THE RESPONSE OF THE CHRISTIAN BROTHERS EXECUTIVE
TO ALLEGATIONS OF SEXUAL ABUSE OF PUPILS
BY MEMBERS OF THE CONGREGATION.

1940 to 1970
CONFIDENTIAL

During the thirty years after 1940 the Christian Brothers Provincial Council (Executive) first in Sydney (until 1953) and later after the division of the Australian Province into two, in Sydney and Melbourne, had to deal with numerous allegations of sexual misconduct by Brothers.

A number of these allegations & offences concerned misconduct of Brothers of a heterosexual nature: adultery, fornication, fondling of the secretary - and so on. These allegations are not considered in detail in this paper.

The key decision-makers on the Brothers executives were I.L. Mackey T.B. Garvey, S.R. Young, S.L. Carroll. Jerome Levander.

Leo Duffy, the Australian Assistant was often involved in decision-making. The two Superiors-General involved were Pius Noonan and E.F. Clanc.

These executives did NOT have to face the following complications during their investigations and decision-making:

(a) media intrusion - no case received any, or any sustained media comment;
(b) legal repercussions - no case, as far as I can see, reached the courts during these thirty years and there were many misconduct situations.

In these two areas, media coverage and court cases, Provincials in the 1950 did not have to worry, though the possibility remained in the back of their minds.

Only towards the end of the period did psychiatrists / psychologists enter the arena for diagnosis and counselling of Brothers with 'Second Vow' problems.

In their correspondences Provincial Councils do not appear to have ever asked themselves why there should be so many cases. 1953 was the peak year for 'Second Vow problems'.

By the late 1960s problems appear to be becoming fewer; my guess is that the large number of Brothers leaving after Vatican II did take out most of those with perceived problems.

Of the Provincial and General Councillors mentioned above, all took the matter of sexual abuse, referred to as "interference" in nearly every case, seriously, though Provincial T.B. Garvey seemed to have shown less urgency than many of his consultants would have wished.

In general, though, if it is ever necessary to prove that Provincial Councils of this era did act with firmness in dealing with situations where Brothers were accused of "interfering" with boys it will be possible to sho
that they did act vigorously in most cases. They did not merely shunt Brothers accused from place to place without thought for the welfare of the boys.

They could act, naturally, only when matters were brought to their attention. In this context, Western Australia and its Boys Homes were a long way away.

These executives did interpret 'interference' (Sexual abuse) as 'direct genital contact'.

Formal Responses: Canonical Warnings: Dismissal.

Many Brothers who were accused of interference and who admitted the charge immediately or after a period of time wanted to leave the Institute. Usually no barrier was placed in the way of their leaving. On the contrary. This was at a time when many Brothers who wished to leave on other grounds were not given dispensations. Some of these Brothers who were not given dispensations, late 40s / early 50s are still doing sterling work today.

Young Brothers, those on annual vows, who were guilty of sexual abuse were in almost every case not permitted to take further vows. Often an early dispensation was arranged for a young Brother against whom a clear case was made out of sexual abuse against a boy.

With Brothers finally professed, especially Brothers finally professed many years, matters were more complicated. When a Jubilarian was found late in life to have offended many times during his mission years, things could be very complicated indeed.

Canonical Warnings.

The formal structure for dealing with a finally Professed Brother who had transgressed publicly on a matter 'connected with the Second Vow' was outlined to Br. T.S. Garvey, the newly-appointed Provincial, St. Patrick's Province, Southern Australia in a letter from the Superior-General, E.F. Clancy, 12 February 1954. The context was the activity of Br. B.X.F. in Perth keeping company with a married woman: Clancy wrote:

I want you to insist upon his transfer from West. Australia. If necessary, place him under Obedience to accept his transfer. If he still refuses, give him a First Canonical Warning. If he persists with his refusal, issue a Second Canonical Warning after the lapse of at least three full days. Allow a further seven days to pass, and then let me know what the position is. In issuing the Canonical Warnings, make sure to observe the following points:
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i) There must be included in each Canonical Warning the formal threat of Dismissal from the Institute if the culprit fails to amend.

ii) Each canonical warning is to be accompanied by a suitable Penance, e.g. by the saying of some prayers that you will decide.

iii) The Canonical Warnings are to be sent to the culprit by Registered Post (or given personally in the presence of two witnesses. This you cannot do.)

You are to keep a copy of each Canonical Warning that you send, together with a copy of the exhortations that you will send with them, urging the culprit to amend. Of course, you will also preserve any correspondence that may happen to come to you from Br. B.X.F.

If it should happen that there is a danger of grave external scandal, or of serious imminent injury to the community, you are to dismiss him immediately yourself, with the consent of your Council, as set out in Constitution 222.

Policy: Interfering with Boys.

