

Nicole Winfield reports from the Vatican for the Associated Press on the latest details in the abuse scandal in Germany.

**Pope draws ire over abuse
Priest in Germany got new job, hurt children**

Germany's sex-abuse scandal has now reached Pope Benedict XVI: His former archdiocese disclosed that while he was archbishop a suspected pedophile priest was transferred to a job where he later abused children.

The pontiff is also under increasing fire for a 2001 Vatican document he later penned instructing bishops to keep such cases secret.

The revelations have put the spotlight on Benedict's handling of abuse claims both when he was archbishop of Munich from 1977-1982 and then the prefect of the Vatican office that deals with such crimes - a position he held until his 2005 election as pope.

And they may lead to further questions about what the pontiff knew about the scope of abuse in his native Germany.

Benedict got a firsthand readout of the scandal Friday from the head of the German Bishop's Conference, Archbishop Robert Zollitsch, who reported that the pontiff had expressed "great dismay and deep shock" over the scandal, but encouraged bishops to continue searching for the truth. Hours later, the Munich archdiocese admitted that it had allowed a priest suspected of having abused a child to return to pastoral work in the 1980s, while Benedict was archbishop. It stressed that the former Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger didn't know about the transfer and that it had been decided by a lower-ranking official.

The archdiocese said there were no accusations against the chaplain, identified only as H., during his 1980-1982 spell in Munich, where he underwent therapy for suspected "sexual relations with boys." But he then moved to nearby Grafing, where he was suspended in early 1985 following new accusations of sexual abuse. The following year, he was convicted of sexually abusing minors.

"We find it extraordinarily hard to believe that Ratzinger didn't reassign the predator, or know about the reassignment," said Barbara Blaine, president and founder of SNAP, Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests.

Roger Cohen, an op-ed columnist for the New York Times, wrote the following on February 22.

The Narcissus Society

... Crunch time has come on a question central to the nation's future, where an acknowledgment is needed that, when it comes to health, we're all in this together. Pooling the risk among everybody is the most efficient way to forge a healthier society. That's what other developed societies do. And they don't have 30 million plus uninsured.

Now, as I understand it, the Tea Party movement is angry about waste, bail-outs for the rich and spiraling debt. They detest big government. But if waste and debt are really what's bothering them, how about the waste in the more than 1,800 daily health-care related personal bankruptcies, the 25 to 30 percent of some corporate insurers' costs going on administration (versus 6 percent for Medicare), the sky-rocketing health premiums that are undermining U.S. corporations (and so taking jobs), the endless paperwork of private reimbursement procedures, and the needless deaths?

Americans don't want a European nanny state — fine! But, as a lawyer friend, Manuel Wally, put it to me, "When it comes to health it makes sense to involve government, which is accountable to the people, rather than corporations, which are accountable to shareholders."

All the fear-mongering talk of "nationalizing" 17 percent of the economy is nonsense. Government, through Medicare and Medicaid, is already administering almost half of American health care and doing so with less waste than the private sector. Per capita Medicare costs for common benefits grew 4.9 percent between 1998 and 2008, against 7.1 percent for private insurers. Why not offer Medicare as a choice — a choice — to everyone? Aren't Republicans about choice?

The public option, not dead, would amount to recognition of shared interest in each other's health and of the need to use America's energies and resources better. It would involve 300 million people linking arms.

Or we can turn away from each other and, like Narcissus, perish in the contemplation of our own reflections.

Daniel O'Rourke is a married Catholic priest, whose column appears in the *Observer*, Dunkirk, NY

Sexual Schizophrenia

When it comes to human sexuality, the United States has a split personality. It is schizophrenic. On the one hand, we have a deeply engrained, rigid Puritan/Victorian ethic, virtually unbending in its sexual standards. On the other, the freedom of speech amendment to the Constitution has allowed explicit sexual material in the media, in print and especially on the Internet. The result is a national schizophrenia.

