[4] Robinson, G. (2008). *Confronting Power and Sex in the Roman Catholic Church.*
http://bishopgeoffrobinson.org/usa_lecture.htm

Violence is the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in Injury, psychological harm, mal-development or death.

The World Health Organization
World Report on Violence and Health

Introduction

The Church will begin to solve its problems and resolve its tensions when, and only when, clericalism and its adherents reverse priorities and place truth and justice ahead of institutional image.

Harry J. Byrne[1]

Introductory Comments

Only if we are able to stop terrorism in our hearts will we be able to stop terrorism in the world.

Alice Walker[2]

American anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1971, 1973, 1980, 1983) described his personal research methodology as t*hick description.* In writing this book, I have been influenced by Geertz's methodology of gathering information and by his hermeneutic of interpretation. In order to examine clergy and religious leader sexual abuse of the laity and institutional practices of clericalism[3] or clergy malfeasance[4] it is useful to study these violence behavior patterns as cultural forms. Any particular cultural form, Geertz's body of work demonstrates, can be read and studied as a living text. By means of a close reading, two kinds of understanding emerge. The *first* is an understanding of the context in which a particular cultural form emerges. The *second* is an understanding of the cultural form itself. In such a view, sexual abuse of the laity by ordained clergy persons or other spiritual and religious leaders consists of anti-social behaviors or actions done by individuals *and* it also consists of a pre-existing cultural form. The context for that form includes the surrounding culture, in this case Christendom, and a particular institutional culture, in this case, a denomination, an institutional church or other religious institution (Geertz, 1980, pp.103-104).

The goal of such a close reading and interpretive analysis is to learn the form's embodied faith, which in turn recursively reveals the whole. As Geertz comments, the hermeneutical issues of reader and text converge in

such an approach (1980, p.130). By means of the interaction of the reader-observer with the text (cultural form), new understandings emerge. By examining, therefore, the meanings of the cultural forms of (1) clergy and professional leader sexual abuse and (2) institutional clericalism, new understandings emerge about the meaning(s) of such violation to the victims of these specific forms of interpersonal violence. As a clinician-theologian it is my personal belief that understanding cultural forms *and* discrete incidents of abusive violence are both needed for those who seek to help the victims of such violence as, for example, therapists, victim advocates, lawyers, spiritual helpers, etc.

In this book an effort has been made to provide a logical progression of ideas without excessive repetitiveness. Nevertheless, there is a certain reflexive or recursive quality about these chapters as ideas and concepts circle around and interpenetrate each other. For a reader with no academic background in violence studies, the chapters should be read sequentially. However, if a reader has some awareness of the complexity of socio-bio-psychological and religious community research into the global phenomenon of human violence, each chapter can be read on its own and out of sequence.

Sexual Abuse of Individuals: Theoretical Foundations for Understanding

The credibility gap has turned into an abyss.

Hannah Arendt [5]

In the writings of Jungian analysts Guggenbuhl-Craig (1991) and Rutter (1989), the problem of professional sexual abuse of clients (those who in one way or other seek a professional's help) is not limited to ordained clergy or to religious leaders. Problematic sexual relationships occur as well in multinational corporations, institutional administration, and the professions of medicine, education, psychotherapy and law.

As evident in the works about sexual abuse inside other-than-Christian American religious communities (Downing, 2001; Ford, 2006; Goldberg, 2004; Kramer and Alstad, 1993; Lesser, 2010; Pelhem, ud.) issues of

religious leader abuse are not limited to Christian denominations. This is particularly true, in situations where spiritual seekers and disciples are expected to unquestioningly surrender their own wills and submit in obedience to the teacher as part of their spiritual discipline or religious heritage.

Roman Catholic scholars (Doyle, Sipe and Wall, 2006; Kennedy, 2001; and Sipe, 1996) inform us that the issue of religious leader sexual abuse is not a new reality in Christian Church history. Doyle, et. al., document that written records concerning religious professional sexual misconduct in the Christian Church reach back nearly 1700 years to the Council of Elvira in Spain. Nor is it only an American phenomenon (Kenney, 2011; Robinson, 2008).

Other scholars (Fortune, 1989c: Herman, 1997; Labacqz and Burton, 1981; and Rutter, 1989) inform us that sexual impropriety or sexual misconduct among male ordained clergy is not limited to isolated or deranged individuals. Instead, clinical profiles of male abusers, with the exception of pedophiles, indicate male clergy abusers of adults fit a culturally normal socio-psychological profile.

Shupe (1998, 2008), a sociologist, notes the paucity of sociological studies of sexual abuse and institutional responses to such behavior in religious organizations. Inasmuch as much religious clergy misconduct is criminal behavior and much institutional behavior is criminal corporate behavior, he wonders why more sociological studies of such deviance have not been done.

In denominations where the phenomenon has been studied by appropriate demographical research methods, the population of abusive clergy appears to be approximately 10 to 12 percent of all ordained clergy nationwide (Cooper-White, 1995; Labacqz and Burton, 1991). While, generally utilizing the 10 to 12 percent data, Rutter's work (1989) indicates that he believes it is likely that the percentage of abusers among members of the ordained clergy is likely to be higher than 12 percent. Some very small, therefore inconclusive studies during the past twenty years tend to support his perception. I have chosen not to include these smaller studies in my analysis of these perplexing problems.   In order to simplify the matter for readers, I utilize the figure of 10 -12% when I am summarizing and analyzing materials. When I am reporting other's work, especially in the

current Roman Catholic scandal of pedophile priests, I utilize the author's statistics.

This book, therefore, provides readers with foundational materials that are helpful in understanding the correlated phenomena of clergy sexual abuse and morally compromised institutional clericalism in response to individual situations of sexual abuse. These chapters provide the reader with building blocks for creating a theoretical framework or cognitive construct regarding the prevalence of sexual abuse inside the human institutional church. This foundation of western psycho-sociological theory, public health theory, and recent strides in understanding human consciousness itself can then be applied by the reader to unique situations of clergy abuse and clericalism.

Once the socio-psychological or psycho-sociological dynamics of clergy abuse and clericalism are better understood, then religious communities can begin to discuss ways of dismantling the individual and cultural buttresses that are needed for this form of violence to perpetuate itself across time.   For example, once we understand the phenomenon that pre-pubertal and adolescent boy children who are sexually abused in early childhood can and often do become adult sexual abusers of others, we can deliberately apply public health principles of curtailing, stopping, healing, and preventing. We can begin to work systematically and effectively in addressing multiple roots and manifestations of this problem.

We can and should provide therapeutic and spiritual resources to adults who have been abused in their own early childhoods as one step in breaking the chain of abusive violence. We can and should do public information events about the symptoms and damages of child abuse. We can and should work to change the surrounding culture and its implicit permissions for adults to abuse children. We can and should create effective institutional and managerial strategies to prevent incidents of sexual abuse and to efficiently and appropriately manage sexual abuse aftermaths. Systems theory teaches us that any small change in a positive direction (less abuse of women and children) will affect the entire culture of violence and move it towards a more violence-resistant one (Bolen, 1999 and 2005; Kelman and Hamilton; 1989, Satir, 1972).

To create violence-resistant cultures, not only do we need to stop events of violence after they have begun; not only do we need to heal the individual and collective wounds that violence has already caused: it is urgent that

human individuals and human cultures around the world begin to self-transform in order to prevent the continuous re-occurrence of violence in human history (World Council of Churches, 2001; World Health Organization, 2002). This transformation can only begin and spread one person at a time until a collective mass of transformed individuals has occurred. At some future time (in this model of individual and collective transformation), underlying violence-perpetuating cultural belief systems and ordinary violence-supportive daily practices will have been successfully modified (Bolen, 1999, 2005).

For preachers, clinicians, healers and victim advocates to say that they are not interested in understanding sexual violence and institutional violence theory but only want to read about practical issues or immediate solutions is similar to telling a neurosurgeon that he doesn't need to study and understand the body's complex neurological pathways and their pathologies before doing surgery. On one hand, I too am interested in practical results. On the other hand, I personally believe that without understanding the psycho-dynamic and socio-cultural issues involved in Western cultures' structural buttresses for the sexual abuse of women and small children, it is unlikely that lasting, positive transformative change can or will occur. One way to gain an in-depth understanding of the cultural forms of (1) clergy and religious leader sexual violence and (2) institutional clericalism or systemic malfeasance is to do a close reading of these cultural forms in light of (or from) `the perspective of) victim experiences.

When we look at nation-organized warfare, as a comparative example, we find an interlocking set of cultural premises and behavior: *if* there is strong community support for a particular event of organized warfare, *if* there are strong ideologies (such as honor or patriotism) supporting any given individual's participation in warfare, *if* industries and universities tie their economic output to the creation of war technologies, *if* religious and spiritual leaders declare the war to be a holy war waged in God's name, *if* bellicose governments activate fear in the general population by the utilization of propaganda; and *if* public media spread disinformation to create enemies, it is unlikely that addressing only individuals will make any significant changes in the underlying war system (Keen, 2006a).

Some understanding of the interpenetration of many different issues (economic realities, cultural histories of enmity, technological systems, religious ideologies and theologies, etc) is needed to address both the

individual who is asked to become a warrior *and* the culture which has created a war machine. In my opinion, Vietnamese Buddhist monk Thich Nhat Hanh (1995) and American Soto Zen monk Claude Anshin Thomas (2004) are correct: the warrior is only the hands of the war machine. His or her community of reference is its mind and body.

Similar realities must be examined within sexual violence-prone cultures (Robinson, 2008). Rarely, if ever, is a sexual abuser's action isolated from all cultural influences and ideologies. We need to ask, therefore if the sexual predator is the hands of the sexual violence machine? Even the rationalizations for his behavior which a predator uses to deny the harm of his actions to others – his personal defense system against change – usually reflect commonly held beliefs, attitudes, and ideas. If we wish to move in the direction of preventing clergy and religious leader sexual abuse of the laity, then we need to isolate and begin to transform the socio-cultural and ideological factors which contribute to its ongoing presence in religious communities. Shupe's (2008, p. 2) claim that clergy malfeasance occurs because of the sociological nature of the religious institution itself is one that, in my opinion, must be taken very seriously. Any efforts to prevent clergy and religious leader abuse of the laity must understand, therefore, the sociological nature of religion as a cultural institution.

Individuals who seek (in situations of clergy sexual violence and institutional clericalism) to become healers and culture change-agents need to examine the taproots of such violence. These taproots are not only manifested in external and visible behaviors. They have burrowed deep inside structures of the human mind and the transpersonal sea of collective consciousness in which the individual mind exists.

In order to understand, to manage, and ultimately to transform cultures of violence, we must also understand, manage and transform ourselves.

Footnotes

[1] Monsignor Harry J. Byrne, July 24, 2008, 1.

[2] Alice Walker, 2006. 173.

[3] *Clergy sexual abuse* is unwanted sexual attention from an ordained individual or religious professional such as a pastor or priest; sexual relationships of a pastor or priest with members of his congregation.

[4] *Clergy malfeasance* is the exploitation and abuse of a religious group's followers by trusted elites and leaders of their religion. It may include criminal behavior such as the rape of small children or adolescents. It may also include the criminal behavior of becoming a witness to another's criminal abuse and acting as an accomplice after the fact.

[5] Hannah Arendt, 1969a, 4.

A World Public Health Model

Less visible [than warfare], but even more widespread, is the legacy of day-to-day individual suffering. It is the pain of children who are abused by the people who should protect them, women injured or humiliated by violent partners, elderly people maltreated by their caregivers, youths who are bullied by other youths, and people of all ages who inflict violence on themselves. That suffering – and there are many more examples that I could give - is a legacy that reproduces itself, as new generations learn from the violence of generations past, as victims learn from victimizers, and as the social conditions that nurture violence are allowed to continue.

Nelson Mandela[1]

Introductory Comments

Former President of South Africa, Nelson Mandela (2002) wrote the Foreword to *The World Report on Violence and Health* published by the World Health Organization (WHO). In his introductory remarks, he noted the massive destruction caused by modern technologies of warfare. Then he provided the stark commentary quoted above about the kinds of violence which exist in the private sphere of human life.

After these introductory remarks, Mandela went on to comment that violence is not inevitable and that violence-supporting cultures can be turned around. Such changes take focused and deliberate human work. Violence thrives, according to Mandela, in cultures where those in authority utilize violence and in cultures where a genuine respect for human rights is absent.

He urged readers of the *Report* to address the roots of violence so that countries, communities, and families can attain peace, justice and prosperity. Only, he warned, if we individually and collectively work together

to end cultures of violence will we transform our cultural and personal legacies of violence *from a crushing burden into a cautionary lesson*.

General Director of WHO Gro Harlem Bruntland echoes Mandela's concerns as she describes the impact violence has on world health issues. She notes the obvious: individuals who live inside war zones know and understand that war's violence is an all-pervasive reality that permeates every aspect of life (WHO, 2002)

Bruntland further notes that in violent cultures individuals sometimes retreat into gated communities in order to find safety. She reminds her readers that for many individuals there is no such retreat because the violence that they face behind the gates is the violence done by family members and known acquaintances. In these situations escape from violence is often impossible.

She notes wherever violence is prevalent (as it is in violence-prone individuals, families, and cultures), individual and community health is compromised. As a result of this awareness, violence, with its immediate, short-term and long-term consequences, is now recognized as the number one public health problem in the world. Because this is so, violence not only jeopardizes humanity's present health and well-being. It jeopardizes humanity's common future as well.

The World Health Organization's Typology of Violence

The WHO violence typology describes three major categories and two sub-categories of violence. The first major category includes self-inflicted violence such as drug abuse or suicide. The second category encompasses complex socio-political, socio-historical, and socio-economic forms of violence such as warfare or oppressive economic systems. The third category of is that of interpersonal violence. Within this last category, two subcategories or locales are identified. The first subcategory is the familial and the second is the community (p. 5). Another way to extend the descriptions of the latter category might be to differentiate between manifestations of violence that occur in private and those that occur in public spheres of human life.

By utilizing this typology it becomes possible to account for physical violence, sexual violence, psychological violence, deprivation, and neglect (what we might call maltreatment) as distinct forms of violence. Each form of violence interacts with and reinforces other forms while it concomitantly carries its own unique signature of ideology, history, and practice.

Sexual and gender-based violence fits inside the interpersonal category. It includes rape, sexual trafficking in women and children, incest, domestic partner abuse, sexual harassment and other forms of personal or private sphere violence based upon sexual and gender differences. Each form of violence has overlapping characteristics with other forms. However, each form also has a recognizable *signature* that identifies its uniqueness. Similarities and uniqueness must both be understood in any effort to contain or eradicate any specific form of interpersonal violence. Sexual trafficking in women and children, for example, will require quite different understandings and prevention methodologies than job-related sexual harassment in a Fortune 500 firm. Sexual molestation of children will require a different analysis and approach than physical assaults on adult women.

While the WHO *Summary Report* does not specifically note the difference between sexual assaults where physical contact takes place and forms of sexual violence which many American authors define as non-contact sexual harassment violations, it is clear that once again there are some similarities and differences between both forms of abuse. Adding this additional information to the WHO typology enriches its complexity and completeness. By refining our definitions of abusive violence, we set the stage for demographic work which establishes incidence and social location of victims *and* sexual violence perpetrators.

Non-contact violations include exposing one's genitals to children or adults, peeping, obscene or sexually provocative electronic mail messages, stalking, threatening or obscene and harassing phone calls, or any other forms of behavior in which physical touch is not used in the service of violence. One commonality found in all of these forms of abusive behavior, however, is that the perpetrator's intention appears to be intimidation in order to gain control of the other by terrifying her or him (West, 1999). In each of these violations it is frequently the case that perpetrators who are inclined towards non-contact violations may simultaneously or sequentially practice several forms. They may both peep and make harassing phone

calls. They may expose genitals, peep and send obscene electronic mail. Common clinical awareness about non-contact violations indicates that it is quite common for an individual perpetrator to simultaneously practice two or more forms of anti-social sexual behavior.

The interpersonal nature of these personal violence assaults means they most commonly occur in private settings and are hidden away from the public view of the community. However, sexual harassment (of either a contact or non-contact nature) can and does occur in both public and private spaces.

When we look a bit more specifically at sexual violence as an interpersonal category of violence, we can identify some anomalies in the WHO typology.

To illustrate: rape of enemy women is common in war zones (Brownmiller, 1975; Giosetti, 1968; Lorentzen and Turpin, 1998). In war-related forms of rape we find elements of the second form – the larger socio-historical-economic context of militarism and war combined with a more personal form of sexual violation. These war crimes are interpersonal in nature. Yet they may be defined by military superiors and subordinates as a legitimate act of warfare towards the enemy. War zone rapes may be very public as in group rape perpetrated by an entire cadre of soldiers. Rape camps or rape hotels may be established by the elites of one military group to violate and intimidate enemy women.

However, in civilian cultures not at war, most rapes do fit the typology's category of interpersonal violence in that they are done by individuals the victims know by name and by face (Russell, 1978; Warshaw, 1994). Thus, they are affinity violations or acquaintance violations. In situations of domestic abuse and rape, the perpetrator shares the same household as his or her victim(s) (Wilson, 1997).

While individuals and cultural institutions may decry, in public, interpersonal forms of violence such as battering, rape and sexual harassment, there are, nevertheless, worldwide cultural supports for them. Support for rape and other forms of sexual violence by men towards women is found in pornography, popular media, humor, theology, religious practices, and, in the case of war economies, military history and culture. An *ecological model* of such violence must, therefore, include overlapping and concentric circles of influence and support.

The first and innermost circles of the public health typology, according to the WHO *Summary Report* authors, must include the individual level for both perpetrators and victims. It must consider biological and social or personal history factors. The second larger circle needs to examine close personal relationships and the way(s) in which these varied relationships influence perpetrators and victims. The third and still larger concentric circle examines the community level and the larger social networks such as schools or churches and their influence on perpetrators and victims. The final, encompassing concentric circle is that of broad social forms and social climates. Here we find issues of shared social norms, attitudes and values, as these are concomitantly shaped by and manifested in individual behaviors. Of particular interest in sexual and gender-based violence, according to the WHO, are cultural ideologies and patterns which support male dominance of women and small children. Such ideologies serve as a psycho-social or spiritual-religious foundation for violence towards them (p. 9). In this regard, the WHO authors comment that *[The] person with an aggressive personality is more likely to act violently in a family or community that habitually resolves conflict through violence than if he or she were in a more peaceable environment* (p. 10).

Thus, we see that the placement of the individual perpetrator within his greater social milieu is one correlative factor in his behavior. A particular milieu in which the violent individual lives and perpetuates violence is a socio-cultural community which historically has shaped his specific behaviors and their frequency. These cultural forces shape each individual within their purview.

The individual enters an interactive *contract* with his environmental culture. Inside such a contract cultural processes help to sustain continuity over time of his particular behaviors and patterns of interaction.

To summarize, the on-going culture and language in which human beings live shape what they know of the world and the choices they make about appropriate behaviors. As they enact their own life in the middle of their culture, they become participants in a continuous re-shaping of that culture. Thus, every individual participates with her or his generational cohort to transmit a particular culture forward in time into the future. Each current generation becomes a living and always changing bridge from past to future and, as this bridge, members of the generation both inherit and co-create their culture for future generations. It is in the present moment that

each individual makes choices about what she and he will pass on from their dead ancestral and living contemporary life histories. In such a complex interplay of causality and manifestation, it is unlikely that any one factor can be totally isolated from the others as a solitary and singular cause of all forms of violence or even any one manifestation. In attempting to eradicate violence from the human community, the hydra-headed nature of its realities must be acknowledged.[2]

If we wish to understand and influence perpetrators or victims and the intricate dance or interaction that encompasses them, we must do a multi-factorial analysis of their particular eco-system of violence and learn how to understand their unique place within that system.

Not only physical abuse is included in the WHO typology of interpersonal violence. Psychological abuse is also noted. Here the perpetrator's intent is to intimidate, to humiliate, to demean, and to gain control over the victim. The perpetrator's behavior is designed to coerce and control the other. Psychological or emotional violence includes verbal abuse, isolating behaviors, and controlling or dominating behaviors.

A Public Health Model

A public health model for understanding violence emphasizes the need for prevention in addition to the needed effort to treat and support those already victimized by violence. The long term goal of anti-violence work is not only to mitigate the effects of violence after they have occurred but to prevent violence before it begins and, therefore, to curtail or prevent future acts of reactive violence in a never-ending cycle of violence. Successful efforts in violence diminishment or eradication prevent new acts of victimization and new victims. In short, the seemingly inevitable cycle of violence perpetuation is dismantled.

Let me use smallpox and malaria as physical examples of the public health model since physical disease is more commonly understood as a world-wide public health problem than is violence. When the world public health community decided to contain and eradicate small pox from the world's global health experience, world-wide resources were committed to this effort. Not only were patients who already had the disease treated, protective isolation (quarantine) practices kept the disease from spreading

to new individuals and to new communities. In addition, however, to methods of treatment and isolation the world health community began a systematic and world-wide immunization program. Reaching the long-term goal of smallpox eradication meant that individuals, local communities, nation-states, and the international community all needed to understand this importance of this goal to local situations. They needed to have a workable understanding of the methodologies which would be used in service of the eradication goal. As members of the world community, individuals also had to agree to work together. They needed to allocate resources. They needed to inform their various populations of the importance of the goal and the methods used to reach that goal.

The goal was not only furthered by health care workers. It was promoted by research and development organizations, pharmaceutical corporations, philanthropic activities in funding, epidemiological consultants, transportation specialists, religious teachers, etc. In addition, many widely varying socio-political realities needed to be addressed. Local, national and international governments and their internal agencies needed to be persuaded to allow their people to participate. In some communities prejudice against developed world medicine needed to be addressed and shamans or local medicine women and men included in creating and implementing plans for community-wide immunization. Local spiritual leaders needed to buy into the plan.

To eradicate smallpox, the world health community not only had to understand the human body and the human community, it needed, as well, to understand the smallpox organism. It would not be appropriate to deal with the eradication of smallpox by utilizing methodologies that have been developed to eradicate malaria. Both diseases have been major public health issues – especially in the developing nations of the world. In world-wide treatment programs both face similar socio-economic-political realities. Yet to effectively eradicate both of these diseases, the world health community needs to understand the unique characteristics of both diseases. In the case of malaria, the additional complication of mosquito populations and their breeding cycles and living conditions must be understood and addressed.

In a public health model for stemming the epidemic of global violence primary prevention efforts become part of the work needing to be done inside the world community.[3] If the human community wishes to lower

levels of violence in local, regional, national or international arenas, then the taproots of violence (its ideologies, its causes, its motivations) must be understood and addressed. Cutting off one head of one form of violence simply allows new forms to manifest and proliferate. If only palliative approaches to violence are used, a particular situation may improve for a short time. Since the underlying causes and issues remain untransformed, however, these situations remain volatile breeding grounds for new episodes and rapidly mutating forms of violence to appear and reappear.

In some situations poorly thought through palliative measures actually increase the virulence and frequency of violence. For example, in some historical situations, women were kept out of the economic development loop created by developed nations to help developing nations. In some cultures after these development efforts ended, the family remained impoverished. Women and children – especially girl children - in dependent, impoverished life situations are particularly susceptible to domestic abuse because they have few resources of their own to utilize in protecting themselves from the correlative realities of ignorance, poverty and violence.

Subsequent to a growing international awareness of this reality, many Western health, economic development, and peace action organizations such as FINCA, Heifer International, Quest for Peace, etc. now actively promote and practice gender equity and female empowerment activities in their programs of development and economic assistance in the impoverished world. Recognition now appears nearly universal that the education and inclusion of women and girls in development enterprises is needed to alter the long-standing poverty of entire families and episodes of domestic violence against women and children. It is not sufficient to simply educate boys and men. Girls and women must be brought into the development – education equation. When this happens, it becomes more possible to address long-standing issues of culturally-embedded gender-based violence.

For a permanent change in humanity's proclivity to utilize violence in order to manage conflict or to impose dominance, the underlying foundations of violence must be addressed. In many situations, this means that oppressive social structures and human situations of structural injustice need to be identified and transformed.

Because violence appears to be a human experience in which a certain kind of contagion occurs, it is necessary not only to treat a local manifestation of violence after it has occurred but to examine and resolve as many precursors as possible in order to eradicate them before new cycles of violence begins. Change efforts, therefore, must be systemic and long-lasting for violence to decrease. By making systemic changes in the ordinary and predictable trajectories of violence the human community in the present moment can begin to change the legacy of violence it passes on to future generations.

One of the needed places to begin violence control and violence eradication efforts is to identify, examine and properly diagnose the violence-supporting cultural matrix which surrounds each particular act and form of violence. The systemic, often-unconscious rationalizations and buttresses for violence must be recognized, acknowledged, challenged and transformed. Situational and structural supports for violence must be altered in order that less violent – hopefully non-violent - individuals and communities can be created and sustained.

To do the necessary global re-arranging of world-views, attitudes, values and deeply-seated belief systems, it becomes essential for individuals to change their personal lives as well as for nation-states to change their political lives. Changes in the human consciousness of individuals are needed alongside of changes in the socio-historical-political consciousness of the nation-state and the global community (Nhat Hanh, 1981, 1987a).

Sexual violence and gender-based physical violence are human arenas of interpersonal violence that beg for such a thorough-going examination and transformation. Both forms of violence are supported at all levels of society. Specific forms of gender-based domination, coercion, control and sexual violence may even be demanded by a wide variety of the world's religious teachings and common practice (Bullough and Bullough, 1974, Daly, 1968, 1973, 1978; Hussein, 2007; Phipps, 1983; Walker, 1992), In a widely varied world of regional religions, violence against women and small children is taught as dogma and theology and culturally expected and accepted as praxis. To not recognize this is to promote palliative measures at the expense of long-term change and transformation.

The role of organized religion in promoting armed violence and violence against women and children cannot be over-emphasized and it should not

be overlooked (R. Eisler, 1987; Wink, 1998). To transform cultures of violence, religious dogma, precepts and praxis must be closely examined through the hermeneutical lens of violence. Each culturally acceptable and promoted form of violence must be systematically and carefully addressed in any community effort to lessen these forms of violence. In general, this work needs to be done by individuals who live inside the world-view of a specific religion. However, it is important to note that the outsider may be the best diagnostician while the insider may be the best agent of transformation. Both roles – insider and outsider - are essential to the reduction of violence or, hopefully, its eradication.

Certainly when the professionals or priestly caste of a specific religion promulgates gender-based or family-based violence by religious teachings these teachings must be identified as toxic and they must be accurately de-constructed and openly challenged. In addition, when the ordinary and routine life of gurus, monks, priests, clergy, lay spiritual teachers or theologians embodies sexual violence and abuse, these abusive behaviors need to be exposed and stopped. In these kinds of situations, factual truth needs to be uncovered and disclosed (Goldberg, 2004; Kramer and Alstad, 1993; SNAP, *Silence…*).

The issue here, as Nelson Mandela has correctly noted, is the urgent need to remove the crushing burden of today's legacy and to transform it into a precautionary warning for future generations.

Systems theory teaches us that when we begin to make even small changes, the entire system changes. Even small changes in the immediate present can have large and long-lasting future effects. How an individual thinks and acts can and does make a difference in altering the climate of violence which currently covers the world like a noxious fog.

The WHO Report *Summary* notes and underscores the difficulty of such a thorough-going cultural transformation. The difficulty in addressing these kinds of needed ideological changes, it notes, begins at the individual level.

> *Raising awareness of the fact that violence can be prevented is, however, only the first step in shaping the response to it. Violence is an extremely sensitive topic. Many people have difficulty in confronting it in their professional lives because it raises uncomfortable questions about their personal lives. Talking about*

violence means touching upon complex matters of morality, ideology and culture. There is, thus, often resistance at official as well as personal levels to open discussion of the topic (WHO *Summary Report* (p. 1).

Working Goals for the Eradication of Violence

Authors of the WHO *Report Summary* identify several working goals for work in violence prevention. In any work directed towards the prevention, treatment, control and eradication of violence, these are useful working goals or objectives to keep in mind.

- o To challenge individual or cultural secrecy and the taboos that surround topics of violence

- o To challenge the belief that violence is inevitable in human life

- o To encourage discussion and debate in order to increase human understanding of the complex nature of violence in human life

- o To create working partnerships of all kinds and at all levels in order to work towards the goals of prevention, lessening and ending episodes of violence (pp. 1-2).[4]

A Way to Proceed

As the public health sector of the world community begins to work at violence prevention and eradication, it can provide a model for other sectors of the global community. Utilization of the scientific method is one tool that can be adapted in many ways. The WHO *Summary Report* identifies key elements of this model. In the following listing, I have expanded upon the *World Report* with examples and commentary.

- o Define and monitor the extent of the problem. Here methodologies of demographic and epidemiological research are needed. One goal is to get a realistic working demographic estimate of the frequency, and severity of the problem. A second goal is to identify at-risk populations.

o Identify causes of the problem. In complex socio-cultural problems, such as violence, this task can appear daunting. For example, the easily visible and the non-visible socio-historical-cultural roots of war or sexual violence are multi-faceted and multidimensional. Nevertheless, the depth, specificity and accuracy of this phase of analysis provide a much-needed needed foundation for the creation of specific plans of action.

o Formulate ways to address the problem. In general, with complex socio—historical and cultural issues such as sexual abuse and violence multiple approaches need to be conceptualized and considered. As individuals and communities begin to formulate accurate understandings about the roots of violence and its manifestations in living communities, several workable plans can emerge. In this step it is essential to have all involved parties at the table. It is necessary to develop open patterns of inclusive dialogue. No matter how problematic and obnoxious an individual or community is perceived to be, nevertheless, it is vital to the success of action and activism that these voices are brought into the conversation. As part of these conversations, strengths and assets (as well as problems and liabilities) need to be identified. Once this process is completed, action begins.

o Evaluation includes multiple measures of qualitative and quantitative measurement or assessment of positive change, i.e., change in the desired direction. Here is it important to note that it is important for the evaluation team to be a part of the conversation from the beginning of the processes of planned and orderly change efforts so that they can make informed and appropriate judgments about appropriate measurement protocols.

o When trends of positive movement begin to appear, then it becomes necessary to apply these measures widely in order to discover which approaches work best to guarantee long-lasting and sustainable change.

o Promulgate findings throughout the world community so that other individuals and communities can benefit from what has been learned from this cycle of study and action (WHO, 2002, pp. 2-3).

If we look at the earlier example of smallpox and malaria prevention and eradication efforts, we can begin to see some of the complexities involved in a public health model. If one wishes to eradicate small pox or malaria from the world community, one must utilize the methodologies of epidemiology to identify at-risk populations. To eradicate or significantly lessen these common diseases from the world community the team must understand as many aspects of the disease process as possible. Community development and intervention models must be created and tested. Questions, such as how is it caused; how does it spread; what is effective to stop it from spreading, etc. must be asked and answered. At this level, the methodology for both diseases is similar: gather as much information as possible in order to understand the disease process. In the case of malaria the complex role of the life cycle of the mosquito must also be understood.

In both situations, socio-historical and ideological realities must be integrated into the study (research) and planning process. In both situations, principles of individual and group change must be understood and implemented.

While there are many overlapping theoretical constructs and methodologies utilized in both eradication efforts, specific approaches designed to fit the complex eco-system of both diseases will need to be created, implemented and evaluated. One cannot treat malaria with smallpox vaccinations nor can one treat smallpox by controlling mosquito populations.

In a similar manner, research into the violence of war and research into the violence of sexual harassment may have some overlapping theoretical and methodological issues. However, if one wishes to eradicate sexual harassment from Christian communities, it is unlikely that an analysis and critique of just war theology will provide a good foundation for action.

As an individual who grew up inside of one of the historic American peace churches, I find it particularly curious that the external violence of war has been so well critiqued but the community's internal experiences of violence such as sexual abuse and domestic abuse have been tolerated or even promulgated by the faith tradition. When one comes to understand the interface between militarism's violence and gender-based violence, then it becomes clear that the complete eradication of one of these two forms of

violence necessarily means eradication of the second (Brownmiller, 1975; R. Eisler, 1982; Lorentzen and Turpin, 1998).

Concluding Remarks

When we bring a public health perspective to bear on questions of personal violence – most particularly acts of clergy, professional or leader abuses against the laity – we discover the immediate need to consider the impact of religious ideology on subsequent acts of violence. We find the need to understand *clericalism*.[5] In part, this need to understand dogma and its embodied consequences in clerical life arises because cultural worldviews provide the ideological foundation for structures of violation to emerge.

In addition, we need to examine the hierarchical nature of the religious caste because violence-prone individuals tend to live in violence-prone cultures. As Kramer and Alstad (1993) note: authoritarian religious or spiritual structures that insist on lay surrender and obedience to authority figures are especially prone to become the breeding grounds of abuse of the vulnerable by the powerful; of the laity by the professional.

Recommended Supplemental Readings

1) Bloom, S. L. (Ed.). (2001). *Violence*: *A Public Health Menace and a Public Health Approach* [Forensic Psychotherapy Monograph]. New York, NY: Karnac.

2) Fortune, M. (1983). *Sexual Abuse Prevention.* New York, NY: Pilgrim.

3) World Health Association. (2002). *World Report on Violence and Health* [Summary Report}. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO.

Personal Reflection Questions

1) In your own words, create a typology of personal violence which you can use to recognize various forms such as sexual harassment or

rape. Briefly define or describe each type of violence which you include in your definition. Be as specific as possible in your answer.

2) A public health model involves three kinds of needed action if a specific public health problem is to be alleviated or controlled. These different types of action are (a) to prevent the problem from emerging at all, (2) to quarantine, contain, curtail or prevent its spread once a disorder or problem is already present; and (3) to effectively treat and help those already affected by the problem. These are technically known as primary, secondary, and tertiary forms of prevention. In what ways might individuals and religious communities practice all three levels of prevention in situations of clergy sexual violence? Use your own words and be as specific as possible.

3) In your opinion, what cultural practices and cultural ideologies support or buttress incidents of clergy sexual violence? Be as specific as you can be. Do you know of any scientific literature that supports you perceptions? Again identify specific authors or research studies.

Footnotes

[1] Nelson Mandela. (2002). V.

[2] The *Hydra* is a mythical beast from antiquity. The beast had multiple heads. If one head was cut off, two heads grew in its place.

[3] See Mary Yoder Holsopple, Ruth Krall and Sharon Pitman Weaver (2002).

[4] For a community development model that describes a practical working methodology for this step, see www.preventioninstitute.org

[5] As utilized in this manuscript, *clericalism* is a form of institutional or structural violence that occurs or manifests itself inside religious organizations.

Religious Typologies of Violence

Unjust systems perpetuate themselves by means of institutionalized violence

.

Walter Wink[1]

Introductory Comments

God told me to do this is different from you must do what I say because God commanded it: the first is either the act of faith or the act of lunacy; the second is a bartered transaction in which one person is the arbiter of orthodoxy [for the second].

Rafael Chodas[2]

One way to organize the study of violence and its many forms is to form typologies. By means of typologies, scholars organize data in such a way that underlying structures become both visible and manageable. In this chapter two typologies are described and explored. It is inevitable in such a section that there is some overlap. There are also unique components to each typology. These typologies were created for their authors' purposes. Each functions as an intellectual framework for describing, examining, and understanding various phenomena related to violence. Each helps us in our efforts to understand the complexities of violence. In our search for ways to work towards violence resistant relationships and cultures each helps us to proceed. In both typologies described below, I have abstracted a large amount of theoretical material and readers are referred to original sources for more information. Where I have added examples or commentary, I identify my additions.

If we see violence as one form of interpersonal domination in which one individual seeks to overpower and control a second individual, then the

words of William Lee Miller (2008) in his biography of Abraham Lincoln serve as a warning compass for students of violence and its effects in all aspects of human life.

> *To impose one's will on other resistant human wills by physical coercion – the exercise of power – is morally precarious, actually for both parties, but notoriously so for the powerful (151.*

This is especially true, I think, in sexual violence of all kinds. The sexual violence perpetrator coarsens, violates and betrays his own personal self even as he is demeaning, dominating, controlling, assaulting, violating, and harming his victims' selves. As he dehumanizes his victims during sexual assaults, he simultaneously dehumanizes himself *and* destroys his own moral character. He becomes emotionally crippled and unable to empathize with the pain and terror of his victims. He becomes an alien to human experiences of empathy, compassion, healthy affection, and mature sexuality. He becomes a member of the walking dead – unable to feel and unable to relate to others in a reciprocal, adult manner. In a certain sense, by his demanding, intrusive, isolating, and offending touch of others he announces that he, himself, has isolated himself away from the joys of ordinary shared and reciprocal human experience. As he forever changes his victim's life experience, developmental journey and personal identity, he also changes his own. By means of controlling and violating behavior his personal identity becomes that of a sexual violence predator (Shupe, 2008, p. 11). When his behavior becomes public knowledge he becomes someone to be distrusted, socially feared and interpersonally despised.

Robert McAfee Brown in Conversation with Newton Garver: A Typology of Violence

> *If a sexual abuser is confronted by a child or a woman unused to the exercise of political power and personal strength, it is easy for him to achieve domination.*

> Hannah Arendt[3]

Shifting attention from a public health violence model for understanding violence, we turn now to the work of Presbyterian theologian and ethicist

Robert McAfee Brown. In his book *Religion and Violence* (1978*)* Brown elaborated upon various definitions of violence to create a typology which Christians can use to discuss ethical and moral dimensions of violence. While his typology is consistent with many aspects of the WHO typology, he expands and deepens our conversation about religious abuse and sexual violence by the introduction and application of theological and ethical content from a Christian context (pp. 7-9).

Beginning with a common dictionary definition of violence (*overt physical acts of destruction*) and building on the theoretical work of Newton Garver, Brown noted the definition's incompleteness. Brown's work, therefore, describes an extended typology of violence. While the following typology categories represent Brown's work the examples are mine.

Personal overt physical assault: here one individual does physical harm to another. An example is rape. Another example is unwanted and harassing touch such as grabbing, groping, or fondling.

Institutional overt physical assault: here we find corporate acts of violence. An example is war. While Brown does not explicitly comment on the socio-political legitimization of violence I think that it is helpful to differentiate between culturally legitimated forms such as a declared war and non-legitimated forms such as unauthorized war-time massacres.[4] Socially legitimated forms of sexual abuse and harassment form another example

Personal covert violence; here we find situations in which one individual violates the personhood of another in ways which are psychologically or emotionally harmful. An example can be found in the work of anthropologist Gregory Bateson (1972a, 1978) in which he describes pathogenic double-bind communication patterns. In such patterns of verbal and non-verbal communication, the recipient of another's speech or action is always in the wrong. In common street parlance, we know this as *damned if I do; damned if I don't*. This particular form of violence includes both verbal and nonverbal elements. Double bind communication patterns usually cause severe psychic distress in their recipient. The more severe the consequences are for making a wrong response, the more damaging this pattern of communication is to its recipients.[5]

Institutionalized covert violence: here we find situations in which corporate structures violate the personhood of individuals and entire communities.

Ecclesiastical or courtroom procedures that attack the credibility or character of abuse victims regarding an act of sexual violence which they suffered are a good example of such violence. Stockton (2000) describes a Presbyterian church in which multiple women accused their minister of sexual harassment. The women ended up being accused in ecclesial courts of making false allegations, divisive behavior and a failure to reconcile (pp. 131-146). The women who accused the minister then sued in civil courts where they were awarded significant damages. Stockton comments about this kind of conflict and failed administrative process, *There were serious spiritual, political, and judicial failures in the case. How to correct them is unclear. Since it is not possible to write compassion into a constitution, any change will have to come on the political and judicial sides* (p. 151). In these kinds of situations we note organizational and institutional tolerance for or active support of sexual harassment and sexual violence. Here we find subtle and not-so-subtle forms of institutional behavior intended to repress, control, coerce and intimidate victims into silence.

Jeanne Miller (2000), mother of a son who was abused by a member of the ordained clergy provides a very clear example of this kind of hidden, mean-spirited behavior which attacks the victim's character and seeks to do institutional damage control by bearing false witness against victims behind their back. In such a situation, individuals rarely can defend their character from assault. After two years of attempting to get honest action from the Diocese of Chicago in which her son's victimization occurred, she met with the archdiocesan chancellor. During their conversation he told her that if she continued to pursue this matter she and her husband would be *excommunicated for violating canon law* (p. 157). In commenting on this threat she noted that at that moment, it was a horrible threat because her religion was *all important to me* (ibid.).

More than ten years after her son was abused, new allegations surfaced about the priest who was now located in a different parish. Parents from that parish contacted Miller and told her of a meeting with diocesan officers. While she recognized the clerics in attendance, none of them recognized her.

> *The bishop explained to the parish members that Father could not have been a threat to their children He was certain no child had been harmed because the lawsuit ten years ago was merely the result of*

one member's overreaction to an innocent situation. He said that the mother had eventually dropped the lawsuit because she had no claim. I could hardly breathe when I rose to introduce myself to these men and explain to the parents who I was in connection with the previous lawsuit against Father, and that the lawsuit had not been dropped but settled (p. 161).

Forced into a situation where his story was no longer true to the parents of the new diocese, the Bishop *quickly changed his story* (ibid.). Additional lies were told, however, and facts were omitted that were relevant to the discussion at hand. Miller notes that by the evening's end, *the parents were livid* (ibid.). Not knowing the sexual history of the priest abuser, they had trusted him with the welfare and teaching of their unsupervised children.

At a later meeting in the parish, a thirteen year old girl approached the microphone and announced that she had been molested by the priest as he coached her for her confirmation. Subsequent to this public announcement and Chicago press coverage of the incident, the priest was arrested, convicted of child molestation and was sentenced to three years in prison (pp. 161-162).

These are religious forms of institutional covert violence. They are structurally very similar to government and secular corporate criminal activity and deliberate negligence (Kelman and Hamilton, 1989). When church authorities use the power, influence, and money of their religious organization to cover-up clergy sexual criminal behavior or when they play legal hard ball with victims who speak out in public against their sexual abusers, these church authorities are participating in covert corporate criminal behavior (Berg, 2006; Berry, 1992; Berry and Rehner, 2004; Boston Globe, 2002; Israeli and Chua-Eoan, 2010; Shupe, 2008).

Structures or systemic violence: This category is an extension of institutionalized violence in both overt and covert forms. Inside of this category we note the realities of social dislocation, social injustice and social oppression. By their corporate and individual inabilities to protect themselves, the weakest and most vulnerable members of a society live in situations in which their personhood is attacked and their possibilities for an open future destroyed. Religious denominations or organizations that consistently hide and protect ordained sexual predators inside the

protective cover of clerical culture engage in systemic or structural violence.

In the 2006 documentary *Deliver Us from Evil*, film maker Amy Berg (2006) focuses on the Roman Catholic diocese of Los Angeles in 2006 where the secular criminal justice system investigated hundreds of allegations of sexual abuse and decades-long diocesan cover-up activities. The current scandal of the Roman Catholic Church in America is not about one *bad priest or even a hundred bad priests.* Rather, the scandal is largely about a clerical system that hid many abusive priests and allowed them to continue to abuse children. The system informally legitimated the priest's abusive acts by not appropriately disciplining or managing priests.

Violence against truth: In his introduction to the second edition of his book (1987), Brown describes the violence of disinformation – a form of violence against the truth itself (Brown, pp. xvii-xviii). The word *disinformation* identifies the deliberate use of linguistic maneuvers such as euphemisms and outright lies to create a false or illusory reality in which individuals are misled about the nature of factual truth and factual data. The phrase *smoke and mirrors* is often informally used by members of the American media to describe this kind of corporate behavior. Here leaders and employees of corporate entities, such as institutional churches, deliberately and calculatedly tell lies or use other language maneuvers such as insider *code language* to hide a larger truth (Sipe, March 5, 2010)

Shupe (2008) notes that even the phrase *sexual abuse* which on its surface seems to be a candid and forthright way to discuss clergy abuse can be used as a code phrase to hide morally reprehensible behavior such as forced sodomy and vaginal rape of pre-pubertal children (and I would add rape of adults as well). The linguistic journey of naming actual behavior from sexual misconduct as a euphemism for sexual abuse as a euphemism for anal rape as the truthful descriptor helps us to see the subtleties of the human wish of powerful abusers (and the men and women who support them or protect them) to deny truth its full and open presence inside a given human community. These kinds of verbal manipulations function as disinformation and they contribute to the betrayal of trust for individuals and entire community. They provide the living matrix for secondary victimization of individuals, their families, and those who attempt to support them.

Violence against the truth includes the careful manipulation of information in a way that distorts factual truth and disseminates lies and half-truths as if they were the truth. Doyle (ud, *Doctrine*) describes a doctrine of mental reservation used by some bishops to defend their prevarication and misrepresentation of factual truth by telling lies. In an obscure and arcane doctrine which has never become an authorized part of Roman Catholic canon law, an equivocation or lie might be legitimately used in situations where a man's life was in danger. This kind of behavior insinuates that truth is being told and that transparency is being practiced. Nothing could be further from the truth. Doyle writes, *in the present situation some claim that it is morally justifiable to lie in order to protect the reputation of the institutional church. The lie generally is formulated in either an active form such as denying that a person has sexually abused children, or in a passive form, such as failing to inform a pastor or a parish that any assigned priest or cleric is a known abuser….The concept of the "good of the church" never allows for enabling sexual abuse or covering for sexual abuse since the "church" is hardly limited to the clerics or the hierarchy but includes the abused and the lay faithful susceptible to abuse* (p. 4).

In 2003 *New York Times* religion correspondent Peter Steinfels noted that the following issues were all at work in the Roman Catholic Church's contemporary pedophile scandal: (1) misplaced trust, (2) indifference to children, (3) fear of scandal, (4) subservience to lawyers, (5) concern for church assets, (6) diocesan prerogatives, (7) administrative incapacity, and (8) outright complicity (p. 42). In this context of institutional ineptness or complicity, he also identifies the appalling behavior of priest predators (p. 40).

Steinfels places responsibility for the scandal and its mismanagement. He writes, *The bishops have themselves to blame for the people's suspiciousness and lack of information because of the bishops closed door procedures and unwillingness to full disclosure* (pp. 43-44). After a lengthy summary of American history vis-à-vis priest clergy abuse Steinfels concludes that *church leaders too often said one thing in public, believed another in private, and acted in ways not necessarily consistent with either.* (p. 66)

Arendt (1986) coined the word *defactualization* to describe this practice of lying in the nation-state's political actions. In situations of defactualization we find concealment, misrepresentation, half-truths, and the deliberate life.

These are political weapons used by institutional representatives to maintain authority, power and control over other human beings. In my opinion, they are political weapons used to avoid personal and institutional accountability for leader misbehavior at the highest levels of America's institutional Roman Catholic Church.[6]   Brown makes the case that disinformation (or defactualization in Arendt's language) constitutes violence against the personhood of the body politic (in short, all of us) and truth itself. I have added this category to Brown's earlier typology.

As does the WHO *Summary Report* typology of violence*,* Brown's work helps us to grasp both the complexity and the nuances of violence and its manifestations in our common, ordinary and daily religious lives. In my opinion, his work supports the WHO typology because it encourages us to look at ways in which subtle (and not-so subtle) forms of violence affect our relationships with our own self, with significant others, and with our ever-enlarging socio-economic-historical communities. Brown's typology begins to provide us with enhanced, nuanced conceptual language so that we can recognize and describe violence as that which it is. As we begin to gain a better nuanced system of language, various forms of violence begin to undress in front of us.

In *The Liberation of Theology (1*976) Latin American Jesuit theologian Juan Luis Segundo repeatedly urges his readers to learn to call things by their right names. There is a sense, I think, in which terms such as *sexual misconduct* or *sexual molesting* or *sexual abuse* are misleading. They function, I believe, as a way of softening the harsh reality of the violence experienced by a sexual perpetrator's victims. If we used terms such as sexual violence and rape, the community at large would be more alert and attentive to the dangers contained within the linguistic naming of behavior.

Robert McAfee Brown in Conversation with Dom Helder Camara: A Typology of Structural or Systemic Violence

Theology is intimately bound up with the psychological, sociological and political status quo although it may not be consciously aware of the fact,

Juan Luis Segundo[7]

In Brown's discussion of a second violence typology, this time of systemic or structural violence, he built upon Dom Helder Camara's work. During the latter part of the 20th century Camara was the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Recife, Brazil. As he confronted a nationally oppressive socio-political milieu and its concomitant repressive realities for the poor, he reflected on the church's *preferential option for the poor.* His written work describes his analysis of oppressive social system violence as a spiral structure.[8]

The *spiral of violence* contains three separate stages of oppressive human activity in large social systems such as the nation—state or large corporations. Each successive stage in the spiral of violence responds to prior stages and builds upon them. Each stage sets in motion the actions of succeeding stages. In many situations the spiral continues to move through many repetitions of the three stages – each repetition intensifying and escalating the nature of repressive and oppressive violence.

I think it is perhaps easier to see the spiral of violence in socio-political systems at a remove from religious institutions. In part, this is so because we do not tend to focus on religious organizations as having a corporate institutional identity. We tend to spiritualize the church and its leaders and overlook its corporate institutional identity (Steinfels, 2003; Shupe, 2008). In terms of this manuscript, the spiral of violence is seen as individuals and communities confront the reality of two forms of clergy sexual violence inside the community of faith. The *first* of these is the actual act of sexual violence by a religious leader. The *second* is the church's corporate or institutional cover-up to protect the church from scandal and accountability for its personnel management.

At times the end result of such a spiral is that victims of an individual abuser's sexual assault are abandoned, verbally attacked or blamed (Berg, 2006; Dick, 2006; Doyle, July 13, 2008, July, 2009; Ellison, 2011; Greeley, 2004a). In addition, witnesses and messengers of truth are verbally or economically assaulted or actively shunned by the community (Berg, 2006; Berry and Renner, 2004; Chinicci. 2010; Collins, 2004: Shupe, 2008). The presence of whistle blowers within oppressive organizations is aggressively managed by administrators and others who seek to keep factual truth out of the public's view (Kelman and Hamilton, 1989). Reprisals against witnesses who tell what they know are swift and surgically precise. The

goals of such strikes against witnesses are to discredit them and to divert attention away from the violence to which they bear witness.

In the documentary film, *Deliver us from Evil* (2006), psychotherapist Mary Gail Frawley-O'Dea reported that in many situations parish priests who observed and reported a fellow priest's sexual abuse of minors to their bishop were punished by the religious hierarchy of their diocese while the sexual abuser was maintained in place or promoted.[9] In another example, Father Thomas Doyle's promising career as a secretary-canonist of the Apostolic Delegation to the Vatican in Washington, DC was completely derailed after he submitted a 1985 white paper on priest sexual abuse in the United States which he and his co-authors submitted to The Council of United States Bishops (Collins, 2004; Doyle, ud, *A Short History…)*; Twenty years later Doyle's career as a United States Air Force chaplain was similarly derailed by the archbishop who had denominational oversight of Roman Catholic military chaplains (MSNBC/Associated Press, 2004; Wakins, 2004).

In Camara's *first stage* we find injustice and active structural or systemic oppression done by one group, usually the elite ruling class or culture, toward a second, usually the ruled class. At stake are issues of oppressive behaviors or malfeasance behaviors by persons holding institutionalized and legitimated positions of power and authority. There may be socio-military or socio-economic or socio-cultural-historical or socio-religious components to the injustice. There may be racial, religious, ethnic, sexual orientation, or gender components. There may be personal identity components. In whatever form these unjust structures manifest themselves, they are rationalized, defended, and maintained by individuals in power as *the way things are* or *the way things need to be o*r *the way God wants them to be.* Positional *s*tructures of authority and power are used to maintain a status quo which benefits those in positions of power and authority (see also Shupe, 2008, Wink, 1998, Chapter Two). Where those who are powerful see the need to reaffirm their position, authority, and power, they can and will resort to violence (Arendt, 1969a, 1969b, 1986).

In my personal observation of religious institution authoritarian structures and governing individuals God is usually invoked when the person in authority senses that his or her personal power and authority needs the buttressing power of divine authority in order to maintain a position of human power, authority and control of others. Oppressive dogmas and

doctrines which actively dehumanize and oppress or exclude others are widely pronounced as God's will. Obedience to the oppressive human individuals in control of morally corrupted religious institutions is proclaimed as God's desire.

In addition, it is common for organized religion to provide buttressing ideologies for its own socio-political practices of injustice and authoritarian control. It is common, therefore, for leaders of organized religion to provide theological buttresses for their embodied, sometimes criminal, social praxis (Sipe, 1996, April 1, 2007).

As Segundo (1976a, 1976b), Janeway (1980) and Wink (1998) note these underlying structures of violence may be present in such a manner that their victims are unaware of the truthful realities or facts which surround their life experience of oppression and violence. They may be unaware of the cultural trusses that support and maintain oppressive structures in place for succeeding generations.

During the 1980's Latin American theologians, who lived in situations where the majority of people lived in abject poverty, described the need to conscienticize the poor about the causes of their poverty and suffering. While this process was not exactly the same as mid-century feminist consciousness-raising groups in the United States, the aims of feminist consciousness-raising and Latin American conscienticization were quite similar: (1) to develop awareness of and insight into the socio-economic and socio-historical-cultural roots of impoverishment, victimization and suffering and (2) to understand the politically repressive and oppressive social structures in which they and their communities lived their daily lives. In a similar way clergy abuse victim support groups such as the Roman Catholic group SNAP[10] provide a place for awareness-raising and personal support as individual victims and their families begin to comprehend what actually happened to them during the primary act of sexual abuse and the secondary acts of clerical re-victimization (Doyle, July 13, 2008; SNAP webpage: http:///www.snapnetwork.org).[11]

In Camara's model, as Brown (1987) describes it, individuals and entire communities need to become aware of the truthful realities of their personal and communal life situations. They need to learn to distinguish truth from disinformation; facts from lies. By learning to report and then analyze their own life experiences, individuals and entire communities can begin to

identify oppressive social structures that are at the root of their suffering. By careful analysis, individuals and entire communities can become awakened to the troubling socio-political and ideological-theological structures of their life history and pain. They learn by such a process that their suffering in neither accidental nor caused by gods or fate. They learn to identify specific individuals and specific institutional structures that have (or currently are) oppressing and exploiting them.

To summarize: *in stage one* of the spiral of violence, individuals and entire communities live within social structures where they are actively, but secretively, oppressed by those in power. As they begin to interrogate the meaning of their suffering which usually means identifying its sources, they begin to come together. They move from explaining their life-situation to themselves and others in self-blaming individual models to exploring the socio-cultural realities in which they are embedded and in which they experience daily life.

In the second stage of the spiral of violence, victimized individuals began to organize their collective resources in order to resist further victimization. They began to speak out for their own basic human rights. Collectively (rarely individually) they began to protest against the encapsulating and suffocating nature of the socially organized and rigorously maintained structures of violence in which they suffer.

In South Africa, for example, we can see the important role of Archbishop Tutu in speaking out against apartheid and in mobilizing some parts of the Christian world in resistance movements (Allen, 2004; 2006). We can see his important role in organizing a world-wide boycott of South African goods and services as a form of pressuring the pro-apartheid government to change.

Roman Catholic clergy abuse victim support groups such as Bishop Accountability, Link-up, Voice of the Faithful and SNAP provide clear examples of individuals who have come together to challenge the socio-cultural and socio-theological realities in the organizational church which have buttressed the clergy hierarchy's unwillingness to appropriately supervise child sexual abusers inside the ordained clerical system of the Roman Catholic Church. In addition to their information-gathering and resistance activities, these organizations also provide victim support activities (J. M. Miller, 1998).

In the *third and final stage* those who benefit from the unjust and repressive structures and those who have initiated and maintained them (generally the members and entire groups of the community's privileged elite castes) respond to their critics (and a perceived loss of power) with increased repression and outright violence. In locations such as army-controlled Guatemala or El Salvador, murder and massacres occurred. The most well-known example of this response is the assassination of Bishop Oscar Romero after he appealed during a Sunday homily broadcast to the nation's ruling elites and army to stop the government-legitimated massacres of civilians.

Regarding this kind of violence Arendt (1969a) comments that the loss of power (and I would add the perceived potential for a loss of power) *becomes a temptation to substitute violence for power* (p. 152). Repressive violence, Arendt notes, can destroy the people's individual and communal power but it can never create it.

For organizational elites (who are in the powerful position of social control of other's lives) the resort to excessive violence comes into play when power and control is being lost (or appears to be in such a situation of loss). Arendt, in this respect, claims that when elites begin to lose control (or in my experience, even a perception that they might lose control) their individual sense of social impotence is one breeding ground for retaliatory violence.

Dominican priest and Catholic canon law expert Thomas Doyle (September 8, 2009) provides us with an example of systemic abuse in a religious system. In his message to the California Supreme court regarding *Query v The Roman Catholic Bishop of Oakland,* Doyle documents a clerical system in which there as *widespread criminal behavior by Catholic priests.* Within this system members of Roman Catholic laity were not protected from known abusers. In multiple affidavits to secular courts Doyle (May 24, 2004, March 3, 2008, September 8, 2009) testifies to pervasive and long-existing structural violence inside the United States Roman Catholic Church as it has refused to manage priest pedophiles. He also describes attacks by the church's lawyers on the veracity and credibility of victim-accuses after they have initiated lawsuits to redress their complaints.

The January 21, 2011 Report of a Philadelphia County (PA) Grand Jury provides us with additional examples of structural violence as it relates to

clergy sexual abuse of pre-pubertal and adolescent children. The bullets below represent Brown's and Camara's categories. The illustrative examples are from the final grand jury report.

- o *Spiral of violence and structural oppression, stage one*: diocesan re-location of predator priests without any warning to the new parish about past criminal behavior; offending priests were repeatedly re-assigned to new parishes or new pastoral tasks – often involving children.

- o *Spiral of violence and structural oppression, stage two*: formerly victimized children, now adults, and their birth families lodge complaints with the church's hierarchy and they are told that the church has no awareness of these alleged previous clergy violations;

- o *Spiral of violence and structural oppression: stage three*: the hierarchy turns its diocesan staff and corporate lawyers loose for a hostile and well-coordinated attack on the victim's credibility;

- o *Stage Two reprised*: As the victims continue to persist in seeking truth and justice, they turn to the civil courts to help them

- o *Stage Three reprised***:** As the church is pressured by the civil court system for information, members of the hierarchy resort to perjury and defense lawyers further attack victims in their testimony.[12]

As demonstrated above the current clergy sexual abuse crisis in the American Roman Catholic Church fits Brown's and Camara's model for structural or systemic violence. Widely available documentation from expert witnesses and grand jury reports demonstrates the presence of an unresponsive church hierarchy who actively hid sexual predators from criminal prosecution and kept them in active ministry without warning the laity (stage one). As victims and their families began to organize themselves and confront the church demanding change (stage two), the institutional church pushed back by attacking the credibility of victims and the character and careers of their helpers (stage three).

Doyle (September 8, 2009) writes,

> *in the 25 years that I have been directly involved in this issue, I have seen Church officials and their attorneys defame, slander, devalue and threaten victims, victim's families, their attorneys, their supporters and those who have advocated for them. All of this was done in the name of "defending the Church"* (p. 3).

Later in this same document he continues:

> T*he objections of the Catholic cardinals, archbishops and bishops, expressed by their attorneys are based on their fundamental but totally erroneous belief that they are somehow above the laws of the State of California. This arrogant and unrealistic attitude has apparently blinded them to the essential fact of what this entire phenomenon is all about. It is not about money, or the image of the hierarchy or the power of bishops.* ***It is about thousands of innocent, vulnerable children whose physical, emotional and spiritual lives have been savagely devastated by Catholic priests and bishops and their rightful search for compassion and justice*** (emphasis his) (p. 3).

Arendt's work (1969b) regarding violence compliments our understanding of Camara's work. She notes that totalitarian and authoritarian governing bodies form and re-form themselves in their efforts to stay in power. In such organizations and governments, random as well as organized and well-financed acts of social violence create fear and terror. These actions are designed to destroy truth, control the people and shut down all dissent. When all dissenting groups cower in silence, the organization's internal and external institutional powers to govern successfully have died (p. 5). What remains is the raw power of authoritarian violence as the solitary buttressing power for governance.

In the context of the church as a sociological organization, when dissent is not tolerated and the people cower in fear of the priest, bishop, God and eternal damnation, the spiritual mission of the church has died. What remains is a corrupt and violent human institution with only raw power and violence to defend itself.

While the cycle of violence is perhaps more visible inside of organized political states than in religious organizations, nevertheless, an understanding of these processes are helpful in recognition of various social maneuvers by corrupted social institutions. Coming to understand the manner in which organized religion has historically dealt with complaints of corruption and evil inside institutional religious structures can help individuals to move free of the noxious effects of such oppressive social realities.

As this chapter is being written (April, 2011), the international Roman Catholic Church is under intense world scrutiny for its administrative mishandling of clergy sexual abuse cases around the world.[13] As more and more factual truth about individual abusers and members of the church's governing hierarchy is uncovered by governmental investigations, activists and journalists, the church is unwillingly being forced into a position of accountability for its institutional behavior in pedophile pries cover-up activities. The institutional church's corrupt corporate structures and behaviors are now, partially at least, visible.

Concluding Remarks

There is no cosmic evil: the suffering of the world arises from our own actions or our failure to act, either from inadequate or bad will, or from inadequate or bad information, or from inadequate or inefficient effort, or from lack of power or ability to do better or differently.

J. Harold Ellens[14]

While no typology of violence answers all questions about the nature of violence, nevertheless typologies are useful because they provide a structure for systematically organizing known information. If the goal is eradication of violence from the human community, then it is useful to know exactly what particular form of violence we are talking about. Actions that may be useful in attempts to eradicate adult sexual harassment in the workplace may be totally inappropriate in efforts to eradicate sexual solicitation and sexual molestation of children in the religious confessional. It is, therefore, essential to differentiate and describe different forms of violence before attempting to intervene. Each form of violence has its own identifying signature of epidemiology, demography and manifestation.

Until these kinds of variables are known, intervention efforts are likely to be inadequate, in competent and ineffective and may be even be harmful. Rather than interrupting and transforming situations of violence, inappropriate intervention may exacerbate the situation and make it worse.

However, it important to note in actual human life (as contrasted to words on paper) it may be much harder to distinguish between the various forms of violence. The parameters may seem unclear to casual observers of violence in the public sphere. For example, it has taken many decades of work within the anti-rape movement to convince courts that rape and battering within marriage is, indeed, rape and battering. It still remains difficult to persuade police, juries and judges that rape and battery of a prostitute is, in fact, rape and battery and not consensual sex. So, while the definitions in a typology may be quite clear, it is another social reality altogether when typologies are applied in real life situations. [15]

Recommended Supplemental Reading

1) Arendt, H. (1969). *On Violence.* New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.

2) Brown, R. M. (1987). *Religion and Violence.* Philadelphia, PA: Westminster.

3) Capps, D. (1995). *The Child's Song: Religious Abuse of Children.* Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox.

4) Wink, W (1998). *The Powers that Be: Theology for a New Millennium. New York, NY: Doubleday.*

Personal Reflection Questions

1) In your own words describe violence against the truth. In your own experiences to date, where have you noticed or experienced this particular form of systemic violence? What consequences (to yourself or others) have you noticed? Be as specific as you can be.

2) In your opinion how do experiences of personal violence affect those who are targets of this kind of violence? If appropriate, use examples from your own life or the lives of others you know best.

3) Have you ever been a victim of structural or systemic violence? If so, how did you respond? Be as specific as you can in order to describe the oppressive social system in which you found yourself and your personal responses.

4) When you think about authoritarian systems you have personally known, when and how did you realize they were authoritarian. What were the behavioral manifestations you witnessed? Were you, at any time, confused by your observations and experiences? If so, how did you resolve this confusion?

Footnotes

[1] Walter Wink, 1998, 7.

[2] Rafael Chodas, 2007, 100-101.

[3] Hannah Arendt, 1969b, 52.

[4] For more information about legitimated and non-legitimated forms of authoritarian violence see *Crimes of Obedience* (Kelman and Hamilton, 1989).

[5] Gregory Bateson's own mid-century interests here included schizophrenogenic family structures/patterns of communication and dolphin training exercises.

[6]See Doyle, SIpe and Wall, 2006; Greeley, 1982, 2004a, 2004b.

[7] Juan Luis Segundo, 1976b.

[8] See also Ellens, Volume Four, 2004, 1-17.

[9] In the documentary film, *Deliver Us from Evil s*ee the story of Father Oliver O'Grady's management by the Diocese of Los Angeles from the mid-1970's until his conviction and sentencing for sexual abuse of children.

[10] http://www.snapnetwork.org

[11] See also http://richardsipe.com/Dialogue/Dialogue-17-2008-11.html

[12] Pattern abstracted from the January 21, 2011 Grand Jury Report of the Court of Common Pleas, First Judicial District, Philadelphia County, PA regarding Roman Catholic diocesan hierarchy and their secretive, abusive behavior towards victims of clergy sexual abuse in the Philadelphia Diocese. Non-cooperative and obstructive behaviors towards the civil justice system are also noted.

[13] See the June 7, 2010 issue of *Time Magazine* for its extended discussion of the current crisis of faith caused by the Roman Catholic Church's decades-long internal management of its sexually abusive priests*.*

[14] J. Harold Ellens, 2004, Volume One, 3.

www.ruthkrall.com

- 3 -

Human Consciousness and Human Action

Culture is the totality of any given society's way of life. It comprises a people's total social heritage including language, ideas, habits, beliefs, customs, social organizations, and traditions, arts and symbolism, crafts and artifacts. Underlying culture is a network of interrelated value systems that is capable of influencing perception, judgment, and behavior.

Hannah W. Kinoti[1]

Introductory Comments

Evil is not a division between groups of people, us and them. It is a line that runs through each human heart.

A. W. Richard Sipe[2]

Little work has been done at the theoretical junction of sexual violence studies and human consciousness studies. In general the issue of human consciousness has been assumed to belong either to medical and psychotherapy communities of discourse or to obscure academic areas such as artificial intelligence or paranormal studies. In addition, some of what we know about the structures of human consciousness comes to the West from Eastern philosophies and religions. Thus, to many westerners this thinking is both foreign and inaccessible. Nevertheless, my own sense of the matter is that in order to understand the elaborate interpersonal ritual dance of victimizers and victims, we need at least some rudimentary insight into structures of human consciousness at a somewhat abstract level.

When individuals shake their heads and say about any given perpetrator, *I simply don't understand how he could anally rape a small child* or confess their puzzlement about *how a brilliant intellectual devoted to the Christian community decided to sexually harass dozens of adult women,* they are

wandering into a minefield of socio-cultural issues (understanding the cultural heritage and cultural values of another); psychological issues (understanding the personal motivations and behavior of another): or into a moral-spiritual minefield (judging his motivations and behavior).

Personal Struggles with Understanding

I am the twelve-year-old-girl,
refugee on a small boat,
who throws herself into the ocean
after being raped by a sea pirate.

And I am the pirate,
my heart not yet capable
of seeing and loving.

Thich Nhat Hanh[3]

In my personal belief system no human being (and his behavior) is a totally foreign or alien presence within the human community. Thus, when confronted by my own question, *how could he have possibly thought that was acceptable human behavior,* I must make space for the awareness that I am not separate from either the good or the evil that he has done. I am a part of the human community in which his behavior has occurred. At some level or another, therefore, I share in the responsibility of the community to confront what has been done so that individuals and the community as a whole can begin to heal the wounds this individual's choice of violent behavior has created in the lives of others. To be quite clear, in this model of understanding human inter-connectedness, I am not personally accountable for a sexual predator's specific choices of personal and destructive sexual violence behaviors. My responsibility for the presence of multiple acts of sexual violence is more diffuse and global in nature. I am part of the community with a common, often unchallenged, history and culture. My responsibility, therefore, includes such correlated activities as the kinds of movies I watch or the kinds of books I buy. In such a model, the personal questions for me are these: In what behavioral ways do I support a violence-prone culture? In what daily choices of mine do I support a culture in which violence against women and children is

acceptable – as entertainment, as an economic factor, as a spiritual belief system?

If everyone at the deepest levels of human consciousness is kin to me and if I am kin to everyone else, then I need to understand the mystical claim from both Eastern and Western philosophies and religious traditions that at the deepest levels of human consciousness I am at one with this violent individual who has chosen to betray his own humanity in his actions of violating others. Likewise, I am one with his victims. All of us are single cells of a complex and little understood transpersonal human consciousness.

In this chapter, therefore, I enter into conversations with twentieth-century literature about human consciousness. My personal doorway into this conversation is contemporary medical research literature into the body-mind connection and my personal experiences as a beginning practitioner of meditation or contemplative prayer.

In the time-passage of my life, I have come to the conclusion that my personal share of human sinfulness usually begins in my imagination, is rooted in my cultural experience and is nurtured in my deliberate cultivation of anger and desires for revenge, in my desires to control the uncontrollable, or in my desires to escape being accountable for the harm I have already done to others. As I have examined this reality in myself, I have begun to recognize that when I can overhear and then observe my thoughts and fantasies of harming others, I become more aware and deliberate about choosing not to manifest these thoughts and wishes. I am now aware that I can deliberately change my hostile imagery and refuse to give it more psychic space in my interior world. When revengeful or hateful thoughts change by intentional self-conversation with them, then I am more able to speak civilly with all kinds of people – some of whom stretch open my tolerance levels by their ideologies, their personalities, or their behavior.

Anthropologist and spiritual teacher Angeles Arrien (2001) teaches her students that when they find themselves obsessively rehearsing a hostile mental fantasy or narrative (in which they are either a victim or perpetrator of victimization), they should remind themselves n*ow that is a story that doesn't need to happen*. Deliberately shifting the inner violence-saturated reverie away from the story of imagined violence and violation, the individual can begin a process of teaching the inner self about what is

desired and what is not desired in the inner life. In such a manner the deep mind is instructed not to carry out the fantasized fear or revenge fantasies that have, for this moment at least, colonized the mind and taken up residence there. Neither courting our fears of being harmed nor grooming our fantasies of harming another, we move free into an alternative process of consciousness-shaping.

Learning very late in the twentieth-century about the half-life of the neuro-peptide chemical mix activated inside the human body by emotions (E. Miller, 1997; Pert. 1997), I have been helped to realize that if I keep angry and revengeful thoughts and emotions alive by endlessly rehearsing them in my imagination then I keep the chemical stew alive. In a certain sense I re-victimize myself each time I replay the mental story. The narrative activates the chemical stew just as if it were factual reality. Rather than returning to a state of biological homeostasis, I stay emotionally and physically aroused. Since I now know this, I am responsible to manage this chemical stew of arousal that accompanies my personal experiences of fear, anger and rage. If, on realizing that I am terrified, enraged, immobilized by ancient grief, or furious about something in the past that surfaces in memory or something fantasized in the future, I simply speak to the trigger memory or fantasy: *That is past history. In this moment you are safe. Let this memory go. Do not invite it to hang around inside your mind. Quiet your mind. Find the still point. Let the body's emotional arousal chemicals decompose. Return to equanimity*.

Inside a state of restored emotional-physical homeostasis, I can then contemplate my necessary actions and move ahead without being totally derailed or sandbagged by strong or overwhelming emotional responses to past injuries (or future terrors). I can, if I choose to do so, interrogate the memory (or fantasy about the future) that has arisen from the depths of my well-socialized personal consciousness. I can, in essence, access and rely upon the wisdom and rational capabilities of my cognitive brain rather than simply react to ancient triggers of my reptilian survival one.

Obviously, this kind of self-conversation is totally inappropriate if I (or others) am in a situation of active danger. Here I need to pay attention and act to remove myself (or others) to safety. Here the reptilian brain serves me when I pay attention to its sometimes elusive warnings that this situation (or person) is potentially and dangerously violent and that I (we) am in this present moment actively endangered.

By slowly learning to manage my emotions, I have realized that I don't need to demonize those who sought to harm me (or others) in some way or another. Like me, they too are fallible and mortal. In a state of well-reasoned and compassionate thought, I can put up the needed barriers between the two of us to prevent additional harm but I don't need to retaliate in kind as a way of protecting my inner self (or others) from danger. If I believe others are endangered, I can tell them what I perceive and urge them to protect themselves. When appropriate, I can actively assist them to move to a position of physical or emotional safety.

I have been helped the most in this process of psychological and spiritual growth as a healer-teacher by the writings of Thich Nhat Hanh (1981, 1987a, 1987b, 1993, 1996, 2001). After attending one of his public North American lectures during an academic sabbatical I began to read his books as they came off the American press. His poem, *Please call me by my true names*, has served me as a reminder of my commitment to learning compassion during the research processes for this book. In the last decade of my life as a faculty member in peace studies, I asked students to read and reflect upon this poem in the light of their personal career goals as peace-makers. As they (and I) reflected upon the multiple identities of our lives, insights emerged about our individual participation in creating a violence-prone culture.

Reading about and studying sexual violence, in its many permutations, is very difficult and painful work. As I began research processes and then later began the actual writing of this book, I decided that Nhat Hanh's poem was the measure by which I wanted to live and by which I wished to write during this time of study and reflection. It became a resource to which I frequently returned. My task as an author was not, I knew, to see myself as separate from the people whose narrative life stories I seek to understand and to learn from. I was not God nor was I omniscient. In addition, I was neither their confessor nor their judge. Nor was I perfect for, like every actor in the sexual violence narrative and in its aftermath narrative, I too was a fallible and mortal human being.

Choosing to look outward at the topic of embodied sexual violence inside the world of religious professionals, I have periodically needed, therefore, to look inside my own spirit to see where it too carries the culturally planted seeds of such a disorderly and damaging violence. I have repeatedly needed to examine the images and stories of my fantasies and fears.

Memories have surfaced and these have needed to be examined for the wisdom of why they emerged in this particular context and moment.

Compassion does not mean an absence of holding people accountable for their abusive actions towards others. Rather, compassion means that one attempts, as much as possible, to see the world of each individual whole. The clinical issues for all of us who work in the field of sexual violence are complex. We need to learn how to hold abusive people fully accountable for their decisions and behavior while simultaneously developing a non-judging compassion for their suffering, indeed, for the suffering of everyone engaged in the tragic cultural interaction of sexual violence that destroys so many lives and so many communities (Herman, 1984, 1987, 1997; Sipe, January 23, 2007; West, 1999).

Buddhist teacher Jack Kornfield (2002, 141) addresses this complex issue.

> *To make peace we cannot ignore war, racism, violence, greed, the injustice and suffering of the world. They must be confronted with courage and compassion. Unless we seek justice, peace will fail.* ***Yet in whatever we do we must not let war, violence, and fear take over our own heart*** (emphasis mine).

When we come into moments of compassion, we discover that no individual can be excluded from the human family as *not one of ours*. A new level of personal responsibility for the whole is reached. Not only am I personally obliged to act in moral and ethical ways, I become responsible to search for ways to work at healing the terrible wounds which acts of human violence create (Moss, 1998). Being called to an activist role or to a healing role, I must recognize that I am continuously being wounded by my culture's sexual violence atrocity stories. The wounds of the world become my wounds and my wounds become the world's wounds. Seeking to heal my own wounds and seeking to be a resource to others as they need to heal their own wounds, I become responsible to seek ways to prevent violence from perpetuating itself and damaging additional lives. In whatever way I can I need to stop being a human host or carrier of violence. I need to encourage others to make this same decision.

At the still point of human consciousness, when I am brave enough to wait there, pathways open into the future that do not involve violating others or responding to their initiating acts of violence in disruptive or harmful ways.

In such a way, as Nhat Hanh so powerfully construes it for us, I become one with the raped girl and I become one with the raping pirate. Here, at the still point, compassion is born for the suffering which has created the cultural and personal interaction of rapist and rape victim. Here, at the still point, I can learn how to respond. Here, in the spaciousness of the still point, the healer is born; the shaman is initiated and the genuine priest or spiritual teacher is consecrated.

Legion is my name

> *And Jesus asked him, "What is your name?" And the man answered him, saying, "My name is Legion, for we are many."*

Mark 5:9

As an example of such a model for understanding human consciousness, Christian scriptures report another violent and terrifying man who lived in the region of the Gadarenes many centuries ago. This is a very contemporary story and it is relevant to the clergy sexual abuse issue. In modern cultures all individuals are composed of many identities (Gergen, 1991). If there ever was a single autonomous self in charge of all aspects of a single individual's behavior, for modern and post-modern individuals that era has long since passed. Living with conflicting motivations, not all aspects (or parts) of our respective personalities agree about what we should do in any given situation (Rossman, 1999). Like the ancestors who preceded us in history, at times we *do what we should not do* and at other times we *refuse to do what we should do.*[4] In this respect, all of our names are legion.

This is, I think, especially true for religious leaders and ordained clergy who decide to betray and attack the sexuality, spirituality, and personal identity of those students, parishioners, or employees they are supposed to serve. The decision to harm another is somehow or other located in the psychological and spiritual fault lines of the abuser's personality. Roman Catholic clergy abusers of small children, for example, may have been abused when they were children – often by a priest (Sipe, November 15, 2009). Here we see a generational transit of trauma and a re-enactment of earlier acts of sexual violence. The inner splitting is dramatic to observe as it plays itself out in behavior. On the one hand clergy and religious

53

professional sexual abusers of others are the spiritual and moral guardians of their religious traditions and theology (Rosetti, 1996). In this capacity they are expected to serve as role models of a mature spirituality and faith. On the other hand, by criminally abusing others sexuality they demonstrate an immature and emotionally twisted psychological-cognitive decision-making process. In addition, they demonstrate an immature or deformed spiritual formation process (Sipe, September 6, 2011). By their actions, they betray their vocation, their moral and spiritual teachings to others about how to live, and their community's trust (Berg, 2006; Shupe, 1995, 2008).

The effect of sexual violence (splitting the consciousness of victims into dismembered and displaced memory) exemplifies another aspect of abusive relationships. Dissociative disorders litter the personal and clinical landscapes of individuals who survive acts of sexual violence (Herman, 1997; Levine, 2003; Levine with Frederick, 1997; Rothschild, 2000; van der Kolk, et. a., 1996). It is almost as if, in the moments of victimization, the perpetrator creates a permanent home for himself inside his victim's body-mind. It is as if the victim's pre-victimization self has died and a foreign self has been inserted inside the sensory-cognitive structures and the psycho-neuro-immunological systems of the body-mind. Herman (1991) notes that brain structures such as the hippocampus demonstrate physical changes years after the events of abuse have stopped.

While I am personally uncomfortable with the term *soul murder,*[5] nevertheless this is a term one finds in clinical literature about the long-lasting effects of clergy sexual abuse (and other forms of child abuse) with small pre-pubertal children and pre-majority adolescents (Rosetti, 1990; Shengold, 1989, 1999; Sipe, August 5, 2009). While in my personal opinion, a human soul cannot be murdered, I have absolutely no doubt that sexual abuse in any form forever alters the individual's future developmental life trajectory. In many abused individuals some aspect of the self has, indeed, died. This is especially true when abuse has a long history and/or a life-threatening quality. The combination of multiple abuse events and victim terror, helpless rage, and sense of powerlessness changes not only the personality of the individual victim; it changes their cognitive and socio-emotional life trajectory into the future.

The power and influence of authoritarian social structures to create situations in which violence is a likely result is now well-documented

(Adorno, et.al., 1980; Milgram, 1974; Shupe, 2008; Shupe, et al., 2000; Wink, 1999; Zimbardo, 2010). Priest and canon lawyer Thomas Doyle (August 27, 2010) comments about the current Roman Catholic pedophile scandal that *there will continue to be abuse by the clergy as long as the ecclesiastical environment that allowed it to flourish continues as a closed, hierarchical system enshrouded in secrecy and sustained by the power of fear* (2). In his discussion of dominance systems, Protestant theologian and professor of biblical interpretation Walter Wink (1999) writes that the dominance system is *characterized by unjust economic relations, oppressive political relations, biased race relations, patriarchal gender relations, hierarchical power relations, and the use of violence to maintain them all* (39).

Human institutions are composed of many conflicting voices. Some voices proclaim the institution as the pathway to salvation while at the same time individuals who represent the public face of the institution attack the selfhood of others as an attempt to control them (Doyle, July 13, 2008). Proclaiming the inherent holiness and sanctity of the institution (and by implication, the holiness and sanctity of those who constitute its human face), administrative officers deny the sinfulness (or institutional corruption) of their abusive (and sometimes criminal) social actions in the world.

Individual consciousness and institutional consciousness appear to be holographic images of each other. In a subtle but recognizable model of hypocrisy individuals proclaim moral teaching and in public pretend to be above reproach; yet these same individuals in private secretly dominate, abuse and victimize vulnerable individuals. In theological terms, the weak and the vulnerable who are victimized by clergy sexual abusers are denied their spiritual inheritance as daughters and sons of the divine – as individuals carrying the divine image. In psychological terminology their abuser dehumanizes them by violating their basic humanity.

While it is tempting to think that I am morally superior to others and would never victimize anyone in such a harmful manner, this is a psychological and spiritual trap. And, getting caught in this trap, helpers, therapists, and victim advocates lose their capacity to heal the devastating wounds of sexual violence perpetrators and their victims. Moving into a position of judgment (*I am totally unlike this nasty, horrible person*) and away from the lived position of compassion, healers or shamans or consecrated priests

55

enter the claustrophobic world of victim and victimizer as antagonistic participants rather than as compassionate change-agents.

Similar realities are true for the victims of violence. Our Western Christianized culture tends, in some very insidious ways to blame victims of sexual crimes for their victimization (Burgess and Holmstrom, 1979, Herman, 1997; Krall, 1990; Lerner and Simons, 1958; van der Kolk, et. al., 1996). Culturally we perceive victims of violence as responsible for their perpetrator's actions towards them. We might judge the victim's character (*She has never been a nice person and she deserved what happened to her.*) or we might judge his behavior (*That boy-* aged 4 - *behaved in seductive ways towards his abuser. He was asking for it. He wanted it.*). When individuals or an entire community blame the sexual violence victim (for having a faulty character or for enacting problematic behavior) the perpetrator is released from his rightful accountability for his actions. The victim, in a victim-precipitation model, is thus assumed to be morally responsible for her experiences of victimization at other's hands. Such convoluted patterns of cultural thinking and blaming continue to entrap victims within the story of their victimization. These stories can be shattered but this takes awareness and compassion on the part of helpers and witnesses.

Were we able, in some small way, to walk in a victim's shoes for even one hour we would realize that when we blame victims for the individual or institutional violence done to them, we actively re-victimize them. We further harm them and may delay or prevent their ability to reconstruct their lives in a healthy manner (Krall, 1990).

It is one thing to rest secure in our own identity as an individual not drawn or tempted to do acts of sexual victimization. This is a needed resource if, as healers and advocates, we wish to be helpful to victims or perpetrators. We need to be able to trust ourselves and others need to be able to trust us. It is quite another to see ourselves as totally other from either the perpetrator or the victim of sexual violence. At the level of our deepest humanity we are, various world religious and philosophical traditions tell us, one.

Human Consciousness Factors in as a Variable

> *When a critical number of people change how they think and behave,*
> *the culture does also and a new era begins.*

Jean Shinoda Bolen[6]

We must consider the role played by human consciousness in our discussion of clergy and religious leader sexual abuse. In some manner or other, we intuit that the individual mind and the collective mind are deeply reflective of each other. Nhat Hanh (1987) identifies this continuous interpenetration of all reality as a state of *Interbeing*.

In such a perspective, an individual is conceived and born as one cell of individual human consciousness. Throughout her or his life, this newly-born human being swims in a vast pre-existing ocean of collective and/or transpersonal human consciousness. From the moment of his conception until his death, he is constantly being affected by the complex interplay of his interior and external environments. From the moment of her conception her presence in the universe inevitably begins to re-shape this pre-existing and all-encompassing sea of human awareness and consciousness. Because this is so, the newly conceived child inevitably affects and is affected by the social milieu into which he descends at birth. The newborn child and his culture are inevitably affected and changed by each other.

In such a model for thinking about human life, it becomes clear that what one individual thinks and does affects the whole. Conversely, the consciousness and behavior of the whole affects the individual. Violence-prone cultures influence individuals towards violence. Violence-prone individuals participate in the communal creation of violence-prone cultures. The reverse of this common-sense wisdom is equally visible in biophilic, violence-resistant individuals and cultures.

Sexual violence, in such a model, is not only the personal decision of an anti-social or deviant individual (which it most assuredly is). It also contains systemic and multi-generational aspects. In a certain sense, for violence-prone individuals culture functions as a provocateur for violence. What exists in the present consciousness and behavior of individuals and entire

57

cultures has been previously formatted as a possibility inside of their ancestral history and culture.

This individual who does violence is deeply shaped by the transpersonal culture into which he has been born. In his turn he will influence the culture's future for new, as yet un-conceived and unborn generations. Roman Catholic authors (Doyle, July 13, 2008; Doyle, Sipe and Wall, 2006) document the centuries-long phenomena of sexually active (theoretically celibate) priests and sexual abuse of children and adolescents inside the Roman Catholic priesthood. Family systems theory teaches clinicians that unresolved, denied or actively hidden life history issues and secret-keeping in a small social system such as the human family will repeat and replicate the behavior in future generations (Satir, 1962). This is most likely true of larger organizational systems as well. Wink, (1999) in commenting on systemic oppression, notes that *like a massive family system, no institution or organization is allowed to "get better" without repercussions from other, more pathological Powers. The Domination System does not permit deviations from its values (36).* The aphorism *those who forget history are bound to repeat it* points at this socio-cultural phenomenon. It is also true, I believe, that those who deny today's pathological history set up complex socio-cultural tendencies or patterns for replication in future generations.

In today's Roman Catholic clergy sexual abuse scandal it is clear that not only did individual priests offend; a culture of anti-social deviance developed and it surrounded and protected individual priests who sexually attacked others. The church's institutional leaders, over the centuries, dealt with sexual abuse by priests in violence-tolerant and personally-supportive ways which both protected abusive priests and perpetuated priestly pedophilia over the Christian centuries (Berry and Renner, 2004; Doyle, Sipe and Wall, 2006; E. Kennedy, October 21, 2011; Robinson, 2008).

When we discuss the role of human consciousness in human life (specifically as this topic relates to clergy and religious leader sexual violence) it becomes essential to identify a sense of linguistic meaning for the word *consciousness*. In his helpful letter to the editors of *Shift Magazine* (subtitled *At the Frontiers of Consciousness),* reader Victor Acquista (2008,) clarifies that the word *consciousness* reflects seven distinct meanings of the word or concept.

Collectively, therefore, we find multiple, but overlapping and nuanced, meanings for the West's use of the word consciousness. This affects our current discussion of clergy sexual violence. In the sequence below, Acquista's list of seven is followed by my addition of two more from my own thinking about these issues. The addition of the final item from depth psychology/psychotherapeutic theory completes the list. The examples are mine.

Self-awareness or identify: I recognize or understand something about myself. As I mature physically and mentally I come to a position of self-consciousness or self-awareness. This is often a reflexive act that originates in the interaction of self and the encompassing environment. We can, as individuals, therefore, identify a *me* and a *not-me.* In Eastern philosophies the division between the self and others or self and world is an illusory human perception. There is no autonomous *I* and no autonomous *other.* Perceptions of separateness lead the human into suffering (Smith and Novak, 2003, 31-37).

Mental or cognitive functioning that involves perception and understanding: This is perhaps best represented by the individual who is in a state of surgical anesthesia. We refer to him as unconscious. When he awakens, we talk about him as having re-gained full consciousness or as having an alert mental status. Eastern and Western medicine and philosophies refuse to equate the human being to either the body or to the cognitive mind. In some way or another, each human being is a body-mind. In addition, recent developments in Western medicine refuse to equate the human mind solely with the body's structural brain.

Cognitive intentionality that guides and structures behavior: I deliberately can choose to learn to play the violin. To gain the needed skills, I make every day choices. I may watch myself in a mirror to see exactly how I hold the violin. I practice. I submit myself to the guidance of a teacher. To grow in ability, I need to focus and attend to what I am doing and to what my teacher is saying to me. I need to practice new technical skills. I need to listen critically to my own playing. Eventually, with hours of focused intentional practice, the body-mind learns the skill of playing the violin. The student no longer needs to focus on which finger is located correctly or incorrectly. The mind-body connection of skilled playing comes together and the advanced student can focus on issues of interpretation rather than technical issues of finger placement. It seems to me that sexual abuse

recidivism may well mirror such a learning phenomenon. With each repetition, the abuser's body-mind creates neural pathways and learned skills that lead towards additional events of abuse and violation. The first time abuser is likely to have fairly poor skills as an abuser. However, a repeat abuser no longer needs to focus on basic skills: he can focus on refining his techniques. How he interprets his behavior also gets more and more integrated into his personality. Knowingly or unknowingly he creates and then claims as his own, the personal identity of a sexual abuser.

Unfolding or awakening: Generally this refers to emotional, mental or spiritual processes in which something profoundly shifts in an individual's interior understanding of the self, her experiences and perceptions of the world or both; In such a shift any or all of these realities may change. In Christianity, conversion is such an experience. So is mystical union with Christ. In Buddhism, it is enlightenment.

Collective awareness: Individuals or groups of individuals choose actions in the world that will build other's awareness about issues. For example, a group of individuals may initiate a peace march to inform others and to practice a form of non-violent political action. The goal here is essentially educative. Individuals within any given group may share a common perception about reality. Since the 1970s it has seemed to me that denominational gossip about sexually abusive religious leaders serves the purpose of communicating collective-insider's awareness about acts of sexual misconduct. Yet, while gossip builds internal communal awareness of a problem, no individual in a position to do something about it wants to be publicly accountable for keeping the abusive person in the position of authority and power in which he continues to abuse. Dominican priest Thomas Doyle (August 16, 2008) writes;

> *I first became aware of the reality of sexual abuse of minors by priests before I was ordained through rumors and stories about certain priests in the Order who "liked altar boys." I never knew that "liking altar boys" went far beyond touching until after I was ordained* (5).

In an earlier interview Doyle (Truth Forum, 2006) described his early years as a seminarian. In that interview, he comments (about his seminary instructors and the religious hierarchy of supervising bishops and cardinals) that if *I knew they knew.*

A developmental model by which an individual deliberately organizes and addresses a personal or collective world-view: An individual may accept, for example, Jung's view of an archetypal synthesis and utilize it to explain the world to the self or others. He may use Jung's teaching to create a frame of reference for his own personal behavior. He may teach my ideas to others as a definitive way of understanding human development. They too may then adapt this model as their own internal guide for understanding the complex inner and outer worlds which they inhabit. Eventually, an entire community may form which uses such an understanding to guide its communal decision-making. When the collective world view of any community is that victims of sexual violence are solely responsible for their experiences of victimization, few victims will name their abuser or talk about the harm that he did to them.

Transpersonal consciousness: Here each human being is one cell of a greater, all-encompassing environment of collective human consciousness. Each active and living cell interacts with and is interconnected with every other active, living cell. Nhat Hanh (1987) identifies this reality as one of *interbeing*. An individual's private thoughts and public behaviors influence the whole. In turn, the whole influences the individual's personal thoughts and public behaviors.

Transcendent consciousness: There are mystical states of consciousness in which the discrete individual, however briefly, loses awareness of her personal self-identity and instead finds herself absorbed in unity with the whole. There is a sense of timelessness, a sense of organic unity of all that exists, and a loss of self-awareness or self-consciousness. In a spiritual sense, this involves mystical union with that which is greater than the self. These kinds of experiences may or may not be religious in nature. They may, in fact, be chemically induced by substances such as marijuana or peyote.

Conscious, pre-conscious, and unconscious structures: A final addition to such a list arises in depth psychology or psychodynamic theory in which the mental structures of human consciousness include conscious, pre-conscious and unconscious material and processes. Each level of consciousness interacts with others to initiate, repress, and influence the direction of discrete human behavior events (Cameron, 1960; Hofling and Leininger, 1967).

It is my opinion that, of necessity, one must examine the role of collective and transpersonal human consciousness as well as individual structures and experiences of consciousness as originating sources of clergy and religious leader abuse. Individual, collective and transpersonal consciousness must be understood because of the interpersonally contagious nature of sexual violence inside religious communities.

In theoretical works on healing, some clinicians have begun to remind their students and clients that they are not only responsible for their actions which create the opportunity for disease to manifest itself (as for example, cigarette use), they are responsible for their illness-creating or wellness-creating thoughts and intentions as well (Dyer, 2005; E. Miller, 1997; Moss; 1998). It seems to me that this insight which has arisen in the mind-body healing movement is applicable to episodes of sexual violence inside religious sub-cultures.

We are, in a model adapted from their insights, not only responsible for the acts of violence we do, we are responsible for the thoughts which precede behavioral manifestations. In situations of sexual violence both forms (the thought and the thought's manifestation in behavior) pollute the transpersonal ocean of consciousness. Both contribute to the formation of violence-prone cultures, organizations, and individuals. In the documentary film, *Deliver Us from Evil* (Berg, 2006) one of the comments (about Father Oliver O'Grady's long history as a child sex abuse criminal) noted that in his last California parish O'Grady spent most of his energy and time actively being a sex abuser. O'Grady's addiction to child pornography indicates his personal use of images to nurture his inner life as well as his outer behavior. He groomed multiple children and their families into trusting him prior to his actual sexual assaults. O'Grady's inner life and his outer life were organized around and consumed by sexual violence fantasies and abusive actions.

The power of our thoughts deeply-grounded in culturally-influenced belief structures, most often unconsciously shape the intention that guides our behaviors (Dyer, 2005). Before we act, we create thoughts, images, fantasies, reveries, deeply held beliefs, and tell ourselves stories. Each of these mental processes, whether we are fully conscious of them or not, influence our actual behavior towards others. We are, as depth psychologists assure us, creatures with complex and often contradictory motivations.

The Hundredth Monkey

> *Texts and textual subtexts can have destructive effects on individuals, communities, and cultures by way of the negative archetype that it may generate at the unconscious psychological level.*

J. Harold Ellens[7]

To further describe and discuss the complex topic of human consciousness as the seat of human violence, I turn to the writings of a group of contemporary scholars and healers who believe that human beings, in this moment of their individual and collective evolutionary species history need to deliberately evolve a new human consciousness. In such a human-directed evolution of consciousness, violence needs to give way to more peaceful means as way to solve human conflicts and problems; domination needs to give way to egalitarian reciprocity; unyielding and brutal egoistic competition needs to give way to cooperation and selfishness needs to give way to altruism.

Our biological heritage as a species includes aggression and violence. It also includes altruism, the capacity for love, and the ability to dedicate our selves to the good of the whole. At this moment in our species' history our capacity to do malicious, planned, deliberate violence has outstripped our capacity for altruistic love and service to the whole. Thus, if the species is to survive, the reasoning goes, members of the human species must begin to re-shape individual and collective consciousness.

A group of European and American scholars have thus begun to ask, *can we choose, consciously and deliberately, a new form of human consciousness to guide our species into the future?* Thus the tale of the hundredth monkey makes its appearance here. The underlying question for this manuscript is simple: what will it take for religious communities to change their religious milieu and culture from one which breeds and facilitates sexual and spiritual abuse done by individual members of the clergy?

What needs to happen, in my opinion, is that the cultural underpinnings for sexual violence need to change. In addition, individuals also need to stop

making violent decisions which feed the creation of violence-prone culture. The collective community needs to stop protecting sexual predators from being held fully accountable to the entire community for their actions (Fortune, 1983a; Doyle, Peterson, and Mouton, 1985; Doyle, Sipe and Wall, 2006; Krall, 1992; Kramer and Alstead, 1993; Rosetti, 1996; Shupe, 2008)? Together the religious community needs to examine and attempt to answer the question: what ancient historical religious crossroads (of ideology and praxis) need to be re-visited in order to change the trajectory of abuse-facilitating religious ideology and cultural history which began there?

Jungian psychoanalyst Jean Shinoda Bolen (1999) narrates Ken Keyes' twentieth-century story of the hundredth monkey (11-13). The tale, Bolen notes, is based on the Morphic Field Theory of Rupert Sheldrake. In his theoretical work, Sheldrake hypothesizes that *a change in the behavior of a species occurs when a critical mass – the exact number needed – is reached.* When that happens*, the behavior or habits of the entire species change* (13).

Not too long ago, the story tells us, scientists in Japan began studying monkey colonies on many different islands. Their study methodology involved dropping sweet potatoes on the beach in order to keep track of various monkeys. One day they noticed Imo, a juvenile female monkey, wash her sweet potato in the surf. Over time, Imo showed her playmates and her mother how to wash sweet potatoes in the salty water before eating them. On this particular island, gradually all monkeys began to wash their sweet potatoes before eating them. Keyes imagined that the potatoes tasted better without the sandy grit and with the salty taste of ocean water.