Assistant, Marino to Garvey, 15 October 1959. In your last letter dealt with by me you referred to the matter of those accused of interfering with boys in the West, (Brother Alonzo; Salvius; Laurian). Although it is perhaps out of my province to be writing to you at all about this matter, still I am taking the liberty of asking you to ensure that the most careful investigation is made concerning these charges. I know that the Br. Third (Jerome) is in the West in these times, I have written to him, telling him of my feeling about this sorry business, and suggesting that he should try his best to get to the truth. To my mind, where evidence of serious misconduct is sustained, a Canonical Warning does not always meet the situation, and I think that the question of dismissal should at least be considered. The weakness is a deplorable one and scandalous in the extreme. The ever-present possibility of publicity being given to the incidents gives abundant cause for the most serious concern. In one or two of the cases (Brothers Alonzo and Salvius) mentioned, it seems to me, if my memory serves me correctly, that similar charges were preferred on some former occasion. Jerome...should satisfy himself of the true state of affairs. If you feel that there is reason to refer the cases, or any of them, to the General, it would be good to do so without delay. I find it difficult to accept the claim of the young Brother that he did not realise that his conduct in Clontarf was very dangerous, and very unseemly. His very instincts (Laurian) would surely warn him. In any case it would seem that he has a most dangerous weakness, to say the least.

The Publicity Issue.

(Kennedy, J.S. to Lacey, J.P. (Waverley), 12 August 1948.) Providence has been very good to us in saving us from publicity in complaints of this type. We have much to be grateful for under that head even though the recurrence of such complaints is a source of constant worry to Superiors.
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This case has been considered carefully with a view to avoiding any divulging of information or charges and at the same time to act as prudently as possible keeping in mind the welfare of the Congregation and the feelings of the individual.

Sexual Abuse: Repeat Offenders.

Councils were aware that abuse cases were likely to recur even where 'in both cases there was hope that rehabilitation had taken place.' 'Generally the dog returns to his vomit especially where the Second Vow is concerned.' (S.R. Young to Nooman, P. 1 December 1948.)

Handover Problems.

Sickness, death and defection have made it extremely difficult for us to keep reasonable staffs in some communities.

Mackey to Nooman, 25 April 1949.

Harm to the Boys.

(Clancy to Garvey, 6 May 1954) I am glad that you have had Brother M. O. Q.'s attention directed to the matter concerned. You will find that that particular weakness is difficult to root out. It is remarkable how it tends to break out time after time. It should be a real help to Brother that he has been exhorted to keep the closest watch possible over himself. One of the greatest troubles with the weakness is the harm that it does to the boys. Boys seem to find it hard to forget anything of that nature, especially on the part of one whose office it is to deplore such conduct, and there is the danger that the same weakness may manifest itself in the boys when they are later placed in somewhat the same circumstances. I believe, also, that Brother M.Q. is a very good Brother, and we must pray that Almighty God, through the intercession of His Immaculate Mother, will protect him in the future.....It would probably be a help for him to be out of office.

(Clancy to Young, 9 November 1953). What experiences we have had with regard to collapse in the matter of the second Vow: Now you have the case of an old man. I'm not of your opinion with regard to Brother M.P., unless his lapse was something short of interference. For anyone with the tendency there is always the danger of further outbreak, and we are bound to protect both the boys and the good name of the Institute. It could well mean that a boy who has been the victim of such a weakness on the part of his teacher would become a moral collapse, and be in serious danger of losing his soul. God has been extraordinarily good in protecting us from scandal in the past. I feel that we are bound to do all that we can to remove every possible danger of any recurrence of this sad weakness. So for my part, I would not accept for renovation of Vows, any Brother of Temporary Profession who shows that he is afflicted with the weakness.

(Clancy to Garvey, 30 June 1959). I am sorry you have had trouble with Brother B.S. (Castledare Boys Home). Unfortunately that sort of trouble never seems to be very far away. And it does so much dreadful harm - especially to the boys concerned, and to others who may hear of it. Please God we will be preserved from the scourge in the future. I am glad that you have given the Canonical Warning to Brother B.S. I believe that there
is no other course to follow but to impress upon transgressors the seriousness of the fault and the scandal that accompanies it.

SEXUAL ABUSE: EXECUTIVE RESPONSE: VARIA.


'Plainly he is unsafe and should be released. His letter is an effort to make me believe that he is more sinned against than sinning...'

(Sydney) Young to Noonan, 28 October 1946.

'I can speak only for our own province when I say that the happenings during the past six years or so show how much we have slipped. The number of shameful betrayals of trust with reference to boys is very saddening and unfortunately they appear to be on the increase. God grant it may be the darkest patch before the dawn!'

(Lewisham). Young to Clancy, 28 September 1953.

'Baptist Healy is the Superior and he has a most difficult community...Now there is the terrible question of interference with boys; the third case inside a decade in that community. I am having a young man up to answer charges tonight.' (M.P.K.)

Noonan to Mackey, 10 March 1948.

'This ugly case...you did well to give him leave of absence.'

Noonan to Lacey, 2 August 1948.

(Waverley) 'He is unsafe and should be released.'

