

**DECLARATION OF A.W. RICHARD SIPE**

I Richard Sipe, declare:

1. My name is A. W. Richard Sipe (Aquinas Walter Richard). My complete and current CV is attached. I am involved in full-time research and consultation about celibacy and the sexual practices of Roman Catholic clergy. I have authored seven books on the subject and served as a consultant or expert witness in over 200 cases of sexual abuse of minors by Roman Catholic clergy in the United States and Canada, usually on behalf of plaintiffs.

2. I was trained as a psychotherapist/counselor specializing in the counseling of clergy and religious. I have been active in my field for over 40 years. I was a certified Psychiatrist Assistant in the State of Maryland from 1982 to March 1, 1999, when I retired.

3. I held an appointment as Instructor in Psychiatry (part-time), Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry, division of children and adolescents, Baltimore, Maryland, for 25 years until retirement in 1997.

4. In May 2005, I gave my most recent day of recollection on celibacy to priests in the Diocese of Rochester New York. In the past I have conducted three-day workshops on celibacy to groups of priests and nuns. From 1967 to 1996 I taught at three major Roman Catholic seminaries and a Catholic college. I held the position of Assistant Professor of Pastoral Counseling, St. John's University and Seminary, Collegeville, Minnesota (1967-1970). I continued to lecture periodically at this seminary, the most recent series being in 1996. I was Lecturer in Pastoral Counseling at the Jesuit seminary, Woodstock College, Woodstock, Maryland (1968-1970). I was Adjunct Associate Professor of Psychology, Loyola College, Baltimore, Maryland (1971-1975) and Adjunct Professor of Pastoral Counseling, St. Mary's Seminary and University, Baltimore, Maryland (1972-1984). The latter institution is a Pontifical Seminary.

5. I attended Roman Catholic parish grade school, Catholic high school, college and seminary. I entered a Benedictine Monastery in 1952 and was ordained a priest in 1959. I taught for five years in a Catholic high school until 1964. I remained a monk and priest until 1970, when I requested and received permission from the Vatican to be dispensed from my vows as a monk and a priest.

6. I was married in a Roman Catholic ceremony in 1970 and remain a church member in good standing.

7. As a teacher/therapist/counselor I have had a consultative relationship with more than

1 1,000 Catholic clerics, and more than 500 persons with whom Catholic clerics have been  
2 sexually involved. I have reviewed over 1,200 case histories of Roman Catholic priests  
3 including some who have sexually abused minors.

4 8. I have consulted with or reviewed the histories of over 2,500 persons who were sexually  
5 abused as minors, many of them by Catholic priests or religious.

6 9. From 1965 to 1970 I trained and served on staff at Seton Psychiatric Institute (formerly Mount  
7 Hope founded 1840 closed 1973); at the time it served as the premier psychiatric hospital for the  
8 treatment of Catholic priests from around the United States and the world along with its lay  
9 patients. Beginning with my association with Seton Institute I worked closely with experienced  
10 psychiatrists and psychoanalysts, including my mentor, Dr. Leo Bartemeier, (Cf. *Collected*  
11 *Papers, 1970*)<sup>1</sup> who had consulted with Catholic bishops and religious superiors for decades. I  
12 became acquainted with numerous case histories involving sexual activity between Catholic  
13 priests and minors extending back to 1917. Dr. Thomas Verner Moore who was a priest and a  
14 psychiatrist treated priests and Catholic religious in this hospital from 1923 onward. His work at  
15 Seton and at the Catholic University of America in Washington, DC was well known to bishops  
16 throughout the US also because of his writing about the mental health problems of priests in  
17 popular ecclesiastical journals even in 1936. The Archbishop of New York, Francis Spellman, in  
18 1946 initiated proceedings to establish a mental health hospital in his archdiocese to care for  
19 problem priests. At the same time there were blue prints for a similar hospital on the grounds of  
20 the Catholic University. Although neither of these projects came to materialize it demonstrates  
21 that Catholic bishops had an understanding and expectation that some priests had sexual contact  
22 with minors even in the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s.

23 10. I served on the board of directors of St. Luke Institute from 1986-1988; it was founded in  
24 1981 to deal specifically with the mental health concerns of priests, initially alcoholism. In 1986  
25 Fr. Michael Peterson, M.D. the founding psychiatrist instated a special protocol to treat sexual  
26 problems of priests, including assaults on minors. Evaluations of priests usually took from one to  
27 two weeks and were conducted in facilities close to main hospital building (formerly St.  
28 Bernadine's convent). Inpatient treatment, if recommended, could last from six months to a year.