Bolen quotes Keyes as he recounts his story:

> *Although this was significant, what is even more fascinating was that this change of behavior did not take place only on one island. Suddenly, monkeys on all the other islands were now washing their sweet potatoes as well - despite the fact that monkey cohorts on the different islands had no direct contact with each other* (Bolen, 1999, 12).

Bolen comments that individuals who begin deliberately and intentionally to change their own personal consciousness and behavior in the direction of positive and desired change do not know how close they are to embodying the one hundredth monkey phenomenon. However, as individuals begin to make changes that one day will collectively change a culture, they begin to build a collective momentum for that moment when one historical era ends and time shifts into a new era. It is a given that such a new era will have a different collective consciousness than the era that preceded it. Individuals and entire communities from this moment forward in history will experience and live within a different personal and communal consciousness.

The more monkeys there are washing sweet potatoes, the more likely it is that additional monkeys will do so as well. The more individuals seeking to create violent-resistant cultures, the more others will join them. This is how morphic fields and their energy patterns work. Building upon her Jungian awareness of archetypal realities, Bolen further comments: m*orphic fields and archetypes behave as if they have an invisible pre-existence outside of time and space, become instantly accessible to us when we align ourselves with that form, and are expressed in our thoughts, feelings, dreams, and actions* (15).

Violence-prone Individuals and Communities

> *The hostile imagination creates enemies…We become infiltrated by a spirit of hatred.*
>
> Sam Keen[8]

As we continue our investigation into correlated issues for clergy-initiated sexual violence it becomes immediately evident that no single causation can be blamed. Some religious communities (like some secular corporations or nation-states) are more violence-prone than others. Some individuals are more violence-resistant than others. While some episodes of each form of violence appear to be rooted in the immediate past, many more can be recognized as some form of re-enactment legacy from distant historical events (Carroll, 2001; Denzey, 2007; Doyle, SIpe, Wall, 2006).

Questions arise, therefore, about what specific historical cultural issues are in play when we identify groups (such as religious clergy or spiritual teachers) as violence-and-abuse-prone (Berg, 2006; Doyle, July 13, 2008; Doyle, Sipe and Wall, 2006; Doyle, Peterson and Mouton, 1985; Krall, 1992; Kramer and Alstad, 1993; Shupe, 2008). However one resolves one's own questions about the multiple roots of clergy violence, it is clear: acts of human-originated violence are born inside human consciousness. Since each "information bite" of human consciousness has been shaped by cultural forces, all forms of violence transmit across generational lines by means of human hosts in each present generation. Without successful intervention in the present, the violence of the ancestors replicates itself in the violence of their descendents.

Becoming Buddha-like - Becoming Christ-like

To refrain from evil,
To do the good,
To purify the mind,
This is the teaching of all Awakened ones.

The Buddha[9]

As a man thinks in his heart, so is he.

Proverbs 23:7

In Buddhist thought, learning to recognize, acknowledge and manage the continuous stream of thoughts some American authors call the *monkey mind* is an important mental methodology in the search to become Buddha-like. In contrast, being unaware and unawake constitutes human entrapment within illusion and suffering. Entrapped, suffering individuals and collective humanity are caught in unending cycles of participatory human suffering. Human violence is but one form of that suffering.

Christianity, likewise, advises its adherents that understanding and managing what the mind thinks is a factor in becoming Christ-like. Not only physically-enacted adultery matters in the prevention of salvation, Jesus

warned his disciples, interior lust (the motivating desire of consciousness - the heart - to commit adultery) also matters (Matt. 5:28).

As an organized, millennia-old religion, institutional Christianity has identified lists or typologies of sins and virtues. The interior sin of covetous greed, for example, is manifested in unattractive, grasping behavior. Thus, there is a pre-existing internal component of greed which manifests itself in external grasping behaviors. The inner world of covetous greed is manifested in the outer world by embodied grasping behaviors which harm or violate others. What is structurally and behaviorally true of greed is also true of lust. An inner experience of lust is manifested in sexual behaviors that disrespect and disregard the consent and welfare of others. Human sinfulness has an inner component in human consciousness and an outer component that is behaviorally manifested in the world of others.

It is likely, I think, that active or passive fantasies about harming others (to violate them) or to gain control over them in order to dominate them changes the larger psychic ocean of human consciousness. In addition to affecting individuals, desires to create psychological (or economic) leverage against others or to gain revenge for real or imagined wrongs may also change the collective pool of human consciousness. When such desires arise in personal consciousness they may be a mirror image of the collective unconscious. If this is so, a feedback loop is likely operational. That which arises within the self can be allowed to remain unchallenged and unchanged. It can and often is allowed to mature into action. By means of our human thoughts and our human actions, we live inside the sea of collective consciousness. Just like the fish in literal water we human beings are usually not aware of this sea of consciousness which surrounds us at all times. When the whole accepts and behaviorally endorses violence as a means to some desired social end, individuals are freed to act violently in an unself-conscious or unaware manner.

In the case of clergy sexual violence perpetrators one of the issues appears to be an authoritarian need to dominate and to control others by means of their sexuality. The personal need to control another may well be a mirror image of a religious culture in which the hierarchy seeks to dominate and control the lives of the laity and lesser clergy. The critical role played by obedience and submission theologies (Christianity) or obedience and surrender philosophies (Eastern religions) needs to be

further explored as one of the causal realities of the sexual abuse scandal as it unfolds in religious communities.

To contemporary secular researchers in human consciousness studies an awareness of the relationships of human thought, wishes, desires, and fantasies is formulated by the precept that what behaviorally manifests itself in the collective outer world must, of necessity, first be conceived in the inner world of human desires, fantasies, thought and consciousness. In as much as this inner world has inevitably been previously shaped by the outer world, a somewhat circular process in involved. Even as world shapes the perpetrator; perpetrator, in turn, shapes world.

Concluding Remarks

> *A good man out of the good treasures of his heart brings forth that which is good; and an evil man out of the evil treasures of his heart brings forth that which is evil: out of the abundance the heart, the mouth speaks.*

<div align="center">Luke 6:45</div>

It is imperative for the healing of the world's religious institutions of their various pathologies and sinfulness that we examine clergy and religious leader violence with all of the collective and individual wisdom we possess. This call is in line with Juan Luis Segundo's (1976a, 1976b) claim that the mission of Christian theology is to change a world characterized by violence, injustice, and oppression into one characterized by peace, justice and mercy. One means for doing this is by compassionate, awakened persuasion. Another means is to hold people fully accountable for their harmful, violent actions. A third means, which we address elsewhere, is to call things by their proper names – avoiding obfuscating language and euphemistic labeling of factual reality. When we name things appropriately, we avoid participation in cultural denial. Each of these means is guided by human decisions to foreswear denial and disinformation and to pursue the truth.

To stop getting the same results from any particular form of individual or collective human action inside history, it is imperative to change human consciousness so that different actions can be manifested inside individual

life and inside communal life. With different actions, there will be different consequences. Mental and cultural feed-back loops will change.

In Christian teachings, this is the meaning of the words *repentance* and *conversion.* In the life-long process of conversion away from selfishness and murderous intentionality, a new humanity and a new pro-social and compassionate community can emerge. This is not a singular and miraculous process of being "born again" by simplistic means or word manipulation but rather involves a life-long habit of paying careful attentiveness to the inner life of the mind and to the minds external manifestations in behavior.

Whether or not there is a hundredth monkey, whether or not all living species have a *Morphic Field.* it is clear that effective social change does involve reaching a collective mass of people about the necessity for individual and communal repentance and conversion. In order for Western Christendom to abandon its complicit acceptance of clergy sexual abuse and clericalism, individual Christians must come to an intellectual and spiritual awareness that each Christian must begin to change his personal thoughts as well as his public behaviors. Each individual must be willing to be accountable for her or his social behaviors in community and each must be courageous enough tp hold others accountable for theirs.

This is a behavioral description of mature adult consciousness. Mature human consciousness is the ground in which the tap root of mature adult spirituality can grow and become manifest.   It is also the matrix for mature, healthy and life-sustaining relationships with others.

Recommended Supplemental Readings

1) Chodron, P. (2006). *Practicing Peace in Times of War.* Boston, MA: Shambhala.

2) Ellens, J. H. (2004). Religious Metaphors Can Kill in J. H. Ellens (Ed.), *The Destructive Power of Religion: Violence in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. (Vol.1: *Ideologies and Violence*, pp. 256-271). Westport, CT: Praeger.

3) Nhat Hanh, T. (1981). *Peace is Every Step: The Path of Mindfulness in Everyday Life.* New York, NY: Bantam.

4) Nhat Hanh, T. (1987). *Interbeing.* Berkeley, CA: Parallax.

Personal Reflection Questions

1) What is your personal definition (or definitions) of the words *human consciousness*?

2) In your personal understanding of life, how to you see the relationship between your own mental thoughts (or your experience of emotions) and your public behavior? Spend some time reflecting on this question and then be as specific as you can be in describing the way you experience the links between your inner world and your public actions with others.

3) What is your own personal model for bringing about positive social change in violent situations? Does it make a difference in your actions if you are the target of violence or if someone else is? Once again, spend some time thinking about how you respond. As you answer these complex questions, be as specific as possible.

Footnotes

[1] Hannah J. Kinoti, 1996, 63.

[2] A. W. Richard Sipe, October 17, 1992, 5.

[3] Thich Nhat Hanh, 1993, A poem fragment from *Please Call Me By My True Names*

[4] The Christian Apostle Paul, describes this aspect of his life in Romans 7:15-23.

[5] If the *soul* is that aspect of human life and consciousness which transcends life into eternity – which is a central teaching in Christianity's doctrine of the after-life and a central teaching of Eastern religions which

teach reincarnation, then as long as human life and consciousness are present, then the soul remains alive. So, if the soul lives on in the afterlife of individuals, while the soul can be raped, plundered, mutilated, distorted, or even lost, it cannot be destroyed or murdered.

[6] Jean Shinoda Bolen, 1999, 3.

[7] J. Harold Ellens, 2004, Volume Three, 2.

[8] Sam Keen, 2006a.

[9] Quoted by Huston Smith and Philip Novak, 2003, 87.

- 4 -

Subterranean Roots:
Contributions of Depth Psychology to the Conversation

For the good I would do, I do not but the evil I would not do, that I do.

Romans 7: 19

Introductory Comments

Anyone who denies having an unconscious stops an essential process of awareness which involves being very alert to the workings of one's own filtering mechanisms.

Joel Kramer and Diana Alstad[1]

Ancient authors and contemporary ones agree that the human being is composed of oppositional internal forces which seem to influence their behavior in the world. Whether it is the Christian apostle Paul bemoaning his contrariness in moral behavior (refusing to do that which he knows he ought to do) or contemporary social science researchers and authors who write about religious leader malfeasance, it is impossible to overlook questions of the human personality.

Our discussion so far about human consciousness and its relationship to all forms of violence now shifts. Having identified that understanding issues of human consciousness and human cognition are relevant if we are to understand the complexities of human violence, we shift now to an examination of psychological driving forces in human behavior. To do this, we need to make a brief detour into the field of human enquiry known as depth psychology or analytic psychology. This chapter is, therefore, an extension of the preceding one.

Violence is sometimes perceived to be a socially approved and legitimated form of human behavior. Nevertheless, for the recipients of others' assaults, violence remains a highly feared and traumatizing interpersonal transaction. In addition, when encountered inside previously trusting human relationships, violence betrays those who are its targets. Acts of physical violence – including sexual violence – destroy interpersonal trust between the violence perpetrator and his victim. It may also destroy a victim's ability to trust anyone – including that individual's god(s). Acts of violence by trusted religious leaders in a community, therefore, frequently traumatize entire communities and break down intra-community trust and identity as well. Not only do individuals feel profoundly betrayed, entire communities perceive sexual acts of violence to be a serious betrayal of the social and religious contracts among people.

In addition, it is my personal intuition that those who enact violent behaviors towards others coarsen, objectify and dehumanize themselves as well as the human objects of their action. Both parties in the interpersonal dance of perpetrator and victim are, therefore, negatively affected by each act of sexual violence.

In thinking specifically about gender-based and age-based sexual violence of all kinds, it is clear that in patriarchal cultures around the world, issues of hierarchy, authority, power, control and domination over women and children are factors (Daly, 1978; R. Eisler, 1987; Kramer and Alstad, 1993; G. Lerner, 1993). In general (although not always), these are acquaintance or affinity violations. It is also clear that abusive individuals make and subsequently enact decisions about violating the rights of others inside an all-encompassing patriarchal cultural milieu (Brownmiller, 1975; Krall, 1990, 1992; Wink, 1998, 32-62). Those in power, usually but not always men, seek to maintain their position, status and authority by dominating less powerful and thus vulnerable men, women and children inside complex human social relationship networks.

Institutions inside Christendom, the political state influenced by Christianity, participate in the world wide patriarchy. Christian Institutional behavior becomes, therefore, a hologram of its surrounding culture (Daly, 1968, 1973, 1978; Denzey, 2007; R. Eisler, 1987; Krall, 1990, 1992; Phipps, 1983; Soelle, 1992).

In a variety of patriarchal world cultures, therefore, religion supports overt and covert oppression and violence directed towards women and small children. Inside patriarchal cultures, violent actions against women and children continue to be rationalized and defended as divinely-ordained and are, therefore, theologically and socially defended (Capps, 1995, 2004a, 2004b; Daly, 1978; Hussein, 2007; A. Miller, 1980a, 1980b, 1983, 1984, 1990, and 1991; Walker, 1992). As contributory cultural forces within the ocean of patriarchal consciousness, patriarchal religions and their often unconscious but concomitant values, beliefs, and prejudices play a significant role in shaping the consciousness of abusive clergy and religious professionals.

There are two issues in this manuscript that reflect patriarchal values and they need to be identified as separate issues. This chapter, however, deals only with the first. The *first* of these is the individual and his personal psychology and pathology. To understand the phenomenon of clergy sexual abuse of the laity, we need to raise questions about the inner world of abusive individuals. This interior world of the individual human psyche is not directly accessible to us. Each individual's internal decision-making processes are not visible on the surface of his behavior. His behavior is the tip of an emotional and cognitive iceberg that mostly rests under the surface of his personal consciousness. Therefore, we look to depth psychology to provide a road map to understanding individuals.

The *second* issue is rooted in socio-anthropological understandings of individuals inside groups. To understand the phenomenon of *clericalism*[2] in which institutions protect those guilty of *clergy malfeasance*[3] we need to look not only at the internal dynamics of powerful individuals. We need to look at sociological and cultural factors. We have already begun to do this in previous chapters and will return to this topic again in subsequent ones.

The World Health Association (2002) reminds us that violence-proneness is both individual and cultural. This theme has been initially defined in chapter one and will continue to reappear in this manuscript.

Yet, to understand any individual in any religious hierarchy who sequesters criminal individuals inside religious institutions we need the contributions of depth psychology *and* the sociology of groups. Consequently, both psychological and sociological hypotheses and explanations need to be identified and examined.

For our purposes, therefore, *patriarchy* can be understood to be a world-wide philosophy or ideology regarding male domination (Lerner, 1993). When perceived to be useful or needed to protect their positions of power and authority, patriarchal men (and women) do not hesitate to resort to controlling, often violent, acts of physical, emotional, psychological or religious violence (Arendt, 1969b). Some means of patriarchal control and coercion manifest in structural and economic forms of violence (Brown, 1987). Others manifest in religious abuse (Daly, 1968). Still others manifest as efforts of emotional or psychological control (Kramer and Alstad, 1993). In these many manifestations of patriarchal violence, one underlying motivation is to coerce the weaker party into doing the will of the dominant one (Janeway, 1981; Kelman and Hamilton, 1989; Wink, 1998). In another context than sexual violence, Zimbardo (2008) notes the emergence of human brutality in situations of absolute control of one individual or group by others.

Another motivating force is the desire of the stronger party to maintain his position of authority, power and privilege. To lose control is to lose a sense of identity and social role. To lose control demonstrates a loss of personal or institutional status, authority, identity, and power (Janeway, 1981). As Arendt (1969a, 1969b) comments, when individuals begin to lose community-agreed upon power and authority, the temptation is to resort to coercion and violence in efforts to regain it.

European Masters of Suspicion

> *Each person encounters society as a dimension of his or her own consciousness.*
>
> Gregory Baum[4]

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries, three great masters of suspicion emerged. Their work arose in a European context. They were Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud. Each man created alternative systems of naming and meaning within European-American cultures. Each man's work helped to change European-American understandings of culture and personality. As a result of their collective influence, the West's awareness

changed regarding socio-economic forces, historical narratives, philosophy-religion, sociology-anthropology, the arts, and psychology.

In our post-Freud, post-Marx and post-Nietzsche Western world, it is now readily recognized and acknowledged that a surface-only meaning for texts, events, behavior, or cultural ideologies is suspect. After the work of these three individuals, it became impossible to see the human being as only a sum of his overt behavior. In Western cultures it became commonplace in modernity to understand that complex human phenomena, such as clergy abuse of the laity, contain many sub-narratives in which culture and a conscious human personality continuously interact.

Without their collective and foundational work some ideological aspects of the twenty-first century would be a truly puzzling enigma. Without their seminal work the current century's understanding of psycho-social, anthropological, and culturally-rooted behavioral issues would be a different understanding.

In this chapter, therefore, I make a brief detour away from the more abstract discussion of human consciousness and sexual violence per se in order to provide the reader with some of the theoretical contributions made by two psychodynamic schools in their study of human behavior. I am going to focus on Freud and Jung and their followers. In an attempt to understand the actions of sexually abusive clergy foundational concepts form the European-American psychodynamic or depth psychology tradition provide us with theoretical windows into a culture's or a subculture's shaping of individual consciousness. To do this, the psychological tools of Freud and Jung are needed.

The Psychoanalytic Tradition

> *The John-Jay Study commissioned by the US Bishops in 2004 reported that 6.5 percent of priests ordained between 1960 and 1984 were reported for abuse of minors.*

<div align="center">

A. W. Richard Sipe[5]

</div>

The consequences of abuse are both psychological and physical, but the vehicle of the damage is sexual. The abuse forms the basis for, and invariably causes sexual dysfunction of some kind: impotence, sexual aversion, hyper sexuality, the development of paraphilias – frequently pornography, voyeurism, fetishes - or the perpetuation of abuse in a new generation. Studies demonstrate 20 percent of men who were abused become abusers and 80 percent of abusers were themselves abused.

A. W. Richard Sipe[6]

The psychoanalytic tradition has deeply influenced American culture and its understanding of the motivating importance of hidden aspects of human consciousness on human behavior. Much of the language and many of the technical concepts created by the masters of depth psychology now belong in the ordinary vocabulary of Western individuals. The influence of the analytic paradigm is evident in Ingmar Bergman or Woody Allen movies. Its influence is also recognized in courtroom insanity pleas. Its influence is evident in commercial advertising and can also be observed on the editorial pages of great newspapers.

Many contemporary psychologies, such as Skinner's behaviorism[7] critique the Freudian model. Periodically in the therapeutic community one hears that contentious claim that *Freudian understandings are dead.* I personally do not believe this is true. I continue to trust depth psychology for its description of personality structures and consciousness. This conceptual language shapes my understanding of the pernicious pathologies of the human personality.

This incursion will be brief and readers who wish more information are referred to the voluminous literature that surrounds both analytic schools of thought; Information about each school's founder and his specific theoretical contributions to our understanding of the structures of human consciousness as they affect human behavior is readily available in books and on the internet.

Sigmund Freud and the Freudians: Psychoanalysis

In his medical work as a late Victorian, as a theoretical cartographer of the human psyche, and as a secularized Austrian Jew, Freud (Freud, 1996,

2000; Gay 2006) re-worked cultural assumptions about human personality and its pathologies. Violent European wars during his lifetime engaged him in questions of human goodness and human evil. He was, in my opinion, a pessimist concerning the inherent goodness of human individuals and the perfectibility of human culture.

He was concerned with establishing psychoanalysis as a scientifically acceptable form of inquiry. His work became, therefore, part of the modern medical culture. Over time he created and shaped a whole new medical-psychiatric language subsystem to explain human development, human behavior, and human deviance.

He focused upon factors in childhood conditioning, education and experience which he believed survived in adult life and manifested their continuing psychic presence in human behavior. In short, an individual's childhood conditioning largely determined the type of adult he would become. To do his healing or remedial work with adult clients, Freud focused on memories and fantasies and dreams of his clients. He looked at his clients' socialization inside of a particular family and the larger culture. In particular, he examined the noxious influences of social and cultural elements in childhood as he saw evidences of them in his adult analytic patients.

He was one of the first clinicians of his era to notice that infants and small children were sexual beings. This concept of infantile sexuality scandalized many of the Victorians of his era.

In his studies of the powerful ability for regressed memories and forgotten life experiences in early childhood to influence all subsequent stages of human development and behavior, Freud studied unconscious material mechanisms by means of dreams, slips of the tongue, free-association, and hypnotic states. He examined structures and processes of human consciousness.

As he observed his client's states of consciousness, he hypothesized that human beings contained two conflicting innate or inborn instincts or drive states. Each of these drive states profoundly focused and shaped each human personality and its behavior. The *first* of these drive states is the life-affirming *libido* or e*ros.* The source of all creativity, not just pregnancy and birth, the instinctual libido/eros is profoundly life-affirming. While it

includes human sexuality the conceptual libido/eros in Freud's model of human consciousness is a much more complex drive state. Libido/eros is a biophilic life-seeking instinct which supports human beings in the formation of meaningful human relationships and meaningful work. It provides the psychic energy for life, growth, and survival. It is active inside all life-affirming and creative aspects of human action. As tools or methodologies to map the psychological structures and working mechanisms of human consciousness analysts in Freud's lineage examine and interrogate visual works of art, archeological artifacts, biographical narratives, and written literary texts (most especially ancient mythology) as clues to human psychological development.

The *second* instinct is the destruction-seeking *thanatos*. Thanatos is a powerful negative instinct or drive state which works towards an individual's self-other destruction and annihilation. By means of his descriptions of thanatos we see Freud's attempt to identify the motivating origins and manifestations of self-other destructive behavior for individuals and for the collective group of humanity. The concept of the thanatos drive state provided Freud with a beginning foundation for his discussions of the origins and manifestations of human aggression and human violence. Thanatos is involved in all destructive and attacking behavior against others such as war, murder, and criminal sexual violence. It is involved in self-destructive behavior as well.

In order to avoid socially-manifested, and psychologically-motivated destructive aggression, i.e., violence, Freud believed that the individual (indeed entire communities) needs to learn how to manage the various energies or conflicting drive-states in such a way that the person and her community survived and flourished. As an assist to these individual growth processes, civilization itself participated in the necessary repressive shaping of consciousness away from negative behavior to positive, socially acceptable behavior. Not only the state of *what-in-the-present-is* mattered to Freud, he was also concerned with the various historically-created *should-be* and *should-not-be* taboos of families, communities, religions, and entire civilizations. These powerful taboos (for example, the incest taboo) surround individuals from birth until death and act as forceful motivators of social control. Many of these prescribed and proscribed taboos are experienced in human social groups as *the way things are.*

Freud believed that the acculturation processes of civilization taught succeeding generations about *the true nature of things* for their group. In their acceptance of acculturation and, what I would call domestication, individuals became a mirror image of the culture and language group into which they had been born. Receiving their cultural heritage from parents and others, they in their turn as adults in control, pass it on to future generations.

Freud held to a *catharsis* hypothesis. Needing to manage unacceptable impulses, individuals discharge negative, culturally-forbidden impulses by means of symbolic or representational activities. These activities substituted acceptable behavior for non-acceptable behavior and allowed individuals to discharge (to cathart) the driving underlying motivations without harming the self or others. Unacceptable and disallowed hostile and aggressive feelings and impulses needed to be managed by the individual without destroying themselves or others. In Freud's model both drive states remain hidden in the psychic structure of the unconscious. Later human theorists in clinical research disciplines would explore an extended catharsis hypothesis which directly and indirectly tied aggressive behavior to human experiences of frustration (Lorenz, 1966).

To accomplish this work of catharsis, various personality defense mechanisms are utilized. In sublimating, for example, an individual who experienced repeated, but repressed, desires to mutilate and kill might choose a career in which such desires could be expressed in socially acceptable ways. Perhaps the individual becomes a coroner or a butcher. Here the aggressive motivation to carve up other life forms served the common good. The motivating drive state remained. What changed was the external object towards which it was behaviorally directed. What changed was the means by which the personality satisfied the destructive drive state and impulse in socially acceptable ways. By processes of sublimation, therefore, the hostile energies were transformed, redirected, and behaviorally expressed in socially responsible and socially-acceptable behaviors.

The basic mechanism, however, which underlies all of the other defense mechanisms, is the need of the personality to repress from consciousness that which the ego or executive self of the personality views as painful, ego-ideal dissonant, undesirable, disgusting, unpleasant, culturally-forbidden or dangerous to the ego-ideal of the person. This repressed material goes

underground in the individual unconscious and continues to operate outside the awareness of conscious human memory and thought. In normal daily life, awareness of its presence is non-accessible to the person in her ordinary states of awareness. Thus, the individual remains *unconscious* and *unaware* of the real motivating reasons for his behavior in many situations. The ways individuals do this are numerous.

Faced with wishes to do that which is unacceptable – or actually having done something which is socially forbidden, the personality seeks to return to an ego-consonant view of the self. The conflicted individual, therefore, needs to rationalize his actual decisions with explanatory maneuvers that seek to protect the ego-ideal. For example, faced with overwhelming trauma that the personality simply cannot handle an individual may split her consciousness in a process known as dissociation. By means of dissociation, her or his experiences of the traumatic event become unavailable to ordinary memory. The ego, therefore, is able to manage daily life. Nevertheless, underground in the human unconscious, the experience shapes and conditions ongoing motivations for behavior. Recent therapeutic work also indicates that the body's multiple memory systems retain information about the traumatic event and it may or may not be accessible in the individual's cognitive narrative of memory (Herman, 1997; Levine, 2003, 2005, 2010; Rothschild, 2000).

Since this repressed material is not accessible to the person who makes daily decisions in the world of ordinary consciousness, the self-other explanations individuals create or offer to explain their behavior lack full awareness. Here, we then see the defense mechanism of *projection*. By means of projection, aspects of the individual's inner world are projected, unconsciously, into the outer world of human relationships. One can witness, therefore, the phenomenon where individuals blame and castigate others for motivations (and even behaviors) which are very similar to their own. Based on unconscious structures of the personality, this mechanism remains outside the awareness of the judging and acting individual. The use of projection as a way to manage social interactions with others may well be more observable to observers than to the individual who uses projection to manage psychic material that threatens to enter full awareness.

Many years ago, for example, clinical psychologist Sheldon Kopp (1972) observed that many physically violent homophobic individuals have

repressed, unacceptable, and unconscious personal desires for same-gender sexual activity. When these repressed and consciously-denied desires threaten to emerge into fully aware consciousness, an emergency of self-perception and ego-ideal self-definition is activated. To manage the anxiety caused by the threatened emergence into conscious life of this forbidden and repressed desire for same-sex relationships, the individual resorts to violence against the threatening *other* to help him re-suppress or re-repress his own inner urges. Such a psychic maneuver enables him to maintain a secure self-definition as exclusively heterosexual. Tragic acts of murderous paranoia, rage, and brutality can occur as a consequence of this sequence of repression, threat of an emergent awakening, and re-repression. Kopp commented that this year's violent oppressor is often, therefore, next year's consenting sexual partner. This is his reminder to clinicians that unconscious material will keep threatening to appear until the underlying drive state is satisfied and managed.

Even though the buried material is lodged in the unconscious, its motivating energy remains active in the personality. It is free, therefore, to influence and motivate behavior without the individual's awareness of its role. Such forms of unconsciously-motivated behavior are manifested without the full consent of the ego.

In some twenty-first century clinical literature, these repressed materials contribute to a sense of the self being divided against itself, of having competing aspects or parts of the self (Rossman 1983; Rossman and Bresler, ud). Some driving aspects of the personality remain below conscious awareness. Some may even represent or express competing or conflicting aims. Nevertheless, powerful drive states and their ability to trigger behavior are always present and operational.

One of the ways to understand some adult abusers who were as children abused by others is to see them as individuals who repetitively seek to resolve the early abuse and its traumatic effect on their developing personality by re-enacting it in adulthood (Terr, 1990, 261-280). Unable to integrate what happened to them as children, the narrative of their life is displayed – albeit unconsciously, in their abusive adult behaviors towards children the age they themselves were when first abused.

Traditional concepts of *free will* or *human choice* are modified in Freudian and post-Freudian thought. However any particular Freudian analyst might

describe this to a patient, intersecting areas of conscious awareness and non-conscious unawareness are always in play in determining specific actions in human behavior.

In many therapeutic traditions, following Freud, it is commonplace wisdom to note that entrenched patterns of behavior which do not serve the human being well are patterns which are deeply rooted in repressed, troubling past events. These are, in analytic theory, stored in repressed unconscious memory. No matter the cost, the individual seems *destined* to repeatedly engage in patterns of self-other destructive actions in the world. One clinical hypothesis is that the individual by resorting repetitively to such dysfunctional behavior is attempting to solve an intra-psychic problem with obscure childhood origins. While his behavior is visible to him (and to others), he and they are unaware of its originating motivations. It is these motivations which control and drive his behavior. Something other than conscious, deliberate, rational adult cognitive choice is driving his negative, destructive activities in the world.

For example, depth psychologists such as European analyst Alice Miller (1983, 1984) have put Adolf Hitler on the posthumous clinical couch. She remarks upon his father's enraged and brutal, physical violence towards the child Adolf. Her clinically-informed armchair hindsight hypothesis is that Hitler's murderous acts towards the Jewish community have a deep taproot in Hitler's experience of terrifying and humiliating violence when he was too young to protect himself from being the target of his father's authoritarian, tyrannical and cruel parenting behaviors.

In personal conversations about human freedom with analytically-influenced philosopher Rollo May (ca, 1975), he explained to me his own understanding of free will and determinism in Freud's work. Human beings, May said, were largely determined by the combination of their place in culture, their genetic make-up and their often repressed prior life experiences. However, if and when they grow in awareness (or awakened consciousness), they have moments of genuine freedom and choice for which they are genuinely and morally accountable. He used a metaphor of a person walking towards a goal. By deliberately and consciously changing one or two centimeters of difference in directionality, the person changed the future. Becoming aware is a process of personal growth and it results in an ability to make free-choices at small and humble life intersections. These tiny decisions made in genuine freedom, in turn, affect (or help to

determine) the future and all subsequent choices. Each moment of enacted freedom creates a climate in which additional moments of genuine freedom open to the individual.

The new age mantra that *you are where you are today because of the perfection of your past choices* is yet another attempt to describe the phenomenon that the present moment represents the sum accumulation of all past experiences in a person's lifetime.

In my personal opinion, particularly on the deeply interpenetrated yet separate topics of clericalism and clergy violence the underlying determinism here needs to be questioned. This is especially true from the viewpoint of victims. Victimized individuals usually do not choose their personal reality and destiny. They do not always enact behavior rooted in their historical past. This is, I believe, particularly true for victims of other's violence. What may appear to be an accident of being in the wrong place at the wrong time from the victim's point of view is rarely that simple. In most situations of clergy sexual violence, for example, victims have been groomed for a period of time by their would-be predator. In this grooming process, victims are encouraged to trust the individual who later becomes their victimizer. It is, in my opinion, the predator's behavior which is, at some levels of his personality, determined by his life history. For many perpetrators there is a certain obsessive quality or recidivist pattern to their repeated victimizations of others. The victim (or victims) of such violence is often an unsuspecting and trusting individual who got snared in the perpetrator's proclivity to resort to sexual violence as a way in which to dominate, overpower, and control others.

Individuals who abuse others *are, nevertheless,* making choices about their own behavior. More than victims, they exemplify some of the Freudian concerns about unconscious motivations as well as deliberate choices. The victimizer in many situations of clergy abuse is able to walk away from the violent situation with his personal life and hidden motivations intact.

Victims of perpetrators' behavior reap the consequences of the perpetrator's decisions. The act of experienced violation and betrayal shatters one's previous understandings of the world. Following acts of sexual violation, victims often become more limited in their life choices because of strong bio-physiological and psychological responses to the experience of violence and its subsequent traumatization (Terr, 1990; van

der Kolk, et. al., 1996). In the aftermath of victimization, many victims (perhaps all) seek to find an organizing rationale for what happened to them. They need, in essence, to reconstruct their inner and outer worlds.

While accidents and the actions of others are all factors in the present-moment-reality for each one of us, still there is a level of human communal life in which individuals are making choices all the time. At some level, according to Buddhist wisdom, as human beings become aware (awakened), they have choices. For these choices, they are, therefore, morally accountable to the community of others. For the short and long-term consequences of their behavior in the lives of others, they are responsible.

Common clinical wisdom expresses a similar idea. The clinical proverb, *The best way to predict a client's future behavior is to know and understand his past patterns of behavior,* talks about a human being's limited freedom to choose freely in light of the strong impact of his past life history and choices. New habits and new patterns of behavior are, therefore, rare but always possible in the present moment. However, without awareness, new habits and patterns of behavior are unlikely. Another clinical saying also expresses some of this wisdom. *To keep getting the same results, keep doing the same thing; to get different results, change your behavior*.

Perhaps this is what the biblical Paul observed in his own life when he commented on the good that he should do which remains undone and the evil which he should not do but which in fact, he does (Romans 7:15-23). According to the Freudians, something drives such conflicted patterns of human behavior other than free-will and choice: these are the conflicting drive states of thanatos and libido/eros. In a Freudian perspective, in such situations unconscious and deeply repressed memories and motivations are operant driving forces for action.

As twentieth-century social scientists studied Freud's work on the catharsis of destructive urges, an interesting finding emerged. Individuals who released aggressive feelings or drive-states by (1) becoming aware of them and (2) by *talking* about them lowered their likelihood for engaging in aggressive, hostile or anti-social behaviors towards others. As individuals gained awareness of inner emotional experiences of frustration, anger and rage *and* as they talked about this inner desire to strike back at others they lessened the likelihood of anti-social behavior towards others. However,

releasing the energy of internal drives towards aggression by *actions* in the physical world brings about an increase in acts of aggression and violence. It appears as if physically aggressive behaviors do not cathart hostile and destructive drive states but rather exaggerate or intensify them (Zimbardo, 1988, 644-645).

Rather than resolving the inner tension, it seems that engaging in violent actions builds an internal psychological momentum in which even more violence is conceived and then perpetrated. If we add theoretical insights to this therapeutic conundrum with information from American behaviorism (Skinner, 1953) it may be that complex stimulus-response patterns are being patterned, imprinted, and conditioned for future events of similar violence. It may be that doing a violent action today conditions an individual and predisposes him or her to do additional violent actions tomorrow. Rather than releasing the individual from the negative drive state and behavioral chain of enacted violence, the drive state appears to be intensified and individuals are more securely entangled inside the motivating bondage of their destructive urges towards others.

In such a model of human personality formation and behavior, the human being acts without a genuine and truthful awareness of his own motivations. His sense of personal accountability and responsibility for his choices and behavior in the outer world are overshadowed by those inner forces of which he is unaware. In a certain sense, it is possible to conclude, therefore, that without awareness, the individual unconsciously enacts and re-enacts both his own personal repressed history and the shared repressed cultural history of his communities of reference.

Carl Jung and the Jungians: Archetypal Psychology

In Swiss Protestant Carl Jung's (2000) theory, the ego (that which in Freud's theoretical work is associated with consciousness) is part of a bi-polar personality structure. In this bi-polar structure, the ego is concerned with the world, with health and emotional soundness. It is concerned with its relationships in the world. Its polar opposite is the *Self*. In the Self Jung saw the divine spark of humanity and its eternal values. Swiss Jungian analyst Guggenbuhl-Craig (1991) in his discussion of Jung's theoretical personality structure notes the similarities of the Jungian Self to Christian concepts of the Christ within humanity (69-70).

In Jungian theory, an *archetype* is an inherent human potential which, in principle, is present in all human beings. Individuals who are faced with typical, constantly recurring life situations resort, according to Jung and his contemporary followers, to pre-existing archetypal forms as the enact behavior. Archetypes, which pre-exist both inside and outside any given individual's consciousness, have two poles. Both poles of the archetype exist in any given human being and interaction. Within the human psyche when one pole of an archetype is activated (constellated) in the outer world, the opposing pole is constellated in the interior world.

In some social relationships, archetypal relationships occur where one pole of the archetype is activated in one person while its opposite is activated in the second. However, in theory at least, both persons in the archetypal relationship are continuously constellating both poles of the archetype in their inner world.

In case of the physician, for example, Guggenbuhl-Craig (1991) notes that the archetypal outer physician also has an archetypal inner patient and that a similar reality exists in the archetypal outer patient who has an inner physician. In the relationship of a specific physician and a specific patient, the archetype is activated by the asymmetrical ministering nature of the relationship. With or without awareness of the participants in the actual doctor-patient relationship, archetypes are in motion at all times. Once constellated, the behavior of both parties is continuously shaped and re-shaped by archetypal forces. These usually lie outside of their conscious awareness. He notes ruefully that even the experience of having successfully completed a through training analysis does not protect the working analyst from slipping into unconscious and harmful archetypal behavior with her clients. Continuous supervision and rigorous self-examination is, therefore, advised for all analysts and other ministering persons.

Since the ego likes clarity, it tries to resolve the ambiguity of this bi-polar archetypal stew by an unequivocal choice for one side of the pole or the other. In this situation, the archetype becomes split and one pole is repressed into the unconscious where it operates outside the realm of direct human awareness. As a dynamic but unconscious process, that which has been repressed is expressed by the individual in external behaviors by means of *projection*. In projection, that which is internal, repressed, undesired, unknown, and unaware gets transferred from its

original source and action and is, therefore, free-floating inside the personality. Split away from its polar opposite, it is ready to be projected onto others in the outer world.

When, for example, a healer can no longer see or acknowledge his own wounds (or be consciously aware of his archetypal inner patient), he projects these unto the patient and ceases to recognize the patient's own archetypal inner healer. As the physician does this, he comes to believe that he, by his own actions, is the healer rather than the facilitator of the patient's inner healer (which is the true source of healing (Guggenbuhl-Craig, 90).

In such a situation, the temptation is to overpower or to exercise excessive control behaviors over the patient, as a professional way of relating to him. In such a process, the physician-healer comes to dominate the patient-healer relationship. Incapable of dealing with his own unconscious needs or fears of ill-health and death, he loses sight of the client's strengths and needs. Clinical warnings abound, for example, on the topic of a missed, life-threatening diagnosis in either a *f*avorite patient or a thoroughly detested one. The clinical aphorism that *he who doctors himself (or his own family) has a fool for a doctor* refers to the recognized collective wisdom of the healing professions that denial, projection, and transference issues interfere with accurate data-based diagnoses and treatment protocols*.*

Regarding this trajectory in the use of power, control and domination, Guggenbuhl-Craig notes that the *more power is exerted by the physician in his relationships with patients, the less the genuine healer appears* (90). The same could be said about the teacher and the student or the priest and an individual making a confession. Power and control issues need, therefore, to be made conscious by the dominant person and then they need to be managed in order for the patient to heal, the student to learn, and the confessed sinner to grow spiritually.

In each ministering profession and relationship, there is a polar split of the professional who ministers and the recipient who receives his ministering actions. When dominating and controlling power-over modes of relating are utilized in these asymmetrical ministering relationships, the lesser party becomes objectified as *other.*

Jung's concept of the male-female archetype includes the archetypal structures of the *animus* (the male archetype which women experience) and the *anima* (the female archetype which men experience) As a woman interacts with a man, for example, she reacts not only to his particular human characteristics but to the animus-anima archetype as well. When a woman is afraid of her interior animus or a man despises his interior anima, then distortions of the personality and distortions of gender-relationships occur. Once again, issues of power and control manifest themselves in dysfunctional ways.

Again, the reminder, in any archetypal situation, both poles of the archetype are constellated and operant in the interaction. The issue for the personality is how to manage the process of constellation in a manner that both acknowledges and honors both polar realities in such a way that personal integrity is maintained; in such a way that relational integrity is maintained.

To Freud's basic instincts of libido and thanatos Jung added the need to create and the need to self-actualize. There is a sense in which Jungian psychology sees the human personality as a balancing act. Strong opposing forces within the personality needed to be managed for a healthy personality to live in the world. In this sense he is much more optimistic about human nature than is Freud.

In thinking, for example, about the student-teacher archetype; for the teacher to manage the archetype and its driving energy, she must recognize and acknowledge that her outer teacher has an inner knowledge-hungry child. When the teacher recognizes and honors her Self and the now-operational or activated bi-polar student-teacher archetype, then not only factual knowledge is taught to the student but his own inner archetype of the outer knowledge-hungry learner and the inner teacher is stimulated. In such a situation not only information is learned. An active desire for knowing is stimulated and arises in the student. However, when the archetype is split and control and domination characterize the relationship, the student becomes a passive vessel and one can see boredom emerge along with self-other destructive behaviors that sabotage the teacher-student relationship and its goal of education (Guggenbuhl-Craid, 95-96).

One more set of Jungian concepts is helpful. In Jungian thought there are three closely related structures of human consciousness which get

addressed by the term *shadow.* In the physical world*,* that which receives light casts a shadow. So too, according to Jung is this relationship of light to shadow found in the inner psychological world.

It is possible to think about an ego-ideal or Self, for example as that which exists in the light. However, because it receives the light, the ego-ideal has a constellating shadow which accompanies it and becomes manifest wherever the ego ideal seeks to express itself.

Three structures Jung called by the common name of *shadow* are as follows. The *personal shadow* includes but is not limited to the images, drives, and unpleasant personal (or cultural) experiences which have had to be repressed. This concept is related to Freud's concept of the unconscious as the repository of that which is no longer accessible to awareness and choice-full recall or conscious use. In Jung's system, the shadow inevitably works against the individual's light-infused ego-ideals.

The *collective shadow* operates inside any particular collectivity or social grouping. The family would be such a group; so would a church be one; a cohesive nation-state another; a world language-group yet another. The collective shadow contains all that is not acceptable within the cultural milieu within which it operates. The collective shadow works against the collective ego-ideal. Thus, the collective shadow helps to explain individual and group brutality, greed, cruelty, and all forms of individual and systemic violence inside the human community.

Jung's concept of the *archetypal shadow* represents, according to Guggenbuhl-Craig, that which we might ordinarily call *evil.* It is something which operates independently. It might, perhaps, be called the murderer within. It is a longing drive instinct towards death, destruction, misery and suffering (111). There are some similarities in Jung's concept of the archetypal shadow to Freud's concept of the drive state thanatos.

To me it is interesting to speculate whether language itself participates in creating, casting or maintaining such a destructive archetypal shadow. Individuals who are fluent in two languages often comment that exact and precise translations of certain words or concepts cannot be made because linguistic structures, vocabularies and organizing constructs in one language have no precise equivalent in a second one. Since language is the way in which individuals formulate conscious thought and since thought

motivates behavior, the absence of a shared linguistic symbol or conceptual ideology can, it seems to me (at least in a hypothetical manner) function as a repressive element. Where there is no "word" the experience cannot be conceptually communicated and understood.

When a culture has no linguistic symbol for a particular human experience, it is, or so it seems to me, unlikely to recognize or process such an experience in either individual or collective experience. Such an experience, when it occurs must of necessity remain repressed, inchoate, unrecognized, unregulated and unexpressed.

This is specifically an issue, in my opinion, for small children who may have inadequate language abilities to express their stressed responses to specific acts of violation at the hands of older children or adults. Lacking a word for their experiences, they are particularly vulnerable (Terr, 1990). While their physical body is recording a rape, for example, a pre-school child may not have language for her own genitals or for those of others. She may not be able, therefore to either understand or to describe what happened to her. Play therapy may allow such a preverbal child to demonstrate the traumatic events of violation in which her young life got trapped.

Many years ago I heard about a just talking girl who got a severe vaginal infection. The medical puzzle was solved when the child's pediatrician discovered grass inside her vagina. The parents eventually figured out that a brother (almost ten years older than his sister) had done this/had taught this behavior to his sister. In essence the older boy's behavior constituted a form of incestuous sibling sexual abuse.

In his comments on issues of human consciousness and violence Professor Dwight Judy of Garrett Seminary (2011) commented to me that it is essential to raise the question of whether or not *something bigger is at work* when we look at events of professional clergy abuse and institutional clericalism inside the church. He specifically referenced the Christian concept of the *powers and principalities*. As I have reflected upon his question, it does appear to me that this third element of Jung's work, archetypal shadow aspect of consciousness, creates a space for such pre-existing cosmological structures of evil to enter a depth psychology discussion of violence.[8]

Concluding Commentary

> *The person who has been abused in childhood is unable to weave his or her relationships out of whole cloth. The fibers of those personalities have been torn; their ability to establish solid relationships is in tatters. Most times they don't understand why they can't connect with other people in meaningful ways.*

A. W. Richard Sipe[910]

In the twenty-first century, when we ask ourselves (or others) about any individual's motivations, we implicitly acknowledge our intellectual debts to these great depth psychologists who probed the human psyche for its secrets. Contemporary law and contemporary therapy reflect this preoccupation with understanding how an individual came to be the adult he is, how he came to choose the behavioral path he chose. In the years since their deaths the *therapeutic age* which they helped to establish has flourished in Europe and in North America.

One intellectual legacy of Freud and Jung and their disciples is that we are now aware that it is foolhardy to attribute single motivations to complex adult behaviors. No where is this warning advice more needed than when we interrogate the dead who, as adults, sexually abused others.

Of necessity, such a short discussion of the complexities of Freudian and Jungian thought abbreviates the insights of each. Yet even such a brief incursion into clinical theory is essential for understanding Euro-American structures of belief about human aggression and violence. Freud and his followers and Jung and his followers each provide a small glimpse into the clinical theory which underlies some of the emerging ideas about human consciousness and the role that it plays in violent human actions.

With this clinical information in place, it is now time to turn our discussion specifically to socio-cultural issues which surround specific topics of human aggression and human violence. To begin to understand the complexity of sexually abusive violence, it is necessary to look outside the interior selves of perpetrators and victims into the external world of culture.

Recommended Supplementary Readings

1) Freud, S. (1996). *Totem and Taboo.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

2) Guggenbuhl-Craig, A. (1991). *Power in the Helping Professions. Wo*odstock, CT: Spring Publications.

3) Herman, J. L. (1997). A Forgotten History in J. L. Herman, *Recovery and Trauma: The Aftermath of Violence from Domestic Abuse to Political Terror.* New York, NY: Basic Books, 7-32.

4) Jung, C. G. (2000). *The Undisclosed Self.* New York, NY: Signet.

Personal Reflection Questions

1) In your own thinking, how do you explain the tendency for some individuals to act in self-other destructive ways? What motivates individuals to harm themselves? In your opinion, what motivates them to harm others?

2) In your own thinking about human beings, how do you resolve the question of whether human beings are essentially – in their basic humanity – evil or good? If you stood at the bedside of a newborn baby, how would you answer this question? If you stood at the bedside of a dying old person, how would you answer it? When you look at your own life, how do you answer it?

3) What is your understanding of the psychological process of projection? Where have you witnessed other individual's projections? Have you ever caught yourself in the act of projecting an inner mental state out into the world where you blamed and criticized others for doing things quite similar to things you repeatedly do or have done?

Footnotes

[1] Joel Kramer and Diana Alstad, 1993, 106.

[2] *Clericalism* is an institutional clergy structure and practice that protects the clergy and church institutions from accountability for misdeeds and malfeasance at the expense of the laity

[3] *Clergy malfeasance* is the criminal exploitation and abuse of a religious group's followers by trusted elites and leaders of their religion.

[4] Gregory Baum, 2007, 119.

[5] A. W. Richard Sipe, November 15, 2009, 11, footnote 41.

[6] A. W. Richard Sipe, September 9, 2009, 1.

[7] See the work of B. F. Skinner (1953) as an example of such a critique.

[8] For an extended discussion of the powers and principalities issue, the reader is referred to the theological writings of Walter Wink (1992, 1998).

[9] A. W. Richard Sipe, September 9, 2009, 3.

- 5 -

The Social Construction of Human Power

Occasional abuses of power, if properly dealt with do not necessarily reduce the perceived legitimacy of the state itself. But repeated failures of the authorities to adhere to the criteria and procedures for the legitimate exercise of power, particularly if these failures remain uncorrected, will gradually erode the legitimacy of the state.

Herbert C. Kelman and V. Lee Hamilton[1]

Introductory Comments

Power is not a thing…but an interaction.

Elizabeth Janeway[2]

If we substitute the word church for the word state in Kelman's and Hamilton's quotation above, then we find that it has direct applications to the concerns of this manuscript. Churches, like the state, are prone to human abuses of position and power (Shupe, 2008). When dealt with promptly and properly, such abuses do not undermine the church's social mission and moral efficacy in the world. Repeated failure, however, undermines the legitimacy of the church's ethical and spiritual teachings. Eventually, continuous, incompetent or corrupt institutional management of human abuses within the institutional church undermine its moral authority.

When we look at the issue of clergy and religious professional sexual abuse of the laity, the landscape is filled with a wide variety of religious organizations and their collective failure to deal promptly, appropriately and effectively with abuse perpetrators (Downing, 2001; Doyle, Sipe and Wall, 2006; Kramer and Alstad, 1993; Lesser, 2010; Price, T., 1992a, 1992c; Shupe, 1998; Shupe, et. al., 2000, Sipe, 1996, February 23, 2003).

In many different religious groups we find abuses of positional and personal power done by individuals. We also find a strong tendency of religious or spiritual communities to hide perpetrators of sexual abuse inside personnel practices of silence and secrecy. In these situations institutional abuses of power and authority become complicit with the abuser's actions. Shupe (2008) names such institution-protecting individuals who cover up sexual crimes done by clergy or other religious leaders as criminal accomplices after the fact.

Both kinds of violence (individual clergy sexual; abuse and systemic mismanagement of clergy sexual abuses) represent violations of position, authority and power. Both kinds of abuse if not dealt with promptly, erode communal confidence in the legitimacy and morality of the church, its theology, its ethical integrity and the content of its spiritual teachings. Both can deeply affect the financial infrastructure that sustains church programs (Sipe, November 6, 2008; Turliish, October 31, 2011). Both undermine the credibility and perceived legitimacy of the church and its teaching. Both undermine the efficacy of the church as it attempts to carry out its stated mission in the social world of believers and the secular world of unbelievers.

Power Defined

>*Power: corresponds to the human ability to act; to act in concert with other human beings; it is, therefore, never the property of an individual but belongs to a group and remains in existence as long as the group remains together/no longer; the "man in power" represents the people of whom he is a part.*

>Hannah Arendt[3]

In its most rudimentary form power is the ability to act. In addition, an individual's or community's exercise of power involves human relationality. Power is, therefore, exercised in relationship to something or to someone. Even the tiniest of babies has power – although we rarely think of babies in this way. Any adult who attempts to fix the universe for a screaming two week old infant at 3 AM is aware of this particular baby's interpersonal

power to demand attention and to get action from the much more powerful (and very sleepy) adults who are in charge of the household.

A baby whose needs are consistently cared for in a respectful, loving manner is learning the rudiments of developmentally appropriate power in her relationships with her caregivers. She is learning something – however inexperienced she might be in the ways of the world – about taking care of her needs and about the dependability or reliability of those others in her world whom she meets every day as she communicates her needs.

In addition to personal social power, physical power is available to each human being as they mobilize their muscles and their will to accomplish physical tasks. An individual who can bench press 200 pounds has power – the physical power of the body's musculature *and* the mental or emotional power of the mind and will to generate self-discipline, training, and action.

Our conversation about power in this manuscript assumes the presence of these basic forms or experiences of personal power. It assumes that each individual has the personal means to influence the physical world of matter and the social world of human relationships. In short, each human being has power.

However, for the purposes of this chapter, we are more interested in socio-cultural manifestations of power – what might be called political power if we agree that we are not talking about electoral politics. In this kind of power, an individual seeks to influence other individuals to act in ways the first person (the influencing agent) desires. The more social influence an influencing agent can exert, in this kind of analysis, the more power she or he is capable of moving in the interpersonal social sphere.

Socio-cultural power is exercised in personal choices and actions within the social world: it is, therefore, relational. It can be expressed between two persons, between one person and a collective group of thousands or between two collective groups. Thus, in any human social relationship, power dynamics are present. This is true in a family and it is true in the work place. It is true on the football field and it is true in a poker game. It is true in the marital bed and it is true in the church.

As individuals interact and seek to influence each other, power fluctuates and moves. It shifts and dances. As power moves and dances, it carries a

possibility for personal and social change. It can also be used, however, to doggedly maintain the status quo in the face of perceived threats to permanence and stability. The kinds of power activated in any given interpersonal or socio-cultural situation hold and reveal the entire socio-cultural universe of intentionality and meaning.

Those who wield power to influence others must be either persuasive or coercive. Those who receive or decide to accept another's influence must be persuaded or coerced. Value judgments and perceptions about issues of legitimacy come into play.

Much of the cultural dance of power operates below the threshold of awareness and consciousness. Janeway (1981) makes the important point that some individual responses to power relations are visceral – the physical body responds to others who are seeking to influence them, to persuade them, or to control and coerce them. Not only the person's mind can accept or resist influence: his body can as well. To learn to access visceral wisdom, individuals must pay attention to the messages the body sends in situations of social influence.

From this brief description so far, a truism emerges. Individuals and groups are continuously seeking to affect and to influence each other. This social reality keeps the interpersonal dance of power constantly in motion.

To disempower someone, therefore, means that an individual or group seeks to control or to shut down the shifting dance of power among people. Seeking to disempower another, one individual seeks to limit or control the power of the other to act in ways contrary to the controlling person's wishes. A white racist, for example, may use violence or the threat of violence in an attempt to prohibit a person of color from exercising and expressing his own share of the relational power that belongs to any social exchange between the two. An abusive sexual predator may similarly attempt to control or close down the power of his victims to make appropriate self-protective responses. Institutions may seek to gut the power of their dissenting members by economic reprisals (such as firing an individual) or social isolation and shunning (such as excommunication) as a form of bureaucratic control.

In an individual's or group's desire to control others, violence or the threat of violence can be called into play. The best way to permanently

disempower someone is to murder them. Obviously, this is not a solution to most conflicts about power between human beings. Other means of disempowerment rely, therefore, more on emotional and psychological forms of violence rather than on enacted physical violence.

In situations of unequal power and influence, the recipient of disempowerment efforts by others senses or deliberately assesses the potential volatility and danger of disobedience to her own safety. She assesses both the short-range and the long-range consequences of her failure to submit to another's demands for partial or total control of the interpersonal space between them. She weighs the cost of resistance and disobedience. Once again, some of her perceptions and analysis may be visceral. In situations of life-threatening violence, her physical body and its automatic response patterns may assume a more dominant response to the situation than her cognitive mind.

A student who is being sexually harassed by a teacher may deliberately weigh the consequences of allowing or disallowing the abusive behavior to continue. She is apt to identify the options available to her. If the threat to her physical safety, self-esteem, or academic success is minimal, she may act in one way. If the threat is significant, she may choose another way to manage the situation. In addition, her behavior will be influenced by what she knows about institutional policies regarding professor harassment of students. How she responds will, in a large part, be influenced by her past life experiences with abuse and her awareness of social responses to complaints about abuse. Every recipient of abusive behavior must make choices about how to respond. How the individual does that reflects both her personal life history and the culture in which she lives.

Noticing how cultures and individuals deal with power and abuses of power provides observers with information about individual and group dynamics. The personality and character of individuals, groups, and entire cultures is embedded within and expressive of the sources, motivations, and behavioral manifestations of power. How individuals and groups manage a wide variety of power relationships tells us much about the nature of their individual personalities and the socio-cultural signature of their shared culture.

Does, for example, an individual's culture emphasize submission and obedience to authorities? Are less powerful individuals taught to feel fear,

shame or guilt when they disobey those who are powerful? Are subgroups of the culture forbidden the cultural right or privilege to publicly protest undesirable or unjust demands for their obedience and submission? Is their any cultural history or support for those who actively dissent and who disobey?

In Western cultures we tend to see power as a noun. In its role as a noun, the concept of power can be modified by adjectives – personal power, collective power, abusive power, socially responsible power, etc. As a noun, we tend to quantify power. He has lots of power and she has almost none. In this model we can see individuals carrying a power-loaded gunnysack. When an individual wants or needs to influence someone, he opens the gunnysack and invests or spends some of his accumulated stash of power. I think this is a somewhat flawed perception or inadequate model of power.

Power as a Process of Social Interaction

> *A man feels himself much more of a man when he is imposing himself and making others an instrument of his will.*

> Bertrand de Jouvenal[4]

Another way to look at power is as a process of social interaction that both *reflects and produces* great social change (Janeway, 1981, 1). In the blowing winds of human social influence some individuals find themselves cast in the role of the powerful. Others are cast in the role of the weak, the vulnerable, the victimized, or the powerless. In some situations an individual might be quite powerful while in others he may be almost powerless. Here the relational nature of power becomes evident. When we think of power as a relational process rather than a noun, it is cast in terms of role relationships.

But, once again, language is deceptive. No human being is omnipotent; no human being is without the ability to exercise personal and communal power.

Nevertheless, the relationship of the powerful to the weak is omnipresent in human cultures. Whether by birth and caste, by gender or skin color, by inherited or earned wealth, by personal charisma, by membership in the dominant cultural ethnic group, or by personal achievement and self-improvement efforts, some individuals command more personal space and more personal resources than others.

One source of power lies in being exceptional in one way or another. It may be that the individual is a natural athlete and becomes the best football player in a generational cohort. Maybe the individual lives in a situation of inherited wealth. Maybe she has intellectual brilliance. Perhaps he is drop-dead gorgeous. Maybe she just oozes charisma.

An often neglected source of power in academic discussions is an individual's (or group's) willingness to use personal dominance and interpersonal violence to influence those in subordinate positions. Since Individuals and groups with great relational power – no matter its source, are more able to successfully influence other individuals, groups, and entire cultures. The addition of social or technological weaponry creates a situation in which social influence is deeply colored by fear in subordinates. An example of technological weaponry is a gun. An example of social weaponry is control of the subordinate's financial security.

Persons most vulnerable to the uses and abuses of social power are those who control few personal and communal resources. Perhaps their vulnerability is due to age (too young or too old), ethnicity (the wrong religion or skin color), national origin (a developing nation with few economic resources or a troubled political history), language facility, emotional flexibility or resourcefulness, gender, sexual orientation or many other factors which human beings use to sort each other's ability to influence their shared material and social world.

One often neglected dimension in the life history of the vulnerable lies in an individual's (or, in some situations, a community's) life history of victimization (usually in childhood and adolescence). Once successfully victimized, the individual (or community) is more vulnerable to future victimizations. Deprived of the power to equitably negotiate relationships and resolve interpersonal conflicts, the subordinated individual or group is more readily victimized by the powerful who seek to control them in some manner or another.

In general, financial wealth, membership in the ruling class, and the power of social influence go together. An ability to coerce (by force or violence) and power go together. In many, but not all, situations, the ability and willingness to dominate others and to gain power over them is accompanied by the presence of wealth, positions of inherited or earned privilege and a certain willingness to coerce others' behavior with the threat of negative repercussions such as violence for disobedience. Another slightly less demeaning aspect of the inequitable power relationship is the ability of the powerful to offer carrots as a means of influence. A carrot might be a job promotion or it might be social inclusion.

To summarize so far: If individual A (the influencing agent) wishes individual B (the receiving agent) to do something which individual B does not necessarily want to do, then Individual A must have either the ability and willingness to persuade or the ability and willingness to coerce . Holding resources that increase his personal power, individual A is in a better social position to influence individual B to do his will than vice versa.

Coercive domination can be accomplished by the fist, economic reprisals, a sense of social shaming, social isolation and ostracism as well as by a vast array of social, economic, and material weapons. It is easier and socially less energy-expensive for individual A if he can persuade individual B by mutual agreement or by a carrot rather than by needing to resort to coercive force, violence and the stick.

The Formidable Powers of the Powerful

Power corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Lord Acton[5]

In human cultures around the world, those who are in positions of social power (the ability to lead, to influence, to order and to command, to be followed unquestioningly or to be submissively obeyed) find their powers rooted in and defined by social mores, myths, and ideologies. In situations of unequal power, the powerful control the culture's guiding mythologies. The powerful, therefore, define the culture's scriptures - establishing which are orthodox and which are heterodox. They equally define taboos and

forbidden actions. They control the penalties for deviance and cultural disobedience. If, for example, an individual in a powerful position openly and knowingly violates a community's sexual taboo, consequences will be different than if a relatively powerless person violates the same taboo.

In short, the powerful define, write, create, exegete, and preach that which becomes *normative* or appropriate role behavior for their culture. In the social mind of the powerful, the uncounted and unheralded mass of humanity is simply *there* as audience to the lives and actions of the powerful. Co*mmon folk* go unrecognized and are seen as unimportant. Individuals leading quiet lives are neither visible to these important ones nor are they visible to others who are equally unimportant. The invisible ones are only recognized by the powerful when their presence ratifies the experience of being powerful. The presence of the many, the unimportant and the non-powerful in the world is seen by the powerful as being inconsequential unless the ordinary and usually powerless ones in some way or another become imbued with collective power to threaten the power and authority of the powerful.

Several American authors in the current world-wide Roman Catholic pedophile scandal comment that the high-ranking members of the church's international hierarchy view the church's hierarchy as that social group which constitutes the true *church*. In such an understanding the role of the pope, cardinals and bishops is to make all the important decisions which affect the daily practice of Catholic life. It is their job to dictate what must be believed and what must be done to be a lay member of the institution called church. In such a model, the role of the vast majority of Christians (the laity) is to *pray, pay and obey* (Doyle, July 13, 2008; Carroll, 2009).

The ideology of the powerful is not monolithic and universally accepted. People everywhere have the commonsense wisdom to know that some leaders are benevolent and some are malicious. For example, we can compare and contrast the styles of the powerful from the twentieth-century, Nelson Mandela and Oscar Arias with each other and with Adolf Hitler and Josef Stalin. Even within their own era of history, their contemporaries understood their malicious or benevolent use of power. Rulers who are greatly feared (for example, authoritarian tyrants and dictators) exercise their power in one way while leaders who are loved and respected (for example, great humanitarians) do so in other ways.

In addition, there are some factors that become immediately visible when we think about the texture of lives and ideologies manifested by the socio-cultural caste or class of powerful elites. Here I am indebted to Janeway's lengthy discussion of the powerful throughout her book (1981). I have chosen in what follows below to cluster, paraphrase and abbreviate her discussion. The examples are mine.

Controlling wealth and processes of wealth-generation, the powerful establish the economic doctrines, policies, customs and laws which prevail in their society or institution. They control the application of rewards and penalties inside their group. In general, the principal ideology of the powerful is that what benefits the powerful is beneficial for the polis as a whole. The concept of trickle down economics is an example.

Controlling historical memory, the powerful create the social memory of a group. The more ideological historical "memory" is, the less the powerless can gain access to historical truth or even the simple facticity of events. The second wave of American feminism, Latin American conscienticization efforts during the region's mid-century civil wars, American ethnic studies programs, and investigative journalism are all efforts at correcting an incomplete or corrupted historical narrative which excludes or diminishes some aspect of the common life. Doyle (April 21, 2010) comments that in the wake of the current Roman Catholic sexual abuse scandal, the Vatican is re-writing factual history in its ideological efforts to do damage control and protect its ruling hierarchy.

Controlling the governing ideology of an era powerful elites establish the ruling ideologies of their time in history. In the twentieth-century, for example, two competing materialist philosophies were utilized by the ruling elites of the United States (unrestrained materialist capitalism) and Russia (materialistic communism). Leaders and rulers on each side of the materialistic divide played dangerous games of power and control as each sought to extend their powers, systems of world control, and exploit the resources of developing third world nations for their own side in this conflict.

Controlling access to data and information, the powerful establish boundaries of that which is secret and restricted. Gaining access to information and factual truth is one way of obtaining and wielding power. Restricting access to accurate information is a way to limit another's power.

Controlling access to truthful and factual information is essential to cultural elites in their management of power relationships. This is why intentional lying, defactualization, and the dissemination of disinformation are so prevalent among those who seek to gain and hold institutional, political or military power over others. Secrecy works to protect the powerful from being accountable to ordinary citizens for their actions (or failures to act). Being kept outside the loop of accurate information works to deceive others and render them powerless in their relationships with those in power.

Controlling access to knowledge and processes of knowledge generation and retrieval, the powerful establish who will gain access to the professions. The processes of professionalization and related processes of credentialing, licensing, or certifying are purported to be *for the good of the people* or for *the safety of the people*. But high prestige professions strictly control the access gate to their particular profession. Not all with the ability to succeed will be accepted. Some who, by virtue of family connections or wealth, gain access will be incompetent or corruptible. By controlling access and by controlling numbers, those who do gain access to the professions are, therefore, guaranteed access to personal power, social influence, and wealth (see Krall in Kraybill, 1981).

Controlling access to wealth establishes the parameters of those who will be allowed to enter the doors of the privileged. Even here, however, distinctions will be made between new wealth and old wealth. More social prestige and power is attached to individuals who are wealthy because of the actions of their ancestors (no matter how despicable those ancestors' behaved in generating the clan's wealth).

Controlling access to coercive rituals is another way of maintaining power for the powerful. An individual or group who controls eternal salvation in the afterlife, for example, has an implicit ability to coerce obedience by the threat of excommunication and loss of salvation (Doyle, July 13, 2008; Carroll, 2009). This power provides the gatekeepers (or human mediators) of heavenly salvation with the right to demand obedience to human authorities and their rules as the entrance price to a happy afterlife.

In the political world, he who has the biggest, the most innovative, and most destructive weapon, generally has the most power. Thus, we witness the constant jockeying in the political world of the nation-states for new and improved weaponry.

Controlling the power to name and to define is a somewhat arcane and vague power. But those who define what is acceptable and non-acceptable; what is orthodox or heterodox; what is essential and what is non-essential; what is serious and what is frivolous; what is admirable and what is contemptible; what is art and what is craft, what is sacred and what is secular; what is sexy and what is disgusting, what is fair and what is foul; what is equitable and what is unjust; what is faith and what is science; what is sanity and what is lunacy; what is beauty and what is ugliness, what is truth and what is untruth; what is fact and what is ideology; what is reality and what is illusion; what is well-mannered and what is insufferably rude; what is health and what is pathology; what is tyranny and what is freedom; what is despotic and what is benevolent, who belongs and is an insider and who doesn't belong and is an outsider: these culture-creating and culture-maintaining individuals control the cultural climate in which individuals live, move, and operate. They establish the ground rules by which a culture defines itself. Once so defined – at least until a successful cultural challenge is made - individuals and groups live within these humanly created boundaries and cultural blinders.

If repeatedly and persuasively told, for example by fashion industry moguls, that it is ugly and utterly tasteless to wear crimson and purple together, most individuals who are aware of the rule about beauty (and who wish to succeed in business) will abide by it rather than face social ridicule and ostracism. This is the social power of the little black cocktail dress and genuine wild-harvested pearls. This is the power of the tailored black tuxedo and white tie. Knowing the fashion rules and obeying them appears to be a human choice. But it is a socially obedient choice within strong cultural consequences for disobedience. The price for ignoring the rules or deliberately flaunting them is career stagnation, social ostracism and isolation from the higher echelons of power and prestige. To be totally ignorant of the rules is a sign that one is an outsider.

Or, for another example, if one is culturally informed by one's culture that it is wrong to commit adultery, those individuals with social power who break the rule and are adulterous will be cautious and discrete if they wish to keep intact their personal reputation and socio-cultural ability to influence others. This has been repeatedly seen in the United States over the past twenty years as state governors and former governors, senators, former vice-presidential and presidential candidates and even sitting presidents

have lost power when adulterous liaisons or lecherous and harassing behaviors have been revealed in the nation's press.

Controlling the power of inclusion and exclusion, the powerful define those who are insiders, and belong and those who are the outsiders or the others and do not, therefore, belong. Controlling access into the centers of power, they can disregard the impact of their actions on those who are less powerful.

In general, then, many forms or types of power and many forms of power-generating activity are utilized by the powerful. In this manuscript I call these individuals the *culture gatekeepers*, *culture critics, culture creators or cultural instigators* of a given society. These are the individuals who lead, direct, and administer. They see themselves as legitimate guardians of that which is believed to be true, necessary and desirable within any particular culture. In their social roles of leadership, they simultaneously reflect, or channel, the culture into which they were born and co-create the present culture in which they live. They set in motion many of the social currents that will define the proximate and distant future. They define, patrol, and defend the boundaries of what is possible within their specific culture and cultural sub-group.

Their powers can be declared by appearance. For example, a cardinal's robe and miter proclaim his position, status, and power in much the same way as an army general's uniform, ribbons and medals do. A stethoscope, worn around a physician's neck, functions in the same way. So too does a prison guard's uniform differentiate him from a prisoner wearing a prisoner's uniform.

When the powerful trend setters decide that red and purple are the newest, most fashionable rage, the majority of the population will follow. All of a sudden, stores will showcase red and purple apparel as the latest and most au courant color combination. Models on the covers of magazines such as *Vogue* will teach the less elite classes about the ways in which the "new" color combination should be worn.

Accustomed to the deference, submission and obedience of their followers (whether willing or not), the powerful come to see the weak, the vulnerable, and the powerless as objects to be manipulated rather than as subjects with whom to relate and collaborate. What is often overlooked, therefore, is

the extreme dependency of the powerful upon the powerless ones who serve them. Ruling over the weak, the powerful, because of this usually unconscious or denied dependency, come to fear the weak. If it is true that the powerful elites rule only with the consent (willing or coerced) of the weak, then the powerful ones live on top of a very shaky pyramid whose foundation consists of irrational, sometimes cruel, and often factually ignorant relationships with the majority of people who are seen as ignorant and powerless.

The relationship of the powerful to the weak is never a relationship of parity or equality. At best it is a relationship of continuous rule and occasional efforts at mass persuasion. At worst, it is one of unpredictable, despotic domination, coercion, control and, when the powerful see it as essential to the survival of their own powers, cruelty and violence.

One consistent tactic or pattern of behavior among the powerful as they seek to maintain or extend their control is to divide the weak and keep them from seeing their common or mutual self-interests in relationships with the powerful. Whether we read Sun Tzu's *The Art of War* (1963) or we read Machiavelli's *The Prince* 2006), the tactic of divide, conquer, control and command is well known among those who hold a life status or social position of power over others. Religion, economic patterns of wealth generation, the high culture of the arts such as music and the theater, clan and family relationships, and common ideologies of power and dominance all keep oppressive institutional systems intact. Underneath these various velvet gloves of ruling elite power, however, lays the iron fist of coercive force and repressive violence.

Herman (1997) describes a perpetrator's use of power to prevent becoming accountable for his actions:

> *In order to escape accountability for his crimes, the perpetrator does everything in his power to promote forgetting. Secrecy and silence are the perpetrator's first line of defense. If secrecy fails, the perpetrator attacks the credibility of his victim. If he cannot silence her absolutely, he tries to make sure that no one listens. To this end, he marshals an amazing array of arguments, from the most blatant denial to the most sophisticated and elegant rationalizations. After every atrocity one can expect to hear the same predictable apologies: it never happened; the victim lies; the victim exaggerates; the victim*

brought it upon herself; and, in any case, it is time to forget the past and to move on. The more powerful the perpetrator, the greater is his prerogative to name and define reality, and the more completely his arguments prevail (8).

Domination (by the powerful of the weak) works to sustain the pre-existing powers of those who hold power while simultaneously denying access to personal and socio-cultural power for the weak. When oppressive systems and structures work smoothly, the underpinning ideologies and social structures that sustain power are almost invisible and consequently go unquestioned by the weak. This invisibility works to the advantage of the powerful because it does not allow the weak to change their situation. Hannah Arendt (1969a, 1969b) notices that when this invisibility of the structures of the status quo is threatened, the powerful do not hesitate to resort to coercive measures or violence to protect their interests.

What are the benefits of power for the powerful? Why are they so reluctant to lose them? Once again I am indebted to Janeway's (1981) complex analysis of the relationship of the powerful to the weak. I have paraphrased her work below.

- o The mystical sense of unity found by the leader with the people who follow him;

- o There is no need for compromises, for awkward bargaining, no losses, no conflict, no friction;

- o Ease of action for the one in power, a sense of omnipotence, a sense of being grander and larger than life;

- o A sense of superhuman strength that sustains the body polis;

- o Unquestioned authority and the concomitant ease of rule. It is much less difficult to rule when one's authority is not questioned. If one needs to bring out the various forms of coercion, costs to rule accelerate immensely;

- o The power to act successfully is buoyed by the collective powers of those who are the governed;

111

It is important to note: not all influencing power is malevolent. Not all power is to be feared. Nor is all power concentrated only in the hands of the powerful. The powers of the weak are, therefore, always present whether or not the weak are aware of this or actively utilizing them.

Those in social positions of malevolent, despotic or corrupted power, however, are frequently threatened by the powers of the weak. They seek, to maintain control and, when threatened, to shatter and scatter to the winds the powers of the weak. Again, this attempt to gain control by domination is often coercive, threatening, and sometimes physically violent. The iron fist in a velvet glove is still an iron fist. Camara's definition of structural violence (Brown, 1987) is an important reminder: systemic oppression, resistance, and escalating repression can be seen in the private sector as well as in governmental structures. It can even be seen in the hierarchical church or other religious organizations as much as in corporate structures of secular wealth generation or governmental regulations. .

The Situation of the Weak

Restructuring in social spheres involves restructuring power.

Joel Kramer and Diana Alstad[6]

Janeway (1981) writes that the powers of the weak *differ from the powers of the powerful. These powers will often not be perceived as powers at all and seldom be considered positive. [To the] powerful they appear as stumbling blocks, limitations, and misfunctions in the ordained and expected conditions of life* (157).

In general, the powers of the week, as with those of the strong, are amoral. They can be used for harm as well as for good. In examining the limited powers of the weak (in their interactional relationships with the strong), Janeway identifies two central powers.

The first power is the experience of disbelief and mistrust; the opportunity to define or to re-define human realities in light of personal or community experience. In this form of individual or communal power, the weak call into

112

question those aspects of their individual or collective life experience that have been defined by the powerful. Mere cognitive disbelief in the ordinary or the orthodox is not the issue at hand, however. Rather, inside one's own consciousness, the *not so*, the *no* and the *no more* are heard. This can take the form of a silent withdrawal of consent – which no longer gives support in any way to the powerful. In this form, the weak do not draw attention to themselves. They simply withdraw and refrain from participating. It can, however, include overt, purposive and sometimes disguised or hidden acts of resistance, dissent and disobedience. It can include passive and actively obstructive acts of resistance. These resistant and dissenting actions can be those of an individual or an entire group.

The foundational aspect of the power to disbelieve is the *refusal to accept the definition of one's self* (or, in my opinion, to accept the inevitability and unchanging nature of the abusive situation itself) *that is put forward by the powerful* (167). Within this power, secrecy, the lies of propaganda and powerful individuals' active and purposive use of disinformation as a disempowering tactic are undressed. Seeing whether or not the emperor is wearing clothing is a metaphor for this process.

In other situations, the disbelief of the weak is openly and directly expressed. In general, this allows for the second power of the weak to emerge.

The second power is that of coming together. *Mistrust must be acted on, and effective action by the ruled is not solitary and singular, but joint and repeated* (168). One of the critical realities here is that the weak tend to mistrust themselves *and* other weak individuals or communities rather instead of distrusting the powerful. Coming together allows the shattering of this distrust among peers. It creates a milieu in which the disbelieving individual hears and experiences the reality that she is not alone in her life experiences, her perceptions of others and her concerns about injustice. Her fears about *being crazy* are capable of being examined and disabused inside a group of supportive peers. His fears about reprisals from the powerful can be shared. This was the power of the mid-century civil rights movement in the United States. This is the power-of-coming-together of Roman Catholic lay groups such as SNAP[7] or Bishop Accountability as they reveal, confront and actively counter oppressive and sometimes criminal behavior of North American bishops and cardinals. This is the power demonstrated by a very small group of sexual harassment victims

and victim advocates inside the Mennonite Church who forced denominational disciplinary actions regarding the abusive and harassing behavior of its leading theologian and ethicist John Howard Yoder. Going public with their concerns and information, they coerced the Institutional Mennonite Church into action (Cott, 1992, Gospel Evangel, 1992; Price, 1992a, 1992b; Schrag, 1992).

Janeway makes the point that this power of the week must be firmly rooted within or located in proximity to the first power of mistrust. Individual disbelief and mistrust melds into collective disbelief and mistrust. Reasonable grounds for distrust are explored and made both visible and believable to an entire group. In Camara's model, this is the second stage of the spiral of violence. In this model, after awareness has been raised and disinformation unveiled, next come questions of collective action.

In Segundo's theology (1978a, 1978b), as socially disenfranchised individuals come together in discussion groups, individuals begin to question their culture and their relationships. They may learn to ask the question, w*hy am I denied justice while my sexual abuser is honored by the church?*[8] As they examine and investigate such a question, they learn that their situation as a despised victim is not primarily caused by their individual behavior but by economic and social policies of the church's hierarchy. Learning to hear and to dissect the ruling classes' ideologies – those ideologies which are a disservice to their own lives and the lives of their families, they begin to question the economic policies of their church. They begin to see themselves as human beings who deserve explanations rather than as despised and powerless individuals. As persons, they discover that they too have a social voice. They too have power to influence their life situations.

The response of the establishment to self-other empowerment activities by the weak and disenfranchises is one guide to the extent and effectiveness of these small and humble powers of the weak. One of the gut responses of the powerful regarding actions by the weak is a somewhat paranoid perception that that *they* (the dissenting and disobeying weak) are subverting the common good and must, therefore, be immediately and harshly controlled to restore order. Another response is to try and isolate emerging community resistance leaders from the group (often with deliberate character assassination attempts) in order to isolate them from their group. Here disinformation (what the Bible calls bearing false witness

114

and spreading lies) is frequently spread. Character defamation of the dissenting individual or group is common.

The weak are often surprised to discover that a quiet group which has done no more than express disagreement with some official statement is suddenly assaulted by caricaturists and preachers (Janeway, 1981, 162). In this situation a question arises for Janeway about the paranoid impulses of those in power. If power is what it appears to be in the mind of the powerful: the right to command, the ability to coerce, and the right to hold on to positions of authority, then the question becomes one of seeking to understand what the powerful really want in their relationship with the weak.

One thing desired by the powerful, according to Janeway is that the powerful want to be perceived as legitimate – as having the socially accepted right to their position and its authority and power. *When the weak socially embody dissent, disbelief, coming together and disobedience, they actively threaten something that the powerful viscerally and ideologically need: legitimacy in the minds of the ruled and submissive obedience to the demands of the powerful* (summary statement and emphasis mine).

> *Disbelief, then, signals something that the powerful fear, and slight as it may appear, we should not underestimate its force. It is, in fact, the first signal of withdrawal of consent by the governed to the sanctioned authority of their governors, the first challenge to [their] legitimacy* (Janeway, 1981, 162).

In looking at the public scandals in today's contemporary Catholic Church, it is clear that when victims of priest sexual abuses such as pre-pubertal and adolescent rape, began to distrust the Church's actions and began to come together, the nation's institutional Catholic Church was threatened and resorted to lying, dissembling, and vicious verbal and legal attacks on victims and their supporters (Berg, 2006; E. C. Kennedy, October 28, 2011; Grand Jury Reports, Philadelphia County (PA), 2003, 2011).

Structures of Power

Our conditioning to obey authority is the foundation of the culture of domination

Starhawk[9]

The enactment of power, according to Kelman and Hamilton (1989) involves perceptual issues. If the powerful person is to successfully influence the behavior of less powerful others, then the powerful individual must first be perceived as powerful by the person who receives his instructions or commands to obey.

One of the interesting things to observe, as an outsider, in the current Roman Catholic clergy sexual abuse and clergy clericalism abuse crisis is what appears to be massive lay disobedience to the papacy in matters of faith and praxis (for example, deliberately absenting themselves from confession or using bio-chemical (the pill) and barrier (the condom and the diaphragm) forms of birth control. Another area of disobedience involves priests who have adult consenting sexual relationships with men or women. Since the prohibitive teaching of the church fathers about these issues is very clear, only marital sexuality is allowed and conception must be a potential result in each act of intercourse, such massive disobedience is striking. Obviously, many Roman Catholics (in matters of human sexual expression) have decided the papacy, the Vatican Curia, cardinals, and diocesan bishops no longer control the gates of heaven and hell and their ultimate salvation. They have taken matters into their own consciences and have chosen to act in ways which are expressly forbidden by their church's hierarchy (Carroll, 2009). In a certain sense, it seems to me as an outside observer, these disobedient members of the laity and the clergy have begun to de-legitimize the church's ruling hierarchy in matters of sexual morality. Once the underlying control and ideology of absolute papal and bishop authority and control are breeched in one area, it is very likely they will be breeched in other areas as well.[10]

Since Milgram's (1974) mid-20th-century studies clearly demonstrate that in social relationships of position, power and authority, the tendency for the command recipient is to submit and to obey the person she or he perceives to be a legitimate authority, such active disobedience and de-legitimation of

the church's hierarchical authorities is even more striking. Zimbardo's 1971 prison experiments also document the intense and often violent social pressures for obedience by individuals in power against those who are powerless and, therefore, lack social control (1988, 2008).

In positions of absolute authority and power (such as papal infallibility in matters of doctrine and praxis), the temptation for the powerful is to engage in totalitarian, anti-social or criminal behavior against the weaker party.

Social psychologist Philip Zimbardo writes:

> *I challenge the traditional focus on the individual's inner nature, disposition, personality traits, and character as the primary and often sole target in understanding human feelings. Instead, I argue that while most people are good most of the time, they can readily be induced into engaging in what would normally qualify as ego-alien deeds, as antisocial, as destructive of others* (2008, vii)

In the context of papal infallibility and church council infallibility regarding issues of personal salvation and moral behavior, here too the massive quantity of disobedience among today's Roman Catholic laity and among the lesser clergy is quite striking.

The Protestant Reformation is a historical example of massive disobedience to the official and absolute clerical powers of that era. The split in Christendom which resulted provided Western Christianity with a splintered concept of religious authority. According to some Roman Catholic authors (Cozzens, 2002, Sipe, 2010, *Mother Church…*) the current American Catholic Church is in a crisis of disbelief equal in magnitude to the crisis precipitated by Martin Luther and other religious reformers in the sixteenth-century.

To summarize, whether or not those in the subordinate position obey is partially dependent upon their perception about the legitimacy of the power and authority held by the dominant person. The *weak*; by their perceptual readings about legitimacy (both visceral and cognitive) make decisions about obedience. They will, in this decision-making process factor in their own projections about carrots or punishments. In situations of disbelief and dissent, whether or not to disobey or to obey is largely dependent upon this internal weighing of consequences. In this internal process, partly

conscious and partly unconscious, the subordinate weights his options in light of his personal estimate of the social costs of dissent and disobedience. In addition, he considers the benefits of compliance and obedience (Kelman and Hamilton, 1989). The foundations of all power relationships, therefore, are deeply rooted in social relationships of influence and command. But they are mediated by interpretive processes in the powerless. To rule effectively, individuals in power must be perceived as having legitimate authority as well as power. Or, they must be perceived as willing to use the coercive power of violence to enforce their demands. Authority and power can be perceived by the weaker individual as either legitimate or non-legitimate. In situations where subordinates question the rightful authority of position, the qualifications of the individual in power, or the legitimacy of a demand or command, dissent and acts of deliberate disobedience function therefore as overt or covert challenges to those dominant individuals who hold positions of power and authority over them.

A Feminist Typology of Power

Power and weakness are factored into masculine and feminine gender images quite explicitly. 'Virile' men are decisive and forceful (say our dictionaries) and 'feminine' women are passive.

Elizabeth Janeway[11]

Starhawk's (1987, 1-27) typology of power is helpful to further our understanding of the various structures of power that exist in Western cultures. In what follows I abstract and paraphrase her work. Any examples are mine.

The *first form of power* is *power-over.* Power-over is related to domination and *is born of war.* Power-over is backed by coercive force or the threat of coercive force. This can be a gun. It can also be a clenched and raised fist or the threat of such a fist. It can be a bad grade in an academic course or it can be termination of employment. Because Western consciousness is steeped in experiences and ideologies of hierarchies, patriarchies, and their subsequent systems of domination and control, human consciousness – in its individual and collective forms - is shaped by this reality. In light of

this colonization of consciousness by systems of domination, Starhawk comments: *the inside of our minds resembles the battlefield and the jail* (9).

My understanding of Starhawk's comment is that when we human beings are born into patriarchal cultures in which power is universally perceived as power-over, our individual consciousness, our collective consciousness and our archetypal consciousness are all strongly shaped by this pre-existing monolithic world view regarding power. We are comfortable with it because i*t is just the way things have always been* and *the way things are* and *the way things are supposed to be*. Because this system of control is so strongly in command of our world and our own consciousness, it becomes invisible to us. We become like the proverbial fish swimming in his tiny pond. No other world than the tiny pond we know can be perceived, observed, sensed and known. Such shaping leads most of us into default positions of submitting and obeying in situations of unequal power relationships.

Here we see the intricate interaction of the ability to command by the powerful and the obligation to obey by the weak. Certain issues of authority, particularly position or role-authority, are deeply rooted in experiences of fear faced by subordinates when they encounter a power-over situation. The act of disobedient dissent usually has negative or punitive sanctions and consequences attached to it. For example, in most hierarchical organizations, a work evaluation that states *insubordinate* provides the recipient of such an evaluation with a serious indicator that management is setting the pathway in motion for the individual's employment to be terminated.

The language of power-over and domination is the language of rules, laws, and inherited or imposed orthodoxies. It motivates by fear. There are at least two forms to this fear: *First*, we fear the coercive force of the dominant one and the negative sanctions he can impose. *Secondly*, we fear the loss of value, sustenance, comfort, and tokens of esteem (the positive sanctions or rewards) he can offer.

In Starhawk's typology, the power-over icon is the pyramid. Its governing structure is hierarchical position, authority and command.

According to Starhawk *the second form of power* is *power-from-within* or *empowerment*. Here an individual (or community) gains strength from its

willingness and ability to act. In one's own personal willingness to act, personal empowerment is embodied and enacted in the social world.

A sense of power-from-within is related to the sense of mastery which a child gains as she begins to encounter the world and learn to manage her bodySelf in the context of the natural and social worlds. In this sense, learning to walk in the life of each individual was an early act of personal empowerment. As the young child begins to explore her world by walking, her world expands and she begins to exercise her personal will in new ways. When a just-verbal child learns to say an effective *no* to the significant adult others in her environment, in a very rudimentary way she has begun to learn how to utilize her own powers of self-definition in the world. By learning to walk and by also learning to speak a forceful *NO!*, she is empowering herself for future adult-child relationships within which she is no longer totally dependent upon adults for her own opinions in the world. How adults respond to her self-declaration of independence will shape future behaviors in response to adult authority and power.

Power-from-within sustains us in our daily lives as we live inside complex relationships with the natural world and with the social world where we circulate. It arises from our bonding with other human beings and with the natural world that surrounds us. It is the source of creativity. Seeing what needs to be done and taking personal responsibility to speak and to act is true empowerment for individuals.

In Starhawk's typology the *third form of power* is *power-with.* Here individuals find strength in the collective. Located within the reciprocal and egalitarian relationships of equals, this is a power based not on command and obedience but in the ability to suggest and be listened to; the ability to hear the suggestions of others as equal to one's own. This is a power of discussion and dialogue. It is the power of the collective. In such relationships, the ability to persuade is not based upon coercion or fear.

Power-with can be helpful or it can be destructive. A destructive example is found within *group-think* (Asch, 1956) situations where individuals abrogate their own sense of power-from-within and responsibility to act independently of the reference group and unquestioningly yield to the group's external control – whether or not they privately agree, whether or not they have serious doubts about the group's wisdom in a particular situation.

One thing is clear: living within systems of domination means that power-with experiences and interactions are often destroyed by those in positions of hierarchical power-over. Mutual, respectful, egalitarian relationships – those empowered collective moments of action – are, therefore, very rare in dominator societies. Power-with is rooted in collective discussion and decisions. It does not utilize coercion to impose its will on members of the group or on others. A welcoming and hospitable place is made for dissent and conversation.

The language of power-with is the ordinary language of the community – the language which shapes every-day expectations and behaviors. It is deeply rooted within the collective value system of the whole. Its icon is the circle (Bolen, 1999, 2005)

Concluding Comments

The abuse of power is about the tangible social control that the more powerful can exercise with impunity over the less powerful.

Laurie Hersch Meyer[12]

Vis-à-vis power, this manuscript has several underlying concerns. *The first of these* is concern for the power relationships between sexually abusive predators (who are clergy, religious leaders or religious professionals) and their victims. This manuscript contends that these kinds of predatory and abusive personal relationships involve violations of position, power and authority. They are deeply harmful because they assault the individual on the bodily level, the community's social level and on the religious community's spiritual, religious, or ethical level. By their very nature, they manifest the use of threatened or actual violence by sexual predators to control their victims. These acts of sexual violation are, in addition to power and authority violations, acts of interpersonal and social contract betrayal.

Social understanding of sexual abuse violations often focuses on the sexual nature of the abuser's actions. Thus, the moral or ethical issue is framed in terms of sexual misconduct or sexual morality violations. In this framing, there is an implicit belief in mutual consent and shared consent for the sexual behavior. However, since these violations are power and

authority violations, they demonstrate control efforts and abuse of the vulnerable by those with power-over. In such a situation there is no possibility for mutual consent. *The moral offense, therefore, is primarily one of violence and the malicious misuse of power and positional authority rather than a sexual code violation. .*

The second concern is about the relationship of institutional power and leader abuses of institutional power or even criminal behavior to protect institution's leaders from full accountability for their inept or criminal personnel management behaviors when directly or indirectly confronted with allegations about predatory and violent sexual abuse inside their organization. An example of a direct confrontation is when parents tell a diocesan official about the rape of their son or daughter by a member of the clergy. An example of indirect confrontation is when rumors about sexual abuse inside their organization cross administrators' desks and they do not investigate the accuracy of the rumor nor do they appropriately discipline and manage the predatory individual. The moral offense here, then, is not organizational ineptness. It is overt and deliberate complicity with criminal sexual behaviors by subordinates.

Andrew Greeley (2004), a sociologist and ordained Roman Catholic priest, claims that in Roman Catholic moral theology those bishops, cardinals and priests who (1) knew about a colleague's or fellow priest's sexual abuse of pre-pubertal and adolescent children and (2) chose to protect predatory priest abusers by cover-up behaviors were equally as responsible for the evil done to children as were the predatory priests (102-104). In short, *clericalism* of a criminal nature is also a sin in Catholic moral theology. The active sin of criminal clericalism, therefore, not only violates human secular laws; it violates the church's own moral and ethical teachings (which historically have been represented to the faithful laity and secular society as God's laws).

In general, professional individuals with institutional power are expected by the social contract to provide safety to the weak, the vulnerable or the victimized. Individuals in positions of authority and power are expected to use their powers in socially legitimate ways. When these social contracts are violated, individuals who believed that they would be protected inside the institution or by the institution find themselves victimized and re-victimized by the organization's hierarchy and their pandering subordinates.

To more effectively deal with clergy abuse and institutional clericalism, both forms of violation (1) sexual predation and (2) institutional practices of criminal clericalism must be examined, understood and addressed. One hoped for consequence of such an examination is a renewed, realistic, and trustworthy expectation morally appropriate sexual behavior and integrity by individual members of the clergy and for institutional integrity and for publicly transparent organizational personnel management patterns in all situations of predatory sexual abuse.

Recommended Supplementary Readings

1) Doyle, T. P. (2006). Clericalism: Enabler of Clergy Sexual Abuse. *Pastoral Psychology* 54, 189-213.

2) Ellens, J. H. (2004). Introduction: The Destructive Powers of Religion in J. H. Ellens (Ed.). *The Destructive Powers of Religion in Judaism, Christianity and Islam: Sacred Scriptures* (Vol. 1; *Ideologies and Violence,* pp.1-9). Westport, CT: Praeger.

3) Ellens, J. H. (2004). Religious Metaphors Can Kill in J. H. Ellens (Ed.). *The Destructive Powers of Religion in Judaism, Christianity and Islam: Sacred Scriptures* (Vol. 1: *Ideologies and Violence*, pp. 256-271). Westport, CT: Praeger.

4) Infallibility. *The Catholic Encyclopedia.* Retrieve from: http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07790a.htm

5) Trible, P. (1984). Tamar: The Royal Rape of Wisdom in P. Trible, *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives* (pp. 56-63), Philadelphia, PA: Fortress.

Personal Reflection Questions

1) How do you define power? In your own mind what is it? How does power manifest its presence or absence in the interpersonal world? How do you know when power is present and when it is absent? What specific markers give you clues about the movement of power between and among individuals and groups?

2) What behaviors define individuals who are powerful? What behaviors define individuals who could be defined as powerless (for example, victims of violence)? What is your personal belief system about desired behaviors between those who are culturally powerful and those who are culturally weak? In what ways, if any, do you embody your belief system in daily behaviors in your communities of reference?

3) How do you describe and predatory sexual abuse by clergy?   What behavior markers identify the presence of this kind of personal violence?

4) How do you define criminal clericalism done by members of the clergy?   What behavioral markers identify this form of structural violence?

5) Provide a specific example from your own life of a time (1) when you experienced feelings of personal empowerment (feeling powerful and able to act) and (2) a time of feeling disempowered (feeling powerless and unable to act)? Write a narrative of both situations. Who were the people in these personal stories bout power and powerlessness? What happened in each situation or experience? Were there any significant life consequences or results of these two kinds of power-related experiences in your life?

Footnotes

[1] Herbert C. Kelman and V. Lee Hamilton, 1989, 124.

[2] Elizabeth Janeway, 1981, 11.

[3] Hannah Arendt, 1969a, 143.

[4] Quoted in Hannah Arendt, 1969b, 36.

[5] Lord Acton's often-repeated comment was spoken in his criticism of the Roman Catholic Church's newly declared doctrine of papal infallibility

[6] Joel Kramer and Diana Alstad, 1993, 7.

[7] SNAP: Support Network for those Abused by Priests

[8] For an example see Erin Durkin, *New York Daily News,* January 3, 2012,

[9] Starhawk (Miriam Simos), 1987, 11.

[10] According to the 2009 Pew Forum Report on Religion and Public Life, as reported by Roman Catholic theologian Richard McBrien, 1 in 10 Americans has left the Roman Catholic Church. *Thus if ex-Catholics were a denomination unto themselves, they would constitute the second largest, behind only the Catholic Church itself,* 1.

[11] Elizabeth Janeway, 1981,10.

[12] Laurie Hersch Meyer, 19992, 2.

- 6 -

Authority Defined

Authority involves two components:
the right to command others and the power to do so.

Herbert C. Kelman and V. Lee Hamilton[1]

Introductory Comments

The hypocrite acts in order to be seen by other people, an attempt to strengthen one's position in life. The teachings of Jesus stressed that hypocritical behavior protects the power of the dominant group and enhances the respect given to them by ordinary people. Hypocrisy is a particular temptation for those who exercise authority in religion.

Gregory Baum[2]

Institutional authority and power are ever-present experiences in the Western world and they arise as interpersonal realities in the context of social groups. Examples of such groups include the legally-constituted family, nation-states, religious organizations such as the church, temple, or mosque, health care establishments, or competitive sports. Whenever and wherever one finds humans in organized social groups in which someone serves as the group's authorized leader, issues of position authority and position power arise. While these two human experiences are deeply related in Western consciousness and behavior, they are not the same phenomena.

In addition, authority and power are intimately related to coercion and violence. Here too, however, they are not the same reality. The proximity of authority to power and the proximity of power to coercion and violence mandate a closer examination of the nature of authority in human systems.

In issues of clergy sexual abuse and religious institution clericalism this is especially true.

Social psychologists and sociologists identify types of authority. The two basic categories of differentiation are (1) individuals who possess personal authority and (2) Individuals (and institutions) possessing institutional or collective authority.