(V.P.K.) Mackey to Noonan, 24 November 1948.

'It appears definite that he should never be allowed near a schoolroom again. I think he will agree to apply for his dispensation...'


'Last year we allowed him to make his fourth Annual Vows. Now he has made a frank admission of very serious misdemeanours with three boys at Middle Park...recommend an immediate application for dispensation from vows...Pending the arrival of the dispensation he has been given leave of absence to forestall possible consequences of a compromising kind.'

(T.O.S.) Mackey to Noonan, 31 August 1945.

'Whatever your decision, he must never be allowed back to active work.'
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(T.C.S.) Mc Carthy, W. X. to Mackey, 14 September 1945

'He must be kept out of any danger of relapse and never in contact with the young. But try to find him work... plenty of work... manual work.'

(Strathfield) Young to Clancy, 9 November 1953

'Now to cap all, seven of the eight Coadjutors here in Strathfield have been engaging in the filthiest of talk and poking fun at Fr. Johnston's plain talks on the Second Vow. The poor Superior is just prostrate. He has asked me to take the matter up and I will have to do that today. It will mean that unless the reports are entirely exaggerated an emptying out of these men no matter what the cost.'

Young to Clancy, 9 November 1953

'A few days ago the O.F.M. Chaplain at Waverley College called the Superior and told him that X would have to be changed at once - second offence this year. He went to Chatswood this morning.'

Clancy to Young, 24 November 1953

'... there is so much evil in the world that we must not be surprised to find it coming to the surface even in our very midst.'

Young to Duffy, 24 November 1953

'Brother N. has admitted his guilt in the single case referred to in Yeppoon... I have administered a severe censure to Brother N. with a threat of future expulsion should any further trouble of the like occur.'

'Brother K. has denied categorically all the accusations against him. I told him that he had the option to come before the Council and defend himself. He has elected to do just that.'

Doyle, S.B. to Clancy, 14 May 1959

'I heard that there was a case of interfering with boys by Br. B.S. at Castledare. I asked the Provincial about it. He said he was examining the matter. I have a kind of feeling that he does not get down with sufficient energy to business of this nature.'

Brother B.S. was accused of interfering with boys at Castledare, (touching their private parts and inviting them to touch his private parts). We investigated the matter. He admits the former charge, but denies the latter. He has been written to and the seriousness of the matter pointed out. He seems very repentant, saddened and naturally upset about the whole business. We have changed him to Moonee Ponds and I will send him a Canonical Warning. He has been in very poor health, with blood pressure and kidney trouble, and says that the drugs he has had to take have had a bad effect on him.

Young to Duffy, 2 November 1953

(Yeppoon; A.Y.D.) S.R. Young to Leo Duffy, 2 November 1953

'I had a letter today from Brother admitting the trouble in Yeppoon and most humbly acknowledging the fact that he had on two occasions - Yeppoon and Sydney - proved false to his obligations and compromised the Order. He said the only reason why he had not asked for a Dispensation was the conviction
that after he had failed in one solemn obligation he would not mend matters by being false to another vow. What should be done in this case? The lapse was prior to that for which he received a Canonical warning in Sydney. It probably goes back to 1942.

Pressure for Brothers.

In spite of these problems, each one known only to a few people, the demand from Bishops, priests and Catholic people for more Brothers and more openings was insatiable.

Doyle to Garvey, 14 August 1963.

'I am sorry you are losing this man when there is such a demand for Brothers on all sides...'

Doyle to Garvey, 29 August 1963.

'We have had calls from several Bishops in the past weeks all asking for foundations.'

Institution Boys becoming Brothers.

By the mid-1950s, if not before, there was a sense among some Provincial Councillors that Brothers who had been 'orphans' were rather more likely to be involved in sexual abuse allegations than other Brothers.

Executives were aware that the basic reason for this might be the lack of ordinary secure family background which the orphans might have experienced. This was especially so in those Brothers who had been child migrants.

I now have to propose two other reasons why orphans, especially child migrants might have been involved in sexual abuse allegations rather more often than their numbers suggested:

* They may have been much more likely to have been sexually abused themselves in the Boys Home, and children abused are much more likely to become abusers than children not abused.

* In many of the Boys Homes (the reality did wax and wane) there was a pervasive undercurrent of boy-on-boy sexual groping. In Hindoo, 1944-6 Consultor J.F. Doyle believed that up to 3/4 of the boys were involved in this though some were worse than others and in one letter he names them!


I enclose the Decree of dismissal for Br. P.X.O'F. You will have had the decision of the General Council by telegram already. We were sorry that such a step was necessary but one of his disposition was evidently not suited for our life. We had nothing further from you on the Morris case and so have not moved.

Garvey to Duffy, 17 January 1965.

'P.X.O'F. is a mystery man. He admitted to me that he was doing the wrong thing with boys. How he can regard himself as innocent I am at a loss to
know. We fitted him out with clothes, gave him his ticket to Clontarf in Western Australia and £10 pocket money. He was warned not to apply for a teaching job. The rest you know.

