



THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR
SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN
IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN IRELAND

Briefing Paper

A critique of the report on the Holy See's institutional knowledge and decision-making related to former Cardinal Theodore Edgar McCarrick (1930 to 2017) prepared by the Secretariat of State of the Holy See, Vatican City State (dated 10 November 2020)

March 2021





THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR
SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN
IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN IRELAND

Copyright

© The National Board for Safeguarding
Children in the Catholic Church in Ireland, 2021.

The material in this publication is protected by copyright law. Except as may be permitted by law, no part of the material may be reproduced (including by storage in a retrieval system) or transmitted in any form or by any means, adapted, rented or lent without the written permission of the copyright owners.

To seek permission for use or for more information contact
admin@safeguarding.ie.



About the Briefing Papers

The National Board for Safeguarding Children in the Catholic Church in Ireland (National Board) was established to provide advice, services and assistance in furtherance of the development of the safeguarding of children within the Roman Catholic Church on the island of Ireland. The National Board also monitors compliance with legislation, policy and best practice and reports on these activities annually, as comprehensively set out in the Memorandum and Articles of Association of the Company, Coimirce.

Article 4 (iii) of the Memorandum and Articles of Association of the Company requires the National Board to: “ report and provide, upon request from the Constituents or any Constituent, support, advisory and training services to such Constituents or Constituent on policies and practices relating to safeguarding of children.”

The National Board already provides comprehensive Guidance to support the implementation of *Safeguarding Children, Policy and Standards for the Catholic Church in Ireland 2016*. In addition annually we produced Guidance, Advice and Practice (GAP) papers further complements the detailed Guidance on topics of current interest to constituents.

This development of Briefing Papers is envisaged to provide information contained in detailed research papers, journal articles, and inquiry reports relevant to safeguarding that we condense into a short digest format for ease of reference.

The Briefing Papers are the National Board's critique and assessments of key points and lessons that can be learned from externally written reports.

The views expressed are those of the National Board and should not be considered as a definitive position on the given topic.

Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Issues and Application for the Irish Church	2
Analysis	6
Chronology of Safeguarding Events	8
Conclusion	17

Abbreviations Used

AB- Archbishop

CDF- Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith

FBI- Federal Bureau of Investigation

NCMC- National Case Management Committee

PN- Apostolic Nuncio

ROI- Republic of Ireland

US- United States

USA- United States of America

USCCB- United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

Introduction

Pope Francis asked the Secretariat of State to conduct a thorough examination of records to ascertain relevant facts known to dicasteries and contained in the Archives relating to former Cardinal McCarrick. On reading the finalised report, Pope Francis asked this to be made public for the good of the Universal Church.

Purpose:

To examine the Holy See's institutional knowledge and decision-making related to McCarrick.

However, it does not examine McCarrick's culpability under canon law as that was already adjudicated on by the CDF.

Reference material examined by the Secretariat of State included:

- Examination of all records across Secretariats: Congregation of Bishops; CDF; Congregation for Clergy; Congregation for Divine Worship and Discipline of Sacraments; Apostolic Nunciature
- 90 witness statements: former seminarians; lay people; officers in USCCB and McCarrick's Secretaries across US
- Review of all statements
- Review of all documents
- Testimonies from administrative penal process

The report stated:

- Interviews included emotional accounts of behaviour, including sexual abuse or assault, unwanted sexual activity, intimate physical contact and the sharing of beds without physical touching. The interviews also included detailed accounts related to McCarrick's abuse of authority and power. These accounts were shared with Pope Francis and are preserved in the Holy See's archives.
- Victim consent was sought to reference their accounts in report. The report stated that any person who was victimized by McCarrick of course remains free to share their experiences publicly, as several have already done.

The National Board has critiqued the report to highlight learning that can be taken to assist the Catholic Church in Ireland and has structured it under the following headings:

- 1. Issues and Application for the Irish Church**
- 2. Analysis**
- 3. Chronology/Time line of safeguarding events**

Issues and Application for the Irish Church

Issue	Application for the Irish Church
<p>Recruitment and appointment to high office</p> <p>1. No reference to procedures in place by USCCCB at the time – clearly breaches of safeguarding code – unsupervised contact with children. Worrying behaviours displayed by McCarrick which went unchecked relating to his developing relationships/grooming families and young men.</p> <p>2. No mention of police checking/vetting.</p> <p>3. No reference to production of evidence that McCarrick was a priest in good standing. He was able to travel across US and internationally representing the USSCB and continued to have public ministry, in spite of being told not to.</p> <p>4. Elevation to senior office does not seek advice from safeguarding office.</p> <p>5. Bishops were asked opinions, some failed to refer to concerns they had received or heard about McCarrick’s abusive behaviour.</p>	<p>1. National Board guidance requires very clear codes of behaviour which includes: No unsupervised contact; clarity around boundaries and relationship between adults and children; guidance on exceptional one to one contact with children; supervision ratios; data protection and sharing of personal information etc.</p> <p>2. Whilst vetting should never be seen as clear evidence of no previous concerns or allegations, it should be used as part of safe recruitment. In Ireland it is a requirement of civil law and Church guidance in both jurisdictions.</p> <p>3. Requirement for annual reissue of ‘celebret’. Requirement for celebret to be removed if restrictions are placed on ministry. Requirement to sign in and to evidence celebret for public ministry.</p> <p>4. Seeking advice from the National Board relating to appointments to high office does not happen in Ireland.</p> <p>5. National Board is not aware what references are taken up when a priest is recommended for leadership roles in the Church.</p> <p>However, visiting priests (from international countries) do require that the home Bishop provides an “honest” reference. Failure to disclose important information may have consequences in the context of the Motu Proprio <i>Vos estis lux mundi</i>.</p>