A 20th Century Social Sciences Typology

> *A person precariously balanced on top of a pile of logs is aware of the hurt if the pile collapses. Not surprisingly he calls for stability, for change that is gentle. A person who is squeezed under the pile of logs is conscious of his present pain. He calls out to be freed, even if it brings down the whole pile.*

Archbishop Runcie of Canterbury[3]

Building on Weber's influential 1947 work, social psychologists Kelman and Hamilton (1989, 133-135) construct a typology to describe various ways in which contemporary patterns of authority are manifested in daily life. I briefly summarize their combined work below. The examples are mine.

Traditional Authority

Traditional authority has been handed down from the past inside historical lineages. Traditionally transmitted rules determine the person who holds the position of chief authority. The chief or leader or ruler gains and administers authority by means of inherited position and rank. He may have assistants and these assistants may be blood relatives or appointed staff members. For example, when England's Queen Elizabeth the Second dies and Prince Charles becomes King Charles royal succession by tradition will have occurred. Since in British law and its monarchal tradition male heirs take precedence over female heirs and first-born sons take precedence over all of their siblings, the right of succession to the throne is well-defined. Prince Charles, according to the traditions and legal rules of the British monarchy, will eventually become king as the first-born son of a

sitting queen who inherited the throne from her father because she had no brothers.

Charismatic Authority

Charismatic authority is associated with movements that repudiate the past and in this sense constitute a revolutionary or transformative force in social groups and cultures. Such authority is found within new political or religious movements. The social position of leader or authority figure depends not upon an inherited bureaucratic position with rules of accession defined in the past. Rather, it depends upon the personal charisma of an individual. Charisma is expressed by means of extraordinary powers or abilities such as heroic strength, intellectual genius, or prophetic insight. Those who follow a charismatic leader do so because of his or her performance in expressing something which they wish or need, individually or collectively, to express. Charismatic authority, therefore, is based on personal qualities or characteristics of a would-be leader in the present moment. There is a kind of circular reasoning here. Charismatic leaders are recognized because they have charisma; they have charisma because they are recognized (Kelman and Hamilton, 1989, 127).

In general, after coming to power, charismatic leaders attempt to consolidate their powers by bureaucratic means – establishing a chain of command that can endure. Charismatic leaders may name their own successors; the lineage may become familial and generational or it may become bureaucratic   In planning for leadership to pass from a charismatic leader to his successor, attempts are made by bureaucratic measures to legitimize their successor(s).

In 2010, as this is being written, it is possible to see a clear example of these patterns and processes of succession. William Franklin Graham has succeeded his charismatic, but now frail and aging, father Billy Graham at the helm of the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association. Other sons are less successful. For whatever reason, for example, Oral Roberts' son and Robert Schuller's son no longer head the vast religious bureaucratic empire their charismatic fathers founded.

Legal or Rational-Bureaucratic Authority

129

The purest type of legal or rational-bureaucratic authority is represented by modern corporations and their institutional bureaucracies. Here we find an impersonal form of order in which a set of abstract normative rules governs institutions. There is a pyramidal chain of command and the ordering of this command is hierarchical. Authority is linked to a held-office. Technical or personal qualifications are used by individuals to rise in rank. Individuals may be hired because of their educational credentials. Subsequently, they may be promoted because of financial growth in their department. Legitimacy derives from one's position in the hierarchy and one's successful leadership of others. Bureaucratic authorities have systemic rights to make demands and to expect compliance or obedience. An individual in the position to make demands of her subordinates finds her legitimacy enhanced if she is perceived as having the necessary technical qualifications or professional skills to occupy the position she holds.

Religious leaders of a denomination, for example, have managerial authority by virtue of the position they hold. In addition, religious professionals (clergy, denominational theologians or ethicists, institutional administrators, etc.) in general not only hold positions of institutional authority. By virtue of their position inside the governing structures of a religious organization they also hold spiritual authority over the lives of rank and file members. By their use of their position's authority and power, religious administrators and ordained clergy shape institutional policies and practices. They negotiate their institution's interface with the external social milieu. They control and proclaim common or acceptable religious beliefs and practices. They make decisions about heresy and orthodoxy. They shape, therefore, not only institutional policy and practice: they shape the collective spirituality of the whole. Actions, therefore, of those who manage a religious organization such as a church or teaching center directly affect the spirituality, beliefs, and praxis of lay individuals who live, study and worship in this specific community.

Even if the church's public relations publications proclaim that all church officials are servant-leaders, this does not mitigate the reality that individuals in administrative positions hold and enact the authority of their official position (and thus hold socio-political power over the lives of others). By virtue of their position and its authority, they have access to all of the privileges and perquisites of administrative power. In return, they are expected to responsibly manage the organization and its people and financial assets. In such a manner, religious professionals and

administrators are set apart from the ordinary individual who utilizes the services of the religious institution – for example, a worshipping member of the laity or someone who is a religious institution client.

Professional Authority

Professional authority derives from an individual's possession of technical knowledge and skills such as those held by a physician, college professor or lawyer. The professional-client relationship is not one in which the client is obligated to obey. A professional person is an authority inasmuch as she has command over a body of knowledge or possesses technical expertise. Professional authorities have the right to request or to suggest behaviors from their subordinate clients but they do not have the perceived social right to demand automatic compliance or to coerce obedience by violence. Teachers can, of course, fail a student and lawyers can refuse to represent a client who fails to cooperate. In general professionals do not have the violent powers of the nation-state to guarantee compliance nor, with the exception of clergy, can they withhold salvation. For the most part, therefore, they depend on the powers of persuasion and social influence. Some professionals, as noted in Guggenbuhl-Craig's work (1999), rely on social manipulation, intimidation and fear to coerce their client's conformity with the professional's requests/demands of them.

Hybrid Forms of Authority

I wish to add a fifth category to the above typology. In complex cultures such as well-established historical religious denominations, one often sees individuals in positions of authority who simultaneously demonstrate very complex forms of authority. A university professor in a denominational university may come from a family which has held institutional religious power in a specific denomination for decades. This individual may occupy his position due to the collective power and influence of his or her extended social network of family and clan. Here some elements of inherited position and power appear on the surface to be legal or rational-bureaucratic in nature. Individuals with limited personal resources in terms of intellect or leadership may thus advance into positions of great personal power and authority simply because of their family connections.

Another individual may rise into positions of power and authority because of unique skills and abilities. His or her professional qualifications or technical abilities may be accompanied by great personal charisma. He or she may be, or so it often seems, a natural leader, an individual who others seek to follow. Upon assuming power, this individual may then demonstrate great abilities in bureaucratic management of others. Here again there is a blending of types. Charismatic personal authority interacts with legal or rational bureaucratic authority.

Finally, there are many visible situations in the world where people assume positions of power by despotic means. They rise in power because they are willing and able to tyrannize others into following them. They may lead by social manipulation and by sowing fear among their social peers and followers. These are the natural dictators, tyrants and totalitarian leaders of a wide variety of social groups: nation-states, educational institutions, religious organizations, and even athletic teams. They accrue followers by fear, manipulation, and lying. In addition, they find supportive individuals who seek to rise in power, wealth and influence alongside of them by whatever means necessary.

The Structure of Authority

Actions that depart from societal standards of responsibility (or morality) typically involve causing harm to others or to society in general; actions that depart from societal standards of propriety typically involve performing in ways that are deemed inappropriate for a person in the actor's position (or any adult in the society); Deviations from standards in either of these domains may take the form of violation of rules, role expectations, or values. Which violation a person focuses on depends on the level at which a given standard is represented in his cognitive structure, which in turn is in part a function of his socialization. If the standard has been adopted at the level of compliance, he will focus primarily on rule violations; if it has been adopted at the level of identification, he will focus on deviations from role expectations; and if it has been internalized, he will focus on violations of values.

Herrbert C. Kelman and V. Lee Hamilton[4]

Because the very concept of authority constitutes a role relationship between two sets of actors within specific social units – the position of an authority figure socially obligates, or at the least, predisposes, a subordinate to submission, compliance, and obedience. Inasmuch as a central structural feature of authority relates to the ability to command, one central behavior of those in positions of authority is to activate the duty to obey in their subordinates. This is particularly visible in leaders and followers with authoritarian personalities and in human systems which reflect authoritarian beliefs, values, attitudes, and structures. Authoritarian relationships can include a husband and wife, a teacher and pupils, a career officer and enlisted soldiers, a minister and congregants, an adult and a child, or a work place supervisor and employees.

Authoritarian systems can be found wherever human groups are found. They can include totalitarian governments, religious cults, armies, employment environments, football teams, or any other collective system of human life.

Competing Structures of Obedience

In contemporary Western Christendom, the duty to obey the nation-state, for example, is complicated by a powerful imperative to disobey in the name of religion, conscience or other powerful ideologies (Kelman and Hamilton, 1989). While the nation-state's authoritarian demand may be for total obedience and compliance, the West's concept of a personal conscience and individual moral agency provides a duty and a rationale, in some situations, for the individual to question and to resist the demand for obedience. The reverse situation exists when a specific religious group demands total obedience which conflicts with the state's demands or demands of personal conscience. Such resistance and dissent often, but not always, results in disobedience and a refusal to comply.

Kelman and Hamilton (1989) note that in the West there are two interpenetrated structures (the nation-state and organized religion) that both call for ultimate allegiance and unquestioning obedience. At times these two large systems (and their buttressing ideologies) are competitive and hostile towards each other but at other times they mutually reinforce each other's power and influence. In Western history the balance of power and authority has repeatedly shifted between these two well-organized

social institutions. Each system has a well-established doctrine of obedience and submission by subordinates to those in positions of authority (Bainton, 1979).

In a secular materialistic society, it seems to me, a third powerful force has emerged. This is the economic structure of peer-pressure materialism. In addition to demands for allegiance from the civil order and the religious order, it seems to me as if the economic order now also, at times, calls for unquestioning allegiance and submission.

Organizational Credentialing and Supervision

Once an individual knows what type of authority she deals with in any given situation, questions of legitimacy remain. A physician's wall of educational diplomas and professional licenses is, in part, a witness wall that testifies to her legitimacy and, indirectly, her ability to be trusted by her clients. A police officer's uniform and badge provide legitimacy information. So too does a bishops robe, pectoral cross and ring. Licensure, certification, ordination and other credentials all serve a similar function. This function is the declaration of social legitimacy and trustworthiness.

If we look at medicine as our first example, a state's medical licensure board does not have a direct, daily supervisory role in governing the medical practice of a physician the board has previously licensed to practice medicine. The working assumption of the medical board is that a properly credentialed physician is both safe to practice medicine and personally trustworthy. Only if significant malpractice, legal, or ethical issues arise will the licensing (credentialing) board re-engage itself in questions about this particular individual's right to practice medicine in this particular state. The licensing board, therefore, maintains its supervisory relationship with all licensed physicians – however loosely that supervision may be implemented in the absence of complaints, evidence of criminal activity or clinical malpractice.

Ordained clergy usually function in a similar way. A credentialing or ordaining body assesses the candidate for ordination or credentialing. This credentialing aspect of religions organizations determines that an individual has met the criteria for ordination and authorizes the ordination to take place. Once ordained, licensed or otherwise credentialed, the minister or

priest is assumed ready to practice his or her ministerial calling with a minimum of direct, hands-on supervision by the denominational credentialing body. Unless complaints arise from the laity, supervising bodies usually do not initiate personnel investigations on a regular basis. Nevertheless, the ordaining or credentialing body remains responsible for the actions of those it supervises. In the situation of ordained clergy, institutional supervisory responsibility may be delegated to a conference minister in congregational polity denominations or to a bishop in episcopate ones. In some independent, non-denominational and community-based congregations this responsibility may be lodged with a local ministerial advisory committee or even with a lay governing board inside the congregation.

Questions of Legitimacy

When dealing with authority figures their subordinates must make decisions when they are requested, urged or commanded to do something. This "something" may be an agreeable request to the subordinate. In this kind of situation, compliance is readily obtained. However, if and when the request or command of an authority figure is not agreeable to a subordinate, the individual with less power and influence must make a decision about yielding to or refusing to yield to the person with institutional position, power, and authority. The person with less authority and power in the situation consciously or unconsciously faces internal and personal questions regarding (1) the requesting or commanding person's authority, (2) the institutional legitimacy of his role and position, and (3) the legitimacy of his request or command. Whether or not a subordinate or person of lesser position and power submits and obeys is based upon his assessment of the situation in which he finds himself. In situations of coercive violence, even this aspect of personal choice is denied to him by the person in the authority position. Social psychology theory elaborates upon these "choices" of subordinates when requested to or commanded to obey.

First, individuals faced with a command or request to do something will assess the *legitimacy of the institution* requesting or requiring their obedience. For example, drill instructors during basic training may insist that military novices do physically challenging or even dangerous activities they would not personally choose to do in other situations. However,

individuals in military training have, implicitly at least, agreed that their government's military organizations have the right to request full obedience in matters of military preparedness. Thus, there is a high compliance rate.

Kelman and Hamilton (1989, 126) note that once the legitimacy of a system has been established, subordinates next establish the legitimacy of specific authorities inside the system. Two important factors then surface: (1) the qualifications of the person in the authority position and (2) the way that this leader comports herself in the position of authority she occupies. In short, in matters of requested (but perhaps internally contested) obedience, it matters as much to subordinates, who their superiors are as the content of the specific request for obedience and compliance.   In general, subordinates are concerned that their superiors meet competency requirements and that their superiors behave in trustworthy and role-appropriate ways.

Questions of institutional legitimacy overlap with questions about the social location of the *person* from whom the command has been issued a legitimated position of authority? Does he or she officially represent the system in some recognized manner? Does the request or command legitimately represent the system's structural hierarchy and its rules for organization?

A United States president, for example, can command troops to move while a former president cannot. In the United States, the military hierarchy, in late December, would obey the sitting president. In late January of an inaugural year after he is no longer in office, they would not obey a former president. Once the bureaucratic transfer of power has been made, the military legally can only obey the sitting president no matter how much they may prefer the commands of his predecessor.

Secondly, therefore**,** subordinates assess the issue of *individual authority* and *legitimacy.* In the Roman Catholic Church, for example, the Pope may insist that abortion is wrong for all individuals. Roman Catholic faithful, we assume, will follow or obey the institutional church's demand for compliance with this denomination-wide moral teaching. Obedient Roman Catholic women will not obtain abortions. However, an atheist who lives in the same civic culture as her Roman Catholic peers may find no need to follow the institutional church's commandments because, for her, the church and the Pope are outside of her personal and institutional

communities of reference and the value-generating systems in which she lives. For the Roman Catholic faithful, the Pope has denomination-conferred positional authority to make theological and moral demands on the laity. However, for individuals who do not accept the authority and legitimacy of the church or the authority of its pope, there is no perceived need to obey. For individuals outside the Roman Catholic confession of faith, a sitting pope's commands are irrelevant *unless* he has and wields political power to coerce obedience from everyone. Popes wielding the political power of a large number of followers and corporate wealth may lobby secular legislators to pass laws sympathetic to the Roman Catholic position. If the legislature agrees, then the atheist faces the question of the government's legitimacy in determining personal moral conduct in a situation where she is faced with an unwanted pregnancy and where she decides that an abortion is the needed moral choice for her to carry out.

Third, the command recipient assesses the issue of command legitimacy. A supervisor's command to his subordinate to murder a colleague would be perceived (outside of the nation state's security, military and police forces or organized crime) as an illegal or an immoral one. As such, the recipient's behavior would most likely be regulated by a perceived duty to disobey. In her refusal to submit and obey, she would be entitled to disobey by community-held moral principles. Here the individual's moral duty to disobey takes precedence over her or his organizational duty to obey a person holding superior rank. Regarding the duty to disobey certain questions arise:

Authority: Sticks or Carrots?

Individuals in positions of authority can choose from a range of behaviors in order to influence their subordinates to obey them. They can attempt to induce behavior in their subordinates, for example, by persuasion, benign or malignant permission, negotiation, setting examples, offering rewards, manipulation of subordinate hopes and fears, imposing negative sanctions, the use of economic carrots and even the coercive force of economic reprisals, and an implied or overt threat of violence.

In situations where the superior wants something done or does something that is illegal or immoral, most of the superior-subordinate relationship obedience or compliance issues are unspoken. Noting that something

illegal or immoral is being done, the superior (or the subordinate) may simply walk away and allow it to continue without comment, question, critique, or correction. Either or both may model secretive behaviors. If there is an implicit demand, for example, to protect the institution at all costs, much of the subordinate-superior relationship communication pattern has to do with keeping issues secret and hidden from the public view. That which in ordinary situations might be quite visible is, in this now self-institution protective situation kept invisible. If there is no paper trail and no explicit conversation about what is happening, individuals all along the power chain (from the CEO to the lowest paid worker) can then deny awareness of illegal, criminal or immoral behavior. In situations of deliberate criminal misbehavior, a paper trail may never be created at all or in situations of potentially disastrous discovery, can be destroyed without supervisory repercussions. An absence of personal accountability for institutional misconduct or even criminal malfeasance is essential to maintain a corrupted leader's power and authority in case the illegal or immoral institutional behavior threatens to become a public issue.

Collective or Personal Dissent and Moral Agency

There is a certain sense in which subordinate individuals perceive that they are not morally responsible for the decisions they make and the behavior they enact in situations of organizational obedience issues. In many situations where individuals comply with organizational demands, they assume that moral responsibility for their decisions and actions rests with the persons in control of the organization – in short, their superiors. In this kind of situation, they hand over their personal share of moral responsibility (their moral agency) to a higher ranking person. Moral agency, therefore, is assumed to lodge with the person who holds the position of legitimated authority. Even while the subordinate person is the physical actor who carries out a request or command, the issue of his personal moral agency for his action is seen, by the subordinate, as residing in the organization's legitimate authority. The person in command not only holds the position of authority. He controls power, privilege, and access to desired resources (carrots) such as promotions. His position also allows him to utilize negative sanctions (sticks) such as a refusal to promote.

Thus, in general, students obey professors who can fail them; employees obey bosses who can fire them; members of the military services obey their

commanding officers who can imprison them or dishonorably discharge them; members of the laity obey clergy on matters of faith, doctrine and orthodoxy; and priests obey their bishops. Individuals at lower levels of any given pyramidal hierarchy tend to obey those in the institutional ranks above them. Judging a supervisor to be in a legitimate role, rarely do subordinates question the propriety of the supervisor's command. Even when they privately do so, they generally do not share their misgivings with others. This is especially true in authoritarian organizations or in situations where they are supervised by authoritarian individuals who hold rank above them.

For subordinate to disobey they need to re-define the supervisor's position or status as non-legitimate or incompetent. They may assess, accurately or non-accurately, that their supervisor, while holding a position of authority, has no real share of institutional power. In some situations, a subordinate may choose to defy a supervisor he perceives to be incompetent. In other situations, the subordinate may identify the request for obedience as non-legitimate or immoral or, in some situations, as simply inconvenient. In rare occasions, a subordinate may appeal to a supervisor of her supervisor to intervene. Such an appeal always carries with it the risk of being labeled a trouble-maker and an insubordinate individual. It carries the risk of punitive actions by one's superiors. To be successful in such an appeal, the subordinate needs to be both courageous and politically astute.   In general, in such situations, it is helpful to align with as many allies (inside of and outside of the organization) as possible.

One institutional alternative (which I have seen in several work environments where subordinates detested a particular supervisor) is for subordinates to organize effective pressure from above and collective pressure from below in a convulsive attempt to get rid of a collectively disliked, and mistrusted, supervisor. For example in the following hypothetical example, a disliked and distrusted state university director of student financial aid can find himself in the vise where student parents complain effectively to members of the president's cabinet or the university's board of regents about the incompetent performance and unjust favoritism of the financial aid director at the same time the student-written campus newspaper runs a series of unflattering and politically-damaging articles about unfair student-aid practices. Students may also effectively lobby the teaching faculty to take sides. A wise administrator in this situation will weigh the needs, wishes and rights of students aid the

needs, wishes, and rights of the student aid professional for a fair hearing. But the administrator will also weigh the costs of any decision and its effects on his own position survival in the context of these complicated and contested political realities. Any administrative decision he makes in such a situation carries risks to his own position and power.

In all situations where I have witnessed these well-organized campaigns to get rid of a hated and distrusted supervisor, the attacked individual chose to resign before being fired. Stripped of unquestioning submissive compliance from below and threatened from above by well-organized political pressures, the hated supervisor had minimal survival maneuvering room. Quite frequently his peer cohort group abandoned the individual – not wishing to be taken down with him or her. Whatever personal and positional authority and political capital this middle manager had amassed during his career to date was dissolved by a lack of consent from those he previously ruled.

If, however, the middle manager can manage to persuade his superiors that he was unjustly accused and deserved to stay, then, in most instances, his power to occupy his position can remain intact. Even here, however, the institutional warning is clear; *stop being a problem to your own supervisors.* In general, individuals who hold positions of authority, power, privilege, and influence do not want them threatened by incompetent, politically naïve, and problem-creating subordinates.

In cases of clergy sexual abuse of pre-pubertal children, for example, when parents and the community withdraw their support for the ministering individual, the denomination's supervisory and management personnel must make a decision.[5] They can remove an offending individual from active ministry. They can re-assign him or her to desk positions where no children can be violated. They can shelter the offending individual by secrecy and lying about his behavior or theirs. They can choose to deny that the parents and children are telling the truth. They can actively attack the credibility of victims. Each administrative decision has consequences for each individual in the allegation scenario. Each has consequences in the surrounding community.

The Decision to Disobey

Kelman and Hamilton (1989, 90) note that in many situations, subordinates perceive a non-choice character of the situation. They also, however, cite real life situations in which individuals do have preferences and sometimes do make choices other than ones demanded or commanded by their superiors (90). The willingness and decision to actively disobey usually happens only after a period of some anxiety and a careful consideration of options and their potential consequences.

For example, journalist James Carroll, a former Paulist priest, in his 2009 autobiography describes his personal angst over a mid-twentieth-century papal encyclical which ruled that oral contraceptive birth control was not allowed to Roman Catholic married couples. He describes his inner sense that as a priest he would not enforce this teaching inside the university community where he ministered as a Roman Catholic campus chaplain. He made a personal assessment that while the reigning pope was the legitimate leader of his religious faith, and the teaching was an institutional expectation for all Catholics, the doctrinal requirement was illogical and out-dated in modern cultures. His personal assessment functioned to de-legitimate the Catholic Church's requirements for priestly obedience in matters of counseling adolescents and adults about their sexuality. As a matter of his personal conscience and his understanding of human love and sexual relationships he disagreed with the teaching. He decided, therefore, *before his ordination* that he would not enforce the doctrine, i. e., he would disobey his immediate superiors, the church's hierarchy, and the Pope. He, in the privacy of the confessional would not enforce the teaching. His dissent was unspoken. The direct consequence here is that although he promised full obedience to the church's hierarchy and, implicitly at least, loyalty to its doctrinal teachings about contraception, at his ordination he withheld full internal consent from his spoken vow of obedience. While making his final vows, (in my words) he mentally crossed his fingers behind his back and kept a private right to personally-dissent-and-disobey-his bishop and the church at large in this matter. Carroll reports that he was aided in his personal decision by his awareness that that many already ordained priests in the church and many members of the laity in the pews disagreed with the teaching and also disobeyed the Church's theological and doctrinal requirements about not using chemical and mechanical means of birth control (Carroll, 2009).

The Special Case of Small Children

One issue which most authors do not address in discussions of authority and disobedience is the issue of children's obedience to adults. In general, children before their majority have neither the mature intellectual ability to assess commands and their consequences or the physical maturation to successfully disobey. Taught to unquestioningly and non-discriminatingly obey adults who have authority over them, many children are vulnerable to abuse and manipulation by adults. This is particularly evident in situations of sexual abuse of pre-pubertal children by religious authorities they have been taught to trust, revere and obey. Taught by parents, teachers and priests never to question or disobey a priest or ordained minister, the child is trapped when confronted by his sexual demands (Doyle, September 8, 2009).

Concluding Comments

A domination system must have a domination myth…a story to explain how things got this way. For a story told often enough, and confirmed often enough in daily life, ceases to be a tale and is accepted as reality itself. And when that happens, people accept the story even if it is destroying their lives. .

Walter Wink[6]

To briefly summarize Kelman and Hamilton's 1989 work on authority and obedience: faced with a demand to obey, subordinates will assess the legitimacy of the command; the legitimacy of the individual issuing the command; and the legitimacy of the system itself to control his or her behavior. While some of this complex assessment may be cognitive and deliberate, much will be rooted in unconscious factors and in visceral responses. What I call the *"no way in hell am I going to do that" response* is rare and it is usually accompanied by strong emotions such as fear and anxiety. These visceral responses can be ignored, over-ridden, or they can guide the individual's decision-making process. For individuals accustomed to living a life with full and ordinary obedience, such a strong visceral response often creates a crisis of personal identity in which severe

cognitive dissonance is a factor. Moving from the identity of an obedient subordinate to one of a dissenting and, implicitly at least, disobedient one gives most Western individuals, children and adults alike, pause.

In my experience of observing such transformations from automatic obedience to principled disobedience, the hours before an initial act of dissent and disobedience begins or becomes public knowledge are the times of most self-questioning. They are the hours or days of strong emotional experiences of fear and anxiety. As the individual realistically examines the consequences of disobedience, she seeks to understand whether she can better live with her own self in a situation of non-willing obedience or in a situation of dissenting disobedience. Once the decision to openly dissent (implicitly to disobey) is made and disobedient action has begun, the emotional arousal quiets. The individual begins to do that which he has felt morally or ethically or even pragmatically obliged to do. Choosing personal authority to act from the center of one's own guiding ethical and moral center rather than from within the ordinary social expectations of obeying other's guiding authority is an act of genuine self-empowerment (Starhawk, 1981). But it is rarely easy and a decision to disobey always has consequences. Some of these consequences may have been foreseen. Others may never have been imagined.

Twentieth-century examples of individuals who made public choices to openly and publicly dissent rather than to comply with oppressive social norms and institutional expectations for behavior include Susan B. Anthony and Alice Paul, and Sojourner Truth in the United States women's suffrage campaign; Fanny Lou Hamer, Pauli Murray, Rosa Parks, Martin Luther King, Malcolm X and many less well known committed participants in the American Civil Rights movement; Gandhi and Indian participants in the salt walk which began the process of dismantling British colonial rule in India; Guatemala's poet-theologian Julia Esquivel's documentation of governmental and military atrocities and massacres during Guatemala's mid-twentieth-century military dictatorship; Daniel Ellsberg's release of the Pentagon Papers; Deep Throat's revelations of lies and criminal misconduct during the Nixon Administration's Watergate affair; and Roman Catholic Dominican priest Thomas Doyle in his decision to aid the victims of clergy rape by confronting his denomination's clericalism.

Recommended Supplemental Readings

1) Cozzens, D. (May 17, 2010). Don't Expect Accountability from the Last Feudal System in the West in the *National Catholic Reporter. Online*. Retrieve from http://ncronline.org.print/18343

2) Kelman, H. C. and Hamilton, V. L. (1989). *Crimes of Obedience*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

3) Kennedy, E. C. (October 28, 2011). What Is the Sin of Bishop Finn? Retrieve from http://www.ncronline/blogs/bulletin-human-side/what-sin-bishop-finn

4) Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View.* New York: Harper and Row.

5) Soelle, D, *Beyond Mere Obedience*. (1992). (L. W. Denef, Trans.). New York, NY: Pilgrim.

Personal Reflection Questions

1) Define authority.   How do you recognize authority in real life situations? For example, I think about a policeman in an intersection. The light is red but he is motioning traffic to proceed?   Which authority takes precedence: the state law about red traffic lights as a sign to stop or the policeman signaling that you should continue moving through the intersection? As a driver in this situation, how do you make decisions about who or what to obey and who or what to disobey?   Create several examples from your own life experience (times where you experienced internal or external conflict about obedience and disobedience) to illustrate the abstract concept of authority.   When you are ready, write several paragraphs in your notebook to answer the following questions.   (a) What actually is authority? (b) What are the social signs of authority? (c) How do you personally know when you are faced with issues of obeying or disobeying authorities in your personal life?

2) In your own words identify the behavioral markers of authority? What are the visible markers you personally use to identify the presence of

someone in authority? For example, do you have visceral reactions to authority figures? If so, what are they?

3) In your own life, can you identify situations in which you believe you have an obligation to obey someone who has legitimate authority over you? For example, a man working a drill press is wise if he obeys his company's policies for safe use of this press. Develop some specific examples from your own life to illustrate situations in which you personally believe you have a personal responsibility or obligation to obey some external authority figure(s).

4) In your own life, can you identify situations in which you believe you have an obligation to disobey someone or something? For example, conscientious objectors believe they have a duty (rooted in personal conscience or their religious denomination's teachings) to resist military service because of their beliefs against killing other human beings. Develop some specific examples from your own life to illustrate situations in which you believe you personally have an obligation to disobey authority figures in your life?

5) In your own words, write down a definition of helpful, useful or positive authority. Next write a definition of corrupt, abusive, or harmful authority. Spend some time comparing and contrasting your two definitions in light of your own personal experiences with authority. When you do this kind of reflection, what do you learn about your personal responses to people who have authority over you (for example, parents, teachers, traffic cops, employment supervisors, etc.)?

6) When you are faced with a decision to obey or to disobey someone in an authority position over you, what decision-making process do you activate? Maybe you talk with trusted advisors. Maybe you pray. Maybe you make lists. Be as specific here as you can be.

Footnotes

[1] Herbert C. Kelman and V. Lee Hamilton, 1989, 53-54

[2] Gregory Baum, 2007, 68

[3] Archbishop Runcie of Canterbury preached at the open air Eucharist in Cape Town, South Africa on the day of Desmond Tutu's enthronement as Archbishop. Quoted in Michael Nuttall, 2003, 32

[4] Herbert C. Kelman and V. Lee Hamilton, 1989, 114-115

[5] See Mary Gail Frawley O'Dea (May 16, 2011). Where is Catholicism's Tahrir Square? Retrieve from
http://ncronline.org/blogs/examining-crisis/where-catholicisms-tahrir-square

[6] Walter Wink, 1998, 42

Religious Authority and the Duty to Obey

A certain amount of obedience is needed for individuals to live in organized societies. In every society some individual has some authority over other individuals; each individual lives in some kind of obedience to authority

Henry Gleitman[1]

Introductory Comments

Obedience is the psychological mechanism that links individual action to political purposes. It is the dispositional cement that binds men to systems of authority.

Stanley Milgram[2]

Institutional religious authority constitutes a mandate for religious leaders to guide, to regulate and to supervise the religious beliefs, spiritual lives, collective liturgical practices, and moral or ethical behavior of others. The mandate can be accomplished by modeling, by persuasion, by coercion or even, in some situations, by violence. Religious officials can use their position and its concomitant authority over others to persuade, inspire, instigate, edify, comfort, and educate or to control, indoctrinate, threaten, terrify and abuse. They can use their position's bureaucratic powers to guide spiritually maturing individuals and communities or they can use these same powers to create immature, unthinking, and unquestioning conformity. Religious leaders and clergy can manage their institutions democratically or they can use a range of authoritarian measures designed to maximize lay obedience and minimize dissent. They can use their position and its authority and power to share power with the laity or to exclude the laity from mutuality.

The history of religious authority in Christian organizations, for example, combines ancient teachings about authority as divinely ordained as well as contemporary ideologies and institutional practices which are influenced by the contemporary era. Today's claims about contemporary religious authority have a long taproot inside Christian history, its teachings and its liturgical practices. Today's socio-cultural and secular understandings of leadership influence contemporary theologies of Christian leadership and religious authority. Christian organizations located inside of democratic cultures will likely, therefore, perceive their role and mission quite differently than do Christian organizations located inside totalitarian states. A Christian institution will perceive itself differently in nation states where it is the majority religion than will a similar institution which is located in nation states where Christianity represents a minority status among many religions. These socio-cultural realities will undoubtedly influence the ways in which religious organizations structure leadership and constitute membership. Their governing ideologies, as Walter Wink notes below, will not just float down to earth from the heavenly ethers. They will be grounded in the socio-cultural and anthropological realities of specific historical religious communities.

The Iron Fist of Authority: Violence and Social Control

> *An ideology…is invisible but it does not just float in the air; it is always the justification for some actual group.*

Walter Wink[3]

In modern secular Western societies, the Christian Church (in its many national and denominational permutations) has lost its political power to put people in stocks, imprison them, flog them in public, burn them at the stake or drown them for questioning the church's ruling hierarchy and its governing doctrines and ideologies. Thus, in Euro-American Christendom the overtly coercive physical violence edge of religious authority (regarding matters of faith, praxis and custom) has been muted or totally lost over the Christian centuries. In most situations in Western Christendom, civil authorities do not enforce religious law. Thus, inside secular civil societies, the church's formal coercive powers are limited to lobbying the civil authorities for restrictive legislation in matters of the common social ethic,

economic sanctions inside the community of faith, and the right to include or to exclude individuals from religious ceremony participation.

While the iron fist of coercive physical violence is rarely visible inside Western religious institutions, they retain retaliatory social powers of economic and social retaliation. Guilt and shame induction attempts can accompany other forms of social violence such as economic reprisals. In some situations social shunning, abandonment, and excommunication are initiated against individuals who will not conform to religious denomination expectations for their submission and obedience in matters of faith and behavior. At times when the church or its subsidiary institutions feel threatened (from within or without) the religious establishment will resort to civil law to protect itself from real or imaginary attacks. By a wide variety of legal and public relations maneuvers, institutional administrators seek to protect the institution and their own positions of authority and power.

Employees of religious institutions who dissent in one way or another may face claims of insubordination or heresy. They can be fired with few recourses of appeal. Consequently, they may find themselves on the outside of their socio-cultural and religious heritage as well as on the outside of their place of employment. Authoritarian administrators understand the principle that by punishing and making an example of one individual they can corral others. By this meaner they can seek to squelch all forms of internal dissent. Making a scapegoat of one individual, therefore, serves to protect and reinforce the position, authority and power of individual leaders.

The iron fist of religious orthodoxy inside authoritarian organizations, no matter how covered it is with a velvet glove of so-called servant-leadership, can, therefore, allow powerful authoritarian leaders to retaliate when threatened by subordinate dissent or overt challenges to their power by members of the laity. As long as they hold their institutional positions, authoritarian leaders retain formidable social powers and privileges. Various assets of social capital and economic capital allow leaders to reassert their positional authority if and when others threaten to unseat them or in other ways threaten their power and ability to control others. Their behaviors usually include efforts to divide and conquer those who dissent from unquestioning obedience. Authoritarian leaders may, therefore, rely on such tactics as blaming others, making false accusations, spreading rumors, and disseminating disinformation. They can lie,

threaten, institute economic sanctions, manipulate public opinion, assassinate the character of their opponents, overtly or covertly exclude their opponent's participation and make selective use of the civil legal system to intimidate (Arendt, 1969a, 1969b; Berry, 2011; Berry and Renner, 2004; Fox, 1996, 2011; Lobdell, 2009, 135-162; Shupe, 2008, 45-82; Sipe, March 5, 2010).

Exception to the General Pattern

One large exception to the general rule about an absence of coercive physical violence inside contemporary religious institutions exists in situations where individual members of the religious clergy or leadership caste sexually assault members of the laity – often in God's name – and are not held publicly accountable for their actions because of their position and role. In such a situation, the violent iron fist of an individual's religious authority reveals itself directly to his victims. Well-positioned sexual abusers count on their positional role (its authority, privileges, power, financial resources, and connections to the ruling elite) to provide them with immunity from publicity, accountability, and prosecution (Doyle, January, 2003; Morris, 1999). Institutionally powerful sexual violence perpetrators, therefore, can and do manipulate complex organizational cultures and structures to protect themselves (Sipe, 1996, June 1, 2010).

In addition, abusers manipulate their victims to be silent about the abuse they've experienced. They may, and often do, make overt threats of additional physical violence such as harm to parents or siblings. They may persuade their victims that no one will believe them. Abusive religious leaders and clergy may use theological jargon to persuade their victims that God's will is being done. They frequently make covert metaphysical threats in addition to the physical assault on their victims. One way this is seen among clergy pedophiles is when they threaten child and adolescent victims with hell and a loss of salvation if the children (the victims) report the offending party (the sexually abusive clergy person) to civil or religious authorities.

The perpetrator's post-victimization manipulation, in one way or another, includes persuading other powerful individuals (or event the community as a whole) to support non-action, silence, and secrecy. A powerful coterie of the perpetrator's supervisors, subordinates and peers may be overtly or

150

covertly intimidated from revealing or reporting what they know. In this manner individuals (who themselves have not physically or sexually abused others) become accomplices to the abuse (Rutter, 1989; Shupe, 2008). Once a climate of silence and secrecy is established, sexual predators can successfully hide and remain outside any efforts to hold them accountable for their behavior. Successfully hidden from the view of the majority inside the corrupted silence of the minority, they are free to continue their abusive behavior towards as many vulnerable individuals as they choose to victimize.

Institutional Issues

The Domination System...is characterized by unjust economic relations, oppressive personal relations, biased race relations, patriarchal gender relations, hierarchical power relations, and the use of violence to maintain them all.

Walter Wink[4]

There is a continuum of control options in hierarchical organizations. At one end of the continuum there is persuasion and the use of carrots (positive reinforcements such as promotions and salary increases). At the other end is coercive physical violence. Somewhere in the middle we begin to see the application of negative sanctions such as economic reprisals, social isolation, ostracism, shunning, employment termination and/or excommunication.

Individuals in bureaucratic positions of institutional authority and control make daily choices about how they will conduct themselves in the management of their authority, power, perquisites, and control of others. They make choices about how they will use the privileges of position (such as money or access to other powerful people) that automatically accrue to them on taking office. The sum total of their administrative choices will determine whether they are democratic, autocratic, or even proto-fascist authoritarian leaders of others.

A certain organizational truism can be described. When a leader has sufficient tenure in his position, an entire organizational culture is shaped

around his personal leadership style. Even when he (or she) is no longer in the position of authority and power, the organizational culture which he shaped (its policies and its organizational practices) tends to perpetuate his influence. Thus, the deeds of any leader in hierarchical or pyramidal organizations tend to live on beyond them. Because of subordinate shaping, compelling leadership patterns tend to survive even in successive generations of leadership. This is at least partly true because of the socialization of the organization's members towards unquestioning submission, compliance and obedience.

In situations where an institution's leader is able to have a say in the appointment of his governing boards, this tendency is exacerbated. In talking about these complex issues of corporate culture and management styles with a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) friend of mine, we began to describe various organizational cultures that we each have encountered during our respective careers. He said to me, *autocratic or authoritarian or even interpersonally abusive presidents of large organizations tend to appoint board members who will support them in their administrative style and decisions. When the administrator resigns, retires, or dies, the board members he appointed will tend to select a replacement administrator who reflects and mirrors the administrative style of the former president. Thus, for example, a weak president will appoint a weak governing board. An ideological president will seek board members who mirror his ideology. A corrupt president will create a board which does not challenge his personal or institutional corruption. Not only is an institution's subordinate staff conditioned to accept ideological, weak or corrupt leadership, the governing board is also conditioned to do so. By this means a leader's style perpetuates itself long after he has been replaced by someone else.*[5]

In attempting to understand the complex relationships among Pope John Paul II, Cardinal Ratzinger – now Pope Benedict XIV, the Vatican Curia, and the Roman Catholic Church's Cardinals and Bishops (the Church's ruling elites) I have often returned to and have reflected upon my friend's comments. Because of John Paul's long reign as Pope and because of the central role played by Cardinal Ratzinger during John Paul's reign, the House of Cardinals was selected to be in ideological accord with John Paul's and Cardinal Ratzinger's shared beliefs, values, and ideologies of papal rule. The Roman Catholic Cardinals selected during John Paul's long reign, with advice from Cardinal Ratzinger, upon the pope's death then selected Cardinal Ratzinger as John Paul II's successor. Since his election

and elevation, Pope Benedict XVI) has continued to rule over the church's theology, ideology, praxis, and personnel in a style very reminiscent of his predecessor's. The cardinals appointed during Benedict's papacy continue to reflect the political and theological ideologies of both men. Eventually these cardinals will appoint Benedict's successor (Berry, 2011; Berry and Renner, 2004; Collins, 2004; Fox, 2011; Hegarty, October 6, 2011; Israeli, and Chua-Eoan, June 7, 2010; Robinson, 2008; Yallop, 2007, 2010).

The Default Position of Subordinate Obedience

> *Surrender to authority is an integral part of the psychology of authoritarian hierarchy. Hierarchies of power, especially those that purport to be spiritual, are based on hierarchies of value where the leader is considered better, purer, or essentially different. Next comes the heir-apparent or the inner circle. This creates separation between those of different levels, and between the group as a whole and those outside the hierarchy. Surrendering to a guru [spiritual teacher] thus involves surrendering to a hierarchical mode of relating that has within it dominance and submission.*

<div align="center">Joel Kramer and Diana Alstad[6]</div>

Because of our long childhood, human beings encounter issues of authority and its coercive powers immediately after birth. Unable to survive without a long period of dependency, our human reliance upon older and more experienced caregivers is extended in time. The human child's long period of dependency establishes a dynamic, living template of authority-subordinate consciousness and behavior that lasts a lifetime. Patterns of obedience and submission to more powerful elders are established in infancy and childhood and they persist into adulthood.

The legacy of this long human childhood enmeshes the individual in experiences of dependency. Human dependency means repeated encounters with authority figures. Children everywhere encounter the reality that they are expected to obey their elders (initially parents and then other adults) in control of the adult-child situation. The long acculturation process shapes human consciousness which, in turn, shapes an individual's adult world view, attitudes, values, beliefs, choices and

behavior. The adult human being in situations where she encounters authority has long-established, well-developed, and personally-integrated proclivities towards submission, obedience, and compliance. Some authors (Kelman and Hamilton, 1989; Kramer and Alstad, 1993; Milgram, 1974; Zimbardo, 1986) note, therefore, that the human default position in situations where obedience to human authorities is requested (or required), is to surrender one's own will, submit and to obey those perceived to be in control, i.e., the authorities.

The macrocosm of the surrounding culture (including the family, the school and the religious institution) and the microcosm of an individual's consciousness and personality in many ways are, therefore, mirror images of each other. By late adolescence and adulthood the obedience and submission template of any given human being has been deeply imprinted inside the individual's personality. Authority figures often function, even in mature adulthood, as archetypal parent figures. Entering an interpersonal situation with someone perceived to be an authority figure, individuals project much of their earlier relationships with childhood authorities (such as parents and teachers) into these adult situations (Fromm-Reichmann, 1960).

This awareness is perhaps particularly applicable to the archetype of spiritual teacher and spiritual seeker. Religious language (in which the religious community names God, the clergy person, or the guru "father") encourages and perpetuates such projections. In such a situation, not only does the religious leader wear his or her personal face in the religious seeker's consciousness. The religious leader also wears God's face (Borg, 1997) Clergy or religious leader sexual abuse of subordinates, therefore, functions structurally as spiritual incest (Frawley O'Dea in Berg, 2006).

When disobedience or simply thinking for one's own self has been actively discouraged in childhood and adolescence by caretakers' abuse, violence and other fear or anxiety-generating behaviors, it becomes psychologically or emotionally aversive to the adult to do other than surrender her own will to another, to submit and to obey the implicit or explicit command she has been given. Obedience, as an adult behavior, becomes rationalized by a variety of cognitive processes. The taproots of required obedience in early childhood get covered over by later human experiences until they are obscured by cultural denial and other psycho-socio-cultural processes. European analyst Alice Miller (1990a, 1984b) categorizes these mental

154

strategies as a psycho-social *banishment of knowledge.* In order to cope with the fear-embedded nature of their personal life history and experiences, children learn to deny and repress the factual history of authoritarian abuse and physical violence in their early lives.

Previously abused as children some adults are no longer aware of these shaping realities in their adult beliefs, values, attitudes, and behavioral responses to others. They wear their needed-for-survival-in-childhood-psycho-social blinders into adulthood even when these blinders now serve no reasonable purpose at all other than a continuing repression of awareness. Adults who were abused in childhood can become emotionally restricted in their adult relationships with others. In addition, the authoritarian nature of their upbringing may mean that they become unable to think for themselves. Living inside the distorted consciousness shaped by the presence of childhood-installed blinders they do not (perhaps psychologically cannot) know or apprehend the foundational sources of their life-constrictive attitudes, beliefs, values, and behaviors. They do not (perhaps cannot) apprehend the reasons for their troubled relationships with others.

Roots of the West's Ideology of Religious Authority

> *Auschwitz was a turning point for Christian self-understanding. It reveled to us the power of social and religious pathologies. It brought to light the terrible consequences of the destructive trends in religion.*

Gregory Baum[7]

Concepts of authority, coercion, control, force, power, strength, violence and obedience are all closely related in a world socially organized around structural dominance and power (Baum, 2007; R. Eisler, 1987; Janeway, 1981; Lerner, 1993a, 1993b; Soelle, 1992; Wink, 1998). These world view[8] fundamentals shape individual and collective attitudes, beliefs, and values as well as overt behaviors. Inherited from the ancestral generations they can last, largely unquestioned, for centuries and millennia. As these concepts sequentially pass through multiple generations, the tendency is towards elaboration and reification. Therefore, the tendency of the

generations is towards less flexibility and more elaborate systems of indoctrination, social control and conformity. Just as 1900 years of Christian teaching shaped an ideological anti-Jewish bias inside Christendom (manifested in the twentieth-century European Shoah), two millennia of ideological anti-woman and anti-child rhetoric is foundational to Christendom's acceptance of, indeed its active promulgation of, men's domination of and violence against women and their children.

The generational world view accrues a pre-determined tendency towards unquestioned acceptance, obedience and replication. Thus, the generational tendency is towards unquestioned and socially enforced legalism. Regarding legalism, Gregory Baum (2007) writes that l*egalism is… the religious attitude which makes observance the end of religion (70).* In a legalistic culture, the living spiritual matrix of the original idea or religious practice has been replaced by unthinking rote repetition. By generational modeling and by active instruction, individual and collective consciousness is colonized and domesticated to the dominant ideology of a particular culture.

The more unconscious the collective world views which shape legalistic behavior and the more unselfconscious and automatic the individual behaviors of submission and obedience to others in positions of authority, the less likely it is that individuals will question and challenge the teachings of others regarding the necessity for obedience and submission (Kramer and Alstad, 1993; Soelle, 1992, Wink, 1998, 2004). No matter how immoral or abusive the requirements of authority figures; no matter how harmful or destructive their behavior is towards others, the obedient individual will obey simply because they perceive obedience is required (Milgram, 1974). .

In the accrual of generational weight, unquestioned realities become *the way things are* and the *way things have always been* and the *way things should always be.* In religious institutions, once fluid, charismatic and previously appropriate and responsive ideologies harden into rigid orthodoxy and totalitarian legalistic dogma. Another way of asserting this lies in the common-sense wisdom that if one wishes to survive, perhaps even to thrive, in authoritarian systems it is personally naïve, politically and economically unwise or ethically irrelevant *to* question or challenge strong authority figures. Subordinates, individually and collectively, presume the

social duty and guiding spiritual imperative is to yield, to surrender to submit, and to obey (Kramer and Alstad, 1993).

Former *Los Angeles Times* religion correspondent William Lobdell (2009) describes his astonished bewilderment, during a congregational meeting in which Father Michael Pecharich announced his retirement from religious duties at San Francisco Solano Church in Rancho Santa Margarita (CA). The immediate cause of his coerced resignation was the priest's history of child molestation. Watching as parishioners responded in rage at their diocese about the resignation announcement and loss of a trusted and beloved priest, Lobdell was incredulous. The congregation's response of unquestioning support for a priest who had minutes before informed the congregation that the cause of his resignation was that he had sexually molested a child made little sense to Lobdell. After a time of reflection he wrote:

> The parishioners' responses in these situations underscore how desperately we all crave spiritual leadership. We want to invest our trust in good men (and women, in most faiths) whom we can look up to – and even idolize. It is comforting to believe that there are people who are holier than ourselves, whom we know and can follow (156).

In religious cultures guided by strong doctrines of authority and conformity, great value is placed upon individuals and entire communities doing exactly what is expected and asked of them by established community leaders. Great emphasis is placed upon following a leader's explicit and implicit expectations about how they should act and respond. Legitimately credentialed religious leaders can demand orthodoxy and conformity as the price of subordinate belonging. In general, the people submit and obey. As Kramer and Alstad (1993) note, in such situations, lower-ranking individuals form strong personal and emotional attachments to authoritarian leaders. In lower-ranking individuals there is, perhaps, *a need to surrender their own moral responsibility to authoritarian leaders, and consequently to submit and obey* (Kramer and Alstad, paraphrase and emphasis mine).

In general, the Christian West relies upon internalized experiences of guilt while many Eastern cultures rely upon shame to perpetuate cultural norms and behaviors. Personal and collective belonging lies in doing that which is expected – usually without questions or meta-commentary about the appropriate or inappropriate nature of the "required" behavior in question.

Consequently, many, perhaps a majority of religious individuals believe that there is spiritual and social safety in knowing the socio-cultural-religious rules of their community and obeying them without doubts or questions. This is perhaps especially true for small children and pre-majority adolescents, in part, because some areas of their physical brain and neurological body are not yet developmentally mature. They are not able, because of their developmental status, to think analytically about these matters. Their vulnerability to abuse is, therefore, heightened by their developmental status of physical, cognitive, and emotional immaturity.

In the dominant position of authority and power, authoritarian religious leaders expect their followers and disciples to follow unquestioningly their rules, commands, or suggestions. In the subordinate position of lesser power, their followers may find many reasons to obey the directives of those they perceive to be the authorities in control. This is true even when they may have doubts about the wisdom of the directives or even severe personal disagreements with them. The cost of open dissent is too great to break free of the religious binds ruling religious leaders place on those below them (Kramer and Alstad. 1993).

The visual symbol of the speaking clergy in an elevated pulpit and the listening laity in pews looking up serves as an iconic metaphor and behavioral practice in situations of clergy power and laity powerlessness. Members of the clergy proclaim and members of the laity are silent. The preached-to laity is then expected to embody what they have heard. That which is moral and that which is immoral becomes, therefore, an idea or belief system of the clergy and religious hierarchy which has been mediated to them by exhortation and discipline.

The Issue of Dissent

> *Personal redemption cannot take place apart from the redemption of our social structures.*

> Walter Wink[9]

But there is another reality. Many members of the laity do not agree with the teaching they receive from the pulpit. Most especially in a democratic

society, some adult women and men do not agree with some behavioral demands or the orthodox doctrinal positions of their religious traditions. For many different reasons, including maintenance of family harmony or keeping open social connections that are financially lucrative, they simply defect in place. In public they obey the outward demands for conformity as the price of social belonging while holding internal beliefs that contradict their external behaviors. In many cases, but not all, this is a form of self-protective hypocrisy.

In situations where clergy sexual abuse occurs and where abusive clericalism occurs, religious lay individuals are likely to face a personal crisis of belief and praxis. Individuals can resolve their experience of cognitive dissonance by denial (the evil others allege is not and cannot be factual), by defecting-in-place (refusing to face or responsibly deal with the implications of what they believe or know to be factually true), by protesting and acting as a change agent; or by leaving the community altogether.

Episcopalian theologian and former Roman Catholic Dominican priest Matthew Fox (1996) quotes Yevtushenko, a noted Russian author, about the responsibility of individuals to speak up or carry responsibility for evil. While Yevtushenko was talking about oppressive social realities in the former Soviet Union, Fox applies his words to today's Roman Catholic Church. Yevushenko wrote:

> *There is patience and tolerance worthy or respect – the patience of a woman suffering in labor, the patience of real creators at work, the patience of people under torture who will not name their friends. But there is also useless, humiliating patience. How can we respect ourselves if we allow such disrespect for ourselves every day?*

> *Let's be honest about it and admit that it was not only the ruling clique that was guilty [during Stalin's reign of terror], but the people as well, who allowed the clique to do whatever it wanted. Permitting crimes is a form of participating in them, and historically, we are used to permitting them. That is servile patience. It is time to stop blaming everything on the bureaucracy. If we put up with it, then we deserve it (238).* [10]

In oppressive social situations, the silent voices of the many support the abusive voices of the few. This becomes, therefore, a form of individual

and group complicity. In another context than sexual abuse, Maryknoll Father Roy Bourgeois commented to me that *silence in situations of violence, oppression and injustice is the voice of consent.*[11]

Individual and collective silence in situations of violence, systemic oppression, and active injustice tends to invalidate a religious group's spiritual authority. It also tends to lead others to discount its proclamation or spiritual teachings. In the social judgment or the watching world, a community's or an individual's embodied behavior in the world takes precedence over proclamation. What one does is a better indicator of one's deepest beliefs than what one says. Too much incongruity between proclamation and behavior threatens the community's moral teaching. The watching world will judge and condemn the hypocrisy of such disparities.

Inside abusive organizations, dissenting individuals have several options. (1) They can deny awareness of the situation in their consciousness. (2) They can begin to transform their values and willingly, in full agreement with the system, conform ideologically to the religious system and its requirements. In sexual abuse situations, for example, they can argue that children and adolescents wanted and even enjoyed sexual contact with their abusive religious elders. In this situation, therefore, sexually abused children can be blamed and the clergy abuser exonerated or actually seen as the real victim. (3) Individuals can defect in place and choose to remain silent. (4) They can openly criticize the abuse and work to change the system (and its underlying ideology). (5) Finally, they can choose to leave and go elsewhere. Whatever their choice, there are social, cognitive, psychological, emotional, and spiritual costs to the individual. There are consequences, as well, to others. These simultaneously personal and communal costs may not be fully realized until the choice of behavior has been both made and embodied in action.

It is impossible, in my opinion, to regularly profess with one's mouth and one's overt, public behavior that which one actively and privately disbelieves, disagrees with or dissents from. Recognizing, for example, the truthfulness of victim complaints about leader sexual abuse of children, healthy adults have an inner revulsion towards this kind of behavior. For most mature and spiritually healthy adults, silence in the face of such abuse is a personally unsettling form of religious hypocrisy. Silence, in the face of abuse, becomes psychologically and spiritually intolerable. Finding themselves embedded within rigid, authoritarian and oppressive or even

actively pathological religious systems, healthy and psychologically mature adults (in one way or another) will need to resolve the intolerable condition of cognitive dissonance in which their value system regarding safety of small children from sexual abuse is incongruent with group membership in a religious system where such abuse is tolerated and protected. Confronted with factual information about abuse, emotional, spiritual and religious crises are common (Anonymous, ud; Doyle, 1984; Gumbleton, November 4, 2011; Sipe, January 23, 2007).

As Fox, Yevtushenko and Bourgeois reminded us above, we are each morally responsible for that which we profess, witness and know.   How we respond to the presence of sexual violence in our communities of reference reveals our personal moral rudder and the status of our interpersonal integrity.

Our personal responses to other's suffering not only shape our individual moral integrity, they also shape the common social morality and public behavior of our communities of reference. Individual and communal morality and behavior shape the spirituality of the whole.

It is possible in one's lifetime to move towards spiritual and moral maturity or it is possible to remain fixated in immaturity. Each individual's embodied decisions when they encounter the suffering of others participate in the shaping of the collective morality and spirituality of the whole.   In this manner, the collective whole becomes responsible for the safety of the individual.

Entire religious communities may be spiritually immature or even actively pathological. As the latter, they may be actively or passively destructive to the ongoing lives of others.   One measure for assessing community spiritual wholeness or community spiritual pathology is the presence of active, informed, and embodied compassion towards the suffering of others.   Such compassion includes an effective and practical praxis that attempts to ameliorate that suffering. A spiritual praxis that does not give any evident and behavioral concern for another human being's suffering is either immature or corrupt. In some situations it is both.

Structural Elements of Religious Obedience

The main virtue of an authoritarian religion is obedience.

Dorothee Soelle[12]

In her important late-twentieth-century book German Protestant theologian Dorothee Soelle (1992) comments on the dangers of authoritarian religion by noting three structural features of such religion. These include (1) *acceptance of superior power which controls our destiny and excludes self-determination;* (2) *subjection to the rule of this power which needs no moral legitimation in love or justice;* and (3) *a deep-rooted pessimism about humans, seen as powerless and meaningless beings incapable of truth and love* (xii).

Encapsulated within an authoritarian world view is a belief in duality: someone speaks and the "other" listens; someone knows and the "other" is ignorant; someone rules and the "other" is ruled (xiii). In religious settings which emphasize obedience as the primary virtue, self-abnegation becomes the individual's obligation and spiritual or religious center of gravity. Soelle asks, *why do people worship a God whose supreme quality is power, not justice, whose interest lies in subjection, not in mutuality, who fears equality* (xv)? She answers her own question. *Those who use religious language and talk about religious obedience towards God without telling us what they mean, have a clear message for their audience. It is identical with the prevailing values of the given culture (xv).* In Soelle's opinion those who seek most to save the religious message of faith in Christ by placing a strong emphasis on authority and obedience do the most to imperil it (3).

It is not the God of the historical past (with historical authority and a demand for unquestioning obedience) nor, I add, his dead theologians and *church* rulers, who speak to the present. In Soelle's theological work, it is the living Christ who encounters individuals in the present moment. She writes:

> *For by employing the language of the fathers and mothers one preserves their world and in so doing alienates the present world, whether one wants to or not. The resurrected Christ is only that*

Christ who confronts us in the present and speaks the truth about our lives today. One from whom we learn nothing, who does not transform us and sensitize our conscience, remains dead (5).

By What Authority Do You Do These Things?

Dominating imperialism is always predatory and exploitive.

J. Harold Ellens[13]

A Personal Assumption

My personal organizing assumption about Christian church history is very simple and straight-forward. Any events in the early history of Christianity which happened before the Western (Roman) Catholic Church and the Eastern (Orthodox) Church split in CE 1054 are part of the tradition-shaping faith history of all Christians.[14] This includes, therefore, all consensus agreements and practical theologies which Christendom hammered out in its first millennia. In addition, events which happened before the sixteenth-century Protestant Reformation (CE 1517 and following) and the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation Council of Trent (CE 1545-1565) likewise belong to all Western Christians.

Thus, only after the sixteenth-century can Western Protestant and Sectarian Christians fully disengage themselves from the dominating influence of the Roman Catholic Church's history and praxis. It is, I believe, both disingenuous and theologically naïve for Protestants and Sectarians to disengage 21st century ideologies, belief structures and liturgical practices which developed during the first 1500 years of Christian experience from any discussions of contemporary theological and social issues within Christendom.

While there is an omnipresent temptation for Protestant and Sectarian Christians to blame and pre-judge Roman Catholicism as the quintessential source of corruption in Christian history and while it is equally tempting for Roman Catholics to blame Protestants and Sectarians for Catholic-, bashing and schism, neither of these approaches is remotely useful when

163

we examine the complex sociological issues of clergy sexual abuse inside Christian communities. The phenomenon of clergy sexual abuse of children and adolescents, for example, was known inside the Christian community as early as the Fourth Century when church fathers at the Council at Elvira (CE 324) discussed it and published formal prohibitions against the practice (Doyle, Sipe and Wall, 2006). In a similar manner, clergy or religious leader sexual abuse of adult women and men is currently found in most (perhaps all) denominations across the Christian spectrum (Fortune, 1989c; Labaqcz and Barton,1991; Rutter, 1989). It is also present inside other-than-Christian religions groups or spiritual traditions (Downing, 2001; Kramer and Alstad, 1993; Lesser, July-August, 2010).

According to the *World Report on Violence and Health* (WHO. 2002) when the world community decides to begin to work at violence prevention, it must seek to understand and then to change the long-standing cultural ideologies and attitudes which support violence.   These violence-prone ideologies must be unmasked as a necessary precursor to making permanent changes inside the world community.   In such a model of violence prevention, it is essential to sort through Christian origins and Christian history to discover the violence-prone theologies, doctrines, dogma,, and common practices of the historical and sociological Christian Church.   Only then can the world community or the Christian community begin to dismantle the structures of oppression which create opportunities for individuals to do violence to each other.

All Western Christians are descendents of the Christian story from the New Testament Church until the Roman Catholic-Orthodox split and the even later splintering of the Western Church during the Protestant Reformation. Every Western Christian (indeed every Westerner) in one way or another has been conditioned by beliefs, attitudes, and ideologies regarding human sexuality, gender relations, child-adult relations, leader authority, and the structuring of power which originated in the first millennia of Christian history (Doyle in Berg, 2006).

We know in terms of many different accounts of human history that to deny the roots of destructive communal experience and practice often means successive generations are destined, in one way, or another to unconsciously repeat ancient, unexamined and dysfunctional patterns of collective human behavior. We know also that when we distance ourselves

from our own historical roots and ancestral experience, it is easier to engage in prejudicial analysis and sometimes violent behavior against the "other" (Keen, 2006a; Kopp, 1972, Satir, 1972).

In my personal reading of church history and church origins, the following description of events in fourth-century Christian Rome belongs, therefore, to the common cultural and religious history of all Western and Eastern Christians. It is possible, I think, to see some of the clergy sexual abuse issues in the 21st century as having long roots inside the soil of early church behaviors and decisions. Unresolved problems of our faith ancestors still remain unsolved today.

The concept of a unified religious authority as rendered below by May (1992) and Denzley (2007) is a sobering one. We need, to ask ourselves how this narrative affects our contemporary understanding of clergy sexual abuse and religious leader clericalism.

Human Authority as a Religious Concept

For the Christian, the New Testament is the natural point of beginning.

Roland H. Bainton[15]

Hannah Arendt (1969a, 1969b) notes the concept of authority must be differentiated from coercion by force or violence and from persuasion through arguments and logic. Following Arendt's conceptual work North American Church of the Brethren theologian Melanie May (1992) in her exegesis of the biblical text, b*y what authority do you do these things* (Matthew 21:23*)* comments that *the concept of authority to which we are heirs was crafted precisely as an alternative to these already common ways* (coercion and persuasion) *of handling foreign affairs and domestic affairs (4).*

May borrows Arendt's idea that the linguistic usage of authority as an *institutional religious concept* arose during the classic Roman era of political power and reign. Before the Romans, the Greeks who preceded them in the West's history of empire saw religious piety as dependent upon the immediate (and immanent) revealed numinous presence of the gods in

human affairs. In the Greek communal mind the gods protected the people and their cities but only occasionally came down to visit earth from the mythic sacred mountain where they lived and from which they ruled.

In the classical Roman mind, however, the concept of religion (re-ligare) meant to be *tied back* and *obligated to the past, to lay the foundations, to be connected to the legendary and superhuman attempts to build the cornerstone, and to found for eternity* (May, 4). To be religious, therefore, meant to be tied or bound to the past. Cicero, for example, wrote that i*n no other realm does human excellence approach so closely the path of the god as it does in the founding of new and in the preservation of already founded communities. The binding power of the foundation itself was religious, for the city* [of Rome] *offered the gods of the people a permanent home* (May, 4-5).

Rome became, therefore, the city-home of the gods on earth. In the city's founding, aspects of the Western concept of authority were created and consolidated. Early Christianity developed and spread throughout Roman-legion-controlled lands. Roman political-religious concepts of ancient authority were grafted to ancient Hebraic concepts about the priest's and the king's God-given positional authority to guide and control the people's religious practice and social praxis.

Authority, unlike the use of coercion or persuasion (both events embodied in the present moment) has its roots, therefore, in the past. Authority in the Roman model (later adapted by early Christian leaders as applicable to the institutional Christian church) derived from the founding of the city of Rome. In Rome's founding stories, the gods delegated their divine authority to human beings so that these human ancestors would build the city of Rome. Once built and populated, this city would then become the Roman gods' earthly home. In such a model, human authority is always derivative from the the past and its dead (May, 5).

As tradition and power passed from generation to generation, authority rooted in an ancient and mythic past was preserved and institutionally embodied in each generation's present life and contemporary communities. One learned how to live a good life by listening to and obeying those who preserved and transmitted the wisdom of the pas as divinely-originated, infallible demands on the present (see also Robinson, 2008).

In 1992, May noted that this particular political understanding of a religious authority imperative from historical Rome passed, almost un-criticized by early Christian priests and theologians, into the socio-political and socio-theological foundations of the Christian community (5). Authority, indeed the religious impulse itself, was not, therefore, a direct, numinous personal encounter of individuals with their God. Rather, for the Christian laity, institutional Christianity became a humanly-mediated religious encounter with the divine. The ancient foundations of the institutional church's spiritual authority over the life and beliefs of ordinary lay individuals were placed inside the socio-political and cultural environments and ideologies about rule from ancient Rome. Even as Rome's political empire disintegrated and Roman secular rulers waned in power and influence, Rome's ideologies of institutional structure and religious authority were grafted whole into the Christian institution of the church. These ancient ideologies eventually evolved into a concept of church council and papal infallibility[16]. In theory and in practice doctrinal infallibility and religious leader authority provided an ideological foundation which served to unify the faithful, organize lasting structures of polity and leadership, and clarify the responsibilities of the clergy and laity in their relationships with God, the church, and one another.

After moving his headquarters of rule and power to the East, Emperor Constantine the first (CE 272-337) and the Church Council of Nicaea (CE 325) sought to unify the empire by privileging Christian faith as the religious glue that bound the empire together. Rome's ancient conceptual practice of human authority and obedience as a political *and* religious obligation were laid in the foundations of Christendom's newly acceptable socio-political and religious presence in Constantine's empire. Obedience by the majority to those in positions of authority thus obtained a central position in Christian theology. In this theology Christians owed obedience to the human leader of the empire (the emperor), the human leaders of the institutional church (the patriarchs and the bishops) and to the divine Lord. Nor only was the ordinary Christian obliged to obey God, he was also obliged to obey the Christian emperor and the collective power of the Church's human leaders. In addition, a Christian woman was required to obey her father, her husband, and in their absence, her oldest adult son. Minor children were at the bottom of the totem pole and were required to obey everyone in adult positions of authority over them. The consequence of disobedience inside such an understanding of the humanly-mediated

ordering of the divine will was banishment or death during life and eternity-long damnation in the afterlife.

By this means, obedience became a central unifying ideology of the emerging Christian church and subsequently Western culture as well. What did it mean to be a faithful Christian? Surrender, submission and obedience to Christ, to the ruler, to the religious hierarchy and to the paternal father came to be the central tenet of Christian faith and the central organizing factor in Christian community life. Obedience became established as the proper behavior for those in subordinate positions – whether these were foreign-born aliens, slaves, children, women or non-dominant men.

Religious Authority and Leader Infallibility

Infallible: incapable of error

Webster's New World Dictionary

Denzley (2007) traces development of the concept and practice of the Christian Bishop of Rome as God's chosen authoritative and theologically infallible ruler on earth. In her re-telling of Rome's Christian history, she relates the biographical story of Bishop Demasius (CE 303-384) and the history of fourth-century Rome and its Christian community.

As the son of a Christian priest, Bishop Damsius inherited his father's priestly role. During his childhood and adolescence, the newly Christianized city of Rome was divided by religious factionalism. Two bishops of Rome sat on their separate ecclesiastical thrones in two distinct zones of the city. The names of these two men were Liberius and Felix the third. Upon each man's death, the issue of succession arose. Christians in the city debated w*hich man is the legitimate bishop of Rome?* The followers of Liberius elected and installed Ursinus. The followers of Felix elected and installed Damasius. Two men (each claiming God's sole authority for himself) ruled a fractured but institutionally ambitious, Christian Church in Rome.

Bishop Demasius (in his ambitious desire to be the singular Bishop of Rome and to control the emerging Christian Church's ideology and financial resources) unleashed *the bloodiest outbreaks of Christian violence* [against other Christians] *that Rome had ever known* (177). On several occasions Bishop Damasius and his hired thugs massacred Christian followers of Ursinus. In addition, Demasius laid siege to the Basilica of St. John Lateran (which was already known among Roman Christians as the official seat of the Bishop of Rome).

By means of repeated massacres over a period of several years (massacres whose sole purpose was to destroy Ursinus' claim to the ecclesiastical position of bishop of Rome), Bishop Demasius eventually claimed the singular Roman bishop's throne for himself. He ruled with all of the power and authority of the Roman Christian Church at his command. Denzley continues:

> *It was a bitter lesson for the developing Christian community: no cost of human life was too great in the greater good of Christian "unity." Chief among Damasius' concerns was to see to it that the bishop of Rome was foremost among all of the bishops of the late empire – a position we call "Roman primacy." Because of the city's connection to both Saint Peter and to Saint Paul, Damasius was fond of referring to Rome as the "apostolic see." He was thus the first of the bishops of Rome to claim that of all of the bishops of the late empire, his was the most important. In effect, he began the process by which the pope became the unquestioned head of the Roman Catholic Church not just the bishop of Rome among a coalition of other powerful bishops reaching across a newly Christian Europe from Gaul to Syria, from the Danube to North Africa. In reality, the concept of a chief bishop – what we now call the pope – had to be developed and asserted* (178).

The mixture, therefore, of ideology (a unified Church) combined with the authority of a singular powerful bishop (authority reinforced by the application of murderous violence) consolidated the human position, power and authority of a singular Bishop of Rome. A theology soon developed in Rome that the Roman Bishop's power and authority were derived from God himself and were (retrospectively) witnessed to in canonical scripture.

This concept of derivative authority developed its full bloom after Constantine's political and doctrinal unification of the Christian church throughout his empire and after Demasius' solidification of church structures and hierarchy to do his will. From Bishop Demasius' era forward in history, the institutional Catholic Church increasingly imbued the Pope's human institutional authority with God's divine authority. After early and divisive – but decisive - councils of bishops, the concept of a single, ruling pope was ratified and in church theology tied the Roman papacy back to Christian scripture written centuries before: *Upon this rock* (Peter) *I build my church* (Mathew 16:18-19).

All subsequent powers and authority of the newly unified office, Bishop of Rome, from this historical moment in time became derivative. In this post-Constantinian historical moment of political intrigue, armed domination, murder, and imposed rule, bishops and priests of the Christian Church created the foundations of its ongoing institutional structure, mandate and internal culture. Unquestioning obedience to Church decrees and religious authorities became the required norm. The lesser clergy and laity now became, in ideological theology, obliged to submit to and obey their religious superiors as the proper response to religious rule on earth and the only pathway to salvation and life in heaven after death.

As the historical Christian Church grew in political power and as it consolidated its authority, the lesser clergy and the laity became more and more subservient to the demands of the institutional church's authoritarian power and its coercive practices of religious-political coercion. Obedience to the institutional hierarchy gradually and over time became equated with obedience to God. Disobedience to the hierarchy became associated with doctrinal heresy and disobedience to God. Hell's violence and torments awaited heretics in death but only after the earthly church's violence assaulted them during life.

Centuries later, threatened by the Protestant Reformation, the sixteenth-century Council of Trent re-affirmed the power and authority of the papacy, the church councils, and the bishops. The 19th-century doctrine of the pope's theological infallibility (1870) in matters of faith, doctrine and praxis follow directly from an ancestral lineage or religious orthodoxy that began with the claim of Pope Demasius to be the supreme and singular ruler of his fellow Christian bishops, priests and religious, and all of the laity.

Even in today's Roman Catholic Church obedience looms large as the central structuring force for ordained and non-ordained religious life (Doyle, July 13, 2008; Fox, 2011). Obedience remains a large socializing factor in the lives of seminarians and religious order novices (Armstrong, 2005; Carroll, 2009; Keiser, 2002). The demand for obedience is life long. Once ordained by and incardinated to a specific administrative bishop, a Roman Catholic priest is expected to obey him in all matters of faith and life (Carroll, 2009). At the time of his ordination, a priest vows obedience to the bishop of his incardination and to that bishop's successors. Bishops too vow obedience – this time directly to the Pope who appoints them and to all of the appointing pope's successors (Carroll, 2009; Fox, 2011).

During his American tour in 2008 Australian Roman Catholic Bishop Geoff Robinson commented upon the problem of *creeping infallibility.* As the Christian Roman Catholic Church moved through history many of its doctrines were not declared infallible but by weight of custom and practice they have assumed a mantle of infallibility because contemporary popes and the Vatican Curia do not wish to cast doubt on the sanctity of their predecessors. Likewise, they do not wish to question or change on-going customs and traditions initiated by their predecessors. Since history is inevitably untidy and full of contradictions, this means contemporary members of the hierarchy must revise history to protect their contemporary position and authority (Doyle, April 21, 2010). By the weight of historical accretion through the Christian centuries, therefore, theologies and spiritual praxis customs become reified as infallible without being declared as such by either church councils or popes.

It is a mistake to see this emphasis on Christian obedience as unique to the contemporary Roman Catholic Church. Almost every Christian denomination has orthodoxy and system obedience requirements for ordination or denominational leader administrative positions. Those religious beliefs seen as most central to Christian experience are enforced by doctrinal expectations of belief and submission to the ordaining body – whether this is a congregation, a diocese, or a denomination. This expectation for compliance, orthodoxy, and obedience is subsequently passed down from the administrative hierarchy to the ordinary Christian in the pews. Praying, paying and obeying as the expected spiritual works of the laity are not restricted to the Roman Catholic form of Christianity. These three are largely the expected behavior pattern for most members of the Christian laity in most denominations.

In the organized church's insistence upon obedience by the rank and file members the laity is expected to agree with and to live in accord with all of its church-mandated theologies and doctrines. Failure to obey in visible ways and the active presence of openly expressed dissent or "misbehavior" can lead to denominational discipline or even excommunication. Most Christians are taught from childhood on that only the church and in its doctrinal teachings can guarantee their salvation in the afterlife. Thus, for many Christian lay members of the Christian Church, excommunication by their church cuts them off not only from the spiritual and social resources of the church in this life but also from eternal salvation in the next.

The legacy of derived authority from the early church remains one important and influential concept of church theology and denominational polity. Passing on the authority of the past to present leaders is fundamentally the mystical and spiritual nature of ordination in all Christian denominations. While the universal church has splintered and re-splintered over the course of two Christian millennia, the concept of religious institution authority and religious leader authority and the church's demand for questioning obedience of the laity in matters of orthodoxy and praxis remain relatively intact.

The ideology of today's denominational churches regarding the temporal and spiritual authority of the institutional church and its ordained leaders remains, for the most part, derivative of this early Roman Catholic episcopate understanding of the relationship of religious leaders to the laity. Not only in the Roman Catholic Church are members of the laity expected to defer to members of the clergy. Salvation (and beliefs about salvation) continues to be mediated by the church – even in situations where individuals most proclaim their personal relationship to the divine as born again Christians.

Once denominationally ordained or credentialed, an individual's ordination sets the religious leader apart from ordinary people. In Shupe's (2008) sociological language and in May's (1992) theological language, the ordained individual becomes part of the religious elite whose authority is institutionally derivative rather than charismatic or personal. Consequently, he (or very recently she) is assumed by many members of the laity to have spiritual super-powers because of his (or her) closeness to the divine source of all religious authority. He or she becomes part of a small group of people whose religious teachings are to be seen as holding governing

authority for all members of the congregation or parish. By means of ordination and the granting of religious-spiritual authority ordained individuals become trusted representatives of the divine to ordinary people in the pews.

A certain tension is always present between the concept of a personal, direct and revelatory spiritual encounter with the divine and the necessity to have one's knowledge of the divine mediated by dogma, doctrine, theology, and above all, by the institutional church's authority. By the twenty-first century, the theological and doctrinal question remains: *By what authority?* Each maturing religious individual, in one way or another, faces this question as she or he determines the contours of personal experience and navigates her religious group's doctrinal requirements for belief and behavior.

The Central Dilemma of Religious Authority

> *Hypocritical religion is play-acting.*
>
> Gregory Baum[17]

In his biographical book, South African Episcopalian clergyman Michael Nuttal (2003) describes a very real dilemma he faced as the number two cleric in the South African Episcopal hierarchy. Archbishop Desmond Tutu on assuming the leadership of his church in South Africa asked Nuttall and others to advise him even *when their advice was painful to receive and their temptation was to remain in silence.* Nuttall adds, s*ilence was an easier option, or that respectful, even fearful deference to authority so well established within the life of the church* (29). In discussing his relationship with Tutu, he continues: *subconsciously we* [members of the South African Episcopal religious hierarchy and priests] *were faced with an intriguing question: how does one relate to a leader who has the world at his feet, or more subtly, how does one respond to the mystique of the prophet and the prophet's actions or utterances (29)?*

Nuttall has, I believe, captured an important element of religious authority. How, in situations of great positional authority and great personal charisma, are religious leaders to be held accountable for their actions by those who

are in subordinate roles and positions of lesser institutional influence or personal authority?   Seen, in general, as holding a position that represents and is derivative from God's authority, how are the Christian Church's human leaders to be held accountable by the vast majority of Christians – those who form the laity?

This question is glaringly present when powerful religious leaders abuse their position in acts of betrayal against those who are subordinated to them by church doctrine and practice.   Whether a leader is sexually abusive of those he is called, by his ordination, to serve or is administratively abusive to his subordinates, the questions about accountability loom large. The historical teachings of the Christian community about the divine source of human religious authority may mean that leader abuse can never be confronted appropriately.

Manifestations of Violence

> *The abuse of power …includes using and abusing others for one's own enhancement and to preserve power. Behind images of peace, altruism, love, non-violence, and saving the world, many groups used threats and violence to maintain obedience and protect themselves against what they perceived as danger to the group.*

<div align="center">

Joel Kramer and Diana Alstad[18]

</div>

Inside many of its contemporary denominational permutations, sexual abuse of the laity by Christian clergy and religious leaders is a significant problem. Religious institutions and their internal practices of self-institution protection in response to individual abusers exemplify a form of morally corrupted systemic oppression and structural violence known as clericalism (Doyle, July 22, 2006). Social psychologists Kelman and Hamilton (1989) use the terminology of *crimes of obedience* to describe similar forms of systemic corruption in corporate secular institutions while sociologist Shupe (2008) uses the language of *criminal malfeasance* to explain similar phenomena in a wide variety of religious organizations. These authors note an almost predictable regularity of criminal behavior within morally corrupt authoritarian religious institutions.

In terms of this manuscript, *one manifestation* of corrupted religious establishments is presence of an individual member of the clergy who sexually abuses his or her subordinates or individuals he has been called to serve in some manner or another. When sexual abuse perpetrators are not held fully accountable, in public, for their actions, their victim's need for justice and healing is abandoned. The victim's personal experiences of abuse and violation are exacerbated by inept or malicious institutional patterns of church management in which sexual abusers are excused from accountability for their abusive actions.

The *second manifestation* of corrupted religious establishments is found among administrators who seek to protect the religious organization, its financial resources, or even its spiritual teaching from scandal and from financial liability by protecting the perpetrator. When the goal is *preventing scandal* rather than stopping the abuse and providing help to the perpetrator's victim, the church becomes part of the problem. When administrators and personnel managers protect perpetrators and victimizers and the church as an institution from public accountability and financial liability, victims initially traumatized by events of clergy sexual abuse are subsequently re-traumatized by the supervising hierarchy of church related institutions (Berg, 2006; Berry, 2011; Doyle, July 13, 2008; P. Eisler (May 10, 2011).

A *third manifestation* lies in the institutional church's disregard for and active hostility towards individuals who seek to help victimized individuals find a meaningful and healing path into the future. These are the individuals I call witnesses. Others call them whistle blowers. They may be victim advocates, members of a victim's family, victims' lawyers, psychotherapists, or concerned and supportive lay individuals. In rare cases they may be dissenting members of the ministerial caste. In bearing witness to the original abuse and to the secondary abuse, they become targets for the hostility of the church and its leaders. Standing in solidarity with the victims of clergy sexual abuse and institutional clericalism, the witnesses become a secondary target of attack by institutional representatives, administrators, and church-hired lawyers or church-hired public relation firms (Stockton, 2000).

When religious institution professionals (1) sexually abuse others, (2) protect clergy sexual abusers and (3) attack whistle blowers, these

complex organizational behaviors create an unsafe and hostile religious environment for the laity.

Administrator and clergy personnel managers who refuse to appropriately discipline individual abusers facilitate the *sociological power of the predators…they manage to avoid social control* (Shupe, 2008, 179). By their refusal to act, appropriately, decisively, and compassionately administrators directly contribute to a sexual predator's continuing abuse of additional victims (Greeley, 2004a).

In addition, as concerned witnesses seek to change the patterns of clericalism in the direction of factual truth and moral behavior they too become victims. The secondary victims of abusive clericalism are the messengers, the whistle-blowers, or informed witnesses who seek to (1) make the sexual predator publicly accountable for his behavior, (2) correct or transform the institutional situation; (3) gain justice for the victims, and (4) avoid future victimization events of others. By drawing attention to the individual clergy abuser's misconduct *and* to the supervising institution's managerial misconduct, witnesses and whistle-blowers hope to transform the institutional church so that it can once again become a trustworthy place for spiritual and religious instruction and community.

In reading a wide variety of Roman Catholic authors regarding their church's contemporary sexual abuse and clericalism scandal, an important question arises: does individual or institutional concern over litigation and institutional fiscal liability issues trump the Church's concerns about spiritual and moral integrity; about accountability, justice, and righteousness; about restitution and forgiveness? This question is also visible just under the surface of the Mennonite Church's personnel actions with John Howard Yoder during the nearly thirty years that he sexually harassed and sexually abused adult women and during the nearly four years he was involved in a formal process of church discipline.[19]

All clergy sexual abuse and all systemic abuse in religious organizations violate individuals. These complex social abuse forms also violate entire communities of faith and spiritual practice. Both forms of abuse and violation are largely facilitated one individual's willingness to betray another human being's trust by enacting violence. In addition to human betrayal, truth is betrayed. Both forms of abuse (individual sexual abuse and

collective clericalism) constitute, therefore, very complex social patterns of interpersonal social violence.

In addition, when individual clergy sexual abuse is combined with religious institution clericalism and systemic abuse, religious institutions also betray the community's spiritual faith and religious teachings. All of these various manifestations of abuse betray and negate teaching about moral and ethical conduct with others. In this manner the spiritual and moral fitness of the whole is compromised.

Concluding Comments

In the Gospel of Matthew, Jesus instructs his disciples:

> *You are the salt of the earth but if the salt has lost his savor wherewith shall earth be salted? It is, therefore, good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under men's feet* (Mathew 5:13).

Sexual violence is one form of a control or obedience disorder in the life of the individual who rapes or otherwise sexually abuses others. The rapist abuses his power – whether this is the physical power of his body or the power of his position and authority – to take control of the life of another and damage it. He not only expects to be obeyed, by his abusive sexual behavior he demands total control over the other person and the interpersonal space between them. Sexual abuse is, therefore, one personal manifestation of authoritarianism. It is demonstrated in the microcosm of one abusive interpersonal encounter of the sexual abuser with his victim.

Religious or spiritual system clericalism is a second form of authoritarianism. It replicates the abuse of the individual perpetrator at a systemic level. Here too, we see obedience and control disorders writ large – now in the social macrocosm.

In addressing his church's sexual abuse crisis and scandal, Father Andrew Greeley noted (2004a) that Roman Catholic Church cardinals, bishops, diocesan priests, and religious brothers who accommodate and protect the actions of pedophiles and who hide awareness from the laity about the presence of sexual abusers of children in their parishes are each

considered in Roman Catholic moral theology and ecclesiology to share moral responsibility and moral accountability with the perpetrator for his actions. Sociologist Shupe (2008) notes that such individuals become criminal accomplices to the actions of the sexual abuse perpetrator they chose to shield, hide, and protect.

At the core of abusive authority is a demand for a well-conditioned, instantaneous, automatic, unquestioning obedience that includes deference to the wishes of another at the cost of one's own moral agency (Adorno, et. al., 1980, Armstrong, 2004; Fox, 1996, 2011; Kramer and Alstad, 1993; Soelle, 1992). Unexamined and unquestioned obedience forms, therefore, the core structure of individual and collective authoritarian consciousness. These rigid structures of a submissive consciousness subvert individuals' abilities to make moral decisions that require critical thinking.[20] [21] They vitiate an individual's ability to act courageously in the face of oppression and injustice. They predispose authoritarian individuals and organizations to behave abusively towards others who are weaker or vulnerable to abuse because of situational or developmental factors.

Individual and institutional demands for obedience without the possibility for questioning, the expression of doubt or the communicating of informed criticism function, therefore, as the most visible sign of authoritarianism in individuals and in organizations. Within authoritarian consciousness – whether individual or collective - individual and institutional forms of victimization of others become mirror images of each other. This is as true in the church as it is in multinational corporations or nation-state governments.

As we close this chapter, the words of Jewish Holocaust survivor and Nobel Prize winner Elie Wiesel come to mind: *Let us remember: What hurts the victim most is not the cruelty of the oppression but the silence of the bystander.*[22]

Recommended Supplemental Readings

6) Armstrong, K. (2004). The Spiral Staircase: My Climb Out of Darkness. New York, NY: Anchor Books.

7) Chodas, R. (2004). God Does Not Require Obedience: He abhors it in J. H. Ellens (Ed). *The Destructive Power of Religion: Violence in Judaism, Christianity and Islam: Contemporary Views on Spirituality and Violence* (Vol. 4: *Contemporary Views on Spirituality and Violence,* 77-110). Westport CT: Praeger.

8) Eisler, P. *USA Today* (May 10, 2011). Church abuse cases and lawyers an uneasy mix.   Retrieve from http://www.usatoday.com/news/religion/2011-05-09-vienna-virginia-church-abuse-case-lawyers-insurers_n.htm#uslPageReturn

9) Kramer, J. and Alstad, D. (1993). *The Guru Papers: Masks of authoritarian power.* Berkeley, CA: Frog, Ltd.

10)   Robinson, G. (2008). *Confronting Power and Sex in the Roman Catholic Church.* Retrieve from http://www.bishopgeoff_robinson.org_usa_lecture.htm

11)   Sipe, A. W. R. (June 1, 2010). *Sex, Obedience and Discourse.* Retrieve from http://www.richardsipe.com/Media/2010-06-02-ncr.htm

12)   Soelle, D.   (1992). *Beyond Mere Obedience.* (L. W. Denef, Trans.). New   York, NY: Pilgrim

13)   Eisler, P. (May 10, 2011). *USA Today.* Church abuse cases and lawyers an uneasy mix. Retrieve from http://www.usatoday.com/news/religion/2011-05-09-vienna-presbyterian-church-abuse-case-la

Personal Reflection Questions

1) In your personal experiences with life to date, how do you understand and describe the relationship between a direct personal encounter with God to a relationship mediated by a denomination, church, parish, or other religious organization? Take some time to write in your notebook about what you know and believe about this relationship of immanent, numinous spirituality and organized religion.

2) Think about your own religious life and your personal spirituality. What or whom do you obey? When you obey, what is your personal reason for doing so? Is it, for example, fear of hell? Or is it fear of displeasing some authority figure, for example, your parents? There are many good or useful reasons to obey religious, familial, or secular authorities. Think through your own personal choices of obedience and disobedience. When you are ready write several paragraphs that describe and explain your personal behavior with others who claim to have positions of authority in your life. Be as specific as possible.

3) What do you personally believe to be the roots of clergy sexual abuse?. Spend some time thinking about this question and talk about it with your classmates and your friends. When you are ready, write several paragraphs to describe and explain your opinions and beliefs. Be as specific as possible.

4) What is your opinion of the position taken by the World Health Organization which claims that in order to prevent any form of violence from happening one must examine its ideological taproots inside the culture where this particular form of violence occurs? Once again, spend some time thinking about this question and talk about it with your classmates and friends. Once you are ready, write a few paragraphs in your notebook in which you identify and explain your personal position.

5) If you agree with the World Health Organization that cultural ideologies must be examined as one root of violence, what is your opinion about specific ideologies, beliefs, and practices which support clergy sexual abuse of members of the laity? Make a list and explain why you believe these ideas and beliefs are issues which need to be examined and addressed.

6) If you do not agree, then describe your own opinions about ways to lessen sexual and systemic forms of violence inside religious institutions. Once again, make a list and then explain your ideas.

Footnotes

[1] Henry Gleitman, 1986. 396-397.

[2] Attributed to Stanley Milgram by John Dean, 2006, 40.

[3] Walter Wink, 1998, 20.

[4] Walter Wink, 1998, 39.

[5] My friend, a successful and well-respected CEO of a large ecumenical religious organization wishes to remain anonymous.

[6] Joel Kramer and Diana Alstad, 1993, 65.

[7] Gregory Baum, 2007, 77.

[8] A world view, according to Walter Wink (1998, 14-22), dictates the way entire societies perceive the world. They are, in Wink's words, *the bare-bone structures with which we [humans] think. They are the foundation of the house of our minds on which we erect symbolic myths and systems of thought* (14). By means of our collection of world views, we make sense of the worlds we perceive – the interior world and the exterior world.

[9] Walter Wink, 1998, 35.

[10] Yevgeny Alexandrovich Yevtushenko quoted in Matthew Fox, 1996), 238.

[11] Personal conversations, Goshen College, Goshen, IN, ca 1991.

[12] Dorothee Soelle, 1882, xiii.

[13] J. Harold Ellens, 2004, Vol. 4, 6.

[14] This general comment excludes small groups such as Coptic Christians who claim an alternative history

[15] Roland H. Bainton, 1986, 14. Bainton's quote appears in his study of war and peace inside Christendom's boundaries.

[16] Papal infallibility was formally established at the First Vatican Council on July 18, 1870. An infallible teaching of the Pope is therefore not only without error, *it is exempted from the possibility of error.* It is, therefore, a teaching which is binding on all Catholics forever and cannot change (*Catholic Encyclopedia Online).*

[17] Gregory Baum, 2007, 68.

[18] Joel Kramer and Diana Alstad, 1993, 51.

[19] For a discussion of the role played by the insurance industry vis-à-vis institutional liability insurance, see P. Eisler, May 10, 2011 in his discussion of clergy sexual abuse and religious institution liability. In the background of this article is the decision of the Vienna Presbyterian Church (Vienna, VA) ministry team to both acknowledge specific acts of clergy abuse done by clergy and to offer public apologies. For more information see the April 2, 2011 issue of the *Washington Post* for its coverage of the Vienna Presbyterian Church's decision-making process and public apology.

[20] Karen Armstrong's 2004 autobiography of her experiences as a convent novice and her life after leaving the convent describes the after-effects of the convent's novice supervisory and her authoritarian conditioning of Armstrong to automatic obedience to her religious superiors. Armstrong writes, *an institution is supposed to make you self-reliant, but mine had made me dependent. As I struggled to fill the requisite number of pages, I had to face the grim fact that I no longer had ideas of my own. Indeed I had been carefully trained not to have them (32).* As I read Armstrong's autobiography, I wondered whether or not the contemporary Roman Catholic sexual abuse and clericalism scandal represents a pervasive personal obedience and control disorder or a personal-institutional pathology that results in faulty spiritual formation in which mindless and repetitive obedience for obedience's sake is stressed. The consequence of this kind of spiritual formation is a mindless legalism and a dead (or dying) spirituality. Internally numbed in one's inner life and refused personal conscience and moral agency, it seems to me as if an additional consequence is that one becomes numb and unable to feel compassion for others. When the consequences of thinking for oneself or expressing personal doubt about the wisdom of some action or teaching result in social ostracism from the very community in which one has invested one's vowed

life of service to God, then the consequences of disobedience to one's religious superiors take on cosmic proportions. Armstrong's reflections document the dulling of her own critical thinking abilities, her abilities to write clearly, and an impairment of her own personal moral sensibilities as a consequence of this faulty theology and spiritual praxis of demanded automatic obedience to a human supervisor.

[21] James Carroll's 2009 autobiography describes his strong negative reaction to early personal and clerical encounters with Paulist religious brothers and their alcoholic hazes in the privacy of the order's rectory in Boston. One wonders how much clergy alcoholism is an attempt to further numb the ordained individual's moral awareness of evils in the system which s/he feels cannot be openly addressed due to entrained patterns of required obedience and fear of systemic and economic or professional retaliation. To be fully and maturely alive, individuals need to be able to think for themselves and to make choices about many things – including their sexuality. To be a whistle blower one must be both morally outraged and courageously principled. One must be willing to be disobedient and go against group opinion. Groomed systemically to automatic, unquestioning obedience, an individual clergy person perhaps cannot and does not develop the mature sequential skills of paying attention, noticing, analyzing, questioning and deciding to engage in intentional, principled disobedience. Noticing that one's inner world is psychically numb or even spiritually dead, it is an easy step to physically numb and cover-over this awareness by various addictions: alcohol and drugs, television, computer games, sexual misconduct, pornography, etc.

[22] On the internet, this quotation is widely attributed to Wiesel. I have been unable to locate its original source.

- 8 -

The Perplexing Issue of Religious Authoritarianism

Few things have done more harm than the belief on the part of individuals or groups (or tribes or states or nations or churches) that he or she or they are in the sole possession of the truth: especially about how to live, what to be and do – and that those who differ from them are not merely mistaken, but wicked or mad: and need retraining or suppressing. It is a terrible and dangerous arrogance to believe that you alone are right: have a magical eye which sees the truth, and that others cannot be right if they disagree.

Isaiah Berlin[1]

Introductory Comments

We [theologians} *must ask ourselves what is in our religious tradition that has prompted hatred for outsiders and justified violent actions against them.*

Gregory Baum[2]

As seen in the preceding two chapters, the presence of personal and positional authority informed by or motivated by personal needs to control others is an essential component of abusive interpersonal behavior. Western social sciences (psychology, social psychology, and sociology) identify the personal and institutional dynamic of authoritarianism as a destructive subversion of legitimate and needed interpersonal and social authority.

Authoritarian individuals and authoritarian institutions share an ideology of unquestioning and absolute obedience. An underlying psycho-social dynamic of authoritarian ideology and behavior is the need for power and total control by one individual or group of individuals.

Before proceeding further, it is important to note that not all leadership inside hierarchical organizations is authoritarian. It is also important to note that not all authoritarian patterns of governance are at all times inappropriate. There are situations where having someone take absolute control may save lives. A police officer, arriving at the scene of a multi-car and truck pile up on a major interstate highway, needs to take control and he needs unquestioning obedience to his directives from everyone in order to ensure the common safety of all. Such a dangerous situation does not call for convening a committee or developing a collective consensus about how to proceed. A similar situation exists in the chaotic aftermath of natural disasters such as devastating floods, fires or earthquakes. If no one takes command of the situation, the losses of human life will be magnified. In emergency situations, therefore, someone needs to assume the role of leadership and "being-in-control" and that individual needs to be perceived and accepted as having the authority to do so.

In addition, not all authoritarian leadership is un-remedially corrupted by power and unresponsive to the needs and rights of subordinates. Nor are all authoritarian administrators totalitarian dictators.

That said, however, authoritarianism is a dangerous social pattern of collective governance and rule. It shifts easily into individual and systemic abuses of authority and power. It also lives in close proximity with moral or ethical corruption. It taps into powerful, well-socialized needs of subordinates to defer, obey, surrender, yield, and submit to the will of those they perceive to be authorities (Kramer and Alstad, 1993) In authoritarian social structures subordinates often believe that moral agency for their actions in carrying out orders rightfully belong to their superiors. Therefore, in morally-compromised situations, subordinates do not raise questions, dissent, report to civil authorities,, or in any way challenge and confront misbehavior of their superiors and peers. In this manner they become complicit participants in unethical, morally-compromised, or criminal actions.

Individual Sexual Abuse

Individual sexual abuse is a power and control violation. When religious professionals sexually abuse others who are in subordinate positions to

them (for example, a teacher-student or a priest-parish member), it is also a position and authority violation. The perpetrator's violation of his victim's body/self[3] represents (1) a deep-seated personal need to control and dominate his selected victims *and* (2) his choice of a methodology for satisfying this personal need or drive to gain dominance.

Lodged within this assertion is a clinical observation that the presence of many psychodynamic driving forces is represented in most human behaviors. Very rarely is human behavior motivated by one un-conflicted motivator or driving force. The personal need for power and control is only one such dynamic driving force seen in the personalities of authoritarian individuals. The need to control others can be accompanied by *acquired situational narcissism characterized by a sense of entitlement, superiority, lack of empathy, impaired moral judgment and self-centeredness (Sipe, October 15, 2011, 4).*

Institutional Structural Abuse: Clericalism

Institutions are driven by complex social forces and individuals inside a wide variety of institutions rarely recognize or understand cultural climate activators for complex forms of institutional behavior such as corporate malfeasance and clericalism (Adorno, et. al., 1989; Asch, 1956; Gleitman, 1986; Milgram, 1974; Zimbardo, 1988, 2008). The interplay of individual motivation (such as a need to gain and maintain power and social prestige) with social forces (such as organizational policy or even legal codes and regulations from an external system) creates a systemic organization that is multi-dimensional. To both insiders and outsiders the system may be, therefore, incomprehensible in its totality. Ethical or moral responsibility and accountability may be very diffuse and lodged within multiple levels of organizational policy, culture and supervisor responsibility. Multiple and conflicting (at times even mutually hostile) forces for dominance, control and influence can be overt and visible or covert and almost impossible to discern.