In 1956 the new Novitiate opened at Lower Plenty (Victoria). Clancy to Garvey, 25 March 1956.

'To insure good material for Houses of Formation great care is to be exercised in the selection of those who ask to be admitted to the Institute. To decide who has a vocation and who not, is beyond our human power. Yet there are some things which seem to hold in the whole matter of vocations, that are essential to all. They may be summed up briefly in a few headings:

1) the boy should have a really good reputation in his school and be recommended by his teachers honestly before God;

2) he must have normal intelligence and some disposition for study;

3) his family background must be above reproach. This is really a more important point than is sometimes considered. The boy who comes from a family of modest means may be excellent but it is the moral life of the family life that is to be studied. For this reason we need to be extra careful when boys from our orphanages present themselves for admission. I do not say that they should not be admitted, but they should be very carefully screened before being admitted to trial and during that period to give them special attention so as to know their intentions and dispositions. Past experience has shown how we must put first the interests of the Institute and in cases of doubt give the benefit of the doubt to the Institute rather than to the individual.

4) That aspirants have good health and that the family record in that matter be looked into. A serious medical examination should be required for all. Appearances of boys are not always reliable in the matter of health. It is necessary in our inquiries as to hereditary ills like insanity, T.B. or epileptic fits to be careful as families do not wish to make such known. Any indication to unusual traits in character or odd ways of acting are all signs of unsuitability for common life. Eyesight and hearing should be examined.


'I am so glad that Br. A. Nelson has become such a devoted Novice Master. He did not have any great training for the job. The news of the community which is all non-teaching Brothers is very good. The one exception in the bunch is N.I. and it bears out my remarks sent to you all regarding the admission of past pupils from orphanages to the Institute. The whole experience of the past shows that it is only the exceptional one who gives the satisfaction that we require. Other institutions - men and women - have had the same experience. I read recently in one of these books, treating of the science of vocations, that those who better their social positions by joining an Order or Institute, are very often the most difficult subjects for superiors to handle.
The Brothers accused maliciously: Celsus Walsh.

Mackey to Noonan, 3 December 1949.

Celsus Walsh is Superior of South Melbourne orphanage and has done great work cleaning up immorality which seems to be a blight on such establishments. He is somewhat strict and perhaps too great a contrast to his predecessor. He was recently summoned before the Vicer-General, Monsignor Fox and the Vice-Chancellor, Father Killeen, a former lawyer, to answer charges of immorality made against him by former inmates, who had either absconded or been sent away as incorrigible. Br. Celsus gave an emphatic denial and was directed to appear at Royal Bark for an investigation. The Fourth accompanied him, and the enquiry lasted about four hours. Most of the questioning was done by Father Killeen, with the help of the Fourth. The absconders and about ten others were examined, and the conclusion was that the whole thing was a mess of lies and contradictions; that Brother Celsus was innocent, and that he had been guilty of indiscretion inasmuch as he sometimes put his hand on the knee or leg of a boy as he sat next to him in the playground.

The next day the Fourth got the official verdict from Dr. Mannix, (Archbishop of Melbourne), a rather strange verdict. He was exonerated, but, to avoid embarrassment, was to be changed after Christmas. This seems a grave injustice to Br. Celsus, in whom the Council has complete confidence. However, I am sure he would not care to remain in Victoria now. It is rather sad to know that he has had endless trouble with the chaplain, and has been unable to get any satisfaction.

Mackey to Br. Assistant, 15 March 1950.

Br. C. Walsh. Monsignor Fox wired from Tasmania where he was holidaying that the Chief Secretary was enquiring the date of the transfer at South Melbourne. I replied that we were unanimously of the opinion that justice demanded that there would be no transfer. The verdict of Monsignor Fox at the enquiry was 'completely exonerated'. The Third and the Fourth took the matter up in Melbourne with Monsignor Fox who interviewed the Chief Secretary and everything was arranged satisfactorily. We dare not let Br. Celsus know what has been going on as he is already very broken up. The whole position is most ironical as he has done a tremendous lot to clean up the place, making himself a martyr to duty. Our opinion is that he has fallen foul of somebody at Royal Park - you know his abrupt and forthright manner - and they were determined to get him. You can hardly imagine how changed poor Celsus is, and we are all convinced that he is absolutely innocent.

The Brother Vaguely Accused: Enuncendo.

L.W. worked in the West Australian Boys Homes during the 40s and 50s and has been 'mentioned in despatches' during my study of the history of the Boys Homes but nothing clear as to what he actually did (wrong) has been mentioned - after 15 months of investigation.