<p>Positioning – making himself untouchable</p> <p>McCarrick positioned himself well with his fundraising; development of close relationships with important people, including Popes; TV audiences; entertainers; FBI (as an agent); politicians. Overly familiar – referred to as Uncle Ted. Made families feel special.</p>	<p>This is not a matter for the National Board alone but should be clarified through an overarching Code of Behaviour for priests and Religious. [Integrity in Ministry]</p>
<p>Normalising behaviour</p> <p>No one expressed concern about the dinners and gatherings and ‘nephews’ sleeping in same bed – was this misplaced respect, fear and did they not know that it was wrong?</p>	<p>Procedures in place to manage this include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Code of behaviour • Whistleblowing • Training about appropriate boundaries.
<p>Ignoring allegations</p> <p>Failure to recognise allegations because they were not made directly to Church officials.</p>	<p>National Board Guidance on the reporting and management of allegations is very clear and references the need to consider ‘allegations, suspicions, concerns and knowledge.’</p> <p>It also has guidance on third party and anonymous allegations, as referenced in the Vademecum (November 2020).</p>
<p>Inaction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First allegation (Mother 1) made anonymously not reported to anyone. Correspondence not kept. 2. Second allegation Priest 4 – not believed by Monsignor Gambino. Sent for counselling and Confession – abused by counsellor. Stated “no chance of complaining about Bishop – no one listens”. When reported again to Bishop – he thought the Bishop (Hughes) was not shocked – promised to do something but he did nothing. 3. Priest 1 not believed by Bishop Hughes because he himself has sexually abused boys. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National Board has advice on management of anonymous allegations – must at least consult and keep records. 2. Whilst this relates to an abuse of adult (National Board has no remit); it is a criminal offence (civil and canonical) to fail to take action. 3. It is not unusual for vulnerable people to be abused. Clearly this priest was vulnerable. His own abusive behaviours do not mean that he himself was not abused. In fact, it is common for abusers to have been abused themselves. Allegation should have been reported to civil authorities, and investigated canonically.

<p>4. Priest 3 told of abuse in Confession. Priest advised him to talk to his Bishop (Hughes) which he did. Hughes did not seem surprised. Told the priest to forget about it and forgive McCarrick. No records kept.</p> <p>5. Monsignor Bottino, Bishop Smith and Bishop McHugh observed abusive behaviour as did others and did nothing.</p>	<p>4. Correct action taken initially by Bishop Hughes to discuss outside of confessional. Failure then to act. National Board has guidance in place which deals with disclosures in Confession.</p> <p>5. This is captured under National Board guidance – Management of Allegations against Bishops (including negligence and cover up). The National Board also has guidance for complainants who are dissatisfied with how their allegation is handled.</p>
<p>Failure to follow procedure</p> <p>1. Initial allegations not formally put to McCarrick in 1997.</p> <p>2. Two anonymous postings about McCarrick’s abusive behaviour shared with him who passed them away by stating he had shared with FBI. PN also informed. No one conducted any inquiries. Third letter sent to Cardinal O Connor who apologetically sent it to McCarrick. Even lawyer in Bishops’ Conference failed to take action. It would seem that sexual behaviour with seminarians and abuse of children was well known and accepted. No one took action.</p> <p>3. When allegations were put to him, his denial was accepted without further inquiry.</p> <p>Anonymous letters ignored – no attempt to conduct inquiries or report to Police.</p>	<p>1. In Ireland there is very clear guidance on managing allegations of abuse, reporting, and record keeping, including the need to inform the respondent following consultation with the statutory authorities.</p> <p>2. The National Board has a role in monitoring that allegations, suspicions, concerns and knowledge are reported to the civil authorities.</p> <p>However, this is hugely impacted by data protection legislation; and the National Board cannot say with certainty that all allegations brought to the attention of a Church body have been reported.</p> <p>3. Procedures in Ireland set out all steps following conclusion of statutory investigations. It is recommended that advice is sought from an Advisory panel or NCMC (a body of experts in civil, canon law, child safeguarding, management of offenders and victim support, whose role is to offer advice as requested by the Church authority). This ensures that a decision about the respondent’s denial is not taken without consultation.</p>

