

I. Introduction

A Culture of Sexual Abuse has existed in The Diocese of San Diego since the 1940s, from which more than 150 victims have publicly come forward.¹ Church policy has created the environment in which this culture took root and has flourished. Any reasonable person exposed to the information available to the Diocese would conclude that the Diocese had reason to know that its priests and other religious personnel were sexually abusing children.²

The Culture of Sexual Abuse has taken root in every segment of the Diocese. Diocesan participants in the Culture of Sexual Abuse can be found literally from top (The Chancellor) to bottom (Assistant Pastors, religious personnel, and lay employees). Sexual abusers can be found within the leadership of the Diocese during the reign of each of San Diego's Bishops.

This culture has flourished under the formal rules and customs imposed upon Catholic families regarding the position and authority of priests, the role the Church Hierarchy expected its priests to play in counseling of the faithful and becoming involved in the lives of children to promote vocations as priests and religious personnel, and through a policy mandating secrecy regarding sexual abuse. The Diocese failed to respond to the dangers inherent in this environment. The Diocese did not create any meaningful system for monitoring and accountability. This failure has allowed perpetrators to assume positions of leadership and to be clustered within the Diocese's organizations and parishes.

The Diocese created an environment in which both the role of the priest in the exercise of his normal duties, and the respect required of the laity, created relationships between priests and children, that were vulnerable to exploitation. Priests defined right and wrong, and to a child sexual contact with a priest could have been indistinguishable from the priest's expected role. From the child's perspective, the contact must have been "right" since it came from a priest, and it was not permissible to contemplate that a priest would engage in conduct that was "wrong." Priests were advised by canon law to take a special interest in young people. Priests were often encouraged to pay special attention to young boys, in hopes that they would inspire them to have

¹ It is reasonable to understand that the number of claimants reflect only a fraction of the total number of abuse victims. For example, while Fr. Anthony Rodrigue has admitted to molesting at least 150 children, only 20 have come forward and filed civil actions.

² The Culture of Sexual Abuse is so pervasive and deeply rooted in the Diocese of San Diego, that it would be more than disingenuous of the Diocese to argue that it was beyond its ability to have known the facts in any one of the more than 150 claims of abuse that have been filed. Diocesan leaders were intimately aware of and participated in the Culture of Pedophilia. The Diocese had knowledge of the Culture of Pedophilia and did not meaningfully investigate the scope of the problem, and in doing so, failed to meet its obligations to monitor and reasonably supervise its agents.

thoughts of a vocation to the priesthood or religious life. In short, the Diocese created the environment in which *The Culture of Sexual Abuse* took root and flourished.

For decades, the Diocese of San Diego operated under a policy which considered the reassignment of abusive priests to new parishes to be an appropriate manner in which to deal with charges of sexual abuse, including abuse against children. The policy required that, in all circumstances, sex abuse cases between a priest and penitent were to be kept strictly secret. This policy shielded perpetrators from accountability and placed them directly into situations where they had access to new victims, all of which served to nourish the Culture of Sexual Abuse.

During the many decades of the secret policy to silently sweep away incidents of abuse no less than 11 members of the Diocese's Hierarchy committed acts for which they have been accused of committing sexual abuse.³ This includes priests who were charged by the Bishop with overseeing vulnerable populations, such as those at the orphanage known as Nazareth House and the institution known as Boys Town of the Desert. Under the basic legal principles of agency, the Diocese was on notice as to the abusive behavior of these officials who acted as its agents.

There is a clear pattern of the clustering of sexual abusers in specific organizations and parishes of the San Diego Diocese. Such clustering suggests that a population of abusers was discernable to leaders in the San Diego Diocese and that intentional steps were taken to organize that population.

Letters written by the victims and their families, along with government records, indicate that the Diocese knew of the abusive acts of several of its individual priests and religious personnel, yet continued, as best it could, to maintain secrecy, to protect the violators and not the victims, and continued to place these individuals into positions with access to children.

Taken together, all of the information available to the Diocese pointed to the existence of an environment in which a Culture of Sexual Abuse flourished. In every case the Diocese had reason to know that abuse was taking place. Through either negligence, willfulness, or both, the Diocese failed to respond to the available information.