I find in the following correspondence that he was 'under a cloud' for years with higher Superiors, but again no-one would say what he had actually done. He is now a married man with 3 children; left c. 1975.
LAMBERT WISE.
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I notice that Brother Lambert Wise is a member of the teaching staff at Rostrevor - a Boarding college. Perhaps you do not know that there was some reason in the past to believe that contact with boys constituted a danger to him. If the weakness really was there, it is the kind of thing, unfortunately, that does not die easily, but has the habit of reasserting itself unexpectedly...I have good reason to know what unfortunate happenings have occurred in the past with others. (Clancy to Garvey, 27 August 1957.)

Box 217 File 2434 Correspondence, St. Patrick's Province, (Australia).

I think you would be well-advised to let Brother P.L. O'D. know during the next Annual Visitation, of the desirability of keeping Brother L.W. away from all supervision of the boys except perhaps when they are in the field. His relations with boys have given rise for concern before, and, for everybody's sake, the greatest care should be taken to protect both him and the boys.

(Duffy to Carroll, 7 January 1954).

LEWIS LEVANDER.

(Mackey to Clancy, 3 March 1950) 'His is one of those cases where a man has given the best years of his life to the Congregation and has his interests only in the Congregation and its welfare, but evidently finds it hard or impossible to conquer weakness. I feel that this is a case you must decide.'

(Mackey to Clancy, 7 March 1950) Last Sunday I met him at Castle Hill and recommended him to send on to you by air a letter he had submitted to me. I have no doubt that he wishes to remain in the Congregation. It seems definite he has a weakness in dealing with the boys and it is difficult to say if such a weakness would show itself again if it was given a chance. At the moment there seems to be nothing that would justify his dismissal without preferring any charge or giving any opportunity for defence. Personally, I would be in favour of giving him a further chance to prove himself, though it would be necessary to investigate any charge Father O'Flynn might decide to make against him. I have not thought it wise to go near Father as I think he has handled the matter incorrectly and unwisely.

(Mackey to Clancy, 27 March 1950. ) 'I interviewed Br. L.L. last Friday with little success. He does not seem prepared to talk. I told him I would have to see Father O'Flynn if he was not willing to give the required information, but I told him I would wait for a few days.'
Clancy to Mackey, 31 March 1950. 'As to the Levander case I shall await hearing from you after you have been able to interview him and so send me some definite charge in the matter.

M.O.Q.

Box 217. File 2434 Correspondence, St Patrick's Province.

(Duffy to Garvey, 6 May 1954.) 'I am glad that you have had Brother Q's attention directed to the matter mentioned. You will find that that particular weakness is difficult to root out. It is remarkable that it tends to break out time after time...One of the greatest troubles with the weakness is the harm that it does to the boys. Boys seem to find it hard to forget anything of this nature, especially on the part of one whose office it is to deplore such conduct, and there is the danger that the same weakness may manifest itself in the boys when they are later placed in somewhat the same circumstances. I believe also that Brother M.O.Q. is a very good Brother... It would probably be a help for him to be out of office.'

Box 217. File 2433 Correspondence, St. Patrick's Province, (Australia)

(Duffy, P.L. to Garvey, T.B. 22/10/1953.) 'Br. M. O.Q. During Visitation I was told that Brother, during his period at Parade, was careless with regard to his relations with the boys, and that during physical culture exercises, he, on some occasions, put his hands on the private parts of one or more of the boys, during balancing exercises, for example...if... he will need a pretty straight talk. If he has gone astray in the matter in Launceston, you will need to have to consider transferring him. I have good reason to believe that it happened (before at Parade) and that kind of weakness does not die easily.

(Duffy to Garvey, 28 October 1953) There is an important matter that I want you to give your attention to. It concerns the Superior of Launceston. When I was in Australia on the Visitation, I was told that Brother, during his period at Parade, was careless with regard to his relations with boys, and that during physical culture exercises, he, on some occasions, put his hands on the private parts of one or more of the boys, during balancing exercises. This came to me from a boys who was concerned, but it came in an indefinite sort of way, and only after I had left Tasmania and finished the Visitation there. If I went back especially to Launceston, or if I called Brother over to Melbourne, it would have given
rise to undesirable comment. It is not the sort of thing I would like to write down. Now I read from the Second Consultant's Report, which I want you to read again, that Brother is upset. The Consultant attributed this to trouble with a difficult Parish Priest (Dean Upton). That may be the correct diagnosis, but Brother may be troubled in the other matter also. I would like you to make it your business to meet Brother, and assure yourself that there is no irregularity about the matter that I have raised. You can tell him that the matter has been brought under notice that he was careless in the past in this matter, and ask him what truth there is in the matter. You can approach the question with all kindness and let him see that you want to help him. If he is still being troubled in the same way, he will need a pretty straight talk. If he has gone astray in the matter in Launceston, you will have to consider transferring him. If you want further observations about this from me you can write to me, but I think that you ought not to postpone too long straightening out the question. Maybe the incident at Parade was a passing phase. I have good reason to believe that it happened and that kind of weakness does not die easily.

(Clancy to Brother Consultant, 7 January 1954) 'The question does not lend itself to treatment by letter.'