---

<sup>1</sup> *A Physician In the General Practice of Psychiatry and Hope A Psychiatrist's Commitment.* 1970,  
A.W.R.Sipe editor, Brunner/Mazel. New York

1 There was usually a waiting list for both the evaluation process and inpatient treatment. The  
2 hospital complex is now located in Hyattsville, MD and has a 72-bed capacity. Father Peterson  
3 informed the board of the program and carefully reviewed the protocol for evaluation and  
4 treatment of child molesting clergy. The Board received one of the first reports on the progress  
5 of the program—of 132 priests evaluated 76 were found to have sexual problems, predominantly  
6 with minors. This same report was hand delivered to the Papal Nuntio. A priest cannot self-refer  
7 for evaluation or hospitalization. Only a bishop or religious superior can refer a priest for  
8 treatment. The bishop or superior was also responsible for the payment for treatment. It was  
9 standard procedure for the priest patient to be informed that the results of his evaluation, or in the  
10 case of inpatient treatment, his discharge summary, would be sent to his superior. There was  
11 never an exception to this requirement for treatment either at Seton or St. Luke’s that I knew of.  
12 A team involving a psychiatrist, psychologist and social worker conducted an evaluation. Most  
13 of the time the first evaluation report was delivered over the phone to the bishop or superior. A  
14 written report including recommendations usually followed. A more elaborate physical,  
15 psychiatric, psychological, social and spiritual assessment and treatment program was  
16 established for each priest admitted to the hospital. Medical components involved a complete  
17 physical and laboratory workup including an MRI of the brain, EKG, EEG, and blood work. In  
18 addition to an in depth psychosocial history a battery of psychological tests were administered  
19 including personality, projective, IQ and neuropsychological tests. The results of tests, progress  
20 reports, and discharge summaries were addressed to the priest’s bishop or superior; and hospital  
21 administrators preferred contact with the bishop or superior since he would ultimately be  
22 responsible for the future assignments of a patient and for future referrals to the institute. For the  
23 same reasons bishops and superiors were encouraged to visit their priest patient and his treating  
24 psychiatrist. Some bishops delegated another priest of the diocese or even a lay team to receive  
25 the reports so, after discharge, there would be a community of clergy who could be alert to the  
26 clerical needs of the priest, and danger signs to his sobriety and sexual abstinence. At no time  
27 was the bishop, superior, or church official considered part of the “treatment team.” They serve  
28 in the capacity similar to that of “family members” of a person who received psychiatric  
treatment. In fact, in 2009 Cardinal Mahony told a group of his priests that they should handle  
the problem of abusing priests as a “family problem.”

11. The media is in large part responsible for widespread public awareness of the problem of  
sexual abuse of minors by Roman Catholic priests in the United States (and currently the world).

1 On January 6, 2002 the *Boston Globe* began a series of 1,200 articles on the problem of clergy  
2 abuse. They requested an interview with my psychiatrist wife, Marianne Benkert, and me, in  
3 October prior to publishing their first report. The Searchlight Team was motivated for an  
4 interview by *Sex, Priests and Power: The Anatomy of a Crisis* a book I published in 1996. Most  
5 commentators date the *Crisis* of clergy abuse to that date.<sup>2</sup> The U.S. bishops christened the  
6 situation a *crisis* in appointing a *National Review Board* to investigate the crisis.<sup>3</sup> They also  
7 engaged the John-Jay School of criminal Justice to make a survey of clergy abuse utilizing  
8 diocesan records.<sup>4</sup> The authors of both reports interviewed me because of a 25-year ethnological  
9 study (1960-85) I conducted on the celibate/sexual function and behaviors of priests in the  
10 United States.<sup>5</sup> The world press noted the report of the book *A Secret World* I gave at the  
11 American Psychological National Meeting (August 11, 1990) and published my conclusions that  
12 “at any one time only fifty percent (50%) of priests practice celibacy and six percent (6 %) of  
13 Catholic priests get involved sexually with minors.” Over 250 reviews of the book were  
14 published, mostly favorable even in professional journals. Some notable sociologists (Fr.  
15 Andrew Greeley) criticized the methodology of my work despite statements that they agreed  
16 with the conclusions. Dr. Dean Hoge, of Catholic University said that mine were the “best  
17 numbers available.” Dr. Anson Shupe professor of sociology at Indiana-Purdue and the leading  
18 scholar on clergy malfeasance is supportive of my work.<sup>6</sup> Many American bishops are openly  
19 dismissive; some refused permission for me to speak within their jurisdiction, others attempted to  
20 have me dismissed from civil committee appointments (Governor’s Committee on Child Abuse).  
21 A member of the National Review Board said in a public forum, “Boy, do the bishops hate you.”  
22 The John Jay study was dependant on self-reports from bishops. Its conclusions, however, are  
23 important. For instance it concluded that six and one-half percent (6 ½ %) of priests ordained  
24 between 1960 and 1984 were ultimately alleged abusers of minors. This correlates with the  
25 conclusion of my study. The Los Angeles Archdiocese was notably uncooperative with the

---

24 <sup>2</sup> *Betrayal: The Crisis in the Catholic Church*. 2003. The Investigative Staff of the Boston Globe.