³ These officials include: Monsignor James Booth; Father Louis Copsteak; Monsignor Donald F. Doxie; Father Steven Dunn; Monsignor Brent Eagan; Monsignor Rudolph Galindo; Monsignor Michael Higgins; Monsignor William A. Kraft; Monsignor Maximillian Macouset; Monsignor Joseph R. Nunez; and Father Nicholas Reveles.

II. A Rich Environment For Abuse

The Diocese created an environment in which the role of the priest in the exercise of his normal duties and the respect required of the laity, created relationships between priest and children that were particularly vulnerable to exploitation. The Roman Catholic Church has traditionally taught that priests have been especially called by God to hold their sacred office. Catholic children are taught that priests are God's special representatives and take the place of Christ, especially when they celebrate Mass or hear their confessions. The priests control access to the seven sacraments, which Catholics believe are necessary for eternal salvation. It is not unreasonable for a Catholic child to believe that a priest controls the keys to Heaven, or that when he speaks, he speaks as God's appointed agent. Thus, lay people from childhood are groomed by the Catholic Church to maintain a spirit of docility and unquestioning obedience to priests and bishops.

Priests enjoy unparalleled respect and power, simply by the fact that they are priests. Their very profession, according to tradition and teaching, demands that they not be questioned and that they be obeyed in all matters. Priests define right and wrong, and to a child even sexual contact with a priest could have well been indistinguishable from the priest's expected role. From the child's perspective, the contact must have been "right" since it came from a priest, because it was not permissible to contemplate that a priest would engage in conduct that was "wrong." Priests are advised by canon law to take special interest in young people. Priests are often encouraged to pay special attention to young boys, in hopes that they would inspire them to have thoughts of a vocation to the priesthood or religious life. In short, the Diocese created the environment in which The Culture of Sexual Abuse took root.

III. Policy of Silence

A policy to keep secret the details of sexual abuse cases existed for decades in the Roman Catholic Church in America and in the Diocese of San Diego. This policy shielded sexual abusers from civil and criminal accountability, and ensured that potential victims did not have notice of a predators' past abuse.

The most shocking evidence of this policy is a secret instruction from The Holy See, issued by the Vatican in 1962, entitled "On The Manner Of Proceeding In Cases Of Solicitation," regarding how church leaders were to proceed in cases where a priest entices a penitent to engage in sexual conduct, specifically including situations where children are being sexually abused. The instruction directs that transferring offending priests to a different Church is an appropriate way of dealing with the problem, and in all circumstances sex abuse cases between a priest and penitent are to be kept strictly secret. Individuals who violated the secrecy requirement were subject to excommunication. The instruction was issued to all Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops and other Diocesan Ordinaries, and contained an order from the Pope "to keep and observe it in the minutest detail."

As late as 1990, leaders of the Roman Catholic Church in America were continuing to devise strategies to keep secret the information regarding abuse. In a 1990 address entitled "NCCB Guidelines and Other Considerations in Pedophilia Cases," Bishop A. James Quinn described the process for reviewing the personnel file of priest accused of pedophilia as follows:

"So you go to the office and examine the personnel file. Prepare for a discovery that brings a subpoena for the accused cleric's personnel records. The confidential, personal files of the personnel files of the diocese or a religious community are not privileged, and may be subpoenaed by a court or demanded by attorneys in the process of discovery. And that includes what the Code of Canon Law calls the secret archives. Even the priest-penitent privilege is under attack in some quarters. We can talk about that this afternoon.

Nevertheless, personnel files should be carefully examined to determine their content. Unsigned letters alleging misconduct should be expunged. Standard personnel files should contain no documentation relating to possible criminal behaviour. Serious moral questions, signed allegations, those should be a part of the secret file anyhow. But they still subpoena them. But comb through your files.

Now what files have been subpoenaed, they can not be tampered with, destroyed, removed; that constitutes obstruction of justice and contempt of court. **Prior however, thought and study ought to be given if you think its going to be necessary; if there's something there you really don't want people to see you might send it off to the Apostolic Delegate, because they have immunity to protect something that-is potentially dangerous, or that you consider to be dangerous, you might send it there.** (*emphasis added*)

In his speech, Bishop Quinn counseled against trying accused priests before Church tribunals prior to a civil trial, in part, out of a concern that the Tribunal records could be subpoenaed. Bishop Quinn disclosed that the National Conference of Catholic Bishops had brought a request before Rome to allow bishops to dismiss priests through an administrative process rather than through a church tribunal. The effect of allowing the administrative action would be to avoid a tribunal with judges, evidence, witnesses, documents and decrees – all of which are discoverable in a civil trial. Thus, the American Bishops were trying to limit, even eliminate, many of the records in abuse cases.