Institutional religious system abuse, i. e., clericalism, is a specific form of corporate criminal malfeasance. It represents a complex pattern of social and interpersonal violence that includes misuse of socio-institutional position authority as well as the personal authority and charisma of individuals. The authority to command others' work in order to meet

legitimate institutional goals is often diffuse and shared by a wide variety of individuals. Delegated authority and power exists at all levels of an organizational hierarchy. In large corporate bodies, legitimate systemic authority is rather easily re-defined and re-directed by individuals and groups toward behavior which is not legitimate, moral or ethical. Subordinates may be abused in the name of authority. Individuals external to the system can also be abused. Social psychologists call this form of corrupted institutional behavior a *crime of obedience (*Kelman and Hamilton, 1989). In situations where such criminal behavior is subsequently covered-up by perpetrators and their associates, not only those who *did* acts of wrong-doing are morally culpable: those internal witnesses or silent others who protect wrong-doers from accountability are also morally responsible for the wrong-doing. Sociologists identify these silent and un-protesting complicit witnesses as *criminal accomplices* (Shupe, 2008).

Therefore, institutional religious abuse of employees and members of the laity also represents a authoritarian power and control violation. The demand for absolute loyalty and unquestioning obedience; the presence of reverential deference by subordinates to their superiors; and strong personal needs not to "rock the boat" by dissent are several markers or identifiers of authoritarian institutions. More accurately put, these are the signs of corrupted institutions populated by authoritarian leaders and their subordinates.

Victim Experiences

This goal of gaining dominance over the body/self of his victim is viscerally and intuitively understood by many, perhaps all, victims of sexual abuse. Part of the fear and terror of being raped is a response to violence directed at ones self. The visceral and cognitive awareness that sexual violence is being used in the service of the victimizer's drive to completely control his victim and to prevent her from leaving the violent situation to find safety is well-known by victims. The cold fury or heated rage of the victimizer transmits itself across the permeable barriers of individual consciousness. Isolated in situations where there is no rescuing intervention by others, victims of sexual abusers usually have no way of knowing during a violent encounter whether or not they will survive it. Entrapped in the violence of the attack, victims have no power to contain, limit, or control their abuser's violence.

Gaining total control by sexual violence demonstrates an abuser's willingness to use whatever markers of personal identity and authority he possesses in the service of domination. The threat of more violence in the service of maintaining control over his victims is always present whether or not it is explicitly stated (West, 1999).

In situations of personal violence, one emotional experience of victims is fear or terror. Another is helpless rage. Unable to flee or to successfully fight back, the individual freezes in place (Levine, 1997, 2005, 2010). In situations where sexual violence represents acquaintance abuse, trust betrayal adds a sense of confusion and an inability to make sense of what is happening. The ability to create an accurate historical narrative of the victim's life experience is often distorted. Underlying these intense emotional and cognitive experiences is the social reality of disempowerment. Individual authoritarian abusers actively dismantle their victim's personal ability to successfully protect the self. Absolute control, victim obedience, (unresisting victim compliance) and disempowerment are therefore, the goals of sexual predator victimization.

Victims of systemic or structural religious abuse inevitably experience social events of victimization as personal. While this is easily understood in situations of a contact or non-contact harassment violation, it is less easily understood when victims are targeted by collective systemic oppression. In situations of structural abuse, there is a somewhat personalized, yet very diffuse, sense that in some way or another, the victim is responsible for his victimization by members of the social order. In general, therefore, the victim is subjected to social ostracism or blaming and shaming activities. She may also blame herself for other's actions towards her.

Only when victims begin to see the social structures as providing pseudo-legitimacy to abusive authoritarian leaders can they begin to critique the system. Only when they speak up and begin to encounter others similarly abused do they begin effectively to embody the collective powers of the weak: disbelief and coming together (Janeway (1981). These two powers form the foundation from which they can begin to re-empower themselves and others. This is the foundation for beginning to dismantle their abuser's control over them.

A Hypothetical Example

When one thinks, for example, of a hypothetical corporate religious body composed of millions of individuals in a world wide organization controlled by a very small coterie of well-educated, physically comfortable, socially-connected, very powerful (but abusive) ordained leaders and administrative managers, it becomes essential to give up simplistic notions of reform. If, in addition, we know that this abusive and cohesive managerial coterie individually and collectively proclaim the ideology that the organization's presiding elder or coalition of chief executive officers has an infallible connection to a divine supernatural being in whose name he or they rule, one begins to understand that facile understandings of religious authoritarianism do not serve the long-range goals of violence prevention, the creation of a safe and trust-worthy religious clergy, and the development of a healthy, compassionate, and mature lay member spirituality.

If in addition, we factor in immense financial assets in money and real estate and the economic reality that these assets are all centrally located and controlled by a very small number of individuals even though they have been created or purchased with the tithes and gifts of ordinary members of this religious organization, abusive behavior becomes even more complex to understand, Add to this beginning profile the socio-cultural reality that thousands of ordained clergy and members of the hierarchy in this world-wide religious corporation have sexually abused children, adolescents and adults and have engaged in financial chicanery or embezzlement in order to prevent any lay or public awareness.

Finally, factor in the ruling elders' connections (both personal and political) with other ruling elites of the world's nation states and multi-national corporations. The sum totality of these multiple forms of authority, power and connectedness means that government bodies and media are hesitant to reveal what they know for fear of being voted out of office or successfully sued. Authoritarian institutions and leaders both tend to be protected by the surrounding social order from negative publicity about ethically corrupted or criminal behaviors. Both tend to escape the application of negative sanctions for their behavior.

When sexual abuse of subordinates or others is done by privileged members of the protected elites in this organization, those who allege such

violations tend to be discounted as bearing false witness. If the allegations have significant credibility, the organization may attack whistleblowers, witnesses, or victims financially. When absolutely needed in order to control damaging allegations and keep them a secret, secret financial settlements may be transacted in which silence is bought.

Over time, a corporate social climate develops and perpetuates itself. Abusive individuals inside the protective boundaries of the organization are institutionally protected from publicity and full accountability for their actions. They are given protection to avoid prosecution by civil authorities, in order to preserve the institution's image in the world, to prevent scandal, and to maintain the power of those who are in control of the religious institution.

When such a profile (created by combining several religious groups and organizations) is abstractly created and described, it becomes clear that this corporate religious entity transcends the simple sum total of its participating individuals and its leaders' proclamations of a pious religious ideology of obedience and forgiveness. A too-sure notion of one individual leader as the sole source of corruption, criminality, abuse of the collective whole, and violence against victims and whistle-blowers is naïve. So too is the belief that one person can change such a complex corporate culture with the use of his pen and personal authority.

The Powers

> Secrets (not truth) confirm power. Secrecy is the major tool of clerical control and its operational imperative.

<div align="center">A. W. Richard Sipe[4]</div>

In his important trilogy of books about individual and collective good and evil, Walter Wink (1985, 1989, 1992)[5] utilizes biblical and theological language to elucidate his contention that (1) the social powers are good, *created in, though, and for Christ* (*1992, 63-68*); (2) these same powers are fallen and the presence of evil is within and *among* us (68-73) and (3) the powers are redeemable and can be transformed and redeemed (83-85).

Wink quotes sociologist Peter Blau:

> *Once firmly organized, an organization tends to assume an identity of its own which makes it independent of the people who have founded it or of those who constitute its membership (81).*

In Wink's discussion of human organizations, he correctly notes, I think, (1) that individuals occupy institutions and (2) that institutions also simultaneously occupy individuals. Individual human consciousness participates in the structuring of the collective but the collective also participates in the structuring of individual consciousness (77-85). Good *and* evil take up residence inside individual lives and collective institutions. This is as true for religious organizations as it is for secular ones. It is as true in small organizations as in very large ones. All individuals and institutions live within the organizing social culture or ethos of their time in history. They both reflect this culture and participate in its maintenance and promulgation.

Well established organizations take on a life of their own. Leaders come and leaders go. Some leaders may be just and fair-minded while other leaders may be corrupt and oppressive. But the accrued weight and wisdom of organizational cultures reveal, if one is attentive, that what is important to organizations qua organizations is to sustain themselves by any means necessary. In general, this means promoting, accepting and utilizing authoritarian forms of governance.

Authoritarianism Described

> *Unfortunately there are priests that aim at becoming bishops, and they succeed. There are bishops who don't speak out because they know they will not be promoted to a higher see, or it will block their candidacy for the cardinalate. This type of clericalism is one of the greatest ills in the church today. It stops priests and bishops from speaking the truth and induces them into doing and saying only what pleases their superiors.*

> Carlo Maria Martina[6]

In his 2006 book *Conservatives without a Conscience* political analyst and author John Dean describes the role of authoritarianism in the United States. In his introductory remarks, Dean claims that 25% of the American population can be identified in one way or another as authoritarian conservatives. He continues

> *Regrettably, empirical studies reveal, however, that authoritarians are frequently enemies of freedom, antidemocratic, antiequality (sic), highly prejudiced, mean-spirited, power-hungry, Machiavellian and amoral. They are often conservatives without conscience who are capable of plunging this nation into disasters the like of which we have never known (xii).*

Throughout the book Dean builds upon contemporary social psychology research about authoritarianism. To assist him in his discussion of political trends, he created a typology of authoritarian personality styles. I paraphrase and supplement Dean's work below since I wish to adapt his work about authoritarianism inside the political nation-state and apply it to religious corporations, leaders, and followers.

Within authoritarian organizations, there are individuals who seek to be in positions of authority and to exercise power over others. Rather than submit to others, they wish to be in a position of control where others submit to them. They seek influence, authority and power so that they can induce others to submit to them.

Inside authoritarian organizations there are also individuals with authoritarian personalities who submit to other's authority. They obey authority figures without questioning. These obedient followers or subordinates populate the lower administrative ranks as well as constituting the majority of authoritarian individuals. These are the individuals who will follow authoritarian dictates without question simply because, in their perception, they have an obligation to obey authority figures in the chain of command above them. Kelman and Hamilton (1989, 107-122) remind us that in this group of followers, there are *rule-oriented authoritarians* whose primary concern is to know the rules and to follow them unquestioningly, *role-oriented authoritarians* whose primary concern is with role and position and who follow, therefore, leaders in superior roles over them – also without questioning them, and *value-oriented authoritarians* who obey

because they share similar values and belief structures with those in positions of power.

Value-oriented authoritarians are, in my opinion, the true believers in various forms of authoritarian-supportive ideology and are, therefore, the most committed followers of authoritarian leaders. Having no doubts and no questions about either authoritarian ideology or authoritarian leaders, they personify Berlin's commentary above.

Finally, there is a category of individuals whom Dean calls proto-fascist leaders. He claims that these individuals have no morals and no conscience, in short, no personal integrity. Clinically we might call these individuals by the old diagnostic terms of psychopaths or sociopaths. The pattern here is one in which the ideology of order and in-group safety trumps concerns over human freedom and human rights. Gaining and keeping positions of authority by any means possible is the goal of these individuals. Secrecy, violations of the common social code of human respect for others, the deliberate spreading of lies and disinformation, malicious and hostile character assassination of enemies, Machiavellian manipulative behavior to divide and control dissent, and, where both useful and possible, torture, assassinations and other forms of violence are all in evidence as tools of authoritarian governance and the maintenance of systems of control over others.

A summary of the behaviors seen among authoritarian individuals in the political sphere is, I believe, instructive to any discussion of religious authoritarianism in individuals and in religious corporations. If, as Dean claims, 25% of all Americans are authoritarian in their orientation to authority, then it is likely that this percentage of individual authoritarians is present within American religious organizations as well.

Authoritarian Behavior

> *The larger challenges of the [sexual abuse} crisis are not limited to behaviors but impinge on the structure of ministry.*

> A. W. Richard Sipe[7]

194

What then is authoritarian behavior? How does authoritarianism operationally manifest itself in human relationships and human organizations?

The composite summary of authoritarian behaviors which follows below is mine. It builds, however, on works by Arendt (1969a, 1969b), Dean, 2006; Fox, 2011; Keen, 2006a; Kelman and Hamilton, 1989; Kramer and Alstad, 1993; Milgram, 1974; Shupe, 1995, 1998, 2008, 2011; Sipe, (October 15, 2011); and Soelle (1992).

First, we see patterns of social and hierarchical domination by those in control and patterns of instantaneous obedient surrender and submission by those who are controlled. Personal moral agency is regarded as lodging within the individual in the superior position. The most important determinant or requirement of authoritarian leaders and systems is for subordinates to obey their superiors without challenging them (or their orders), in short for unquestioning obedience. *Obedience for obedience's sake* is, therefore, the keystone or cornerstone of authoritarian consciousness. Its presence is the definitive or identifying mark of authoritarian individuals and systems.

Secondly immoral or illegal behavior on the part of authoritarian leaders includes the (1) manipulation of truth for political and/or self-serving purposes; (2) lying, spreading disinformation and defactualization in regards to truth; (3) dehumanization of others (most especially those seen as enemies); (4) character assassination and bearing false witness against those seen as opponents; (5) financial chicanery and economic manipulation in the service of maintaining power and control - that behavior which Shupe (1995, 1998, 2008, 2011) calls criminal malfeasance (see also, Berry, 2011); (6) narcissistic and aggressive prejudice against racial minorities, sexual minorities, the handicapped, the weak, the vulnerable, the powerless, and the impoverished (Dean, 2006); (7) mean-spirited, non-compassionate and non-empathic responses to the troubles of others and a willingness to exploit those troubles for personal and institutional gain; (8) strong coercive attempts to silence all dissent (Fox, 2011) and is (8) ideologically militant (Fox, 2011; Yallop, 2007, 2010).

In terms of the political order, these individuals may or may not be religious. However, in the context of religious organizations, these individuals are the

prototypical religious ideologues who demand conformity to their version of religious truth. Legalistic attempts to control others abound.

Finally, we note behavior on the part of followers that includes (1) ceding one's personal moral agency for one's own behavior to one's superiors; (2) an absence of compassionate empathy for others; (3) an inability or unwillingness to take personal responsibility for one's own behavior and its consequences in the lives of others; (4) dishonesty and telling other people what they want to hear rather than the truth, lack of personal integrity; (5) protects superiors; (6) toadying behavior towards individuals in positions of authority and power over them; (7) mean-spirited, often dehumanizing behavior towards others in the power chain below them: decision-making guided by self-protective processes; (8) easily makes enemies of those who are different in some way from them; (9) authoritarian followers willingly dehumanize and demonize others and are willing, actively or passively, to sabotage the lives and careers of individuals below them in the chain of command in the service of obedience to their superiors.

In the religious community these are the individuals who follow powerful, oftentimes charismatic, abusive leaders and who defend them and protect them from all criticism. These are the individuals who have no qualms about trashing the lives and careers of their peers or those who are less powerful than they are in order to gain positions of power and influence. These are the individuals who strongly believe in the orthodox ideologies of control which they both admire and follow without question.

To summarize: authoritarian leaders and their followers can both engage in dishonest, bullying, narrow-minded, intolerant, zealous, dogmatic, and highly hostile legalistic behavior towards others. Individuals in both sub-groups can be hypocritical and deeply un-self-aware in interpersonal encounters with others whom they seek to control. Both groups expect and demand unquestioning loyalty to the organization or to its leaders (most often, both). Leaders and followers both tend to be strict disciplinarians in their family lives and in their organizational lives. Individuals in both groups tend to lack empathy for the situations of others and are often actively hostile to and aggressive towards individuals and communities which are, in some way or another, weak and vulnerable to attack. The most vicious hostility of authoritarian individuals, however, is reserved for those who dissent, who question, who support the vulnerable, and who seek to know the truth of any given situation. The authoritarian push-back in any situation

which threatens the status quo of dominance and power-over is likely to be immediate and directed towards immobilization of criticism and destruction of any impetus towards reform or a change in direction towards more openness, more transparency, and more integrity of governance.

Psychological Mechanisms in Play

> *Repression is a seamless garment, a society which is authoritarian in its social and sexual codes, which crushes its women beneath the intolerable burdens of honor and property, breeds repression of other kinds as well. Contrariwise, dictators are always – or at least in public, on other people's behalf, - puritanical.*

Salmon Rushdie[8]

Personal Predispositions towards Authoritarianism

North American clinical psychologist Robert Grant (1994-1995) has worked with hundreds of Roman Catholic ordained priests and religious (vowed monks and nuns) as a clinical consultant in spiritual formation activities and therapy. In his perception dogmatic and authoritarian parents are *often the most abusive individuals in a child's life history*. He writes: r*igid spiritual, political, economic, and child-raising beliefs can dominate every aspect of daily life in these families. Everything can be subordinated to the rigid "belief system" (17).* Continuing his discussion of abusive families, he writes: S*ome of the cruelest and most sadistic forms of child pedagogy are carried out in the name of preserving a "higher order." Hell and damnation are frequently utilized to back up a variety of distorted beliefs (17).*

In adult life their choice of a religious vocation, Grant notes, individuals religiously and physically abused (perhaps sexually abused as well) in childhood often express self-righteousness and a deep-seated fear of non-believers or others who do not share their rigid belief system. Noting that a rigid, authoritarian orthodoxy is evidenced in many forms of religious fundamentalism, Grant believes that abusive, authoritarian, and rigid familial patterns of child discipline prepare the future priest or religious for an equally rigid and authoritarian religious vocation.

Grant writes that the role of authoritarian religious beliefs is deeply implicated in the spiritual formation and the psychological formation of a religious professional who, in the course of his ministry, becomes abusive to others. Abused in childhood or adolescence by adult authorities (parents, teachers, priests) who presided over his behavioral, emotional and religious life, the now-grown-up child becomes, in turn, an abusive adult.

Grant's observations are supported by clinical literature (A. Miller, 1980a, 1980b, 1983, 1990, 1991; by social science research (Adorno, et. al., 19990; Milgram, 1974); and by Roman Catholic sexual abuse victim advocates (Sipe, April 28, 2010, September 6, 2011).

Psychological Mechanisms

According to social psychology literature, a variety of psychological mechanisms come into play when individuals within authoritarian systems enact unjust, openly repressive, illegal or immoral behaviors towards other individuals. The following operate, usually outside conscious awareness of individual and collective violence perpetrators, but are, nevertheless, visible in authoritarian individuals and socially deviant and oppressive organizations.

- o Creation of an enemy inside the individual or collective human mind (Keen, 2006a): To do this, individuals engage in a process of internal psychological manipulation that allows them to keep their self-esteem intact and thus they become able to rationalize, in the name of control, security, and safety, nasty, violent, abusive, or unjust behaviors towards others.

- o A sense of authorization, preferment or entitlement: Individuals in the power position believe it is their privilege, right, obligation, or duty to command and enforce obedience in their subordinates (Cozzens, 2002, May 17, 2010). As part of their positional authority and control, they believe that they are entitled to institutional privileges denied to ordinary people (i.e., the laity) such as deferential reverence from others, immunity from criminal prosecution, and use of communal financial resources for self-aggrandizement and self-protection.

o The processes of dehumanization in which individuals stop seeing others as fully human: There is a noted lack of empathy for others. To successfully dehumanize another means that their humanity and human characteristics are erased. Those who dehumanize others have lost the awareness that everyone shares a common humanity (Zimbardo, 1988). Processes of dehumanization strip people of their identity and their interconnected community of meaning, values, and relationship with others (Hamilton and Kelman, 1989, 19-20).

o Processes of routinization frequently accompany dehumanization: Routinization is a process in which people become involved in action without considering its implications or consequences and without really making a formal decision to proceed. Processes of routinization (1) allow individuals to avoid moral decision-making and (2) allow individuals to avoid confrontation with the consequences of their actions (Hamilton and Kelman, 17-18).

o Another mechanism that is often activated is a process of deindividuation: By means of anonymity and secrecy, individuals develop a sense of not being personally responsible or socially accountable for his choices and behaviors. Lost within the collective, individuals become faceless actors (Gleitman, 1986, 401). When individuals cease being recognized as individuals and w*hen responsibility is diffused, potential victims cannot identify the source of [the problematic] behavior and authority figures cannot identify the source. As a result, the probability for anti-social acts increases* (Zimbardo, 1988, 660). Cloaked in anonymity and secrecy and unable to be personally recognized as the source of anti-social behavior, the human personality is freed to engage in actions she might not do or consider doing (Festinger, quoted in Zimbardo, 1989, 660).

o Increased social distance also plays a role: The greater the social distance, the greater the likelihood there is that individuals will be able to separate their own behavior from awareness of its consequences in the lives of others. The other's suffering remains invisible, and therefore, non-existent to the offending individual. This distance can be physical or psychological. It can be the distance of widely divergent social status. It can be induced by uniforms or, I add, clerical garb (Gleitman, 1986, 401; Grossman, 1995).

o Processes of moral disengagement come into play: Active violence against individuals and groups requires more than simple dehumanization. Moral disengagement is accomplished by techniques that disconnect reprehensible conduct (and its active harm) *from the usual moral standards and internal controls* that prohibit such inhuman behavior (Zimbardo, 1988, 665). One way to accomplish this is to create and use euphemistic code language which can make evil deeds seem benign or perhaps even good (Doyle, Sipe, and Wall, 2006, Sipe, March 5, 2010).

o Victims are frequently blamed for their experience of victimization: The psychological maneuver known as blaming the victims is almost omnipresent in situations of individual clergy sexual abuse and systemic clericalism (Burgess and Holmstrom, 1979; Krall, 1990; Lerner and Simons, 1958; van der Kolk, et. al., 1996).

o Defense mechanisms of repression, rationalization and projection are utilized by the personality to avoid becoming fully aware of its own actions: By such a means individuals can avoid cognitive dissonance in which their ideals and behavior are destructive ones (Adorno, et. al., 1980; Cameron, 1963; Hofling and Leininger, 1967; Kopp, 1972)

o Finally, Zimbardo (1988, 662) notes the importance of emergent norms inside social groups: Seen in conjunction with other psychological processes such as dehumanization, emergent norms stimulate, encourage, protect, and reward certain forms of antisocial behavior, violence, and social deviance. This concept is closely related to the phenomenon of group think. In situations of group think, individuals faced with authoritarian figures (to whom they are subordinate in some way) do not share their dissent or their inner hesitations.

Within authoritarian systems, the judgment that *he is not a team player* is used by authoritarian leaders and their supportive subordinates to limit, to co-opt or to totally exclude the possibility for informed dissent. Within authoritarian systems, to be perceived as *not a team playe*r is one road to career immobilization or suffocation. The underlying message is that all dissent is politically and personally dangerous. If one wishes to advance in the authoritarian hierarchy and gain a position of institutional power, dissent

in any form is forbidden (Fox, 2011). Those who raise questions or who dissent in any way are punished.

Outsiders and insiders witnessing the debacle of the Roman Catholic Church's management of its sexually abusive priests witness a similar reality: it has been disastrous for one's own career advancement as a diocesan priest to report a fellow priest's sexually abusive behavior to supervising members of the church's hierarchy (Campbell, October 4, 2004; Frawley O'Dea in Berg, 2006; Martini in Sipe, October 15, 2011).

Concluding Remarks

> *It is also ironic that the virtues of loyalty, discipline, and self-sacrifice that we value so highly in the individual are the very properties that create the destructive organizational engines of war and bind men to malevolent systems of authority. A substantial proportion of people do what they are told to do, irrespective of the content of the act and without limitations of conscience as long as they perceive that the command comes from a legitimate authority.*

Stanley Milgram[9]

When one reads a wide variety of authors about the current sexual abuse and clericalism scandals inside a wide variety of Christian organizations, then issues of corrupted authority and rigid authoritarian belief structures become visible vis-à-vis the internal structure of the scandal. These rigid ideologies of total control then play out in religious institution administrative decisions about managing clergy sexual predators (Berg, 2006; Berry, 1992, Berry and Renner, 2004; Boston Globe, 2002; Breslin, 2004; Caroll, 2002, 2009; Collins, 2004, May 17, 2010; Cozzens, 2002; Doyle, July 13, 2008; Doyle, Sipe and Wall, 2006; Fox, 2011; Greeley 2004b; Lobdell, 2009; Rather, 2010; Shupe, 2008; Sipe, 1996; Sipe in Plainte and McChesney, 2011; Steinfels, 2003; Weakland, 2009).

While it is perhaps unusual to consider the church primarily as an institutional corporation, when we do so, we find that issues of institutional malfeasance and leader deviance are remarkably similar to crimes of obedience inside secular corporate businesses or governmental structures.

Victim Advocacy and Healing Work

For individuals who become victim advocates for clergy sexual abuse victims, it is essential to understand the dynamics of corrupted and violent authority. For individuals called to become healers, it is equally important to understand how victims become trapped not only in the actual event of victimization but also how they are influenced by the interpersonal realities which created the milieu which inevitably permitted and perpetuated such victimizations. If our goal as advocates and healers is not only to heal the wound of sexual violence and victimization in individuals and social groups, but to move towards prevention of future occurrences, then it is essential to understand these pervasive cultural forms and patterns of communication between (1) sexual predators and (2) victims of authoritarian systems and leaders.

As I have written these three chapters about authority, power, obedience, authoritarianism, and violation, I have come to the conclusion that while the act of sexual violation is immensely damaging to the personality of every actor in the elaborate drama of victimization, the long-term damages of such violation for the victim (once the physical body has healed) is from the betrayal of once trusted and obeyed authoritarian individuals and institutions. Clergy sexual abuse of the laity and abusive structures of institutional clericalism are obedience disorders in both sets of perpetrators. They are also betrayal disorders. They are also double-bind communication disorders. Because this is so, victims remain entrapped in the demand for submissive obedience long after the physical acts of violation are concluded and their assailant(s) have moved on to other victims.

I will end this chapter by quoting Kramer and Alstand (1993)

> *Deep structural change cannot come without the breakdown of old ways. It is only from this place of tension, backlash, and crisis that viable values that meet the movement of history can emerge* (30).

Recommended Supplemental Reading

1) Dean, J. (2006). *Conservatives without a Conscience.* New York, NY: Viking.

2) Kelman, H. V. and Hamilton, V. L. (1989). *Crimes of Obedience.* New Haven Ct: Yale University Press.

3) Shupe, A. (Ed.). (1998). *Wolves within the Fold: Religious Leadership and Abuse of Power.* Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

4) Sipe, A. W. R. (2011). Mother Church and the Rape of Her Children in Plante and MCChesney (Eds.). *Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: A Decade of Crisis, 2002-2012).* Retrieve from http://www.richardsipe.com/Misc/2011-10-15-mother-church.htm

5) Wink, W. (1988). *The Powers that Be: Theology for a New Millennium.* New York, NY: Doubleday.

Personal Reflection Questions

1) Have you ever personally witnessed authoritarianism? If so, what behavioral markers were visible to you?

2) Have you ever experienced authoritarianism in your relationships with others? If so, write a description of this situation. This is a story for your own understanding. You can make decisions about sharing it with others. Identify the story's protagonists with as much clarity as possible. What behaviors from others did you experience? What were your personal responses to the authoritarian behaviors you experienced? As you review your own life situation then, are there things you wish now that you had done differently?

3) As you reflect on the narrative you have written above, what can you learn about yourself in situations which call for authoritarian obedience? If you had this situation to live all over again, are there things you would choose to do differently.

4) If you are already a manager of other people in some form of supervisory relationship with them, think about your own style of management. How do you manage dissenting opinions in your own sphere of influence and power?   Have these three chapters taught

you anything about your own personal view of the world in which power-relationships are inevitable?

5) If you are a witness to injustice, for example, a reported incident of clergy sexual abuse (rape) of a small pre-pubertal child, what is your moral obligation to act? What fears do you have about your personal abilities to carry out your perceived moral obligation? How can your develop the personal courage of your convictions? Where can you find support for doing what you know is needed? In these chapters about power, authority, control and authoritarianism, what do you need to know about the power dynamics of any future situation in order to move effectively as an agent of change and transformation?

Footnotes

[1] Isiaih Berlin quoted in J. H. Ellens. (2004, Vol. 2), *86-87.*

[2] Gregory Baum, 2007, 89.

[3] The body/Self of an individual is the complex composition of a human person and it includes tangible realities such as the body and intangible realities such as the spirit or soul. It also includes aspects of the social matrix in which the individual creates and maintains systems of personal meaning.

[4] A. W. Richard Sipe, October 15, 2011,1,

[5] For many years Wink was the Professor of Biblical Interpretation at Auburn Theological Seminary in New York.

[6] Carlo Maria Martini (June 4, 2008), quoted in Sipe, October 15, 2011, 5.

[7] W. W. Richard Sipe, October 15, 2011, 3.

[8] Salmon Rushdie quoted in J. L. Herman (1997), v.

[9] Stanley Milgram, 1974, citation source lost, most likely Dean.

The Language of Abuse and Violation

Worlds and world views change only when their building blocks – the constructs of language and thought – change first.

Patricia Roth Schwartz[1]

Introductory Comments

Scandalous wrongs cannot be glossed over or tolerated. We need a change of attitude that makes room for the truth. Conversion and repentance begin when guilt is openly admitted, when contrition is expressed in deeds and manifested as such, when responsibility is taken, and the chance for a new beginning seized upon.

Tebartz van Eist[2]

Within the past forty years Western secular culture, especially in North America, has undergone great changes in its awareness of the harm done by sexual violence. As the World Health Association's *World Report on Violence* and Health (2002) notes, the damage to the lives of victims and their families, to the community, and to the economic well-being of the nation is now well-documented. It is equally well known to clinicians of all kinds that mental and physical health statuses are severely compromised by the presence of sexual violence and trauma in an individual's life history (van der Kolk, et. al., 1996).

In addition to this more generalized knowledge about the intra-psychic and physical body damages done by all forms of personal violence, within the past twenty-five years, Roman Catholic priests, laicized former priests and monastics, victim advocates, and media journalists (Berg, 2006; Doyle, 2003, 2009-*Spiritual trauma…*; Doyle, Sipe, and Wall, 2006; Lobdell, 2009; Sipe, January 23, 2007, October 15, 2011) have begun to identify and

describe the damages done to a victimized individual's communal religious life and to his inner spiritual life. The combined spiritual and religious life costs cannot be quantified in economic terms but they are, nevertheless, devastating (Sipe, January 2, 2007, August 5, 2009). Terms such as *slayer of the soul*[3] or *soul murder*[4] are powerful descriptive metaphors and bear witness to the life-long impact of sexual violation.

Yet, at this moment in time, unlike what has happened in criminology the social sciences, and clinical professions, the greater Christian community has not agreed on a common language for talking about sexual violation. Where agreement appears to be coalescing, the language tends to deny, contain, and conceal the factual realities that identify and define clergy sexual violence in the context of religious life (Doyle, Sipe, and Wall, 2006). The persistent use of euphemistic phrases such as *inappropriate boundary violations* or *sexual abuse* or *sexual molestation* covers up the precise nature of the sexual violations in any given situation.

Women's Conversations about Sexual Violence

If we don't talk about what happened, then it didn't happen.

Alice Miller[5]

American women began meeting in consciousness-raising groups during the 1970s. One of the topics women talked about was sexual violence. In the 1970s the annual FBI publication, *Uniform Crime Reports*, routinely published a disclaimer about the accuracy of its sexual violence demographics.[6] It was well recognized that episodes of sexual violence against women and children were vastly under-reported crimes. Raped, for example, many women did not report the experience to anyone. Even when a woman did report a sexual violence crime, police jurisdictions often un-founded her complaint. If and when sexual violence cases were prosecuted, juries frequently refused to believe and act on victim's accusations.

In issues related to children, studies of the effect of massive trauma began with Anna Freud's studies of the effects of mother-child separation during the World War Two bombing raids in Great Britain. By the 1970s and 1980s, however, more and more researchers were studying children's

responses to trauma and new conclusions were being reached. Sexual trauma, however, was frequently avoided or denied as a cultural form of epidemiological proportions (Herman, 1997; Terr, 1990).

Sexually molested by a parent, a teacher, neighbor, an older child, a nun, or a priest, children most often told no one. When children did report being molested to an adult, they were often not believed. Even when believed, adults tended to discount the lasting effects of childhood violation. In the situation of abused and traumatized children, juries and judges often tended to discount the damage done guided by a belief that children would not remember what happened to them.

In her 1990 book *Too Scared to Cry* child psychiatrist Lenore Terr discusses awareness of the lasting effects of trauma (of any kind) in a child's life and journey into adulthood. She remarks that the cultural assumption, prior to the 1980s was that children traumatized in childhood would forget the traumatic event as they matured. Terr's work as a child psychiatrist placed in juxtaposition with the work of adult psychiatrist Judith Herman (1992) clearly demonstrated the long-lasting and devastating impact of childhood trauma.

In the case of clergy abuse of the laity, some law enforcement agencies covertly refused to investigate and press charges. Even if cases came to trail, juries and judges often delivered more lenient sentences to clergy than were assigned to non-clergy defendants with similar crimes.

Even today, when sexual crimes become public knowledge, victims are often stigmatized inside their communities. In a great many cases, victims are held directly or indirectly responsible for the violence unleashed against them (Burgess and Holmstrom, 1979; Krall, 1990; van der Kolk, et. al., 1996). The social milieu in which rape and other sexual crimes occurs provides a barrier (1) to women's and children's reports, (2) to women and children who do report being believed. Many violated individuals, therefore, refuse to report events of sexual assault and physical battery inside their life experience.

However, as feminist women inside the second wave of the American women's movement began to create changes in the American psyche about the factual prevalence of sexual violence in the lives of women and their children, a new language began to emerge. This new language began

first to shape women's own perceptions about what was needed to change American culture in order to create more safety zones for women and children. Secondarily, it began to re-shape American culture. In this re-shaped culture, more women and children began to speak up and to talk about events of sexual violation in their lives. An unexpected consequence was that more men and boys also began to speak up about their own experiences of sexual victimization.[7]

Social, psychological, medical, and forensic scientists began to do well-funded and scientifically respectable studies about women's and children's experiences with sexual violence. Initial demographic studies done by clinicians in their own practices in the 1970s appeared to indicate that 1 in 8 American women were sexually assaulted in their lifetime and 1 in 10 children abused. But by 1990, the data indicated that 1 in 4 American girls and women were sexually assaulted and that much of this sexual violence happened before girls reached their legal majority (Koss, 1985; Koss and Oros, 1982; Krall, 1990; Warshaw, 1984). This figure has appeared to hold up in many demographic studies of sexual violence in the lives of women and girls.

Gradually American consciousness changed regarding the seriousness of sexual assault demographics. More people began to understand that most women and children were not violated by the lurking, dangerous stranger rapist of their mother's warnings. The acquaintance rapist or abuser became a recognized presence in all socio-economic and ethnic spectrums of American life.

Research study after research study documented that most women and children were sexually violated and abused by individuals they knew before the abusive violence began. New typologies of sexual violence developed in order to accommodate this new awareness. New languages were formed to describe the realities of sexual abuse. Rutter (1989) noted, for example, that the phrase *sexual harassment* was coined in 1976. Creation of the concept of a *hostile climate* or a *chilly climate* as a form of harassment was in use by the late 1970s. By the late 1980's the phrases *acquaintance rape* and *date rape* were in common use (Warsaw, 1988). The term *affinity violations* appeared somewhat later. By the middle of the 1990's the concept of *betrayal trauma* was introduced (Freyd, 1996).

As more precise language developed to describe the nuances of sexual violence in the lives of American women and children, the nation's law codes slowly began to change. The new language, and the behavior it described, began to enter common awareness of the people. Not too long ago, the televised animated serial *King of the Hill* aired several segments about an event of employee sexual harassment in a propane gas store. The concept of sexual harassment in the work place is now obviously secure in American culture and consciousness. The presence of sexual trauma is now recognized as well.

Consequently, many American citizens have a much more accurate understanding of the complexities and consequences of sexual violence than they did in 1970. Embedded within this knowledge is a world view shift about the inappropriate nature of such violence in the family, in dating relationships, in the workplace, in educational institutions, on the streets, and in the church. What is tolerated by a culture becomes prevalent enough in that culture to define it and to control social behavior within it. When tolerance levels for specific behaviors change culture-wide, the culture has begun to transform itself.

As cultural awareness changed, mental and physical health clinicians looked, as well, at the perpetrators of violence in new ways. No longer was the acquaintance perpetrator excused or given a pass for his behavior as just having *natural reactions to the sight of a woman's* (or child's) *attractive body.* No longer was sexual violence seen only as the work of a deranged and obviously demented person. The very ordinariness of the act of sexual violence and the very ordinariness of its perpetrators became evident.

Social scientists and others began to look closely at gendered behavior in the violence interaction. One of the most startling findings, repeated in study after study, was that most adult male perpetrators of sexual violence against adult women were culturally normal (Herman, 1997, 75). Their personalities did not deviate in massive ways from the average, normal American male personality. Obviously, there were individual exceptions to this generalization. Nevertheless, the pattern became clear. Most sexual violence perpetrators were culturally *normal* in their psychological personality profiles.[8]

Adult male pedophiles, on the other hand, do evidence significant personality differences from other adult men who were deemed in these

studies to be culturally normal. Manifested psychopathology is evident in this subgroup of adult male perpetrators of sexual violence against pre-pubertal children.

As research progressed, another finding became evident. Men, who in their own childhoods had been abused or who in early childhood had witnessed their mother being abused, were men who were much more likely to be abusive towards women and children in their own late adolescent and adult life. Something about this kind of intimate childhood exposure to personal forms of violence predisposed a certain group of adult men towards becoming perpetrators of the same kind of violence they'd experienced or witnessed in childhood.

Women, on the other hand, who in childhood were abused or who witnessed such abuse tended to respond in a variety of ways: they became abusers of others, usually their children, or they entered relationships in which they were abused (Herman, 1997). A girl, who was incestuously molested in childhood, for example, might be raped during her teenage years and still later be battered inside marriage during her adult life. Another girl in the same childhood situation might become both a victim and an abuser. In this situation, she might abuse her children while her male partner abuses both her and her children. In this latter situation, unable to protect her self, she also became unable to protect her own children. A third girl in the same situation might become an adolescent prostitute. Drug and alcohol addictions are common. Anorexia and bulimia are common. At times suicide is a delayed outcome of early sexual abuse.

Regarding adult professional abuse in the arena of sexuality, another finding became clear. While there were professional women in their professional roles, as teachers, for example, and mothers in their parental roles who abused children, other women and men, their psychological make-up deviated from the social and psychological personality norms for most adult American women. In addition, as abusers they were statistically in the minority. By and large, professionals who perpetrated sexual abuse (towards women, children, adolescents, and other men) were male (Rutter, 1989).

The cycle of abuse passes itself forward in history. Unless specific interventions are made, only a few individuals violated in childhood manage to avoid passing on that abuse and violence in some manner or other when

they become adults. Some abused boys, for example, may experience impotence. Others might become abusers themselves. In this cycle, each generation of victims becomes, in turn, a new generation of victimizers and perpetrators. Each enters adulthood with intact wounds of the abuse. This is true even when the abuse has been cognitively forgotten (Freyd, 1996; A. Miller, 1984; Sipe, 2009b; van der Kolk, et. al., 1996),

Cultural Sanctions for Abusing Women

> *A similar mechanism operates when a person engages in anti-social behavior that was not ordered by the authorities but was tacitly encouraged and approved by them – even if only by making it clear that such behavior would not be punished. In such a situation, behavior that was formally illegitimate is legitimated by the authorities' acquiescence.*

Herbert C. Kelman and V. Lee Hamilton[9]

Obviously complex personal and cultural issues are at play here. I have previously argued that sexual violence against women is culturally condoned or positively sanctioned, and therefore legitimated, by three independent but interactive realities in American communities (Krall, 1990, 1992). All three, individually and in concert with each other, create a culture of violence.

The *first variable* is readily accessible violent pornography which both celebrates and advocates such violations of women and small children (Griffin, 1981, United States Attorney General, 1986). Killbourne's important work (1979, 1989, and 2001) extends the critique of pornographic imagery into the central iconic visual symbols of American advertising.

The second variable is Christian history and Christianity's long-standing theologies that denigrate women, women's bodies, and women's sexuality establish and maintain a cultural world view in which violence against women thrives (Bullough and Bullough, 1974, Daly, 1968 and 1978, Dworkin, 1974; R. Eisler, 1987; Phipps, 1983). Unlike the usual missionary claim that Christianity has been *very good for women*, in factual reality its long-standing patriarchal demand for women's obedient submission to men has been very, very damaging.[10]

Third, the psychoanalytic tradition (and its own secular mythos about women's biological, psychological and moral inferiority to men) has established a belief system that women are, by nature, immature, narcissistic masochistic, and histrionic (Herman, 1997, J. B. Miller, 1976). According to the earliest analytic tradition, women need, and therefore want, to be sexually dominated and conquered. In this cultural world view the woman's *no* as well as her *yes* becomes a *yes.* Men's sense of entitlement to sexual activity takes precedence over the woman's resistance and verbal or nonverbal *no*.

Each of these three world views, in my opinion, needs the other two in order to survive and dominate Western cultural perspectives about how men and women relate to one another, about how adults and children relate to each other. Each of these subsystems of Western culture has a complex self-justifying language and iconography which it uses to perpetuate its own world view across time. Each over time has become a self-perpetuating meme.[11]

Today, I would add a *fourth* reality. This is pervasive militarism. Aggressive military cultures often are sexually violent cultures (Brownmiller, 1975; Lorentzen and Turpin, 1998). When, for example, new military recruits are taught in boot camp about what to do with the enemy's *Susie Rottencrotch* they become part of a historical legacy of sexual abuse of enemy women that is millennia-old.

Not only rape of enemy women is common, rape and sexual harassment of a fellow officer are also common in militaries which have integrated male and female forces. In spring, 2010, American editorial cartoonist Gary Trudeau created a series of cartoon strips about rape and sexual harassment inside American troops deployed abroad. This series followed a sequence of news articles in the national press about professional military women's fears of reporting incidents of rape and sexual harassment to military chaplains and higher ranking officers. In December, 2011 there was a series of media revelations about rape and sexual harassment allegations inside the nation's military academies.[12]

Just as war and rape go together so do male domination and female submission. In the patriarchal and militaristic world view of contemporary militaristic Christendom, violence against women is acceptable as long as it is directed at some other man's woman, some other group's women. The

rape hotels of organized warfare provide *rest and recreation* to combat troops.

It is likely that men who learn to rape and sexually harass women in one situation also retain a world view that sexual violence is sometimes acceptable in other situations. Whenever men's personal, cultural (and military) domination over women is threatened, one possible consequence is spontaneous *and*/or premeditated sexual violence against women and their children.

Encapsulated within these multiple but mutually reinforcing cultural narratives, the woman becomes a target of men's violence in much the same way that, over the centuries, the Jewish community became Christianity's hated and targeted *other* (Carroll, 2001; Jacoby and Carroll, 2008; Soelle, 1992; Wiesenthal, 1997). Without broad, albeit sometimes unconscious, historical, cultural, textual and linguistic support (indeed advocacy) for sexual violence as one way for dominant men to control women, the American landscape would be, I believe, far less infected by our current virulent epidemic of violence directed at women and their children.

The Language of Sexual Misconduct

We have little understanding of how many kinds of peace there are in the world. There is the difference between institutional peace and personal peace… How can we seek peace…if we don't even understand what it is?

Edward Wood[13]

When clergy *sexual boundary violations* with women became public knowledge, certain kinds of vocabulary (including the vague term *sexual boundary violations* itself) were historically used to describe these behaviors. Some of this language was (and remains) deliberately vague and misleading. Such language revealed very little about the specific kind of accusations or allegations about behavior. Hearers could imagine a situation of adult consenting adultery when confronted with allegations of sexual boundary violations. Even a more descriptive term such as sexual

213

molestation of children can hide specific crimes of oral rape, vaginal rape, and anal rape. The vague terminology of sexual molestation, allows the community at large to imagine that the child was fondled through layers of clothing when the reality was anal rape. This misperception allowed members of the public at large to (1) doubt that anything serous happened or to (2) believe that the child was actually harmed.

In a similar manner, the language of clericalism can hide repetitive episodes of criminal behavior by administrators of religious institutions. Even the term criminal malfeasance can hide specific institutional behaviors which, when described in behavioral detail, provide the community with precise information. *The bishop shielded criminal perpetrators from prosecution* or *the chief financial officer embezzled millions* provide the community with specific information rather than a code word sound bite.

In general, euphemistic language or code language obfuscates rather than clarifies; it tends to deny and hide rather than to open and reveal. It seeks to contain damages done rather than seek to mend damages. It perpetuates secrecy rather than open transparency. Euphemistic language is incapable of differentiating between behaviors that may be morally or ethically wrong but not violent or criminal and behaviors which are morally or ethically wrong *and* violent and criminal.

In their discussion of Roman Catholic clergy celibacy violations and clergy abuse of the laity and other priests, Doyle, Sipe and Wall (2006) and Sipe (March 5, 2010) describe a certain kind of *code language* which Roman Catholic Church administrators (monsignors, bishops, archbishops and cardinals) used in pedophile priest personnel matters.[14] This code language protected the offending priest as his supervising bishop moved him around from parish to parish and nation to nation under the cover of linguistic disinformation, defactualization or outright lies (Berg, 2006). Without clarification from those who created and subsequently used this code language, it became impossible to understand the precise nature of an offender's sexual misconduct.

In the situation of Mennonite theologian and sexual harasser John Howard Yoder, the church press commonly used terms that are vague at best and deliberately misleading at worst. Phrases such as *sexual misconduct, sexually inappropriate actions, inappropriate actions, sexual boundary*

violations, or even *transgressing sexual boundaries* were most frequently utilized*.* Most of these phrases, if not all of them, could represent, in Christian theology, adult mutually-consenting adultery. The precise nature and frequency of Yoder's unwanted, sometimes physically assaulting, and other harassing behaviors towards adult women was thus obscured. The nature of his contact violations with multiple adult women were never precisely noted by church agency administrators. The nature of women's complaints about his behavior remained secreted inside church agencies for almost thirty years before Yoder's behavior was publicly exposed in a student newspaper by a group of students at Bethel College in North Newton, KS.[15]

Adultery or Sexual Abuse?

The first clarification of terminology that needs to be made, therefore, lies in the differentiation of abusive sexual violence from adultery. While adultery violates Christian theology and it may also violate secular legal understandings of marriage, adultery does not, in and of itself, constitute sexual abuse and sexual violence by either of the two participating individuals with the other.

Let's examine the following hypothetical example: On a cross-country business flight Samantha Gruen, Vice-president of Old Smokie Health Care Systems meets Henry Blanc, Vice-president of Green Acres Public Health Technologies Corporation. As they chat, over the course of their five hour flight, they discover that they will be staying at the same hotel in a large city convention center. Before they arrive at their destination, they decide to share a room, and a bed, with each other. Both are sexually interested in the other. In short, they mutually initiate and consent to a short-term sexual liaison.[16]

While their respective marital partners, on discovering this brief weekend sexual encounter, may feel betrayed and violated by Samantha's and Henry's sexual choices and behaviors, the pair's sexual relationship is not, in and of itself, internally abusive. Both individuals were more or less in a life situation of professional and economic parity. Both had personal and administrative power in their work situations. But most importantly, neither worked for nor needed the economic and power resources of the other in order to survive. Neither one lied or misled the other about their pre-

existing marriages. Neither one attempted to coerce the other. Their negotiations to have a short-term sexual relationship were friendly, mutually desired, and there was an absence of coercion.

Such a relationship may be seen morally as *sexual misconduct.* In terms of their respective families and communities, their sexual behavior could be seen as *inappropriate conduct* or as *sexually inappropriate conduct.* It could be seen, most especially by their respective marital partners, as betrayal and as behavior which has *transgressed sexual boundaries.* When discovered by others in their professional communities or work institutions, it might even be described as *sexually indiscrete.*

Whatever language might be used to describe Samantha's and Henry's sexual behavior with each other, their behavior, per se, was not a manifestation of violence by one partner in the pair towards the other. Their relationship was not professionally abusive. It was not coerced. It was not violent. Thus, their behavior does not constitute *professional sexual abuse* or *authority abuse.*

In terms of Christian theology, their sexual relationship would most likely be considered a moral violation of the marital covenant or marital contract. In terms of criminality, only a few states would view their sexual actions with each other to be a *crime against the marriage.* In today's United States, it is highly unlikely that any state would begin criminal proceedings against the pair. Most states would, however, recognize their adulterous actions as uncontestable grounds for divorce.

To summarize*, adultery* consists of a voluntary and mutually consenting sexual relationship between two adult persons who are not married to each other. At least one partner in such a relationship is married to another individual. In Roman Catholic theology adultery refers to marital infidelity when two persons, one of whom is legally married to another, have even a transient sexual relationship, as for example, with a prostitute. In the Catholic Church's moral law, even such a one-time paid transaction is considered to be adultery. One needs to understand that in adulterous relationships both individuals are mutually and morally accountable for their sexual interaction. In contrast, in sexually violent relationships, the perpetrator of violence carries full moral responsibility for his actions with another.

Professional sexual abuse is manifested in relationships of unequal power. The individual with more power engages in inappropriate professional or personal behaviors with the individual who has lesser power. These behaviors may be contact violations such as unwanted touch and rape or they may be non-contact violations such as obscene phone calls, stalking and harassing language. They may masquerade as consenting sexual intercourse.

Legal and Clinical Language

Beginning in 1974 when the State of Michigan revised its criminal codes regarding sexual and domestic violence, a more uniform approach gradually began to be evidenced in state and federal law codes. For specific descriptions of any given state, however, it would be necessary to review the code and its descriptions of forbidden behavior. In this section, therefore, I have created an amalgam of such codes.

Rape occurs when a person overcomes another person by force and without that person's consent initiates sexual intercourse. In most states anal, oral and vaginal penetration is considered to be rape. Penetration can be achieved by a penis, a tongue, or a finger. In some situations, a material object is used and this is also considered rape. It is believed that rape represents an individual's aggressive desire to dominate the victim. It is not usually viewed as misguided or misperceived needs for sexual fulfillment. In reality, many rapists have regular sexual partners. According to the United States Department of Justice website (www.justice.gov) some states consider all forced sexual activity to be rape.

Sexual Assault includes a wide range of victimization separated from rape or attempted rape. These crimes include attacks or attempted attacks involving unwanted sexual contact between the victim and offender. The attack may or may not involve physical force. The behaviors include such things as grabbing and fondling. According to the United States Department of Justice website, it may also include verbal or physical threats of attack. Sexual assault behaviors include force and coercion or the (implied or explicit) threat of such coercion.

Sexual abuse in some states is defined by code. In the church's usage this constitutes an act where one individual knowingly causes another individual

to engage in sexual activity by threats or by putting the person in fear. This can include, therefore, emotional, verbal, or physical behaviors. It can be broadly defined as non-consensual sexual contact of any kind. The behavior is designed to coerce and intimidate its recipient. Lack of consent can, therefore, be inferred from the use of force, threat, and physical or psychological intimidation. It can also include the perpetrator's exposure of his genitals to another. It can include coerced masturbation.

Sexual misconduct, as mentioned above, is the preferred language of religious organizations to describe a wide range of behavior. It consists of adult contact of a sexual nature that is unprofessional or improper in light of that religious organization's code of morality. While the behavior may appear to be consenting adult behavior for both parties, the church claims that such behavior is improper and is, therefore, unacceptable sexual conduct for its clergy and lay members. The behavior may range from consensual acts of adultery to criminal behaviors such as stalking or rape.

Sexual exploitation is generally used to describe sexual contact between an adult and a minor. However, it is also used by religious organizations to describe sexual contacts between church personnel and the individuals to whom they are in ministry. This could be a minister, a deacon, a Sunday school teacher, a secretary, a youth minister, or a member of the church's guidance board. It involves any form of sexual contact or even an invitation to sexual contact that involves a member of the congregation or religious community. It can include oral, anal and vaginal intercourse, unwanted and unnecessary touching such as tickling, slapping, wrestling, or other touch that creates uncertainty in its recipient; inappropriate gifts such as lingerie; prolonged hugs in situations where short hugs are appropriate; mouth kisses when air kisses are appropriate; commentary on the other person's body; touching the sexual organs of the other person's body; deliberate public sexualized touching of the sexual organs of one's own body, use of pornographic materials in conversation.

Sexual harassment is a term with legal implications since civil and criminal codes define the parameters of harassing behaviors. It includes *quid pro quo harassment* in which the perpetrator implicitly or explicitly promises material benefits (a promotion, a better course grade) for sexual favors. *Quid pro quo harassment* occurs in situations where one individual is responsible, in some way, for the second. Explicit or implicit demands are made for sexual favors with either promises or threats attached. For

example, *if you have sexual relationships with me tonight, I will raise your grade*, is an example of an explicit promise. *If you refuse to have a sexual relationship with me, I will not write good graduate school references for you*, is more likely an example of an implicit threat. Quid pro quo harassment involves all kinds of behavior which are known, or should reasonably be known, to be unwelcome. Such behavior can occur as an isolated incident or it can consist of multiple incidents over time – towards the same victim or towards multiple victims.

In addition to quid pro quo harassment, the term *sexual harassment* covers a wide range of behaviors. Some, not an exhaustive listing, include threats and verbal abuse, unwelcome remarks and innuendo about an individual's body or sexual organs; circulating offensive sexual materials such as pornographic cartoons; discussion by mail, computer, phone or fax material of a sexual nature which can be interpreted as offensive to the recipient; making unwanted sexual invitations or making sexually suggestive remarks; unwanted and unnecessary physical contact such as hugging, tickling, kissing, fondling, patting, or pinching. Another form of sexual harassment is the *creation of a hostile climate.* In such a situation, for example a classroom, a student's ability to learn is compromised; the employee's ability to perform his or her work is compromised. Hanging sexually explicit or pornographic pictures in office cubicles is recognized as one form of this behavior. Other forms include verbal harassment such as sexualized teasing or sexual comments and internet harassment.

A *sexual predator* is an individual with repeated sexual violations either with one individual or with multiple individuals. The term can also have a specialized use when it describes adults who prey on children via the internet or other communications media.

Stalking, according to the National Center for the Victims of Crime website http://www.ncvc.org/ is described as unwanted attention, harassment, and contact. It can include malicious and repeated following and pursuit; it includes repeated and unwanted intrusive (and often frightening) communication from the perpetrator in person, by phone, by mail, or my other communication media. It can include sending the victim unwanted gifts. The victim finds this behavior to be terrifying. The center's webpage states that nearly 80% of these victims are female; slightly more than 90% of the perpetrators are male. The majority of stalkers are not mentally ill but they may be socially maladjusted. The motivation appears to be that of

exerting power, control, and domination over victims. The Center notes that many individuals who engage in one form of non-contact sexual violation such as stalking often engage in other forms of abusive behavior such as peeping or making obscene phone calls.

Current Institutional Language Patterns

When I browsed the internet to see how current religious organizations define unacceptable sexual behavior, I found one set of language in use. When I looked at a broad cross-sampling of colleges and universities, I found a different set of linguistic markers in use. In such an unscientific survey, it appears as if Christian religious organizations prefer to use the term s*exual misconduct* for both adultery and all forms of sexual abuse while American educational institutions – both religious and secular – prefer to use legal language for sexual abuse. Generally such language is specific: *rape, sexual harassment, sexual exploitation* and *sexual abuse* are each defined and in frequent use.

The church has, in seems to me, a theological and moral interest in both adultery and professional sexual violence inside the boundaries of the Christian community. As noted above these terms do not refer to the same realities and each need to be named properly and examined in its own right.

Another interesting detail stood out. If one searches American academic websites, almost every college and university has published something about its own policies regarding sexual violence. Definitions may vary but, in general, the consequences for rape, sexual harassment, and professional sexual abuse are included. Most sites I accessed have explicit information about the consequences (to faculty, staff, and students) of sexually abusive behavior. Many sites include information for victims about how to access emergency medical and police services.

In looking at today's information, it is clear that a previously existing cultural climate of permissive acceptance [of sexual violence] inside America's educational institutions has changed and is continuing to change. Graduate student women who twenty years ago, were jokingly referred to as *the sexual slaves* of their dissertation advisors or major professors now have formal university protection against such patterns of sexual

harassment and exploitation. This does not necessarily mean that the practice of professor-student sexual relationships has ended but the public face of the institution is now aligned against such behaviors on the part of faculty or administrative staff and students. In terms of legal accountability for their faculty's and staff's behaviors, college and university administrators understand that they must seek to contain and control such behaviors. No longer does *wink-wink* behavior go on by departmental administrators, academic vice presidents, provosts, and college presidents because the legal and financial consequences of such covert behaviors are now clear. Educational institutions which do not deal with known sexual violators in a timely and appropriate manner are going to be sued. In many situations, financial penalties will be assessed against both perpetrator and institution. Individual supervisors may be included in such suits and they, too, face likely financial consequences of their inaction.[17] In the aftermath of the Penn State Football program sexual abuse scandal in December, 2011, several of my professional colleagues from a variety of colleges and universities reported that they received electronic mail or paper mail correspondence from the office of the president, the office of the provost or the university's human resources office spelling out their institution's sexual abuse policies. Also contained was a warning that sexually abusive behavior would not be tolerated on these various campuses.

When I searched a wide variety of congregational websites for information about policies and procedures, with a very few exceptions, most of the congregational websites I surfed offered no information at all. Very few congregational websites had any explicit information about the expected personal conduct of religious professionals and staff with parishioners. Since the best estimates we have indicate that perhaps 10 -12 % of all clergy (across all religious denominations) are professional abusers, this absence of visible information about expectations and standards raises intriguing questions about active denial regarding sexual misconduct and sexual violence inside America's religious and clerical cultures (Cooper-White, 1995; Fortune, 1983 and 1989; Labacqz, 1990; Labacqz and Burton, 1991; Rutter, 1989)

The websites of large American Christian denominations, on the other hand, were more likely to offer such information as definitions, consequences, and theological or scriptural prohibitions. Some regional denominational headquarters, such as the Episcopal Diocese of New Hampshire (http://nhepiscopal.org), had extensive information about the

diocesan-wide Safe Church program. Information about diocesan expectations for screening for paid and volunteer workers for a past history of sexual abuse were clearly stated.

The Allegation Issue

Another linguistic clarification which needs to be made is about the words *allege* and allegation. To allege something means to make an unsupported or unproved claim. An *allegation*, therefore, according to several dictionaries is an assertion without proof. It is only a claim that must be proved. In our current culture, it is a statement asserting something without proof.

This bit of word-sleuthing about the word *allegation* is essential because one continues to hear and to read about women's and children's allegations regarding sexual abuse long after the reality of abusive behavior has been confirmed by an adjudication or legal process. As an example here, I refer to Anabaptist-Mennonite scholars and their continued use of the word *alleged* in their published and unpublished comments about John Howard Yoder's sexual abuse behavior.

Yoder's sexualized violent behavior towards students, student wives, colleagues, and wives of colleagues and friends was alleged in rumors before the summer of 1992. According to the 1992 Prairie Street Mennonite Church Yoder Task Force, *John has acknowledged the truth of the charges* (T. Price, June 29, 1992, B 1-2). After Yoder's public acknowledgement of the nature of his abusive behavior the language needed to change. In relationship to Yoder's lived-life, continued use of a*llege* and *allegation* in articles or books written about his life and work after this date is no longer appropriate.

Specific information about the exact nature of many of Yoder's offenses has been withheld. I assume this is because of legal agreements between Yoder and his various work environments and between Yoder and Indiana-Michigan Conference of the Mennonite Church). In the summer of 1992 an Indiana-Michigan Conference press release contained, however, information that Yoder had acknowledged the accusations made against him by a group of Mennonite women. Since some of the women's allegations were published in the summer of 1992 by investigative reporter

Tom Price of the *Elkhart Truth*,[18] the general nature of Yoder's abusive behavior is known.

Inasmuch as Yoder's acknowledgment was reported in some detail to the secular and religious press, women's accusations or complaints about Yoder's specific behaviors are no longer allegations. They have been acknowledged by Yoder and confirmed by Mennonite Church officials to be factual truth. The continued linguistic use of the words *alleged* and *allegations* casts unwarranted doubts about the victim's truthfulness. It keeps the question of Yoder's culpability for his sexual harassment open. It helps to create a church-wide public climate of disbelief and denial regarding Yoder's actual behavior. This is not helpful at all. It is a very, very subtle form of continuing to judge, blame and intimidate victims for speaking up and breaking open the silence of Yoder's abusive behaviors towards themselves and others.[19]

Since the women's complaints as published in the *Elkhart Truth* (1992) were explicitly about contact forms of sexual violence and non-contact forms of sexual harassment, the continuing use the word allegation functions as a code word to deny Yoder's behaviors and their negative influence on the lives of many women. it is past time for religious writers and scholars to stop their linguistic minimizing maneuver and to acknowledge that they do know, at least in part, the specifics of Yoder's actions because he, himself, acknowledged that he was guilty of the behaviors of which he had been accused. Secular and religious press articles both published this information. It is no secret.

Social Awkwardness, Social Immaturity or Sexual Abuse

At times witnesses and scholars have made the argument that abusiveness in the life of a gifted culture instigator or spiritual teacher is really just an expression of his genius, his social ineptness or his interpersonal awkwardness. In this kind of convoluted argument, victimized individuals know themselves to be victims but, in reality, no harm was meant to them by their victimizer. In such a misreading of factual data, the argument continues, victims misunderstood the intentions and actions of the individual who, in fact, victims do know, victimized them.

Another variation of this argument is that a particular intellectual genius did not know that his behavior was offensive to others because his mind was preoccupied with higher matters. Socially inept in situations of ordinary social life, this individual simply made an error in social relationship judgment. Because the individual meant no harm, no moral judgment should be attached to the offensive behavior. Consequently, while his behavior may be perceived as rude or even offensive, it is not to be seen as either immoral or violent because his intent was innocent of any intention to harm.

Social awkwardness is clumsy social behavior that lacks in both charm and grace. The absence of social graces may result from inadequate opportunities, an absence of teaching and modeling or adult failures to help a child gain social skills in childhood. For example, someone may not know the exact order of silverware to use in a six course banquet. Social discomfort and awkwardness result.

Social awkwardness can result from interpersonal shyness. In this situation, the individual simply cannot think of an appropriate response to social intercourse situations. The shy person is so preoccupied with his or her inner misery in the social company of others that no response they make to another will be based on the realities of the interpersonal situation. Thus, we refer to this person as having *foot-in-mouth* disease or being a *social wallflower*. Release from this form of social awkwardness usually occurs when the person can leave the social environment in which his social misery has been born.

Dictionary definitions of awkward include clumsy, lacking in grace or dexterity, uncomfortable and inconvenient.[20] We might add an absence of the social ability to be interpersonally attentive and responsive to the exigencies of the social environment.

Non-conventional social behavior may appear as social awkwardness. But this kind of deliberate behavior can have many motivations. It may appear to others to be ignorance of social customs such as wearing a plaid sport coat to an early morning formal wedding. It may appear as a deliberate flaunting of social expectations such as a college professor who lectures in a tee shirt with a necktie. It may be the result of religious convictions such as the wearing of special religious garb in all public occasions. It may even be the behavioral declaration of independence of an adolescent that *I do*

not belong here. I am not who you expect me to be. I am different than you.
You cannot control me. Do not tell me what I can and cannot do.

Behavior that draws attention to the self may be the deliberate attempt of the individual to *pull the leg* of his viewers. It may be an expression of disdain. Eccentric behavior is sometimes even mistaken for genius – usually by those who seek to be eccentric for the sake of being eccentric. Nevertheless, brilliant and illustrious individuals do, at times, appear to be eccentrics or oblivious to their appearance. For example, it is possible to refer to the famous Albert Einstein photograph in which he sports widely askew hair and sticks his tongue out at the camera. Or it is possible to refer to a famous anthropologist's penchant to lecture to graduate students in a specific shirt in which a sleeve seam was torn. One simply has to assume that the aging Einstein was being playful or perhaps even impatient with yet another photographer in his face. One similarly has to assume that the anthropologist's concern with matters of personal appearance took second place to the lecture in the case of the never-mended and repeatedly seen torn sleeve.

Sexual abuse of others, on the other hand is violent behavior. It originates in motivations to control others, to dominate them, to humiliate and demean them, to frighten them, to violate them, and to harm them (West, 1992).

Confidentiality and Secrecy

There is another issue of language over which the institutional church and its individual members have often tripped in dealing with clergy abusers. This is the issue of *confidentiality* and the related issue of *secrecy*.

In this book, the oppressive issue of clericalism and abusive secrecy is noted. Included in the critique of clericalism is the institutional church's self-protective secrecy about the presence of abusive clergy, professionals or administrators in congregations, seminaries, colleges and universities, monasteries, religious service agencies, chaplaincy programs, etc.

Christianity is not alone in this problem of institutional secrecy and disinformation. Goldberg (2004) describes the secretive manner in which the Minneapolis Zen Center managed public information after the

community's leaders learned about sexual misconduct towards disciples and students done by their former, but deceased, Abbott, Dainin Katagiri.

Jungian analyst Peter Rutter (1989)[21] refers to this issue in his discussion about professional guilds and their collective reluctance to self-police ethical sexual violations by members of their guild or the professional community at large. He notes that there is a difference between organizational or professional guild secrecy and the practice of confidentiality with clients. Former Benedictine monk, sexologist, and psychotherapist A. W. Richard Sipe (1992) concurs. Sipe[22] distinguishes between confidentiality and secrecy in the following manner.

> *Confidentiality is a private personal and privileged communication that must be protected at great sacrifice (not only out of professional duty) because it is in the service (and necessary for) of transformation and growth. It may also be necessary to protect due process. Secrecy is the stance that reserves access to knowledge in the service of power, control, or manipulation. Secrecy is often rationalized as the only way to avoid scandal* (6).

There are at least five public arenas in which the practice of confidentiality is appropriately mandated either by law, a professional code of ethics, or long-established social custom:

As clients relate to psychotherapists or physicians, they have the legal rights of our society to have shared information be respected as privileged or private revelations that are not to be gossiped about or shared indiscriminately with others. There are limitations to this privilege. If a client credibly reveals his intention to murder someone, it is the clinician's responsibility to report this intention to the criminal justice system in order to protect an intended victim. In addition, if the client credibly reveals that he (or someone else) is engaged in child sexual abuse, the clinician must reveal this information to child protective services. The limit of confidentiality and the right to privacy ends at the boundary of others' needs for safety and protection.

Journalists receive information from sources who do not want to be named. Consequently, they practice confidentiality regarding the sources of their information. Some journalists may choose to pay a fine or go to jail rather

than reveal these sources to the public. Here too the rights of privileged information are not absolute.

Another arena for confidentiality is in the financial dealings of individuals with banks or with the federal government. In the United States it is customary to get mailed information on an annual basis that documents what information can be shared and what information cannot be shared. In addition, these brochures generally note any avenues of customer response that can address issues of violation. Even here, however, there are limitations to privacy and to confidentiality. Credit problems are reported to credit bureaus. Illegal cash flow is reported to federal or state governments. Once again, with criminal behavior by the customer, the privileges of financial privacy are withdrawn by the larger society. In addition, situations of bankruptcy involve legal procedures which become widely known to the larger community.

In many organizations, there is the assumption that personnel matters are to be held by human resources managers in a confidential manner. Issues of individual salaries, for example, in many institutions (but not all state and federal ones) are held to be confidential. Personal information such as family phone lines or home addresses may be deemed by company policy to be confidential. In addition, performance reviews in some organizations are held to be matters of privacy for the employee although they may be widely shared among managers who need to make personnel decisions. In situations where an employee successfully sues an employer for grievances, the specific terms of out-of-court settlements may be sealed from the public's view by judges.

Finally, the religious community has long held that there is privileged communication between members of the clergy and the people they serve. In the Roman Catholic Church, for example, what is spoken in the sacrament of penance is never to be revealed outside the confessional. Protestant writers Voelkel-Haugin and Fortune (1996) note that *confidentiality has traditionally been the ethical responsibility of the professional within a professional relationship and* [it] *is generally assumed to be operative even if a specific request has not been made by the congregant (*29).

In general, inside sacramental churches (Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and Episcopalian) the act of confession is a sacrament. The expectation of

priestly confidentiality is permanent and sealed by the priest's acts of absolution and restoration. As Doyle, Sipe and Wall (2006) note, in situations where human sin has been revealed inside the confessional, the religious professional is to guide the confessant on a known pathway to spiritual restoration and wholeness. This path for the offender or sinner involves genuine remorse, repentance, contrition, penance or acts of restitution.

As a matter of denominational polity for ministers, many Protestant denominations specify the obligation of the clergy person to maintain an attitude and behavioral practice of confidentiality in regards to personal information shared with them by parishioners. In general, in these statements of polity, the purpose for confidentiality is to provide congregants with a safe place to unload spiritual burdens without fearing public disclosure. The absence of clerical gossip networks provides individual congregants with an attitude of respectful listening and helps to create a trusting communal environment so that they can mature spiritually.

Inside a wide variety of Protestant traditions, confidentiality is the general expectation regarding issues shared with ministers by congregants. Some denominations, however, note the exception in the case of criminality or potential criminality. The issue of child abuse appears to be the driving force in such situations as states continue to press churches to follow state policies of full revelation in order to protect an abused child from further abuse.

As Voelkel-Haugen and Fortune (1996) discuss the issue of confidentiality, they differentiate it from secrecy. *Secrecy* is the absolute promise or absolute commitment never to reveal under any circumstance any information that comes to the attention of a member of the clergy or, for that matter, to a member of the congregation. *Confidentiality*, on the other hand, is the expectation that shared information will be held in a trustworthy manner. With the congregant's permission, it may be shared in order to consult with others. And, in addition, it may be shared without consent to protect the individual or others. They note: c*onfidentiality is not intended to protect abusers from being held accountable for their actions or keep them from getting the help they need. Shielding them from the consequences of their behavior will likely further endanger their victims and will deny them* [the abusers] *the repentance they need* (29).

228

In terms of professional, leader and clergy abuse inside religious institutions, the situation is clearer. Confidentiality is to serve the individual making a confession and the collective community. When the individual congregant's spiritual confession is kept in confidence all members of the community live in a situation of mutual trust between its priest and the community. Confidentiality in such a model has *no* intention of shielding or protecting incompetent, negligent, or abusive professionals. It was never intended to protect religious leaders from moral accountability for their actions.

In situations of credible, formally adjudicated, and documented professional, leader and clergy sexual abuse invoking the issue of confidentiality is a faulty institutional action and it engages the church in complicit secrecy. It fails to protect the individual and the congregation (or other religious institutions) from harm. In addition, it allows the professional or clergy abuser to hide the specific actions and abuse from public awareness.

In an attempt to break from a historical position of not publishing information about documented and adjudicated clergy and religious professional sexual misconduct, a coalition of Meetinghouse editors[23] issued a revised publication standard for church press publications. A new publication policy was put in place: stories about sexual misconduct would be published after an official action was taken by a church institution. Claiming that p*ublic responsibility includes the need for public accountability* the document goes on to state that clergy abuser or religious professional abuser accountability *needs to be at least as broad as the offender's influence on the church.*

When sexually abusive clergy members, for example, are manipulative, they can utilize the church's secrecy as a way to organize supporters against the victims of abuse or against the church's management decisions about discipline. When religious institutions allow such manipulation to occur under the guise of protecting the church from public scandal, the denomination, congregation or other subgroup of the church engages in secondary violation of the victims of the predator's violence. .

I find Voelkel-Haugin's and Fortune's commentary regarding the issue of a confession of sexual abuse towards children inside the confessional to be

instructive about how churches might proceed in this issue of confession and confidentiality. They write:

> *For example, a Roman Catholic priest can hear the confession of a child abuser, prescribe penance to report himself, and withhold absolution until the penance is accomplished. Confession to a priest does not mean it is the priest's obligation to absolve in the absence of penitent acts. Confession opens the opportunity for penitent persons to repent and make right the harm they have caused.*
>
> *Likewise, for a Protestant in a non-sacramental confessional situation, directives may be given and actions prescribed that include the abuser reporting himself to child protective services. If it is clear that the penitent will not follow the directive of the religious leader and self-report, then some Protestant ministers have the option and the obligation to report directly.*
>
> *The vulnerability of the child and the significant likelihood that the abuse will continue superseded an obligation to maintain in confidence the confession of the penitent* (30)*.*

Clergy Sexual Abuse Reprised

As Rutter (19890 and other experts in the field of sexual violence studies note, *professional abuse* (sometimes called *authority abuse)* is an act of violence (Fortune,1983a, 1983b, 1989c; Herman, 1997). Sexually inappropriate actions are viewed as violence because of the power differential implicit in the relationship. Inside a pre-existing helper-client power relationship genuine, mutual consent for sexual relationships is impossible. Whether the offender is a teacher in a relationship with a student, a physician with a patient, or a clergy person with a member of the congregation or parish, the structure of abuse is about the professional's misuse of position, authority, power and influence. In such situations, the weaker party's vulnerability is exploited. The individual who holds a culturally-legitimated position of authority and power takes advantage of and preys upon the weaker party.

Professional codes of conduct, such as medicine's Hippocratic Oath, recognize the professional person's responsibility to protect the rights and

vulnerabilities of the weaker or less powerful individual in the relationship. Refusing to sexually abuse the lesser status person is one way to honor such an oath.

Clergy sexual abuse specifically refers to licensed or ordained members of the clergy who abuse or violate individuals under their spiritual care. This may include a congregation's minister or youth minister. It may include a confessor in the confessional. It may include a clergy person who serves as a hospital or prison chaplain. It may include religious professionals who administer religious organization agencies. In some situations, it may also refer to ordained individuals who have teaching or administrative responsibilities in, denominational elementary schools junior high and high schools, colleges, universities, and seminaries.

Because clergy are often seen by others as representing, in some manner, God's will and teachings, clergy abuse is particularly devastating to the spiritual well-being of victims and survivors. In this situation, not only the person's body and psyche are invaded and used, their inner spirit or soul is also affected. The damages to the victimized individual are not only physical, emotional and psychological: they are also spiritual.

Concluding Comments

To summarize, churches and educational systems have begun to realize that professional sexual abuse is a serious issue in the communal life of ministers, scholars, students, and religious seekers. Many undergraduate and graduate campuses have written policies that prohibit sexual activity between faculty members and the students they teach, supervise, evaluate, grade or for whom they will in the future write letters of reference. Denominational headquarters frequently have similar statements regarding ministers and the lay people they serve. Fewer congregations have such policies (or at least fewer of them post such information) on their websites).

Some religious organizations and denominations have written prohibitions against any unmarried sexual activity between ministers, counselors, Sunday school teachers, and church administrators with lay people in the congregation. This often includes formal prohibitions against dating relationships between single ministers and members of their own congregations.

In situations of sexual assault and violence, most campuses recognize that students need to be encouraged to report these episodes to the police and to receive emergency medical help and long term emotional support. Churches, on the other hand, appear much less inclined to encourage individuals to report sexual abuse, sexual assault and sexual violence to police or to medical authorities. Both, however, recognize a continuum of unacceptable sexual behavior designed to harass, humiliate, or intimidate victims.

In addition to educational institutions and churches, professional guilds are increasingly drafting sexual harassment guidelines for their members. During the late 1990s I was a board member in two separate professional organizations where sexual abuse reporting policies were created because of unwanted, inappropriate member behavior towards other members. In both situations a reporting and accountability mechanism was built into the bylaws as a way of negotiating a safe organization for all individuals who were members. As another example, in 1999 the [American] Society for Christian Ethics ran a series of articles about sexual harassment in its publication *Annual. S*ubsequently, the Society created its own professional code of sexual ethics for members of the Society.

American tolerance for adultery and other forms of sexual misconduct among politicians has drastically changed since the 1940s Roosevelt presidency or the 1960s Kennedy presidency. During these presidencies, we now are informed by academic historians and presidential biographers that presidential extramarital sexual dalliances were protected from public awareness by the press. Today, the American press reports its knowledge of a politician's extramarital sexual behavior to America's people. In general, in the new millennium, politicians can no longer count upon secrecy and press protection for adultery, sexual abuse, sexual harassment, or other forms of abusive or aberrant sexual misconduct. As this set of paragraphs are being written in the summer of 2011 a former governor of the State of California is the most recent example of America's news media and its practice of full disclosure for a wide variety of forms of political sexual misconduct including adultery, sexual affairs, impregnations, and sexual harassment.

Even as Americans over the past forty or fifty years have become much more tolerant about consenting unmarried adult sexual behavior, they have become much less tolerant about sexual violence, sexual misconduct,

sexual hypocrisy, sexual harassment and leader or professional sexual adultery and abuse. No longer is it only grocery store tabloids which te*ll al*l.

Recommended Supplemental Reading

1) Doyle, T., Sipe, A. W. R., and Wall, P. J. (2006). *Sex, Priests and Secret Codes: The Catholic Church's 2000-year Paper Trail of Sexual Abuse*, Los Angeles, CA: Volt.

2) FaithTrust Institute website: http://www.faithtrustinsitute.org

3) Fortune, M. (1983). *Sexual Violence: The Unmentionable Sin.* New York, NY: Pilgrim.

4) Pellauer, M. D., Chester, B., and Boyajian, J. (1987). *Sexual Assault and Abuse: A handbook for clergy and religious professionals. San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row.*

5) Richard Sipe's web site, http://www.richardsipe.com

6) Sipe, A. W. R. (March 5, 2010). *Code Words to Hide Sex Abuse. Retrieve from* http://www.richardsipe.com/Click_and_Learn/2010-03-05-code_words_rev_html

7)   See the SuperLawyers Blog (December 1, 2011). *Jeff Anderson on the Sex Abuse Scandal at Penn State.* Retrieve from http://blog.superlawyers.com/2011/12/jeff-anderson-on-the-sex-abuse-scandal-at-penn-state

8) Voelkel-Haugen, R. and Fortune. M. M. (1996). *Sexual Abuse Prevention.* Cleveland, OH: United Church Press.

Personal Reflection Questions

1) In your own language, how do you differentiate between sexual immorality and sexual violence?

2) How do you differentiate between consenting sexual intercourse and sexual assaults? What distinguishes these two patterns of behavior from each other?

3) Do you know what language your religious denomination uses to describe violent sexual abuse done by clergy members? In your opinion, is this the appropriate language to use? Why or why not?

4) If you were to become aware that your denomination was protecting sexually abusive clergy or sexually abusive professional religious leaders, what do you think you could do (in your current life situation) about this reality to begin to change it?

5) What inner radar can you develop to detect institutions which use obfuscating code language to hide and protect sexual abusers?

6) What specific kinds of code languages have you heard in your denomination when individuals discuss sexual immorality by clergy members? What kinds of code words to they use to describe sexual violence? Are these the same words? Are they different words? Does nonverbal behavior modify the actual words when they are spoken to convey which type of behavior is being described?

Footnotes

[1] Patricia Roth Schwartz. 1988. 10.

[2] Quoted by Hans Kung (2010); taken from van Eist's March 14, 2010 Limburg radio address.

[3] Stephen J. Rosetti, 1990.

[4] Leonard Shengold, 1989, 1999.

[5] Alice Miller, 1983, 258.

[6] United States Federal Bureau of Investigation *Uniform Crime Reports,* published annually in Washington, D. C.

[7] As an example of the changing definitions for sexual violence: On January 6, 2012, Attorney General Eric Holder announced the first change in the federal definition of rape since 1929 (*the carnel knowledge of a female, forcibly and against her will*). The new definition of rape is *The penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without the consent of the victim.* This change will directly affect the Department of Justice's annual publication, *Uniform Crime Reports.* For further information, see http://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/2012/January/12-ag-018.html.

[8] There is a difference between the statistical concept of normal and the street usage of normal to indicate healthy. I am referring here to statistical norms rather than to the idea that these abusing individuals were psychologically and emotionally healthy.

[9] Herbert C. Kelman and V. Lee Hamilton, 1989,16-17.

[10] For a more extensive discussion of this claim, see my 1990 dissertation, *Rape's Power to Dismember Women's Lives: Personal Realities and Cultural Forms*.

[11] A meme is to human culture what a gene is to human biology. Both genes and memes seek to reproduce themselves in future generations

[12] On January 19, 2012 *The Arizona Daily Star* (p. A-17) carried a news story entitled, "Pentagon Works on Plan to Curb Sex Assaults." Defense Secretary Leon Panetta was quoted as saying that *there were 3191 sexual assaults reported to the military last year, which is a slight increase from 3158 reported in 2010.* Panetta acknowledged, however, that *because so few victims report the crime, the real number is closer to 19,000 assaults.*

[13] Edward W. Wood, (2008), 84.

[14] See also Weakland (2009) for his discussion of code language by the American Roman Catholic hierarchy in regards to pedophile priests and bishops.

[15] K. Cott, 1992.

[16] To create this brief vignette, I have adapted one from Gergen (1991, 66-68).

[17] A 2011 sex abuse scandal involving Penn State University's football program led to the filing of lawsuits against Jerry Sandusky and university officials. For information see *The Super Lawyers Blog.* Retrieve from http://blog.superlawyers.com/2011/12/jeff-anderson-on-the-sex-abuse-scandal-at-penn-state

[18] See Tom Price *Elkhart Truth* articles (1992).

[19] An example of this intellectual turn-of-phrase usage can be found in Zimmerman (2007). He writes: *Later in Yoder's life various women accused him of strange and unwanted patterns of sexual language and behavior. These allegations led to a church disciplinary process* (64, footnote 37).

[20] American Heritage, Revised Edition. (2007). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

[21] Peter Rutter, 1989, see Chapter 8, Ordained Clergy and Religious Leader Sexual Abuse.

[22] Sipe is quoting an author by the last name of Hay. However, a full bibliographic reference is not provided.

[23] Meetinghouse editors represent a coalition of church press editors in the Mennonite Church and in the Brethren in Christ Church.

Ordained Clergy and Religious Leader Sexual Abuse

Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. You will know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thistles or figs of thorns? Every good tree brings forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree brings forth evil fruit. Wherefore by their fruits you will know them.

Matthew 7: 15-20

Introductory Comments

Perhaps the most baffling and trying aspect of twenty-first-century spirituality is the disparity between spiritual teaching and the behavior of teachers. Men, women, Western, Eastern, fundamentalist, New Age, modern, indigenous – none have escaped the temptation to abuse power.

Elizabeth Lesser[1]

The issue of *professional abuse* is not limited to clergy or to other professional and administrative members of the religious establishment. It can be found in any work environment where one individual has agreed to provide professional services to a second person who has implicitly or explicitly asked for his help. Lawyers with clients, work supervisors with supervisees, teachers with students, physicians with patients, therapists with clients as well as ministers with laity are all included in this broad category of individuals who professionally abuse other individuals. In these situations, the abusive individual has positional authority of some kind over the weaker, less powerful, or vulnerable individual. Such positional authority may also include elements of personal charismatic authority.

Religious leader abuse occurs when individuals who have a religiously-oriented supervisory relationship of any kind engage in sexually harassing, sexually abusive or sexually violent relationships with the people they supervise or provide services to. We find this kind of abuse present when a religious department professor sexually harasses a departmental administrative assistant. We find this kind of abuse when a minister has sexual intercourse with the church's secretary or sexually propositions a member of his congregation. We also find this kind of abuse when the chairman of the church's board of elders makes sexual advances to the congregation's female minister. We find it when an ordained clergyman rapes a pre-pubertal child. We find it when a theology professor makes obscene phone calls to his students or sends unwanted and sexually offensive electronic mail to his secretary.

In some author's work, a further refinement of terminology has been developed to address specific issues of *clergy abuse*. In this situation, abusive behavior, such as sexual harassment by ordained clergy or ordained religious, is described and discussed. Depending upon the age of the targeted victim, additional clinical language might be used such as pedophilia. Depending on the severity of the behavior, legally-defined language may be used such as rape, attempted rape, or stalking.

At its core, however, professional abuse exemplifies a power-over relationship in which the individual with role-authorized power and socially legitimated authority victimizes an individual who is in the position of lesser power or influence. The context of such victimization occurs inside of position or role relationships where the abusing individual is the ministering or helping person to the other.

Because abuse within the boundaries of a religious community can occur inside a broad category of human situations, I utilize the term *professional abuse* in this chapter with the understanding that I am referring to professional members of the religious establishment – preachers, priests, nuns, monks, ethicists, biblical scholars, professors of theology and religious institution administrators. When I am specifically referring specifically to ordained members of the clergy – be they deacons, ministers, chaplains, members of religious orders, priests, bishops, or cardinals, I may also use the phrase *clergy abuse*.

Inside the borders of organized Christianity, it is important to note that professional abuse or clergy abuse is not limited to any one denomination (Labacqz and Burton, 1991; Fortune, 1983a, 1983b, 1989; Rutter, 1989; Shupe, 1995, 2008; Shupe, Stacey, and Darnell, 2000). No religious community appears to be free of its potential presence. Yet, clinical psychologist Robert Grant (1994-1995) rightly notices the high prevalence of abusive behavior that emerges in rigid and authoritarian religious environments. Abuse appears, in his clinical experience, to thrive in closed religious communities where individuals have not matured in their spiritual formation beyond *obedience for obedience's sake* (summary words and emphasis mine).

When we scan literature about other world religions, it becomes clear that similar kinds of abuse occur in eastern religions. Monks and spiritual gurus in a side variety of traditions demonstrate a range of similar behaviors (Downing, 2001; Goldberg, 2004; Ford, 2006; Kramer and Alstad, 1993; Pelham, ud.). Here, one can substitute the phrase *guru abuse* or *spiritual teacher abuse* for clergy abuse. In most places within this manuscript, with the exception of my discussions of Buddhist teachings, I use the phrases clergy abuse, clergy sexual abuse, religious leader abuse, or professional abuse to describe these kinds of situations.

A Clinical Perspective

> *There is such a thing as bad sexual behavior because it destroys or distorts the personality of the participants.*

Karl Menninger[2]

North American physician and Jungian analyst Peter Rutter (1989) was one of the first authors to utilize the term *professional abuse* in regards to improper sexual behaviors of professionals with their clients. Rutter's use of this phrase spans many different professions, for example, medicine and law. He investigated the issue of the sexual use and abuse of vulnerable individuals by the professionals to whom they had turned for counsel and help. Rutter's work, therefore, not only deals with clergy abuse. In his work, he also details abuse by physicians and therapists of their patients,

abuse by teachers of their students, and abuse by lawyers towards their clients.

Rutter comments that each of these professions has three serious internal problems. *First*, individual members of the profession do not live within the taught and legally or culturally mandated ethics of their profession. *Second*, other individuals within the profession do not report or discipline ethical offenders. *Third*, a professional culture develops in which the victims of professional sexual abuse are blamed for the abuse.

Inside such socially organized patterns, professional abuse, while explicitly forbidden by spiritual teachings or professional codes of ethics, is implicitly condoned and protected by cover-ups. The vulnerable ones who need protection are victimized by the very persons to whom they turn for teaching, support, help and counsel. Subsequent to the abuse done by their abuser, they are secondarily re-victimized by their abuser's professional guild's unwillingness or inability to enforce professional standards in a meaningful way.

One of the commonly held perspectives is that professional sexual abusers are quite rare in North American professional cultures. A second perception is related to the first. It is that those individuals who do abuse others are deeply disturbed and deranged individuals.

Rutter disputes these common notions. *First*, he notes that sexual abuse of clients by the professional person – no matter what the profession – is actually quite common. *Second*, he advises his readers that it is not the lunatic fringe of a profession who engage in sexual behavior with their parishioners, their patients, their students, or their clients.

What becomes immediately visible in his work is the reality that quite ordinary professionals engage in this form of unethical behavior. Rutter comments, *highly eroticized entanglements* by a wide variety of professionals show similar patterns of behavior (1). Professionally abusive doctors, teachers, lawyers and clergy show more similarities with each other than differences in their respective behaviors. To clarify this further, a professional abuser in any given profession has many personality and behavior similarities with professional abusers in other professions. It is not the specificities of a given profession that shape the abuser's behavior. It is the nature of the hierarchical ministering relationship itself. In such

240

relationships, one person (the helper) holds a position of authority, power, privilege and influence over the one being helped, taught, or spiritually advised.

Rutter describes aspects of this common pattern of professional abuse in the following manner:

> [*There is*] *an intoxicating mixture of the timeless freedom, and the timeless danger, that men feel when a forbidden woman's sexuality becomes available to them. The freedom stems from the illusion of such moments in which a man can convince himself that nothing but sexual merger with the female body seems real. He sets himself off from past and future, contemplating neither his motivation nor the consequences of his acts. The feeling of danger balances the one of freedom, for within this danger is the intuition that the act he is so strongly fantasizing may be wrong, that it may bring catastrophe on both himself and the woman* (Rutter, 1989, 2).

He goes on to note that in the moment of deciding whether or not to cross the boundary of appropriate professional behavior for one that violates the spirit and the ethics of his professional calling, the man feels very, very powerful and very, very vulnerable.

In the relationship of abuser and victim, the abuser believes that the victim consents to the abuser's vision of the relationship and agrees that the act is one of mutual consent. Sexual predators, in this position, count on their victims not to report their behaviors to professional guilds, to their friends and families, or to police and other legal community structures. Even if reported, they count on their guild to protect them rather than the victim of their actions.

The path to professional victimization of another is a convoluted one for predators. It is filled with illusions about the nature of the self, the nature of the other, and the nature of appropriate boundaries between the self and other. As does Rutter, many other authors note, that in a professional relationship, it is always the professional person's responsibility to maintain appropriate personal and sexual boundaries (Fortune, 1983a, 1983b, and 1989; Grant, 1994-1995; Guggenbuhl-Craig, 1971; Heggen, 1993; Labacqz and Burton, 1991).

241

Transference and Counter-transference

> *The Catholic bishops had the primary responsibility to maintain discipline and therefore bear the primary responsibility for their failure to maintain discipline. They almost never acted effectively against abusers. Instead they tried to maintain the façade of the Church, a façade that became increasingly hollow. The bishops suffered from a clericalism that identified the Church with the clergy. The laity were unimportant except insofar as they provided the opportunity for clerical careers…The bishops wanted to keep the abuse quiet and out of the public eye, and the abusers, of course, were quite happy to cooperate so they could escape punishment and keep abusing.*

Leon J. Podles[3]

In psychodynamic or depth psychology theory, one foundation for this clinical wisdom about perpetrator accountability for his own behavior lies in the complex theoretical doctrine of the clinician's professional responsibility to manage all *transference* and *counter-transference* issues that manifest in the course of treatment inside every clinical relationship. *Transference* is the process by which an adult re-experiences earlier relationships with significant others as if those experiences were in the present moment. Others in the present moment are seen as these important figures from the past. Psychodynamic analysts recognize the importance of parents, teachers, and other authority figures in childhood. During therapeutic hours clients attribute all kinds of emotional realities to the therapist which have little or no foundation in objective fact. Positive emotions such as love, sexual attraction, or profound gratitude may be experienced and expressed. Negative emotions such as helplessness, terror, fear, resentment, ridicule or open hostility may be experienced and expressed. Because these transference elements can interfere with the therapeutic relationship, the therapist is responsible to recognize their appearance and to manage them in ways that promote the client's maturation and healing processes.

Not only may the patient contaminate the present-moment with unrealistic or irrational past-moment emotional response patterns and projections, therapists may do so as well, thus, the term counter-transference. Norman Cameron (1963) in his monumental book about personality development and psychotherapy commented:

242

Transference and counter-transference, the revivals of emotional residues from childhood are likely to be present in any therapeutic situation, simply because of the unique relationship of therapist and patient (753-754).

Analyst Frieda Fromm-Reichman (1960) identifies transference as a common human experience inasmuch as individuals in present-moment relationships repeat earlier learned patterns of emotional response and behaviors. She writes:

Such significant carry-overs from people's early relationships with the parents of their childhood…will affect their relationships with their family doctor, the dentist, minister, etc. Even the mere anticipation of consulting any qualified helper…may pave the way for the transference relationship (97).

Both parties to the relationship engage in this elaborate relational process in which residues of past relationships enter the present one and contaminate the present-moment therapeutic or ministering space between the two individuals. The one who ministers and the one who is ministered to are both parties to the transference-counter-transference process. To reiterate the point being made here: It is the professional's responsibility to recognize and manage the diverse and complex manifestations of transference and counter-transference as they appear and reappear. Working through these issues successfully enable clients to mature.

When transference and counter-transference issues surface inside the professional relationship another factor is also in play. This is activation of a personality defense mechanism known as projection. Projection is one of a garden variety of defense mechanisms and it is utilized by nearly everyone at some time or another in their adult relationships with others. For projection to activate itself, something arising within an individual is perceived by the personality as existing outside the personality. As an unconscious defensive maneuver of the personality, projection allows each of us to perceive our own faults, unacceptable impulses, or ego-alien desires as belonging to another. It helps individuals to maintain an inner ego-ideal sense of the inner self and its external behaviors it the world. It helps to protect the self from internal and unacceptable ego-alien experiences (Cameron, 1963, 235).

Perhaps an example that is clearly pathological can help us to see the ordinary. Fromm-Reichman described a patient who saw his blue-eyed female therapist as a brown-eyed male with a heavy beard and mustache. This clearly unrealistic or non-factual image projected unto his therapist was that of his abusive father. In her theoretical discussion of this case Fromm-Reichmann added:

> *Concomitantly, with the distortion of the psychiatrist's looks, he also misinterpreted the doctor's reactions and behaviors of being similar to childhood experiences with his father. Many of these childhood experiences had never been revised and re-evaluated because they had been dissociated up to the time the patient had entered the therapeutic relationship with the doctor. This interpretive clarification of the transference experience at last made a revision possible* (Fromm-Reichman, 1960, 103-104)*.*

In some manner or another, it is likely that all adults experience transference issues and utilize projection as a way to stabilize their self-image and to manage their relationships with others. When dealing with relationships where a significant power differential exists between two individuals (such as that of a minister and parishioner or a priest confessor and the individual making his confession), issues of transference and counter-transference always lurk nearby.

In situations of inappropriate sexual behavior inside of professional relationships, common opinion tends to see the violation as a sexual violation. Without denying the moral components to the offense, Rutter and others note, however, that it is really a power violation. My personal belief as a clinician is that these violations are position authority violations *and* power violations. Seen in this light, the issue of mutual or reciprocal consent becomes crucial.

Reciprocal Consent

> *The signature motif…is that of power, often masked as authority, exercised almost intuitively for purposes of control.*

> *Eugene Kennedy*[4]

North American culture has long maintained that children who are minors cannot give consent to sexual relationships because they are not mature enough to understand the nature of the act nor its consequences. In addition, individuals who are mentally handicapped in severe ways are also recognized as unable to give informed consent. People who are drugged, drunk, or in any other way unconscious, are likewise deemed unable to do so.

During the past 35 years our common United States legal-political culture has further clarified the issue of consent in issues of sexual behaviors between professionals and their clients. An individual who is in a relationship in which there are position, authority and power imbalances (a teacher and student, a priest and congregant, a supervisor and the individual he supervises, or a doctor and patient) interacts within a professional environment in which there cannot be, by definition, mutuality of consent.

Because of the nature of human dependency within the individual of lesser power upon the one holding greater power, the dependent individual cannot give mutual, reciprocal consent to sexual behavior in the relationship no matter who initiates the sexual aspects of behavior. Thus, we see that clergy sexual abuse of the laity can happen between priests or ministers and legally mature adults as well as with pre-pubertal children or with post-pubertal adolescents who have not yet reached their legal majority. In none of these relationships with the laity can the more dependent individual give informed consent to the sexual relationship with the more powerful or dominant one.

At play, in the background of any helping or ministering relationship with unequal power dynamics, therefore, are issues of perception, projection, transference and counter-transference. It is the professional obligation and responsibility of the ministering person to recognize these issues and to manage them in a professional manner. A professional manner does not, indeed cannot, include acting them out in sexualized behaviors.

Wearing God's Face

Power perverted in the name of religion is the problem.

A. W. Richard Sipe[5]

According to Rutter, 96% of sexually exploitive relationships occur between male professionals and women under their care or supervision. It is clear, therefore, that culturally sanctioned male power and domination issues pervade the abusive clerical relationship with individuals for whom the clergy person has a spiritual ministry (Rutter, 1989, 20).

In any abuse of pre-pubertal children and minor adolescents, authority and power are additionally lodged within the positional role or adult. Additional power is located at the interface of age differentials and adult roles. In the case of clergy abuse, perceptions of God's power and authority are also embedded in the issue of human power. Because members of the clergy are seen as acting on God's behalf, sexual abuse issues complicate the spiritual life of the victims in lasting ways (Sipe, August 5, 2009).