<p>4. No appointment of any independent person to review all information, no lay experts consulted; no reference to civil authority personnel.</p> <p>5. Poor record keeping. Allegations reported to various Church authorities and attorneys; there were no records kept on their own response and nothing could be found afterwards.</p>	<p>4. Whilst many dioceses and religious have lay Designated Liaison People or people they appoint to conduct preliminary investigations, this is not compulsory. Each Church body has access to an Advisory Panel or the National Case Management Committee which provides independent advice.</p> <p>5. This reflects recording practice in Ireland during the first phase of National Board reviews of child safeguarding practice in Church bodies. The current review process will uncover whether progress has been made in this area.</p> <p>The National Board has produced clear guidance on this area and offers a separate support service specifically on structuring case files to assist in this area of practice.</p>
<p>Role of Apostolic Nuncio (PN) and lack of accountability by other Church Leaders</p> <p>Several reports made to PN and Bishops – limited if any action taken.</p> <p>Elevation to high office co-ordinated by PN.</p> <p>Restrictions on ministry not formally addressed by PN.</p>	<p>Guidance is currently being drafted for the management of allegations against Bishops and their equivalents.</p>

Analysis

The report highlights a number of important safeguarding matters that have not been addressed strategically by the Irish Church, and these largely relate to abuse of vulnerable adults and abuse of power. McCarrick abused both. However, it was not until allegations of child abuse were made in 2017 – 17 years after his conduct involving young adult abuse was known in Rome - that a canonical preliminary investigation was initiated. By choosing in effect to ignore allegations made by young men, what does this appalling behaviour say about the Church's acceptance of abuse of young adults and seminarians who are not classified as 'vulnerable'?

From reading the report, it would appear that McCarrick held considerable power, not just over seminarians and young men and their families, but over his brother bishops. The report is peppered with references to praise and commendations about McCarrick's good works. His work, which undoubtedly was commendable, coloured brother bishops' and Holy See officials' judgement and prevented them from taking appropriate safeguarding action.

A third issue which requires consideration is the absence of a mechanism for 'whistleblowing' in USA, as there are a number of references to a fear of consequences for seminarians who had been abused by McCarrick:

'...they had previously felt powerless to report McCarrick's misconduct because they feared that they would be disbelieved by their parents or by ecclesiastical superiors, or because they were convinced that they would be retaliated against if they came forward.'

In some instances, seminarians were believed, but sadly, McCarrick's behaviour seemed tolerated by his brother bishops. In Ireland there is guidance on whistleblowing, but there are no known instances of this being enacted.

The final strategic issue of relevance in Ireland is the continuing matter of appropriate pastoral support of and compassionate responses to complainants. The National Board have highlighted concerns about the absence of consistent good care being offered to complainants of abuse. In McCarrick's case, when a preliminary investigation was finally conducted and the testimonies of 17 post-pubescent boys were taken – the report identified key elements:

- Several victims stated that keeping their stories secret for decades had been a terrible burden that exacted a heavy emotional toll;
- Still others were angered that McCarrick's misconduct was being investigated so long after the events; and they felt re-victimized by the widespread publicity and, sometimes, by the inquiries that formed the basis of the inquiry report;
- McCarrick abused his authority to gain and maintain access to them. A number of individuals reported feeling powerless to object to or resist physical or sexual advances given McCarrick's position of authority:

- He forged relationships with their families – becoming known as ‘Uncle Ted’, saying Mass in their homes, taking them on holidays etc.;
- He took boys away on international trips, introducing them to famous people;
- He created relationships where the boys had a sense of “gratitude”, making it difficult for them to understand the nature of their relationship;
- McCarrick isolated them from their parents;
- He gave the boys alcohol to disinhibit them;
- He created a culture of fear and intimidation that supported his personal objectives.