While shocking on its face, Bishop Quinn's speech becomes more alarming when placed within historical context. In 1985, The NCCB received a report entitled "The Problem of Sexual Molestation By Roman Catholic Clergy," which described the continuing and growing problem of sexual abuse by priests. According to the report, if the Church failed to deal with the problem of its pedophile priests, the Church could face liability in excess of \$1,000,000,000.00 over the next 10 years. The report outlined steps that the church, through the NCCB, must take to protect

the Church – and its most innocent parishioners – from the devastating effects of priests who molest children. Bishop Quinn’s speech takes on special significance when viewed as a response to this report – a response that instructed American bishops, in essence, to make fewer records and to hide bad records.

Local examples of the policy to silently sweep away accusations of abuse include Fr. Anthony Rodrigue. A series of letters were written to the Hierarchy for years about Fr. Rodrigue’s actions as a sexual abuser with no meaningful action taken by the Diocese. Finally, in 1976, while Fr. Rodrigue was assigned to Our Lady of Guadalupe in El Centro, Calif., a brave priest, Fr. Luciano Visconti, wrote a letter to the Hierarchy on behalf of 10 parents, complaining of Father Rodrigue’s actions. This letter was written in Spanish and signed by all 10 parents. In police reports Father Rodrigue described this as “the fifth letter.” This letter led to Fr. Rodrigue being sent to treatment at the House of Affirmation in Whitinsville, Mass. However, Fr. Rodrigue was allowed to continue in parish work while waiting for space to become available at the House of Affirmation. This, according to press reports, includes assignments at Our Lady of Soledad, Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, St. Joseph The Worker, and St. George’s Catholic Churches. Following four months of “treatment” in late 1976-1977, Fr. Rodrigue was sent to a “renewal program” in Northern California. In 1977, Fr. Rodrigue was assigned to St. George’s parish, where he engaged in fondling and oral sex with young boys of the parish, some as young as 9 years old. In 1982, Fr. Rodrigue was sent to St. Joseph The Worker Catholic Church in Loma Linda. Despite years of written complaints, and subsequent “treatment” paid for by the Diocese, there is no record of any meaningful notice from the Diocese to parishioners where Fr. Rodrigue was assigned, warning parents and children of his tendency to commit sexual abuse.

Monsignor William A. Kraft is another example of the policy to silently sweep away accusations of abuse. In 1969, letters were written to then Bishop Furey about sexual abuse committed by Monsignor Kraft. No meaningful action was taken by the Bishop, and Monsignor Kraft was allowed to continue in the active ministry as a pastor with regular contact with children. No notice of his history of abuse was ever given to the parents in the parishes where Monsignor Kraft was assigned.

Monsignor Rudolph Galindo is yet another example of the policy to silently sweep away accusations of abuse. In 1983, Monsignor Galindo was sent to treatment following accusations by boys that he committed sexual abuse. Upon his return from treatment, Monsignor Galindo was allowed to return to active ministry, which included unfettered and unquestioned access to children. No notice of his history of abuse was ever given to the parents in the churches in which Monsignor Galindo worked

IV. Abusers In The Hierarchy ⁴

The Bishop does not administer the Diocese alone. Given the size and complexity of the task of administration, the Bishop charges other men to act as advisors and administrators. Key members of the Hierarchy of the San Diego Diocese were practitioners in the Culture of Sex Abuse. Self-preservation would have led these individuals, who were in a position to prevent or thwart proper investigation, to shield and promote other abusers for fear of their own exposure. Many of these men held important offices during the tenure of more than one of the Diocese's Bishops.

Monsignor James T. Booth (Accused of abuse from 1965-1969)

Monsignor Booth was a senior Chancery Official under three of San Diego's Bishops: Bishop Buddy, Bishop Furey, and Bishop Maher.

