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“Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away.”

Such were the words of Abraham Lincoln, offered in his second inaugural address on March 4, 1865. Almost five weeks later, on April 9th the war would be ended. It was Palm Sunday. Five days beyond, at Ford’s Theater, on Good Friday, Lincoln would die. A period of great turmoil, a scourge if you will, was soon to pass, but ever so slowly, away.

Such, I am afraid, will be the experience of the Church in the scourge of the current sexual scandals, passing ever so slowly...away. In the meantime, informed Catholics are left to a new renaissance of the Greek Tragedies explaining the plight of a people left to a world of fragile peace and broken promises begging for heroes and heroines to protect them and their children. Not a bad start in addressing the need for a basic criterion for heroic figures to fill the ranks of the ecclesial leadership among laity, religious, and clergy.

Those with the benefit of military experience understand the difference between strategy and logistics. The same principles of action in war can be applied to floods, hurricanes, and rampant viruses. Both recognize a common threat and address a solution to the recognized threat. Strategies, practiced by amateurs, identify objectives in the response while logistical responses, practiced by professionals, set the pattern for the solution. The recent Church scandals fill the media with strategies for a solution. They are as varied as those who offer opinions ranging from...
those who promote silence with no response to those who promote the "one strike and you're out," solution. Neither guarantees justice either to the one or the many.

Logistics is where the Church needs to focus her immediate attention. To do that one must identify the players on the field of action and there are many. They include the perpetrators of immoral actions, victims, untold witnesses by association to the victims, members of the hierarchy, attorneys, seminary administrators and faculties, vocation directors, and finally those who screen the candidates for the seminary. In a perfect world they would all work in harmony to remove the Church from the current scourge. Such is not the case.

For the sake of time, and release from untold distraction, this talk will primarily address only one feature in the logistical response to the current scandals. That is the professionals who deal with the screening of candidates for the seminary. (But, for the benefit of clarity, brief reference to other members of the review team listed above will be called upon.)

Please, let it be recognized from the beginning of this conversation that the psychological screeners are not, and never have been, nor ever should be, the absolute standards for final judgment on candidates for priesthood. They offer the tools of assistance for those who assess the candidates from the seats of authority in the Church. Please know that before we can discuss the tools of the trade of the screeners we must consider the impact of the current culture upon them. That said we can understand via the human condition that there are no purely objective psychological screeners. After all, psychologists and psychiatrists are like the priests of the Church in that they often seem to be barometers of the culture in which they live.

Every culture, and its counterpart subculture, has three parts. They are: people, philosophies and agendas. Before examining the tools of the trade for health care professionals we must consider the philosophies of the day and the impact they have on understanding the meaning of health at the current time.

I suggest that the perils for the Church arose in the subculture of our society with its philosophies of feminism, homosexuality, and sexual libertarianism and their impact on the judgment of those charged with the care of the "sheep." The first two are historical and well-known while the third is subtle and unnoticed. The third encompasses the most of us who, as products of the post American Depression, were nourished on the thought that, "my kid will always get whatever he wants because I never got it." In the third philosophy of life we hate to hear the word "no," for those little personal sexual perversions we assume are due to us as if by divine right. The screeners must identify the positive standards of a
candidate for the seminary and then adjust to those standards who can be considered capable of the priestly life.

In the fourth century B.C. the Greek philosopher Plato addressed the doctrine of virtue in his famed “Symposium.” In this writing he addresses the fifth century B.C. interaction between Agathon, a Greek playwright, and his famed counterpart Socrates, the great philosopher, on the issue of love and the criterion of what makes a good man. The ancient world of the theatre and the world of philosophy recognized the criterion that supports us in the post modern world as Prudence, Justice, Temperance, and Fortitude. It was the age of the objective standards.