In his discussion of *God out there* Marcus Borg (1997) provides an example that illustrates the complexity of the ministerial role for parishioners – most especially for pre-majority children. But since remnants of childhood remain to be transferred over and over again in adulthood, one should not look too sentimentally at childhood images of God as embodied in or personified by the minister. Many adults operate with similar imagery patterns.

To be clear, Borg is not writing about sexual abuse issues among the clergy or theoretical transference issues in the pews. I lift his example because it reminds us of the manner in which many individuals relate to or *transfer* their inner images of God to the external face and character of their minister. It is important to note that the reverse is also quite common. The human face of the minister becomes God's face. This is quite common among child victims of clergy sexual abuse.

Borg writes:

Central to the story of how I met God the first time is my earliest visual image of God which goes back to preschool days. When I thought of God, I thought of Pastor Thornton, the pastor of our church. He had grey hair (rather wavy as I recall). He wore a simple black robe (our branch of Lutheranism rejected clergy ornamentation such as stoles and vestments. I remember him as a big man. I was thus startled about a year ago when I saw an old photo of him with our family. He was in fact a relatively small man, shorter than my mother and father. But he was my earliest visualization of God. When I prayed, I visualized Pastor Thornton's face. I knew of course that he wasn't God even as a preschooler, I would have said, "No," if someone had asked me if he were. But when I thought about God or prayed to God, I "saw" Pastor Thornton (Borg, 1997, 9-10).

While Borg's account is of his pre-school self, it is quite clear to pastoral ministry students that many adults transfer a similar image onto the clergy. Like Borg, they would recognize, if asked, that the minister was not God. But, like Borg, many adolescent and adult images of God are anthropomorphic representations – representations in which God wears the human minister's face. Thus, they transfer to the minister the face of God. They consequently respond to the minister *as if* he were God. Issues of obedience to God's identity and authority get mixed up with issues of obedience to the human minister's identity and authority.

Socio-cultural and socio-religious factors such as gender, ethnicity, age, social status, and early images of God affect all projection, transference and counter-transference issues that surface in all clergy-laity relationships. They particularly surface in clergy misconduct behaviors directed towards the laity in their care.

Because women (and children) are both acculturated to and accustomed to the male demand for obedience, submission to authority, sexual servicing of the man's desire, and yielding to the male's dominance and will, they become very vulnerable to abuse at the hands of male professionals whose work is to serve them or minister to them in some manner or another (Rutter, 1989, 20-21). They are, one might say, predisposed to predatory position and authority abuse because of their gender and age socialization.

However, Rutter notes (and I paraphrase): men in positions of power who sexually abuse others exploit and seek to control not only the other

247

individual's sexuality; they also exploit the person's ability to trust others. Inasmuch as an inclination to trust derives from the very nature of the professional role itself, the professional's abdication of his responsibility to be trustworthy has lasting consequences. When the abuser is employed by the religious institution, not only individuals are harmed, the religious institution as a whole is damaged and seen as untrustworthy.

Providing a Safe Environment

If religion cannot tell the truth about itself, it has nothing to say.

A. W. Richard Sipe[6]

Inside a professional relationship the weaker one, the younger one, or the more vulnerable partner to the relationship is the person who is being served by the professional. Thus, the teacher has professional obligations to act in trustworthy ways with the student; work supervisors with those they supervise, a therapist with the client; a physician with the patient, and members of the clergy with members of the laity. A large part of this professional obligation or ethic of care is to provide a safe relational place for the more dependent other.

The medical guild has long recognized the inappropriate nature of sexual relationships between physicians and their patients. The Hippocratic Oath, for example, states this quite explicitly:

> *I swear by Apollo the physician and by Aesculapius to keep the following oath: I will prescribe for the good of my patients and never do harm to anyone. In every house where I come, I will enter only for the good of my patients, keeping myself far from all intentional ill-doing and all seduction, and especially from the pleasures of love with women or men, be they free or slave.*

To make the extreme case and these are my examples: suppose a young pre-school child behaves in a seductive manner towards his or her pastor; suppose a mid-life woman seeks to seduce her pastoral counselor; suppose an adolescent dresses provocatively and deliberately seeks to sexually entice his confessor. If, in each situation, the clergy person yields

248

to the direct or indirect, the implicit or the explicit, the covert or overt initiative of the younger, the less powerful, the more vulnerable individual, the minister or priest is guilty of clergy abuse.

Since, in most situations of clergy abuse, it is the clergy person who initiates the sexual relationship; since it is the clergy person who is seductive: the issue becomes even clearer. Sexual abuse, which attacks the sexuality of the other, is not primarily a sexual morality issue. The act is one of violence. Sexual abuse is an act of violation. Such abuse attacks the personhood of its targeted victim by means of assaulting the individual in a gendered or sexual manner.

The issue at hand is not the clergy person's perception of sexually charged, sexually provocative or sexually enticing behavior on the part of the other. Instead, the issue is that the person with the most authority and power in the relationship, in this case the clergy person or religious professional, is obliged to define and to maintain the relationship's professional boundaries. It is the professional person's obligation to protect the other by refusing to violate him or her with abusive actions of any kind. It is the professional person's obligation to protect the sexual boundaries of his or her professional role.

This standard is not prudery, it is prudence.   It is not passion but compassion. It is not predation but service.

Sexual relationships or sexually harassing behaviors between a professional person and his (or rarely, her) clients is behavior that violates the personhood *and* the trust of the client. The presence of pre-violation trust signifies that the dependent party in the relationship believes that (trusts) the professional person will act in his or her best interest. When this trust is violated, the violated individual may have future trouble in trusting others. Not only is this specific relationship spoiled. The potential is greatly present that all similar future relationships will likewise be spoiled, i.e., untrusting, ones as well. The body, the psyche and the spirit are each wounded and in need of healing. But since the trusted minister or healer has been the source of the wound, there remains no safe place inside the abusive relationship to seek healing. In a very real way, the victim has been abused, violated, abandoned and isolated from reciprocal, trusting human contact with others.

The principal is clear: it is impossible inside a non-equal relationship (in which authority and power are embedded inside a professional role or institutional position) for the client, the weaker party or the more vulnerable party to give informed consent to a consenting, mutually reciprocal sexual relationship. Consequently, sexual encounters or sexually seductive behaviors initiated by professional persons towards the individuals whom they serve are never consenting sexual relationships. They are, by their very nature, non-consensual and. therefore they are abusive. With pre-majority children and adolescents, they are also criminal behaviors.

The Need for Accurate Information

Facts need testimony to be remembered and trustworthy witnesses to be established in order to find a secure dwelling place in the domain of human affairs.

Hannah Arendt[7]

From his review of literature available to him, Rutter (1989) suggests that 10% of all professional men betray the ethics of their profession by becoming sexually abusive to their parishioners, students, clients or patients. He notes the informal wisdom of his peers in religious studies which suggest a somewhat higher percentage for clergy. Noting this common perception, he is insistent that clergy abuse research is urgently needed to understand the extent of the issues and problems faced by religious communities.

Rutter notes that most sexual abusers are repeat abusers. Therefore, the ratio is not one abuser to one single victim of abuse. The ratio can represent one abuser and many victims.

In my opinion one of the most needed activities of prevention is for all religious groups to gather reliable demographic data and to make that data public. Good, well-defined demographic research, as the *World Health Report on Violence* (WHO, 2002) notes, is the foundation for adequate plans and methodologies of treatment and prevention. Unless one is very clear about the specific issues and kinds of violence included in the broad

topic of clergy sexual abuse of the laity, it will be nearly impossible to create any genuinely helpful and lasting interventions.

Professional Guild Responsibilities

> *I believe…that this loss of authority that we lament is not merely a crisis of obedience, as our talk of discipline and order and rule suggests, but a crisis of credibility. How can the church credibly witness to the Gospel in word and deed when the news everywhere is of clergy sexual abuse of power, or money scams, or political manipulation and cover-up?*

Melanie May[8]

An additional question becomes immediately visible when one looks at a figure of 10% of professional abusers on average in any given North American profession. That question is this: *What do other non-abusive members of their professional guilds do about the presence of sexual abusers inside the guild?* More simply put: what do the 90% of non-abusing professionals do about their ethical, moral and spiritual obligations to deal with the 10% who abuse?

Rutter (1989) attempts an explication of this issue by beginning with his observation that non-abusing members of most professions seem reluctant to admit the factual reality that other members of their profession ever sexually abuse others. This is demonstrated in a variety of individual and guild values, attitudes, and behaviors:

- o Don't write about this; don't read about this; don't even notice or think about this
- o Look the other way
- o If you do notice it, keep it an insider's secret
- o If asked, deny that this behavior is present or even possible
- o Do not allow the public to know about this
- o Intimidate others away from factual sources of information
- o Refuse to allow statistical studies to be done to document the presence of such a problem during your watch as administrator
- o Refuse to fund research about it

- Refuse to publish articles in which statistical or other kinds of informational research studies have been done
- Threaten legal action or professional reprisals against others who appear ready to reveal such behavior to others
- Enact personal or professional reprisals against whistle-blowers who do inform others about the presence of sexual abuse by another professional.
- Control all public access to information to prevent adverse publicity
- Above all, protect the profession even if this means denying the rights of victims (32-34)

By means of this short laundry list of self, profession or agency protective attitudes and behaviors, Rutter describes an informal, yet internally policed and maintained, professional guild code of secrecy that overlays and outweighs explicitly stated professional codes ethics and behavioral standards. This pattern of secrecy results in passive and active acts that suppress information.

He asks why professional men, who, themselves, behave in moral and ethical ways, do not in a timely manner confront and report their abusive colleagues. He identifies complex intra-psychic motivations which I paraphrase below:

- Some men hold on to fantasies that although this kind of sexual behavior has never happened to them in their professional career, there is hope that one day it may happen to them. Hearing about a colleague who has crossed the boundary, such fantasies are encouraged.
- Some men live vicariously through the abusive behaviors of others. In such a scenario, Rutter notes that an abusive professional serves as a *surrogate* who lives out the sexual fantasies of his professional colleagues. Professional men, therefore, do not want to prevent abusive sexual behavior by their surrogate

He notes, e*ach episode of actual sexual contact generates, like a virus, an infectious atmosphere that lowers the resistance of men who are struggling not to act on their fantasies* (1989, 63).

I would note, as well, that in many employment situations, supervisors may be engaging in similar kinds of behavior. In this situation, they provide a

252

self-legitimating model to their subordinates for such behavior. In addition, they are often known or rumored to be so engaged. A mutual game of *extortion* is thus played. Neither can reveal the actions of the other to ethical or professional boards of inquiry without his own life actions being similarly revealed. It is possible, theoretically at least, for a whole professional cadre of men, a faculty department, for example, to know that unethical behaviors are going on and for no one to be free enough to do the right thing – to call a halt to it by reporting it. Rumors may abound: *Did you hear that so and so is sleeping with so and so?* Recipients of the rumors, in their professional guild behaviors, act (1) as if they have no awareness at all of anything ethically or morally wrong with a colleague's sexually abusive behavior, (2) as if they have no ethical or moral responsibility to the victims of such violence, (3) as if they have no professional obligation to maintain and adhere to their specific guild's professional ethic.[9]

In such a situation, massive collusion of all members of the department precludes action by any one of them. This is, I believe, a very powerful example of *group think* in action. The collusion is very well hidden in the underground of individual and group consciousness. In this kind of situation, no one will speak our for fear of consequences directed at them personally. They may fear that their own ethically questionable sexual behaviors will become known. They may fear economic reprisals, for example, that if they blow the whistle, they will be fired. They may fear that others will exclude them from professional and social networks. Sadly, in many situations, these self-serving fears are realistic.

Such a hypothesis does not completely or satisfactorily answer the motivation question for secrecy inside a professional guild. The question remains open. Why do non-abusive members of a profession so actively protect abusive individuals who betray their professional code of ethics, their professional obligations and their clients? In the case of ordained clergy, this question is even more complex because these situations usually violate deeply held community beliefs and frequently preached moral precepts. They also contradict essential teachings about Christian faith and discipleship.

Nevertheless, secrecy and cover-ups about professional sexual abuse are quite common inside various professional guilds. At least two behavioral side effects co-exist inside the pattern of this kind of secretive guild

behavior. In the first, the victim (or the victim's family) is accused of lying and making false accusations. In the second, the messenger or whistle-blower in the guild is accused of lying. In both situations, harassing and abusive behavior may be directed at the victim and/or at the whistle-blower by the abuser or by those who are engaged in covering-up the abuser's behavior.

In both situations, victims and whistle blowers, social ostracism by the community may be a direct result of reporting clergy sexual abuse of the laity. Inside any and all of these, the abuser remains hidden inside a veil of protection, denial and secrecy. The rights and needs of the abuser have, in such situations, taken precedence over the rights and needs of the victims of abuse.

A Working Profile of Abusers

> *When church professionals – teachers, ministers, counselors, and others trusted with authority – misuse their power, the church must first say very clearly that any personal reconciliation called for must first begin with truth-telling and the confession, repentance, and restoration to the health of the abuser. Second, church leaders must signal to members that while the church is concerned for restoration of those who sin, it will protect abusees from their abusers, and will not add to the harm already done (16).*

Laurie Hersch Meyer[10]

Rutter (1989) comments that an individual's professional success creates a high-risk situation for him – one in which he frequently becomes an actual abuser. In part, this is due to cultural processes that allow successful men to *make their own rules* about what is appropriate interpersonal behavior in their particular career and life situation. Accumulated power, especially of role or position, influence and money, allows the individual great personal freedom of action. Many of these men have competitively and aggressively pursued position, power and authority (in short, dominance over others) as a pathway to career success. Some of them have refused to accept the word *no* in their upward career trajectory. In addition, such an individual is used to having his words and behavior accepted and believed. Such a

combination of power and privilege glosses over aspects of his behavior which are less than honorable. Many of the men who sexually abuse others are, therefore, powerful respected men in their occupation. Some of these men feel no moral need to justify what they do to themselves or others. They simply act upon their impulses. Others create elaborate self-serving rationalizations for their behavior.

Still others distort, to their own advantages, the underlying agreements of relationships with others. An abusive teacher, for example, may tell himself that he is really helping a shy student to emerge from her cocoon, thereby helping her to become more independent, self-reliant, and interpersonally successful. In this illusory fantasy, the abusive man persuades himself that his sexually abusive behavior is actually *good for* the other person.

Other abusers may simply note that the surrounding environment is such that they believe that they can *get away with it* and so they act. Still others find permission in the sexually abusive behavior of others in their immediate surroundings. In a sense abusive men become mentors and models for each other about what is desirable, possible and implicitly allowable. Some men persuade themselves that this is a *true love* relationship or that they have found a *soul mate.*

In a *Fortune Magazine* article (May 10, 1999) about sex addiction of some of the United States' most powerful corporate leaders, author Betsy Morris quotes Patrick J. Carney. Carney heads one of several sexual addictions treatment centers that cater to the rich and famous. According to Morris, Carney is the nation's leading expert on corporate sex addiction. Carney comments,

> *Most of my patients are Chief Executive Officers and doctors or attorneys or priests. They are people with a great deal of power. We have corporate America's leadership marching through here because they don't want anyone to know* (69).

Carney's words, in 1999, echo those of Rutter in 1989.

In the situation of clergy abuse, Rutter notes that a clergy abuser's institutional bureaucratic power is enhanced by and complicated by the common perception among clergy and laity alike that the pastor, priest, deacon, spiritual teacher, theologian, or minister is a human representative

of Christ and is responsible to God as well as to the human being in his or her care. Consequently, in situations of shared belief – as for example, in the confessional – for the priest or minister to suggest by nuance, word or deed that a sexual encounter with the other is part of God's plan for their relationship is to abuse not only the body and psyche of the vulnerable person but the spiritual center as well. In situations in which the theology or doctrines of a religious group is used by the spiritual leader or the spiritual teacher to justify his behavior, he not only violates and betrays the trust of the vulnerable person. He also exploits and betrays the shared belief system and the community from which it has arisen (Rutter, 1989, 28).

If we add insight from Swiss Jungian analyst Guggenbuhl-Craig's work (1992) on professional abuse, we see that the work of ministry is itself betrayed. In his self-other destructive act of sexual abuse, the ministering person destroys the essence of his ministry. In this profound invalidation of his life and work, the ministering individual performs a self-destructive act that will shatter much that he himself teaches to be important.

Marker Events

> What is real? What is pretense?   What seemed to be love and care turns out to be selfishness and exploitation.
>
> A. W. Richard Sipe[11]

In a conference setting for clinicians, clinical psychologist Robert Grant (2010) commented that a marker event, for example, the first time a priest sexually molests a pre-pubertal child, is always surrounded by a communal culture in which meaning gets attached to the *marker event*. To understand a marker event means that individuals must acquaint themselves with the surrounding culture in which the marker event happened.

In situations of multiple situations of pre-planned abuse, there is always a pathway of abuse development. In such situations, it is essential to ask about the decision-making process by which the perpetrator moved from being a non-abuser into becoming an abuser. What happened along the

developmental life trajectory of this particular perpetrator? What messages did he receive from his family, community and culture? The full-blown sequential abuser, in Grant's opinion, has had to get well-practiced in the behaviors of abuse. In each subsequent abusive event, the perpetrator gains additional skill in the particular form(s) of abuse in which he engages. In addition, I would add, neural and chemical pathways or patterns are created in the body's psycho-neural system. A certain kind of conditioning occurs. A combination of many biological and cultural factors begins to predispose the individual to the performance of repetitive behaviors. As I listened to Grant, it seemed to me as if he was describing an addictive pattern of behavior – with each subsequent repetition of sexually harassing or sexually abusive behaviors, the abuser became more compulsive about and driven to repetition. If no effective intervention occurs, the behavior is, therefore, likely to intensify – with more frequent repetitions and, in some situations at least, repetitions with more violence.

As the abuser gains the practiced skills of abuse, each subsequent abusive act further deepens the perpetrator's system of rationalization. In short, when we look at the trajectory of abuse in the lives of perpetrators from the vantage point of the marker event of abuse, what we see are growing skills at the action level and repetitive, increasingly well-anchored rationalizations at the cognitive level. In addition, the body's physiological conditioning and emotional commitments to specific behaviors also continues to mature as the body accommodates to these specific, obsessive, and habitual or addictive patterns of behavior.

Concluding Comments

A conspiracy of secrecy maintains the privilege and social esteem of the priesthood while permitting sexual activity -- men who use the power and position of "priest" to seduce men, women and children

Margaret Miles[12]

In such an examination of leader, clergy and professional abuse, it becomes important to note the intricate interpersonal realities of sexual abuser to sexual abuse victims.

The victim may be personally vulnerable due to a wide range of factors. In particular, they may be vulnerable because of naïve or misplaced trust. Many clinicians and researchers note that a previously abused individual is more likely to be subsequently abused by someone else.

It is also believed that a perpetrator role has elements of learning as well. Each subsequent act of abuse reinforces that pattern. Elements of learning as well as neuro-sexual-biological changes are likely in an abuser's development of skills in repeated abuse situations. When an abuser repeatedly attacks one individual, complex on-going relationship patterns of control and obedience, of dominance and submission, of developing trauma bonds shield and sustain their interactions.

Inside the abuser-abusee interaction some aspects of behavioral histories for both emerge:

- o The abuse victim may or may not have a prior history of abuse;
- o The victim may be vulnerable because of a current life situation in which she/he has requested help;
- o The victim may simply be in the wrong place at the wrong time;
- o The abuse victim may be vulnerable because of age, ethnicity, financial limitations, gender, sexual orientation, or simply proximity to the offender.
- o The abuser may also have a history of having been abused. Some literature strongly suggests that experiences of abuse, especially in early childhood and adolescence, have a strong correlation with abusive actions towards vulnerable others in adult life. Former priest and sex therapist A. W. Richard Sipe (1996, 12) claims, for example that 70-80% of the current priest pedophiles in the Catholic priesthood were abused as children – many of them by priests;
- o The abuser may occupy an institutional role of great power and authority. His victims may fear his acts of reprisal if they challenge his actions. Indeed, he may threaten reprisals if his victims tell anyone about the events of abuse;
- o The abuser may meticulously plan his seduction and abuse. In many circumstances abusers groom victims for a period of time so that victims unquestioningly trust him before he actually abuses them;
- o The abuser may also be an opportunistic abuser. If opportunity presents itself, he spontaneously begins abusive behaviors towards the other;

- A witness to the abuse – whether by direct observation or by being told about it later – can act on behalf of the victim, on behalf of the victimizer, on behalf of the surrounding organizational institution, or refuse to act at all. However, it is important to note that a refusal to act allows the abuse to go on and has a similar consequence to that of directly or overtly acting against the victim's needs and rights. Implicitly, at the least, a refusal to act supports the abuser against the one who is being abused.

When professional clergy sexual abuse happens within any of the institutions of organized religion, victims are wounded in all dimensions of their personal and social lives. The more they have seen the face of God in their violator's face, the more damaging the results will be to their personal spirituality and religious behavior. The more profoundly they perceive and experience abandonment by other human beings or by God, the more difficult will be their journey to healing.

In addition, by his actions of sexual abuse, the religious professional abuser has betrayed to collective trust of his community of faith. If we look closely, we will see he has also betrayed his own humanity as well as his religious calling to serve the specific community in which he has been ordained.

Thus, in all situations of professional abuse, trust has been betrayed. Quite often, trust has been betrayed multiple times. When an institutional climate of secrecy protects sexual abuse perpetrators from full accountability, victims of sexual abuse are re-violated and re-betrayed by the institutional community of faith.

Recommended Supplemental Readings

.

1) Capps, D. (2004). The Lasting Effect of Childhood Trauma in J. H. Ellens (Ed.). *The Destructive Power of Religion: Violence in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (Vol. 4, *Contemporary Views on Spirituality and Violence,* 211-220). Westport, CT: Praeger.

2) Fortune, M. M. (1989). *Is Nothing Sacred? When pastoral abuse invades the pastoral relationship.* San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row.

3) Herman, J. L. (1997). A Helping Relationship in J. L. Herman, *Trauma and Recovery: The aftermath of violence from domestic abuse to political terror, pp. 133-154.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

4) Labaqcz, K. and Barton, R. G. (1991). *Sex in the Parish.* Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox.

5) *USA Today*. (June 5, 2011). Pastor Peter James Went Further: We Won't Hide Behind Lawyers…Jesus Said The Truth Will Set Us Free. Retrieve from http://www.usatoday.com/news/religion/2011-05-09-vienna-virginia-church-abuse-case-la

6) West, T. (1999). The Harm of Sexual Harassment. *Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics 19, 377-382.*

Personal Reflection Questions

4) In your own words describe this chapter's abstract concept of transference and counter-transference? Does it make any sense to you at all? Use your own words to be as specific as you can be in writing your answer. If possible, give specific examples to illustrate your understanding of these two complex realities in human relationships where there are power imbalances.

5) What personal guidelines do you use in relating to individuals with whom you have a professional relationship or a business relationship? When, if ever, is it appropriate to initiate a sexual relationship? Does your answer change if you are a supervisor of this individual? Does your answer change if you provide a personal service (such as medical care or legal advice) to the person in control of the relation? Does your answer change if you are the person's pastor or spiritual advisor? Does your answer change if you are a student in the other person's classroom? Does your answer change if you are a member of the other's religious or denominational congregation?

6) What personal guidelines do you use in relating to individuals whom you consult professionally for help or advice such as your pastor or a

hospital chaplain or a classroom professor?   When, if ever, is it appropriate for them to sexually proposition you or "come on" to you? When, if ever, is it appropriate for you to sexually proposition them?

7) If a professional person makes an unwanted sexual advance to you, do you know how to protect yourself? If it is a classroom professor, do you know college's or university's or seminary's procedures for reporting the behavior? If it is a member of the clergy, do you know your denomination's policies for managing this kind of behavior by clergy members? Would you report the incident to law enforcement officers?

8) What kind of an inner compass do you have to protect yourself (and others) in situations of sexual abuse and harassment? Be as specific here as possible. If you think you are in danger of a sexual assault, what do you do to protect yourself? Be as specific as possible.

Footnotes

[1] Elisabeth Lesser, July-August, 2010, 54.

[2] Karl Menninger quoted by A. W. Richard Sipe, 1996, 24.

[3] Leon J. Podles, 2008, 489-490.

[4] Eugene C. Kennedy, 2001, 68.

[5] A. W. Richard Sipe, 1996, 163.

[6] A. W. Richard Sipe, 1996, 45.

[7] Hannah Arendt, 1969a, 6.

[8] Melanie May, May 23, 1992, 1.

[9] For an extensive discussion of these complex issues see Leon J. Podles (2008). Podles, a Roman Catholic layman, was a former federal investigator, chapter 13, pp. 393-437.

[10] Laurie Hersch Meyer, May, 1992, 16.

[11] A. W. Richard Sipe, August 5, 2009, 4.

[12] Margaret Miles, Foreword in A. W. Richard Sipe, 1996, x.

Betrayal Trauma

Trust born of care is, in fact, the touchstone of the **actuality** (emphasis his) *of a given religion. All religions have in common the periodical childlike surrender to a Provider or providers who dispense earthly fortune as well as spiritual health; some demonstration of [*human*] smallness by way of reduced posture and humble gestures; the admission in prayer and song of individuals of misdeeds, of misthoughts, and of evil intentions; fervent appeal for inner unification by divine guidance, and finally, the insight that individual trust must become a common faith, individual mistrust, a commonly formulated evil, while the individual's restoration must become part of the ritual practice of many, and must become a sign of the trustworthiness in the community.*

Erik Erikson[1]

Introductory Comments

Some of the most central and vexing issues that our society faces about childhood sexual abuse [are that] *the injury is extensive, pain endures, victims are stigmatized, denial persists, victims are further injured through denial; and perpetrators continue to victimize children.*

Jennifer J. Freyd[2]

Our total dependency at birth upon others to guarantee our survival from childhood and adolescence[3] into mature adulthood means that human beings develop complex interpersonal relationships with others. These relationships involve a social contract of interdependency, the formation of strong social alliances, and are based on a foundation of basic trust. Our human experience of trust in others begins, therefore, in the earliest moments of life after birth.

In Erikson's 1968 study of the developmental progression of human beings from infancy to adulthood, he identified the infant's first developmental task as that of learning to feel secure with her or his primary caretakers. Most frequently, in Erikson's era, these were mothers. Today, many fathers are equally involved in providing direct nurturing and trustworthy childcare. This developmental task of learning basic trust includes two dimensions: trust in the infant's own body-self and trust in others to meet his physical survival and emotional needs. It is on this foundation that all future psycho-social development depends. Erikson writes:

> *The general sense of trust, furthermore, implies not only that one has learned to rely on the sameness and continuity of the outer providers, but also that one may trust oneself and the capacity of one's own organs to cope with urges and that one is able to consider oneself trustworthy enough that the providers will not need to be on guard lest they be nipped (248).*

With consistent, responsive, and loving care, the maturing infant experiences his social world as trustworthy. Here the infant begins to encounter her own identity and senses that in the company of these people who care for her that she is "all-right" (249). As trust develops, the maturing child begins to create and nurture the personal identity template that he will carry with him into later developmental periods. Each subsequent developmental period and agenda builds upon previously learned and accomplished developmental tasks. Serious damages to basic trust and personal identity in early and middle childhood create a very real possibility for a troubled developmental trajectory into adult identify and a disrupted or damaged capacity for mature intimacy with the self and others.

As Erikson noted above, the ground for individual and communal religious faith is anchored in early human experiences of trustworthiness in human others. He writes that each society and each age need to find its own institutionalized form of reverence and that this reverence becomes vital within a greater world view or what he calls world-image (251).

When a child's encounter with the world is constantly chaotic, inconsistent, or infused with violence, the child forms a foundational personality template of basic mistrust. As part of her maturing sense of self, the individual will also develop relatively stable and life-long patterns of relating to the self

264

and others that express and further develop this absence of trust. It is upon this foundation that the maturing individual will construct his personal identity. In each developmental stage there can be corrective life experiences but the foundational template remains relatively untouched if attention is not paid to deliberate growth changes and opportunities.

To summarize: the desired outcome of a child's early life experiences is the development of a secure personal identity which incorporates a realistic awareness of inner and outer realities and of self and others. This is best accomplished by any child if the world and his human relationships are repetitively and consistently experienced as reliable, caring and trustworthy. If a child's experience of her relationships to adults is too chaotic or too violent or too inconsistent, her life journey into a mature, healthy adulthood will be made more difficult.

In Erikson's ground-breaking work on human development, the progression of all developmental stages is inexorably anchored to the child's vital early relationships to adults. Without their care, the child could not survive to adulthood. The more trustworthy the adults are in the child's life, the more likely it is that she will be able to form lasting and secure attachments to others. When others demonstrate a consistent commitment to the child's welfare, the child can create a trusting framework for understanding his own self and the selves of those in his immediate environment. Eventually, the maturing child will transfer this learning to make connections to assisting with or providing for the welfare of others. Experiencing trustworthy adults in early childhood, the child imprints a deep inner sense of personal security. His personal sense of inner security lends itself towards a life journey of being trustworthy to others. One aspect of a healthy mature adult identity is, therefore, the presence of an accurate perceptual compass about whom to trust and whom to mistrust (Freyd, 1996).

The obverse situation is equally clear. A child who is brutalized and traumatized early and repeatedly during these critical years of childhood and adolescence will have a much more troubled journey into a secure adulthood. She may never be able to trust others. Or, conversely, she may make repetitive faulty decisions about too-easily trusting others. He may never be able to form lasting and personally intimate attachments to others.

Childhood experiences of betrayal and traumatic violence are not causally predictive of specific future generational violence. There is no 1:1 correlation of violence and betrayal experienced in childhood with later specific forms of violent or other maladaptive adult behavior such as criminal behavior, alcoholism or sex addiction. Nevertheless, for many, perhaps all, childhood and adolescent victims of sexual abuse by trusted adults, this betrayal and violation will deeply influence later adult life.

While sexual abuse violence trauma and betrayal trauma affect children, adolescents and adults, the earlier the betrayal, the more likely it is that damaging life-long effects will manifest themselves. An individual's developmental stage is significant because the way human beings interpret their world is shaped by their cognitive ability to understand it and encode that understanding into language with the self and others. A child raped at three years of age has a very different trauma experience and capacity to encode into memory and language what happened to him than a young adult raped at 18. Sipe (January 23, 2007) writes:

> *In order to have a fighting chance at developing in a normal way – that is to be capable of meeting the ordinary psychological growth challenges - children desperately need to maintain a mental image of a loving and rescuing parent. Men who destroy that parental birthright have been called "Slayers of the Soul". Religious authorities are among the most powerful figures that have the capacity to perpetuate what has been called "Soul Murder"* (1).

Yet even here, clinical experience suggests that traumatic experiences with untrustworthy adults and episodes of adult violence towards the child can be at least partially mitigated for the child or adolescent if other compassionate adults behave in trustworthy respectful, caring, resourceful, and supportive ways. This is especially true if and when the child or adolescent tells them about his terrifying experience(s) with sexual violence and he is believed and offered compassionate and knowledgeable help.

In a continuing education lecture series for clinicians, physician-oncologist Rachel Naomi Remen answered a question from an audience member by reminding her large clinical audience that it only takes one caring adult to help a troubled and abused child or adolescent move towards a healthy adulthood. `She described an adult client of hers who had a very abusive and chaotic childhood. When she asked her client about how he had

survived to become the non-abusive and emotionally secure man he was, he talked with her about the family dog. The dog's clear and unrelenting love for him rescued him and helped him survive with his personality relatively intact. In essence, Remen summarized, the dog was consistently trustworthy and unconditionally loving. In the dog's presence, the young boy felt recognized, affirmed and loved. In addition, I think now, the dog also allowed the young boy to develop the ability to love – and to experience safety in expressing his love to his canine friend without fear of violence or betrayal.

Nevertheless, clinical literature about pedophilia,[4] for example, is clear: a small percentage of sexually violated and traumatized children and adolescents will become carriers of the particular form of violence which they experienced. They, in their turn, will become pedophiles (Berg, 2006; Freyd, 1996; Sipe, November 15, 2009).

Trust betrayed not only interferes with a natural human inclination to trustingly accept loving care from others and to thrive in its presence. It also interferes with a second natural inclination which is to unreservedly and trustingly love and care for others.

Clinical psychologist J. Lamar Freed (2011) notes that regardless of a child's age or level of personal psycho-social development, an event of sexual abuse by a priest or ordained minister not only puts a tear in the child's developmental progression. It *actually shreds the framework of a developing view of the world as a trustworthy and predictable place.*

Trust Betrayed [5]

> *Abuse elicits a terrifying combination (of) helplessness and rage-feelings that the child must suppress in order to survive. The child, therefore, denies or justifies what has happened, deadens emotions, identifies with the aggressor, and even takes on the guilt that is appropriate to the offender.*

<div align="center">

A. W. Richard Sipe[6]

</div>

In her 1996 book about betrayal trauma Freyd comments that betrayal violates the implicit and/or explicit trust of individuals in others'

trustworthiness. The more necessary (to some form of survival) the relationship is for the betrayed individual, the greater the betrayal and its consequences for the betrayed one. When betrayal is extensive, it becomes traumatic (9). I would add that most instances of sexual betrayal, in addition to physical violence, involve some form of verbal and/or emotional violence. This is especially true when individuals are raped and physically abused by someone they have previously believed to be a trustworthy care-giver, respected elder, friend or mentor. In situations of clergy sexual violations, the betrayal also inflicts spiritual harm. Physically violent aspects of interpersonal betrayal intensify its traumatic after-effects. Freyd writes:

> *Consider the pressure on a child who is sexually abused by a parent or other adult who has power and authority over the child. The child* **needs** (emphasis hers) *to trust his or her parents and caregivers. Childhood sexual abuse, whether molestation or even penetration occurs, usually leaves no physical evidence. It is neither explained nor understandable to the child. It is often not even acknowledged by the perpetrator except to say it didn't happen or wasn't what it seemed to be* (3-4).

Herman (1997) noted that during the late twentieth century ongoing longitudinal clinical studies demonstrated *the profound developmental impact of childhood trauma* (238). She writes that clinicians and society at large only slowly recognized the long term consequences of America's *endemic social violence* (238). In these clinical studies, findings indicated an emerging model of trauma that included not only the psychological, cognitive, and emotional responses to trauma but also included long-term physical consequences. Herman continues:

> *It has become clear that traumatic exposure can produce lasting alterations in the endocrine, autonomic and central nervous systems. New lines of investigation are delineating complex changes in the stress hormones, and in the function and even the structure of specific areas of the brain. Abnormalities have been found particularly in the amygdale and the hippocampus, brain structures that create a link between fear and memory (238).*

Both Freyd (1996), a psychologist, and Herman (1997), a psychiatrist, agree. The phenomenon of mind-body dissociation is an essential aspect of post-traumatic stress disorders.

Herman discusses her clinical awareness of the cost of dissociation to the long-term health of individuals whose life has been forever changed by violence. She writes:

> *Previously many clinicians, myself included, viewed the capacity to disconnect mind from body as a merciful protection, even as a creative and adaptive psychological defense against overwhelming terror. It appears now that this rather benign view of dissociation must be reconsidered. Though dissociation offers a means of mental escape when no other means of escape is possible, it may be that this response from terror is purchased at far too high a price (239).*

Pert's (1997) groundbreaking work on the important role played by the chemical bath of the neuropeptides in emotional responses to human experience adds complexity to our thinking about individual victims and their life-long responses to priest rape in childhood and adolescence.[7] Finally, Levine's work (1997, 2003, 2005, and 2008) about the importance of the autonomic nervous system and multiple memory systems in Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) symptom formation has begun to transform many therapy modalities for helping individuals who suffer PTSD after many different trauma-producing experiences. The role of the body in storing traumatic memory means child and adolescent sexual abuse, when understood not only cognitively (as in memory and narrative) but also pscho-biologically (as in the body's bio-chemical, cellular and autonomic nervous system responses) can be successfully treated many years after the initial trauma.

Taken together these authors guide clinicians through complex bio-physiological mechanisms of self-protection during events of overwhelming terror and trauma. Once understood, appropriate and helpful client-specific clinical approaches can be developed (Rothschild, 2000, 2003 and 2006). .
The human body-mind-self has a strong neurobiological response to trust betrayed – especially in childhood and adolescence when the personality and analytic cognitive abilities are still maturing. It also has a strong and

lasting neurobiological response to traumatic encounters with violence. Both forms of trauma (betrayal trauma and violence trauma) are present in the child's and adolescent's encounters with sexual abuse by caregivers and adults in positions of authority over them. These are the individuals whom the child has no option but to trust for some element of his safety, survival and personal well being.[8]

Religious Conditioning for Clergy Sexual Abuse

> *The Church is a visible institution. The Church teaches as official dogma that the Church as we know it, that is, a hierarchical structure that is totally run by celibate male clerics (mostly bishops), was initiated by Jesus Himself. The Church teaches that the pope is the representative (vicar) of Christ on earth. It teaches that Christ founded His church and left it in the hands of the twelve apostles and explicitly willed that these apostles pass this power down to their successors. Consequently, the official teaching is that the visible church is run by men who have been especially chosen by the Supreme Being. Furthermore, the Church teaches that priests are fundamentally different than other humans. They are, in the words of John Paul II,* **uniquely configured to Christ** *(emphasis his). Catholics are taught to believe that priests are special. They represent Jesus Christ. They have very special spiritual powers. Their intercession is essential for anyone who wishes to make it to heaven in the next life. This teaching is the foundational for the* **clerical culture** *(emphasis his) that runs the church.* **Clericalism** *(emphasis his) is the belief that clerics (deacons, priests, and bishops) are superior to lay persons and are rightfully entitled to deference, unquestioned respect and exemption from many of the obligations born by most lay people.*

Thomas P. Doyle[9]

Clinical psychologist and ordained Methodist minister Dwight Judy (2011) commented in personal correspondence with the author that another form of severe damage (to the abused individual) is when clergy sexual and/or physical abuse is accompanied by sexual, physical, emotional, and/or religious abuse at home. Within some authoritarian and religious family structures and religious organizations, the punitive, angry, and revengeful

God is invoked as a rationale for these complex forms of childhood abuse.[10]

In the commentary which follows in this section, I rely on written materials by Dominican priest and Roman Catholic canon lawyer Thomas Doyle. In particular, I rely on a speech given to SNAP,[11] a clergy abuse victim's advocacy group. As a Roman Catholic canon lawyer, Doyle has interviewed hundreds of victims and some perpetrators. He has reviewed thousands of pages of legal testimony from criminal suits against clergy sexual abuse perpetrators and has provided affidavits in civil suits against Roman Catholic institutions which protected pedophile perpetrators from prosecution. He has provided testimony to several grand jury investigations into Roman Catholic institutional malfeasance in protecting priest pedophiles from criminal prosecution. As a priest-advocate for Roman Catholic clergy sexual abuse victims he has, therefore, witnessed first hand the devastating long-term effects of childhood sexual abuse in adult survivors of such abuse.

In private communication with (then) Roman Catholic religion journalist Rob Dreher (February 9, 2008), Doyle commented on Dehner's investigations and reports about the Catholic child abuse scandal: *if you keep going down this path you are going to go to places darker than you can imagine* (1). In his blog discussion of his personal conversion away from orthodox and conservative Roman Catholicism to an Eastern Orthodox faith, Dehner (2010) notes that Doyle's warning was well-grounded although not immediately apprehended and understood.

In his July 13, 2008 SNAP address Doyle's thesis is that the spiritual trauma associated with clergy abuse is *directly related to the belief system of the victims which is usually a mixture of authentic doctrine and irrational beliefs that have been planted and nourished by the Church itself (9).* He identifies several church teachings that are influential in how children, adolescents, and adults experience and subsequently respond to clergy sexual abuse and institutional clericalism.[12] These theological and doctrinal teachings range from the doctrine of God to the nature of the Church to the sacramental priestly identity of all Roman Catholic clergy.[13]

In Roman Catholicism *the doctrine of God* includes formal teaching that God punishes sins and rewards good behavior. Sins are committed in thoughts and action. In order for God to be just, it is necessary that he

punish sin. Clergy, in representing God on earth, have a special preference in God's plan. He is especially pleased when members of the laity obey the priests and the bishops in living a life acceptable to God (as defined by the institutional church). Questioning a priest or disobeying his teachings is an act of sin. Since God punishes all sin, acts of disobedience and acts of doubtful questioning must be avoided. In addition to sinful acts, every human being is born in a state of original sin and is prone to evil. In such a situation, Christians must earn God's love. The faithful Christian obeys church doctrine and priestly teaching in order to have a safety net with the divine. Only the church's sacramental rite of baptism removes the eternal consequences of original sin. Only the church's sacramental rite of penance and absolution removes the eternal consequences of sinful thoughts and actions.   Doyle writes:

> *Traditionally the Catholic Church's teaching on human sexuality has held that all sex outside of marriage is gravely or morally sinful. This means that any sexual act, thought, or desire with oneself or another is so heinous that to die with the sin unabsolved meant eternity in hell. Catholics are taught that the safety net is absolution by the priest through the sacrament of penance, or* **confession** (emphasis his) *as it is commonly known. That belief leads to feelings of helplessness and rejection. It also fortifies the toxic dependence on the priest* (10).

The doctrine of the church holds that the Catholic Church was founded by God and was intended by God from all eternity. Thus the institutional church becomes the divine kingdom of God on earth and the Church is the only authority that can interpret and proclaim the divine will of God to the human community. Subsequently, Catholic children are taught that the religious hierarchy was specifically designed by God to guide the people of God in their religious and moral lives. Higher ranking members of the clergy such as bishops, archbishops, cardinals and the Pope represent the divine will. Because the Church and its clerics are *presented as superior to lay persons,* the laity lives in fear of offending God by offending God's divinely chosen representatives on earth (10). Since, in this theology, the church is *perfect* it is, by definition, incapable of inflicting suffering or committing wrong-doing (10).

The doctrine of forgiveness is often interpreted as leaving an offense behind and forgetting about it while *foregoing any expectations of justice or*

punishment for the wrongdoer (11). Such a view of forgiveness is faulty in Doyle's opinion. He writes: c*hurchmen or others who urge forgiveness intentionally misinterpret the doctrine of forgiveness for their own selfish benefit. They also do not comprehend the depth of pain that comes from sexual abuse nor do they understand what victimization means* (11).

The doctrine of the priesthood teaches that the priest, by virtue of his ordination, is God's representative on earth. *The Catechism of the Catholic Church* teaches that i*n the ecclesial service of the ordained minister, it is Christ himself who is present to the Church as Head of the body. This is what the Church means by saying that the priest by virtue of the sacrament of Holy Orders acts "in persona Christi capitis" (in the presence of Christ as head).*   One social and religious consequence of this teaching is that many Catholic members of the laity believe that the priest is an incarnated divine representation of God (11). *This is perhaps especially true for children and adolescents* (commentary and emphasis mine). Doyle continues that in his capacity of priest, therefore, *the* priest *has the authority to act in the power and person of Christ himself* (11).[14]

Doyle summarizes his much more extensive discussion of these doctrines in the following manner:

> [Ordinary lay Catholics] *see priests as unique beings, different from ordinary men, deserving of their respect, obedience and even awe. In Catholic culture the priest is in a far superior position to lay persons because of his vast mysterious powers. The power a priest holds over lay people plus the enormous mystique that he actually stands in the place of god sets a clergy victim up for severe emotional and spiritual trauma* (12).

When a child, adolescent or adult is vaginally, orally, or anally raped by a priest, the devastation is not only, therefore, psychological, emotional and physical. It is also spiritual. The priest who represented Christ and God at their baptism, at the Eucharistic meal and in the confessional is the same individual who raped them. Many adult Catholic survivors of priest abuse share in the perception that the violation was some form of divine retribution for their personal but unknown failures and faults. Doyle quotes SNAP founder Barbara Blaine, *many of us feel as if we had been raped by God* (13).

Pathological Communication-Relationship Patterns
The Double Bind

Abuse follows an established form but the suffering is unique.

Jimmy Breslin[15]

In 1956, anthropologist Gregory Bateson and his associates published the first theoretical discussion of a pathological communication-relationship pattern between two people which resulted in intense psychic distress for one of them (Jackson, 1968). The Bateson research team named this pattern the double bind. The double bind includes three components.

> *First,, there is an intense relationship in which the message-receiving individual (the victim) feels it is vitally important to discriminate what sort of message is being communicated by the second person (the victimizer). The victim is concerned with behaving appropriately to the message received from the victimizer.*

> *Second, however, the…victim is caught in a situation in which the…victimizer expresses two contradictory injunctions. Both injunctions carry negative sanctions for the victim's failure to make the appropriate response.*

> *Finally, the…victim is prohibited from leaving the field of the contradictory messages* (Krall, 1990, 426).

To complicate matters further, one message may arrive verbally and the second may arrive nonverbally. Receiving a double-bind communication message set, the victim is unable to successfully decode both messages simultaneously. Unable to leave the command field, the victimized individual must choose how to respond to the two contradictory or conflicting injunctions and neither response will be the correct one. The victim, therefore, will always be in the wrong no matter what she or he chooses to do in response to the injunctions received.

To reiterate, the victim of double bind messages is prohibited by the nature of the situation (and its implicit or explicit threat of impending violence), from making a meta-communicative statement about the situation in which

she or he finds the self. Thus, she has no psychological or cognitive way in which to successfully protect the self from the violence of the message pattern.

Haley (1976) in his attempt to clarify Bateson's work wrote that Bateson's idea of the double-bind included an idea that the victimizer communicates two levels of message to the victim. Both message levels both qualify and conflict with each other (68). As noted above, the bind becomes fully operative when the individual cannot leave the field of interaction (68).

In 1972, Bateson abstracted the primary negative injunction into two styles: (1) *Do not do so and so or I will punish you* and (2) *If you do not do so and so I will punish you* (206). The primary and secondary injunctions are usually sent on different channels. The verbal message, for example, may be explicit while the non-verbal one may be conveyed by posture, gesture, tone of voice, and even the abstract implications of the verbal message may all convey the secondary injunction. The recipient-victim of such convoluted messages must make sense of them in a high stress (and often violence-loaded) interpersonal situation.

In 1990, in the cultural context of young adult acquaintance rape I wrote:

> *The double-bind concept appears to illuminate women's experiences…in rape events. [In rape events] there is a confusing mix of channel messages in a situation of coercion. These messages are implicit in the organization of rape behaviors as an interpersonal transaction. These messages can be described in terms of two opposing views of rape which are currently present in our culture's interpretation of rape. First, rape is violence against women and responsibility for rape belongs to the man: rape is sexual and responsibility for rape belongs to the woman (412-413).*

During rape, the primary message is one of violence. It can be seen in an implicit or explicit injunction, *Do not disobey me or I will kill you.* In the body's kinesthetic channel the message is transmitted nonverbally: *Obey me and I will rape you.* In the body's kinesthetic awareness, the violence or rape masquerades as sexual intercourse – an ordinary means of individuals developing personal intimacy with one another and demonstrating affection, care and love.

The body's physical arousal and orgasm during rape is usually confusing to women during rape and often infuriating after the rape is over. The awareness of physiological arousal requires information about the autonomic nervous system and its management of arousal in a wide variety of situations. It also requires contextual interpretation. It is an example of what anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1973) calls the eye twitch-wink distinction. The woman must learn to process what she knows about physical arousal and release in all kinds of situations (sneezing, riding a roller coaster, jumping out of airplanes for pleasure, just escaping sudden death on the highway, making love, and experiencing gendered sexual violence, as examples). From a biological perspective, physiological arousal caused, for example, by fear, terror, and panic or the physiological arousal of sexual desire do not differ all that much in physiological terms. The differentiation between the arousal of terror and the arousal of sexual desire is primarily contextual and interpretive. Having experienced the intense arousal of fear in rape and orgasmic release, the woman becomes trapped in her own pre-rape socialization and her post-rape interpretations and questions. Unless women are helped to sort out this kind of interpretation after a rape, they may remain stuck in self-blame and self-interrogation.

The Life Experience of Victimized Children[16]

> The act of sexual abuse itself is the most obvious source of physical and emotional pain.
>
> Thomas P. Doyle[17]

In her extended discussion of the distortions of memory that occur when pre-pubertal children are sexually violated by adults who have a greater physical size than they do and perhaps even more importantly have a position of social power and role authority over the child, Freyd (1996) comments on the existential bind (what I would call a double bind) that encapsulates an acquaintance betrayed child, a sexually abused child. There can be no clinical doubt: a child or adolescent sexually abused by an adult who has power and authority over him finds himself trapped in a terrifying space and moment from which he or she sees no exit. Seeing no physical escape from the clergy rapist, (or the parent rapist) the victim splits

the body and mind and mentally escapes the situation. Some children may, therefore, watch the events of violation from an out-of-body experience. Freyd writes:

> The child **needs** (emphasis hers) to trust his or her parents or caregivers. Child sexual abuse perpetrated by a trusted caregiver is therefore a prime example of the kind of event that can create information blockage in the mind of the victim. To know is to put oneself in danger. To not know is to align with the caregiver and ensure survival. Some degree of amnesia or unawareness of the event is thus a natural reaction to childhood sexual abuse (164-165).

Doyle (July 13, 2008) describes the situation for pre-pubertal and adolescent children raised inside the Roman Catholic Church and families who sought to be absolutely faithful to the teachings of the church. When their rapist was a priest they'd previously been taught to revere, believing (trusting) Roman Catholic children were caught in the situation where their confessor and guarantor of eternal salvation was also their sexual assailant. Doyle comments:

> When many clergy abuse victims began to look at their lives it became obvious that there was something different about the impact on a believing Church member when raped or assaulted by a clergyman or religious woman. Not only did the rape or assault have disastrous physical, emotional, and psychological effects but it was spiritually damaging as well (7).

The bind which faithful believing Catholic families and their children experience is complex and multifaceted. In involves catechetical teaching from earliest childhood that they **must** (emphasis his) accept and believe what the "Church" says or teaches without question. This philosophy of compliance has been imposed in such a way that "believers" generally are not able to distinguish between a foundational doctrinal statement and a casual utterance by a clergyman. They have been taught that to doubt or question a cleric is to offend God and thus commit a sin (7).

Laicized former Benedictine monk and psychotherapist A. W. Richard Sipe (June 1, 2010) concurs with Doyle about the emphasis placed on obedience to the institutional church and to its clerical leadership. He quotes theologian Yves Conger that sins of the flesh (i.e. sexual sins) are

the only sins and obedience (to the church) the only virtue (1). This is a second aspect of the double bind that the clergy abused parishioner experiences.

Taught from earliest childhood on that the only legitimate form of sexual expression is lodged within a church-sanctioned heterosexual marriage, the child's maturing mind and belief system accepts this teaching. One might say that the consciousness of the believing church member, for example, an altar boy, has been shaped by years of family and catechetical training to believe (1) that sexual expression belongs only inside church-covenanted heterosexual marriage and (2) that priests are above criticism or question because they represent Christ on earth in a special way. To question either of these two is to put one's soul in danger.

Finally, the church's teaching about priest celibacy means that church members trust that the priest's sexual continence, chastity and celibacy has been divinely ordained. Receiving at ordination a special divine charism that enables celibacy the priest is, therefore, to be trusted in all matters regarding sexuality and interpersonal relationships with individuals of both genders and all ages.

In my opinion, adult women who are victimized by clergy experience similar kinds of betrayal. Consequently, they are also simultaneously traumatized by the events of sexual violence *and* the profound betrayal such an assault represents. They too face psychological and spiritual consequences following such assaults.

Let me summarize. The double bind in which a priest-raped child, adolescent or adult is encapsulated appears to me to include at least three aspects of church teaching: *one* is that sexual sin (any non-marital sexual thought or activity), un-confessed and un-absolved by a priest, means that one will go to hell; *the second* is that priests represent God on earth and if one questions or accuses a priest one will offend God, be in a state of sin which needs confession and absolution or one goes to hell. *The third* is the belief that priest celibacy enables the cleric to selflessly serve his parish in a sexually trustworthy manner and act as Christ on earth in leading the parish.

However, a child, adolescent or adult who is raped by a priest (or member of a religious order) confronts the second contrary aspect of the double

bind. The cleric (or member of a religious order) is not celibate and has engaged the child in priest-forbidden sexual activity. In the situation of boy victims, the sexual activity is homosexual. Thus, the priest (in the child's personal life experience) is not trustworthy, and he engages in violent, abusive and frequently same gender sexual activity within his ordained, unmarried and theoretically chaste life status as a priest, bishop or cardinal.

To complicate matters for the raped individual, the ordained priest who raped him is the same priest who in the parish confessional represents the *only* (emphasis mine) route to absolution for his "sinful" participation, however unwilling and coerced, in the sexual actions which the priest initiated. In addition, many children are threatened into silence by the abusive priest. They may also intuitively comprehends that no one will believe them if they report the priest's behavior. Thus, in the time of physical, emotional, psychological, cognitive and spiritual crisis, the victimized individual is isolated from a supportive community which might, in better circumstances, help the pre-pubertal child or post-pubertal adolescent to understand that he is not the cause of his abuse and that he is, therefore, not living in a state of un-confessed sin which will guarantee he ends up in hell if he dies without the sin being confessed and absolved.

Bateson and later interpreters of Bateson's epistemology of the double-bind comment that one way to shatter the all-encompassing and encapsulating nature of double-bind communication patterns between abusers and victims is meta-commentary (or, when appropriate, bind-shattering humor). Effective meta-commentary splinters and destroys the binding elements by revealing them in their true nature and essence as conflicting and mutually exclusive control messages.

In the paragraphs above I have been doing meta-commentary and in his 2008 SNAP lecture Doyle likewise provided meta-commentary. Meta-commentary breaks down the crazy-making aspects of a double bind communication process. It reveals the structural and deeply binding irrationality of the interpersonal message as it is conveyed to and directly experienced by its receiver. It breaks down the apparent "one, unified message' and reveals the nature of fused contradictory messages. It helps victims to understand that in the supposed single message, both sides of the double bind fuse and are presented as if they were one message to the recipient. Receiving such a complex message, the recipient cannot make a proper response. No matter what response he makes, he is always wrong.

Responding to one side of the message and ignoring the other, he is wrong. If, he responds to the second leg of the embedded message, he is also wrong.

Caught in a situation from which one cannot escape, there is no way to proceed with clarity. Such messages deeply violate the social contract among people for clarity, for social respect and for social responsiveness. The more the individual perceives that his life is threatened in some way, the more devastating the situation is for him.

Parenthetically, receiving double bind messages create severe distress in animals in captivity which must relate to human trainers (Bateson, 1976, 241-242)   Porpoises, living and being trained in captivity, were distressed and their trainers interpreted this in the following way: *being in the wrong (emphasis mine)* disturbed the porpoises and they became very agitated between training sessions. Bateson interpreted the porpoises' distress and agitation in the following manner:

> *Severe pain and maladjustment can be induced by putting a mammal in the wrong regarding its rules for making sense of an important relationship with another mammal* (Bateson, 1969, 242).

Not only are human beings emotionally distressed and biologically stressed in situations of human captivity and double bind violence, for example, clergy rape of boys and girls. So too are our mammal relatives in captivity for purposes of human research – a field of porpoise-human interaction from which they cannot escape. The double bind, therefore, functions across mammalian species to agitate and distress victim–recipients entrapped within the structures of double-bind communication patterns.

In a pedophile priest rape situation with a pre-pubertal child, for example, a deep, pervasive confusion controls the child's inner world and survival fears and terror are constant companions to the child's confusion. For post-pubertal children who are just beginning to experience the maturation of their biological sexual maturity, sexual identity issues can be long-standing and overwhelming (Sipe, November 15, 2009).

Clinicians skilled to help their clients interpret double-bind messages also recognize and must deal with another reality. In abusive situations an accurate meta-commentary which may or may not include humor[18] frees

incredible rage in the interpersonal space between the bind-creating party and the bind-receiving one. Depending on the situation, that rage may be lethal. As I have witnessed individuals caught in double-bind situations, I have witnessed intense and terrifying (to the person experiencing it) helpless rage in the recipient of double bind communication messages. The helplessness is related to the closed field of the interaction and the rage is related to an inability to protect her body/Self from violation and violence (and control by the other). The victim is, therefore, tied to the double-bind-message-initiator and cannot find a way to protect and extricate the self from the violence directed at him.

However, when individuals begin to successfully deconstruct the bind, rage flares in the double-bind victimizer. As the perpetrator loses control, he seeks to re-gain it by any means at his disposal. This is also terrifying to the recipient and may re-establish the active presence of the double-bind – this time in more enduring ways.

It appears to me, therefore, that rage (most likely helpless reactive rage in victims) and most likely a controlling or enslaving hostile rage in victimizers) is the predominant emotional component of the double bind. For victimizers, an initiation of double bind commands or behavior is always oriented towards gaining irrational control of the other. It is, therefore, structurally and essentially violent.

As Arendt (1969a) in her political analysis of world events so clearly and persuasively reminds us the powerful in a situation of power being lost resort to violence in order to return them to control and to retain their positions of power-over. In my opinion, even the threatened loss of control invites the occasion of violence. Thus, when a victim of double bind communication patterns begins (within the inescapable field of the command injunctions) to resist or to challenge the initiator (victimizer), escalating levels of violence are quite likely.

A child or adolescent, caught within the double bind situation of priest rape is developmentally and cognitively unable to do what Doyle and I have done above. Caught in a situation of ongoing terror and identity confusion, he is unable to cognitively and abstractly think his way out of the trap he has been caught in. In addition, as Doyle notes above, because of his religious indoctrination, the victim of clergy sexual abuse has no way to realistically interpret what is happening to him. Since, in many cases, the

child or adolescent does not report the abuse or is not believed if and when he does report it his physical isolation during the rape is compounded by his encapsulation within the double bind and the ongoing social isolation it creates. If there was any kind of sexual pleasure associated with the assault, the child is even further encapsulated by false guilt inside the experience. As Bateson and his colleagues so clearly demonstrated, double-bind communication patterns, especially in early and mid-childhood are crazy-making interpersonal realities for the recipient of the victimizing message.

Without using Bateson's theoretical epistemology and terminology of the treacherous double bind, Richard Sipe (November 15, 2009) captures it precisely.

> *The behavior of an adult who acts in ways that are socially abhorrent and morally wrong challenges the child's conscience and judgment beyond reconcilable bounds. The clergyman presents himself and is accepted as a public moral arbiter. Yet the civic and religious leader draws the youngster into acts that are socially and morally unacceptable and must remain hidden. The bond of secrecy forms a noose that chokes maturing expression (4).*

The child or adolescent is not only trapped by the priest's adult physical size and muscular strength, the priest's social connections to other powerful adults, and the priest's spiritual authority in the life of the religious community, he is trapped within the structures of the double-bind communication pattern itself. It is the double bind structure, in my opinion, that has the longest-lasting and most pathological consequences for a young child whose cognitive abilities are still developmentally incapable of creating such a complex analysis. There is no way to think one's way out of the bind unless one is capable of creating precise and structurally accurate meta-commentary (or devastating and bind-shattering adult humor). Since human brains mature somewhere in an individual's early twenties, a young victim's moral reasoning ability is still childlike. The younger the child, the more incapable the child is to understand what has happened to him in any situation of clergy or religious professional rape or other forms of sexual molestation.

In the actual abuse situation, the victimized individual is paralyzed by terror. In the aftermath, he remains paralyzed by his literal fear of a literal God and

socially-realized fear of God's abusive priest. Frequently, Doyle (July 13, 2008) and Sipe (November 15, 2009) note, it takes years for a victimized child or adolescent to reveal the secret events of priest or bishop sexual abuse hidden in his early childhood. Some of that secret may well have been stored in human memory systems in such a way that the child cannot access his own life history (Freyd, 1996, Herman, 1981, 1992; Levine, 2003, 2005; Mendelsohn, et. al., 2011; Rothschild, 2000, 2003).

In other situations, the victimized child or adolescent has remembered the abusive incident(s) but has experienced adult disbelief and punishment for "lying about a priest" or he has been threatened by his abuser with earthly or heavenly violence if he tells someone. Given the religious community's presumption that priests are trustworthy religious and moral leaders and the institutional church's denial of clergy malfeasance and institutional wrong-doing, it is quite likely that many clergy-abused individuals die with this secret intact.

In the case of a violent assault (such as vaginal, anal or oral rape and coerced masturbation or fellatio) children and adults enter a crisis not of their own making. This crisis involves the entire personality of the individual. The younger the individual, the more likely it is that the developmental trajectory to a healthy and secure adulthood will be derailed. Sexual violence of all forms predisposes individuals to a wide variety of psycho-physiological and social disorders. Sipe (November 15, 2009) categorizes severe and life long consequences. I have added several additional items to Sipe's list.

Alterations in sexual development (Sipe): *This abuse forms the basis for, and invariably causes sexual dysfunction of some kind: impotence, sexual aversion, hyper-sexuality, the development of paraphilias - frequently pornography, voyeurism, fetishes – or the perpetration of abuse in a new generation…early promiscuity and sexual inhibition can both be consequences* (1). Sipe notes that sexual identity confusion is a frequent consequence of boys or young men raped by male clergy. Finally the blend of sex and violence can result in sadomasochistic sexual behaviors or even rape of others in the victim's adult life (1).

Development of anxiety disorders (Sipe): Because adult sexual behavior with children is a violent assault, anxiety disorders are prevalent in adult survivors.   Symptoms can include addictions of all kinds (for example

283

alcohol or drugs), obsessive-compulsive disorders, phobia development, panic episodes and uncontrollable episodes of anger and rage. Post-traumatic stress disorders are prevalent (2).[19]

Clinical depression (Sipe): Depression tends to be recurrent. For young people abused by priests, there is a loss of innocence, a loss of self-confidence, a loss of self-esteem, and a loss of religious faith. In addition, life-long physical disabilities such as morbid obesity may accompany depression (3).

Inability to trust others (Sipe): The consequences of abuse are long-lasting and survive long after the abuse has ended. The pre-pubertal child or post-pubertal adolescent caught in priest sexual abuse frequently feels abandoned and isolated. In the moment of rape, for example, they are alone with their abuser (3). Isolating terror of the actual event may generalize inside the growing personality to create psychic numbing and an inability to connect in meaningful ways with others.

Relationships in rags (Sipe): The individual abused in childhood or adolescence is often unable *to weave his or her relationships out of a whole cloth. The fibers in their personality have been torn; their ability to establish solid relationships is in tatters* (3). In adult life divorces, separations, and alienation from others are common. Individuals remain deeply wounded in their abilities to form deep, reliable and sustaining attachments with others (3).

Experiences of isolation (Sipe): *The survivors of abuse have a lonely core that isolates them from themselves and everyone else. That core is unassailable because it is entrapped in an unspoken and unimaginable secrecy. They can't share because the secret is often hidden from them. Even if they have memory traces they cannot put them in any coherent way that will make sense to anyone (including themselves). Even if their memories are clear, indelibly burnt into their mind and heart, many men and women have no way to scale the wall of guilt and shame that surrounds their childhood secrets (4).* He continues that inside this isolation, they may believe that they are the only targeted victim of such abuse.

Personal development and personalities altered and perverted (Sipe): From his decades of clinical work with priests and victims Sipe is

adamantly clear that abuse irrevocably alters and changes the individual's growth and development patterns and progression (4).

Sexual Pleasure Confusion: Clinical psychologist and Methodist minister Dwight Judy (2011) adds another dimension to this discussion. Individuals sexually abused in childhood and adolescence can find the pleasures of adult sexual interaction contaminated or marred by early experiences of abusive sexual contact with adults. I would add to Judy's comment that for some individuals, early and prolonged abuse appears influential in the development of hyper-sexuality for some. For others, abuse functions as a psycho-emotional shut-off valve for sexual responses of arousal and orgasmic release.

Trauma Bond: Thomas Doyle, in his July 13, 2008 speech to SNAP, adds another. He describes a trauma bond[20] between the abusive priest and his victim. He describes this bond as similar to the bond which binds abusive spouses and their abused partners. Inside such a bond, the abused victim repeatedly returns only to be re-victimized once more.

While Doyle does not elaborate on the exact nature of betrayal bonds or trauma bonds, it is important to note that they can be correlated to the Stockholm syndrome.[21] One symptom of a trauma bond is the development of strong emotional ties between two persons in a relationship where the individual with power, authority, and control physically, emotionally, verbally, psychologically, and in the case of priest abuse, spiritually abuses the second and weaker or more vulnerable party in the relationship.

Dissociation (Krall): One aspect of the trauma suffered during and after sexual violence involves dissociation, the splitting of body and mind in the service on survival by compartmentalizing the abusive aspects of the relationship. Denial of harm and the expression of positive affect towards the abuser by the victim is, therefore, one frequent manifestation of the trauma bond (or betrayal bond).

To summarize: the consequences of clergy sexual abuse affect all aspects of the victim's personality, his psycho-social development, his sexual development, his inner perceptual world, his systems of memory recall and integration, his ability to create an accurate, historical life-narrative, his ability to trust others and his ability to form permanent supportive

relationships. In addition, there is growing evidence inside the American Roman Catholic tradition that priest sexual abuse of children and adolescents profoundly affects an adult survivor's abilities to maintain a sustained and sustaining religious faith.

Religious or Spiritual Problems

> *Religious or Spiritual Problems: This category can be used when the focus of clinical attention is a religious or spiritual problem. Examples include distressing experiences that involve loss or questioning of faith, problems associated with conversion to a new faith, or questioning of other spiritual values which may not necessarily be related to an organized church or religious institution*

> American Psychiatric Association[22]

In 1994 the American Psychiatric Association added the diagnosis "religious or spiritual problem" to its fourth edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual.* The diagnostic category results from transpersonal psychologists (and other clinicians) who described distress or spiritual emergencies associated with spiritual practices.

According to psychologist David Lukoff (1998) the new diagnosis differentiates between religiosity and spirituality. *Religiosity* is defined as being associated with religious organization(s) and religious personnel. *Spirituality*, on the other hand, is defined as the degree of involvement or state of awareness or devotion to a higher power or life philosophy (p. 1).

Religious problems involve a person's conflicts over the beliefs, practices, rituals and experiences related to a religious organization or institution. Examples of religious problems can include (1) the loss of or questioning of faith, (2) changes in denominational memberships, (3) conversion to a new religion, (4) intensification of adherence to the beliefs and practices of one's faith, (5) joining, participating in or leaving a new religious group (p. 2).

Spiritual problems involve an individual's relationship with a higher power - one which is not necessarily connected to a religious organization (1). Examples of spiritual problems can include (1) loss of faith, (2) near-death experiences, (3) separation from a spiritual teacher. (4) a questioning of

spiritual values which is commonly associated with loss, (5) leaving a spiritual teacher and moving away from communities where they previously found spiritual meaning and teaching, (6) loss of previously comforting religious or spiritual tenets and community (pp. 4-7).

In reading authors such as Doyle (January, 2003) and Sipe (January 23, 2007), it seems quite apparent that any survivor of a violent sexual assault by a member of the ordained clergy (or other religious teacher) can develop religious *and* spiritual problems. Clinicians, victim legal teams, victim advocates, and other helpers should be aware of the likelihood of very complex socio-religious-spiritual responses in child, adolescent and adult survivors of religious clergy or spiritual teacher abuse. Informed responses by others include, therefore, an awareness that religious leader victimized individuals need time and support in order that they can sort through post-victimization religious and spiritual issues as well as physical, cognitive, emotional, social and psychological ones (Bloom and Reichert, 1998, 59-65; Dick, 2006; Mendelsohn, et.al., 2011, 135-136).

Spiritual Emergencies

> *Recovering anything sacred after a betrayal from religion graphs a voyage of possibility and inquiry that may seem unimaginable to some of us. There is a scar in the soul that is easily bruised again. Even the term – God - can be a minefield of conflicting feelings, memories and images.*

> Mikele Rauch[23]

In the handbook, *First Contacts: Crises and Spiritual Emergencies* (2003-2004) author Courtney Young includes physical abuse (rape, physical battering, or the recovered memories of previous encounters with such violence) as a crisis which the individual needs to manage in one way or another. Young goes on to note that the most helpful thing that can happens is for the crisis to be identified as early as possible *(7).* Early identification enables helpers to do early interventions. He identifies an *emergency* as a situation in which things *might never be the same again* (14). One of his principles for appropriate intervention is that *the sooner an appropriate response can be made, the easier and better the resolution will be (*7). Courtney defines spiritual emergencies as *a sudden break or*

involuntary change in a person's fundamental systems of belief, spiritual activity and psychic behavior, often accompanied by or immediately following a crisis (31).

Doyle in his July 13, 2008 SNAP address discusses spiritual trauma. His thesis is that sexual abuse by an ordained clergy person *has a profoundly traumatic effect precisely because of its spiritual nature* (15).

From almost thirty years of legal and pastoral work with adult survivors of child sexual abuse by priests, Doyle identifies markers of spiritual trauma. These symptoms often, perhaps usually, co-exist with physical, social, psychological, emotional and cognitive aftermaths of clergy-initiated child abuse.

Attitudes towards God

Priest sexual abuse victims describe a *loss of God* (Doyle, July 13, 2008, 16). This can have a variety of meanings to different individuals. For some, it may mean that God has deserted them or rejected them because of the priest's betrayal. For still others, it may reflect their estrangement from the priest which psychologically represents estrangement from God. For still others it may mean estrangement from the sacraments because priests control access to the sacraments. Doyle summarizes: *To distrust a priest is to distrust God, or so many are taught. When a priest-abuser betrays that trust the victims can easily feel that God has betrayed their trust. They, in turn often cannot feel trust in the clergy nor trust in God because their spirituality is such that the two are intertwined. Total loss of trust in the clergy is not permanently traumatic if one's spirituality is not dependent upon them yet for most Catholics the spiritual relationship the God is filtered through and consequently dependent on priests and bishops. Cut loose from priests, many victims erroneously believe they are cut loose from God* (15).

He continues: The loss of God turns to despair. Victims of clergy abuse describe their experience as soul murder. Victims betrayed by the clergy, isolated from the Church community and unable to reach out for support fall deeper into despair. The rupture of their relationship with God is final. This deep spiritual loss leads to additional anxiety, depression and hopelessness (18).

In religious situations where individuals (most especially children and adolescents) have conflated the image of God with the image of the clergy person who abused them, it is almost impossible after events of clergy victimization for the victimized individual to see God in a positive light. God, by cognitive and emotional association with the priest, becomes a harsh, abusive, victimizing deity who cannot be trusted.

Attitudes towards Ordained Clergy

Some adult survivors of clergy abuse report an initial confusion following a priest's act of rape or other form of sexual abuse. Long-enduring cultural feelings of awe and respect for the priesthood and priests are now challenged by feelings of terror, rage and hopelessness that result from the sexual violation itself. But if the child victim believes he cannot be angry with a priest because he fears God's wrath or if he feels guilty for what happened between the two of them then the personality must cope, unassisted by his religious heritage with the violence and the confusion. As the individual matures, his inner feelings may change to anger and loathing – not only for this particular priest but for all priests. This generalization of affect is common in many forms of trauma. Phobic responses to anyone wearing clerical garb may develop. Attendance at religious services or liturgical events or even the sensory accoutrements of churches and cathedrals may activate flashbacks and intrusive memories. A phobic response to any religious service attendance may result. Doyle (July 13, 2008) writes:

> *A believing Catholic's perception of the priest on all levels – emotional, cognitive and spiritual – is that of a being in whose essence God resides in a special powerful way. When a priest sexually violates a minor or an adult the shock to the victim's spiritual and emotional system is beyond adequate description. Most often the victim cannot process the fact that the priest, the embodiment of Christ, has sexually violated him or her. The complex trauma begins with the sexual violation itself and extends to the shock form the deep sense of betrayal not just by a trusted person but by the God personified by that person (16).*

Attitudes towards the Church and Community of Faith

Inasmuch as the institutional church is so strongly identified with its clergy, with liturgical worship and its sensory accoutrements, and with the divine being, many victims are unable to distinguish between them. This may be especially true for pre-pubertal children whose intellectual and moral development is still child-like. Doyle (July 13, 2008) comments that many adult survivors of clergy sexual abuse are unable to participate in worship activities or other forms of communal activity. *This is no small issue because the major life events are all commemorated in the Church's sacramental ceremonies… The pain is especially acute when connected to the more emotion-laden life events such as baptism, marriage and death. Many victims have experienced severe pain at not being able to attend the funerals of loved ones or not being able to have children baptized* (17). Doyle notes the rich liturgical heritage of Catholic faith and comments that clergy sexual abuse *destroys the trust in the Church's representatives and it fragments the symbols of belief* (17). He quotes Australian Bishop Geoff Robinson, *The abuse shatters the power of the symbols of that belief, e.g., the picture of a priest holding a host aloft becomes a mockery* (17).

When victimized individuals encounter situations in their lives that would benefit from spiritual or religious support (birth of a child, death of a child, parent, or spouse, severe or life-threatening illness, or the loss of a job and economic stress) abused individuals find themselves unable to turn to the church for support and guidance. That which was once their primary spiritual guidance and support system has now become a source of severe inner distress and spiritual anguish. That which once provided security (the Church and its priests) now provokes anxiety, rage, disillusionment, insecurity, and an inability to trust.

Judy (2011) comments that when an individual consciously withdraws from the spiritual home of a worshipping church community it is an act of self-differentiation. He writes, *it takes either great pain or great courage to do so.* I would add to Judy's comments that great rage at experienced abuse of the body/Self or witnessed abuse of others can also be a motivating factor in such an embodied decision. Sipe's February 23. 2003 comment that (6) *anger is the root of courage* seems applicable here.[24]

Bearing Witness

> *The sexual violation of a child or adolescent by a priest is incest. It is a sexual and relational transgression perpetrated by THE father of the child's extended family, a man in whom the child is taught from birth to trust above everyone else in his life, to trust second only to God. Priest abuse IS incest.*

Mary Gail Frawley – O'Dea[25]

In his SNAP address Doyle notes, correctly, I think, that many therapeutic encounters do not address spiritual wounds or spiritual emergencies. Secular therapists may feel incapable of dealing with concerns which seem to them to be primarily religious in nature (Lukoff, 1998). In addition, the institutional church's response has been to promise vaguely to pray for the victims and, in the same breath, urge them to forgive the abuser without holding the abuser accountable for his violent actions (Doyle, July 13, 2008). Neither of these institutional approaches remotely addresses the complex, multi-faceted wounds that clergy sexual abuse causes.

The first responsibility of any clinician or witness to clergy sexual abuse is to get the victim to a position of physical and psychological safety – to stop the abuse in whatever way it can be stopped. It is clear that institutional religious establishments do not understand this principle for children, adolescents, and adults sexually victimized by predatory religious leaders, in general, and by clerics, in specifics. In many situations, the perpetrator is protected by the institutional religious organization while victims are abandoned and frequently re-victimized (Berg, 2006; Boston Globe, 2002; Doyle, Sipe and Wall, 2006; Sipe, November 15, 2009, March 5, 2010).

The second responsibility of any clinician or witness to clergy sexual abuse is to provide information to the general public so that no additional victims may be violated. This most likely means reporting the perpetrator to law enforcement or child protective services. It means, I believe, institutional transparency about religious personnel who sexually abuse children, adolescents or adults in their religious duties. It means making public that which perpetrators and their religious institution protectors would prefer to keep secret in order (1) to avoid institutional scandal; (2) to avoid criminal prosecution by secular authorities; (3) to avoid litigation; (3) to maintain personal and institutional power; or (4) to protect institutional financial

resources; (5) to avoid additional and personally embarrassing revelations about leader misconduct and malfeasance.

Chinnicci (2010) writes that institutional religion has multiple responsibilities in situations of clergy and religious sexual abuse of the laity. First, the abuse must be stopped. Subsequent to this first principle, these responsibilities involve – not necessarily in this order of importance - (1) securing and continuing to ensure personal safety for every member of the community; (2) therapeutic, spiritual and financial help for victims and their families; (3) providing truthful information to the individuals directly involved and to the larger community; (4) crisis intervention work with the communities of faith in which abuse happened – attending to the spiritual and emotional and psychological well-being of the community; (5) providing spiritual and therapeutic resources to the perpetrator. In addition, Chinnicci's entire book profiles the supervising religious community's need to deal with underlying theological and doctrinal questions. The community as a whole needs to understand how abuse events relate to the spiritual beliefs and teachings of the gathered religious community.

This is a complex and costly prescription for the return of spiritual health to any religious community compromised by clergy sexual abuse of the laity (or, in the case of seminaries, other members of the incipient clergy community). Such a view of institutional responsibilities inevitably means making appropriate institutional reparations to victims to help them find a way back into healthy ongoing lives. Such a view means making preventive provisions that abuse does not recur inside the religious community, or if it does re-occur, is immediately and appropriately supervised so additional victims are not created.

Chinnicci's work reminds us that sexual abuse of individuals by clergy and members of religious orders do not only damage the individual victim. It damages marriages and families. It also damages the moral and spiritual life of the religious community as a whole.

From his experiences with many adult survivors of child sexual abuse Doyle believes that intervention in the spiritual aspects of clergy sexual abuse trauma is threefold. *First,* the individual's concept of the priest or clergy member must be addressed. He states that the concept of the priest as a personal representative of God or as a human stand-in for God must be de-mythologized. The adult survivor of sexual abuse can learn to see

292

the priest as a very fallible human being who engaged in criminal behavior. Separation of God's face from the priest's face is essential.

Once the priest (or other ordained members of the clergy and religious hierarchy) is no longer seen as God, as God's direct human representative, or as a humanly-incarnated aspect of Jesus, then, *secondarily*, the concept of God needs to be demythologized. Doyle explains further:

> *It is possible to move to a concept of God that does not lend itself to the toxic beliefs about guilt, suffering, sin and punishment. Such a transition is easiest on the cognitive level but much more challenging to the emotions.   Many victims are all too painfully aware of the personal devastation caused by the sexual abuse yet they continue to feel guilt because they have exposed a priest or sued a Church entity such as a diocese. This is all grounded in the irrational belief that God resides in a special way in the institutional church* (July13, 2008, 22).

The critical issue here, from a Protestant point of view, is to differentiate one's relationship with God from one's institutional role as a member of a particular church or religious congregation (Judy, 2011).

Finally, the spiritually traumatized survivor of clergy sexual abuse needs to re-examine his or her loss of a community of faith, that which may have been experienced before abuse as a spiritual home. Here individuals will have a wide variety of responses. A healing and guiding process in which the victim is helped to see that God is a higher power not contained within any human institution, that the institutional church has been a barrier to a personal relationship with the divine, and that spiritual maturity involves coming to a point where the individual has a healthy sense of self-worth and a personal relationship with the divine (Doyle, 1984, 2009).

Concluding Comments

> The establishment of safety is the starting point for all efforts at healing.

> Saundra L. Bloom and Michael Reichert[26]

If we think of a tsunami in a given geographical area, the public health principle that Bloom and Richert state becomes clear. It is impossible to help individuals rehabilitate their lives and to begin to rebuild them if they are still in physical danger of being overtaken by flood waters and washed out to sea with the outgoing tidal spasm. Individuals must reach high, dry ground before they can do anything else. Their immediate life crisis must be resolved before long-term rebuilding of their individual lives and communities can begin. Unable to provide for their own physical safety and survival, they must be given food, water, clothing, and safe and sanitary shelter. Whenever possible, they must be reunited with those they trust and love.

In my opinion, the same principle applies to the emotional, physical, religious and spiritual, psychological and social tsunami of clergy sexual abuse. Violated individuals must be assisted to find safe ground by timely, trustworthy and compassionate interventions by helpful others. While the devastation clergy abuse victims experience is not of buildings washed away, the inner trauma that accompanies the experience of assault and violence has wiped out or shredded a certain sense of invulnerability, trust in others, trust in God, and trust in themselves.

In addition, where the institutional church has become a secondary victimizer by its secretive protection of clergy abusers, victimized individuals have also lost a community in which they previously found meaning. In the middle of the religious-spiritual flood's devastation, they are often isolated and abandoned by their human community, their God, and any personal sense of wholeness and emotional or spiritual integrity. They, too, like the tsunami flood victims must (1) receive emergency assistance and once physically safe; (2) be supported by a caring community; and (3) helped in continuing and practical ways to rebuild their lives.

In the past five years I have talked with a variety of my Roman Catholic friends – none of whom have talked about being sexually abused by priests or nuns. All of them are, however, very aware of this issue. They tell me about friends who describe themselves as recovering Catholics or recovering Christians. In some cases their friends or family members have sought a different denominational home. Others have sought refuge in Eastern religious practices such as Buddhism, Taoism or the spiritual practices of Yoga. Some, perhaps the majority, have left behind all

294

religious faith and spiritual practice. This is psychologically equivalent to the life status of political refugees who live in refugee camps outside the borders of their national home. Living outside the communal boundaries their ancestral faith community, the resources of religious practice are no longer available to help them weather adversity and trauma.

The experienced spiritual trauma of clergy sexual victimization has produced, in my opinion, a socio-cultural situation of spiritual exile for victims (Berg, 2006; Dick, 2006; Ellison, 2011; D. Price, 2008). Living in disillusioned exile are other witnesses to the victim's experiences (Anonymous, ud; Dreher, February 9, 2009, 2010; Lobdell, 2009; Manley in Berg, 2006; Mouton in Burkett and Brunt,1993; Sipe, ud, *Bishop Geoff* ...)

Individuals whose religious faith has been destroyed by (1) personal experiences of having been abused; (2) the story of clergy rapes and other forms of sexual violence in the lives of others or (3) the story of deceitful hierarchy who engage in systemic criminal behavior and secrecy find they have no spiritual home. They live outside the sociological and theological boundaries of the institution of organized religion in which they were first taught about God, the Church and salvation. That which once held immense meaning to them is now empty and devoid of practical, embodied meaning. Sexual trauma recovery experts and authors comment that *for some victims, the loss of one's religious attachments means the loss of a powerful resource for healing. This loss is compounded when members of the clergy are themselves implicated in crimes of violence or exploitation or religious authorities appear to condone or excuse such crimes* (Mendolsohn, et. al., 2011, 135-136).

Perhaps the final words of this chapter can best be spoken by Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew. When I was talking with a neighbor of mine about how I was spending my days in retirement, he looked straight at me and said, *those abusing priests and ministers need to hear Jesus*. And then he quoted the following passage to me verbatim. In case I was unsure about where to find the text or how to interpret it, he also told me how to find it by using an online concordance.

I have since seen the text quoted by others in the context of the Roman Catholic pedophile scandal but at the time of this conversation with my neighbor the text had not yet emerged in my consciousness as a relevant place to begin thinking about clergy abusers, victimization, and victims.

Known to me since childhood, I had not connected this scriptural teaching of Jesus to any situations of clergy or religious professional sexual abuse of those who are young, weak, or in any other way vulnerable to such abuse.

If a member of the laity, a former Marine, a grandfather, and a man who earns his living as a sales representative can understand, comfortably cite and appropriately exegete the text in its simplicity, certainly a university or seminary-educated priest or minister should be able to understand and apply the specific teaching of Jesus as applicable to his interpersonal sexual behaviors with others. Even more so should a bishop, a cardinal, a pope, a denominational supervisor, a religious superior, a theology professor, a spiritual director, or a seminary president be able to understand the need for proper clergy supervision regarding clergy sexual abusers and their inexcusable, morally reprehensible and criminal behavior towards members of the laity or others whom they supervise or are responsible for in some manner (as for example, a religious studies professor with his students).

Jesus Speaks

At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, w*ho is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?*

And Jesus called a little child unto him and set him down in the middle of them. And said, *verily I say unto you, except you be converted and become as little children ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven. And who shall receive one such little child in my name receives me. But who shall offend one of these little ones which believes in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea (*Matthew 18:1-6).

Recommended Supplemental Readings

1) Carnes, P. (1997). *The Betrayal Bond.* Deerfield Beach, FL: Health Communications.

2) Doyle, T. P. (July 13, 2008b). *The Survival of the Spirit While Mired in the Toxic Wastes of the Ecclesiastical Swamp.*   Retrieve from http://www.ocnireland.com/newsletter/2008/OCN_newsletter_0_2008.pdf   or http://richardsipe.com/Dialogue/Dialogue-17-2008--08-11.htm/

3) Doyle, T. P. (2009), The Spiritual Trauma Experienced by Victims of Sexual Abuse by Catholic Clergy. *Pastoral Psychology* 58, 239-260.

4) Freyd, J. J.   (1996). *Betrayal Trauma: The Legacy of Forgetting Childhood Abuse.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

5) Wall, P. J. (January 9, 2008). *Ten Common Myths about the Sexual Abuse of Minors and Vulnerable Adults by Clerics.* Retrieve from http://patrickjwall.wordpress.com/2008/01/09/10-common-myths-in-the-sexual-abuse-of-minors-and-vulnerable-adults-by-clerics/

Personal Reflection Questions

1) In your lifetime have you ever been betrayed by a person you thought was a close friend or family member? If so, what was the experience like for you?   Write a few paragraphs describing this in sufficient detail that someone else – reading your words – would understand what the situation was like for you. The choice whether or not to have others actually read these paragraphs is yours.

2) What in your own life history of experiencing personal betrayal helps you to understand men, women, and children who have been betrayed by religious and spiritual leaders?

3) If you know someone who has been sexually abused by clergy or religious professionals, are there specific ways you can reach out to them in helpful compassion?   What, if anything, are you willing to do to be helpful?   What, if anything, are you unwilling to do?   Be as specific as you can be.

4) In your own words describe and discuss anthropologist Gregory Bateson's concept of the double-bind. Does it make any sense to you at all? Describe specific examples to illustrate your understanding of

this complex communication pattern that occurs in human relationships where there are power imbalances and where the stronger individual wishes to control and gain dominance over the weaker one.

5) When individuals lose their trust in religious leaders, faith community or their belief in God because of their personal experiences with clergy sexual violence and/or institutional clericalism , what do you think they need to do to regain the ability to trust others? What do they need to do to restore their trust in God?   Be as specific as you can be.

6) If you were in a clergy sexual abuse victim's shoes, what could you do to find your way back into a religious belief system? Is this, in your opinion, a desirable goal? If so, why do think this? If not, again, why do you think this? Spend some time reflecting on these questions before you answer.

Footnotes

[1] Erik H. Erikson, 1963, 250.

[2] Jennifer J. Freyd, 1998, 164.

[3] These are my estimation of an American's child's developmental stages: early childhood or pre-school years (0-5), middle and late childhood or elementary school years (6-11), early adolescence or middle school years (12-14) and late adolescence or senior high school years (15-18)

[4] A. W. Richard Sipe (March 5, 2010, 1) describes pedophilia as a psychiatric diagnostic term that is limited to sexual preoccupation or involvement with a child (usually under 13 years of age) by a person at least five years older than his or her victim.

[5] In his discussion of priest sexual abuse statistical incidence rates vis-à-vis children and adolescents in the United States, Richard Sipe (May 3, 2010, 1-2) estimates that 6–9% of Roman Catholic clergy have been sexually engaged with minors. He quotes Pepe Rodriguez (1995) who established a 7% figure. Sipe utilizes other data sources to establish a conservative

6% baseline estimate. Diocesan-specific figures include (1) Los Angeles, 11.6% of priests; (2) Boston, 7.6-10%; (3) New Hampshire, 8.2-11%; and Tucson, 23%. In addition, U. S. Church documents credibly report between 5000 and 6000 clergy who have abused minors. From reading a variety of authors, it is clear that much of this abuse was rape. Other activities include coerced masturbation and fellatio.

[6] A. W. Richard Sipe, January 23, 2007, 1.

[7] See David Price, 2008, for his personal story.

[8] Peter Levine's work (1997, 2010) on the responses of the body in situations of overwhelming terror is especially helpful in understanding the biological, psychological, emotional and cognitive subtleties of dissociation. Babette Rothschild (2000, 2003) provides clinicians with current information about the psychophysiology of trauma and its aftermaths.

[9] Thomas P. Doyle (July 26, 2010, 1-2.

[10] See also Thomas P. Doyle, July 13, 2008.

[11] Survivor's Network of those Abused by Priests. Originally created to assist Roman Catholic survivors of ordained clergy and religious monastic's abuse, this organization now represents victimized individuals from many different religious traditions. According to information on its website (summer, 2011) SNAP has more than 10,000 members. The web address is http://www.snapnetwork.org

[12] *Clericalism* is an institutional clergy structure and practice that protects the clergy and church institutions at the expense of the laity.

[13] The World Health Organization's *Summary Report on Violence and Health Summary* (2002) notes and underscores the necessity for and the difficulty of carrying out needed thorough-going cultural transformation. The difficulty in addressing these kinds of needed ideological changes, it notes, begins at the individual level. *Raising awareness of the fact that violence can be prevented is, however, only the first step in shaping the response to it. Violence is an extremely sensitive topic. Many people have difficulty in confronting it in their professional lives because it raises uncomfortable*

questions about their personal lives. Talking about violence means touching upon complex matters of morality, ideology and culture. There is, thus, often resistance at official as well as personal levels to open discussion of the topic. 1.

[14] Pope Pius Xll: Encyclical, *Mediator Dei.* November 20, 1947.

[15] James (Jimmy) Breslin, 2004, 108.

[16] In this section the word children refers to pre-pubertal and post-pubertal children before their legal majority. Since menarche for American girls now can begin as early as nine years of age, issues of sexual identity are shaped somewhat differently for these girls than when menarche occurs at twelve or thirteen or fourteen. Given that the human brain finishes its maturation in an individual's early twenties, there are great developmental differences among boys and girls between the ages of early childhood and puberty and between puberty and full adult maturity.

[17] Thomas Doyle (July 13, 2008), 8.

[18] Bateson and his colleagues identify two ways of breaking open or shattering double-binds to free recipients. One is meta-commentary. The second is humor.

[19] Clinical psychologist J. Lamar Freed (2011) states that according to the American Psychological Association's *DSM IV* the etiology of PTSD follows a traumatic event which causes intense fear and/or helplessness in individuals. Symptoms include re-experiencing the trauma through nightmares, obsessive thoughts and flashbacks (feeling as if you are actually in the traumatic situation again). Individuals with PTSD experience anxiety and may organize their lives around avoidance of anything that reminds them of the initial traumatic event.

[20] Psychologist Patrick J. Carnes (ud.) correlates trauma bonds with betrayal bonds. He writes that exploitive relationships create trauma bonds. These kinds of bonds occur when victims socially bond with their oppressor and are loyal to him. 1.

[21] The Stockholm syndrome refers to a paradoxical psychological phenomenon in which hostages express empathy and have positive feelings forwards their captors. It is likely according to contemporary research into this syndrome that victims view the perpetrator as giving them life because he doesn't kill them in the course of their captivity Wikipedia. (ud), 1.

[22] APA, (1994) DSM p. lv, p. 685.

[23] Mikele Rauch, 2009, 8.

[24] In this quotation, A. W. Richard Sipe was quoting St. Augustine

[25] Quoted by Thomas Doyle, July 13. 2008, 13. See also Frawley O'Dea in Berg, 2006.

[26] Sandra L. Bloom and Michael Reichert, 1998. 163.

- 12 -

Institutional Clericalism

In Jesus' teaching, Christians are summoned to confront the structures of oppression and the symbols for legitimating injustice within the Christian tradition. This means not only radically confronting the anti-Jewish trends in Christian preaching and teaching, but also wrestling against the patriarchal domination and the suppression of women mediated by the Christian tradition. It includes overcoming the church-centered understanding of world history, which serves as the legitimization of the white mans hegemony in the world and painfully confronting all of the ideological elements in the Christian religion.

Gregory Baum[1]

Introductory Comments

He who knows evil is being done, and does nothing to stop it, is guilty with the evil doer.

Attributed to Ambrose of Milan (CE 339-399)

This chapter continues the discussion of authoritarian social structures begun in chapters 6, 7.and 8. It asserts that clericalism is a concrete form of institutional authoritarianism – this time dressed in the religious robes of the Christian church or other religious-spiritual institutions.

Sexual abuse of small children and pre-majority adolescents by individual priests, religious brothers or nuns is one aspect of the contemporary Roman Catholic Church scandal. Perpetrators of sexual abuse enact a wide variety of socially deviant behaviors. When awareness of their harmful-to-others, anti-social and sexually deviant behaviors emerges inside institutions, human resource personnel managers, chief executive

officers and mid-level program supervisors are morally and legally obligated to manage the offender in order to protect the common good.

Since it is unrealistic to think that every clergy person will always, in every situation, behave in morally appropriate ways, it is likely clergy sexual violations will periodically emerge. Clergy sexual abuse will, therefore, episodically challenge religious organizations and their administrators. This is why institutions need clear written procedures about managing abuse. It is equally important that institutions then follow these procedures in order to stop the abuse and manage its aftermaths.

The national and international institutional Roman Catholic Church's failure to deal promptly, decisively, ethically or morally, and transparently with sexually abusive priests and members of religious orders provides us with a concrete example of the form of systemic abuse known as clericalism. The verbal construct of *clericalism* is useful in discussions of systemic religious organization abuses of authority and power. It provides us with a conceptual framework to use in describing and analyzing institutional aftermaths of clergy sexual abuse.

Socio-Cultural and Historical-Theological Taproots of Abuse

People's self-symbolization enters into the creation of their history, their culture, and their society

Gregory Baum[2]

People's individual and collective behavior cannot be understood apart from their historical and contemporary communities of reference. The concept that no single religious professional abuser can be understood without concomitantly understanding the culture(s) and life experiences in which he (or occasionally she) matured and the cultures in which he now lives is essential to understanding the perpetrator aspect of sexual abuse in religious scandals. The individual *and* his personal life history need to be understood in light of his communities' histories, and their long-standing cultural ideologies. In such a model for understanding an abusive human being, the individual, his secular society, *and* his faith community are all implicated in the formation of his abusive personality.

In a similar way abusive religious institutions must be understood in light of their histories, their ideologies, and their patterns of self-regulation. To identify and describe, for example, the socio-cultural and theological-religious environments in which the Roman Catholic pedophile crisis ripened, today's Catholic scholars and social activists consult church history, church canon law, lay folk practices, lay piety, institutional dogma and doctrine, religious and spiritual practices of the clergy, spiritual formation activities of the clergy, the long history of their religious orders (many of which began in earlier centuries as reform efforts), and Roman Catholic understandings of Christian theology. The historical human social institution of the Catholic Church is cross-examined socio-historically as well as theologically and doctrinally (Chinnici, 2010; Cozzens, 2002; Doyle, July 13, 2008, Doyle, Sipe and Wall, 2006; Kennedy, 2001; Podles, 2008; Robinson, 2008; Sipe, 1996).

Clericalism:
    Structural Violence

> *It is clear…that the response of the Church to the public revelations of abusive bishops and priests have been knee jerk emotions to protect image and money. The history of the current response to celibate violations remains for the most part reactionary.*

<div align="center">A. W. Richard Sipe[3]</div>

Clericalism consists of self-protective and morally-compromised administrative practices in situations where allegations are made regarding clergy sexual abuse of the laity. It includes a set of institutional practices that protect abusive clergy from public censure or criminal prosecution and insulate church institutions from scandal and other public image problems at the expense of the sexual predator's victims. Inside the structures and practices of clericalism, there is no institutional accountability to the public for incompetent or criminal management practices.

Denominational clericalism is, therefore, a secondary and reactionary form of religious abuse. It re-victimizes those previously assaulted by individual clergy sexual abusers.

In his 2008 Affidavit in the Case of Jane Doe versus OMI of Texas, Roman Catholic Dominican canon lawyer Thomas Doyle summarized a set of institutional behaviors that constitute clericalism.

> *Based upon my review of over (sic) thousands of cleric files, I have observed a pattern of conduct throughout the ecclesiastical entities in the United States ….This pattern of conduct includes (1) accepting unfit candidates…for the priesthood, (2) assigning and reassigning known abusers, (3) failing to investigate allegations according to proper canonical procedure, (4) failure to report known criminal behavior to law enforcement authorities, (5) failure to warn the community when transferring a known abuser from one assignment to another, (6) failure to provide even fundamental psychological care for victims, (7) failure to properly document accusations and reports of abuse, (8) failure to isolate accusers, (9) failure to provide psychotherapeutic intervention in a timely manner for all (29).*

In addition to the behaviors named by Doyle, institutions and their human authorities create and implement deliberate policies and practices of self-protective exclusion. Principled people, who by rights of position or by virtue of professional expertise should be included in decision-making that affects the abusive situation at hand are walled-off and excluded. Individuals who urge greater openness, accountability and institutional transparency are forced out of positions of information and influence. Individuals who seek to hold the abuser and the church accountable for their respective abuses are attacked as non-credible. They are seen as disloyal to the organization (and its administrators) by refusing to be team players in protecting the institution's self-protective secrecy. In some situations, individuals who call for institutional change may be fired for insubordination or subjected to other forms of economic and social reprisal.