25 <sup>3</sup> *A Report on the Crisis in the Catholic Church in the United States*. February 27, 2004.

26 <sup>4</sup> *John-Jay College of criminal Justice Report*. February 27, 2004.

27 <sup>5</sup> *A Secret World: Sexuality and the Search for Celibacy*. 1990. Brunner/Mazel.

28 <sup>6</sup> Anson Shupe, 2007. *Spoils of the Kingdom: Clergy Misconduct and Religious Community*.

1 investigation to the degree that the bishop-appointed chair of the National Review Board,  
2 Governor Frank Keating, fingered the cardinal as operating like “*cosa nostra*.” Keating’s  
3 successor as board chair, Anne Burke Chief Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court, concluded that  
4 the bishops were intent on “business as usual;” this despite the agreement of both reports that  
5 bishops failed to “hold themselves accountable.” Several Grand Jury Reports<sup>7</sup> are worthy of  
6 careful study because they are incisive and penetrating in their observations and conclusions that  
7 clearly demonstrate the ***pattern and practice*** that traces a blueprint of the operation and behavior  
of Cardinal Mahony and the Los Angeles Archdiocese in regard to sexual offending priests.

8 12. Many grand jury conclusions are applicable to the Los Angeles operation, namely:

- 9 • *Top Archdiocesan officials knew the extent of clergy sexual abuse problem for many*  
10 *years before it became known to the public.* (Boston)
- 11 • *The Archdiocese has not yet demonstrated a commitment to reform commensurate with*  
12 *the scope of the tragedy.* (Boston)
- 13 • *The Grand Jury concludes that the history of the [diocese] demonstrates that as an*  
14 *institution they are incapable of properly handling issues relating to the sexual abuse of*  
15 *children by priests.* (Suffolk County Supreme Court Special Grand Jury)
- 16 • *The diocese knowingly endangered children.* (New Hampshire)
- 17 • Cardinal Mahony and Los Angeles church officials retained priests in office even after  
18 they knew they had abused minors (i.e. Frs. Baker, Miller, Rucker, Sutphin, Wempe).  
19 They hindered investigations by delaying or withholding documents; case histories  
20 demonstrate how they intimidated victims, delayed reports, failed to honor their  
agreements to make files public and generally preferred to avoid scandal, preserve image

---

21 <sup>7</sup> *The Report of the Archdiocesan Commission of Enquiry into the Sexual Abuse of Children by Members*  
22 *of the Clergy: Conclusion and Recommendations.* 1990. The Archdiocese of St. John’s,  
Newfoundland.

23 *Suffolk County Supreme Court Special Grand Jury Report.* 2002.

24 *The Sexual Abuse of Children in the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Boston.* A Report of the Attorney  
General. 2003.

25 *Report on the Investigation of the diocese of Manchester.* 2003. The New Hampshire Department of  
Justice.

26 *Grand Jury Report of Sexual Abuse in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.* 2005.

27 ETC.

1 and property over the protection of minors and the vulnerable.

2 13. When the John-Jay Report was published they concluded that between three and six  
3 percent (3-6%) of priests between 1950 and 2002 were reported for sexual abuse of minors.  
4 However, within a year 700 additional reports were made to church officials. A review of public  
5 documents now (2011) reveal that the number of alleged abusers is close to 6,500 priests over  
6 that period of time.<sup>8</sup>

7 14. In 2002 Boston recorded that 7.6% of priests having served there were alleged abusers.  
8 New Hampshire recorded 8.2% alleged abusers. Currently reports of 10% are considered  
9 accurate for those areas. The "Sensitive Claims Committee" of the Tucson AZ diocese listed  
10 22% of active priests on its ledger in 1988 for alleged abuse. Investigative reporter Jean  
11 Guccione reported on the Los Angeles that, "the 228 priests who have been accused of child  
12 molestation were assigned to three out of four parishes in the Los Angeles Archdiocese at some  
13 point from 1950 to 2003. Though they were accused of molestation at about 100 parishes, the  
14 priests lived or worked in the 221 parishes..."<sup>9</sup> Eleven percent (11.5%) of active LA  
15 archdiocesan priests were implicated for abuse. Similar research was conducted regarding the  
16 graduates of St. John's Seminary, Camarillo and subsequent reports of abuse. Although the  
17 studies are yet not public one reliable account states that up to 30% of two ordination classes  
18 (1966 and 1972) were later reported for abuse.