Sometimes this sexual material is more pornographic than erotic. Isabel Allende in a memorable metaphor told us, "Erotica is using a feather; pornography is using the whole chicken." Our Internet is using a whole chicken -- and the entire world is watching.

How does the rest of the world react to this pathological split personality? Much of the Muslim world, which is even more repressed than the most Victorian among us, thinks Americans are debauched, degenerate hedonists. Remember, with burkas covering them literally from head to toe, some Muslim women don't even show their faces or ankles except to their husbands at home. That, of course, is another kind of societal sexual sickness.

On the other hand, much of old Europe and Latin America see our view of human sexuality as repressed and unrealistic. They are not entirely wrong. To a great degree Protestant Americans have inherited their Puritanism from a Victorian England and Catholics from a Jansenistic Ireland. Many American Christians especially the young have rejected such rigidity -- and the Jews have always been much more tolerant. But no matter, that inheritance has helped shape our ambivalent culture.

I'm not advocating the open tolerance of mistresses characteristic of Latin societies. I believe strongly in monogamy and marital fidelity. I remember being shocked when at the 1974 funeral of French Prime Minister Georges Pompidou, I saw a photograph of his wife and family to the right of his coffin and his publicly accepted mistress to the left.

Jesus, of course, had strong views on monogamy and fidelity. "Therefore they are no more two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder" (Mt. 19:6). Scripture scholars have rightly argued at length over the adultery "exception clause" relating to divorce and remarriage in this passage, but the monogamous ideal in both Matthew 19 and Genesis 2:24 is clear.

On dealing with the woman caught in adultery, however, Jesus was most lenient (John 8:3-11). He certainly did not consider sexual fidelity the law's first and greatest commandment, as the Victorians and some American seem to have done (Mt. 22:37-40). Jesus was much more concerned about love and forgiveness than about sex.

On this Jesus was not alone. Read the book of Osee or Hosea in the Hebrew Scriptures where the prophet Hosea took back his whoring wife and forgave her. The story is symbolic but more than just symbol. It's telling us that's the way God treats us -- and the way we should treat each other. Like most of the country, I remember feeling sadness and outrage for Silda Spitzer, as she stood shell-shocked by her husband Elliott when his involvement in high-priced prostitution forced him to resign as New York's Governor. Most thought she never should have stood there beside him, but

evidently she has forgiven him. Their family is still intact and she has not written a book about their marital troubles.

There have been lots of marital scandals in the news recently. John Edward's baby, South Carolina Governor Mark Sanford's Argentina soul mate, Nevada Senator John Ensign's affair with his best friend's wife, Tiger Woods' sexual addiction.

None of this, however, is new. It's even older than Warren Harding's mistress and Babe Ruth's womanizing. Today's media regularly reports such scandals. That was not true in President Harding or Babe Ruth's day. Neither was it true in Franklin Roosevelt or John Kennedy's time. The press knew of their sexual shenanigans, but never wrote about the personal lives of politicians. Is our present nothing-is-personal, voters-have-the-right-to-know approach better for our democracy? I'm not so sure. Or is it the media pandering to our prurient curiosity for ratings and advertisers?

What is it about politicians, sport heroes and celebrities? Do they think they are above the rules that lesser folks, like you and me, struggle to live by? Their celebrity status seems to give them a sense of entitlement to financial and sexual perks. They consider themselves above the law and think they can get away with it. And they do -- for a time until today's tell-all media punctures their delusion.

But back to our schizophrenic split personality. In much of the non-English speaking world politicians' consensual adult sexual conduct is not huge news and does not endanger their political careers. Are they right or are we? I really don't know.

I only know that a conflicted American society has a full-blown case of sexual schizophrenia.

John Kavanaugh, S.J., proposes an *Antidote for Anomie* in America magazine.

In early February, I received a packet of letters from eighth-grade students at Saint Joseph School in New York City. The students suggested ways to be both challenging and respectful while discussing politics, and many sounded more mature and honest than some adult Democrats and Republicans or MSNBC and Fox News commentators. I hope that as they grow up, they will not become contaminated by the degraded discourse of our politics and media.