Chronology of Safeguarding Events

1977	Pope Paul VI appointed Monsignor Theodore McCarrick Auxiliary Bishop in New York. Of those consulted, no one reported having witnessed or heard of any improper behaviour with children or adults.
1981	Pope John Paul II appointed McCarrick as Bishop of Metuchen (1981). No credible information emerged suggesting that he had engaged in any misconduct.
1986	Pope John Paul II appointed McCarrick as Archbishop of Newark.
1993	Cardinal O Connor carried out “verification checks” on McCarrick to ensure no impediment to Papal visit. This was based on Priest 1. Cardinal McCarrick advised PN ‘no impediments’.
1994	<p>Superior General of the Religious Sisters of Mercy of Alma (Michigan) telephoned PN Cacciavillan to express concern over potential scandal, were Pope John Paul II to visit Newark.</p> <p>The Sister reported that during a spiritual retreat a priest had spoken to her of the “bad moral conduct of Archbishop McCarrick with young seminarians.”</p> <p>Mother Mary Quentin suggested that Archbishop Cacciavillan speak directly to the priest who had supplied her with the information. The PN told her that the priest need not contact him, as he would “see about it” himself. Very shortly thereafter, the priest – someone already known to the PN – telephoned to tell Cacciavillan what he had heard.</p> <p>PN contacted James A. Cardinal Hickey of Washington, whom he trusted. Hickey stated that he had never known of any sexual impropriety. He queried ulterior motives by priest and religious Sister. He did however suggest that someone interview the priest, but unless any accuser comes forward it should be dropped. The PN took no further action, in light of the commendation made by the AB.</p>
1996	<p>A psychiatrist from Pennsylvania was asked to engage with Priest 1 to ascertain if he was fit to return to office. Priest 1 made several allegations of abuse by McCarrick on himself and others. The psychiatrist informed a respected priest psychologist who in turn informed Cardinal O Connor. Cardinal O Connor consulted Bishop Hughes who knew Priest 1. He said he had no confidence in Priest 1 to present facts objectively.</p> <p>Cardinal O Connor wrote to PN Cacciavillan about the potential elevation to the episcopate of a priest from the Archdiocese of Newark, but did not reference the allegations against McCarrick.</p> <p>NOTE – Priest 1 was stricken from list of candidates from becoming an auxiliary Bishop.</p> <p>Later in October 1996, Cardinal O’Connor asked Monsignor Cassidy to meet with Dr Fitzgibbons and Priest 1. Monsignor Cassidy and Dr Fitzgibbons seemed “convinced” that Priest 1 had been victimized by Bishop McCarrick, but Cardinal O’Connor himself did not find their conclusions “definitely persuasive”.</p>

1997	The psychiatrist travelled to Rome and shared both verbally and in writing his concerns about the abuse by McCarrick on Priest 1. He met the Congregation of Bishops' Secretary, Archbishop Jorge María Mejía: No action taken as a result of the meeting or written communication.
1997	Consideration of McCarrick as Archbishop of Chicago. Many Cardinals in Rome and USA involved; No mention of allegations. He was not recommended for the post on other grounds .
1999	<p>Consideration of McCarrick for Diocese of New York.</p> <p>Cardinal O Connor advised new PN of concerns of McCarrick's moral character. He was asked to write a report, which he did. The report was shared with previous PN who failed to acknowledge the gravity of the issues in the detailed communication from O Connor. Report also went to Pope John Paul II.</p>
2000	<p>McCarrick was appointed to Washington by Pope John Paul II.</p> <p>Allegations against him were known at this time:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Priest 1, formerly of the Diocese of Metuchen, claimed that he had observed McCarrick's sexual conduct with another priest in June 1987, and that McCarrick attempted to engage in sexual activity with Priest 1 later that summer; (2) a series of anonymous letters, sent to the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, the PN and various cardinals in the United States in 1992 and 1993, accused McCarrick of paedophilia with his 'nephews'; (3) McCarrick was known to have shared a bed with young adult men in the Bishop's residence in Metuchen and Newark; and (4) McCarrick was known to have shared a bed with adult seminarians at a beach house on the New Jersey shore. <p>These allegations were summarized in a 28 October 1999 letter from Cardinal O'Connor, the Archbishop of New York, to the PN, and were shared with Pope John Paul II shortly thereafter.</p>
2000	<p>Archbishop Montalvo, the PN to the United States, conducted a written inquiry directed at four New Jersey bishops to determine whether the allegations against McCarrick were true. The bishops' responses to the inquiry confirmed that McCarrick had shared a bed with young men, but did not indicate with certainty that McCarrick had engaged in any sexual misconduct. What is now known, through investigation undertaken for the preparation of the Report, is that three of the four American bishops provided inaccurate and incomplete information to the Holy See regarding McCarrick's sexual conduct with young adults. This inaccurate information appears likely to have impacted the conclusions of John Paul II's advisors and, consequently, of John Paul II. He asked that the PN verify whether there were unfounded accusations.</p> <p>McCarrick was not appointed to New York.</p>
2000	<p>PN pursued inquiries as requested by Pope John Paul II, contacting four bishops who responded with varying degrees of honesty.</p> <p>The PN concluded that he could not conclude either way on whether there were credible concerns about McCarrick's morality, but suggested he should not be considered for further responsibilities.</p>