19 15. Father Curtis Bryant, S.J. served as Director of Inpatient Services at St. Luke's Institute in  
20 Suitland, (Hyattsville) MD from 1989 until 1997. He then assumed a position as an assistant to  
21 the Vicar for Clergy of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles and was part of the "intervention team"  
22 seeing patients and conducting evaluations. Fr. Bryant and I had occasional contact in  
23 Georgetown, at St. Luke's and in Santa Clara University the weekend of June 5, 1998 when we  
24 served on a project to help research and clinical professionals better understand the issues  
25 relevant in the research, diagnosis, treatment and prevention of child and adolescent sexual abuse

---

25 <sup>8</sup> Cf. the records of *BishopsAccountability.org*.

26 <sup>9</sup> *The Los Angeles Times*. October 13, 2005. Cf. also the LA Times database, released on 4/20/06, which  
27 provided the basis for this analysis of the parishes, and the accompanying article; also available are  
28 details on the 11 Priests Missing in the 2004 report by Jean Guccione and William Lobdell.

1 committed by Roman Catholic priests. That project resulted in a publication.<sup>10</sup> During this  
2 weekend Fr. Bryant said within the group that the LA Archdiocese “received an average of  
3 five complaints or reports each month (about clergy sexual activity) and that had  
4 remained constant for five years.” (Fr. Bryant died suddenly in 2003 just prior to another  
5 Santa Clara conference.) Sr. Sheila Mc Niff, SHCJ, like Fr. Bryant, a former staff member from  
6 St. Luke’s has served as coordinator of the Victims Assistance Ministry of the Archdiocese of  
7 Los Angeles,

8 16. Ten days before the two reports sponsored by the USCCB—*A Report on the Crisis in*  
9 *the Catholic Church in the United States* and *The John-Jay College of Criminal Justice*  
10 *Report*—were made public in Washington DC, the office of the Archbishop of Los Angeles  
11 provided a document—*Report to the People of God: Clergy Sexual Abuse Archdiocese of Los*  
12 *Angeles 1930-2003*.<sup>11</sup> Although the document provides numerous apologies for past oversight it  
13 is grossly deficient of the candor and objectivity demonstrated in the Grand Jury reports from  
14 across the country. Paradigmatic of its disingenuousness is the assurance of the oversight of the  
15 Sexual Abuse Advisory Board and the description of its function. (Cf. *C. Lay Review*, Page 5.)  
16 When former board member (1992-2002) Judge Richard Byrne was deposed on October 29,  
17 2009, he could not recall that anyone ever reported an abusing priest to the police, and when  
18 asked: did it “ever occur to you that it might be a good idea to help these [abused] children?” He  
19 answered, “No.”

20 17. I have reviewed thousands of pages of documents from abuse cases related to the  
21 Archdiocese of Los Angeles. They reveal a pattern and practice of concealment of abuse, and  
22 known abusers, transfers of abusing priests, reassignments of abusive priests without informing  
23 the parishioners or even the staff, allowing or facilitating the transit of an abusive priest to  
24 another locality even a foreign country, and retaining known abusers in ministry (Cf. *12 above*).  
25 The well documented conflict between Cardinals Rivera and Mahony which obviates the  
26 possibility that both are telling the truth,<sup>12</sup> the Mahony letters exposed in his November 23, 2004

---

27 <sup>10</sup> *Bless Me Father For I Have Sinned: Perspectives on Sexual Abuse Committed by Roman Catholic*  
28 *Priests*. 1999. T. Plante, Editor. Praeger.

<sup>11</sup> February 17, 2004.

<sup>12</sup> Tony Castro. October 1, 2007. *Press-Telegram*.

1 deposition that contradict statements he made under oath in deposition and on the witness stand  
2 in the 1998 Fr. O Grady trial in Stockton, CA<sup>13</sup> are some of the elements that indicate a  
3 personality profile of clerical deception and obfuscation that is reflected in the operation of the  
4 archdiocese in regard to the abuse of minors and preeminently in the protracted and Byzantine  
5 maneuvers to keep hidden documents relating to abuse that certainly can be of use in combating  
6 further clergy malfeasance and harm.

7 I declare under penalty of perjury and of my own personal knowledge except where  
8 indicated, that the foregoing is true and correct and if called upon to give testimony could do so  
9 competently. Executed on January 28, 2011, in Beverly Hills, California.

10 \_\_\_\_\_  
11 A.W.Richard Sipe  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>13</sup> Don Lattin. December 11, 2004, "Cardinal Mahony Accused of Perjury in Sex Abuse Case. *San*  
28 *Francisco Chronicle*.