(Garvey to Duffy, 28 April 1954) 'Shortly after my return I received word from the Provincial of the North that a boy in the Juniorate had repeated what you had already mentioned after hearing a talk on purity by Brother Borgia. We discussed it in Council and I decided to send Brother Second over to interview Brother M.O.Q. The consultor had a good 'cloak' for the visit. The Archbishop had purchased some 15 acres of land near Ulverston which he is hoping some day to use for an Agricultural school under the Brothers. The Second went to Ulverstone direct. Brother M admitted indiscretions at Parade and said that he had asked for a change repeatedly on account of his weakness but without success. Brother received good advice and the Brother Consultant thinks that owing to his good religious spirit things should be all right. He seems to be doing very well in Launceston. Probably he will resign at the end of the year. If so I feel sure that the Council will accept it. The boy who reported to Brother Borgia was an Old Paradian, who had been at work for three years or so before going on to the Juniorate...

A.D.D. (TASMANIA).

(Doyle, E.B. to Clancy, E.F., 14 May 1959.) 'This is not the first time that a charge of this nature has been brought against Brother 'Pafnutius'. Brother Provincial said he would issue a C.W. to Brother if you sent out instructions to that effect. He seems to take the matter rather leniently— he says that there is no case proved against
the Brother. Personally I would have him get a Canonical Warning for his 'indiscretion' and to show him that we take a very serious view of the matter.

(Garvey to Clancy, 13 April 1959) 'We have had trouble in Tasmania. Brother A.D.D. was reported to the Parish Priest for fondling a girl aged 10. The Superior requested that he see the parents and explain. The Parish Priest thought this unwise as he said that the father was enraged and was threatening to report the matter to the police. Brother wrote to me and I advised him to come to St. Kilda immediately. On his arrival he declared his innocence of anything serious and said his conscience was quite clear of anything wrong. He also requested that he be changed. Brother P. Hurley of Wakefield St. Adelaide was suffering from a nervous breakdown, so 'Pafnutius' fitted in there. The Brother First about this time went postulating to Tasmania. Reports that he brought back indicated that there were other cases in which Brother accused had been extremely foolish. He has been written to but still claims innocence of anything serious. He is being warned of the seriousness of fondling children, and how he could damage the Church and the Congregation by such foolishness.

Brother Bertrand Crennan.

(Duffy, P.L. to Clancy, E.F. 12 April 1953.) 'I was summoned urgently by the Archbishop on Good Friday, and I have been here investigating a charge of interference laid against Br. Bertrand Crennan. I am certain that there is not the slightest truth in the charge, and hope to bring matters to a successful conclusion within a day or two. You need have no apprehensions about him. I am certain that there is no need to worry. The story is a long and involved one and I will send you a report when the whole business is finished.

(Duffy, P.L. to Clancy, E.F. 1 May 1953.) 'Brother Bertrand's position is lamentable. His appointment has been publicised in the Melbourne Catholic press and has been announced in the College Annual Magazine. He has received many congratulatory messages from various parts of Australia. His brother is Monsignor Crennan. He has been Superior in Melbourne for 20 years, and so is very well-known and respected, there. Apparently this is the first time in which his reputation has been questioned. Now in the midst of all the publicity that the formation of the two Provinces is receiving from both the Brothers and from seculars, he has had to withdraw from the Council to which he was appointed as a Consultor. The effect upon himself is very hard to realise, but it must be bitter in the extreme. It is true that he was imprudent, but his imprudence has been highlighted by a group of bad boys – two of them are confessed fornicators – and the parents of one of them. As I told you I interviewed these two parents in what was the most wretched experience of my life and they proved...
themselves to be utterly unreliable and unreasonable. The whole trouble has been the dislike which these boys have entertained towards Brother Bertrand. If they had liked him the matter would never have been mentioned, I believed. And he has a wretched manner, and has been altogether unreasonable in his dealings with the Brothers of his community as I pointed out in the Visitation reports on the St. Kilda community about the middle of last year.

He is an obstinate, wooden man, but a good man, and nobody regrets more than himself the imprudence of which he has been guilty. I think that it is better that he should not be a Consultor, and in so far as his imprudence has led to his removal from that responsible position, some good has come of it. But I believe that it is really due to him to lighten his cross as far as it can be done.

******************************************************************************

V.K.F.
(Mackey to Noonan, 3 June 1946.) 'Brother V.K.F. was in serious trouble again, interfering with a boy at Lewisham. In 1941 he was in similar trouble, and I think, actually had his dispensation, but refused to accept it. He was to make up his mind at Retreat about applying for a dispensation, but I have not yet heard from him. He says that when he was in trouble before he made as strong a resolution as possible to avoid trouble, but still lapsed. He thinks and I am inclined to agree that the probability is against him. In many ways he is excellent - efficient, hard-working, loyal, and apart from this a fine man - but he does seem a self-satisfied type. He and Brother X are regular to all appearance and the Brothers generally know nothing of any troubles they may have - hence the greater danger of scandal.