2000	<p>Another review of letters submitted by the four bishops, Prefect Re consulted John Paul II and wrote:</p> <p>‘I wish to assure you that I have referred [the matter] to the Holy Father, who is inclined to believe that the “rumours and allegations” have no real foundation, given the great priestly and ecclesial spirit of the Most Excellent Prelate [McCarrick].</p> <p>Nevertheless, His Holiness is in agreement that it is not appropriate to run the risk of these accusations resurfacing by promoting Msgr. McCarrick to a more important See’.</p>
August 2000	<p>McCarrick wrote a letter rebutting the allegations. His denial was believed.</p> <p>The report queries how McCarrick learned that Cardinal O Connor had complained about him – “someone in the curia tipped him off”.</p>
2000	<p>At the time of McCarrick’s appointment, and in part because of the limited nature of the Holy See’s own prior investigations, the Holy See had never received a complaint directly from a victim, whether adult or minor, about McCarrick’s misconduct.</p>
2000	<p>Normal protocols for consulting CDF prior to appointment to Washington waived.</p>
November 2000	<p>Dominican priest Boniface Ramsey had concerns about McCarrick being appointed AB of Washington, so spoke to and put his concerns in writing to PN Montalvo. He was anxious about retaliatory action. No response received to the letter.</p>
December 2000	<p>McCarrick awarded the Eleanor Roosevelt Human Rights Award by United States President Bill Clinton.</p>
January 2001	<p>An anonymous letter received about McCarrick by PN. He sent that and Fr Ramsay's letter to Secretary of State Cardinal Sodano, who shared all with Pope John Paul II. The response was “<i>Nihil dicens</i>”.</p>
February 2001	<p>Pope John Paul II made McCarrick Cardinal; and JOHN PAUL II personally made the decision to appoint McCarrick to Washington, and he did so after receiving the counsel of several trusted advisors on both sides of the Atlantic.</p>
November 2001	<p>Cardinal Hickey, then Archbishop Emeritus of Washington, received a letter from a Catholic layman relating to allegations of abuse against a bishop. On consultation with PN, Bishop Lori was appointed to meet the layman. Outcome was ‘the allegation described to me was hearsay. It is not based on any first-hand information.’</p>
March 2002	<p>PN received another letter received about abusive behaviour; this referenced a previous letter to PN on same matter but could not be located. PN contact AB of Newark who reported other letters received and stated “they are anonymous with no way for us to trace them,” and stated that he and his staff felt that “no conclusions are warranted on the basis of this information.</p> <p>Same month another letter to AB Myers who shared with PN.</p> <p>No investigation conducted, nor reference to letters being shared with Holy See.</p>

April 2002	<p>McCarrick held a number of portfolios for USCCB.</p> <p>In April 2002 he was involved in developing new policies to address child sexual abuse within the Church, including during the April meeting with Pope John Paul II in Rome, where he emerged as the primary public spokesman for the American bishops.</p>
April 2002	<p>As a result of articles of sexual abuse scandal in <i>Boston Globe</i>, McCarrick asked by Director of Communications in Washington about seminarians sharing his bed. He said that did happen but nothing sexual.</p>
April 2002	<p>McCarrick stated publicly that all allegations should be reported to civil authorities.</p> <p>Advised that he had faced one unfounded allegation 10 years previous.</p> <p>Also said he had never had sexual relations with anyone.</p>
April 2002	<p>A journalist gave Communications Director a list of 7 seminarians who were allegedly abused by McCarrick. McCarrick denied everything.</p> <p>Gibbs conducted some inquiries. The reporter tried to contact the people on the list. Concluded it was a “dead end”.</p> <p>Several other journalists tried to pursue but nothing was forthcoming.</p>
August 2004	<p>In August 2004, Priest 1 petitioned the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith for hierarchical recourse against the decree of his bishop, who had refused to provide him with an assignment in light of the accusation that Priest 1, had sexually abused two minor males in the early 1990s. CDF which included, as a mitigating factor in Priest 1’s favour, a summary of Priest 1’s allegations against McCarrick regarding the two incidents in 1987.</p> <p>Priest 1s petition was denied in Sept 2005.</p>
November 2004	<p>Bishop Wuerl of the Diocese of Pittsburgh provided PN Montalvo with a signed statement from Priest 2. No record of the Curia being informed.</p>
February 2005	<p>Archbishop Myers of Newark informed PN as a result of mediation between Priest 2 and McCarrick; his conclusion was that the behaviour by McCarrick could constitute sexual harassment. He also referenced other documents and perhaps settlements by McCarrick. Myers said that matters might become public but he “prayed” that would not happen. For his part he said “I myself do not plan any further actions in these matters”. Suggested Bishop of Metuchen may have other information. No record of what PN did – curia not informed.</p> <p>Financial settlement reached between diocese and Priest 2.</p>
June 2005	<p>Pope Benedict XVI extended McCarrick’s tenure in Washington by two years. All knowledge known about McCarrick in the Vatican was made known to Pope Benedict XVI.</p>
November 2005	<p>New details relating to Priest 1’s allegations emerged. The Holy See reversed course in late 2005 and urgently sought a successor for the Archbishopric of Washington, requesting that McCarrick “spontaneously” withdraw as Archbishop after Easter 2006.</p>