Our political discourse suffers anomie, or normlessness. There is little respect for any position other than self-interest. Instead of thoughtful critique we hear knee-jerk expletives. If you watch the three major networks and PBS, you may not see much of this, although I think it is true that they are slanted to the left. But if you tune in to the cable channels, you will find grist

for every mill—pundits who deride Sarah Palin as stupid and pundits who -
“wonder” if President Obama is a citizen. Watching some of these
programs could make a person feel he or she is in a near occasion of sin.
Whether you are a liberal or conservative, the sin might be wrath. Worse still,
it could be despair.

What is any of us willing to sacrifice for the common good?

As for myself, I will take my young correspondents’ advice—to respect
President Obama but also challenge him. The president was thrust, even
before his swearing in, into a daunting state of affairs, a country that was
militarily and economically compromised. This does not mean he can blame
everything on former President George Bush. President Obama should give
Bush credit for the good decisions he had made, acknowledge what
programs the new administration maintains and announce what policies it
will change.

Most important, he should be ruthlessly honest with us. This is the only way
to lance the boil of self-interest inflaming the body politic. But it will be a
difficult task, because members of his audience do not want to hear any bad
news, at least none that touches them.

Instead of naming and confronting this delusion, it seemed the president,
until now, wanted only to please everyone. As it turns out, no one seems
pleased. Just look at the health care reform mess. Pro-choice groups claim
that a conscience clause for doctors and hospitals is violence against
women. Trial lawyer lobbyists do not want restraints on lawsuits. Insurance
companies object to interstate competition. Patients oppose limits on the
procedures or coverage they seek. The right wants less government and
less taxation. The left wants more programs and services. The reason most
people are resistant to true health care reform is that they are afraid of losing
something.

The president displays many virtues—especially in matters requiring
prudence, justice and temperance. What he must call upon now is his
fortitude. He should admit that all of us are going to lose something. And he
should ask this: What, specifically, is any of us willing to accept for the
common good? More taxation? Fewer entitlements? Both are required of us.
But if the answer is a resounding no from the right and left wings of our
country, we can be assured that things will only get worse. With trillion-dollar
wars and trillion-dollar deficits, the economy will reel. Without health
insurance reform, it may come apart.

In health care, no matter what the upshot of the recent White House summit,
we need a single-payer system insuring basic care for all. And we need
competition among the insurance plans, even across state lines, for those
purchasing a Cadillac, boutique or special options plan. We need the tort
reform and limits to lawsuits against beleaguered doctors that will displease
many lawyers. But we also need the freedom to buy approved medications

from other countries, which will displease big Pharma. And we patients must finally realize that in matters of health, we do not have a right to everything possible.

As Americans, we must be willing to sacrifice a bit of our vested interest, if our economy and health-care system are to be preserved. In late January, the president told Diane Sawyer on ABC's "World News," "I'd rather be a really good one-term president than a mediocre two-term president." He now has the opportunity to prove it. Maybe his fellow Americans will be inspired by his own willingness to sacrifice a second term in order to tell us not what we want to hear, but the truth we need to hear.

Bishop Gumbleton reviews James Carroll's book, *Practicing Catholic*. The review was originally published in the *NCR* and was forwarded from the *Roman Catholic Womenpriests Web site*.

"Reform is coming not from the collapsing clerical establishment but from the people. We maintain our loyalty to the church because we cannot live without it. The church gives a language to speak of God, a meaning that is God. The church feeds us in the Eucharist, keeps the story of Jesus alive in the preaching of the Word, marks our journey through life with the sacraments, and underwrites our participation in the community that transcends space and time."

As "practicing Catholics" all of us can rejoice in the great vision of Pope John XXIII with which Carroll concludes his story:

"Today ... Providence is guiding us toward a new order of human relations, which thanks to efforts far surpassing human hopes, will bring us to the realization of higher and undreamed of experiences."

Zenit.org is the source for this article. They have recently expressed a need for support to continue their ministry of providing the news from Rome.