- Under Bishop Buddy, Monsignor Booth was: a) the Bishop's Secretary; b) Chancellor; c) Consultor; and d) as a member of the Bishop's Administrative Council, which included the oversight of the protective institutions.
- Under Bishop Furey, Monsignor Booth held the following positions: a) Chancellor; b) Consultor; and c) as a member of the Administrative Council, which included oversight of the protective institutions.
- Under Bishop Maher, Monsignor Booth served as Chancellor.

Monsignor Booth was a member of Bishop Buddy's inner circle. As the Bishop's Secretary, Monsignor Booth was in daily contact with Bishop Buddy and communicated with the Bishop on sensitive issues and priority matters. As Chancellor, Monsignor Booth was the senior administrating official at the Chancery. As a member of the Board of Consultors, Monsignor Booth was part of a select body that acted as an advisory board to the Bishop on matters essential to the administration of the affairs of the Diocese. As a member of the Administrative Council, Monsignor Booth assisted the Bishop with the oversight of cemeteries and protective institutions such as Nazareth House and Boys Town of The Desert.

⁴ While this report is focused upon charges of sexual abuse in the Diocese, it should be noted that two of the Bishops of San Diego have been associated with sexual based scandal. In the mid-1980s, the San Diego Union and Evening Tribune detailed a personal relationship between Bishop Maher and his personal secretary, Eliva Aguilar. These reports revealed real estate purchases authorized by Maher for Aguilar. Bishop Brom was the subject of abuse allegations resulting from conduct allegedly committed while he was Bishop of Duluth, Minn., Diocese.

Under Bishop Furey, Monsignor Booth continued to be an inner-circle advisor as Chancellor, Consultor, and as a member of the Administrative Council. Monsignor Booth continued as a member of the inner circle serving as Chancellor under Bishop Maher. Throughout his period of membership in the inner circle, Monsignor Booth was also pastor of Mission San Diego de Alcalá. He was also chaplain at Nazareth House Orphanage, which was next door to the mission.

For most of his tenure as a Chancery official there was no one, other than the Bishop, who held more power in the San Diego Diocese than Monsignor Booth.

Monsignor Donald F. Doxie (Accused of abuse from 1968-1971)

Monsignor Doxie was a senior Chancery Official under three of San Diego's Bishops: Bishop Buddy, Bishop Furey, and Bishop Maher.

- Under Bishop Buddy, Monsignor Doxie served as: a) the Secretary to the Chancellor; b) Vice-Chancellor; c) Consultor; and d) as a member of the Administrative Council, which included oversight of protective institutions such as *Nazareth House and Boys Town of The Desert*.
- Under Bishop Furey, Monsignor Doxie served as: a) the Bishop's Secretary; b) Vice-Chancellor; c) Consultor; and d) as a member of the Administrative Council, which included oversight of protective institutions such as *Nazareth House and Boys Town of The Desert*.
- Under Bishop Maher, Monsignor Doxie served as: a) Episcopal Vicar; b) a member of The Tribunal; and c) Consultor.

As Secretary to the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor, Monsignor Doxie was the second-highest-ranking official in the Chancery behind Monsignor Booth. He would have worked on a daily basis with Monsignor Booth on sensitive and priority issues. As a member of the Board of Consultors, Monsignor Doxie was part of a select body that acted as an advisory board to the Bishop on matters essential to the administration of the affairs of the Diocese. As a member of the Administrative Council, Monsignor Doxie assisted the Bishop with the oversight of cemeteries and the protective institutions such as *Nazareth House and Boys Town of The Desert*.

As Bishop Furey's Secretary, Monsignor Doxie was in daily contact with Bishop Furey and communicated with the Bishop on sensitive issues and priority matters. As Episcopal Vicar, Monsignor Doxie was charged with supervising geographic regional leaders, known as the Deanery in the San Diego Diocese. As a member of The Tribunal, Monsignor Doxie was a key figure in the Diocese's investigatory and judicial body.

Throughout most of his time as a Chancery official, Monsignor Doxie was the second-most-powerful official other than the Bishop. Monsignor Doxie's influence may have been a bit broader than Monsignor Booth's, because he served on the Tribunal, which would have formally investigated and prosecuted cases of sexual abuse.

Monsignor Brent I. Eagen (Accused of Abuse in 1972)

Monsignor Eagen was a key Chancery official under Bishop Maher. Monsignor Eagen served as: a) Chancellor; b) Moderator of the Curia; c) as a member of the Administrative Council; d) as a member of the Presbyteral Council and Priest's Senate; e) as a member of the Building Committee; and g) Director of Insurance and Financial Programs.