December 2005	An allegation that McCarrick had shared a bed in the past with Priest 2 was described in an article written by a blogger called Abbott was published on the Internet.
December 2005	<p>Cardinal Re advised McCarrick in Rome of resurfacing of allegations. McCarrick agreed to resign but to avoid scandal asked that the announcement of his successor in Washington happen on same day as his resignation.</p> <p>McCarrick responded to allegations:</p> <p>“(1) unfortunately, it is true that sometimes [McCarrick] invited the one or another seminarian to sleep in his bed at the vacation house,</p> <p>(2) But there has never been a sexual act or anything related to the sexual sphere (i.e. not even incomplete acts).”</p> <p>Report says:</p> <p>‘[McCarrick] understands that he has been imprudent in having acted in this way, which lends itself to leading people to think of that which ... in reality never occurred’.</p>
10 December 2005	Bishop Bootkoski provided reports from Priest 1 and 2 to PN who forwarded these with the Abbot article published on the internet to Cardinal Re.
January 2006	McCarrick wrote to Cardinal Re denying any abuse.
7 th February 2006	Abbott published another brief article online quoting an email he said he had received from a former priest in the Archdiocese of Newark about McCarrick sleeping with seminarians.
March 2006	<p>Archbishop Myers opposed McCarrick having an apartment in Seton Hall - a small on-campus residence complex reserved for priests. The residence was close to, but physically separate from, Immaculate Conception Seminary.</p> <p>McCarrick retired to Redemptoris Mater seminary.</p>
June 2006	President Bush hosts a retirement dinner for McCarrick.
June 2006	Incident report from Priest 1 filed by lawyer to Diocese of Metuchen, included 10 page letter from Priest 1 to Bishop Hughes, dated May 1994.
August 2006	<p>Lawyer met reps from Diocese of Newark and Metuchen to discuss financial settlement for Priest 1.</p> <p>This was relayed to Cardinal Re who advised that McCarrick should not reside at Redemptoris Mater and that he should lead a reserved life of prayer.</p>

2006	<p>Archbishop Viganò sent a memorandum to Superiors referring to the allegations and rumours about McCarrick's misconduct during the 1980s and raised concerns that a scandal could result given that the information had already circulated widely. Noting that the allegations remained unproven (<i>Si vera et probate sunt exposita</i>) and recognizing that only the Pope could judge a cardinal under the canon law, Archbishop Viganò suggested that a canonical process could be opened to determine the truth and, if warranted, to impose an 'exemplary easure.'</p> <p>Archbishop Leonardo Sandri, the Substitute, followed by Secretary of State Cardinal Bertone reviewed Archbishop Viganò's memo and shared it with Cardinal Re.</p> <p>Outcome was that Cardinal Re would write to the PN for a discreet intervention.</p>
January 2007	<p>PN replied to letter regarding residence etc. and advised that he had spoken to McCarrick about his residence and life of prayer. McCarrick told the PN that the allegations were false.</p> <p>PN asked the Rector of the Seminary about McCarrick, who reported that McCarrick was "touchy" but had never done anything "indecent".</p>
January 2007	<p>Secretary of State Cardinal Bertone and Substitute Archbishop Sandri, shared Viganò's concerns and Cardinal Bertone presented the matter directly to Pope Benedict XVI.</p> <p>Ultimately, the path of a canonical process to resolve factual issues and possibly prescribe canonical penalties was not taken. Instead, the decision was made to appeal to McCarrick's conscience and ecclesial spirit by indicating to him that he should maintain a lower profile and minimize travel for the good of the Church. In 2006, Cardinal Re, Prefect of the Congregation for Bishops, instructed PN Sambri to convey these indications orally to McCarrick.</p>
August 2007	<p>\$100,000 paid in settlement to Priest 1 by Diocese of Newark and Metuchen. McCarrick not named in settlement.</p>
August 2007	<p>Pope Benedict XVI selected McCarrick to serve as special papal envoy to the Seventh Symposium of the Religion, Science and the Environment Movement, which was held the following month in Greenland.</p>
2007 - 2008	<p>McCarrick, although retired remained active, travelling overseas and as consultant for USCCB committees. He still was in public ministry.</p> <p>He stayed in an apartment in same complex as Redemptoris Mater seminary.</p> <p>PN aware of McCarrick's travels. Cardinal Re was not.</p>
April 2008	<p>Psychotherapist and former Benedictine monk Richard Sipe published on the Internet an "open letter" to Pope Benedict XVI titled <i>Statement for Pope Benedict XVI About the Pattern of the Sexual Abuse Crisis in the United States</i>.</p> <p>McCarrick's behaviour inviting seminarians to his holiday home was referenced though no actual allegation of abuse.</p>