In a recent article from the Catholic magazine *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, Fr. Michael F. Hull offers a tremendous insight on the Church’s interaction with both the hard and soft sciences in the formation of priests. From Vatican II’s statement *Gaudium et Spes* (Church in Modern World) he states, “Advances in biology, psychology, and the social sciences not only lead man to greater self-awareness, but provide him with the technical means of molding the lives of whole peoples as well.” (GS,5) It was a statement that seemed both novel and appealing to a generation that stood witness to the new frontier of space. And yet the dialogue on the role of science and religion had been dated back to the times when Galileo was a boy. For our conversation we will consider the Age of Reason, nearly two centuries before Vatican II.

The runaway enthusiasm for the Age of Reason, if not canonization for the natural and social sciences, in the 19th century, when Freud was a boy, was flagged by Pope Pius IX in his syllabus of errors, *Maxima Quiden* (June 9, 1862) The Holy Father condemned the widely-held belief that “Human reason, without any reference whatsoever to God, is the sole arbiter of truth and falsehood, and of good and evil; it is law to itself, and suffices, by its natural force, to secure the welfare of men and of nations.” (#3)

The sage wisdom of Pope Pius X in *Lametabile Sane* (July 7, 1910), his Syllabus of Errors, condemns the statement, “Since the deposit of Faith contains only revealed truths, the Church has no right to pass judgment on the assertions of the human sciences.”

Pius XII, in the mid twentieth century, according to Fr. Hull “was most prescient in reminding us to be on guard against too quick an adoption of ideas, ideas that may arise from both the physical and social sciences, without fully examining the repercussions and their consonance with the faith.”

In Vatican II the Council Fathers would also raise a flag of concern on the Church’s interaction with the sciences, “Consequently, methodical research in all branches of knowledge, provided it is carried out in a truly scientific manner and does not override moral laws, can never conflict
with faith, because the things of the world and the things of faith derive from the same God.” Gaudium et Spes (#36)

All concerns aside, the doors for psychological assessments for candidates for priesthood opened with initiatives of Vatican II. It would be up to the local Bishops’ Conferences to implement the guidelines recommended by the Vatican Congregation for Education in 1970.

The number of Church statements on the screening of candidates for priesthood have been many. Within each may be found two basic assumptions. First, they see for the benefit of the Church, and the candidate himself, the various psychological screening programs would be objective and hopefully fair and accurate. Second, that those involved in the psychological screening programs would be both aware of and faithful to all of the tenets of the Catholic Church. Unfortunately, the passage of time, in these assumptions, has become a cruel teacher for the Church.

In the Vatican Council Decree, Optatam Totius (Decree on Priestly Formation) (10/28/65) reference is made to the candidates but not the psychological evaluators. Their time had not yet come. The recognition of the integrity of the evaluator would be added later in the American “Program for Priestly Formation.”

“Notwithstanding the regrettable shortage of priests, due strictness should always be brought to bear on the choice and testing of students. God will not allow his Church to lack ministers if the worthy are promoted and those who are not suited to the ministry are guided...to adopt another calling.” (OT. III. 6)

In 1970 the Vatican called for the Bishops’ Conferences across the world to implement the principles espoused in Optatam Totius. The American version was later called the “Program of Priestly Formation” (PPF). It was approved by the USCC/NCCB (United States Catholic Conference/ National Conference of Catholic Bishops) and the Holy See in 1971. It would later be modified in 1976, 1981, and 1993.

In June of 1981 Pope John Paul II mandated an apostolic visitation to all seminaries in the United States. Bishop John Marshall, Ordinary of the Diocese of Burlington, led the visitations. The project involved almost 70 bishops and other Church educators and lasted nearly three years. (At the present time Archbishop Edward O’Brien, Ordinary for the United States Military Ordinariate is leading a similar visitation program for the American seminaries. The final observations from the Congregation for Education may not be available for several years.)

In 1986, following the American visitations, the Vatican Congregation for Education offered its observation on freestanding diocesan seminary theologates. Two years later a complimentary document would
be offered for college seminaries. And finally in 1985, with revision of the Code of Canon Law in 1983, the principles for seminary formation programs were modified.