Is Priestly Celibacy Psychologically Dangerous? Interview With Psychiatrist and Professor

By Carmen Elena Villa

Priestly celibacy is not psychologically dangerous, and in fact, sexual behavior based on "anything goes" is what is truly destructive to the personality.

This is the affirmation made by Dr. Aquilino Polaino Lorente, a physician and psychiatrist who teaches courses on psychopathology at the University of St. Paul in Madrid.

The psychiatrist -- best known for his work in children's and family psychology -- was a speaker at the two-day conference held last week at Rome's Pontifical University of the Holy Cross.

The conference, "Priestly Celibacy: Theology and Life," was sponsored by the Congregation for the Clergy as an event for the Year for Priests.

ZENIT spoke with Polaino about his view that a correct understanding of sexuality leads to a correct understanding of celibacy for the Kingdom of God.

ZENIT: Is priestly celibacy psychologically dangerous?

Polaino: It's not dangerous at all because perhaps it blends very well with what is the realistic anthropological structure of the human condition. Celibacy has its difficulties of course given that human nature is somewhat deteriorated and fallen and all the dimensions must be integrated.

It seems to me that open sexual behavior is more dangerous, not normative in that anything goes; I believe that has consequences that are more destructive of the personality than celibacy well lived in its fullness, without ruptures or breaks.

ZENIT: What does a priest need in order to be faithful to his vow of celibacy all the days of his life?

Polaino: The tradition of the Church has a multitude of counsels that can be put into practice and that are effective, for example, protecting one's heart and sight. What is not seen is not felt. Not that one must be looking at the ground; one can see without looking. This ensures the cleanliness of the heart and also the living of the first commandment, which is to love God above all things. Flies do not enter a pressure cooker. A satisfied heart does not entertain stinginess or fragmentation.

ZENIT: Do you think that the hedonist culture of this new century, so widespread in the media, influences the fact that some priests are not faithful to their vow of celibacy?

Polaino: It's possible, because priests also have the frailty of the human condition. I think we must focus more on the huge number of priests faithful to their vocation. The exceptional also happens in priestly life but it is exceptional. Although periodically it might be very appropriate to address the exception, we cannot be blind to the immense majority of priests who are loyal, who live their vocation to the fullest, who are happy, to whom the world owes happiness. This must be emphasized.

ZENIT: Can a correct view of sexuality give a correct view of the celibate life?

Polaino: Yes. I believe sexuality today is a very confused function, it is a faculty about which there are more errors than points of agreement with what human nature is. And perhaps it is a program to teach and impart in all ages because as it is one of the fundamental pivots of human life, if it is not well looked after, if people are not well formed, what they will experience is the reigning confusion. This affects seminarians as well as young people and engaged couples about to be married. Today that education is an education for life. It is a subject that at times is badly taught because errors are taught and that means to confuse even more, instead of

explaining the subject with a scientific rigor that is founded on human nature.

ZENIT: What does it mean that a priest is called to be a spiritual father?

Polaino: I believe that is one of the topics that has been least reflected upon. Spiritual paternity must also be lived by biological parents and many of them have never heard anything about this. Spiritual paternity is, in a certain way, to live all the works of mercy, to console the sad, to ransom the captive, to be hospitable, to affirm the other in his worth, to avoid creating problems for him and to encourage and motivate him so that he will grow personally, to stimulate the appearance of values that he already has because they came to him with his nature but perhaps he has been unable to identify them or make them grow. I think this world is an orphan of that spiritual paternity and maternity, and I think it is a dimension that the priest already lives without realizing it.

ZENIT: Can the celibate life make this spiritual paternity more fruitful?

Polaino: Necessarily yes because there is more time and more availability. If the final objective is union with God, spiritual paternity takes on greater meaning because it is the best image of the divine paternity in the contemporary world; hence [the celibate person] is like a mediator and to the degree that he lives the divine filiation, he will also live spiritual paternity very well.

[Translation by ZENIT]

Please forward articles and comments to tony@tonyercolano.com