As organizational officers attempt to do damage control in a sexual predator's wake, they seek to prevent information about his identity and behavior sexual from leaking outside the organization's walls. The internal expectation – whether explicitly stated or not – is that everyone needs to fall in line behind administrative efforts to contain damaging information and to prevent the church from public scandal. The institution needs to be circled and protected from public revelations of the predator's sexual misconduct. Dissent of any kind is seen as treachery and those who openly

urge full disclosure and institutional transparency are seen as hostile enemies of the organization and its administrators.

On October 30, 2011, a 53 page motion in a criminal case against Msgr. Linn and four others from the Philadelphia (PA) archdiocese was filed by Philadelphia County prosecutors.[4] In their motion prosecutors claim that Msgr. Linn *acted under a well-established, deliberate, orchestrated plan* by religious administrators in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia to protect abusive priests (Turlish, October 31, 2011, 2).[5]

In her *National Catholic Reporter Online* blog Sister Maureen Paul Turlish wrote:

> *[Bishops across the country have decided not to follow the USCCB's[6] mandate but rather have spent years and millions of dollars fighting the court-ordered release of documents, files and records, keeping depositions sealed, avoiding having to testify in civil court cases by filing for the federal protections of a Chapter 11 reorganization bankruptcy and challenging state court decisions right up to the U. S. Supreme Court.*
>
> *While no bishop in the United States has ever been held criminally responsible for enabling the sexual exploitation of a child, they have cut deals to avoid prosecution in a number of jurisdictions. Bishops have left known sexual predators in ministry, transferred them around a diocese, to other dioceses, and even out of the country in attempts to protect a religious institution's image rather than the children who are its most vulnerable members and about whom Jesus speaks so often in the gospels* (1).

Doyle and Turlish are two of the many Roman Catholic authors who describe and protest the current clericalism scandal in their denomination. They ascribe the behaviors of clericalism to problematic Roman Catholic theology, a revisionist church history, faulty canon law applications, immature or fixated clergy sexual, spiritual and moral development, and a world-wide authoritarian hierarchical organization which insists upon secrecy and obedience (see also Cozzens, 2002; Collins, 2004; Doyle, Sipe, and Wall, 2006; Kennedy, 2001; Podles, 2008; Robinson, 2008; Sipe, 1996).

By focusing upon Roman Catholic discussions of clericalism as a problematic and abusive social practice of authoritarianism in religious institutions, I am suggesting that other denominations and religious groups can learn from the close analysis provided by Roman Catholic insiders: academicians, members of religious orders, canon lawyers, institutional administrators, priests and laicized former priests, journalists, sociologists, lawyers in the secular realm, psychologists, and psycho-therapists. Such a thorough-going insiders' discussion contains multiple and discrete perspectives about the interpenetrated realities of clergy sexual abuse and church leader clericalism.

This type of comprehensive and multi-disciplinary truth-telling and critical analysis is very rare in Christian history. Therefore it can be helpfully instructive to other religious denominations and spiritual teaching institutions. This is particularly true for religious organizations or denominations which have similarly faltered in holding abusers accountable for their actions; which have failed to protect vulnerable children, adolescents and adults from abusive events of clergy-initiated personal violence; and which have failed to heal the individual and communal wounds left behind as a residue long after the acts of sexual abuse have ended.

The Institutional Church in Crisis

> *You cannot be the last person to know about the disorder in your house. Raise your hand to the guilty, since a lack of punishment breeds recklessness that opens the door to all kinds of excess. Your brothers, the cardinals, must learn by your example not to keep young, long-haired boys and seductive men in their midst.*

Bernard of Clairvaux (CE 1090-1155) to Pope Eugeniis, III

Cozzens (2002), an ordained priest (formerly a seminary rector) makes the case that clergy sexual abuse of individuals in their care (whether this is as parish priests, bishops, members of religious orders, or academic professors in seminaries and theological programs) represents not only an individual crisis for victims and their advocates but also a systemic one for the entire church as well.

This systemic crisis in lay faith and praxis has been precipitated by (1) priest sexual assaults on pre-pubertal children and pre-majority adolescents; (2) faulty institutional personnel management practices with perpetrators; (3) subsequent cover-ups of the institutional church's corporate malfeasance; and (4) public relations and legal counsel assaults on those who threaten to uncover and reveal the church's secrets. Not only does the crisis affect the financial well-being of the Church, it also causes severe doubts among Roman Catholic laity about previously accepted theological and doctrinal foundations for Catholic faith and praxis. The crisis of sexual abuse and clericalism morphs into a spiritual or religious crisis of faith.

On November 4, 2011, retired United States Bishop Thomas Gumbleton spoke during mass at the Lynn University Campus Ministry Chapel in Boca Raton, Florida. Working with the lectionary text from Matthew 23:1-12, Bishop Gumbleton recalls that Jesus called the religious leaders of his day hypocrites (1). In his application of the text to the twenty-first century, he commented:

> I think, once more, there's a little too much clericalism where we separate the clergy and the laity. Only the clergy can come upon this side of the altar, not lay people and especially not women…There is a lack of leadership when you realize that 30 million people have walked away from the Catholic community. That's 10 percent of the U. S. population, 30 million people who were Catholic say, "I don't bother anymore."

> What do our leaders do about it? They hardly avert it. They pay no attention. We ought to be reaching out, calling them back. But even more, our leadership in the Church has been terribly flawed. It's that whole sex abuse crisis: that it happened in the first place and continues to happen sadly enough. Out leaders covered it up, protected the perpetrators and continued to move them around from parish to parish where it would happen again (2).

From Cozzens' perspective in 2002, the mushrooming nature of the crisis (sexual abuser after sexual abuser revealed; cover-up after cover-up uncovered); the outraged disrespect of increasing numbers of the laity toward the Church's hierarchy and clergy; and a subsequent polarization of the church's laity regarding orthodoxy in belief and practice have brought

the American Catholic Church to the brink of destabilization. He writes, *religious beliefs as we know them are being actively threatened* (6).

He describes complex patterns of Catholic Church and clergy culture and behaviors. He identifies or marks several aspects of Clergy culture as relevant as the scandal broke open and intensified after issues in the Boston diocese became public knowledge in the spring and summer of 2002. Cozzens' analysis is an early one. It is unlikely that he could have foreseen the world wide Roman Catholic Church scandal and crisis of 2011. I summarize and paraphrase his work below:

- o Duplicitous arrogance of certain bishops, archbishops and cardinals who sought to prevent truthful information from becoming visible.
- o The choice of bishops, archbishops, and cardinals to place the financial resources of the church and the reputation of the priesthood ahead of the safety needs of children and teenagers.
- o The perception that bishops continue to guard their positions of authority, power and control more than they are concerned about leading their people (priests and laity alike) in spiritual formation.
- o Lay anger at the church's inflexible dogmatic doctrinal teachings about lay sexuality, for example, birth control, abortion, masturbation, divorce and remarriage, and homosexuality, at the same time public revelations about clergy rapes and institutional protection of the violent and abusive clergy individuals were front-page news (1-2).

As Cozzens makes his case, he describes certain patterns of religious hierarchy behavior. He begins this discussion with the *pattern of group loyalty* (12 ff). To speak unpopular truths about the presence of sexual violence and abuse in the priesthood is to put one's career in jeopardy because the individual who chooses to speak against the abuse or the hierarchy's patterns of dealing with it is seen as disloyal by both his professional peers and his supervising bishop. Dissent and questions cause one to be labeled *not a team player.* Even to report to one's administrative officers a fellow priest's acts of sexual violence is to jeopardize one's own career trajectory (see also Berg, 2006).

On November, 10th, 2011, Father Thomas Doyle described the powers of a bishop inside the Roman Catholic hierarchy in his discussion of a court decision in Great Britain.

A bishop has a spectrum of control over priests officially assigned to his diocese and to priests from elsewhere who are working there, control that is more comprehensive than the relationship of any employer to his employees. The closest analogy would be the relationship between an inferior to a commanding officer in the military (2).

Doyle describes a bishop's powers in concrete terms. I itemize and paraphrase his work below:

- Only a bishop can appoint a priest to his post and only he can remove a priest from his post.
- A priest can be suspended by his bishop without due process
- The bishop can suspend a priest's faculties – those special permissions needed for a priest to perform his priestly duties
- The bishop can remove a priest from his assignment and leave him without an assignment (and a salary)
- The bishop can suspend a priest's salary, health care benefits, and retirement benefits
- The bishop can stipulate where a priest must live
- The bishop can stipulate the priest's style of clothing, even when traveling outside the bishop's diocesan region
- Only the bishop can issue the norms, rules, and regulations under which a priest serves. The only exception to this generalization is the rules and regulations which are stipulated in the international Roman Catholic Church's system of canon law.

Doyle summarizes: *The bishop is part of a governmental system that is the last absolute monarchy in the world. He is an aristocrat and the sole authority in his own share of the overall church kingdom* (2).

The common diocesan response of subordinate priests, deacons, and members of religious orders assigned to the bishop's region to the (implicit or explicit) demand of the bishop for unquestioning loyalty in the presence of clergy sexual abuse is silence and secrecy. In addition, loyalty to the bishop demands that priests and other subordinates to the bishop treat others who dissent as enemies of the bishop and/or as enemies of the Church.

For an ambitious priest, the best self-protective course is, therefore, an obedient, hierarchy-supportive, cooperative and obedient silence. While Cozzens (2002) does not directly comment about this, such an atmosphere of repressive silence and collective refusal to act serves to legitimate the sexual violence perpetrator's actions (see also Kelman and Hamilton, 1989).

Whenever the external world (for example, secular journalism or the civil courts) notes and comments upon the presence of clergy sexual abuse inside the church the clerical hierarchy perceives and actively represents the outside world to be hostile to the church (see Jenkins, 1996). One consequence of bishop and diocesan paranoia about outsider hostility is that bishops and their supportive subordinates aggressively attack journalists for their reporting and the civil courts for prosecuting criminally abusive priests. They seek to undermine the credibility of victims and victim advocates. The intra-organization loyalty demand is enforced in order to protect the organized, institutional church, a particular institutional agency such as a seminary, an individual administrator such as a bishop, or a specific predatory priest from criticism and scandal. Factual truths regarding abuse, therefore, can not be admitted. Denial, deliberate planting of disinformation, the cynical processes of defactualization and historical revisionism (as well as outright lying) become commonplace.[7]

As the Catholic Church's pedophile scandal began to unfold in public in 1984 (and continues to unfold until the present moment) members of the religious hierarchy routinely practiced shooting the messenger by attacking the veracity of concerned witnesses – including the secular courts, the media and its reporters, as well as church insiders who dissented from the policy and practice of silence and secrecy. Victims, seeking perpetrator and church accountability, were treated as enemies of the church when they reported their abuse to church administrators. Church officials openly lied to victims about the status of priest abusers. They sought to mislead secular law enforcement activities (see Berg, 2006). In this model of church management loyalty was enforced by coerced silence and oppressive secrecy in the presence of one's peers, one's immediate religious superiors, and the bureaucratic hierarchy as a whole. Those who remained silent were rewarded. Those individuals such as Thomas Doyle who spoke up in advance of the public crisis (Doyle, Peterson, Mouton, 1985; Doyle, April 30, 2011) to warn the hierarchy were punished by removing them from

312

their professional positions of employment, by attacking their personal character or by discrediting their professional qualifications.[8]

Nowhere in this clerical model of silent unquestioning loyalty to one's ethically compromised peers and superiors is found a practical, compassionate and embodied awareness of the need for protective loyalty to the vulnerable people whom the church serves. In such an oppressive climate, victims of priest sexual predators are either totally overlooked or they become embedded within the hierarchy's paranoid projection of them as enemies of the clergy and the church.

A second organizing concept for Cozzens is the *pattern of responsibility* (14 ff)*.* In Roman Catholic polity, bishops, archbishops, and cardinals bear the leadership burden for institutional church management. One aspect of their role is to maintain and impose orthodox doctrine as it is prescribed by the Vatican, preached by priests, and practiced by the laity. Within the structures of the national and international church, bishops and religious order superiors are responsible to supervise the work of priests and religious subordinates. How loyal subordinates are and how orthodox they are perceived in their work by their supervisors provides a premonition about their own likelihood to be promoted up the channels of churchly command. Career advancement up the ladders of the church's bureaucratic hierarchy is a direct result of how subordinates respond to their superiors–those bishops, archbishops and cardinals who are religiously responsible for the spiritual formation of priests and administratively responsible for their professional performance (see also Berry and Renner, 2004; Doyle, November 10, 2011, Podles, 2008, 393-421; Yallop, 2007).

One consequence of the bishops' ecclesial authority and power over others is that bishops experience the daily reality of preferment – an interior sense of being chosen, of being privileged. In such a situation of preferment and entitlement, titles, power, status, privilege, being-in-control, and one's own sense of being a better person than others are all potential liabilities for the holder of these roles. Regarding hierarchy privilege, preferment and position, Boston journalist Jimmy Breslin caustically commented in 2004 that t*he gold ring on a bishop's finger is the commercial of a pimp* (7).

A final organizing characteristic is the *pattern of tranquility* (Cozzens, 2002, 16ff). Here issues are recognized as needing to be addressed but for

reasons of ambition or for fear of conflict, the attitude becomes, *this situation will not surface into awareness on my watch*. The fear is the fear of individuals with higher positions of authority and power in the hierarchy – the archbishop, the cardinal, members of the Vatican Curia, or the Pope himself. Embedded within these generalized kinds of non-specific fear is, however, a very specific fear of personal ambition thwarted. If one is seen as someone who dissents from the standard and required silence and secrecy, promotions will be denied and desirable or prestigious parish postings non-existent (see also Israeli and Chua-Eoan, 2010; Robinson, 2008; Sipe, October 15, 2011)

When these three patterns are fully activated, one sees institutional paranoia and chaos, deceit, disorder and dysfunction. Vis-à-vis the contemporary sexual abuse crisis what can be observed in place of principled moral action is a profound and pervasive paralysis of moral action. In place of compassion and a concern for justice for victims; in place of concern for the spiritual and emotional welfare of victims and their families: one sees expressions of disbelief, open hostility, and systemic denial. In place of accountability and transparency, one sees evasive public relations and an attempt to "spin" factual data into its opposite (see also Podles, 2008; D. Price, 2008).

In Cozzens' 2002 opinion, during the years between 1984 and 2002, church administrators and members of the religious ruling class grew more and more elitist. They lost touch with ordinary parish priests and the laity that the church claims to serve. Individuals within the hierarchy became more and more insulated and isolated from issues that are important to parish Catholics. He notes that a certain kind of wariness manifested itself towards any priest or religious subordinate who reported problems or relayed allegations of sexual abuse in the diocese to his superiors.

In these kinds of deliberate non-paying-attention situations, a culture of denial formed. In this culture, the surface appeared smooth and unruffled. However, under the surface real people suffered. Cozzens quotes Fred Kofman of Argentina:

> *The surface is a farce, everyone knows it is a farce, yet the face of the organization is that nothing is wrong. Everybody knew they were not telling the truth and that others were not telling the truth and they*

were not taking about real issues. Everybody knew this but nobody wanted to say that the emperor had no clothes (23-24).

Psychologist and former priest Eugene Kennedy (2001) cogently connects and comments about these issues:

> *[W]e must examine the ruling dynamic of the official church, that fretwork of bureaucracies that misinterprets its calling to serve the Church as People of God as its right to control it by manipulating the sexual feelings or its men and women. Tragically, in the style with which many church officials deal with ordinary Catholics we see, in a commanding and imperial context, exactly the same dynamic that may be observed in the seduction of the innocent in sexual abuse committed by priests* (xiii).

The microcosm (a sub-group culture of sexually abusive priests) becomes an image of the macrocosm (an administratively abusive church hierarchy and praxis. The obverse is also true. The structural similarities of both forms of abusive behavior to each other are unmistakable. Individual violence (of the abusive priest) and systemic oppressive violence (of the hierarchy) mirror each other in victims' abuse experiences. The pedophile abuses his pre-pubertal victims. Members of the church's hierarchy subsequently, by their administrative actions, re-abuse the abuser's victims. Trust betrayed forms the leitmotif for both forms of abusive violence (see also Sipe, January 23, 2007).

Moral and Spiritual Corruption

The object is to avoid scandal.
A. W. Richard Sipe[9]

At its core clericalism represents a religious form of reactive, repressive, usually secretive and covert, form of institutional violence.[10] It is one manifestation of cultural and religious authoritarianism. Clericalism is, therefore, a systemic obedience disorder. It infects individuals and entire social groups.

Institutional clericalism includes well-established and ideologically defended doctrines of institution-protective or leader-protective secrecy. It includes well organized social patterns of denial, lying, and silence. Patterns of institution-image-serving deception in situations of clergy sexual abuse (1) protect sexual perpetrators from community discovery and from full public accountability for their abusive actions and (2) protect religious institutions and supervisory personnel from legal accountability for their personnel management practices after failing to appropriately supervise, discipline and control individual abusers.

When church officials in corrupted religious systems learn about a clergy sexual predator, their concern is to contain the scandal and to mute community indignation that individual sexual abuse ignites. Another concern is to protect the institution's financial assets. This is particularly true when minors have been sexually assaulted (for example, anally or vaginally raped) by a clergy person. By their cover-up actions, institutional administrators magnify the impact of the scandal when it does eventually surface into public awareness. When victims insist upon making their allegations public, when local governments decide to prosecute, not only the abusive sexual act becomes public information. The institution's cover-up activity is also revealed. Institutions caught in this kind of public scandal usually rely upon legal counsel and public relations firms to fight back. When allegations of sexual abuse accompanied by allegations of institutional abuse do become public information, the scandal is magnified (Boston Globe, 2002; Grand Jury of Philadelphia County (PA), 2003, 2011; Steinfels, 2003). In addition, when victims successfully persuade juries of their wrongful treatment by sexual predators *and* church administrators, financial repercussions are extensive (Berry, 2011; Chinicci, 2010; Israeli and Chua-Eoan, June 7, 2010; Sipe, February 23, 2003, November 6, 2007).

Power for its own sake is wielded. Control of others for the purposes of control is practiced. The privileges and perquisites of position-authority, power, control of others, access to great financial wealth, and the preferment of having a high social status are courted, maintained and manipulated at great costs to the religious organization's self-proclaimed spiritual mission in the world at large. Shupe (2008) describes religious institutions as *enormous opportunity structures for crime* (37). Sipe (September 6, 2011) states that sociopathic or psychopathic[11] religious leaders populate these religious organizations (2).

316

Clericalism, in such a contex*t*, represents the living presence of moral (and spiritual) decay. It represents the presence of evil inside the structures of the religious institution.

Active Denial and Not Knowing

> *Any sexual relationship of a minister with a non-adult is exploitation. …Any sexual relationship between a minister and a church staff person subordinate to them is exploitation. Any sexual relationship between a minister and a person being or having been counseled is exploitation. Any sexual relationship between a minister and a member that is not that minister's spouse is exploitation. All should result in termination of the minister from the employ of the church.*

> *ARCE[12]*

In the human community, common-sense, personal decency, morality, or integrity (as well as the most valued precepts of our varied religious heritages about treating others as we would like to be treated) teach us that an absence of these attitudes and behaviors can and does cause active harm to others. Personal violence behaviors and systemic violence behaviors betray individual *and* collective members of the human community. Truth is denied, gutted, and replaced by a lie. Personal authenticity is replaced by two-faced hypocritical behavior. The healing capacity for genuine emotional intimacy is destroyed.

Repressive, dishonest and criminal behavior inside secular organizations (such as government or corporate manufacturing), is frequently analyzed in social-psychology, sociology and criminology literature Only recently, however, has the United States legal system begun to hear victim complaints regarding Christian administrative personnel management practices in situations of clergy abuse. Shupe (2008), makes the point that criminal behavior inside religious institutions and organizations has rarely been studied and is, consequently, poorly understood by professional sociologists. My own perception, to supplement Shupe's commentary, is that very little accurate demographic or epidemiological research

documentation exists regarding incidence, specific behaviors, social location of perpetrators and victims, and long-term consequences.

Rutter (1989) comments that institutions and professional guilds actively discourage professional sexual abuse research, documentation, and reporting. Long-range prevention efforts, therefore, are severely handicapped by (1) inadequate demographic or epidemiological data, (2) limited descriptive analysis of the relationship of perpetrator behavior and administrative personnel practices, and (3) active suppression of research efforts by institutions and religious journals or other forms of public media. Regarding this latter issue of active suppression of truthful information, according to Peter Rutter, professional guilds (such as the clergy) prefer to look the other way and either ignore or deny the presence of professional abuse and sexual misconduct. This collusive form of guild denial yields patterns of inadequate and misleading interpretive work in this politically sensitive area of personal violence studies.[13] It also serves to legitimate abusive behaviors by guild members and provides perpetrators with overt or covert permission to continue their abusive anti-social actions towards others.

Where institutional clericalism is operant, secrecy and denial prevail. As laicized Benedictine monk, sexual abuse researcher, and psychotherapist A. W. Richard Sipe (1996) notes, moral accountability for the church and institutional secrecy cannot co-exist. In these kinds of situations of abusive cover-up activities, *New York Times* journalist Peter Steinfels (2003) comments that a church can fail at being the church (in its spiritual and ethical mission) while succeeding as an institution (in its financial aspects).

Institutional paranoia about the outside world is a prominent internal feature of institutional cultures where clericalism prevails. Many authors note that in situations of institutional wrong-doing the psychological need of superiors is to control informational flow *and* the behavior of others. This need has at least one root in fear – the fear of losing position, authority, power status, and control. The institution (by means of its authorities and those subordinates who unquestioningly support them) perceives that its existence is threatened by the emergence of factual truth. The institution, therefore, attacks and deliberately distorts the credibility of victims, victim advocates, the courts, the media or any other individual or group perceived likely to dislodge and make public patterns of cover-up. Stonewalling, delaying tactics, and truth distortions such as disinformation,

defactualization, minimalization, and misrepresentation are common. Historical revisionism is equally common (Doyle, April 2, 2010)

In her discussion of the temptation for church administrators to push-back or counter-attack those who confront the church's administrators in cover-up situations, Church of the Brethren theologian Laurie Hersh Meyer (1992) writes:

> W*hen the stronger person in a relationship of legitimated power accuses the weaker of "destroying their reputation" or otherwise attacking them, they often find sympathy from other holders of power. Their counter-attack also effectively changes the subject from considering any wrong-doing they did to concern for what they (and those publicly identified with them) may suffer if charges of their wrong-doing are explored, discovered to be true and must be admitted (4).*

By their collective actions, therefore, abusive leaders of religious institutions seek to intimidate others from uncovering factual truth and revealing it. They seek to preserve their personal authority, power and control. Their personal self-image projected into the world and the perquisites of power become more important than any moral or spiritual obligation to participate in the doing of righteous and healing deeds. When image prevails over truth, the religious hierarchy and their silent subordinates compromise the church's moral and spiritual integrity (Greeley, 2004a). The organization's appropriate spiritual authority and teachings are, therefore, invalidated and destroyed. When truth finally becomes known, its leaders lose moral credibility or moral persuasiveness in the greater community. The ensuing crisis of faith inside the community reveals the enormity of the religious hierarchy's betrayal of the people of God (the laity) when they choose to shelter and hide a sexual abuse perpetrator (Benkert and Doyle, 2009; Doyle, 1994, July 13, 2008; Dreher, February 9, 2008; Manley in Berg, 2006; Mouton in Burkett and Brunt, 1993; Lobdell, 2009; Sipe, ud. *Bishop…*).

Public Relations, Liability Insurance and Legal Counselors

> *Common religious tenets of atonement – admitting mistakes, accepting responsibility, apologizing – run counter to the legal tenets of avoiding self-incrimination and preserving all avenues of defense against potential lawsuits.*

Peter Eisler[14]

One of the issues which is somewhat difficult to unearth – but which is present in most situations of clergy sexual abuse inspired clericalism is the presence of a strong, binding institutional relationship of religious organizations and their administrators with insurance companies and these companies' legal counsel. For a discussion about this issue see a May 9, 2011 online article at http://www.usatoday.com/news/religion/2011--05-09-vienna-virginia-church-abuse-case-lawyers-insureres_n.htm#USA PageRetrun

In situations of clergy sexual abuse, the legal counsel of an institution's liability insurance company and its attorneys are hidden voices in the dialogue of institution, perpetrators, victims, and the surrounding community. Only rarely does this guiding voice become audible and perceptible in the external world where accusations of clergy abuse and clerical criminal malfeasance threaten organizations with public scandal and liability.[15]

In corrupted institutional systems, individual victims of clergy or religious professional abuse are subsequently institutionally abused. Intentional doubt is planted about their personal character as well as the veracity and credibility of their complaints and accusations. Confidentiality and protection of the abuse perpetrator (often by claiming personnel confidentiality or spiritual confidentiality) acts to protect the external image of power and authority corrupted institutions. Outright lies of denial may be offered to victims of sexual abuse, to the news media, the public at large, congregations, or to the courts as individual administrators perjure themselves to maintain institutional secrecy (Berg, 2006; Boston Globe, 2002; Breslin, 2004; Grand Jury, Philadelphia County, PA; 2011; Lobdell, 2009, Podles, 2008).

In abusive and secretive church institutions, the emotional, psychological, spiritual and religious wounds of victims of primary and secondary abuse remain unrecognized and are unattended to. Treated as outcasts by members of the religious institution's hierarchy, victims (and their families and allies) are abandoned by the very church or religious institution in which they had previously placed trust.

In addition, when institutions commit themselves to policies of denial, silence and secrecy, no effort is made to alert potential victims or to prevent additional victimization from occurring. In many situations, therefore, an individual abuser is free to continue his active victimization of others under the protective arms of the religious institutions in which he works.

Individuals who witness corporate acts of structural violence and their consequences in the lives of others may decide to protest an organization's managerial behaviors. They may make a personal moral decision not to be complicit with the institution's patterns of organized violence against others. In secular life, this phenomenon is usually called *whistle blowing*. In religious organizations it may be identified (usually decades or centuries later) as a *prophetic message* or *bearing witness*. In authoritarian secular and religious organizations, as Wink (1984, 1988, and 1992) notes, the message of a critical prophetic witness is highly unwelcome. Arendt (1969b) correctly notes: a perceived loss of power or an actual loss of power among social authorities can both increase the likelihood of additional violence. Sensing an imminent loss of control, authority figures seek to maintain, by any means necessary, their positions of power and control over others – those others who have begun to protest their victimization at the hands of the powerful. The conflict of the vulnerable, violated, and weak with powerful leaders who have abused them and destroyed their personal rights to a safe environment can be protracted. It is frequently marked by additional acts of institutional victimization of the vulnerable.

Twentieth-century theologians of liberation in Latin America, for example, Juan Luis Segundo (1976a, 1976b), drew attention to the socio-political reality that those who bear witness against structural violence and oppression become identified with the previously targeted victims of violence. Entering into solidarity with the victims of structural violence, they become subject to the same hostile, aggressive forms of oppressive and

repressive behavior as the original targets. Institutional rage and retaliation are common.

Corrective moral voices of concerned witnesses to the abusive violence of clericalism are, therefore, often maliciously maligned. They, like the direct v1ictims of clergy sexual violence, may also be institutionally disciplined, socially isolated and shunned or even excommunicated. Legal actions against them may be undertaken (Berg, 2006; Stockton, 2000). Shooting the messenger (metaphorically and occasionally in life) is frequently – perhaps even overwhelmingly - present.

Thus, for example, when El Salvadoran Roman Catholic Bishop Oscar Romero protested politically-motivated violence against the people and in a Sunday morning homily asked the army to stop the massacres and disappearances in El Salvador, the response of the nation's political and military leaders was to assassinate Bishop Romero.

The attack on the witness or the whistle blower can be and usually is well orchestrated, well financed with organizational money, and conducted with savage efficiency. Institutional reprisals or push-back attacks can be personally, economically, or, in the case of the church or other religious institutions, spiritually devastating. Such behavior harms not only the individual but it also harms the community the church represents. This kind of behavior betrays or destroys individual and communal trust.   In their discussion of religious clericalism, Roman Catholic authors are clear. Once destroyed, an individual's trust in religious leaders and the institutions they represent can almost never be restored and rebuilt (Anonymous, (ud); Sipe, January 23, 2007; August 5, 2009).

In situations where church administrators decide to protect clergy sexual abusers from full accountability for their actions informed Roman Catholic insiders describe a corporate willingness to expend massive amounts of the church's financial and personnel resources in order to prevent any emergence of factual truth (Berry, 1992, 2011; Breslin, 2004; Doyle, August 16, 2008; Sipe, November 6, 2007; Podles, 2008; Yallop, 2010).   These authors comment that lawyers and public relations firms have been and continue to be utilized to create a veneer of religious piety, respectability and responsibility. The cost of these consultants to the church remains a hidden one.   It is not visible in the Church's self-published figures about financial aspects of the Church's institutional crisis (Doyle, 2006),

In addition, legal settlements with victims are frequently made in an effort to silence them and do institutional damage control. These settlements are accompanied by a stipulated agreement that no further public commentary can be made by any victims of abuse who have reached such church-negotiated settlements. Court-sealed settlements, therefore, remain outside the public's awareness of financial issues.

Nevertheless, by the end of 2011, the American public and Roman Catholic faithful do have some sense about the magnitude of the financial aspects of the clergy sexual abuse crisis in the United States. The known cost to the American Catholic Church is between 3 and 4 billion dollars. Court-mandated settlements continue to make news and the precise total amount is not known by anyone but the institutional church. Some informed church observers believe that the scandal's total costs to the American Roman Catholic Church should be multiplied by a factor of 2 or 3 (Doyle, 2006).

Guided by insurance company corporate lawyers the church is advised to make no statements that can increase institutional or administrative financial liability, responsibility, and accountability. Thus, no apology to victims can be offered. Usually the details of these situations are considered to be confidential and even the secular press may be unable to report them accurately because courts have sealed the documents of agreement.

In cases where the American Roman Catholic church *bought* the silence of individual abuse victims (and their families) in sealed legal settlements, it did nothing to warn other potential victims. Recently some settlement details and previously sealed Grand Jury Reports have been unsealed by American courts when various forms of American media have filed suits and exerted public pressure to get files unsealed by legal means (Boston Globe, 2002; Grand Jury, Philadelphia County, PA, 2003, 2011; Weakland, 2009).

In addition to insurance liability and legal hard ball, administrators and managers of church institutions attempt to divert attention from the issue of abusive clergy and clericalism by exploiting other explosive communal issues. For example, Roman Catholic journalist Jimmy Breslin (2004) has documented that as the public's awareness of both aspects of the pedophile scandal spread rapidly, American parish priests were being commanded by the Vatican and its American hierarchy to preach on topics

of abortion and the evils of civil unions or marriages for lesbian and gay individuals. Breslin, as do many members of the Roman Catholic Christian laity, perceives that the institutional church hierarchy utilized diversionary hate-mongering in order to distract practicing Catholic Christians' attention from the pedophile scandal and its concomitant and on-going clericalism scandal. He believes that by means of such diversionary tactics, the institutional church's hierarchy hope to avoid public awareness of its own sinfulness and a public backlash against the denominational church. In 2004, he wrote, *The Church of Rome today cries 'abortion' to distract us from crimes by their pedophiles and pimps. When this seems to exhaust itself, it turns to gay marriage. Look out that it doesn't make these the last two issues of their existence* (5).

Moral and Spiritual Hypocrisy

> Do not model your lives and work after those of the Scribes and Pharisees: The say what to do but they do not do it.

Jesus of Nazareth[16]

In their extended discussion of spiritual teacher abuse inside Eastern meditation centers Kramer and Alstad (1993) note that in situations of guru sexual abuse of disciples a lie embeds itself in the center or core of the practicing community. The sexually abusive community elder or abusive spiritual guru teaches his followers a spiritual practice and ideology or belief system which he does not practice. His teaching, indeed his very identity as a spiritual teacher, represents a personal lie. He teaches one set of beliefs and practices to his disciples. His life, however, embodies a contradiction between words and his lived or embodied behavior. Teaching one thing, the spiritual teacher practices its contradicting opposite. Teaching, for example, the divinely ordered necessity for non-violence in human relationships, the teacher practices sexual violence. Teaching unselfish love, the teacher selfishly abuses his students. The teacher, therefore, can not know if what he teaches is valid or attainable because he has never attained the ideological goal of his teachings. He does not practice that which he teaches others to do.

324

Christianity often uses the phrase *religious hypocrisy* to describe such a situation inside the boundaries of Christian faith. During his lifetime, Jesus' most stinging words of rebuke were spoken to hypocritical religious leaders. In Jesus' opinion, while their visible cultic practice was impeccable, their behavior towards others was evil (Matthew 23).

Over time, any human system which denies the factual truth about abusive, violent and repressive religious leaders eventually legitimizes the violence and guarantees its perpetuation. Once legitimated by common practice, abuse, violence, and the hypocritical lie root themselves within the psyches of individuals and within the ongoing social patterns of group behavior. The meme[17] of abusive and pathological authoritarian behavior becomes *the way things are, the way things have always been and the way things should always be.* That factual reality which is truth is defactualized and obfuscated. The lie is now socially freed and legitimated to masquerade as truth.

Rather than confront abusive teachers and de-legitimate their abuse, the complicit community engages in denial, projection and the suppression of dissent. Over time, the community as a whole is compromised and corrupted by the teacher's spiritual and moral lie because the teaching has become embedded in its socio-psychological-ideological foundations. Its spiritual practice is compromised. Individual and communal consciousness shifts to accommodate the lie and its concomitant and ongoing socio-cultural patterns of abuse. A permanent cultural home is made for abuse to continue and the lie embedded in the teacher's words becomes truth.

In such a manner, each member of the living community potentially becomes a carrier of (1) abusive violence, (2) the ideological lie which supports abuse (3) abusive authoritarianism.

In any community, which simultaneously denies factual truth about religious leader sexual abuse and actively supports the ideological lie of his teachings, the words the teacher speaks become more important than his (or her) embodied actions. Students and disciples are more apt, therefore, to follow the model of the teacher's behavior than they are to embody his words about right living. The folk precept, *actions speak louder than words,* bears a common sense testimony to this reality.

The authoritative orthodoxy of the spoken or written word becomes an ideological witness to the community's authoritarian belief structures. In such a situation, it is his intellectual word which matters, not an individual's actual relationships with others. Since, over time, the teacher's words have been tainted by the lie embedded within his life, they, like his behavior, cannot be trusted. The teacher's abusive behavior and lie-filled teaching are now fully operant below the surface of community awareness and its corporate or communal life. The corrupted teaching, separated from awareness of his behavior, continues, therefore, to be the accepted orthodoxy and guiding praxis of the community. This corrupted orthodoxy, in its turn, provides an ideological foundation that legitimizes and encourages abusive behavior to emerge and re-emerge within his intellectual lineage in subsequent generations.

The abusive teacher's disciples and apologists frequently follow the same patterns of behavior in their relationships with others that their teacher modeled in his behavioral treatment of his victims. In this kind of a sexual-abuse-corrupted religious community, spiritual hypocrisy becomes routinized. Spiritual authoritarianism accompanied by various forms of abuse masquerades as spiritual maturity. Pathological spiritual formation becomes the norm. The abusive religious leader's behavior (and its culturally denied communal consequences) has become a subterranean foundation for future religious leader sexual misconduct and abuse.

When organized religious groups (whether these are Christian seminaries or Buddhist meditation centers) justify or legitimate (explicitly or tacitly, covertly, or overtly) the abuse of position, power and authority by community leaders in social relationships of higher rank individuals over lower rank ones, authoritarianism is in control of the religious institution's politics.

Jesus describes this kind of religious behavior as *full of extortion and excess* (Matthew 23: 25) and as an *outward appearance of righteousness that covers internal hypocrisy and iniquity* (Matthew 23: 28). Hypocritical leaders love gold, high public status, power over others, and parading their outward acts of piety in public liturgical practices. They seek to have positions of power over others. They strut and ostentatiously display their piety for all to see. They hide their actions of abusive behavior towards others inside public proclamations of orthodoxy and public demonstrations of liturgical propriety.

Jesus accuses hypocritical religious leaders of omitting the important aspects of Mosaic Law: matters of *judgment, mercy and faith* (Matthew 23; 23). In the teachings of Jesus, therefore, we see his emphasis upon right-living (orthopraxis) rather than spiritualized teaching, public prayers, public tithing, and perfectly scripted liturgical ceremonies (cultic sacramental orthodoxy).

Concluding Comments

Those who speak truth to power will suffer for it.
You can count on this.

A. W. Richard Sipe[18]

An underlying concern in this chapter has been my growing conviction that religious institution clericalism re-violates clergy sexual abuse victims. It further assaults and damages their lives. In addition, it damages the entire faith community. It breeds distrust. When the church, as an institution engages in the behaviors of clericalism, it consequently exacerbates and extends victims' suffering. One reason this is so is that the clergy sexual abuser and the religiously abusive church both betray the victim's trust in the church as God's community and simultaneously destroy a victim's internal ability to trust others. Quite often, the individual's ability to trust God is also destroyed. Just as a victim's abuser revealed himself, by his abusive actions, to be untrustworthy, so too does the church, by its abusive actions, reveal itself to be untrustworthy. Untrustworthy individuals and institutions are unsafe places for vulnerable individuals to visit or to permanently inhabit.

In addition, by its dishonest and secretive personnel and financial management practices, the church also betrays honorable clergy as well as committed and faithful members of the laity. It also betrays sexual predators' future victims in that it did nothing to protect them by preventing sexual abuse perpetrators from continuing to commit additional predatory acts.

As a reactive and uncaring administrative response to victims' accusations of clergy sexual abuse, institutional clericalism may have even more lasting

repercussions in victims' ongoing lives than did the original abusive acts. In part this is so because the institutional behaviors of clericalism (1) isolate victimized individuals from getting needed help; (2) reinforce a victim's internal sense of helplessness, powerlessness, isolation from their personal communities of reference as well as her or his sexual identity and religious identity confusion; (3) destroy comforting and meaningful spiritual, emotional, and social resources for coping with life's disasters; (4) separate victims from a meaningful relationship with God.

Structurally, at the level of human consciousness and human social experience, the behaviors of clericalism replicate the earlier acts of sexual violation. The act of clergy sexual misconduct (physical assaults or a wide variety of sexual harassment behaviors, for example) and the acts of defensive and reactionary clericalism are seen by some authors as constituting a form of soul murder (Doyle, July 13, 2008; Sipe, August 5, 2009).

Clericalism is a corrupted and morally devastating form of religious institutional leadership. Its repressive systemic violence, in the aftermath of religious leader sexual abuse is perpetrated against the sexual abusers' victims. It constitutes a religious form of authoritarian corporate criminality.

A Model for Study

This chapter's descriptive analysis of Roman Catholic authors regarding the current sexual abuse and clericalism scandal in their church provides other denominations with a model for examining these complex issues inside their own denominational boundaries. A multi-faceted analysis of the deeply interpenetrated problems of clergy sexual abuse and institutional clericalism is, I believe, essential to all efforts (1) to prevent both forms of violence from recurring and (2) to heal the wounds of the violence which has already happened. Complexity (rather than naive simplicity) allows for multiple causalities and correlations. It allows for a much more penetrating and accurate analysis than does blaming, judging, denying, or making excuses.

When we (members of the laity and clergy together) better understand the phenomena of clergy sexual abuse and its interrelatedness with institutional clericalism, we will be in the position of being able to talk

meaningfully about healing the community's multiple wounds. We will be more realistic in our efforts to minimize the likelihood of clergy sexual abuse in future generations. In short, by seeking to understand clergy sexual abuse and institutional clericalism, the church or other religious organizations can work towards the creation of a more just and a more violent-resistant religious culture.

In order to make sexual violence, in all of its many forms, unacceptable behavior inside the gathered, historical communities of religious faith, the community must begin to uncover, undercut and destroy all forms of ideological support for the continuation of such abuse. In turn, this diminished ideological support for sexual violence and authoritarian oppression of others will begin to shape the community's patterns of social behavior away from sexual violence, religious abuse and corrupt institutional administrative practices. By honestly facing its real problems in a transparent manner, religious cultures which have previously supported sexual violence and institutional violation of the rights of victims can begin to transform themselves into violence-resistive cultures. However, for this to happen, members of violent-supportive cultures must be willing to change their ideologies *and* their behaviors.

Recommended Supplementary Reading

Benkert, M. and Doyle, T. P. (2009). Clericalism, Religious Duress and its Psychological Impact on Victims of Clergy Sexual Abuse. *Pastoral Psychology* (58), pp. 223-238*.*

Doyle, T P. (2009). The Spiritual Trauma Experienced by Victims of Catholic Clergy Abuse. *Pastoral Psychology* (58), pp. 239-250

Podels, L. J. (2008). *Sacrilege: Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church.* Baltimore, MD: Crossland.

Robinson, G. (2008). *Confronting Power and Sex in the Roman Catholic Church.* Retrieve from *http://www.bishopgeoffrobinson.org/usalecture.htm*

Sipe, A. W. Richard November 6, 2007). *Why Bankruptcy?* Retrieve from www.richardsipe.com/Dialogue/dialogue-11-2007-06-12.html/

Sipe, A. W. Richard (2010) Sipe, A. W. R. (2010). *The Time for Apologies is Over! It's Time to Talk Reform of the Clerical Culture at the Heart of the Abuse Scandal. Retrieve from* http://www.catholica.com.au/gc3/rs/005rs191010.php

Personal Reflection Questions

1)   In your own words, define clericalism. What behaviors might you observe and identify in situations of religious institution clericalism? Write a short paragraph which includes your definition and includes a list of behaviors that you think might indicate the presence of clericalism in religious institutions.

2)   If you witnessed or knew about criminal sexual abuse of anyone in your congregation or spiritual teaching center, what do you think your response would be? What do you think it should be? Spend some time reflecting on these two questions and then write a short paragraph describing your ides and conclusions. The answer to these two questions may or may not be the same answer.

3)   If you were the lead minister of a congregation and received a written complaint of sexual harassment of a teen by the church's youth minister and if that harassment was directed at several of the church's teenagers on a recent field trip, what actions do you think you would need to take immediately? Think about this question in terms of the youth minister, the minister's family, the victimized teenagers, the families of these teenagers and members of the congregation. Discuss this question with others. When you are ready, in your own words, write a specific plan for proceeding. Identify what you would do first. Then follow the sequence of needed actions until you reach the last thing you would do to manage the situation.

4)   Have you ever witnessed examples of clericalism in your personal contacts with religious institutions and religious professionals? If so, what impact did it have on your spiritual beliefs or your understanding of religious faith? You may have been a young person who felt powerless to do anything. If that is the case, how would you act now that you are a mature

330

adult? What would be your personal actions now if you could return to this situation and live it over again?

Footnotes

[1] Gregory Baum. 2007, 81.

[2] Gregory Baum, 2007, 117.

[3] A. W. Richard Sipe, Novembe7, 2004, 5-6.

[4] For additional background information, see the Grand Jury Report, Philadelphia County, PA (Grand Jury Report; January 21, 2011: Court of Common Pleas, First Judicial District of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia County).

[5] On January 23' 2012, Philadelphia County Prosecutors in their case against Monsignor Linn accused the diocese of Philadelphia of being an *unindicted co-conspirator* and, according to an Associated Press Report filed by Mary Claire Dale, stated the *Roman Catholic Church fed predators a steady supply of children.* Linn is charged with *conspiring with priests and church officials to keep priests accused of sex abuse in ministry and parishioners in the dark.* See Dale, 1.

[6] United States Council of Catholic Bishops

[7] See Thomas P. Doyle (April 21, 2010) for his article *Revising History Vatican Style.*

[8] I have lost the reference but in reading the *Arizona Daily Star*, Tucson's city-wide newspaper in 2009, I came across an interview comment made by a United States Roman Catholic bishop. He was quoted as saying that Thomas Doyle and his work with sexual abuse victims were unimportant to Roman Catholic understandings regarding the sexual abuse crisis in his denomination. I paraphrase from memory. *His work is trivial and mediocre. He is a theological and ethical light weight*. I immediately recognized the bishop's comment as a discrediting personal attack. My personal reading of Doyle's written work persuades me that this American bishop quoted by the *Star* was counter-attacking Doyle's because of his effective work as a

victim advocate. The bishop, it seemed to me, was seeking to invalidate Doyle's importance as a canon law expert in the eyes of the American public. By choosing to go on the offensive by making this kind of unsubstantiated public media attack, the bishop further weakened his personal credibility as a spiritual and ethical leader and as a church administrator. His public defamation of Doyle's character, personal ability, and work was just one more attempt by today's Roman Catholic hierarchy to deflect attention away from the nature and extent of the sexual abuse and clericalism crisis in their denomination. Attack the messenger or the whistle blower is a common Machiavellian tactic in morally corrupt institutions. Meanwhile, in January, 2012, the Roman Catholic sexual abuse and clericalism crisis continues to gather momentum with each new revelation of sexual abuse and each new revelation of hierarchy cover-up activities. Doyle's 1984 prescient, written warning to his church was ignored and his once-promising career at the Vatican embassy was ended. His now decades-old perspective has long since been vindicated. For journalist John Allen's take on Doyle's importance and effectiveness, see Allen, J. (December 24, 2010). Benedict XIV and Tom Doyle on the Crisis. *National Catholic Reporter Online:*
http://ncronline.org/blogs/all-things-catholic/benedict-xvi-and-tom-doyle-crisis

[9] A. W. Richard Sipe, September 6, 2011, 2.

[10] To review characteristics of overt and covert institutional violence, see Chapters 1 and 2.

[11] These clinical terms from the twentieth-century describe individuals who can be clinically diagnosed as having character disorders (as contrasted with thinking disorders or emotional disorders).

[12] ARCE, April 9, 2011, 5.

[13] See chapter 9, pages 236-239 for Peter Rutter's analysis of this issue.

[14] Peter Eisler, May 10, 2011. 2.

[15] Most churches and other religious institutions have a commercial liability general policy that provides coverage for injuries that occur in or are related

to church programming. The insurance company understandably wants to limit its liability and when sexual abuse allegations and accusations arise, the company assigns a lawyer to the church to help its leaders provide quick and effective defensive action. The liability insurance company's usual legal advice to church officials is to remain silent and refuse to make any statement that might imply admission of liability. A church's failure to follow the insurance company's legal counsel may result in the termination of its liability policy by its insurance provider. Victims and the congregation, on the other hand want to know that church leaders are honest, practice transparent leadership, and are accountable to the church and to victims. If there have been failures in leadership, the congregation and victims want apologies so that forgiveness and reconciliation can happen. A central question becomes this: how can members of a church's leadership team balance the church's spiritual task of truthfulness, repentance and apologetic compassion for victims with the risk of legal liability stemming from actions meant to facilitate healing, repentance, truth-telling, apologies, requests for forgiveness and reconciliation ?

[16] This paraphrase of Jesus' teaching is taken from Matthew 23:3. Throughout this chapter, Jesus repeatedly warns his disciples of the practices and spiritual-moral dangers of hypocrisy. Towards the end of this chapter Jesus calls hypocritical religious leaders *white-washed sepulchers* – beautiful on the outside but filled with dead men's bones and putrefying decay.

[17] A meme is to culture as a gene is to the biological organism. Both seek to replicate themselves inside future generations.

[18] A. W. Richard Sipe, July, 2006, 3.

- 13 –

An Ancient Parable

Hear oh Israel: The Lord our God is the Lord. You shall love the Lord God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might.

Deuteronomy 6: 4-5

You shall love your neighbor as yourself.

Leviticus 19: 18

Introductory Comments: Credo

Sexual violence and betrayal inevitably transforms the life of those who get entrapped in the embodied interpersonal experience of violation. Many people subsequently remain enmeshed in the post-violence narrative of these violent events that snared them. By careful healing work the individual can recover from the physical assault. By equally careful and attentive healing work, victims can also heal their post-trauma economic, psychological, emotional, and social wounds. They can, I believe, also heal the spiritual wounds left behind by the trauma of being betrayed. What they cannot do, however, is return to the life they knew before they were victimized. The many ways their lives have changed need to be recognized. Their losses need to be compassionately acknowledged. They need time to rage at and to grieve these losses.

In this bewildering time after the events of their victimization has stopped but before their wounds have healed, sexual abuse victims need the compassionate attentive support of other human beings. They need to encounter trust-worthy people who care for them and wish them well.

I strongly believe that victims of sexual assault share a potential for healing with everyone who has been traumatized by interpersonal violence of any

kind. Every individual who has reclaimed his or her personal life after encountering life-threatening violence stands as a witness to the power of the life force to bring healing if and when we humans cooperate with it and support the re-emergence of a strong desire to heal and to live whole.

Victimized individuals can learn to move free from their sexual predator's colonization of their inner world by terror and fear. But this internal transformation takes time, it takes paying attention, and it takes active support by caring individuals.

In the words of poet William Safford victims can become survivors and survivors can become those who have overcome adversity. They can learn to *weave a parachute of all that is broken* and create a protective *shield from their scars*.[1] They can once again be whole.

The Parable of the Good Samaritan: Luke 10:28-34

During his lifetime, Jesus taught in parables and metaphors. Today as we read the Gospels in Christian scriptures we understand that he was well-acquainted with Mosaic Law and post-Mosaic Law as both were taught and understood in his era. According to the Gospels, he sometimes quoted various aspects of Hebrew religious law to hostile authorities who sought to trap him in heresy.[2]

In the ancient story I am about to re-tell religious lawyers (Scribes) were those educated men whose training taught them to know the intricacies of religious law and to apply it to contemporary situations. Priests and Levites were individuals who led the religious community in worship, and, in addition, provided for cultic enforcement of the law in all aspects of daily life. They too were knowledgeable about the details of the law and its commandments.

The story begins quite simply. A religious lawyer asks Jesus a question. It may have been an honest question or it may have been a malicious question intended to entrap Jesus. We do not really know at this distance, therefore, whether the question was honest and searching or dishonest and malevolent in its intent. On its surface, the question was about salvation and eternal life. At a deeper level, however, the question was one of interpretation and the demands of orthodoxy. At an even deeper level, the

question was about the definition of the word *neighbor.* Just who was the neighbor included in the teachings of Mosaic Law?   Which persons were the faithful required to love in the same way they loved (and in our language, cared for) themselves?

The first historical context note: In the culturally understood background of this parable is the socio-cultural reality that while the Samaritan people were genetically related to their Hebrew neighbors, Hebrew citizens in general refused to have anything to do with them, seeing them as half breed heretics.[3] In other stories from Christian scriptures we learn that orthodox Hebrews did not care to speak with Samaritans much less have any other personal or social contacts with them. The reasons for such inter-group antagonism and ethnic xenophobia were likely complex and rooted in their long shared geographic proximity and shared socio-cultural history. What some scholars believe today, however, is that the Samaritan subgroup of this region had intermarried during the Babylonian exile with non-Jews and they kept only the Mosaic Law (the Torah). Professor Paul Keim[4] notes that the Samaritans *would not have followed the plethora of religious regulations that in their view came after the authoritative teaching of the Torah.*[5] In terms of the orthodox Hebrew majority, therefore, they were, in our words, very distant relatives who were disdained and repudiated as relatives and as neighbors. Spong (2001) identifies this intense disdain as a form of xenophobic *visceral loathing.* Keim concludes that Jesus chose the Samaritans because of *the ambiguity of their status on the line between Jew and non-Jew.* As individuals on the margins of the Hebrew community they were vilified by the pious majority.

*The second contextual note: S*everal characters, the story's protagonists, represent religious and cultural orthodoxy. They were people who by virtue of their training and education knew Mosaic Law and its various requirements inside and out. They were also knowledgeable about applications of Jewish law and cultic regulations which were post-Mosaic. These well-educated men were, in addition, the community's enforcers of the law. They and the community as a whole believed that their interpretive and embodied orthodoxy was essential for the community's socio-religious-political survival and represented, therefore, faithfulness to the Mosaic covenant. These interpreters and enforcers of the law mediated, therefore, between God and the community. They were the individuals who collectively guided worship rituals and enforced cultic purity in the daily and ordinary life of the entire community. In terms of this book's language, the

held positions of religious authority, social influence, and power; they were, therefore, their community's religious authorities and the communal enforcers of orthodoxy.

In his brief discussion of Jesus and his relationships to religious authorities placed in the context of today's Roman Catholic Church pedophile scandal, Podles (2008) writes:

> *But the Pharisees used their religious authority to maintain a façade of righteousness and to demand obedience from pious Jews, when all the while they were filled with avarice and corruption* (13).

The issue of religious leader corruption appears to have been endemic among the various ethnic religious and political authorities of Jesus' faith community and historical era. Podles rightly notes that *the dynamics of corruption were present in the religious communities of Judaism and of the early Church that sprang from it* (13).

Third contextual note – a word about language: the Greek word for neighbor can be translated as *one who is near or close by.* Hebrew words can be translated as *someone other than kin with whom you have an association, such as a friend.* A second word is derived from the verb meaning to *reside, settle or dwell.* By virtue of Jewish religious and social customs in that era, therefore, Romans, Samaritans, gentiles, and other foreigners would have been excluded from the orthodox Jewish community's definition of neighbors.

There is a certain sense, therefore, that this parable is a story about the tension between informational, interpretive, and cognitive orthodoxy and a life actively engaged in the embodied practice of service to others. This parable raises questions about the appropriate behavioral markers or witness to the more abstract concept *love of God and love of neighbor.* The parable provides, therefore, a situational application of the teaching from Jewish scriptures regarding love of God and love of neighbor.

The Story Unfolds

> *Love your enemy is probably the most radical thing Jesus ever said, unless, of course we consider the parable of the Samaritan. There the admonition is to let your enemies love you.*

Robert Funk[6]

In the story, as Jesus told it, an un-named individual with an un-announced ethnicity makes his way on the treacherous road between Jerusalem and Jericho. This stretch of road is known to be the hideout for bandits and thieves of all varieties. As he walks the narrow, winding road, the man is assaulted by thieves who beat him, steal all of his possessions including his clothing, and leave him to die.

By chance, the parable continues, a priest comes by, sees the man's plight, and crosses to the other side of the road to continue his journey. A second man, this time a Levite, also came by. He was more curious. He stopped to look at the man and then he too passed him by on the other side of the road. In essence, both men left the wounded man to die.

We are told absolutely nothing about these two men's, personalities, personal motivations or thoughts about this matter. All Jesus describes in their behavior.

A Samaritan, culturally despised by Jesus' listeners, subsequently came upon the scene of the crime. Seeing the naked man's wounds and inability to help himself the Samaritan stopped and went to the man's side. He took some wine and disinfected the man's wounds. Then he poured oil to assist in physical comfort and bodily healing. After attending to the immediate needs of the man's physical wounds, he loaded the man on his pack animal (in this part of the world one assumes a donkey) and walked beside the animal as he and the crime victim made their way to a sheltering inn. Here they settled in for the night and the man cared for the victim's wounds.

In the morning, the Samaritan paid the inn-keeper for the wounded man's continuing stay at the inn and provided for the man's ongoing care. He promised the inn-keeper that he would return and pay any additional costs that were incurred by the man's need for additional care.

Having told his tale, Jesus asked of his listeners, "who, in my story, was the neighbor?"

A Contemporary Application of Jesus' Teaching

As we have seen so far in this manuscript, victims of clergy sexual abuse and victims of institutional clericalism are deeply wounded by both forms of personal violation and betrayal. After the predator's act(s) of violation, victims are abandoned. They, and their deep wounds, are unattended and they are left alone to suffer. Raped, sexually harassed, or otherwise victimized by ordained members of the clergy (or other religious leaders) they face disbelief, blaming by others for their own victimization, judgment, open hostility, shunning, exclusion, isolation, and abandonment. Friends, family, and members of the church's hierarchy may accuse them of lying. Their story may be discounted and they may be discredited. They may be accused of seeking to enrich themselves at the expense of the church. In some cases children and adolescents may be physically beaten or punished by their parents or other guardians in other damaging ways for accusing a minister or priest of raping them or sexually molesting them. Their friends and acquaintances may shun them and gossip about them in mean-spirited and negative ways. In general, the deeply wounded individual must prove his or her credibility before anyone stops to care for his wounds.

When victims later encounter corrupted administrative or institutional behaviors, their physical violation and their psychological wound is ignored, denied, and the victim is frequently accused of inviting it by his appearance or his behavior, by his character or his actions. The rights of the perpetrator of sexual violence for due process take precedence over the rights of the victim to be heard, believed and ministered to in healing ways. Mercy and support for the perpetrator trumps mercy, support, and justice for the victim. Wounds, just barely scarred over, are scraped open and the victims once more are abandoned and isolated from the community.

In the interior world of their psyche and cognition, victims know first-hand the dual trauma of physical violence and the trauma of betrayal. They may experience intense shame. They may experience deep confusion about what has happened to them. This is not unlike the confusion individuals often feel on waking after having been beaten into unconsciousness.

340

Sexual abuse victims may be overwhelmed by murderous rage or profound feelings of helplessness. They may accept the blame and accusations from others that somehow or other they are personally responsible for the act of violation. They may be deeply depressed and suicidal. In addition, they may blame themselves for not avoiding the clergy abuser's violence. Consequently, not only their physical body has been ravaged; their inner world of psyche, spirit, and soul has been vandalized, plundered, colonized by violence, split apart and they have been *left to die*.

Friends and other lay members of their community or even their religious leaders may urge them to forgive and forget as a way of creating community harmony. In this advice, the community releases the perpetrator of violence from responsibility and accountability for his violent actions towards his victims and for his betrayal of the entire community. Such socio-religious-theological advice often, in its turn, re-victimizes the vulnerable individual. It may, in fact, delay or completely prevent her ability to seek healing. It may exacerbate her shame, her rage, her helplessness, her confusion and her sense of powerlessness. It may further isolate her from efforts to heal her wounds.

When official or administrative representatives of the institutional church cover up acts of sexual violence and sexual harassment, these representatives stop, look and cross by on the other side of the road. They assess the financial obligations caused by the victim's wounds to be too costly to pay. They assume this damage, done by one of their guild, is not their problem and not their responsibility to manage. They do not approach the victim with compassion. They do not begin acts of care. They do not tell the victim that they are concerned for his welfare and healing. They make no effort to begin emergency or crisis care. They look, avert their eyes, and then decisively cross by on the opposite side of the road.

In some situations, church administrators know who the bandits are, know exactly what they have done, forgive and absolve them for their violent actions, and join them in leaving the scene of violation. In their economic, social and religious support of the bandits, they become accomplices, after the fact, to the sexual violence perpetrator's physical acts of violation and abandonment.

Religious administrators' choices to enter solidarity with sexual violence perpetrators and to protect them from full accountability for their acts of

violation mean that these religious authorities re-vandalize and re-plunder the victim's life. They may directly and deliberately lie to her. They may cast doubts in the community about her credibility. They may seek to guarantee her silence by money or threats. Most importantly, however, by their abandonment of care for the victim, they protect the perpetrator of the victim's violation. They take sides. They chose to support the perpetrator and they choose to attack and abandon the perpetrator's victim. They too may urge victims to forgive and to forget.

Jesus' teaching is clear. In his application of the community's religious and civil law love of God and love of the neighbor are the essential elements of divine law. Both provide the foundation of God's community on earth. What is demanded by this law is not represented by rigid orthodoxy, intellectual beliefs, or perfectly enacted cultic ritual acts. Love of God and love of the neighbor is represented by compassionate, loving, attentive, personal care. This care is expressed promptly, appropriately, and directly to the specific, individuated needs of the wounded person whom we come across in our life journey.

The wounded man, assaulted by bandits, stripped of his possessions and left naked to die; the victim of sexual violence, physically and emotionally violated by her clergy assailant, left to fend for herself, and abandoned by the religious authorities of her or his community: these are the neighbors of Jesus' parable. This violated and abandoned one is the neighbor, Jesus teaches, we must love.

We are to love this violated and abandoned one as we love ourselves. We are, therefore, to care for this wounded one as we would care for a beloved neighbor. The individual we notice to be in trouble is the neighbor we are instructed to help. In Jesus' teaching abstract legalistic and cultic ritualized love of God and neighbor is to be operationalized inside the human community. In Jesus' teaching, abstract theology and cultic ritual is subordinated to a living praxis of care for the neighbor. Jesus' teaching is quite clear: His followers and disciples are instructed to care for the wounded ones stripped of their humanity, abandoned and left to suffer alone.

How do we demonstrate our love of the divine? In Jesus' teaching, we do this by offering personalized, situation-appropriate, and compassionate care to those who need to heal their wounds - wounds caused by human

acts of violence and violation. We are to offer help in order that the wounded and violated individual can once again be made whole.

For healing to happen, the wounds must be recognized, acknowledged, and treated. Appropriate responsibility and accountability must be assigned. In addition, the individual must be supported in the healing journey by a psychological-emotional-spiritual process that disinfects the wounds of violence and applies a healing balm to the spirit. Violated and victimized people need help to manage their physical, economic, emotional, cognitive and spiritual pain while the body/Self recovers.

In Jesus' world view, it is the task of the faithful community to support victims of violence in their healing process. To do this, individuals in the faith community are obliged, by their commitments to Jesus' teaching, to provide knowledgeable and situation-appropriate on-going care.

As we read the parable in light of sexual violation, the story appears to warn its readers that authoritative knowledge of the law and pure cultic practice is insufficient and that Mosaic Law was organized around lived-life service to others rather than intellectual knowing and rigid orthodoxies. Thus, embodiment and concrete applications of the law in service to others, in Jesus' teaching, take precedence over abstract principles and dogmatic, legalistic hair-splitting. The preferential option of such a theology is for those who have been victimized and who are, therefore, vulnerable to further abuse.

In Jesus' teaching, therefore, we sense that in real life, following God's law is manifested not by knowledge and intellectual interpretations or opinions of dogma but by compassionate action which meets the needs of the wounded other person who is in proximity to us. When need manifests itself in a human face the proper response is informed, compassionate action (love) rather than a rigidified legalistic cognitive neighbor-isolating cultic practice (orthodoxy). In other teachings by Jesus we are taught that the manner in which we treat the wounded other, is the manner in which we treat Jesus himself.

Recommended Supplemental Reading

1) Luke 10: 28 and following.

2) Trible, P. (February, 1981). Feminist Hermeneutics and Biblical Studies. *Christian Century* 99 (4), 116-118.

Personal Reflection Questions

1) As you think about Jesus' parable of the Good Samaritan, which of the story's characters best represents your own position in today's events of religious professional sexual abuse of others? Are you the victim? Are you one of the priests? Are you the Samaritan? Are you the inn-keeper? Are you the donkey? Are you the inn-keeper? Write a short paragraph that explains your position in as much detail as possible.

2) In your opinion does the parable of the Good Samaritan provide any insight into today's secular news items about clergy sexual abuse of other individuals? If you discover new insights in this ancient parable for today's world write a short paragraph in which you identify these insights as specifically as you can and explain how they apply to you. If you do not think the parable presents any new insights, write a short paragraph explaining your thinking. Are there any other teachings of Jesus which might apply to situations of religious leader sexual abuse or to situations of criminal clericalism? Write a short paragraph explaining your answer.

Footnotes

[1] William Safford in Robert Bly, 1993, 10.

[2] See Matthew 22:34-40 and Mark 12:28-34.

[3] John Shelby Spong, 2001, 133.

[4] Electronic correspondence with Professor Paul Keim: Goshen College Bible, Religion and Philosophy Department, July 19, 2011.

[5] ibid.

[6] Robert Funk (200). The Once and Future Jesus in George Jenks (Ed.). *The Once and Future Jesus.* Santa Rosa, CA; Polebridge Press, 16*.*

- 14 -

The Duty to Forgive

When you stand praying, forgive if you hold a grudge against anyone so that your Father in heaven may forgive your trespasses. If you do not forgive neither will your heavenly Father forgive you your trespasses.

Mark11:25-26

Introductory Comments

Theology does not exist in a vacuum, nor is it handed down unchanging from one generation to another. It is shaped by the experience of historical, cultural and socio-political contexts.

Michael Nuttall[1]

During the years I have been studying and thinking about issues related to clergy sexual abuse of the laity (one form of personal violence)[2] and institutional clericalism (one form of systemic or structural violence),[3] I have simultaneously been thinking about Christianity's forgiveness theologies. Encountering explicit descriptions of rape, contact sexual harassment, and other forms of sexual abuse done by religious professionals, I kept asking myself about the Christian Church's ideology of obligatory forgiveness. The more I read first-hand accounts of violation, the more it seemed to me that some theologies and doctrines of forgiveness not only can be but actually have been used by the institutional church in the service of denial, re-victimization and social oppression. In researching these topics in the work of others, I soon learned that questions of forgiveness are debated in sexual violence literature because of the frequent injunction to religiously-situated victims to *forgive and forget.* Exactly what the victim's advisors mean when they issue these injunctions to her is ambiguous. Is she to abandon her search for healing? Is she supposed to ignore and deny what

happened to her? Is she supposed to open herself to additional victimization? Or, is she, just to silence herself inside her communities of reference?

Just as there is no common agreement in the religious community about this issue, there is no common agreement in the therapeutic community. For example, Enright (2001), Worthington (2006), and Lamb and Murphy (2002) provide diverse and conflicting opinions. They and other clinical writers provide a wide variety of clinical treatment protocols around topics of forgiveness. Not all authors agree on forgiveness as an essential aspect for victim therapy after episodes of betrayal and experienced violation.

Domestic violence literature, on the other hand, remains quite clear across a wide variety of authors. Perpetrator battering, victim forgiveness of her batterer, a period of truce between the pair often called a honeymoon, and a return by the batterer to additional acts of battering form the structure of domestic violence. Battered women's shelters provide the needed documentation that the best way for a woman to escape the structure of battering inside her domestic relationship is for her to flee to a safe place where the abusive and battering spouse or partner can't gain any personal access to her or her children.[4]

Scanning the literature about clergy sexual abuse of the laity, it becomes evident that a variety of authors, both clinical and theological, note that in the urgent push for victims to forgive their assailant, a perpetrator's accountability for his actions is often overlooked (Doyle, 2009, 246; Fortune, 1989b; Lamb and Murphey, 2002). Models of obligatory forgiveness are seen as interpersonally defective, ill-conceived and frequently toxic to victims. Doyle (2009) quotes Margaret Kennedy's article in the *Child Abue Review*:

> *Churches use the concept of forgiveness to short circuit the survival empowerment process…The Church cannot bear to hear about child sexual abuse, so the quicker the child forgives, the easier it is for the listener* (Kennedy, 2000, 133).

I personally would extend Kennedy's comments to include victimized adults as well as children. The interest of the Church as an organization is, therefore, not aligned with healing the emotional and spiritual wounds of abuse victims when that abuse has been done by members of the religious

guild – whether these are clergy or religious studies professors or church administrators. By its denial of the rights of victims for full information, the institutional church (whether deliberately and knowingly or unknowingly) aligns itself with the perpetrator and his so-called due process personnel rights.

In an absence of perpetrator repentance and change such demands function as another form of communal re-victimization (more commonly described in professional clinical literature as a form of secondary victimization). Forgiveness demands placed on victims by others can further isolate individuals within the trauma response. This happens, in part, because external social demands for forgiveness frequently remove any permission for victims to talk about what has happened to them or to seek help from others. In short, forgiveness demands often function as conversation stoppers and as victim silencers. They also prevent victims from seeking justice and reparations. In this regard obligatory demands for forgiveness function as a aggressive verbal political action against the victim.

Forgiveness Boundary Issue Identified

> **Forgive:** (1) Excuse for a fault or offense; (2) absolve; (3) give up all claims on account of; (4) remit a debt owed; (5) remit obligation; (6) cancel indebtedness; (7) cease to feel resentment[5]

To help me clarify the boundary line between forgiveness in the service of personal and communal healing and pathological theologies of forgiveness in the service of oppression I worked out a rough-sketched description of offensive, predatory behaviors in which forgiveness issues might arise. This eventually became Appendix A: the Sexual Abuse Glossary. Even a quick scan of the glossary demonstrates a wide range of sexually abusive behaviors. Not all behaviors equal all other behaviors in severity of the attack on victims or in the physical and psychological damage done to them.

However, such a statement about an implicit continuum of violation needs a caveat: what can be a devastating and permanently debilitating violation to one victim can be a manageable and survivable violation in the life of another. This is to say, therefore, that the experienced wounds and

personal suffering of victims are as unique as the victims themselves are. The wounds and healing responses of victims are as unique as the situation of violent betrayal which captured them in its web. The interaction of victim, perpetrator, cultural situation, and subsequent community responses all affect the victim's ability to heal after betrayal and violation.

A warning is needed. Anyone who has not known the personal betrayal of acquaintance sexual violation has no experiential clue about the devastation of victim's inner and social experience following acts of predatory victimization. The supposedly reassuring comment *I understand just how you feel* can be as patronizing and as harmful as the comment *it is time to get over it already* or the *let bygones be bygone* response*.*

Many victims of sexual violence have reported a wide variety of unhelpful or actively damaging conversational and behavioral responses to them as they sought to find help after violation. The reasons these responses come up in therapy, for example, is that victims feel further betrayed and misunderstood by verbal and nonverbal responses made by friends, acquaintances, and institutional helpers such as the police or other clergy.

When issues of institutional clericalism surface after the initial victimization by a clergy sexual predator, issues of denominational betrayal and secondary victimization deepen and create additional barriers to victim healing. What was initially a daunting task (to heal and return to ordinary life after abusive experiences with formerly trusted others) becomes almost overwhelming. The necessary process of regaining control of one's own daily social life and one's inner experiences is complicated by an absence of support from one's religious community, friends and even, at times, family members.

In emergency room settings as a rape crisis line victim advocate, part of my role was to respond to anything that happened in the victim's immediate surroundings in a supportive, empowering, and helpful manner. During the 1980's, rape crisis line volunteers or victim advocates often worked in pairs. On one occasion my crisis line partner was in the examining room with a newly raped young woman and the medical care team. I was in the waiting room with the woman's male friend. He had driven her to the emergency room. He said to me (and the entire emergency room lobby) with great forcefulness, *I am going to find and kill that son-of-a-bitch.*

It was my job to listen to and support him but it was also my job to help him see that this was not a helpful attitude for his woman friend to encounter as she exited the examining room. She needed his emotional support – not his declaration of rage and an intention to behaviorally enact it. She did not need to divert her attention from beginning to re-gain control of her life. She did not need, in her immediate post-rape situation, to take care of these intense emotional and visceral response needs of her male friend. She needed, in this time of crisis, to be supported in re-gaining personal control over her own life. She needed to make decisions for herself about how to proceed from here on in her life. For example, she would need to make, during this emergency room visit, a decision about reporting the rape to police. Making such a report would commit her to a lengthy process of making additional decisions in her future.

Witnessing the man's visceral and verbal rage, I needed to help him through his own crisis of response to her victimization so that he could be genuinely supportive of her as she began to regain personal control over her own life and to move forward into the future.

In most instances of clergy abuse of the laity that I know personally, victims and those who love them do not get this kind of immediate support. Frequently, they are caught in additional instances of abusive social commentary. Reported situations of clergy violence elicit blaming, shaming, disbelief, accusations, advice-giving, name-calling, and other forms of hostile interpersonal behavior directed at victims. Since clinical research protocols teach us that the first responses an individual encounters after acts of betrayal and sexual violence have significant, long-term consequences in a victimized individual's likelihood of healing (Krall, 1990), the reality of inappropriate, sometimes hostile, verbal and behavioral responses to victims of clergy abuse is particularly troubling. Such behaviors interfere with the victim's ability to heal and may, in some situations contribute to an on-going inability to do so.

The Role Stories Play in Theologizing about Forgiveness

We went to Portland over the weekend and met with an attorney on Monday afternoon. That was every bit as hard as seeing the Inquisitors[6] who came to the house, perhaps harder because it was in

an unfamiliar place. I told him the story of my abuse and recovery to date. The attorney said we had a very strong case. He offered that, in addition to asking for money and an apology we could ask for policy changes in the Church's way of handling these problems.

I didn't really like going to an attorney but I don't know any other way to equalize the power differential between "The Church" and me. The money represents two things for me. First, it is some compensation for the damage to me and my family and second it serves as a bold demand for institutional change.

Randi Ellison[7]

In my early efforts to understand Christian theologies of forgiveness, I looked at the question from the point of view of individual victims. When victims of individual violence told me that they'd been advised by a friend or their church's minister to forgive their clergy assailant and forget the assault I knew, as a health care professional, that it was impossible for victims to follow this advice no matter how diligently they tried to do so. The assault was not only an event in a past historical moment of time. It was preserved in the cognitive, biological, emotional, psychological, and even cellular memory of the victim. In many experiences of violence, that past historical moment gets re-enacted in terrifying night dreams and equally terrifying daytime flash-backs in a wide variety of unpredictable and uncontrollable present moments. That which is past history in the shared encounter of violence with the perpetrator remains present history in his victims' consciousness and in their routine daily lives.

We know from research, diagnostic and therapeutic work of clinicians regarding PTSD[8] that complex systems of memory rarely change without therapeutic help. Victims of life-threatening assaults, for example, rarely, if ever forget. In fact, they probably should not forget because the remembered experience can serve them in future situations of personal violence. Memory can become part of an individual's source of wisdom. It can help to protect her from future attempts of violation.

In addition to my personal reflections, one of my professional colleagues kept reminding me that these complex forms of protected clergy sexual abuse are not only personal violations. They always entail, by their very nature, an institutional dimension as well. In our many conversations with

each other, we debated theology, declared our personal opinions, and more importantly told stories to illustrate our opinions, beliefs and questions. Together we talked about the interface between personal violence and systemic or structural violence in a wide variety of violence narratives and encounters.

In the background of my thinking about sexual atrocities and forgiveness is the broader context of other violent atrocities which were simultaneously personal and collective, for example, the Jewish Holocaust, the massacre of civilians at My Lai, and the beatings, murders and assassinations of civil rights workers in the United States during the last century.

While I professionally believe that sexual violence is a deeply personal reality for each victim, I also believe that each form of sexual violence is a unique cultural form of personal violence and that the form surrounds each act of sexual violence, each encounter with a victimizer. The cultural form of sexual violence shares many similarities to other cultural forms of violence – most specifically other forms of personal violence that have been pre-planned and executed in malicious and dehumanizing ways.

In our conversations and letters my friend and I talked about post-apartheid South Africa and the Truth Commission work guided by Episcopalian Archbishop Desmond Tutu under the supervision of Nelson Mandela's presidency.[9]   He talked about institutional injustices he had witnessed in a wide variety of religious institutions. I talked about a forgiveness lecture I had just heard given by Azim Khamisa whose young son was murdered.[10] I discussed Jack Kornfield's book[11] about forgiveness in Eastern spiritual communities as well as in one's own interior personal life. We talked about the book *Amish Grace*[12] and its discussion of an Amish community's response to a massacre of Amish school children in Pennsylvania. I recalled stories of military massacres and forced disappearances during protracted civil wars in Guatemala and El Salvador during the 1980s. We talked about Simon Wiesenthal's collected essays on the topic of forgiveness in the context of the twentieth-century Jewish Shoah.[13]

In telling my personal stash of irreparable harm forgiveness stories and in listening to his, I began to sift through my own beliefs about forgiveness in situations of great injustice, in situations of great violation. I began, very slowly, to encode into language an emerging theology about forgiveness that differs from the "automatic duty of Christians to forgive theology" which

I was taught as a child.   Each story of sexual violence done by a religious professional to a person for whom he has intellectual and spiritual responsibility is (1) the story of a personal attack (in one way or another) and (2) the story of an institutional attack (in one way or another). By virtue of his institutional power and authority, the religious professional victimizer does not only rape or sexually harass others in his own name, he rapes and harasses in the name of the collective whole because he represents and is supervised by the organizations for which he works. Because of his position as a religious specialist, he also rapes in God's name.

The collective whole, most especially his institutional supervisors, are responsible to supervise his professional work and his institutional behavior as long as he is employed by the collective whole. Unsupervised or inappropriately supervised, the collective whole also is accountable to the perpetrator's victims because its administrators did not stop his behavior or terminate his institutional connections in a public manner which warned others about his behavior.

Victims of such clergy sexual abuse get trapped, therefore, in very complex interpersonal and social realities. These realities have political dimensions as well as personal ones. An individual, for example, sexually harasses them. His behavior represents his own personal choices about how he treats them. He is, however, also an ordained clergy person or a theological ethics professor. In some manner or other he is employed by the church or other religious organization. He is, therefore, a representative of the institution. He not only acts, therefore, in the authority of his own name or personal identity. Because he embodies the authority of his institutional position, his actions represent, therefore, the institution which ordained him or which employs him. He harasses or rapes, therefore, in his own name and authority; in the name and authority of the collective whole he represents or works for; and in God's name.

While he is personally responsible for his abusive actions, administrators of the collective whole (a church, a seminary, a theology department) are also responsible for his actions. When the individual was hired, his supervisors assumed this responsibility. It is part of their job to make certain that their employees behave in acceptable ways. In short, it is their job to make certain that their employees or supervisees are trustworthy. Church employers are not only responsible for ascertaining the theological

orthodoxy of their employees. They are responsible to promptly and effectively manage every sexually abusive employee's behavior.

While the sexual predator chooses a victim's sexual identify as the focus of his assault, the assault also has other socio-political dimensions. These dimensions can be gender-based, age-based, ethnicity-based, sexual orientation-based, or social position-based. Perhaps, as an example, a victimizer does not agree that women should be ordained. Teaching in a theological seminary, he begins to sexually harass his women students. In terms of the seminary's decision to educate women for ministry he may verbalize his support of women in ministry at the very same time he sexually harasses and tyrannizes the women students in his classrooms. The function of his assaults is not only to vandalize the sexual identity of his victims. The assaults serve also to disempower his women victims in their religious calling and professional social identity. His behavior, therefore, steals the victim's rightful share of personal authority and personal power. It vandalizes her sexuality. His violation is always, therefore, an authority and power violation as well as a sexual one.

Supervisors, learning about these violations, are obligated to stop his harassing behavior *and* to take specific actions to make certain it does not happen again on their supervisory watch. Failing to take action is a form of organizational behavior which operationally legitimizes the perpetrator's behavior. It provides him with a guarantee that he will not be held accountable for his abusive actions.

When institutions provide cover for sexual predators by either inept and incompetent or malicious and self-serving personnel management practices, they further betray the victim of clergy sexual abuse. When professional personnel managers of abusive individuals make decisions which protect the institution from shame, embarrassment, public scandal, or financial liability, they frequently make choices that benefit and empower perpetrators. These choices also victimize and further betray the clergy predator's victims. In this manner, personnel managers become an integral part of the cultural form of sexual abuse. They, like the perpetrator, help to guarantee that sexual abuse will continue to manifest in the common social world of individuals and institutions.

In essence, the complicit managers provide a cultural milieu for the predator to continue to enact his chosen form of sexual violence against

victims of his own choosing. Secretive, cover-up actions of professional personnel managers structurally replicate, therefore, the perpetrator's sexual assault in its disempowering function. Within their practices of institutional collusion with sexual predators, we see a complex socio-political assault on the previously sexually assaulted individual. The outcome is additional wounding and further disempowerment.

A second consequence is additional social isolation for the victim(s) of a sexual predator. His victims are silenced. By means of active silencing and attempts to isolate and dissuade victims from making public revelations about their abuse, victims are prevented from re-empowering themselves. They are prevented from the healing that occurs when truth is spoken and recognized as truth.

Refusing to act with confrontational compassion (that demands full accountability from a perpetrator for his aberrant, anti-social and usually criminal violent behavior towards others) institutional personnel managers (including supervisory boards of governance, chief executive officers and human resource managers) demonstrate that they are victim-empathy-incapacitated. By virtue of their secretive role behavior, they demonstrate their inabilities to demonstrate realistic concern for the physical and emotional needs of victims. They reveal, by their behavior, that they are morally-challenged. Whether inadvertently (because of inept or incompetent skills) or deliberately and maliciously (due perhaps to legal advice about the need to avoid liability litigation), institutional personnel managers additionally betray victims and become, therefore, secondary abusers and victimizers. As Kelman and Hamilton (1989) and Shupe (2008) point out (depending on the precise nature of the abuser's actions) they may also become criminal accomplices (after the fact) to a sexual crime. Administrators who do not effectively manage clergy sexual predators share the moral culpability of the perpetrator for his abusive and criminal actions (Greeley, 2004a). In not managing a perpetrator's past actions sexual violence, in essence they give permission for it to continue. Thus, the absence of appropriate supervisory discipline legitimates future violations. By failing to act, they become accomplices to the perpetrator's actions.

Because we are talking about religious professionals and religious institutions, acts of predatory and institutional violation are also done in God's name and on God's behalf. Frequently, one concomitant behavior to

the physical assault and the institutional assault is a religious assault made in God's name. During or just after a physical assault, victims may be told that God approves of the perpetrator's actions and that submission to his or her perpetrator is part of God's plan. Church administrators may threaten victimized individuals with excommunication if they speak out about their abuse in a public forum (J. Miller, 1999).

When we look closely at the phenomena of clergy or religious professional sexual abuse of the laity and institutional clericalism, something becomes clear. The final assault on victims is the perpetrator's, institution's and God's (human-perceived and human-declared) obligatory demand for the victim to forgive. This may be also accompanied by an insistent demand for reconciliation in order for victims to demonstrate their willingness and ability to forgive in a public manner.

Obligatory demands to forgive are rarely, if ever accompanied by statements of personal accountability, regret, repentance, apologies, an intention to never repeat the behavior on the part of sexual violence perpetrators. Very rarely, if ever, do perpetrators make any effective attempts at appropriate, victim-centered restitution.

In addition, such obligatory demands in situations of clericalism almost never involve institutional transparency, repentance, apologies, and sincere efforts at restitution towards the institution's victims. Most institutional administrators never make a genuine effort to reform abuse-promoting attitudes and policies. In a similar way, we rarely encounter un-coerced institutional efforts at victim-centered restitution.

Inasmuch as a community's understanding of God's demands is often initiated by and mediated by powerful human beings in administrative positions of religious authority, it remains unclear about what God would actually say to the victims who are violated by these same religious professionals (or their colleagues and very close friends). There are, nevertheless, hints in scripture that violence and social oppression disrespect and negate the divine will for human life. There are more biblical teachings about injustice as oppositional to the divine will then there are specific biblical teachings about forgiving those who (deliberately, maliciously, and repeatedly) continue to violate and oppress others. I return to this issue in the next chapter.

Forgiveness Demands: Another Form of Victim Abuse

> *The teachings of Jesus stressed that hypocritical behavior protects the power of the dominant group and enhances the respect given to them by ordinary people. Hypocrisy is a particular temptation for those who exercise authority in religion.*

Gregory Baum[14]

Eventually, my concerns for victim safety and healing led me to formulate a hypothesis. This hypothesis states that some, perhaps all, obligatory forgiveness theologies are anchored in the ideological and political demands of the powerful (i.e., victimizers) for victims to offer automatic forgiveness. This demand may be made in the name of community harmony. Or it may be made in the name of the community's desire to restore the perpetrator to full inclusion. Automatic forgiveness, in my opinion therefore, is used to legitimate perpetrator abuse *and* structural oppression in the name of divine forgiveness. It allows perpetrators and their protectors to continue their abusive behaviors unchecked and unaccounted for. It allows the community to live in denial.

By means of such political and ideological demands, victimizers avoid personal or institutional accountability for their own actions. No matter how harmful and profound the acts of victimization, victimizers and their personnel managers avoid personal responsibility for the destruction of their victim's interior and social lives.

In such a profane theology of forgiveness, victimizers become the victims when automatic, obligatory forgiveness is withheld by those they previously violated. Blame returns to the victim because of her inability or unwillingness to forgive without full accountability on the part of her victimizer(s). In addition, she is held fully responsible for the disruption of community harmony because of her insistence upon truth, accountability, and justice. She is seen as an enemy of harmony in the church. She, not the abuser, is blamed for the social disruption of community tranquility.

Likewise, institutional managers negate the victim's need for truth, justice and perpetrator accountability by their insistence upon the necessity of secrecy and protection of the perpetrator while they require or demand obligatory forgiveness from his victims. For personnel managers of sexual

predators the obligatory model of forgiveness sanctions and covers over their complicity with the perpetrator. They are freed from any form of transparent accountability for their failure to manage the perpetrator in an appropriate manner. Here too blame returns to the victim for her inability or unwillingness to forgive in an absence of institutional transparency and accountability.

In such a theology (or model) of forgiveness two groups of individuals (perpetrators and perpetrator protectors) are psychologically freed to abandon the victim and ignore her or his needs for resolution and healing. The depersonalization and dehumanization of their victims is made complete. Victimized by the perpetrator, re-victimized by institutional managers of the perpetrator, and, in religious environments, implicitly victimized and abandoned by God, the victim of clergy sexual abuse and clericalism becomes the common enemy to be attacked (Keen, 2006). As the violated and dehumanized other during her experiences of sexual abuse she is subsequently set up for the social role of despised and hated other inside the community of faith. She is blamed for the disruption of tranquility. She is blamed for the scandal. She can be accused of having desired the abuse. She may even be called an adulterer (T. Price, July 13, 1992).

In my perspective, therefore, theologies of obligatory forgiveness (however well-intentioned or ill-intentioned) contradict what psychotherapists, a wide variety of healing professionals, and victim advocates have learned about complex healing processes after events of sexual victimization. In addition, they contradict what victims themselves report about their individual processes of learning to live and heal themselves after primary and secondary acts of victimization.

Victims, their advocates and compassionate healers report that obligatory forgiveness demands constitute a secondary form of victimization and that this victimization functions as one more form of victim-betrayal (Berg, 2006; Doyle, July 13, 2008, 2009 *Spiritual Trauma…*, Ellison, 2011; Lamb, 2002; D. Price, 2002).

Since obligatory theologies tend to re-victimize those who have been most harmed by lived-through events of sexual violence *and* their subsequent encounters with oppressive structures of institutional violence, it becomes

imperative to re-examine the concept of forgiveness. When we do this, two faulty models for understanding forgiveness become immediately visible.

Faulty Forgiveness Models

> *Sexually offending priests typically have multiple victims and are unlikely to stop abusing children unless the opportunity is removed.*

> Lynn Abraham[15]

The *first of these* faulty or abusive models occurs within sacramental churches which practice obligatory confession and absolution as a means of church control over access to the Eucharistic meal and access to church-mediated eternal salvation. When, for example, (1) a priest hears the privileged and confidential confession of a fellow priest who has raped a series of pre-pubertal small children and (2) when the confessor priest absolves the offending priest without insisting that child protective services be notified, victim safety and healing are jeopardized. Prevention of future events of victimization is compromised in the name of forgiveness, absolution and personal salvation for the predator. In such a situation, the confessor priest does not hold the confessing priest fully accountable for his violent actions, does not insist on full repentance and reparations as a prerequisite for absolution, and he does not hold the sexual perpetrator to a reasonable standard of responsibility to his victims and the community at large for his criminal actions. After such a faulty absolution process, the confessor priest now shares moral responsibility for any future abusive or criminal actions done by his brother priest (Berg, 2006; Chinnicci, 2010; Greeley, 1982, 2004a, 2004b).

The *second example* involves supervisory behavior in situations where subordinates are known to engage in abusive and/or criminal sexual behavior with others. When, for example, a seminary president or rector refuses prompt action (1) to discipline or fire a sexually abusive faculty member and (2) to make information public about the faculty member's behavior and the disciplinary process, such morally complicit administrative behavior functions to legitimate the behavior and to protect the predator at great costs to victims, potential victims, and the community at large. According to Shupe (1998, 2008) administrators and other individuals who know about offending and criminal sexual behavior but do nothing to end it,

become accomplices to the behavior after the fact. Non-action and secrecy overtly or covertly communicate, therefore, institutional acceptance of the behavior. Silence and secrecy function structurally, therefore, to legitimate the behavior (Kelman and Hamilton, 1989). Legitimated, the perpetrator has implicit institutional permission to continue his behavior.

Whether this administrative and supervisory refusal to decisively and appropriately act is due to management incompetence or whether it is due to deliberate, well-thought out and attorney-guided administrative decisions designed to avoid scandal, institutional embarrassment, or successfully side-step expensive liability litigation, the end result is the creation of a hostile environment for victims and potential victims. The consequence of such inaction is that likely future victims are both unwarned and unprotected.

Both forms of morally complicit behaviors (priest confessors for individual perpetrators *or* negligent institutional supervisors of perpetrators) legitimize the continuance of offensive, predatory behavior by perpetrators. In general, these kinds of forgiveness behaviors towards sexual violence perpetrators condone their behavior. Thus, they guarantee that the behavior will continue unabated. Additional victims will be harmed. Past victims will receive no validation and no support for their complaint. The community continues to remain unaware.

The consequences of these forms of "forgiveness" or "absolution" are overwhelmingly negative. When sexual violence perpetrators are not held fully and publicly accountable for their predatory actions towards other individuals inside the faith community, these perpetrators understand that they have institutional permission to actively continue the specific forms of violence they direct at others.

This is as true of the offending individual as it is true for the offending institution. After setting in motion elaborate institutional procedures of secrecy it is almost impossible for victims to gain the needed information that serves as a foundation for personal healing to begin. Behind such dark curtains of secrecy it is also equally impossible for the public to learn the truth of the matter. In such a situation, preventive protection of potential victims cannot occur. To warn others means that information needs to be made public. Making public such information opens individuals and

361

institutions to question. For the authoritarian institution seeking to protect itself at all costs, such a process of information-sharing is impossible.

I have become very interested in self-report narratives of victims (Berg, 2006; Dick, 2006; Ellison, 2011; Freyd, 1996, Kaiser, 2002; Katz, 1984; D. Price, 2008; Rauch, 2009). I am also interested in journalist coverage about instances of clergy sexual violence and clericalism (Berg, 2006; Berry, 1992; Berry and Renner, 2004; The Boston Globe Investigation Staff, 2002; Breslin, 2004; Steinfels, 2003; and T. Price, 1992). In a careful cross-reading of both kinds of narratives what becomes visible is that sexual violence perpetrators who are not held immediately, fully and transparently accountable for their behavior continue their behavior. In addition, the number of victimization events and the number of victims both tend to escalate. From Grant's (1994-1995) perspective as a clinical psychologist, over time, with repeated violations, perpetrators of violence develop their skills as predators and victimizers. In other words, the perpetrators develop expertise in being sexual abusers. Their body's neurological and muscular body accommodates to these new skill levels and facilitates further abuse incidents.

It is very clear to me that for all members of the faith community to heal, victim truth-telling and compassionate community listening are both essential. Inside a circle of denial, lies, and misrepresentations of truth, the collective whole is disabled. In this situation, victim of clergy abuse and the abuse of clericalism are abandoned and left wounded by the side of the road. The spiritual and ethical mission of the community is gutted.

Concluding Comments

The corrupting trends tend to attach people uncritically to their tradition, protect them from coming to self-knowledge, defend the authority of the dominant classes, create a false sense of superiority over others, and produce dreams of victory over outsiders (76).

Gregory Baum[16]

According to Baum (2007) the social sources of corrupting trends in religious organizations, churches and denominations are the tendencies of the community to defend its power elites and to defend the community from

external hostile forces (76).   An example of this kind of religious corruption was uncovered in Boston in 2002. Public documentation by the *Boston Globe's* investigatory reporters revealed that the leader of the Roman Catholic community in Boston, Cardinal Law, deliberately and knowingly protected a group of predatory and criminal priest pedophiles by refusing (1) to disclose the priests' sexual misconduct with children in the parishes to which they were assigned, (2) to remove them from parish ministries where children were present, and (3) to report criminally abusive priests to civil authorities for investigation and prosecution (*Boston Globe*, 2002).

In these kinds of situations, the church's demand for victims of clergy sexual abuse to forgive their rapists or sexual harassers is further exacerbated by the religious establishment's insistence that victimized members of the church should forgive the institutional church for its mismanagement of sexual predators. In both of these situations the institutional church is attempting to protect its financial and personnel resources from outside claims (which the church's elites perceive as attacks).   In addition, the church seeks protection of its elites in their positions. Church administrators seek to maintain their authority, privilege, power, financial perquisites, and their ability to control others in God's name.

American Roman Catholic journalist James Breslin (2004) covered the pedophile scandal in Boston. He wrote, *The [Catholic] church sees holiness in a great big building. Then it produces pedophiles and pimps and lies and says we should forgive the priests* (4).

In both situations (1) a clergy sexual predator and (2) institutional clericalism: the demand upon victims for obligatory forgiveness is, I now believe, a political demand or political weapon to be used against the victims of clergy violence. Such demands or social weaponry are rooted in the desire for power and control but are dressed in the garb of a religious or spiritual obligation. The demand may even be presented as a humanly-mediated divine prerequisite for eternal salvation.

Such a demand, no matter how elegantly or how euphemistically it is expressed in theological or doctrinal teaching, constitutes social oppression and it privileges victimizers. It most certainly does not serve victims and their needs for justice and accountability. The presence of such demands actively and effectively suppresses the compassionate support needed for

post-violation healing. Individual and communal demands for obligatory forgiveness never serve the victim's and community's need for truth.

Furthermore, such a teaching ignores, perhaps even contradicts, Jewish and Christian scriptures and spiritual traditions about the need for individual victimizers to turn from their acts of violence, repent, and make restitution. Such a teaching also ignores, and perhaps disdains, Jewish and Christian teachings about the demand for justice in situations of institutional violence and active, ongoing oppression of the weak or vulnerable.[17]

Finally, automatic obligatory demands for victims to forgive and to forget also go against contemporary clinical wisdom. In this wisdom, victims are assisted to construct a historically accurate account of violation in order to reclaim disassociated aspects of the violation narrative (Mendelshohn, et. a., 2011; van der Kolk, et. al., 1996).

It is clear: a more nuanced theology of forgiveness is needed. Such a theology needs to be in actual dialogue with real victims of violation and real victims of systemic oppression. In victim life narratives and reports of their personal experiences, abstract, conceptual theologizing can be tested to see if it is faithful to the deepest spiritual insights of the religious tradition or if it is a political and ideological tool of religious elites to maintain control and power and to refuse to be accountable for their actions.

Recommended Supplementary Reading

1) Hauerwas, S. (April, 1992) *Why Truthfulness Requires Forgiveness: A Commencement Address for Graduates of the Church of the Second Chance*, Goshen, IN: Goshen College. ITS Media Collection and Mennonite Church Archives.

2) Koontz, G. G. (April, 1994). As We Forgive Others: Christian Forgiveness and Feminist Pain. *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 68, 170-193.

3) Koontz, G. G. (1992). Redemptive Responses to Violation of Women: Christian Power, Justice, and Self-giving Love in E. G. Yoder (Ed.). Occasional Papers # 16: *Peace Theology and Violence*

Against Women, Elkhart, IN: Institute of Mennonite Studies, 1992), 29-47, Response by Lois J. Edmund, 48-54.

4) Kornfield, J. (2002). *The Art of Forgiveness, Lovingkindness, and Peace.* New York, NY: Bantam.

5) Landman, J. (2002). Earning Forgiveness: The Story of Perpetrator, Katherine Ann Power in S. Lamb and J. G. Murphey (Eds). *Before Forgiving: Cautionary Views of Forgiveness in Psychotherapy* (232-261)*.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

6) Yoder, J. H. (2001). *Body Politics Five Practices of the Church Community before the Watching World.* Scottdale, PA: Herald, Chapter One.

Personal Reflection Questions

1) As specifically as possible, write your own definition of the words *forgive* and *forgiveness.* After you have written your definitions, think of an example that illustrates each one. Then write a paragraph or two that explains how the example you have created represents or illustrates these two words.

2) Think of a time when you were asked to forgive someone? Write a paragraph or two describing the situation. After you have finished composing your personal story, think about the question: how does this particular story affect your own theology of forgiveness? When you are ready, write another short paragraph that answers this question.

3) Think of a time when you hurt someone or offended someone and asked them for forgiveness. Write an account of this story in one or two paragraphs. Be as specific as you can be. After you have finished describing the story, reflect on how this story affects your personal theology of forgiveness. When you are ready, write another paragraph or two that explains your answer.