As the Booth/Doxie reign sunsets, the Eagen reign begins. As Chancellor, Monsignor Eagen was the senior administrating official at the Chancery. As Moderator of the Curia, Monsignor Eagen supervised and coordinated the work of the other key officials. As a member of the Board of Consultors, Monsignor Eagen was part of a select body that acted as an advisory board to the Bishop on matters essential to the administration of the affairs of the Diocese.

As a member of the Presbyteral Council and Priest's Senate, Monsignor Eagen was a member of groups charged with selecting policy items for consideration by the Diocese, and identifying priests and laity to staff the Diocese's committees and boards. As a member of the Building and Insurance and Finance Committees, Monsignor Eagen held responsible positions regarding Diocesan finances.

Monsignor Michael Higgins (Charged with Solicitation of a Penitent)

Under Bishop Maher, Monsignor Higgins was the Officialis of The Tribunal. He was the head official responsible for the formal investigation and prosecution of charges of abuse.

Monsignor William A. Kraft (Accused of abuse 1953-1978)

Monsignor Kraft was a Chancery official under three of San Diego's Bishops. Under Bishop Buddy, Monsignor Kraft played the key role in the development of the Diocese's outreach program to college students know as the Newman Ministry. Under Bishop Maher, Monsignor Kraft was: a) a member of the Presbyteral Council; b) a member of the Building Committee; d) a member of the Cemeteries Committee, and d) Director of Insurance and Financial Programs.

Under Bishop Brom, Monsignor Kraft continued to play a significant role in the finances of the Diocese. Monsignor Kraft's assignments under Bishop Brom included: a) The Building Committee; b) Office of Deferred Giving; c) Office of Development; d) Catholic Relief Services; and e) The Stewardship Program.

Monsignor Rudolph Galindo (Accused of abuse 1953-1983)

Monsignor Galindo played a key role in the office responsible for formally investigating and prosecuting abuse allegations, The Tribunal. Monsignor Galindo was a member of the Tribunal under both Bishops Furey and Maher.

Additionally, under Bishop Maher, Monsignor Galindo was a key figure in dealing with the Mexican Missions, replacing Monsignor Nunez as Commission Director.

Monsignor Joseph R. Nunez (Accused of abuse 1956-1957)

Under Bishop Buddy, Monsignor Nunez was Assistant Diocesan Director of The Catholic Youth Organization and the Director of Mexican Missions Commission. He continued his role of Director of Mexican Missions Commission under Bishops Furey and Maher.

Father Steven Dunn (Accused of abuse at Seminary in 1980-1983)

Under Bishop Maher, Father Dunn played a significant role in the formation and guidance of his fellow priests and seminarians.

Father Dunn was Director of the Diocese Ministry to Priests, which was responsible for pastoral support of individual priests with addictions and other mental health problems. Father Dunn was also Vice-Rector of Saint Francis College Seminary.

Monsignor Maximillian Macouset (Accused of abuse in 1961)

Monsignor Macouset was a member of the Mexican Missions Commission under Bishops Buddy and Furey.

Father Louis Copesteak (Public Reports of sexual abuse in the San Diego Union-Tribune)

Under Bishop Maher, Father Copesteak was a member of the Tribunal and also served on the University of San Diego's Board of Trustees.

Father Nicholas Reveles

Under Bishop Maher, Father Reveles served on the Diocese's Music Committee.

V. Clustering of Sexual Abusers

There is a clear pattern of the clustering of sexual abusers in specific organizations and parishes of the San Diego Diocese. Such clustering suggests that a population of abusers was discernable to leaders in the San Diego Diocese and that intentional steps were taken to organize that population.

Abusers Serving in the Hierarchy under Bishop Buddy:

Monsignor James T. Booth;
Monsignor Donald F. Doxie;
Monsignor William A. Kraft;
Monsignor Joseph R. Nunez;
Monsignor Maximillian Macouset.

Abusers Serving in the Hierarchy under Bishop Furey:

Monsignor James T. Booth;
Monsignor Donald F. Doxie;
Monsignor Joseph R. Nunez;
Monsignor Rudolph Galindo;
Monsignor Maximillian Macouset.