Pope John Paul II would also initiate his famed Apostolic Exhortation, *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, (I will give you Shepherds after my own heart [Jer. 3:15]) on the Feast of the Annunciation, March 25, 1992. It followed the 1990 International Synod of Bishops and their statement: "Priestly Formation in the Circumstances Today." Though the document offered a realistic view of the demands and temptations of an atheistic postmodern world upon the young it offered only a passing acknowledgement to the need for formation personnel to be competent in psychology.

"The bishops first of all should feel their grave responsibility for the formation of those who have been given the task of educating the future priests. For this ministry, priests of exemplary life should be chosen, men with a number of qualities: human and spiritual maturity, pastoral experience, professional competence, stability in their own vocation, a capacity to work with others, serious preparation in those human sciences (psychology especially) which relate to their office, a knowledge of how to work in groups." (PDV.204)

The concern for those involved in the psychological screening had been addressed by the USCC/NCCB Committee of Vocations and Priestly Formation in the “Handbook for Vocation and Seminary Personnel” (1987) and would again be addressed in the “Program of Priestly Formation,” Fourth Edition, 1993 (PPF). In the composition of both documents great energies were expended to seek out the wisdom of those involved in the social sciences and seminary formation programs and as such both sources offer a similar expectation.

"Seminaries should draw up guidelines (via their faculties) for psychologists and other admission personnel describing objectively those traits and attitudes which give hope of a true vocation as well as those characteristics which indicate that a priestly vocation is not present. Seminaries should ensure that those employed in the psychological evaluation of seminarians are well versed in and supportive of the Church’s expectations of candidates for priesthood, especially in regard to celibacy." (PPF V. 518)

The “Handbook” offered a suggestion for the need of the assistance of a psychological professional as consultant to the seminary formation programs. The unseen danger yet to play out in the seminary formation programs was the confusion by faculty and administrators, in conjunction
with the psychologists, on the proper boundaries for the internal and external forums. With this in mind Bishop Keating informed the rectors of those seminaries utilized by the Arlington Diocese that the psychological reports for candidates were not to be released to the member of the seminary faculties.

"It is recommended that safeguards be introduced to guarantee the proper use and to prevent the misuse of information derived from this source. There is normally much to be gained by contracting a competent psychiatrist or psychologist to meet regularly with the faculty and discuss questions and problems that they face in this and other areas of seminary life." (Handbook VIII-22)

Again, the "Handbook" offers some rather poignant responses to questions raised on the homosexual candidates.

"The Bishops Committee on Priestly Formation has received correspondence requesting a policy or guidelines regarding homosexuality and candidates for admission to the seminary.

"Preliminarily, the Committee believes that, in light of dynamics of the human personality, and in light of the redemptive mystery, no document can take the place of the human in the decision-making process.

"The word 'orientation' is used commonly when referring to sexuality. However, due to its very ambiguous usage in modern society, the word has been used here only in the footnotes. Further, since the Committee believes that any adequate screening procedure will include psychological testing (PPF<n. 94), the same footnote utilized vocabulary from the American Psychiatric Association.

"The following reply is based upon the best information available at this time on this complicated subject.

"The Reply:

"Sexually active heterosexuals, or those who have a public patterned lifestyle reflecting heterosexual behavior, cannot be considered candidates for priestly formation.

"Sexually active homosexuals, or those who have a public patterned lifestyle reflecting homosexual behavior, cannot be considered candidates for priestly formation.

August, 2007
"The acceptability of a person who has a homosexual proclivity, appetite or behavioral impulse, which may also be understood as temptation, and which does not involve commitment to or support of homosexual practices or life styles, depends upon the particular prudent judgment of the appropriate authorities. These authorities should consider the applicant's desire, ability and commitment to live a permanent celibate life (demonstrated by a convincing and adequate time span of celibate living), acceptance by the Catholic community, notoriety, personal development factors, the need for adequate fraternal support, and the effects of preparing for priesthood in a mainly male environment. Adequate time, reflection, testing and caution should be given in considering the admission of such candidates." (Handbook III-11, 12)

The Handbook then goes to differentiate between two types of homosexual orientation: Ego dystonic homosexuality, and Ego syntonic homosexuality.