(Mackey to Noonan, 1 February 1949.) 'A good man in many respects, but incorrigibly and dangerously weak. He was given leave of absence to enable him to commence work at the beginning of February.'

******************************************************************************

Brother (Victoria).

(Levander, F.J. to Clancy, E.F., 13 December 1965.)

"I still do not recommend Brother (Victoria) for Final Vows. The risk is too great. We have from S.C. on our hands AT THE moment and are to see him tomorrow. Failings of
of this kind leave a scar on the memory and there is always the danger of circumstances arising that tempt the individual to repeat the act. Our friend, S.C. has quite a campaign of sodomy to his credit. The fear of scandal does not seem to worry these people with such tendencies.

(Garvey to Clancy, 29 August 1963) 'We have at least four psychiatric cases on our hands at the moment.'

(Levander to Clancy, 14 December 1961) '...we have had to wait on a psychiatrist’s report for Br. P.H. He left the novitiate and returned and is now about to go into the schools. He has a Second Vow problem and could be a menace with youngsters.'

Brother T.S.

(Mackey to Noonan, 31 August 1945). 'He was prepared to nothing except in vague terms - "I can’t remember anything like that happening;" "I can’t remember being in the room with him." "Perhaps somebody has been putting it into his head." "Perhaps he is getting scrupulous." He later admitted one incident, putting the little guilt admitted on the other. There was no doubt in our minds of the guilt and a unanimous verdict was given against him. He has had two previous warnings. Extenuating circumstances are: age, lapse of time since the occurrences - about five years - during which no similar incident has come to our notice; mental weakness; the shock to his brother; his general helplessness. Whatever your decision, he must never be allowed back to active work, and in any case we shall probably have to support him at least in part.

Mc Carthy, W.M. to Mackey, 14 September 1945.) 'His is a really bad case. I do not see how you could have come to any other decision regarding him. He merits the most severe penalty but as you say there are circumstances which make one hesitate from passing sentence. He must be got out of any danger of relapse and never be in contact with the young. You must try to find him work, plenty of work;...even weeding the garden. He must not be idle and he must be made feel that he has to atone for his offences.

RANDOM CASES.

(Young, S.R. to Clancy, 1 May 1953) 'Yesterday a letter from......says that E.B. must be changed out of.........on his Confessor's advice.'
Mackey to Noonan, 7 February 1949) M.M. 'I am applying a dispensation. The whole matter is that I have got into trouble with one of the other sex whom I must marry.'

(Mackey to Noonan, 17 December 1948.) G.N. 'G.N. was rejected for vows...His was a very bad case and he had to be sent at short notice to Albury from MM on November 24 pending instructions from me. He was given leave of absence and sent to his home on 29 November...We have not yet discussed dismissal for him, which he so richly deserved.

Osmund Robinson.

(Garvey to Clancy, 24 September 1963). 'His dispensation the Sacred Congregation of Religious will make no difficulties about its concession. His own statement of case was not necessary and it was the kind of thing that does us no good giving details.'

St. Kilda Community.

(Duffy to Noonan, 24 August 1952.) 'You will be receiving word of application for dispensation from a member of this Community. His story to me was the most distressing that I have yet heard. There is, of course, nothing to be done except to get his dispensation. Briefly, he is guilty of adultery on several occasions with a Catholic woman, one of the workers on a Committee in a Sydney suburb and he has been carrying the problem around with him for twelve months. He was changed here for 'reasons of conscience', but I am certain that the poor Provincial had no idea when he was changing him what the nature of his conscience trouble was.

E.D.

(Mackey to Clancy, 1 September 1952) 'I have been advised by two Spiritual Directors - Brother writes - to ask you to obtain a Dispensation from my vows for me. Just before Christmas last year I had sexual intercourse several times with a married woman in Sydney and cannot now settle down to the Religious life or teaching. If possible I would prefer not to have to teach next term but shall most willingly carry on until you can arrange otherwise.

E.D.

Young to Clancy, 4 August 1952. 'We have a big problem on our hands at the present time. C.A. - who gets along well with the Bishop is under a cloud for 'interference' in school. There have been previous clouds of a like-nature. He is in hospital with 'fits' and will be discharged in a day or two.'
(Duffy to Clancy, 6 August 1952) 'I do not know if you have heard that C.A. has been charged with interfering with boys. The Second tells me that this is the third or fourth occasion on which similar complaints have been made against him.'

(Young to Clancy, 5 January 1953) 'I thought my troubles might end with 1953 but on the very last day of the Old Year, the morning mail brought in an S-marked letter from X stating that the Administrator has asked that Y be transferred outside the diocese and that 'his strange philosophy of approach to the boys' be kept under close check. I have written to the Administrator for something more specific. Poor Rockhampton again!'