2008	<p>Archbishop Viganò again shared his concerns.</p> <p>Viganò concluded by saying:</p> <p><i>“For once, it might be healthy if the ecclesiastical authorities were to intervene before the civil authorities and if possible before the scandal erupts in the press.</i></p> <p><i>This would restore a little dignity to a Church so tried and humiliated for so many abominable behaviours on the part of some pastors. In this case, the civil authority would no longer be required to judge an Eminent Cardinal, but a pastor in whose regard the Church had already taken the measures it deemed most opportune.”</i></p> <p>No formal inquiry was initiated.</p> <p>Cardinal Re transmitted the indications to McCarrick in writing.</p> <p>While Cardinal Re’s approach was approved by Pope Benedict XVI, the indications did not carry the Pope’s explicit imprimatur, were not based on a factual finding that McCarrick had actually committed misconduct, and did not include a prohibition on public ministry.</p> <p>A number of factors appear to have played a role in Pope Benedict XVI’s declination to initiate a formal canonical proceeding: there were no credible allegations of child abuse; McCarrick swore on his “oath as a bishop” that the allegations were false; the allegations of misconduct with adults related to events in the 1980s; and there was no indication of any recent misconduct.</p> <p>McCarrick remained in ministry.</p> <p>He continued his overseas work.</p>
May 2008	<p>PN report states:</p> <p>‘Sometime after my arrival in Washington, the Cardinal admitted to me in my office that he had committed imprudent acts, such as inviting a seminarian into his bed in the house by the sea, because there was no bed [for the seminarian]; but, crying, he swore before God, judge of the living and the dead, that he had never committed a homosexual act, either with a minor or with an adult.’</p>
2008-2009	<p>Attempts made to curtail McCarrick’s travel, active engagement in Church and State events.</p> <p>Attempts also made to sort his residence away from Redemptoris Mater.</p>
2009-2011	<p>McCarrick continued to engage in Church and state events and travel overseas (though much reduced).</p>
2011-2013	<p>Archbishop Viganò appointed as PN to USA.</p> <p>He states he initially spoke to McCarrick about the restrictions on his travel – there is no record of this and McCarrick says he did not. McCarrick continues to travel extensively on Church business, have public ministry and engage with political figures, in USA and internationally.</p>
2012	<p>Priest 3, another priest of Metuchen, informed PN Viganò of Priest 3’s lawsuit alleging that overt sexual conduct between him and McCarrick had occurred in 1991.</p>

2012	<p>PN Viganò wrote to Cardinal Ouellet, the new Prefect of the Congregation for Bishops, about an allegation of abuse from Priest 3. Cardinal Ouellet instructed PN Viganò to take certain steps, including an inquiry with specific diocesan officials and Priest 3, to determine if the allegations were credible. PN Viganò did not take these steps and therefore never placed himself in the position to ascertain the credibility of Priest 3. He did telephone Bishop Bootkoski, who informed PN Viganò that Priest 3 was neither credible nor reliable.</p>
2013	<p>McCarrick attended the Conclave to elect a new Pope, though he was ineligible to vote as he was over 80.</p>
March 2013	<p>At the time he was elected in March 2013, Pope Francis had never heard rumours related to McCarrick's past conduct and did not know that McCarrick had previously received indications to change residence, minimize travel or reduce his public profile.</p> <p>The report identifies information known by several Cardinals which was not shared with Pope Francis.</p> <p>PN Viganò states that he spoke twice to Pope Francis about a "thick dossier" on McCarrick. Pope Francis has no recollection of these discussions.</p> <p>There are no written records to confirm that PN Viganò informed Pope Francis.</p>
May 2014	<p>McCarrick continued to travel internationally and work on humanitarian matters.</p> <p>PN Viganò was kept informed of his work by McCarrick.</p> <p>On 5 May 2014, PN Viganò wrote to Cardinal Parolin to express concern about McCarrick's travel, stating that he had repeatedly been given instructions to refrain from making trips and 'not to make public appearances'.</p>
July 2014	<p>Cardinal Parolin, in his own handwritten note on an internal memorandum related to China stated: 'In a forthcoming meeting in Rome I will speak with Cardinal McCarrick about the problems raised by PN Viganò, about whom I was also able to speak with Cardinal Ouellet.'</p> <p>Cardinal Parolin did not speak to Pope Francis about this.</p>
2016	<p>Viganò resigns as PN.</p> <p>He is replaced with Archbishop Pierre.</p>
March 2016	<p>Following receipt of a letter from McCarrick, Cardinal Parolin stated that he mentioned in a brief conversation with Pope Francis that McCarrick was "gossiped about" regarding past imprudent acts with adults and that the Congregation for Bishops had previously indicated to McCarrick that he should lead a more reserved life and not travel so much. Cardinal Parolin recalled that he "did not present it as a matter of grave concern, or as something very serious," but that he asked if anything should be done, noting, "He keeps writing. He continues to travel. He continues to meet people." Cardinal Parolin recollected that, during this exchange, Pope Francis commented that "maybe McCarrick could still do something useful."</p> <p>Cardinal Parolin recalled that Pope Francis was aware that both Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI had known of the old allegations against McCarrick, and that McCarrick had nevertheless remained active during the two prior papacies.</p>