"Ego Dystonic Homosexuality: these are homosexuals who have a sustained pattern of overt homosexual arousal that the individual explicitly states has been unwanted and a persistent source of distress.

"Ego dystonic homosexuality is a classification which is reserved for individuals for whom changing sexual orientation is a persistent concern; and for whom homosexual orientation is a constant form of anxiety or distress. Similarly, distress resulting simply from a conflict between a homosexual and society, or the laws of the Church, should not be classified here. In this classification, the distress that a person experiences is more than a simple conflict with external law or society, but a conviction for change which has been internalized and integrated.

"Ego syntonic homosexuality: these are homosexuals who have a sustained pattern of overt homosexual arousal which the individual accepts and desires as a source of sexual gratification and expression.

"These are individuals who explicitly accept homosexual activity, and who express satisfaction with homosexual arousal. This arousal is not accompanied by either guilt or anxiety. (cf. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, (DSM III), American Psychiatric Association, 1980),

"The crucial issue for our consideration is the preferential arousal pattern. Indeed, some persons with such feeling may never indulge in overt homosexual behavior because of either intense social fears or moral
prohibitions, or because of patterns of control developed though internal conviction and the development of moral consciousness.

"The words, inclination, appetite, behavior impulse and temptation, as well as orientation, in this sense apply to individuals who have an erotic attraction for someone of the same sex in the same way that a heterosexual person would be erotically attracted to someone of the opposite sex." (Handbook III-12)

Immediately following the section on homosexual candidates the handbook offers the advice of several theologate rectors when dealing with homosexual candidates.

1) no candidate can be admitted to a seminary who is known to have been sexually active within three to five years prior to applying for admission;

2) it must be proven by tests that the applicant has the capacity for impulse control; (Please note well at this time there are no firm tests on impulse control. That information must be obtained via the “history” taken by the screener.)

3) a person who is unusually effeminate should not be accepted. (Again, please be aware there are some who are “Milquetoasts” or “Wimpy” but are not homosexuals. Also for consideration, heterosexual milquetoasts are not common.)

4) any person who has participated in a “gay” culture, especially in a militant fashion, should not be considered for admission to a seminary.

(Handbook III-13)

One of the great wonders of the Church in the United States is that until now there have been no formal protocols listed for those candidates seeking entrance to the seminary for either a diocese or a religious community. Dioceses have selected their own forms of evaluation, some very long and detailed while others very simple. Unfortunately, in some cases the standards of evaluation may be compromised due to financial costs required to evaluate a candidate. In other words, if the diocese skimps to save the office budget now it may have to pay much more at a later time, due to litigations, because the screening was deficient. Such a situation is being rectified by the National Council of Diocesan Vocation Directors. It is expected that the council will present their recommended protocols to the Bishops Committee for Priestly Formation. The BCPF August, 2007 237
will then review and present the protocols to the American Bishops at the following national meeting in either June or November.

Listed below are those steps for a psychological examination required for a candidate entering Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, in Emmitsburg, Maryland. The "Mount", as it is called, trains around 150 seminarians from over twenty-five American dioceses. It is a traditional "standing" formation program considered one of the best formation programs in the country. The term "standing" indicates all its classes are maintained in the seminary compound unlike other programs that send the students out to the local university. References to Axis disorders may be found in the Diagnostic Statistical Manual utilized by those in the field of psychology.

**Psychological Examination**

The following tests, or their equivalent, must be included in the psychological examination:

1. **CLINICAL INTERVIEW**: face-to-face interview that includes a complete psychological history.
2. **WECHSLER ABBREVIATED SCALE OF INTELLIGENCE (WASI)**: assesses verbal and performance-based intellectual functioning. (measure neuro-psychological testing via Block Designs)
3. **MINNESOTA MULTIPHASTIC PERSONALITY INTERVIEW-2, REVISED PERSONNEL EDITION**: complete review of Axis I disorders (major personality disorders), along with alcohol/drug and additional potential scale. (If necessary, further testing could be involved.)
4. **COOLIDGE ASSESSMENT BATTERY**: overview of Axis II disorders (e.g., Mental retardation issues) plus executive functioning scales. (this test is a new field and reviews the neuro-psychological formation)
5. **FIRO AWARENESS SCALES/MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR**: combination for purpose of determining fitness for ministry: the first checks for interactional styles (e.g., reflective vs. active), the second for personality style and temperaments. (Looked for types of personality deemed appropriate and inappropriate)
6. **BROWN ATTENTION DEFICIT DISORDER SCALES**
7. SEXUAL ADDICTION SCREENING TEST (S.A.S.T.)
   (If necessary further testing could be involved.)
8. INTERNET SEX SCREENING TEST
9. RORSCHACH TEST combined with PERSONAL SENTENCE COMPLETION INVENTORY: these tests will overlap to monitor for potential deviant sexual interests. (This is considered a “projective test” demonstrating what is “underneath.” It can be useful in the right hands but its weakness is that it cannot differentiate a sociopath from the norm as the sociopath can “lie” through it.)
10. FEEDBACK: overview of results to the client in person.
11. REPORT: complete results, along with appropriate recommendations, sent to you and your formation personnel.

The true diagnostian in the psychological tests is able to look for the “soft signs,” beyond the lab results. He must enjoy a higher level of awareness involving the virtue of prudence when assessing the candidate. In prudence the assessor must have docility, a memory that is faithful, and the ability to make a judgment for action.

Though the psychological examination requirements listed above may be some of the best in the United States there are some added considerations to be identified. First, as alluded to earlier, the screener must be a Catholic in good standing with the Church and agree to all the tenets of the Church, most notably in the understanding of morals. This includes priests/religious and Catholic institutions/clinics that test for either the diocesan or seminary programs. Second, an objective review should be taken of those recent psychological therapy programs claiming, with a high certainty, the ability to identify homosexual applicants. Third, and most important, the interest of ascetics, supplanted by the newfound staple of psychology needs to be revisited in the screening to see if the candidate can live the ascetical life. Adolph Tanquerey defines asceticism as “the efforts of the Christian souls to struggle to acquire perfection.” (The Spiritual Life, TAN Books)

In recent decades those in hierarchical positions have complained to seminary rectors about pastorally deficient, if not dysfunctional ordinandi, showing up in the parish assignments. Something had to be done for the sake of sanity of the laity. In the first case an extra pre-theology year was viewed as the solution. When that was judged inadequate a “spirituality year” much like a novitiate for religious, was incorporated. Most failed without understanding why or because they were too costly. Realistically,
they were “too little too late” in the ascetical formation of their future priests. Such a formation, according to Pope Paul VI in a conference for the Vocation Directors of the World, was found in homes that demonstrated examples of: prayer, hard work, generosity, and sacrifice. A formation program that would far precede the psychological screeners.

I recall Bishop Keating asking me if the Arlington Diocese should add an extra year in the pre-theology program for the candidates. I reminded him that we had more problems with priests who were in the seminary programs longer (6-8 years) rather than those shorter (4-5 years.). With that he decided against adding an extra year to the program. It was a novel idea, addressing the intellectual side of the candidates, but offered little for the overall development of the future priests.

In reference to the issue of ascetics in seminary formation programs, including vocational discernment programs, please refer to the recent edition of the Linacre Quarterly (Feb. 2006). The entire issue is dedicated to an article by Dr. Richard Cross, Ph.D., entitled: “The Collapse of Ascetical Discipline and Clerical Misconduct: Sex and Prayer.” Dr. Cross, a psychologist from Leominster, Massachusetts, offers one of the most insightful tracts on the current sexual scandals. Whereas most documents on the subject may dare to define the problem engendered in the scandals he reaches beyond current limits of definition and addresses what he sees as the cause of the scandals.