4) Has there ever been a time in your life when you felt absolutely no need or no desire to forgive someone who harmed you? Write a

paragraph or two describing this situation. Once you have finished describing the situation think about how these events of being harmed and your personal unwillingness or inability to forgive have shaped your personal theology of forgiveness. Once again, be as specific as possible.

Footnotes

[1] Michael Nuttall, 2003, 75.

[2] To reprise: *clergy sexual abuse* is unwanted sexual attention from an ordained individual, such as a denominational executive, pastor, priest, chaplain, seminary professor, monk or nun, etc.

[3] To reprise: *clericalism* is an institutional clergy structure and practice that protects the clergy and church institutions at the expense of the laity. The practice of clericalism by religious institutions may include sinful behavior such as lying and bearing false witness. It may include criminal behavior such as perjury and becoming an accomplice to criminal behavior of subordinates after the fact. In structure and institutional behavior it is very similar to crimes of obedience in corporations and governmental institutions.

[4] For further information about domestic violence and treatment responses see K. J. Wilson's edited collection of resources, (1997).

[5] Appendix B, A Word Web: The Language of Forgiveness.

[6] This is Randi Ellison's name for the two church representatives to whom he first reported his experiences of clergy sexual abuse. One representative, in his supervisory denominational relationships, reported directly to his denomination's bishop (17).

[7] Randi Ellison, 2011, 37.

[8] *PTSD* is an acronym for Post-traumatic Stress Disorder. For a working clinical definition or description of this diagnosis see the APA (American Psychiatric Association) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders,* (1994, 4th *ed.*). In the summer of 2011 as this is being written,

the APA is in the final stages of revising and releasing what will become the DSM 5th ed. For clinical information about diagnostic and treatment issues regarding PTSD see Herman, 1992; Mendelsohn, et. al., 2011: van der Kolk, et. al., 1996. For a clinical review of the complex issues faced by victims as they seek to heal themselves of their wounds and recover, see Levine, 1997, 2003; Mendelsohn, et. al., 2011; Rothschild, 2000, 2003.

[9] John Allen, 2006.

[10] Azim Khamisa, 2005.

[11] Jack Kornfield, 2002.

[12] Donald Kraybill, et. al., 2007.

[13] Simon Wiesenthal, 1998, *The Sunflower: On the Possibilities and Limits of Forgiveness.*

[14]Gregory Baum, 2007, 68.

[15] September 17, 2003, Grand Jury Report, First Judicial District of Pennsylvania, Criminal Trial Division.

[16] Gregory Baum, 2007, 76.

[17] For a discussion of a Jewish theology of repentance see Deborah E. Lipstatdt, 1998, 193-197; for a discussion of a Jewish theology of forgiveness see Susannah Heschel, 1998, 172-173. For a discussion of Christian forgiveness theologies in situations of atrocities, see Robert McAfee Brown, 1998, 121-124. For a discussion of atonement theology, see Carroll,. 2001; See Dorothee Soelle, 1998, 244-246 regarding Christian theologies of repentance.

- 15 -

Christian Models of Forgiveness

Authentic forgiveness can benefit the victim if he or she arrives at the point of shedding the emotional control the abuser had over him or her years after the actual event took place. True forgiveness is happening when the victim moves beyond the place where the sexual assault dominates feelings and emotions and continuously disturbs the ability to love and be at peace. It is happening when the victim controls his or her anger rather than being devoured by it. At this point the abuser himself and the enabling Church system have lost control over the victim.

Thomas P. Doyle[1]

Introductory Comments

Can a subordinate person in a subordinate position forgive someone in a dominant position without reinforcing that subordination?

Sharon Lamb[2]

Throughout this manuscript six discrete kinds of abusive violence inside religious communities have surfaced. Each kind represents a specific destructive form of human betrayal. Each has its own signature. Each has been described in previous chapters in more detail. They are included here as a reminder of the post-victimization social terrain for victims in which others may suggest, request, require, or demand forgiveness from them.

The *first kind* of violence is a form of personal violence in which one individual physically assaults another by means of her or his sexuality. Sexual assault violations demonstrate a perpetrator's intention to dominate and control another individual by means of her or his sexuality. For his victim, one immediate consequence, in addition to physical wounds, is

369

terror mingled with helpless rage. A second consequence is an internal sense of confusion. Long term consequences can include physical disabilities, addictions, difficulties in establishing relationships with others, emotional problems, and spiritual or religious problems.

The *second kind* of violence masquerades as consenting sexual activity between a professional and an individual who is in a subordinate, dependent, or client role. In this manuscript, professional members of the religious elite such as ordained clergy or theological professors in the religious academy are the perpetrators of this kind of abuse. In addition to intellectual confusion and psychological problems, one major consequence is a long-term inability to trust others. This, in term, affects the victim's abilities to create mature, loving and intimate relationships with others.

The *third kind* of violence is sexual harassment. Whether this is a contact form of violence such as fondling, grabbing genitals, buttocks, or breasts, unwanted hugging and kissing or whether it is a non-contact violation such as stalking, making unwanted sexual propositions, exposing one's own genitals, sending obscene correspondence, making obscene phone calls or the creation of a hostile environment, the victim feels threatened, demeaned and violated. West (1999) accurately describes women's sense of terror, fear, and anger when they are sexually objectified by harassment behaviors. In this third form of sexual violence individual victims are also betrayed and traumatized. This is particularly true if institutions tolerate and thereby legitimate harassment by non-action.

The *fourth kind* of violence is found within oppressive and sometimes criminal (Shupe, 1995, 2008) religious systems. In these systems abusive institutional religious professionals (for example, chief executive officers or members of an institution's board of governance) protect sexually abusive religious professionals from public scrutiny and prosecution. Board members, institutional administrators and peer professionals in their protection of sexual abusers develop a corporate climate that is structurally equivalent to financial and manufacturing sector or governmental crimes of obedience. When institutional administrators of religious organizations and the perpetrator's professional peers engage in secretive institutional practices which obstruct full accountability and justice, they become complicit accomplices to the sexual abuse.

In addition to experiencing violence done by to them by members of the religious elite, victims and victim advocates also face a communal form of violence. For lack of a better word, I will call this *fifth* form of violence community disbelief, abandonment, and public censure. Many victims have described their encounters with peer lay members of their religious community as hostile. They report having experienced blaming, shaming, character attacks, expressions of disbelief and denial, and the community's active support of the perpetrator as an active form of taking sides (see also Podles (2008, 423-440) for his discussion of lay complicity).

An online handout designed by SNAP[3] for lay members of churches where its clergy have been accused of sexual abuse is entitled *You Can Make a Difference. S*uggestion number 11 addresses this issue:

> *If you feel obliged to "support" an accused cleric, even if you feel the allegation is baseless, please do so privately. Publicly backing a suspected molester contributes to an intimidating climate that makes it harder for victims and witnesses to come forward. So pray for the accused, visit him or her, bring him/her food and comfort him/her one-on-one. Remember, the victim or the victim's family may also be members of your parish and deserve the same Christian attitude during this very difficult time.*

Lay mobilization of community support for a perpetrator and the concomitant denial of community support for his victims are experienced by victims (and their families) as yet another form of religious betrayal and social violence. Not only has the victim, in this situation, faced the violence of physical violation; not only has the victim experienced the social violence of institutional clericalism: the victim, in encountering his or her community's denial of truth and more personally focused acts of judgment, blaming, and disdain, loses a social-spiritual resource for healing and a social-religious identity. Isolated during the act of sexual violence; additionally isolated by institutional administrative responses of secrecy, denial, deceit, and active protection of the perpetrator, victims are once more betrayed and even further isolated in yet another social transaction that mirrors and mimics the original act of violation.

A *sixth* from of violence is the social attack made by institutions and individuals on whistle blowers. Like the victims of sexual abuse and the abuse of clericalism, whistle blowers face a social assault of formidable

proportions. Their character is assailed; their credibility is assaulted; there may be serious financial repercussions, and they may face legal challenges about their work on behalf of victims. They also often face a loss of their religious support community as the community organizes itself to ostracize them.

Each of one of these forms of betrayal and violation not only create trauma within individuals. By their participation in human evil, they are toxic to the social order. Each has, therefore, an active potential to splinter entire communities and separate friend from friend, family member from family member; and victimized individuals from God.

Advice to Forgive

> In keeping with the Catholic theology of penance and forgiveness, the clergy abuser is encouraged to acknowledge his sinful actions, seek God's forgiveness, and sin no more. Victims are encouraged to forgive those who have abused them. This unrealistic emphasis is not on the abuse and its powerfully destructive effects on the victim, but on a future wherein the sexual abuse is not a cause for embarrassment for the institutional Church. The fallacy of considering clergy abuse only in terms of sin is that it serves as an excuse to overlook the criminality of the act. It also serves as a distraction from the need for accountability on the part of the abuser as well as the ecclesiastical system that formed, enabled, and in the end, covered for the abusive offender.

Thomas P. Doyle[4]

It is in the sobering aftermaths of violence and betrayal that difficult questions of forgiveness arise. In each situation of religious professional violence a needed reality check arises. What do victims hear when we or others advise them that they should forgive those who sinned against them and be reconciled? When (1) a fellow believer (an authority figure) assaults them *and* (2) other fellow believers (institutional administrators and authority figures) cover up such violations *and* (3) additional fellow believers (members of their faith community) refuse to acknowledge their

complaints of violation and betrayal, what is the nature of forgiveness which is requested or demanded from them.

Equally difficult questions arise when the institutional church, in a slightly different situation or circumstance, announces that a sexual abuse perpetrator has been institutionally forgiven and should now be accepted by everyone in the community – victimized individuals and non-victimized individuals alike – as a fully restored minister or religious leader. If there have been no apologies to the victims of violation; if there has been no public act or repentance; and if there have been no efforts made at restitution by the perpetrator, the institutional administrators who protected him, or the community which attacked his victims as non-credible, what do victims hear about their own moral claims for accountability and justice?   In these complex situations with multiple violations what is the relationship of accountability to mercy? What is the relationship of justice to forgiveness? What is the relationship of forgiveness to reconciliation? In the absence of full disclosure and the revelation of painful truth, how can victims move free and heal their wounds? How can the community heal its wounds? Finally, in an often-overlooked question, how can the perpetrators become freed of their own deep-seated wounds?

More troubling questions arise when the institutional church – as an organization – managerially punishes those who report sexual abuse and legally attacks those who blow the whistle on faulty management practices vis-à-vis clergy sexual abusers. If, in such a situation, the institutional church insists upon its legal rights to do what it has done, not only victims but witnesses to this kind of debacle may be asked (implicitly or explicitly) to condone and overlook the church's behavior – in short, to excuse and to forgive the church for its ongoing violation of the rights of others.

Not only victims of sexual violation face complex issues of forgiveness? Whistle blowers who have been institutionally punished for their acts of victim advocacy also have been transgressed against. They, too, have known isolation from professional supervisors, peers, and entire personal communities of reference. They too have grievances and wounds. They too have been sinned against. Their support of the victims brings them into solidarity with the victims. In this solidarity, they too become victimized by the abusive powers of this tragic and violent narrative (Herman, 1997).

Underlying these kinds of interpersonal and sociological realities is an ideological or theological question. What is the intention of a community's spiritual teaching that human forgiveness is *the* essential act to earn divine forgiveness and human salvation? What is the intention of the community's teaching that forgiveness is the basis for human to human reconciliation or for divine rescue and salvation? What is the intention when forgiveness is proclaimed as the only path to creating lasting peace between enemies and antagonists?

In the language of the 20th century's Latin American Theologies of Liberation, what is the preferential option of this kind of theology? Does it seek to support the powerful and thus to perpetuate injustice or does it seek to liberate those vulnerable ones who have been wounded by the active oppression of clergy violence?

> *The only way to peace…is the way of forgiveness. The way of love, the way in which we give up vengeance and refuse to take revenge.*

> Thomas Gumbleton[5]

When members of the religious community hear a teaching such as the one above, what do they hear? Do they hear a message of appeasement, non-accountability and continuing support for individual violence and systemic injustice? Do they hear a message of support for denial of truth? Do they hear support for the status quo? Do they hear a message of cheap grace? Do they hear a message that supports untruth and deliberate ignorance of factual realities? Do they hear support for institutional perpetuation of ongoing injustice?

Or, do they hear the bishop's message as one of conversion, transformation, and a potential for reconciliation of those made enemies by violence and betrayal? By preaching forgiveness as the path to peace, the bishop faces us with a difficult question: in the message's simplicity are all members of the religious community guided to understand the difficult work of spiritual maturity? Alongside the message of forgiveness, does the message of accountability and justice emerge as a co-equivalent one to messages of forgiveness and reconciliation? Believing in the necessity of forgiveness, how can the members of the faith community hold perpetrators accountable for their behavior? How can messages of forgiveness co-exist with messages of justice? In what specific ways can members of a faith

community support those victimized by sexual oppression and violence (Chinicci, 2010)?

How can any religious community, by its teachings about mercy, forgiveness, reconciliation, and peace, meaningfully address victims, victimizers, whistle blowers, assorted witnesses such as lawyers or child protection service agency staff, and the religious community of lay individuals unless it simultaneously addresses issues of accountability and justice?

A Brief Look at Textual Issues

This is what the Lord requires of you: do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with your God.

Micah 6:8

When a spiritual teaching about forgiveness is based on scriptural or traditional proof-texts and when the teaching of forgiveness gets disconnected from issues of justice and accountability, then other spiritual or scriptural teachings lose importance in the construction of any theology of forgiveness. Scripture, and religious tradition, can become yet one more set of weapons to use against victims.

When we focus on the whole rather than one specific text, Jewish and Christian scriptures have many varied opinions about the relationship of justice, mercy, and accountability to forgiveness. These opinions are found in a wide variety of biblical situations or narratives of human oppression and systemic evil.

Issues and principles of textual interpretation and exegesis lie outside the boundaries of this manuscript. Nevertheless, it does seem important to note that within Jewish and Christian scriptures and interpretive traditions, there are a variety of theological traditions that relate to issues of violation, repentance and forgiveness.

In the prophetic trajectory of Jewish scriptures, it is clear that truth, justice, mercy and healing are linked together. Each has links to issues of conversion and salvation. In many prophetic texts, the community is

obliged to rescue and support culturally vulnerable individuals and seek ways to remedy their distress. In addition to individual action, the community is urged to reform and redeem itself by systemic repentance and transformation. God's forgiveness in these texts is tied to human repentance and conversion.

In a contemporary Jewish theology of forgiveness, only a victim of wrong-doing can forgive his assailant.[6] A third party, therefore, cannot forgive a sexual aggressor for his acts of violence done to someone else. Neither an individual nor an institution can relieve the assailant of his moral responsibility and personal accountability to his victims for the harmful consequences of his actions. No one can be a proxy in absolving the sins of violence done to someone else. Only the victim of the acts of violence has the moral prerogative to forgive.

Christian scriptures reveal several teachings regarding forgiveness. For example, in the rule of Christ teaching (Matthew 18:15-17) nothing is said about the obligation to forgive when the offender refuses to acknowledge the situation, fails to repent, does not acknowledge his need for forgiveness and continues his behavior. In fact, after three failed attempts to get him to repent and change his behavior, he is to be kicked out of the community and treated as an unbeliever

In the Lord's Prayer (Matthew 6: 8-14), the believer prays to the heavenly father to be forgiven as he forgives – thus creating the spiritual imperative or obligation to gain God's forgiveness by human action. There are debates, however, among Christian theologians about whether this prayer refers to sin and victimization of others or to financial debts owed inside the community of faith

In responding to Peter's question about seven times being sufficient for forgiving a repeat offender (Matthew 18:21-22) Jesus' reply is seventy times seven. Here Jesus places no restrictions on forgiveness and makes no ties to repentance. Clearly a forgiving spirit is the desired outcome of this teaching.

Luke 17: 3-4 says that when a brother sins against another brother, the victim is to rebuke him. If the offender repents, the victim is to forgive him. Here forgiveness is directly tied to the victimizer's statement of repentance.

Even with such a small sampling of the biblical injunctions regarding forgiveness, it becomes clear that Jewish and Christian scriptures (and their respective methods of interpretation) represent a variety of opinions about what forgiveness is and what it entails inside a shared community of belief and faith. In general in Biblical theology, there does not seem to be an urgent, all-encompassing theological demand for believers to forgive unrepentant sinners who have sinned against them.

In post-biblical Christian atonement theologies, however, Christ in his forgiveness of his executioners stands as a model for church teachings about the need to forgive in situations of abuse where the abuser remains unrepentant. Christ's spontaneous forgiveness of his tormenters has become the standard for obligatory, spontaneous forgiveness of others.

Cleaning God's Living Room of Moral Corruption

The Jews' Passover was at hand and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. He found in the temple those that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money. And when he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them out of the temple and the sheep and the oxen and poured out the changers' money and overthrew the tables. And he said unto them that sold doves, "take these things hence; do not make my father's house a house of merchandise."

John 2:13-16[7]

Christian scriptures reveal Jesus' chronic irritation with corrupt religious authorities. Forgiveness theologies appear to be missing from his various confrontations with the religious elite of his time. Narratives about his relationship to the scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, and priestly castes reveal an uncompromising and confrontational spirit. Systemic oppression of the vulnerable by the religious elite is not an acceptable climate or practice. I turn, first, therefore, to questions of forgiveness for actions done within the framework of corrupted institutions.

The prophetic strand of Holy Scripture repeatedly calls the morally corrupted nation-state *and* the morally corrupted religious establishment to abandon unjust and inhumane actions towards the vulnerable ones who have been harmed by these actions. This critique of corrupted systems in

Jewish and Christian scriptures is never simplistic. It is never vague. It is always situationally precise. It describes and addresses specific corrupt leaders. It names those whose actions are complicit with evil. In addition to corrupted leaders, scriptural texts also address complacent religious worshippers – those who pay more attention to doing the proper liturgies of worship than they do to helping their fellow citizens who suffer under the social and religious bonds of injustice.

Institutional abuses of power and authority are, inevitably sustained by human beings who are not willing to challenge structures of injustice. These individuals include abusive leaders and their supportive followers. They include insiders who look the other way and refuse to hold abusive leaders accountable for their actions. Leaders, insiders and their unquestioning sycophants are complicit in the systemic violence done to others – often in God's name. In short, by refusing to confront evil-doers, they collude with the violence by protecting or excusing the violence's perpetrators.

Systemic injustice is present when the church attacks the character and truthfulness of the victims of clergy violence and of those individuals we have called witnesses or whistle-blowers. Directly or indirectly attacking and excluding are common Machiavellian tactics for maintaining the status quo inside institutions which practice unethical, immoral or criminal behavior.

To continue to benefit from the church's social support while others are denied access, isolated, excluded, abandoned or attacked as un-credible witnesses places an individual Christian in a unique moral hot seat. As long as he remains silently in place, he is, in effect, supporting the continuance of abuse, deceit, and overt hostility to victims. He, like the leaders of abusive systems and their supportive subordinates, becomes complicit in the moral and spiritual failure of the church.   He becomes a participant in the violence done in God's name and in the community's name against others.

In regards to the world-wide cover-up of priests and their sexual abuse of children and adolescents, Thomas Doyle (July 13, 2008) writes v*ictims/survivors need to…come to an emotional as well as cognitive acceptance of the fact that the institution and its office holders **will not***

*because they **cannot** (emphases his) respond in a manner that would reflect full awareness and accepted responsibility* (23).

If the victimizing church or religious institution shows absolutely no sign of repentance and reformation, then, it seems to me as a clinician-theologian that it is irresponsible to ask individuals doubly victimized by clergy abuse and institutional clericalism to forgive the institutional church and to become reconciled with it. Borrowed from another arena of religious intolerance and injustice, Metropolitan Community Church minister Mel White's words apply here as well.

> *Love demands that we quit cooperating with those who oppress us by their actions or with those who oppress us by refusing to act. It is time to begin a campaign of relentless nonviolent action that will convince church leaders to do justice at last* (2006, 330).

To ask victims of clericalism to forgive and to forget is, therefore I believe, revelatory of a certain kind of spiritual death and socio-psychological maliciousness in the perpetrators of institutional sinfulness. Secretive, self-protective institutional behaviors do not address the need to heal the wounds of betrayal and violation in victims. They do not address the need to protect additional individuals from harm. Because of their failures, such institutional administrators cannot lead the religious community in spiritual formation activities which foster mature Christian faith. Their failure to model the religious instructions they so piously utter makes them hypocritical spiritual failures.

Unless institutional administrators and members of the religious hierarchy make a full, public, and transparent confession of the evils they have done as institutional administrators, victims of clericalism need to remain wary of all efforts to silence them or to reconcile with them. For victims, the insistence of others that they need to forgive and to forget and reconcile with either their non-repentant abuser or with the institution which protected him presents victims with a treacherous pathway in which re-victimization at the hands of their original victimizer and at the hands of their institutional secondary victimizers is equally likely.

This is not to say that individual victims of clergy abuse and clericalism cannot develop a spirit of compassion for those who have betrayed and violated them. It is not to say that they cannot, in their own spiritual

379

journey, allow grudges and desires for revenge to fade away. It is not to say they cannot, or should not, forgive.

It is, however, a sign of spiritual and emotional wisdom to withhold trust from any individual or community which has made no efforts to do that which Holy Scripture mandates for offender reform and institutional correction: repent, confess, and turn away from evil permanently. It is a sign of personal self-respect to make personal decisions about forgiveness and reconciliation as appropriate or inappropriate actions.

The Nature of Forgiveness

> Reconciliation can only happen between persons who respected their own humanity and that of others
>
> Archbishop Desmond Tutu[8]

When we look at religious literature (Doyle, Sipe, and Wall, 2006; Fortune, 1989b; Hauerwas, 1992; Koontz, 1992, 1994; Kornfield, 2002; Tutu in Allen, 2004; and Yoder, 2001) and when we look at contemporary social science and clinical literature (Enright, 2001; Lamb and Murphy, 2002; A. Miller,1991; Naperstek, 2001; Ozzick, 1997; and Worthington, 2006), it becomes quite apparent that there is no unitary understanding in our contemporary vocabulary and practice about what it means operationally to forgive. Culturally, therapeutically, and religiously we use the vocabulary of forgiveness but we do not all mean the same behavior when we speak or write the word forgiveness.

One major issue, as individual Christians and the gathered community of Christians encounter spiritual teachings about the divine imperative to forgive others, is that there is no commonly accepted operational definition. Do we, or others, refer to a behavior, an attitude or an interior emotional status when we use the words *forgive* and *forgiveness?* What exactly does it mean *to forgive*? Does forgiveness mean restoration of trust? Does it carry an automatic guarantee of reconciliation?

Equally complex: what does it mean to be *forgiven*? How does one know one is forgiven?

Questions about forgiveness need to be identified before we can begin to create a responsible theology of forgiveness – one that takes seriously the needs of victims as well as the needs of perpetrators.

- Is forgiveness an inner spiritual attitude of yielding to that which has happened, accepting it, and refusing to pursue revenge or to exact revenge for offenses done? If so, does forgiveness forego all victim demands for accountability, repentance, and change on the perpetrator's part?

- Or, conversely, is forgiveness a public and interpersonal transaction between victim and perpetrator? If it is a public action between the violated and the violator does forgiveness remove all ongoing perpetrator responsibilities for the consequences of his actions? In such a model is a perpetrator freed from an interpersonal obligation to repent and to accept personal responsibility and to make amends for what he has done?

- Where does the locus of forgiveness lie: inside the confessing community; inside the relationship between offender and victims; or inside the mind and psyche of the victim?

- Is forgiveness, therefore, a feeling or an emotional disposition? Or is forgiveness, perhaps, an act of the individual will to hold no grudges and to seek no revenge. Is forgiveness something the victimized one can do privately within the thinking and emotional self? Does the victim need to ever inform the offender that he has been forgiven?

- Does forgiveness mean the forgiving victim needs to develop amnesia for part of her life history – forgetting the violent act and the harm done to her by the perpetrator?

- What are the communal aspects of forgiveness? Does it need to be liturgically announced or proclaimed by a religious functionary such as a priest? Does the community, in some way, need to bear witness to the act of forgiveness as a pre-requisite healing and reconciliation?

- Finally, in the situation where a perpetrator is dead, how do victimized individuals forgive the individual who died without confessing or repenting? Does a perpetrator's death cancel his accountability

obligations to his victims?   Does his death provide a necessary and final cover for his actions?   Can (or should) the community as a whole, hold the deceased to be accountable for his behavior while he was alive?   If a perpetrator is dead, for example, should his misbehaviors be revealed and discussed in public forums such as seminars, sermons, or classroom settings?

How we think about these kinds of questions (in the abstract) can help us to think about the specifics of our personal theology of forgiveness. We need to ask ourselves in this kind of personal self-investigation if it matters to us in our personal theology of forgiveness whether we are a perpetrator of injustice, a victim, or a bystander. Do we contextualize our theology of forgiveness dependent upon our social location and social behavior?   Do we understand the mandate to forgive in different ways in different life experience situations?

While religious communities and their leaders produce many sermons about forgiveness, it is rare to hear a sermon which deals with specific situations of violation that involve a specific perpetrator, a specific victim, and their specific common community of reference. When we consider the specificities of forgiveness teachings in conjunction with the social realities of experienced violence, perhaps our theologizing and sermonizing need to become more relevant to difficult questions rather than simply repeat pious phrases inherited from the ancestors. It seems to me that more sermons (and more theologians) need to struggle with the tensions and relationships among our theologies of perpetrator-oriented mercy and victim-oriented justice; truthful repentant accountability by perpetrators and victim forgiveness; with difficult issues of restitution and reparation; with a perpetrator's desire for full reconciliation and reintegration into his faith community and his victim's need for continuing protection, physical or emotional distance, and safety.

The question of the religious community's preferential option emerges front and center in any dogmatic theologizing and doctrinal preaching about forgiveness. Does the community opt to support the perpetrator, the victim, both or neither? Does the community seek to live in the pseudo-comfort of denied, disembodied, and dissembled truth or does it seek to live with the uncomfortable awareness that truth-telling is the first essential act of healing for each individual and each community entrapped in the cultural form of sexual violation and victimization?

Christian Models of Forgiveness

> *If you bring your gift to the altar and remember that your brother has a grievance against you, leave your gifts at the altar and go your way. First be reconciled to your brother and then come to offer your gift.*

Matthew 5:23-24

To make these somewhat abstract intellectual issues of forgiveness more concrete, three theological models follow below. None is exhaustive. None answers every question that might be asked of Christians in complex situations of violence and abuse. None offers a definitive resolution to an individual's dilemma of understanding what it means to forgive another. None is simplistic and formulaic. Each represents a different denominational orientation. Each is suggestive of the kinds of realities which must be faced when the institutional Christian Church theologizes that its people need to forgive in order to be forgiven. All arose in particular cultural situations of violence and victimization and all are, therefore, illustrative of a particular Christian point of view.

A United States Roman Catholic Model

> *As Christian Catholics we are not expected to make the world perfect but to help heal its wounds and achieve holiness by being healthy. To ask, "What is it that ails you"" rather than to issue commands for control or to thunder judgment.*

Eugene Kennedy[9]

In their book about the Roman Catholic Church's long history with priest sexual misconduct and abuse of minors, Doyle, SIpe and Wall (2006) note the interplay of a wide variety of issues that affect the religious community's discussion of forgiveness. Central to their discussion are two elements. One is the victim's pre and post-victimization relationship with a particular predatory priest. The second is the victim's relationship with her or his church – a diocese or a parish church in which administrative clericalism protected sexual abuse predator from prosecution in the civil justice system. In their opinion, as Catholic priests and laicized former priests any

theologically adequate doctrine of forgiveness and reconciliation must, address multiple and complex issues.

In Roman Catholic theology the sacramental role of the priest involves presiding over the baptismal font, officiating at the Eucharist, mediating forgiveness for sins, and assisting the soul to make the transition from life to the afterlife. These actions of the priest are essential acts for an individual's salvation and are, therefore, central sacraments within the Catholic community of faith. Each is implicated in Roman Catholic beliefs about human death and eternal life. Each also implies a sacramental understanding of the role of the priest to stand in God's or Christ's place within the human community.

A Roman Catholic theology of sin contains information about three forms of sin: (1) *original sin* which one is born with and which is washed away in Christian baptism, (2) *mortal sin* which is a grave sin against God and at death results in an immediate transit to hell unless it has been confessed to a priest and has been absolved by him, (3) *venal sin* which is a less serious sin that results in a transit to purgatory after death unless it has been confessed and absolved by a priest. Penitential acts and the making of amends by the sinner may be required as one aspect of the priest's offering forgiveness and absolution in the sacrament of penance (confession).

For many adult survivors of priest sexual abuse in childhood, one significant aspect of the healing journey involves making accountability demands upon the offending priest *and* upon the offending institutional church. These authors' position is that only when the issues of accountability and justice have been significantly raised, explored, and effectively addressed are victimized individuals capable of turning their attention towards the complex question of forgiveness.

Doyle, Sipe, and Wall (2006) assert that victims must first attend to internal psychological-spiritual processes of self-forgiveness. The victim's need to develop the ability to *forgive the* self takes precedence over his or her ability to forgive others. In self-forgiveness, the victim abandons an inner preoccupation that he or she carries personal responsibility for the acts of sexual victimization done by another. False guilt and false self-blaming must be exposed and expelled by spiritual and psychological work. This is so because false guilt prevents individuals from recognizing situations

384

where they experience realistic guilt for other aspects of their personal behavior.

In addition, victims need to come to the hard realization that *life is never fair.* They need, therefore, time to grieve for the life they never had. In my opinion, as a clinician-theologian, this stage may involve deep, keening grief for aspects of the self which died or were permanently re-shaped as a result of victimization. It involves grieving for all of the personal and social losses which followed victimization. In the midst of such deep grief work, victims may experience a psychological, emotional, social, and spiritual resurrection. Inside the present moment of grace, the possibility emerges and subsequently allows for rebirth of the once-vandalized and often vacated self. Obviously lost years and lost experiences in the past cannot be regained. But in the present moment, there are powerful human abilities to reclaim that which can be reclaimed: the present moment and all future moments of life.

As part of their process of healing, victims need to be (1) assured by others and then to (2) come to a deep inner recognition that they are fully human, did not deserve their violation, and have not been abandoned by either their human friends or by the divine healing presence. This interior work of emotional and spiritual rebirth often includes coming to a full awareness that their victimization by clergy or other religious professionals is not God's punishment for some unknown personal violation of God's code for human behavior. If victims of sexual abuse and institutional clericalism are to regain their ability to forgive others, victims need assurance from compassionate and trustworthy others that they are (1) now safe from further violation, (2) not alone, and (3) are not blameworthy for the violence they have experienced.

According to these authors, forgiveness of others (when it is timely) serves the inner healing processes of the victimized self. It releases victims from the harmful emotions of rage, bitterness, hatred and desires to enact revenge. Forgiveness is a psycho-emotional-spiritual process which slowly allows victims to move beyond resentful grudge-holding and desires for vengeance. It allows a way to manage deep inner fantasies of harming the other as the self was harmed. It frees the energetic self to move on in life unburdened by the helpless rage they felt at being victimized. In such a manner, the emotional and spiritual bondage of anger, rage, fear, anxiety, hatred, desires for revenge, and enemy-making is released. The cognitive

385

mind is freed from obsessive and recurring cognitive fantasies about revenge. In addition, I add, the physical-emotional body (and its psycho-neuro-immunological systems) is released from the toxic chemical stew of intensely felt negative emotions such as rage, terror, and helplessness.

Prerequisites for Perpetrator Forgiveness

> *The cost for* [the perpetrator] *being forgiven is the truth – the plain, simple, unvarnished truth based in fact. Nothing less than the truth and reformation will do for the priests or bishops who have taken sexual advantage of a boy, girl or vulnerable adult. Nothing less than reformation is required from bishops and priests who have countenanced abuse, covered up abuse, excused or protected clergy. All of these men are guilty of scandal.*

Thomas P. Doyle, A. W. Richard Sipe, and Patrick J. Wall[10]

Claiming that knowledge of truth is essential to healing the wounds of sexual abuse, these authors assert that the price of (being offered) forgiveness from his victims is the perpetrator' repentance and truth-telling.

What then of forgiveness of sin and absolution for the perpetrators of systemic or structural abuse? For the institutional church to be healed of its sins, truth-telling is also the remedy. Without truth-telling, the institution remains mired in denial and it continues to re-victimize sexual abuse survivors. Without truth-telling there is no institutional accountability and no release from its decades-long engagement with sin as it hid and protected thousands of priest pedophiles.

For perpetrators of both forms of abuse issues of forgiveness and being forgiven are quite simple in theory but quite demanding and complex in actual practice.

- o A perpetrator must acknowledge the full extent of his violation. He must, therefore, tell the unvarnished and un-rationalized truth in full.
- o Perpetrators must take complete responsibility for their abusive actions. This involves taking responsibility for the consequences of their behavior in the lives of their victims.

386

- The abuse perpetrator or victimizer must sincerely repent and positively determine that he will not repeat the behavior when he seeks forgiveness.

Factual truth-telling is, therefore, the first prerequisite to being forgiven for sexual abuse perpetrators *and* for institutional or systemic abuse perpetrators. A second and concomitant prerequisite is *acknowledging one's personal responsibility* for one's abusive decisions and actions. A third is *repentance and reformation.*[11] No half-measures or cut-rate efforts can merit forgiveness or bring healing to the victimizer or to abusive institutional church leaders. In such a model, offered forgiveness can never be the excuse for perpetrator denial and forgetting.

Within such a model, the issue of *restitution* to the victims of violence is the final requirement. In some situations, however what is lost in a victim's life is permanently lost and must simply be grieved and let go. In this situation, a repentant victimizer must come to a full recognition that he can never repair the damage he has done.[12] As part of his journey to God's forgiveness, perpetrators must come to a full emotional, cognitive and moral understanding of the damage they have done to the other by their violent and predatory behavior. They must both know and acknowledge their acts wrong-doing as harmful to their victim(s).

In this particular Roman Catholic model for forgiveness the onus has shifted from a political-theological demand of the powerful that the victimized one should or must forgive to a model in which the victimized individual (and others) hold the perpetrator fully accountable for his actions as a prerequisite to any religious community conversations about the need for his victims to forgive him. In an absence of a full and repentant confession about the violence done, it is unlikely, in these authors' opinion, that victims can realistically forgive those who have harmed them.

An Anglican South African Model

What is the role of the church in a situation of painful conflict such as this? It is at least threefold. Firstly, there is the obvious duty to care for the injured and bereaved and for those displaced from their homes. There is an obligation to provide tangible relief, both material and spiritual. Secondly, there is a duty to discern and

declare the truth about the violence as the church perceives it, to name the causes, and to make this known without fear or favor. Thirdly, there is the need to promote dialogue between the parties and to offer mediation in the interests of peace and reconciliation.

Michael Nuttall[13]

When we look at another issue of personal violence and institutional violence done in God's name and with support of the religious establishment, we find a second model for forgiveness. In the following vignette, we examine the important work done in South Africa by President Nelson Mandela[14] and Anglican Archbishop Desmond Tutu as the nation-state moved away from its long-standing policies of repressive, violent racially-motivated apartheid.

Reconciliation as the Goal

It is clear that if we look only to retributive justice then we could just as well close up shop. Forgiveness is not some nebulous thing. It is practical politics. Without forgiveness, there is no future.

Desmond Tutu[15]

In John Allen's authorized biography (2006) of Desmond Tutu several themes and issues become visible. Tutu was well-aware of the systemic and morally corrupt use of institutional power to suppress dissent and this awareness was shaped by his personal encounters with South Africa's political structures of apartheid. As he came into a mature theological position, Tutu realized that systemic, institutional oppression dehumanized the oppressor as much – if not more so – than those he oppressed. In this light, Tutu taught that reconciliation between South African whites and blacks could not happen until the victims of apartheid reclaimed their full humanity. He believed this was essential inasmuch as *reconciliation can only happen between persons who respected their own humanity and that of others* (164).

In one of his sermons on texts taken from Revelations 21:1[16] and Isaiah 11:6[17], Tutu preached on the topic of spurious reconciliation. He described spurious reconciliation and a spurious city of "peace" in the following language:

A place where there is no peace, a daubing of the walls with whitewash, a papering over the cracks instead of dealing with the situation as it demands, a serious facing up to the unpleasantness of it all. In South Africa, we have often heard people speaking disapprovingly of what they have called "confrontation", which they then opposed to "reconciliation." In this way glorious gospel words have fallen into disrepute and have been horribly devalued so that many have come to think that "reconciliation" meant making peace with evil, immorality, injustice, oppression, and viciousness of which they are the victims and, quite rightly they have rejected such a travesty of the genuine article. How could anyone really think true reconciliation could avoid a proper confrontation (34)?

Allen comments about Tutu's theology that Tutu believed that if South Africa was to move forward, all South Africans needed to confront the consequences of their apartheid era actions and work through them together. During the Mandela presidency nation-wide practices of confession and truth-telling became the foundation for personal amnesty and for national healing and reconciliation.

In 1990, in the Transvaal, Tutu preached to the first conference in which members of the Dutch Reformed (white and previously pro-apartheid) churches) met to worship with anti-apartheid churches (both black and white). This was the most representative gathering of Christians in South Africa's post-colonial history. Tutu talked about the Zacchaeus[18] story in which Christ released Zacchaeus from the burden of his life history so that he could say, *I will make restitution*.

If there is to be reconciliation, we who are the ambassadors of Christ, we to whom the gospel of reconciliation has been entrusted, surely we must be Christ's instruments of peace. We must ourselves be reconciled. The victims of injustice and oppression must be ever ready to forgive. This is a gospel imperative. But those who have wronged must be ready to say, "We have hurt you by injustice, by uprooting you from your houses, by dumping you in poverty-stricken resettlement camps, by giving your children inferior education, by denying your humanity and tramping down of your human dignity and denying your fundamental rights. We are sorry. Forgive us." And the wronged must forgive.

Those who have wronged must be ready to make what amends they can. They must be ready to make restitution and reparation. If I have stolen your pen, I can't really be contrite when I say, "Please forgive me" if at the same time I still keep your pen. If I am truly repentant, then I will demonstrate the genuine repentance by returning your pen. Then reconciliation, which is always costly, will happen (222).

Preached nine months after Nelson Mandela's release from prison, Tutu's sermon to this audience of formerly separated churches stated that *the church could not preach reconciliation to the nation if they were not themselves reconciled (342).*

Tutu's Theology of Forgiveness

The victims of injustice and oppression must be ever ready to forgive. This is a gospel imperative.

Desmond Tutu[19]

In Tutu's theology of forgiveness and reconciliation he linked three obligations or prerequisites to reconciliation. Two were moral obligations of the perpetrators of violence and one was the spiritual obligation of the Christian victims of violence (342).

- o Perpetrators of violence need to confess their sins and they must be willing to say to their victims, *I have hurt you by injustice. I am sorry. Forgive me.*

- o In turn, when victims hear such a confession and receive such a request, they have a spiritual obligation to forgive the person who has sinned against them.

- o Finally, perpetrators are under a moral and spiritual obligation to make amends by acts of repentant restitution and reparation.

Restorative justice, in Tutu's theology belongs inside a Christian ritual of forgiveness. In light of a perpetrator's sincere and genuine repentance, there is no place for retribution or vengeful punishment. What is needed is a redressing of previous imbalances and restoration of broken

relationships. In this kind of justice, rehabilitation of both the perpetrators of violence and the victims of violence is actively sought. The goal is to provide the perpetrator with the opportunity to be reintegrated into the very community that he previously offended by his acts of violence against it.

In his Nobel Prize address in 1984 Tutu commented:

> *There is no peace because there is no justice. There can be no real peace and security until there first be justice enjoyed by all of the inhabitants of that beautiful land…God's shalom, peace, involves inevitably righteousness in decision-making, goodness, laughter, joy, compassion, sharing and reconciliation (92).*

In Allan's edited collection of Tutu speeches and sermons (1994) Tutu consistently and repetitively returns to the themes of peace, justice and reconciliation. Peace, he teaches, is *the reconciling of those who were separated, divided.* Reconciling means *creating friendship, bringing together…*those individuals who were *formerly at variance, who were enemies before, who were alienated* (168).

In one sermon Tutu thinks out loud about the nature of morality. *When moralists are uncertain about the moral quality of an act, then, they will ask, what are the consequences of this particular act…If the consequences are evil, then the act being evaluated is declared to be evil (168).*

Dirk Odendall (2007), a South African white man, discusses South African national realities as the nation and its churches began to emerge out of a nationally legitimated apartheid-divided and racially oppressive era. In his discussion of *secondary violence*, he notes that when individuals ascend into positions of institutional power, they are expected by their community to use the power of their position and authority in certain ways. In doing so, they become culturally invisible as an individual. This now invisible person comes to believe that he must protect the institution at all costs.

For example, (and this example is mine) a religious professional (for example, a seminary president or rector) acts in his professional role as his position dictates. In our example, he acts as a seminary president rather than as himself. He acts, therefore, in the name of the seminary or the seminary's denomination rather than in his own name. His moral decision-making becomes institutionalized and distanced or compartmentalized from

391

his personal system of moral reason. He becomes encapsulated by the role, status, position, and authority of the office of president. In his enactment of his role as a seminary president, he harms the powerless ones or the vulnerable ones in the name of institutional needs or requirements for institutional legitimacy, power and financial security. He participates in the sanctions, recriminations, entrenched systemic abuse and socially-approved violence that are done in the seminary's name against the less powerful.

Odendall refers to these secondary violence abuse forms as *iatrogenic abuse – cloaked as serving the community but using the authority and power of position to put the people in their place* (emphasis mine, 254).

While Odendall is describing systemic apartheid-era abuses in South Africa, he could be discussing clergy sexual abuse and abusive institutional powers of the organized church. In situations of systemic abuse formalities and legalities are used to protect abusive institutional practices at all costs. Invisible, inside their position (with all of its status and privileges) of organized institutional power, governing individuals become very susceptible to perpetrating secondary acts of violence because they have become invisible as the human being who occupies the role. Their victims are depersonalized and dehumanized and their victimization has become routinized (Berry, 1992; Berry and Renner, 2004; Boston Globe, 2002; Breslin, 2004; Collins, 2004; and Doyle, Sipe, and Wall, 2006; Kenny, 2011; Grand Jury, Philadelphia County, 2003, 2011; Sipe, 1996).

My personal sense of this matter is that when individuals conflate themselves (and their personal identity) with the position and role they occupy or the rules of the institution they inhabit, systemic abuse is much more likely to happen. Once the abuse has happened, it is much more likely to be rationalized and defended as necessary (Chinnici, 2010; Cozzens, 2002; Kelman and Hamilton, 1989; Shupe, 1998: Sipe, July 9, 2010).

If we apply Tutu's model to contemporary Catholic, Protestant, and Sectarian situations of clergy sexual abuse or institutional clericalism, then the three elements of such a model must become visible. For forgiveness to be possible, *perpetrators must first tell or acknowledge the facts of their behavior* with sufficient detail so that victims are relieved of the social judgment that they are responsible for their own violation or that they were

lying or that they were exaggerating. Secondly, *perpetrators need to repent and this is demonstrated when they sincerely apologize* to their victims either directly or through an intermediary who speaks for them. This latter qualification is especially needed if victims of sexual abuse continue to be terrified of and intimidated by their victimizer or simply do not trust his intentions towards them. Third, *victimizers need to make whatever restitution and reparations* they can make.

The moral and spiritual task for victimizers in such a model is to tell the complete truth about their misconduct, refuse to defend or rationalize it, and then to sincerely repent (summary and emphasis mine). One aspect of such repentance is a determination never to abuse this person or any other person again. In such a conversion, new behaviors will manifest themselves and restitution will be made.

In Tutu's model, for reconciliation to occur the victim needs to accept the perpetrator's accounting of truth and his proffered apology as sincere. He needs, therefore, to forgive. *The spiritual task for victims, therefore, is to forgive.*

A Mainline United States Protestant Model

There is so much at stake and so much is lost when a person of extraordinary gifts takes the path of arrogant disregard and deception, not by one act, but by many. Even in the face of a pattern of misconduct, some will respond with sympathy. But others respond with grief, anger and contempt.

Marie Fortune[20]

In 1989, Marie Fortune (an ordained minister in the United Church of Christ and expert consultant to denominations with clergy sexual abuse problems) addressed a gathering of United States and Canadian Mennonites on the topic of justice. She commented that she preferred the term *justice-making* because the verb form implies a process of connection and restoration of that which has been distorted or broken by experiences of injustice (4)

Justice-making

Forgiveness is a choice.

Robert D. Enright[21]

Asking what is required in situations of justice making, Fortune identified seven components. The first of these is *truth-telling*. This does not only involve truth-telling by perpetrators of violence. She urges her listeners to make a space for giving a voice to descriptions of the social reality or realities which contribute to injustice and which have previously been kept silent or hidden (6). This stage is somewhat similar to the World Health Organization's recognition that acknowledging violence-prone ideology is an important step in violence prevention (WHO, 2002).

Secondly, there needs to be an *acknowledgment of the truth*. It is not sufficient to listen to the story of violence and abuse. The story needs to be publicly acknowledged. Victims need to hear that they were both heard and believed. *I hear you. I believe you. What has happened to you is wrong. It is a sin. It is evil. You did not deserve it* (6). If perpetrators are unwilling to do this step, then representatives of the community must step in and do it.

Third, the victim needs **to** *experience compassion* for his wounds. When someone suffers, it is the human task of Christian believers to be with the suffering individual and to provide whatever assistance they can. It is necessary for Christian individuals and the Christian community to stand by the victims of abuse and to refuse to engage in verbal acts of minimization or denial. When personally uncomfortable with the story of victimization, the community needs to acknowledge that discomfort rather than deny and suppress the factual story of abuse. By being realistic about the presence of abuse, the community can avoid the need to tidily explain things away. The community can allow its knowledge of sexual abuse to be realistic rather than illusory. It can refuse to participate in denial as a way to stay comfortable (7).

Fourth, it is essential to *protect vulnerable individuals from additional abuse*. Doing this may mean utilization of law enforcement or court protocols (7-8). Providing accurate and specific public information is another way to manage this.

Fifth, *the abuser needs to be held accountable for his behavior.* This is essential whether or not the abuser acknowledges the factual reality of his abuse and the extent of his abuse

Sixth, acts of *restitution or reparations* are essential pre-conditions for reconciliatory work between victims and perpetrators. Payment made for the harm done is often an essential ingredient for restoring a situation of right-relatedness (9). This may include paying for medical care or therapy for the victims of violence and their families. Making amends is a vital part of the process of reconciliation.

Finally, *vindication and exoneration of the victim needs to happen.* When victims believe themselves to be the responsible part in the victimization done towards them, work needs to be done with them to help them remove self-blame, guilt, and shame from their emotional experience of the acts of victimization. They need to recognize that moral responsibility for their victimization lies with their abuser. Victim's needs and preferences need to be honored about how public or private this exoneration is.

I want to add my comments to Fortune's on this last item. In my dissertation on women's post-rape responses to their victimization (1990), I looked at this issue of accountability and moral responsibility through the extensive and growing body of social psychology research about victim-blaming. Not only victimizers blame victims. Observers, witnesses, and helpers also blame victims. Finally, victims blame themselves.

In my mid-century review of nearly 30 years of research into just-world-thinking and victim-blaming (Burgess and Holmstrom, 1979; Lerner and Simons, 1958) it became apparent to me that there is a clinical issue here to be managed. The self-blame literature suggests that by her behavioral self-blaming process, the victim of another's violence may be attempting to reclaim the future. Somehow or other she intuits that if she just behaves differently in the future, she will be able to forestall further acts of victimization. This clinical issue must be well-managed or the victim will, in order to please or pacify her helpers, silence her own self-preoccupations about re-gaining control over her own life. [22]

Somewhat later than my dissertation, van der Kolk and McFarlane (1996) summarize this line of victimization research in the following manner:

Many traumatized individuals, particularly children, tend to blame themselves for having been traumatized. Assuming responsibility for the trauma allows feelings of helplessness and vulnerability to be replaced with an illusion of potential control. Ironically, rape victims who blame themselves have a better prognosis than those who do not assume the false responsibility; it allows their locus of control to remain internal and prevents helplessness 15).

I agree with Fortune. The person who decides to victimize another person is the morally responsible party. However, any witness (for example a victim's attorney, a pastoral counselor, victim advocate, or therapist) to someone else's victimization needs to tread very carefully when working with self-blaming victims in order to avoid driving them into silence about their own belief that they are personally responsible for what happened to them. This is especially true if their victimizers or members of their community of reference blame the victim for her personal character or her behavior as the causal reality that led to the predator's acts of victimization. Victims need time and space to talk about this without too much or too vigorous insistence on the part of their witnesses and helpers that they hold no responsibility at all. Forgiveness of the self for having been vulnerable to victimization is frequently one aspect of clinical therapeutic work with victims.

To be as clear as I can be here: a victim is not responsible for the violent actions of another towards her. The victimizer carries full responsibility and needs to be held fully accountable for what he chose to do.

In lay sermons and classroom presentations about rape and other forms of sexual violence which are found inside the Christian community, I use the following example. If a naked woman walks down a dark alley at midnight in the dark of the moon and is raped, she is not responsible for the rape. The man who raped her is fully and solely responsible and morally accountable for both his decision to rape her and his behavior during and after the rape. There are other responses he could have made to her nakedness and her visible vulnerability.

If all of an individual's behaviors are compassionate ones in such a situation rather than erotic and violent ones, he will not rape her. He will find some way or another to help her find safety in the midst of her naked personal vulnerability. Maybe he will need to call law enforcement to help

her. Maybe he needs to ask a woman friend or family member to join him in helping her. Whatever the situation, he will not move into violence and sexual assault. He also will not walk away from her, ignoring her plight, and abandoning her. He will seek a way to help her that protects her from violation, a way that begins to restore her to her own abilities to adequately care for and protect herself.

In light of the psychological manifestations of self-guilt as a way of protecting the personality of individuals violated by sexual assault, it is important to listen carefully before contradicting a victim's self-blame as inappropriate. It is important, if possible, to hear the victim all the way through the issue in order to understand its motivating forces in her personality. Only then can cautious work be done to help the victim move away from self-blaming and other concomitant expressions of self-negation.

Clinical work or other forms of healing work over time can assist the previously victimized individual to give up this very complex form of self-guilt: a form of false guilt and a mental process of illusionary or magical thinking. In historical retrospect it is useful for the victim to think though the issue of how she might have protected herself in the past and to think about self-protection in the future. Yet a certain reality is in place: all future events of violence and potential acts of violence will have unique characteristics which cannot be totally predicted or controlled. This stage replicates the process of self-forgiveness described above by Doyle, Sipe, and Wall.

It is clear to any reasonable adult that when a priest anally rapes the church's pre-pubertal altar boy, the child is not responsible for the rape – no matter what the priest (or his supervising bishop) says about the boy's seductive behavior. When a youth minister vaginally rapes a teenage girl or orally rapes a teenage boy during a group outing, it is also quite clear that the adolescent is not responsible. When a clergy person gives an adult woman drugs or alcohol until she passes out and then subsequently rapes her, it is also clear that she is not responsible for the rape.

It needs to become equally clear that an adult woman seduced by her pastoral counselor or successfully propositioned by a priest hearing her confession is likewise not responsible for the seduction and the priests' morally inappropriate and unprofessional behaviors. Until we all get clear

397

on this issue, however, it is essential to listen carefully to all victims who proclaim their personal moral responsibility for being victimized.

Forgiveness Issues for the Perpetrator

The wound that silences our speech continues to haunt us.

Stanley Hauerwas[23]

In Fortune's major work on forgiveness (Horton and Willaimson, 1998) victim forgiveness of the perpetrator is the last step. The first step is justice. She notes that offering forgiveness before restoring justice is cheap grace and it does not contribute to the genuine healing of either the victimizer or the victim.

In the absence of justice, redemption for the offender is undercut because an absence of justice permits him to escape full accountability for his actions. In addition, it is often the case that premature forgiveness perpetuates ongoing cycles of abuse.

As the religious establishment seeks to create a climate of justice, it is essential to acknowledge that harm has been done to one person by another person (in this document a religious leader, a clergy person, or religious institution administrator). What does it mean, therefore, to acknowledge harm done? The *perpetrator's factual and truthful confession of wrong-doing* is the first step he must take. By truthfully naming his actions and his acknowledging his responsibility for them, his victims and their shared community are freed from the community divisiveness that denied wrongdoing brings.

When confronted with allegations of sexual misconduct, the perpetrator may express guilt and remorse. However, Fortune believes it is essential for the victim(s) and the surrounding community to recognize that remorse and repentance are not the same reality. One can experience remorse, guilt and shame at having one's prior misdeeds aired in public without being genuinely repentant for the harm one has caused. *Repentance is the essential standard* and it involves the offender making fundamental

changes in his behavior *and* in his character structure. It means he avoids repeating the abuse in the future.

Genuine repentance generally involves *restitution and reparations*. Recognizing his own responsibility to restore full humanity to the victim he has previously dehumanized, the victimizer attempts to make meaningful amends. Restitution recognizes the real costs (physical, spiritual, emotional and economic) to the victim. In whatever way he can do so, the truly repentant individual seeks to restore that which has been broken or totally destroyed by his sexual abuse. Forms of restitution, for example, may include paying for the victim's medical bills or therapy as well as medical transportation costs. It may include making a symbolic and sizeable charitable donation to a local abuse prevention agency.

One of the goals of truth-telling is *to de-privatize the abuse story* by breaking open the circle of secrecy and silence which has encapsulated both the victimizer and the victim. Open truth-telling recognizes that continued silence or secrecy protects the offender from taking his full responsibility for his actions. Silence and secrecy do not, indeed cannot, hold the abuser accountable for his actions.

An additional benefit of truth-telling is that it may provide some future protection to individuals who may still be at risk for violation from the offender. It also validates accusations of witnesses and victims. The abuser's truth-telling helps to buffer the victim's subsequent encounters with others who continue to blame her. In any such truth-telling, the desires and needs of the victim for privacy and control of information need to be honored.

Recognizing that not all victimizers will cooperate with truth-telling and that some will reject the hard work of repentance and transformation, it becomes essential for the institutional church to recognize that the victim's need for justice cannot be made to rest solely on the victimizer's willingness to cooperate. In such a complex set of issues, therefore, guaranteeing justice for the victim(s) remains the responsibility of the institutional church in whose buildings and programs the abuse occurred.

Psychological evaluation and treatment of the perpetrator, in Fortune's view, must precede institutional forgiveness and denominational absolution of abusive individuals (i.e., restoration of credentials for ministry). The

delicate balance of justice, repentance, mercy, compassion, restitution and forgiveness must be kept in mind in all victim, victimizer, and institution interactions. The institutional church in its commitment to truth-telling and justice for victims must also avoid, in my opinion, self-righteous and vindictive actions towards the abuser.[24] For not only could any one of us become the victim of another's violence it is also quite possible that any one of us could become a victimizer of others (Nhat Hanh, 1993).

Forgiveness Issues for the Victim

Forgiveness as an act of self-help may be in some way immoral. The act of incest, the act of rape, the act of battering is not just a personal insult. It is an insult to all women and makes it more dangerous for all women to exist in the world.

Sharon Lamb[25]

According to Fortune, while forgiveness by the victim towards her abuser(s) may be the desired outcome of victim-offender adjudication, any shortcut that prematurely demands forgiveness does not serve the victim, the perpetrator or the community.

As Fortune, along with many other authors, recognizes sexual victimization events are not only stored in cognitive memory, they are stored in the sensory body, in the kinesthetic body and in the psycho-emotional body. Clinicians and skilled body workers know they are also stored in the psycho-neuro-immunological systems of the body (Levine, 1997, 2003, 2005; Naperstek, 2001; Pert, 1997, Rothschid, 2000). Forgiving is, therefore, not the same thing as forgetting.

I add that forgiveness is also not the same as reconciliation. Willingness (or even the ability) to forgive does not necessarily correlate with any given victim's ability or willingness to unconditionally trust her victimizer. Trust once betrayed may be incapable of being rebuilt. Reconciliation may be forever impossible.

Here I think the work of Kramer and Alstad (1993) helpfully supplements Fortune's work. Religious professional abuse victims may need to continue throughout their life-time to make deliberate, conscious decisions about

trusting others and about opening personal boundaries for appropriate intimate human relationships to develop. Victims may make, therefore, a decision that because of the nature of the abuse, they want no further contact with the person who violated them. Whether or not the perpetrator wants continued contact and conversation with his victims, is irrelevant. Whether or not the religious community wants full reconciliation between perpetrators and victims is equally irrelevant. Victims need to be able to choose a position of non-contact for as long as their psychological, emotional, physical, and spiritual health needs demand it. Pushing victims into premature "nice-nice" patterns of reconciliation that allows the victimizer and the surrounding community to feel that all is resolved and life can return to its previous state of emotional and spiritual balance is yet another form of secondary victimization.

Fortune sees a victim's forgiveness of her abuser *as the letting go of the immediacy of the trauma*. Lamb, (2003, 164-166) describes this particular understanding of forgiveness as essentially an act of self-help. Lamb, however, mistrusts the self-help model because of its socio-political implications inside the community of women. Fortune's definition is similar to Roman Catholic Bishop Geoff Robinson's description of forgiveness: *forgiveness can benefit the victim if he or she can arrive at the point of shedding the emotional control of the abuser had over him or her even years after the actual tragic event took place* (quoted in Doyle, July 13, 2008, 6). In such a self-directed process of forgiveness, victims are enabled to control their anger and shed their obsession with the story of their abuse. At this time they step free of the abusers' control of their lives. In such a model, forgiveness serves the victim of violation.

In Fortune's forgiveness model clergy abuse victims need the assurance of the institutional church that the clergy victimizer will be held fully accountable for his behavior including a full telling of the truth in public, removal of credentials, etc. Victims need to know they are believed and considered trustworthy. They need to have their personal concerns for safety acknowledged and honored. All of this attention to the victim's needs is, in general, a prerequisite for victims to be able to respond with forgiveness.

Releasing the Demand for Perpetrator Change

> *They have healed the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly,*
> *saying, Peace, peace when there is no peace.*

Jeremiah 6:14.

While it may seem counter-intuitive, another way to approach this issue of the relationship between perpetrator accountability, victim forgiveness, and victim healing is that for a successful long-term reclamation of her life, victim healing happens best when victims learn not to insist upon changes in their perpetrator(s) – objectively desirable as these may be – as a pre-requisite for getting help and healing themselves. For victims to demand that perpetrators must repent, apologize and change as a prerequisite of the journey to a position of feeling safe is to continue to tie themselves to the person who victimized them. It is always impossible to change another person's attitudes and behavior. This is especially true when a perpetrator sees no reason to change his life or his behavior. To tie one's own life and the search for healing, therefore, to a particular outcome of perpetrator change is to (in a psychological sense) place the (1) victimizer in a cognitive gunny sack and carry him everywhere or (2) keep the victimizer in the driver's seat where he continues to control his victim's life. Both metaphors here demonstrate incomplete separation of the victim from her victimizer.

The long term pathway to healing lies in victims learning how to remove their personal energy lines from the perpetrator and his abusive actions towards them. This kind of healing work is hard work because memories of the abuse will appear and reappear in the body-mind-energetic self. But learning to unhook one's own body-mind-energetic self from the perpetrator allows victims to utilize the lessons they have learned from the events of abuse without continuing to be terrorized and devastated by fears of the abuser and rage at what he did to them. In such a model of forgiveness, the victim unties her desires for revenge and releases them. She moves free of the victimizer and the event of victimization.

This form of self-other forgiveness does not free the abuser from accountability for his actions. It does not release him from the community's moral imperative for behavioral change. It does not change society's interest in incarceration if that is needed to protect other individuals.

It does begin to free, however, the abused one from the long-term body-mind and socio-cultural consequences of victimization. Victims gaining freedom from the inevitable, and sometimes frightening fantasies of revenge and retaliation allows the sexual abuse victim more inner psychic space to work on healing her own wounds. It allows her the interior place of peace in which she can begin moving away from her experiences of victimization as the determining life event that influences all subsequent life decisions. It allows her to move into the future without the gunny sack. It puts her in the driving seat of her own life. One place to do this healing work is in the spacious inner still-point of the present moment.

To me, in dialogue here with Fortune, it seems as if the best intention for victims to establish for themselves is a long-term goal of gaining personal freedom from the tyranny of memory, body sensations, emotion and vengeful, retaliatory mental fantasies. Working towards this goal will involve anger and grief work. The work will also likely include self-forgiveness work. It also needs to include discussions about personal safety in the absence of perpetrator repentance and change. It will inevitably involve self-forgiveness work.

Victims of sexual abuse can learn how to hold their perpetrators fully accountable for their actions without seeking to avenge the self for its violation. Healing includes giving up false guilt. It includes giving up the intention to do acts of vengeance. Once successfully de-attached emotionally or energetically from their victimizer, then victims can choose to make decisions about specific forms of forgiveness or non-forgiveness. They can make informed decisions about reconciliation or non-reconciliation. Forgiveness rather than a demand or obligation becomes, therefore, a victim's choice. Contrary to obligatory demands made on her by others which re-victimize her, as her choice, the decision to forgive and the self-authentic actions that go with this decision can facilitate her healing and allow her to move free of her perpetrator's hold on her psyche and her life.

But as long as victims continue to obsess in cognitive memory about their victimizer, his actions, intentions, and what they would like to do to him in return, they remain energetically tied to him. The healing journey, in my opinion, involves victims removing the deeply embedded and interconnecting energy lines between themselves and their abuser(s).

Another way to say this is that victims learn to shatter the double binds in which the act of victimization captured them. As they do this, the abuser's transplanted and embedded rage surfaces and can be managed by victims in ways which do not cause them to engage in self-other destructive behaviors.

Thus a psychological, or emotional or spiritual or physical or cognitive intention to move free from the victimizer's internal hold on their personal consciousness and internalized body sense is helpful. In this model, forgiveness is an interior sense of refusing to be bound by one's own memory, helpless rage, confusion, dissociated memories, revenge fantasies, and grudges against the abuser. By active personal work on the self, the victimized individual can become more realistic about needing to intellectually know what happened to her (to the best of her abilities). She can claim the reality for herself that her personal identity and personal self worth are no longer defined for her by her abuser and his dominating violent actions towards her. She reclaims her bodySelf for herself and in that process reclaims her abilities to manage her ongoing life with others.

In such a way, the victim of clergy abuse may be able to release her obsessive post-violation body-rooted memories and let her abuser be what he, in the historical past, factually was – the one responsible for her victimization and post-victimization suffering. She can then deliberately unhook her psyche from his and move free of his noxious influence on her ongoing life.

Clinical wisdom runs contrary to certain religious teachings of the church that demand (1) that victims both can and should spontaneously and repeatedly forgive their victimizer, and (2) that the perpetrator and his victim(s) need to be reconciled to each other as a demonstration or a talisman of the victim meeting her religious obligation to forgive. Depending on the situation between the two individuals, such a demand for reconciliation may elicit more victimization. Clinical wisdom also runs contrary to the popular cultural demand that victims should just forgive, forget, and return to their pre-victimization self.

My understanding of Fortune's work on forgiveness is that a victim's forgiveness of her abuser ought not to be demanded of her by others; that reconciliation cannot be commanded by others, and that individual abilities and preferences of victims need to be acknowledged and respected.

When individuals representing the institutional church blame victims for abuse at a clergy perpetrator's hands or excuse the perpetrator from the need for full public accountability for his actions, the victim is secondarily betrayed and re-abused. When institutions practice misguided secrecy about the truthful facts of the abuse of their employee, the institutional church betrays the spiritual church. Religious leaders who practice secrecy about an employee abuser's actions inside their institutions in a misguided sense of personnel confidentiality may or may not realize it but they are creating the very kind of vulnerability that the abuser previously exploited and violated inside the secrecy of his assaults.

Forgiveness of an abusive institutional church may very well need to include the decision to absent oneself from the abusive worshipping community in order to seek another spiritual home. The victims of clerical abuse need to be supported as they cut their emotional and spiritual ties in order that they can find a healthy spiritual community. Once the victim is no longer tied by the abusive energy of an oppressive and abusive religious environment, she can begin to repair the spiritual and religious damages her soul or spirit has endured. In the short term, this may mean learning to live in religious or spiritual exile. In the long term it may mean making significant changes in her religious beliefs and practices so that she can once again find a spiritual home for her ongoing life.

Concluding Remarks

> *I send you forth as sheep among wolves. Therefore be as wise as snakes but as harmless as doves.*

Jesus of Nazareth[26]

In thinking about forgiveness in the context of the personal sins of clergy sexual abuse and the institutional sins of clericalism some things have become clearer to me in my own theology of forgiveness.

1) No theology of forgiveness is adequate if it is not anchored in a truthful accounting about the violence done and an informed awareness of the harm done. Such truth-telling needs to be as public as the acts of abuse were public. Since much sexual abuse is private,

a modification of this principle needs to be in place. When the scandal of abuse reaches into multiple communities and multiple nations, then truth needs to be as public as the reach of the scandal. When the victimizer is either unwilling or unable (as after death) to tell the truth, then the religious institution which supervised him and his work must step up and tell the truth to the best of its abilities. There are at least three reasons for this concern with factual truth. The *first* is to vindicate the victim in her claims of being abused. The *second* is to create a social space which allows other victims to come forward. And *third*, given the nature of perpetrator recidivism even in situations of good intentions, this helps protect vulnerable individuals from additional acts of victimization.

2) No theology of forgiveness is adequate if it legalistically exegetes and proof-texts only selected passages of the biblical text. If every biblical text in both testaments on the topic of forgiveness is examined, multiple models become evident. If one looks at a variety of Christian denominations, different interpretations of the need to forgive, the methods of achieving forgiveness, and the meaning of forgiveness to perpetrators and victims become evident. When one expands one's personal horizons to look at other world religions even more models and understandings emerge.

3) No theology of forgiveness is adequate if it does not include the need to balance issues of justice and mercy for both persons in the victim-victimizer pair. If the abuser, for example, is managed with mercy and no demand for full accountability for his actions, then issues of justice for his victim(s) go unexamined and unaddressed. If, on the other hand, the victim is managed with mercy that is unaccompanied by a commitment to truth and justice, then no remote possibility exists for healing the breach between them that the act of abuse has created. As Chinnici (2010) points out, the institutional church has pastoral care responsibilities to both parties. Both need to be appropriately accompanied and ministered to. None of the parties in the aftermath of sexual and clerical abuse situations should be abandoned.

Pastoral Ministries

A pastoral ministry to both victims and victimizers (and their families and their communities of reference) must deal with the uniqueness of the complaints between them. A pastoral ministry to the victimizer must call him to full accountability and genuine repentance as a part of assisting him to towards re-humanization and reclamation of his rightful share of full humanity. A pastoral ministry to the victim acknowledges her victimization, identifies it as sin on the part of her victimizer(s) and assists her to begin the process of regaining her rightful full share of a full and re-humanized humanity. It helps this process if the pastoral minister or ministerial team can see both individuals as being divinely created in God's image.

I am a realist. It may well be impossible for a clergy abuser and his victim(s) to re-create the pre-victimization experiences of trust and community with each other. It may even be unwise for them to be in a social situation where they need to encounter each other and to talk with each other. If the community can learn to hold the human desires for a "nice-nice" resolution to all conflict in abeyance, the two individuals may learn, over time, to be in the same geographical space without either one needing to act out or to panic and come unglued.

However, in my opinion, to insist upon reconciliation and a return to a prior relationship inside the boundaries of the faith community may be unwise and unhelpful to both of them in their very individualized re-humanization and healing processes. While a certain ability to forgive may free the victim from the need to bear a grudge against her victimizer, it may well be very unwise for her to ever be in spatial proximity to him again. It may also be very unwise for her to trust him again.

Both forms of clergy abuse (sexual abuse and clericalism abuse) are particularly noxious to the development of mature faith and spirituality. Non-coercive healing takes time and, as some Roman Catholic authors (Doyle, December, 2008; Sipe, November 7, 2004, January 23, 2007, 2007, November 15, 2009) have pointed out, the combination of clergy abuse and clericalism is particularly deadly to the abuse victim's inner spiritual life. I personally have come to believe this is true for both parties (victims and victimizers) to acts of victimization.

The decision to violate another human being (in its essential psycho-emotional dynamic of seeking to control, dominate and dehumanize) creates a situation which deadens the inner life of victimizers and desensitizes them to the suffering of the other. Questions, therefore, about spiritual re-birth are central to the ideal of individual and communal reconciliation.

Individuals violated by religious professionals may experience the inner consequences of violation as an emotional and spiritual numbness or inner deadness. They may use metaphors such as soul rape or soul death to describe this inner absence of full aliveness. Questions, therefore, about spiritual re-birth are also central to the victim's healing and reclamation of her life. Retrieving her soul from its shattered and splintered container can allow her to reclaim her life as fully and totally her own.

My friend, Presbyterian theologian Nelle Morton, used to tell me that when a linguistic metaphor becomes a cliché, it no longer is capable of communicating transformative meaning and becomes, therefore, incapable of grasping our attention in revelatory ways. Dead theologies like dead metaphors are incapable of shattering that which has hardened inside of our cultural and personal consciousness. They are incapable of illuminating that which needs to be seen in new ways. In light of the complex issues raised by this chapter, I raise the question of whether any obligatory theology of forgiveness is capable of touching the lives of perpetrators, of victims, of their respective families, of witnesses, of advocates and helpers, and the worshipping community at large.

Each situation of abuse and each individual's responses to abuse will reflect a complex personal stew of motivations and responses. It is impossible, therefore, to create theological systems and doctrines that mandate that *forgiveness is obligatory and it must be the first step* or on the contrary *forgiveness is always the last step.* In the vast literature (some of it based on clinical research) another reality becomes clear. Some individuals are able almost immediately to forgive another who has done great and irreparable harm to them. In other situations, individuals may need to take years of intense theological and psychological work before they can forgive. Some may never be able to do this.

I personally believe that Kramer and Alstad (1993) in their discussion of guru abuse bring a necessary corrective to the obligation model for

Christian forgiveness and reconciliation. Just because a person has forgiven her abuser and refuses to pursue revenge for his prior violence towards her does not mean that she needs to open her personal boundaries with him in ways which may further endanger her. She may need to remain socially and emotionally closed in all possible ways to her former abuser.

Finally, the wisdom of many of the world's religious traditions is that we have each had experiences in which we have abused others or sinned against them. In addition, most of us have had the experience of being violated and abused in one way or another during our life time. Each of us, therefore, contains the dual identity of abuser and victim, of sinner and sinned against, of light and shadow. In light of this dual identity, the development of compassion for both offender and victim needs to be the goal of the extended religious community. Compassion does not mean approval of the perpetrator's action. It does not mean excusing or explaining away his behavior on one ground or another. It does not mean legitimating his violence by remaining silent.

Both victimizer and victim, according to the wisdom of Bishop Tutu, have been dehumanized by the acts of victimization. Both need, therefore, to be re-humanized before their can be forgiveness and reconciliation.

Recommended Supplementary Reading

Forgiveness is (not) simply a matter of being told God has forgiven us… Unless we are able to tell one another the truth through the practice of forgiveness and reconciliation, we are condemned to live in a world of violence and destruction.

Stanley Hauerwas[27]

Note: A wide variety of world religious and philosophic traditions teach humanity about the wisdom of learning to forgive as the foundation for building peace in the world. As noted above, however, we do not all share a common language and understanding for what this injunction to forgive actually includes. I believe we must begin, individually and communally, to re-examine our culturally-inherited ideas, values and prejudices about forgiveness. We need to move beyond unthinking pious injunctions and

dead metaphors or clichés when we say to others that *they obviously should forgive* others for the violence done to them. We need to move to a cultural home in which truth is recognized as the foundation for cultural and individual wholeness and well-being….for salvation itself.

Seeking to understand the religious and philosophical impulse that forgiveness is a healing act as well as a saving one is an essential task for those of us who work with individuals who suffer from violence-caused permanent losses as well as from post-traumatic stress disorders. As I write these words, it is the first anniversary of a 2011 shooting incident in my home city in which six people died, a number of additional individuals were seriously injured, and an entire city was both grieved by and traumatized by the gunman's act of premeditated and killing violence. As part of the city's attempts to manage it collective trauma and find a way to healing, representatives of various world religious traditions came together in public venues, shared worship space and created rituals together.

The list which follows below, therefore, includes Eastern and Western perspectives about forgiveness; it includes a sampling of contemporary authors who represent Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and the secular academy. The authors represent religious leaders, religious historians, sociologists, and psychotherapists. The list also represents individuals who have been victimized by various forms of violence in which their losses can never be recovered or repaired.

1) Chan, V. (with the Dalai Lama) (2004). *The Wisdom of Forgiveness: Intimate conversations and journeys*, New York: Riverhead.

2) Enright, R. D. (2001). *Forgiveness is a Choice: A step-by-step process for resolving anger and restoring hope*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

3) Hauerwas, S. (April, 1992) *Why Truthfulness Requires Forgiveness: A commencement address for graduates of the church of the second chance*, Goshen, IN: Goshen College. ITS Media Collection and Mennonite Church Archives.

4) Khamisa, A. (2005). *From Murder to Forgiveness: A father's journey.* La Jolla, CA: ANK Publishing, Inc. www.Azimkhamisa.com

5) Kornfield, J. (2002). *The Art of Forgiveness, Lovingkindness and Peace.* New York, NY: Bantam.

6) Kraybill, D. B., Nolt, S. M. and Weaver-Zuercher, D. L. (2007). *Amish Grace: How forgiveness transcended tragedy*, New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, 2007.

7) Lamb, S. and Murphey, J. G. (Eds.). (2002). *Before Forgiving: Cautionary views of forgiveness in psychotherapy.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

8) Miller, A. (1991). *Breaking Down the Wall of Silence: The liberating experience of facing painful truth.* New York, NY: Penguin/Dutton, 1991).

9) Miller, I, (2006). *Eye for an Eye, Cambridge, NY: Cambridge.*

10) Nhat Hanh, T. (2001).. *Anger: Wisdom for cooling the flames*, New York, NY: Riverhead Books, 2001.

11) Ruth, J. L. (2007). *Forgiveness: A legacy of the West Nikkel Mines Amish school.* Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

12) Tutu, D. (1999). *No Future without Forgiveness,* New York, NY: Image/Doubleday.

13) Wieswenthal, S. (1997). *The Sunflower: On the possibilities and limits of forgiveness.* New York, NY: Schocken.

Personal Reflection Questions

5) What does the religious injunction *to forgive others* mean to you?

6) When you ask someone to forgive you, what exactly are you asking them to do?

7) What does it mean to victims of clergy sexual abuse when they are told to forgive their victimizer? What exactly are they being asked to

do? What behavior will indicate that they have actually done what they have been admonished to do?

8) What does it mean to victims of clericalism when they are told to forgive the church and its administrators? What exactly are they being asked to do? What behavioral outcome will indicate that they have actually done what they have been instructed to do?

9) In the absence of sincere and repentant apologies, in your opinion, does a victimized individual have a theological and religious obligation to forgive those who have harmed them? Does she or he have a psychological or emotional imperative to forgive the victimizers and oppressors?

Footnotes

[1] Thomas P. Doyle, July 13, 2008, 6. Doyle is condensing and paraphrasing the work of Australian Roman Catholic Bishop Geoff Robinson in his book *Confronting Power and Sex in the Catholic Church,* *220-225.*

[2] Sharon Lamb, 2003, 165.

[3] SNAP: Support Network for those Abused by Priests. See http://www.snapnetwork.org for more information about SNAP and its mission and work. This particular article no longer seems to be available. It has been replaced by an article entitled *What to do when your priest is accused of abuse.* Suggestion 14 (p.3) now reads like this: *Calls, visits, gifts and prayers – all of these are appropriate ways to express your love and care for the accused priest. Public displays of support, however, are not. They only intimidate others into keeping silent. In fact, it is terribly hurtful to victims to see parishioners openly rallying behind an accused priest. You may want to publicly defend a priest, collect funds for the priest's defense, and take similar steps. Please don't. Express your appreciation of the priest in direct, quiet ways. Even if the priest is innocent, somewhere in the parish is a young girl being molested by a relative or a boy being abused by his coach or youth leader. If these children see adults they love and respect publicly rallying around accused perpetrators, they will be less likely to report their own victimization to their*

parents, the police, or other authorities. They will be scared into remaining silent and their horrific pain will continue.

[4] Thomas P. Doyle, July 13, 2008, 2-3.

[5] Thomas Gumbleton, United States Roman Catholic Bishop (retired), September 15, 2011, 3.

[6] Deborah E. Lipstatd, 193-196.

[7] This narrative is included in all four gospels. See also Matthew 21:12-13, Mark 11:15-18; Luke 19:45-46. At times Christians refer to these nar ratives as Jesus purifying the temple; at other times they discuss it as Jesus cleansing the temple. Jesus' actions draw anger from temple authorities. In comparing the narratives, we find that Jesus names the situation he witnesses to be a "den of thieves" rather than as "a house of prayer for all people." It is quite likely that Jesus was commenting on corrupt business practices by the animal sellers and the money changers during an obligatory annual cultic ritual event.

[8] John Allen, 2006, 164.

[9] Eugene Kennedy, 2001, 185.

[10] Thomas P. Doyle, A. W. Richard Sipe, and Patrick J. Wall, 2006, 272-273.

[11] Seminary professor and ordained Methodist minister Dwight Judy (summer, 2010, personal correspondence) questioned if individuals holding such a theology of forgiveness understand *how difficult this is psychologically?* He notes his opinion that this model is deficient in that it emphasizes human rational functions without equally identifying and utilizing the understandings of contemporary depth psychology about additional personal experience and motivations.

[12] For a comparison on the topic of losses where no restitution is possible (in the context of a murder which occurred during a bank robbery attempt), see Janet Landman's important 2002 essay in Murphy and Lamb. A lost life can not be adequately compensated for or recompensed by a repentant

perpetrator regarding the violence he or she did which destroyed another's life.

[13] Michael Nuttall, 2003, 75.

[14] See Tutu's discussion of the role played by Nelson Mandela in S. Weisenthal, *The Sunflower Symposium* 1998, 266-268.

[15] Desmond Tutu in Wiesenthal Symposium, 268.

[16] *And I saw a new heaven and a new earth after the first heaven and the first earth were passed away: and there was no more sin*

[17] *The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them.*

[18] Luke 19: 1-10

[19] Quoted in John Allen, 206, 222.

[20] Marie Fortune, 1989b, 132.

[21] Robert D. Enright, 2007, 1.

[22] For additional information about just world thinking and victim blaming, see my 1990 Ph.D. dissertation *Rape's Power to Dismember Women's Lives: Personal Realities and Cultural Forms* (School of Theology at Claremont, Claremont, CA).

[23] Stanley Hauerwas, 2000, 144.

[24] See Joseph Chinicci's (2010) extended discussion of compassionate and managerially appropriate pastoral ministries to perpetrators of sexual abuse. Read Doyle's (1994) brief description of his pastoral work with abusers.

[25] Sharon Lamb, 2003, 165.

[27] Stanley Hauerwas. Goshen College (Goshen, IN) Commencement Address, April, 1992.

- 16 -

Summary and Conclusions

All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.

Edmund Burke[1]

Introductory Comments

Why did they[2] choose to protect the reputation of the institution over the well-being of children? The question is easy to ask. The answer is very painful. It really reflects on them and it reflects on all of us. In my view, we have a tendency to defer to the most powerful individuals among us, to defer to the most powerful institutions, and [we] make choices, oftentimes, to gravitate to the power, the influence, the money, and our loyalties lie there, and we ignore the signs and the symptoms of children being harmed…(1) We all have to be trained and vigilant; (2) we have to develop public policy that mandates reporting; and (3) we have to repeal and/or remove the laws that protect the offenders and those that protect them, such as statues of limitations.

Jeff Anderson[3]

Several forms of clergy violence have been described in previous chapters. (1) There are events of clergy criminal sexual assaults on children, adolescents and adults; (2) there are contact and non-contact sexual harassment events (some of which, for example, stalking, are also criminal acts) against individuals of varying ages; (3) there are events that masquerade as consenting sexual intercourse but are abusive because of the position, authority, power and dependency differentials between the perpetrator and his victim(s); (4) there are institutional and administrative violations of previously-victimized individuals and their families by clergy and

religious professionals; and finally (5) there are religious institution and administrative attacks made against victims, witnesses or whistle blowers.

Each of these types of violation is simultaneously (1) an act of violence and (2) a manifestation of a cultural form of violence. Each act of violence and each form of clergy or religious leader violence has a unique signature of characteristics, actions and consequences.

Each sexually abusive act done by individual violence perpetrators, however, also shares similarities with other acts of abusive and violent personal violation. The shared consequences of all forms of personal violence are most evident in their individual and social aftermaths. Consequently, each act of clergy sexual violation is both an act of violence *and* an act of betrayal.

Likewise, each structural or systemic act of violence within religious institutions has its own unique signature of social and individual motivations and behavior. Religious clericalism shares many similarities with other authoritarian societal institutions in which crimes of obedience occur. Here too each embodied act of structural oppression is both an act of violence and an act of betrayal.

With both forms of violation (personal violation and institutional violation) post-traumatic stress disorders and betrayal disorders are common consequences in victims' lives. In addition, because this manuscript has looked at violations done within the religious community by clergy and religious administrators, religious problems and spiritual problems are common aftermaths among victims, families and close friends of victims, witnesses such as whistle blowers, lawyers, journalists and outraged members of the laity.

In essence, individuals victimized by any one of these forms of clergy and religious professional abuse often live in spiritual exile from their previous faith communities of reference. They may report soul loss, soul murder, or soul plundering by their various victimizers. They may report a loss of faith in the tenets of their religious heritage. They may lose confidence in their religion's rituals and sacraments. They may feel punished by God for unknown infractions. They may find themselves in situations where any amount of religious participation

triggers anxiety attacks and phobic responses. Living in a situation of spiritual exile, individuals may feel themselves to be absolutely alone in the universe. Abused and abandoned to suffer alone by members of their human faith community, they believe they have likewise been abused and abandoned by the God of their pre-victimization life.

The Moral Offense

Any religion can become corrupt.

Leon J. Podles[4]

Perpetrators of Sexual Abuse

Following Clifford Geertz's model of *thick description (1971, 1973, 1983),* the preceding chapters have diagnosed clergy sexual abuse as being one form of position, authority, power, and status violations. In such a model for analysis and understanding, the sexual attack represents an individual perpetrator's choice of a methodology. Sexuality, however, is not the primary motivating drive. In his behavioral expression of underlying hostility and control needs, the perpetrator attacks his victims' sexuality. As a religious professional he also expresses his disdain of his religious tradition and its teachings. The sexual assault, as methodology, expresses a perpetrator's determination to dehumanize the weaker and more vulnerable other by violating their sexuality. In addition, the perpetrator's behavior is profoundly self-destructive.

If an offender's sexual orientation is heterosexual and his sexual attraction is to pre-pubertal children, his sexual abuse victims are likely to be small children of the opposite gender as his. If an offender's sexual orientation is homosexual and his sexual attraction is towards children, his victims are likely to be of the same gender as he is. If he is a bi-sexual individual, his victims may be small children of either gender. Offenders who sexually assault and abuse post-pubertal adolescents and adults will show similar patterns of sexual orientation in their choice of victims.

In addition, some perpetrators appear to have a fixated or obsessive pattern of abuse in which victims demonstrate similar personal characteristics beyond age and gender. Victims, in these situations, are carefully identified and groomed before sexual abuse begins. Other perpetrators are opportunistic equal opportunity violators. In a situation where they recognize that they can successfully violate someone of either gender, they will do so.

The moral offense done by perpetrators, however, is not primarily one of sexual immorality. The encompassing moral issue is located in the arena of expressed interpersonal hostility and violence. In the context of his institutional role as a religious professional, the sexual violation, done by a religious professional, represents a major obedience disorder. His actions represent a specific form of anti-social behavior.

In many situations, the perpetrator's violent act of sexual abuse is, therefore, both a sin against religious law and a violent crime against civil law. It expresses, in some perverse way, his disdain for the religious tradition (and teachings) that he represents and for civil law in the society in which he lives. Therefore, perpetrators need to be held accountable for their actions in both cultural arenas – the religious and the civil.

Perpetrators of Clericalism

Inside the institutional and professional behaviors of clericalism a similar reality emerges into view. The enacted behaviors of religious leader clericalism reveal position, authority, and power, violations. The behaviors of clericalism are enabled by power, status, prestige and economic differentials between perpetrators and victims. Utilizing the economic and social power of an institution, the perpetrators of clericalism also demonstrate disobedience disorders. These become most evident when the behaviors are compared with the spiritual teachings of the institution these corrupted administrators represent. Here, too, we find anti-social character disorders.

Thus, the macrocosm of the church as institution and the microcosm of individual clergy violators form holographic images of each other. In their various forms of abusive behavior, both legitimize each

other's criminal behaviors. By seeking to de-legitimize victims' demands for full accountability, individual perpetrators of both forms of abusive violence stabilize the intricate ballet of perpetration and victimization. Together, they keep this obscene dance in motion. Thus, both kinds of abusive clergy behavior (sexual abuse and sexual abuse cover-ups) enable future acts of victimization to occur.

Criminal Cover-up Activities

In many situations where institutions have protected sexual abuse perpetrators, members of the religious hierarchy have initiated and carried out criminal cover-up activities. Administrators in such situations have, therefore, engaged in behavior which is both sinful and criminal. These men and women, whether they are members of the institution's board of directors, its chief executive officer, its human resource director or even a presiding bishop of a large urban diocese also need to be held accountable in both arenas – the religious/moral/spiritual and the civil.

Obedience Disorders

Obedience disorders as evidenced within narcissistic character or personality disorders and anti-social behavior disorders are prevalent inside both major categories of clergy abuse: the individual and the corporate. Obedience disorders form the backbone of these cultural forms of individual and institutional authoritarianism. Clergy sexual abuse behaviors are similar in scope and behavior to other forms of professional abuse behaviors seen in the professions of medicine, law, psychotherapy, education, etc. One difference, however, is that secular professionals, in general, do not claim to be acting in God's name or as God's mediator when they sexually abuse their clients and subordinates.

In a similar ways the cover-up behaviors of clericalism are similar in style and scope to criminal cover-up behaviors in government and industry. Here too we see the difference in religious communities because corporate religious administrators claim to be acting in God's name and on God's behalf. They invoke ancient spiritual teachings

and religious traditions to bolster their claims. Thus, religious institution authoritarianism is similar in structure to political, corporate and governmental authoritarianism. Clericalism is, therefore, a religious form of a larger social construct which social psychologists identify as *crimes of obedience*. Sociologists address this behavior as *criminal malfeasance* and complicit institutional peers as *accomplices to crime during or after the fact*.

The Faith Embedded Within

> *Trust and obey for there's no other way to be happy in Jesus than to trust and obey*
>
> Christian Folk Hymn. Lyrics by John H. Sammis

Two particularly disruptive theologies regularly appear inside situations of religious authoritarianism. *The first* is a theological mandate for obligatory obedience to those in positions of authority. The clergy-proclaimed theological duty to obey religious authorities for obedience's sake creates personalities who are subsequently vulnerable to abusive relationships with those in authority positions. This is particularly true for children and adolescents. But it is also true for subordinated and dominated women and men.

The second is the theological mandate for obligatory forgiveness. The obligatory duty to forgive can re-open victims to further abuse by their perpetrators or by institutional administrators who protect clergy sexual perpetrators. In addition, obligatory or automatic forgiveness does not assist victims to do the hard work of healing their wounds.

Both of these authoritarian duties (the duty to obey and the duty to forgive) demonstrate a theological and ethical preferential option for the powerful. Both serve perpetrators rather than victims. Each duty or obligation works against the needs of victims to encounter perpetrator accountability, institutional truth-telling and systemic justice. Each disrupts victims in their search for personal healing.

Taken together, these two duties tend to create a hostile socio-cultural-religious climate in which victims of clergy sexual violence

can be, and often are, re-victimized with impunity. Both duties tend to legitimate acts of violation and insulate their perpetrators from accountability for the damaging consequences of their actions. Both tend to negate common socio-cultural and religious obligations to care for each victim of clergy violation as we would care for ourselves or those we loved.

In his teaching parable which we know as *Parable of the Good Samaritan* Jesus proposed an alternative model. In this model, members of the faithful religious community are obliged to demonstrate healing compassion for the victims of violence and the religious community is rebuked for its hypocrisy in favoring the powerful over the weak. In short, Jesus calls members of the religious community to demonstrate, in lived-behavior, a preferential option for the victims of individual and systemic repression, oppression, and violence.

Recommendations

> *[T]ruth may be demoralizing, but truth is always less demoralizing than the most encouraging lie.*

A. W. Richard Sipe[5]

Beginning to work, individually and communally, to change religious environments where clergy sexual violence is legitimated and where systemic institutional violence is denied, and consequently legitimated, means that individuals and entire communities need to make a commitment to truth-telling. Individuals and communities need to recognize that silence and denial empowers those who victimize others. Silence in the face of sexual violence or in the face of structural violence is a form of complicit support for those who do violence and harm to others. It participates in the re-victimization of individuals and entire communities by violence perpetrators.

I will enumerate some of the issues which I have thought about as preventive activities. But every reader of this manuscript can become a partner in an extended discussion about ways to transform the

common religious culture from a violence-prone one to a violence-resistant one. No one individual in any religious community has all the insights and answers which a community needs to begin to move away from its on-going acceptance of many different cultural forms of authoritarian violence as the *way things are, have always been and should always be.*

- o Congregations and religious institutions need to screen every employee and volunteers for a prior criminal record of sex offenses before hiring them or using them as volunteers. This is especially true for everyone who works with children and adolescents. Information about this procedure and its consequences need to be transparent to all potential hires.

- o Congregations and religious institutions need to develop informational policies and prevention procedures and these policies and procedures need to be communicated to every member of the community. Regular, preferably annual, training programs are essential elements of any prevention plan.[6]

- o Congregations and religious institutions need to understand the differences and similarities between a sin and a crime. Criminal acts need to be reported to civil authorities for prosecution. This is especially true with sexual violations. When perpetrators find protection and their actions are covered-up in the interest of protecting the religious institution's image in the world, perpetrators will continue to victimize and re-victimize others.

- o Congregations and religious institutions have pastoral care responsibilities to (1) perpetrators and their families, (2) victims and their families, (3) whistle blowers, witnesses and their families, (4) the specific faith community or institution in which abuse occurred, (5) the larger, more encompassing community at large. No one individual can serve all of these needs. Therefore, a well-balanced team ministry program needs to be implemented in situations of clergy and religious professional sexual abuse. It may be that individual congregations do not have the personnel and financial resources to accomplish this. In such a case, denominational assistance and support is vital.

o Congregations and religious institutions need to identify and train a specific cohort of people who are knowledgeable about this issue of clergy violence and who are skilled in making situation-appropriate interventions. All members of the community, congregation or denomination need to know who is routinely and predictably available to receive and investigate complaints about sexual misconduct by members of the religious institution's staff. Policies and procedures need to be developed and they need to become public information. As part of this effort, networks of professionally trained support individuals, such as therapists, need to be identified. These outsiders can provide or supervise congregational support groups as needed.

o When hiring new individual's to the staff of a religious institution, expectations about appropriate behavior need to be specific, precise and in writing. A zero tolerance policy for sexual abuse in any of its forms needs to be in place and this policy needs to be regularly communicated in order to de-legitimize sexual violence as acceptable behavior in religious organizations.

o Seminaries need to develop a sexual ethics course which is required for all students who plan to enter ministry as an occupation. Physicians and other health care professionals, psychotherapists in various professional guilds, and lawyers are all required by their respective licensing boards to pass a professional ethics course before an application for licensure will be processed and granted. Denominations which certify seminary graduates as candidates for ordination could likewise require such documentation. It is essential that moral and ethical awareness and development becomes part of a seminarian's formal education program. It would be, I think, very useful if seminarians were exposed to discussions of sexual transference and counter-transference issues so that they would be prepared to manage these complex interpersonal realities when they surface in pastoral or supervisory relationships with members of the laity.

o Denominations need to develop a required continuing education program in sexual ethics for all currently ordained individuals who have not completed such a course during their pre-ordination studies. Such a course could be administered by denominational seminaries as part of their continuing education outreach services to ordained ministers. These courses could also be completed online for ministers who are unable to attend continuing education events at distant seminaries. Religious professionals could be given a deadline for completing such courses.

o Spiritual formation programs in seminaries need to understand that an ordination candidate's sexual, spiritual, moral and psychological maturity is a pre-requisite for ministry. Intellectual brilliance is not, nor can it ever be, a sufficient and singular foundation for ministry.

o Rigorous and determined efforts must be made to discourage and prevent ordination for any individual who demonstrates behavior consistent with anti-social, narcissistic character and personality disorders.

o Political work needs to be done in each state or province to remove the statutes of limitations for civil and criminal actions stemming from allegations and accusations of clergy sexual and physical abuse of children and adolescents. Rather than fighting against such changes, religious individuals and organizations should welcome them.

o Education of the laity is needed. Perhaps in addition to special days such as World Communion Sunday, the Christian community needs to agree on a worldwide sexual violence prevention Sunday. On such a Sunday, sexual abuse could be regularly and consistently discussed as both a sin and a crime. The goal of such an ecumenical effort would be twofold: (1) prevention of clergy sexual abuse and (2) healing victim wounds.

o Objective and truthful demographic research is urgently needed. It would be most helpful if denominations could agree

on the definitions of behaviors to be studied in order that a more comprehensive analysis is possible. Employing public health principles and research methodologies to the apparently pervasive problems of religious professional sexual abuse could, in my opinion, begin to help religious traditions quarantine abusers and begin to lower the amount of abuse inside religious traditions.

o The church's theologians need to revisit each religious institution's troublesome theology to locate ongoing ideological support for the cultural form of abuse.

Conclusions

Whoever shall offend one of these little ones who believe in me, it would be better for him that a millstone should be hanged around his neck and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.

Jesus of Nazareth[7]

If and when we look closely at the social realities of clergy sexual abuse (directed against individuals who occupy social positions of non-dominant subordination to their religious leaders) we find the perpetrator's intention to dominate others combined with a deep-seated and engrained personal need to control victims. A perpetrator's interior emotions or motivations of murderous rage are directed and projected outward in the service of his control and domination needs.

If and when we look closely at the experiences of clergy sexual abuser victims, we find terror, fear, anxiety, murderous rage, internal confusion, sexual identity concerns, religious problems and spiritual problems. We find physical, psychological, social, spiritual and economic costs in the aftermath of such violence. We find the long-lasting consequences of violent stress trauma and betrayal trauma.

If and when we look we look closely at the nature of authoritarian systems and corrupt administrators who cover-up clergy sexual abuse, we find systemic corruption and abuse. We find an absence

427

of empathy and compassion for the victims of abuse. We find manipulation of factual truth by the system's perpetrators. We find an absence of pastoral care ministries to all of the individuals who are enmeshed in the interpersonal dance of victimization and violation.

If and when we look closely at the experience of clericalism's victims, we find betrayal trauma and religious and spiritual problems. We find secondary victimizations of those previously abused by sexual abuse perpetrators. We find an aftermath of spiritual and religious problems.

During the course of our examination, it has become evident that in these personal violence and institutional violence interactions every protagonist caught inside the victimization narrative needs to be healed and transformed. In Bishop Tutu's language, each needs to be re-humanized. This manuscript has argued that such a conversion and transformation involves the intentional alteration of individual, collective, and transpersonal human consciousness:

o Jewish and Christian faith traditions, for example, describe the pathway to transformation, re-humanization and restoration for perpetrators of violence as being one of genuine remorse, transparent repentance, confession and truth-telling, a moral intention of the will never to repeat the violence against anyone, offering sincere apologies, asking forgiveness, and providing for restitution or reparations.

o The clinical pathway to transformation for victims of violence includes a willingness to confront and acknowledge their victimization, creation of an accurate historical narrative of what happened to them, and the ability or willingness to describe their perpetrator's misconduct to others (such as therapists). For many victims, dealing with an internalized sense of shame, guilt, and self-blame is essential. It is helpful in the healing process if victims can unplug themselves from insisting that perpetrator(s) change, acknowledge, repent, and explain or apologize as a precondition for their personal and social healing.

o For victims of sexual abuse, issues of forgiveness and issues of reconciliation often need to be separated from each other. Victims may or may not be able to forgive their assailant(s). Even if and when they are able to offer forgiveness, they may or may not choose to reconcile with the perpetrator(s).

o If (a) there is no perpetrator repentance and remorse and if (b) the perpetrator remains physically or psychologically dangerous to his victim's personal safety and psychological welfare then issues of victim safety and potential victim safety take precedence over issues of forgiveness and reconciliation.

o If and when issues of protecting other individuals from victimization occur, then victims, witnesses and victim advocates need to make informed decisions about reporting the violator to civil authorities for prosecution. This may mean encouraging victims to file reports with civil law enforcement agencies. It may mean, in the case of small children, making such a report if the perpetrator's victims are unable to do so. It means cooperating with law enforcement investigations of criminal activity.

o The pathway to institutional transformation is similar to the transformation and re-humanization journey of perpetrators. In institutions where abusive religious leaders have engaged in the actions of clericalism as their predominant response to victims, victim's families, and whistle-blowers, crimes of obedience are common. In order to heal themselves *and* their institution, religious leaders are called to turn-around their actions in the world, in short, to become converted to the needs of the weak and vulnerable. A return to truthfulness about their own sinfulness and criminality is the first step in such a conversion away from structural oppression and its repressive systemic abuse and violation of the vulnerable.