	Both Pope Francis and Cardinal Parolin also understood that the Congregation for Bishops remained the competent dicastery to handle the matter, as it had since 2006. The issue did not come up again between Pope Francis and Cardinal Parolin until the autumn of 2017.
2017	Believing that the allegations had already been reviewed and rejected by Pope John Paul II, and well aware that McCarrick was active during the papacy of Benedict XVI, Pope Francis did not see the need to alter the approach that had been adopted in prior years.
2017	In June 2017, the Archdiocese of New York learned of the first known allegation of sexual abuse by McCarrick of a victim under 18 years of age, which occurred in the early 1970s. They reported the allegation to the law enforcement authority in New York. Shortly after the accusation was deemed credible, Pope Francis requested McCarrick's resignation from the College of Cardinals.
Oct 2017	Pope Francis instructed Cardinal Dolan to initiate a preliminary investigation. This was conducted between late December 2017 through mid-April 2018, with the help of lay investigators. The New York Diocesan Review Board examined the case and conducted further interviews with both the accuser and Cardinal McCarrick and, based on the accumulated evidence, unanimously found the allegations against McCarrick credible and substantiated.
May 2018	Cardinal Dolan informed Cardinal Parolin of his own <i>votum</i> "that, given the gravity of the allegations against Cardinal McCarrick, he be permanently removed from public ministry and placed on a life of prayer and penance."
June 2018	Archbishop Becciu, informed Pope Francis that the allegation against McCarrick involving Minor 1 had been deemed credible.
July 2018	The decision was made public on 20 June 2018. Pope Francis accepted McCarrick's resignation from the College of Cardinals.
December 2018	In light of the facts gathered during the Holy See's preliminary investigation and the study of the documentation gathered from Holy See files, Pope Francis authorized the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith to conduct an administrative penal proceeding in the McCarrick case. Following an administrative penal process by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, McCarrick was found culpable of acts in contravention of the Sixth Commandment of the Decalogue involving both minors and adults, and on that basis was dismissed from the clerical state.
February 2019	McCarrick filed a recourse. On 13 February 2019, the Ordinary Session (Feria IV) of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith considered the recourse presented by McCarrick. The Ordinary Session confirmed the decree of the <i>Congresso</i> , and the Holy Father thereafter recognized the definitive nature of the decision. After information about McCarrick became public a second child victim came forward after which the Holy See actively looked for others who may have been abused by McCarrick.

Conclusion

The Vatican commissioned report into the Holy See's institutional knowledge and decision-making related to former Cardinal Theodore Edgar McCarrick is a shocking read. It not only recounts the sad history of abuse by McCarrick and the impact of the abuse on his victims, but also sets out inaction and negligence by those in the hierarchy in USA and in the Vatican who failed to acknowledge or investigate this abusive behaviour.

It is commendable that Pope Francis commissioned the report and made it public. It is therefore important that the report is read in full by those in a position of authority.

The National Board has sought to draw out some lessons for Ireland:

- The absence of a common Church policy in relation to vulnerable people is an area of concern. The question for the Church authorities in Ireland is whether any Church leaders have ignored or dismissed abusive behaviour towards adults by those in a position of trust.
- Misplaced complacency caused by a view from some within the Church that the worst is over in relation to allegations of abuse by clerics and religious needs to be guarded against.
- Reports of other behaviours towards vulnerable people – Mothers and Baby homes; Forced adoptions; Abuse of seminarians and children of priests - have not (at the time of writing) been strategically addressed by the Church in Ireland.
- The appointment process for high office holders in the Church needs to take into consideration safeguarding issues, including leadership in this important ministry. A more standardised appointments process should be developed which is open and transparent.
- The McCarrick Report graphically underlines that the behaviour and attitude of bishops needs to be discussed with a view to developing clear accountability. For this to happen the bishops in the Irish Episcopal Conference must be fully united in agreement as to how this is to be achieved, having regard to the currently recognised independent authority of each individual bishop.
- The reluctance to genuinely offer care and support to those who come forward with allegations and concerns, has been an issue that the National Board has consistently raised. A renewed "victim centred" approach needs to be considered which accepts that the Church has a duty to both accompany and provide support to those who have been abused. There is no place for any aloofness or lack of concern, no place for the attitude shown by the priest and the Levite in the parable of the Good Samaritan.

Pope Francis in his concluding address at the 'Summit' meeting of the Bishops on the Protection of Minors in the Church (February, 2019), reminded bishops that "the best results and the most effective resolution that we can offer to the victims to the people of the holy mother Church and to the entire world, are the commitments to personal and

collective conversion, the humility of learning, listening, assisting and protecting the most vulnerable’.

The McCarrick Report presents the bishops of the Church with no greater testament of the crucial and urgent need to heed and implement the Pope’s pleas.



THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR
SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN
IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN IRELAND