Cross identifies the first cause of the sexual scandal as a:

“spiritual malaise that was building throughout the twentieth century created psychologically untenable conditions for many priests and bishops. This malaise was the prime mover in the failure of sexual discipline. Its most visible signs were a defiance of authority and the collapse in ascetical discipline – a collapse that formed the uniquely sexual features of the scandal. Ascetical discipline was practiced better in the early part of the twentieth century when sexual misconduct by priests was relatively rare. The things that changed between the first and second halves of the twentieth century were not the management policies on sex abuse and secrecy at all costs – these remained a constant throughout – rather, they were changes in spiritual focus, quietly signaled in the rise of allegiance to the therapeutic mentality.” (Cross, Linacre Feb. 2006)

Finally, to draw attention to the absence of asceticism in the modern formation programs Dr. Cross seems much like the child who says, “the King is naked.” “Fasting and abstinence – until recently, core features of ascetical discipline – are not mentioned in the apostolic exhortation, Patres Dabo Vobis (1992) or in the encyclical Sacerdotalis Caelibatus (1967); these are the most important statements on the formation of Roman
Catholic seminarians and priests since Vatican Council II. References to ascetical discipline in popular books on priestly formation and religious life are rare and mention of fasting is virtually non-existent (Ibid)

The apparent absence of any interest in ascetics by the professionals sets up a rather serious compromise on those screening the candidates. They are left to the attitudes against religion and religious devotion. Cross suggests the following attitudes can also be found in the clergy.

1. The psychology of the priest can be adequately explained from a naturalistic prospective, which ignores the central role of religious devotion in the psychological functioning of the priest.
2. The metaphor of the battle between the spirit and the flesh is an outmoded and distorted view of human nature.
3. Ascetical disciplines are un-natural and potentially pathological. Some contend that they are pathological because they repress sexual expression.
4. Sexual behavior and fantasy are necessary to human happiness (Ibid).

Dr. Cross suggests that ascetics are the key to reclaiming credibility to the active clergy in the Church and ultimately through them to the laity under their tutelage. Ascetics that recognize certain virtues that serve as cornerstones to civilization. Most notably the Four Cardinal Virtues (Prudence, Justice, Temperance, and Fortitude) found the writings of Plato and later adopted by the early Church Fathers and St. Thomas Aquinas.

At this point of time the concept of “ascetics”, like the terms “ego dystonic” and “ego syntonic” homosexuality, has been relegated to the seminary/chancery archives. The new conversational terms are: “SSA” (Same Sex Attractions), deemed transitory, and “Deep-Seated Homosexual Tendencies.” And with them are found new pioneers in reparative therapies for homosexuals. Most notably Dr. Joseph Nicolossi and his organization, NARTH (National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality) on the West Coast of the United States and Dr. Richard Fitzgibbons, on the East Coast. Fitzgibbons, co-author to the CMA (Catholic Medical Association) statement, “Homosexuality and Hope,” adds a novel feature to his therapy addressing the “forgiveness factor” of the homosexual and the need for him to forgive the malefactor who brought him to such a condition.

The influence of the two doctors mentioned above does not exhaust the list of institutions and individual psychiatrists edging their way forward in the neo-therapies offering assistance to those suffering from
homosexuality. Other notable voices ring out. There is Dr. Robert L. Spitzer and his “Reorientation Therapy.” As a point of trivia, in 1973 Dr. Spitzer was one of those who had homosexuality removed from the psychiatric manual of mental disorders. Dr. Paul McHugh, as former head of the psychology department at Johns Hopkins Hospital has also encouraged a study probing for a greater understanding in examining and defining the causes for homosexuality. They stand at the entrance of a rather interesting frontier offering hope to those suffering from homosexuality.

In December of 2005 the Vatican Congregation on Education offered new directives on homosexual candidates for the seminary, “Concerning the Criteria of Vocational Discernment Regarding Persons With Homosexual Tendencies In View of Their Admission to Seminaries and Holy Orders.”

The new document comes at a time when the idea of “reparative” therapies are still quite novel. With them comes an enthusiasm that homosexuals can be assisted in reclaiming their heterosexual attractions and/or can attain a level of chastity of which they may be considered for candidacy for the seminary. More simply they see that homosexuality is transitory and can be resolved. My one caution is that the therapies are novel and have not endured the test of time. Without due regard of the ecclesial authorities the seminarian/priest may find himself in an untenable situation where he is assigned with a dysfunctional seminarian/cleric who himself suffers from any number of emotional or addictive disorders. And in that scenario he may suffer a relapse to his earlier state before the reparative therapies.