(Young to Duffy, 24 November 1953). 'The Fourth Consultor has been called in the first instance of the present case by Father K. who was insistent that Brother A. should be changed. A boy had gone to him outside Confession to say that A. had examined his hernia wound and the swollen testicles, handling the latter. A. denied all this except that he had examined the wound at the request of the boy. When the Fourth questioned the boy - a second year lad of dull mentality - the boy was very hesitant about the whole thing and would not write down anything. In the light of all this the benefit of the doubt was given to Br. A. with a reprimand for his indiscretion.

***********************************************

Cases by Places.

These add a little to the preceding outline of evidence and comment.

Lewisham.

(Young to Clancy, 23 September 1953) '...and now there is the terrible question of interferences with boys, the third case inside a decade in that community.'

Young to Clancy, 29 September 1953.
'I had to change a young man from Lewisham over the weekend. "Interference with boys", principally in a less-serious form but two or three cases of indecent touching momentarily. I would like to have your opinion about his plea for consideration - I had two long talks with him - at Scrutiny. I have my own beliefs about this trouble as a disease, but when his case comes up before a new Council I would like to know whether the Sacred Congregation would countenance a further trial for such a one.'
(Young to Clancy, 8 October 1953). 'X had to be changed from Lewisham to Waverley because of "interference". He is a sad case, appears to be good but with that terrible weakness and most anxious not to be sent away. Z from the Novitiate goes in a day or two - similar trouble, I understand. Then P. will have to be paid off too at the end of the year.

Castle Hill: School for the Deaf.

(Young to Clancy, 5 March 1953). 'There have been a couple of nasty spots of trouble at Castle Hill recently. The young man - "Pambo" - had to be removed last week to Wollongong because of "interference" involving quite a number of the deaf mutes. Last week he and the Superior had a long conference with me dealing with another more serious revelation, but, thank God, one in which no Brother is implicated. A well-known Parramatta Holy Name man who has been deemed a great friend of St. Gabriel's and who knows the sign language as well as any Brother, has had serious accusations made against him by two of the senior boys. It will require careful handling. The trouble took place in the main last year.

Nudgee Junior, Indooroopilly.

(Young to Clancy, 23 September 1953). 'This morning's mail brought in news of immorality and bad language of the most objectionable kind in Nudgee Junior dormitory. Is it any wonder with the record there over the past couple of years.

(Young to Clancy, 29 September 1953). 'Indooroopilly was really in a worse condition than any of us imagined. Recently I had another disturbing report from there about language and immorality among the boys. I asked the Consultor to pay the place a visit. Brother Z should have been changed last Christmas. He certainly will be this Xmas. The big trouble is to get an asylum for all the misfits we have.

Charters Towers.

(Young to Clancy, 23 October 1953). 'Our latest problem is a serious one concerning alleged immoral happenings over some years. The man charged is a Golden Jubilarian - now at Charters Towers. I am in the middle of an investigation but already things are looking bad for him. It is so sad. Should there be anything wrong since his advent to the Towers and should it become known I just don't know how we could face the Bishop after the already besmirched history of Charters Towers.
(Young to Clancy, 31 October 1953.) 'Our latest trouble is one of 'interference' and coming not from a young man but from a Jubilarian – A.C. It came out through a letter to Justus from ex-M.S. The latter mentioned specific cases in Mackay. Investigation proved that what he stated was true and in the course of inquiries another case came to light in Yeppoon. He has already got a C.W. for a happening in St. Mary's Sydney. I have written to him but not yet to A. who is confined to his bed in Charters Towers. Brother X has applied for Voils, but I feel sure he will not get thro'. M.P. is one who, in spite of his lapse, I would be inclined to give a chance to.

(Young to Clancy, 9 November 1953) 'In making inquiries about A.C. at Yeppoon I accidentally came across trouble in which Y figured. He has admitted it.

**SUMMARY.**

Most of the findings of this investigation are satisfactory; though I have organised material almost entirely around primary source quotations, and allow these to speak for themselves. They may SAY different things to different readers.

Provincial Councils took sexual abuse allegations seriously; did investigate and did realise the harm that abuse could do to the boys.

They did not have the spur to action that a court case would have provided (not that they needed court cases!) nor did they face the blare of publicity. These were risks but the risks did not eventuate.

They were hampered by the contemporary parameters which provided few apostolate (missions) outside the classroom for 'teaching Brothers'.

They cannot reasonably be criticised for not providing counselling for victims of abuse since professional counselling is a more recent panacea, and would not have occurred to them. There was no clear idea of the long-term harm that sexual abuse might do to a victim.

Since there was no clear written-down, comprehensively formulated policy towards these cases, there was a tendency to let personalities interfere; by this I mean that sometimes apparently like cases were not dealt with in a like way. There was inconsistency. One (normally young) Brother could be dismissed on the slightest whiff of trouble, while another (more often professed) Brother could be shifted around before the on-going problem was confronted. The human muddle was too apparent at times. But most often effective action was taken to deal with accusations; and repeat offenders were removed from occasions of re-offending.

On balance, 'we' (the Brothers) come out of the investigation fairly well.