What Would Jesus Recommend?

Jesus publicly rebuked the hypocrisy of the religious leaders of his time. They were rebuked, in public, for teaching one thing and living out its opposite. For healing to return to the religious community of

his time, he called them to repentance, conversion and transformation.

As difficult as this teaching is, it remains spiritually and psychologically sound. Unless individual and institutional perpetrators stop abusing others, publicly apologize for past abusive acts and change their behavior, there can be no healing of the religious community which they lead and control. Using Jesus' language, there can be no lasting forgiveness. There can be no reconciliation. There can be no salvation.

Footnotes

[1] Edmund Burke, quoted by Keith Thompson, 2011, *Twice a Spy,* Doubleday, iv.

[2] Penn State Administrators, 2011 Sexual Abuse Scandal.

[3] Jeff Anderson interviewed by *The Super Lawyers Blog,* 1-2. Retrieve from http://blog.superlawyers.com/2011/12/jeff-anderson-on-the-sex-abise-scandal-at-penn-state

[4] Leon J. Podles, 2008, 13.

[5] A. W. Richard Sipe, June, 2006, 1.

[6] In searching the internet for models, I found the web-page for the Episcopal Diocese of New Hampshire and a program called *Safe Church* that has been created by the Episcopal Church-USA. Regular training programs are offered for members of the clergy and for the laity. Participation is required for all clergy and refresher training is required every five years after completing the initial training program. As part of its information pages, the Diocese lists New Hampshire's criminal background check webpage. Also listed is New Hampshire's Department of Motor Vehicles background check webpage. The New Hampshire Episcopalian Diocesan home page is http://www.nhepiscopal.org

Part One Appendices

A   Sexual Misconduct Glossary

B.   Forgiveness Word Web

Appendix A

Sexual Abuse Glossary

Adultery: Voluntary, consenting sexual relationships between an individual who is married with another individual who may be single or married but who is not his or her spouse. It provides the offended partner with legal grounds for divorce. In a few states, it is considered a crime against marriage. In the Roman Catholic tradition even a transient sexual relationship (for example, with a prostitute) is considered adultery.

Allegation: An assertion without proof, only a claim that must be proved, a statement asserting something without proof.

Assault: Unlawful physical attacks or the immediate threat of such attacks.

Betrayal: The violation of implicit or explicit trust.

Betrayal Trauma: Under certain conditions betrayals facilitates a "betrayal blindness" in which the betrayed person does not have conscious awareness, or memory of the betrayal.[1]

Clergy Malfeasance: The exploitation and abuse of a religious group's followers by trusted elites and leaders of their religion.[2]

Clergy Sexual Abuse: Unwanted sexual attention from an ordained individual, such as a pastor or priest; sexual relationships by a pastor or priest with members of his congregation. Sexual contact by a pastoral counselor or chaplain with church members; sexual contact between a confessor and the individual he is spiritually counseling. Includes the following kinds of behaviors:

- o Flirtations, advances or propositions
- o Sexual talk and innuendo
- o Graphic and/or degrading comments about another's appearance, dress, or anatomy
- o Display of sexually suggestive objects, pictures, or cartoons
- o Sexual jokes and offensive behaviors

- Sexually intrusive questions about another's personal life
- Explicit descriptions of the minister's own sexual life
- Abuse of familiarities or derivatives such as "honey, sweetie, sugar, dear, or baby."
- Unnecessary, unwanted, or prolonged physical touching such as kissing, hugging, petting, patting or pinching
- Whistles and catcalls
- Exposing genitals
- Physical or sexual assault, including rape
- Sexual intercourse with members of the parish or congregation
- Anal, oral or vaginal rape

Clericalism: An institutional clergy structure and practice that protects the clergy and church institutions at the expense of the laity.

Deviance, Primary: Situational deviant behavior which occurs once or several times – perhaps by accident – and does not become part of the actor's self-identity; behavior which is not amenable to sociological measurement or analysis;[3]

Deviance, Secondary: Involves a sequence of actions that go beyond any particular number of incidents. These actions influence and alter the actor's role network of interaction with other people as well as his or her lifestyle and his or her self-concept and it requires an audience.[4]

Elephant in the Living Room: (1) an idiom that applies to an obvious problem that is going unaddressed; (2) an obvious truth that is being ignored or goes unaddressed; (3) the terms refers to a question, problem, solution or controversial issue that is obvious but is ignored by a group of people out of embarrassment or taboo; (4) can imply a value judgment that the issue ought to be discussed openly; (5) can simply be an acknowledgment that the issue is there and is not going to go away by itself; (6) often refers to an emotionally charged issue where people who might have spoken up decide such a conversation is probably best avoided; (7) often used to describe an issue that involves a social taboo or culturally denied reality.[5]

Epheophilia: A lay term that describes sexual preoccupation or activity with an adolescent (usually 13-17 years old) by a person at least five years older than the victim.[6]

Ideology: The deformation of truth for the sake of social interest [7]

Pedophile: A psychiatric diagnostic term that is limited to sexual preoccupation or involvement with a pre-pubertal child (usally under 13 years old) by a person who is five years older than the victim.[8]

Perpetrator: An individual who victimizes another. A serial perpetrator victimizes a number of individuals in sequence.

Predator: An Individual who preys on the vulnerabilities of others; an individual who victimizes others.

Professional Abuse: Unethical behaviors between a professional person (lawyer, teacher, physician, nurse, clergy, work supervisor, agency administrators, therapist, etc.) and the individual s/he supervises or serves. See clergy abuse for examples of unethical and inappropriate behaviors between a professional person and his or her clients.

Rape: A form of assault in which one individual coerces or forces sexual intercourse against that person's will. Oral, anal, and vaginal rape are included in the legal codes of most states. A few states, however, include all kinds of forced sexual activities in their legal definitions of rape. Also included in many states is the forced introduction of an object other than the penis – such as a finger, a tongue, a bottle, etc.[9]

Recidivism: Repeated offenses by the same perpetrator towards one victim or towards a series of victims.

Religious Abuse: What people suffer when the leaders of their faith communities – or others – punish, humiliate, or otherwise exploit them in the name of God.[10]

Religious Duress: Religious duress is a unique kind of threat and constraint experienced by some members of the Roman Catholic Church as a result of religious indoctrination and training. Fear, awe and respect for the clergy foster the development and acculturation of *religious duress*. This phenomenon can seriously impede a person's capacity to accurately perceive and evaluate abusive actions perpetrated on them by clergy. This constraint poses an impediment to emotional and spiritual development. Internalized religious duress confuses and psychologically overwhelms

such individuals and renders them incapable of absorbing their sexual trauma. The consequent feelings of numbness and immobility distort an individual victim's perception of reality. It then becomes impossible for the individual to act in a manner that would protect and promote their emotional growth and well-being.[11]

Sexual Abuse: An action where an individual causes another person to engage in sexual activity by threatening actions or behaviors that place the second individual in fear. Sexual abuse may be defined by various states in slightly differing forms. Basically, however, it includes non-consenting sexual contact of any kind. The behaviors seen include:

- Physical, verbal or visual behaviors that are meant to intimidate and coerce sexual activity
- Non-consenting and unwelcome physical touch of the breast, buttocks, and genitals.
- Unwanted and unwelcome kissing, fondling, petting, genital contact or masturbation
- Exposing genitals to the other
- Use of force and coercion
- Conversation that implies the use of force or coercion to gain sexual contact.

Sexual Assault: Defined by law codes of various states. In general it involves any form of sexual contact in which force, coercion, or the threat of force and coercion is used to gain sexual access. Includes but it not limited to oral, anal or vaginal rape. Included are any forms of unwanted sexual contact or attempted contact between the victim and offender. Grabbing, fondling, kissing, hugging, are included. Also included in some states are verbal threats of sexual coercion.

Sexual Exploitation: This is a term more often used by religious organizations than secular ones when dealing with adult victims. However, this term is also used to describe adult-child sexual behaviors. In describing adult-adult behavior, it involves sexual contact between church personnel and those who are the recipients of such services, as for example, a priest or minister and a congregant. It involves any form of sexual contact or any invitation to sexual contact initiated by a professional person in a position of power, authority, or trust towards a recipient of services. Sexual

exploitation refers to a sexual act which takes advantage of another individual for personal gain. Behaviors can include:

- Unwanted, sexualized physical contact
- Vaginal, oral or anal intercourse
- Intrusive touching, tickling, wrestling, or other physical contact that causes discomfort in the recipient of the touch
- Inappropriate gifts
- Prolonged hugs in situations where short hugs may be appropriate
- Kissing on the mouth when check or air kisses may be appropriate
- Showing sexually provocative printed materials or objects such as pornography
- Sexual talk and innuendo
- Sexual propositions
- Inappropriate commentary on body parts such as breasts, genitals, buttocks
- Unwelcome and inappropriate touching of body parts:

Sexual Harassment: Offensive behaviors based on age, gender or sexual orientation. It involves engaging in behaviors which are known or ought reasonably to be known to be unwelcome. It has the effect of coercing, undermining, intimidating or demeaning an individual. The term has legal implications because civil and criminal codes describe it. Quid pro quo sexual harassment may include implicit or explicit propositions that include a condition of continued employment, promotion, or better grades (as in the case of teacher-student relationships). In addition, it involves the creation of hostile environments based on gender or sexuality. Sexual harassment behaviors can include, therefore, one or more of the following:

- Verbal abuse or threats
- Unwelcome remarks about one's body or sexual organs
- Circulating unwanted and offensive sexual material in print, photocopies, or cartoon forms
- Discussion by mail, fax, phone or other electronic media of material of an offensive sexual nature
- Displaying sexually offensive materials in public spaces
- Making unwelcome sexual invitations
- Making sexually suggestive remarks

439

- Leering or making offensive sexual gestures
- Unwanted and unnecessary physical contact such as hugging, kissing, fondling, petting, patting, or pinching
- Making unwelcome sexual propositions
- Retaliation against individuals who refuse to engage in sexual activities with the harasser

Sexual Misconduct: Adult sexual contact that is immoral, unprofessional or unethical behavior. In general, this phrase is used more often in the religious press and where it can include sexual harassment, sexual exploitation, or sexual assault. Used euphemistically to cover-up a situation of sodomy-rape, for example, the term serves as a code word to hide the specific nature of the misdeeds from the public.

Sexual Predator: Describes an individual with repeated sexual violations or offenses with one individual over time or with multiple individuals; see predator above.

Stalking: A pattern of repeated and unwanted attention and contact. It usually involves following and watching the victim in an unwanted manner. As a pattern of behavior it can include:

- Willful, malicious, and repeated following and harassment. The pursuit of the victim by the perpetrator is experienced as frightening and threatening.
- Repeated, unwanted, intrusive and frightening communication from the perpetrator by mail, phone, email, or in person
- Repeatedly showing up in the victims personal space when she is unprotected and alone
- Repeatedly sending unwanted gifts
- The consequences of stalking include fear, anxiety, terror, nervousness, a sense of overt vulnerability, hyper-vigilance, sleep problems, feelings of isolation, and acute stress symptoms

Statutory Rape: This is legally defined rape. In some states it may include consenting sexual relationships between minors. However, in most situations, it is defined as sexual relationships between an adult and a person who has not reached the statutory age of consent. It also includes sexual relationships with adults who are deemed incapable of giving

440

consent. Force and coercion are not needed for conviction in statutory rape cases.

Victim: The recipient of a criminal act or unwanted sexual contact. Victims may be individuals or a category of individuals such as such as a group.

---

[1] Jennifer J. Fried, *Betrayal Trauma: The Logic of Forgetting Childhood Abuse.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 9.

[2] Anson Shupe (Ed.). (2000). *Wolves within the Fold: Religious Leadership and Abuses of Power.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1.

[3] Anson Shupe (2008). *Rogue Clerics: The Social Problems of Clergy Deviance.* Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publications, 11.

[4] Anson Shupe. (2008). 11.

[5] Retrieved April 12, 2011 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elephant-in-the-room

[6] A. W., Richard Sipe, May 3, 2010, 1.

[7] Gregory Baum (2007). *Religion and Alienation.* New York, NY: Orbis, 76.

[8] A. W. Richard Sipe, May 4, 2010, 1.

[9] On January 6, 2012, United States Attorney General Eric Holder announced the first change in the federal definition of rape since 1929 (*The carnal knowledge of a female, forcibly and against her will).* The 2012 definition of rape is: *the penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus with any body part or object or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without the consent of the person.* This new wording will assist police in criminal investigations and prosecution. It will also affect the collection of demographic crime data. Finally, it will affect the summary reports of American Crime which are published annually in the *Uniform Crime Reports.* For additional information, see the Department of Justice webpage, www.justice.gov.

[10] Mikele Rauch. (2009). *Healing the Soul After Religious Abuse: The Dark Heaven of Recovery.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

[11] Marianne Benkert and Thomas P. Doyle. (November 2, 2008) Manuscript: *Religious Duress and Its Impact on Victims of Clergy Sexual Abuse*, 2.

Appendix B

A Word Web: The Languages of Forgiveness[1]

Absolve: (1) To give up all claim on a debt owed, (2) to cease to fell resentment against one's enemies, (3) to pardon offense, (4) to cancel indebtedness.

Absolution: (1) To clear of blame or guilt, (2) To grant forgiveness of sins, (3) in the Roman Catholic Church during the sacrament of penance, the priest removes the anticipated divine punishment for sin after confession. This is believed to be done in the authority granted to the church by Jesus (see, Matthew 18:18); (4) Some Protestant churches' clergy liturgically announce the forgiveness of sin to penitent believers at the conclusion of a collective confession.

Accountability (to account for): (1) Make a reckoning; (2) report, (3) to give the reason for, (4) to explain, (5) to be answerable for something, (6) to be responsible for, (7) to justify

---

[1] A word web examines the meanings of the words used in a particular context – it looks at all meanings and the word web is complete when the synonyms begin to circle around each other. In this particular word web, I looked at verbs as well as nouns and I looked at the continuum of human responses to deliberate, malicious harm done to them. Word webs can help us to better conceptualize our theory creation because we have looked at what our common, ordinary, daily language teaches us about meaning. In the academic disciplines of theology, sociology, history, and psychology, the ordinary language is given technical meanings but by necessity these technical meanings build upon the ordinary meanings of the words in their daily use. For example, some denominations have a whole theology of *grace.* This system of theological analysis, however, does not wonder too far from the ordinary American dictionary meanings. In compiling this word web I consulted *The American Heritage Dictionary*, Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 2007; T*he Random House Unabridged Dictionary*, New York, NY: Random House, 1987; and *Webster's New World Dictionary*, New York, NY: Pocket Books, 2003.

Amend: (1) to change for the better, (2) to remove or correct faults, (3) to rectify, (4) to become better by reforming oneself

Amends: (1) Reparation, (2) compensation for loss, damage, injury

Amnesty: (1) A general pardon, especially for political offenses, (2) act of forgiveness for past offenses, often to a group or a class of people, (3) forgetting or overlooking past offense

Apologize: (1) to offer an apology or an excuse for some fault, insult, failure or injury

Apology: (1) Written or spoken e expression of remorse or sorrow fro having insulted, failed, injured or wronged another

Atone: (1) Make amends or reparation for an offense or crime, (2) to expiate

Atonement: (1) Satisfaction or reparation for a wrong, (2) Amends, (3) Doctrine of reconciliation between God and humanity

Avenge: (1) Vengeance, (2) to act in revenge, (3) to inflict pain or harm in return for pain or harm received, (4) retribution, (5) retaliation for previous wrongs

Clemency: (1) Merciful, (2) quality of being lenient, (3) disposition to show forbearance, compassion, forgiveness

Condone: (1) Disregard, (2) overlook something usually illegal or immoral, (3) give tacit approval, (4) pardon an offense, (5) forgive an offense, (6) excuse

Confession: (1) Disclose a misdeed or faulty, (2) concede the truth, (3) to declare openly, (4) acknowledgment of sin or sinfulness, (5) profess a belief

Confirm: (11) To verify, (2) establish the truth, (3) corroborate

Contrite: (1) Repentant

Contrition: (1) Sincere and complete remorse, (2) regret with a sense of guilt, (3) Sincere penitence, (40 repentant for sin with intention to amend, (5) fully expressing sorrow and pain for one's sins or offenses

Convert/Conversion: (1) To change into another form, (2) To transform, (3) To persuade or be persuaded to adopt another religion, (4) adapt, (5) transmute

Discipline: (1) training to act in accordance with rules, (2) punishment inflicted by way of training or correction, (3) the practice of the church as distinguished from its doctrine, (4) to bring to a state of order, (5) to control

Excuse: (1) Forgive; (2) overlook; (3) free from an obligation; (4) pardon; (5) indulgence; (6) release from obligation

Forbearance: (1) Self-control in situations of provocation, (2) the act of self-restraint

Forget: (1) Cease to remember, (2) fail to remember, (3) fail to think of, (4) take no note of

Forgive: (1) Excuse for a fault or offense, (2) absolve, (3) give up all claims on account of, (4) remit a debt owed, (5) remit obligation, (6) cancel indebtedness, (7) cease to feel resentment

Grace: (1) Mercy, (2) clemency, (3) compassion, (4) kind forbearance to offenders, (5) benevolence, (6) divine love and protection

Iatrogenic Abuse: Putting people "in their place" under disingenuous verbiage of "serving the God and the community"

Just: (1) Honorable, (2) fair, (3) equitable, (4) merited, (5) legitimate, (5) fitting, (6) guided by truth, reason, fairness, justice, (7) In keeping with truth or fact, (8) rewards or punishment rightly deserved, (9) suitable, (10) behavior that is righteous

Justice: (1) Moral rightness, (2) fairness, (3) righteousness, (4) to act in fairness toward others, (5) to treat fairly, (6) equitable, (7) administering deserved reward or punishment, (8) a moral principle determining behavior.

445

Justify: (1) To demonstrate to be just, right or valid, (2) to warrant, (3) to defend, (4) show a claim to be right, (5) show satisfactory reason

Lex talionis:[1] (1) Punishment should compare in degree and kind to offender's wrongdoing, (2) an eye for an eye; (3) to equal the social balance or scales of justice after wrongdoing, injustice or harm – whether intentional or accidental

Mercy: (1) Kindness, (2) compassion, (3) pity, (4) discretionary power of a judge to pardon someone

Ostracize: (1) Exclude by general consent, (2) shun, (3) blacklist, (4) exclude from society, friendship, conversation, and ordinary communal privileges

Pardon: (1) kind indulgence as in forgiveness, (2) excuse, (3) release from penalty of offense, (4) forgiveness of serious offense, (5) absolution, (6) remission, (7) cancellation of punishment, (8) acquit, (9) clear, (8) release from penalty of offense, (9() papal indulgence.

Penance: (1) Punishment undergone as tokens of penitence, (2) discipline imposed by church authority, (3) the religious sacrament of confession of sin made with sorrow and remorse accompanied with the intention of amendment followed by forgiveness

Penitence: (1) regret for one's wrongdoing or sin

Penitent: (1) feeling and expressing sorrow for sin or wrong-doing, (2) disposed to atonement or amendment, (3) in the Roman Catholic tradition, a person who confesses his sin and subjects himself to punishment, (4) conscience-stricken, to feel sorrow for sin or wrong-doing with an intention or inclination to change

Quid pro quo: An equal or fair exchange

Reconciliation: (1) re-establish a friendship, (2) settle a dispute, (3) to be or to make resigned to, (4) make compatible, (5) win over to friendliness, (6) settle a quarrel, (7) restore person to communion

Rectify: (1) Set right, (2) to correct

Redress: (1) Set right what is wrong, (2) remedy, (3) correct, (4) adjust evenly again, (5) to set right an unjust situation

Remit: (1) Remedy, (2) pardon, (3) forgive, (5) diminish, (6) abate, (7) refrain from enforcing punishment, (8) excuse, (9) overlook

Remorse: (1) Anguish for past misdeeds, (2) bitter regret, (3) deep and painful regret for wrongdoing

Reparation: (1) Act of making amends, (2) something done or paid to make amends for wrongdoing or injustice

Repent: (1) To feel sorry for past conduct, (2) conscience-stricken, (3) to feel sorrow and inclined to change, (4) to be contrite

Repentance: (1) **F**eelings of regret for what one has done or has failed to do, (2) feeling sorry, (3) feeling self-reproach, (4) conscience-stricken, (5) to be penitent, (6) to change behavior, (7) contrition for past sin or wrong-doing.

Restitution: (1) Compensation for loss, damage, or injury, (2) the return of something to its rightful owner, (3) equivalent compensation for loss, damage, or injury, (4) making amends, (5) return to former state

Restore: (1) Bring back into existence, (2) to bring back to a previous condition, (3) reinstate, (4) give back

Retaliation: (1) To return like for like, especially evil;

Retribution: (1) Requital according to merits or desserts, especially for evil, (2) punishment

Revenge: (1) Retaliate for real or perceived wrong, (2) to avenge, (3) to exact punishment in resentful, vengeful spirit, (4) to retaliate, (5) carrying out bitter desire to hurt another for a wrong done

Severe Compassion:[2] **(1)** Attempting to compassionately understand each participant in a victimization account, (2) refusing to deny the oppressive harmfulness of sexual violence in the ongoing life of victims, severe compassion makes no excuses for wrong-doing, (3) nevertheless,

severe compassion is a methodology that enables the witnesses to such violence in their attempts to understand how the unthinkable actually happens: by means of severe compassion, scholars attempt to understand the victimizer's perspective. In such a process of compassionate investigation, outsiders to the events of victimization attempt to determine a socio-cultural frame of reference or a pre-existing cultural form which legitimates such particular events of victimization and encourages them to happen. As I use the phrase here, it participates in the process anthropologist Clifford Geertz[3] calls thick description.

Shun: (1) To avoid deliberately and consistently, (2) Amish communities have a whole cultural practice (the ban) of shunning the baptized individual who strays from church dogma about social practices such as owning and driving a motorized vehicle

Transmute: (1) to change

Vengeance: (1) Retaliation, (2) retribution, (3) inflicting punishment on another in return for an offense or injury, (4) withholding benefits and kindness in return for offense or injury

Vengefulness: the urge to retaliate

---

[1] See Ian Miller, 2006, for an extended discussion of the concept of lex talionis

[2] According to Jim Frederick in his foreword to Sue Dias' book *Minefields of the Heart* (2010, xiii) Norman Mailer coined the phrase "severe compassion." I have borrowed the term and have adapted it for situations of clergy sexual abuse of the laity and clergy involvement in the institutional practices of oppressive and criminal clericalism.

[3] Clifford Geertz, (1980, 103-104).

Permissions

The Rev. Dr. Thomas P. Doyle granted permission to quote his written work.

Mr. A. W. Richard Sipe granted permission to quote his written work. His online website www.richardsipe.com contains a wide variety of resources about clergy sexual abuse and clericalism. I recommend it to anyone who wishes to learn more about the contemporary (1984-2012) Roman Catholic clergy sexual abuse and clericalism scandals.

Mr. Stuart Bassil granted permission to use his photograph of a South African elephant as the cover photograph.

Acknowledgements

While this manuscript represents my personal research and writing during the years since my retirement from undergraduate classroom teaching, there is a sense in which this book gradually became a communal project. At various times throughout the research and writing process, I tapped into the professional expertise of my close friends and former colleagues. Not every individual agreed with every other individual in his or her assessment of what needed to be said and what needed to be left unsaid. Not everyone agreed with my thinking and conclusions. While initially intimidating, I eventually found this diversity of opinion to be helpful because it forced me to open my own opinions and analysis to more intense scrutiny. I am, therefore, deeply indebted to the following individuals. Each one has generously and graciously shared her or his time and knowledge with me. None, however, is responsible for my failings as a scholar or a writer.

Phyllis Lehman Collier, my undergraduate college roommate and a public health specialist in women's and children's health, read the first complete rough draft with an administrator's eyes. She provided me with an informed critique regarding my utilization of public health concepts and vocabularies. This was important because my own clinical background is in psychiatric and community mental health nursing and psychotherapy. Her initial questions and analytical commentary helped to guide me like a GPS device as I worked to integrate a public health perspective with clinical psychotherapy concepts and socio-psychological violence theory. As I gradually added ethical and theological perspectives, the manuscript's growing complexity at times became overwhelming. I kept hearing Phyllis' advice to think through what my research and writing goals were, what my personal hypotheses were, and what I wanted to communicate by writing this book. She encouraged me to draw my own conclusions and then to make recommendations for changes in the way religious professional sexual predators are handled by church administrators.

My academic colleagues and friends the Rev. Dr. Ted Grimsrud, the Rev. Dr. Dwight Judy, the Rev. Dr. Norman Kauffmann, Elaine King McKee, Ken McKee, Dannie Otto and Dr. Philip Stoltzfus shared considerable amounts of time and energy in personal communication with me about the construction of this book and its content. Each raised important questions for me to consider.

The Rev. Dr. Thomas P. Doyle read early rough draft chapters that deal with contemporary Roman Catholic theology, community life and the dual scandals of clergy sexual abuse and clericalism which have shaken the international Roman Catholic Church. His feedback provided clarity regarding ideas, beliefs and spiritual formation activities which are unique to the Roman Catholic tradition. In several places he corrected my Protestant-Sectarian use and understanding of Catholic theological language. Since Father Doyle and I have never met in person, his generosity of spirit in sharing his time and expertise with an Anabaptist-Mennonite outsider to his faith tradition and spiritual flock is much appreciated.

My academic colleague and friend Joyce Munro gave me the great gift of hospitable, open-hearted, compassionate and wide-ranging conversation. She encouraged me to talk in depth about my personal inner life and how it was being affected by my study and writing. Our conversations (in person, by phone and by electronic mail) often turned into roaming intellectual marathons. I am so grateful that in the middle of her busy academic career, she regularly created space for me to do some in-depth questioning of and reflecting upon the information I was learning. In addition she shared her professional expertise as a writer and as a teacher of writing and this manuscript is stronger because of her informed critique about vision, voice, style and composition issues. Her insistence upon intellectual clarity kept me returning to the manuscript with a determination to do better. She also sent me a copy of the 2011 Philadelphia Grand Jury Report as well as sections of the *Philadelphia Inquirer* that related to sexual abuse and clericalism issues in the Philadelphia County diocese of the Roman Catholic Church. Seeing the local headlines, news reports, and editorial cartoons gave me a better sense of local public opinion than I could have gained elsewhere.

A group of colleagues and friends read selected sections or chapter drafts. On several occasions, an individual read multiple drafts of a single chapter. In all situations, criticism was straightforward, direct, cordial and helpful. Questions were insightful and precise. Their encouragement to persist was essential at several moments when I wanted to do almost anything else than sit at a computer writing about clergy sexual abuse. I am grateful to the following individuals for allowing me to tap into their academic and professional expertise: Dr. J. Lamar Freed, Dr. Carolyn Holderread

Heggen, Gene Miller, and Dr. Calvin Redekop. In addition, Dr. Paul Keim answered several specific questions about Biblical languages and texts.

The New Perspectives in Theology Group (College Mennonite Church, Goshen, IN) provided me with an early opportunity to test my growing concern about the active harmfulness of pathological religion in the intersected lives of the laity and clergy.

Reference librarians, archivists and professional research staff from the Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminaries (AMBS, Elkhart, IN), Goshen College (GC, Goshen, IN), the Institute of Mennonite Studies on the AMBS campus, the Mennonite Church Archives on the Goshen College campus and on the Bethel College campus in North Newton (KS), the Mennonite Historical Library on the Goshen College campus, Elkhart City (IN) Public Libraries, Pima College Libraries (Tucson, AZ) and Tucson Public Libraries all extended their expertise in tracking down resource materials. In addition, my librarian friend Gene Miller located and helped me access a particular set of articles about the Vienna (VA) Presbyterian Church from the *Washington Post*. Each individual's help is very much appreciated.

I also want to express my gratitude for the technological help provided to me by my nephew Carl D. Krall. None of this material would now be published on the world-wide web without his help. In the twelve months before beginning to create a website, our electronic and phone conversations moved gradually from a "what if" and "how" into an in-person working relationship. We began to make in-person web page construction and publishing decisions together. His computer expertise is formidable and I am appreciative of his patience as he began to teach me the basics of yet another complex communication skill. I have "borrowed" some of his photography to make this site a bit more visually interesting. During the sometimes meandering process of teaching myself how to utilize and document web-based research, he volunteered for the tedious but essential task of double-checking the maze of manuscript URL addresses just before my final copy editing process was completed. To view Carl's photography webpage and blog, visit Krall.org.

Resources Consulted[1]

Acquista, V. (2008). Letter to the Editors in *Shift: At the Frontiers of Consciousness*. 19 (June-August), *p. 5.*

Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levenson, D. and Sanford, R. N. (1980). *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Allen, J. (December 24, 2010). Benedict XIV and Tom Doyle on the Crisis. *National Catholic Reporter Online* http://ncronline.org/blogs/all-things-catholic/benedict-xvi-and-tom-doyle-crisis

_____ (Ed.). (2004). *Bishop Desmond Tutu: The Rainbow People of God: The making of a peaceful revolution.* New York, NY: Doubleday.

_____ (2006). *Rabble-Rouser for Peace: The authorized biography of Desmond Tutu.* New York, NY: Free Press.

American Psychiatric Association (1994). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders,* (4th ed.*).* Washington, DC: APA.

Anglican Church of Canada (May 12, 2011). *Anglicans Aim for Abuse-free churches.* http://news.Anglican.ca/news/stories/2365

Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics 19 (1999), pp. 377-382.

Anonymous - by a friend of Bill W. (ud). *I Don't Go To Church Anymore.* *http://www.companionsinhope.com/FTP/IDontGoToChurchAnymore.htm*

ARCE. (April 9, 2011), p. 5. http://thewartburgwatch.com/2011/04/08/Vienna-presbyterian-church-rocked-by-sex-abuse

Arendt, H. (1986). *Beyond Past and Present: Six exercises in political thought.* New York, NY: World.

_____ (1969a). *Crises of the Republic.* New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich.

_____ 1969b). *On Violence.* New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Arrien, A. (2001). *Walking the Mystical Path with Practical Feet.* Berkeley, CA: Conference Recording Service.

Armstrong, K. (2005). *The Spiral Staircase: My climb out of darkness.* New York, NY: Anchor.

Asch, S. E. (1956). Studies of Independence and Conformity: A minority of one against a unanimous majority, *Psychological Monographs* 70 (9), Whole Number 416.

Associated Press (December 15, 2011). 1 in 4 women attacked by partner, says [CDC} survey. *Arizona Daily Star,* p. A-16.

Associated Press (January 7, 2012). US redefines rape, listing men and others as victims. *Arizona Daily Star,* p. A-20.

Associated Press (January 19, 2012). Pentagon works on plant to curb sex assaults. *Arizona Daily Start,* p. A-17.

Bainton, R. (1979). *Christian Attitudes towards War and Peace: historical survey and examination.* Nashville, TN: Abingdon.

Barry, C. (April 20, 2002). *A Priest in the Camp of the Sexually Abused.* (Associated Press/*LATimes*). http://articles.latimes.com/2002/apr/20/local/me-doyle20

Bateson, G. (1977). Afterword in J. Brockman (Ed.). *About Gregory Bateson: Essays on Gregory Bateson* (pp. 235-247)*.* New York, NY: Dutton.

_____ (1978). The Birth of a Matrix or Double-bind: An epistemology in M. M/ Berger (Ed.). *Beyond the Double Bind* (pp. 39-64). New York, NY: Brunner/Mazel.

_____ (1976). Double-bind in C. E. Sluzki and D.C. Ransom (Eds.). *Double-bind: The foundation of the communicational approach to the family* (pp. 237-242). New York, NY: Grune and Stratton.

_____ (1976). Foreword in C. E. Sluzki and D.C. Ransom (Eds.). *Double-bind: The foundation of the communicational approach to the family* (pp. xi-xvi). New York, NY: Grune and Stratton.

_____ (1966). Minimal Requirements for a Theory of Schizophrenia. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 2(5) pp. 477-491*.*

_____ (1972). A Note on the Double-bind in 1962 in D. D. Jackson (Ed.). C*ommunication: Family and Marriage* (pp. 58-62). Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior.

_____ (1981) Paradigmatic Conservatism in C. Wilder-Mott and J. H. Weakland (Eds.). *Rigor and Imagination: Essays from the legacy of Gregory Bateson* (pp. 347-354). New York, NY: Praeger.

_____ (1972). *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected essays in anthropology, psychiatry, evolution and epistemology*. San Francisco, CA: Chandler.

_____ and Brosin, H., and Birdwhistell, R. I. (1971). *The Natural History of an Interview.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago*.*

_____ and Jackson, D. D., Haley, J., and Weakland, J. H. (1963). Toward a Theory of Schizophrenia in D. D. Jackson (Ed.). *Communication, Family and Marriage* (pp. 31-54)*.* Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior.

Baum, G. (2007). *Religion and Alienation*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.

Benkert, M. and Doyle, T. P. (2009). Clericalism, Religious Duress and its Psychological Impact on Victims of Clergy Sexual Abuse. *Pastoral Psychology* (58)*,* pp. 223-238
.
_____ and Doyle, T. P. (November 27, 2008). Manuscript: *Religious Duress and its Impact on Victims of Clergy Sexual Abuse.*

Berg, A. (2006). *Deliver Us from Evil: Innocence and faith betrayed.* Disarming Films/Lionsgate http://topdocumentaryfilms.com/deliver-us-from-evil/

Berry, J. (1992). *Lead Us Not into Temptation: Catholic priests and the sexual abuse of children*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

_____ (2011). *Render Unto Rome: The secret life of money in the Catholic Church.* New York, NY: Crown Publishers.

_____ and Renner, G. (2004). *Vows of Silence: The abuse of power in the papacy of John Paul II.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Bishop Accountability: http://www.BishopAccountability.org

Blaine, B. (2012). The Policy Seeks Silence but the Church Needs Prevention in T. G. Plante and K. L. McChesney (Eds.). *Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: A decade of crisis, 2002-2012* (pp. 154-170). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger

Bloom, S. L. (Ed.). (2001). *Violence: A public health menace and a public health approach* [Forensic Psychotherapy Monograph Series]. New York, NY: Karnac Books,

_____ and Reichert, M. (1998). *Bearing Witness: Violence and collective responsibility.* New York, NY: Haworth Maltreatment and Trauma Press.

Bolen, J. S. (1999). *The Millionth Circle: How to change ourselves and the world.* Berkeley, CA: Conari.

_____ (2005). *Urgent Message from Mother: Gather the women and save the world.*   Boston, MA: Conari.

Borg, M. J. (1997). *The God We Never Knew: Beyond dogmatic religion to a more contemporary faith.* San Francisco, CA: Harper/San Francisco.

Boston Globe Investigative Staff. (2002). *Betrayal: The crisis in the Catholic Church.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Co

458

Breslin, J. (2004). *The Church that Forgot Christ*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Brown, J. C. and Bohn, C. (1989). *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse.* Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press*.*

Brown, R. M. (1987). *Religion and Violence.* Philadelphia, PA: Westminster.

_____ (1998). Symposium Response in J. H. Cargas and B. V. Fetterman (Eds.) in *S.* Wesienthal, *The Sunflower: On the possibilities and limits of forgiveness* (pp. 121-124). New York, NY: Schocken*.*

Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against Our Will: Men, women, and rape.* New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Bullough, V. (with B. Bullough) (1974). *The Subordinate Sex: A history of attitudes towards women.* Chicago, IL: University of Illinois.

Burgess, A. W. and Holmstrom, E. (1979). Adaptive Strategies in Recovery from Rape. *American Journal of Psychiatry* (136), pp. 1278-1282.

Burkett, E. and Brunt, F. (1993). *Gospel of Shame: Children, sexual abuse and the Catholic Church.* New York, NY: Penguin.

Byrne, H. J. (July 24, 2009). *The Dishonoring of my Regiment.* http://harryjbyrne.blogspot.com/2008/07/dishonor-of-my-regiment.html

Cameron, N. (1963). *Personality Development and Psycho-pathology: A dynamic approach*. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.

Campbell, K. (October 14, 2004). Beyond Anger: An Interview with Thomas Doyle. http://www.snapmidwest.org/htm/TomDoyleinterview.htm or http://web.archive.org/web/20100328012715/http://www.snapmidwest.org/htm/TomDoyleInterview.htm

Capps, D. Augustine: (2004a). The Vicious Cycle of Child Abuse in J. H. Ellens (Ed.). *The Destructive Powers of Religion: Violence in Judaism, Christianity and Islam.* (Vol. 3: *Models and Cases of Violence in Religion*, pp.127-150). Westport, CT: Praeger.

_____ (1995). *The Child's Song: Religious abuse of children*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox.

_____ (2004b). The Lasting Effects of Childhood Trauma in J. H. Ellens (Ed.). *The Destructive Powers of Religion: Violence in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. (Vol. 4: *Contemporary Views on Spirituality and Violence*, pp. 211-226). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Carnes, P. J. (1997). *The Betrayal Bond.* Deerfield Beach, FL. Health Communications.

Carroll, J. (2001). *Constantine's Sword.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

_____ (June 8, 2010). Mandatory celibacy is at the heart of what's wrong. http://ncronline.org/news/accountability/mandatory-celibacy-heart-whats-wrong

_____ (2009). *Practicing Catholic*. New York, NY: Houghton   Mifflin Harcourt.

_____ (2002). *Priests' Victims Victimized Twice.* http://www.companionsinhope.com/FTP/Commentary/VictimizedTwice.htm

CDC Child Protection Page: www.CDC.gov/violenceprevention/childmaltreatment/index/html

Chinicci, J. P. (2010). *When Values Collide: The Catholic Church, sexual abuse and the challenges to leadership.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.

Christian Scriptures Referenced

> Mathew 5:13; Matthew 5:23-24; Matthew 5: 28; Matthew 6: 8-14:
> Matthew 7:15-20; Mathew 10:16; Mathew 16:18-19;
> Matthew 18: 1-10; Matthew 18: 15-17; Matthew 18:21-22;
> Matthew 21:12-13; Matthew 23; Mark 5:9; Mark 9:33-37;
> Mark 11:15-18;   Mark 11: 25-26; Luke 6: 45; Luke 9:46-48;
> Luke 17: 3-4; Luke 19: 1-10; Luke 19:45-46; John 2:13-16;
> Romans 7:15-23; Revelations 21:1.

Chodas, R. (2007). God Does Not Require Obedience: He abhors it in J. H. Ellens (Ed.). *The Destructive Powers of Religion: Violence in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (Vol. 4: *Contemporary Views on Spirituality and Violence*, pp. 77-110). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Chodron, P. (2001). *The Places that Scare You: A guide to fearlessness in difficult times.* Boulder, CO: Sounds True, 2001.

_____ (2006). *Practicing Peace in Times of War*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.

Coleman, A. (June 8, 2006). Sex Abuse Whistleblower Father Thomas Doyle Says that Cardinal Mahoney Has Done Nothing to Help Victims of Pedophile Priests. *Pasadena Weekly.* http://www.bishop-accountability.org/news2006/05_06/2006_06_08_Coleman_OneTrue.htm

Collins, P. (2004). *The Modern Inquisition*, New York, NY: Overlook Press.

Cooper-White, P. (February 20, 1991). Soul Stealing: Power relations in pastoral sexual abuse. *Christian Century.*

Cooper-White, P. (1995). *The Cry of Tamar: Violence against women and the church's response.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1995).

Cott, K. (1992). Yoder disinvited to conference in *Bethel Collegian* 80 (8), March 5, pp.1 and 8. North Newton, KS: Mennonite Church Archives at Bethel College.

Council of Elvira (4th century, CE). *Catholic Encyclopedia*
http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05395b.htm

Council of Elvira (4th century, CE). *The Original Catholic Encyclopedia*
http://oce.catholic.com/index.php?title=Council_of_Elvira

Council of Nicaea (325 CE). *Wikipedia*.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First_Council_of_Nicaea

Council of Trent (1543-1563, CE). *Wikipedia.*
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Council_of_Trent

Courtois, C. A. (July 28, 2011). SNAP Annual Gathering Keynote Address:
*Understanding Complex Trauma, Complex Reactions and Treatment
Approaches.* Retrieve by following links at
http://www.snapnetwork.org

Cozzens, D. (May 17, 2010). Don't Expect Accountability from the
Last Feudal System in the West. *National Catholic Reporter Online*.
http://ncronline.org/blogs/examining-crisis/dont-expect-accountability-
last-feudal-system-west

_____ (2002). *Sacred Silence: Denial and crisis in the church*, Collegeville,
MN: Liturgical Press.

Dale, M. C. (January 23, 2012). Associated Press: Pa. Archdiocese
Named "Unindicted co-conspirator." *Newsday Online*
http://www.newsday.com/news/nation/pa-archdiocese-named-
unidicted-co-conspirator-1

Daly, M. (1973). *Beyond God the Father.* Boston, MA: Beacon.

_____ (1968). *The Church and the Second Sex: With a new feminist post-
Christian introduction by the author.* New York, NY: Harper
Colophon.

_____ (1978). *Gyn/Ecology*. Boston, MA: Beacon.

Dean, J. (2006). *Conservatives without a Conscience*. New York, NY:
Viking.

De Antonio, W. V. (November 1, 2011). Catholics in America: Persistence and Change (Survey offers portrait of US Catholics in the second decade of the 21st century). *National Catholic Reporter* [Insert] 48 (11), pp.1a-28a.

Denzley, N. (2007). *The Bone Gatherers: The lost worlds of early Christian women* (pp. 176-204). Boston, MA: Beacon.

Dick, K. (2006). *Twist of Faith: A story of sin, betrayal, and the power of truth.* HBO Documentaries.

Downing, M. (2001). *Shoes outside the Door: Desire, devotion and excess at San Francisco Zen Center.* Washington, DC: Counterpoint.

Doyle, T. P. (ud). *A Short History of **the Manual*** www.richardsipe.com/Doyle/Manual-History%20%2010-12-2010.pdf or http://archives.weirdload.com/manual.html

_____ (March 12, 2010). Canon Law: *"Crimen Solicitationis" Promulgated by the Vatican: The 1922 Instruction and the 1962 Instruction.* http://reform-network.net/?p=3006

_____ (February, 2006). Manuscript: *Canon Law: What Is It?*

_____ (August 27, 2010). *Clergy Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: Reflections* [from] *1984 to 2010.* http://www.richardsipe.com/Doyle/2010/2010-08-27-reflections.htm or http://reform-network.net/?p=7134

_____ (January, 2006). Clericalism: Enabler of Clergy Sexual Abuse. *Journal of Pastoral Psychology* 54(3), pp.189-213.

_____ (November 10, 2011). Court Ruling on Church Responsibility the Correct One. http://ncronline.org/blogs/examining-crisis/courts-ruling-church-responsibility-correct-one?page=1

_____ (ud). Manuscript: *The Doctrine of Mental Reservation,* pp. 1-4.

_____ (February 17, 2011). *Excerpts from Reports on Sexual Abuse by Catholic Clergy.* http://www.richardsipe.com/Doyle/2011/Doyle%20-%20Excerpts%20from%2018%20reports%20-%20June%2027,%202011%5B1%5D.pdf

_____ (June 9, 2008). *Gathering with Bishop Geoff Robinson.* Retrieved from http://reform-network.net/?p=1784

_____ (1994). Healing the Pain. *The Blue Book: Annual Proceedings of the National Catholic Council on Alcohol and Drug Related Problems,* pp. 65-71.

_____ (April 4, 2010). Interview with George Negus: *Father Tom Doyle –Uncensored.* http://enlightenedcatholicism-colkoch.blogspot.com/2010/04/father-tom-doyle-uncensored.html

_____ (2006a). Interview, *The Truth Forum.* from http://formercatholicsforchrist.yuku.com/topic/487/Father-Tom-Doyle-Priest-of-Integrity or http://www.votf.org/category/priest-support-working-group/priest-integrity-award

_____ (July 21, 2011). Irish Prime Minister Challenges the Vatican – and us. http://ncronline.org/blogs/examining-crisis/irish-prime-minister-challenges-vatican-and-us

_____ (May 21, 2011). John Jay Never Assessed Arrogant Clericalism. http://ncronline.org/blogs/examining-crisis/john-jay-never-assessed-arrogant-clericalism

_____ (July 23, 2010). *My Comments on Andrew Brown's Blog* [*The Secret Secret of the Vatican*]. http://www.richardsipe.com/Doyle/2010/2010-07-25.htm

_____ (July, 2008). *The Myth of False Claims and Accusations of Clergy Sexual Abuse.* http://www.richardsipe.com/Doyle/2008/2008-07-myth_of_false_claims_revised.htm

_____ (January 11, 2011). *Paraclete Report.* http://www.richardsipe.com/Doyle/2011/2011-01-11--paraclete_report.htm

_____ (April 1, 2010). *The Pope, the Church and Sexual Abuse: A Perspective.* http://reform-network.net/?p=3595 or http://www.richardsipe.com/Doyle/2010/2010-04-01-perspective.htm

_____ (November 11, 2010). Pope, Cardinals Don't Need Prayer; They Need to Listen. http://ncronline.org/news/pope-cardinals-don%E2%80%99t-need-prayer-they-need-listen

_____ (2006). Public Lecture, Tucson, AZ: St. Michael's Episcopal Church.

_____ (July 22, 2006). *Reflections on Clergy Abuse: Where we are today.* http://www.richardsipe.com/Doyle/1993-2007/2006-07-22-reflections_on_clergy_abuse_revised.htm

_____ (January 1, 2010). *Reflections from 25 years of Experience at the start of the New Year.* http://www.richardsipe.com/Doyle/2010/2010-02-01-Some_Conclusions_from_25_Years_of_Experience.pdf

_____ (April 21, 2010). Revising History Vatican Style*. National Catholic Reporter Online.* http://ncronline.org/blogs/examining-crisis/revising-history-vatican-style

_____ (January, 2003). Roman Catholic Clericalism, Religious Duress, and Clergy Sexual Abuse. *Pastoral Psychology* 51 (3), pp. 189-231.

_____ (2011). Sexual Abuse by Catholic Clergy: The spiritual damage in T. G. Plante and K. L. McChesney (Eds). *Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: A decade of crisis, 2002-2012* (pp. 171-182). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

_____ (May 22, 2010).   Shades of Grey in a World of Apparent Absolutes. *National Catholic Reporter Online.* http://ncronline.org/news/justice/shades-grey-world-apparent-absolutes

_____ (December 31, 2008 [2009]). The Spiritual Trauma Experienced by Victims of Catholic Clergy Abuse. *Pastoral Psychology* (58), pp. 239-250.

_____ (July 13, 2008). *The Survival of the Spirit While Mired in the Toxic Wastes of the Ecclesiastical Swamp*. http://www.ocnireland.com/newsletter/2008/OCN_newsletter_06_2008.pdf   or   http://reform-network.net/?p=1892

_____ (August 16. 2008). *Thomas Doyle Reflects on His Regiment.* http://www.richardsipe.com/Dialogue/Dialogue-18-2008-09-08.html

_____ (March 3, 2008). Tom Doyle *Affidavit* (Bear County, Texas). http://reform-network.net/?p=1464

_____ (May 24, 2004). *Tom Doyle Affidavit* (Davenport, Iowa). http://www.bishop-accountability.org/ia-davenport/archives/doyle.htm

_____ (September 8, 2009). *Tom Doyle Writes to California Supreme Court re Quarry v the Roman Catholic Bishop of Oakland*. http://reform-network.net/?p=2357

_____ (December, 2008). *The Understanding of Forgiveness….the victim's Voice.* http://www.richardsipe.com/Doyle/2010/May/forgiveness.htm

_____ (December 21, 2010). What Victims Hear in Pope's Talk on Abuse*. National Catholic Reporter O*nline. http://ncronline.org/blogs/examining-crisis/what-victims-hear-popes-talk-sex-abuse

_____ and Mouton, F. R. and Peterson, M. (1985). *The Problem of Sexual Molestation by Roman Catholic Clergy: Meeting the problem in a comprehensive and responsible manner.*   http://www.bishop-accountability.org/reports/1985_06_09_Doyle_Manual/

_____ and Sipe, A. W. R., and Wall, P. J. (2006). *Sex, Priests and Secret Codes: The Catholic Church's 2000-year paper trail of sexual abuse.* Los Angeles, CA: Volt.

Dreher, R. (February 9, 2008). *How Much "Truth" is Too Much?*
http://www.bishop-accountability.org/news2009/01_02/2009_02_09_Dreher_HowMuch.htm

_____ (2010). *Orthodoxy and Me.*
http://catholicforum.fisheaters.com/index.php/topic,3422384.msg33109968.html#msg3310996

Durkin, E. (January 3, 2012). Priest Accused of Abuse Honored at Marine Park Church Tree-lighting. *New York Daily News.*
http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/priesr-accused-sex-abuse-honored-marine-park-church

Dworkin, A. (1972). *Woman Hating.* New York, NY: Dutton.

Dyer, W. M. (2005). *The Power of Intention.* Carlsbad, CA: Hay House.

Dziech, B. W. and Weiner, L. (1990). *The Lecherous Professor: Sexual harassment on campus*, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Eisler, P. (May 10, 2011). *USA Today.* Church abuse cases and lawyers an uneasy mix. http://www.usatoday.com/news/religion/2011-05-09-vienna-virginia-church-abuse-case-lawyers-insurers_n.htm

Eisler, R. (1987). *The Chalice and the Blade: Our history, our future.* San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row.

Ellens, J. H. (2004). *The Destructive Powers of Religion: Violence in Judaism, Christianity and Islam,* Volumes 1-4. Westport, CT: Praeger.

_____ (2004). Introduction: Spirals of violence in J. H. Ellens, (Ed.). *The Destructive Powers of Religion: Violence in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (Vol. 4: *Contemporary Views on Spirituality and Violence,* pp 1-17). Westport, CT: Praeger.

_____ (2004). Religious Metaphors Can Kill in J. H. Ellens (Ed.), *The Destructive Power of Religion: Violence in Judaism, Christianity and Islam.* (Vol.1, *Ideologies and Violence*, pp. 256-271). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Ellison, R. (2011). *Boys Don't Tell: Ending the silence of abuse.* New York, NY: Morgan James

Enotes, (ud). *Child Abuse in the Catholic Church.* http://www.enotes.com/catholic-child-abuse-article//print

Enright, R. D. (2001). *Forgiveness is a Choice: A step-by-step process for resolving anger and restoring hope*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Episcopal Diocese of New Hampshire's Safe Church Program. Retrieve from New Hampshire Diocesan homepage at http://www.nhepiscopal.org

Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and Society.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton

_____ 1969). *Gandhi's Truth: On the origins of militant nonviolence*, New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

_____ (1958). *Young Man Luther*, New York, NY: W. W. Norton,

FaithTrust Institute webpage: http://www.faithtrustinstitute.org

Ford, J. I. (2006). *Zen Master Who: A guide to the people and stories of Zen, New York,* NY: Wisdom Publications.

Fortune, M. M. (August, 1989a), *Domestic Violence and its Aftermath: New perspectives on crime and justice, Occasional Papers*, Akron, Pa: Mennonite Central Committee Office of Criminal Justice.

_____ (1989b). Forgiveness is the Last Step in A. L. Horton and J. A. Williamson (Eds.). *Abuse and Religion: When praying isn't enough, Boston, MA; Lexington Books/D.C Heath.*

_____ (1989c). *Is Nothing Sacred: When pastoral abuse invades the pastoral relationship.* San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row.

_____ (1983a). *Sexual Abuse Prevention.* New York, NY: Pilgrim.

_____ (1983b). *Sexual Violence: The unmentionable sin*, New York, NY: Pilgrim.

_____ and Marshall, J. L. (2002). *Forgiveness and Abuse: Jewish and Christian Perspectives.* Binghamton, NY: Haworth-Putnam.

Fox, M. (1996). *Confessions: The making of a post-denominational priest.* San Francisco, CA: Harper/San Francisco.

_____ (2011). *The Pope's War: Why Ratzinger's secret crusade has imperiled the church and how it can be saved.* New York, NY: Sterling/Ethos

_____ (2003). *Radical Prayer: Love in action.* Boulder, CO: Sounds True.

_____ (1998). Symposium Response in H. J. Cargas and B. V. Fetterman (Eds.). Book Two: *The Symposium* (145) in S. Wiesenthal*, The Sunflower.* New York, NY: Schocken

Fox, T. C. (May 17, 2002). *Seventeen Years Ago a Report on Clergy Sexual Abuse Warned US Bishops of Trouble. National Catholic Reporter.* http://www.bishop-accountability.org/news/2002_05_17_Fox_WhatThey.htm

Freed, J. L. (May 9, 2010). Electronic correspondence with author

Freud, S. (2005). *Civilization and its Discontents*, New York, NY: W. W. Norton

_____ (1996). *Totem and Taboo.* New York, NY. W. W. Norton

Freyd, J. J. (1996). *Betrayal Trauma: The legacy of forgetting childhood abuse. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.*

Fromm-Reichman, F. (1960). *Principles of Intensive Psychotherapy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Gambit: Best of New Orleans. (ud). *The Sacrifice of Father Thomas Doyle*. http://www.bishop-accountability.org/news2004_01_06/2004_02_13_BestOfNewOrleans_TheSacrifice.htm

Gay, P. (2006). *Freud: A life for our time.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Geertz, C. (1971). *Myth, Symbol and Culture.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton

_____ (1973). *Interpretation of Culture: Selected essays.* New York, NY: Basic Books

_____ (1980). *Negara: The theatre state of nineteenth-century Bali.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

_____ (1983). *Local Knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology. New York, NY: Basic Books.*

Gergen, K. J., (1991). *The Saturated Self: Dilemmas of identity in contemporary life.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Giosetti, D. (Ed.) (1988). *Women on War: Essential voices for the nuclear age from a brilliant international assembly.* New York, NY: Simon and Schuster Touchstone.

Gleitman, H. (1986). *Basic Psychology* [2nd edition] (pp. 323-329 and pp.396-397). New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Gospel Evangel. (1992). CHURCH NEWS: Conference suspends theologian's credentials, (July 14, 1992), p.11.

Goldberg, N. (2004). *The Great Failure: A bartender, a monk and my unlikely path to truth.* Boulder, CO: Sounds True.

Goldberg, N. (2004). *The Great Failure: A bartender, a monk and my unlikely path to truth.* San Francisco, CA: Harper/San Francisco.

Grand Jury Report (September 17, 2003). Court of Common Pleas, First Judicial District of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia County. http://www.catholicsexabuse.com/THE_PHILADELPHIA_GRAND_JURY_REPORT/Section_I__Introduction_to_the_Grand_Jury_Report

Grand Jury Report (January 21, 2011), Court of Common Pleas, First Judicial District of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia County. http://www.bishop-accountability.org/pa_philadelphia/Philly_GJ_report.htm or www.**phil**a.gov/districtattorney/PDFs/clergyAbuse2-finalReport.pdf

Grant, R. (March 15, 2010). *Anger, Forgiveness, and the Healing Process* [Continuing Education Seminar]*,* Tucson, AZ

Grant, R. (ud). *Anger, Forgiveness, and the Healing Process* (audio CD and home study program). Haddonfield, NJ: Institute for Brain Potential

Grant, R. (1994-1995).   *Healing the Soul of the Church: Ministers facing their own childhood abuse and trauma.* Oakland, CA: Self-published.

Greeley, A. M. (1982). *Cardinal Sins*. New York. Bernard Geis.

Greeley, A. M. (2004a). *Priests: A calling in crisis.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Greeley, A. M. (2004b). *Priestly Sins*, New York: Forge Press.

Griffin, S. (1981). *Pornography and Silence: Culture's revenge against nature.* New York, NY: Harper and Row.

_____ Griffin, S. (1979). *Rape: The power of consciousness.* San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row.

Grossman, D. (1995). *On Killing: The psychological cost of learning to kill in war and society*, Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Guggenbuhl-Craig, A. (1991). (J. R. Haule, Trans.). *Power in the Helping Professions*. Woodstock, CT: Spring Publications.

Gumbleton, T. (November 4, 2011). Church's Leadership Has Strayed from Gospel. *National Catholic Reporter Online Blog.* http://ncronline.org/blogs/peace-pulpit/churchs-leadership-has-strayed-gospel

_____ (September 15, 2011). To Heal We Must Reach Out in Love and Forgiveness. *National Catholic Reporter Online Blog.* http://ncronline.org/blogs/peace-pulpit/heal-we-must-reach-out-love-and-forgiveness

Haley, J. L. (1976). Development of a Theory: A history of a research project in C. E. Sluzki and D. C. Ranson (Eds.). *Double-bind: The foundation of the communicational approach to the family* pp. 59-104). New York: Grune and Stratton.

Hauerwas, S. (2000). *A Better Hope: Resources for a church confronting capitalism, democracy, and postmodernity.* Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press.

_____ (April, 1992). *Why Truthfulness Requires Forgiveness: A commencement address for graduates of the church of the second chance*, Goshen, IN: Goshen College. ITS Media Collection and Mennonite Church Archives.

Hegarty, K. (October 6, 2011). *Priestly Ministry: An insider's view.* http://www.associationofcatholicpriests.ie/2011/10/kevin-hegartys-talk-at-the-agm-tuesday-oct-4th/

Heggen, C.H. (1983). *Sexual Abuse in Christian Homes and Churches*, Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1993.

Herman, J. L. (1992). Complex PTSD: A syndrome in survivors of prolonged and repeated trauma. *Journal of Traumatic Stress,* 3, pp. 377-391.

_____ (1987). *Sexual* Violence [Conference Seminar Paper]: Learning from Women. Boston, MA: Harvard Medical School Department of Continuing Education.

_____ (1984). *Sexual Violence: Work in Progress* [No.83-05]. Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College.

_____ (1997). *Trauma and Recovery: the aftermath of violence-from domestic abuse to political terror.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

_____ and Hirschman, L. (1977). *Father-daughter Incest. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 2, pp. 735-756.

Hersch Meyer, L. (1992). *The Rule of Christ: The Abuse of Power and Authority: A Believer's Church Perspective*, Manuscript: Mennonite Historical Library, Goshen College, Goshen, IN.

Heschel, S. (1998). Symposium Response in H. J. Cargas and B. V. Fetterman (Eds.) in S*.* Wesienthal, *The Sunflower: The Possibilities and Limits of Forgiveness* (pp. 172-173). New York, NY: Schocken*.*

Hofling, C. K. and Leininger, M. M. (1967). *Basic Psychiatric Concepts in Nursing.* Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lippincott.

Holsopple, M. Y., Krall, R.E., and Pittman, S. W.   (2004). *Building Peace: Overcoming violence in communities*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Council of Churches Publications.

Horton, A. L. and Williamson, J. A. (Eds.). *Abuse and Religion: When praying isn't enough*, Boston, MA; Lexington Books/D.C Heath.

Hustek, A. (October 24, 2011). *Trauma and Transformation Conference Addresses Sexual Abuse in the Church: Archbishop Anthony Mancini says inadequate education and training contribute.* http://bcc.rcav.org/canadian/1119-trauma-and-transformation-conference-addresses-sexual

Hussein, K. (2007). *A Thousand Splendid Suns.* New York, NY: Riverhead.

Infallibility. *The Catholic Encyclopedia.* http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07790a.htm

Israeli, J. and Chua-Eoan, H. (June 7, 2010). Why Being Pope Means Never Having to Say You're Sorry: The sex abuse scandal and the limits of atonement. *Time* 175 (22), pp. 36-43.

Jackson, D. D. (1968). A Note on the Importance of Trauma in the Genesis of Schizophrenia in D. D. Jackson (Ed.). *Communication, Family and marriage* (pp. 23-39). Palo Alto CA: Science and behavior.

Jacoby, O. and Carroll, J. (2008). *James Carroll's Constantine's Sword: The Documentary.* Metropole Film Board/Storyville Films Production

Janeway, E. (1981). *Powers of the Weak.* New York, NY: Morrow Quill Paperbacks.

Jenkins, P. (1996). *Pedophiles and Priests: Anatomy of a contemporary crisis.* New York, NY: Oxford.

Jewish Scriptures Referenced

> Deuteronomy 6:4-5; Isaiah 11:6; Jeremiah 6:14; Leviticus 19:18; Micah 6:9; Proverbs 23:7

Judy, D. (2008 - 2011). Correspondence with author

Jung, C. G. (2000). *The Undisclosed Self*, New York, NY: Signet.

474

Katz, J. H. (1984). *No Fairy Godmothers, No Magic Wands: The healing process after rape.* Saratoga, CA: R & E Publishers.

Kauffmann, N. L. (2006 - 2011). Electronic and mail correspondence and phone conversations with author

Keen, S. (2006a). *Faces of the Enemy: Three Slide Lectures.* San Rafael, CA: Sam Keen Productions.

_____ (October, 2006). Conference keynote address: *Faces of the Enemy: The art of enemy-making.* Kalamazoo, MI: Common Boundary Conference.

Keim, P. (July 19, 2011), Electronic correspondence with author

Keiser, R. B. (2002). *Clerical Error*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Kelman, H. C. and Hamilton, V. L. (1989). *Crimes of Obedience*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kennedy, E. C. (June 30, 2011). Set-decorator Catholicism: clericalism thrives in a new phase of the sex abuse crisis. http://ncronline.org/print/25445

_____ (July 7, 2011). Set-decorator Catholicism: The common traits of set decorators. http://ncronline.org/print/25558

_____ (2001). *The Unhealed Wound: The church, the priesthood, and the question of sexuality.* New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

_____ (October 28, 2011). What Is the Sin of Bishop Finn? http://ncronline.org/print/27337

Kennedy, M. (2000). Christianity and Child Sexual Abuse: The survivor's voice leading to change. *Child Abuse Review* 9, pp. 123-141.

Kenney, E. (2011). *Statement of the Taoiseach on the Dail Motion on the report of the Commission of Investigation into the Catholic Diocese of Cloyne in Dail Eireann* (Manuscript)

Kilbourne, J. *Killing Us Softly 1979,, Still Killing Us Softly, 1989,Killing Us Softly Three,2001.*
http://jeankilbourne.com/?page_id=3

Kinoti, H. W. (1996). Culture, defined (p. 63) in L. M. Russell and J. S. Clarkson (Eds.). *Dictionary of Feminist Theologies.* Lexington, KY: Westminster/John Knox.

Koontz, G. G. (April, 1994). As We Forgive Others: Christian forgiveness and feminist pain, *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 68, pp. 170-193.

Koontz, G. G. (1992). Redemptive Responses to Violation of Women: Christian power, justice, and self-giving love in E. G. Yoder (Ed.). *Peace Theology and Violence against Women* [Occasional Papers # 16, pp. 29-47], Elkhart, IN: Institute of Mennonite Studies..

Kopp, S. (1972). *Back to One: A practical guide for psychotherapies.* Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.

Kornfield, J. (2002). *The Art of Forgiveness, Lovingkindness, and Peace.* New York, NY: Bantam.

Koss, M. (1985). The Hidden Rape Victim: Personality, attitudes and situational characteristics. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 37 (4), pp. 105-122.

Koss, M. and Oros, C. J. (1982). Sexual Experiences Survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 50 (3). pp. 645-654.

Krall, R. E. (1996). Anger and an Anabaptist Feminist Hermeneutic, *Conrad Grebel Review* 14 (2), pp.145-163.

_____ (1992). Christian Ideology, Rape and women's post-rape journeys in E. G. Yoder (Ed.). *Peace Theology and Violence against Women* [Occasional Papers # 16]. Elkhart, IN: Institute of Mennonite Studies, 76-92.

_____ (1991). *Community and Diversity: Can we have both?* Goshen, IN: Office of the Academic Dean. Goshen College, Goshen, IN.

_____ (1990). *Rape's Power to Dismember Women's Lives: Personal realities and cultural forms.* Claremont, CA: Southern California School of Theology at Claremont

Kramer, J. and Alstad, D. (1993). *The Guru Papers: Masks of authoritarian power.* Berkeley, CA: Frog Ltd.

Kraybill, D. B. (1981). (Ed.). *Perils of Professionalism: Essays on Christian faith and professionalization.* Scottdale, PA: Herald.

Kraybill, D. B., Nolt, S. M. and Weaver-Zuercher, D. L. (2007). *Amish Grace: How forgiveness transcended tragedy*, New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Kung, Hans (2010). *Ratzinger's Responsibility.* http://ncronline.org/news/accountability/ratzingers-responsibility

Labacqz, K. (1990). Love Your Enemy: Sex, power, and Christian ethics. A*nnals of the Society of Christian Ethics* 10, pp. 3-24.

_____ and Barton, R. G. (1991). *Sex in the Parish.* Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox.

Lamb, S. (2002). Women: Abuse and Forgiveness: A special case in S. Lamb, and J. G. Murphey, (Eds.). *Before Forgiving: Cautionary views of forgiveness in psychotherapy* (pp. 155-171)*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

_____ and Murphey, J. G. (Eds.). (2002). *Before Forgiving: Cautionary views of forgiveness in psychotherapy.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Landman, J. (2002). Earning Forgiveness: The story of perpetrator Katherine Ann Power in S. Lamb and J. G. Murphey (Eds). *Before Forgiving: Cautionary views of forgiveness in psychotherapy* (pp. 232-261). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Lerner, G. (1993a). *The Creation of Feminist Consciousness.* New York, NY: Oxford.

Lerner, G. (1993b). *The Creation of Patriarchy.* New York, NY: Oxford.

Lerner, M. J. and Simons, C. H. (1958). Observers Reactions to the Innocent Victim: Compassion or rejection? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 4(2), pp. 203-210.

Leslie, K. J. (2003). *When Violence is No Stranger: Pastoral counseling with survivors of acquaintance rape. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.*

Lesser, E.   (July-August, 2010). Ten Pitfalls to Avoid on the Path. *Spirituality and Healing* 13 (4), p. 54.

Levine, P. A. (2008). *Healing Trauma: A pioneering program for restoring the wisdom of your body*, Boulder, CO: Sounds True.

_____ (2005). *Healing Trauma: Restoring the wisdom of your body*, Boulder, CO: Sounds True

_____ (2010). *In An Unspoken Voice: How the body releases trauma and restores goodness.* Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books.

_____ (2003). *Sexual Healing: Transforming the sacred wound*, Boulder, CO: Sounds True.

_____ and Frederick, A. (1997). *Waking the Tiger, Healing Trauma: The innate capacity to transform overwhelming experiences*, New York, NY: North Atlantic.

Lewis, C. S. (1967). *The Screwtape Letters.* New York, NY: Harpers.

Lindsey, W. D. (December 15, 2011). Father Wenthe of St. Paul, Minnesota Gets Year in Jail, Judge Zeroes in on Clerical Narcissism. http://www.bishop-accountability.org/news2011/11_12/2011_12_15_Lindsey_FatherWenthe.htm

Lipstatdt, D. E. (1998). Symposium Response in H. J. Cargas and B. V.Fetterman (Eds.). *in S.* Wesienthal, *The Sunflower: On the Possibilities and Limits of Forgiveness*, pp. 193-196*.* New York, NY: Schocken.

Lobdell, W. (2009). *Losing My Religion: How I lost my faith reporting on religion in America --- and found unexpected peace.* New York, NY: Harper/Collins.

Lorentzen, L. A. and Turpin, J. (Eds.). (1998). *The Women and War Reader.* New York, NY: University Press.

Lorenz, K, (1966). *On Aggression*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Love G. & Norris K. (ud). *The Cost of Being a Shepherd: How Vienna Presbyterian Church chose between its sexual abuse victims and a potential loss of insurance coverage* http://www.ministrysafe.com/resources-helpful-articles/VPC%20-%20Cost%20of%20Being%20a%20Shepherd%206-1-11%20%283%29.pdf

Lukoff, D. (1998). From Spiritual Emergency to Spiritual Problem; the transpersonal roots of the new DSM IV category. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology 38 (2), pp. 21-50.* http://www.spiritualcompetency.com/pdfs/jhpsetosp.pdf

Lundstrom, M. (March 21, 2002). Female Victims of Clergy Abuse: Female victims often overlooked in horror stories of clergy abuse. Originally in *Sacramento Bee.* *http://snaparch.com/female_victims/female_victims_index.htm*

Machiavelli, *The Prince*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 2006.

Mandela, N. (2002). Foreword (p. v). *Summary: World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.

Markon, Jeffrey (January 6, 2012). Justice Department Expands Definition of Rape to Include Other Victims. *Washington Post Online.* http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/justice-dept-expands-definition-of-rape-to-include

Marty, M. E. (2007). *The Mystery of the Child.* Grand Rapids, Mi: William B. Erdman's.

May, M. (1992). *The Rule of Christ: By What Authority? An Invocation of Pentecost.* Manuscript. Mennonite Historical Library. Goshen College campus, Goshen, IN.

May, R. (ca 1975). Conversations with author. Cabo San Lucas, Mexico:

Mendelsohn, M., Herman, J. L., Schatzoa, E., Coco, M., Kallivayalii, D., and Levitan, J. (2011). *The Trauma Recovery Group: A Guide for Practitioners.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to Authority: An experimental view.* New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Miller, A. (1990). *Banished Knowledge*, New York, NY: Doubleday.

_____ (1991). *Breaking Down the Wall of Silence: The liberating experience of facing painful truth.* New York, NY: Penguin/Dutton

_____ Miller, A. (1980a). *The Drama of the Gifted Child.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

_____ Miller, A. (1983). *For Your Own Good: Hidden cruelty in child-rearing and the roots of violence.* New York, NY: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

_____ Miller, A. (1980b). *The Untouched Key: Tracing childhood trauma in creativity and destructiveness,* (Trans., H. and H. Hnnum). New York, NY: Doubleday.

_____ Miller, A. (1984). *Thou Shalt Not Be Aware: Society's betrayal of the child.* New York, NY: Meridian

Miller, E. E. (1997). *Deep Healing: The Essentials of Mind/Body Healing.* Carlsbad, CA: Hay House.

Miller, J. B. (1976). *Towards a New Psychology of Women.* Boston: Beacon.

Miller, J. M. (1998). The Moral Bankruptcy of Institutionalized Religion (pp. 152-172) in A. Shupe, (Ed.). *Wolves in the Fold: Religious leadership and abuses of power.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press*.*

Miller, W. L. (2008). *President Lincoln: The duty of a statesman.* New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Morris, B. (1999). Addiction to Sex: America's corporate dirty secret. *Fortune Magazine* (May 10), pp. 65-79.

Moss, R. (1998). *Spirituality and Healing Seminar.* Kansas City, MO: Institute of Noetic Sciences.

MSNBC/Associated Press. *Catholic Priest Who Aids Church Sexual Abuse Victims Loses Job.* http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/4865148/ns/usnews/

Munro, J. (2008-2011). Electronic mail, correspondence and telephone conversations with author

Murphy, J. G. (2002). Forgiveness in Counseling: A Philosophical Perspective in S. Lamb,and J. G. Murphey, (Eds.) *Before Forgiving: Cautionary views of forgiveness in psychotherapy.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Murphey, J. G. (2002). Foreward in S. Lamb and J. G. Murphey, (Eds.).

Before Forgiving: Cautionary views of forgiveness in psychotherapy. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

National Center for Victims of Crime webpage: http://www.ncvc.org/

National Child Abuse Hotline: 1-800-4-a-child (1-800-422-4453)

National Sexual Violence Resource Center webpage: http://www.nsvrc.org/

Negus, G. (April 4, 2010). Interview: *Tom Doyle…Uncensored.* http://enlightenedcatholicism-colkoch.blogspot.com/2010/04/father-tom-doyle-uncensored.html

Nhat Hanh, T. (1995). Public Lecture. Berkeley, CA

_____ (2001). *Anger: Wisdom for cooling the flames.* New York, NY: Riverhead Books

_____ (1987a). *Being Peace,* Berkeley, CA: Parallax.

_____ (1987b). *Interbeing.* Berkeley, CA: Parallax.

_____ (1993). *Love in Action.* Berkeley, CA: Parallax.

_____ (1981). *Peace is Every Step: The path of mindfulness in everyday life.* New York, NY: Bantam.

Nuttall, M. (2003). *Number Two to Tutu*, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: Cluster Publications.

O'Brien, N. F. (March 13, 2009). US church's costs for clergy sex abuse topped $438 million last year, *Catholic News Service,* Retrieved June 9, 2011 from http://www.Catholicnews.com/data/stories/cns/0901158.htm

Odendall, D. H. (2007) Secondary Violence: Adding Insult to Injury, in J. H. Ellens. (Ed.). *The Destructive Powers of Religion: Violence in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (Vol.*3: Models and Cases of Violence in Religion*, Chapter Ten, pp. 253 ff). Westport, CT: Praeger.

O'Dea, M. G. F. (July 28, 2010). A Proposal for Dealing with Priest Perpetrators. *National Catholic Reporter Online*. http://ncronline.org/print/19430

_____ (May 10, 2010). The Gift of Shame. *National Catholic Reporter Online*. http://ncronline.org/print/18203

_____ (July 21, 2011). The John Jay Study: What it is and what it isn't. *National Catholic Reporter Online.* http://ncronline.org/print/25739

_____ (2007). *Perversion of Power.* Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

_____ (March 16, 2011)   Where is Catholicism's Tahrir Square? *National Catholic Reporter Online.* http://ncronline.org/print/23489

Ozick, C, (1997). Symposium Response: Notes towards a Meditation on "Forgiveness," (pp. 213-220) in H. J. Cargas and B. V. Fetterman (Eds.). in *S.* Wesienthal, *The Sunflower: On the possibilities and limits of forgiveness.* New York, NY: Schocken.

Patrick, A. E. (1999)., Sexual Harassment: A Christian Ethical Response, *Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics* (19) 371-376.

Pelhem, P. (2000). *Teaching and Receiving the Precepts: A disciple of the Buddha does not misuse sexuality.* *http://www.chzc.org/pat13.htm*

Pellauer, M. D., Chester, B., and Boyajian, J. (1987). *Sexual Assault and Abuse: A handbook for clergy and religious professionals. San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row.*

Pert, C. B., (1997). *Molecules of Emotion: Why you feel the way you feel.* New York, NY: Scribners.

Phipps, W. E. (1983). *Influential Theologians on Wo/man.* Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Plante, T. and McChesney, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: A decade of crisis, 2002-2012).* Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Podles, L. J. (2008). *Sacrilege: Sexual abuse in the Catholic Church.* Baltimore, MD: Crossland.

Polling, J. N, (1991). *The Abuse of Power: A Theological Problem*, Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press

Pope "Deeply ashamed" of abuse scandal (April 16, 2008). *Arizona Daily Star,* A-4.

Pope Pledges Support for U. S. Church: Nation and World. (April 20, 2008). *Arizona Daily Star,* A-4.

Pope Paul VI. (July 25, 1968). *Humanae Vitae* [Encyclical regarding marital sexuality and chemical or mechanical forms of birth control]. *Rome: Vatican City.* http://www.vatican.va/holy_fatherpaul_vi/enciclicals/document/hf_p-vi_enc25071968 ...

Pope Paul VI. (January 24, 1967). *Sacerdotalis Caelibayus* [Encyclical regarding priest celibacy]. Rome: Vatican City. http:www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_va/encyclcals/documents/hf_p-_enc_24061967_6/10/2010

Pope Pius Xll. (November 20, 1947. Mediator Dei in *Actis Apostolicae Sedis* 39 (1947), 548.

Post, J. E. (2012). Response of the Faithful: Ten years of crisis in T. G. Plante and K. L. McChesney (Eds). *Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: A decade of crisis, 2002-2012* (pp. 146-154). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Prevention Institute webpage: http://preventioninstitute.org

Price, D. (2008). *Altar Boy, Altered Life: A true story of sexual abuse.* Indianapolis, IN: Dog Ear Publishing.

Price, T. (June 29, 1992). Theologian cited in sex inquiry. *The Elkhart Truth,* B-1 ff.

Price, T. (July 13, 1992). Theologian accused: Women report instances of inappropriate conduct. *The Elkhart Truth,* B-1 ff.

Rather, D. (2002). *Spiritually Bankrupt.* http://www.companionsinhope.com/FTP/Commentary/DanRatherSpirituallyBankrupt.htm

Rauch, M. (2009). *Healing the Soul after Religions Abuse: The dark heaven of recovery.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Rigert, J. and Sipe, A. W. R. (2010). *What Can Benedict Do to Resolve the Sexual Crisis of Catholicism?* http://www.catholica.com.augc3/rs/006rs051110.php

Roberts, T. (March 30, 2009). Bishops Were Warned of Abusive Priests. *National Catholic Reporter Online.* http://ncronline.org/news/accountability/bishops-were-warned-abusive-priests

Robinson, G. (2008). American Tour Lecture: *Confronting Power and Sex in the Roman Catholic Church.* http://bishopgeoffrobinson.org/usa_lecture.htm

_____(2011). Changing the Culture in T. G. Plante and K. L. McChesney (Eds.). *Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: A decade of crisis, 2002-2012* (pp. 91-102). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

_____ (2007). *Confronting Power and Sex in the Catholic Church.* Victoria, Australia: John Garrett.

Rossetti, S. J. (1996). *A Tragic Grace: The Catholic Church and child sexual abuse.* Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press.

Rosetti, S. J. (Ed). (1990) *Slayer of the Soul: Child sexual abuse and the Catholic Church.* Mystic, CT: Twenty Third Publications.

Rossman, M. (1989). *Healing Yourself: A step-by-step program for better health through imagery*. New York, NY: Pocket Books.

Rossman, M. and Bressler, D. (ud). Academy for Guided Imagery Training Materials: Reading Manuals, Audio-tapes, Video-tapes

Rothschild, B. (2000). *The Body Remembers: The psycho-physiology of trauma and trauma treatment.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

_____ (2003). *The Body Remembers Casebook: Unifying methods and models in the treatment of trauma and PTSD. New York: NY: W. W. Norton.*

_____ (2006). *Help for the Helper: The psychophysiology of compassion fatigue and vicarious trauma.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Russell, D. E. H. (1984). *The Politics of Rape.* New York, NY: Stein and Day.

Rutter, P. (1989). *Sex in the Forbidden Zone: When men in power abuse women's trust.* Los Angeles, CA: Jeremy P. Tarcher.

Ryan, Z. (November 25, 2011-December 6, 2011). Bishop [Tom Gumbleton] Tells of Being Forced From Parish. *National Catholic Reporter,* p. 6.

Safford, W. (1993). Poem: "Any Time" in R. Bly (Ed.). *The Darkness Around Us is Deep: Selected poems of William Safford.* New York, NY: Harper Perennial.

Satir, V. (1972). *Peoplemaking,* Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior.

Schrag, P. (March 23, 1992). Bethel cancels invitation to Yoder after receiving protest letters. *Mennonite Reporter.*

Schwartz, P. R. (1988). Women and Spirituality. *Belles Lettres* 3 (20), p.10.

Segundo, J. L. (1976a). *The Hidden Motives of Pastoral Action: Latin American reflections.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.

Segundo, J. L. (1976b). *The Liberation of Theology.* Maryknoll, NY: *Orbis.*

Sex Scandal "Very badly handled" Pope Says. (April 17, 2008). *Arizona Daily Star,* A-2.

Shengold, L. (1989). *Soul Murder: The effects of childhood abuse and deprivation.* New York, NY: Fawcett Columbine*.*

Shengold, L. (1999). *Soul Murder Revisited: Thoughts about therapy, hate, love and memory.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Shupe, A. (1995). *In the Name of All That's Holy: A theology of clergy malfeasance.* Westport, CT: Yale University Press.

_____ (May 20, 2011). Report on Catholic Pedophile Priests Misses the Mark. http://www.richardsipe.com/reports/Shupe-%20The%20John%20Jay%20Document%202011.htm

_____ (2008). *Rogue Clerics: The social problem of clergy deviance.* Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

_____ (2011). Vicissitudes of Response to Pastoral Malfeasance: A Sociological View of Church Polity in T. G. Plante and K. L. McChesney, *Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: A decade of crisis, 2002-2012* (pp. 103-115). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

_____ (Ed.). (1998). *Wolves within the Fold: Religious leadership and abuses of power.* Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

_____ and Stacey, W. A., and Darnell, S. E. (Eds.). (2000). *Bad Pastors: Clergy misconduct in America.* New York, MY: New York University Press.

Sipe, A. W. R. (June 12, 2004). *A Dangerous Business. Retrieved from* http://www.richardsipe.com/Lectures/2004-06-12-SNAP.html

_____ (September 11, 2009a). *Are American Bishops Gay?* http://www.richardsipe.com/2009-09/US%20Catholic%20Bishops%20-%20Are%20They%20Gay.pdf

_____ (July 22, 2010). Beneath the Child Abuse Scandal*, National Catholic Reporter Online* *http://ncronline.org/print/19343*

_____ (ud). *Bishop Geoffrey Robinson in America, 14 May, 2010-14 June, 2010.* http://www.catholica.com.au/gc2/occ/013_occ_210608.php

_____ (September 6, 2011). *Catholic Seminaries: The inside story.* http://richardsipe.com/reports/2011-09-06-seminaryevaluation.htm

_____ (ud) *Clerical Sex, Blackmail, and Sexual Abuse*. http://www.catholica.com.au/gc2/occ/028_occ_141108.php

_____ (March 5, 2010). *Code Words to Hide Sexual Abuse.* http://www.richardsipe.com/Click_and_Learn/2010-03-05-code_words_rev.html

_____ *(November 7, 2004).* VOTF Address: *Forgiveness of Clergy Sexual Abuse:* http://www.richardsipe.com/Lectures/2004-11-07-VOTF.html

_____ (April 1, 2007). *How the Church Sexualizes the Sacraments.* http://www.richardsipe.com/Dialogue/Dialogue-04-2007-01-02.html

_____(January 30, 2006). *How to Spot an Abuser.* http://www.richardsipe.com/Comments/2006-01-30-Spot_an_Abuser.html

_____ (January 23, 2007). *Loss of Faith and Clergy Sexual Abuse*, http://richardsipe.com/Click_and_Learn/2007-01-23-Loss-of-Faith.html

_____ (May 20, 2010). *The Pope Has a Sex Problem.* *http://www.richardsipe.com/Lectures/2010-05-20-boston.html*

_____ (July 21-23, 2006. *The Power of Powerlessness.* http://richardsipe.com/Lectures/2006-07-SNAP.htm

_____ (2011). Scandal versus Crisis: Mother Church and the rape of her children in T. D. Plante and K. L. McChesney (Eds.). *Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: A Decade of Crisis, 2002-2012* (pp. 117-129). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger. Also available at http://www.richardsipe.com/Miscl/2011-10-15-mother_church.htm

_____(April 28, 2010). Secret Sex in the Celibacy System. *National Catholic Reporter Online* http://ncronline.org/print/18075

_____ (July 25, 2007). *Sex in Roman Catholic Seminaries and Beyond.* http://richardsipe.com/Dialogue/Dialogue-12-2007-07-25.html

_____ (June 1, 2010). *Sex, Obedience and Discourse.* http://www.richardsipe.com/Media/2010-06-02-ncr.htm

_____ (1996). *Sex, Priests and Power: Anatomy of a crisis. New York, NY: Bruner/Mazel.*

_____ (May 3, 2010). *Sexual Abuse of Minors by U. S. Roman Catholic Bishops and Priests.* http://www.richardsipe.com/Forensic/2010-05-03-fact-check.htm

_____ (2010). *The Time for Apologies is Over! It's time to talk reform of the clerical culture at the heart of the abuse scandal.* http://www.richardsipe.com/Dialogue/Dialogue-22-2010-10.html

_____ (November 15, 2009). *Unspeakable Damage: The effect of clergy sexual abuse.* http://www.richardsipe.com/2009-09/UnspeakableDamage-2009-08.pdf

_____ (February 22, 2011). *U. S. Catholic Bishops: The face of deception.* http://www.richardsipe.com/reports/2011-02-22-us-bishops.htm

_____ (February 23, 2003). *View from the Eye of the Storm.*
       http://www.votf.org/Survivor_Support/sipe.html

_____ (November 6, 2007). *Why Bankruptcy?*
       from http://www.richardsipe.com/Dialogue/Dialogue-11-2007-06-
       12.html

_____ (October 15, 2007). *Witness from Seminaries.*
       http://richardsipe.com/Dialogue/Dialogue-13-2007-10-15.html

Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and Human Behavior*, New York, NY:
       MacmiIllan.

Smith, H. and Novak, P. (2003). *Buddhism: A concise introduction.*
       San Francisco, CA: Harper/San Francisco*.*

SNAP webpage: http://www.snapnetwork.org

SNAP (ud). *Silence Makes Evil Possible: There are many ways
       you can help to protect the vulnerable, expose truth and
       heal the wounded. Here are some suggestions.*
       http://www.snapnetwork.org/take action

SNAP (ud). *What to do when your priest is accused of abused.*
       http://www.snapnetwork.org/what to do when your priest is accused
       of abuse
        or
       http://www.snapnetwork.org/take_action

SNAP (ud). *You Can Make a Difference.* No longer accessible or visible:
       Retrieved May 24, 2011 from
       http://www.snapnetwork.org/links homepage/wanna make
       difference.htm

SNAP (ud). *99 Percent of Children Who Report Sexual Abuse Are Telling
       the Truth.*
       http://blogs.philymag.com/the_phily_post/2011/12/22/96-percet-
       children-report-sexual-abuse-telling-truth

Sluzki, C. E. and Ransom, D. C. (1976). *Double Bind: The communicational approach to the family. New York, NY: Grune and Stratton.*

Soelle, D. (1992). *Beyond Mere Obedience.* (L. W. Denef, Trans.), New York, NY: Pilgrim.

_____ (1998). Symposium Response (243-245) in Cargas, H. J. and Fetterman, B. V. (Eds.). i*n S.* Wesienthal, *The Sunflower: On the Possibilities and Limits of Forgiveness.* New York, NY: Schocken.

Spong, J. S. (2001). *A New Christianity for a New World: Why traditional faith is dying and how a new faith is being born.* San Francisco, CA: Harper/San Francisco.

Spong, J. S. (1999). *Why Christianity Must Change or Die.* San Francisco, CA: Harper-Collilns.

Starhawk. (1981). *Truth or Dare: Encounters with power, authority and mystery.* San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row*.*

Steinfels, P. (2003). *A People Adrift: The crisis in the Roman Catholic Church of America.* New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Stockton, R. J. (2000). The Politics of a Sexual Harassment Case (pp. 131-154) in A. Shupe, W. A. Stacey, and S. E. Darnell. (Eds.). *Bad Pastors: Clergy misconduct in modern America.* New York, NY: New York University Press.

Stoltzfus, P. (2010-2011). Electronic and mail correspondence with author

Sun Tzu. (1963). *The Art of War* (trans., S. B. Griffin). London, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

SuperLawyers Blog (December 1, 2011). *Jeff Anderson on the Sex Abuse Scandal at Penn State.* http://blog.superlawyers.com/2011/12/jeff-anderson-on-the-sex-abuse-scandal-at-penn-state.shtml

Terr, L. (1990). *Too Scared to Cry: How trauma affects children…and ultimately us all. New York, NY: Basic Books.*

Thomas, C. A. (2004). *At Hell's Gate: A soldier's journey from war to peace.* Boston, MA: Shambala.

Tipping, C. (2009). *The Power of Radical Forgiveness: An experience of deep emotional and spiritual healing*, Boulder, CO: Sounds True.

Trible, P. (1984). *Texts of Terror: Literary-feminist readings of Biblical narratives.* Philadelphia, PA; Fortress.

Turlish, M. P. (October 31, 2011). Accountability, Transparency and the Bishops. *National Catholic Reporter Online.* http://ncronline.org/print/27346

_____ (December 9, 2011). The Time is Now: Childhood sexual abuse and statutes of limitation. *National Catholic Reporter Online.* http://www.ncronline.org/blogs/examing-crisis/time-now-childhood-sexual-abuse-and-statures-limitation

Turner, S. W., McFarlane, A. C., van der Kolk, B. A. (1996). The Therapeutic Environment and New Explorations in the Treatment of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (537-558). in B. A. van der Kolk, et al., (Eds.). *Traumatic Stress: The effects of over-whelming experience on mind, body and society.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Tutu, D. (1983). *Hope and Suffering: Sermons and speeches*, Grand Rapids, MI: Erdman's.

Twomey, S. (June 13, 2002), For Three Who Warned Church, Fears Borne Out: Priest, journalist, and professor who foresaw sex abuse scandal frustrated by bishops. © *The Washington Post.* *http://www.behindthepinecurtain.com/wordpress/for-3-who-warned-church-fears-borne-out/*

United States Attorney General's Commission on Pornography, *Final Report. (July, 1986).* Washington, DC: Office of the United States Attorney General.

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (2006), *The Nature and Scope of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950-2002, 2006 Supplementary Report: A Research Study Conducted by the John Jay College of Criminal Justice,* City University of New York.

United States Federal Bureau of Investigation. (annual). *Uniform Crime Reports.* Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

United States Department of Justice webpage: http://justice.gov

United States Department of Justice. *Attorney General Eric Holder Announces Revisions in* **The Uniform Crime Report's** *Definition of Rape.* http://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/2012/January/12-ag-018.html

van der Kolk, B. A., McFarlane, A. C., and Weisaeth, L. (Eds.). (1996). *Traumatic Stress: The effects of overwhelming experiences on mind, body and society*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

_____and McFarlane, A. C. (1996). The Black Hole of Trauma in van der Kolk, B. A., et. al., *Traumatic Stress: The effects of overwhelming experiences on mind, body and society* (pp. 3-26). New York, NY: Guilford.

_____ and van der Hart, O. V. D., and Marmar, C. R.,   Dissociation and Information Processing in Posttraumatic Stress Disorder in van der Kolk, B. A,, et. al., *Traumatic Stress: The effects of overwhelming experiences on mind, body and society* (pp*. 303-327).* New York, NY: Guilfford.

_____Trauma and Memory in van der Kolk, B. A., et. al., *Traumatic Stress: The effects of overwhelming experiences on mind, body and society* (279-302)*.* New York, NY: Guilfford.

_____ and Perry, J. C., and Herman, J. L. Childhood Origins of Self-destructive Behavior. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 148, pp. 1665-1671.

Voelkel-Haugen, R. and Fortune. M. M. (1996). *Sexual Abuse Prevention*. Cleveland, OH: United Church Press.

Voice of the Faithful: www.votf.org

_____ (October 11, 2011). Voice of the Faithful's Conclusions about the John Jay College Report, *The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950-2010*. (Manuscript, 1-11). http://votf.org/johnjay/John_Jay_Causes_and_Context_Report.pdf

Wakins, D. J. (2004). Catholic Priest Who Aids Church Sexual Abuse Victims Loses Job. *New York Times Online* (April 29). http://www.snapnetwork.org/news/otherstates/doyle_loses_job.htm

Walker, A. (1992). *Possessing the Secret of Joy.* New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich,

Walker, A. (2006). *We Are the Ones We Have Been Waiting For. New York,* NY: New Press.

Wall, P. J. (2010). Civil Rights and the 21st Century. http://www.richardsipe.com/Patrick_Wall/Humbert-2010—08-20.htm

_____ (January 30, 2008b). *The Crafty Perpetrators Remain.* http://patrickjwall.wordpress.com/2008/01/30/the-crafty-perpetrators-remain/

_____ (January 9, 2008). *Ten Common Myths about the Sexual Abuse of Minors and Vulnerable Adults by Clerics.* http://patrickjwall.wordpress.com/2008/01/09/10-common-myths-in-the-sexual-abuse-of-minors-and-vulnerable-adults-by-clerics/

Warshaw, R. (1984). *I Never Called it Rape*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Wartburgwatch (April 11, 2011). *Vienna Presbyterian Church Finally Goes Public about Sex Abuse* http://www.wartburgwatch.com/2011/04/11/vienna-presbyterian-church

_____ (April 8, 2011) Vienna Presbyterian Church Rocked by Sex Abuse Scandal http://www..wartburgwatch.com/2011/04/08/vienna-presbyterian-church

Watzlwick, P. (1968) A Review of the Double Bind in D. D. Jackson, (Ed.). *Communication, Family and Marriage* (63-86). *Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior.*

_____ (1976). The Double Bind Theory by Self-Reflexive Hindsight in C. E. Sluzki and D. C. Ransom, (Eds.) *Double Bind: The foundation of the communicational approach to the family* (pp. 307-314). New York, NY: Grune and Stratton.

West, T. (1999). The Harm of Sexual Harassment. *Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics* 19, pp. 377-382.

Wiesenthal, S. (1997). *The Sunflower: On the Possibilities and Limits of Forgiveness* (Book One: Wiesenthal's Question). New York, NY: Schocken.

Wilson, K. J. (1997). (Ed.) *When Violence Begins at Home: A Comprehensive \ Guide for Understanding and Ending Domestic Violence*, Alameda, CA: Hunter House Publishers

White, J. (April 2, 2011). Vienna Presbyterian Church Seeks Forgiveness, Redemption in Wake of Abuse Scandal. http://thewartburgwatch.com/2011/04/08/vienna-presbyterian-

White, M. (2006). *Religion Gone Bad: The Hidden Dangers of the Christian Right.* New York: NY: Jeremy Tarcher/Penguin.

Williamson, M., (2002). *Everyday Grace: Having hope, finding forgiveness and making miracles.* New York, NY: Riverhead Books.

Wilson, K. J. (1997). (Ed.) *When Violence Begins at Home: A Comprehensive \Guide for Understanding and Ending Domestic Violence*, Alameda, CA: Hunter House Publishers

Wink, W. (1992). *Engaging the Powers: Discernment and resistance in a world of domination,.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.

_____ (2007). The Myth of Redemptive Violence, in J. H. Ellens, (Ed.). *The Destructive Powers of Religion: Violence in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*: (Vol. 3: *Models and Cases of Violence in Religion*, pp.265-286). Westport, CT. Praeger.

_____ (1984). *Naming the Powers: The language of power in the New Testament.* Philadelphia, PA: Fortress.

_____ (1988). *The Powers that Be: Theology for a new millennium.* New York, NY: Doubleday.

_____ (1985). *Unmasking the Powers: The invisible forces that determine human existence. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress.*

Wood, E. W., Jr. (2008). *Worshipping the Myths of World War Two: Reflections on America's dedication to war,* Dulles, VA: Potomac Books.

World Council of Churches. (2001). *Decade to Overcome Violence: 2001-* 2010, Geneva, Switzerland.

World Health Association (2002a). *World Report on Violence and Health.* Geneva, Switzerland.

_____ (2002b). *Summary: World Report on Violence and Health.* Geneva, Switzerland.

Worthington, E. L., Jr. (2006). *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: Theory and application.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Yallop, D. (2010). *Beyond Belief: The Catholic Church and the child abuse scandal.* London, UK: Constable Books

_____ (2007). *The Power and the Glory: Inside the dark heart of John Paul II's Vatican.* New York, NY: Carroll and Graf.

Yoder, E.G. (1992). *Peace Theology and Violence Against Women, Occasional Papers, # 16*, Elkhart, IN: AMBS/Institute of Mennonite Studies.

Yoder, J. H. (2001). *Body Politics: Five practices of the church community before the watching world.* Scottdale, PA: Herald.

Young, C. (2003-2004) Manuscript: *First Contacts: Crises and spiritual emergencies. Findhorn and Edinburgh,* Self-published.

Zimbardo, P. G. (2008). *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding how good people turn evil.* New York, NY: Random House Trade Paperbacks.

Zimbardo, P. G. (1988). *Psychology and Life*, Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Zimmerman, E. (2007). *Preaching the Politics of Jesus: The origin and significance of John Howard Yoder's social ethics* Telford, PA: Cascadia.

---

[1] Unless specifically noted by a specific date or note in the bibliographic listing, all URL addresses were current, retrievable, and visible on January 2, 2012