Nonetheless, research into this field must be encouraged by the Church. Following are some insights of Dr. Richard Fitzgibbons offered in a recent interview with Zenit News Service to help understand the recent Vatican Statement on homosexual candidates for the seminary. It is quoted both liberally and literally.

First, Dr. Fitzgibbons addresses those with the deep-seated sexual tendencies who identify themselves as homosexuals and are not interested in addressing the cause of the tendency. They suffer from a profound weakness in self-identity and are attracted to men’s bodies. Most of these men had painful adolescent experiences of significant loneliness and sadness, felt insecure in their masculinity, and had a poor body image.

“Unresolved paternal anger is regularly misdirected as rebellion against the Magisterium and the Church’s teaching on sexual morality.”

Second, Fitzgibbons recognizes individuals with “mild” homosexual tendencies who are not comfortable in their condition and are more apt to
seek therapy and spiritual direction. “The goal of counseling is to uncover early conflicts, forgive those who hurt them and increase their male confidence – which in time may lead to the resolution of same-sex attractions.” There is hope to be found for these men.

When asked if there were tests to identify homosexuality in a candidate he referred to two tests. First, the Boy Gender Conformity Scale from the University of Indiana. (Refer to Table 1 at end of paper) Second, the Clarke Sexual History Questionnaire. (Refer to Table 2 at end of paper) He indicates that these tests can “identify with 90% accuracy males with same-sex attractions.”

He also suggests the need for an extensive history of childhood and adolescent experiences with the father and male peers, and of the body.

When the evaluation reveals probable same-sex attractions, a recommendation is given to uncover and engage in the hard work of resolving his emotional pain with a competent mental health professional and spiritual director. After the candidate’s male confidence has grown significantly and he no longer has same-sex attractions, he could reapply.

What is a psychological screener to anticipate in today’s candidates for the seminary?”

“A 2005 national study demonstrated that 28.8% of Americans will have an anxiety disorder in their lifetime, 24.8% an impulse-control disorder and 20.8% a mood disorder.

“The most common origins of these emotional weaknesses in men arise from a lack of closeness and affirmation in the father relationship and with male peers. These emotional conflicts result in weaknesses in male confidence, sadness, loneliness, anger and often a poor body image. In addition, those from divorced family backgrounds have major trust weaknesses.”

The interviewer states: “The new Vatican instruction says that homosexual tendencies that are a manifestation of a transitory problem – for example, delayed adolescence— must be clearly overcome at least three years before diaconal ordination. What is your opinion of that?

“Fitzgibbons: I believe that this statement means that it is not sufficient for the seminarian to be chaste for three years. He must also first know himself; that is, understand his emotional conflicts which cause same-sex attractions and have worked to resolve those conflicts.
"Chastity for three years is not adequate because under stress in priestly ministry unresolved loneliness, isolation or insecurity from the adolescent life stage could lead to same-sex attractions – even attraction to adolescent males in an unconscious attempt to escape from one's pain."

There is little doubt the future solutions for the current crisis will be long in coming. Many will be cursed by the memories of past maladies and great financial losses to the Church may bring all involved to an understanding in poverty we may find purity in our identities with the Lord and His creation. Let us pray for one another.

Table 1:

Sexual orientation and boyhood gender conformity: Development of the Boyhood Gender Conformity Scale (BGCS)

Stewart L. Hockenberry and Robert E. Billingham

(1) Department of Applied Health Science, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405 USA