Abusers Serving in the Hierarchy under Bishop Maher:

Monsignor James T. Booth;
Monsignor Donald F. Doxie;
Father Steven Dunn;
Monsignor Brent I. Eagen;
Monsignor Michael Higgins;
Monsignor William A. Kraft;
Monsignor Joseph R. Nunez;
Monsignor Rudolph Galindo;
Father Louis Copesteak;
Father Nicholas Reveles.

Abusers Serving in the Hierarchy under Bishop Brom:

Monsignor William A. Kraft.

Abusers Serving as Chancellor or Vice Chancellor:

Monsignor James T. Booth;
Monsignor Donald Doxie;
Monsignor Brent Eagen.

Abusers Serving on The Tribunal:

Monsignor Michael Higgins;
Monsignor Donald F. Doxie;
Monsignor Rudolph Galindo;
Father Louis Copesteak.

Nazareth House:

Monsignor James Booth;
Monsignor Brent Eagan;
Sister Bridgette;
Sister Finbar;
Brother Gallager;
Sister Germanus;
Robert Gordon;
Ms. Loman;
Larry Stewart.

Boys Town Of The Desert:

Father Robert Nikliborc (Director).
Brother Paul;
Brother Thomas;
Brother Gallagher;
Brother Joseph;
Brother Kerwin.

Our Lady Of Guadalupe (Calexico):

Father Anthony Rodrigue;
Father Paul Gill;
Monsignor Rudolph Galindo;
Monsignor Joseph Nunez;
Father Barry Vineyard.

Our Lady Of Grace (El Cajon):

Father Paedar Brennan;
Father Ned Creighton;
Father Thomas Moloney;
Father Paolino Montagne.

Saint Edward's (Corona):

Monsignor Rudolph Galindo;
Monsignor Matthew Thompson;
Father Paul Gill.

Our Lady Of Perpetual Help (Lakeside):

Father Paul Gill;
Monsignor Maximillian Macouset;
Father Anthony Rodrigue.

Saint John's (Encinitas):

Father Franz Robier;
Father Anthony Rodrigue;
Father Patrick Kearney.

Saint Therese (San Diego):

Monsignor William Kraft;
Father Peter Luque;
Father Malachy McGinn.

Saint Charles Borromeo (San Diego):

Monsignor William Kraft;
Father John C. Keith;
Father Robert Buchanan.

San Salvador (Colton):

Father Peter Loque;

Father Gustavo Benson;
Father Anthony Rodrigue.

Blessed Sacrament (San Diego):

Monsignor William Kraft;
Father Sheehy;
Father Franz Robier.

Blessed Sacrament (San Diego):

Monsignor William Kraft;
Father Sheehy;
Father Franz Robier.

Saint Bridgid's (Pacific Beach):

Monsignor Donald Doxie;
Father Franklin Becker.

Saint Catherine (Riverside):

Father Peter Covas;
Father Herman Flynn.

Saint Anthony's (Colton):

Father Peter Loque;
Father Franz Robier.

Our Lady Of Perpetual Help (Riverside):

Father Thomas Moloney;
Father Munley.

Divine Word Seminary:

Brother Raymond Etienne;
Brother Vincent Mauer.

Saint Rose of Lima (Chula Vista):

Father Patrick O'Keeffe;
Patrick O'Shea.

Saint Joseph's (Barstow):

Father Anthony Rodrigue;
Father John Keefe.

VI. Conclusion

For decades, the men charged with administering the Diocese of San Diego, and implicitly protecting its children, were practitioners in a Culture of Sexual Abuse. Diocesan leaders failed to respond to an environment in which sexual abusers could exploit the relationships the Church fostered between its young people and religious figures.

Rather than developing a program to monitor for and respond to incidents of sexual abuse, the Diocese engaged in a policy which failed to hold abusers accountable and silently reassigned abusers to places where they continued to have access to unsuspecting young people.

The Diocese actions created a rich environment in which a Culture of Sexual Abuse flourished. Sexual abusers were clustered in positions of leadership and in parish assignments. In each and every case of abuse, it was through either negligence, willful disregard for the facts, or both, that the Church failed to respond.

Any reasonable person exposed to the information available to the Diocese would conclude that the Diocese had reason to know that its priests and other religious personnel were sexually abusing children.