Abstract Two hundred twenty-eight respondents (110 heterosexuals and 118 homosexuals) completed a survey containing a 20-item Boyhood Gender Conformity Scale (BGCS). This scale was largely composed of edited and abridged gender items from Part A of Fruend et al.’s Feminine Gender Identity Scale (FGIS-A) and Whitam’s “childhood indicators.” The combined scale was developed in an attempt to attain a reliable, valid, and potent discriminating instrument for accurately classifying adult male respondents for sexual orientation on the basis of their reported boyhood gender conformity or nonconforming behavior and identity. In addition, 33% of these respondents were administered the original FGIS-A and Whitam inventory during a 2-week test-retest analysis conducted to determine the validity and reliability of the new instrument. All the original items significantly discriminated between heterosexual and homosexual respondents. From these a 13-item function and a 5-item function proved to be the most powerful discriminators between the two groups. Significant correlations between each of the three scales and a very high test-retest correlation coefficient supported the reliability and validity assumption for the BGCS. The conclusion was made that the five-
item function (playing with boys, preferring boys’ games, imagining self as sports figure, reading adventure and sports stories, considered a “sissy”) was the most potent and parsimonious discriminator among adult males for sexual orientation. It was similarly noted that the absence of masculine behaviors and traits appeared to be a more powerful predictor of later homosexual orientation than the traditionally feminine or cross-sexed traits and behaviors.

Table 2:

Clarke Sexual History Questionnaire

This is a short overview of what the SHQ-R has to offer.

For: Assessment of risk to others and likelihood of treatment success

Reading Level: For males 18 years and older

Length: Approx. 60-90 minutes, self-report

Format: Paper & pencil
Software (Smartlink)

Scoring: PAA Scoring Bureau Service
Computer Scored

User Level: C

Authors
Ron Langevein, PhD. & Dan Paitich, PhD.

Description
Twenty-three scales provide a comprehensive sexual history to help evaluate an offender’s risk to others and potential for rehabilitation. The
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SHQ-R questionnaire determines a respondent’s specific sexual experiences and also investigate history of:

- voyeurism
- sexual dysfunction
- exhibitionism, transvestism
- toucheruism
- fetishism

Frotteurism. It is a paraphilia involving rubbing against a nonconsensual person to achieve sexual arousal or even an orgasm, discreetly without being discovered, typically in a public place such as a crowded train.

Usually such a nonconsensual sexual rubbing is viewed as criminal offense; a form of sexual assault albeit often classified as a misdemeanor with minor legal penalties. Conviction may result in a sentence including compulsory psychiatric treatment.

A person who suffers from a frotteurism is known as a frotteur.

- fantasy
- sexual abuse
- exposure to pornography

**Table 3:**

In June of 2002 the American Bishops, meeting in Dallas, Texas, called for an evaluation of the sexual scandals involving the Catholic Clergy. They wanted a better understanding of the events that brought on the greatest ecclesial scandal since the Reformation. The John Jay School of Law provided its findings in January 2003. The report covered a fifty year period of time in the United States. In review of their findings we can see in the decades of the 60s and 70s there were 5,647 reported cases of sexual abuse. This reflects 61% of all reported cases in the fifty year review period of the report. (JJ Study 4.5.1) The John Jay Report lacks any identification of the age groups for perpetrators during the two decades but we may fairly assume some consistency with the stats over the fifty year period. On the larger scale twenty five percent of the perpetrators were
pastors while over forty three percent were listed as parochial vicars. (JJ Study 4.5.2) In most cases we could assume the parochial vicars would have been ordained under fifteen years. Diocesan administrations all across America knew there was a serious problem among the ranks of the clergy and a need for greater attention to the screening of the candidates for the priesthood. But what kind of discernment would be most useful and at what cost to the academic soul, social, spiritual dimensions of the formation programs for priests? The diocesan doors opened to the assumed security of psychology/psychiatry and closed to the age-old practice of asceticism in the training of candidates as models of virtue. And as good men. A new age was born unto the Catholic Church in America.

The Catholic laity would not know of the deep and dark perversions in the ranks of the clergy for another two decades. And yet it was always lurking in their midst. For one, the weaknesses of the clergy are often a barometer to the culture weaknesses (materialism, alcohol and drug abuse, sexual promiscuity) in which they serve. For another, the laity were witnesses to the deviations in the basic moral and catechetical teaching of their Faith and did not recognize where there is a Faith problem one must expect a moral problem and vice versa. The passage of time has been a cruel teacher for all of us in this regard.